

Chapter 14

Evidentials, Information Sources and Cognition

Ercenur Ünal and Anna Papafragou

University of Delaware

14.1 Information sources in cognition and language

Humans rely on various experiences to find out new information about the world around them. Information about the world can be acquired directly through various perceptual processes (e.g., *seeing* a vase break) or indirectly through communication or various types of inferences (e.g., *figuring out* that the vase broke based on pieces of glass). These experiences (e.g., visual or auditory perception, hearsay, inference) that characterize the conditions under which we discover information are known as *sources of information* (Johnson, Hastroudi, & Lindsay, 1993). The process of attributing a piece of information to a specific source is known as *source monitoring* (Johnson, 1988).

Experimental research has shown that people do not tag their memories with source information. Instead, source monitoring decisions are based on how well the subjective characteristics of a given memory match the generic profile of a source. For instance, if a memory is highly rich in visual details, people tend to attribute it to visual perception (Johnson, 2006; Johnson et al., 1993). Because of the subjective nature of this process, people are not always accurate in their source monitoring decisions. In fact, several studies with speakers of English have shown that people often make source monitoring errors and mistakenly report directly perceiving things that they have only indirectly acquired through imagination, visualization or inferences (Anderson, 1984; Durso & Johnson, 1980; Johnson, Kahan, & Raye,

1984; Johnson, Raye, Wang, & Taylor, 1979; Johnson, Taylor, & Raye, 1977). For instance, people who have read descriptions of scenes report having seen pictures of those scenes (Intraub & Hoffman, 1992); similarly, people who have read sentences that give rise to certain conversational inferences misremember the content of those pragmatic inferences as having been explicitly stated (Bransford & Franks, 1971; Brewer, 1977; Chan & McDermott, 2006; Fazio & Marsh, 2010; Harris, 1974; Harris & Monaco, 1978; McDermott & Chan, 2006).

Developmental research on source monitoring has shown that children's understanding of the conditions that lead to knowledge develops over a lengthy period. Visual access seems to be understood early: in simple tasks, even 3-year-olds can identify someone who has looked inside a box as knowledgeable about a box's contents over someone who has simply lifted the box (Pillow, 1989; cf. Pratt & Bryant, 1990). Furthermore, between the ages 4 and 6, children can selectively use visual access to learn about visible properties of someone such as their hair color), but children can use verbal communication to learn about invisible properties of someone, such as whether they speak French (Fitneva, Lam, & Dunfield, 2013). Furthermore, children report being more confident about their own knowledge when they gain it through visual access compared to being informed by someone else (Koenig, Clement, & Harris, 2004; Robinson, Haigh, & Nurmsoo, 2008). Understanding the causal link between inferential access and knowledge does not develop until age 6 (Sodian & Wimmer, 1987, cf. Miller, Hardin, & Montgomery, 2003, but see Keenan, Ruffman, & Olson, 1994). In one study, 6- but not 4-year-olds could tell that someone who has not looked inside a container filled with balls could infer the color of the balls using a critical premise (i.e., they knew that the balls were transferred from a transparent container containing balls of the same color; Sodian & Wimmer, 1987). Understanding more subtle distinctions among types of inference continues to develop over the

primary school years or sometimes even later (cf. Pillow, 1999, 2002; Pillow & Anderson, 2006; Pillow, Boyce, & Stein, 2000).

In this chapter, we consider how conceptual representations of information sources make contact with language. Human language has the means to encode information sources (through *evidentiality* distinctions) but - as shown throughout this volume - there is considerable cross-linguistic variation in this domain. In many languages, information sources are not grammatically marked: in English, the sentence (1a) can be used whether the speaker has directly witnessed the event or has only indirect information about it, even though it is possible to lexically specify informational access, as in (1b). About a quarter of the world's languages mark evidential distinctions in their grammatical systems (Aikhenvald, 2004, 2014). For instance, in Turkish, two verbal suffixes, *-di* and *-miş*, encode evidential distinctions between direct and indirect past experience respectively (Aksu & Slobin, 1986; Aksu-Koç, 1988; Göksel & Kerslake, 2011; Kornfilt, 1997; Slobin & Aksu, 1982). In sentence (2a) *-di* encodes the speaker's first-hand experience of the basic level proposition conveyed in the utterance. In sentence (2b) *-miş* encodes the speaker's indirect acquisition of the information either through verbal communication or inference. All past-tense sentences involve a choice between these two suffixes.

- (1) a. Ali arrived.
b. I saw/heard/figured out that Ali arrived.
- (2) a. Ali gel-di.
Ali come-PAST DIR.3SG
'Ali came' (DIRECT)

b. Ali gel-miş.

Ali come-PAST IND.3SG

‘Ali came’ (INDIRECT)

This variation raises the question whether cross-linguistic evidential differences might be reflected in the corresponding source concepts. Could speakers of a language with grammaticalized and obligatory evidential devices, such as Turkish, be less prone to source monitoring errors compared to speakers of a language that lacks such devices, such as English? And might source concepts emerge earlier in learners of languages such as Turkish compared to learners of English?

