Hearing Babies Respond to Language's Patterning and Socially-Contingent Interactions with a Signing Avatar: Insights into Human Language Acquisition

*Laura-Ann Petitto¹**, Rachel Sortino¹, Kailyn Aaron-Lozano¹, Grady Gallagher¹, Setareh Nasihati Gilani², David Traum², Arcangelo Merla³, Chiara Filippini^{1&3}, Cryss Padilla¹

1: Gallaudet University, 2: University of Southern California, 3: Universita G. D'Annunizio Chieti-Pescara, Italy

ABSTRACT

A novel learning tool with artificial agents was built to facilitate language learning in young babies deprived of language exposure during a critical period in child development, 6-12 months. Here, babies have peaked sensitivity to the rhythmic temporal patterning of language, which permits segmentation, categorization, and discernment of statistical regularities of phonetic-syllabic units central to word/language learning, and early reading success¹. One target population are the many deaf babies with minimal usable access to language in early life, hence our use of a natural signed language, American Sign Language (ASL). The system, "RAVE" (Robot, AVatar, thermal Enhanced language learning tool) involves an embodied robot (directs babies' attention to an avatar screen), avatar (produces language/Linguistic Nursery Rhymes in ASL; routine Social Communications such as HI, BYE-BYE; non-linguistic/non socially-contingent body movements/postures, "Idle"), and thermal imaging (an innovation that permits detection of Autonomic Nervous System activity associated with emotional engagement and attention);² the babies' nature/degree of engagement provided an index of when they were "ready to learn," which then triggered the avatar when to start and cease a socially contingent communication. Dialogue scripts then guided selection of avatar communications with baby that were socially contingent on the baby's states of engagement and productions. Earlier studies suggest that babies can follow a robot's gaze³, but infant language learning from a TV screen is problematical⁴. Our scientific challenge and question were whether babies can detect internal differences among the avatar's communicative modes by producing differential behavioral responses; the hypothesis being that differential behavioral responses would provide evidence of a potential to learn language from an artificial agent. METHOD. Experiment w/8 babies: 1 deaf/sign-exposed, 7 hearing: 1 sign+speech exposed, 6 non-sign exposed (a design feature to reveal salient linguistic perception/production features independent of language meaning); 7-13mths; seated before RAVE on parent's lap (Fig 1). A key feature of the ASL stimuli was that they contained the rhythmic temporal patterning universal to all languages and critical to this age^{1,5}, **RESULTS**. All 8 babies produced differential behavioral responses to the avatar's different communicative modes/conversational turns (i.e., sustained visual attention, social gestures, and linguistic). Case studies of 4 showed largest percentage of their *linguistic responses* to the avatar's Linguistic Nurserv Rhymes: 36% linguistic responses to avatar's Nurserv Rhymes vs 26% to avatar's Idle, 26% to avatar's Social Communications, 24% during 3-Way avatar, baby, robot exchanges. Babies' linguistic responses included manual babbling, production of proto-sign phonetic units, protosigns, linguistic sign-phonetic, sign imitations. **DISCUSSION:** The findings are remarkable because most of these hearing babies did not understand the meaning of ASL and instead appeared riveted by the universal rhythmic temporal patterning of language; add, the avatar was on a TV screen. Beyond social interaction, babies responded greatest to the avatar when its productions were socially contingent (e.g., Nursery Rhymes, Social Gestures versus Idle), thus providing powerful insights that the presence of language's rhythmic patterning and social contingency constitute two potent and necessary features of human language acquisition. The study demonstrates the potential for language learning from agents in young babies^{6,7,8}.

Society for Research in Child Development (SRCD). March 22, 2019

References

1. Petitto, L.A., Langdon, C., Stone, A., Andriola, D., Kartheiser, G., and Cochran, C. (2016). Visual sign phonology: Insights into human reading and language from a natural soundless phonology. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science 7, 6, 366–381.

2. Merla, A. (2014). Thermal expression of intersubjectivity offers new possibilities to human-machine and technologically mediated interactions. Frontiers in psychology 5, 802.

3. Meltzoff, A.N., Brooks, R., Shon, A.P, and Rao, R.P.N. (2010)."Social" robots are psychological agents for infants: A test of gaze following. Neural networks 23, 8-9, 966–972.

4. Kuhl, P.K., Tsao, F-M., and Liu, H-M. (2003). Foreign-language experience in infancy: Effects of short-term exposure and social interaction on phonetic learning. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 100, 15, 9096–9101. arXiv:http://www.pnas.org/content/100/15/9096.full.pdf.

5. Petitto, L.A., Holowka, S., Sergio, L.E., and Ostry, D. (2001). Language rhythms in baby hand movements. Nature 413, 6851, 35.

6. Nasihati Gilani, S., Traum, D., Sortino, R., Gallagher, Aaron-Lozano, K., G., Padilla, C., Shapiro, A., Lamberton, J., & Petitto, L.A. (2019). Can a virtual human facilitate language learning in a young baby? Extended Abstract of the International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS), Montreal, May 2019.

7. Nasihati Gilani, S., Traum, D., Merla, A., Hee, E., Walker, Z., Manini, B., Gallagher, G., & Petitto, L. (2018). Multimodal Dialogue Management for Multiparty Interaction with Infants. In refereed published Paper in the Proceedings of the 20th Association for Computing Machinery/ACM International Conference on Multimodal Interaction, Colorado, October 2018.

8. Scassellati, B., Brawer, J., Tsui, K., Nasihati Gilani, S., Malzkuhn, M., Manini, B., Stone, A., Kartheiser, G., Merla, A., Shapiro, A., Traum, D.,& Petitto, L.A. (2017). Teaching Language to Deaf Infants with a Robot and a Virtual Human. In refereed published Paper in the Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems/CHI (pp.553; 1-553:13). New York, NY, USA: ACM. ISBN 123-4567-24-567/08/06. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.475/123_4.

*Corresponding Author: Laura-Ann.Petitto@Gallaudet.Edu

Figure 1 shows Experimental setup with baby seated on parent's lap (who wears sunglasses to prevent parent's eyes from being picked up by eye-tracker) before a table containing the robot (to baby's right), TV monitor with Avatar (to baby's left), eye-tracker (center table) and Thermal Infrared imaging camera (right of robot's head through black curtains).

