

# Learning thresholds lead to stable language coexistence

M.V. Tamm<sup>1</sup>, E. Heinsalu<sup>2</sup>, S. Scialla<sup>2,3</sup>, M. Patriarca<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ERA Chair for Cultural Data Analytics and School of Digital Technologies, Tallinn University, Tallinn, Estonia;

<sup>2</sup> National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia;

<sup>3</sup> Università Campus Bio-Medico di Roma, Rome, Italy

(Dated: June 21, 2024)

We introduce a language competition model that incorporates the effects of memory and learning on the language shift dynamics, using the Abrams-Strogatz model as a starting point. On a coarse grained time scale, the effects of memory and learning can be expressed as thresholds on the speakers fractions. In its simplest form, the resulting model is exactly solvable. Besides the consensus on one of the two languages, the model describes additional equilibrium states that are not present in the Abrams-Strogatz model: a stable coexistence of the two languages, if both thresholds are low enough, so that the language shift processes in the two opposite directions compensate each other, and a frozen state coinciding with the initial state, when both thresholds are too high for any language shift to take place. We show numerically that these results are preserved for threshold functions of a more general shape.

PACS numbers:

*Introduction.*— In multilingual societies languages are in constant competition with each other. This competition manifests itself in language shift, when individuals switch the language they use, leading to a gradual change of the linguistic composition of the society and, in some cases, eventual disappearance of one of the languages.

Starting from the seminal papers of Baggs and Freedman [1] and Abrams and Strogatz [2], language competition has been described by dynamical models mathematically similar to models of ecological competition or chemical reaction kinetics. Variants and generalizations of these models have been proposed [3, 4], in order to take into account additional aspects of the underlying language dynamics and social processes, e.g. the presence of bilinguals [5–7], the effects of political and geographic barriers [8, 9], population dynamics [10–12], the inhomogeneity of resources [13], and the similarity between languages [14]. Generalizations of these models have been used to study various other aspects of social dynamics, such as change in religious affiliation [15] and political polarization [16], thus making language competition an archetypal problem of social dynamics.

However, not enough attention has been paid so far to the effect of the learning processes on the dynamics of language competition. Learning a new language is a prerequisite of language shift [17], and thus microscopic barriers to learning can suppress the shift. Here we aim to fill this gap. We argue that, although language shift in a two-language system can still be studied in terms of an Abrams-Strogatz(AS)-type model, the microscopic mechanisms of the learning process suggest the existence of thresholds in the transition rates.

One reason for that comes from the fact that one needs sufficiently frequent repetitions to learn. Indeed, it is known since Ebbinghaus' study of human memory that retention of information is described by a "forgetfulness curve" [18, 19], and that forgetting can be contrasted

(the amount of information subject to long-term retention increased) through sufficiently frequent repetitions. One expects, that learners of a rare language do not have sufficient repetitive encounters with speakers of this language to reach this retention level, so that a minimal prevalence of a language is needed for it to be learned organically.

Furthermore, in many cases language learning does not happen organically through encounters with other language speakers, but is the result of a conscious decision to allocate time specifically to learning. For such a conscious learning to be feasible, the learning individual should perceive time spent to learn as beneficial compared to other economic activities. Similarly to the case of organic learning, this can be expected to occur when language prevalence exceeds a certain threshold.

To describe these effects, in what follows we introduce a generalized AS model whose transition rates have thresholds on the speakers fractions. We study the effects of these thresholds in case of both step-wise and sigmoid shapes of the rates and, contrary to the standard AS model with  $a > 1$ , obtain stable coexistence of languages for a wide range of parameters and initial conditions.

