

## Skidmore College Creative Matter

---

Psychology Faculty Scholarship

Psychology

---

2013

# The Ontogeny of Lexical Networks Toddlers Encode the Relationships Among Referents When Learning Novel Words

Erica H. Wojcik  
*Skidmore College*

Jenny R. Saffran

Follow this and additional works at: [https://creativematter.skidmore.edu/psych\\_fac\\_schol](https://creativematter.skidmore.edu/psych_fac_schol)

 Part of the [Child Psychology Commons](#), and the [Cognitive Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Wojcik, E.H. & Saffran, J.R. (2013). The ontogeny of lexical networks: Toddlers encode the relationships amongst referents when learning novel words. *Psychological Science*. 24(10), 1898-1905. doi: 10.1177/0956797613478198

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Psychology at Creative Matter. It has been accepted for inclusion in Psychology Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Creative Matter. For more information, please contact [jluo@skidmore.edu](mailto:jluo@skidmore.edu).



## The Ontogeny of Lexical Networks: Toddlers Encode the Relationships amongst Referents when Learning Novel Words

Journal:	<i>Psychological Science</i>
Manuscript ID:	PSCI-12-1579.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research article
Date Submitted by the Author:	14-Jan-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Wojcik, Erica; University of Wisconsin-Madison, Psychology Saffran, Jenny; University of Wisconsin - Madison, Psychology;
Keywords:	Cognitive Development, Language Development, Learning

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Only

Running head: TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

The Ontogeny of Lexical Networks:

Toddlers Encode the Relationships amongst Referents when Learning Novel Words

Erica H. Wojcik and Jenny R. Saffran

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Address Correspondence to:

Erica Wojcik

University of Wisconsin Madison - Department of Psychology

1202 W. Johnson St. Madison Wisconsin 53703

United States

Phone: 6175298359; Email: [ehwojcik@wisc.edu](mailto:ehwojcik@wisc.edu)

Keywords: Cognitive Development, Language Development, Learning

Running head: Toddlers Encode the Relationships Amongst Referents

Article type: Research Article

Submitted: 07/17/2012

Revision Accepted: 01/17/2013

## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

2

## Abstract

Although the semantic relationships between words have long been acknowledged as a crucial component of adult lexical knowledge, the ontogeny of lexical networks remains largely unstudied. To determine whether learners encode relationships amongst novel words, two-year-olds were trained on four novel words, comprising two pairs of visually similar referents. Participants then listened to repetitions of word pairs (in the absence of visual referents) that referred to either similar or dissimilar objects. Toddlers listened significantly longer to word pairs referring to similar objects, suggesting that their representations of the novel words included knowledge about the similarity of the referents. A second experiment confirmed that toddlers can learn all four distinct words from the training regime, providing evidence that the results from Experiment 1 reflected the successful encoding of referents. Together, these results show that toddlers encode the similarities amongst referents from their earliest exposures to new words.

*Keywords:* word learning, lexical development, semantic networks

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Since Quine (1960) pointed out the complexity of mapping a new label to its proper  
7 referent, a large literature has emerged concerning how children learn words. Most of this  
8 research, however, assumes that the goal of word learning is to map a word to its correct referent  
9 or category of referents. While mapping is a crucial component of word learning, a tremendous  
10 amount of additional information comes along with hearing a new word. Imagine a child hearing  
11 a novel animal labeled for the first time: “That’s a *dog!*” Obviously, the child needs to learn the  
12 label-referent mapping. However, she could also encode useful information about other nearby  
13 objects (such as a leash or a ball); the background context (i.e., a park versus a kitchen); or the  
14 similarity between this new animal and her pet cat.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 If we consider the full complexity of the perceptual and semantic input available to young  
28 children, word learning becomes a multi-dimensional problem that extends beyond label-referent  
29 associations. We know that skilled language users exploit this rich structure; adult semantic  
30 knowledge is not organized like a dictionary of label-referent pairings. Instead, the lexicon is a  
31 complex semantic network that represents relationships amongst words (e.g., McClelland &  
32 Rogers, 2003; McNamara, 2005; Steyvers & Tenenbaum, 2005). This has been demonstrated  
33 most clearly with the semantic priming paradigm, in which participants are faster to respond to a  
34 target word if it is related to a prime word. Adults show semantic priming effects for many types  
35 of lexical/semantic relationships, including feature overlap, thematic role similarity, and verb-  
36 noun relationships (e.g., Neely, 1991; McNamara, 2005).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Despite extensive research focused on adult semantic knowledge, little is known about  
52 the ontogeny of lexical networks. In particular, how do lexical-semantic relationships emerge  
53 over the course of word learning? Lexical knowledge continues to develop throughout childhood  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