These questions connect to a broader debate concerning the relation between language and cognition (for recent reviews, see Bowerman & Levinson, 2001; Casasanto, 2008; Gentner & Goldin-Meadow, 2003; Gleitman & Papafragou, 2005, 2012; Gumperz & Levinson, 1996, Landau, Dessalegn & Goldberg, 2010; Lupyan, 2012; Malt & Wolff, 2010; Ünal & Papafragou, in press; Wolff & Holmes, 2011; see also Sapir, 1924 and Whorf, 1956 for early discussions). This debate involves two prominent views that both presume that language and thought are tightly related but differ with respect to the direction of the causal flow between language and thought. In one view, habitual differences in the way languages frame the world may lead to differences in how accessible certain conceptual representations are to speakers of these languages (Bowerman & Choi, 2001; Bowerman & Levinson, 2001; Levinson, 2003; Sapir, 1924; Whorf, 1956). Importantly, the changes in conceptual representations might be more or less permanent, such that they are at play regardless of whether or not speakers are explicitly using language. According to an alternative view, language reflects largely shared universal

conceptual representations without changing them (Chomsky, 1975; Fodor, 1975; Gleitman & Papafragou, 2005, 2012; Landau & Jackendoff, 1993). This position acknowledges that people may recruit language while performing cognitive computations but posits that these linguistic influences are transient and often diminish or disappear when speakers are prevented from accessing language (Landau et al., 2010; Trueswell & Papafragou, 2010). In the specific case of evidentiality, these positions make different predictions, with the former expecting wider language-driven discontinuities in adults' source monitoring performance compared to the latter.

The two broad positions sketched above about the nature of the language-cognition interface have different expectations about how language might relate to cognitive development. If language-specific semantic encoding patterns increase the salience of certain conceptual distinctions, the process of acquiring the semantics of one's language might accelerate cognitive development in the relevant domain (e.g., Bowerman & Choi, 2001; Bowerman & Levinson, 2001). According to an alternative view, semantic distinctions in language map onto already existing conceptual prerequisites, and thus language builds upon rather than scaffolds cognitive development (e.g., Chomsky, 2000; Gleitman, 1990; Pinker, 1984). In the specific case of evidentiality, the first position expects that acquiring the semantics of obligatory and frequent evidential morphemes might accelerate the development of children's source monitoring, whereas the second position expects source monitoring development to follow a more stable, perhaps universal timetable.

Until recently, most studies of adults' and children's source monitoring had been conducted with speakers of English and other languages where evidentiality is not grammaticalized so these competing predictions could not be addressed. In the sections that follow, we review newly-available experimental evidence to assess whether the linguistic

encoding of information source affects source monitoring in adults (Section 14.2) and children (Section 14.3) from different language backgrounds, and discuss the conclusions in the context of broader theoretical debates about the language-cognition interface.

14.2 Cross-linguistic variation and adults' source monitoring

Could cross-linguistic differences in the way Turkish and English speakers encode evidentiality in language lead to differences in their memories for information sources? A study by Tosun, Vaid, and Geraci (2013) addressed this question by comparing Turkish and English monolinguals and Turkish-English bilinguals on their memories for information presented in firsthand vs. non-firsthand form. In the study phase, participants read sentences presented on a computer screen. In Turkish, half of the sentences were in firsthand form and marked with direct past tense (-*di*), the other half were in non-firsthand form and marked with indirect past tense (-*miş*). In English, half of the sentences were in firsthand form and included only a past tense verb (e.g., *Mary missed her flight*), the other half were in non-firsthand form and included an adverbial and a past tense verb (e.g., *Mary allegedly missed her flight*). Later participants completed a memory test in which they were given another set of sentences and reported whether they had read each sentence before, as well as the original form (firsthand vs. non-firsthand) of the sentences. English speakers were equally accurate for sentences presented in firsthand and non-firsthand form. Furthermore, their accuracy in reporting the original form of the sentence did not differ depending on whether the sentence was in firsthand or non-firsthand form. By contrast, Turkish monolinguals and Turkish-English bilinguals were less accurate in recognizing sentences presented in non-firsthand form. Furthermore, they misremembered the original form of non-firsthand sentences as having been in firsthand form.

Tosun et al. have argued that these findings support the position that cross-linguistic differences shape source memory. However, several aspects of their methodology raise issues about the interpretation of these cross-linguistic differences. First, the stimuli and the task used for the English and Turkish groups were not equivalent. While English speakers reported merely the presence or absence of a lexical item (i.e., the evidential adverb), Turkish speakers made more detailed judgments and reported which one of the two evidential morphemes (*-di* or *-miş*) marked the verb—which might be harder than remembering lexical items. Second, Tosun et al. did not include an independent measure of cognitive equivalence among English and Turkish speakers. These differences in the stimuli and potential differences among the language groups might drive the cross-linguistic differences in memory performance.

At the very least, these findings suggest that the *explicit* linguistic form of an utterance might influence subsequent memory for the information conveyed in that linguistic message. These findings also cohere with the findings of a recent study with only Turkish-speaking adults, which showed that explicit choices about the evidential morpheme included in linguistic messages might influence suggestibility to misinformation (Aydın & Ceci, 2013). Nevertheless, both studies diverge from typical investigations of the language-cognition interface in which speakers of different languages are compared on a *non-linguistic* task (for an overview of studies within this paradigm, see Gleitman & Papafragou, 2005, 2012). Thus, both studies leave open the question of whether speaking a language that obligatorily encodes evidentiality influences source memory even in the absence of explicit involvement of language.

