

# A Theory of Language Learning and Production

**Varsha Kushwaha**

(Research Scholar)

Department of English

Aligarh Muslim University

Uttar Pradesh

**Email:** varsha.dctr@gmail.com

## Abstract

Language is a system of principles and symbols that is applied for meaningful communication. Language learning relates to first-language learning, which learns children learning of their language. Through language, we can express our ideas and view to others. It mentions to the knowing knowledge of rules and being capable to speak about them. Human language is different from communication of animals.

Theories of language production suggest that utterances are built by a mechanism that distinguishes linguistic subject from linguistic frame. Producing language in uttered discussion is not possible without motions. Language production is the production of uttered and scripted language. Language production connects the arranging of linguistic information.

Human language is different because it has characteristics of productive, translation etc. It believes on social learning and convention. The human beings have evolved a capacity to communicate through language. The capacity to learn a natural language differentiates human being from other beasts, and is generally absorbed during the first decade of life throughout the critical time for language learning. The language system that evolves penetrates everyday life, rendering for an infinite linguistic ability and for the necessary creativity of language. Development and the mind have done an amazing work resolving many difficult problems in action control, admitting problems of learning, hierarchical hold over serial behaviour.

It is not wonderful that these resolutions are victimized to solve other difficult problems such as pattern of a communication system. We suggest a theory of language of learning and production. The growth of grammatical position and symbols of language become significant through basing in perceptual experience and action system.

## Keywords

Language, ascendants, modular option, psychology, simulation, communication.

## For Referring This Paper:

Kushwaha, Varsha (2014). A Theory of Language Learning and Production. *International Journal of Research (IJR)*. Vol-1, Issue-2. Pg-82-88.

## Introduction

Language is the human ability for achieving and using critical process of communication and a language is any particular example of such a process. The nature of language and the evolutionary system raising it are issues of argument. This is separately due to the complexity nature of language.

Social enterprise provides the possibility of a new access. This opinion of language and knowledge has relevant philosophical ascendants, particularly in the phenomenological custom, which mentions that meaning does not dwell a pre-given Platonic world of endless truths to which mental representations link and adjust.

Language yields the chance to link all possible functions within a network, thereby elaborating the meaning of individual placed experiences. Language does this by arising sum of possibilities for function the world presents us, and by preparing those functions within a web of connected meanings. It pursues that if we hold language to its use, we consider one part of language's nature.

Data from psychology, psycholinguistics, and neuroscience have established the significance of function processes to perception and to language inclusion.

Any theory of this interaction has not been suggested. We adjust proved theories of motor control, the modular option and recognition for control (MOSAIC) and hierarchical modular option and identification for control (HMOSAIC) theories. We use the theory to language learning, inclusion, and some prospects of production, namely gesture. We starts with a short survey of recent work on the collection between language and action and the neurophysiology of the link

between language and action. This review is pursued by a description of the MOSAIC and HMOSAIC models and how we change them to utilize to language process. We suggest that the neural networks emphasising the HMOSAIC model include pre-motor mirrorneurons and canonical neurons, and Hebbian learning lies the connection of neural networks used in lecture production and function control so that the meaning of the utterance is established in the activity and the anticipated result of the action. We talk about how the model uses to the learning of verbs, nouns, and syntactic structures, how it represents simple language inclusion, and we use the model to gesture as one element of language production. Whereas we focus on the connection between language and activity, we do not claim that language phenomena can be adapted by action processes. There is powerful evidence for contributions to language inclusion by eternal systems and emotional systems and we address some of this work in the discussion. Our primary aim, however, is to make progress in realizing what seem to be big contributions of action to language.

## Language and Action

Action would appear to have short in common with language. Nonetheless, strong links between language and action have been based in analyses based on evolution neurophysiology and behaviour. We focus on behavioural data.

The Indexical Hypothesis mentions that sentences are realized by making a simulation of the actions that underlie them. Glenberg and Kaschak examined this proposal in a work in which participants evaluated the sensibility of sentences describing the change of

concrete objects such as “Anne delivered the pizza to you or you delivered the pizza to Anne”.

Glenberg and Kaschak concern to this kind of interaction as an Action-sentence Compatibility Effect (ACE). If the meaning of a phrase infringed with the needed hand movement, reading of that phrase was retorted. Taylor and Zwaan have established an impact of forces explained in sentences on the force employed in answering to the sentence. Glenberg presents how use-induced plasticity in the motor system impacts the processing of both abstract and concrete language.

