



Comprehension of verb number morphemes in Czech children: singular and plural show different relations to age and vocabulary

| | |
|------------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>First Language</i> |
| Manuscript ID | FLA-15-0059.R1 |
| Manuscript Type: | Original Manuscript |
| Keywords: | morphology, grammatical number, comprehension, grammatical agreement, picture-pointing task |
| Abstract: | Two experiments examined Czech children’s comprehension of grammatical number marking in verbs. Children were presented with picture pairs involving one or multiple participants in the same action, and were asked to point the picture described by a recorded sentence. Experiment 1 (N=72, age 3;0 to 4;7) tested four types of sentences, some of which marked the number of participants on the verb only. There was a marked increase in comprehension scores with age and receptive vocabulary scores in singular, but not in plural sentences. This pattern was present regardless of how number was marked. Experiment 2 (N=45, age 3;4 to 4;9) replicated the key findings of Experiment 1. The results suggest that comprehension of morphological number markers remains difficult even when children routinely produce such markers. However, when compared with results from other languages and experimental paradigms, it appears that the effect is due mainly to children’s comprehension of the task and not limitations in their grammatical knowledge. |

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Abstract

Two experiments examined Czech children's comprehension of grammatical number marking in verbs. Children were presented with picture pairs involving one or multiple participants in the same action, and were asked to point the picture described by a recorded sentence.

Experiment 1 (N=72, age 3;0 to 4;7) tested four types of sentences, some of which marked the number of participants on the verb only. There was a marked increase in comprehension scores with age and receptive vocabulary scores in singular, but not in plural sentences. This pattern was present regardless of how number was marked. Experiment 2 (N=45, age 3;4 to 4;9) replicated the key findings of Experiment 1. The results suggest that comprehension of morphological number markers remains difficult even when children routinely produce such markers. However, when compared with results from other languages and experimental paradigms, it appears that the effect is due mainly to children's comprehension of the task and not limitations in their grammatical knowledge.

1
2
3
4
5 The category of number is present in most, if not all languages of the world. It encodes
6
7 whether a linguistic expression refers to one or more referents, and it is used primarily with
8
9 nouns, e. g. *car* vs. *cars*. In addition to that, many languages possess various agreement
10
11 morphemes that mark number information on elements other than nouns, such as adjectives or
12
13 verbs. This means that the choice of morphemes that mark one element in a phrase or a
14
15 sentence depend on grammatical categories of a different element; e. g. in English, the
16
17 marking of a verb depends on the number of the subject (*he walks* vs. *they walk*). The ability
18
19 to use grammatical agreement demonstrates the knowledge of the relations between various
20
21 elements within sentences, often non-adjacent, thus showing mastery of complex linguistic
22
23 rules. The acquisition of agreement and number marking on verbs provides opportunities to
24
25 study the development of abstract linguistic representations in children. The verb inflection
26
27 system in general is challenging for children in a number of languages (e. g. Rice, Wexler, &
28
29 Hershberger, 1998), and examining different aspects of this system in development helps to
30
31 understand the nature of this challenge.
32
33
34
35

36
37 One peculiar fact about number agreement in development is that for a long time
38
39 during development, children have limited ability to use agreement morphemes in
40
41 comprehension. Several reports found that children show surprisingly late comprehension of
42
43 verb number, having problems to distinguish referents of sentences such as *The birds sing* and
44
45 *The bird sings*. This is so even when children use the corresponding morphemes in their own
46
47 productions. Kenney and Wolfe (1972) examined the production and comprehension of third-
48
49 person singular forms in children acquiring English. While 4-year-olds used the inflected
50
51 form correctly in most cases, they were not able to interpret the singular meaning of the form.
52
53 Problems with the comprehension of verb number were also reported in more recent studies in
54
55 different languages. Johnson, de Villiers, and Seymour (2005) presented three- to six-year-old
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 American children with sentences such as *The duck(s) swim(s)*, and asked them to point to a
4 picture with one or two referents. The nominal plural ending was masked by blending with
5 the verb-initial s-, and children thus had to rely on the verb ending to interpret the number of
6 participants. Only five- and six-year olds performed above chance. There are some additional
7 studies that made similar findings in English (Johnson, 2005; Leonard, Miller, & Owen,
8 2000). The poor performance of children acquiring English might be due to the subject-verb
9 agreement system of English that gives children only limited opportunity to learn the
10 agreement phenomena. However, Pérez-Leroux (2005) performed a similar study in children
11 acquiring Spanish aged 3 to 6 years in Dominican Republic, and found very similar results.
12 Only children above five showed reliable use of verb number inflection in comprehension,
13 even though Spanish has a richer system of verb agreement than English. The findings were
14 similar to those by Johnson et al. (2005) in that there were asymmetries in singular and plural
15 comprehension. In both languages, children comprehended the morphologically marked forms
16 better than forms with zero marking; comprehension was better for singular forms in English
17 and for plural forms in Spanish. These findings were elaborated in a series of experiments on
18 child Spanish recently reported by Miller and Schmitt (2014). These confirmed that children
19 acquiring Spanish have problems comprehending number encoded in verb affixes.

