Sign Language Acquisition Studies: Past, Present And Future

Diane Lillo-Martin

University of Connecticut

and Haskins Laboratories

In this paper, I overview aspects of sign language acquisition studies conducted over the past twenty years, and speculate on the future of such studies. Rather than a chronological overview, I have organized the research into five themes, according to some of the goals of these works. These themes are as follows.

1) Exploring the parallels between sign and spoken language acquisition. In this category I include a variety of studies which show that sign language acquisition takes a similar path as spoken language acquisition, under comparable input conditions (i.e., children whose parents sign to them fluently from birth). Such studies serve to drive home the point that sign languages are fully natural languages and by implication, are deserving of all the rights associated with full natural languages.

2) Explaining the differences between sign and spoken language acquisition. In this category are studies which note potential differences in the path of acquisition of sign and spoken languages, and attempt to account for them, often by appealing to the modality. In some cases the differences are quite straightforwardly due to the modality (e.g., although sign phonology and spoken phonology have abstract principles in common, they are deeply rooted in modality differences); in others, a good argument has been made that ties the difference to a particular aspect of the modality.

3) A. Using sign language acquisition data to inform us about sign language grammar. B. Using sign language grammar to inform us about sign language acquisition. These two categories are grouped together to emphasize the importance of a strong, reciprocal relationship between studies of grammar and studies of acquisition. Studies in this category show how acquisition studies can bear on theoretical questions in grammatical analysis, and how grammatical developments can lead to new questions or reanalysis in acquisition studies. Such relationships between acquisition

and grammar are not unique to sign language studies, of course, but sign language researchers can and do profitably participate in these kinds of works.

4) Using sign language acquisition data to inform us about theories of language acquisition. Again, sign language research is not alone in pursuing the goal of developing and testing explicit theories of how language acquisition proceeds, but it has much to contribute to such goals. It is particularly important to include sign languages in the database of language acquisition facts which theories strive to explain, since any such theory would have as its goal providing an explanation for the ability of *any* child to learn the natural language she is exposed to.

5) Using sign language acquisition data to tell us about the nature of language. Sign languages and deaf communities allow us to understand in more detail the nature of language since, due to experiments of nature, they sometimes reveal what happens to language in extreme circumstances. Information about what emerges is of great significance to theories of language.

Of course, many studies fall into more than one of the categories above, and others may not have been specifically directed at any of these topics. However, I think it can be useful to take this type of view and examine the broader impacts of studies, whatever their original goals were. The overview provided here is not meant to be exhaustive, but selects examples of studies falling into each theme, to give the reader an idea of directions and possibilities. Additional research in all of these areas is eagerly anticipated.

1. Exploring the parallels between sign and spoken language acquisition

In this category I include research which aims to show that a particular sign language 'is a language' and is acquired on a par with spoken languages (see Lillo-Martin, 1999; Newport & Meier, 1985 for reviews of some of this research).

One clear example comes from the work of Laura Ann Petitto. Her body of research makes the strong claim that sign language is acquired in exactly the same way as oral language. For example, in one of her own overviews she claims, "Deaf children exposed to signed languages from birth acquire these languages on an identical maturational time course as hearing children acquire spoken languages" (Petitto, 2000).

Milestones claimed by Petitto to be 'identical' in signing and speaking children include babbling (7-12 months of age); the first word stage (11-14 months); and the first two-word stage (16-22 months).

Furthermore, Petitto says, "social and conversational patterns of language use ..., as well as the types of things that they 'talk' about ..., have demonstrated unequivocally that their language

acquisition follows the identical path seen in age-matched hearing children acquiring spoken language" (Petitto 2000).

Similar reports that the general path of language acquisition is similar for signed and spoken languages can be found in studies of sign languages other than ASL; for example, Italian Sign Language (Caselli & Volterra, 1990), Brazilian Sign Language (Quadros, 1997), and Sign Language of the Netherlands (Van den Bogaerde, 2000), among others.

Consider the case of babbling. Research on the babbling of hearing children shows that vocal babbling (repetitive, syllabic sounds such as 'baba') emerges around 6 to 8 months of age, and continues (with certain changes) until it disappears as words come in. Petitto & Marentette (1991) similarly observed that deaf children exposed to sign language produced 'manual babbles' during this same period. They found manual babble activities occurring as 32%-71% of the gestures produced by two deaf children studied at 10, 12, and 14 months of age. Petitito & Marentette argued that manual babbling is like vocal babbling in satisfying three conditions. First, the babbles employed phonetic units restricted to those used in signing; second, they showed syllabic organization; and third, they were used non-communicatively. Petitto (2000) concludes, "the discovery of babbling in another modality confirmed the hypothesis that babbling represents a distinct and critical stage in the ontogeny of human language."

The similarities in babbling between children learning a sign language and children learning a spoken language were emphasized and expanded on in studies by Meier & Willerman (1995) and Cheek et al. (2001), although they propose that babbling in both modalities is a consequence of motor development rather than an expression specifically of the linguistic faculty. Like Petitto & Marentette, Meier & Willerman and Cheek et al. observed manual babbling in children exposed to sign language: they observed five deaf children at approximately 7, 10, and 13 months and reported manual babbling between 25% and 93% of all gestures produced. However, unlike Petitto & Marantette, who reported that manual babbling was much less frequent in the three hearing subjects they studied (about 20% of gestures), Meier & Willerman and Cheek et al. report that the five hearing children not exposed to sign language whom they studied produce manual babbles much like those of deaf children, at rates of 44% – 100% of all gestures.

