

**Title:** Lexical acquisition through category matching: 12-month-old infants associate words to visual categories

**Authors:** Barbara Pomiechowska<sup>1</sup> & Teodora Gliga<sup>2</sup>

**Affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup> Cognitive Development Center, Department of Cognitive Science, Central European University, Hungary

<sup>2</sup> School of Psychology, University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom

**Corresponding author:** Barbara Pomiechowska, Cognitive Development Center, Department of Cognitive Science, Central European University, Nádor u. 9, Budapest 1051, Hungary, email: [PomiechowskaB@ceu.edu](mailto:PomiechowskaB@ceu.edu)

**Word count:** 140 words (abstract) + 2177 words (main text; does not include Methods and Results sections)

**Abstract**

Although it is widely recognized that human infants build a sizeable conceptual repertoire before mastering language, it remains a matter of debate whether and to what extent early conceptual and category knowledge contributes to language development. We addressed this question by investigating whether 12-month-olds used preverbal categories to discover the meanings of new words. We showed that infants ( $N = 18$ ) readily extended novel labels to previously unseen exemplars of preverbal visual categories after only a single labeling episode, while struggling to do so when taught labels for unfamiliar categories ( $N = 18$ ). These results suggest that infants expect labels to denote categories of objects and are equipped with learning mechanisms responsible for matching prelinguistic knowledge structures with linguistic inputs. This ability is in line with the idea that our conceptual machinery provides building blocks for vocabulary and language acquisition.

**Keywords:** word learning, word extension, categorization, cognitive development, infancy



1  
2  
3 Language not only pervades human communication and social interactions, but also  
4  
5 provides us with powerful cognitive tools. In particular, language enables the  
6  
7 development of new systems of knowledge (Spelke, 2003) and their transmission  
8  
9 (Gelman & Roberts, 2017). Important concepts are lexicalized (e.g. “coffee”,  
10  
11 “computer”, “DNA”) and labels are used in generic statements to convey semantic  
12  
13 knowledge that extends beyond the here and now (e.g. “Coffee keeps people awake”).  
14  
15 The development of these devices of cultural transmission starts in the form of word  
16  
17 learning in early infancy. Although infants witness only particular things being named  
18  
19 for them, their mental lexicon is not a catalogue of sounds paired with those items.  
20  
21 Rather, it contains labels standing for categories of objects, such as body parts, food  
22  
23 items, or artefacts (Bergelson & Swingley, 2012; Parise & Csibra, 2012). To date,  
24  
25 however, it remains unknown how word meanings enabling the storage and  
26  
27 generalization of cultural knowledge develop. Two main answers have been  
28  
29 suggested.  
30  
31

32  
33 On one hand, some have argued that the discovery of word meanings is  
34  
35 initially guided by attentional biases (Smith, Jones, & Landau, 1992) that make  
36  
37 children attend to salient perceptual features and interpret words as names for objects  
38  
39 sharing these features (Smith, 2003). For example, toddlers tend to generalize new  
40  
41 words to objects of the same shape (a phenomenon known as *shape bias*, Colunga &  
42  
43 Smith, 2005). However, experience with language is needed for this strategy to  
44  
45 emerge (Smith et al., 2002; Smith & Samuelson, 2006), and children below 2 years of  
46  
47 age struggle to use it (Son, Smith, & Goldstone, 2008). This observation is in stark  
48  
49 contrast with the evidence that preverbal infants successfully generalize familiar  
50  
51 words (Bergelson & Swingley, 2012; Parise & Csibra, 2012), suggesting that before  
52  
53

1  
2  
3 shape bias develops, other cognitive mechanisms must support the acquisition of  
4  
5 word meanings.  
6  
7

8           On the other hand, it has been proposed that language builds on preexisting  
9  
10 conceptual knowledge (Clark, 2017; Mandler, 2004). Indeed, it has been widely  
11 documented that infants have access to some innate concepts (e.g. object, agent,  
12 Carey, 2009) and readily learn a variety of novel categories, both with help from  
13 communication (Ferguson & Waxman, 2016; Ferry, Hespos, & Waxma, 2013) and,  
14 more importantly, without it (Mandler, 2004; Mareschal & Quinn, 2001). Preverbal  
15 categories could become the meanings of new words thanks to a specialized word-  
16 learning mechanism, referred to as *category matching* (Macnamara, 1982; Nelson,  
17 1973). According to this account, infants seek to map new words onto categorical  
18 representations already available in their conceptual repertoire. Once the new word  
19 becomes linked to a specific category, word generalization beyond the labeling  
20 context comes for free as all objects identified as members of this category fall under  
21 the label describing it. Such a mechanism would ensure fast word learning from  
22 minimal input. Despite the consensus that language must, to some degree, be built  
23 upon our prelinguistic representations (Clark, 2004), to date there is no direct  
24 evidence that category knowledge can be directly used as a source of word meanings  
25 in infancy.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45           Here, we asked whether human infants possess special cognitive mechanisms,  
46 such as *category matching*, that ensure efficient word learning and open the way for  
47 the acquisition of knowledge conveyed through language. More specifically, across  
48 three experiments, we investigated whether preverbal categories can be accessed by  
49 infants and interpreted as word meanings when only one of the category tokens is  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

55  
56

named. First, we tested whether 12-month-olds use preverbal category knowledge to

57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 identify the meanings of new nouns and extend them to previously unseen category  
4  
5 exemplars (Experiment 1). Then, we explored whether preverbal categories were  
6  
7 necessary and sufficient to explain the observed word extension effects (Experiments  
8  
9 2 and 3).

## 10 11 12 **Experiment 1**

13  
14  
15 Twelve-month-olds viewed objects from two new categories, either in a category-  
16  
17 training procedure or in a manner not conducive to category learning. Then, they saw  
18  
19 a single exemplar of each category being labeled. We reasoned that, when given the  
20  
21 opportunity to learn categories before labeling, infants would engage in word learning  
22  
23 through category matching and extend the new labels to previously unseen exemplars  
24  
25 of these categories.  
26  
27

## 28 29 **Methods**

30  
31 **Participants.** In total, 36 healthy, full-term 12-month-olds participated in the  
32  
33 experiment. Eighteen infants were assigned to the blocked-categories group (10  
34  
35 females, average age 12.11 months, range 11.64 to 12.76 months) and 18 to the  
36  
37 interleaved-categories group (8 females, average age 12.06 months, range 11.73 to  
38  
39 12.65 months). An additional 7 infants were tested but excluded from the final sample  
40  
41 as they did not provide enough data ( $n = 4$ ; see Data Analysis) or failed to complete  
42  
43 the experiment ( $n = 3$ ). Families were recruited on a voluntary basis through  
44  
45 advertisement in the local press. All infants were raised in monolingual English-  
46  
47 speaking families and written informed consent was received from all caregivers. The  
48  
49 target sample size of 36 was determined a priori based on previous studies that have  
50  
51 investigated word-learning and word-extension in infancy using eye tracking (e.g. Yin  
52  
53 & Csibra, 2015). We acknowledge, however, that more optimal approaches for  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

determining sample sizes (i.e. taking into account publication biases) have been recently suggested (e.g. Anderson, Kelley, & Maxwell, 2017).

