

The Development of Language in Genie: A Case of Language Acquisition beyond the "Critical Period"

Victoria Fromkin, Stephen Krashen, Susan Curtiss,
David Rigler, and Marilyn Rigler

Genie's story is tragic, involving, as it does, the irretrievable loss of human potential. For most of the first fourteen years of her life, Genie was isolated in a small, dark room, where she suffered extreme physical and emotional neglect. Out of this tragedy, linguists, psychologists, neurologists, and others have learned a great deal from careful study of Genie's development. Beginning almost immediately after she was discovered in 1970 and continuing until 1979, she was evaluated regularly, and as a result, our understanding of many aspects of language acquisition, cognitive development, the critical age theory, and brain lateralization and function has advanced enormously.

*In this selection the development of Genie's linguistic abilities is examined in detail. As you read, keep in mind the normal stages of language acquisition described in earlier selections in Part Nine. When the following article first appeared, the authors were guardedly optimistic about the possibility of Genie's further linguistic development. Unfortunately, by 1979 it had become clear that her progress in language development had slowed dramatically and that a 1974 prediction of permanent dysphasia had been correct. However, Genie continued to be far more advanced cognitively than linguistically, and she could communicate effectively using a variety of nonverbal techniques, including her own drawings. In 1977, Susan Curtiss published a study, *Genie: A Psycholinguistic Study of a Modern-Day "Wild Child"* (New York: Academic Press), which presented background material on Genie's personality, especially her interactions with Curtiss, and*

Notes: The research reported on in this paper was supported in part by a grant from the National Institutes of Mental Health, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, No. MH-21191-03.

This is a combined and expanded version of a number of papers presented before the American Psychological Association, the Linguistic Society of America, the Acoustical Society of America, and the American Speech and Hearing Association, including S. Curtiss (1972); Curtiss et al. (1972, 1973); Krashen et al. (1972a, 1972b); Fromkin (1972); D. Rigler (1972).

detailed her linguistic development and the ways in which she was evaluated.

According to Maya Pines, "within a few months of [Genie's] arrival at Children's Hospital [in 1970] she began going to nursery classes for normal children. She soon transferred to a special elementary school for handicapped children. Next, she spent several years in a city high school for the mentally retarded. Outside school, a speech therapist worked with her consistently for many years" (Psychology Today, September 1981, p. 31).

Genie, the subject of this study, is an adolescent girl who for most of her life underwent a degree of social isolation and experiential deprivation not previously reported in contemporary scientific history. It is a unique case because the other children reported on in contemporary literature were isolated for much shorter periods and emerged from their isolation at much younger ages than did Genie. The only studies of children isolated for periods of time somewhat comparable to that of this case are those of Victor (Itard 1962) and Kaspar Hauser (Singh and Zingg 1966).

All cases of such children reveal that experiential deprivation results in a retarded state of development. An important question for scientists of many disciplines is whether a child so deprived can "catch up" wholly or in part. The answer to this question depends on many factors including the developmental state achieved prior to deprivation, the duration, quality, and intensity of the deprivation, and the early biological adequacy of the isolated child. In addition, the ability of such "recuperation" is closely tied to whether there is a "critical period" beyond which learning cannot take place. The concept of a "critical period" during which certain innately determined faculties can develop derived from experimental embryology. It is hypothesized that should the necessary internal or external conditions be absent during this period, certain developmental abilities will be impossible.

Lenneberg (1967) presents the most specific statement about critical periods in humans as it concerns the acquisition of language. He starts with the assumption that language is innately determined, that its acquisition is dependent upon both necessary neurological events and some unspecified minimal exposure to language. He suggests that this critical period lasts from about age two to puberty: language acquisition is impossible before two due to maturational factors, and after puberty because of the loss of "cerebral plasticity" caused by the completion of the development of cerebral dominance, or lateralized specialization of the language function.

The case of Genie is directly related to this question, since Genie was already pubescent at the time of her discovery, and it is to this question that the discussion is primarily directed. The case also has relevance for other linguistic questions such as those concerning distinctions between

the comprehension and production of language, between linguistic competence and performance, and between cognition and language.

There are many questions for which we still have no answers. Some we may never have. Others must await the future developments of this remarkable child. The case history as presented is therefore an interim report.

CASE HISTORY

Genie was first encountered when she was thirteen years, nine months. At the time of her discovery and hospitalization she was an unsocialized, primitive human being, emotionally disturbed, unlearned, and without language. She had been taken into protective custody by the police and, on November 4, 1970, was admitted into the Children's Hospital of Los Angeles for evaluation with a tentative diagnosis of severe malnutrition. She remained in the Rehabilitation Center of the hospital until August 13, 1971. At that time she entered a foster home, where she has been living ever since as a member of the family.

When admitted to the hospital, Genie was a painfully thin child with a distended abdomen who appeared to be six or seven years younger than her age. She was 54.5 inches tall and weighed 62.25 pounds. She was unable to stand erect, could not chew solid or even semisolid foods, had great difficulty in swallowing, was incontinent of feces and urine, and was mute.

The tragic and bizarre story which was uncovered revealed that for most of her life Genie had suffered physical and social restriction, nutritional neglect, and extreme experiential deprivation. There is evidence that from about the age of twenty months until shortly before admission to the hospital Genie had been isolated in a small closed room, tied into a potty chair where she remained most or all hours of the day, sometimes overnight. A cloth harness, constructed to keep her from handling her feces, was her only apparel of wear. When not strapped into the chair she was kept in a covered infant crib, also confined from the waist down. The door to the room was kept closed and the windows were curtained. She was hurriedly fed (only cereal and baby food) and minimally cared for by her mother, who was almost blind during most of the years of Genie's isolation. There was no radio or TV in the house and the father's intolerance of noise of any kind kept any acoustic stimuli which she received behind the closed door to a minimum. (The first child born to this family died from pneumonia when three months old after being put in the garage because of noisy crying.) Genie was physically punished by the father if she made any sounds. According to the mother, the father and older brother never spoke to Genie although they barked at her like dogs. The mother was forbidden to spend more than a few minutes with Genie during feeding.