20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

Preferential looking vs. picture-pointing studies

Even though limited comprehension of verb number has been found in a number of studies, opposite findings have been reported as well. Childers, Echols, and Tomasello (2001) used a picture pointing task with children acquiring Spanish, and their 3-year-old participants showed above-chance comprehension of third-person singular, but not plural. However, as Miller and Schmitt (2014) pointed out, the children showed a baseline preference for the singular pictures, which was different from the two other picture-pointing studies. There are two other studies that used the preferential looking paradigm in addition to picture pointing,

1
2
3 and found evidence of comprehending verb number in young children. In the preferential
4
5 looking method, children are presented with two visual stimuli and auditory input and the
6
7 experiments test whether they look towards the stimulus described in the auditory input.
8
9 Legendre, Barrière, Goyet and Nazzi (2010) used the method, along with the picture pointing
10
11 task, in French children. Spoken French has no phonological differences between the singular
12
13 and plural forms of most verbs and pronouns, but there is one context in which the pronoun-
14
15 verb phrase is different in singular and plural. In this context, the normally silent [z] ending
16
17 on the third-person plural pronoun is pronounced when the pronoun is followed by a verb
18
19 beginning with a vocal. Legendre et al. showed that French 30-month-olds, but not 24-month-
20
21 olds, could use this single-phoneme cue to make the distinction between singular and plural
22
23 referent pictures. Children at 30 months showed sensitivity to number marking in the
24
25 preferential looking task, as well as in the pointing task, and there was no significant
26
27 difference between comprehending the singular and plural forms. These findings do not
28
29 confirm the suggestion that children are only sensitive to overt number marking; if this were
30
31 the case, French children should show better performance in plural. The results also indicate
32
33 that French children comprehend number marking much earlier than children acquiring
34
35 English or Spanish. This may be related to the differences in how number was marked in the
36
37 French stimuli, where the number-marking morpheme preceded the verb, while the English
38
39 and Spanish stimuli used suffixes.
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 Another preferential looking study was reported by Brandt-Kobele and Höhle (2010),
47
48 who examined the comprehension of number marking in 3-year-olds acquiring German.
49
50 Children in their study showed preference for pictures that corresponded to the linguistic
51
52 input, and this was comparable for singular and plural sentences. However, children did not
53
54 show reliable comprehension in the pointing task. The data from German thus contradict
55
56 previous studies from English and Spanish in that the number inflection was comprehended
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 by children below 4, but are in line with the English and Spanish data, as children showed no
4
5 comprehension of number in the pointing task. This is at odds with the data from French
6
7 where children below 3 years performed above chance even in the pointing task.
8
9

10 The existing research thus presents conflicting findings on when and how children
11
12 understand the verb inflection for number. It is likely that variations in the task format and
13
14 visual stimuli contribute to the variability of findings, as suggested by Legendre et al. (2010)
15
16 and Miller and Schmitt (2014). An important source of variability could be the cross-
17
18 linguistic variation, but the available data do not show any clear pattern. Of the four languages
19
20 studied, French and English have very limited number morphology of verbs, while German
21
22 and Spanish have distinct inflectional forms for most person/number combinations of the
23
24 inflected verb. In each group of languages, early comprehension of verb number was found in
25
26 one but not the other language. The distinction between rich and limited morphology thus
27
28 does not coincide with children's difficulty in comprehending number agreement. At the same
29
30 time, it should be noted that the range of languages that have been examined is still quite
31
32 limited.
33
34
35
36
37

38 One limitation of the existing studies is the fact that they only considered the factor of
39
40 age in a very rough way, if at all. Johnson et al. (2005) reported their results for English-
41
42 learning children in yearly age bands from 3 to 6 years, with evidence of comprehension only
43
44 in children 5 and above. Similarly, Pérez-Leroux (2005) compared two groups of children,
45
46 below 5, and 5 and older. Miller and Schmitt (2014) used one group of 4-year-olds in the
47
48 experiment targeting comprehension of verb morphemes in Spanish null-subject sentences.
49
50 The existing studies on German and French found comprehension of verb agreement in much
51
52 earlier ages but also in these studies, the age factor was treated only on group level (Legendre
53
54 et al., 2010) or not at all (Brandt-Kobele & Höhle, 2010). It is thus not clear when and how
55
56 abruptly the changes in comprehending singular and plural verb forms happen. Related to this
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 is the question of whether the ability to comprehend number changes with age, or rather with
4
5 increasing linguistic skills. The existing studies provided no estimate of individual level of
6
7 language development.
8
9

10 The present study: design, questions, hypotheses
11

12
13 The present paper presents two experimental studies that attempted to extend the available
14
15 data on children's comprehension of number agreement morphemes. The studies are novel in
16
17 two directions. They test a new language, Czech, and they track language development using
18
19 continuous data on age and overall language development. The experiments are also based on
20
21 larger participant numbers than the existing studies in Spanish and English, and have thus
22
23 greater power to detect differences from the chance level. In addition, Experiment 1 compared
24
25 comprehension of sentences with subject number marked on the verb only, and sentences
26
27 where number information was also presented on nouns.
28
29
30
31

32 Examining a new language may be viewed as a critical contribution. The previous
33
34 research examined four languages. Only two of them, Spanish and German, have complex
35
36 verb inflection paradigms, and the results from these proved somewhat contradictory. Adding
37
38 another language may thus show which of the previous results is more likely to generalize
39
40 across languages.
41
42

43
44 The key questions motivating the studies are:
45

- 46
47 1) Do Czech children around 4 years of age comprehend number marking on verbs in
48
49 the absence of other cues?
50
- 51
52 2) Is there an asymmetry between comprehending singular and plural?
53
- 54
55 3) How does comprehension of verb number increase with age and vocabulary skills?
56
57 Is there a steady increase? Is the increase similar for singular and plural stimuli?
58
59
60