**Apparatus.** Infants' binocular gaze data were acquired using a Tobii TX 300 eye-tracker (Tobii Technology AB, Danderyd, Sweden) with a 23-inch integrated monitor (sampling rate: 120 Hz, resolution: 1920 x 1080 px). The sound was delivered via external stereo speakers. The experiment was administered using custom-built Matlab scripts with the Psychophysics Toolbox for stimuli presentation (Brainard, 1997) and the Tobii Pro Analytics software development kit for data collection (<https://www.tobii.com/product-listing/tobii-pro-sdk/>).

### **Stimuli**

**Pictorial stimuli.** We selected two types of objects that were unfamiliar to the infants: coffee makers and staplers (Fig. 1). Prior to the experimental session, the caregivers confirmed that the infants had not been previously exposed to these objects. Multiple color photographs ( $n = 15$ ) were selected for each type of object. The depicted items differed in color, orientation, and shape, but had a similar surface area. All stimuli were presented on a white background around 15 cm x 15 cm in size that subtended approximately  $14^\circ$  of the visual angle. For each object category, a subset of 13 images was randomly selected (different for every participant): 8 images for the familiarization, 1 for the word learning, and 4 for the word recognition test.

**Speech stimuli.** The speech stimuli were two phonetically distinct pseudowords that conformed to English phonotactics: *rif* and *toma*. As infants process labels that are presented in sentence frames more efficiently (Fenell & Waxman, 2009), the words were embedded in carrier phrases (see Design and Procedure). All speech stimuli



were recorded by a female native speaker of British English, using infant-directed speech.


**Design and Procedure.** The experiment consisted of three phases administered without pause: familiarization, word training, and word-extension test, for a total length of about 4 minutes. Infants were randomly assigned to one of the two groups, which differed only with respect to the type of familiarization, i.e. *blocked* or *interleaved categories*. Infants were tested individually in a soundproof, dimly lit room. They sat in a car seat approximately 60 cm away from the monitor. To obtain a reliable eye-tracking signal, a five-point calibration sequence was used prior to the recording and was repeated until all points were successfully calibrated.

**Familiarization.** Each infant was exposed to a set of objects consisting of 16 visual items, 8 tokens per category. Images were introduced by sliding into the geometrical center of the picture located within a preselected area (1580 x 620 pixels) positioned in the middle of the display. Each image was presented for 1.5 s, zooming in and out, before leaving the display by sliding out.

In both groups, infants received two familiarization streams containing 8 items each. In the *blocked-categories* group, one familiarization stream consisted of 8 items from category A and the other of 8 items from category B (Fig. 1). The order of item appearance and the order of category presentation (A v. B) were randomized. In the *interleaved-categories* group, both familiarization streams included 4 items from one category interleaved with 4 items from the other category. The items were randomized with the constraint that no more than two tokens of the same category could be presented in succession.

Younger and Fearing (1999) demonstrated that, when presented with items

from two distinct real-world categories (i.e. CAT and HORSE) interleaved within a single familiarization stream, infants had difficulty forming two differentiated categories. In contrast, infants excel at forming categories when familiarized with items of a single real-world category (i.e. CAT and HORSE, see Eimas & Quinn, 1994).



**Fig. 1. Schematic visualization of the experimental design in Experiment 1.** The task had three phases: familiarization, word training, and word-extension test. Only the familiarization phase differed between the conditions with respect to whether the tokens of the two target categories were blocked into separate familiarization streams (the *blocked-categories* group) or not (the *interleaved-categories* group). Speech stimuli were administered only during the word training and word-extension test (see bottom row). The depicted object images represent a sample stimuli sequence corresponding to one experimental session. Each category token was presented only once.

Moreover, grouping or highlighting various exemplars of the same category is a strategy employed by teachers when they intend to demonstrate category- as opposed to exemplar-specific properties (Shafto, Goodman & Griffiths, 2014). Therefore, the

1  
2  
3 presentation of category A and category B tokens in two separate familiarization  
4  
5 streams should lead to formation of two distinct categories, whereas a presentation of  
6  
7 tokens from category A interleaved with tokens from category B should lead to  
8  
9 weaker categorization performance or a lack thereof (see also Experiment 3).

10  
11 **Word training.** Following familiarization, infants were introduced to two novel  
12  
13 words, each paired with a previously unseen exemplar of one of the target categories.  
14  
15 Each object was labeled six times: “*This a NAME! NAME! Do you see the NAME? Look*  
16  
17 *at the NAME! Find the NAME! NAME!*” The pictures were kept still during the delivery  
18  
19 of the auditory stimuli, but moved to the four corners and the center of the screen  
20  
21 (randomized) in between the labeling phrases to maximize the infants’ interest in the  
22  
23 procedure. The label-category pairings and the order of presentation of a particular  
24  
25 label-category pair during the training were counterbalanced across infants.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 **Word-extension test.** The test phase comprised 4 trials; 2 per word. All test trials had  
32  
33 the same structure: after fixating on a centrally displayed attention getter, infants were  
34  
35 exposed to two novel images (one from each category), different at each of the four  
36  
37 test trials. The images were displayed side-by-side for 10 seconds. Only one label was  
38  
39 provided during each test trial. The label was uttered three times: first, embedded in a  
40  
41 carrier phrase and then twice as a single word with short periods of silence between  
42  
43 presentations, i.e. “*Look at the NAME! NAME! NAME!*”  
44  
45