A subsequent study by Ünal, Pinto, Bungler, and Papafragou (2016) addressed this question more directly. In an initial experiment, native speakers of English and Turkish were asked to describe photographs of change of state events. Half of the photographs depicted the

point after which an event took place so that what happened could be inferred on the basis of post-event visual evidence (e.g., a woman next to bubbles traveling in the air); the other half depicted the point at which an event was unfolding so that what happened could be directly seen (e.g., a woman blowing bubbles). Linguistic descriptions confirmed the presence of strong cross-linguistic differences: English speakers did not use any evidentiality devices in their descriptions, whereas Turkish speakers marked the events they had seen with the direct morpheme (*-di*) 73% of the time and the events they had inferred with the indirect morpheme (*-miş*) 64% of the time. Closer inspection of the data revealed that Turkish speakers' use of the indirect evidential for inferred events was sensitive to the strength of the post-event visual cues that gave rise to an inference: in half of the inferred events, post-event visual cues were ambiguous and clearly different from a perceived event, and Turkish speakers used the indirect morpheme 80% of the time ("high-indirectness" events); in the other half, post-event visual cues yielded secure inferences that were closer to direct perception, and Turkish speakers used the indirect morpheme only 48% of the time ("low-indirectness" events).

Despite these cross-linguistic differences, there were also commonalities in how people from the two language groups handled subtle aspects of information sources. When asked to judge whether they had "seen" or "inferred" the events used in the description task, a control group of English speakers chose "seen" for the seen events (that were also overwhelmingly marked with the direct marker in Turkish), "inferred" for the high-indirectness events (that consistently elicited indirect morphology in Turkish), and both "seen" and "inferred" options equally for the low-indirectness events (that elicited indirect morphology in Turkish only about half of the time). Thus the conceptual distinctions between evidence types drawn by English speakers (whose language lacks grammatical evidential distinctions) appear to align with fine-

grained distinctions between direct vs. indirect evidence that underlie the use of evidential morphology in Turkish.

To examine potential effects of language on the ability to track sources of information, Ünal et al. (2016) asked new groups of speakers of Turkish and English to complete a source memory task. In a study phase, participants saw the set of photographs from the description task depicting seen and inferred events (alongside additional photographs that served as fillers). In a later memory phase, they saw a second set of photographs where each of the inferred events was replaced by the seen version of the very same event (depicted by the point at which the event unfolded). In both language groups, half of the participants had to merely report whether they had “seen” or “not seen” the event, and the other half had to complete more detailed source judgments by choosing one of three options: “seen”, “inferred” or “neither.” If language influences source monitoring, then Turkish speakers should be more accurate in their source memories than English speakers, especially for the high-indirectness events that were consistently marked in Turkish with the indirect evidential. If source monitoring is independent from language, then Turkish and English speakers should be equally prone to source monitoring errors. The results were consistent with the second possibility: Turkish and English speakers were equally accurate in their source memory (with accuracy hovering around 70%). Furthermore, for both groups, error rates were higher for low-indirectness events (i.e., events that were closer to perception and were more confusable with seen events) as opposed to high-indirectness events. Finally, when participants who completed the detailed source judgments made an error and failed to report having “inferred” the event, they reported having “seen” the event regardless of their linguistic background (cf. also Anderson, 1984; Durso & Johnson, 1980; Johnson et al., 1977; Johnson et al., 1979).

In sum, studies with Turkish-and English-speaking adults demonstrate that these language groups differ in how they mark source of information linguistically. Cross-linguistic differences in memory performance emerge in contexts where speakers are required to process linguistic material as part of a cognitive task. Nevertheless, these cross-linguistic differences do not extend to contexts where adults are asked to perform a truly non-linguistic task. Taken together, cross-linguistic studies comparing Turkish and English adults' memories for source of information suggest that long-term experience with the evidential categories of one's native language does not shape conceptual representations of information sources.

14.3 Cross-linguistic variation and children's source monitoring

There is considerable research on the acquisition of evidential morphology (Aksu & Slobin, 1986; Aksu-Koç, 1988, 2000; Aksu-Koç et al., 2009; Courtney, 1999; 2014; Ozturk & Papafragou, 2015; Papafragou et al., 2007; Uzungag, Tasci, Küntay, & Aksu-Koç, 2016; Ünal & Papafragou, 2016; de Villiers et al., 2009; for an overview see Matsui, 2014 and Fitneva, Chapter 15 of this volume). Some of this work has also included non-linguistic assessments of children's source monitoring and has found a tight relation between linguistic evidentiality and conceptual representations of information sources (Aksu-Koç, 1988, Ozturk & Papafragou, 2015; Papafragou, Li, Choi, & Han, 2007; Ünal & Papafragou, 2013, 2016). In a recent demonstration, young learners of Turkish produced and comprehended the direct evidential (*-di*) before the indirect evidential (*-miş*) in linguistic tasks (Ozturk & Papafragou, 2015). Interestingly, the same children had higher success in identifying direct sources, such as visual perception, as the experience that led to their own or someone else's beliefs compared to indirect sources, such as inference or hearsay. In another study, Turkish-speaking children between the ages of 3 and 6

produced evidential morphemes accurately but had difficulty comprehending evidentially marked utterances (Ünal & Papafragou, 2016, cf. also Aksu-Koç, 1988; Ozturk & Papafragou, 2015; Papafragou et al., 2007). Importantly, in the same study, children of the same age groups had difficulty reasoning about others' evidence even when the task did not involve knowledge of evidential language; but the difficulty disappeared when children were accessing their own information sources. These studies thus reveal asymmetries between sources (direct vs. indirect) and perspectives (self vs. others) that persist across linguistic and non-linguistic contexts and suggest a homology between linguistic evidentiality and underlying non-linguistic source concepts.