1
2
3 In order to keep the results comparable with as much of the existing research as
4 possible, the experiments used the pointing task rather than the preferential looking method.
5 While preferential looking has only been used in German and French, all existing studies
6 included picture pointing. In addition, the pointing task may reflect the typical use of
7 language comprehension better than the preferential looking task. While the process of
8 language comprehension is highly automatic, its results, i. e. the messages we comprehend
9 and upon which we perform deliberate actions, are open to conscious control. The pointing
10 task is sensitive to this level of comprehension. The alternative, implicit tasks such as
11 preferential looking may reveal some aspects of children's language knowledge but do not
12 show that children are able to act on this knowledge. Moreover, preferential looking results
13 may be affected by children's preferences for individual pictures, and it is not always possible
14 to created a fully counterbalanced design to control for this preference.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 The basic properties of Czech
31

32
33 Czech is West Slavic language, together with Polish, Slovak and Upper and Lower
34 Sorbian. It is highly inflected with extensive case marking and verb inflection. Nouns,
35 adjectives and many pronouns and numerals are marked for seven cases, as well as number.
36 Verb marking reflects person, number, tense and aspect on verbs. Both nouns and verbs have
37 different inflectional classes, so that the same categories can be marked by different
38 morphemes, depending on the class membership of the noun or verb. There are 14 main
39 inflectional classes of nouns and 13 for verbs, with numerous minor subclasses. From the
40 viewpoint of the present study, the relevant forms are the third person present indicative form
41 of verbs in singular and plural. There are five main classes of verbs with regard to these
42 forms.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Hypotheses and expectations

The working hypothesis for the study was that children will show problems with using agreement in comprehension. Furthermore, we hypothesized that the performance will be positively related to age and general language tasks, e. g. a vocabulary test. Given the existing findings from other languages, we expected that children would show reliable comprehension of number morphemes only after their 5th birthday or later. This is the predominant pattern in the literature for the picture-pointing task. Only in French, children responded better than chance at 3 years of age even in the pointing task (Legendre et al., 2010); however, the marking of number in the studies of French differs from the other languages in that the plural marker was not a suffix on the verb but a clitic merging with the initial segment of the verb. As such, it may be more salient than number markers in other languages. It could be argued that Czech, as a language with rich agreement morphology, provides children with ample opportunities for learning the significance of number marking on verbs, and they would thus perform better than children acquiring a language with limited morphology, such as English. However, the same argument could be made for Spanish, and there is enough evidence to show that number marking is difficult for children acquiring Spanish. Even German children show limited performance in pointing tasks, even though the language inflects all main verbs for number. For this reason, the expectation was that Czech children would also show weak performance with number interpretation. At the same time, given the age range of children involved in the study, it was expected that children's performance would show a positive relation with age and vocabulary skills.

Experiment 1

In the first experiment, comprehension of sentences with singular or plural arguments was compared in four types of structures. There were two types of sentences in which number

1
2
3 information was only carried on the verb and the subject was omitted. The two types differed
4
5 by containing either transitive or intransitive verbs. Two additional types were included as
6
7 controls; one with explicit lexical subjects, including a redundant number marker on the
8
9 subject as well as the verb. The other type of controls had singular subjects and singular verb
10
11 forms but differed in whether the object noun was singular or plural. This compared the
12
13 comprehension of number marking in verbs and in nouns. Examples of the four sentence
14
15 types are in Table 1.
16
17

18 19 Method

20
21
22 *Participants.* The final sample consisted of 65 monolingual Czech-speaking children aged 3;0
23
24 to 4;7 years ($M = 3; 6$), who were not receiving special educational services and their
25
26 teachers had no suspicion of developmental delays. They were all recruited from standard
27
28 public preschools in Prague, Czech Republic. There were seven cases when children were
29
30 dropped because of incorrect information on the consent forms, or because they did not
31
32 cooperate during the procedure. However, most children who started the procedure were able
33
34 to finish.
35
36

37
38
39 *Stimuli.* In a picture-pointing task, twenty items were presented on a laptop computer screen.
40
41 Items consisted of a sentence and a pair of pictures that differed in the number of
42
43 participants/objects involved in the action. In ten items, the subject was omitted and the only
44
45 cue for the interpretation was the number inflection on the verb. Five of these items contained
46
47 a transitive verb, five an intransitive one. Of the remaining items, five items included a lexical
48
49 subject, and five items contrasted the singular or plural object instead of subject. For each
50
51 stimulus type, there were 2 stimulus sentences representing one condition (singular and
52
53 plural) and 3 sentences representing the other condition. This was counterbalanced using two
54
55 versions of the protocol, so that the total of singular and plural items per person was the same,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and that the total number of singular and plural items across persons in each condition was the
4
5 same..

6
7
8 ---

9
10
11 Table 1 about here

12
13
14 ---

15
16
17 The stimuli were designed so that we first created the stimulus sentences, and then asked an
18
19 artist to create the pair of pictures for the singular and plural version so that there were as few
20
21 changes as possible. The artist used computer graphics so that the pictures for plurals included
22
23 the original picture for singular, and added one participant.

