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Introduction

- Babies will learn word-object associations better if they have name-training prior to a word learning task (Namy & Waxman, 2000; Fennell & Waxman, 2010).
- Name-training teaches participants that isolated words can refer to objects in the context of the task. A word that the baby knows is aurally presented in isolation while its image is presented on a screen. This is repeated several times, and thus when the baby is presented with an isolated novel word, he can map this word to its referent (i.e., novel object) more successfully.

LEARNING WORD-OBJECT ASSOCIATIONS

- Infants as young as 7 months have been shown to learn vowel-object pairs in a laboratory setting when the auditory stimuli are synchronous with the visual stimuli hitting the edge of the screen (Gogate & Bahrick, 1998).
- Curtin (in press) has had success with word-object associations in 12-month-olds using the nonsense words “fep,” “wug,” and “dax”

SEEKING SUCCESS AT ITS YOUNGEST

- As demonstrated by looking patterns during video footage of their parents as compared to footage of unknown men and women, 6-month-olds comprehended the terms “mommy” and “daddy” in a laboratory setting (Tincoff & Jusczyk, 1999). Therefore, 6-month-old infants will be the youngest age group to participate in the current study.
- Important for understanding the mechanisms by which infants acquire language, and may have implications for teaching new words. Also, this would be the earliest demonstration of novel word learning in a laboratory setting.

Participants

- Projected N = 12 (balanced for gender)
- Age = 6 months
- Inclusion criterion: participants had to comprehend at least 1 of the 4 training words (as measured by the MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventory, or MCDI)

Stimuli

- The potentially familiar words “bottle,” “baby,” “doggy,” and “car” were chosen because of their relatively high comprehension percentages by 8 month-olds (the youngest age group in the MCDI). The words’ percentages were 57%, 28%, 38%, and 29% respectively. These 4 words along with their prototypical images were used for the word-object pairs in the training phase.
- The nonsense words “fep” and “wug”, along with images of unique, unfamiliar objects were used for the word-object pairs in the habituation and test phases.
- Auditory stimuli were recorded by a Canadian English-speaking female using infant-directed speech (baby-talk). The stimuli were analyzed for intonation and duration, and then matched on those factors. The “fep” and “wug” stimuli are as similar as possible so that they cannot be distinguished based on duration alone; the mean duration of “fep” is 0.894 seconds, and the mean duration of “wug” is 0.869 seconds.
- Visual stimuli moved linearly across the screen; the auditory stimuli were not matched to the timing of the visual stimuli’s movements.

Procedure

- Infants sat on their parents’ lap in the testing room and the experimenter sat in an adjoining control room. A video camera enabled the experimenter to see what was happening in the testing room in order to control the trials according to the infants’ habituation (habituation ended when looking time across a 2-trial block decreased to 65% of the longest block, with a maximum of 24 trials). The experimenter coded the looking behavior throughout the sessions.
- Using potentially familiar words, the training phase taught participants to associate words heard in isolation to the referent being shown on the screen.
- The habituation phase taught participants the novel words “fep” and “wug”.
- In the test phase, participants were exposed to both same and switch trials to verify that looking times were longer in the switch trials, demonstrating proper word-referent mapping of the novel word-object pairs.
- The order of presentation during training and test was counterbalanced.
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