LING/PSYC 30401 Psycholinguistics: Language Processing   **Fall 2022**
Instructor: Monica Do {monicado@uchicago.edu}

Class Meetings	Office Hours
Time: Mon/Wed 1:30-2:50pm	**Time:** Tuesdays, 3:30-4:30pm
Location: Cochran-Woods Art Center (CWAC) 156	**Location:** Rosenwald 229C

Course Description: This class will provide an introductory overview of psycholinguistic work in sentence comprehension and production. The readings will cover a selection of well-known issues/topics in the field that will be of interest to those studying sentence processing and production from an experimental perspective. Readings will include (relatively) recent studies that shape the way that we approach these issues.

Canvas Policy
All course materials, including: (1) Readings, (2) Assignments, and (3) Announcements will be posted on Canvas. Students should check Canvas *regularly* for course announcements, assignments, and materials. Unless otherwise stated, students should submit completed assignments through Canvas.

Course Requirements
   A. **Content Engagement (25%):** Students are expected to come prepared to respond thoughtfully to the lecture material and discussion questions during the scheduled class meeting.

   B. **Annotated bibliographies (20%):** Each student will create an Annotated Bibliography (AB) for a total of <u>four</u> course and/or optional readings of their choice. These should be uploaded to Canvas before the end of the quarter.
   A sample AB is provided on Canvas. Each AB should include a roughly 1-page summary of the reading that includes details about:
      i.   **Central Issue:** What is the open question they outline in the introduction?
      ii.   **Aims:** What is the specific research question they're asking?
      iii. **Method(s):** What experimental paradigms? Independent/Dependent variables?
      iv.   **Results:** What did they find?
      v.   **Implications:** How do their findings bear on the original issue outlined in the intro
      vi.   **Your questions/comments** about the work

   C. **Proposal Meeting (10%):** Each student or group should have met with me **before Friday, October 28th** to discuss their choice of topic. During this meeting, students should present their proposal in the form of an AB with the results section replaced by a predictions section. In addition, proposals should include at least 6 references. A meeting sign-up sheet will be distributed during the quarter.

   D. **Final project (45%):** Students will propose an experiment designed to address an open issue in any aspect of psycholinguistics. Students are free to choose any topic of interest, but practically speaking, it will be more manageable to propose a follow-up to one of the studies covered in the course than it will be to propose something 'from scratch'.

I *encourage* **students to collaborate** with other students in groups of 2-3 to come up with research question(s) and design an appropriate experiment. **However, each student should still hand in their own research proposal.**

This proposal should be structured like the 'Introduction' and 'Methods' section of an experimental article. **Students do not need to collect any data** for their projects.

Academic Integrity:

It is the responsibility of students to be familiar with the University's policy on academic honesty. Instances of academic dishonesty will be referred to the Office of the Provost for adjudication.

Students with Disabilities:

Students who need any special accommodations, should provide their instructor with a copy of their Accommodation Determination Letter (provided by the Student Disability Services office) as soon as possible so that they may discuss with their instructor how necessary accommodations may be implemented in this course.

Course Schedule & Reading List

Week 2: Top-Down versus Bottom-Up Approaches to Processing	
Date	*Readings Due*
10/3	**Required Readings:** Allopenna, P. D., Magnuson, J. S., & Tanenhaus, M. K. (1998). Tracking the time course of spoken word recognition using eye movements: Evidence for continuous mapping models. *Journal of memory and language*, *38*(4), 419-439. Altmann, G. T. & Kamide, Y. (1999). Incremental interpretation at verbs: restricting the domain of subsequent reference. *Cognition*, 73(3), 247-264. **Further Readings:** Dahan, D., & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2004). Continuous mapping from sound to meaning in spoken-language comprehension: Immediate effects of verb-based thematic constraints. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 30, 498-513. Boland, J. E., Tanenhaus, M. K., Garnsey, S. M., & Carlson, G. N. (1995). Verb argument structure in parsing an interpretation: Evidence from wh-questions. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 34(6), 191-238.
10/5	**Required Readings:** Spivey-Knowlton, M. & Sedivy, J. (1995). Resolving attachment ambiguities with multiple constraints. *Cognition*, 55, 227-267. **Further Readings:** Kaiser, E., Runner, J. T., Sussman, R. S., & Tanenhaus, M. K., (2009). Structural and semantic constraints on the resolution of pronouns and reflexives. *Cognition*, 112 (1), 55-80. Van Gompel, R. P. G., Pickering, M., J., & Traxler, M. J. (2001). Reanalysis in Sentence Processing: Evidence against Current Constraint-Based and Two-Stage Models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 45 225-258.