24
25
26
27 *Procedure.* Children were tested individually in a quiet room in their preschool. Only the
28
29 examiner (the second author, VB) was present during the session, and the whole session was
30
31 videorecorded. Children were instructed that they would see two pictures involving one or
32
33 more things/persons/animals. They were asked to point to the picture that corresponded to the
34
35 sentence heard. In order to avoid confounding effects of intonation, we controlled these by
36
37 using the same pre-recorded stimuli for all participants (native speaker, male voice). For each
38
39 item, the picture was shown first, and the recording was played while the child looked at the
40
41 screen. The answer was considered correct if the child pointed to the picture that
42
43 corresponded to the sentence within a 10s limit. Otherwise, the answer was regarded as
44
45 incorrect (wrong picture, out of limit) or missing (no answer). If children did not obey the
46
47 instruction for the first time, the pre-recorded sentence was presented once more. The relative
48
49 position of the target picture was also counterbalanced in both of the protocols (10 on the
50
51 right, 10 on the left).

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Vocabulary test.* Because there is no standardized assessment instrument available for Czech,
4
5 an experimental task developed by the authors was used. This was a 30-item receptive
6
7 vocabulary task that used similar format as the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (Dunn &
8
9 Dunn, 2007). In each item, children were shown a page with four pictures and asked to point
10
11 to the picture that corresponded to the word given by the experimenter. The task was used in
12
13 previous studies from the same lab (e. g. Smolík, 2015).
14
15

16
17 *Analyses.* The data were analyzed using binomial mixed models fitted using the lme4 library
18
19 for R (Bates, Maechler, & Bolker, 2011). This method is similar to logistic regression in that
20
21 it can estimate the effects of continuous predictors, such as age, on the chance of a categorical
22
23 event, such as a correct response in an individual trial. Categorical predictors, e. g.
24
25 experimental condition, may be included as well. Unlike logistic regression, mixed logistic
26
27 models can account for the repeated-measures nature of experiments in which a participant
28
29 responds to multiple trials, and the same trials are presented to a number of participants. To
30
31 account for this, the models reported here include crossed random effects for persons and
32
33 trials. The method estimates the value of the logarithm of the odds of the correct response,
34
35 and the change in this value associated with different values of the predictors. By taking the
36
37 exponential of the estimated value for a categorical predictor, we obtain the odds ratio, i. e.
38
39 the ratio between the baseline odds and the odds when the predictor has a non-baseline value.
40
41 For a continuous predictor, the odds ratio is the expected change in odds when the predictor
42
43 increases by one unit.
44
45
46
47

48 Results

49
50 The overall mean proportion of correct responses was 0.58 (SD=0.16), with 0.52 (0.28) in
51
52 singular and 0.65 (0.24) in plural trials. However, these mean values are of little interest since
53
54 the goal was to examine the relations between comprehension and age, captured in Figure 1.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The figure suggests that younger children show similar performance in singular and plural,
4 perhaps with an initial advantage for plural sentences. However, the comprehension of
5 singular sentences increases sharply in older children, while the comprehension of plural
6
7
8
9
10 remains at the same level.

11
12 The primary statistical analysis included three predictor variables, age, grammatical
13 number (singular vs. plural), and the sentence type (4 types), as well as the interaction
14 between age and number. There was no significant effect of sentence type, and removing this
15 predictor from the model did not result in significant decrease in the model fit ($\Delta\chi^2(12)=7.57$,
16 $p=0.82$). For this reason, the model without sentence type was retained and is reported here.
17
18 The results of the statistical analysis (see Table 2) confirmed the tendencies observed in the
19 graph. The intercept, which reflects the estimated performance in singular at 3 years of age, is
20 significant and negative, suggesting that the initial performance in singular is below the
21 chance level. The significant positive effect of condition means that the performance in plural
22 at 3 years is significantly better than in singular. The effect of age is an estimate of age-related
23 change in the singular condition. Since the effect is highly significant, it shows that
24 performance in singular increases with age; the odds ratio of 1.036 shows that the chance of
25 observing a correct response is 2.81 times higher at 4 than at 3 years. The significant negative
26 interaction term for condition and age shows that the effect of age is lower in plural than in
27 singular; in fact, there is a slight decrease in successful comprehension with age.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 ---

47
48
49 Figure 1 about here

50
51
52 ---

53
54
55 Table 2 about here

1
2
3 ---
4
5

6 Since it is known that young children of the same age show substantial individual differences
7 in their linguistic skills, an alternative analysis was performed with vocabulary score used
8 instead of age. This was warranted also by the results of a regression analysis examining the
9 overall performance in the comprehension task as a function of age or the vocabulary score.
10 Vocabulary score accounted for 8.5 % of variance in the task, while age only for 1.7 %. The
11 model with vocabulary scores as a predictor provided similar results to the model with age
12 (cf. Table 2 and Fig. 1). There was a clear interaction between condition and lexical score, i.
13 e. the relation between sentence comprehension and vocabulary was different for singular and
14 plural sentences. Comprehension of singular sentences improved with larger vocabulary, but
15 this was not the case in plural sentences.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Discussion