It is not the purpose of this paper to attempt to explain the psychotic

behavior of the parents which created this tragic life for Genie, not to relate the circumstances which led to the discovery. (See Hansen 1972; D. Rigler 1972.) It is reported that Genie's father regarded her as a hopelessly retarded child who was destined to die at a young age and convinced the mother of this. His prediction was based at least in part on Genie's failure to walk at a normal age. Genie was born with a congenital dislocation of the hips which was treated in the first year by the application of a Frejka pillow splint to hold both legs in abduction, and the father placed the blame for her "retardation" on this device.

On the basis of what is known about the early history, and what has been observed so far, it appears that Genie was normal at the time of birth and that the retardation observed at the time of discovery was due principally to the extreme isolation to which she was subjected, with its accompanying social, perceptual, and sensory deprivation. Very little evidence exists to support a diagnosis of early brain damage, primary mental deficiency, or infantile autism. On the other hand, there is abundant evidence of gross environmental impoverishment and of psychopathological behavior on the part of the parents. This is revealed to some extent in Genie's history and equally by the dramatic changes that have occurred since her emergence. (See D. Rigler 1972; M. Rigler 1972.)

Genie's birth was relatively normal. She was born in April 1957, delivered by Caesarian section. Her birth problems included an Rh negative incompatibility for which she was exchange transfused (no sequelae were noted), and the hip dislocation spoken of above. Genie's development was otherwise initially normal. At birth she weighed 7 pounds, 7.5 ounces. By three months she had gained 4.5 pounds. According to the pediatrician's report, at six months she was doing well and taking food well. At eleven months she was still within normal limits. At fourteen months Genie developed an acute illness and was seen by another pediatrician. The only other medical visit occurred when Genie was just over 3.5 years of age.

From the meager medical records at our disposal, then, there is no indication of early retardation. After admission to the hospital, Genie underwent a number of medical diagnostic tests. Radiology reported a "moderate coxa valga deformity of both hips and a narrow rib cage" but no abnormality of the skull. The bone age was reported as approximately eleven years. Simple metabolic disorders were ruled out. The neurologist found no evidence of neurological disease. The electroencephalographic records reported a "normal waking record." A chromosomal analysis was summarized as being "apparently normal."

During the first few months of her hospitalization additional consultations were undertaken. The conclusion from among all of these evaluative efforts may be summarized briefly. Functionally Genie was an extremely retarded child, but her behavior was unlike that of other mentally defective children. Neither, apparently, was she autistic. Although emotionally disturbed behavior was evident there was no discernible evidence of physical or mental disease that would otherwise account for her

retarded behavior. It therefore seems plausible to explain her retardation as due to the intensity and duration of her psychosocial and physical deprivation.

The dramatic changes that have occurred since Genie's emergence reinforce this conclusion. Approximately four weeks after her admission to the hospital a consultant described a contrast between her admission status and what he later observed (Shurley, personal communication). He wrote that on admission Genie

was pale, thin, ghost-like, apathetic, mute, and socially unresponsive. But now she had become alert, bright-eyed, engaged readily in simple social play with balloons, flashlight, and toys, with familiar and unfamiliar adults. . . . She exhibits a lively curiosity, good eye-hand coordination, adequate hearing and vision, and emotional responsivity. . . . She reveals much stimulus hunger Despite her muteness . . . Genie does not otherwise use autistic defenses, but has ample latent affect and responses. There is no obvious evidence of cerebral damage or intellectual stenosis—only severe (extreme) and prolonged experiential, social, and sensory isolation and deprivation during her infancy and childhood Genie may be regarded as one of the most extreme and prolonged cases of such deprivation to come to light in this century, and as such she is an "experiment in nature."

GENIE'S LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENT

Important elements in Genie's history are still unknown and may never be known. We have no reliable information about early linguistic developments or even the extent of language input. One version has it that Genie began to speak words prior to her isolation and then ceased. Another is that she simply never acquired language at all beyond the level observed on hospital entry. One thing is definite: when Genie was discovered she did not speak. On the day after admission to the hospital she was seen by Dr. James Kent who reports (Kent 1972):

Throughout this period she retained saliva and frequently spit it out into a paper towel or into her pajama top. *She made no other sounds except for a kind of throaty whimper. . . .* (Later in the session) . . . she imitated "back" several times, as well as "fall" when I said "The puppet will fall." . . . She could communicate (her) needs nonverbally, at least to a limited extent. . . . Apart from a peculiar laugh, frustration was the only other clear affective behavior we could discern. . . . When very angry she would scratch at her own face, blow her nose violently into her clothes and often void urine. During these tantrums *there was no vocalization. . . .* We felt that the eerie silence that accompanied these reactions was probably due to the fact that she had been whipped by her father when she made noise.

At the outset of our linguistic observations, it was not clear whether

Genie's inability to talk was the result solely of physiological and/or emotional factors. We were unable to determine the extent of her language comprehension during the early periods. Within a few days she began to respond to the speech of others and also to imitate single words. Her responses did not however reveal how heavily she was dependent on non-verbal, extralinguistic cues such as "tone of voice, gestures, hints, guidance, facial and bodily expressions" (Bellugi and Klima 1971). To determine the extent of her language comprehension it was necessary to devise tests in which all extralinguistic cues were eliminated.¹ If the comprehension tests administered showed that Genie did comprehend what was said to her, using linguistic information alone, we could assume that she had some knowledge of English, or had acquired some linguistic "competence." In that case, the task facing Genie would not be one of language learning but of learning how to use that knowledge—adding a performance modality—to produce speech. If the tests, on the other hand, in addition to her inability to speak, showed that she had little ability to understand what was said to her when all extralinguistic cues were eliminated, she would be faced with true first-language acquisition.

