

Events along the garden path: A reduced N400 and a P600 in semantically reversible discourse

Gina Kuperberg, MD, PhD^{1,2}, Kristina Fanucci^{1,2}

¹Tufts University & ²Martinos Center, Mass General Hospital




Background



- We store vast amounts of knowledge within memory, including information about familiar events, states and facts (1,2,3), as well as their likely relationships (4,5,6,7).
- How quickly can we draw upon this type of knowledge to predict upcoming events during word-by-word sentence comprehension? And what happens if we predict wrongly?

Design

Condition Name	Description	Example
Event-related Coherent	Second event is causally related to the first.	Kristen had insecticide applied to her house because there were cockroaches in her kitchen.
Event related Incoherent	Reversible discourse. Events are temporally related to one another but the discourse connector, 'because', renders their causal relationship incoherent.	There were cockroaches in Kristen's kitchen because she had insecticide applied to her house.
Lexically related Incoherent	Events are unrelated but the critical word is semantically related to lexical item(s) in the first clause.	Kristen had insecticide applied to her house because it was brick and metal throughout.
Unrelated Incoherent	Events are completely unrelated.	Kristen had insecticide applied to her house because she had a meal with her friends.





Results





Unrelated Incoherent minus
Event related Coherent: 300-500ms

N400: larger to critical words in **Unrelated Incoherent** than **Event related Coherent** sentences



Lexically related Incoherent minus
Event related Coherent: 300-500ms

N400 also larger to critical words in **Lexically related Incoherent** than **Event related Coherent** sentences, despite being matched on LSA.



300-500ms **600-800ms**
Event related Incoherent minus
Event related Coherent

BUT some N400 attenuation to critical words in the **Event related Incoherent** sentences.

These critical words, however, produced a P600 effect.

Conclusions

- (1) We use stored relationships between events, beyond simple lexical semantic relationships, to predict upcoming events during comprehension, even in non-lexically constraining contexts (see also ref 8).
- (2) Event predictions can influence semantic processing of incoming words, ahead of these words being fully integrated into their context.
- (3) Event predictions can also influence later stages of processing: if full integration of an incoming word into its context yields an event representation that disconfirms these predictions, and this error is detected, the parser commits to additional analysis or reanalysis of the input (9).

References

1. McRae, K., Ferretti, T. R., & Amyote, L. (1997). Thematic roles as verb-specific concepts. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 12, 137-176.
2. Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.
3. Jackendoff, R. (2002). What's in the Lexicon? In: *Storage and Computation in the Language Faculty*. S. Nooteboom, F. Weerman, and F. Wijnen, eds, 23-58. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
4. Fillmore, C. J. (2006). Frame semantics. *Cognitive Linguistics: Basic Readings*, 34, 373-400.
5. Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding: An inquiry into human knowledge structures*. Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.
6. Sitnikova, T., Holcomb, P., & Kuperberg, G. R. (2008). Neurocognitive mechanisms of human comprehension. In T. F. Shipley & J. M. Zacks (Eds.), *Understanding Events: How Humans See, Represent, and Act on Events* (pp. 639-683): Oxford University Press.
7. Zwaan, R. A., & Radinsky, G. A. (1998). Situation models in language comprehension and memory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 123(2), 162-185.
8. Kuperberg GR, Paczynski M, Dittman T. (2011) Establishing causal coherence across sentences: An ERP study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*. 23(5): 1230-1246.
9. Kuperberg GR. (in press) The pro-active comprehender: What event-related potentials tell us about the dynamics of reading comprehension. In: *Unraveling the Behavioral, Neurobiological, and Genetic Components of Reading Comprehension*. Miller, B., Cutting, L., & McCardle, P. (Eds): Baltimore: Paul Brookes Publishing.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by NIMH (R01 MH071635) and NARSAD (with the Sidney Baer Trust).

Contact: Gina Kuperberg
kuperber@nmr.mgh.harvard.edu