

# Evaluating Models of Syntactic Category Acquisition without Using a Gold Standard

Stella Frank (s.c.frank@sms.ed.ac.uk) and  
Sharon Goldwater (sgwater@inf.ed.ac.uk) and  
Frank Keller (keller@inf.ed.ac.uk)

School of Informatics, University of Edinburgh  
10 Crichton Street, Edinburgh EH8 9AB, UK

## Abstract

A number of different measures have been proposed for evaluating computational models of human syntactic category acquisition. They all rely on a gold standard set of manually determined categories. However, children's syntactic categories change during language development, so evaluating against a fixed and final set of adult categories is not appropriate. In this paper, we propose a new measure, *substitutable precision and recall*, based on the idea that words which occur in similar syntactic environments share the same category. We use this measure to evaluate three standard category acquisition models (hierarchical clustering, frequent frames, Bayesian HMM) and show that the results correlate well with those obtained using two gold-standard-based measures.

## Introduction

By the time children reach school age, they have achieved the remarkable feat of acquiring most of their native language, typically without explicit instruction. This includes the acquisition of *syntactic categories* (noun, verb, adjective, etc.). A number of computational models of category learning have been developed, most of which conceptualize the problem as one of grouping together words whose syntactic behavior is similar. Typically, the input for the model is taken from a corpus of child-directed speech, and clusters are created based on distributional information (Redington et al., 1998; Mintz, 2003; Parisien et al., 2008).

A problem common to all existing models is the evaluation of the model clusters. Often researchers have tested the output of their models against gold-standard category assignments, such as that available in the CHILDES database (MacWhinney, 2000). These gold-standard categories are based on the intuition of human annotators and are representative of adult morphosyntactic knowledge. Therefore, this type of evaluation is not ideal for assessing the syntactic categories of children, as these may include linguistically valid distinctions not recognized by the gold standard. Conversely, the gold standard may make distinctions that children do not have, or only acquire during language development. For example, at the age of two, English-learning children have not fully acquired the verb category (Olguin & Tomasello, 1993), and functional categories such as determiners are acquired even later (Kemp et al., 2005).

It is therefore highly desirable to develop an evaluation measure that does not make reference to an (adult) gold standard. On the other hand, the measure should give results that correlate with gold-standard-based measures, indicating that it is capable of capturing the linguistic distinctions inherent in the gold-standard. Finally, the ideal measure needs to be

applicable to a wide range of different acquisition models (e.g., it should not be limited to probabilistic models).

This paper proposes a new evaluation measure which meets these criteria: *substitutable precision and recall*. It relies on a classical idea from linguistics, viz., that words which share the same syntactic category occur in similar syntactic environments. It does not require a gold standard, and therefore is suitable for evaluating pre-adult categories. At the same time, it yields results that correlate with gold-standard-based measures. We will show this by applying our new measure, as well as existing measures, to three standard models that discover syntactic categories in child-directed speech. This is the first time these models have been systematically compared; previous authors have used their own evaluation measures and only applied them to their own data sets, thus making a comparison across models difficult.

## Gold-standard-based Evaluation Measures

In the following section we describe two evaluation measures that have been used to evaluate category acquisition models. Both require gold-standard labeled data, which is problematic from an acquisition standpoint for the reasons previously discussed. Hand-labeled data is also scarce, particularly for languages other than English.

Some of the models we investigate categorize word types (a type being a word such as *duck*), whereas others categorize tokens (particular instances of *duck*). In order to compare both kinds of models, the measures we describe are used to score tokens, not types.

**Matched Accuracy** This measure is widely used in the field of Natural Language Processing for unsupervised part-of-speech tagging, in which the tokens of a text are automatically annotated ("tagged") with cluster numbers. To obtain the matched accuracy *MA*, the clusters induced by the model are mapped onto the gold-standard categories in order to provide a gold-standard part-of-speech label for each cluster. *MA* is then defined as the percentage of word tokens with correct category labels. The crucial aspect is the mapping between the clusters and the gold standard categories. In this paper, we use many-to-one accuracy, where each model cluster is matched onto the gold-standard category with which it shares the most tokens. This can result in a situation where multiple clusters are mapped onto the same gold standard category. This means the model is not penalized for creating more fine-grained clusters than the gold standard.