*Abrams-Strogatz model.* – The AS model [2] is a two-state language competition model, where individuals speak either language X or Y and can at any time undergo a language shift. The fractions of the X- and Y-speakers,  $x(t)$  and  $y(t)$ , satisfy the condition  $x(t) + y(t) = 1$ . The mean field dynamical equations for  $x(t)$ ,  $y(t)$ , can be thus rewritten as a single equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= -\dot{y} = r_x(x)y - r_y(y)x; \\ &= r_x(x)(1-x) - r_y(1-x)x. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The transition rates  $r_x$  (for  $Y \rightarrow X$ ) and  $r_y$  (for  $X \rightarrow Y$ ) are assumed to be monotonously increasing functions of




Figure 1: Panel (a): Transition rates  $r_x(x)$ . Black dotted line – power law rate (2) of the AS model with  $a = 1.3$ ; thin blue line – step function rate defined by Eqs. (4)-(5); thick red line – generalized sigmoid rate with  $w = 0.1$  and constant  $r_{0x}$ ; dashed magenta line – generalized sigmoid rate with  $w = 0.1$  and  $r_{0x}(x) = 0.25 + 0.75x$ . For all transition rates  $j_x = 1, x^* = 0.2$ . Panel (b): The  $x$ -velocity field defined by Eq. (1), computed for the same transition rates as in panel (a) and for  $y^* = x^*, \gamma = 0.55$ .

their arguments; the boundary conditions  $r_x(x \rightarrow 0) = 0$  and  $r_y(y \rightarrow 0) = 0$  express the fact that language shift does not take place in the absence of speakers of the other language. In the AS model [2]

$$r_x(x) = j_x x^a, \quad r_y(y) = j_y y^a, \quad (2)$$

where the exponent  $a > 0$  is called volatility [20] and the parameters  $j_x, j_y$  represent the maximal rates of language shift, reached when a speaker is immersed in a linguistic environment composed solely of speakers of the other language. In an analogy with reaction kinetics, Eqs. (2), describing the  $X \rightarrow Y$  language shift, can be interpreted in terms of a chemical reaction  $X + Y \rightarrow 2Y$ , which would suggest volatility  $a = 1$ ; however, an analysis of real data suggests that  $a \in [1, 2]$  [2, 21]. The power law transition rate  $r_x(x)$  of the AS model is shown in Fig. 1(a) by the black dotted line for  $a = 1.3$ .

The difference in the maximal rates  $j_x, j_y$  quantifies the social effects that influence the language choices of the individuals. Measuring time in units of  $(j_x + j_y)^{-1}$  and introducing the dimensionless parameter  $\gamma = j_x/(j_x + j_y)$ , Eq. (1) becomes

$$\dot{x} = \gamma x^a (1 - x) - (1 - \gamma)(1 - x)^a x. \quad (3)$$

The long-time behavior of the solution of this equation depends on the values of  $a$  and  $\gamma$ . For  $a > 1$  there are two attractive equilibrium points,  $x = 0$  and  $x = 1$ . For  $a = 1$  there is a single attractive point:  $x = 1$  for  $\gamma > 1/2$ , and  $x = 0$  for  $\gamma < 1/2$ . For  $a < 1$  an attractive stable point with  $x \in (0, 1)$  exists, corresponding to language coexistence; however values volatility  $a < 1$  are not observed in reality.

*Abrams-Strogatz model with step-function learning rates.* – Learning a language is a prerequisite for language shift. For the reasons outlined in the introduction, we expect the rates  $r_x, r_y$  to have a shape different from

Eq. (2), assumed in the AS model. Indeed, we expect that an individual is able to learn a language only if the interaction rate with the speakers of this language exceeds some critical value. If all X-speakers are identical, one expects the existence of a critical concentration  $y^*$ , below which language Y cannot be learned, and an analogous critical concentration  $x^*$  for Y-speakers, suggesting a rate function of the form [see the thin blue line in Fig. 1(a)]

$$r_x = r_{0x}(x)\Theta(x - x^*), \quad r_y = r_{0y}(y)\Theta(y - y^*). \quad (4)$$

The threshold values  $x^*, y^*$  are assumed to be different, reflecting the differences in language learning difficulty or prestige. The functions  $r_{0x}(x)$  and  $r_{0y}(y)$  are positive and non-decreasing, satisfying the conditions  $r_{0x}(x=1) = j_x$  and  $r_{0y}(y=1) = j_y$ .