46  
47 Images were presented in silence for 2 seconds before the onset of speech so  
48  
49 that we could measure the baseline preference for the two objects. The three tokens of  
50  
51 the target label were delivered after 2.8 seconds, 5 seconds, and 7.5 seconds,  
52  
53 respectively. The side on which the images appeared and the order of word and image  
54  
55 presentation were counterbalanced across participants. There were two possible word  
56  
57 orders: ABAB and BABA.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 A short attention getter was presented in the center of the display before every  
4 familiarization stream, every word-training trial, and every word-extension test. The  
5 attention getter was gaze-controlled by the infants. That is, its duration was not  
6 predefined, but it depended on the infants' looking behavior. The attention getter was  
7 displayed on the screen until infants fixated on it continuously for 500 ms.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 **Data analysis.** Infants had to fulfill two criteria to be included in the final sample: (1)  
15 minimum 50% attendance to the screen during each of the three experimental phases,  
16 (2) contribution of a minimum of one valid test trial for each word (i.e. a trial with  
17 more than 50% attendance to the test stimuli computed across both pre- and post-  
18 naming). Infants in both groups spent a comparable amount of time attending to the  
19 stimuli (blocked-categories group:  $M = 77\%$  of total session time,  $SD = 11\%$ ,  
20 interleaved-categories group:  $M = 78\%$ ,  $SD = 9\%$ ,  $t(34) = .09$ ,  $p = .930$ ) and provided  
21 a comparable amount of valid test trials (blocked-categories group:  $M = 3.61$  trials,  
22  $SD = 0.70$ ,  $R = 2$  to  $4$ ; interleaved-categories group:  $M = 3.78$  trials,  $SD = 0.55$ ,  $R = 2$   
23 to  $4$ ,  $t(34) = .80$ ,  $p = .430$ ).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 To analyze infants' looking behavior during test trials, we defined two regions  
37 in the test display, one corresponding to the target and one to the distracter object.  
38  
39 Following the terminology used in the eye-tracking literature, we refer to these  
40 regions as areas of interest (AOI): the target AOI and the distracter AOI, respectively.  
41 We investigated two indices of word comprehension: the *proportion of target looking*  
42 and the *longest look difference scores*. The *proportion of target looking* (PTL) was  
43 computed by dividing the amount of time spent in the target AOI by the total amount  
44 of time spent in the target and distracter AOIs. Using proportional rather than absolute  
45 looking times ensure that the effects are not driven by infants who display overall  
46 longer looking times. The longest look was defined as the longest time spent within a  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 single visit to an AOI (a visit corresponds to the sum of fixations within the AOI not  
4 separated by a fixation outside of the AOI). The *longest look difference scores*  
5 (LLDS) were calculated by subtracting the longest look to the target from the longest  
6 look to the distractor and then dividing this difference by the sum of longest looks to  
7 both the target and distractor. The difference scores ranged from -1 to 1, with positive  
8 values indicating that infants directed their longest look to the target.  
9

10  
11 To assess the impact of the speech stimuli delivered during the test on the  
12 infants' looking behavior, test trials were divided into pre-naming and post-naming  
13 segments and both word-comprehension measures were derived separately for each  
14 segment (for the time course of infants' target fixation see Figure S1 in the  
15 supplemental material available online). The post-naming segment started 367 ms  
16 after the onset of the first token of the target word (Swingley, Pinto & Fernald, 1999)  
17 and lasted until the end of the trial (i.e. the pre-naming lasted for 3.167 seconds,  
18 whereas the post-naming lasted 6.833 seconds). An increase from pre- to post-naming  
19 in the looking toward the target as indexed by the PLT or LLDS was taken as  
20 evidence for word extension.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

## 39 **Results**


40  
41 To assess infants' word extension performance, the mean proportions of target  
42 looking time during the pre- and post-naming segments of the test were entered into a  
43 two-way mixed ANOVA with group (blocked-categories familiarization v.  
44 interleaved-categories familiarization) as a between-subject factor and segment (pre-  
45 v. post-naming) as a within-subject factor (Fig. 2). This analysis yielded a significant  
46 main effect of segment,  $F(1,34) = 4.29, p = .046, \eta_p^2 = .11$ , and an interaction between  
47 group and segment,  $F(1,34) = 12.39, p = .001, \eta_p^2 = .27$ . In line with our predictions,  
48 follow-up paired-samples  $t$  tests revealed that this interaction was due to the increased  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 target looking from the pre- to the post-naming segment in the blocked-categories  
4  
5 group,  $t(17) = 3.69$ ,  $p = .002$ ,  $d = .87$ , 95% CI = [.04, .14] (pre-naming: M = .51, SD  
6  
7 = .08, post-naming: M = .60, SD = .12), with 15/18 infants showing this effect, but  
8  
9 not in the control group,  $t(17) = 1.11$ ,  $p = .283$ ,  $d = .26$ , 95% CI = [-.02, .07] (pre-  
10  
11 naming: M = .52, SD = .17, post-naming: M = .49, SD = .16). Moreover, following  
12  
13 naming, only infants who received category training looked at the named object  
14  
15 significantly more than expected by chance (.50),  $t(17) = 3.58$ ,  $p = .002$ ,  $d = .84$ , 95%  
16  
17 CI = [.54, .66] (interleaved-categories group:  $t(17) = .23$ ,  $p = .82$ ,  $d = .05$ , 95% CI =  
18  
19 [.41, .57]). Prior to naming, neither group displayed a preference for either of the test  
20  
21 stimuli (blocked-categories group:  $t(17) = .60$ ,  $p = .558$ ,  $d = .14$ , 95% CI = [.47, .55],  
22  
23 interleaved-categories group:  $t(17) = .41$ ,  $p = .690$ ,  $d = .09$ , 95% CI = [.43, .60]).

24  
25  
26 Please note that for two-samples tests we report 95% confidence intervals (CI) for the  
27  
28 difference in the mean of the dependent variable and for one-samples tests we report  
29  
30 95% CIs for the mean.