The presence of such homologies leaves all options open as to whether source concepts might be susceptible to influences of language. An obvious possibility that is left open is that processing evidentially marked linguistic information when performing a cognitive task could influence performance (as in the Tosun et al. study with adults above). Aydın and Ceci (2009, 2013) tested this possibility. In their study, English and Turkish-speaking children between the ages of 4 and 6 first heard a narrative describing a birthday party (e.g., “She spilled the orange juice”). Then, they heard another adult describing misleading information about the birthday party (e.g., “She spilled the apple juice”). Both the original and the misleading information was evidentially marked in both languages (morphologically with *-di* or *-miş* in Turkish and lexically with “I saw” or “I heard” in English). Importantly, the evidential form in the original and the misleading descriptions was either the same (i.e., direct-direct or indirect-indirect) or different (direct-indirect or indirect-direct). Children were given a forced-choice memory task where they had to respond to questions about the details of the birthday party. Of interest was whether children would be less suggestible for original information in direct form followed by

misleading information in indirect form compared to the opposite situation, and whether this difference would be greater for Turkish-speaking children compared to English-speaking children. Overall, Turkish-speaking children were more accurate than English-speaking children. However, the interaction between language and the evidential form in the original-misleading information sequence (i.e., direct-indirect vs. indirect-direct) that would lend support for the prediction above did not reach significance (even though there was a trend in the direction that the authors expected). Thus, whether the evidential form in an utterance has further cognitive implications in children remains an open question.

A different question is whether distinctions within the domain of information sources might develop earlier in learners of languages such as Turkish that obligatorily or grammatically mark these distinctions compared to learners of languages such as English that mark these distinctions only lexically and thus optionally and less systematically. Notice that the lack of source monitoring differences between Turkish- and English-speaking adults (see Section 14.2) does not preclude the possibility of language exerting strong and early effects on the development of source reasoning in less mature learners.

A developmental study by Aksu-Koç and colleagues (Aksu-Koç et al., 2009; Ögel-Balaban, Aksu-Koç, & Alp, 2012) asked how the acquisition of evidential distinctions might influence the timetable of the development of source monitoring. In a linguistic task, young Turkish speakers between the ages of 3 and 6 learned about events through visual perception, inference, or hearsay, and were asked to describe these events. Then children were given two standard source monitoring tasks. In the source choice task (adapted from Gopnik and Graf, 1988), children discovered the contents of a box by visual access, verbal communication or inference, and were asked to report how they came to know about the contents of the container.

In the speaker choice task (adapted from Drummey and Newcombe, 2002), children heard several statements uttered by two female speakers. Later, children were presented with another set of statements and had to choose which speaker originally uttered each one. Children's performance in the source task did not correlate with accurate production of evidential morphology in the linguistic task. However, children's performance in the speaker choice task was predicted by their production of the hearsay morpheme (*-mİş*) in the linguistic task. Furthermore, Aksu-Koç and colleagues argued that the 4-year-olds in their speaker choice task outperformed the English-speaking 4-year-olds in Drummey and Newcombe's study. The authors tentatively concluded that the acquisition of evidential morphology can shape the development of source monitoring in language-specific ways, and that, in Turkish, acquiring evidential morphology helps children recall the source of a verbal report (as indexed by the speaker choice task).

Although these findings are suggestive of a relation between linguistic and cognitive development, several factors limit the conclusions that can be drawn about the nature of this relation. First, given that the Turkish indirect evidential, on its hearsay interpretation, does not actually encode the speaker from whom the information is acquired, it is surprising that the production of the hearsay morpheme predicted performance in the speaker choice task. Semantically, there is a straightforward mapping between the meanings of Turkish evidentials and the information sources assessed in the source choice task – and yet children's performance in the source task did not correlate with accurate production of evidential morphology. Second, since this was a correlational study, the direction of the causal relationship between language and cognitive development might be the opposite of what the authors propose. Rather than evidential production driving success on the speaker choice task, it could be that the ability to track the

source of a verbal report might drive accuracy in using the indirect evidential in its hearsay function. Finally, it is difficult to make claims about potential cross-linguistic differences in the developmental timetable of source monitoring without directly comparing different language groups (here, English and Turkish learners).

