



**The impact of input quality on early sign development in native and non-native language learners.**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Child Language</i>
Manuscript ID	JCL-11-14-140.R3
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Paper
Keywords:	Sign Language, Development, Parental input

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

For Review

INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

The impact of input quality on early sign development in native and non-native language learners.

(Received 29/11/14, Revised 12/07/15, Accepted 06/12/15)

Jenny Lu

Deafness, Cognition and Language Research Centre, University College London &  
Department of Psychology, University of Chicago

Anna Jones

Deafness, Cognition and Language Research Centre, University College London

Gary Morgan\*

Department of Language and Communication Science, City University London

\*Corresponding author

City University London - Language and Communication Science  
Northampton square, London EC1V0HB  
United Kingdom

[G.Morgan@city.ac.uk](mailto:G.Morgan@city.ac.uk)

Running head: INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Acknowledgments

The work of Jenny Lu was funded by a Fulbright fellowship and Gary Morgan by the Economic and Social Research Council of Great Britain (Grant 620-28-600 Deafness, Cognition and Language Research Centre).

For Peer Review

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

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

**Abstract**

There is debate about how input variation influences child language. Most deaf children are exposed to a sign language from their non-fluent hearing parents and experience a delay in exposure to accessible language. A small number of children receive language input from their deaf parents who are fluent signers. Thus it is possible to document the impact of quality of input on early sign acquisition. The current study explores the outcomes of input in two groups of children aged 2- 5 years: deaf children of hearing parents (DCHP) and deaf children of deaf parents (DCDP). Analysis of child sign language revealed DCDP had a more developed vocabulary and more phonological handshape types compared with DCHP. In naturalistic conversations deaf parents used more sign tokens and more phonological types than hearing parents. Results are discussed in terms of the effects of early input on subsequent language abilities.

*Keywords:* phonological development, parental input, sign language, language acquisition

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

The impact of input quality on early sign development in native and non-native language learners.

The vast majority of child language learners become native speakers of at least one spoken language. Children who are exposed to signed languages from birth from deaf parents are also termed native signers and their sign acquisition shows parallels in onset, rate, and patterns of development compared to children learning spoken languages. Only around 5-10% of deaf children have deaf parents (DCDP) and in this small group of signers first signs and early sign combinations appear at a similar age to first spoken words, early word combinations, and syntax is also mastered along a similar timescale (Chamberlain, Morford, & Mayberry, 2000; Morgan & Woll, 2002; Schick, Marschark, & Spencer, 2005; Morgan, 2014b).

The remaining 90-95% of deaf children who acquire signing are the off-spring of hearing adults (DCHP) who do not know a sign language before their child is diagnosed deaf (Spencer & Marschark, 2006). This means that the majority of deaf children are first exposed to sign after the first few years. While these children are labelled non-native signers, for them, sign is their first language. This is a very interesting question in itself, as it is almost impossible for a hearing child not to be exposed to a spoken language from birth onwards, although some rare cases do exist (Curtiss, 1977).

There are two aspects of this atypical language learning situation relevant here. DCHP experience delays in exposure to both spoken and signed language because of deafness and parents who begin to learn a sign language after their child is diagnosed deaf (Woll, 2013). With the advent of the Newborn Hearing Screening Programme in the UK in 2006, the vast majority of children with a hearing loss are identified by the age of six months. Even so, this does not mean that DCHP are exposed to sign language at an early age. First, their parents do not know before birth their child will be deaf, so they cannot begin to learn a sign language

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 until after that point. While the deaf child gets older the parents then need to start the process  
4  
5 of learning what for them at this point, is a foreign language. Secondly, DCHP receive non-  
6  
7 native sign input from hearing parents who are just learning the language. The rest of this  
8  
9 study focuses on this second aspect: quality of input.  
10

11  
12 There is some understanding about what delay and non-native input mean for DCHP's  
13  
14 eventual level of sign language mastery (Newport, 2002; Ferjan Ramirez, Lieberman &  
15  
16 Mayberry 2013; Morgan, 2014). However this research for the most part focuses on the end-  
17  
18 state of non-native language acquisition. In contrast, there has been very little examination of  
19  
20 the actual signing skills of young DCHP compared with same age native signers, as they are  
21  
22 acquiring the language. Nor has there been much work on the quality of the sign input to  
23  
24 DCHP from hearing parents who themselves are beginning to learn to sign. It is not  
25  
26 comparable to include children who are exposed to a language that is not the native tongue of  
27  
28 their parents (e.g. children of immigrants whose parents choose to speak the community  
29  
30 rather than the heritage language). This latter population do experience early input in a native  
31  
32 language through incidental learning and interaction with other children or adults even  
33  
34 though their parents speak to them in a non-native language. In contrast it is usually the case  
35  
36 that DCHP in the earlier years are only exposed to sign from their parents rather than the  
37  
38 wider deaf community.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 There is one special population of children which has some overlap with DCHP.  
46  
47 These are children whose first language acquisition is disrupted due to international adoption  
48  
49 (IA) and subsequent exposure to another language in the adopted family (Gauthier &  
50  
51 Genesee, 2011). In the reported studies of these children, the new first language develops  
52  
53 somewhat differently from the typical time course and leaves some long-lasting effects  
54  
55 especially involving the processing of phonology in working memory (Gauthier & Genesee,  
56  
57 2011).  
58  
59  
60

