Psychology of Language and Communication 1999, Vol. 3, No. 1

AYLIN C. KÜNTAY
University of California, Berkeley

HOW DO TURKISH PRESCHOOLERS ANCHOR REFERENTS IN CONVERSATIONAL EXTENDED DISCOURSE?*

Most studies that examine how children introduce new referents into discourse have used experimental referential disambiguation techniques or picture-based storytelling tasks. One of the most prevalent findings is that young children mostly use definite expressions as first-mention forms, inappropriately presupposing listener familiarity with the encoded referents. Studies on children's referential strategies in their naturally occasioned narratives are very sparse. The focus of this study is to examine how Turkish preschool children manage introduction of referents in their conversationally occasioned extendeddiscourse, specifically in their lists and personal narratives. Analyses suggest that preschool children display more mature-looking linguistic strategies to present referents into their conversationally extended discourse than into their picture-based narratives. The results are discussed in terms of the different pragmatic pressures exerted by picture-based and naturalistic discourse activities.

Young children talking about objects over the phone or acting out lively stories often lose adults with ambiguous or unidentifiable references in their speech. Yet, in other speech contexts, adults find themselves dumbfounded by the lucidity of the referential content that the very same children display. As a result, our folk thinking about the competency of young children's referential strategies remains indeterminate.

Most developmental studies which examine preschool children's referential introduction strategies concur with the "limited proficiency" notion in our folk double-think. In a nutshell, the prevailing conclusion cutting across these studies is that preschool children fail to mark newness of first-mention referents to their listeners, inappropriately assuming that their audience shares the same perspective or state of knowledge.

The three types of methodologies that have been commonly used to examine referential strategies in oral language are *referent disambiguation tasks* (e.g., Clark, 1970; Dasinger, 1995; Karmiloff-Smith, 1979; MacWhinney & Bates, 1978; Maratsos, 1976; Warden, 1976), *picture-based storytelling tasks* (e.g., Bamberg, 1987; Dasinger, 1995; Hickmann, 1982; Hickmann,

---

* The article is based on a paper presented at the International Conference "Children's discourse from a narrative perspective" (Kazimierz Dolny, September 17–21,1998, Poland). Requests for reprints should be sent to the author at the Institute of Cognitive Studies, University of California, Berkeley CA 94720, USA. E-mail: kuntay@cogsci.berkeley.edu

1995; Hickmann, et al., 1996; Küntay, 1995; Nakamura, 1993; Smoczyńska, 1992; Warden, 1981), and *animated video storytelling tasks* (e.g., Chafe, 1980; Clancy, 1992). These experimental procedures allow researchers to systematically manipulate the types and interrelationships of referable entities in addition to providing a standard content for subjects' talk.

Despite their methodological advantages, the referential behavior observed in such elicited situations cannot be unproblematically generalized to naturalistic talk settings in which new referents are introduced into conversational extended discourse. It is highly likely that a speaker who volunteers a narrative will use different referential strategies to set up characters than one who is offered the floor for a picture-constrained building up of an extended turn. As Bornens (1990) argues, picture-based stories cannot substitute for reality-based stories and might lead to apparent incognizance in young children with respect to the unity of characters across successive frames. With a similar implication, Orsolini and Di Giacinto (1996) aptly point out that selection of introductory forms is constrained by the discourse genre. Although there are problems in extrapolating research findings based on stories collected primarily as a response to visually presented stimuli, studies on children's referential strategies in their naturally occasioned narratives are very sparse. There are some recent studies of children's conversationally prompted narratives (Peterson 1993; Peterson & McCabe, 1994)[1]. Although illuminating, the developmental analyses undertaken in these studies do not dwell on the specific linguistic forms employed by the children, finding it adequate to distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate referent introductions[2]. Thus, referential strategies displayed in young children's naturally produced extended discourse clearly need to be further studied.