In the simple case, when

$$r_{0x} \equiv j_x, \quad r_{0y} \equiv j_y, \quad (5)$$

Eq. (1) becomes

$$\dot{x} = \gamma\Theta(x - x^*)(1 - x) - (1 - \gamma)\Theta(1 - x - y^*)x. \quad (6)$$

The dynamical evolution described by Eq. (6) is controlled by the step functions  $\Theta(x - x^*)$  and  $\Theta(1 - x - y^*)$ . For each pair of parameters  $x^*, y^*$ , the conditions  $x = x^*$  and  $1 - x = y^*$  generate four possible options, corresponding to the two  $\Theta$ -functions assuming a value equal to zero or one. For each of these options, Eq. (6) becomes linear and can be solved exactly, unlike the AS model.

If  $x \in (1 - y^*, x^*)$ , i.e., if the arguments of both step functions are negative, Eq. (6) reduces to  $\dot{x} = 0$ , and  $x(t) \equiv x_0 \forall t$ . This frozen regime describes a population where interaction rates are so low that nobody will learn the other language and undergo language shift.

If  $x > \max(x^*, 1 - y^*)$ , then  $\Theta(x - x^*) = 1$  and  $\Theta(1 - x - y^*) = 0$  and Eq. (6) reduces to  $\dot{x} = \gamma(1 - x)$ . The solution of this equation increases with time,  $x = 1 - (1 - x_0)\exp(-\gamma t)$ , and therefore, if the condition  $x > \max(x^*, 1 - y^*)$  is satisfied initially, it remains satisfied at all subsequent moments. This regime corresponds to a system containing enough X-speakers, so that Y-speakers will learn language X, but not vice versa, and the dynamics eventually converges to consensus in language X, i.e., to solution  $x_I = 1$ .

The case  $x < \min(x^*, 1 - y^*)$  is analogous up to replacement  $x \leftrightarrow 1 - x, \gamma \leftrightarrow 1 - \gamma$  and leads to the convergence to consensus in language Y, corresponding to the attractive stable point  $x_{II} = 0$ .

Finally, if  $x \in [x^*, 1 - y^*]$ , both step functions equal one, i.e., there are enough contacts in the system, so that both transitions from X to Y and from Y to X are possible. In this case, Eq. (6) becomes  $\dot{x} = \gamma - x$ , which has the solution  $x(t) = \gamma - (\gamma - x_0)\exp(-t)$ ,




Figure 2: Panel (a): Plane  $x^*-y^*$  split into different regions corresponding to possible outcomes of the dynamics defined by Eq. (6): state 0 represents a dynamics frozen at the initial condition  $x_0 = x(0)$ ; state I to the X-consensus attractive fixed point  $x_I = 1$ ; state II to Y-consensus,  $x_{II} = 0$ ; and state III to the coexistence point  $x_{III} = \gamma$ . Panel (b): Cross-section of  $x_0-x^*-y^*$  space along the dashed line  $x^* = y^*$  in panel (a), showing the dependence on initial conditions. The initial conditions  $x = x(0)$  of each region lead to a unique asymptotic solution indicated, apart from those of the shaded region, defined by  $x^* = y^* = \min(\gamma, 1 - \gamma)$  and  $x^* < x_0 < 1 - x^*$ , which lead to  $x_{II} = 0$  if  $\gamma < 1/2$  or  $x_I = 1$  if  $\gamma > 1/2$ .

monotonously approaching the limiting value  $x_{III} = \gamma$ . Importantly, contrary to the previous cases, the constraint  $x(t) \in (x^*, 1 - y^*)$  defining this dynamical regime may not be fulfilled at  $t > 0$ . If  $\gamma \in [x^*, 1 - y^*]$ , the dynamics remains in the same region and the solution converges to the attractive stable point  $x = x_{III}$ . If  $\gamma$  is above the upper limit of the interval,  $\gamma > 1 - y^*$ , the solution  $x(t)$  will increase until it reaches the region  $x > \max(x^*, 1 - y^*)$  at some time and at long times gets attracted towards the stable point  $x = x_I$ . If  $\gamma$  is below the lower limit of the interval,  $\gamma < x^*$ , then at some time the solution will reach the region  $x < \min(x^*, 1 - y^*)$  and will eventually converge towards the stable point  $x = x_{II}$ .