31  
32  
33 A two-way mixed ANOVA on the average longest look difference scores  
34  
35 yielded a significant interaction between group and segment:  $F(1,34) = 15.37$ ,  $p <$   
36  
37  $.001$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = .31$ . Infants' looks towards the target increased in duration after labeling in  
38  
39 the blocked-categories group,  $t(17) = 4.06$ ,  $p = .001$ ,  $d = .96$ , 95% CI = [.13, .42] (pre-  
40  
41 naming: M = -.01, SD = .20, post-naming: M = .26, SD = .26), with 16/18 infants  
42  
43 displaying this pattern of results, but not in the interleaved-categories group,  $t(17) =$   
44  
45  $1.49$ ,  $p = .154$ ,  $d = .35$ , 95% CI = [-.04, .25] (pre-naming: M = .06, SD = .35; post-  
46  
47 naming: M = -.04, SD = .37). Before labeling, the difference scores were at chance in  
48  
49 both groups (blocked-categories group:  $t(17) = .29$ ,  $p = .776$ ,  $d = .07$ , 95% CI = [-.11,  
50  
51 .09], interleaved-categories group:  $t(17) = .76$ ,  $p = .458$ ,  $d = .18$ , 95% CI = [-.11,  
52  
53 .24]). After labeling, the longest look difference scores increased above chance in the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 blocked-categories group,  $t(17) = 4.32$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $d = 1.02$ , 95% CI = [.13, .39], but  
4  
5 not in the interleaved-categories group,  $t(17) = .46$ ,  $p = .65$ ,  $d = .11$ , 95% CI = [-.22,  
6  
7 .14].  
8  
9



10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 **Fig. 2. Results of Experiment 1: (a) mean proportions of target looking time and (b) mean**  
29 **longest look difference scores during test, split by pre- v. post-naming, for the blocked- and**  
30 **interleaved-category groups.** Diamonds indicate means and black horizontal lines indicate  
31 medians. The bottom and the top of the boxes represent the first and the third quartiles. Whiskers  
32 extend from the middle quartiles to the smallest and largest values within 1.5 times the  
33 interquartile range. Black points connected across boxes represent the data sets of individual  
34 participants. Dotted lines represent the chance level: (a) 0.5, (b) 0. Significant effects are  
35 indicated with asterisks: \*\*  $p < .01$ . Positive values in (b) indicate that longest looks were  
36 directed at the target and negative values that they were directed at the distracter.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

## 42 Discussion

43  
44 Our results suggest that preverbal categories are used by infants as meanings of newly  
45 encountered labels and enable them to determine the extensions of these labels after  
46 only a single naming episode. However, two alternative explanations of our findings  
47 should be considered. First, although unlikely (Son, Smith, & Goldstone, 2008), it  
48 remains possible that infants could generalize new words without prior category  
49 knowledge. We addressed this possibility in Experiment 2 by testing whether  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 removing the category training would affect infants' word extension performance.  
4  
5 Second, the chance performance in the interleaved-category group might have been  
6  
7 due to learning a single superordinate-like category that included both coffee makers  
8  
9 and staplers. Children are reluctant to attach multiple names to a single object (a  
10  
11 phenomenon known as *mutual exclusivity*, Markman & Watchel, 1988), so they might  
12  
13 have disregarded the naming events because objects from the single superordinate  
14  
15 category were given two different names. We investigated this issue in Experiment 3,  
16  
17 by testing whether the interleaved-category presentation of two kinds of objects leads  
18  
19 to formation of a single category.  
20  
21

## 22 23 **Experiment 2**

24  
25 To establish whether word generalization depends on category knowledge, we  
26  
27 modified the task used in Experiment 1 by removing the familiarization phase.  
28  
29 Furthermore, we administered an additional word-recognition test that followed the  
30  
31 word-extension test. By using the same objects as presented during the labeling  
32  
33 events, this test was meant to investigate whether it is specifically the ability to  
34  
35 generalize words, and not the ability to map words onto the specific objects, that is  
36  
37 impaired without category knowledge.  
38  
39

## 40 41 **Methods**

42  
43 **Participants.** Eighteen healthy full-term 12-month-olds (6 females, average age  
44  
45 12.08 months, range 11.5 to 12.9 months) participated in the experiment. Thirteen  
46  
47 other infants were excluded from the analysis because they did not provide enough  
48  
49 data ( $n = 10$ ; following the same exclusion criteria as in Experiment 1), because the  
50  
51 experiment was interrupted ( $n = 1$ ), because of a technical failure ( $n = 1$ ), or because  
52  
53 of being born preterm ( $n = 1$ ). Families were recruited and gave consent to participate  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



as in Experiment 1. Sample size was selected to match that of Experiment 1.

**Apparatus and stimuli.** The experimental setup and stimuli were identical to those used in Experiment 1. For each object category (coffee makers and staplers) a subset of 5 pictures was randomly selected (i.e. different for each participant) that included 1 picture for the word learning phase and the word recognition test and 4 for the word extension test. The order of image presentation was randomly determined for each participant.

**Design and procedure.** The design and procedure were the same as in Experiment 1, except as follows: first, the word training phase was not preceded by any familiarization. Instead, to ensure that the infants attended to the screen before the word training started, we presented them with a five-second video clip depicting flower buds opening to the sound of soft music. Second, we administered two types of word-learning tests of 4 trials each to independently assess two dimensions of infants' word-learning performance: *word extension* and *word recognition*. The word extension test was identical to the one in Experiment 1 and consisted of two measurement periods: pre- and post-naming (see Experiment 1).

The word recognition test had the same structure as the word extension test, except that instead of using novel category exemplars, we used the same tokens as presented during the word training test. The order of presentation of the two tests was fixed to enable direct comparisons with Experiment 1, i.e. the word extension test was always administered immediately after the word training and before the word recognition test. Word-training and test trials were presented after a short gaze-controlled attention getter (minimum duration: 500 ms).

**Data analysis.** The participant inclusion criteria and data analysis were identical to

those in Experiment 1. We conducted two separate analyses for each type of test. Word-extension analysis consisted of 18 data sets, while word-recognition analysis consisted of 15 data sets as three participants did not contribute at least two valid word-recognition trials. On average, the included data sets contained 3.78 valid word-extension test trials (SD = .43, R = 3 to 4) and 3.33 valid word-recognition test trials (SD = .82, R = 2 to 4).


## Results

**Word extension.** Unlike in Experiment 1, infants did not increase their looking to the named category exemplars from pre- to post-naming, as revealed by a paired-samples  $t$  test comparing the proportions of target looking between pre- and post-naming,  $t(17) = .36$ ,  $p = .723$ ,  $d = .08$ , 95% CI = [-.06, .08] (pre-naming: M = .49, SD = .08, post-naming: M = .50, SD = .10). Their looking level remained at chance throughout the test trial (pre-naming:  $t(17) = .62$ ,  $p = .545$ ,  $d = .14$ , 95% CI = [.45, .53], post-naming:  $t(17) = .02$ ,  $p = .98$ ,  $d < .01$ , 95% CI = [.45, .55]). The duration of the infants' looks directed to the target and distractor objects was not affected by labeling,  $t(17) = .86$ ,  $p = .402$ ,  $d = .20$ , 95% CI = [-.07, .16] (pre-naming: M = -.05, SD = .13; post-naming: M = -.01, SD = .21), with difference scores remaining at the chance level during both pre-naming,  $t(17) = 1.73$ ,  $p = .101$ ,  $d = .41$ , 95% CI = [-.12, .01], and post-naming,  $t(17) = .14$ ,  $p = .888$ ,  $d = .03$ , 95% CI = [-.11, .10]. Thus, in this experiment, infants did not generalize novel labels. This result is in line with the literature documenting difficulties in word extension without relevant category knowledge in older children (Son, Smith, & Goldstone, 2008).

