RESEARCH QUESTION:
How does the language ecology affect the speed of the emergence of phonology?

BACKGROUND:[1,2]

METHODS:
Participants: 25 signers
--12 signers of Central Taurus Sign Language (CTSL): CTSL-cohorts 1,2,3 (4 signers each)

Types of interaction/input:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-horizontal</th>
<th>+horizontal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-vertical</td>
<td>HomeSigners (Nic.)</td>
<td>NSL1, CTSL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+vertical</td>
<td></td>
<td>NSL2,CTSL2, CTSL3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Horizontal contact*: does the person sign with other signers
*vertical contact*: does the person sign have a language model from the previous cohort

Esogenic: homogeneous community membership
Exogenic: heterogeneous community membership

Data: 1992 vignette descriptions; 6452 handshapes

Stimuli:

How quickly does phonology emerge in a “village” vs. “community” sign language?
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ANALYSIS:

CONCLUSIONS:
--Community size is important: a larger community (NSL) has higher complexity than a smaller one (CTSL),
--Language ecology matters too: CTSL (esogenic) has lower complexity than NSL (exogenic)
--The kind of interactions with others is also important: horizontal and vertical contact among signers decreases complexity
--Phonologization involves pruning (more evident in joint complexity) and building (more evident in selected finger complexity)
---Pruning is associated with joint complexity; building is associated with selected finger complexity.
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