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Of the documented differences between DCHP and deaf children with deaf parents  
7  
8 (DCDP), one is for vocabulary. DCHP have slower sign vocabulary development than DCDP  
9  
10 (Mayne, Yoshinaga-Itano, Sedey and Carey, 2000; Moeller, 2000; Woll, 2012). Mayne et al.  
11  
12 (2000) reported an average vocabulary of 163 signs for a group of DCHP aged between 2-3  
13  
14 years old. This compares to an average of over 500 words for hearing children of the same  
15  
16 age (Fenson, Dale, Reznick, Bates, Thal, & Pethick, 1994) and over 300 signs for DCDP  
17  
18 (Anderson & Reilly, 2002; Woolfe, Herman, Roy, & Woll, 2010). There have been many  
19  
20 studies documenting how non-native signers process the phonological parameters of signs  
21  
22 differently to native signers. As in spoken languages, signed languages systematically  
23  
24 organize meaningless phonological units into meaningful ones (Stokoe, 1960; Brentari,  
25  
26 1998). The three main phonological parameters discussed in the literature are: handshape (the  
27  
28 configuration of the hand), movement (how the sign is articulated), and location (where the  
29  
30 sign is articulated). Similar to phoneme development in spoken language acquisition signing  
31  
32 children must acquire a repertoire of different handshapes found in the adult language. Again  
33  
34 in parallel to spoken language sounds, different handshapes used in the input to children  
35  
36 during their acquisition of sign language differ in their phonological complexity. For example  
37  
38 a fist handshape has a simpler phonological representation than a 'Y' handshape (as in the  
39  
40 'telephone' gesture formed with a fist with protruding thumb and pinkie). For a full  
41  
42 description of sign language phonology see Brentari (1998).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Mayberry and Eichen (1991) addressed phonological processing as a potential mechanism  
50  
51 underlying differences in comprehension abilities between native and non-native signers.  
52  
53 The errors they reported for adult native signers on a sentence shadowing task were mostly  
54  
55 semantic substitutions (e.g. repeating GOOD instead of BAD) while non-native adult signers  
56  
57 produced far more errors with phonological substitutions (e.g. AND instead of SLEEP where  
58  
59  
60

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 the orientation of the hand is the only difference between signs). These studies demonstrate  
4 that adult signers with different language learning experiences perform differently in  
5 language processing tasks. However, they are retrospective in the sense they demonstrate the  
6 outcomes of different early experiences rather than a description of these experiences  
7 themselves. Rather than looking at the long-term outcomes of early language experiences, in  
8 the current study we are interested in examining the contexts where DCHP and DCDP are  
9 learning to sign and we focus on the phonological level.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18  
19 During the early period of language acquisition all children appear to be particularly  
20 sensitive to the process of encoding and piecing together phonological units (Vihman, 1995).  
21 There is a relatively good understanding of sign phonological development in DCDP.  
22 Handshape has been identified as the most difficult parameter to acquire followed by  
23 movement and lastly locations (Meier, 2005; Boyes-Braem, 1990; Marentette & Mayberry,  
24 2000; Morgan, 2006). When attempting to articulate a sign that contains a not yet acquired  
25 complex handshape, DCDP will often substitute the target form with a simpler one already in  
26 their repertoire (Boyes-Braem, 1990; Marentette & Mayberry, 2000; Clibbens & Harris,  
27 1993; and Morgan, Barret-Jones, & Stoneham, 2007). This process has been compared to  
28 sound substitutions in spoken language acquisition; e.g. through consonant harmony (Smith,  
29 1973; Vihman, 2005; Clibbens & Harris, 1993; Morgan, 2014). Although far less studied, the  
30 order of acquisition of phonological parameters appears to be the same for DCHP (Singleton,  
31 Morford, & Goldin-Meadow, 1993). Morford (2003) described two deaf adolescents of  
32 hearing parents who began to learn ASL in their late childhood (12-13 years). The children  
33 made rapid progress in handshape development but did not produce phonological  
34 substitutions. It is plausible that phonological substitution is a process linked to sensory-  
35 motor limitations in younger children. An intriguing possibility is that the outcome of such  
36 simplification processes might be a different quality of phonological representations for  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 native signers compared with late learners. The resulting effects on DCHP's processing  
4  
5 abilities could resemble the level of phonological sensitivity attained by second language  
6  
7 learners which might explain the findings of Mayberry & Eichen (1991).  
8

9  
10 There are some previous studies of how hearing parents sign to deaf children  
11  
12 (Arnesen et al., 2008; Hermans, Knoors, & Verhoeven, 2010; Musselman & Akamatsu,  
13  
14 1999). Lederberg (2006) argued hearing sign input constituted variable and low quality input.  
15  
16 Retrospectively, we can assume that DCHP have some communicative experience with their  
17  
18 parents and at some point they formally began to learn a sign language, but very little is  
19  
20 documented on the quality of that early input. Spencer & Lederberg (1997) found that  
21  
22 hearing mothers of deaf children produced as many spoken utterances as hearing mothers of  
23  
24 hearing children both when their children were 12 months and 18 months. However, hearing  
25  
26 mothers produced fewer signed utterances than deaf mothers, which in several studies has  
27  
28 been linked to the challenges hearing mothers have establishing joint attention with their deaf  
29  
30 children (Harris, 2010). Spencer & Lederberg (1997) reported that when their children were  
31  
32 12 months, hearing mothers produced from zero to 51 signed utterances. When the children  
33  
34 were 18 months old, the range was zero to 57 utterances. When signed and spoken utterances  
35  
36 were compared, some parents did not sign at all but used only spoken language, whereas  
37  
38 others were accompanying up to 81% of their spoken utterances with signed utterances.  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 As described previously, early exposure to a sign language is quite rare in the deaf  
44  
45 community and so this sets up an unusual natural experiment. Deaf children with hearing  
46  
47 parents who sign with their children allow us to look at the importance of quality of input  
48  
49 from a novel perspective. Will exposure in early childhood to a sign language from hearing  
50  
51 parents lead to similar language acquisition patterns as described for native signers? It may be  
52  
53 that *early* exposure to language is critical rather than the quality of that exposure. Conversely,  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

is the age of acquisition only one part of the story, in the sense that timing and quality of input are mutually important for ultimate attainment of first language development?