The possible outcomes of the dynamics are summarized by Fig. 2. Figure 2(a) shows the  $x^*-y^*$  state diagram, split into different regions depending on the possible solutions, indicated in the same area; e.g., in the region labeled “0 + I + II”, the system can remain frozen in the initial state (0) or converge to the consensus in X (I) or in Y (II). Figure 2(b) illustrates the dependence of the outcome on the initial condition  $x_0 = x(0)$  in the case  $x^* = y^*$ . The plane is divided into disjoint regions corresponding to different outcomes. If the initial conditions of the system are within the gray region, the system will converge either to state I of X-consensus, if  $\gamma > 1/2$ , or to state II of Y-consensus, if  $\gamma < 1/2$ .

In Fig. 3 we plot with solid lines  $x(t)$  for  $\gamma = 0.3$  and three threshold values of  $x^* = y^*$ . For  $x^* = 0.7$  [panel (a)], initial conditions  $x_0 > 0.7$  and  $x_0 < 0.3$  lead to the attracting fixed points  $x_I = 1$  and  $x_{II} = 0$ , respectively, while for intermediate initial conditions the dynamics remains frozen. If  $x^* = 0.35$  [panel (b)], the basins of attraction of  $x_I$  and  $x_{II}$  are separated by  $x_0 = 1 - y^* = 0.65$ .

Note that trajectories starting between  $x^*$  and  $y^*$  consist of two different exponential parts; the kink corresponds to  $x = x^*$ , at which the first step function in Eq. (6) changes its value. Finally, if  $x^* = 0.2$  [panel (c)], initial conditions  $x_0 > 0.8$  and  $x_0 < 0.2$  are still attracted to  $x_I$  and  $x_{II}$ , respectively, but the intermediate initial conditions converge to  $x_{III} = \gamma = 0.3$ , corresponding to a stable dynamic equilibrium between languages.

*Abrams-Strogatz model with sigmoid learning rates.* – Because people are not identical, but rather heterogeneous in their linguistic traits, such as communication patterns and language learning abilities, due to factors like individual skills, education, and age [17, 22], individuals should be characterized by different threshold values  $x^*, y^*$ . If the distribution of these traits is relatively narrow, this changes the step-function  $\Theta$  in Eq. (4) into a sigmoid function  $H$ . Namely,  $\Theta(x - x^*)$  becomes  $H(x, x^*, w)$ , where the parameter  $w$  represents the step width and the sigmoid function  $H$  satisfies the conditions [see the thick red line in Fig. 1(a) for  $w = 0.1$  and constant  $r_{0x}$ ]

$$H(0, x^*, w) = 0, \quad H(1, x^*, w) = 1. \quad (7)$$

Analogously,  $\Theta(1 - x - y^*)$  is replaced by  $H(1 - x, y^*, w)$ . As an example, we choose

$$H(x, x^*, w) = \frac{S(x, x^*, w) - S(0, x^*, w)}{S(1, x^*, w) - S(0, x^*, w)}, \quad (8)$$

$$S(x, x^*, w) = \{1 + \tanh[(x - x^*)/w]\}/2,$$

which satisfy boundary conditions (7), and converge to  $\Theta(x - x^*)$  for  $w \rightarrow 0$ .

In Fig. 3 the dashed lines represent numerical results for  $x(t)$  for the case of sigmoid learning rates(8) with  $w = 0.07$ . Comparing the solid and dashed lines in Fig. 3(a), it can be observed that when the step-function is replaced by the sigmoid function, the neutral equilibrium due to frozen dynamics becomes unstable and the trajectory slowly converges either to  $x_I = 1$  or  $x_{II} = 0$ .

*Mechanism behind the language coexistence.* – The model (6) exhibits two additional regimes not present in the AS model: a frozen state for  $x^* + y^* > 1$  and an attractive stable point corresponding to the coexistence of languages X and Y for  $x^* + y^* < 1$ .