## Theories of Control: MOSAIC and HOMASAIC

In this part, we explain a theory of motor control evolved by Wolpert and colleagues after describing.

Two kinds of models are arised in theories of motor control. A controller calculates Context-sensitive motor commands to fulfil aims.

According to Wolpert, these calculations are far from trivial because the same motor command to the muscles will have dissimilar effects depending on muscle tire, modifications in body form such as hand position, and characteristics of the objects of interaction. To refine the problem, the musculoskeletal scheme is not eminent dimensional.

At last, learning of the controller is tough because feedback in the form of perceptual information must be utilized to maintain motor processes.

The second kind of model is a predictor. The work of the predictor is to predict results of literal actions. The predictor creates use of an effective copy of the commands generated by controllers. The

same motor dominates that are sent to the body to render movement are also sent to the predictor and are used to generate predictions.

These predictions are useful for quick correction of movement before sensory feedback can be achieved if the movement was not failed by comparing the prediction to real sensory feedback, raising perceptual exact comparison of the predicted sensory feedback to actual feedback produces a fault signal used in learning.

The Wolpert et al. MOSAIC model dwells of multiple pairs of predictors and controllers even for relatively simple action like lifting a bottle. Each of the predictors and controllers is applied as a recurrent neural network .We will concern to a connected pair of a predictor and controller as a faculty. For example, the control of action for lifting a particular box may consist of one module for when the container is full and one module for when the container is empty.

## Connecting HMOSAIC to Language

In this section, we evolve the HMOSAIC model so that it becomes a model of hierarchical command in language as well as action production, that is, the ABL model. This evolvment is pursued by a discussion of the application of ABL to exclusive prospects of language learning. Each of these parts accepts a description of how the ABL model uses and a short review of defending data.

It is generally remarked that language is a productive scheme in that a limited number of words and syntactic rules can be used to produce a limited number of sentences. In communication, those sentences must convert a kind of constraints such as who is performing

what to whom, number, gender and so on. But, getting mixtures that make sense is a tough problem. Thus, an important aim for an embodied account of language is to make perfect combinations of words.

Thus, we set for ourselves two big challenges. One is to evolve a theory of language in which constraints on meaning are chief. The simple idea is that constraints on meaning reflect constraints on effective activity. The second challenge is to establish how the hierarchical organization of language can increase from the hierarchical organization of motor control.

## Learning Linguistic Constructions

In this part, we think how the ABL theory can supply a distinctive account of many elements of language learning. We start with a consideration of the learning of verbs and nouns. We prove how the theory accounts for learning syntactic-like constructions such as the twice object construction that explains shift cases.

In several Western cultures, parents generally call attention to objects and actions when calling them for their babies.

Canonical neuron system of the child will be excited, thereby converting the actions available to the child for interacting with the object. At the same time, for the child who has learned some of the articulations wanted to pronounce “bottle”, the child’s speech-MM is activated by the parent’s uttered words.

Thus, the stage is set for Hebbian learning of the meaning of the spoken words by connecting the activated action controller and the activated speech controller. In effect, the module becomes the representation of a construction that connects phonology.

## Inclusion: Applying the motor system to conduct simulation

A number of researchers have suggested that language comprehension is a system of simulation and that the simulation creates use of the motor system. We give an example of how the ABL theory makes such a simulation, and what it is about that simulation that calculates as language comprehension.

## Motion as one element of language production

The ABL model supplies insight into many characteristics of language production such as syntactic grounding, interactive conjunction in gesture and conversation. Owing to, place constraints; here we think production of co-speech gesture, and non literal gestures. These gestures concern to speech content by indicating to objects, by describing with the hands object figures and motion paths, and by using particular locations to represent ideas such as the past.

Gesture can use comprehension and production. Many graceful studies by Gentilucci and co-workers have represented a close relationship between words production and the observation of arm and hand gestures. Bernardis and Gentilucci represented that word and corresponding-in-meaning communicative arm gesture affected each other when they are expelled: the second formant in the speech spectrum is more advance when the word is declared together with the motion. No change in the second formant is mentioned when performing a meaningless arm movement regarding the same joint. Symbolic communicative gestures and

addressed words are connected in the communication system.

