

## **1. GENERAL COGNITION**

### **1.1 Attention**

1. Chun, Marvin, and Wolfe, Jeremy M. (2001) Visual attention. Blackwell handbook of perception. 272-310.
2. Driver, J. (2001). A selective review of selective attention research from the past century. *British Journal of Psychology*, 92 Part 1, 53-78.
3. S.R.H. Langton, R.J. Watt and V. Bruce. (2000). Do the eyes have it? Cues to the direction of Social Attention. *Trends Cog. Sci.* 4, pp. 50–59.
4. Treisman, AM, & Gelade (1980). A feature-integration theory of attention. *Cognitive Psychology*, 12(1), 97-136.
5. Posner, M.I., Davidson, B.J. & Snyder, C.R.R. (1980). Attention and the detection of signals. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 109: 160-174.

### **1.2 Memory**

6. Shiffrin, R. M. & Schneider, W. (1977). Controlled and automatic human information processing: II. Perceptual learning, automatic attending, and a general theory. *Psychological Review*, 84, 127-190.
7. Miller, G.A. (1956). The magical number seven plus or minus two: Some limits on your capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 63, 81-96.
8. Tulving, E, (2002). Episodic memory: From mind to brain. *Annual Review of Psychology* 53, 1-25.
9. Anderson, J. R. (1991). Is human cognition adaptive? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 14, 471-517.
10. Cowan, N. (2000). The magical number 4 in short-term memory: A reconsideration of mental storage capacity. *BBS (2001)* 24(1), 87-185.
11. Raaijmakers, J. G. W., & Shiffrin, R. M. (2002). Models of memory. In Pashler, H., & Medin, D. (eds.) *Stevens Handbook of Psychology 3rd Edition, Vol. 2: Memory and Cognitive Processes* (pp. 43-76).
12. Baddeley, A. (2003). Working memory: Looking back and looking forward. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 4, 829-839.
13. Kruschke, J. (2008). Bayesian approaches to associative learning: From passive to active learning. *Learning & behavior*, 36 (3), 210 – 227.

### **1.3 Categories**

14. Goldstone, R. L. & Barsalou, L. W. (1998). Reuniting perception and conception. *Cognition*, 65(2-3), 231-262.
15. Kemp, C., Perfors, A. & Tenenbaum, J. (2006.) Learning overhypotheses with hierarchical Bayesian models. *Developmental Science*, 307-321.
16. Rosch, E. & Mervis, C. (1975). Family resemblances: Studies in the internal structure of categories. *Cognitive Psychology*, 7, 573-605.
17. Murphy, G. & Medin, D.L. (1985). The role of theories in conceptual coherence. *Psychological Review*, 92, 289-316.

### **1.4 Eye movements**

18. Land. Ch. 4. Fixation strategies during active behavior: A brief history. Van Gompel et al (eds). *Eye movements*.

19. Staub & Rayner. Ch 19. Eye movements and on-line comprehension processes. Gaskell (ed). Oxford Handbook.
20. Hayhoe, M. M., and Ballard, D. H. (2005) Eye Movements in Natural Behavior, *Trends in Cognitive Science*.

## **2. PSYCHOLINGUISTICS**

### **2.1 Comprehension**

#### ***Spoken word recognition***

21. Marslen-Wilson, W.D. (1987). Functional parallelism in spoken word-recognition. *Cognition*, **25**, 71-102.
22. Gaskell chapter 4 2007. Oxford Handbook of Psycholinguistics.
23. Dahan & Magnuson 2006. Traxler & Gernsbacher handbook.
24. McClelland, J.L., Mirman, D., and Holt, L.L. (2006). Are there interactive processes in speech perception? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10(8), 363-369.

#### ***Sentence processing (syntactic processing)***

25. Bever, T.G. (1970). The cognitive basis for linguistic structures. In R. Hayes (Ed.), *Cognition and language development* (pp. 277-360). New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc.
26. Altmann, G., & Steedman, M. (1988). Interaction with context during human sentence processing. *Cognition*, 30, 191-238.
27. Frazier, L. (1987). (tutorial on sentence processing) Altman et al. (Eds.)
28. MacDonald M., Pearlmutter N. & Seidenberg, M. (1994). The lexical nature of syntactic ambiguity resolution. *Psychological Review*, 101, 676-703.
29. Trueswell, J. C., Tanenhaus, M. K., & Garnsey, S. (1994). Semantic influences on parsing: Use of thematic role information in syntactic ambiguity resolution. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 33, 285 -318.
30. Garnsey, S. M., Pearlmutter, N. J., Myers, E. & Lotocky, M. A. (1997). The contributions of verb bias and plausibility to the comprehension of temporarily ambiguous sentences. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 37 (1), 58-93.
31. Gibson, E. (2000.) Ch. 5. The Dependency Locality Theory: A Distance-Based Theory of Linguistic Complexity. In Alec Marantz, Yasushi Miyashita, and Wayne O'Neil (eds). *Image, language, brain*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
32. Levy, R. 2008. Expectation-based syntactic comprehension. *Cognition* 106(3):1126-1177.
33. Lewis, R. L., & Vasishth, S. (2005). An activation-based model of sentence processing as skilled memory retrieval. *Cognitive Science*, 29, 1-45.
34. Tanenhaus, M.K. & Trueswell, J.C. (1995). Sentence Comprehension. In Eimas & Miller (Eds.) *Handbook in Perception and Cognition, Volume 11: Speech Language and Communication*. Academic Press, pp. 217-262.
35. Tanenhaus, M.K. & Brown-Schmidt, S. (2008). Language processing in the natural world. In Moore, B.C.M., Tyler, L.K. & Marslen-Wilson, W.D. (eds.) *The perception of speech: from sound to meaning*. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 363, 1105-1122.
36. Oxford Handbook. Ch. 23. Kutas & Federmeier - Event-related brain potential (ERP) studies of sentence processing