4

(Carey, 1985) and into adulthood (Ameel, Malt, & Storms, 2008), so it is possible that representations of lexical relationships emerge later in the word learning process. On the other hand, infants are sensitive to statistical relationships amongst newly learned words (e.g., Lany & Saffran, 2011), and adults can track multiple levels of statistical information in parallel (Romberg & Saffran, 2012; Yurovsky, Yu, & Smith, 2012). It is thus possible that from their earliest exposures to new words, young children encode not only label-referent associations, but also the relationships amongst the referents. Recent studies have demonstrated that by 21 months of age, infants show semantic priming effects for highly familiar words (Arias-Trejo & Plunkett, 2009). However, we do not know whether young children encode the relationships between the referents of novel words as they begin to learn those words, or alternatively, if individual word representations need to be robust before these connections are encoded. The current study was designed to address these issues.

There are many facets of semantic relatedness that might be encoded by young learners, such as functional or thematic similarity. In the current study, we focused on visual similarity because it is an early organizing feature in non-linguistic categorization (e.g., Behl-Chadha, 1996; Quinn, Eimas & Rosenkrantz, 1993; Sloutsky, 2003). The fact that two-year-olds attend to shape during word learning suggests that visual characteristics are prioritized (i.e., Samuelson & Smith, 2005). Semantic priming studies also suggest that visual similarity is a component of adults' lexical representations (Schreuder, Flores D'Archaïs, & Glazenburg, 1984; Yee, Ahmed, & Thompson-Schill, 2012). We thus chose to begin our investigation of the ontogeny of lexical relationships by manipulating the visual similarity of novel referents.

In the first study, two-year-olds learned four novel words that consisted of two visually-similar referent pairs. Although they were ostensibly taught object labels, the similarity structure

## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

5

of the referents provided the participants with another type of information that they could incorporate into their representations of the novel words. We then tested participants using an auditory task previously developed to examine toddlers' knowledge of the relationships between highly familiar words (Willits et al., 2012). The question of interest was whether listening preferences for pairs of novel words would be affected by the visual similarity of the referents of those words, in the absence of the referents themselves.

### Experiment 1

The current study was designed to investigate whether toddlers encode the similarity structure of a small artificial lexicon. Toddlers show sensitivity to semantic relationships amongst familiar words by 21 months of age (Arias-Trejo & Plunkett, 2009) and can activate this knowledge in the absence of visual referents by 24 months of age (Willits et al., 2012). Because our task required the activation of novel lexical representations, we tested a slightly older age group (26- to 28-month-olds).

Participants were first trained on four label-object pairs. Crucially, each object was visually similar to one other object and distinct from the other two (see Figure 1). We then asked whether toddlers were sensitive to the similarities amongst the referents of the words they had just learned. To do so, we compared participants' listening times for word pairs that referred to similar objects versus word pairs that referred to dissimilar objects. This method allowed us to examine toddlers' nascent lexical representations in the absence of visual referents, thus tapping into the encoded representations of the words they had just learned.

### Method

#### Participants

Participants were 32 full-term monolingual English-learners (16 male) with a mean age

## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

6

of 27;0 months (25;11 - 28;4 months). Eight additional toddlers were excluded from the analyses due to fussiness (7) or an average looking time  $> 2$  SDs from the mean (1).

**Stimuli**

**Training.** The stimuli consisted of 4 novel labels (*tursey, coro, blicket, pif*), each paired with a single novel object image. While the objects were all different, they were organized into two visually similar pairs: two were blue/rounded, and two were red/pointed (see Figure 1).

