Kindergarteners’ statistical learning is influenced by instruction
Spit, S.B.; Andringa, S.J.; Rispens, J.E.; Aboh, E.O.

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: http://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.
Kindergarteners’ statistical learning is influenced by instruction

Sybren Spit, Sible Andringa, Judith Rispens & Enoch O. Aboh, University of Amsterdam

Statistical learning
Inferring word boundaries (Safran, Johnson & Aslin, 1996; Endress & Bonatti, 2007; Gomez & Gerken, 1999)
Learning words and referents (e.g. Vouloumanos, 2008; Yu & Smith, 2007; Smith, Suanda & Yu, 2014)
Acquiring agreement markers (e.g. Lany, 2014; Lany & Safran, 2013; Monaghan, Mattock, Davies & Smith, 2015)
Learning a meaningful agreement marker (Spit, Andringa, Rispens & Aboh, under review)

Explicit instruction and replication
Lack of replication in general (Cumming, 2014), and in linguistics in particular (Marsden, Morgan-Short, Thompson & Abugaber, 2018)
Reported positive effects of explicit instruction in adults (Spada & Tomita, 2010), but no studies with children

Research questions
Can we replicate our findings that kindergarteners learn a meaningful agreement marker on the basis of distributional properties?
Does explicit instruction influence the acquisition of such a marker?

Participants
102 Dutch speaking children (51 females, \(M = 5.7\)), 50 were explicitly instructed, 52 were not instructed

Method
Exposure
Miniature language:
Four proper names, three verbs, two grammatical markers,
six frequent nouns and twelve infrequent nouns
Exposure: 108 training sentences (+ 12 fillers)

Rule
Pli: probability that the noun has multiple referents = 1
Tra: probability that the noun has multiple referents = .5

Test
Picture matching task with eye tracking

Results

Effect | OR  | 95% CI  | z  | p  |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
Study 1 | 9.5% | 1.515 | 1.071…2.257 | 2.178 | 0.029 |
Study 2 | 7% | 1.347 | 0.975…1.863 | 1.843 | 0.065 |
Current study | 7.4% | 1.370 | 0.927…2.023 | 1.614 | 0.107 |

Conclusion
Explicit instruction did not increase accuracy, but it did lead to earlier predictive eye movements
In a follow-up experiment, we will test children on a delayed post-test, to investigate the effect of sleep on the development of kindergarteners’ knowledge
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