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Part 1:
The problem of bias
Bias

• Bias and linguistic description
• Some illustrations:
  – Selection bias: Dutch causative constructions
  – Confirmation bias: Takivatan Bunun argument alignment
• Implications
Bias

- Is pervasive in research and human cognition
- Is not necessarily harmful
- Can “lead to severe and systematic errors” (Tversky & Kahneman 1982: 3)
- Incidental vs. systematic bias
Bias

• Systematic bias can introduce patterns in the data that are easily interpreted as meaningful

• Bias is not necessarily the result of:
  – Stupidity
  – Negligence
  – Malice
  – Ignorance
Bias

• Received considerable attention in:
  – Psychology
  – Statistics
  – Epidemiology and clinical studies

• How many studies on methodological bias in linguistics are you aware of?
Dutch causatives

• General picture: two causative verbs
  – *doen* ‘do’: direct causation
  – *laten* ‘let’: indirect causation

Verhagen & Kemmer (1997)
Coppen et al. (2007), *ANS*
Dutch causatives

– *Doen* ‘do’: Causer has a tendency to be inanimate (58%)

(1) *de stralen-de zon doe-t de temperatuur oplop-en*
the shine-ADJR sun do.PRES-3S the temperature rise-INF

‘The bright sun *makes* the temperature rise.’ (V&K)

– *Laten* ‘let’: Causer is typically animate (99%)

(2) *de sergeant liet ons door de modder kruip-en*
the sergeant let.PST.S us.ACC through the mud crawl-INF

‘The sergeant *had/made* us crawl through the mud.’ (V&K)
Dutch causatives

• The problem: other constructions with causative-like semantics
  – *Maken* ‘make’

(3) *hij* maakte *me* nerveus
    3S.NOM make-PST.S 1S.ACC nervous

  ‘He *made* me nervous’ (fv800876)

(4) ... *ze* maakte *me* ook aan *het* lachen
    3S.F.NOM make-PST.S 1S.ACC also at the.N laugh-INF

  ‘she also *made* me laugh.’ (fv800706)
Dutch causatives

• The problem: other constructions with causative-like semantics
  – *Geven* ‘give’

(5) Ø  *geef*  *me*  *gras*  *te*  *eten.*
    give  1S.NOM  grass  PRT  eat.INF

  ‘… *make* me eat grass.’ (fv800618)

(6)  *geef*  *ons*  *iets*  *te*  *doen*...
    give  1P.ACC  something  PRT  do.INF

  ‘[If You have special wishes,] *let* us know it …’ (internet)
Dutch causatives

• Why are these ‘prototypical’ causatives more interesting for linguistic description?

• Why are certain instances considered atypical?
Dutch causatives

• Because we believe there is a group of ‘causative’ constructions that is somehow theoretically privileged

• A priori theoretical bias
  – Retrievability / imaginability
    (Tversky & Kahneman 1982: 11ff)
  – Negative bias
  – Selection bias
Bunun argument structure

• Bunun, Austronesian, Taiwan
  – Takivatan dialect
• Predicate-initial
• Complex verbal morphology
• Philippine-type voice system
  – ‘focus’ (≠ pragmatic focus)
  – Argument alignment system
Bunun argument structure

• Verbal suffixes:
  – “Focus” / role alignment (AF/UF/LF)

(1)  \textit{na-ma-tasʔi-Øʔak} busul
     IRR-DYN-build-AF-1S.TOP  gun
     ‘I make a gun’

(2)  \textit{... na pa-tasʔi-un}
     so CAUS.DYN-build-UF
     ‘(The thing is broken,) so I want to have it fixed.’

(3)  \textit{pa-tasʔi-an}
     CAUS.DYN-build-LF
     ‘I want to make it so that something stays in a fixed spot’
Bunun argument structure

• Verbal prefixes (I):
  – Participant orientation (BEN/INSTR/…)

(4)  **ki-saiv-ʔak**  **qaimaŋsuð**
BEN-give-1S.TOP   thing
‘Somebody has to give me things.’

(5)  **sin-su-suað**  **bunuað**
RES.OBJ-REP-grow   plum
‘They had grown plums.’
(Indicates that the plums are already on the tree)
Bunun argument structure

• Verbal prefixes (II):
  – Internal temporal structure

(7) \textit{ma-baliv-ʔak} \textit{iðuq} \textit{a} \textit{min-puhuq}
  DYN-buy-1S.F orange LNK INCH-rot
  ‘I bought meat that had become rotten.’