Label-object pairings were counterbalanced across participants.

--Insert Figure 1 around here--

**Testing.** Each test trial consisted of repetitions of a word pair (e.g., *tursey, coro, tursey, coro...*). Eight trials comprised word pairs that labeled visually similar objects, and eight comprised word pairs that labeled visually dissimilar objects. Counterbalancing ensured that word pairs referring to similar objects for half of the toddlers referred to dissimilar objects for the other half of the toddlers. Referents were not displayed during the test phase.

**Procedure**

Toddlers were seated on a caregiver's lap in a sound-attenuated booth; the caregiver wore blacked-out sunglasses and listened to music over headphones. The training trials were presented on a center monitor. The *training phase* (2.5 min) began with the 4 objects displayed in a grid for 10s. During each subsequent training trial (6s), a single object was displayed on either the left or the right side of the screen and was labeled twice: "Look at the \_\_\_! There's a \_\_\_!" or "See the \_\_\_! This is a \_\_\_!" The first two trials used familiar objects (*ball* and *shoe*) to introduce the format. The next 4 blocks each included 4 novel object trials, with each label-object pair presented once per block (randomized).

The *test phase* immediately followed training. Each of the 16 test trials began with a



## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

7

1  
2  
3  
4 central attention-getter paired with music. Once the toddler looked to the center, the neutral  
5  
6 visual stimulus (a spinning pinwheel) began to play on one of two side monitors 90° to the left  
7  
8 and right. When the toddler looked to that side, a word pair was repeated from speakers mounted  
9  
10 directly below the monitors until the infant looked away for more than 2s, or for a total of 20s.  
11  
12 Half of the trials consisted of repetitions of word pairs with similar referents, and the other half  
13  
14 consisted of repetitions of word pairs with dissimilar referents. Each block of 4 trials included  
15  
16 two similar and two dissimilar trials. After the experiment, parents filled out the MacArthur-  
17  
18 Bates Communicative Development Inventory (short form Level II; Fenson et al., 2000).  
19  
20  
21

### 22 Results and Discussion

23  
24  
25 The question of interest was whether toddlers' listening times to word pairs were  
26  
27 influenced by the visual similarity of their referents (in the absence of those referents). Thus, we  
28  
29 compared listening times to word pairs that labeled similar or dissimilar objects. A paired  
30  
31 sample t-test revealed a significant effect of trial type (similar vs. dissimilar):  $t(31) = 3.91$ ,  $p <$   
32  
33  $0.001$ ,  $\eta^2 = 0.331$ . Toddlers preferred to listen to label pairs referring to similar objects (7.99s;  
34  
35  $SE = 0.50$ ) compared to labels referring to dissimilar objects (6.54s;  $SE = 0.38$ ; see Figure 2).  
36  
37 We also calculated a preference score for each toddler by subtracting their mean listening time  
38  
39 on dissimilar trials from their mean listening time on similar trials. Of the 32 participants, 25 had  
40  
41 a positive preference score, indicating that they listened longer on similar trials (see Figure 3).  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 --Insert Figures 2 & 3 around here--  
47

48  
49 The results of Experiment 1 suggest that when toddlers are learning new words, they do  
50  
51 not just learn the associations between labels and their referents; they also encode relationships  
52  
53 amongst the referents. The visual similarity of the objects affected which word-pairs toddlers  
54  
55 preferred to listen to, *in the absence of the referents themselves*. Because the label-object  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

8

1  
2  
3 pairings were counterbalanced across participants, the pattern of results cannot be due to  
4  
5 idiosyncratic preferences for some labels or label pairings over others. The information toddlers  
6  
7 encoded about the visual similarities amongst referents affected their behavior in an auditory test.  
8  
9