37. Tabor, W. & Hutchins, S. (2004). Evidence for Self-Organized Sentence Processing: Digging In Effects. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 30(2): 431-450.
38. Hawkins, J. (2007). Processing typology and why psychologists need to know about it. *New Ideas in Psychology* 25, 87–107.
39. Chater, N., & Manning, C. D. (2006). Probabilistic models of language processing and acquisition, *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10(7), 335-344.

## **2.2 Production**

### ***Lexical retrieval***

40. Vigliocco & Hartsuiker (2002). The interplay of meaning, sound, and syntax in sentence production. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 442 – 472.
41. Griffin & V. Ferreira Ch. 2. - Properties of Spoken Language Production. In Traxler & Gernsbacher.
42. Peterson, R.R. & Savoy, P. (1998). Lexical Selection and Phonological Encoding During Language Production: Evidence for Cascaded Processing. *JEP: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 24(3), 539-557.
43. Levelt, W.J.M., Roelofs, A., & Meyer, A.S. (1999). A theory of lexical access in speech production. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22(1), 1-38.

### ***Grammatical encoding***

44. Bock 1982. Toward a Cognitive Psychology of Syntax: Information Processing Contributions to Sentence Formulation. *Psychological Review*, 89, 1-47.
45. Oxford Handbook. Ch. 27. Ferreira & Slevc - Grammatical encoding
46. Dell GS. 1986. A spreading activation theory of retrieval in sentence production. *Psychological Review*. 93:283–321.
47. Branigan, H.P., Pickering, M.J., & Tanaka, M. (2008). Contributions of animacy to grammatical function assignment and word order during production. *Lingua*, **118**, 172-189.
48. Jaeger, T.F. and Norcliffe, E. in press. The cross-linguistic study of sentence production. *Language and Linguistics Compass*.
49. Ferreira, V. & Dell, G. (2000). Effect of Ambiguity and Lexical Availability on Syntactic and Lexical Production. *Cognitive Psychology* 40, 296– 340.

## **3. JUDITH-SPECIFIC – RATIONAL INFERENCE IN COMMUNICATION**

### **3.1 Theoretical pragmatics**

49. Grice 1975
50. Levinson 2000. Presumptive meanings. Ch. 1, ch. 5.
51. Wilson & Sperber 2004. Relevance Theory. In L. Horn & G. Ward (eds.) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*.
52. Horn 2007. Neo-Gricean pragmatics: a Manichaeian manifesto. In “Pragmatics”, Palgrave Macmillan.

### **3.2 Experimental investigations**

#### ***Audience design/perspective-taking & common ground (tag: common ground)***

53. Selected papers from Clark. 1992. *Arenas of language use*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- a. Definite reference and mutual knowledge (1981)
  - b. Referring as a collaborative process (1986)
  - c. Hearers and speech acts (1982)
54. Clark, H. and Brennan, S. (1991). Grounding in communication. In L.B. Resnick, J.M. Levine, and S.D. Teasley. Perspectives on socially shared cognition.
  55. Dell, G. and Brown, P. (1991). Mechanisms for Listener-Adaptation in Language Production: Limiting the Role of the “Model of the Listener”.
  56. Lockridge, C. and Brennan, S. (2002). Addressees’ needs influence speakers’ early syntactic choices. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 9 3(, 550-557.
  57. Horton, S. and Gerrig, R. (2005). Conversational common ground and memory processes in language production. *Discourse Processes*, 40, 1-35.
  58. Arnold, J.E. (2008). Reference Production: Production-internal and Addressee-oriented Processes. *Language and Cognitive Processes*.
  59. Keysar, Barr, Balin, Brauner (2000). Taking perspective in conversation: the role of mutual knowledge in comprehension. *Psych Science*.
  60. Heller, Grodner & Tanenhaus (2008). The role of perspective in identifying domains of reference. *Cognition*, 108, 831-836.

