



<u>Lecturer:</u>	Tan Gedik	<u>Course days and time:</u>	Mon 3:30-4:20pm Thu 10:30-12:20pm
<u>E-mail:</u>	tan.gedik@bilkent.edu.tr	<u>Place:</u>	H-233
<u>Office:</u>	G128-C (using Rachel Bruzzone's office this semester)	<u>Contact hours:</u>	Three
<u>Office hours:</u>	1-2 pm on Mondays <i>or over Zoom (arrange via email)</i>		

Welcome to PSYC442

Building on some of the basic terminology, methodology, and research questions students learned in previous courses, this course bridges the connection between psychology and linguistics, showing what each respective field can complementarily tell us about the human mind and cognition. As such, students will explore the psychological, cognitive, and neural bases of first and second language acquisition in childhood and adulthood, and bilingualism/multilingualism. Students will also become familiar with theories of language and what these theories suggest about language learning by creating in-class mini linguistics experiments. To follow up on linguistic terminology, the following link may prove useful: <https://glossary.sil.org/term>

If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me during office hours or arrange some other time via email.

Emails: please make sure to have proper email etiquette. Allow me **up to 48 hours** to reply to emails.

Electronic devices: you may use your laptops or tablets to take notes/read the articles.

1. Course Learning Outcomes

- Demonstrate knowledge of major theoretical themes in psycholinguistics: nativism, statistical learning, models of second language learning, models of bilingualism and its mental representation
- Demonstrate knowledge of research findings in psycholinguistics at varying levels of granularity: phonetics, phonology, semantics, syntax, pragmatics
- Demonstrate knowledge of experimental setups and their outcomes in psycholinguistic experimentation
- Demonstrate knowledge of basic statistical methods and experimental tools that psycholinguists use in research and theory/model-building
- Demonstrate knowledge of the connection between psycholinguistics and other psychological areas of research (vision, learning, thought, attention, development, social, etc)

2. Course Objectives

On successful completion of this course, students will have:

- Discussed the differences between formalist and emergentist approaches to language acquisition in homework assignments
- Demonstrated the link between domains of psychology and language in in-class discussions & in-class mini experiments
- Analyzed linguistic data in a term paper
- Presented psycholinguistic hypotheses in an in-class presentation

- Assessed the psycholinguistic implications for psychology in homework assignments
- Classified the subunits of linguistics

3. Assessment

There will be 5 homework assignments (3-4 Q&As, and a short essay of 700-1200 words each), one final project (i.e., term paper) and a presentation/discussion leading.

*Homework assignments will cover readings. There will be several short Q&As and a prompt to write a short essay. The questions/prompts will be posted on LMS. The rubric will also be available on LMS.

*The final project topics will be given to students ca. in the 2nd week of class. The term papers are expected to be 3000-4000 words (further guidelines and the rubric are available on LMS; to be submitted until **May 19, 2023 11:59pm**) and **are expected to be co-authored (contact me if for some reason you have to single-author the paper)**! They will be based on a hypothesis and data sets given to them. Alternatively, the students are given the option to create an experiment, or use one of the experiments we demoed in our class and write a research proposal for it (not suggested if you are completely new to linguistics, students need to consult the lecturer before deciding on this option). Students could also find their own dataset and liaise with the instructor. The paper should demonstrate the relevant background knowledge of the students and how they analyze a given data set. If you are not sure about your topic, get in touch with me!

*The presentations are scholarly discussions that we will have in our 1 hour slots. The first two weeks will be demonstrated by the lecturer. Then, a group of 5-6 students (depending on class size) will lead the discussion each week (they will be provided with 3 questions but each student in the group that leads the discussion will need to come up with 1 question each). During the semester, every student is expected to ask/answer questions in our discussion slots at least two times. This will demonstrate skills necessary to be a good audience member as well as good scholars who can ask critical questions. This will also give the students a chance to ask questions to the lecturer about the parts that may have been unclear.