LINGUISTIC COMPREHENSION

The administration of the comprehension tests which we constructed had to wait until Genie was willing and able to cooperate. It was necessary to develop tests which would not require verbal responses since it was her comprehension not her active production of speech to be tested at this stage. The first controlled test was administered in September 1971, almost eleven months after Genie's emergence. Prior to these tests Genie revealed a growing ability to understand and produce individual words and names. This ability was a necessary precursor to an investigation of her comprehension of grammatical structure, but did not in itself reveal how much language she knew since the ability to relate the sounds and meanings of individual lexical items, while necessary, is not a sufficient criterion for language competence.

It was quite evident that at the beginning of the testing period Genie could understand individual words which she did not utter herself, but, except for such words, she had little if any comprehension of grammatical structures. Genie was thus faced with the complex task of primary language acquisition with a postpubescent brain. There was no way that a prediction could be made as to whether she could or would accomplish this task. Furthermore, if she did not learn language it would be impossible to determine the reasons. One cannot draw conclusions about children of this kind who fail to develop. One can, however, draw at least some conclusions from the fact that Genie has been acquiring language at this late age. The evidence for this fact is revealed in the results of the

¹ The tests were designed, administered, and analyzed by S. Curtiss.

seventeen different comprehension tests which have been administered almost weekly over the last two years. A slow but steady development is taking place. We are still, of course, unable to predict how much of the adult grammar she will acquire.

Among the grammatical structures that Genie now comprehends are singular-plural contrasts of nouns, negative-affirmative sentence distinctions, possessive constructions, modifications, a number of prepositions (including *under*, *next to*, *beside*, *over*, and probably *on* and *in*), conjunction with *and*, and the comparative and superlative forms of adjectives. (For further details on the comprehension tests, see Curtiss et al. 1973.)

The comprehension tests which are now regularly administered were designed by Susan Curtiss, who has been most directly involved in the research of Genie's linguistic development. (New tests are constantly being added.) The nouns, verbs, and adjectives used in all of the tests are used by Genie in her own utterances (see below for discussion on Genie's spontaneous speech production). The response required was primarily a "pointing" response. Genie was familiar with this gesture prior to the onset of testing. One example can illustrate the kinds of tests and the procedures used.

To test Genie's singular/plural distinction in nouns, pairs of pictures are used—a single object on one picture, three of the identical objects on the other. The test sentences differ only by absence or presence of plural markers on the nouns. Genie is asked to point to the appropriate picture. The words used are: balloon(s), pail(s), turtle(s), nose(s), horse(s), dish(es), pot(s), boat(s). Until July 1972, the responses were no better than chance. Since July 1972, Genie gives 100 percent correct responses. It is important to note that at the time when she was not responding correctly to the linguistically marked distinction, she could appropriately use and understand utterances including numbers ("one," "two," "three," etc.) and "many," "more," and "lots of."

SPEECH PRODUCTION AND PHONOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

Genie's ability to comprehend spoken language is a better indication of her linguistic competence than is her production of speech because of the physical difficulties Genie has in speaking. At the age when normal children are learning the necessary neuromuscular controls over their vocal organs to enable them to produce the sounds of language, Genie was learning to repress any and all sounds because of the physical punishment which accompanied any sounds produced. This can explain why her earliest imitative and spontaneous utterances were often produced as silent articulations or whispered. Her inability to control the laryngeal mechanisms involved in speech resulted in monotonic speech. Her whole body tensed as she struggled to speak, revealing the difficulties she had in the control of air volume and air flow. The intensity of the

acoustic signal produced was very low. The strange voice quality of her vocalized utterances is at least partially explainable in reference to these problems.

Because of her speech difficulties, one cannot assess her language competence by her productive utterances alone. But despite the problems which still remain, there has been dramatic improvement in Genie's speech production. Her supraglottal articulations have been more or less normal, and her phonological development does not deviate sharply from that observed in normal children. In addition, she is beginning, both in imitations and in spontaneous utterances, to show some intonation and her speech is now being produced with greater intensity.

Like normal children, Genie's first one-word utterances consisted of Consonant-Vowel (CV) monosyllables. These soon expanded into a more complex syllable structure which can be diagrammed as (C) (L/G) V (C), where L stands for liquid, G, glide, and the parenthesized elements optional.

Words of two and three syllables entered into her productive vocabulary and in these words stress was correctly marked by intensity and/or duration of the vowel as well as vowel quality (with the unstressed vowel being ə). To date, all of the consonants of Standard American English are included in her utterances (with the interdental fricatives occurring only in imitations, and the affricates occurring inconsistently). She still deletes final consonants more often than not. Their correct sporadic presence, however, shows them to be part of her stored representation of the words in which they occur. Consonant clusters were first simplified by the deletion of the /s/ in initial /sp/ /sk/ /st/ clusters; at the present time, in addition to this method of preserving the CV syllable structure, she sometimes adds an epenthetic schwa between the two consonants.

Other changes in Genie's phonological system continue to be observed. At an earlier stage a regular substitution of /t/ for /k/, /n/, and /s/ occurred in all word positions: this now occurs only word medially. /s/ plus nasal clusters are now being produced.

What is of particular interest is that in imitation Genie can produce any English sound and many sound sequences not found in her spontaneous speech. It has been noted by many researchers on child language that children have greater phonetic abilities than are revealed in their utterances. This is also true of Genie; her output reflects phonological constraints rather than her inability to articulate sounds and sound sequences.

Neither Genie nor a normal child learns the sound system of a language totally independent from the syntactic and semantic systems. In fact, the analysis of the syntactic and semantic development of Genie's spontaneous utterances reveals that her performance on the expressive side is paralleling (although lagging behind) her comprehension.

As stated above, within a few weeks after admission to the hospital Genie began to imitate words used to her, and her comprehension of

individual words and names increased dramatically. She began to produce single words spontaneously after about five months.