(8) \textit{nitu ma-naskal sadu-ki uskun-an}
  NEG STAT-happy see-DEF.SIT.PROX together-LO
  ‘I was not happy to see my companions do it like this.’
Bunun argument structure

• Verbal prefixes (III):
  – Control (internal/external/joint)

(6)  \textit{pa}-tasʔi-un  \\
\textit{CAUS.DYN}-make-UF  \\
‘I will have it fixed (by someone else).’

(7)  \textit{ka}-\textit{dayaδ}  \textit{baδbaδ}  \\
\textit{ASSOC.DYN}-help \textit{have.conversation}  \\
‘I’ll help you talk (by speaking in your place).’
Bunun argument structure

- **Personal pronouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bound</th>
<th>Free</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topic (TOP)</td>
<td>Non-topical agent (NTOP.AG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1S</td>
<td>-(ʔ)ak</td>
<td>-(ʔ)uk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2S</td>
<td>-(ʔ)as</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1E</td>
<td>-(ʔ)am</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2P</td>
<td>-(ʔ)am</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bunun argument structure

- Different subsystems, different grammatical distinctions
Bunun argument structure

- No single internally consistent argument alignment system
- Transitivity is at best epiphenomenal
- No distinctions corresponding to traditional argument alignment systems (NOM-ACC or ERG-ABS)
Bunun argument structure

• Why do researchers tend to analyse Philippine-type argument alignment as a coherent system?
  – Involving verbal prefixes, infixes, suffixes, reduplication, and nominal morphology

• Why is there a strong inclination to explain systems like this as irregular/unusual ergative alignment?
  (e.g. Mithun 1994; Ross 2006)
Bunun argument structure

• A priori theoretical bias
  – Illusory correlation
    (Tversky & Kahneman 1982: 13-14)
  – Positive bias
  – Confirmation bias
Why should we care?

• What if you use this data?
• Method bias:

  “Method variance refers to variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the construct of interest.”

  (Podsakoff & al 2003 quoting Bagozzi & Yi 1991)

  – How can research based on biased descriptive data avoid drawing biased conclusions?
Why should we care?

- Negative effect on comparative research making use of this type of data
- Confirmation of established theories based on method-induced correlations
Why should we care?

- Negative effect on comparative research making use of this type of data
- Confirmation of established theories based on method-induced correlations

**Confirmation of theory**

Linguistic description

**Horror!!!**

Linguistic theory

Introduction of bias
What now?

• Don’t panic
  – Bias is unavoidable
  – Bias is natural
  • “people rely on a limited number of heuristic principles which reduce the complex tasks of assessing probabilities and predicting values to simpler judgmental operations”

(Tversky & Kahnemann 1982)
What now?

• Awareness and proper appreciation of the problem
• Research into bias and bias reduction in linguistics
• Value of theoretical independence in linguistic description
• Research into incoherence (or even chaos) in linguistic structure
Intermezzo:
Preconceptions and grammar
There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.

Shakespeare, *Hamlet*
Preconceptions

• Where does bias come from?
  – Cognitive / neuro-physiological restrictions
  – Environmentally induced
  – Theory-induced
  – …
Preconceptions

- Influences of theoretically induced bias on our understanding of language:
  1. Selection of evidence (e.g. Dutch causatives)
  2. Interpretation of evidence (e.g. Bunun pred-arg structure)
Preconceptions

• Questions
  – Are we missing something important?
  – What can we do about it?
Grammatical rules

• Traditional view:
  – Grammar = rules about language
  – Language can be modeled in terms of automata theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical rules</th>
<th>Language / cognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>discrete</td>
<td>fluidity (semantics, observation, …)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolute</td>
<td>statistical uncertainty / approximation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synchronic</td>
<td>dynamic nature of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levels of analysis</td>
<td>interactions between different levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selectiveness

- Possible solution: attractor network
- ‘basins of attraction’ (Bybee 2013)
  - “... represent the convergence of cognitive and communicative factors that frequently occur together in human experience.”
  - “Like the craters on the moon, the basins are nearer or farther from one another according to semantic similarity. Some basins are larger: these represent more contexts of use ...”
What about the empty spaces between the basins?
Selectiveness

• The empty spaces
  – Does language only consist of craters?
  – Are uncommon or unnoticed phenomena less important to grammar?
  – To what extent is the distinction between relevant and irrelevant linguistic phenomena determined by theoretical considerations?