In a study that involved a direct comparison between language groups, Lucas, Lewis, Pala, Wong, and Berridge (2013) tested young learners of English, Turkish, and Chinese on false belief, executive function and flexible trust tasks. In the flexible trust task that is most relevant for present purposes, children had to keep track of two speakers' accuracy in labelling objects in order to be able to select which speaker to trust when learning a label for a novel object. Children were also given standard false belief tasks and executive function measures. The results revealed that only Turkish-speaking 4-year-olds performed above chance levels in the false belief task. As expected based on prior research, Chinese children outperformed the other two language groups in the executive function measures. Importantly, in the flexible trust task, Turkish-speaking children performed better than both English-speaking and Chinese-speaking children. The authors hypothesized that Turkish children's superior performance in the false belief and flexible trust tasks can be attributed to learning a language with grammaticalized evidentiality.

Unfortunately, this hypothesis could not be tested directly since Lucas and colleagues did not include a measure of Turkish children's knowledge of evidential language. Furthermore, Lucas and colleagues did not directly test whether the relation between language and flexible trust was mediated by false belief performance, so the mechanism that might transmit language effects on flexible trust is unknown. This is especially important given that the mapping between the meaning conveyed by evidentiality markers (direct, hearsay or inference) and the information sources in the task (Speaker A vs. Speaker B) was not straightforward (as in the studies of Aksu-

Koç and colleagues). A more recent study that included a comparison between Turkish- and English-speaking 4-year-olds' source monitoring revealed similar performance in the two language groups (Ünal & Papafragou, 2015). In that study, Turkish-speaking 4-year-olds were highly successful in gaining knowledge about events from both direct/perceptual and indirect/inferential evidence, but had difficulty attributing perception- or inference-based knowledge to someone else for the very same events. Crucially, an age-matched group of English-speaking 4-year-olds were no less accurate than their Turkish-speaking peers when tested with the very same tasks.

In another cross-linguistic comparison, Papafragou, Li, Choi, and Han (2007) asked whether the development of source monitoring proceeds differently in learners of English and Korean, a language that morphologically encodes direct evidence (*-e*) vs. hearsay (*-tay*). In the Self task children discovered what object was hidden in a doll house either by looking inside the doll house or from the experimenter's verbal report, and reported how they knew. In the Others task, children had to identify which one of the two puppets was more knowledgeable about the contents of a container. One of the puppets either looked inside the container or was told about its contents. The other puppet did not gain access to the container's contents because it simply performed an irrelevant action such as kicking or shaking the container. Children had higher success in reporting how they had found out about the hidden object themselves (i.e., Self task) as opposed to identifying the knowledgeable puppet (i.e., Others task). Crucially, there was no language effect, showing that source monitoring proceeds similarly in learners of English and Korean.

In the same study, a subset of the Korean learners was also given an evidential production task. The task showed that these children were in the process of acquiring the evidential

distinctions in their language. More detailed comparisons between the evidential comprehension and non-linguistic source monitoring tasks revealed that Korean-speaking children performed better in the non-linguistic task compared to the linguistic task. This asymmetry offers evidence against the possibility that evidential distinctions in language serve as pacesetters for cognitive development. Additional support for this conclusion comes from more recent work with Turkish learners using a fuller battery of matched linguistic and non-linguistic tasks (Ozturk & Papafragou, 2015); this work shows that Turkish-speaking children have difficulty with aspects of linguistic evidentiality even after mastering the corresponding information-access concepts. Thus children's knowledge of evidentiality follows, and probably builds on, their ability to handle information sources.

Summarizing, there is currently a small number of cross-linguistic studies on the development of source monitoring. Although some of these studies have reported a source monitoring advantage for Turkish learners over English learners, these studies lacked important controls and suffered from several interpretative issues (Aksu-Koç et al., 2009; Lucas et al., 2013; Ögel-Balaban et al., 2012). One study that did include those controls (Papafragou et al., 2007) found that young learners of English and Korean converge in their source monitoring abilities (see also Ünal & Papafragou, 2015). Furthermore, there is evidence that acquiring evidential morphology lags behind the ability to reason about information sources in several respects (Ozturk & Papafragou, 2015; Papafragou et al., 2007). Together, findings from these studies support the idea that cognitive development follows a similar timetable across learners of languages with different evidential systems, and that language builds on (rather than shapes) the ability to reason about different types of information access.

14.4 Conclusions

In the present chapter, we have reviewed a growing body of experimental studies addressing the relation between linguistic evidentiality and source monitoring. Our goal was to assess whether the linguistic encoding of information source affects source monitoring in adults and children from different language backgrounds and to use this evidence to throw light on broader theoretical debates about how language interfaces with cognition.

Both adult and developmental studies have shown that linguistic categories of evidentiality have cognitive consequences, but that these linguistic influences are strictly limited to cases where language was explicitly involved in a cognitive task (e.g., contexts in which people had to process sentences with evidential markers; Aydın & Ceci, 2009, 2013; Tosun et al., 2013). These cross-linguistic differences did not extend to situations in which speakers were tested with a cognitive task that did not require processing linguistic stimuli (Papafragou et al., 2007; Ünal et al., 2016). Even though some studies claim to have discovered cross-linguistic differences in the development of source monitoring (Aksu-Koç et al., 2009; Lucas et al., 2013; Ögel-Balaban et al., 2012), several aspects of these studies are problematic. Taken together, the available evidence suggests that cross-linguistic variation in the expression of evidentiality does not alter the mechanisms of source monitoring in adults or the timetable of cognitive development in children. In both cases, learned linguistic categories of evidentiality do not serve as a guide to conceptual representations of information sources (and may, in fact, develop later than such conceptual representations in young learners; Ozturk & Papafragou, 2015; Papafragou et al., 2007). These conclusions cohere with a broader perspective about the role of language in cognitive processes, according to which the effects of language are carried online, in the moment of performing cognitive computations and do not alter the underlying conceptual structure (cf.

also Gleitman & Papafragou, 2005, 2012; Ünal & Papafragou, in press, for supporting evidence from other domains).

