ERP time-course of (pseudo-)word form activation and integration



Introduction

Comprehending the meaning behind a sentence requires a match between lower level (feed-forward) lexical form processing and higher level (feedback) context expectations

- Lexical processing (P1, N1): word form pre-activation (Kim & Lai, 2012)
- Context predictability:
 - N400 semantic integration (e.g. Kutas & Federmeier, 2011) vs. word meaning retrieval (Brouwer et al., 2016)
 - P600 structural revision/verification (e.g Kuperberg & Jäger, 2016) vs. integration difficulties (Retrieval Integration RI account, Brouwer et al., 2016)
 - PNP (post N400-positivities) costs of revision; prediction error detection (e.g. Van Petten & Luka, 2012, DeLong et al., 2014)

Does contextual support facilitate/override lexical processing of pseudo-words? Do failed attempts at pseudo-word integration suffer the same costs as word integration?

Methods

- Modified Potsdam Sentence Corpus high frequency target words by replacing a medial letter of the original target words with a similarly shaped letter
- Context sentence **predictability:** high (mean cloze 0.84) vs. low (mean cloze 0.01)
- Lexicality: word vs. pseudo-word
- 144 pairs of sentences in German, read by 20 native speakers

Design and Procedure

High predictability context sentence

Button press

Caroline liebte es, sich die Zeit mit Schach, Dame oder Mühle zu vertreiben. Caroline liked to spend her time playing chess or checkers.

Low predictability context sentence

Caroline liebte es, die Fotos aus ihrer Kindheit anzusehen. Caroline liked to look at pictures from her childhood.

Neutral target sentence

Oft holte sie aus dem Regal ein Spiel/Speel und öffnete es. She often took a game from the shelf and opened it.

March 30 – April 1, 2017

Yoana Vergilova^{1,3*}, Heiner Drenhaus^{1,2,3}, Matthew Crocker^{1,2,3}

¹ Department of Language Science & Technology, Saarland University, Germany

² Cluster of Excellence MMCI, Saarland University, Germany

³ SFB1102: Information Density and Linguistic Encoding



- efforts
- Frontal PNP words

30th CUNY Conference on Human Sentence Processing I Cambridge, MA, USA

. . .

350ms 150ms

opened

and



• Unsupported pseudo-words' meanings were never accessed and thus never fully integrated in context (RI account), but compare non-pronounceable non-word data which shows a large P600 effect and no N400 effect (Kim & Lai, 2012)

• Supported pseudo-words may have been perceived as misspellings, thus requiring allocation of more resources to repair, compared to unsupported pseudo-words (traditional accounts)

• Plausible, but unsupported words elicited frontally distributed PNPs, indicating costs of disconfirmed predictions (traditional accounts)





Later, words and pseudo-words elicit positivities with distinct topography

- Frontal PNPs to unexpected words reflect costs of failed predictions
- Posterior P600s reflect stronger attempts to re-integrate and reprocess supported pseudowords