SENTENCE STRUCTURE

For normal children perception or comprehension of syntactic structures exceeds production; this is even more true in Genie's case possibly for the reasons given above. But even in production it is clear that Genie is acquiring language. Eight months after her emergence Genie began to produce utterances, two words (or morphemes) in length. The structures of her earliest two-word "sentences" were Modifier + Noun and Noun + Noun genitive constructions. These included sentences like "more soup," "yellow car," "Genie purse," and "Mark mouth." After about two months she began to produce strings with verbs—both Noun (subject) + Verb, and Verb + Noun (object), e.g., "Mark paint" (N + V), "Curtiss cough" (N + V), "want milk" (V + N), and "wash car" (V + N). Sentences with a noun followed by a predicate adjective soon followed, e.g., "Dave sick."

In November 1971, Genie began to produce three- and four-word strings, including subject + verb + object strings, like "Tori chew glove," modified noun phrases like "little white clear box," subject-object strings, like "big elephant long trunk," and four-word predications like "Marilyn car red car." Some of these longer strings are of interest because the syntactic relations which were only assumed to be present in her two-word utterances were now overtly expressed. For example, many of Genie's two-word strings did not contain any expressed subject, but the three-word sentences included both the subject and object: "Love Marilyn" became "Genie love Marilyn." In addition, Modifier-noun Noun Phrases and possessive phrases which were complete utterances at the two-word sentence stage are now used as constituents of her longer strings, e.g., "more soup" occurred in "want more soup" and "Mark mouth" became a constituent in "Mark mouth hurt."

In February 1972, Genie began to produce negative sentences. The comprehension test involving negative/affirmative distinctions showed that such a distinction was understood many months earlier. (In the tests she had no difficulty in pointing to the correct picture when asked to "show me 'The girl is wearing shoes'" or "Show me the bunny that has a carrot" vs. "Show me the bunny that does not/doesn't have a carrot.") The first negative morpheme used by Genie was "no more." Later she began to use "no" and "not." To date, Genie continues to negate a sentence by attaching the negative morpheme to the beginning of the string. She has not yet acquired the "negative movement transformation" which inserts the negative morpheme inside the sentence in English.

About the same time that the negative sentences were produced, Genie began to produce strings with locative-nouns, such as "cereal kitchen" and "play gym." In recent months prepositions are occurring in her utterances. In answer to the question "Where is your toy radio?" she

answered "On chair." She has also produced sentences such as "Like horse behind fence" and "Like good Harry at hospital."

In July 1972, Verb plus Verb-phrase strings were produced: "Want go shopping," "Like chew meat." Such complex VPs began to emerge in sentences that included both a complex Noun-phrase and a complex Verb-phrase, e.g., "Want buy toy refrigerator" and "Want go walk (to) Ralph." Genie has also begun to add the progressive aspect marker "ing" to verbs, always appropriately to denote ongoing action: "Genie laughing," "Tori eating bone."

Grammatical morphemes that are phonologically marked are now used, e.g., plurals as in "bears," "noses," "swings," and possessives such as "Joe's room," "I like Dave's car."

While no definite-indefinite distinction has appeared, Genie now produces the definite article in imitation, and uses the determiner "another" spontaneously, as in "Another house have dog."

At an earlier stage, possession was marked solely by word order, Genie now also expresses possession by the verb "have," as in "bears have sharp claw," "bathroom have big mirror."

A most important syntactic development is revealed by Genie's use of compound NPs. Prior to December 1971, she would only name one thing at a time, and would produce two sentences such as: "Cat hurt" followed by "dog hurt." More recently she produced these two strings, and then said "Cat dog hurt." This use of a "recursive" element is also shown by the sentence "Curtiss, Genie, swimming pool" in describing a snapshot.

Genie's ability to combine a finite set of linguistic elements to form new combinations, and the ability to produce sentences consisting of conjoined sentences, shows that she has acquired two essential elements of language that permit the generation of an infinite set of sentences.

This is of course an overly sketchy view of the syntactic development evidence in Genie's utterances. (For further details see Curtiss et al. 1972.) It is clear even from this summary that Genie is learning language. Her speech is rule-governed—she has fixed word-order of basic sentence elements and constituents, and systematic ways of expressing syntactic and semantic relations.

LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENT IN RELATION TO NORMALS

Furthermore it is obvious that her development in many ways parallels that of normal first-language acquisition. There are, however, interesting differences between Genie's emerging language and that of normal children. Her vocabulary is much larger than that of normal children whose language exhibits syntactic complexity parallel to Genie's. She has less difficulty in storing lists than she does learning the rules of the grammar. This illustrates very sharply that language acquisition is not simply the ability to store a large number of items in memory.

Genie's performance on the active/passive comprehension test also

appears to deviate from that of normal children. Bever (1970) reports on experiments aimed at testing the capacity in young children "to recognize explicitly the concept of predication as exemplified in the appreciation of the difference between subject-action and action-object relations." The children in these experiments were requested to act out using both simple active sentences and reversible passive sentences, such as "The cow kisses the horse" and simple passives such as "The horse is kissed by the cow." He reports that "children from 2.0 to 3.0 act out simple active sentences 95 percent correctly, (and) . . . do far better than 5 percent on simple passives." He concludes that "since they perform almost randomly on passives . . . they can at least distinguish sentences they can understand from sentences they cannot understand. Thus, the basic linguistic capacity evidenced by the two-year-old child includes the notion of reference for objects and actions, the notion of basic functional internal relations, and at least a primitive notion of different sentence structures." Genie was similarly tested but with the "point to" response rather than the "acting out" response. That is she was asked to point to "The boy pulls/is pulling the girl" or "The girl is pulled by the boy." For each such test sentence she was presented with two pictures, one depicting the boy as agent, the other with the girl as agent. Unlike the children tested by Bever, Genie's responses to both active and passive sentences have been random, with no better than a chance level of correct responses for either the active or the passive sentences. This is particularly strange when compared with Genie's own utterances which show a consistent word order to indicate Subject Verb Object relations. While she never produces passive constructions, her active sentences always place the object after the verb and the subject before the verb (when they are expressed).

