

Semantic coherence facilitates distributional learning of word meaning

Long Ouyang, Lera Boroditsky, Michael C. Frank

Department of Psychology, Stanford University

Author Note

An earlier version of this paper appeared in the Proceedings of the 34th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society. Address correspondence to:

Long Ouyang

Jordan Hall, Building 01-420

450 Serra Mall

Stanford, CA, 94305

Email: [louyang@post.harvard.edu](mailto:louyang@post.harvard.edu)

## Abstract

Computational models have shown that purely statistical knowledge about words' linguistic contexts is sufficient to learn many properties of words, including grammatical category and meaning. For example, a learner might infer that "postman" and "mailman" have similar meanings because they have quantitatively similar patterns of association with *other* words (e.g., both "postman" and "mailman" tend to occur with words like "deliver", "truck", "package"). Are people able to leverage distributional statistics in this way in the service of learning about the meanings of words? Results from prior artificial language learning experiments suggest that the answer may be no. However, experiments in this paradigm expose participants to entirely novel words, whereas real language learners encounter input that contains some known words that are semantically organized. In three experiments, we show that (1) the presence of familiar semantic reference points facilitates distributional learning of meaning and (2) this effect crucially depends both on the presence of known words and the adherence of these known words to some semantic organization.

Semantic coherence facilitates distributional learning of word meaning

*“You shall know a word by the company it keeps.” Firth (1957, p.11)*

How do people learn the meanings of words? Research indicates that learners use many sources of information about word meaning, including physical, social, conceptual, and linguistic cues (Baldwin, 1993; E. V. Clark, 1988; Gleitman, 1990; Hollich, Hirsh-Pasek, & Golinkoff, 2000; Markman, 1991). One abundant source is distributional information about language itself—people use statistical knowledge about language input during learning. For example, learners can group sounds together into word forms based on their statistical co-occurrence (Saffran, Aslin, & Newport, 1996; Saffran, Newport, & Aslin, 1996) and pair word forms with their referents based on consistent associations (L. Smith & Yu, 2008; Yu & Ballard, 2007). In the current paper, we explore a more sophisticated type of distributional learning: using evidence about the linguistic contexts that a word occurs in as a cue toward its meaning (Braine, 1987; Maratsos & Chalkley, 1980; Redington, Chater, & Finch, 1998; K. H. Smith, 1966). Throughout this paper, unless otherwise specified, we will use “meaning” in the sense of which concrete referents a word picks out in the world; following Wittgenstein (1953/1997) and others, we recognize that this is only one of the many facets of meaning.

As an example of distributional learning of meaning, one might infer that “postman” and “mailman” have similar meanings based solely on the fact that they both tend to occur with words like “deliver”, “package”, and “truck.” To give an intuition in a different domain, we might judge whether two people are similar based on their patterns of association with other people. If we know that Alice associates with accountants and lawyers and that Bob associates with professors and college sophomores, we might judge that they are dissimilar. For words, this kind of learning is driven not by *direct* co-occurrence between two words of interest but rather by the similarity in their linguistic contexts—their patterns of co-occurrence with *other* words. As Firth (1957) put it, one learns a word “by the company it keeps” (p.11). We will refer to such learning as *distributional learning of word meaning*.

Distributional learning as a general mechanism is thought to be important throughout language learning, including acquisition of word meaning (Landauer & Dumais, 1997) and grammatical category (Redington et al., 1998). Nevertheless, a number of experiments, conducted mainly on acquisition of grammatical category, suggest that human learners' capacities are limited in this regard (Braine, 1987; Brooks, Braine, Catalano, Brody, & Sudhalter, 1993; Frank & Gibson, 2011; Frigo & McDonald, 1998; Gerken, Wilson, & Lewis, 2005; Kempe & Brooks, 2001).

Our study addresses this mismatch by specifying conditions under which people succeed in distributional learning. In particular, we investigate the effect of having existing linguistic knowledge. Prior experiments typically exposed learners to artificial languages composed of entirely novel words. Our experiments suggest that *semantic coherence*, the presence of known words adhering to some semantic organization, facilitates distributional learning of word meaning. A small semantic hook allows people to leverage distributional information for inferring the meaning of other novel words. Phrased in terms of the Alice–Bob example, we stand a better chance of learning about Alice from her associates if those associates have roles that are already meaningful to us. Knowing that Alice associates with professors and college sophomores gives us a clearer picture of her than, say, knowing that she associates with taphonomists and bryologists.<sup>1</sup> Learning a word from its company is easier if this company is already familiar.

We begin by briefly reviewing some of the general evidence for distributional learning. We then introduce the specific language structure we explore in this paper and discuss some of the successes and the failures in finding evidence of distributional learning of *grammatical category* in experiments that use this language. In Experiment 1, we present evidence that semantic coherence can facilitate distributional learning of word meaning. In Experiments 2 and 3, we further explore this effect by isolating two components of semantic coherence—familiarity of words and presence of an overarching semantic organization—and find that neither alone

---

<sup>1</sup>Though, we can infer much more about Alice if we know that taphonomy is the study of decay and fossilization and that bryology is the study of certain plants called bryophytes, which include mosses, hornworts, and liverworts.

facilitates learning. We conclude by discussing the limitations of purely artificial language learning, possibilities for future empirical and computational work, and potential mechanisms for the effects we observe.

### **Evidence for distributional learning**

Initial proposals about distributional learning came from philosophical and linguistic research on the nature of meaning. In the philosophical literature, Wittgenstein (1953/1997) objected to the idea that words have precise, formal definitions and argued that meaning derives from patterns of usage. To illustrate, he considered the word “game” – a term used to describe activities as varied as chess, poker, basketball, the Olympics and so forth – and observed that these activities lack a shared essence that we could distill to a definition. To use a spatial metaphor, the set of things called games does not appear to be a contiguous region that we could draw a boundary for, but rather a “complicated network of similarities overlapping and crisscrossing” (§66). Wittgenstein argued that understanding meaning requires describing usage.

In linguistics, Firth (1957) similarly argued for a theory of meaning based on patterns of “habitual collocation”. For example (p.12), he asserts that part of the meaning of the “cow” is its co-occurrence with “milk”, as in “They are milking the cows” or “Cows give milk.” “Tigress” and “lioness” do not co-occur with “milk” as often and thus must differ somewhat in meaning. Firth stressed the utility of *pure* co-occurrence independent of extralinguistic or even grammatical aspects. He even outlined a prescient kind of cluster analysis quite similar to modern-day statistical approaches:

“In the study of selected words, compounds and phrases in a restricted language for which there are restricted texts, an exhaustive collection of collocation will suggest a small number of groups of collocations for each word studied. The next step is the choice of definitions for meanings suggested by the groups” (p. 13)

Firth’s contemporary Harris advanced a quantitative version of this notion called the *distributional hypothesis*, which proposes that words are semantically similar to the degree that they participate

in the same contexts (Harris, 1951). Harris argued that, even in cases where word meaning was determined by extralinguistic influences, such influences would have distributional correlates. Thus, meaning could be divined by the quantitative analysis of purely linguistic information.

These proposals about the distributional theory of meaning stimulated early empirical work with humans, which typically supported the distributional hypothesis using small samples of human judgments and corpora (Berry-Rogghe, 1973; H. Clark, 1968; Geffroy, Lafon, Seidel, & Tournier, 1973; Rubenstein & Goodenough, 1965; Steffire & Reich, 1971; Szalay & Bryson, 1974). For example, Rubenstein and Goodenough (1965) compared synonym judgments for pairs of concrete nouns generated by one group of subjects with co-occurrence statistics in a corpus generated by a separate group of subjects. They found a positive relationship between synonymy and degree of linguistic context match.