10  
11 However, there is an alternative hypothesis that could explain these results without  
12  
13 recourse to the encoding of the similarity structure of the referents. It is possible that the toddlers  
14  
15 failed to learn the 4 unique label/object pairs during training. Instead, they may have categorized  
16  
17 the similar items together, treating their labels as synonyms; or, they simply may have not  
18  
19 learned the words robustly enough to distinguish between the visually similar referents. For  
20  
21 example, if *tursey* and *coro* referred to the two round blue objects, it could be that toddlers  
22  
23 treated the labels as interchangeable or were confused about which word referred to which  
24  
25 object. If the data reflect this alternative hypothesis, and toddlers under-learned the lexical  
26  
27 structure provided in Experiment 1, the results do not address our original hypothesis concerning  
28  
29 the encoding of similarity structure amongst the referents, but instead simply reflect category  
30  
31 learning (blue round objects versus red pointy objects). To tease apart these two hypotheses, we  
32  
33 conducted a second experiment, designed to determine whether or not the training procedure  
34  
35 from Experiment 1 results in the specific learning of all four label/object pairs.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

### Experiment 2

44  
45 This study used the same training procedure as Experiment 1. However, instead of  
46  
47 assessing lexical representations using an auditory task as in Experiment 1, we tested word-  
48  
49 learning outcomes with a looking-while-listening task (see Fernald, Zangl, Portillo, &  
50  
51 Marchman, 2008). We asked whether toddlers can learn all four label/object pairs as distinct  
52  
53 lexical entries given the training regimen from Experiment 1. If so, this would support our  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

original interpretation of the results of Experiment 1: namely, that toddlers' listening preferences reflect their newly acquired knowledge about the similarity structure of the referents.

## Method

### Participants

Participants consisted of a new sample of 24 full-term, monolingual English-learners (11 male) with a mean age of 27;8 months (26;11-28;12). Seven additional toddlers were excluded from the analysis due to inattentiveness (4) or experimenter error (3). These participants were comparable to the Experiment 1 participants in their expressive MacArthur-Bates CDI scores (64 versus 67.2 out of 100 possible,  $t(54)=0.52$ ,  $p=0.61$ ).

### Stimuli and Design

The training stimuli were identical to Experiment 1. On each of the 16 test trials, two of the novel objects were displayed on the bottom left and right of the screen. Toddlers heard a pre-recorded sentence directing them to one of the objects. Half of the test trials contrasted similar novel objects (i.e., either the two blue, round objects or the two red, pointy objects). The other half contrasted dissimilar objects (i.e., one blue, round object and one red, pointy object). These two trial types allowed us to examine the robustness of the toddlers' representations of the novel words. In particular, successful word recognition on the similar object trials requires participants to have encoded the fine-grained details differentiating two perceptual neighbors, whereas successful word recognition on the dissimilar object trials does not.

### Procedure

The training procedure was identical to Experiment 1. The test phase began with two familiar-object trials (shoe and dog) intended to orient participants to the task. Next, participants viewed the novel-object trials in 4 blocks of 4. The test trials began with two objects presented in

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
silence (1.5s). Participants then heard one of the objects labeled in a sentence frame  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
 (“Where’s the \_\_\_?” or “Find the \_\_\_.”). This was followed by an attention getting phrase such as  
“Can you see it?” or “Do you like it?” and 1 second of silence.

Each test block consisted of one trial for each label. The blocks were made up of two similar-object trials and two dissimilar-object trials. The target picture (i.e., the picture that was labeled) was presented equally on the left and right side within blocks, and each of the object pictures was displayed equally on the left and right throughout the test phase. Trial order was counterbalanced across participants. After the experiment, the parents filled out the MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventory (short form Level II; Fenson et al., 2000).

### Results and Discussion

The primary question was whether or not participants could learn four distinct word-referent pairs, given that each object was highly similar to one other object. Looking behavior was coded frame by frame (see Fernald et al., 2008). For each 33-ms frame, we calculated the proportion of trials on which toddlers were looking to the target picture.

To determine whether toddlers successfully learned the word-referent pairs, we compared looking behavior before and after the audio presentation of the target word. If participants learned the word, they should increase looking to the target object after hearing its label. A Baseline window (from 450 ms to 2450 ms) represented pre-labeling behavior. The Target window started at 2750 ms, beginning 300 ms after the noun onset to allow for the planning of eye movements (Fernald et al., 2008), and was 1500ms in duration. We calculated the mean proportion of looks to the target for each toddler across frames during the Baseline and Target windows. Trials were excluded if there were more than ten consecutive frames in which the participant was not attending to the stimuli (32 out of 386 total were excluded).

## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

11

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

A paired sample t-test was used to compare looking during the Baseline and Target windows. Participants looked significantly more to the target object during the Target window than during the Baseline window:  $t(23) = 4.78, p < 0.001$  (see Table 1). This provides evidence that the toddlers learned the novel words. However, as noted previously, there were two types of test trials: dissimilar trials, in which toddlers had to locate the target given one of the blue objects and one of the red objects; and similar trials, which required a decision between either two blue or two red objects. It is possible that the overall learning effect was driven by the easier dissimilar trials.

Follow-up analyses were conducted to examine the dissimilar and similar trials separately. A paired sample t-test comparing the Baseline and Target windows for the dissimilar trials revealed that the participants looked significantly more to the target object during the Target window than during the Baseline window:  $t(23) = 3.28, p < 0.005$ . We found the same pattern for the more challenging similar trials:  $t(23) = 3.06, p < 0.01$  (see Figure 4 and Table 1). To compare performance on the two trial types, we calculated difference scores for each subject by subtracting baseline window accuracy from target window accuracy for both similar and dissimilar trials. A paired sample t-test comparing those difference scores revealed no significant difference between trial types,  $t(23) = 0.41, p = 0.69$ . These results suggest that our participants' representations of the novel words were robust and included sufficient detail to permit learners to distinguish between the visually similar referents.

--Insert Figure 4 and Table 1 around here--

The results from Experiment 1 left open the possibility that toddlers did not learn distinct label-referent associations for the visually similar objects; they could have encoded only the broad visual features and treated the similar object labels as synonymous at test. A separate

## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

12

1  
2  
3 word comprehension task was needed to ensure that toddlers could learn the four distinct  
4  
5 words from our testing regime. The results from Experiment 2 demonstrate that the toddlers  
6  
7 formed a strong enough representation of each word to be able to distinguish it from a visually  
8  
9 similar neighbor. This finding supports the hypothesis that the participants in Experiment 1  
10  
11 learned the novel words as distinct lexical items and encoded the relationships between them.  
12  
13 The results from Experiment 1, therefore, are likely due to successful encoding of the  
14  
15 relationships between similar referents during the word learning process.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

### General Discussion

22  
23  
24  
25 When we think about word learning, we tend to focus on how children acquire the  
26  
27 mapping between sounds (or signs) and their referents. However, we know that the links  
28  
29 amongst meanings underpin our conceptual knowledge (see McClelland & Rogers, 2003). The  
30  
31 current study was designed to take a first step towards understanding the ontogenesis of the  
32  
33 associations comprising a semantic network by looking at what toddlers learn about semantic  
34  
35 relationships during their *initial* exposure to new words.  
36  
37  
38

39  
40 In Experiment 1, we asked whether toddlers encode the relationships between word  
41  
42 referents when learning novel words. Participants were taught four novel words structured as two  
43  
44 visually similar pairs. Toddlers listened significantly longer to word pairs consisting of the  
45  
46 labels for visually *similar* referents compared to pairs of labels for visually *dissimilar* referents in  
47  
48 the absence of the referents themselves. Because the only difference between the pairs of words  
49  
50 was the similarity of their referents, these results suggest that early lexical representations  
51  
52 include information about the similarity structure of the words' referents, even for words toddlers  
53  
54 have just learned.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

1  
2  
3  
4 To examine the possibility that the results did not reflect the encoding of word  
5 relationships, but instead the conflating of labels for visually similar items, we exposed the  
6 participants in Experiment 2 to the same training regimen. We found that the toddlers  
7  
8 successfully learned the 4 novel word/referent pairings as distinct lexical entries. Together, our  
9  
10 two experiments provide evidence that while toddlers are learning novel word-referent  
11  
12 associations, they are also encoding the relationships amongst these words.  
13  
14  
15  
16