*Class participation will be monitored by means of exit tickets and participation in our lectures (*when I ask questions, how much do you really try to answer?*). You may not always be able to answer these questions of course. But showing some effort really matters! **Missing 25% of class hours (10 hours) will result in an F grade.**

Type	Count	Total Contribution (%)
Project (term paper)	1	30
Homework	5	50
Presentations	1	10
In-class participation/Course hours	1	10

3.1 Attendance

Students are expected to attend and actively participate in all lectures. Students at most can miss 25% of class hours (10 hours) before they receive an F grade.

3.2 Academic Dishonesty

Plagiarism of any kind (including AI) will result in an F grade. Academic dishonesty or plagiarism is the act of stealing someone else's work and presenting them as your own. This can include copying from an article, internet source, book, using AI or your friend's work without referencing it. Any act of plagiarism will not be tolerated and will result in zero grade for that assignment. It can be as subtle as the inadvertent neglect to include quotes or references when citing another source or as blatant as knowingly copying an entire paper verbatim and claiming it as your own work. I use TurnItIn for all written assignments to check for plagiarism and AI use.

All of the following are considered plagiarism:

- Turning someone else's work in as your own
- Copying words or ideas from someone else without giving credit
- Failing to put a quotation in quotation marks
- Giving incorrect information about the source of a quotation
- Changing words but copying the sentence structure of a source without giving credit
- Copying so many words or ideas from a source that it makes up the majority of your work, whether you give credit or not
- Using AI-based tools and violating any copyright or intellectual property laws
- Using AI-based tools to cheat on assessments

GRADING

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Range</u>
A+	99-100	C+	70-74.99
A	95-100	C	65-69.99
A-	90-94.99	C-	60-64.99
B+	85-89.99	D+	55-59.99
B	80-84.99	D	50-54.99
B-	75-79.99	F/FX/FZ	0

EXTRA BONUS TASK: Participation in Experiments

Students will earn 1% of their overall grade if they participate in an ongoing psycholinguistic experiment. The details will be on LMS. This would be a great chance for those who want to learn more about linguistic experimentation and make a contribution to scientific inquiry.

4. Tentative Schedule				
<u>WEEK</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>What to read</u>	<u>Assignments</u>
Week 1	Jan 29 (3:30-4:20) Feb 1 (10:30-12:20)	Introduction	For Wednesday Feb 1: Brown 1996	<u>-homework #1 due (until Feb 9 11:59pm)</u>
Week 2	Feb 5 (3:30-4:20) Feb 8 (10:30-12:20)	<i>First language acquisition:</i> the beginnings	Robenalt & Goldberg 2015 Goldberg 2003 Dabrowska 2017: 121-142	<u>Term paper topics (report your topics and the authors)</u> <u>#Assignment of discussion groups!</u>
Week 3	Feb 12 (3:30-4:20) Feb 15	<i>First language acquisition:</i> adulthood,	Bulut et al. 2018 Dabrowska 2015	<u>WATCH THIS (highly recommended):</u> https://youtu.be/PdO3I

	(10:30-12:20)	psycholinguistic approaches	Street & Dabrowska 2010	<u>PoPro8</u>
Week 4	Feb 19 (3:30-4:20) Feb 22 (10:30-12:20)	Phonology - Psycho/neurolinguistic approaches, recognition of single sounds and words	Kosmidis et al. 2004 Serniclaes et al. 2005	<u>Discussion Group 1 (Feb 19)</u>
Week 5	Feb 26 (3:30-4:20) Feb 29 (10:30-12:20)	Semantics - psycho/neurolinguistic approaches, auditory and written semantic processing	Manly et al. 1999 Johnson & Goldberg 2012	<u>-homework #2 due (Mar 1 11:59pm)</u> <u>Discussion Group 2 (Mar 26)</u>
Week 6	Mar 4 (3:30-5:20) Mar 7 FÄLLT AUS wegen Frühlingsferien (Spring break no class)	Syntax - psycho/neurolinguistic approaches, auditory and written syntactic processing	Llompert & Dabrowska 2020 Street 2020 Divjak et al. 2022	<u>Ø</u>
Week 7	Mar 11 (3:30-5:20) Mar 14 FÄLLT AUS wegen Konferenz (No class)	Second language acquisition – adult language acquisition, differences from native lang. acquisition	Sparks 2022: 301-320 Dabrowska 2017: 189-211	<u>Ø</u>
Week 8	Mar 18 (3:30-5:20) Mar 21 (10:30-12:20)	Second language acquisition - adult language acquisition, advantages/disadvantages	Madlener 2016 Römer & Yilmaz 2019 Dabrowska 2019 Gedik 2022: 45-51 (27-33 for a quick recap of usage-based approaches!)	<u>Discussion Group 3+4 (Mar 18)</u> <u>-homework #3 due (Mar 22 11:59pm)</u>
Week 9	Mar 25 (3:30-4:20) Mar 28 (10:30-12:20)	Bi/multilingualism – from infancy, implications for language processing, advantages/disadvantages	Bialystok 2011 Quick & Backus 2022 Kunduz & Montrul 2022	<u>- Send a rough draft of what you have been doing with the term paper (Apr 5 11:59pm)</u> <u>Discussion Group 5 (Mar 29)</u>