In the 1980s, computer scientists devised techniques that paved the way for larger scale investigations of distributional learning. Motivated by practical issues in the field of information retrieval, they considered the relationships between words and documents. A typical problem was to retrieve relevant documents from a database based on a query with certain search terms. One solution to this problem is to represent documents as points in a high dimensional space whose dimensions are frequencies for different words (Salton & McGill, 1983). This approach lends itself quite naturally to a matrix representation with words as rows, documents as columns, and cells encoding how often a particular word occurs in a particular document (Figure 1). While we can interpret such matrices as representing documents in terms of their component words, we can also interpret them representing words in terms of their frequency of use across different documents (a useful form for distributional learning). We will refer to such representations as *word-document* matrices. To make an analogy with our Alice–Bob example, word-document matrices license inferences about Alice or Bob based on *where* they appear (rather than *who* they appear with).

Note, however, that the word-document approach discards information about the relative position of words within documents. The word-word approach retains this information (Church &




Figure 1. Word-document and word-word matrices. Word-document matrices measure how often words occur in particular documents. Word-word matrices measure how often pairs of words occur in certain relative positions.

Hanks, 1990; Schütze, 1992), labeling both rows and columns with words; a row might represent the meaning of word A and the count in a particular column might indicate frequency that word A occurred 2 words before word X (Figure 1). This corresponds to the initial example of inferences about Alice or Bob based on *who* they appear with.

Learning models based on word-document and word-word matrices are capable of acquiring semantic properties of words. For example, Landauer and Dumais (1997) built a word-document matrix from a corpus of encyclopedia articles, applied a dimensionality reduction technique (singular value decomposition), and computed the similarity between words using a cosine measure. This Latent Semantic Analysis model (LSA) was able to successfully pass a TOEFL synonym test. Redington et al. (1998) developed a model that performs hierarchical

clustering on a word-word matrix. Although this model was developed to learn syntactic categories like noun, verb, and adjective, it often learned clusters that had semantic organization. For example, in the cluster of adjectives, color words and number words formed separate clusters (p448). The success of early computational models led to a proliferation of models that learn from co-occurrence information (see Riordan & Jones, 2010 for an overview and comparison of state-of-the-art models). The computational evidence is quite strong: In principle, statistical patterns of co-occurrence can drive learning for some aspects of word meaning.

There are computational proofs of concept, but there is little *direct* evidence that humans use co-occurrence information to learn meaning. However, one influential case study offers some indirect evidence. Shepard and Cooper (1992) presented congenitally blind, color-blind, and normally sighted participants with pairs of color words and asked them to make similarity ratings. As might be predicted, the ratings of blind participants did not correlate highly with normally sighted individuals. However, their ratings did appear to preserve the local similarity relationships—violet was rated most similar to purple, teal to green, and so forth. How might have congenitally blind individuals learned anything about color relationships? One possibility, raised by Shepard and Cooper, is that the blind may have extracted these relationships from their linguistic input. More recent work by Bedny, Koster-Hale, Johnston, Yazzolino, and Saxe (2012) has shown similar results with knowledge of visual verbs.

These demonstrations in the blind, while suggestive, are only indirect evidence of distributional learning. Researchers studying learning of grammatical categories (as opposed to word meanings) have employed methods that can in principle provide stronger evidence. These studies expose learners to artificial languages with certain co-occurrence regularities and measure whether learners form categories on the basis of these regularities. In the next section, we discuss results of studies that have examined a kind of co-occurrence structure, known as the MNPQ language.



### A puzzle: the MNPQ language

The MNPQ language contains four categories of words, M (which includes  $m_1$ ,  $m_2$ , and  $m_3$ ), N ( $n_1$ ,  $n_2$ ,  $n_3$ ), P ( $p_1$ ,  $p_2$ ,  $p_3$ ), and Q ( $q_1$ ,  $q_2$ ,  $q_3$ ). Participants hear two types of training sentences: MN and PQ. Thus, sentences like  $m_1n_3$  are grammatical while sentences like  $m_1q_3$  are illegal. Early investigations (Braine, 1966; K. H. Smith, 1966) found that participants tend to endorse novel grammatical sentences as familiar. However, participants also endorse ungrammatical MQ and PN sentences, suggesting that they learn position regularities (that M/P come first and N/Q come second) but not co-occurrence regularities (that M co-occurs with N but not Q and that P occurs with Q but not N). This failure to learn categories on the basis of pure co-occurrence has been reliably observed in a number of studies (Braine, 1987; Brooks et al., 1993; Frank & Gibson, 2011; Frigo & McDonald, 1998; Gerken et al., 2005; Kempe & Brooks, 2001; Lany & Saffran, 2010). However, Reeder, Newport, and Aslin (2009, Experiment 5) report successful learning of a related language, (Q)AXB(R). In this language, there are optional Q and R categories that serve to deconfound co-occurrence regularities from positional regularities (i.e., in MNPQ, Ms and Ps are always sentence-initial and Ns and Qs are always sentence-final). However, it is difficult to directly compare (Q)AXB(R) and MNPQ results, due to the presence of an additional X category in the former; reconciling results from these two languages is a topic for future work. Nevertheless, the MNPQ failures are puzzling, given that computational models suggest that distributional learning is a powerful mechanism.

MNPQ learning is possible, however, when co-occurrence information is partially or completely correlated with another cue. For example, Braine (1987) found successful MNPQ learning when co-occurrence information is partially correlated with natural gender. In this experiment, participants acquired an artificial language by learning to name pictures of referents. In the experimental condition, all pictures of men were labeled by Ms and all pictures of women were labeled by Ps (though not all Ms referred to men and not all Ps referred to women). Learning of the co-occurrence regularities was significantly higher in the experimental condition than in a control condition where natural gender was not correlated with M/P membership.

Though Braine's experiment combined co-occurrence cues with natural gender, he suggested that phonological cues might better serve real-world language learners. For instance, Spanish and Italian speakers might learn grammatical gender categories by taking advantage of the fact that feminine nouns often end with *-a*, while masculine nouns often end with *-o*. More generally, demonstrations that co-occurrence information can be useful in concert with other information sources have encouraged researchers to study how disparate sources might be integrated to facilitate learning (e.g., Johns & Jones, 2012; Monaghan, Chater, & Christiansen, 2005).

Nearly all of this empirical work has interpreted the results of human experiments with reference to learning grammatical category, rather than word meaning. To our knowledge, only one study has examined word meaning. Recently, Lany and Saffran (2010) investigated Braine's proposal of correlating co-occurrence and phonological cues in a study of meaning acquisition. They found that 22-month old infants successfully learned an MNPQ language when co-occurrence was aligned with the number of syllables in a word (in particular, when N words were disyllabic and Q words were monosyllabic) but *not* when the number of syllables was not predictive of N/Q membership. This suggests that distributional information may play a common role in acquisition of grammatical category and word meaning, at least for the MNPQ language.

In our current work, we add to the literature on distributional learning of word meaning by exploring a new information source: semantic coherence. To date, all studies have used the artificial language learning paradigm, with a vocabulary consisting of all novel words. Thus, at the beginning of the experiments, learners did not know the meanings of any of the words. Real learners, by contrast, typically know the meanings of some (if not most) words they hear and such words tend to relate to a single topic of discourse. Put another way, the language that real learners encounter tends to have semantic coherence; some words are known and adhere to some semantic organization. We ask: does semantic coherence facilitate distributional learning of word meaning?