**Pairwise Precision and Recall** These measures are widely used in the cognitive literature on category acquisition (e.g., Redington et al. 1998; Mintz 2003), and are sometimes referred to as accuracy and completeness. To compute them, we consider all possible word pairs. If the words in a pair are grouped together by the model correctly (i.e., they are in the same gold-standard category and in the same model cluster), a true positive ( $tp$ ) is recorded; if they are not in the same gold-standard category, a false positive ( $fp$ ) is recorded. If the two words are not grouped together by the model, but are in the same gold-standard category, then a false negative ( $fn$ ) is recorded. Pairwise precision and recall is then defined as:

$$PP = \frac{tp}{tp + fp} \quad PR = \frac{tp}{tp + fn} \quad (1)$$

Note that  $tp + fp$  is the total number of pairs within model clusters, whereas  $tp + fn$  is the total number of pairs within the same category in the gold-standard.  $PP$  thus measures the proportion of correct pairs within the model clustering (i.e., whether the model clusters together the correct words), while  $PR$  measures the number of correct pairs as a fraction of all pairs in the gold standard (i.e., whether all correct pairs have been found).

### Substitutable Precision and Recall

Our goal is to capture the essential nature of syntactic categories without using the actual categories themselves. Distributional analysis gives us the notion of *substitutability* (Harris, 1946; Brown & Fraser, 1964) as the key aspect of syntactic categories. Substitutable categories are made up of words with identical “privileges of occurrence”, i.e., a syntactic category consists of words which may be substituted for each other within a sentence without making the sentence ungrammatical. For example, *he* and *she* both belong to the same category because *he is happy* and *she is happy* are both grammatical.

The measure we propose, *substitutable precision and recall*, evaluates category acquisition models by testing whether substitutable words — words which appear in the same contexts — have been clustered together. Because nearly-identical sentences (which would be necessary to strictly evaluate substitutability) are rare in corpora, we restrict our notion of context to *frames*: two words appearing in the corpus with exactly one word in between. From these frames, we create substitutable clusters (S-clusters) that consist of the set of word types that appear within the same frame. There is a one-to-one correspondence between S-clusters and frames.

Substitutable precision and recall are calculated similarly to standard pairwise precision and recall. However, this does not require a gold standard; instead, the set of clusters  $C$  induced by the model is compared with the set of S-clusters  $S$ . Substitutable precision  $SP$  (Eq. 2) thus measures whether the clusters consist of substitutable words, while substitutable recall  $SR$  measures to what extent substitutable words have been

clustered together (Eq. 3).<sup>1</sup>

$$SP = \frac{\sum_{s \in S} \sum_{c \in C} |s \cap c| (|s \cap c| - 1)}{\sum_{c \in C} |c| (|c| - 1)} \quad (2)$$

$$SR = \frac{\sum_{s \in S} \sum_{c \in C} |s \cap c| (|s \cap c| - 1)}{\sum_{s \in S} |s| (|s| - 1)} \quad (3)$$

Because the models we are investigating use context information that is similar to frames, there may be danger of overfitting the evaluation measure to the models and their training data. To avoid this, we compute  $SP$  and  $SR$  using a separate test corpus. The S-clusters used for evaluation are based on frames found in both the training and the test corpus, but the words within each S-cluster are from the test corpus only (the test words must be in the training corpus vocabulary). Under the distributional definition, syntactic categories can be interpreted as expectations of substitutability, regardless of whether the members of the category have appeared in the same syntactic context. By using separate, additional data to measure substitutable precision and recall, we evaluate the extent to which these learned expectations of substitutability generalize to increasing amounts of data.