Further research is needed to gain a richer understanding of how linguistic evidentiality interacts with source concepts. Most of the research reported here has focused on the contrast between grammatical vs. lexical encoding of information source. However, there is considerable variation even within the class of grammatical evidential systems, with some systems having several dedicated evidential morphemes within the classes of direct and especially indirect access (see Aikhenvald, 2004, 2014). It is an open question whether richer evidential systems including obligatory (or at least frequently used) distinctions might place different pressures on the source monitoring processes in the minds of the speakers.

This possibility is currently hard to evaluate because we lack information about how more complex evidential systems are actually used during conversation to mark different types of information access (see Ünal et al., 2016). Furthermore, despite their cross-linguistic surface variability, grammatical evidential paradigms appear to be subject to several constraints (Faller, 2001; Willett, 1988). For instance, the meanings typically encoded by evidentials are abstract (Speas, 2004); many grammatical systems of evidentiality seem to respect the broad semantic distinction between direct/visual access, indirect/inferential and indirect/hearsay access, and even though finer subdivisions within these broad classes are possible, four- and five-way evidential systems are in fact quite rare (Aikhenvald, 2014). These broad regularities also appear to affect the learnability of evidential systems (Bartell & Papafragou, 2015). Future studies of evidentiality should explore more specific links between semantic evidential distinctions and the corresponding source concepts using careful comparisons of matched linguistic and non-

linguistic tasks (cf. Ozturk & Papafragou, 2015; Papafragou et al., 2007; Ünal & Papafragou, 2016).

Acknowledgements

Preparation of this chapter was supported by NSF Grant BCS0749870 to A. P.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2014. The grammar of knowledge: A cross-linguistic view of evidentials and the expression of information source. In A. Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (Eds.), *The grammar of knowledge: A cross-linguistic typology*, (pp. 1-51). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Aksu, Ayhan and Dan I. Slobin. 1986. A psychological account of the development and use of evidentials in Turkish. In W. Chafe & J. Nichols (Eds.), *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*, (pp. 159-167). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Aksu-Koç, Ayhan. 1988. *The acquisition of aspect and modality: The case of past reference in Turkish*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Aksu-Koç, Ayhan. (2000). Some aspects of the acquisition of evidentials in Turkish. In L. Johanson & B. Utas (Eds.), *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and neighboring languages* (pp. 15–28). Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter.

- Aksu-Koç, Ayhan, Hale Ögel-Balaban and Ercan I. Alp. 2009. Evidentials and source knowledge in Turkish. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 125, 13–28.
- Anderson, Rita E. 1984. Did I do it or did I only imagine doing it? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 113, 594–613.
- Aydın, Çağla and Stephen Ceci. 2009. Evidentiality and suggestibility: A new research venue. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 125, 79–93.
- Aydın, Çağla and Stephen Ceci. 2013. The role of culture and language in avoiding misinformation: Pilot Findings. *Behavioral Sciences and Law*, 31, 559-573.
- Bartell, Stefan and Anna Papafragou. 2015. *Cross-linguistic variation and the learnability of semantic systems*. Paper presented at the 40th Boston University Conference on Language Development, Boston, MA.
- Bowerman, Melissa, and Stephen C. Levinson. 2001. *Language acquisition and conceptual development*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Bowerman, Melissa, and Soonja Choi. 2001. Shaping meanings for language: Universal and language-specific in the acquisition of semantic categories. In M. Bowerman, & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Language acquisition and conceptual development* (pp. 475-511). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Bransford, John D. and Jefferey J. Franks. 1971. The abstraction of linguistic ideas. *Cognitive Psychology*, 2, 331–350.
- Brewer, William F. 1977. Memory for the pragmatic implications of sentences. *Memory & Cognition*, 5, 673–678.
- Casasanto, Daniel. 2008. Who's afraid of the Big Bad Whorf? Cross-linguistic differences in

- temporal language and thought. *Language Learning*, 58, 63-79.
- Chafe, Wallace L. and Johanna Nichols. 1986. *Evidentiality: The linguistic coding of epistemology*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Chan, Jason C. K and Kathleen B. McDermott. 2006. Remembering pragmatic inferences. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 20, 633–639.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1975. *Reflections on language*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Chomsky, N, (2000). *New horizons in the study of language and mind*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Courtney, Ellen. 1999. Child acquisition of the Quechua affirmative suffix. *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on American Indigenous Languages*, (vol.9) (pp. 30-41). Santa Barbara, CA.
- Courtney, Ellen. 2014. The acquisition of evidential meaning: Insights from Quechua conversations. *Peaches and Plums*, 287-310.
- Drumme, Anna B. and Nora S. Newcombe. 2002. Developmental changes in source memory. *Developmental Science*, 5, 502–513.
- Durso, Francis T and Marcia K. Johnson. 1980. The effects of orienting tasks on recognition, recall, and modality confusion of pictures and words. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 19, 416–429.
- Faller, Martina. 2001. Remarks on evidential hierarchies. In D. Beaver, S. Kaufmann, B. Clark & L. Casillas (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 'Semfest'* (pp. 37–59). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Fazio, Lisa. K. and Elizabeth J. Marsh. 2010. Correcting false memories. *Psychological Science*, 21, 801–803.