To explore this possibility, we presented participants with an MNPQ language where sentences took the form "M and N" or "P and Q". Note that we used the explicit English conjunction "and" between the two words, which imbued sentences with semantic content (i.e.,

our stimuli were not merely a syntactic ordering). We hypothesized that a sufficient level of semantic coherence (specifically, a taxonomic coherence where Ms are animals and Ps were vehicles) would yield successful distributional learning for N and Q words. For instance, hearing the four sentences:

1. dog and dax
2. dog and ziv
3. car and wug
4. car and pif

might allow learners to infer that daxes and zivs belong to the same category, as both words co-occur with “dog”, and that wugs and pifs belong to the same category, as both words co-occur with “car”.

In Experiment 1, we tested whether semantic coherence facilitated distributional learning. In Experiment 2, we compared semantic coherence to phonological coherence. In Experiment 3, we compared semantic coherence to a semantic baseline that used known words that did not adhere to any obvious semantic organization.

### **Experiment 1: Semantic Coherence**

In all the experiments reported in this paper, we exposed participants to auditory sentences from an MNPQ language and then assessed learning using three different measures. We refer to the Ms and Ps as *context words* and we refer to Ns and Qs as *target words*. Context words are found at the beginnings of sentences in our language, while target words are found at the ends of the sentences in our language (Figure 2). We systematically varied properties of the context words and then measured learning of the target words.

In Experiment 1, we parametrically varied two independent properties of the context words. First, we varied semantic coherence—the fraction of M/P words obeying a taxonomic organization (M = animal words, P = vehicle words). Second, as one hallmark of statistical

learning is sensitivity to the amount of evidence observed, we varied the amount of exposure to the language in order to measure the efficiency of learning. After exposure to the language, we tested participants on three measures of MNPQ learning—similarity rating, sentence memory, and a referent assignment task. In the similarity rating task, participants rated the similarity of pairs of target words. In the sentence memory task, participants rated the familiarity of four kinds of sentences: familiar sentences, novel grammatical sentences, and two kinds of ungrammatical sentences. In the referent assignment task, we provided (visual) referents for the context words (e.g., “feeb” refers to a cat) and asked participants to assign the target words to referents (e.g., choose whether “chuv” refers to a horse or a bicycle).

## Method

**Participants.** 678 Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk) workers. Using MTurk’s worker qualifications, we limited participation to workers located in the United States and with a previous HIT approval rate greater than or equal to 90%. We chose MTurk workers as our participants because the number of experimental conditions required a large number of participants. Work by Buhrmester, Kwang, and Gosling (2010) and Crump, McDonnell, and Gureckis (2013) suggests that MTurk is a valid platform for web-based learning experiments.

**Materials.** Sentences took the form “M and N” or “P and Q” (Figure 2). Note that sentences literally included the word “and” in the middle. We generated the actual lexical items randomly for each participant. Ns and Qs were always novel nonsense words and were drawn without replacement from the set {moke, thite, jiv, pif, dex, wug}. Ms and Ps could be either novel or familiar. Novel Ms were drawn from {feeb, bim, lup} and novel Ps were drawn from {zabe, vap, chuv}. Familiar Ms and Ps obeyed a taxonomic organization—familiar Ms were drawn from {hamster, cat, dog} and familiar Ps were drawn from {car, bus, truck}.

To create the audio files, we input the sentences as “X. and. Y.” (e.g., “car. and. chuv.”, including periods) into an American English text-to-speech engine using a female voice.<sup>2</sup> The

---

<sup>2</sup> We pragmatically submitted all of our sentences to the text-to-speech web service that powers Google Translate. During our investigation, the set of voices on the web service changed, which required us to synthesize our stimuli

Exposure sentences			Memory items		Similarity items	
<u><math>m_1 n_1</math></u>	$m_1 n_2$	$m_1 n_3$	Sentence type	Example	Pair type	Example
$m_2 n_1$	<u><math>m_2 n_2</math></u>	$m_2 n_3$	Familiar	$m_1 n_2$	Within-category	$n_1, n_2$
$m_3 n_1$	$m_3 n_2$	<u><math>m_3 n_3</math></u>	Withheld	$m_1 n_1$	Cross-category	$n_1, q_1$
<u><math>p_1 q_1</math></u>	$p_1 q_2$	$p_1 q_3$	Category violation	$m_1 q_2$		
$p_2 q_1$	<u><math>p_2 q_2</math></u>	$p_2 q_3$	Pair violation	$m_1 m_1$		
$p_3 q_1$	$p_3 q_2$	<u><math>p_3 q_3</math></u>				

Figure 2. The MNPQ language and test items for memory and similarity. Underlined sentences were withheld from exposure.

periods between words introduced substantial pauses ranging in length from 150 to 300 ms; piloting revealed that without pauses, it was difficult for participants to distinguish the words. Sentences using only monosyllabic words were around 2 seconds long. Sentences using the sole disyllabic word, hamster, were around 3 seconds long. The referent assignment task involved visual referents. For the context words, we used 128x128 pixel images of a cat, dog, hamster, car, bus, and truck. For the target words, we used 100x100 pixel images of a horse, rabbit, sheep, bear, goldfish, mouse, boat, van, train, motorcycle, plane, and bicycle. Images are shown in Figure 3.

**Design and Procedure.** We parametrically varied coherence. The language for a participant contained either 0/3, 1/3, 2/3, or 3/3 familiar M and P words each. We also varied the amount of exposure to the language—participants heard either 56, 126, 196, or 392 sentences. Before starting the experiment, we asked participants to turn on their speakers and click a button, which played a spoken English word (“airplane”). We required participants to type the word correctly to continue. The experiment had four tasks: exposure, similarity, memory, and referent assignment. Below, we detail each of these tasks.

---

using different software. See also Footnote 5.

**Exposure.** Participants listened to sentences from the language. We withheld six sentences from exposure (Figure 2), yielding 14 unique sentences in the exposure set. Each sentence was heard either 4, 9, 14, or 28 times, giving 56, 126, 196, or 392 total trials. We presented the sentences in random order subject to the constraint that there were no repeated words between consecutive trials (pilot testing suggested that repeated words between trials substantially afforded learning). To encourage compliance, participants had to click a button to hear each sentence.

**Similarity.** For each pair of words in the union of N and Q, we asked participants to rate on a 5 point scale how similar they believed the two words to be in meaning. This resulted in within-category ratings (e.g.,  $n_1$  vs.  $n_2$ ) and cross-category ratings (e.g.,  $n_1$  vs.  $q_1$ ). We presented the pairs in a fixed pseudorandom order containing no repeated words between consecutive trials. Though exposure was entirely auditory, for convenience, we presented these similarity questions as text (e.g., “How similar are **pif** and **thite** ?”); to facilitate mapping between visual and spoken word forms, the speaker button next to each word played the spoken word when clicked. In two catch trials, we asked participants to press the response button corresponding to the solution of a simple arithmetic problem. If participants learned the MN and PQ co-occurrence relationships *and* used these relationships as a basis for lexical categorization, then we expected that participants would rate within-category pairs of words as more similar than cross-category pairs.

**Memory.** Participants listened to sentences and rated on a 5 point scale how confident they were that they had heard the sentence during exposure. We tested four types of sentences:

- *Familiar* sentences heard during exposure.
- *Withheld* sentences not heard during exposure but conforming to the MNPQ structure.
- *Cross-category* sentences of the form MQ and PN.
- *Pair violation* sentences of the form MM, NN, PP, and QQ.




Figure 3. A screenshot of the referent assignment task.

We presented sentences in random order such that there were no repeated words between consecutive trials. In two catch trials,<sup>3</sup> instead of a sentence from the MNPQ language, we played an audio instruction (which could not be repeated by participants) to press a specific response button. If participants learned the MN and PQ co-occurrence relationships, then we expected that they would rate novel grammatical sentences as more familiar than the cross-category sentences.