If a frame is made up of words with multiple (model) cluster memberships, the model may have discovered a valid ambiguity. For example, the frame *to — cake* is (using gold standard tags) ambiguous between  $to_{INF} — cake_N$  (“*We are going to eat cake today*”), which has an S-cluster consisting of words such as *bake* and *eat*, and  $to_{PREP} — cake_N$  (“*Put the juice next to his cake*”), with a corresponding S-cluster consisting of words such as *his* or *that*. For this reason, we add cluster membership information (as found by the model being evaluated) to each frame word, as well as to the words in the S-clusters.

By using a separate test corpus, we introduce a dependency on the size of the test set. In our experiments, we use a test set that is six times the size of the training set (we use the Manchester corpus (1.5M words) to train, and the rest of CHILDES (9M words) to test). Additionally, we only evaluate on frames that occur more than once within the test data, since a single occurrence gives no information about which words should be clustered together, and a single occurrence of a rare event also gives little information about which words *not* to cluster together.

### Models of Syntactic Category Acquisition

In this section we briefly describe three models<sup>2</sup> of syntactic category acquisition that we will use to test our evaluation method. These models were chosen primarily for being representative of the space of possible models: they differ, for example, in their treatment of syntactically ambiguous words and whether or not they categorize every word in the corpus.

<sup>1</sup>Note that we retain the pairwise nature of pairwise precision and recall, which leads to the second term in the products (i.e., the number of non-identical pairs in a cluster is  $|c|(|c| - 1)$ )

<sup>2</sup>We use the word *models* loosely; the authors of these systems do not always assume that they are modeling human learning, but may only be examining the possible usefulness of distributional cues.

## Frequent Frames

Our first model is based on the frequent frames (FF) procedure for discovering syntactic categories described by Mintz (2003), which has been influential in the language acquisition community (see, e.g., Gómez & Maye 2005). Mintz’s approach is inspired by behavioral experiments suggesting that human learning of syntactic categories is strongly aided by the presence of frequently occurring frames (Mintz, 2002). In this case, a frame is defined as any ordered pair of words ( $a, b$ ) that occurs in the corpus with a single intervening word. (Note that this differs from our use in the context of evaluation, where the categories assigned to the words are also included in the frame.) The most frequent frames in the corpus are recorded, and for each one, all words that occur within that frame are assigned to the same cluster.

Our implementation follows Mintz in initially defining a cluster for each frame whose frequency is at least 0.09%<sup>3</sup> of the total number of frames in the corpus. Pairs of clusters with the highest overlap in word types, proportionally to the largest of the two clusters, are then iteratively merged until the target number of clusters is reached.

One drawback of FF is that only a very small percentage of tokens are clustered (4%–8% in Mintz’s experiments with corpora of child-directed speech), and these are almost exclusively nouns and verbs. The clusters do, however, have very high accuracy (i.e., words that are grouped together almost always belong to the same gold standard category), and Mintz points out that a much larger percentage of tokens (48%–61%) belong to the same types as those clustered, suggesting that these tokens could be added to the same clusters. However, this does nothing to cluster the large number of word types that never appear in a frequent frame. Moreover, it ignores the problem of syntactic ambiguity: first, because it is not clear what to do if a word type is initially assigned to multiple clusters, and second, because it assumes that all remaining tokens should belong to the same cluster, which may not reflect any true ambiguity.

## Hierarchical Clustering

Researchers in both cognitive science and computational linguistics have proposed algorithms for syntactic category induction based on clustering context vectors (Redington et al., 1998; Clark, 2000; Schütze, 1995). We implemented the algorithm described by Redington et al. (1998), which has probably had the most impact in language acquisition. It treats the  $n$  most frequent word types in the corpus as the target words, and the  $m$  most frequent types are used as context words (where  $m < n$ ). For each target word, a context vector  $\vec{v} = v_1 \dots v_m$  is created, with  $v_i$  equal to the number of times the  $i$ th context word co-occurs with the target word. Specific context positions (e.g., one word to the left of the target, two words to the right) are accounted for by collecting separate vectors for each position and concatenating them. The simi-

<sup>3</sup>We use a slightly lower cutoff than Mintz (who used 0.13%) in order to have enough frames to make 80 clusters in the experiments.

larity between vectors is computed using the Spearman rank correlation, and a tree structure is created by iteratively clustering together the most similar words (or previously created clusters). By “cutting” the tree at different heights, different numbers of clusters can be produced. The best results of Redington et al. (1998) are with  $n = 1000$ ,  $m = 150$ , and two positions on either side of each target word as context. We use the same parameters here.