Both of these studies find strong similarities between children developing sign language and children developing spoken language. Both also connect their findings to theoretical explanations which stress similarities in the development of sign and spoken languages, although their theories are different. Both are thus good examples of parallels between sign and spoken language acquisition.

Why is it important to demonstrate that deaf children with native signing input acquire sign languages along an 'identical' – or even parallel – time-course as that of children learning spoken languages? For Petitto, the implication of this finding is that the human propensity for language is not modality-dependent. Rather, the mechanisms that make language development possible apply equally well to a visual-gestural language as to an auditory-vocal language. As we seek to understand how language acquisition is possible, our theories might need to be changed to accommodate such modality-independence.

Such conclusions about the nature of the language-acquisition mechanisms would not be warranted if sign languages were considered anything less than full, natural human languages with the same biological foundations as well as similar social environments. Nowadays, well-informed linguists and psychologists do not question the status of sign languages. However, even still there are many people who are not well-informed on this subject and oftentimes they are in positions which allow them to make decisions regarding the welfare of (potential) sign language users. For this reason, the point cannot be stressed too much.

2. Explaining the differences between sign and spoken language acquisition

This category of research focuses on where sign language and oral language acquisition might be different, and attempts to explain this as, for example, effects of the modality. Such modality effects may include iconicity and motor / articulatory development, among others.

An example of research considering the role of modality in explaining differences between sign language and spoken language development looks at the appearance of first signs versus spoken words. Numerous authors have claimed that first signs appear before first words by as much as six months, and the current enthusiasm for 'baby signing' in the hearing population is based on this idea. Meier & Newport (1990), in a thorough review of the literature documenting acquisition milestones for sign versus speech, came to several important general conclusions about the similarities and differences. First, the 'advantage' for signs seems to be about 1.5 to 2.5 months (roughly age 8.5 months for first signs versus age 10-11 months for first words), and this difference is seen only with the earliest context-bound signs, not purely symbolic ones. Second, they argued that the sign advantage exists only for first words, not for first word combinations (early syntax). Finally, Meier & Newport offered a possible explanation for the sign advantage in terms of 'peripheral' mechanisms – those used in the production and/or perception of signs versus words. They provided reasons to think that it takes longer for speaking children to develop sufficient articulatory control to produce utterances which can be recognized as words than for signing

children to develop comparable control. Thus, the difference boils down to a *disadvantage* for spoken language at the earliest stages of lexical development.

Another body of research which examines effects of modality on sign language acquisition concerns early sign phonology. Researchers have studied which components of signs children are more or less accurate with, and found that in many cases children's development can be explained by appealing to the development of motor and perceptual mechanisms. Both of these explanations emphasize the role that modality plays in sign language acquisition. It may well be that modality plays an especially important role in explaining patterns of phonological development.

For example, several researchers find more errors on handshape than location in early signs. Young children's first signs tend to use a handshape with all fingers extended, whether spread or lax (5), or with the fingers all in a fist (A), or with just the index finger extended (1). These handshapes will often be substituted for others in target signs using more complex handshapes. A possible explanation offered for this pattern is that fine motor control needed for handshape develops later than gross motor control needed for location (Cheek et al., 2001; Conlin, Mirus, Mauk, & Meier, 2000; Marentette & Mayberry, 2000). On the flip side of the coin, researchers suggest that it may be easier for children to perceive differences in location as compared with different handshapes, also contributing to the earlier accuracy with the former.

Researchers have also noticed that children's earliest signing often involves movement repetition (Meier, 2006). This can be directly related to repeated movements in motoric development such as the stereotypies of repeated kicking or arm waving. Meier (2006) also argues that children's early non-target forms in two-handed signs may be explainable by reference to a phenomenon known as 'sympathy', whereby children have difficulty inhibiting the action of one hand when the other is active.

Meier (2006) argues that studying articulatory factors in the development of sign phonology is important for at least two reasons. First, knowing which effects come from articulation helps identify those which require other explanations. Second, he suggests that articulatory factors may promote particular kinds of linguistic organization – especially for children – which might lead us to think that these effects may reflect not only different levels of performance with grammar (for signing and speaking children), but also different competences.

Getting at where children's developing ability to produce signs reflects performance or competence differences is difficult, but there are some cases for which an articulatory / perceptual explanation is probably unwarranted. For example, Conlin et al. (2000) and Marentette & Mayberry (2000) suggest that some place errors are not consistent with a motoric explanation, but rather indicate that the child has misrepresented the place value of certain signs. This suggestion

reinforces Meier's comment that understanding articulatory factors helps to identify those aspects of development which require alternative explanations.

These examples have emphasized the modality-dependence of the proposed explanations of phonological development. However, it should be pointed out that articulatory factors may well explain some aspects of early phonological development in spoken languages as well (e.g., MacNeilage & Davis, 1990). 'Modality' effects are present in both modalities, then, and in this sense attending to modality is not only a way of explaining how sign language development and spoken language development are different, but again how they are alike.