- Fitneva, Stanka. A., Nietzsche H. L. Lam, and Kristen A. Dunfield. 2013. The development of children's information gathering: To look or to ask? *Developmental Psychology*, 49, 533-542.
- Fitneva, Stanka. 2009. Evidentiality and trust: The effect of informational goals. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 125, 49–62.
- Frank, Michael. C., Evelina Fedorenko, Peter Lai, Rebecca Saxe, and Edward Gibson. 2012. Verbal interference suppresses exact numerical representation. *Cognitive Psychology*, 64, 74–92.
- Fodor, Jerry. 1975. *The language of thought*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gentner, Dendre and Susan Goldin-Meadow. 2003. *Language in mind: Advances in the study of language and thought*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gleitman, Lila. 1990. The structural sources of verb meanings. *Language Acquisition*, 1, 3-55.
- Gleitman, Lila and Anna Papafragou. 2005. Language and thought. In K. Holyoak and R. Morrison (Eds.), *Cambridge handbook of thinking and reasoning* (pp. 633–661). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Gleitman, Lila and Anna Papafragou. 2012. New perspectives on language and thought. In K. Holyoak and R. Morrison (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of thinking and reasoning* (2nd edition) (pp.543-568). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gopnik, Alison and Peter Graf. 1988. Knowing how you know: Young children's ability to identify and remember the sources of their beliefs. *Child Development*, 59, 1366–1371.
- Göksel, Aslı and Celia Kerslake. 2011. *Turkish: An essential grammar*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Gumperz, John J and Stephen C. Levinson. 1996. *Rethinking linguistic relativity*. Cambridge,

- United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, Richard J. 1974. Memory and comprehension of implications and inferences of complex sentences. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 13, 626–637.
- Harris, Richard. J and Gregory E. Monaco. 1978. Psychology of pragmatic implication: Information processing between the lines. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 107, 1–22.
- Intraub, Helene and James E. Hoffman. 1992. Reading and visual memory: Remembering scenes that were never seen. *American Journal of Psychology*, 105, 101–114.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. *Turkish*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Johnson, Marcia. K. 1988. Discriminating the origin of information. In T. F. Oltmanns & B. A. Maher (Eds.), *Delusional beliefs* (pp. 34–65). New York: Wiley.
- Johnson, Marcia K. 2006. Memory and reality. *American Psychologist*, 61, 760-771.
- Johnson, Marcia K., Shahin Hashtroudi and D. Stephen Lindsay. 1993. Source monitoring. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114(1), 3–28.
- Johnson, Marcia. K., Tracey L. Kahan and Carol L. Raye. 1984. Dreams and reality monitoring. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 113, 329–344.
- Johnson, Marcia. K., Carol L. Raye, Alvin Y. Wang and Thomas H. Taylor. 1979. Fact and fantasy: The roles of accuracy and variability in confusing imaginations with perceptual experiences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 5, 229-240.
- Johnson, Marcia. K., Thomas H. Taylor and Carol L. Raye. 1977. Fact and fantasy: The effects of externally generated events on the apparent frequency of externally generated events. *Memory & Cognition*, 5, 115-122.

- Keenan, Thomas, Ted Ruffman and David R. Olson. 1994. When do children begin to understand logical inference as a source of knowledge? *Cognitive Development*, 9, 331–353.
- Koenig, Melissa A., Fabrice Clement and Paul L. Harris. 2004. Trust in testimony: Children's use of true and false statements. *Psychological Science*, 15, 694-698.
- Landau, Barbara, Banchiamlack Dessalegn and Ariel M. Goldberg. 2010. Language and space: Momentary interactions. In P. Chilton and V. Evans (Eds.), *Language, cognition, and space: The state of the art and new directions. Advances in cognitive linguistics series*, (pp. 51-78). London, United Kingdom: Equinox Publishing
- Landau, Babara and Ray Jackendoff. 1993. "What" and "where" in spatial language and spatial cognition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 16, 217-238.
- Levinson, Stephen. C. 2003. Language in mind: Let's get the issues straight! In D. Gentner & S. Goldin-Meadow (Eds.), *Language in mind: Advances in the issues of language and thought* (pp. 25–46). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lucas, Amanda J., Charlie Lewis, F. Cansu Pala, Katie Wong and Damon Berridge. 2013. Social-cognitive processes in preschoolers' selective trust: Three cultures compared. *Developmental Psychology*, 49, 579-590.
- Lupyan, Gary. 2012. Linguistically modulated perception and cognition: The label-feedback hypothesis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3, 1-13.
- Malt, Barbara C. and Philip M. Wolff. 2010. *Words and the mind: How words capture human experience*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