An effective description of language is that it comprises of symbols and rules for controlling them. This kind of description describes for the realities that language is generative and integrative. The symbols and rules descriptions of language have a tough time describing meaning, language use, and evolvment. The ABL theory makes some of the space between sensorimotor and symbolic descriptions by merit of the symbolic nature of the production of the high-level controller and predictor models. These predictor models give vectors of chances rather than the particular actions.

As Barsalou has established, these simulations can operate as logical symbols in conceptual schemes. The ABL perceptual symbols are based in motor controls and the prefigured sensory results of those requirements.

Another significant element of language use is that it pushes a perspective. This requirement for perspective may be connected to the reality that we have substances so that we know consequences from a given perspective explains three proportions of position construal of a view. The granularity proportion represents the ability to explain objects the perspective dimension catches point of opinion, such as explaining an exchange as selling; and

the function dimension represents to dissimilar interpretations of the same object allotting to different functions.

## Non-motor procedures

I have centred on motor procedures for two connected causes. We trust that the simple function of knowledge is check of activity. It is difficult to assume any other tale. That is, systems develop because they provide to the capacity to exist and those activities need action.

Thus, although minds have effective abilities for feeling and those abilities are in the service of action. Second, I suggest that systems that have developed for handle of situation-particular action have been used to control situation-particular language.

## Conclusion

I suggest that hierarchical, aim-conducted mechanisms of action control, that is to say matched controller modules have been used for language learning, and production. I want to enhance knowledge about theories language learning and production so I have chosen this topic. My policy recommendations might be subsumed under a larger topic, which mentions the approach of theories of language.

## References:

1. Chang F, Dell GS, and Bock K. Becoming syntactic. *Psychological Review*, 113(2): 234e272, 2006.
2. Classen J, Liepert J, Wise SP, Hallett M, and Cohen LG. Rapid plasticity of human cortical movement representation induced by practice. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 79(2): 1117e1123, 1998.
3. Childers JB and Tomasello M. Two-year-olds learn novel nouns, verbs, and conventional actions from massed or distributed exposures. *Developmental Psychology*, 38(6): 967e978, 2002.
4. De Vega M. Levels of embodied meaning. From pointing to counterfactuals. In de Vega M, Glenberg AM, and Graesser AC (Eds), *Symbols, Embodiment, and Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008: 285e308.
5. Dinstein I, Thomas C, Behrmann M, and Heeger DJ. A mirror up to nature. *Current Biology*, 18(1): R13eR18, 2008.
6. D'Ausilio A, Pulvermueller F, Salmas P, Bufalari I, Begliomini C, and Fadiga L. The motor somatotopy of speech perception. *Current Biology*, 19(5): 381e385, 2009.
7. Craighero L, Fadiga L, Rizzolatti G, and Umiltà C. Visuomotor priming. *Visual Cognition*, 5(1): 109e125, 1998.
8. Fadiga L, Craighero L, Buccino G, and Rizzolatti G. Speech listening specifically modulates the excitability of tongue muscles: A TMS study. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, 15(2): 399e402, 2002.
9. Fiebach CJ and Schubotz RI. Dynamic anticipatory processing of hierarchical sequential events: A common role for Broca's area and ventral premotor cortex across domains? *Cortex*, 42(4): 499e502, 2006.
10. Fadiga L, Craighero L, and Roy A. Broca's region: A speech Area? In Grodzinsky Y (Ed), *Broca's Region*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006: 137e152.
11. Gallese V and Lakoff G. The brain's concepts: The role of the sensory-motor system in reason and language. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 22(3): 455e479, 2005.
12. Gallese V. A neuroscientific grasp of concepts: From control to representation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B, Biological Sciences*, 358(1435): 1231e1240, 2003b.
13. Pulvermueller F. Grounding language in the brain. In de Vega M, Glenberg AM, and Graesser AC (Eds), *Symbols, Embodiment, and Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008: 85e116.
14. Rizzolatti G and Arbib M. Language within our grasp. *Trends in Neurosciences*, 21(5): 188e194, 1998.

### About Author:

Varsha Kushwaha is pursuing research from Aligarh Muslim University. She has deep interest in English literature and language. She did her graduation and post graduation from Dr. Ambedkar University. She wants to increase her knowledge in field of literary works of famous writers.

### Contact:

**Varsha Kushwaha**

(Research Scholar)

Department of English

Aligarh Muslim University

Uttar Pradesh

**Email:** varsha.dctr@gmail.com