In summary, while early acquisition might be critical for the development of native language abilities, other factors may be implicated, especially the quality of language input. The current study investigated vocabulary and phonological handshape development in DCHP and DCDP and examined in detail sign phonology input from deaf and hearing parents.

### Method

#### *Participants*

Fifteen child-parent dyads were included in the study (nine DCDP and six DCHP). Both groups of children had been diagnosed severe to profoundly deaf by the time they were six months old with a hearing loss of at least 75 decibels. At the point of data collection the DCDP were aged between 2;5 and 5;3 (mean age 3;3, SD = 13.19 months) and all of their deaf parents were fluent signers. The DCDP were thus exposed to BSL from birth onwards.

At the point of data collection, the DCHP children were aged between 2;10 and 5;0 (mean age = 3;8, SD = 11.19 months). All hearing parents were native English speakers and in the period between identification of their child's deafness and the data collection had achieved level one BSL (Signature basic level). They indicated that they used English with their children from birth onwards and BSL gradually from after identification at 6 months. Six of the DCDP used hearing aids while three of them did not use any amplification. By comparison five of the DCHP had received cochlear implants while one used hearing aids.

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

*Procedure*

There were two parts to the data collection: (1) a picture naming task performed by children and (2) a spontaneous signed conversation between child and parent. Two deaf fluent BSL signers (one of whom is the first author) coded all the signed communication from video recordings and coded for the number and types of handshapes as well as phonological substitutions in both children and parents.

*Picture Naming Task*

Children were tested on the Picture Naming Game (PiNG) (Bello, Giannantoni, Pettenati, Stefanini, & Caselli, 2012), which comprised 44 items: 22 noun and 22 verb eliciting stimuli given by a deaf fluent signer in BSL. Coders first scored if the sign was correct, incorrect, or if there were non-responses. Errors were coded as phonological substitution (e.g. the child substituted a different handshape to that of the target), an idiosyncratic gesture (the child represented the action, function or shape of the target picture but not with any lexical sign e.g. falling on the floor to sign FALL) or an alternative sign (either semantically related or unrelated e.g., the sign FOX instead of DOG – related, or HOUSE instead of SWIM - unrelated). As a measure of children's phonological repertoire we coded all the children's unique handshapes (handshape types) in this task.

*Spontaneous Signed Conversation*

Parents and children were video-recorded during free play sessions which took place within their homes. Adults were asked to play informally with their children using toys which they typically played with together. Given the relatively wide age range, this was considered preferable to using a standard set of toys to ensure a comparable level of familiarity and

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 ability to play and interact comfortably. We asked parents to ‘sign with their children as they  
4 typically do at home.’ To avoid undue influence of the deaf person on the language of the  
5 parent, the tester did not get involved in the conversation directly during filming. But it is  
6 possible that having a deaf adult in the room might have made hearing parents sign more than  
7 they normally do. Sessions were filmed for different lengths of time, so ten continuous  
8 minutes were selected for analysis from each of the recordings, typically starting five minutes  
9 after the start of the session, to allow the dyads to settle into the interaction. All parent-child  
10 interaction was recorded by a deaf fluent signer. As a measure of phonological repertoire, we  
11 coded all parents’ unique handshapes (handshape types) in these conversations. One deaf  
12 parent was unable to take part in this aspect of the study.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

*Reliability*

25  
26  
27  
28  
29 A fluent deaf BSL signer (the first author) coded all of the data and a second deaf  
30 BSL signer coded 20% of the spontaneous signed conversation data. Inter-rater agreement  
31 was high for the lexical signs (Cohen’s kappa = .83) and there was substantial agreement for  
32 handshape type (Cohen’s kappa = .71). The small number of handshape coding  
33 disagreements was resolved through discussion.  
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

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

**Results**

We used non-parametric tests (Mann-Whitney  $U$ ) throughout because data were not normally distributed and there was a lack of homogeneity of variance within groups.

*Children's language: PiNG*

Figure 1 displays the mean percentage scores on the PiNG for correct, incorrect and non-responses. A Mann-Whitney  $U$  test (with a Bonferroni correction of  $p < .02$ ) showed that while DCDP's ( $M = 58\%$ ;  $SD = 18\%$ ) mean percentage score for correct responses was higher than the DCHP ( $M = 34\%$ ;  $SD = 26\%$ ) there was no significant difference between the groups ( $U = 11.0$ ,  $z = -1.88$ ,  $p = .07$ ,  $r = -.49$ , ns). Similarly there was no significant difference between DCDP ( $M = 29\%$ ;  $SD = 10\%$ ) and DCHP ( $M = 20\%$ ;  $SD = 7\%$ ) in terms of mean percentage of incorrect responses made ( $U = 12.0$ ,  $z = -1.77$ ,  $p = .09$ ,  $r = -.46$ , ns). However, the mean percentage score for non-responses was significantly higher for the DCHP ( $M = 47\%$ ;  $SD = 26\%$ ) than the DCDP ( $M = 13\%$ ;  $SD = 7\%$ ) group ( $U = 6$ ,  $z = -2.48$ ,  $p = .01$ ,  $r = -.64$ ), showing that the DCDP attempted to name more pictures while the DCHP left significantly more pictures unanswered.