Word-extension results were compared across experiments using mixed-model

ANOVAs with group (blocked-categories familiarization in Experiment 1 v.

1  
2  
3 interleaved-categories familiarization in Experiment 1, v. no familiarization in  
4  
5 Experiment 2) as a between-subject factor and segment (pre v. post-naming) as a  
6  
7 within-subject factor. The analysis on the proportions of target looking yielded a  
8  
9 significant interaction between group and segment,  $F(2,51) = 4.51, p = .016, \eta^2_{\bar{p}} = .15$ .  
10  
11 This interaction was due to the fact that speech affected infants' looking patterns  
12  
13 differently across groups. That is, before naming the duration of infants' target  
14  
15 looking was comparable across groups,  $F(2,51) = .30, p = .741, \eta^2_{\bar{p}} = .01$ , while after  
16  
17 naming it varied across groups,  $F(2,51) = 4.19, p = .021; \eta^2_{\bar{p}} = .14$ . Post-hoc  
18  
19 comparisons indicated that, after naming, blocked-categories familiarization led to  
20  
21 longer target looking than interleaved-categories familiarization,  $p < .036$  (Bonferroni  
22  
23 corrected), and marginally longer than no familiarization,  $p < .061$  (Bonferroni  
24  
25 corrected). The analysis of longest look differences scores yielded a similar pattern of  
26  
27 results: the interaction between group and segment,  $F(2,51) = 8.96, p < .001, \eta^2_{\bar{p}} = .26$   
28  
29 was due to differences in how naming affected the duration of longest looks across  
30  
31 groups (pre-naming:  $F(2,51) = 1.04, p = .362, \eta^2_{\bar{p}} = .04$ ; post-naming:  $F(2,51) = 5.97,$   
32  
33  $p = .005, \eta^2_{\bar{p}} = .19$ ). Blocked-categories familiarization resulted in longer looks to the  
34  
35 target than each of the control conditions (v. interleaved-categories familiarization,  $p$   
36  
37  $= .003$ ; v. no familiarization  $p < .007$ , both values Bonferroni corrected). These  
38  
39 results confirm that there is a difference in how infants with different levels of  
40  
41 category knowledge extended novel words: namely, infants who received category  
42  
43 training (i.e. blocked-categories familiarization, Experiment 1) performed better than  
44  
45 infants who did not receive such training (i.e. interleaved-categories familiarization,  
46  
47 Experiment 1, and no familiarization, Experiment 2).



**Fig. 3. Results of Experiment 2: (a) mean proportions of target looking time and (b) mean longest look difference scores during test split by pre- v. post-naming as a function of test type (word-extension v. word-recognition test).** Diamonds indicate means and black horizontal lines indicate medians. The bottom and the top of the boxes represent the first and the third quartiles. Whiskers extend from the middle quartiles to the smallest and largest values within 1.5 times the interquartile range. Black points connected across boxes represent the data sets of individual participants. Dotted lines represent the chance level: (a) 0.5, (b) 0. Significant effects are indicated with asterisks:  $+/- p \leq .10$ ,  $* p < .05$ ,  $** p < .01$ . Positive values in (b) indicate that longest looks were directed at the target and negative values that they were directed at the distracter.

**Word recognition.** Infants displayed a tendency to increase their target looking between pre- and post-naming,  $t(14) = 1.75, p = .101, d = .45, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-.02, .16]$  (pre-naming:  $M = .49, SD = .12$ , post-naming:  $M = .56, SD = .09$ ). Eleven out of 15 infants showed this effect. In addition, the proportion of target looking was significantly above chance during the post-naming period,  $t(14) = 2.62, p = .020, d = .68, 95\% \text{ CI} = [.51, .61]$ , but not during the pre-naming period,  $t(14) = .38, p = .710, d = .10, 95\% \text{ CI} = [.42, .56]$ . The duration of infants' longest looks toward to the target object increased significantly from the pre- to post-naming,  $t(14) = 2.27, p = .039, d = .59, 95\% \text{ CI} = [.01, .35]$  (pre-naming:  $M = -.02, SD = .26$ ; post-naming:  $M = .16, SD = .21$ ), with 12/15 participants displaying this effect. The difference scores were significantly above chance during the post-naming,  $t(14) = 3.06, p = .008, d = .79,$

95% CI = [.05, .28], but not during the pre-naming,  $t(14) = .26$ ,  $p = .800$ ,  $d = .07$ ,  
95% CI = [-.16, .13].

## Discussion

Without nonverbal category knowledge, infants failed to extend novel labels to further exemplars of the labeled category, while showing a tendency to identify by name the specific objects that were used during labeling. Although we cannot conservatively conclude that infants mapped the trained words onto the particular objects that were labeled during the training, as the increase in the proportion of target looking after labeling failed to reach significance, the longest look results suggest that such an association has been formed. This discrepancy between the two measures may be explained by the fact that the longest look measure is not affected by the decrease of attention over time, as is the case for total duration of looking (Schafer & Plunket, 1998). Note also that the word-recognition test was always administered following the word-extension test, meaning that infants had to maintain the newly formed label-object mappings over the short delay required to complete the first test phase and to handle possible interference with processing it.

To sum up, word extension does not occur spontaneously following the exposure to labeling and suggests that word extension is independent from word mapping. In particular, witnessing an unfamiliar object being labeled did not provide infants with sufficient information to reliably and rapidly extend the label to other objects.

## Experiment 3

As we did not directly assess category learning in Experiment 1, it remains possible that infants only formed the new categories during the labeling, prompted by the

1  
2  
3 presence of labels. Furthermore, infants in the interleaved-categories condition, who  
4  
5 saw staplers and coffee makers mixed in a single familiarization stream, might have  
6  
7 formed one extensive category containing both kinds of objects. These possibilities  
8  
9 were tested in Experiment 3.