In attempting to speak to this research gap, this paper examines howTurkish preschool children linguistically manage referent introductions in their conversationally occasioned extended discourse. Two commonly observed types of discourse structure constituted the primary focus of interest: *lists* and *narratives*. In lists speakers mention various entities in successive verbal frames, building referential structures, whereas in narratives, Schiffrin (1994) points out that "the basic syntactic unit of a narrative is a clause with temporal juncture, i.e. an event that moves reference time forward, [while] the basic unit of a list is an entity, i.e. anything of which something may be predicated" (p. 297). Both types of discourse structures were very comon in Turkish preschool children's speech. It was deemed important to differentiate lists from narratives in the upcoming analyses given that the two discourse types have different conversational functions and display dissimilar structural features.

Data collection and analysis

The data analyzed for this paper comes from a dissertation study in which elicitation techniques and ethnographic methods were combined to obtain different types of extended discourse from the same set of Turkish preschool children. There was a total of 46 3- to 6-year-old children who participated in the study. The focus here is on the naturalistically

---

[1] These researchers employ a very useful strategy for eliciting narratives which they call "conversational maps", in which familiar researchers interview children by asking about events that might have happened to them (for e.g., *"Have you ever been to the doctor? You have? Tell me about it. What happened?"*).
Althought this method tapped into common childhood experiences and therefore was able to prompt the children to tell personal narratives, the effect of the adult initiation of topics is clearly visible in the transcripts.

[2] For NP introductions, the categories include *related introductions* which "make sense", *unrelated introductions*, *problematic introductions*, and *exophoric referents* (see Peterson, 1993, p. 513).

acquired part of the data although some issues regarding the elicited picture-book stories will be brought up as a backdrop to the main line of discussion.

In order to gather naturalistic extended discourse from Turkish preschoolers, I visited a preschool, which I will call the Eryavuz Center, for two to three days a week over a period of three and a half months. Once I familiarized myself with the curriculum of the different activities at the preschool, I started recording various organized and freetime activities which seemed to occasion child-initiated and child-sustained extended discourse. In addition, I always carried a small tape-recorder in my pocket to record personal narratives and other extended discourse which were often told to me[3].

For this paper, I looked at referential introduction forms in two types of extended discourse types from the transcripts: *lists* and *narratives*. *Lists* were identified by looking for discourse structures that focus on successive character introductions within simple verbal frames. *Narratives*, for the purposes of this study, were determined to be discourse structures that incorporate a real or imaginary timeline on which mentioned events are ordered[4]. Once the discourse segments of interest were identified, those clauses that serve the function of reference introduction were coded for the linguistic strategies used in them. The next section will present the relevant linguistic devices offered by the Turkish language for expressing indefiniteness while introducing new referents into discourse[5].

Introducing referents in the Turkish language

In Turkish, there are no obligatory articles which determine the status of definite versus indefinite nouns in subject position. However, the numeral one *bir* can be employed as an optional marker of indefiniteness, as seen in the contrast between the translations of the following two examples:

(1) ***bir*** *çocuk ev-in-den* *çık-mış*[6]
INDEF child house-GEN-ABL go.out-EVID[7]
('A child went out of his house')

[3] My avalability and attentiveness as a listener must have led the children to identify me as a convenient audience. Their preschool teachers were definitely not as eager to listen as I was to the children's narratives. Most of the children were very fast to identify my difference from the other adults in terms of receptiveness to their extended discourse.

[4] This particular working definition of narrative discourse type clearly runs the risk of oversimplification of what constitutes a narrative in children's talk. Many narrative-like sequences in children's conversations do not involve temporal sequencing. For a detailed discussion of the issues surrounding the definition of the narrative genre, see Küntay, 1997.

[5] Following Du Bois (1980), indefinite expressions are those which have referents presumed non-identifiable by the listener. Definite expressions, on the other hand, have referents that are presumed to be identifiable by the listener.

[6] All examples in this paper are taken from the actual discourse of Turkish preschool children. This and the following example were provided as character-introduction clauses in picture-based stories of two children.

[7] The abbreviations used in the glosses are: ABL [= ablative], ACC [= accusative], DIM [=diminutive], EVID [= evidential], GEN [= genitive], INDEF [= indefinite marker], INF [= infinitive], PA [= past], PA.PERF [= past perfect], PL [= plural], POS [= possessive], PROG [= progressive], PV [= passive], 1SG [= first person singular], 3PL [= third person plural].

