

Dialectics of Understanding: Critical Realism's Role in Evaluating Chomsky's Scientific Methodology in Linguistics

DOI 10.5281/zenodo.13842097

Osias Kit T. Kilag

PAU Excellencia Global Academy Foundation, Inc., Mercado St., Poblacion, Toledo City, Cebu, Philippines

Ryzel Maureen T. Figer-Canes

Eastern Visayas State University, Tacloban City, Philippines

Lorlaine R. Dacanay

Department of Education, Schools Division of Talisay City, Philippines

Ma. Sophia Jade G. Pintado

ECT Excellencia Global Academy Foundation, Inc., Buanoy, Balamban, Cebu, Philippines

Jolina D. Pontellano

ECT Excellencia Global Academy Foundation, Inc., Buanoy, Balamban, Cebu, Philippines

Yola Marie T. Dela Cerna

ECT Excellencia Global Academy Foundation, Inc., Buanoy, Balamban, Cebu, Philippines

Abstract:

This study examines in depth the theory of linguistic nativism proposed by Noam Chomsky, exploring its basis and implications in a critical realist perspective. Chomsky's theory postulates innate cognitive systems known as universal language grammar. Through a critical realist lens that cannot account for the systematic acquisition of linguistics input, this study critically examines the ontological and epistemological foundations of Chomsky's theory, as well as its empirical basis and criticism. Proponents of critical realism argued the role of sociocultural factors in language development and the need for empirical evidence to support theoretical claims. Thus, this particular study offers insights into the complexities of language acquisition.

Keywords: linguistic nativism, Noam Chomsky, universal grammar, critical realism

Introduction:

Linguistics has long been associated with debates about the scientific method. Undeniably, no man on terra epitomized this discourse better than Noam Chomsky, whose ideas profoundly influenced the field for decades until this contemporary era. Chomsky's approach, based on innate grammar and universal grammar theories, received both strong support and harsh criticism. Central to this critique is the question of whether Chomsky's approach is compatible with the standards of scientific inquiry.

Henceforth, in this endeavor, the author explores this controversial area in more detail by using critical realism as a lens through which to evaluate Chomsky's scientific approach to linguistics acquisition input. Critical realism provides a philosophical framework that emphasizes the relevance of understanding the underlying structures and mechanisms governing phenomena while acknowledging the limitations of human understanding and knowledge (Brunson et al., 2023).

By applying the notion of critical realism, the author intended to unravel the dialectics of knowledge surrounding Chomsky's technique. This entails scrutinizing the ontological and epistemological assumptions that underpin his theories, in addition to assessing their empirical validity and explanatory paradigm. In doing so, the author aims to provide a nuanced evaluation of those actions beyond polarized viewpoints, presenting insights into the complicated interaction between concept, proof, and interpretation in linguistic research.

Thus, this endeavor seeks to contribute to the ongoing discourse within linguistics and the philosophy of technology by way of losing light on the compatibility between Chomsky's theoretical framework and the principles of clinical inquiry. Moreover, it underscores the importance of adopting an important realist attitude in evaluating scientific methodologies, emphasizing the want for reflexivity in navigating the complexities of linguistic principles.

The Foundations of Language Acquisition

Chomsky's chief's concept of "linguistic nativism" has been a cornerstone of current linguistics ever since its inception in the mid-20th century (Goldsmith, 2012). Central to this theory is the proposition that human beings are born with an innate ability for language acquisition, a notion that has sparked extensive debate and scrutiny in the subject.



At the heart of Chomsky's principle is the concept of a "universal grammar" (UG), which posits that everyone in the parameter of human languages shares a common underlying system or set of principles (Lin, 2017). Chomsky argues that this typical grammar is encoded inside the human mind, providing a framework that courses language acquisition and production across numerous linguistic environments. Chomsky (1998) stressed, "The genetic component of the faculty of language is the initial state of the language faculty." This affirmation displays his belief in the innateness of linguistic know-how and the function of biological factors in shaping language development.

Chomsky's theory of linguistic nativism has garnered massive supporters and has been supported by various lines of empirical evidence. The Studies of language development in infants have revealed early sensitivity to linguistic patterns and structures. This phenomenon is by all means technically suggesting a predisposition towards language learning from birth. For instance, there is research on language acquisition in infants that has shown that they can distinguish between grammatical and ungrammatical sentences (Gómez & Gerken, 2000). The enigma behind is that infants were able to distinguish the structure even before they begin to produce language themselves. Aside from this empirical evidence, there are studies of brain anatomy and function that have provided further support for the idea of innate language mechanisms, identifying neural structures that are specialized for language processing.