17  
18 Our findings are particularly striking because the training procedure is similar to what is  
19  
20 used in most traditional word learning studies; it was not designed to highlight the relationships  
21  
22 amongst the referents. The training provided ostensive labels for four novel objects, but toddlers  
23  
24 learned more than just this one type of association. They are also taking into account other  
25  
26 relationships, such as those amongst the referents.  
27  
28

29  
30 The demonstration that early lexical representations include information about visual  
31  
32 similarity amongst the referents can be construed as the referential analog to the neighborhood  
33  
34 density effects observed for the sounds of words (e.g., Hollich, Jusczyk, & Luce, 2002). On this  
35  
36 view, young learners encode the visual overlap amongst the referents of different words much as  
37  
38 they encode the auditory overlap of their labels. If this is the case, then what we know about  
39  
40 early lexical representations can inform the study of early semantic representations. For  
41  
42 example, Hollich, Jusczyk & Luce (2002) found that 17-month-olds acquired words forms from  
43  
44 dense neighborhoods (i.e., words that sound similar to many other known words) more readily  
45  
46 than words from sparse neighborhoods. Because our results show that toddlers encode  
47  
48 information about visual relationships amongst referents, it is possible that novel objects with  
49  
50 many similar neighbors are more easily learned than those in a sparse visual neighborhood. In  
51  
52 fact, results from a connectionist model looking at semantic growth suggest that novel words that  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

14

1  
2  
3 are semantically associated with many known words are acquired more quickly (Hills,  
4  
5 Maouene, Riordan, & Smith, 2010). With the results from the current studies in hand, research  
6  
7 can use findings from the auditory domain to advance our understanding of how semantic  
8  
9 relationships interact with word learning.  
10  
11

12  
13 The current results can also help to expand how we think about the word learning  
14  
15 literature. The majority of word learning tasks used with infants and young toddlers involve  
16  
17 brief training sessions designed to expose participants to novel words, often on a 2D screen.  
18  
19 Because of this stripped-down artificial situation, it is unclear whether participants' resulting  
20  
21 knowledge is word-like or not. In these lab settings, infants may just be forming an association  
22  
23 between a sound and a picture. While this type of association is an important component of word  
24  
25 learning and knowledge (e.g., Smith & Yu, 2008; Voloumanous & Werker, 2009), lexical  
26  
27 representations are much richer than just associations between labels and objects. Thus it is  
28  
29 important to determine the character of novel word representations acquired in experimental  
30  
31 paradigms. The current study demonstrates that during toddlers' first encounters with novel  
32  
33 words, they are encoding more than just the label-object associations. In fact, even in the  
34  
35 stripped-down environment of a computerized word learning experimental paradigm, novel word  
36  
37 representations include information concerning the relationships amongst words. Our findings  
38  
39 thus provide evidence that when we employ traditional word learning paradigms that teach new  
40  
41 words in short training sessions, we are indeed investigating novel lexical entries, not just label-  
42  
43 object associations.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 More broadly, the results from this study show the importance of expanding the study of  
52  
53 word learning beyond just the study of how young children learn which labels go with which  
54  
55 referents. Researchers can draw from what we know about adult lexical representations to  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

15

1  
2  
3 investigate when and how toddlers acquire that knowledge. For example, we know that skilled  
4  
5 language users are sensitive to many other types of relationships beyond the visual similarity of  
6  
7 referents. Adults' semantic knowledge includes the functional relationships between words (such  
8  
9 as "broom" and "floor"; Moss, Ostrin, Tyler, and Marslen-Wilson, 1995). It would be  
10  
11 interesting to teach toddlers different kinds of novel words, such as those with overlapping  
12  
13 functional or conceptual representations, to determine which types of relationships are encoded  
14  
15 in early lexical entries. Similar questions emerge for words across multiple syntactic categories,  
16  
17 where relationships between words might be somewhat more abstract. By manipulating the  
18  
19 structure of the artificial lexicon, we will begin to further tease out the type of information  
20  
21 encoded by young word learners – along with the dimensions of similarity that toddlers fail to  
22  
23 encode. Indeed, given the richness of early linguistic, conceptual, and social environments, it is  
24  
25 just as important to discover which types of information learners ignore as to discover which  
26  
27 types of information they encode.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34           Researchers have just begun to explore early semantic networks in young children.  
35  
36 Notably, the auditory task used in the current study is quite different from other behavioral  
37  
38 methodologies that have been used previously, such as the Intermodal Preference Procedure  
39  
40 priming task (e.g., Arias-Trejo & Plunkett, 2009). One benefit of our auditory task is that it  
41  
42 allows researchers to test word knowledge in the absence of visual referents; this was necessary  
43  
44 for the present research question because presenting the toddlers with the referents would have  
45  
46 provided them with the exact information that we were trying to assess. Because the auditory  
47  
48 task is novel, we hope to further explore this methodology, in conjunction with other techniques  
49  
50 such as the IPP priming task, to uncover both the mechanisms behind our effect and the  
51  
52 characteristics of young children's semantic networks.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