		ges		
Week 10	Apr 1 (3:30-4:20) Apr 4 (10:30-12:20)	Bi/multilingualism – adulthood, advantages/disadvantages, accommodating two languages	Prela et al. 2022 Gedik & Uslu 2023 Luk 2022 Tosun & Filipovic 2022	<u>Discussion Group 6</u> <u>(Apr 1)</u>
APR 8-11 NO CLASS RAMADAN FEAST				
Week 11	Apr 15 (3:30-4:20) Apr 18 (10:30-12:20)	Cross-linguistic approaches to psycholinguistics – comparative studies of language processing, focus on WEIRD/non-WEIRD studies	Blasi et al. 2022 Bunger et al. 2016 Keith Chen 2013	<u>Discussion Group 7</u> <u>(Apr 15)</u> <u>-homework #4 due (Apr 19 11:59pm)</u>
Week 12	Apr 22 NO CLASS Apr 25 (10:30-12:20)	Signed languages (incl. gesture) – empirical studies and approaches to signed languages	Evans et al. 2019 Kubicek & Quandt 2021 Uhrig 2020 (345-346)	<u>Discussion Group 8</u> <u>(Apr 29)</u>
Week 13	Apr 29 (3:30-4:20) May 2 (10:30-12:20)	Linguistic Creativity in Atypical Conditions	TBA	<u>Discussion Group 9</u> <u>(Apr 6)</u>
Week 14	May 6 (3:30-4:20) May 9 (10:30-12:20)	Good-enough comprehension & production	Goldberg & Ferreira 2022 Gedik & Dabrowska in prep	<u>-homework #5 due</u> <u>(May 10 11:59pm)</u>
Week 15	May 13 (3:30-4:20) May 16 (10:30-12:20)	Language and its connection to other domains (Color perception)	Hasantash & Afraz 2020 Emery & Webster 2019 Özgen & Davies 1998	<u>Ø</u>