30
31
32 Experiment 1 suggested that children at the age of 3 years have limited ability to comprehend
33 verb number and the number system in general. Three-year-olds had below-chance
34 performance in singular, and significantly better performance in plural. But while the
35 performance in singular got considerably better in older children, the performance in plural
36 was not related to age. Using vocabulary knowledge instead of age resulted in a similar
37 pattern; the children with higher vocabulary scores showed better comprehension of singular
38 sentences, but the relation between vocabulary and number comprehension was much weaker
39 in plural sentences.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 An important finding is that that there was no evidence of differences between
51 sentence types. The pattern of performance was the same whether number was marked on
52 verb only, noun only, or both. The results thus suggest that the difficulty in comprehending
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 number morphemes is not specific to verb morphology but affects number morphology in
4
5 general, or perhaps the notion of reference to number using grammatical means.
6
7

8 Although Experiment 1 provided clear results, it was limited in some ways. One
9
10 limitation is the low number of stimulus sentences per condition. Because the tasks given to
11
12 young children must be limited in length, and there were four conditions in total, there were
13
14 only 5 items per condition. Another limitation is the use of verbs with different complexity of
15
16 number marking. Different classes of verbs in Czech have different way of forming the plural,
17
18 and the distinction between plural and singular has different salience for different words. In
19
20 Experiment 1, the verbs used in the test sentences were mixed with respect to the inflectional
21
22 class. In some verbs, singular differed from plural only by changing the final vowel or
23
24 replacing it with a diphthong (*nese-nesou*; carry). In others, the plural form contained an extra
25
26 syllable (*dělá-dělají*; do). It is thus possible that the differences between the saliency of
27
28 singular and plural marking in some of the verbs were the primary reason for the differential
29
30 effects of age or skill on singular and plural comprehension.
31
32
33

34
35 Experiment 2 was thus designed to compare comprehension of transitive and
36
37 intransitive sentences with omitted subjects, for which the verbs used one type of plural
38
39 marking with comparable level of saliency for singular and plural. Another purpose was to
40
41 replicate the findings of Experiment 1 in an independent sample of participants, though in
42
43 only a subset of the stimulus sentence types.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Experiment 2

Experiment 2 replicated Experiment 1 in most respects. However, the key focus was on establishing whether the asymmetries between singular and plural comprehension will persist if the singular and plural marking of verbs will be similarly complex. For this reason, only two sentence types from Experiment 1 were included, transitive and intransitive sentences with omitted subjects number marking on verbs only. The verbs were selected from one class only, with the ending *-e* (pronounced [ɛ]) in the third person singular form, e. g. *nese* (he/she carries). The third person plural form for these verbs is marked by the diphthong *-ou* [oo], such as *nesou* (they carry).

Method

Participants. A total of 45 children aged 3;4 to 4;9 years, (M=4;1, SD=4.49 mo.), participated in the follow-up study. All of them spoke Czech as the first language and were drawn from standard public preschools in Prague, Czech Republic. Children were not receiving special educational services, and their teachers considered them typically developing. Like in Experiment 1, there were less than 5 cases of children being dropped because of incorrect information on the consent forms, or because they did not cooperate during the procedure. However, most children who started the procedure were able to finish.

Stimuli. The stimuli were constructed in the same way as in Experiment 1, but because there were only two experimental conditions, the total number of stimuli 16, which was lower than in Experiment 1, even though there were more stimuli (8 as opposed to 5) per condition.

Children were presented with pairs of pictures on a laptop computer screen, and a stimulus sentence describing one of the pictures was played while watching the picture. Children's task was to point to the correct picture. There were two training items presented before the 16 experimental items. Half of the stimulus sentences contained a transitive verb, the other half

1
2
3 an intransitive verb. All sentences had null subjects, and the number was only marked on the
4
5 verbs. Table 3 shows a sample transitive and intransitive sentence.
6
7

8 ---
9

10
11 Table 3 about here
12
13

14 ---
15
16

17 *Procedure and analyses.* The procedure was identical to that in Experiment 1. The same
18
19 vocabulary task was used to obtain vocabulary scores from the children. Statistical analysis
20
21 was performed in the same way as in Experiment 1.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Results

Statistical analysis with age and experimental condition as dependent variables revealed an interaction between the predictors. There was no relation between age and comprehension levels for plural items, but a clear increase in comprehension performance with increasing age for singular items. The model estimates are reported in Table 4, and Fig. 2 shows the graph capturing the relation between age and comprehension. The results with age as the predictor closely resemble the results of Experiment 1. The results using vocabulary scores as the measure of language development differed from Experiment 1, finding no effects or interactions of experimental condition. The only significant effect in this analysis was an increase in accuracy with increased vocabulary scores.

Table 4 about here

Figure 2 about here

General discussion

The two experiments reported here bring new evidence to the discussion about children's early comprehension of number agreement morphemes. Czech children were shown to have considerable limitations in comprehending number. These limitations differed for singular and plural sentences in that the comprehension of singular sentences improved with age, but this was not the case for sentences with plural forms. The younger children in both studies, who were about 3;0 or 3;6 years, showed poor performance in both singular and

1
2
3 plural comprehension, perhaps with somewhat higher comprehension scores for plural. Older
4
5 children, before 5, comprehended singular sentences substantially better than sentences in
6
7 plural. In both experiments, the age at which the comprehension of singular forms became
8
9 better than comprehension of plural was around 48 to 50 months, i. e. around the 4th birthday.
10
11 Given that this is a finding from independent samples of children with a partially different set
12
13 of stimuli, the similarity provides strong evidence for the interaction between experimental
14
15 conditions and age.
16
17