**Referent assignment.** We provided participants with referents for all of the Ms and Ps and asked them to choose referents for the Ns and Qs (Figure 3). At the top of the screen, we displayed the Ms and Ps in random order and we provided referents by displaying a single image underneath each word. The M and P referents were either animals (cat, dog, hamster) or vehicles (car, bus, truck); either Ms were animals and Ps were vehicles, or vice versa. Recall that some conditions contained *familiar* M and P words; in these cases, we paired the known words with the obvious referents (e.g., “dog” was always paired with an image of a dog). Below the M and P words and their meanings, we displayed a row containing the N and Q words. Under each word, we displayed a two-alternative referent choice between an animal (the “correct” choice for N

<sup>3</sup> In initial data collection, we did not include catch trials. Let [A/3;B] denote the experimental condition with A/3 coherence and B exposures (e.g., [2/3;196] refers to the 2/3 coherence level with 196 exposures). In [0/3;196], 18 out of 40 participants did not receive catch trials. In [3/3;56], 30 out of 43 participants did not receive catch trials. In [3/3;126], 30 out of 40 participants did not receive catch trials. In [3/3;196], 30 out of 40 participants did not receive catch trials.

words) and vehicle words (the “correct” choice for Q words); participants made a choice by clicking on one of the two pictures. If participants learned the MN and PQ co-occurrence relationships *and* used them to form nascent lexical categories *and* used these lexical categories as a basis for inferences about word meaning, then we expected that referent assignment scores would reflect a tendency to choose on the basis of the taxonomic categories of the co-occurring words (e.g., Ns should be animals because they co-occur with Ms, which are known to be animals).

## Results and Discussion


We excluded the 55 participants who did not correctly answer all of the catch trials.<sup>4</sup> Results are shown in Figure 4. For each dependent measure—memory, similarity, and referent assignment—we defined a within-participant score representing the sensitivity to the co-occurrence regularities in the language. Memory score was the difference in mean ratings between novel withheld sentences (e.g.,  $m_1-n_1$ ) and novel category violation sentences (e.g.,  $m_1-q_1$ ). Similarity score was the difference between mean ratings of within-category (e.g.,  $N-N$ ) and cross-category (e.g.  $N-Q$ ) ratings. Referent assignment score was the total number of correct choices in the referent assignment task. We normalized all scores to the interval [-1, 1].

**Analysis approach.** Using linear models, we analyzed two aspects of the data. First, we looked for main effects of coherence on score (i.e., the Condition coefficients in Table 1). Second, as we were interested in the relationship between amount of exposure and score, we looked for exposure  $\times$  coherence interactions. A significant interaction (e.g., the  $E \times C$  coefficients in Table 1) would indicate a difference in how *efficiently* the statistical learning process makes use of evidence at different coherence levels. For all scores, we coded coherence as a categorical variable and analyzed the data using a regression which modeled the mean score in a participant group

---

<sup>4</sup> Recall that some participants – mostly in the 3/3 conditions – did not receive catch trials (see Footnote 3). This does not bias the results in favor of our hypothesis; if anything, this weakens any effect of semantic coherence, as it introduces noise at the highest level of semantic coherence but not at any other level. Indeed, our results are not affected by including subjects who had catch trials and failed them.





*Figure 4.* Experiment 1 results. Each plot shows data for one measure (memory, similarity, referent assignment) in Experiment 1. Scores ranged from -1 to 1. Data points show condition means, error bars show 95% CIs, and dashed lines show the best-fitting linear regression.

(e.g., 3/3-56) as an interactive function of the number of exposures (e.g., 56) times the condition (e.g., full coherence). In other words, our regression equation was  $\text{score} \sim \text{exposures} \times \text{condition}$ .

To examine the differences between the different coherence levels, we used Helmert contrasts analyzing (i) the difference between the 1/3 and 0/3 conditions, (ii) the difference between the 2/3 condition and the 0/3 and 1/3 conditions combined, and (iii) the difference between the 3/3 condition and the 0/3, 1/3, and 2/3 conditions combined. Results of these analyses are shown in Table 1.

Before detailing the results for each measure, we will first state the two broad patterns of results. First, learning was highest in 3/3 condition. Second, we found the strongest evidence of statistical efficiency (i.e., sensitivity to the amount of exposure) in the 3/3 condition.

**Task results.** We report performance on each of the three tasks separately

**Memory.** There was a significant main effect of exposure, with greater exposure resulted in better memory scores. There was also a significant main effect of condition; 2/3 scores were significantly higher than scores from the 0/3 and 1/3 conditions combined and 3/3 scores were significantly higher than scores from the rest of the conditions combined. Because 2/3 and 3/3 scores both outperformed all the respective lower levels of coherence, we also computed this

model using coherence as a continuous variable; the continuous coherence regressor significantly predicted increases in score,  $\beta = 0.06$ ,  $t(619) = 3.86$ ,  $p < 0.0005$ , suggesting that *parametrically* increasing coherence results in *parametric* increases in memory score.

Additionally, there was a significant exposure  $\times$  condition interaction; the effect of exposures on score was significantly higher in 3/3 than in the other conditions combined, suggesting greater efficiency of statistical learning in 3/3. Thus, more semantically coherent linguistic input (1) bolstered memory for the *MN* and *PQ* co-occurrence regularities and (2) increased the efficiency of the statistical learning process responsible for learning those regularities, at least in the 3/3 condition.

**Similarity.** There was a significant main effect of condition: 3/3 scores were significantly higher than in the other conditions combined. Additionally, there was a significant exposure  $\times$  condition interaction; the effect of exposures on score was significantly higher in 3/3 than in the other conditions combined. Thus, more coherent linguistic input (1) increased the distinction between within-category and cross-category pairs of words and (2) increased the efficiency of the statistical learning process involved in making such distinctions, at least in the 3/3 condition.

**Referent assignment.** There were significant main effects of exposure and condition. 2/3 scores were significantly higher than 0/3 and 1/3 scores combined. 3/3 scores were marginally higher than the rest of the scores combined,  $\beta = 0.03$ ,  $t(615) = 1.72$ ,  $p = 0.08$ , possibly because 3/3 coherence and 2/3 coherence may confer comparable advantages on this task. We also computed this model using coherence as a continuous variable; the continuous coherence regressor significantly predicted increases in score,  $\beta = 0.09$ ,  $t(619) = 2.87$ ,  $p < 0.005$ , suggesting that *parametrically* increasing coherence results in *parametric* increases in referent assignment score. None of the interaction terms reached significance, indicating that the amount of exposure to the language and greater coherence independently increased the ability to assign *N* and *Q* words to the correct referents.

**Integrative results.** Why does semantic coherence facilitate MNPQ learning? Frank and Gibson (2011) have shown that MNPQ learning can be bolstered by easing working memory

demands. Additionally, there is evidence that novel words tax the memory system more, as they are encoded in terms of smaller phonological units (Treiman & Danis, 1988). So it is possible that semantic coherence improved MNPQ learning by reducing memory demands.

We tested for this possibility in our data using mediation analyses. In particular, we tested whether memory scores mediated the effect of coherence on either (1) similarity scores or (2) referent assignment scores. In both cases, we found partial mediation. After controlling for memory, the regression coefficient relating coherence and similarity decreased significantly from 0.07 to 0.03, Sobel  $z = 7.80$ ,  $p < 0.005$ ; this reduced value was significantly greater than zero,  $t(620) = 3.50$ ,  $p < 0.001$ , indicating partial mediation. After controlling for memory, the regression coefficient relating coherence and referent assignment score decreased significantly from 0.10 to 0.05, Sobel  $z = 5.33$ ,  $p < 0.005$ ; this reduced value was significantly greater than zero,  $t(616) = 3.15$ ,  $p < 0.005$ , again indicating partial mediation. Thus, improved memory can explain some, but not all, of the increase in similarity and referent assignment scores due to semantic coherence.