#### *Implicature*

61. Hagoort, P., and Van Berkum, J. J. A. (2007). Beyond the sentence given. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 362, 801-811
62. Bott, L. and Noveck, I. (2004). Some utterances are underinformative: The onset and time course of scalar inferences. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 51 (3).
63. Breheny et al (2006). Are generalised scalar implicatures generated by default? An on-line investigation into the role of context in generating pragmatic inferences. *Cognition*, 100 (3).
64. Grodner, D., Klein, N. M., Carbary, K. M., & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2010). “Some”, and possibly all, scalar inferences are not delayed: evidence for immediate pragmatic enrichment. *Cognition*, 116, 42-55.
65. Huang, Y. and Snedeker, J. (2009). Online interpretation of scalar quantifiers: insight into the semantics-pragmatics interface. *Cognitive Psychology*, 58 (3).
66. Stiller, A., Goodman, N.D, and Frank, M. (2011). Ad hoc scalar implicature in adults and children. *Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*.

#### *Other*

65. Clark, H. H., & Fox Tree, J. E. (2002) Using uh and um in spontaneous speaking. *Cognition*, 84, 73-111.
66. Sedivy (2003). Pragmatic versus form-based accounts of referential contrast: evidence for effects of informativity expectations.
67. Cook, S. W., Jaeger, T. F., & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2009). Producing less preferred structures: More gestures, less Fluency. In *Proceedings of the 31st conference of the Cognitive Science Society*. Vancouver, BC
68. Beaver, D. and Velleman (2011).

### 3.3. Computational/modeling approaches

#### *Optimal cue integration & Bayesian inference (tag: cue integration)*

69. Massaro, D.W. & Friedman, D. (1990). Models of integration given multiple sources of information. *Psychological Review* 97, 225-252.
70. Ernst, M., & Banks, M. (2002). Humans integrate visual and haptic information in a statistically optimal fashion. *Nature*, 415(6870), 429-433.
71. Knill, D., & Saunders, J. (2003). Do humans optimally integrate stereo and texture information for judgments of surface slant? *Vision Research*, 43(24), 2539-2558.
72. Clayards, M, Tanenhaus, M.K., Aslin, R.N., Jacobs, R.A (2008) Perception of speech reflects optimal use of probabilistic speech cues. *Cognition*, 108(3), 804-809.
73. Toscano and McMurray (2010). Cue integration with categories: weighting acoustic cues in speech using unsupervised learning and distributional statistics. *Cognitive Science*.
74. Griffiths, Chater, Perfors & Tenenbaum (2010). Probabilistic models of cognition: exploring representations and inductive biases. *TICS*. Oaksford & Chater (2009).
75. Oaksford & Chater (2009). *Precis of Bayesian Rationality: The Probabilistic Approach to Human Reasoning*. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32, 69-120.

#### *Information-theoretic approaches to communicative efficiency (tag: information theory)*

76. Zipf, G.K. (1949) chapters 1 & 2. *Human behavior and the principle of least effort: An introduction to human ecology*. New York: Hafner.
77. Resnik, P. (1996). Selectional constraints: An information-theoretic model and its computational realization. *Cognition*, 61, 127-159.
78. Fenk-Oczlon, G. (2001). Familiarity, information flow, and linguistic form. Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure, 431-448.
79. Aylett, M. and Turk, A. (2006). Language redundancy predicts syllabic duration and the spectral characteristics of vocalic syllable nuclei. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 119 (5), 3048-3058.
80. Roger Levy, Klinton Bicknell, Tim Slattery, and Keith Rayner. 2009. Eye movement evidence that readers maintain and act on uncertainty about past linguistic input. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
81. Jaeger, T.F. (2010). Redundancy and reduction: Speakers manage syntactic information density. *Cognitive Psychology*.
82. Piantadosi, Tily & Gibson (2011). Word lengths are optimized for efficient communication. *PNAS*.
83. Moscoso del Prado (under review). *Cognitive Implications of Multifractal Structure in Language*.

#### *Game-theoretic approaches to communicative efficiency*

84. Franke, M. (2009). *Signal to Act* (PhD thesis), chapters 1&2.
85. G. Jaeger (2011). Game theory in semantics and pragmatics. To appear in C. Maienborn, P. Portner & K. von Heusinger (eds.), *Handbook Semantics*.

*Bayesian approaches to reasoning & communicative efficiency*

86. Frank, M. C., Goodman, N. D., Lai, P., & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2009). Informative communication in word production and word learning. *Proceedings of the 31st Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*.
87. Frank, Goodman, and Tenenbaum (2009). Using speakers' referential intentions to model early cross-situational word learning. *Psych Science*.
88. Oaksford & Chater (1994). A rational analysis of the selection task as optimal data selection. *Psychological review*.
89. Oaksford, Roberts, & Chater (2002). Relative informativeness of quantifiers used in syllogistic reasoning. *Memory & Cognition*.
90. Hahn, U & Oaksford, M (2007). The rationality of informal argumentation: A Bayesian approach to reasoning fallacies. *Psychological Review*, 114, 704-732.