- Matsui, Tomoko. 2014. Children's understanding of linguistic expressions of certainty and evidentiality. In: Matthews, D. (Ed.), *Pragmatic development in first language acquisition*. (pp. 295–316). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- McDermott, Kathleen and Jason C. K. Chan. 2006. Effects of repetition on memory for pragmatic inferences. *Memory & Cognition*, 34, 1273–84.
- Miller, Scott A., Cynthia A. Hardin and Derek E. Montgomery. 2003. Young children's understanding of the conditions for knowledge acquisition. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, 4, 325-356.
- Ozturk, Ozge and Anna Papafragou. 2015. The acquisition of evidentiality and source monitoring. *Language Learning and Development*.
- Ögel-Balaban, Hale, Ayhan Aksu-Koç and Ercan I. Alp. 2012. The relationship between source memory and linguistic encoding of source: A study of 3-6 year-olds. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 27, 26-47.
- Papafragou, Anna, Peggy Li, Youngon Choi and Chung-Hye Han. 2007. Evidentiality in language and cognition. *Cognition*, 103, 253–99.
- Pillow, Bradford. 1989. Early understanding of perception as a source of knowledge. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 47, 116-129.
- Pillow, Bradford. 1999. Children's understanding of inferential knowledge. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 160, 419–428.
- Pillow, Bradford. 2002. Children's and adults' evaluation of the certainty of deductive inferences, inductive inferences, and guesses. *Child Development*, 73, 779-792.

- Pillow, Bradford H., Valerie Hill, April Boyce and Catherine Stein. 2000. Understanding inference as a source of knowledge: Children's ability to evaluate the certainty of deduction, perception, and guessing. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 169-179.
- Pillow, Bradford. H. and Katherine L. Anderson. 2006. Children's awareness of their own certainty and understanding of deduction and guessing. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 24, 823-849.
- Pinker, Steven. 1984. *The Language Instinct*. New York, NY: Morrow.
- Pratt, Chris and Peter Bryant. 1990. Young children understand that looking leads to knowing (so long as they are looking into a single barrel). *Child Development*, 61, 973-982.
- Robinson, E. J., S. N. Haigh and E. Nurmsoo. 2008. Children's working understanding of knowledge sources: Confidence in knowledge gained from testimony. *Cognitive Development*, 23, 105-118.
- Sapir, Edward. 1924. The grammarian and his language. In D. Mandelbaum (Ed.), *Selected writings of Edward Sapir in language, culture, and personality* (pp. 150-159). Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Slobin, Dan. I. and Ayhan Aksu. 1982. Tense, aspect, modality, and more in Turkish evidentials. In: P. Hopper, (Ed.), *Tense-aspect: Between semantics and pragmatics* (pp.185-200). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Sodian, Beate, Heinz and Wimmer. 1987. Children's understanding of inference as a source of knowledge. *Child Development*, 58, 424-433.
- Speas, Margaret. 2004. Evidentiality, logophoricity and the syntactic representation of pragmatic features. *Lingua*, 114, 255-276.

- Tosun, Sümeyra, Jyotsna Vaid and Lisa Geraci. 2013. Does obligatory linguistic marking of source of evidence affect source memory? A Turkish/English investigation. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 69, 121–134.
- Trueswell, John C. and Anna Papafragou. 2010. Perceiving and remembering events cross-linguistically: Evidence from dual-task paradigms. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 63, 64–82.
- Uzundag, Berna, Suleyman Tasci, Aylin C. Küntay and Ayhan Aksu-Koç. 2016. Functions of evidentials in Turkish child and child-directed speech in early child-caregiver interactions. *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press
- Ünal, Ercenur and Anna Papafragou. In press. Interactions between language and visuo-spatial representations. *Language Learning, Special issue on Linguistic Relativity*.
- Ünal, Ercenur and Anna Papafragou. 2013. Linguistic and conceptual representations of inference as a knowledge source. In S. Baiz, N. Goldman, & R. Hawkes (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 37th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, (pp.433-443). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press
- Ünal, Ercenur and Anna Papafragou. 2015. *The relation between evidentiality and source monitoring*. Poster presented at the 9th Biennial Meeting of Cognitive Development Society, Columbus, OH.
- Ünal, Ercenur and Anna Papafragou. 2016. Production-comprehension asymmetries and the acquisition of evidential morphology. *Journal of Memory and Language*.

- Ünal, Ercenur, Adrienne Pinto, Ann Bungler and Anna Papafragou. 2016. Monitoring sources of event memories: A cross-linguistic investigation. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 87, 157-176.
- de Villiers, Jill. G., Jay Garfield, Harper Gernet-Girard, Tom Roeper and Margaret Speas. 2009. Evidentials in Tibetan: Acquisition, semantics, and cognitive development. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 125, 29–47.
- Willett, Thomas. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language*, 12, 51-97.
- Winawer, Johathan, Nathan Witthoft, Michael C. Frank, Lisa Wu, Alex R. Wade and Lera Boroditsky. 2007. Russian blues reveal effects of language on color discrimination. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104, 7780–7785.
- Wolff, Philip. M. and Kevin J. Holmes. 2011. Linguistic relativity. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 2, 253–265.
- Whorf, Benjamin. L. 1956. Language, thought and reality. In J. B. Carroll (Ed.), *Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.