3A. Using sign language acquisition data to inform us about sign language grammar

When competing grammatical models make different acquisition predictions, developmental data can be used to test the models. This is a principle of spoken language research as well as sign language research, although it has only been applied in sign language research relatively recently. Here I will discuss two examples, the first one only briefly.

Conlin et al. (2000) state, "Studies of early sign development .. may help us decide between competing models of the adult language" (p. 52). For example, they suggest that children's early signs may help in the determination of canonical signs. It has long been recognized that the earliest-occurring handshapes are also the 'unmarked' ones in the adult language (Battison, 1978), so this promise has already been fulfilled in part. They also hope that analyses of children's signing can help in the evaluation of models of adult grammar, in particular when certain models are better able to capture the generalizations about children's productions. Karnopp (2002) takes such an approach in her investigation of the development of phonology in Brazilian Sign Language. She adopts the Dependency Model of van der Hulst (1993) and finds that it makes strong predictions about sign phonology acquisition which were borne out in the data she analyzed from one deaf signing child. She concludes that the sign language acquisition data she analyzed provide strong support for the theoretical model used.

A second example comes from the area of syntax. Lillo-Martin & Quadros (2005; 2006) argued that the acquisition of topic, focus, and WH-questions in ASL and LSB helps to reveal the correct analyses of these structures. We will start with a few examples.

In both ASL and LSB, certain signs can appear in a sentence twice, once in their usual position and again at the end of the sentence, to indicate emphasis on that sign. These constructions are often called 'doubling'. Some examples are given in (1) (examples in this section are from Lillo-Martin & Quadros 2007).

(1) a.JOHN CAN READ CAN

    'John really CAN read.'

  b. MARY FINISH GO BRAZIL FINISH

    'Mary ALREADY went to Brazil.'

  c. I LOSE BOOK LOSE

    'I did LOSE the book indeed.'

Also in both of these languages, the same category of signs which can occur in doubling constructions can occur in the sentence-final position only. These sentences can be referred to as 'final constructions.' Examples are given in (2).

(2) a. JOHN READ CAN

  b. MARY GO SPAIN FINISH

  c. I BOOK LOSE

According to one type of grammatical analysis, doubling and final constructions are related. Both are used for emphatic focus, and according to these theories, they have related derivations (Nunes & Quadros, 2006, 2007; Petronio, 1993; Wilbur, 1997).

However, there is another kind of focus, known as new information focus (for short, 'I-focus'). Unlike the emphatic focus, this places the focused material in the sentence-initial position (Lillo-Martin & Quadros, 2007; Neidle, 2002). Such new information focus is used, for example, in the context of answering a question, as in example (3). The unmarked word order (SVO) is also permitted in such contexts.

(3)   S1:   WHAT YOU READ?

           'What did you read?'

                 I-focus

       S2:   BOOK STOKOE I READ

       S2:   I READ BOOK STOKOE

           'I read *Stokoe's book*.'

According to the proposals of Lillo-Martin & Quadros, I-focus is derived syntactically through a completely different mechanism from that of emphatic focus. They predicted that if their

analyses are correct, children would acquire doubling and final constructions together, since these are both instances of emphatic focus, but these might be acquired independently from I-focus, since it is derived differently.

Lillo-Martin & Quadros (2005) tested their prediction by looking at the longitudinal spontaneous production data from two deaf children acquiring ASL as a native language (Aby, Sal), and two deaf children acquiring LSB as a native language (Ana, Leo). All four children have deaf, signing parents. They were videotaped regularly starting before the age of 2. Their utterances were examined to determine when they started productively using I-focus, doubling, and final constructions. The results of this study are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1.

Summary of Results – Lillo-Martin & Quadros (2005)

Age of acquisition of each structure

Child	I-focus		Doubling	Final
Aby	1;9	***	2;1	2;0
Sal	1;7	***	1;9	1;9
Ana	1;6	**	2;0	2;1
Leo	1;10	***	2;1	2;2

** $p < .005$ *** $p < .001$

It is clear that the children did acquire doubling and final constructions together, but these two constructions were acquired later than I-focus (highly significant by Binomial Exact Probability). These results can be taken to support theoretical analyses which relate doubling and final constructions in ASL and LSB over analyses which give them distinct derivations.

These two examples have shown areas in which data from sign language acquisition can bear on theoretical questions of grammatical analyses. For both sign and spoken languages, there are many cases in which different theoretical proposals do not obviously make different predictions for acquisition, so acquisition data may not bear on such issues. However, other cases lead to expectations of ordering, such that phenomena that are related in the adult grammar can be expected to be acquired together; or phenomena that are separated are expected to be acquired separately. In some cases, specific ordering predictions can be made, such as when a particular construction has others as prerequisites (for discussion of examples, see Snyder & Lillo-Martin, in press). In these

cases, language acquisition data can provide important support – or disconfirmation – of theoretical proposals.

3B. Using sign language grammar to inform us about sign language acquisition

Category 3A looks at ways in which acquisition studies can inform studies of grammar. The present category of studies goes in the opposite direction, using new developments in grammar to inform acquisition studies. These two categories are closely related, since both show the close relationship between acquisition studies and linguistic theory, and in fact there is often a spiral effect such that both fields benefit from and influence each other in the same domain.