Insert Figure 1 here

Figure 2 displays mean percentage error for use of idiosyncratic gestures, phonological substitutions and semantic alternatives produced by DCDP and DCHP. A Mann-Whitney  $U$

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 test (with Bonferroni corrections of  $p < .02$ ) showed that there was no significant difference  
4  
5 between the mean percentage number of idiosyncratic gestures when naming incorrectly,  
6  
7 used by DCHP ( $M = 9\%$ ;  $SD = 7\%$ ) compared with DCDP ( $M = 7\%$ ;  $SD = 8\%$ ;  $U = 20.0$ ,  $z =$   
8  
9  $-.83$ ,  $p = .46$ ,  $r = -.21$ , ns). However, the DCDP ( $M = 11\%$ ;  $SD = 8\%$ ) were significantly more  
10  
11 likely to sign a semantic alternate e.g. FOX instead of DOG, than DCHP ( $M = 4\%$ ;  $SD = 3\%$ )  
12  
13 when they made an error ( $U = 8.0$ ,  $z = -2.25$ ,  $p = .02$ ,  $r = -.58$ ). The error analysis therefore  
14  
15 suggests that DCDP made more semantic links when responding incorrectly to an item.  
16  
17

18  
19 Phonological substitutions were calculated as the total number of substitutions divided by the  
20  
21 total number of signs produced, excluding the unanswered trials. DCDP produced a higher  
22  
23 proportion of phonological substitutions ( $M = 8\%$ ;  $SD = 3\%$ ) than the DCHP group ( $M = 4\%$ ;  
24  
25  $SD = 5\%$ ) but this was also not statistically significant ( $U = 11.5$ ,  $z = -1.83$ ,  $p = .07$ ,  $r = -.47$ ,  
26  
27 ns).  
28  
29

30  
31  
32  
33 Insert figure 2 here  
34  
35

36  
37 Finally, to measure the children's phonology, the number of unique handshapes used in the  
38  
39 PiNG by both groups of children was compared. The DCDP group produced significantly  
40  
41 more unique handshapes types ( $M = 13.56$ ;  $SD = 2.7$ ) than the DCHP group ( $M = 7.17$  types;  
42  
43  $SD = 5.34$ ;  $U = 7.5$ ,  $z = -2.32$ ,  $p = .02$ ,  $r = -.60$ ).  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 *Parents' language: Spontaneous signed conversation*  
50

51  
52 The motivation for analysing the parents' signing was to attest to the quantity (number of  
53  
54 sign tokens) and quality (number of vocabulary types) of the BSL, as well as the richness of  
55  
56 the phonological repertoire (handshape types) in the adult sign input to the children (Figure  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 3). Mann-Whitney  $U$  tests (with Bonferroni corrections of  $p < .03$ ) showed that during  
4  
5 conversations, deaf parents (DP) produced a significantly higher number of signs tokens ( $M =$   
6  
7 90.25;  $SD = 39.99$ ) compared to the hearing parents (HP) ( $M = 33.83$ ;  $U = 7.0$ ,  $z = -2.2$ ,  $p =$   
8  
9  $.03$ ,  $r = -.59$ ); however there was no significant difference between the number of different  
10  
11 vocabulary types (i.e. different items) used in conversations by DPs ( $M = 43.38$ ;  $SD = 18.67$ )  
12  
13 and HPs ( $M = 29.17$ ;  $SD = 26.06$ ;  $U = 14.0$ ,  $z = -1.29$ ,  $p = .23$ ,  $r = -.34$ , ns).  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 Insert Figure 3 here  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 To measure differences between groups in phonology, the number of unique hand shapes  
27  
28 produced in the spontaneous conversation were recorded. During conversations, the DPs  
29  
30 produced a higher number of unique handshapes ( $M = 14.38$ ;  $SD = 5.07$ ) than the HP group  
31  
32 ( $M = 6.17$ ;  $SD = 4.62$ ). A Mann Whitney  $U$  test showed that this difference was significant  
33  
34 ( $U = 5.0$ ,  $z = -2.46$ ,  $p = .01$ ,  $r = .66$ ). This difference in parent phonology follows the same  
35  
36 pattern as described previously for the children. A Spearman's correlation between unique  
37  
38 handshapes produced in all of the children's sign production from the PiNG task and all of  
39  
40 the adult's handshapes in the spontaneous signed conversations showed a strong positive  
41  
42 correlation, ( $r(12) = .60$ ,  $p = .02$ ).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

## 55 Discussion

56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 This is the first study to analyse semantic and phonological characteristics of early  
4  
5 lexical development in DCHP relative to DCDP and is the first description of the  
6  
7 phonological repertoire and quantity/quality of signs in the input to deaf children from deaf  
8  
9 and hearing parents.  
10

*Comparing DCHP and DCDP's phonological systems*

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 There are differences in DCHP and DCDP's phonological systems even though  
17  
18 DCHP are still exposed to BSL relatively early in their development. The age which the  
19  
20 DCHP are being exposed to BSL is early enough to be considered within the putative  
21  
22 'sensitive period' for language acquisition, i.e., the first 5-6 years of life (Newport, 2002).  
23  
24 Thus DCHP, while being in this sensitive period, are shown to have less developed  
25  
26 phonologies as measured by handshape types. We argue that these differences appear  
27  
28 because, while hearing parents are using sign, the early acquisition process for DCHP is still  
29  
30 delayed and the immediate language environment for DCHP is less than optimal. The  
31  
32 advantage of early exposure to a first language is therefore modulated by the effects of a non-  
33  
34 optimal environment.  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 This scenario creates an interesting comparison between the two groups. We observe  
40  
41 that the DCHP, while signing as many correct responses as DCDP, made more non-responses  
42  
43 on the task, indicating a smaller vocabulary. They also have fewer phonological contrasts up  
44  
45 to this point in their development. There are potential outcomes of this atypical early  
46  
47 development for future language skills. In Mayberry's work, phonology has been pinpointed  
48  
49 as a weak area in adult non-native signers. Adult signers who acquired sign at differing ages  
50  
51 display variable abilities in language processing or 'shadowing' tasks where they have to use  
52  
53 rapid sign processing and rehearse signs in working memory (Mayberry, 2010). There is a  
54  
55 general consensus in the wider spoken language research also that delayed language exposure  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 most heavily affects native-like abilities in phonology. In these latter studies, differences are  
4  
5 generally reported for late second language (foreign) phonological skills (e.g. Johnson &  
6  
7 Newport, 1989; Masoura & Gathercole, 1999). But as our findings illustrate, phonological  
8  
9 development is also modulated by late first language acquisition.  
10