Another difference between Genie and normal children is in the area of linguistic performance. Genie's linguistic competence (her grammar, if we can speak of a grammar at such an early stage of development) is in many ways on a par with a two- or two-and-a-half-year-old child. Her performance—particularly as related to expressive speech—is much poorer than normal children at this level. Because of her particular difficulties in producing speech, however, a number of relatively successful efforts have been directed to teaching her written language. At this point she recognizes, names, and can print the letters of the alphabet, can read a large number of printed words, can assemble printed words into grammatically correct sentences, and can understand sentences (and questions) constructed of these printed words. On this level of performance, then, she seems to exceed normal children at a similar stage of language development.

Genie's progress is much slower than that of normals. Few syntactic markers occur in her utterances; there are no question words, no demonstratives, no particles, no rejoinders. In addition, no movement transformations are revealed. Such rules exist in the adult grammar and in normal children's grammars as early as two years. Transformational rules

are those which, for example, would move a negative element from the beginning of the sentence to the position after an auxiliary verb. Such a transformational rule would change *I can go* in its negative form from *Neg + I + can + go* to *I + can + neg (can't) + go*. As stated above, Genie continues to produce negative sentences only by the addition of the negative element to the beginning of the sentence, e.g., *No more ear hurt*, *No stay hospital*, *No can go*.

Cognitively, however, she seems to be in advance of what would be expected at this syntactic stage. Her earliest productive vocabulary included words cognitively more sophisticated than one usually finds in the descriptions of first vocabulary words. Color words and numbers, for example, were used which usually enter a child's vocabulary at a much later grammatical stage (Castner 1940; Denckla 1972).

At the time that Genie began to produce utterances of two words (June 1971) she had an active vocabulary of 200 words, which far exceeds the size of the normal children's lexicon at this stage (about fifty words). This development seems to parallel that found in aphasic children (Eisenson and Ingram 1972). She comprehends all the *wh*- questions; normal children ordinarily learn *how*, *why*, and *when* questions later than *who*, *what*, and *where* (Brown 1968), although syntactically such questions are similar. Her comprehension of the comparative and superlative, and the differences between *more* and *less* also indicate cognitive sophistication not revealed by her syntax, suggesting at least a partial independence of cognition and language.

COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

The attempt to assess Genie's cognitive development is extremely difficult. All tests purported to measure cognitive abilities, in fact, measure knowledge that has been acquired through experience. In addition, many tests are substantially dependent on verbal response and comprehension. The distinction between cognition and language development is therefore not always possible. A number of tests have, however, been utilized.

Genie could not easily be psychologically tested by standard instruments at the time of her admission. It is still difficult to administer many of the standard tests. On the Vineland Social Maturity Scale, however, she averaged about fifteen months at the time of admission, and on a Gesell Developmental Evaluation, a month and a half later, scores ranged from about one to about three years of age. There was a very high degree of scatter when compared to normal developmental patterns. Consistently, language-related behavior was observed to occur at the lower end of the range of her performance and was judged (by the psychologists at the hospital) to be at about the fifteen months level.

Her cognitive growth, however, seemed to be quite rapid. In a seven-month span her score had increased from fifteen to forty-two months,

and six months after admission, on the Leiter International Performance Scale (which depends relatively little on culturally based, specific knowledge, and requires no speech) she passed all the items at the four year level, two at the five year level, and two out of four at the seven year level. In May 1973 her score on this test was on the six to eight year level. At the same time, the Stanford Binet Intelligence Scale elicited a mental age of five to eight. In all the tests, the subsets which involved language were considerably lower than those assessing other abilities.

From this brief summary of Genie's linguistic development we can conclude the following: (1) When she first emerged from isolation, Genie, a child of thirteen years, nine months had not acquired language; (2) Since there is no evidence of any biological deficiencies, one may assume this was due to the social and linguistic isolation which occurred during eleven years of her life; (3) Since her emergence she has been acquiring her first language primarily by "exposure" alone (this is revealed both by her own speech and by her comprehension of spoken language); (4) Her cognitive development has exceeded her linguistic development.

THE "CRITICAL AGE" HYPOTHESIS AND LANGUAGE LATERALIZATION

As mentioned above, Genie's ongoing language acquisition is the most direct test of Lenneberg's critical age hypothesis seen thus far. Lenneberg (1967) has presented the view that the ability to acquire primary language (and the acquisition of second languages "by mere exposure") terminates with the completion of the development of cerebral dominance, or lateralization, an event which he argues occurs at around puberty. As we have demonstrated above, however, while Genie's language acquisition differs to some extent from that of normal children, she is in fact in the process of learning language, as shown by the results of tests and by the observations of her spontaneous and elicited speech. Thus, at least some degree of first-language acquisition seems to be possible beyond the critical period.

Genie also affords us the opportunity to study the relationship of the development of lateralization and language acquisition.

Lateralization refers to the fact that each hemisphere appears to be specialized for different cognitive functions; that is, some functions seem to be "localized" primarily on one side of the brain. . . . [The various monaural and dichotic listening tests given to Genie suggested a pronounced right-hemisphere dominance for language as well as for environmental sounds.]

In trying to assess this unusual situation it is important to note that Genie seems very proficient in what are considered right-hemisphere functions. . . . [In] psychological tests her development can be comprehended more meaningfully when performances on two kinds of test tasks are distinguished: those that require analytic or sequential use of

symbols, such as language and number; and those that involve perception of spatial configurations or Gestalts. On the first group of tasks Genie's performance is consistently in the low range, presently approximating an age of two-and-a-half to three years, approximately the age level of her linguistic performance using comparative linguistic criteria. On configurational tests, however, her performance ranges upwards, lying somewhere between eight years and the adult level, depending on the test. . . . The rate of growth on these tests has been very rapid. . . .

It would appear then that Genie is lateralized to the right for both language and nonlanguage functions. This assumes that these nonlinguistic abilities, which have been shown to be right-hemisphere lateralized, are indeed functions of Genie's right hemisphere. We are now in the process of designing tests involving other modalities which will hopefully provide more conclusive evidence on this question.