Furthermore, the cross-linguistic research have uncovered similarities in the grammatical structures of unrelated languages, lending credence to the conception of an accepted "universal" grammar. Take for instance, the presence of recursion—a nested hierarchical structure—within the syntax of diverse languages has been interpreted as empirical evidence for what we know as universal cognitive potential underlying human language. As Chomsky (2019) notes, "The study of recursion in language has been a centerpiece of generative grammar from its inception, and has provided perhaps the most powerful evidence for the innate shape of the language faculty."

Despite these empirical findings, Chomsky's concept of linguistic nativism has no longer been without its critics. Some scholars have puzzled the quantity to which language universals can be attributed to innate biological factors, arguing rather for the impact on and of environmental and cultural factors in shaping linguistic variety. Critics also point to the range and complexity of the notion of the language acquisition, arguing on the conception of the universal grammar that governs all factors that develop human language.

Moreover, Chomsky's principle has been criticized for its reliance on formal grammatical models that won't fully seize the richness and complexity of the natural language. Critics argue that Chomsky's simply focuses on abstract linguistic structures and formal rules and overlooks the function of pragmatics, discourse, and social factors in shaping language use and interpretation (Chomsky, 2010). As Piattelli-Palmarini (1994) contends, "Chomsky's theory of language is an abstraction that bears little resemblance to the messy truth of normal communicate."

In response to his critiques, Chomsky has subtly and further expanded his theory of linguistic nativism over time. He recognizes the importance of environmental input and social interaction in language acquisition while maintaining that the ability for language is fundamentally rooted in innate cognitive systems. Chomsky then emphasizes the need for a multidisciplinary technique to study language, integrating insights from psychology, neuroscience, and computer science to attain a more profound understanding and information of human linguistic behavior (Alduais, 2022).

Chomsky's theory of linguistic nativism has had a profound impact on our understanding of language acquisition and cognition. While it has generated considerable debate and controversy within the field of linguistics, it continues to serve as a theoretical framework that inspires research and inquiry into the nature of human language. Through ongoing empirical investigation and theoretical refinement, Chomsky's theory offers valuable insights into the complex interplay between biology, culture, and cognition in shaping the human capacity for language.

Chomsky's theory of linguistic nativism has had a profound effect on our understanding of language acquisition and cognition. While it has generated a magnitude of debate and controversy in the subject of linguistics, it continues to serve as a theoretical framework that inspires research and inquiry into the nature of human language. Through ongoing empirical investigation and theoretical refinement, Chomsky's concept offers precious insights into the complicated interaction among biology, tradition, and cognition in shaping the human capability for language.

Ontological Assumptions and Epistemological Tensions:

Critical realism offers a completely unique vantage point of view from which to interact with and critique Chomskyan idea in linguistics. This reception of Chomsky's framework of crucial realism involves a deep exploration of each the ontological and epistemological dimensions of his theories (Jones, 2003). Critical realists argue though our perceptions of truth are mediated by way of social, cultural, and cognitive elements, there exists an objective truth that exists independently of our subjective understanding of things. This ontological stance stands in contrast to positivist and empiricist perspectives, which regularly reduce reality to what is at once observable and measurable.

From the perspective of the critical realist, Chomsky's theories in linguistics may be perceived as grappling with the underlying structures of language. His concept of widespread grammar posits the existence of innate linguistic

standards which might be shared by means of all human languages. This concept aligns with the vital realist emphasis on uncovering the deeper causal mechanisms that govern phenomena. By positing the life of a univesal grammar, Chomsky seeks to find the underlying shape of language that offers upward thrust to the diverse array of languages discovered across cultures.

However, critical realism additionally prompts us to question the epistemological foundations of Chomskyan concept. While Chomsky emphasizes the function of introspection and instinct in linguistic analysis, critical realists argue for the importance of empirical proof and theoretical coherence in scientific inquiry. This tension increases questions on the quantity to which Chomsky's theories are grounded in empirical remark versus abstract speculation.

Furthermore, critical realism encourages reflexivity inside the manner of understanding production (Nastar, 2023). This includes acknowledging the constraints of our knowledge and being open to revising our theories in light of essential evidence. Chomsky's steadfast commitment to certain core standards of generative grammar, notwithstanding ongoing debates and empirical challenges, increases questions on the quantity to which his approach embodies this reflexivity.

One area of tension among Chomskyan theory and critical realism lies in the dating among structure and organization in language. Chomsky's emphasis at the innate, popular standards of language that can be perceived as downplaying the function of social and cultural factors in shaping linguistic variation (Dąbrowska, 2015). Critical realists, alternatively, argue for the beyond dialectical understanding of structure, acknowledging the ways in which social, cultural, and historical forces engage with innate cognitive structures to shape language use and development.

