

# Comprehension of prosodic and syntactic focus marking in Mandarin Chinese - Data from children and adults

International co-operation in higher education and training

Hui-Ching Chen<sup>123</sup> | Stephen Crain<sup>2</sup> | Barbara Höhle<sup>1</sup>

1 | Department of Linguistics, University of Potsdam, Germany 2 | ARC Centre of Excellence in Cognition and its Disorders, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia 3 | International Doctorate for Experimental Approaches to Language and Brain

### Introduction

- Focus indicates the presence of alternatives that are relevant for the interpretation of linguistic expressions and it can be represented by prosodic information and syntactic structure (Rooth, 1992; Krifka, 2008)
- Mandarin speakers (adults and children) can mark focus by using prosodic cues but less research has been done for understanding whether Mandarin speakers can comprehend prosodic focus marking (Yang and Chen, 2014).
- Theoretical considerations: Chinese "uses more syntax and less phonology in focus realization" (Xu, 2004)

# Eye-tracking study

- A more sensitive and more suitable online method in need (Cutler and Swinney, 1987)
- Eye movements can be used to observe the rapid mental processes that underpin spoken language comprehension (Tanenhaus et al., 1995)
- The children's looking patterns mirror the adults' looking patterns, but poor performance in off-line measures for comprehension of the target sentences (Zhou et al, 2012; Höhle et al, 2016)

## Method

# Sentence-picture verification task (Szendrői et al., 2017)

• Participants:

56 Mandarin-speaking adults, 58 5-year-old Mandarinspeaking children (6 were excluded)

- Conditions (See below): Subject-accented, Subject-cleft, Object-pseudocleft
- Between-subject design
- Materials:

- Figure 2.: Focus congruence response data
- Lowest performance in the subject-accented condition & the highest in the objectpseudocleft condition

### Linear Mixed Effects Models

 Group interaction: Differences between subject-accented and

## Results

#### Focus congruence response 0.75 0.50 0.25 12% 0.00 Focus congruence response 0.79% 12% 12% 0.00 Focus congruence response 0.79% 12% 0.75 12% 0.00 Focus congruence response 0.75 12% 0.00 Focus congruence response Condition Subject Cleftsub Pseudocleft

8 test trials, 8 control trials, 4 trials, 2 practice trials

### Figure 1: Test trial example



### Subject-accented

XIAONIAO you shueping, shi ma? bird have bottle Aux Q 'The BIRDYF has the bottle, is that right?' subject-cleft larger in adults than in children





- ◀ Figure 3.: Gaze data for test trials
  - The children's looking patterns are similar to the adults' ones

### Linear Mixed Effects Models

- Group interaction: The difference between subjectaccented and subject-cleft is larger in adults than in children
- No differences between subject-accented and object-pseudocleft condition in both groups

### Conclusions

- The accuracy data and the eye-gaze data mirror each other
- In contrast to Chen no evidence that Mandarin learners rely

Subject-cleft

Shi XIAONIAO you shueping, shi ma? SHI bird have bottle Aux Q *'It is the BIRDYF who has the bottle, is that right?'* Object-pseudocleft Xiaoniao you de shi SHUEPING, shi ma? bird have DE SHI bottle Aux Q

'What the birdy has is the BOTTLEF, is that right?'

more on prosodic cues than adults (Chen, 1998)

 Higher reliance on syntactic than on prosodic cues to identify focus in both children and adults

### Reference

Krifka, M. (2008). Basic notions of information structure. Acta Linguistica Hungarica, 55(3), 243-276. Rooth, M. (1992). A theory of focus interpretation. Natural language semantics, 1(1), 75-116. Yang, A., & Chen, A. (2014). Prosody Focus Marking in Child and Adult Mandarin Chinese. In Fourth International Symposium on Tonal Aspects of Languages. Xu, L. (2004). Manifestation of informational focus. Lingua, 114(3), 277-299. Cutler, A., & Swinney, D. (1987). Prosody and the development of comprehension. *Journal of Child Language, 14*(1), 145-167. Tanenhaus, M. K., Spivey-Knowlton, M. J., Eberhard, K. M., & Sedivy, J. C. (1995). Integration of visual and linguistic information in spoken language comprehension. Science, 268(5217), 1632-1634. Zhou, P., Su, Y., Crain, S., Gao, L., & Zhan, L. (2012). Children's use of phonological information in ambiguity resolution: A view from Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Child Language, 39*(4), 687-730. Höhle B, Fritzsche T, Müller A (2016) Children's Comprehension of Sentences with Focus Particles and the Role of Cognitive Control: An Eye Tracking Study with German-Learning 4-Year-Olds. PLoS ONE 11(3): e0149870. Szendrői, K., Bernard, C., Berger, F., Gervain, J., & Höhle, B. (2017). Acquisition of prosodic focus marking by English, French, and German three-, four-, five- and six-year olds. *Journal of Child Language*, 1-23. Chen, S. H. E. (1998). Surface cues and the development of given/new interpretation. Applied Psycholinguistics, 19(04), 553-582.



This work was supported by the Erasmus Mundus Joint Doctoral Programme of the European Union, 2014–0685/001-001-EMJD (Framework Partnership Agreement 2012-2025) If you have any suggestions, comments, or would like to discuss about the study, please email: huchen@uni-potsdam.de