If this proves to be the case, one tentative hypothesis to explain how this developed is as follows: At the time of her isolation, Genie was a "normal" right-handed child with potential left-hemisphere dominance. The inadequate language stimulation during her early life inhibited or interfered with language aspects of left hemisphere development. This would be tantamount to a kind of functional atrophy of the usual language centers, brought about by disuse or suppression. Apparently, what meager stimulation she did receive was sufficient for normal right-hemisphere development. (One can imagine her sitting, day after day, week after week, year after year, absorbing every visual stimulus, every crack in the paint, every nuance of color and form.) This is consistent with the suggestion (Carmon et al. 1972) that the right hemisphere is the first to develop since it is more involved with the perception of the environment. Genie's current achievements in language acquisition, according to this reasoning, are occurring in that hemisphere which somehow did mature more normally.

The hypothesis that Genie is using a developed right hemisphere for language also predicts the dichotic listening results. The undeveloped language areas in the left hemisphere prevent the flow of (just language) impulses from the left primary auditory receiving areas to the right hemisphere. This explains why Genie's scores are so similar to split-brain and hemispherectomized subjects; the only auditory pathways that are functional for *verbal* stimuli are the right ipsilateral and left contralateral. The low right score is due to the suppression that occurs under the dichotic condition. Her perfect monotic scores are predicted, since suppression only takes place dichotically.

If this hypothesis is true it modifies the theory of the critical period: while the normal development of lateralization may not play a role in the critical period, lateralization may be involved in a different way; the left hemisphere must perhaps be linguistically stimulated during a specific period of time for it to participate in normal language acquisition. If such stimulation does not take place during this time, normal language acquisition must depend on other cortical areas and will proceed less

efficiently due to the previous specialization of these areas for other functions.

A comparison of Genie's with the other instances of right (minor) hemisphere speech in adults implies that Genie's capacity for language acquisition is limited and will cease at some time in the near future. Such cases are rare and not well described from a linguistic point of view. A. Smith's (1966) description of a left hemispherectomized man is the best of these. This man could not speak at all after his left hemisphere was removed but did begin to communicate in "propositional language" ten weeks later. The patient continued to make linguistic progress but remained severely aphasic eight months after surgery (see also Bogen 1969). Similarly, Hillier (1954) reported a left hemispherectomy performed on a fourteen-year-old boy for a tumor whose onset was one year previous to surgery. Again, there was early progress in language learning but after nineteen months progress ceased and the deficit became stable.

It is unfortunate that there is no information concerning cerebral dominance for other cases of isolated children—those that acquired language as well as those that didn't. Itard suggests that Victor was about twelve years of age when he was found in the woods of Aveyron, and that "It is . . . almost proved that he had been abandoned at the age of four or five years" (Itard 1962). If, in those first years he was not genetically deficient, lateralization should have been complete and language should have been acquired. Itard states further that "if, at this time, he already owed some ideas and some words to the beginning of an education, this would all have been effaced from his memory in consequence of his isolation." How, why, and if such "memory effacement" occurs are questions open to speculation. Despite this "effacement," Victor "did acquire a very considerable reading vocabulary, learning, by means of printed phrases, to execute such simple commands as to pick up a key" (Itard 1962, xii), but he never learned to speak. The scar "which [was] visible on his throat" may have damaged his larynx. It is impossible to tell from Itard's reports the exact extent of Victor's comprehension of spoken language.

Another case, similar to some extent to that of Genie, is that of a child who was not exposed to language until she was six-and-a-half years old because of her imprisonment with a mute and totally uneducated aphasic mother (Mason 1942). Within twenty-two months, she progressed from her first spoken words ("ball," "car," "bye," "baby") to asking such questions as "Why does the paste come out if one upsets the jar?" The rapidity with which she acquired the complex grammar of English provides some support for the hypothesis that the language learning mechanism is more specific than general.

This case is also consistent with a two-to-puberty critical period theory. The language learning capacity of the right hemisphere, then, may be limited either in time or amount of learning. Because we have no grammatical descriptions of right-hemisphere speech, we cannot predict how far Genie will progress from comparisons with such cases. On the other hand, Genie's progress in language acquisition impressionistically

seems to have far exceeded that of the other reported cases. We intend to continue administering dichotic listening tests to see if the left hemisphere begins to show increasing language function. If this occurs, one plausible conclusion would be that language acquisition and use are a precondition for such lateralization to occur. We note, of course, that this would be contrary to the Krashen and Harshman position that lateralization *precedes* language acquisition. There is also some evidence of laterality differences in neonates (Wada, quoted in Geschwind 1970; Molfese 1972).

It is clear from this report that we have more questions than answers. We are hopeful that Genie's development will provide some of these answers.

As humanists we are hopeful that our tentative prognosis of a slowing down of language and permanent dysphasia will prove to be wrong. For despite the predictions of our hypothesis, Genie continues to make modest but steady progress in language acquisition and is providing us with data in an unexplored area, first-language acquisition beyond the "critical period." After all, a discarded hypothesis is a small price to pay for confirmation of the astonishing capabilities and adaptability of the human mind. (See the postscript by Maya Pines on page 605.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bellugi, U., and E. Klima. Consultation Report, March, 1971.
- Bever, T. G. "The cognitive basis for linguistic structures." In *Cognition and the Development of Language*. ed. J. R. Hayes. New York: John Wiley, 1970, 279-362.
- Bogen, J. E. "The other side of the brain I: Dysgraphia and dyscopia following cerebral commissurotomy." *Bulletin of the Los Angeles Neurological Societies* 34 (July 1969), 73-105.
- Brown, R. "The development of WH questions in child speech." *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 7 (1968), 279-290.
- Carmon, A., Y. Harishanu, R. Lowinger, and S. Levy. "Asymmetries in hemispheric blood volume and cerebral dominance." *Behavioral Biology*, 1972.
- Castner, B. M. *Language Development in the First Five Years of Life*. ed. A. Gesell. New York: Harper & Row, 1940.
- Chomsky, N. "Explanatory models in linguistics." In *Logic, Methodology, and the Philosophy of Science*. ed. E. Nagel, P. Suppes, and A. Tarski. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962.
- Clarke, A. D. B., and A. M. Clarke. "Some recent advances in the study of early deprivation." *Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 1, 1960.
- Curtiss, S. "The development of language in Genie." Paper presented to the 1972 Annual Convention of the American Speech and Hearing Association, San Francisco, November 1972, 18-20.
- Curtiss, S., V. Fromkin, and S. Krashen. "The syntactic development of Genie." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Atlanta, Georgia, December 1972.