**Summary.** In Experiment 1, we found that semantic coherence (1) increased ability to distinguish novel grammatical sentences from sentences violating co-occurrence regularities in the memory task, (2) sharpened sensitivity to lexical category boundaries based on the co-occurrence regularities in the similarity task, and (3) increased inductive bias in associating words with objects in the referent assignment task. Using mediation analysis, we found that evidence that semantic coherence boosts learning in part because it eases memory demands.

The categories participants learned in Experiment 1 included words with familiar meanings and these words were organized into coherent categories. Would it be enough to merely have familiar words without coherence or the reverse? How does the effect of semantic coherence depend on each? In Experiment 2 we test for the effect of meaning and in Experiment 3, we test for the effect of coherence. In Experiment 2, we remove familiar meaning by exposing learners to languages with phonological, as opposed to semantic, coherence. In Experiment 3, we remove coherence by exposing learners to languages with context words that are familiar but do not

adhere to any obvious semantic organization.

## Experiment 2: Phonological coherence

In Experiment 2, we investigated whether learners could learn the language used in Experiment 1 when the context words (Ms and Ps) exhibited phonological, rather than semantic, coherence. We tested three types of coherence: onset, rime, and syllable count.

### Method

**Participants.** 530 MTurk workers, recruited as in Experiment 1, participated in the study.

**Materials.** The three types of phonological coherence<sup>5</sup> were:

- *Onset.* Ms all started with one consonant cluster (pladge, plaaf, plab) and Ps all started with another (zof, zawd, zawsh).
- *Rime.* Ms all ended with one vowel (calo, pawmo, marfo) and Ps all ended with another (zaygee, kaisee, tetchee).
- *Syllable count.* Ms were disyllabic (coomo, fengle, kaisee) and Ps were monosyllabic (gope, jic, skeege).

**Design and Procedure.** The method was identical to that of Experiment 1.

### Results and Discussion

We discarded the 42 participants who did not pass all the catch trials. Results are graphed in Figure 5. Using a regression model with main effects of exposure and condition and an exposure

<sup>5</sup> The stimuli for the rime and syllable count conditions differ from those in the rest of our conditions. For the rest of the conditions, we used a text-to-speech web service provided by Google to generate the audio stimuli (see Footnote 2) for the bulk of the conditions. However, the available voices on this service changed during our experiment. Thus, we generated new stimuli for the rime and syllable count conditions using commercially available software, NaturalReader 10. To ensure that the old and new stimuli were comparable, we performed a partial replication of Experiment 1 using the new synthesis engine; the difference old and new stimuli did not appear to make a substantial difference. See Appendix A for comparisons.




Figure 5. Experiments 2 and 3 results. Each plot shows data for one measure (memory, similarity, referent assignment). Scores ranged from -1 to 1. Points show condition means, error bars show 95% CIs, and dashed lines show the best-fitting linear trend. For comparison, we also include the 3/3 coherence condition from Experiment 1.

× condition interaction, we compared each phonological condition with the 0/3 condition of Experiment 1 using a regression model (Table 2).

**Memory.** There was no main effect of exposure. There was also no main effect of condition—none of the phonological condition scores were significantly different from 0/3 scores. None of the exposure by condition interaction terms were significant.

**Similarity.** Again, we found no main effect of exposure or condition. One interaction term was significant: there appeared to be greater efficiency of statistical learning in the syllable count condition than in the 0/3 condition.

**Referent assignment.** Again, we found no main effect of exposure or condition. None of the exposure by condition interaction terms were significant.

Across the three models, there were no significant predictors, save the one interaction term for syllable count versus 0/3 on the similarity measure, which can be plausibly attributed to chance. This suggests that phonological coherence was virtually indistinguishable from the 0/3 condition in terms of facilitating MNPQ learning. This indicates that mere phonological coherence is not what drives the effects of semantic coherence. In Experiment 3, we consider

whether the mere presence of familiar words (semantic baseline) aids MNPQ learning.

### Experiment 3: Semantic baseline

In Experiment 1, Ms and Ps were all familiar words obeying a taxonomic organization. In Experiment 3, we explored a language with familiar words but no semantic organization—that is, whether a semantic baseline language facilitates distributional learning. We might expect this baseline condition to facilitate learning due to lower memory demands—known words tax the memory system less, which might free learners to identify co-occurrence regularities.

### Methods

**Participants.** 162 MTurk workers, recruited as in Experiment 1.

**Materials.** In the semantic baseline language, the specific M and P words were drawn randomly for each participant from the pool {*shelf, glove, rain, leash, card, ball*}. In the referent assignment task, these known words were paired with images of the obvious referents (e.g., *card* with a picture of a card).

**Design and procedure.** The method was identical to that of Experiment 1.

### Results and Discussion

We discarded the 18 participants who did not pass all the catch trials. Results are graphed in Figure 5. See Table 2 for regression results.

**Memory.** Baseline scores were not significantly different from 0/3 scores and baseline efficiency was not significantly different from 0/3 efficiency.

**Similarity.** Baseline scores were not significantly different from 0/3 scores and baseline efficiency was not significantly different from 0/3 efficiency.

**Referent assignment.** Baseline scores were not significantly different from 0/3 scores and baseline efficiency was not significantly different from 0/3 efficiency.

Apparently, the baseline input appeared to have provided no benefit compared to the novel words of the 0/3 condition, suggesting that the presence of known words by itself does not aid

MNPQ learning.

### General Discussion

In this paper, we have explored whether people might learn word meanings from language itself, using a word’s patterns of co-occurrence with other words as a clue towards word meaning. Previous work on distributional learning presented a paradox: while computational models suggest that distributional statistics are a powerful source of information, experiments with humans show consistent failures without correlated sources, such as natural gender (Braine, 1987) or phonology (Frigo & McDonald, 1998; Lany & Saffran, 2010; Monaghan et al., 2005). In our experiments, we found that semantic coherence also facilitates distributional learning of meaning; knowing that Alice associates with X and Y tells us something about Alice only if X and Y are already meaningful to us. Additionally, the effect of semantic coherence appears to be driven by the conjunction of familiar words and coherent organization – removing either component removed the facilitation.

Our experiments highlight a shortcoming of artificial language learning paradigms. Researchers using entirely artificial languages may be severely limiting the power of distributional learning. To better match experimental settings with conditions that real language learners find themselves in, we argue for more research using “semi-artificial” languages. Alternatively, it may be possible to mimic semantic organization in entirely artificial languages by seeding sentences with nonce topics (e.g., “the sentence you are about to hear is about *chylu*”).

### Limitations

It is worth pointing out some limitations of our approach that may serve as targets of future work. First, we explored a single artificial language, MNPQ. Past research has focused on this language and shown that it is largely resistant to distributional learning. While less is known about other languages, Reeder et al. (2009) found successful distributional learning for the (Q)AXB(R) language, which fixes a positional confound in MNPQ (Ms and Ps are always sentence-initial and Ns and Qs are always sentence-final), suggesting that learning is sensitive to the language

structure. Thus, findings on one language may not generalize to another—it would be useful to investigate semantic coherence for different languages. Second, we investigated a single type of semantic coherence: context words fell into two different taxonomic categories. Future work should investigate other kinds of coherence, such as thematic coherence. Third, we investigated learning for a single syntactico-semantic construction that biases interpretation towards concrete nouns (e.g., “cat and wug”). Future work should investigate other kinds of words and more varied linguistic structures (e.g., “wug cat”). Distributional learning in the presence of semantic coherence might be particularly effective for learning verbs, adjectives, and prepositions (Redington et al., 1998), where visual referent information may be less predictive of meaning.

