Option 1:

When young children are presented with a novel object and one or more familiar objects as they hear a novel name (e.g. *Where’s the dax?*), they tend to select the novel object. This disambiguation bias is often assumed to reflect children’s expectations about the nature of words or expectations about the communicative intention of speakers. The research presented in this symposium challenges these assumptions and shows that young children can use similar strategies in non-linguistic and non-communicative contexts, while failing to use this strategy in contexts that closely parallel the pragmatics of word learning tasks. The first talk shows that children look at an unfamiliar face when hearing an unfamiliar voice in the presence of both familiar and unfamiliar faces. The second talk reports that children look at an unfamiliar animal when hearing an unfamiliar animal vocalization in the presence of both familiar and unfamiliar animals. The final talk shows that despite mapping novel words to novel objects, children surprisingly map novel gestures to familiar objects instead. The discussion will conciliate these findings within a computational framework that predicts that disambiguation biases emerge within domains in which consistent mappings are observed. Using different paradigms (offline and online experimental measures, computational modeling) on diverse contexts (words, faces, animal vocalizations, and gestures) these studies demonstrate that disambiguation biases are not restricted to linguistic and communicative contexts and instead reflect domain-general strategies children use to resolve ambiguity across situations by relying on already existing knowledge.

Option 2:

A central issue in the field of language acquisition is whether learning mechanisms are specific or general. Several learning mechanisms proposed to be involved in the acquisition of language have been shown to be domain and modality general. The research presented in this symposium explores whether disambiguation biases - often characterized as language-specific or restricted to communicative contexts - also generalizes to non-linguistic contexts. The first talk shows that children look at an unfamiliar face when hearing an unfamiliar voice in the presence of both familiar and unfamiliar faces. The second talk reports that children look at an unfamiliar animal when hearing an unfamiliar animal vocalization in the presence of both familiar and unfamiliar animals. The final talk shows that despite mapping novel words to novel objects, children surprisingly map novel gestures to familiar objects instead. The discussion will conciliate these findings within a computational framework that predicts that disambiguation biases emerge within domains in which consistent mappings are observed. Using different paradigms (offline and online experimental measures, computational modeling) on diverse contexts (words, faces, animal vocalizations, and gestures) these studies demonstrate that disambiguation biases are not restricted to linguistic and communicative contexts and instead reflect domain-general strategies children use to resolve ambiguity across situations by relying on already existing knowledge.

Points to consider:

- Parallelism across abstracts (e.g., Umay does not need headers for Method and Results)

- There’s no need to define disambiguation in each abstract

- Consistent use of terms (Umay and we use the term disambiguation, but Halberda uses learning by exclusion, disjunctive syllogism, and process of elimination). We are not going to make halberd use the boring “disambiguation,” I am sure. But maybe we can have some more consistency.

- Umay characterizes disambiguation as a “word-learning strategy” despite our efforts against this characterization.