5. Sources cited in the syllabus

- Bialystok, Ellen. 2011. Reshaping the mind: The benefits of bilingualism. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology / Revue canadienne de psychologie expérimentale* 65(4). 229–235. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025406>.
- Blasi, Damián E., Joseph Henrich, Evangelia Adamou, David Kemmerer & Asifa Majid. 2022. Over-reliance on English hinders cognitive science. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* S1364661322002364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2022.09.015>.
- Brown, Tina. 1996. Humankind's greatest gift: On the innateness of language. *Nebraska Anthropologist* 90. 31–36. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1089&context=nebanthro>
- Bulut, Talat, Emine Yasar & Denise Hsien Wu. 2018. Comprehension of Turkish Relative Clauses: Evidence from Eye-tracking and Corpus Analysis. *Dil Konuşma ve Yutma Araştırmaları Dergisi* 2(3). 211–246.
- Bunger, Ann, Dimitrios Skordos, John C. Trueswell & Anna Papafragou. 2016. How children and adults encode causative events cross-linguistically: implications for language production and attention. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience* 31(8). 1015–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2016.1175649>.
- Chen, M Keith. 2013. The effect of language on economic behavior: Evidence from savings rates, health behaviors, and retirement assets. *American Economic Review* 103(2). 690–731.
- Cheng, Laretta SP, Danielle Burgess, Natasha Vernooij, Cecilia Solís-Barroso, Ashley McDermott & Savithry Namboodiripad. 2021. The problematic concept of native speaker in psycholinguistics: Replacing vague and harmful terminology with inclusive and accurate measures. *Frontiers in Psychology* 12.
- Cilibrasi, Luca, Flavia Adani & Ianthi Tsimpli. 2019. Reading as a Predictor of Complex Syntax. The Case of Relative Clauses. *Frontiers in Psychology* 10. 1450. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01450>.
- Coşkun Kunduz, Aylin & Silvina Montrul. 2022. Relative clauses in child heritage speakers of Turkish in the United States. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism*. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.21027.cos>.
- Curtis, Meagan E. & Jamshed J. Bharucha. 2010. The minor third communicates sadness in speech, mirroring its use in music. *Emotion* 10(3). 335–348. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017928>.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa. 1997. The LAD goes to school: a cautionary tale for nativists. *Linguistics* 35(4). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1997.35.4.735>.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa. 2012. Different speakers, different grammars: Individual differences in native language attainment. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* 2(3). 219–253. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.2.3.01dab>.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa. 2015. Individual differences in grammatical knowledge. In Ewa Dąbrowska & Dagmar Divjak (eds.), *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*, 650–668. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110292022-033>.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa. 2017. *Ten Lectures on Grammar in the Mind*. BRILL. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004336827>.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa. 2019. Experience, Aptitude, and Individual Differences in Linguistic Attainment: A Comparison of Native and Nonnative Speakers: Experience, Aptitude, and Individual Differences. *Language Learning* 69. 72–100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12323>.
- Degé, Franziska & Gudrun Schwarzer. 2011. The Effect of a Music Program on Phonological Awareness in Preschoolers. *Frontiers in Psychology* 2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2011.00124>.
- Emery, Kara J & Michael A Webster. 2019. Individual differences and their implications for color perception. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences* 30. 28–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2019.05.002>.
- Evans, Samuel, Cathy J. Price, Jörn Diedrichsen, Eva Gutierrez-Sigut & Mairéad MacSweeney. 2019. Sign and Speech Share Partially Overlapping Conceptual Representations. *Current Biology* 29(21). 3739–3747.e5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.08.075>.
- Floyd, Sammy, Adele E Goldberg & Casey Lew-Williams. 2020. Toddlers recognize multiple meanings of polysemous words. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, Cognitive Science Society*.
- Gedik, Tan Arda. 2022. An Analysis of Lexicogrammatical Development in English Textbooks in Turkey: A Usage-Based Construction Grammar Approach. *Explorations in English Language and Linguistics* 9(1). 26–55. <https://doi.org/10.2478/exell-2022-0002>.
- Gedik, Tan Arda, Fatima Uslu. 2023. L1-L2 Transfer in Ditransitive Construction: A Usage-based Replication Study with Turkish Speakers of English. In: Georgiou, G.P., Giannakou, A., Savvidou, C. (eds) *Advances in Second/Foreign*