The existence of a frozen state follows from the assumption that language shift does not occur if the interaction rate among individuals is below some universal threshold. The replacement of the step function with the sigmoid shape (8) describes a more realistic scenario, where language shift rates are not identically zero but strongly suppressed if the interaction rates are below the threshold (corresponding to fractions of speakers  $x < x^*$  or  $y < y^*$ ), see, e.g., the well-known lack of interactions between the Dutch- and French-speaking communities in Belgium [23]. Note that the chosen unit of time (time needed to learn a new language) corresponds to several




Figure 3: Time-evolution of the fractions of X-speakers for different initial conditions  $x(0) = 1/8, 2/8, \dots, 7/8$  (from red to purple) and for  $x^* = y^*$ ;  $\gamma = 0.3$ . Solid lines correspond to the results obtained using the step-function rates and the dashed lines using the sigmoid rates with  $w = 0.07$ . Panel (a):  $x^* = 0.7$ ; possible outcomes are I, II and 0 [see Fig. 2(b)]; for sigmoid rates the 0 regime becomes unstable and converges to either  $x_I$  or  $x_{II}$ . Panel (b):  $x^* = 0.35$ , possible outcomes are I, II; for step-function rates there is discontinuity in  $\dot{x}$  when crossing  $x = x^*$ . Panel (c):  $x^* = 0.2$ , possible outcomes are I, II and III. In the case of S-shaped rates the boundaries of the basins of attraction move slightly, e.g., in panel (c) the initial condition  $x_0 = 7/8$  is attracted to the intermediate stable point  $x_{III}$ . However, outcome I is still possible, as illustrated by trajectory with  $x_0 = 15/16$  (magenta dashed line).

years, so typical observable times do not exceed  $t \sim 30$ , which means that from an observational point of view such a slow decay, for a small enough width  $w$  of the sigmoid function, might actually appear as a stable language coexistence.

In turn, language coexistence for  $x^* + y^* < 1$  is not due to a freezing of the dynamics but to a dynamical equilibrium, in which the same number of speakers switch language with the same rate in the two opposite directions,  $X \rightarrow Y$  and  $Y \rightarrow X$ . Figure 1(a) compares the shapes of various  $Y \rightarrow X$  shift rates  $r_x(x)$ : that of the AS model, Eq. (2) ( $a \geq 1$ ) (where no coexistence is possible); the step-function rate given by Eq. (4); the sigmoid rates defined in Eq. (8); and a generalized rate  $r_x(x) = H(x, 0.2, 0.1)(0.25 + 0.75x)$ , constructed starting from the sigmoid rate, but such that it resembles the power-law rate of the AS model. The corresponding velocity fields  $\dot{x}(t) = v(x)$  associated to the different rates, shown in Fig. 1(b), demonstrate some fundamental differences not revealed by the plot of the rates. In fact, a point  $x \in (0, 1)$  is an attractive stable point only if the velocity field is such that  $\dot{x} = v(x) = 0$  and  $\partial v(x)/\partial x < 0$  [24]. Figure 1(b) shows that there is no such point for the AS model for  $a \geq 1$ , whereas it exists for all the other models considered. We conclude that the absence of language coexistence in the AS model is an artifact of the chosen shape of rate functions and even a relatively small change of the power-law rate form – reflecting an underlying learning process – can lead to stabilization of a state where two competing languages coexist.

*Conclusion and outlook.* – In this letter we presented a language competition model that takes into account the dynamics of the language learning process and allows an

analytical investigation in the mean-field limit.

The addition of constraints on the interaction rates – the minimum interaction frequencies between speakers of different languages required to learn a language – leads to redefining the language shift rates of the AS model through the introduction of a multiplicative Heaviside function term. When population heterogeneity is taken into account, the universal threshold value for all speakers is replaced by a bell-shaped distribution and the step function rates turn into sigmoid rates.

Depending on interaction rates and initial fractions of speakers, we find three possible scenarios: 1) a consensus state characterized by the extinction of one language, either X or Y, and adoption of Y or X, respectively; 2) a final state equal to the initial state, following from the absence of language shifts due to absence or extremely low level of interactions; 3) a final stable state where the two languages coexist.

Beyond the AS model, the approach presented in this letter could be applied to other, more sophisticated models of language competition, therefore enabling the addition to such models of the effect of the learning process. This is expected to lead to more complicated stability state scenarios than the ones shown in this letter. Additionally, one expects language shift in real systems to be subject to some uncertainty and noise.