Another point of contention is the issue of causality in linguistic explanation. Chomsky's recognition on formal grammatical structure and systems may be seen as prioritizing a synchronic, ahistorical approach to language analysis (Bavali & Sadighi, 2008). Critical realists, however, advocate for a diachronic perspective that considers the ancient improvement of linguistic structures and the complicated causal processes that form language change over the years.

Despite these tensions, there also are areas of convergence between Chomskyan principle and critical realism. Both strategies proportion a dedication to uncovering the underlying systems and mechanisms that govern linguistic phenomena. Moreover, each perspective apprehend the importance of idea-constructing in medical inquiry, albeit with extraordinary emphases on the position of empirical proof and theoretical coherence.

The vital realist reception of Chomskyan theory in linguistics offers a rich and nuanced angle on the strengths and barriers of his approach. By interrogating the ontological and epistemological assumptions underlying Chomsky's theories, important realism prompts us to critically interact with the underlying systems and mechanisms of language even as also spotting the complexities of linguistic version and exchange (Uy, et al., 2023). Through this dialectical method, we can benefit from a deeper understanding of the character of language and the ways wherein its miles are formed with the aid of popular ideas and contingent ancient techniques.

Dialectical Discourse of Chomsky and Realism

In the discourse surrounding linguistics, the conflict between Critical Realism and Chomskyan concept serves as a captivating battleground for competing philosophical perspectives. Both camps articulate awesome ontological and epistemological frameworks, leading to energetic debates about the character of language and the technique of linguistic inquiry.

Chomsky's stance on language, substantially his inspiration for universal grammar, has been a focus of contention. According to Chomsky, language is not merely made from environmental stimuli but is as a substitute ruled through innate cognitive systems (Chomsky, et al., 1981). He asserts, "The concept of regular grammar is primarily based at the concept that the capability to examine language is innate, a part of the human biological endowment." This assertion underscores his notion of a predetermined linguistic blueprint that guides language acquisition and production throughout various cultures.

Critical Realism, however, demands situations Chomsky's innatist perspective by advocating for a greater nuanced expertise of the relationship between biology and way of life in shaping language. Margaret Archer, an outstanding prominent figure in Critical Realism, points out Chomsky's technique, stating, "Chomsky's concept fails to safely account for the position of social and cultural elements in shaping linguistic variety and change." (Shotter, 1992). Archer's critique highlights the tension between Chomsky's emphasis on innate cognitive systems and Critical Realism's insistence on the dialectical interplay among biology, way of life, and society.

Another factor of rivalry arises concerning the function of empirical proof in linguistic analysis. Chomsky's reliance on introspection and instinct as equipment for linguistic inquiry has been met with skepticism from proponents of Critical Realism. Archer argues, "Chomsky's concept lacks empirical grounding and relies too heavily on introspection

and instinct, neglecting the importance of systematic commentary and empirical trying out." This critique displays Critical Realism's dedication to empiricism and its insistence on subjecting theoretical claims to rigorous empirical scrutiny (Lipscomb, 2009).

In response, Chomsky defends his method, affirming, "Introspection and intuition play an essential role in linguistic evaluation, permitting linguists to discover underlying cognitive systems that may not be available thru basically observational methods." Here, Chomsky underscores the importance of introspection as a device for uncovering hidden cognitive systems that form language use and improvement.

The conflict between Critical Realism and Chomskyan principle additionally extends to the problem of causality in linguistic clarification. Chomsky's emphasis on formal grammatical policies and abstract linguistic structures can be visible as prioritizing a synchronic, ahistorical technique for language evaluation. In evaluation, Critical Realism advocates for a diachronic perspective that considers the historical improvement of linguistic systems and the complex causal strategies that form language change over time (De Souza, 2022).

This tension between synchrony and diachrony is pondered in the critique provided by Archer, who argues, "Chomsky's theory neglects the historic dimension of language and fails to account for the complex causal tactics that shape linguistic variant and change." Archer's critique highlights the divergence between Chomsky's synchronic method and Critical Realism's emphasis on knowledge language as a dynamic and evolving phenomenon (Canes, et al., 2023).

The conflict between Critical Realism and Chomskyan ideas encapsulates broader debates approximately the nature of language and the technique of linguistic inquiry. While Chomsky's innatist angle gives a compelling account of language acquisition and production, it is met with skepticism from proponents of Critical Realism who propose for a more nuanced expertise of the connection between biology, way of life, and society in shaping language (Malbas, et al., 2023). Through this dialectical change, we obtain insights into the complexities of language and the challenges of uncovering its underlying systems and mechanisms.