(2) *çocuk ev-in-den* *çık-mış*
child house-GEN-ABL go.out-EVID
'The/A child went out of his house'

The presence of the indefinite numeral *bir* in (1) signals that the referent, the child, is newly introduced for the listener. The absence of *bir*, as in (2), leaves the indefiniteness status of the noun unmarked, leaving it to the situational context and the listener's inferential system to fill in the information.

For nouns in non-subject grammatical roles, such as objects, case endings become relevant to the interpretation of definiteness. Unless nouns in non-subject positions are preceded by the indefinite numeral *bir*, referential terms with non-nominative case endings call for a definite interpretation which can be translated with the definite article *the* into English.

Apart from these nominal devices, Turkish, like many other languages, offers a presentational frame which functions as a topic-promoting construction. Lambrecht (1994) points out that the function of presentational constructions is to introduce a referent into the scene of the discourse, raising it into the addressee's consciousness. Turkish presentational constructions can be recognized by the frame *X var*, 'X exists', where X denotes an entity that is introduced into the discourse. An example of a presentational construction observed in the beginning of a conversational narrative of a 4-year-old girl is given in (3):

(3) *Gizem-le* *Cerem* ***var***
Gizem-WITH Cerem exists
'There is Gizem and Cerem'
Hep *benim-le* *oynu-yor-lar*
always me-WITH play-PROG-3PL
'(They) always play with me'...

Meltem[8] (4-year-old girl)

Introducing referents in conversational lists

As mentioned before, presenting a collection of items as part of a descriptive discourse structure is a very common speech activity that Turkish preschoolers engage in. Such lists were mostly spontaneous, volunteered and sustained by the children, often leading to a sidestepping of adult questions calling for a shift to narration. Although listings of activities conveyed through serialized verbs were also observed, most lists included noun phrases that were embedded in single-argument verbal frames. Verbs were frequently omitted in many of the non-initial clauses that constitute the list. The following example from a 5-year-old girl exhibits many of the common features of lists:

(4) **Presents from Europe**

Mine had mentioned earlier in the day that her parents had returned from a trip to Europe the day before.

[8] All names used in the paper for the children are pseudonyms.

01 *biliyomusunuz annem bana ne al-dı?*
do.you.know my.mother to.me what buy-PA
'Do you know what my mother bought for me?'
02 *deniz kızı*
sea girl
'Sea mermaid'
Res[9] *aaah! çok güzel*
'Wow! Very nice'
03 *annem çanta al-mış*
my.mother bag got-EVID
'My mother got (me) (a) bag'
04 *kazak al-mış*
sweater get-EVID
'(She) got (a) sweater'
05 *yeni çoraplar*
new socks
'New socks'
06 *kıyafetler*
clothings
'Clothing'
Res *iyi gez-miş-ler-mi?*
'Did (they) [= your parents] travel well?'
07 *bi tane pantalon al-mış*
INDEF pants got-EVID
'(She) got (me) one (pair of) pants'
Res *kime, sana mı?*
'To who? To you?'
08 *evet*
yes
'yes'
09 *gömlek al-mış-lar*
shirt get-EVID-3PL
'(They) got (me) (a) shirt'
{One of the teachers comes in and interrupts the talk by asking if the children in the room have started tidying up.}

Mine (5-year-old girl)

The extended discourse starts with Mine volunteering to tell what her mother brought from Europe. She starts by mentioning the most prominent entity in her mind, the sea mermaid (02), but then goes on to list many other presents that were brought to her (03-06). In 05 and 06, she ellipts the verb *almak* 'to get', relying on the global configuration provided by the structure of the list. Schiffrin (1994) points out that "ellipsis is a struking illustration of how lists reduce the need to predicate something about each individual

[9] *Res* stands for the researcher.

item, rather any properties of the item that need to be known to merit its inclusion in the list are assumed (or presupposed) from shared knowledge about what category is being described" (p. 297). As for markers of indefiniteness, most of the entities are not prefaced by the indefinite numeral *bi(r)* except the pants in 07. However, since the introductory referential terms are in non-subject grammatical roles and *not* marked by non-nominative case-endings, a "non-definite interpretation" is evoked.