An example of this category comes from studies of children's development of word order. Coerts & Mills (1994) undertook a study of two deaf children's development of the subject – object – verb word order in the Sign Language of the Netherlands (SLN), between the ages of about one-and-a-half years to two-and-a-half years. They found that children showed a great deal of variability in their ordering of subjects and verbs. This variability in the acquisition of word order was puzzling and left without a full explanation in the initial work.

Then Bos (1995) identified SLN as having a process known as Subject Pronoun Copy (SPC) (cf. Padden, 1988). According to SPC, the subject of a sentence can be repeated as a pronoun in the sentence-final position, as shown in (4)a. However, it is also possible for the sentence-initial subject to be unexpressed (this is a general process found in SLN as well as in other sign languages). When the sentence-initial subject is left unexpressed, but the sentence-final subject pronoun is present, the surface order is verb – subject, as in (4)b (examples from Coerts 2000).

(4)   a. INDEX$_{beppie}$ FILM INDEX$_{beppie}$
          'Beppie is filming'.
       b. CRY INDEX$_{dolls}$
          'The dolls are crying.'

Coerts (2000) then undertook to reanalyze the child data previously studied by Coerts & Mills. First, it was clear that the children knew that SLN permits null subjects, as they used them appropriately frequently. She then employed a fairly strict criterion for acquisition of the SPC process: the child must use a sentence-final subject pronoun in a sentence with an overt subject to show that they had acquired SPC. Once the children showed they had acquired SPC, at around two

years, any later instances of verb – subject order in which the post-verbal subject is a pronoun were considered instances of SPC.

Using this reanalysis, Coerts found that the majority of the previously 'unexplained' word order examples were in fact explainable, and children's acquisition of word order was more in line with expectations. Coerts concludes:

> "knowledge of the adult language steers the choice of analysis procedures used for acquisition data ... an analysis procedure that takes subject pronoun copy into account results in a much clearer picture with respect to the acquisition of subject and verb position" (Coerts 2000)

A project by Chen Pichler (2001a; 2001b) resulted in similar findings for ASL, and her study goes beyond consideration of SPC alone to include other instances of word order changes allowed in the adult grammar. Although there had been early claims that children strictly followed the adult basic SVO word order, Schick (2002) found no evidence for this strategy in two-year-olds, concluding instead that children's word order was 'random'. Chen Pichler used a similar approach to Coerts' and determined when children's use of verb-subject order could be considered cases of SPC, and when their use of object-verb order could be considered as following from adult-like word-order changing operations (for example, object shift).

Chen Pichler established clear criteria for counting utterances as legal order changes. For example, post-verbal subjects must be pronouns to be considered SPC; pre-verbal objects occurring with verbs marked for aspect, spatial location, or handling classifier were considered instances of object shift. Using these criteria, Chen Pichler found that children's word order use demonstrates regularity in following grammatical options much earlier than previously thought. Thus, taking into consideration such developments in the syntactic analyses leads to more reliable acquisition studies.

Both of these examples illustrate the importance of considering the target adult grammar when studying language development. The goal of studying language acquisition is to understand how children become adult-like in their knowledge of language. When children differ from adults, an explanation for this difference must be sought. But sometimes researchers examining child development overlook developments in the study of the adult grammar. The description of the language children are exposed to, and will ultimately be users of, changes as researchers gather more data and form hypotheses which point in new directions for further study. Language acquisition researchers can be frustrated by this moving target, but they can also benefit from it in improved analyses and hypotheses of their own.

4. Using sign language acquisition data to inform us about theories of language acquisition

In the previous section, we considered theories of adult grammar and their relationship to studies of language acquisition. Here, we turn to theories of the process of acquisition. Alternative theories of how language develops can be tested and refined using real-time acquisition data from sign languages just as they are tested using data from spoken languages. These theories are general theories about language acquisition, not particular to sign languages (and in general, not developed on the basis of sign language data).

As an example, consider the Verb Island Hypothesis of Tomasello (1992). According to this model of (general) language development, children go through an early period in which "verbs are individual 'islands' of organization in an otherwise unorganized grammatical system" (as summarized by Schick 2002). It predicts that certain patterns (such as word order or inflections) will be found with individual verbs, although there will not be evidence that a whole class of verbs behaves in the same way. This early period of verb islands would begin when children are starting to use two-word combinations, but generalizations would be apparent some months later (say, around the age of two years for most children).

In support of this proposal, Morgan & Woll (2002) conclude: "we found no evidence for the child's exploitation of an abstract set of verb frames before 3;2. The child appeared to build argument structure afresh with each new verb and these verbs were uniquely tied to their communicative function." Only later, they argue, do children build rules which hold over multiple verbs.

Schick (2002) also examined the verb island hypothesis in her study of early sign combinations. She found only limited evidence in support of the hypothesis, in that some of the children she studied showed consistent ordering patterns with some verbs. However, she found that in many cases, word order was quite varied even for individual verbs. This would appear to show neither verb islands, where individual verbs behave alike, nor evidence of word order rules which apply across the board to all different verbs.

In this context, we can return to the findings of Coerts (2000) and Chen Pichler (2001), reported in section 3B. These authors reported systematic use of word order by young signing children when grammatical alternations allowed by the adult grammar are also considered. According to their results, children's signing is neither random nor organized into verb-specific islands. Rather, the rules which characterize the adult grammar are also found in this domain of

children's language. Whether the data analyzed by Morgan and Woll (BSL) and by Schick (ASL) are amenable to the same conclusion remains to be seen.