## 10 11 12 **Methods**

13  
14 **Participants.** Thirty-six 12-month-old infants were included in the final sample.

15  
16  
17 Infants were randomly assigned to two experimental conditions, 18 to the blocked  
18  
19 familiarization condition (10 females, average age: 12.11 months, range: 11.57 to  
20  
21 12.49 months) and 18 to the interleaved familiarization condition (8 females, average  
22  
23 age: 12.15 months, range: 11.62 to 12.51 months). An additional 9 infants were  
24  
25 excluded from the analysis because they did not complete the calibration routine ( $n =$   
26  
27 1), failed to provide enough data ( $n = 6$ ), or failed to complete the experiment ( $n = 2$ ).  
28  
29

30  
31 Sample size was selected to match those of Experiments 1 and 2. Families were  
32  
33 recruited and gave consent to participate as in Experiments 1 and 2.

34  
35 **Apparatus.** Experiment 3 was conducted in a different laboratory than Experiments 1  
36  
37 and 2. The experimental set up was the same as for Experiments 1 and 2, except as  
38  
39 follows: infants' gaze data were acquired using a Tobii Pro X2-60 eye-tracker  
40  
41 (sampling rate: 60 Hz, Tobii Technology AB, Danderyd, Sweden) and the visual  
42  
43 stimuli were displayed on an external 23-inch monitor (resolution: 1920 x 1080 px).  
44  
45

46  
47 **Stimuli.** In addition to the two types of objects used in the previous experiments  
48  
49 (familiarized categories: staplers and coffee makers), we selected one more type of  
50  
51 object that was unfamiliar to the infants (novel category: garlic press) as confirmed  
52  
53 through the parental reports. For the familiarized categories, we used the same  
54  
55 photographs as in Experiment 1, out of which a subset of 10 was randomly selected  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 for each participant: 8 images for the familiarization and 2 images for the  
4 categorization test. We selected 4 additional photographs depicting exemplars of the  
5 novel category from which a subset of 2 images was used during the test (randomly  
6 determined). The additional pictures varied in color, orientation, and shape, but were  
7 matched in size and surface area to the pictures used in Experiment 1.  
8  
9


10  
11  
12  
13  
14 **Design and procedure.** The task included only two phases: familiarization and  
15 categorization test, which were administered without pause. The **familiarization**  
16 phase was identical to that in Experiment 1, with half of the infants tested on the  
17 blocked-categories familiarization and the other half on the interleaved-categories  
18 familiarization. During the **categorization test** phase, infants were presented with two  
19 pairs of test pictures displayed side by side in silence: a previously unseen token from  
20 the familiarized category (stapler and coffee maker, in a randomized order) and a  
21 token of a novel category (garlic press). Each test pair was displayed for 6 seconds  
22 and then repeated with the objects locations (left v. right) swapped, which was in  
23 accordance with the designs used in the infant categorization literature (e.g. Plunkett,  
24 Hu, & Cohen, 2008). Each familiarization stream and each test trial were preceded by  
25 a short gaze-controlled attention getter (minimum duration: 500 ms). The procedure  
26 was the same as for Experiment 1.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 **Data analysis.** The inclusion criteria were the same as in Experiment 1. Note,  
44 however, that the categorization test trials were shorter than the word-extension word  
45 trials, such that 50% of on-screen time corresponded to 3 seconds. Infants had to  
46 provide at least 2 valid test trials to be included in the final sample; one trial per  
47 familiarization category. Infants in both groups attended equally to the display  
48 (blocked-categories group:  $M = 83\%$  of total session time,  $SD = 8\%$ ; interleaved-  
49 categories group:  $M = 82\%$  of total session time,  $SD = 12\%$ ,  $t(34) = .02$ ,  $p = .984$ ) and  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 provided a comparable amount of valid test trials (blocked-categories group:  $M =$   
4  
5 3.89,  $SD = .32$ ,  $R = 3$  to 4; interleaved-categories group:  $M = 3.94$ ,  $SD = .24$ ,  $R = 3$  to  
6  
7 4,  $t(34) = .59$ ,  $p = .559$ ).

8  
9  
10       Following the methodology established in the field of infant categorization,  
11  
12 we assessed category formation by measuring infants' preference for the novel  
13  
14 category tokens operationalized as the proportion of time spent looking at the novel  
15  
16 category relative to the total looking time. Novelty preference is considered to be an  
17  
18 index of category formation (e.g. Ferry, Hespos, & Waxman, 2013; Hu, Plunkett, &  
19  
20 Cohen, 2008; Younger & Ferring, 1999). This reflects the fact that infants  
21  
22 discriminate between the test images and perceive one of them as familiar and the  
23  
24 other as novel based on their freshly formed category knowledge and orient  
25  
26 preferentially to the novel stimulus. To determine whether infants reliably displayed a  
27  
28 looking preference for the novel category, we divided the amount of time they spent  
29  
30 in the novel category's AOI by the total amount of time spent in the novel and  
31  
32 familiarized categories' AOIs (please refer to the on-line supplemental material for an  
33  
34 additional analysis of the longest looks).  
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





**Fig. 4. Results of Experiment 3: average proportions of looking toward novel category**

**tokens during test.** Diamonds indicate means and black horizontal lines indicate medians. The bottom and the top of the boxes represent the first and the third quartiles. Whiskers extend from the middle quartiles to the smallest and largest values within 1.5 times the interquartile range. Dotted lines represent the chance level: 0.5. Significant effects are indicated with asterisks: \*  $p < .05$ .

## Results

Infants in the blocked-categories group looked longer at the novel category tokens ( $M = 0.58$ ,  $SD = 0.16$ ) than infants in the interleaved-categories group ( $M = 0.48$ ,  $SD = 0.06$ ),  $t(23.25) = 2.34$ ,  $p = .028$ ,  $d = 0.78$ , 95% CI = [.01, .18] by a Welch's  $t$  test. Only in the blocked-categories group did infants look towards the novel object more than expected by chance,  $t(17) = 2.14$ ,  $p = .047$ ,  $d = .50$ , 95% CI = [.51, .66] (interleaved-categories group:  $t(17) = .96$ ,  $p = .351$ ,  $d = .23$ , 95% CI = [.45, .52]).

## Discussion

First, category formation occurred in the absence of language in the blocked-categories group under conditions identical to those in Experiment 1, indicating that in Experiment 1 categorical representations were available to infants before labeling.