11  
12 Incomplete first language acquisition has obvious serious consequences. Reduced  
13  
14 phonological skills can also lead to difficulties in the acquisition of grammar as less complete  
15  
16 representations at the sub-lexical level can make morpheme level analysis more difficult and  
17  
18 cognitively taxing. Although not an identical situation, we can return to the study of disrupted  
19  
20 L1 acquisition in children with international adoption (IA), as it provides a useful context for  
21  
22 interpreting the present data (Gauthier & Genesee, 2011). Early disrupted language  
23  
24 acquisition in IA has been linked to continued difficulties in processing the phonological  
25  
26 patterns of the new language even after several years of ‘native-like’ experience. As  
27  
28 Mayberry’s work (Mayberry, 2010) with adult deaf signers has attested - lifelong use of a  
29  
30 language acquired beyond early childhood does not endow the user with native skills in  
31  
32 accessing and manipulating phonology under taxing situations (ones where phonological  
33  
34 working memory is needed). Although the young DCHP and their hearing parents in the  
35  
36 current study make up a small sample, the differences we document are easily linked to the  
37  
38 inferior processing skills in IA and adult late signers. It is also worth mentioning that at this  
39  
40 point we have identified differences in the richness of the two groups of children’s signing.  
41  
42 However, the DCHP may have different future processing profiles compared to the late  
43  
44 exposed L1 deaf adults documented in Mayberry’s study (Mayberry, 2010). The children in  
45  
46 the current study, unlike the non-native signers in Mayberry (2010), have had exposure to  
47  
48 sign and English prior to age 6 years, but without a longitudinal study we do not know what  
49  
50 their language processing results will be like in 20 or 40 years.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 We can speculate that both age of acquisition and the quality and quantity of the input  
4  
5 work together to bring about ultimate attainment in first language acquisition. The  
6  
7 mechanism that explains how atypical early development leads to later differences in  
8  
9 language skills in adult signers is unclear. Here we propose two factors at the phonological  
10  
11 level that are potentially important. First we see DCDP at this young age possess larger  
12  
13 phonological repertoires (albeit when just considering handshapes) than their DCHP peers.  
14  
15 Vihman (1995) argues that children build phonology through storing growing sets of  
16  
17 contrastive sounds. The more sounds represented in the system, the easier to form categories  
18  
19 at the phoneme level. If DCHP have fewer numbers of contrastive handshapes while still in  
20  
21 the sensitive period for phonological development, they might end up with a smaller system  
22  
23 at the point where we assume heightened sensitivity to phonology is beginning to decline  
24  
25 (Bornstein, 1989; Newport 1990; Kuhl, Williams, Lacerda, Stevens, & Lindblom, 1992).  
26  
27 Linked to this possibility are sign perception studies by Best, Mathur, Miranda, and Lillo-  
28  
29 Martin (2010) and Morford et al. (2008) that suggest sparser input could discourage  
30  
31 categorization and hence lead to maintenance of sensitivity to phonetic contrasts to a higher  
32  
33 degree in late than in native signers.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 The second area worth considering is the higher number of substitution errors in  
40  
41 DCDP than the DCHP. This difference did not reach statistical significance but we argue it is  
42  
43 worth considering in tandem with other results. More observations are required to expand on  
44  
45 this phenomenon, but it might be that using typical phonological processes such as  
46  
47 substitution leads to a more interlinked phonological system. The process of substituting  
48  
49 handshapes might help children better master the function of handshapes in forming meaning.  
50  
51 This might be a crucial developmental milestone before developing adult form handshapes.  
52  
53 As alluded to previously, we do not know if the DCHP in the current study will go on to  
54  
55 develop native abilities in forming phonological contrasts. After all, they are still young  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 language learners. However at this point they have both a less semantically linked vocabulary  
4  
5 (indicated by more non-responses and less use of semantically related signs when incorrectly  
6  
7 naming pictures) and a less rich phonological system compared with their native signing  
8  
9 peers and are being exposed to less optimal language input. The question, is how much will  
10  
11 these differences impact their development of handshape? Morford (2003) documented in  
12  
13 much older DCHP that when they were first exposed to ASL at ages 12;1 and 13;7, they did  
14  
15 not produce phonological simplifications through substitutions. Instead, they rapidly acquired  
16  
17 signs, perhaps without sub-lexical analysis, and dealt less with links across simple and  
18  
19 complex handshapes, an approach which resembles more second language acquisition rather  
20  
21 than first. The DCHP in the current study are much younger than in Morford (2003),  
22  
23 however, as the IA studies suggest, disruption in the early stages of acquisition even followed  
24  
25 by rich language exposure can lead to some atypical patterns (Gauthier & Genesee, 2011). Do  
26  
27 the documented differences in the current study for DCHP also lead to a less optimal  
28  
29 phonological system? Detailed analyses of the language abilities as well as input of larger  
30  
31 numbers of DCHP or conducting a longitudinal study are required to properly test this  
32  
33 possibility.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