## Coherence

***Phonological coherence.*** Our finding that phonological coherence does not facilitate learning is may appear at odds with experiments that have reached the opposite conclusion (Frigo & McDonald, 1998; Lany & Saffran, 2010; Monaghan et al., 2005). However, whereas previous work has applied phonological regularities to the *target* words (i.e., the words that experimenters measure learning for), we applied the regularities to the *context* words (i.e., the words that co-occurred with the target words) in order to permit comparison with our semantic coherence conditions. Our operationalization of phonological coherence therefore differs from previous experiments. In our experiments, target words had *second-order* phonological coherence; the target categories themselves did not have phonological regularity but they reliably co-occurred with context categories that did. By contrast, in previous experiments (Lany & Saffran, 2010), target categories had *first-order* coherence: the target categories themselves had phonological regularities (and context categories did not). Both types of coherence have theoretical motivations. Braine (1987) observed that first-order coherence occurs in languages like Spanish and Italian, where gender is marked on the noun (e.g., words that end in *-o* tend to be masculine). We note that second-order coherence occurs in languages like Russian, which mark a noun’s gender on the verb. Thus, distributional learning of word meaning may be sensitive to differences



in the kind of phonological coherence.

***Semantic coherence.*** In our analyses, memory was a significant (partial) mediator of the effect of semantic coherence on similarity and referent assignment scores, suggesting that semantic coherence may reduce memory demands. This is consistent with previous work showing that artificial languages impose high memory burdens on learners and that facilitating memory improves learning (Frank & Gibson, 2011). It is interesting that our semantic baseline language with known words but no semantic organization did not facilitate memory. “Word salad” may not be sufficient for distributional learning—rather, words must obey a coherent organization.

As we mentioned in the introduction, distributional information is useful for acquisition of both syntax and semantics. For example, Redington et al. (1998) developed a distributional learning model for syntactic category which nevertheless extracted many semantic relationships; statistical information may serve as a common foundation for learning some aspects of syntax and semantics. Thus, it may be that semantic coherence also facilitates learning of syntactic category, a possibility we leave for future work.

We suspect that benefits of semantic coherence are fairly general, not limited to distributional learning. As one example, semantic coherence may aid learning based on syntax. Compare “the brusod glorped the chylu” with “the rabbit glorped the duck”. In both cases, we use knowledge of morphology to infer that “glorp” is a verb; verbs typically denote actions, so we can guess that “glorp” does not refer to an object category, eliminating a large space of possible meanings. For the “brusod” case, that seems to be the end of the inference about meaning, whereas in the “rabbit” case, the fact that *animals* participate in the action further constrains meaning (e.g., “glorped” is likely not a synonym for “reimbursed”, “built”, or “proved”).

As another example, semantic coherence may aid purely linguistic explanations. Consider this dialog from the CHILDES corpus (macwhinney00):

Child: What’s a plover?

Father: It’s a kind of bird.

The success of the father’s answer depends on the child knowing (among other things) what a bird is. Contrast that with this hypothetical dialog:

Child: What’s a monoid?

Father: It’s a kind of semigroup.

Not knowing what a semigroup is, the child has learned little about what monoids are. The linguistic context must be familiar and coherent to serve as leverage for the meaning of unknown words. In this respect, our work on semantic coherence is consistent with a large body of literature which has shown that memory for new information is enhanced by consistency with prior knowledge, including results on phonology (Treiman & Danis, 1988), narratives [\(bartlett32\)](#), declarative facts [\(anderson1981\)](#), source memory [\(dewitt2012\)](#), and complex skills like chess [\(chase1973\)](#).

## Distributional learning

***Mechanism.*** Why does semantic coherence facilitate distributional learning—what is the mechanism? We speculate that learners might use semantic coherence to infer the topic of discourse and then attach meaning to novel words on the basis of co-occurrences with these topics. For example, in the highest semantic coherence condition of our experiments, participants may have learned that the topic of discourse is either animal-related or vehicle-related and then tracked co-occurrence between these topics and novel words. If such a mechanism were at work, it might also predict that word learning would have a “contiguous” character, with faster learning for words that occur in more coherent contexts. Future work should reconcile our results with research on word learning as a function of semantic network properties [\(e.g., hills2009, hills2010\)](#).

***In the wild.*** What do our experiments tell us about real language learners? First, we believe that distributional learning may not play a crucial role in the earliest stages of learning meaning (e.g., the naming explosion). In the earliest stages, infants have heard less language,

know fewer words (and thus, the language they do hear may be less semantically coherent), and visual referent information may be available that is predictive of meaning (Riordan & Jones, 2010). However, infants grow older, their database of co-occurrence statistics grows and caregivers may increasingly use abstract words (bergelson+swingley2013), which may require distributional learning (cf. Andrews, Vigliocco, & Vinson, 2009). Thus, distributional learning (for nouns) may be useful for relational terms (e.g., *employee*) or concrete terms whose referents are not available (e.g., *taro*).

Additional research with blind participants (cf. Bedny et al., 2012; Shepard & Cooper, 1992) could help better characterize the role of distributional learning throughout development; it would be informative to know how (e.g.,) knowledge of color terms depends on age in blind learners.

## Conclusion

Since Firth’s edict that we shall know a word “by the company it keeps”, two lines of research have yielded apparently conflicting results. Although computational models suggest that distributional information is a powerful cue towards meaning, artificial learning experiments have suggested a more dubious outlook. Semantic coherence may close this gap between the experimental and the computational: you shall know a word *if you know the company it keeps*.

Table 1

*Regression model for Experiment 1. For readability, exposure values have been divided by 1000.*

Regressor	$\beta$	Std Error	$t$	$p$
Memory				
Intercept	0.0359	0.018	1.91	0.056
Condition: 1/3 – (0/3)	-0.0005	0.027	-0.01	0.984
Condition: 2/3 – (0/3,1/3)	0.0309	0.014	2.09	<0.05*
Condition: 3/3 – (0/3,1/3,2/3)	0.0396	0.010	3.65	<0.001*
Exposures	0.2346	0.083	2.81	<0.005*
E $\times$ C: 1/3 – (0/3)	0.0033	0.120	0.02	0.977
E $\times$ C: 2/3 – (0/3,1/3)	-0.0215	0.065	-0.32	0.743
E $\times$ C: 3/3 – (0/3,1/3,2/3)	0.1326	0.048	2.73	<0.01*
Similarity				
Intercept	0.0501	0.018	2.64	<0.01*
Condition: 1/3 – (0/3)	-0.0070	0.027	-0.25	0.798
Condition: 2/3 – (0/3,1/3)	0.0237	0.014	1.59	0.112
Condition: 3/3 – (0/3,1/3,2/3)	0.0224	0.010	2.04	<0.05*
Exposures	0.1487	0.084	1.77	0.077
E $\times$ C: 1/3 – (0/3)	0.0514	0.121	0.42	0.671
E $\times$ C: 2/3 – (0/3,1/3)	0.0208	0.066	0.31	0.754
E $\times$ C: 3/3 – (0/3,1/3,2/3)	0.1373	0.048	2.80	<0.01*
Referent assignment				
Intercept	0.1087	0.036	3.01	<0.005*
Condition: 1/3 – (0/3)	0.0664	0.052	1.26	0.208
Condition: 2/3 – (0/3,1/3)	0.0616	0.028	2.17	<0.05*
Condition: 3/3 – (0/3,1/3,2/3)	0.0359	0.020	1.72	0.084
Exposures	0.4577	0.159	2.86	<0.005*
E $\times$ C: 1/3 – (0/3)	-0.0919	0.230	-0.39	0.690
E $\times$ C: 2/3 – (0/3,1/3)	-0.1257	0.126	-0.99	0.319
E $\times$ C: 3/3 – (0/3,1/3,2/3)	0.1292	0.093	1.38	0.167