Second, there was no evidence for category formation in the interleaved-categories group. It is therefore unlikely that infants' failure to generalize new words in Experiment 1 could be explained by the formation of a single superordinate category spanning both target categories (staplers and coffee makers), which interfered with the word mapping processes.

## General Discussion

The current results provide the first experimental evidence that preverbal category knowledge bootstraps the discovery of word meanings. We found that 12-month-olds rapidly grasped the meanings of two novel labels, each introduced with an object representing a different basic-level category. Infants' understanding of new words was revealed via their word extension performance: they succeeded at extending the new labels to previously unseen tokens of the referent categories. Importantly, infants could do so only when given the chance to learn the two categories before the new labels were introduced (i.e. blocked-categories familiarization, Experiment 1). Infants who did not have relevant category knowledge before labeling, either because they were exposed to the exemplars of labeled categories in a manner not conducive to category formation (i.e. interleaved-categories familiarization, Experiment 1), or because they were presented with the word training without any prior exposure to the category (Experiment 2), failed to extend novel words (see also, Son, Smith, &

1  
2  
3 Goldstone, 2008).

4  
5 Our results suggest that specialized cognitive mechanisms allow preverbal  
6 infants to rapidly acquire basic linguistic devices of cultural transmission. In  
7 particular, infants rely on category-matching to identify the meanings of new labels.  
8 We demonstrated that even newly formed visual categories can be linked to novel  
9 words as their meanings and can guide the infants' word extension. Our findings by  
10 no means exclude the possibility that, later in development, attentional biases  
11 developing in children due to their experience with language (Gershkoff-Stowe &  
12 Smith, 2004) play a role in word learning (Son, Smith & Goldstone, 2008; Smith et  
13 al., 2002), but highlight the fact that knowledge of preverbal categories contributes to  
14 word-generalization processes before that happens. Note that, in the absence of  
15 relevant category knowledge, infants successfully associate new labels with particular  
16 objects (Pruden et al., 2006; Woodward, Markman, & Fitzsimmons, 1994; suggestive  
17 evidence in Experiment 2). Therefore, nonverbal category knowledge is not a  
18 prerequisite for associating labels and the specific objects used during labeling, but  
19 enables infants to go beyond these associations.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 How is category matching achieved? One possibility is that infants expect  
40 objects introduced through communication to represent categories. According to  
41 Csibra and Shamsudheen (2015), the labeled object is treated as a symbol standing for  
42 its category and the new label is directly attached to a category-level representation.  
43 In this scenario, category knowledge is used *during* labeling. Alternatively, the  
44 category knowledge might only be used at the stage of word extension. Initially,  
45 infants associate the label with a particular object, then upon hearing the new label  
46 without its original referent at test, they retrieve the category to which this object  
47 belongs and extend the label along the boundary of this category. Further research is  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

needed to establish which of these two strategies is at play.

We propose that the category matching mechanism is available for word learning in the real world, but remain aware that the categories used by infants in our study were taught in a lab in the somewhat artificial manner of assembling category tokens. However, category tokens also occur together outside labs (e.g. crossing a London street crowded with cars, strolling in a park full of dogs and trees, or just walking through a supermarket filled with orderly presented products). This is sometimes due to the structuring of our environment for learning purposes. For example, caregivers who are asked to teach the properties of a category automatically select numerous category exemplars rather than a single one to highlight the category-diagnostic properties (Rhodes, Gelman, & Brickman, 2009). Infants, when allowed to freely manipulate objects, tend to explore exemplars of only one category in a sequence rather than alternating between exemplars of different categories (i.e. sequential touching, Rakison & Butterworth, 1998), thus selectively sampling the information in their environment. Even if this particular category learning strategy was never available in real life, our finding still stands as category-matching mechanisms should operate regardless of the way in which categories are learnt (Yin & Csibra, 2015; Waxman & Booth, 2003).

While in the past emphasis has been placed on demonstrating that labeling guides category learning (Ferguson & Waxman, 2017), our study provides the first evidence that visual categories themselves are directly exploited during word learning as sources of word meanings. One important implication of this observation is that individual differences in category learning may be a source of individual differences in the rate of language acquisition. For example, poor category learning in certain developmental disorders, such as autism (e.g. Davis & Plaisted-Grant, 2015), may

1  
2  
3 explain the slower rate of vocabulary growth (Hudry et al., 2014).  
4

5 To conclude, the current results not only constitute the earliest evidence for  
6 the generalization of newly learnt words, but also indicate the cognitive mechanisms  
7 underlying this ability. Infants use nonverbal category knowledge as a source of word  
8 meanings and in its earliest stages, the cognitive machinery responsible for category  
9 formation is a key component of language development. Therefore, nonverbal  
10 conceptual resources provide a stepping stone to language and culture transmission.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

### 21 **Author Contributions**

22  
23 B. Pomiechowska and T. Gliga conceived and designed the study, collected and  
24 analyzed the data, and wrote the manuscript.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **Acknowledgements**

32 We thank Katarina Begus, Gergely Csibra, Johannes Mahr, Eugenio Parise, and Denis  
33 Tatone for comments on the manuscript, the editor and two reviewers for helpful  
34 suggestions, Sinead Rocha for recording the speech stimuli, Eszter Körtveylesi,  
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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

### 31 **Funding**

32 This research was supported by the European Comisison Marie Marie Curie Initial  
33 Training Networks (264301) and the UK Medical Research Council (G0701484).  
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  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

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

**References**

- Anderson, S. F., Kelley, K., & Maxwell, S. E. (2017). Sample-size planning for more accurate statistical power: A method adjusting sample effect sizes for publication bias and uncertainty. *Psychological Science*, 28, 1547-1562.
- Bergelson, E., & Swingle, D. (2012). At 6–9 months, human infants know the meanings of many common nouns. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA*, 109, 3253–3258.
- Booth, A. E., & Waxman, S. R. (2002). Word learning is ‘smart’: evidence that conceptual information affects preschoolers' extension of novel words. *Cognition*, 84, B11-B22.
- Brainard, D. H. (1997). The psychophysics toolbox. *Spatial Vision*, 10, 433-436.
- Clark, E. V. (2017). Semantic categories in acquisition. In H. Cohen & C. Lefebvre (Eds.), *Handbook of Categorization in Cognitive Science* (pp. 397-421). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Clark, E. V. (2004). How language acquisition builds on cognitive development. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8, 472-478.
- Colunga, E., & Smith, L. B. (2005). From the lexicon to expectations about kinds: A role for associative learning. *Psychological Review*, 112, 347-382.
- Csibra, G., & Shamsuddeen, R. (2015). Nonverbal generics: Human infants interpret objects as symbols of object kinds. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66, 689.
- Davis, G., & Plaisted-Grant, K. (2015). Low endogenous neural noise in autism. *Autism*, 19, 351-362.