Another example can be raised from Reilly's study of the development of non-manual marking (as summarized in Reilly, 2006). Reilly and colleagues have been interested in children's development of the use of linguistic non-manual markings versus often very similar affective and communicative facial expressions. Reilly sees this project as in part a test of the question of "the degree to which language is an innately specified independent cognitive function" because it assesses the separability of language from other cognitive functions. She suggests that an approach to language acquisition in which language is seen as a general cognitive system would predict that children would readily recruit their pre-linguistic affective and communicative abilities in the service of linguistic functions, and thus acquire non-manual markings together with their co-occurring manual components. On the other hand, "children would approach each linguistic structure and its morphology de novo" in a more modular approach.

This question is clearly addressed with data from the development of non-manual marking of negation. The negative non-manual marker used in adult ASL is essentially like the negative headshake used communicatively by very young children, whether exposed to sign language or not. Negation can be expressed in adult ASL by a negative sign co-occurring with this negative headshake, or even by the negative headshake alone, as in the examples in (5) (examples from Reilly 2006).

$$\overline{\quad t \quad} \qquad \overline{\quad neg \quad}$$

(5)   a. BOOK READ ME CAN'T

       'I can't read the book.'

$$\qquad\qquad \overline{\quad neg \quad}$$

    b. ME EAT ICE-CREAM

      'I don't eat ice cream.'

Reilly and her colleagues found that deaf children acquiring sign languages, like hearing, non-signing children, produce communicative negative headshakes by about 12 months of age. The first negative signs, NO and DON'T-WANT, emerge at 18-20 months, followed by other negative signs up to age 3;6. For seven of the eight negative signs investigated, Reilly found that the manual sign first appears without the required co-occurring headshake. Several months later, the negative headshake is used together with the negative signs. This separation occurred despite the fact that the negative headshake was used pre-linguistically by these children to mean essentially the same thing.

Reilly concludes that children treat the negative headshake as it is used in ASL as a linguistic element which must be analyzed independently. This would not be expected under the theory of language as a more general cognitive system, but only by the modular approach.

The two theories under discussion in this section – the verb island hypothesis and the modularity of language with respect to other cognitive systems – can be further tested using data from sign language acquisition, as can other theories of language development. In some cases, sign languages provide a new form of data, unavailable using the study of spoken languages alone. The study of the non-manual marking of negation is one such case. In other cases, sign language provide needed breadth and diversity of languages brought to bear on a theoretical question.

5. Using sign language acquisition data to tell us about the nature of language

The study of sign languages and deaf communities can provide information about language development under extreme circumstances which are not found elsewhere. This is a unique contribution to our understanding of the nature of language and the mechanisms which make language acquisition possible. Researchers studying such circumstances have a very special role to play in advancing scientific knowledge.

Examples of such contributions come from the study of recently developed sign languages, late first language learners of sign languages, learners with degraded input, learners of invented sign systems, homesigners, etc. These studies tell us about the ranges of possible languages, the path and properties of language emergence, 'resilient' properties of language which appear in the absence of evidence, critical period effects in language acquisition, how the learner modifies the input she receives, etc. The range of outcomes from such studies is so broad and important that there is no way to give it justice here. However, I will give one example to whet the reader's appetite; for a fuller meal please see the original works in this area.

Late first language learners are virtually unheard of in spoken language communities, but not so in signers. Since about 95% of deaf children have hearing parents (Mitchell & Karchmer, 2004), it is not surprising that the vast majority are not exposed to sign language from birth. Sometimes, parents decide to educate their children orally (without sign language); some of these children are later exposed to a sign language after having learned only a portion of spoken language (often, not enough to communicate effectively). In other cases, children experience late exposure to sign language simply because the resources for exposing the child earlier were not available to the family. For various reasons, children may be exposed to sign language only after the age of two

years, or five years, or twelve years, etc. It is not well understood exactly how such delayed linguistic exposure affects language development, but it is clear that there are such effects.

Morford & Mayberry (2000) provide an overview of some of the research investigating effects of delayed input on (first) language acquisition and processing. Most of this research has been conducted with adults whose exposure to sign language began at different times. By studying adults, researchers investigate the outcome of the language-development process, after years of experience have made the use of sign language a well-practiced, familiar skill.

Overall, studies with adults whose age of first exposure to ASL was approximately 4 to 16 years, as compared to native signers (those with exposure from birth), have consistently reported differences in both production and comprehension tests. Furthermore, studies looking at language processing have also found differences for different age-of-exposure groups. The degree of an effect is not uniform across different studies. For example, Newport (1990) found that later learners (those with exposure after age 12) scored lower than 'early' learners (those with exposure between 4 and 6), who in turn scored lower than native signers, on tests of ASL morphology production and comprehension. However, the three groups were not different on a test of basic word order. Similarly, Emmorey et al. (1995) found that late learners were different from native signers in a study of on-line processing of verb agreement, but not in aspect marking.

Mayberry et al. (2002) extended such findings by comparing late first-language learners of ASL with late *second*-language learners of ASL: late-deafened adults whose exposure to sign language began in the same period as the late first-language learners (9-13). The effects of late exposure were strongest for late first-language learners; late second-language learners performed close to natives.