*Acknowledgments.* – MP, EH, and SS acknowledge support from the Estonian Research Council through Grant PRG1059. MT acknowledges support from the CUDAN ERA Chair project (EU Horizon 2020 research and innovation program, Grant No. 810961). We are grateful to S. Maslov for fruitful discussions.

- 
- [1] I. Baggs and H.I. Freedman. A mathematical model for the dynamical interactions between a unilingual and bilingual population: Persistence versus extinction. *J. of Math. Sociology*, 16:51, 1990.
- [2] D.M. Abrams and S.H. Strogatz. Modelling the dynamics of language death. *Nature*, 424:900, 2003.
- [3] M. Patriarca, X. Castelló, J.R. Uriarte, V.M. Eguíluz, and M. San Miguel. Modeling two-language competition dynamics. *Adv. Comp. Syst.*, 15(3&4):1250048, 2012.
- [4] M. Patriarca, E. Heinsalu, and J.L. Leonard. *Languages in Space and Time: Models and Methods from Complex Systems Theory*. Physics of Society: Econophysics and Sociophysics. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [5] J.W. Minett and W.S-Y. Wang. Modelling endangered languages: The effects of bilingualism and social structure. *Lingua*, 118:19, 2008.
- [6] A. Baronchelli, L. Dall’Asta, A. Barrat, and V. Loreto. Topology-induced coarsening in language games. *Phys. Rev. E*, 73:015102, January 2006.
- [7] E. Heinsalu, M. Patriarca, and J. L. Léonard. The role of bilinguals in language competition. *Advances in Complex Systems*, 17(1):1450003, 2014.
- [8] M. Patriarca and T. Leppänen. Modeling language competition. *Physica A*, 338:296–299, 2004.
- [9] M. Patriarca and E. Heinsalu. Influence of geography on language competition. *Physica A*, 388(2-3):174–186, January 2009.
- [10] I. Baggs and H.I. Freedman. Can the speakers of a dominated language survive as unilinguals — a mathematical-model of bilingualism. *Mathematical and computer modelling*, 18:9, 1993.
- [11] J.P. Pinasco and L. Romanelli. Coexistence of languages is possible. *Physica A*, 361:355, 2006.
- [12] A. Kandler and J. Steele. Ecological models of language competition. *Biological Theory*, 3:164, 2008.
- [13] A. Kandler. Demography and language competition. *Human Biology*, 81:181, 2009.
- [14] J. Mira and A. Paredes. Interlinguistic similarity and language death dynamics. *Europhys. Lett.*, 69:1031, 2005.
- [15] D.M. Abrams, H.A. Yapel, and R.J. Wiener. Dynamics of social group competition: Modeling the decline of religious affiliation. *Physical Review Letters*, 107:088701, 8 2011.
- [16] X. Lu, J. Gao, and B.K. Szymanski. The evolution of polarization in the legislative branch of government. *J. R. Soc. Interface*, 16:20190010, 2019.
- [17] S. Scialla, J.-K. Liivand, M. Patriarca, and E. Heinsalu. A three-state language competition model including language learning and attrition. *Frontiers in Complex Systems*, 1, 2023.
- [18] H. Ebbinghaus. *Memory: A contribution to experimental psychology*. Dover, New York, 1885.
- [19] J.M.J. Murre and J. Dros. Replication and analysis of ebbinghaus’ forgetting curve. *PLoS ONE*, 10, 2015.
- [20] X. Castelló, V.M. Eguíluz, and M. San Miguel. Ordering dynamics with two non-excluding options: bilingualism in language competition. *New J. Phys.*, 8:306, 2006.
- [21] N. Isern and J. Fort. Language extinction and linguistic fronts. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 11(94):20140028, 2014.
- [22] C. Griffiths and A. Soruç. *Individual Differences in Language Learning: A Complex Systems Theory Perspective*. Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- [23] V.D. Blondel, J.L. Guillaume, R. Lambiotte, and E. Lefebvre. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *J. Stat. Mech*, 2008.
- [24] S.H. Strogatz. *Nonlinear Dynamics and Chaos: With Applications to Physics, Biology, Chemistry, and Engineering*. CRC Press, 2018.