- 1  
2  
3 Eimas, P. D., & Quinn, P. C. (1994). Studies on the formation of perceptually based  
4  
5 basic-level categories in young infants. *Child Development*, 65, 903-917.  
6  
7  
8 Fennell, C. T., & Waxman, S. R. (2010). What paradox? Referential cues allow for  
9  
10 infant use of phonetic detail in word learning. *Child Development*, 81, 1376-  
11  
12 1383.  
13  
14 Ferguson, B., & Waxman, S. (2017). Linking language and categorization in  
15  
16 infancy. *Journal of Child Language*, 44, 527-552.  
17  
18  
19 Ferguson, B., & Waxman, S. R. (2016). What the [beep]? Six-month-olds link novel  
20  
21 communicative signals to meaning. *Cognition*, 146, 185-189.  
22  
23  
24 Ferry, A. L., Hespos, S. J., & Waxman, S. R. (2013). Nonhuman primate  
25  
26 vocalizations support categorization in very young human infants. *Proceedings*  
27  
28 *of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110, 15231-15235.  
29  
30  
31 Gelman, S. A., & Roberts, S. O. (2017). How language shapes the cultural inheritance  
32  
33 of categories. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 201621073.  
34  
35  
36 Gershkoff-Stowe, L., & Smith, L. B. (2004). Shape and the first hundred nouns. *Child*  
37  
38 *Development*, 75, 1098-1114.  
39  
40  
41 Hudry, K., Chandler, S., Bedford, R., Pasco, G., Gliga, T., Elsabbagh, M., ... &  
42  
43 Charman, T. (2014). Early language profiles in infants at high-risk for autism  
44  
45 spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 44, 154-  
46  
47 167.  
48  
49  
50 Kemler Nelson, D. G. K. (1999). Attention to functional properties in toddlers'  
51  
52 naming and problem-solving. *Cognitive Development*, 14, 77-100.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Kemler Nelson, D. G. K. (1995). Principle-based inferences in young children's  
4 categorization: Revisiting the impact of function on the naming of artifacts.  
5 *Cognitive Development, 10*, 347-380.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Macnamara, J. (1982). *Names for things: A study of human learning*. Cambridge,  
11 MA: MIT Press.  
12  
13  
14 Mandler, J. M. (2004). Thought before language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 8*,  
15 508-513.  
16  
17  
18  
19 Mareschal, D., & Quinn, P. C. (2001). Categorization in infancy. *Trends in Cognitive*  
20 *Sciences, 5*, 443-450.  
21  
22  
23  
24 Markman, E. M., & Wachtel, G. F. (1988). Children's use of mutual exclusivity to  
25 constrain the meanings of words. *Cognitive Psychology, 20*, 121-157.  
26  
27  
28  
29 Nelson, K. (1973). Some evidence for the cognitive primacy of categorization and its  
30 functional basis. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Behavior and Development, 19*,  
31 21-39.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36 Parise, E., & Csibra, G. (2012). Electrophysiological evidence for the understanding  
37 of maternal speech by 9-month-old infants. *Psychological Science, 23*, 728–  
38 733.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 Plunkett, K., Hu, J. F., & Cohen, L. B. (2008). Labels can override perceptual  
44 categories in early infancy. *Cognition, 106*, 665-681.  
45  
46  
47  
48 Pruden, S. M., Hirsh-Pasek, K., Golinkoff, R. M., & Hennon, E. A. (2006). The Birth  
49 of Words: Ten-Month-Olds Learn Words Through Perceptual Salience. *Child*  
50 *Development, 77*, 266-280.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55 Schafer, G., & Plunkett, K. (1998). Rapid word learning by fifteen-month-olds under  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 tightly controlled conditions. *Child Development*, 69, 309-320.  
4  
5  
6 Shafto, P., Goodman, N. D., & Griffiths, T. L. (2014). A rational account of  
7 pedagogical reasoning: Teaching by, and learning from, examples. *Cognitive*  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13 Smith, L. B. (2003). Learning to recognize objects. *Psychological Science*, 14, 244-  
14  
15 250.  
16  
17 Smith, L. B., & Samuelson, L. (2006). An attentional learning account of the shape  
18 bias: Reply to Cimpian and Markman (2005) and Booth, Waxman, and Huang  
19 (2005). *Developmental Psychology*, 42, 1339-1343.  
20  
21  
22  
23 Smith, L. B., Jones, S. S., Landau, B., Gershkoff-Stowe, L., & Samuelson, L. (2002).  
24 Object name learning provides on-the-job training for attention. *Psychological*  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32 Son, J. Y., Smith, L. B., & Goldstone, R. L. (2008). Simplicity and generalization:  
33 Short-cutting abstraction in children's object categorizations. *Cognition*, 108,  
34  
35 626-638.  
36  
37  
38 Spelke, E. S. (2003). What makes us smart? Core knowledge and natural language. In  
39 D. Gentner & S. Goldin-Meadow (Eds.), *Language in mind: Advances in the*  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 Swingley, D., Pinto, J. P., & Fernald, A. (1999). Continuous processing in word  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52 Waxman, S. R. (2003). Links between object categorization and naming. In D. H.  
53 Rakison & L. M. Oakes (Eds.) *Early category and concept development:*  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
*Making sense of the blooming, buzzing confusion* (pp. 213-241), New York,  
NY: Oxford University Press.

1  
2  
3 Waxman, S., & Booth, A. (2003). The origins and evolution of links between word  
4  
5 learning and conceptual organization: new evidence from 11-month-olds.  
6  
7 *Developmental Science*, 6, 128-135.  
8  
9

10 Woodward, A. L., Markman, E. M., & Fitzsimmons, C. M. (1994). Rapid word  
11  
12 learning in 13-and 18-month-olds. *Developmental Psychology*, 30, 553.  
13

14 Yin, J., & Csibra, G. (2015). Concept-based word learning in human infants.  
15  
16  
17 *Psychological Science*, 26, 1316-1324.  
18  
19

20 Younger, B. A., & Fearing, D. D. (1999). Parsing items into separate categories:  
21  
22 Developmental change in infant categorization. *Child Development*, 70, 291-  
23  
24 303.  
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