The next example comes from a 4-year-old, who tells about his favorite dream by mentioning all the characters, but without recounting any events.

(5) **A nice dream**

Res *peki Emrecim, sen hiç rüya görürmüsün?*
'OK, Emre, dear, do you ever have dreams?'
01 *rüya görü-yor-um ama*
dream see-PROG-1SG but
'I have dreams but'
02 *güzel rüya-lar-ım-dan bitanesini-- bi tanesini her zaman aklı-m-da*
nice dream-PL-POS-ABL one-POS-ACC always mind-POS-LOC]
tutu-yor-um
keep-PROG-1SG
'I always keep one of-- one of my nice dreams in my mind'
Res *hangisi-- anlat bakim*
'Which one-- tell (me)'
03 *annem babam va--* {discarded start}
'my.mom my.dad'
04 *annem var-dı rüya-m-da*
my.mom exist-PA dream-POS-LOC
'There was my mother in my dream'
05 *babam var-dı*
my.dad exist-PA
'There was my father'
06 *ben var-dı-m*
I exist-PA-1SG
'There was me'
07 *bi çiftlik var-dı*
INDEF farm exist-PA
'There was a farm'
08 *kuzu-lar var-dı*
lamb-PL exist-PA
'There were lambs'
09 *öyle bi rüya gör-dü-m ben bi kere*
like.that INDEF dream see-PA-1SG I once
'Once I saw a dream like that'

Erce (4-year-old boy)

In telling about his favorite dream, instead of describing what happens in his dream, Erce highlights the entities that "existed" in his dream as units of a list. In 07, he prefaces his

introduction of the referential term *çiftlik* 'farm' with the indefinite numeral *bi*. Other referents in his list are represented kinship terms (04 and 05), first-person pronoun (06), and a pluralized nominal (08), all being identificationally adequate. He provides a summary in 09 to end the list and link it back to the conversational topic of dreams. Thus, from his perspective, he has completed the "telling" of his dream although he did not recount any action.

In summary, on many occasions, the children were observed providing lists, even sometimes as a response to promptings which obviously probed for personal experience narratives. Although lists are not as complex discourse structures as narratives, they provide insights into prechool children's fledgling referential strategies. It appears that, in young Turkish children's list structures, a set of referential terms are successfully employed in presenting listed entities into discourse. It seems that the predictable and categorical structure of lists, which leads to ellipsis of much of non-nominal information, has a facilitative effect on the referential movement of children across their extended discourse, allowing them to incorporate many entities successively.

Introducing referents in conversational narratives

Usually Turkish preschoolers open up their narratives by identifying the referents that get involved in the subsequent reported events. One very common way of introducing characters in children's speech is through using presentation constructions involving the predicate *var* 'exists', which functions to situate a relevant entity in the story world. Very often children introduced third-person participants into their conversational narratives using a presentational construction featuring the existential predicate *var* 'to exist' and a possessive construction tying the referent as a possessed item to themselves (POS+PR construction). The following example illustrates a POS+PR construction used by Emre, a 4-year-old boy, in the initial "scene-setting" part of his narrative. (The possessive relation is between the storyteller and the third-person participant. See example (6).)

(6) **Small camera**

01	*bir defa-cık*	*benim*	*küçük bi*	*kamera-**m***	***var-dı***
	once-DIM	my	small INDEF	camera-**POS**	**exist**-PA
	'Once I had a small camera'				
02	*resim*	*çek-mek*	*isti-yo-du-m*		
	picture	take-INF	want-PROG-PA-1SG		
	'I wanted to take pictures with it'.				
	{He goes on to tell a narrative about the camera}				

Emre (4-year-old boy)

As seen in 01, Emre uses a presentational construction to introduce an inanimate discourse entity (i.e., a camera) into his narrative and also prefaces the referential term by a descriptive adjective (i.e., *küçük*, 'small'). He also uses the indefinite numeral *bir*. Most of the first-mention forms observed in Turkish children's personal narratives were similarly sophisticated.