These results reinforce the idea that early exposure to language is crucial for its normal acquisition. But what factor(s) will be most affected by delayed input when other factors are relatively spared? Newport (1990) hypothesizes that young children have the ability to detect patterns of the correct grain size for the development of complex morphology, while the greater cognitive capabilities of older children or adults actually interferes with this type of analysis, thus leading to the differences in performance on syntactic versus morphological tests she observed.

An alternative proposal is put forth by Morford & Mayberry (2000), who emphasize the differences in phonological processing skills for native or early learners versus late learners, and suggest that what is missing for late learners is what is learned by those with native exposure in the first year of life. In particular, a great deal of phonological development takes place during this period, and studies show infants' sensitivities to phonological information from a very early age. What Morford & Mayberry propose is that "the true advantage of early exposure to language is the

development of the phonological system prior to the development of the lexical-semantic and morpho-syntactic systems". Problems in phonological processing can have 'cascading' effects on other levels of language processing, showing up in the various areas of effects of language delay.

The hypothesis of Morford & Mayberry should be tested in additional studies of the effects of delayed language input. One important question is whether the hypothesized phonological processing deficit can fully account for the areas of impairment and preservation found in later learners. Are there specifically grammatical differences between early and later learners as well? Some evidence that there are such differences comes from a study of two children whose exposure to ASL began at the age of six. This study, by Berk (2003), finds that the later learners are particularly affected in their production of person-marking agreement on ASL verbs. Other verbal morphology, indicating location agreement, is not affected, although the form of such agreement is very similar to that of person-marking. A specifically grammatical deficit would seem to be implicated (possibly in addition to phonological processing difficulties).

The study of late learners has much to contribute to theories of language and language development. The effects of delayed input should not be random or general, but rather should fall along fault lines which the grammar makes available. Theories of why children are better language-learners than adults are must make reference to crucial aspects of the language-learning mechanism. Such theories have little data to go on outside of the realm of late first-language acquisition in deaf children, since second-language learning appears to have different constraints and consequences. Thus, more work in this area is clearly needed.

6. Research which cuts across themes

Many areas of sign language acquisition research touch on more than one of the themes above, although it has been possible to 'force' example studies into one or another category. One area of research which clearly touches on all of the themes is the acquisition of verb agreement, which has been a subject of attention for well over twenty years.

Meier (1982) examined the acquisition of verb agreement in ASL in comparison to the acquisition of verbal morphology in spoken languages. He posed the question whether agreement would be acquired differently in the two modalities, since the sign language agreement can be considered iconic (e.g., the agreeing verb I-GIVE-YOU may look something like a mime of the giving action). He argued that sign language agreement is acquired in a similar fashion as is complex, unstressed verb agreement in some spoken languages. In particular, he found that agreement is mastered only around age 3;0 (not early due to apparent iconicity). This mastery is

defined as correct use in obligatory contexts, an important consideration since not all verbs take agreement.

On the other hand, Morgan et al. (2006) argue that 'spatial' aspects of verb agreement in sign language make it unlike that in spoken languages, and they claim that typological and modality factors account for developmental patterns in the acquisition of British Sign Language (BSL). They argue that verbal morphology in sign languages has a high degree of simultaneity, making segmentation difficult for the young child. This contributes to the relatively late acquisition they observed in one deaf child who used agreement productively around 3;0.

However, changes in the classification of verbs into those which do or do not require agreement, and different proposals about how verb agreement should be analyzed, have led to a different picture of the nature of early verb agreement. Casey (2003) found early use of verb agreement in a group of ASL-acquiring children, although she identified errors of omission in obligatory contexts continuing to occur until age 3, even using new ideas about verb classification. Quadros & Lillo-Martin (2007) used additional recent developments in the analysis of verb agreement morphology to identify contexts for obligatory use, and found that errors of omission were extremely rare, for two children acquiring ASL and two children acquiring LSB. These studies are now working in the reciprocal direction, as Quadros & Lillo-Martin (in preparation) show that the acquisition data help to identify additional contexts of optionality which are confirmed in studies of adult signers.

As to the fourth theme, studies of verb agreement acquisition have been raised to address various theoretical questions. For example, Morgan & Woll (2002) discuss various approaches to the 'mapping' problem, that is, how children learn to 'map' various known conceptual conceptual representations onto linguistic structures they are acquiring. They use the acquisition of verb agreement as one source of data to address this problem, concluding that children must slowly develop more complex structures (e.g., those with a greater number of argument positions) after starting with simpler ones.

Finally, verb agreement has been studied in late learners, as it seems to be an area of special problems. Adult late learners (Newport 1990) and children with delayed exposure (Berk 2003) have been shown to err on verbal morphology, and they have processing difficulties in this domain (Emmorey et al. 1995). Verb agreement is also a subject of interest in studies of emerging languages (Aronoff, Padden, Meir, & Sandler, 2004; Senghas, 2000).

This one domain of research has been highly productive, with issues and concerns beyond those mentioned here. See also Meier (2002) for a critical review of many of these observations.

