“I think that’s enough”: Mental state verbs rarely report beliefs in child-directed speech
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Children evaluate belief reports based on reality
By age 4, children use mental state verbs (e.g. know, remember), but tend to reject sentences such as Suzy thinks giraffes have stripes and do poorly on false belief tasks (i.a., Wimmer & Perner 1983, Johnson & Maratsos 1997, de Villiers & de Villiers 2000).

Why?

Psychological
Lack of theory of mind (i.a., de Villiers 2005)

Syntactic
Difficulty with multi-clause sentences (i.a., Lohmann & Tomasello 2003)

Pragmatic
Lack understanding of context (Lewis et al. 2012)

In some contexts, mental state verbs have a parenthetical interpretation (Rooryck 2001, Simons 2007)

(1) A: Who stole the cupcake?
B: John thinks Bill was the thief.

(2) A: Why is John mad at Bill?
B: John thinks Bill was the thief.

Lewis et al. 2012
QUD (Where is Swiper?)
Exp: (Dora thinks that) Swiper is behind the toy box.
Child: No—he’s behind the curtain!

Does the distribution in the input give evidence for the pragmatic hypothesis?
- Parenthetical uses might be highly frequent in child-directed speech
- When belief is more relevant, the belief reported might be true

Corpus study

1281 utterances (mental state verbs and complements) in context from CHILDES Brown corpus

think (694), know (439), remember (34), guess (27), mean (24), forget (17), bet (12), wonder (8), pretend (7), suppose (7), wish (5), understand (3), believe (2), hope (2), dream (0), figure (0)

Utterance purpose: (Shatz 1983) kappa: .75

Assertion
I think it’s a truck.

Belief report
I didn’t think you would miss it.

Directing interaction
Do you know where he’s hiding?

Clarification
I don’t know what you mean.

Veridicality of the complement: (de Marneffe et al. 2012) kappa: .86

CT+/-
I don’t think you can put it back.

PR+/-
I think maybe it came from your basket.

Uu
Do you think she needs a helper?

Wh-C
I don’t know what bumped it Adam.

In 40% of our data, complement clauses are true and 70% of these are assertions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assertion</th>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT+</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR+</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT-</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uu</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-C</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40.6 mean 38.2 14.1 2.9

The majority of assertions are true The majority of belief reports are highly marked syntactically

Our corpus study provides evidence for the pragmatic hypothesis of Lewis et al. (2012): children are overwhelmed with parenthetical interpretations (true facts asserted but hedged).

Which factors help predict belief report uses?

Howard et al. 2008 suggest that tense, verb, subject and modal auxiliary matter.

We train a linear model on our corpus:

Favor
- past tense
- main subject 2nd/3rd presence of wh-item complement repeated in context

Disfavor
- think, remember, bet, forget, guess, mean complement subject 1st

No effect
- modal and negation scope type (declarative/interrogative)

The classifier highlights lexical/pragmatic factors which (dis)favor belief report uses. The age at which children become sensitive to each cue needs to be investigated.

think – factive in child-directed speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assertion</th>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT+</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR+</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT-</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uu</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-C</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

59.5 mean 27.1 11.9 1.3

know – predominantly true beliefs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Assertion</th>
<th>Belief</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CT+</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR+</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uu</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wh-C</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.4 mean 63.4 19.5 1.9

Thanks to Paul Sandels, Eryn Ahlers, Tara Stout and Sharon Ross for the data annotation!