Within the broader scene-setting function, the usage of a specialized presentational construction fulfills the purpose of setting up a discourse entity for future predication. As seen in the following example, Turkish children often use explicit third person pronouns in case-endings to continue referring to an element introduced by a presentational

construction in the preceding clause. Most character-introductory constructions did not render any further elaboration of the presented referent within the same introductory clause.

(7) **Police motorcycle**

Res naptınız Egenin doğumgününde?
'What did (you) do on Ege's birthday?' [= another child in the preschool]
01 *işte öyle benim doğumgünümde Ege gel-di*
now such on.my.birthday Ege come-PA
'Well, on my birthday, Ege came'
02 *ondan evvel de şey yap-mıştı-k*
that before PART thing did-PA.PER-1PL
'And before that we had done something'
03 *ben-im büyük bi polis araba-m var*
I-GEN big INDEF police car-POS exists
'I have a big police car'
04 *motosiklet-i büyük-- büyük bi motosiklet-i var*
motorcyle-POS big-- big INDEF motorcycle-POS exists
'(Its) motorcycle is big-- it has a big motorcycle' {self-correction}
05 *o-na Sinan-la ikimiz bin-di-k*
it-DAT Sinan-WITH two.of.us ride-PA-1PL
'We rode/got onto it Sinan and me, two of us'
06 *onu-- kı-rıl-dı*
it-ACC-- break-PV-PA
'It-Accusative-- (it) got broken' {reframing from an active into a passive construction}

Ali (4-year-old boy)

In 03, Ali introduces a referent – a police car – that would be focussed on in the rest of the narrative. In 05, Ali uses a clause-initial, dative-marked pronominal device to maintain reference to the motorcycle. We see that the referential term gets further attenuated to a zero form (i.e., no explicit form) in 06. Although Ali is really fastidious in presenting the inanimate referents, the police car and the motorcycle, into his discourse, employing identificationally explicit forms, he uses an unidentifiable proper name, *Sinan*, in 05. Incidentally, the remainder of the conversation with Ali continues with the adult probing into who Sinan is.

The most "infelicitous" type of introductory forms attested in the Turkish preschoolers' conversational narratives were unidentifiable proper names. Even within the entire corpus collected from a single child, the identificational effort undertaken by linguistic strategies accompanying various proper names differed from one instance of usage to others. That is, the same child could use a very elaborate way of presenting a person into discourse, while, in other situations, he/she could just plunge further into his/her telling after simply mentioning the new referent by a proper name.

In summary, preschool children are careful to employ referential structures that do not presuppose shared information with their addressees with respect to newly introduced entities in their conversational narratives. However, occasionally proper names are used for family members or close friends without an elaboration needed to identify the referent.

Summary and discussion

In their conversational lists and narratives, Turkish preschool children commonly use presentational constructions for anchoring referents into their extended discourse. For introducing third-person participants, they use a special presentational construction featuring the existential predicate *var* 'to exist' along with the possessive pronoun (i.e., the POS+PR construction), linguistically establishing the possessed relation of the referent to themselves. Presentational constructions in narratives allow young speakers to be able to hold back on further predication about newly introduced referents until later non-introductory clauses. In lists, young children carry out the discourse agenda of successive introduction of several elements through using the simple and highly predictable verbal frames offered by presentational clauses. In most of their extended discourse, except with some difficulties with respect to talking about familiar people using proper names, preschool children seem to display competent strategies that respect the indefinite status of newly introduced referents.

The analysis of referential introductions in conversationally occasioned extended discourse demonstrates that Turkish preschool children do not launch into their discourse without making sure that they orient the listener to whom and what they are talking about. However, as pointed out in the introduction, there is a vast amount of research on discourse development that suggests that preschoolers fail to show appropriate referential skills. These seemingly discrepant positions on how competent preschool children are in presenting referents into discourse can be reconciled if methodological differences are taken into account.