7. The future of sign language acquisition research

What does the future of sign language acquisition research look like? A possible future could be one in which studies of sign language acquisition fade away, due to lack of interest, or research only conducted by a few isolated researchers. Our hope, however, is that such studies expand, and that more and more hypothesis-driven research is conducted in this domain. It is important that more Deaf researchers are involved in this area of study, as their understanding of the language and its context is invaluable. This means that more opportunities for training and collaboration should be made available and encouraged.

It is hoped that future research will also enhance connections with the questions asked of spoken language acquisition. Theories of language, and of language acquisition, need to accommodate sign language data, so sign language research that informs and benefits from studies of spoken languages is desirable. Even more studies of an enhanced range of populations is encouraged – for example, cross-sign language comparisons, studies of the effects of differences in input quality and timing, etc. Such studies have so much to offer, both scientifically and practically.

Finally, all of these hopes for future research are based on the premise that Deaf children continue to be exposed to and acquire sign languages. This is the most important component of the future of sign language acquisition research.

References

Aronoff, M., Padden, C., Meir, I., & Sandler, W. (2004). Morpological Universals and the Sign Language Type. In G. Booij & J. van Marle (Eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 2004* (pp. 19-40). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Battison, R. (1978). *Lexical borrowing in American Sign Language*. Silver Spring: Linstok Press.

Berk, S. (2003). *Sensitive Period Effects on the Acquisition of Language: A Study of Language Development.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Bos, H. (1995). Pronoun copy in Sign Language of the Netherlands. In H. Bos & T. Schermer (Eds.), *Sign Language Research 1994: Proceedings of the 4th European Congress on Sign Language Research* (pp. 121-147). Hamburg: Signum.

Caselli, M. C., & Volterra, V. (1990). From communication to language in hearing and deaf children. In V. Volterra & C. J. Erting (Eds.), *From Gesture to Language in Hearing and Deaf Children* (pp. 263-277). Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Casey, S. (2003). *'Agreement' in gestures and signed languages: the use of directionality to indicate referents involved in actions.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, San Diego.

Cheek, A., Cormier, K., Repp, A., & Meier, R. P. (2001). Prelinguistic gesture predicts mastery and error in the production of first signs. *Language, 77*(2), 292-323.

Chen Pichler, D. (2001a). Evidence for early word order acquisition in a variable word order language. In A. H.-J. Do, L. Dominguez & A. Johansen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th Boston University Conference on Language Development*. Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Chen Pichler, D. (2001b). *Word Order Variability and Acquisition in American Sign Language.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Coerts, J. (2000). Early sign combinations in the acquisition of Sign Language of the Netherlands: Evidence for language-specific features. In C. Chamberlain, J. P. Morford & R. I. Mayberry (Eds.), *Language Acquisition by Eye*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Coerts, J., & Mills, A. E. (1994). Early Sign Combinations of Deaf Children in Sign Language of the Netherlands. In I. Ahlgren, B. Bergman & M. Brennan (Eds.), *Perspectives on sign language usage: papers from the Fifth International Symposium on Sign Language Research* (Vol. 2, pp. 319-331). Durham: ISLA.

Conlin, K. E., Mirus, G. R., Mauk, C., & Meier, R. P. (2000). The acquisition of first signs: Place, handshape, and movement. In C. Chamberlain, J. P. Morford & R. I. Mayberry (Eds.), *Language Acquisition by Eye* (pp. 51-69). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Emmorey, K., Bellugi, U., Friederici, A., & Horn, P. (1995). Effects of age of acquisition on grammatical sensitivity: Evidence from on-line and off-line tasks. *Applied psycholinguistics, 16*(1), 1-23.

Hulst, H. v. d. (1993). Units in the analysis of signs. *Phonology, 10*(2), 209-242.

Karnopp, L. B. (2002). Phonology acquisition in Brazilian Sign Language. In G. Morgan & B. Woll (Eds.), *Directions in Sign Language Acquisition* (pp. 29-53). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lillo-Martin, D. (1999). Modality Effects and Modularity in Language Acquisition: The Acquisition of American Sign Language. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Language Acquisition* (pp. 531-567). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Lillo-Martin, D., & Quadros, R. M. d. (2005). The acquisition of focus constructions in American Sign Language and Língua de Sinais Brasileira. In A. Burgos, M. R. Clark-Cotton & S. Ha (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 29th Boston University Conference on Language Development* (pp. 365-375). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Lillo-Martin, D., & Quadros, R. M. d. (2006). The position of early WH-elements in American Sign Language and Brazilian Sign Language. In K. u. Deen, J. Nomura, B. Schulz & B. D. Schwartz (Eds.), *The Proceedings of the Inaugural Conference on Generative Approaches to Language Acquisition - North America, Honolulu, HI* (pp. 195-203). Cambridge, MA: MITWPL.

Lillo-Martin, D., & Quadros, R. M. d. (2007). Focus Constructions in American Sign Language and Língua de Sinais Brasileira. In *Proceedings of TISLR VIII*.

MacNeilage, P. F., & Davis, B. L. (1990). Acquisition of speech production: Frames, then content. In M. Jeannerod (Ed.), *Attention and Performance 11: Motor Representation and Control* (pp. 453–476). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Marentette, P. F., & Mayberry, R. I. (2000). Principles for an emerging phonological system: A case study of early ASL acquisition. In C. Chamberlain, J. P. Morford & R. I. Mayberry (Eds.), *Language Acquisition by Eye* (pp. 71-90). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mayberry, R. I., Lock, E., & Kazmi, H. (2002). Linguistic ability and early langauge exposure. *Nature, 417*(38).