18
19 The analyses using vocabulary scores as the measure of linguistic advance resulted in
20
21 similar findings as the analyses with age in Experiment 1; comprehension performance for
22
23 singular was related to vocabulary scores more strongly than comprehension of plurals. In
24
25 Experiment 2, the interaction between vocabulary score and the condition was not significant,
26
27 even though the tendency was similar as in Exp. 1 (see Fig. 2). Children in Experiment 2 were
28
29 somewhat older, so it is possible that the lack of a significant interaction reflects the absence
30
31 of younger children with particularly low performance on singular items.
32
33

34
35 An important result of Experiment 1 is the lack of differences between sentence types
36
37 in which number was marked on verbs, on nouns, or on both. This suggests that the problems
38
39 with number comprehension are not due specifically to number marking on verbs. Children
40
41 appear to have problems with morphological marking of number in general. Finally, the use
42
43 of age and vocabulary scores as continuous independent variables demonstrated a steady
44
45 increase of comprehension performance during the observed age ranges, at least for singular
46
47 items. The change in comprehending singular sentences appears to be smooth rather than
48
49 sudden, spread out over the period between 3 and 5 years of age.
50
51

52
53
54 The present study is in line with previous findings reported for English by Johnson et
55
56 al (2005), and for Spanish by Pérez-Leroux (2005), and Miller and Schmitt (2014). Even
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 though morphological marking of verb agreement is substantially richer in Spanish compared
4
5 to English, children before 4 or 5 show limitations in number comprehension in both
6
7 languages, suggesting that the poor performance is not due to children's limited experience
8
9 with morphological marking. The present data from Czech strengthen this conclusion, as
10
11 Czech has a rich system of morphological marking as well, and the children still showed
12
13 problems with comprehending number morphology.
14
15

16
17 The present findings correspond to those reported by Johnson et al. (2005) and Pérez-
18
19 Leroux (2005) also with respect to age differences. Three-year olds in Johnson's et al. study
20
21 showed no comprehension of either number, but the differences were observed among six-
22
23 year olds. In the study by Pérez-Leroux, 5-year-olds showed no comprehension, but 6-year-
24
25 olds comprehended plural sentences above chance. The present study suggests that the ability
26
27 to comprehend number develops during the fifth year. This is somewhat earlier than
28
29 suggested by Pérez-Leroux, but the present study was substantially more powerful due to
30
31 larger participant numbers and continuous design; it is thus possible that Pérez-Leroux was
32
33 only able to discover comprehension in the older children while the present study was able to
34
35 find smaller differences.
36
37
38

39 40 Explicitly-marked vs. zero-marked categories 41

42
43 Based on the findings from English and Spanish, Pérez-Leroux (2005) suggested that
44
45 children initially have problems comprehending verb forms with zero morphological marking,
46
47 and understand explicitly marked forms earlier than zero-marked forms. Our results show that
48
49 this is generally not the case. In Czech, the third person present forms have some
50
51 morphological marking in singular as well as plural, but there was a clear difference in
52
53 comprehension in the older children, with singular being easier. It could be argued that the
54
55 marking of singular and plural is in fact different; the morphemes marking plural are longer
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and sometimes add another syllable to the form, while the marking of singular forms is
4
5 usually shorter. However, if this asymmetry were the cause of the difference between singular
6
7 and plural comprehension in Czech, it would be the direct opposite of what the hypothesis of
8
9 explicit marking predicts. If children comprehend the more salient morphological markers
10
11 better, older Czech children should be better at plural, not singular comprehension. This was
12
13 not the case.
14
15

16 17 The comprehension-production asymmetry

18
19
20 The problems with plural comprehension are surprising because four-year-olds
21
22 routinely use verb number marking in their own productions. It is true that children acquiring
23
24 English tend to omit the 3rd person singular –s for a fairly protracted period, but they do not
25
26 ignore it completely and appear to have at least partial mastery of it (e. g. Rice et al., 1998). In
27
28 languages with richer morphology, to our knowledge, systematic omission of plural markers
29
30 has not been reported. In the absence of experimental studies, it is difficult to exclude the
31
32 possibility that children sometimes fail to use plural morphology in their productions, and this
33
34 goes undetected because adults do not know the child's communicative intention. However,
35
36 the comprehension performance in pointing tasks before 4 years of age is essentially random.
37
38 This is not the case in production. Overall, the present experiment and the previous research
39
40 suggest that comprehension of number morphology is in some way behind its production.
41
42 This is atypical in comparison to most other areas of language acquisition; usually, children
43
44 show comprehension of structures that they do not yet produce.
45
46
47
48