16

1  
2  
3  
4 Word learning is not just about mapping a label to its referent and making the  
5  
6 appropriate extensions to other similar referents. Children must also learn how different words  
7  
8 are semantically related to each other. As adults, we know many important relationships between  
9  
10 words, and this connectedness is a crucial component of our semantic and linguistic systems.  
11  
12 Investigating the emergence of these relationships will help us more fully understand the early  
13  
14 word learning process. By demonstrating that young children encode the visual similarity of  
15  
16 referents during word learning, this study contributes to our understanding of word learning and  
17  
18 presents a paradigm that can be used to further investigate early encoding of semantic  
19  
20 relationships and how this knowledge interacts with early word learning.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the participating families as well as the members of the Infant Learning Lab, specifically Casey Lew-Williams, Brianna McMillan, and Hillary Stein. We also thank Jill Lany, Casey Lew-Williams, and Katharine Graf Estes for their comments on previous versions of this manuscript. This work was funded by a NSF Graduate Research Fellowship to EHW; grants from the NICHD to JRS (R37HD037466) and the Waisman Center (P30HD03352); and by a grant from the James F. McDonnell Foundation to JRS.

### Author Contributions

Both authors developed the study concept and design. Testing, data collection, data analyses, and interpretation were performed by E.H.W. under the supervision of J.R.S. Both authors drafted and revised the manuscript.

### References

- Ameel, E., Malt, B., & Storms, G. (2008). Object naming and later lexical development: From baby bottle to beer bottle. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *58*(2), 262-285.
- Arias-Trejo, N., & Plunkett, K. (2009). Lexical semantic priming effects during infancy. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *364*, 3633–3647.
- Behl-Chadha, G. (1996). Basic-level and superordinate-like categorical representations in early infancy. *Cognition*, *60*(2), 105-41.
- Carey, S. (1985). *Conceptual change in childhood*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fenson, L., Pethick, S., Renda, C., Cox, J.L., Dale, P.S., & Reznick, J.S. (2000) Short form versions of the MacArthur Communicative Development Inventories. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *21*, 95-115.
- Fernald, A., Zangl, R., Portillo, A.L., & Marchman, V.A. (2008). Looking while listening: Using eye movements to monitor spoken language comprehension by infants and young children. In Sekerina, I.A., Fernandez, E.M., & Clahsen, H. (Eds.) *Developmental Psycholinguistics: On-line methods in children's language processing*. Amsterdam, NE: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Hills, T. T., Maouene, J., Riordan, B., & Smith, L. B. (2010). The associative structure of language: Contextual diversity in early word learning. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *63*(3), 259-273.
- Hollich, G., Jusczyk, P. W., & Luce, P. A. (2002). Lexical neighborhood effects in 17-month-old word learning. Paper presented at the 26th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development, Boston.

## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

19

1  
2  
3 Lany, J., & Saffran, J. R. (2011). Interactions between statistical and semantic information in  
4  
5 infant language development. *Developmental Science*, *14*, 1207-1219.

6  
7  
8 McClelland, J. L., & Rogers, T. T. (2003). The parallel distributed processing approach to  
9  
10 semantic cognition. *Nature reviews: Neuroscience*, *4*(4), 310-22.