*Differences in signing in deaf and hearing parents*

39  
40  
41  
42 This is also the first analysis of sign phonology of hearing parents of deaf children.  
43  
44 We attempted to capture differences in native and non-native environments through an  
45  
46 analysis of parent input (vocabulary and phonology). While a conversation sample is a  
47  
48 limited corpus, it does tell us that there are important differences in the two types of  
49  
50 environments. The input DCDP receive is larger in quantity than DCHP, although in this  
51  
52 sample there were no differences in number of vocabulary types. In a post-hoc analysis we  
53  
54 also observed simpler language (less fluency) from hearing parents compared with the more  
55  
56 expansive and co-articulated signs in the deaf parents. Fluency increases the likelihood that  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 signs get co-articulated and phonology gets altered in these processes (Ormel, Crasborn, &  
4  
5 van der Kooij, 2013). Hearing parents, as they are still at the initial stages of learning BSL,  
6  
7 have less fluent signing. DCHP, therefore, see less signs and less variability in how those  
8  
9 signs are articulated compared with the co-articulated input for DCDP. Finally, deaf parents  
10  
11 produced a higher number of contrasts (handshape types) in their handshapes than hearing  
12  
13 parents. Finally one important result relates to wider debates about the role of the input in  
14  
15 child language acquisition. Across both groups, handshape type in the input correlated with  
16  
17 the same phonological parameter in the children's signing. Typically this question is posed in  
18  
19 the context of morpho-syntax in the input and the child's acquisition of these features (e.g.  
20  
21 Ambridge & Lieven, 2015). In the current study, we observed that for one of the building  
22  
23 blocks of a sign language (phonological handshape), that its diversity in the input and in the  
24  
25 children's own signing were strongly linked.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 One important area we did not include in this study was an analysis of adult-adult  
32  
33 signing. It is rare for hearing parents to sign to each other or other hearing family members in  
34  
35 BSL during the early stages of learning the language. But DCDP will presumably receive  
36  
37 incidental input from adult-adult conversation not directed at them and this is known to also  
38  
39 influence language development (Akhtar, 2005). This study would have benefited if all of the  
40  
41 possible BSL handshapes were elicited rather than a sub-set. In the PiNG stimuli set, there  
42  
43 were fewer instances of pictures that elicited later acquired handshapes. Equally, future  
44  
45 studies will need to elicit more items than the 44 concepts in the current study as well as  
46  
47 control for sign frequency and handshape complexity. When handshape complexity is  
48  
49 controlled, then it would be intriguing to conduct an additional analysis on whether children  
50  
51 substitute more marked handshapes with unmarked handshapes, replicating the results of  
52  
53 Boyes-Braem (1990). While our participant sample size is good for studies of young deaf  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 children in order to better understand the role of input and native exposure to a language it  
4  
5 will be necessary to observe more children in the future.  
6  
7

8           Studies of sign language acquisition have enriched the general field of language  
9  
10 acquisition by describing how and why modality exerts and does not exert an influence on  
11  
12 development (e.g. Meier et al., 2002; Morgan, 2014b). Similarly, these rare cases of disrupted  
13  
14 first language acquisition can shed light on the effects of age and input on linguistic skills.  
15  
16 Non-optimal first language exposure influences phonological development even in children  
17  
18 exposed to signing at an early age.  
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

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

**References**

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Akhtar, N. (2005). The robustness of learning through overhearing. *Developmental Science*,  
6  
7 8, 199–209.  
8  
9  
10 Ambridge, B., & Lieven, E.V.M. (2015). A Constructivist account of child language  
11  
12 acquisition. In B. MacWhinney and W. O'Grady (Eds). *Handbook of Language*  
13  
14 *Emergence*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell. (pp. 478-510)  
15  
16  
17 Anderson, D. & Reilly, J. (2002). The MacArthur Communicative Development Inventory:  
18  
19 Normative Data for American Sign Language. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf*  
20  
21 *Education*, 7, 83-106.  
22  
23  
24 Arnesen, K., Enerstvedt, R. T., Engen, E. A., Engen, T., Hoie, G., & Vonen, A. M. (2008).  
25  
26 The linguistic milieu of Norwegian children with hearing loss. *American Annals of the*  
27  
28 *Deaf*, 153, 65–77.  
29  
30  
31 Baker, A. E. & Woll, B. (2009). *Sign Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.  
32  
33  
34 Bello A., Giannantoni P., Pettenati P., Stefanini S., & Caselli M. C. (2012). Assessing  
35  
36 lexicon: Validation and developmental data of the Picture Naming Game (PiNG), a  
37  
38 new picture naming task for toddlers. *International Journal of Language and*  
39  
40 *Communication Disorders*, 47, 589–602.  
41  
42  
43  
44 Best, C. T., Mathur, G., Miranda, K. A., and Lillo-Martin, D. (2010). Effects of sign language  
45  
46 experience on categorical perception of dynamic ASL pseudosigns. *Attention,*  
47  
48 *Perception & Psychophysics*, 72, 747–762.  
49  
50  
51 Bornstein, M. (1989). Sensitive periods in development: structural characteristics and casual  
52  
53 interpretations. *Psychological Bulletin*, 105, 179-197.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

