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Evaluation

The languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language I</th>
<th>Language II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(k;g)→(t; d)j</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p;b;d)→(p;b;d)j</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p;b;d)→(p;b;d)j</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p;b;d)→(p;b;d)j</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Paradigm:

Training: [book]

Testing: [book]

Productivity of (k; g)→(t; d)j before -i

Maximally Specific Source-oriented: -i and –a equally likely

Maximally Specific Source-oriented

Reliability-weighted Source-oriented

Reliability-weighted Source-oriented

Simple Positive Product-oriented

Conditional Product-oriented

What is predictive of (t; d)j→(t; d)j?

Final consonant of the singular

Conclusion:

Future directions: Would examples of (t; d)j disfavor velar palatalization (because they exemplify just add –i) or favor it (because they exemplify if the plural ends in –i, the preceding consonant must be [t]?)? Would changing the training task change the shape of the resulting grammar depending on: 1) whether the learners are asked to learn words or how to form plurals from singulars, 2) whether all plural wordforms can be memorized, and 3) whether learners experience singular-plural pairs or words in sentences. Are alveopalatals categorized with velars because of phonetic factors or being allophones in the artificial language?