- Davis, K. "Extreme social isolation of a child." *American Journal of Sociology* 45 (1940), 554-565.
- . "Final note on a case of extreme isolation." *American Journal of Sociology* 52 (1947), 432-437.
- Denckla, M. B. "Performance on color tasks in kindergarten children." *Cortex* 8 (1972), 177-190.
- Dennis, W., and P. Najarian. "Infant development under developmental handicap." *Psychological Monographs* 71, no. 7 (1957).
- Eisenson, J., and D. Ingram. "Childhood aphasia—an updated concept based on recent research." *Papers and Reports on Child Language Development*. Stanford University (1972), 103-120.
- Fraiberg, S., and D. A. Freedman. "Studies in the ego development of the congenitally blind child." *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* 19 (1964), 113-169.
- Fromkin, V. "The development of language in Genie." Paper presented at the 80th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, September 1-8, 1972.
- Geschwind, N. "The organization of language and the brain." *Science* 170 (1970), 940-944.
- Haggard, M., and A. Parkinson. "Stimulus and task factors as determinants of ear advantage." *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 23 (1971), 168-177.
- Hansen, H. "The first experiences and the emergence of 'Genie.'" Paper presented at the 80th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, September 1-8, 1972.
- Hillier, F. "Total left hemispherectomy for malignant glaucoma." *Neurology* 4 (1954), 718-721.
- Howe, M., and F. G. Hall. *Laura Bridgeman*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1903.
- Itard, J. *The Wild Boy of Aveyron*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962.
- Kent, J. "Eight months in the hospital." Paper presented at the 80th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, September 1-8, 1972.
- Koluchova, J. "Severe deprivation in twins." *Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 13 (1972).
- Krashen, S. "Language and the left hemisphere." *Working Papers in Phonetics* 24 (1972), UCLA.
- . "Lateralization, language learning, and the critical period: Some new evidence." *Language Learning* 23 (1973a), 63-74.
- . "Mental abilities underlying linguistic and non-linguistic functions." *Linguistics* (1973b).
- Krashen, S., V. Fromkin, S. Curtiss, D. Rigler, and S. Spitz. "Language lateralization in a case of extreme psychological deprivation." Paper presented to the 84th meeting of the Acoustical Society of America, 1972a.
- Krashen, S., V. Fromkin, and S. Curtiss. "A neurolinguistic investigation of language acquisition in the case of an isolated child." Paper presented to the Linguistic Society of America. Winter meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, December 27-29, 1972b.
- Krashen, S., and R. Harshman. "Lateralization and the critical period." *Working Papers in Phonetics* 23 (1972), 13-21. UCLA (Abstract in *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 52, 174).
- Lenneberg, E. H. *Biological Foundations of Language*. New York: Wiley, 1967.

- Mason, M. K. "Learning to speak after six and one-half years." *Journal of Speech Disorders* 7 (1942), 295-304.
- Milner, B., L. Taylor, and R. Sperry. "Lateralized suppression of dichotically presented digits after commissural section in man." *Science* 161 (1968), 184-186.
- Molfese, D. L. "Cerebral asymmetry in infants, children and adults: Auditory evoked responses to speech and musical stimuli." *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 53 (1972), 363 [A].
- Rigler, D. "The Case of Genie." Paper presented to the 1972 Annual Convention of the American Speech and Hearing Association, San Francisco, California. November 18-20, 1972.
- Rigler, M. "Adventure: At home with Genie." Paper presented at the 80th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, September 1-8, 1972.
- Singh, J. A. L., and R. M. Zingg. *Wolf-Children and Feral Man*. Archon Books, 1966.
- Skinner, B. F. *Verbal Behavior*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.
- Smith, A. "Speech and other functions after left (dominant) hemispherectomy." *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry* 29 (1957), 467-471.
- Spitz, R. A. "The role of ecological factors in emotional development." *Child Development* 20 (1949), 145-155.
- Von Feuerbach, A. *Kasper Hauser*. (Translated from the German) London: Simpkin and Marshall, 1833.
- Zurif, E. B., and M. Mendelsohn. "Hemispheric specialization for the perception of speech sounds: The influences of intonation and structure." *Perception and Psychophysics* 11 (1972), 329-332.

Genie: A Postscript

Maya Pines

In 1978, Genie's mother became her legal guardian. During all the years of Genie's rehabilitation, her mother had also received help. An eye operation restored her sight, and a social worker tried to improve her behavior toward Genie. Genie's mother had never been held legally responsible for the child's inhuman treatment. Charges of child abuse were dismissed in 1970, when her lawyer argued that she "was, herself, a victim of the same psychotic individual"—her husband. There was "nothing to show purposeful or willful cruelty," he said.

Nevertheless, for many years the court assigned a guardian for Genie. Shortly after Genie's mother was named guardian, she astounded the therapists and researchers who had worked with Genie by filing a suit against Curtiss and the Children's Hospital among others—on behalf of herself and her daughter—in which she charged that they had disclosed private and confidential information concerning Genie and her mother for "prestige and profit" and had subjected Genie to "unreason-

able and outrageous" testing, not for treatment, but to exploit Genie for personal and economic benefits. According to the *Los Angeles Times*, the lawyer who represents Genie's mother estimated that the actual damages could have totaled \$500,000. [Editor's note: The case was settled out of court, with no damages awarded.]