- 1  
2  
3 Boyes-Braem, P. (1990). Acquisition of the handshape in American Sign Language. In  
4  
5 Volterra, V. & Erting, C.K. (eds.), *From gesture to language in hearing and deaf*  
6  
7 *children* (pp. 107-127). New York: Springer Verlag.  
8  
9
- 10 Brentari, D. (1998). *A prosodic model of sign language phonology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT  
11  
12 Press.  
13  
14
- 15 Chen Pichler, D. (2012). Language acquisition. In R. Pfau, B. Woll and M. Steinbach (eds.)  
16  
17 *Handbook of Linguistics and Communication Science: Sign Language* (pp. 647-686).  
18  
19 Berlin: de Gruyter.  
20  
21
- 22 Chamberlain, C., Morford, J., & Mayberry, R. I. (1999). *Language Acquisition by Eye*.  
23  
24 Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.  
25  
26
- 27 Clibbens, J. & Harris, M. (1993). Phonological processes and sign language development. In  
28  
29 D. Messer & G. Turner (Eds). *Critical influences on child language acquisition and*  
30  
31 *development* (pp. 197-208). London: Macmillan, New York: St Martin's Press.  
32  
33
- 34 Curtiss, S. (1977). *Genie: A Psycholinguistic Study of a Modern-Day Wild Child*.  
35  
36 Perspectives in Neurolinguistics and Psycholinguistics, Boston, MA: Academic  
37  
38 Press.  
39  
40
- 41 Emmorey, K., Bellugi, U., Friederici, A. & Horn, P. (1995). Effects of age of acquisition on  
42  
43 grammatical sensitivity: Evidence from on-line and off-line tasks. *Applied*  
44  
45 *Psycholinguistics*, 16, 1-23.  
46  
47
- 48 Fenson, L., Dale, P.S., Reznick, J.S., Bates, E., Thal, D., & Pethick, S. (1994). Variability in  
49  
50 early communicative development. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child*  
51  
52 *Development*, 59 (5, Serial No. 242).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

- 1  
2  
3 Ferjan Ramirez, N., Lieberman, A.M., & Mayberry, R.I. (2013). The initial stages of  
4  
5 language acquisition begun in adolescence: When late looks early. *Journal of Child*  
6  
7 *Language*, 40(2), 391-414.  
8  
9
- 10 Gauthier, K. & Genesee, F. (2011). Language development in internationally-adopted  
11  
12 children: A special case of early second language learning. *Child Development*, 82(2),  
13  
14 1-15.  
15  
16
- 17 Harris, M. (2010). Early communication in sign and speech. In M. Marschark and P. E.  
18  
19 Spencer (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Deaf Studies, Language, and Education* Volume  
20  
21 2. New York: Oxford University Press.  
22  
23
- 24 Hermans, D., Knoors, H., & Verhoeven, L. (2010). Assessment of sign language  
25  
26 development: The case of deaf children in the Netherlands. *Journal of Deaf Studies*  
27  
28 and Deaf Education, 15, 107–119.  
29  
30  
31
- 32 Johnson, J. S. & Newport, E. L. (1989). Critical period effects in second language learning:  
33  
34 The influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as a second  
35  
36 language. *Cognitive Psychology*, 21, 60-99.  
37  
38  
39
- 40 Kuhl, P. K., Williams, K. A., Lacerda, F., Stevens, K. N., & Lindblom, B. (1992). Linguistic  
41  
42 experience alters phonetic perception in infants by 6 months of age. *Science*, 255,  
43  
44 606-608.  
45  
46
- 47 Lederberg, A. R. (2006). Language development of deaf children with hearing parents. In E.  
48  
49 Lieven (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics* (second ed., pp. 361-367).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

- 1  
2  
3 Marentette, P. & Mayberry, R. I. (2000). Principles for an emerging phonological system: A  
4  
5 case study of acquisition of ASL. In C. Chamberlain, J. Morford & R. I. Mayberry  
6  
7 (Eds.), *Language Acquisition by Eye* (pp. 71-90). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum  
8  
9 and Associates.  
10  
11  
12 Masoura, E. & Gathercole, S. E. (1999). Phonological short-term memory and foreign  
13  
14 vocabulary learning. *International Journal of Psychology*, 34, 383-388.  
15  
16  
17  
18 Mayberry, R. I. & Fischer, S. D. (1989). Looking through phonological shape to lexical  
19  
20 meaning: The bottleneck of nonnative sign language processing. *Memory and*  
21  
22 *Cognition*, 17, 740-754.  
23  
24  
25  
26 Mayberry, R. I. & Eichen, E. B. (1991). The long-lasting advantage of learning sign language  
27  
28 in childhood: Another look at the critical period for language acquisition. *Journal of*  
29  
30 *Memory and Language*, 30, 486-512.  
31  
32  
33 Mayberry, R. I. (2010). Early Language Acquisition and Adult Language Ability: What Sign  
34  
35 Language reveals about the Critical Period for Language. In M. Marschark & P.  
36  
37 Spencer (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Deaf Studies, Language, and Education*, (vol.  
38  
39 2, pp. 281-291). New York: Oxford University Press.  
40  
41  
42  
43 Mayne, A., Yoshinaga-Itano, C., Sedey, A.L., & Carey, A. (2000). Expressive vocabulary  
44  
45 development of infants and toddlers who are deaf or hard of hearing. *The Volta*  
46  
47 *Review*, 100(5), 1-28.  
48  
49  
50 Meier, R. P., Cormier, K., & Quinto-Pozos, D. (Eds.) (2002). Modality and Structure in  
51  
52 Signed and Spoken Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
53  
54  
55  
56 Meier, R. P. (2005). The forms of early signs: explaining signing children's articulatory  
57  
58 development. In B. Schick, M. Marschark, and P. Spencer (Eds.), *Advances in the*  
59  
60

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 *Sign-Language Development of Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Children* (pp. 202–230).

4  
5 Oxford: Oxford University Press.

6  
7  
8 Moeller, M. P. (2000). Early intervention and language development in children who are deaf  
9 and hard of hearing. *Pediatrics*, 106, E43.

10  
11  
12  
13 Morford, J. P. (2003). Grammatical development in adolescent first language learners.

14  
15 *Linguistics*, 41(4), 681 – 721.