Conclusion:

The endeavor delves into Chomsky's theory of linguistic nativism through the lens of critical realism, offering an in depth evaluation of its propositions. Chomsky posits that humans possess an inherent universal grammar, shaping language acquisition. This challenges behaviorist perspectives, putting forward the poverty of the stimulus, which suggests innate linguistic information aids in language acquisition because of insufficient external enter. However, proponents of critical realism query Chomsky's emphasis on innate systems, advocating for a more holistic comprehension that carries social and cultural influences. They also argue the empirical basis of Chomsky's theory.

Despite criticisms, Chomsky's idea remains influential, driving studies into cognitive mechanisms of language acquisition. It prompts ongoing debates in linguistics, urging researchers to scrutinize its assumptions and empirical evidence. Furthermore, researchers should engage with Chomsky's principle critically to deepen our understanding of language acquisition. Through this exploration, the endeavor highlights the provocative nature of Chomsky's idea and underscores the importance of endured studies to unravel the complexities of human language.

References:

- Alduais, A., Almaghlouth, S., Alfadda, H., & Qasem, F. (2022). Biolinguistics: A Scientometric Analysis of Research on (Children's) Molecular Genetics of Speech and Language (Disorders). *Children*, 9(9), 1300. <https://doi.org/10.3390/children9091300>
- Bavali, M., & Sadighi, F. (2008). Chomsky's Universal Grammar and Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics: An Appraisal and a Compromise. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 11-28. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ920998.pdf>
- Brunson, L., Lauzier-Jobin, F., Olson, B., & Côté, L. P. (2023). Seven key insights from critical realism and their implications for ecological thinking and action in community psychology. *Journal of Community Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.23054>
- Canes, R. M., Cojuangco, F., & Kilag, O. K. (2023). The Enduring Significance of Chomsky's Language and Responsibility: Current Linguistic Perspectives. *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education* (2994-9521), 1(5), 536-546.
- Chomsky, N. (2010). *The chomsky reader*. Pantheon.
- Chomsky, N., & Chomsky, N. (1998). *Universal grammar*. What's Left.



Chomsky, N., Gallego, Á. J., & Ott, D. (2019). Generative grammar and the faculty of language: Insights, questions, and challenges. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*, 229-261.

Chomsky, N., Hornstein, N., & Lightfoot, D. (1981). Principles and Parameters in Syntactic Theory in Explanation in Linguistics. *The Logical Problem of Language Acquisition*.

Dąbrowska, E. (2015). What exactly is Universal Grammar, and has anyone seen it?. *Frontiers in psychology*, 6, 852. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00852>

De Souza, D. E. (2022). A critical realist approach to systems thinking in evaluation. *Evaluation*, 28(1), 72-90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13563890211064639>

Goldsmith, J. (2012). Chomskyan (r) evolutions. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/23251848.pdf?casa_token=P9WEVjdo5uoAAAAA:UNTy36zJQ_sI65P22Qfk73RVwUFYGFCE3EBG1TBm-u0Cp02YN3gCZPYbTxU850u6TULVbqZY0y_M-khmBb_f1b1CJ1vcSMji710EWW0mqUlcC7t4A

Gómez, R. L., & Gerken, L. (2000). Infant artificial language learning and language acquisition. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 4(5), 178-186. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(00\)01467-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(00)01467-4)

Jones, P. E. (2003). Critical realism and scientific method in Chomsky's linguistics. *Critical realism: The difference it makes*, 90-107.

Lin, F. Y. (2017). A refutation of universal grammar. *Lingua*, 193, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2017.04.003>

Lipscomb, M. (2009). The theory and application of critical realist philosophy and morphogenetic methodology: Emergent structural and agential relations at a hospice (Doctoral dissertation, Doctoral dissertation, University of the West of England). <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/323899228.pdf>

Malbas, M., Dacanay, L., & Kilag, O. K. (2023). The Synergy Between Generative Grammars and Literary Style: A Chomskyan Perspective. *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education* (2994-9521), 1(5), 73-84.

Nastar, M. (2023). A Critical Realist Approach to Reflexivity in Sustainability Research. *Sustainability*, 15(3), 2685. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032685>

Piattelli-Palmarini, M. (1994). Ever since language and learning: afterthoughts on the Piaget-Chomsky debate. *Cognition*, 50(1-3), 315-346. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(94\)90034-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(94)90034-5)

Shotter, J. (1992). Is Bhaskar's critical realism only a theoretical realism?. *History of the Human Sciences*, 5(3), 157-173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/095269519200500315>

Uy, F., Cojuangco, F., Canes, R. M., Kilag, O. K., Abendan, C. F., & Dicdiquin, I. (2023). Syntax and Beyond: Investigating Chomsky's Universal Grammar in the Acquisition of Second Languages. *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education* (2994-9521), 1(5), 345-357.