49 Possible limitations in pragmatics

50
51
52 Even though there is now good evidence that children across languages have problems
53
54 with interpreting number morphology in pointing and act-out tasks, the available research
55
56 gives reasons to suggest that the failure is not due to limitations in morphological knowledge,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 or to any limitations in comprehending the notion of number. The chief reason to assume that
4
5 children have the knowledge of linguistic number is research using preferential looking. This
6
7 has shown comprehension of number in French (Legendre et al., 2010), German (Brandt-
8
9 Kobele & Höhle, 2010), as well as English (Kouider et al., 2006). The studies in each of these
10
11 languages tested somewhat different structures, and the languages differ in the exact way
12
13 number is marked, but this confirms that preferential looking studies show sensitivity to
14
15 various form of number marking. The existing pattern of results indicates that the problems
16
17 with number comprehension are limited to the pointing tasks. The failure to select appropriate
18
19 referents may thus result from a difficulty in understanding the task or making a conscious
20
21 decision in the task. There are at least two reasons why the pragmatics of the task situation
22
23 may be challenging for children. First of all, the singular sentences may be viewed as
24
25 appropriate descriptions of both pictures presented to the children in each trial. When a child
26
27 is confronted with two pictures, one with one sleeping cat, the other with two sleeping cats, a
28
29 sentence such as *The cat sleeps* describes the one-participant picture as well as a part of the
30
31 two-participant picture. Perhaps children have problems with evaluating the two pictures in a
32
33 task as distinct units, “framing” them as the objects of reference. Similarly, the plural sentence
34
35 *The cats sleep* may be viewed to refer to the whole array of the singular and plural picture
36
37 together, rather than individual pictures. The comprehension problems may thus result from a
38
39 failure to interpret the two pictures in a trial as units of which only one is described, and the
40
41 description must fit the whole picture.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The interpretation of children’s deficits as limitations in pragmatics might explain why
49
50 there are differences between the pointing and preferential looking tasks. The pointing task
51
52 requires children to make a controlled, intentional decision about where they should point,
53
54 while preferential looking tasks rely on automatic processes manipulating children’s attention.
55
56 The effects of linguistic comprehension on the latter may be more direct than its effects in
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 conscious decision making. If this proposal is correct, some alternative behavioral tasks
4
5 should result in improved performance of the children. One possibility is to replace the
6
7 pointing task with some version of the truth value judgment task (Crain & Thornton, 2000), in
8
9 which the children have to decide whether a description is true about a particular picture. This
10
11 may be embedded in a play context in which children are asked to help a character who is just
12
13 beginning to learn the language, and say whether the character is labeling pictures
14
15 appropriately. Children thus see only one picture with each stimulus sentence, and they have a
16
17 reason for “plausible dissent” if the character describes the picture incorrectly. In this type of
18
19 task, the pragmatic difficulties connected to selecting the appropriate picture should be
20
21 eliminated or reduced. Another way of testing the proposal of pragmatic limitations is to
22
23 include measures of pragmatic development, and examine whether comprehension of number
24
25 is better in children with higher pragmatic scores.
26
27
28
29

30 The suggestion of pragmatic limitations is plausible given the existing research, but
31
32 the present study does not provide direct evidence that this is the actual cause. Rather, it
33
34 suggests that this possibility should be investigated further. One problem with the suggestion
35
36 is that it does not explain the asymmetries between singular and plural in development, and
37
38 the fact that these asymmetries may be different across different languages. While the current
39
40 Czech data and the data from English (Johnson et al., 2005) suggest that young children
41
42 improve in comprehending singular but their comprehension of plural remains weak, the data
43
44 from Spanish suggest better comprehension of plural (Pérez-Leroux, 2005; Miller & Schmitt,
45
46 2014). This is not easily explained by pragmatic factors because such factors should be
47
48 similar in children across languages. At the same time, the current results show that the
49
50 difference between Czech and English on one hand and Spanish on the other is not due to the
51
52 way number is marked on verbs: in this respect, Czech is more similar to Spanish than to
53
54 English.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Even though children's limitations in comprehending the grammatical marking of
4
5 number have been described some time ago (Kenney & Wolfe, 1972), the amount of available
6
7 research on this topic is limited but growing (e. g. Aljenaie, Abdalla, & Farghal, 2011; Arias-
8
9 Trejo, Abreu-Mendoza, & Aguado-Servín, 2014; Arias-Trejo, Cantrell, Smith, & Canto,
10
11 2014, Lanter, & Basche, 2014). The present paper reports on studies that used a new language
12
13 and larger samples than previous research, and provides converging evidence that children's
14
15 comprehension is indeed limited. Taking into account the existing findings, it appears that the
16
17 poor comprehension is limited to language tasks that require active participation and decision
18
19 on the side of children, such as pointing and act-out tasks. Further research should focus on
20
21 the possibility that these effects are caused by limitations in children's ability to understand
22
23 the task requirements, i. e. to the development of pragmatics, rather than morphology.
24
25
26

27 28 Funding

29
30 [funding statement withdrawn for blinding; it was submitted separately on the title page]
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Aljenaie, K., Abdalla, F., & Farghal, M. (2011). Developmental changes in using nominal number inflections in Kuwaiti Arabic. *First Language*, 31(2), 222-239.
- Arias-Trejo, N., Abreu-Mendoza, R. A., & Aguado-Servín, O. A. (2014). Spanish-speaking children's production of number morphology. *First Language*, 34(4), 372-384.
- Arias-Trejo, N., Cantrell, L. M., Smith, L. B., & Canto, E. A. A. (2014). Early comprehension of the Spanish plural. *Journal of child language*, 41(06), 1356-1372.
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., & Bolker, B. (2011). *lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using Eigen and Eigenfaces* [Computer software].
- Brandt-Kobele, O.-C., & Höhle, B. (2010). What asymmetries within comprehension reveal about asymmetries between comprehension and production: The case of verb inflection in language acquisition. *Lingua*, 120, 1910–1925.
- Childers, J., Echols, C., Tomasello, M., 2001. Experimental investigations of children's understanding and use of verb morphology: Spanish- and English-speaking 2 1/2- and 3-year-old children. In: Almgren, M., Barrena, A., Ezeizabarrena, M.J., Idiazabal, I., MacWhinney, B. (Eds.), *Research on Child Language Acquisition: Proceedings of the 8th Conference of the International Association for the Study of Child Language*. Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA.
- Crain, S., & Thornton, R. (2000). *Investigations in universal grammar: A guide to experiments on the acquisition of syntax and semantics*. MIT Press.
- Dunn, L. M., & Dunn, D. M. (2007). *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test IV*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