11  
12  
13 McNamara, T. P. (2005). *Semantic priming: perspectives from memory and word recognition*.  
14  
15 Psychology Press Taylor and Francis Group: New York, NY.

16  
17  
18 Moss, H. E., Ostrin, R. K., Tyler, L. K., & Marslen-Wilson, W. D. (1995). Accessing different  
19  
20 types of lexical semantic information: Evidence from priming. *Journal of Experimental*  
21  
22 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *21*, 863–883.

23  
24  
25 Neely, J. H. (1991). Semantic priming effects in visual word recognition: A selective review of  
26  
27 current findings and theories. In D. Besner and G. Humphries (Eds.) *Basic processes in*  
28  
29 *reading: Visual word recognition* (pp 264-336). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

30  
31  
32 Quine, W.V. (1960). *Word and object*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

33  
34  
35 Quinn P.C., Eimas, P.D., & Rosenkrantz, S.L. (1993). Evidence for representations of  
36  
37 perceptually similar natural categories by 3-month-old and 4-month-old infants.  
38  
39 *Perception*, *22*, 463-475.

40  
41  
42 Romberg, A.R. & Saffran, J.R. (2012) All together now: Concurrent learning of multiple  
43  
44 structures in an artificial language. *Cognitive Science*, manuscript in press.

45  
46  
47 Samuelson, L. K., & Smith, L.B. (2005). They call it like they see it: Spontaneous naming and  
48  
49 attention to shape. *Developmental Science*, *8*(3), 182-198.

50  
51  
52 Schreuder, R., Flores D'Arcais, G. B., & Glazenborg, G. (1984). Effects of perceptual and  
53  
54 conceptual similarity in semantic priming. *Psychological Research*, *45*, 339–354.

## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

20

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Sloutsky, V. M. (2003). The role of similarity in the development of categorization. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 7(6), 246-251.
- Smith, L., & Yu, C. (2008). Infants rapidly learn word-referent mappings via cross-situational statistics. *Cognition*, 106(3), 1558-1568.
- Steyvers, M., & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2005). The large-scale structure of semantic networks: statistical analyses and a model of semantic growth. *Cognitive Science*, 29(1), 41-78.
- Vouloumanos, A., & Werker, J. F. (2009). Infants' learning of novel words in a stochastic environment. *Developmental Psychology*, 45(6), 1611-7.
- Willits, J. A., Wojcik, E. H., Seidenberg, M. S., & Saffran, J. R. (2012). Lexical semantic priming in 24-month-old infants. Manuscript submitted for publication (copy on file with authors).
- Yee, E., Ahmed, S. Z., & Thompson-Schill, S.L. (2012). Colorless green ideas (can) prime furiously. *Psychological Science*, 23(4), 364-369.
- Yurovsky, D., Yu, C., & Smith, L. B. (2012). Statistical Speech Segmentation and Word Learning in Parallel: Scaffolding from Child-Directed Speech. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3, 1-9.

TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Review Only

## TODDLERS ENCODE THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST REFERENTS

22

Table 1

*Mean Proportion of Looks to Correct Object in Baseline and Target Windows*

Trial type	Baseline Mean (SE)	Target Mean (SE)
All	0.50 (0.009)	0.60 (0.022)
Dissimilar	0.51 (0.018)	0.62 (0.031)
Similar	0.49 (0.013)	0.59 (0.025)
Similar - Red	0.47 (0.028)	0.61 (0.041)
Similar – Blue	0.50 (0.025)	0.61 (0.032)

For Review Only







## Figure Captions


*Figure 1.* The participants were trained on the four novel objects presented above. Note that the objects comprise two visually similar pairs.

*Figure 2.* Toddlers listened significantly longer to word pairs that referred to visually similar objects than to word pairs that referred to visually dissimilar objects.


*Figure 3.* A preference score was calculated for each participant by subtracting their mean dissimilar trial listening time from their mean similar trial listening time. Twenty-five out of the 32 infants showed a positive preference score, indicating a preference for the similar trials.

*Figure 4.* Infants looked significantly more to the target picture compared to the distractor after they heard the target label. This effect held for both the dissimilar and similar trials.





# Effect by Participant



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