Meier, R. P. (1982). *Icons, analogues, and morphemes: The acquisition of verb agreement in ASL.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, San Diego.

Meier, R. P. (2002). The acquisition of verb agreement: Pointing out arguments for the linguistic status of agreement in signed languages. In G. Morgan & B. Woll (Eds.), *Current Developments in the Study of Signed Language Acquisition* (pp. 115-141). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Meier, R. P. (2006). The form of early signs: Explaining signing children's articulatory development. In B. Schick, M. Marschark & P. E. Spencer (Eds.), *Advances in the Sign Language Development of Deaf Children* (pp. 202-230). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meier, R. P., & Newport, E. L. (1990). Out of the Hands of Babes: On a Possible Sign Advantage in Language Acquisition. *Language, 66*, 1-23.

Meier, R. P., & Willerman, R. (1995). Prelinguistic gesture in deaf and hearing infants. In K. Emmorey & J. Reilly (Eds.), *Language, Gesture, and Space* (pp. 391-410). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mitchell, R. E., & Karchmer, M. A. (2004). Chasing the mythical ten percent: Parental hearing status of deaf and hard of hearing students in the United States. *Sign Language Studies, 4*(2), 138-163.

Morford, J. P., & Mayberry, R. I. (2000). A reexamination of "early exposure" and its implications for language acquisition by eye. In C. Chamberlain, J. P. Morford & R. I. Mayberry (Eds.), *Language acquisition by eye* (pp. 111-127).

Morgan, G., Barriere, I., & Woll, B. (2006). The influence of typology and modality on the acquisition of verb agreement morphology in British Sign Language. *First Language, 26*, 19-43.

Morgan, G., & Woll, B. (2002). The development of complex sentences in British Sign Language. In G. Morgan & B. Woll (Eds.), *Directions in Sign Language Acquisition* (pp. 255-275). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Neidle, C. (2002). ASL focus and question constructions. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook, 2*, 71-98.

Newport, E. L. (1990). Maturational constraints on language learning. *Cognitive Science, 14*, 11-28.

Newport, E. L., & Meier, R. P. (1985). The Acquisition of American Sign Language. In D. I. Slobin (Ed.), *The Cross-Linguistic Study of Language Acquisition* (Vol. 1, pp. 881-938). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Nunes, J., & Quadros, R. M. d. (2006). Focus duplication of WH-elements in Brazilian Sign Language. In *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistic Society 35*. Charleston, SC: Booksurge.

Nunes, J., & Quadros, R. M. d. (2007). Phonetic realization of multiple copies in Brazilian Sign Language. In J. Quer (Ed.), *Proceedings of Theoretical Issues in Sign Language Research VIII, Barcelona*: Signum Verlag.

Padden, C. A. (1988). *Interaction of Morphology and Syntax in American Sign Language*. New York: Garland.

Petitto, L. A. (2000). The acquisition of natural signed languages: Lessons in the nature of human language and its biological foundations. In C. Chamberlain, J. P. Morford & R. I. Mayberry (Eds.), *Language Acquisition by Eye* (pp. 41-50). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Petitto, L. A., & Marentette, P. F. (1991). Babbling in the Manual Mode: Evidence for the Ontogeny of Language. *Science, 251*, 1493-1496.

Petronio, K. (1993). *Clause Structure in American Sign Language.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington.

Quadros, R. M. d. (1997). *Educação de Surdos: A Aquisição da Linguagem*. Porto Alegre: Editora Artes Médicas.

Quadros, R. M. d., & Lillo-Martin, D. (2007). Gesture and the acquisition of verb agreement in sign languages. In H. Caunt-Nulton, S. Kulatilake & I.-H. Woo (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 31st Boston University Conference on Language Development* (Vol. 2, pp. 520-531). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Reilly, J. (2006). How faces come to serve grammar: The development of nonmanual morphology in American Sign Language. In B. Schick, M. Marschark & P. E. Spencer (Eds.), *Advances in the Sign Language Development of Deaf Children* (pp. 262-290). Oxford: Oxford University Pres.

Schick, B. S. (2002). The expression of grammatical relations by deaf toddlers learning ASL. In G. Morgan & B. Woll (Eds.), *Directions in sign language acquisition* (pp. 143-158). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Senghas, A. (2000). The development of early spatial morphology in Nicarauan Sign Language. In S. C. Howell, S. A. Fish & T. Keith-Lucas (Eds.), *The Proceedings of the Boston University Conference on Language Development* (Vol. 24, pp. 696-707). Boston: Cascadilla Press.

Snyder, W., & Lillo-Martin, D. (in press). Language acquisition and the Principles and Parameters framework. In P. Hogan (Ed.), *Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tomasello, M. (1992). *First Verbs: A Case Study of Early Grammatical Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van den Bogaerde, B. (2000). Input and Interaction in Deaf Families. *Sign Language & Linguistics, 3*(1), 143–151.

Wilbur, R. B. (1997). A prosodic/pragmatic explanation for word order variation in ASL with typological implications. In M. Vespoor, K. D. Lee & E. Sweetser (Eds.), *Lexical and syntactical constructions and the constructions of meaning* (pp. 89-104). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.