16  
17  
18 Morford, J. P., Grieve-Smith, A. B., MacFarlane, J., Staley, J., and Waters, G. S. (2008).

19  
20 Effects of language experience on the perception of American Sign Language.

21  
22 *Cognition*, 109, 41–53

23  
24  
25 Morgan, G. (2006). Children are just lingual: The development of phonology in BSL. *Lingua*,

26  
27 116, 1507-1523

28  
29  
30 Morgan, G. (2014). Critical period in language development. In P. Brooks, & V. Kempe

31  
32 (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language development*. (Vol. 3, pp. 116-119). Thousand

33  
34  
35 Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

36  
37  
38 Morgan, G (2014b). On language acquisition in speech and sign: development of

39  
40 combinatorial structure in both modalities. *Frontiers in Psychology: Language*

41  
42 *Sciences*. 5:1217

43  
44  
45 Morgan, G., Barrett-Jones, S. & Stoneham, H. (2007). The first signs of language:

46  
47 phonological development in British Sign Language. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 28,

48  
49 3-22

50  
51  
52 Morgan, G. & Woll, B. (2002). The development of complex sentences in British Sign

53  
54 Language. In G. Morgan & B. Woll (Eds.), *Directions in Sign Language Acquisition*

55  
56 (pp. 255–275). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Press..

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 Musselman, C., & Akamatsu, C. T. (1999). Interpersonal communication skills of deaf  
4  
5 adolescents and their relationship to communication history. *Journal of Deaf Studies*  
6  
7 and Deaf Education, 4, 305–320.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Newport, E. L. (1990). Maturation constraints on language learning. *Cognitive Science*, 14  
13  
14 (1990), pp. 11–28.  
15  
16

17  
18 Newport, E. L. (2002). Critical Periods in Language Development. In L. Nadel, (Ed.),  
19  
20 *Encyclopaedia of Cognitive Science*. London: Macmillan.  
21  
22

23  
24 Ormel, E., Crasborn O. & van der Kooij, E. (2013). Coarticulation of hand height in Sign  
25  
26 Language of the Netherlands is affected by contact type. *Journal of Phonetics*, 41-  
27  
28 2/3: 156-71.  
29

30  
31 Petitto, L. A. (1997). In the beginning: On the genetic and environmental factors that make  
32  
33 early language acquisition possible. In M. Gopnik (Ed.), *The inheritance and*  
34  
35 *innateness of grammars* (pp. 45-69). England: Oxford University Press.  
36  
37

38  
39 Petitto, L. A., Holowka, S., Sergio, L., & Ostry, D. (2001). Language rhythms in baby hand  
40  
41 movements. *Nature*, 413, 35-36.  
42

43  
44 Sandler, W. & Lillo-Martin, D. (2006). *Sign Language and Linguistic Universals*.  
45  
46 Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.  
47

48  
49 Schick, B., Marschark, M., & Spencer, P.E.(2005). *Advances in the Sign Language*  
50  
51 *Development of Deaf Children*. New York: Oxford University Press  
52

53  
54 Signature Sign Language Exams. Mersey House Mandale Business Park Belmont Durham  
55  
56 DH1 1TH. <http://www.signature.org.uk/british-sign-language>  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

1  
2  
3 Singleton, J.L., Morford, J.P., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (1993). Once is not enough: Standards  
4  
5 of well-formedness in manual communication created over three different timespans.  
6  
7 *Language*, 69 (4), 683-715.

8  
9  
10 Smith, N. (1973). *The Acquisition of Phonology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ Press

11  
12 Spencer, P. E., & Marschark, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Advances in the spoken language*  
13  
14 *development of deaf and hard-of-hearing children*. New York: Oxford University  
15  
16 Press.

17  
18  
19  
20 Spencer, P. E., & Lederberg, A. R. (1997). Different modes, different models:  
21  
22 Communication and language of young deaf children and their mothers. In L. B.  
23  
24 Adamson & M. A. Ronski, (Eds.), *Communication and language acquisition:*  
25  
26 *Discoveries from atypical development* (pp. 203-230). Baltimore: Brookes.

27  
28  
29  
30 Stokoe, W.C. (1960). Sign Language Structure: An Outline of the Visual Communication  
31  
32 Systems of the American Deaf, *Studies in linguistics: Occasional papers* (No. 8).  
33  
34 Buffalo: Dept. of Anthropology and Linguistics, University of Buffalo.

35  
36  
37 Sutton-Spence, R. & Woll, B. (Eds.). (1999). *The Linguistics of British Sign Language: An*  
38  
39 *Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

40  
41  
42 Vihman, M. (1995). *Phonological Development: Origins of Language in the Child*. Oxford:  
43  
44 Blackwell.

45  
46  
47 Woll, B. (2012). Atypical signing. In Pfau, R., Steinbach, M., Woll, B. (Eds.). *Sign language:*  
48  
49 *an international handbook* (pp.762-787). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

50  
51 Woolfe, T., Herman, R., Roy, P., & Woll, B. (2010). Early lexical development in native  
52  
53 signers: A BSL adaption of the Macarthur-Bates CDI. *Journal of Child Psychology*  
54  
55 *Psychiatry*, 51(3), 322-331.

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT




Figure 1. Mean percentage response of correct, incorrect, and non responses on the PiNG for DCDP and DCHP. Error bars show the standard error of the mean (SEM)

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT




Figure 2. Mean percentage of incorrect responses to items on the PiNG that were gestures, phonological substitutions and semantic alternates produced by DCDP and DCHP. Error bars represent the SEM.

## INPUT QUALITY AND EARLY SIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT




Figure 3. Mean frequency of sign tokens and type of signs of DPs and HPs observed in spontaneous signed conversation. Error bars represent the SEM.