- Language Acquisition. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-38522-3_6
- Gedik, Tan Arda, Ewa Dabrowska. In preparation. Good-enough language production in illiterate speakers.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2003. Constructions: a new theoretical approach to language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7(5). 219–224. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(03\)00080-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(03)00080-9).
- Hasantash, Maryam & Arash Afraz. 2020. Richer color vocabulary is associated with better color memory but not color perception. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117(49). 31046–31052. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2001946117>.
- Kosmidis, Mary H, Christina H Vlahou, Panagiota Panagiotaki & Grigorios Kiosseoglou. 2004. The verbal fluency task in the Greek population: Normative data, and clustering and switching strategies. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society* 10(2). 164–172.
- Kubicek, Emily & Lorna C Quandt. 2021. A Positive Relationship Between Sign Language Comprehension and Mental Rotation Abilities. *The Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education* 26(1). 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enaa030>.
- Llompert, Miquel & Ewa Dąbrowska. 2020. Explicit but Not Implicit Memory Predicts Ultimate Attainment in the Native Language. *Frontiers in Psychology* 11. 569586. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.569586>.
- Luk, Gigi. 2022. Justice and equity for whom? Reframing research on the “bilingual (dis) advantage.” *Applied Psycholinguistics* 1–15.
- Madlener, Karin. 2016. Input optimization: Effects of type and token frequency manipulations in instructed second language learning. In Heike Behrens & Stefan Pfänder (eds.), *Experience Counts: Frequency Effects in Language*, 133–174. De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110346916-007>.
- Manly, T. 1999. The absent mind: further investigations of sustained attention to response. *Neuropsychologia* 37(6). 661–670. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932\(98\)00127-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932(98)00127-4).
- Özgen, Emre & Ian R. L. Davies. 1998. Turkish color terms: tests of Berlin and Kay’s theory of color universals and linguistic relativity. *Linguistics* 36(5). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1998.36.5.919>.
- Prela, Leonarda, Miquel Llompert & Ewa Dąbrowska. 2022. Aptitude and experience as predictors of grammatical proficiency in adult Greek-English bilinguals. *Frontiers in Psychology* 13. 1062821. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1062821>.
- Quick, Antje Endesfelder & Ad Backus. 2022. A Usage-Based Approach to Pattern Finding: The Traceback Method Meets Code-Mixing. *Languages* 7(2). 135. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7020135>.
- Reis, AI & A Castro-Caldas. 1995. Lexical processing in illiterates. *Proceedings of the International Neuropsychological Society in Angers, 44, USA*.
- Robenalt, Clarice & Adele E. Goldberg. 2015. Judgment evidence for statistical preemption: It is relatively better to vanish than to disappear a rabbit, but a lifeguard can equally well backstroke or swim children to shore. *Cognitive Linguistics* 26(3). 467–503. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2015-0004>.
- Römer, Ute, Audrey Roberson, Matthew B. O’Donnell & Nick C. Ellis. 2014. Linking learner corpus and experimental data in studying second language learners’ knowledge of verb-argument constructions. *ICAME Journal* 38(1). 115–135. <https://doi.org/10.2478/icame-2014-0006>.
- Römer, Ute & Selahattin Yilmaz. 2019. Effects of L2 usage and L1 transfer on Turkish learners’ production of English verb-argument constructions. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics* (16). 107–134.
- Serniclaes, Willy, Paulo Ventura, José Morais & Régine Kolinsky. 2005. Categorical perception of speech sounds in illiterate adults. *Cognition* 98(2). B35–B44.
- Sparks, Richard L. 2022. *Exploring L1-L2 Relationships: The Impact of Individual Differences*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800411807>.
- Street, James A. 2020. More lexically-specific knowledge and individual differences in adult native speakers’ processing of the English passive. *Language Sciences* 78. 101254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2019.101254>.
- Street, James A & Ewa Dąbrowska. 2010. More individual differences in language attainment: How much do adult native speakers of English know about passives and quantifiers? *Lingua* 120(8). 2080–2094.

Uhrig, Peter. 2020. Multimodal Research in Linguistics. *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 68(4). 345–349.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/zaa-2020-2019>.