	Week 3: 'Good Enough'& Probabilistic Approaches to Processing	
Date	*Readings Due*	
10/10	**Required Readings:** Slattery, T. J., Sturt, P., Christianson, K., Yoshida, M., & Ferreira, F. (2013). Lingering misinterpretations of garden path sentences arise from competing syntactic representations. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 69(2), 104-120. Tabor, W., Galantucci, B., & Richardson, D. (2004). Effects of merely local syntactic coherence on sentence processing. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 50, 355-370. **Further Readings:** Patson, N. D., Darowski, E. S., Moon, N., & Ferreira, F. (2009). Lingering Misinterpretations in Garden-Path Sentences: Evidence From a Paraphrasing Task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 35(1), 280-285.	
10/12	**Required Readings:** Levy, R. (2008). Expectation-based syntactic comprehension. *Cognition*, 106(3). 1126-1177 Hale, J. (2016). Information theoretic complexity metrics. *Language and linguistics Compass*, 10(9), 397-412 **Further Readings:** Hale, J. (2006) Uncertainty about the rest of the sentence. *Cognitive Science*, 30(4), 643-672	

	Week 4: Not-So-Incremental Processing – Long Distance Dependencies	
Date	*Readings Due*	
10/17	**Required Readings:** Gibson, E. (2000). The dependency locality theory: A distance-based theory of linguistic complexity. In A. Marantz, Y. Miyashita, & W. O'Neil (Eds.), *Image, language, brain: Papers from the first mind articulation project symposium* (pp. 94–126). The MIT Press. **Further Readings:** Fedorenko, E., Woodbury, R., & Gibson, E. (2013). Direct evidence of memory retrieval as a source of difficulty in non-local dependencies in language. *Cognitive Science*, 37(2), 378–394. Warren, T. & Gibson, E. (2002). The influence of referential processing on sentence complexity. *Cognition*, 85(1), 79-112.	
10/19	**Required Readings:** Lewis, R. L., & Vasishth, S. (2005). An activation-based model of sentence processing as skilled memory retrieval. *Cognitive science*, *29*(3), 375-419. Wagers, M., Lau, E., Phillips, C. (2009). Agreement attraction in comprehension: representations and processes. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 61, 206-237. **Further Readings:** Dillon, B., Mishler, A., Sloggett, S., & Phillips, C. (2013). Contrasting intrusion profiles for agreement and anaphora: experimental and modeling evidence. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *69*(2), 85-103.	

Week 5: Semantics & Pragmatics	
Date	*Readings Due*
10/24	**Required Reading:** Sedivy, J. C., Tanenhaus, M. K., Chambers, C. G., & Carlson, G. N. (1999). Achieving incremental semantic interpretation through contextual representation. *Cognition*, *71*(2), 109-147. **Further Readings:** Tanenhaus, M. K., Spivey-Knowlton, M. J., Eberhard, K. M., & Sedivy, J. C. (1995). Integration of visual and linguistic information in spoken language comprehension. *Science*, 1632-1634. Chambers, C., Tanenhaus, M. K., & Magnuson, J. (2004). Actions and Affordances in Syntactic Ambiguity Resolution. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 30(3), 687-696
10/26	**Required Reading:** Degen, J., & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2015). Processing scalar implicature: A constraint-based approach. *Cognitive science*, *39*(4), 667-710. Goodman, N. D., & Frank, M. C. (2016). Pragmatic language interpretation as probabilistic inference. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 20(11), 818-829 **Further Readings:** Degen, J., & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2016). Availability of Alternatives and the Processing of Scalar Implicatures: A Visual World Eye-Tracking Study. *Cognitive Science*, 40(1), 172-201.
10/28	**Proposal Meeting Deadline!**

Week 6: Production – From Messages to Sentences	
Date	*Readings Due*
10/31	**Required Readings:** Papafragou, A., Massey, C., & Gleitman, L. (2006). When English proposes what Greek presupposes: the cross-linguistic encoding of motion events. *Cognition*, 98(3), B75–B87. Do, M. L., Papafragou, A., & Trueswell, J. (2020). Cognitive and pragmatic factors in language production: Evidence from source-goal motion events. *Cognition*, 205, 104447. **Further Reading:** Bunger, A., Papafragou, A., & Trueswell, J. C. (2013). Event structure influences language production: Evidence from structural priming in motion event description. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 69(3), 299–323. Slobin, D. I. (1996). From 'thought and language' to 'thinking for speaking'. In J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 70–96). New York: Cambridge University Press.
11/2	**Required Reading:** Brown-Schmidt, S., & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2006). Watching the eyes when talking about size: An investigation of message formulation and utterance planning. *Journal of*