To reiterate, most studies on development of referent identifiability is based on picture-based prompts. Despite offering advantages such as control of content and therefore comparability across individual stories, picture-based prompts bring about a referential structure too much of a "here and now" quality. Clancy (1992) proposes that what looks like inappropriate reference in the picture-book narrative context might be an indicator of misapplication of a referential strategy which is admissible in other contexts. For adult-like performance in presentation of new referents, the young child should apply discourse conventions that they apply in their conversational extended discourse, where the issue of referent identifiability genuinely arises. The problem of referent identifiability does not authentically arise in a picture-narrating situation since it is mutually assumed by both the narrator and the listener that the former is talking about what he or she is looking at unless otherwise specified. Even for older speakers, an abrupt plunge into the description of pictured events would not come across as pragmatically inappropriate as when telling stories about past events and absent characters.

The appropriate referential performance requires coordination among a variety of subskills such as the ability to infer the listener's knowledge state, knowledge of the referential conventions of the language, and organization of large stretches of discourse. There is no evidence that any of these subskills are completely out of preschoolers' range of competence. However, it looks like some speech production situations lead them to utilize their still fragile subskills regarding referential practice with more effectiveness. As researchers, we should keep our eyes open for the different pressures exerted by different discourse contexts and narrative situations with respect to referential choice, instead of taking for granted an absolute "egocentrism" attributed by several researchers to preschool age children.

References

Bamberg, M. (1987). *The acquisition of narratives: Learning to use language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bornens, M.T. (1990). Problems brought about by "reading" a sequence of pictures. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 49*, 189–226.

Chafe, W.L.E. (1980). *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Clancy, P. (1992). Referential strategies in the narratives of Japanese children. *Discourse Processes, 15*, 441–467.

Clark, E.V. (1970). How young children describe events in time. In G.B.F. d'Arcais & W.J.M. Levelt (Eds.), *Advances in psycholinguistics* (pp. 275–284). Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Dasinger, L. (1995). *The development of discourse competence in native Finnish speaking children: A study of the expression of definiteness*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Du Bois, J.W. (1980). Beyond difiniteness: The traces of identity in discourse. In W.L. Chafe (Ed.), *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production* (pp. 203–274). Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Hickmann, M. (1982). *The development of narrative skills: Pragmatic and metapragmatic aspects of discourse cohesion*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Hickmann, M. (1995). Discourse organization and the development of reference to person, space, and time. In P. Fletcher & B. MacWhinney (Eds.), *The handbook of child language*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

Hickmann, M., Hendriks,H., Roland, F. & Liang, J. (1996). The marking of new information in children's narratives: A comparison of English, French, German, and Mandarin Chinese. *Journal of Child Language, 3*, 591–610.

Karmiloff-Smith, A. (1979). *A functional approach to language: A study of determiners and reference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Küntay, A.C. (1997). *Extended discourse skills of Turkish preschoolers across shifting contexts*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.

Küntay, A. (1995). *Developing referential cohesion in elicited Turkish narratives*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of California. Berkeley.

Lambrecht, K. (1984). *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus, and the mental representation of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacWhinney, B. & Bates, E. (1978). Sentential devices for for conveying givenness and newness: A cross-cultural developmental study. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 17*, 539–558.

Maratsos, M.P. (1976). *The use of definite and indefinite reference in young children: An experimental study in semantic acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nakamura, K. (1993). Referential structure in Japanese children's narratives: The acquisition of *wa* and *ga*. In S. Choi (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics* (pp. 84–99). Stanford: Stanford University Center for the Study of Language and Information.

Orsolini, M. & Di Giacinto, P. (1996). Use of referential expressions in 4-year-old children's narratives: Invented versus recalled stories. In C. Pontecorvo, M. Orsolini, B. Burge & L.B. Resnick (Eds.), *Children's early text construction* (pp. 67–81). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Peterson, C. (1993). Identifying referents and linking sentences cohesively in narration. *Discourse Processes, 16*, 507–524.

Peterson, C. & McCabe, A. (1994). A social interactionist account of developing decontextualized narrative skill. *Developmental Psychology, 30*, 937–948.

Schiffrin, S. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Smoczyńska, M. (1992). Developing narrative skills: Learning to introduce referents in Polish. *Polish Psychological Bulletin, 23* (2), 103–120.

Warden, D.A. (1976). The influence of context on children's use of identifying expressions and references. *British Journal of Psychology, 67*, 101–112.

Warden, D.A. (1981). Learning to identify referents. *British Journal of Psychology, 72*, 93–99.