[In the years since the case] was filed, Genie has been completely cut off from the professionals at Children's Hospital and UCLA. Since she is too old to be in a foster home, she apparently is living in a board-and-care home for adults who cannot live alone. The *Los Angeles Times* reported that as of 1979 her mother was working as a domestic servant. All research on Genie's language and intellectual development has come to a halt. However, the research Genie stimulated goes on. Much of it concerns the relationship between linguistic ability and cognitive development, a subject to which Genie has made a significant contribution.

Apart from Chomsky and his followers, who believe that fundamental language ability is innate and unrelated to intelligence, most psychologists assume that the development of language is tied to—and emerges from—the development of nonverbal intelligence, as described by Piaget. However, Genie's obvious nonverbal intelligence—her use of tools, her drawings, her knowledge of causality, her mental maps of space—did not lead her to an equivalent competence in the grammar normal children acquire by the age of five.

Puzzled by the discrepancy between Genie's cognitive abilities and her language deficits, Curtiss and Fromkin wondered whether they could find people with the opposite pattern—who have normal language ability despite cognitive deficits. That would be further evidence of the independence of language from certain aspects of cognition.

In recent months, they have found several such persons among the mentally retarded, as well as among victims of Turner's syndrome, a chromosomal defect that produces short stature, cardiac problems, infertility, and specific learning difficulties in females. With help from the National Science Foundation (which had also funded some of Curtiss's research on Genie), Fromkin and Curtiss have identified and started working with some children and adolescents who combine normal grammatical ability with serious defects in logical reasoning, sequential ability, or other areas of thinking.

"You can't explain their unimpaired syntax on the basis of their impaired cognitive development," says Curtiss, who is greatly excited by this new developmental profile. She points out that in the youngsters studied, the purely grammatical aspect of language—which reflects Chomsky's language universals—seems to be isolated from the semantic aspect of language, which is more tied to cognition. "Language no longer looks like a uniform package," she declares. "This is the first experimental data on the subject." Thus the ordeal of an abused child may help us understand some of the most puzzling but important aspects of our humanity.

FOR DISCUSSION AND REVIEW

1. Noting that all children who suffer serious experiential deprivation show retarded development, Fromkin and colleagues state that "An important question for scientists of many disciplines is whether a child so deprived can 'catch up' wholly or in part." List the various factors to consider in answering this question.
2. Describe as fully as you can the condition (physical, developmental, etc.) of Genie at the time she was discovered and hospitalized. Summarize the conditions under which she had lived and consider the possible effect on her of each.
3. On what basis do the authors conclude that although "functionally, Genie was an extremely retarded child," the most plausible explanation of this retardation was "the intensity and duration of her psychosocial and physical deprivation"?
4. Explain the importance of devising at the outset tests to use with Genie to ascertain the extent (if any) of her language comprehension.
5. Explain the following statement: "The ability to relate the sounds and meanings of individual lexical items, while necessary, is not a sufficient criterion for language competence."
6. The authors state, "Genie's ability to comprehend spoken language is a better indication of her linguistic competence than is her production of speech because of the physical difficulties Genie has in speaking." What does this fact suggest about the importance of such early stages of language discussed by Aitchison as crying, cooing, babbling, and intonation patterns, and of practice?
7. After stating that Genie is learning language, the authors point out differences in her linguistic development from that of "normals." What are these differences, and what is their significance? What stage has Genie reached in the acquisition of negative sentences? What are the implications of this fact?
8. Review the earlier discussions in this section of the relationship between cognitive development and language acquisition. What is the significance of the fact that "cognitively, . . . she [Genie] seems to be in advance of what would be expected at this syntactic stage"? Note, too, that the *rate* of Genie's cognitive growth exceeded that of her language acquisition.
9. Explain how Genie's linguistic development has been a test of Lenneberg's critical age hypothesis (pp. 600–603). Discuss the results of this test.
10. What has Genie taught us about the relationship between language

acquisition and brain lateralization? How do these findings relate to the critical age hypothesis?

11. Explain the tentative hypothesis developed by the authors to account for Genie's being "lateralized to the right for both language and nonlanguage functions." How does this hypothesis, if correct, modify the critical period theory?
-

Teaching How to Talk in Roadville: The First Words

Shirley Brice Heath

Shirley Brice Heath is currently a professor of anthropology and linguistics in the School of Education at Stanford University. From 1969 to 1978, she "lived, worked, and played," in Roadville and Trackton, two very different communities in the Carolina piedmont. Her research in Roadville involved the study of children learning to use language at home and school, and it "raises fundamental questions about the nature of language development, the effects of literacy on the oral habits, and the sources of communication problems in school and workplaces." This research resulted in the landmark ethnographic book Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms. Prior to its publication no in-depth, long-range language study had been conducted to examine children's language in the context of the community in which it was spoken.

In this selection from Ways with Words, Heath meticulously describes what she observed of language acquisition in Roadville. Her observations offer invaluable insights into the nature of baby talk, how young children learn to ask and answer questions, and how and when children are trained in their communities' accepted linguistic behaviors.

Relatives especially caution young mothers not to spoil their babies by picking them up and holding them too much, yet they are also not to let their babies lie and cry. A distinction of noises from the baby is the guideline for when the baby should be picked up. If he is "jus' makin' noise, talkin' to himself," he should be left alone; if, on the other hand, he is "cryin' a li'l bit," he is to be listened to, but not picked up. Only to a loud cry sustained for several moments is the mother to respond by picking up the baby. Those giving advice to young mothers urge that a baby be left to himself some, to explore, to move about, to make noise. The babbling and cooing of babies before and after they go to sleep is recognized as part of this exploring, and mothers happily report to their female relatives when their babies begin to coo, smile, and babble. Young mothers often take the first "da, da, da, da" sounds from the crib as "daddy" and report the "word" proudly to the father. Whenever the baby is then picked up the father or by anyone to whom the story had been reported, "daddy" becomes a favorite word for use in talking to the baby.