An important property of this hierarchical clustering (HC) model is the fact that the context vector for each word type combines the context counts for all tokens of that word. Therefore, every token of a particular word is assigned to the same syntactic category, regardless of the specific context in which it appears.

Although HC does not cluster every word in the corpus, its coverage is far more complete than that of FF. Even in a very large corpus, Zipf’s law ensures that the 1000 most frequent words account for most of the corpus. Despite its broad coverage, however, HC only performs well on words with high frequency, unlike children, who can learn words (and their usage, i.e. their syntactic categories) on the basis of very few observations (Woodward et al., 1994). In contrast, FF may categorize some words that occur only once, provided they occur inside frequent frames.

## Bayesian Hidden Markov Model

Unlike the previous algorithmic approaches, the third approach is based on a probabilistic model. We consider the Bayesian HMM (BHMM) proposed by Goldwater & Griffiths (2007) as our third model because it contrasts with the previous two on several levels: in addition to being based on a probabilistic model, it categorizes every word in the corpus, and it can deal with ambiguity, i.e., it may assign different tokens of the same word type to different clusters.

As a variant of the standard HMM, this model assumes that the corpus is probabilistically generated as a sequence of cluster labels (tags), each of which in turn generates the observed word. The model considers different possible sequences of tags, searching for a sequence that can explain the observed words well, while also being linguistically plausible. In this case, plausibility is enforced using Bayesian priors to capture the intuition that the HMM transition and output distributions are *sparse*, i.e., that each tag is followed by relatively few other tags with high probability, and outputs relatively few words with high probability. In contrast to the other models, neighboring words affect the BHMM’s decision about a word’s category only indirectly, through their category labels.

Our implementation of the BHMM uses Gibbs sampling to identify a sequence of tags that has high probability under the model. In this implementation, the only free parameter of the model is the number of clusters used. In our experiments, we ran the Gibbs sampler for 2000 iterations.

## Model Implementation and Experiments

For all our experiments, we used the Manchester corpus (Theakston et al., 2001), which is annotated with syntactic

ADJ	Adjectives, e.g., <i>funny, pink</i>
ADV	Adverbs, e.g., <i>today, just, normally</i>
OTH	Miscellaneous, e.g., <i>yes, well, hurray</i>
CONJ	Conjunctions, e.g., <i>and, or</i>
DET	Determiners, e.g., <i>a, those, six</i>
INF	Infinitival <i>to</i>
N	Nouns and Pronouns, e.g., <i>you, duckie</i>
NEG	Negations, e.g., <i>not</i>
PART	Participles, e.g., <i>raining, hidden</i>
PREP	Prepositions, e.g., <i>on, to, after</i>
QN	Quantifiers, e.g., <i>many, all, some</i>
V	Verbs, e.g., <i>swim, do, is</i>

Table 1: Collapsed gold-standard categories

categories and is part of the CHILDES database (MacWhinney, 2000). The Manchester corpus consists of transcribed recordings of 12 children interacting with adults, and covers an age range of 1 year 8 months to 3 years. Our models are trained only on child-directed speech (CDS), so we removed all child utterances, as well as any utterances containing unintelligible words; additionally, we split contractions (e.g., *aren't*) into separate words and added beginning-of-sentence and end-of-sentence markers (which were included in the frames used to create S-clusters, but not in the frames used to train the FF model). This left approximately 1.5M words and 360,000 child-directed utterances.

The original set of syntactic categories used for the Manchester corpus contains detailed morphosyntactic information, e.g., *playing* is annotated *part|play-PROG*. After stripping out the morphological information, the category inventory contained 53 categories. We also created a collapsed inventory consisting of 12 categories (see Table 1).