Table 2

*Regression model for Experiments 2 and 3. For readability, exposure values have been divided by 1000.*

Predictor	$\beta$	Std Error	$t$	$p$
Memory				
Intercept	-0.0341	0.027	-1.24	0.215
Condition: Onset – 0/3	0.0626	0.038	1.64	0.100
Condition: Rime – 0/3	0.0652	0.035	1.82	0.068
Condition: Syllable count – 0/3	0.0410	0.038	1.06	0.287
Condition: Semantic incoherent – 0/3	0.0055	0.038	0.14	0.883
Exposures	0.1201	0.119	1.00	0.316
E $\times$ C: Onset – 0/3	-0.0948	0.170	-0.55	0.577
E $\times$ C: Rime – 0/3	-0.1950	0.161	-1.20	0.228
E $\times$ C: Syllable count – 0/3	-0.0735	0.167	-0.43	0.660
E $\times$ C: Semantic incoherent – 0/3	0.0388	0.162	0.23	0.811
Similarity				
Intercept	0.0110	0.025	0.43	0.662
Condition: Onset – 0/3	-0.0031	0.035	-0.08	0.928
Condition: Rime – 0/3	-0.0064	0.033	-0.19	0.846
Condition: Syllable count – 0/3	-0.0455	0.035	-1.27	0.201
Condition: Semantic incoherent – 0/3	-0.0007	0.035	-0.02	0.982
Exposures	-0.0607	0.110	-0.54	0.582
E $\times$ C: Onset – 0/3	-0.0937	0.157	-0.59	0.550
E $\times$ C: Rime – 0/3	0.1951	0.149	1.30	0.191
E $\times$ C: Syllable count – 0/3	0.3049	0.154	1.97	<0.05*
E $\times$ C: Semantic incoherent – 0/3	0.1401	0.150	0.93	0.350
Referent assignment				
Intercept	-0.0553	0.068	-0.81	0.418
Condition: Onset – 0/3	0.1776	0.094	1.88	0.060
Condition: Rime – 0/3	0.0916	0.088	1.03	0.301
Condition: Syllable count – 0/3	0.0234	0.095	0.24	0.806
Condition: Semantic incoherent – 0/3	0.0868	0.094	0.91	0.359
Exposures	0.5462	0.296	1.84	0.066
E $\times$ C: Onset – 0/3	-0.6122	0.421	-1.45	0.146
E $\times$ C: Rime – 0/3	-0.3243	0.400	-0.80	0.418
E $\times$ C: Syllable count – 0/3	-0.0692	0.414	-0.16	0.867
E $\times$ C: Semantic incoherent – 0/3	-0.7403	0.402	-1.83	0.066

## References

- Andrews, M., Vigliocco, G., & Vinson, D. (2009). Integrating experiential and distributional data to learn semantic representations. *Psychological Review*, 116(3), 463–498.
- Baldwin, D. A. (1993, September). Early referential understanding: Infants' ability to recognize referential acts for what they are. *Developmental Psychology*, 29(5), 832.
- Bedny, M., Koster-Hale, J., Johnston, W., Yazzolino, L., & Saxe, R. (2012). To peek and to peer: "visual" verb meanings are largely unaffected by congenital blindness. In *Proceedings of the 34th annual conference of the cognitive science society* (pp. 1–1). Sapporo.
- Berry-Rogghe, G. L. M. (1973). The Computation of Collocations and their Relevance in Lexical Studies. In A. Aitken, R. Bailey, & N. Hamilton-Smith (Eds.), *The computer and literary studies* (pp. 103–112). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Braine, M. D. S. (1966). Learning the positions of words relative to a marker element. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 72(4), 532–540.
- Braine, M. D. S. (1987). What is learned in acquiring word classes: A step toward an acquisition theory. In *Mechanisms of language acquisition* (pp. 65–87). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Brooks, P. J., Braine, M. D. S., Catalano, L., Brody, R. E., & Sudhalter, V. (1993, February). Acquisition of Gender-like Noun Subclasses in an Artificial Language: The Contribution of Phonological Markers to Learning. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 32(1), 76–95.
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2010). Amazon's Mechanical Turk. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*.
- Church, K., & Hanks, P. (1990). Word association norms, mutual information, and lexicography. *Computational Linguistics*, 16(1), 22–29.
- Clark, E. V. (1988, June). On the logic of contrast. *Journal of Child Language*, 15(02), 317.
- Clark, H. (1968). On the use and meaning of prepositions. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 7(2), 421–431.
- Crump, M. J. C., McDonnell, J. V., & Gureckis, T. M. (2013, March). Evaluating Amazon's

- Mechanical Turk as a Tool for Experimental Behavioral Research. *PloS One*, 8(3), e57410.
- Firth, J. R. (1957). A Synopsis of Linguistic Theory 1930-1955. In *Studies in linguistic analysis* (pp. 1–32). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Frank, M. C., & Gibson, E. (2011). Overcoming memory limitations in rule learning. *Language Learning and Development*, 7(2), 130–148.
- Frigo, L., & McDonald, J. L. (1998, August). Properties of Phonological Markers That Affect the Acquisition of Gender-Like Subclasses. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 39(2), 218–245.
- Geffroy, A., Lafon, P., Seidel, G., & Tournier, M. (1973). Lexicometric analysis of cooccurrences. In A. Aitken, R. Bailey, & N. Hamilton-Smith (Eds.), *The computer and literary studies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gerken, L., Wilson, R., & Lewis, W. (2005). Infants can use distributional cues to form syntactic categories. *Journal of Child Language*.
- Gleitman, L. (1990, January). The Structural Sources of Verb Meanings. *Language Acquisition*, 1(1), 3–55.
- Harris, Z. S. (1951). *Methods in structural linguistics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hollich, G. J., Hirsh-Pasek, K., & Golinkoff, R. M. (2000, January). Breaking the Language Barrier: An Emergentist Coalition Model for the Origins of Word Learning. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 65(3), i–135.
- Johns, B. T., & Jones, M. (2012). Perceptual Inference Through Global Lexical Similarity. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 4(1), 103–120.
- Kempe, V., & Brooks, P. J. (2001). The Role of Diminutives in the Acquisition of Russian Gender: Can Elements of Child-directed Speech Aid in Learning Morphology? *Language Learning*, 51(2), 221–256.
- Landauer, T. K., & Dumais, S. T. (1997, April). A solution to Plato's problem: The latent semantic analysis theory of acquisition, induction, and representation of knowledge. *Psychological Review*, 104(2), 211.