- 1
2
3 Johnson, V. (2005). Comprehension of third person singular /s/ in AAE-speaking children.
4
5 *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools* 36, 116-124.
6
7
- 8 Johnson, V. ., de Villiers, J. G., & Seymour, H. N. (2005). Agreement without understanding?
9
10 The case of third person singular /s/. *First Language*, 25, 317–330.
11
12
- 13 Kenney, T. J., & Wolfe, J. (1972). The acquisition of agreement in English. *Journal of Verbal*
14
15 *Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 11(6), 698-705.
16
17
- 18 Kouider, S., Halberda, J., Wood, J., & Carey, S. (2006). Acquisition of English number
19
20 marking: The singular-plural distinction. *Language Learning and Development*, 2(1),
21
22 1-25.
23
24
- 25
26 Lanter, J. A., & Basche, R. A. (2014). Effect of number and similarity on children’s plural
27
28 comprehension. *First Language*, 34(6), 519-536.
29
30
- 31 Legendre, G., Barriere, I., Goyet, L., & Nazzi, T. (2010). Comprehension of Infrequent
32
33 Subject–Verb Agreement Forms: Evidence From French-Learning Children. *Child*
34
35 *Development*, 81, 1859–1875.
36
37
- 38 Leonard, L., Miller, C., Owen, A., 2000. The comprehension of verb agreement morphology
39
40 by English-speaking children with specific language impairment. *Clinical Linguistics*
41
42 *and Phonetics* 14, 465-481.
43
44
- 45
46 Miller, K. & Schmitt, C. (2014) Spanish-speaking children's use of verbal agreement in
47
48 comprehension. *Lingua* 144, 40-57.
49
50
- 51 Pérez-Leroux, A. T. (2005). Number problems in children. In C. Gurski (Ed.), *Proceedings of*
52
53 *the 2005 Canadian Linguistic Association Annual Conference*.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Rice, M. L., Wexler, K., & Hershberger, S. (1998). Tense Over Time: The Longitudinal
4
5 Course of Tense Acquisition in Children With Specific Language Impairment. *Journal*
6
7 *of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 41(6)*, 1412-1431.
8

9
10 Smolík, F. (2015). Word order and information structure in Czech 3-and 4-year-olds'
11
12 comprehension. *First Language, 35(3)*, 237-253.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Table 1: Sample sentence for each stimulus type.

| Type | |
|-------------------------|--|
| No subject intransitive | Tady běží/ běhají here runs _{sg} / run _{pl} |
| No subject transitive | Tady čte/ čtou knihu here reads _{sg} / read _{pl} a book |
| Lexical subject | Maminka/ maminky tlačí kočárek. mom _{sg} /moms _{pl} push a stroller |
| Lexical object | Pán nese tašku/ tašky. man carries bag _{sg} / bags _{pl} |

For Peer Review

Table 2:

Parameter estimates and significance tests for the fixed-effect terms in Experiment 1.

| Effect | Log-odds | OR | z | p |
|--------------------------------|----------|------|------|--------|
| Model with age | | | | |
| Intercept | -0.578 | 0.56 | 2.89 | 0.004 |
| Age (yr, centered at 3) | 1.036 | 2.82 | 4.09 | <0.001 |
| Condition (plural) | 1.451 | 4.27 | 6.65 | <0.001 |
| Age × cond. (plural) | -1.390 | 0.25 | 4.86 | <0.001 |
| Model with lexicon | | | | |
| Intercept | -0.793 | 0.45 | 3.15 | 0.002 |
| Lexicon (raw, median centered) | 0.137 | 1.15 | 3.90 | <0.001 |
| Condition (plural) | 1.316 | 3.73 | 4.64 | <0.001 |
| Lexicon × cond. (plural) | -0.119 | 0.89 | 2.92 | 0.003 |

Table 3

Sample sentences from Experiment 2


| Type | |
|--------------|--|
| Transitive | Tady líže/ lížou zmrzlinu here lick _{sg} /lick _{pl} ice cream |
| Intransitive | Tady plave/plavou Here swim _{sg} /swim _{pl} |

For Peer Review

Table 4


| Effect | Log-odds | OR | z | p |
|--------------------------------|----------|------|-------|--------|
| Model with age | | | | |
| Intercept | -1.04 | 0.35 | -2.09 | 0.04 |
| Age (yr) | 1.43 | 4.18 | 3.34 | <0.001 |
| Condition (plural) | 1.70 | 5.47 | 2.90 | 0.003 |
| Age × cond. (plural) | -1.51 | 0.22 | -3.20 | 0.001 |
| Model with lexicon | | | | |
| Intercept | 0.588 | 1.80 | 3.57 | <0.001 |
| Lexicon (raw, median centered) | 0.110 | 1.12 | 2.50 | 0.01 |
| Condition (plural) | -0.114 | 0.89 | -0.71 | 0.48 |
| Lexicon × cond. (plural) | -0.070 | 0.93 | -1.45 | 0.15 |

Figure 1: Proportion correct in each condition, along with the regression lines for each condition.



Peer Review

Figure 2



Peer Review