For each of the models described in the previous section, we varied the number of clusters  $K$  over three conditions: 12 (as in the collapsed category inventory), 53 (as in the original inventory) and 80 (to create more fine-grained clusters). One of the advantages of the substitutable precision-recall measures is that they do not depend on the gold standard for the “true” number of clusters; thus there is no penalty for a clustering that does not have the same number of clusters as the gold standard.

We also compared each  $K$  condition against a random baseline. For each cluster in the gold standard, we created a cluster with the same number of word types, selected at random from the full vocabulary (the  $K = 80$  and  $K = 53$  conditions shared the same random baseline). This results in a random clustering with the same cluster size distribution as the gold standard, and all tokens of each type in the same cluster.

Our goal is to show that substitutable precision and recall yield informative evaluation results without requiring a gold standard. We therefore evaluated each category acquisition model not only with substitutable precision and recall,  $SP$  and  $SR$ , but also with the measures introduced earlier: matched accuracy  $MA$  and pairwise precision  $PP$  and recall  $PR$ .

A problem arises, however, when we try to compare the three clustering models: they each categorize a different subset of the data. The BHMM model assigns categories to ev-

Measures	Spearman’s rho
$SP, PP$	0.638*
$SR, PR$	0.755**
$SP, MA$	0.677*

Table 2: Spearman’s rho correlations between the rankings given by a pair of evaluation metrics ( $N = 12$ ), computed using the merge condition results; \*\*:  $p < 0.01$ ; \*:  $p < 0.05$ ; all correlations not included in the table are non-significant.

Model	$K$	$PP$	$PR$	$MA$	$SP$	$SR$
Random	12	0.205	0.324	<b>0.796</b>	0.000065	0.254458
Random	53	0.096	0.254	0.720	0.000092	0.173907
BHMM	12	<b>0.570</b>	0.263	0.721	<b>0.000221</b>	0.308508
BHMM	53	<b>0.624</b>	0.175	<b>0.747</b>	<b>0.000347</b>	0.109927
BHMM	80	<b>0.657</b>	0.128	<b>0.775</b>	<b>0.000330</b>	0.084811
HC	12	0.201	<b>0.864</b>	0.361	0.000046	<b>0.375467</b>
HC	53	0.330	<b>0.654</b>	0.523	0.000117	<b>0.202372</b>
HC	80	0.484	<b>0.512</b>	0.639	0.000159	<b>0.183736</b>
FF	12	0.220	0.244	0.448	0.000027	0.217124
FF	53	0.219	0.079	0.392	0.000039	0.120499
FF	80	0.224	0.053	0.423	0.000043	0.096760

Table 3: Results for the merge condition. The best score for each evaluation type and number-of-clusters condition is highlighted.

ery token, the FF model assigns categories to only those word types which appear within frequent frames, and the HC model only categorizes the 1000 most frequent word types. We resolve this problem in two ways. In the *merge* condition, we combine all words that are not clustered by the model into one large cluster. In the *split* condition, we assign each unclustered word to its own cluster. The difference in performance between these two conditions thus indicates the effect of the unclustered words.

Additionally, it is necessary to assign each token in the text to a category, if the model does not categorize tokens (as BHMM does). For HC, each token of a given type is assigned to the type’s category. In the FF model, a word type can belong to multiple categories, making it unclear which category a particular token should be assigned to. We assigned tokens found in frequent frames to the category defined by that frame; other instances of ambiguous types were assigned to a given cluster with probability  $p(c_i|w_i) = \frac{|c_i|}{\sum_{c:w \in c} |c|}$ , that is, according to the size of the clusters that include the ambiguous word type.

## Results

The results are given in Table 3. We first discuss them in light of our proposed evaluation measures,  $SP$  and  $SR$ , and then go on to compare the performance of the different models.

### Comparison of Evaluation Measures

Figure 1 shows the similar performance of the two precision-recall measures. Results for  $SP$  and  $SR$  are significantly cor-




Figure 1: Pairwise precision and recall on the left, substitutable precision and recall on the right. The size of the points indicates the number of clusters: small points are for 12 clusters, medium points for 53, large points for 80. HC and FF results are for the merge condition.