	Memory and Language, 54, 592–609.
	Further Readings:
	Brown-Schmidt, S., & Konopka, A. (2008). Little houses and casas pequeñas: Message formulation and syntactic form in unscripted speech with speakers of English and Spanish. *Cognition*, 109, 274-280.
	Ferreira, F. & Swets, B. (2002). How Incremental Is Language Production? Evidence from the Production of Utterances Requiring the Computation of Arithmetic Sums. *Journal of Memory & Language*, 46(1):57-84.

	Week 7: Production – Sentence Formulation
Date	*Readings Due*
11/7	**Required Reading:**
	van de Velde, M., Meyer, A. S., & Konopka, A. E. (2014). Message formulation and structural assembly: Describing "easy" and "hard" events with preferred and dispreferred syntactic structures. Journal of Memory and Language, 71(1), 124–144.
	Lee, E.-K., Brown-Schmidt, S., & Watson, D. G. (2013). Ways of looking ahead: Hierarchical planning in language production. *Cognition*, 129(3), 544–562.
	Further Readings:
	Gleitman, L. R., January, D., Nappa, R., & Trueswell, J. C. (2007). On the give and take between event apprehension and utterance formulation. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 57, 544–569.
	Griffin, Z. & Bock, K. (2000). What the eyes say about speaking. *Psychological Science*, 11(4), 274-279.
	Norcliffe, E., Konopka, A. E., Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (2015). Word order affects the time course of sentence formulation in Tzeltal. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 30(9), 1187–1208.
	Konopka, A. E., & Meyer, A. S. (2014). Priming sentence planning. *Cognitive Psychology*, 73, 1–40.
11/9	**Required Readings:**
	Cleland, A., & Pickering, M., J. (2003). The use of lexical and syntactic information in language production: Evidence from the priming of noun-phrase structure. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 49(2), 214–230.
	Further Readings:
	Pickering M., J., Branigan, H. P., Cleland, A. A., & Stewart, A. J. (2000). Activation of Syntactic Information During Language Production. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 29(2), 205-216.
	Chang, F., Dell, G. S., & Bock, K. (2006). Becoming Syntactic. *Psychological Review*, 113(2), 234-272.
	Bock, K., & Loebell, H. (1990). Framing Sentences. *Cognition*, 35, 1-39.

	Week 8: Lexical Selection
Date	*Readings Due*
11/14	**Required Readings:**
	Mahon, B. Z., Costa, A., Peterson, R., Vargas, K. A., & Caramazza, A. (2007). Lexical selection is not by competition: A reinterpretation of semantic interference and facilitation effects in the picture-word interference paradigm. *Journal of*

	Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 33(3), 503–535. **Further Readings:** Huettig, F., & Hartsuiker, R. J. (2008). When you name the Pizza, you look at the Coin and the Bread. *Memory & Cognition*, 36(2), 341-360. Bloem, I., & La Heij, W. (2003). Semantic facilitation and semantic interference in word translation: Implications for models of lexical access in language production. Journal of Memory and Language, 48, 468-488. Costa, A., Miozzo, M., & Caramazza, A. (1999). Lexical selection in bilinguals: Do words in bilingual's lexicon compete for selection? *Journal of Memory and Language*, 41, 365–397.
11/16	**Required Readings:** Brennan, S. E., & Clark, H. H. (1996). Conceptual Pacts and Lexical Choice in Conversation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 22(6), 1482–1893. Metzing, C., & Brennan, S. E. (2003). When conceptual pacts are broken: Partner-specific effects on the comprehension of referring expressions. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 49(2), 201–213. **Further Readings:** Clark, H. H., & Wilkes-Gibbs, D. (1986). Referring as a collaborative process. *Cognition*, 22, 1–39.
**11/21-11-25**   Thanksgiving Break!
**Week 9: Presentation Party!!!**
Date	*Readings*
11/28	None! Present your Experiment Proposals ☺
11/30	

Your final project is due to me by 9:00AM CST Friday, December 9!!!