• Cf. “junk” DNA (Pennisi 2012)
Part 2:
A new model of grammatical structure
Construction grammar

• Language is a collection of constructions that represent habitualized linguistic behaviours
  – Usage-based
  – Emergence
  – Non-compositional model (cf. Croft 2001)
  – There are no real grammatical rules
Construction grammar

Latin

Bunun

Event Act Pat Ben Instr Loc ...

Walking Walker ...
Eating Eater Eaten ...

St V O / Si V
Construction grammar

- Problem:
  - In its simplest form, construction grammar presupposes the existence of a single coherent system that generates and stores constructions
  - We saw that Takivatan predicate-argument structure consists of multiple subsystems that are partly clashing with each other.
Language as a complex adaptive system


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical rules</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>CAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>discrete</td>
<td>fluidity (semantics, observation, ...)</td>
<td>fluid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolute</td>
<td>statistical uncertainty / approximation</td>
<td>probabilistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synchronic</td>
<td>dynamic nature of language</td>
<td>inherently dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>levels of analysis</td>
<td>interactions between different levels</td>
<td>interaction between levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language as a complex adaptive system
Language as a complex adaptive system

“Language as a CAS involves the following key features: The system consists of multiple agents (the speakers in the speech community) interacting with one another. The system is adaptive, that is, speakers’ behavior is based on their past interactions, and current and past interactions together feed forward into future behavior. A speaker’s behavior is the consequence of competing factors ranging from perceptual constraints to social motivations. The structures of language emerge from interrelated patterns of experience, social interaction, and cognitive mechanisms.”

(Beckner & al. 2009: 1-2)
Language as a complex adaptive system

- A CAS ≠
  - A complicated system
  - … with lots of participants
  - … that adapts to the environment

(It is much more specific than that)

- A CAS
  - Does not need to have (conscious) agents
Language as a complex adaptive system

• A CAS ≈
  – Decentralized: no central control
  – Connectivity: inter-relationships between elements
  – Dependence on initial conditions
  – Co-evolution: elements change behavior based on interactions with other elements and the environment
  – Emergence: order from randomness
  – Disequilibrium
  – Paradoxical: combination of order and chaos

(Chan 2001)
Language as a complex adaptive system

• ... and some other properties
  – Multiplicity: Many interacting parts
  – Non-linear behavior
  – Hierarchical organisation
  – Modularity / specialisation: emergence of subsystems that fulfil specialised functions
Language as a complex adaptive system

• By itself, defining language as a complex adaptive system is not very informative!
  – We need to understand what it does and how it does it
  – We need a formal description of the system
Questions

• What are the nodes in this system?
• What is the topology of the abstract space in which this system exists?
• What is the internal structure of this system?
• How does it evolve?

• (What kind of complexity measure?)
An initial hypothesis

• Grammar is a hierarchical complex adaptive system in an abstract n-dimensional fitness landscape
  – Hierarchical modularity
  – Multi-dimensional abstract space
  – Nodes can be linguistic entities, not speakers
Diagram illustrating a network of connections between individuals, with one person standing out as a focal point, connected to multiple others through lines that signify communication or interaction.
An initial hypothesis

- Grammar is a hierarchical complex adaptive system in an abstract n-dimensional fitness landscape
  - Competition for survival under environmental pressure (represented as elevations of the abstract space)
  - Environment = linguistic + non-linguistic
Afterthought: Language and evolution as a metaphor
Evolutionary metaphors

• Language evolution

• 19th century metaphor:

“Languages were born and died, like living organisms. They had their life spans, they grew and changed like men and animals, they had their little ills which could be cured by appropriate remedies prescribed by good grammarians.”

Haugen (2001)
Evolutionary metaphors
Evolutionary metaphors

• Language is a superorganism
  (cf. Beckner & al. 2009)

• Language is like a bacterial colony
Evolutionary metaphors

• Language is like a mycelial network

“… mycorrhizal mycelia can also act as a conduit for signalling between plants, acting as an early warning system for herbivore attack.”

(Babikova & al. 2003)
Natural metaphors

Mycorrhizal Fungi
Conclusion
• Bias should be avoided
• Understand bias
• Understand complexity
• Language has no rules
• Grammar ≈ mushrooms
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