Figure 2: Ranked cluster sizes, measured in types: the x-axis represents the clusters, which are ordered according to size; the y-axis gives the size of the clusters on a log scale (GS: gold standard; BHMM: Bayesian HMM; HC: hierarchical clustering, FF: frequent frames). Note the random baseline clusters have the same type-size-distribution as GS.

related with  $PP$  and  $PR$ , respectively (Table 2).  $SP$  also correlates with  $MA$  significantly. This demonstrates that without using the gold standard,  $SP$  and  $SR$  can capture similar distinctions as  $PP$ ,  $PR$ , and  $MA$ .

The values of  $SP$  that we obtain are extremely small. This is due to the fact that, overall, the S-clusters from the frames are much smaller than the model clusters. Because the S-clusters are gathered from a finite set of data, they do not describe complete substitutability. In other words, while membership in a cluster implies substitutability, non-membership does not rule out substitutability. However, all models are penalized equally by this lack of complete data.

It is also interesting to note that the FF models did not do better when evaluated on  $SP$  and  $SR$ , compared to  $PP$  and  $PR$ , despite superficial similarities between the model’s clustering

method and the S-clusters. This demonstrates the importance of using separate testing data: the FF models were unable to generalize to new data.

## Model Performance

The different model types find very different word clusterings, as Fig. 2 helps to illustrate. HC creates clusters with highly skewed sizes (most extremely so in the 12 cluster condition, in which 969 of the 1000 clustered word types are put into one cluster). The cluster size distribution of FF models is much flatter, indicative of FF’s propensity to create highly ambiguous clusterings, in which each word type belongs to many clusters. The BHMM clusterings also have higher levels of lexical ambiguity than the gold standard, resulting in more larger clusters overall, both in terms of types and tokens. Both BHMM and FF tend towards more ambiguity with more clusters. It should be noted as well that the token distributions are highly similar to the type distributions.

Keeping these distributions in mind, we can ask how they affect the evaluation metrics. We expect clusterings with peaked distributions (most words in few clusters) to perform better on recall-based measures ( $PR$ ,  $SR$ ), whereas flatter distributions with high ambiguity may perform better on precision-based measures ( $MA$ ,  $PP$ ,  $SP$ ). Indeed, we find this to be the case. BHMM models perform best on  $PP$ ,  $MA$ , and  $SP$ , while HC models perform best on  $PR$  and  $SR$  (Table 3). The Random baseline clusterings do surprisingly well, outperforming FF on several measures — even slightly on  $SP$  and  $SR$ , for which there should be less advantage for baseline models linked to the gold-standard. This underlines the importance of finding clusters with gold-standard-like size distributions.

## Effect of Unclustered Words

Both the HC and FF do not cluster all word types found in the training data. The HC model clusters only the most fre-

Model	K	PP	PR	MA	SP	SR
HC	12	0.016	0.750	<b>0.380</b>	0.000030	0.193955
HC	53	0.059	0.405	<b>0.550</b>	0.000061	0.061327
HC	80	0.086	0.338	<b>0.666</b>	0.000091	0.046781
FF	12	0.219	0.238	<b>0.486</b>	0.000018	0.095166
FF	53	<b>0.240</b>	0.072	<b>0.440</b>	0.000028	0.023271
FF	80	<b>0.260</b>	0.046	<b>0.471</b>	0.000035	0.014687

Table 4: Results for the split condition. Scores that have improved with respect to the merge condition are in bold.

quent 1000 types, which in our data set make up only 9% of types, but account for 95% of the tokens. FF clusters more types (70%), but these also make up 95% of tokens, indicating that some frequent words (i.e., the words in the frames themselves) remain unclustered.

