Simulating Language
Lecture 12: Iterated Bayesian Learning in populations

Simon Kirby

simon@ling.ed.ac.uk

A reminder of the Griffiths & Kalish result

- Given enough time, the end result of cultural evolution always reflects the prior bias and nothing else

 Bottleneck does nothing
  Noise does nothing
  Details of language model do nothing

- If prior bias is innate, then this means that the universal properties of language are just a straightforward reflection of innateness

 - Contra all that stuff about culture doing interesting things

An important detail: hypothesis selection

- How do you decide, given the posterior probabilities of various languages, which to select?

  - Sampling: given a particular distribution of probabilities, pick your hypothesis from the distribution proportionately.

  - MAP: given a particular distribution of probabilities, pick the best.

- Griffiths & Kalish's result as stated is for **samplers**.

# Friday's lab: replicating the Griffiths & Kalish result for samplers

# Friday's lab: replicating the Griffiths & Kalish result for samplers

# Friday's lab: replicating the Griffiths & Kalish result for samplers

Friday's lab: MAP learning

Friday's lab: MAP learning

Friday's lab: MAP learning

A slightly weird feature of the two grammar model + MAP learning

- In general, for MAP learners the **strength** of their bias isn't important

  - Although the difference between 0.499999, 0.5 and 0.500001 does

- But **in the two grammar model**, bias can sometimes be entirely irrelevant

[0, 0]	learn 0	[0, 0, 0]	learn 0
[0, 1]	prior chooses	[0, 0, 1]	learn 0
[1,1]	learn 1	[0, 1, 1]	learn 1
		[1, 1, 1]	learn 1

- This is a bit untidy, but solely a (slightly odd) feature of this language model

Sampling vs MAP: summary so far

- Iterated Bayesian Learning allows us to more precisely understand the relationship between learning bias and eventual language structure

- If you assume social learning is about maximising the chance of converging on what other people are doing (i.e. selecting the MAP hypothesis), then cultural evolution does a lot of work for you

- Very weak innate biases are all that's needed to explain strong linguistic universals

  - If people are MAP learners

- If we see universals in language, then we should not assume that these are hard-coded as strong constraints in the genes

  - If people are MAP learners

It's really important we get this right!

- If language learning is like sampling, language universals probably closely reflect learner biases. If it's like MAP, they don't.

- How can we tell which is right?

  - Run experiments on real people to see if they behave like they are sampling or selecting the MAP language

  - Maybe evolution will favour one alternative over the other?

    - See final lecture

  - Maybe one of these results is an unrepresentative special case

    - For instance: what happens if we go beyond long skinny diffusion chains and look at transmission in populations?

   - Smith (2009), Burkett & Griffiths (2010)

Moving to populations

Samplers, everyone learns from one teacher (bias for L0 = 0.6)

Samplers, everyone learns from multiple teachers (bias = 0.6)

Samplers, everyone learns from multiple teachers (bias = 0.6)

Legend: $p_0 > 0.4465$ (filled triangles), $p_0 < 0.4465$ (open triangles)

Axes: vertical axis "proportion I_0" from 0 to 1; horizontal axis "t" from 0 to 30.

Sampler populations look like MAP populations!

- In populations, when samplers learn from multiple teachers:

  No convergence to the prior

  Amplification of weak biases

  Bottleneck effects

  ...

- In this context, Bayesian learning is **conformist**

  - Disproportionately likely to learn the more common language

  - Known result of conformist learning: convergence on single language

Learning one language versus learning multiple languages?

- That's based on the assumption that learners try to find a single grammar to account for their data

  - Even if it was generated by multiple people

- Burkett & Griffiths (2010): we can just add this as a parameter of the model

  - Low α: learners tend to learn a single language

  - High α: learners learn multiple languages

Burkett & Griffiths' result

Summary

- An active area of ongoing research

- My hunch is that the Griffiths & Kalish sampling result will turn out to be a special case

  - We should not expect to see a straightforward relationship between language universals and learner bias

- But in either case, Iterated Bayesian Learning has been key to clarifying our understanding of what cultural evolution might be like

Up next

- Thursday: last lab (although we may have catch up lab next week)

  - More Bayesian stuff

- Friday: putting it all together

  - Learning, culture, biological evolution

  - Evolution of the language faculty?