6. Further readings (suggested if you would like to pursue a major/minor in psycholinguistics in the future)

- Barðdal, Jóhanna. 2008. *Productivity evidence from case and argument structure in Icelandic*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Cangır, Hakan. 2021. Lexical Associations in the L1 Turkish Mental Lexicon: Can L1 Lexical Intuition and a Representative Corpus Guide Teaching of Turkish as a Foreign Language Materials? *Dilbilim Dergisi / The Journal of Linguistics* 0(37). 45–66. <https://doi.org/10.26650/jol.2021.972166>.
- Cangır, Hakan, S Nalan Büyükkantarçoğlu & Philip Durrant. 2017. Investigating collocational priming in Turkish. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 13(2). 465–486.
- Cangır, Hakan & Philip Durrant. 2021. Cross-linguistic collocational networks in the L1 Turkish–L2 English mental lexicon. *Lingua* 258. 103057. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103057>.
- Cilibrasi, Luca, Flavia Adani & Ianthi Tsimpli. 2019. Reading as a Predictor of Complex Syntax. The Case of Relative Clauses. *Frontiers in Psychology* 10. 1450. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01450>.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa. 1997. The LAD goes to school: a cautionary tale for nativists. *Linguistics* 35(4). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1997.35.4.735>.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa. 2012. Different speakers, different grammars: Individual differences in native language attainment. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* 2(3). 219–253. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lab.2.3.01dab>.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa. 2018. Experience, aptitude and individual differences in native language ultimate attainment. *Cognition* 178. 222–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.05.018>.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa. 2021. How writing changes language. In A. Mauranen & S. Vetchinnikova (eds.), *Language Change: The Impact of English as a Lingua Franca*. Cambridge University Press, 75–94. Cambridge University Press. <https://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/CJES/article/view/78219>.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa, Esther Pascual & Beatriz Macías Gómez-Estern. 2022. Literacy improves the comprehension of object relatives. *Cognition* 224. 104958. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2021.104958>.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa & Tan Arda Gedik. 2023. Lexical knowledge, memory and experience. 11(1). 57–74. <https://doi.org/10.1515/gcla-2023-0004>.
- Divjak, Dagmar. 2019. *Frequency in Language: Memory, Attention and Learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fedorenko, Evelina, Idan Asher Blank, Matthew Siegelman & Zachary Mineroff. 2020. Lack of selectivity for syntax relative to word meanings throughout the language network. *Cognition* 203. 104348. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2020.104348>.
- Frank, Stefan L., Rens Bod & Morten H. Christiansen. 2012. How hierarchical is language use? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 279(1747). 4522–4531. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2012.1741>.
- Floyd, Sammy, Adele E Goldberg & Casey Lew-Williams. 2020. Toddlers recognize multiple meanings of polysemous words. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, Cognitive Science Society*.
- Gedik, Tan Arda & Fatma Uslu. 2023. L1-L2 Transfer in Ditransitive Construction: A Usage-based Replication Study with Turkish Speakers of English. In Georgios P. Georgiou, Aretousa Giannakou & Christine Savvidou (eds.), *Advances in Second/Foreign Language Acquisition*, 123–146. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-38522-3_6.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2019. *Explain me this: Creativity, competition, and the partial productivity of constructions / Adele E. Goldberg*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Gruszka, Aleksandra, Gerald Matthews & Blazej Szymura (eds.). 2010. *Handbook of Individual Differences in Cognition: Attention, Memory, and Executive Control* (The Springer Series on Human Exceptionality). New York, NY: Springer New York. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-1210-7>.
- Huettig, Falk & Ramesh K Mishra. 2014. How literacy acquisition affects the illiterate mind—a critical examination of theories and evidence. *Language and Linguistics Compass*. Wiley Online Library 8(10). 401–427.
- Ibbotson, Paul, Vsevolod Salnikov & Richard Walker. 2019. A dynamic network analysis of emergent grammar. *First Language* 39(6). 652–680. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723719869562>.
- Mishra, Ramesh K, Niharika Singh, Aparna Pandey & Falk Huettig. 2012. Spoken language-mediated anticipatory eye movements are modulated by reading ability: Evidence from Indian low and high literates. *Journal of Eye Movement Research* 5(1). 1–10.
- Öksüz, Doğuş Can. 2019. *Collocational processing in typologically different languages, English and Turkish: Evidence from corpora and psycholinguistic experimentation*. Lancaster University PhD Thesis.
- Reis, Alexandra, Manuela Guerreiro & Karl Magnus Petersson. 2003. A sociodemographic and neuropsychological characterization of an illiterate population. *Applied Neuropsychology* 10(4). 191–204.
- Römer, Ute & Selahattin Yilmaz. 2019. Effects of L2 usage and L1 transfer on Turkish learners' production of English verb-argument constructions. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics* (16). 107–134.
- Tomasello, Michael. 2003. *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge,

MA: Harvard University Press.

Uzundağ, Berna A. & Aylin C. Küntay. 2022. The acquisition and use of relative clauses in Turkish-learning children's conversational interactions: a cross-linguistic approach – CORRIGENDUM. *Journal of Child Language* 49(3). 633–633. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000922000150>.

Winckel, Elodie & Ewa Dąbrowska. 2024. Language Analytic Ability, Print Exposure, Memory and Comprehension of Complex Syntax by Adult Native Speakers. *Journal of Cognition* 7(1). 7. <https://doi.org/10.5334/joc.333>.