In the split condition, the remaining types are split up into separate clusters, while in the merge condition they are merged into one large cluster. Splitting up unclustered words improved *MA* performance for both HC and FF. This increase in *MA* is expected, given that smaller clusters result in higher accuracy, but the increase was only slight, since relatively few word tokens were affected. FF models with more clusters also saw higher *PP* performance. This again is to be expected; more surprising is the fact that HC models did not improve. This indicates that much of HC's performance in the merge condition was due to the unclustered-words cluster, which included 90% of the word types (and thus many with the same gold standard category).

*SP* and *SR* also decrease in the split condition, in most cases by nearly 50%. This also indicates that original performance was greatly boosted by the unclustered-words cluster, since as a pairwise measure, *SP* and *SR* do not capture clusters with only one word type, effectively removing the unclustered words from this measure.

## Conclusions and Future Work

This paper dealt with the problem of evaluating computational models of human syntactic category acquisition. We started from the observation that children's syntactic categories change during language development, which means that an evaluation against a fixed gold-standard (typically based on adult linguistic intuitions) is not adequate. As an alternative, we proposed substitutable precision and recall, a measure based on the idea that words which share the same category occur in similar syntactic environments. We showed that our new measure significantly correlates with existing, gold-standard measures: substitutable precision correlates with pairwise precision and matched accuracy, and substitutable recall correlates with pairwise recall.

This paper also presented the first systematic comparison of three standard acquisition models from the literature: Redington et al.'s (1998) hierarchical clustering model, which performed well on recall-oriented measures, Goldwater & Griffiths's (2007) Bayesian HMM, which performed well on precision-oriented measures, and Mintz's (2003) frequent frame model which showed surprisingly poor performance.

Finally, we also demonstrated that evaluation results strongly depend on how unclustered words are evaluated.

In future work, we will explore the external validity of substitutable precision and recall. While it is important to show that it correlates with existing evaluation measures, we also need to test it against experimental data (e.g., substitutability judgments). Additionally, we plan to apply it to longitudinal acquisition corpora to evaluate models which follow the time course of category development.

## References

- Brown, R., & Fraser, C. (1964). The acquisition of syntax. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 29(1), 43–79.
- Clark, A. (2000). Inducing syntactic categories by context distribution clustering. In *Proceedings of CoNLL* (pp. 91–94).
- Goldwater, S., & Griffiths, T. (2007). A fully Bayesian approach to unsupervised part-of-speech tagging. In *Proceedings of ACL* (pp. 744–751).
- Gómez, R., & Maye, J. (2005). The developmental trajectory of nonadjacent dependency learning. *Infancy*, 7, 183–206.
- Harris, Z. (1946). From morpheme to utterance. *Language*, 22(3), 161–183.
- Kemp, N., Lieven, E., & Tomasello, M. (2005). Young children's knowledge of the “determiner” and “adjective” categories. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 48(3), 592–609.
- MacWhinney, B. (2000). *The CHILDES project: Tools for analyzing talk*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mintz, T. (2002). Category induction from distributional cues in an artificial language. *Memory and Cognition*, 30, 678–686.
- Mintz, T. (2003). Frequent frames as a cue for grammatical categories in child directed speech. *Cognition*, 90, 91–117.
- Olguin, R., & Tomasello, M. (1993). Twenty-five-month-old children do not have a grammatical category of verb. *Cognitive Development*, 8(3), 245–272.
- Parisien, C., Fazly, A., & Stevenson, S. (2008). An incremental Bayesian model for learning syntactic categories. In *Proceedings of CoNLL* (pp. 89–96).
- Redington, M., Chater, N., & Finch, S. (1998). Distributional information: a powerful cue for acquiring syntactic categories. *Cognitive Science*, 22, 425–469.
- Schütze, H. (1995). Distributional part-of-speech tagging. In *Proceedings of EACL* (pp. 141–148).
- Theakston, A. L., Lieven, E. V., Pine, J. M., & Rowland, C. F. (2001). The role of performance limitations in the acquisition of verb-argument structure: an alternative account. *Journal of Child Language*, 28, 127–152.
- Woodward, A. L., Markman, E. M., & Fitzsimmons, C. M. (1994). Rapid word learning in 13- and 18-month-olds. *Developmental Psychology*, 30(4), 553–566.