# Chapter 6 Further Readings

(Note: This bibliography will be updated regularly.)

### Infant-directed speech

To what extent do adults adapt their spoken language through “baby talk” to meet the needs of infant language learners? And to what extent does this altered input actually help children to learn language? The following paper provides a good starting-point for exploring these questions:

Soderstrom, M. (2007) Beyond babytalk: Re-evaluating the nature and content of speech input to preverbal infants. Developmental Review, 27, 501–532.

### Sound-based cues can provide information about syntactic categories

In Chapter 6, we talked about how children might use semantic and distributional cues to sort words into different syntactic categories. In addition, words from different syntactic categories often show different sound patterns, providing another potentially valuable source of information. Can children leverage sound-based cues in learning about new words and their syntactic categories? The following paper addresses this question:

Fitneva, S. A., Christiansen, M. H., & Monaghan, P. (2009) From sound to syntax: phonological constraints on children’s lexical categorization of new words. Journal of Child Language, 36, 967–997.

### Using artificial languages to study language acquisition

This review chapter provides a useful framework and introduction to research that uses artificial languages to grapple with big questions about the acquisition of linguistic structure. Since its publication, many new and informative articles have appeared, validating the usefulness of this general approach:

Gomez, R. L., & Gerken, L. A. (2000) Infant artificial language learning and language acquisition. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 4, 178–186.

### Syntactic learning in non-human animals

What are the capabilities of other animals to learn the kinds of structured patterns that exist in human languages? This paper provides an overview:

ten Cate, C., & Okanoya, K. (2012) Re-visiting the syntactic abilities of non-human languages: natural vocalizations and artificial grammar learning. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 367, 1984–1994.

### Are some structures more learnable than others?

Do children appear to be biased to learn some structures and patterns more readily than others? And if so, what is the source of such biases? The following papers grapple with these intriguing questions:

Gerken, L. A., Balcomb, F. K., & Minton, J. L. (2011) Infants avoid “labouring in vain” by attending more to learnable than unlearnable linguistic patterns. Developmental Science, 14, 972–979.

Pearl, L., & Sprouse, J. (2013) Syntactic islands and learning biases: Combining experimental syntax and computational modeling to investigate the language acquisition problem. Language Acquisition, 20, 23–68.

### Innateness and the “poverty of the stimulus”

The following papers present a spirited exchange between scholars who hold different views about the “poverty of the stimulus” argument for innate syntactic structure. The papers are best read in the order listed below:

Pullum, G. K., & Scholz, B. C. (2002) Empirical assessment of stimulus poverty arguments. The Linguistic Review, 19, 9–50.

Lidz, J., Waxman, S., & Freedman, J. (2003) What infants know about syntax but couldn’t have learned: Evidence for syntactic structure at 18-months. Cognition, 89, B65–B73.

Ahktar, N., Callanan, M., Pullun, G., & Scholz, B. (2004) Learning antecedents for anaphoric one. Cognition, 93, 141–145.

Lidz, J., & Waxman, S. (2004) Reaffirming the poverty of the stimulus argument: a reply to the replies. Cognition, 93, 157–165.
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