- Lany, J., & Saffran, J. (2010). From Statistics to Meaning: Infants' Acquisition of Lexical Categories. *Psychological Science*, 21(2), 284.
- Maratsos, M. P., & Chalkley, M. A. (1980). The internal language of children's syntax: The ontogenesis and representation of syntactic categories. In K. E. Nelson (Ed.), *Children's language* (pp. 127–214). Gardner.
- Markman, E. M. (1991). *Categorization and naming in children: Problems of induction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Monaghan, P., Chater, N., & Christiansen, M. H. (2005). The differential role of phonological and distributional cues in grammatical categorisation. *Cognition*.
- Redington, M., Chater, N., & Finch, S. (1998). Distributional information: A powerful cue for acquiring syntactic categories. *Cognitive Science*, 22(4), 425–469.
- Reeder, P., Newport, E., & Aslin, R. (2009). The role of distributional information in linguistic category formation. *Proceedings of the 31st Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*.
- Riordan, B., & Jones, M. N. (2010). Redundancy in perceptual and linguistic experience: Comparing feature-based and distributional models of semantic representation. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 3(2), 303–345.
- Rubenstein, H., & Goodenough, J. (1965). Contextual correlates of synonymy. *Communications of the ACM*, 8(10), 627–633.
- Saffran, J., Aslin, R., & Newport, E. (1996). Statistical learning by 8-month-old infants. *Science*, 274(5294), 1926–1928.
- Saffran, J., Newport, E., & Aslin, R. N. (1996). Word segmentation: The role of distributional cues. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 35(4), 606–621.
- Salton, G., & McGill, M. J. (1983). *Introduction to Modern Information Retrieval*. McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Schütze, H. (1992). Dimensions of meaning. *Proceedings of the 1992 ACM/IEEE conference on Supercomputing*, 787–796.




- Shepard, R., & Cooper, L. (1992). Representation of colors in the blind, color-blind, and normally sighted. *Psychological Science*, 3(2), 97.
- Smith, K. H. (1966). Grammatical intrusions in the recall of structured letter pairs: Mediated transfer or position learning? *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 72(4), 580–588.
- Smith, L., & Yu, C. (2008, March). Infants rapidly learn word-referent mappings via cross-situational statistics. *Cognition*, 106(3), 1558–1568.
- Stefflre, V., & Reich, P. (1971). Some eliciting and computational procedures for descriptive semantics. In P. Kay (Ed.), *Explorations in mathematical anthropology*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Szalay, L., & Bryson, J. (1974). Psychological meaning: Comparative analyses and theoretical implications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
- Treiman, R., & Danis, C. (1988). Short-term memory errors for spoken syllables are affected by the linguistic structure of the syllables. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 14(1), 145–152.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1953/1997). *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford, UK; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Yu, C., & Ballard, D. H. (2007, August). A unified model of early word learning: Integrating statistical and social cues. *Neurocomputing*, 70(13-15), 2149–2165.

## Appendix A

## Old versus new stimuli comparison

We performed a partial replication of Experiment 1 with the new stimuli. We collected data in four out of the sixteen experimental conditions and the results mirror those found with the old stimuli:



## Appendix B

Regression results including participants who received catch trials but did not pass all of them  
Experiment 1

Predictor	$\beta$	Std Error	$t$	$p$
Intercept	0.0384	0.017	2.15	<0.05*
Condition: 1/3 – (0/3)	0.0016	0.025	0.06	0.948
Condition: 2/3 – (0/3,1/3)	0.0211	0.013	1.51	0.130
Condition: 3/3 – (0/3,1/3,2/3)	0.0384	0.010	3.67	<0.001*
Exposures	0.2038	0.079	2.56	<0.05*
E $\times$ C: 1/3 – (0/3)	0.0042	0.113	0.03	0.970
E $\times$ C: 2/3 – (0/3,1/3)	-0.0014	0.062	-0.02	0.981
E $\times$ C: 3/3 – (0/3,1/3,2/3)	0.1232	0.046	2.64	<0.01*

---

Predictor	$\beta$	Std Error	$t$	$p$
Intercept	0.0469	0.017	2.65	<0.01*
Condition: 1/3 – (0/3)	-0.0078	0.025	-0.30	0.758
Condition: 2/3 – (0/3,1/3)	0.0174	0.013	1.26	0.206
Condition: 3/3 – (0/3,1/3,2/3)	0.0233	0.010	2.25	<0.05*
Exposures	0.1481	0.078	1.88	0.059
E $\times$ C: 1/3 – (0/3)	0.0560	0.112	0.49	0.619
E $\times$ C: 2/3 – (0/3,1/3)	0.0344	0.061	0.55	0.577
E $\times$ C: 3/3 – (0/3,1/3,2/3)	0.1288	0.046	2.78	<0.01*

---

Predictor	$\beta$	Std Error	$t$	$p$
Intercept	0.0984	0.033	2.91	<0.005*
Condition: 1/3 – (0/3)	0.0439	0.049	0.89	0.370
Condition: 2/3 – (0/3,1/3)	0.0604	0.026	2.28	<0.05*
Condition: 3/3 – (0/3,1/3,2/3)	0.0412	0.019	2.08	<0.05*
Exposures	0.4768	0.150	3.16	<0.005*
E $\times$ C: 1/3 – (0/3)	-0.0674	0.215	-0.31	0.754
E $\times$ C: 2/3 – (0/3,1/3)	-0.1032	0.118	-0.87	0.381
E $\times$ C: 3/3 – (0/3,1/3,2/3)	0.1168	0.088	1.31	0.189

## Experiments 2 and 3

Predictor	$\beta$	Std Error	$t$	$p$
Intercept	-0.0227	0.026	-0.85	0.390
Condition: Onset – 0/3	0.0463	0.036	1.26	0.207
Condition: Rime – 0/3	0.0401	0.034	1.16	0.246
Condition: Syllable count – 0/3	0.0430	0.037	1.16	0.245
Condition: Semantic incoherent – 0/3	-0.0020	0.036	-0.05	0.954
Exposures	0.0777	0.115	0.67	0.501
E $\times$ C: Onset – 0/3	-0.0409	0.163	-0.25	0.802
E $\times$ C: Rime – 0/3	-0.0993	0.157	-0.63	0.527
E $\times$ C: Syllable count – 0/3	-0.0641	0.161	-0.39	0.690
E $\times$ C: Semantic incoherent – 0/3	0.0852	0.156	0.54	0.586

---

Predictor	$\beta$	Std Error	$t$	$p$
Intercept	0.0139	0.024	0.57	0.563
Condition: Onset – 0/3	-0.0097	0.033	-0.28	0.771
Condition: Rime – 0/3	-0.0102	0.031	-0.32	0.745
Condition: Syllable count – 0/3	-0.0402	0.033	-1.19	0.233
Condition: Semantic incoherent – 0/3	-0.0092	0.033	-0.27	0.782
Exposures	-0.0711	0.105	-0.67	0.499
E $\times$ C: Onset – 0/3	-0.0501	0.148	-0.33	0.736
E $\times$ C: Rime – 0/3	0.1874	0.143	1.31	0.190
E $\times$ C: Syllable count – 0/3	0.3049	0.146	2.07	<0.05*
E $\times$ C: Semantic incoherent – 0/3	0.1645	0.142	1.15	0.249

---

Predictor	$\beta$	Std Error	$t$	$p$
Intercept	-0.0471	0.064	-0.72	0.467
Condition: Onset – 0/3	0.1250	0.089	1.39	0.163
Condition: Rime – 0/3	0.0730	0.084	0.86	0.387
Condition: Syllable count – 0/3	-0.0100	0.090	-0.11	0.911
Condition: Semantic incoherent – 0/3	0.0680	0.090	0.75	0.449
Exposures	0.5307	0.282	1.88	0.060
E $\times$ C: Onset – 0/3	-0.4641	0.398	-1.16	0.244
E $\times$ C: Rime – 0/3	-0.3311	0.382	-0.86	0.387
E $\times$ C: Syllable count – 0/3	0.0376	0.393	0.09	0.923
E $\times$ C: Semantic incoherent – 0/3	-0.6766	0.382	-1.77	0.076