



Interactions between Lexical Access and Articulation

Fink, Angela; Oppenheim, Gary; Goldrick, Matthew

Language, Cognition and Neuroscience

DOI:

[10.1080/23273798.2017.1348529](https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2017.1348529)

Published: 01/01/2018

Peer reviewed version

[Cyswllt i'r cyhoeddiad / Link to publication](#)

Dyfyniad o'r fersiwn a gyhoeddwyd / Citation for published version (APA):

Fink, A., Oppenheim, G., & Goldrick, M. (2018). Interactions between Lexical Access and Articulation. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 33(1), 12-24.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2017.1348529>


Hawliau Cyffredinol / General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Interactions between Lexical Access and Articulation

Journal:	<i>Language, Cognition and Neuroscience</i>
Manuscript ID	PLCP-2016-OP-10078.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	18-May-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Fink, Angela; Northwestern University, Department of Linguistics Oppenheim, Gary; University of Bangor, School of Psychology; Rice University, Psychology; University of California San Diego, Center for Research in Language Goldrick, Matthew; Northwestern University, Department of Linguistics;
Keywords:	language production, lexical access, articulation, interaction

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Running Head: Lexical Access and Articulation
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Interactions between Lexical Access and Articulation

22
23
24 Angela Fink^a, Gary M. Oppenheim^{bcd}, and Matthew Goldrick^{a*}
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 ^a Northwestern University, Department of Linguistics, Northwestern University, 2016
33 Sheridan Rd., Evanston, IL 60626; afink@u.northwestern.edu; matt-
34 goldrick@northwestern.edu

35
36 ^b Bangor University, School of Psychology, Adeilad Brigantia, Penrallt Road,
37 Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2AS, UK; g.m.oppenheim@bangor.ac.uk

38 ^c Rice University, Department of Psychology, Houston, TX 77251

39 ^d University of California San Diego, Center for Research in Language, 9500 Gilman Dr, La
40 Jolla, CA 92037

41
42 *Corresponding author; +1-847-491-8053
43
44

45
46 Acknowledgement of Funding

47 This work was supported by the US National Science Foundation under Grant BCS1420820
48 (AF), BCS0846147 (MG); and the US National Institutes of Health under NICHD Grant
49 HD077140 (MG), NIDCD Grant T32DC000041 (GMO), and NIH research grants
50 UL1TR001422 and P30DC012035 to Northwestern University.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

This study investigates the interaction of lexical access and articulation in spoken word production, examining two dimensions along which theories vary. First, does articulatory variation reflect a fixed plan, or do lexical access-articulatory interactions continue after response initiation? Second, to what extent are interactive mechanisms hard-wired properties of the production system, as opposed to flexible? In two picture-naming experiments, we used semantic neighbor manipulations to induce lexical and conceptual co-activation. Our results provide evidence for multiple sources of interaction, both before and after response initiation. While interactive effects can vary across participants, we do not find strong evidence of variation of effects within individuals, suggesting that these interactions are relatively fixed features of each individual's production system.

Keywords: language production, lexical access, articulation, interaction

Interactions between Lexical Access and Articulation

Theories of spoken word production assume that several broad stages of post-semantic processing underlie the planning and execution of speech (Garrett, 1980; Levelt, 1989). Lexical access—the retrieval of lexical and phonological representations from memory—bridges conceptual and word form representations. These word form representations are then used to generate a detailed articulatory plan, which the motor system then executes.

Although these stages have often been characterized as serial and discrete, recent production research has demonstrated that many factors that influence lexical access can also modulate the phonetic properties of the word that is ultimately produced. That is, the same sequence of speech sounds can be pronounced in many different ways, for instance changing their duration, pitch, and intensity without actually changing the word that they denote. Such phonetic properties can reflect not only general speech style (Aylett & Turk, 2004; Baker & Bradlow, 2009) and the structure of the articulatory plan, but also the influence of factors that make selecting a particular lexical item to express a concept (lexical selection) relatively easy or difficult. These factors include contextual predictability (*court* is highly predictable following *supreme*; Bell et al., 2009), informativity (*nowadays* is more informative than *current* because it is unpredictable in any context; Seyfarth, 2014), and givenness (whether a referent has been used previously in a discourse; Fowler & Housum, 1987; Kahn & Arnold, 2012; 2015; Lam & Watson, 2014).

One prominent explanation for such phonetic manifestations of conceptual and lexical effects assumes that lexical access and articulatory processes interact. This interaction can take many forms – which need not be mutually exclusive (e.g., Goldrick,

1
2
3 Baker, Murphy, & Baese-Berk, 2011) – including mechanisms that: a.) coordinate the
4 relative timing of these two processes (Bell et al., 2009); b.) vary articulatory
5 precision/prominence based on the activation of target (Kahn & Arnold, 2012; Lam &
6 Watson, 2014); c.) allow partially active competitor representations to activate articulatory
7 plans (Goldrick & Blumstein, 2006); and/or d.) incorporate articulatory details into stored
8 lexical access representations (Goldinger, 1998; Pierrehumbert, 2002).¹
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 While these interactive accounts allow crosstalk between lexical access and
19 articulation, they generally assume that lexical access is a ballistic process (Logan & Cowan,
20 1984; Navarette, Del Prato, Peressotti, & Mahon, 2014), encapsulated from other
21 components of the cognitive system. Under these ‘planning-drives-articulation’ accounts
22 (see Buz & Jaeger, 2015, for discussion), an articulatory plan develops up until some point
23 at or before the initiation of a motor response, and cannot be changed or disrupted after
24 that time – neglecting the possibility that input patterns could continue to develop after
25 response initiation. For instance, a completed articulatory plan might reflect the state of the
26 planning network at the moment of response initiation, encoding the relative activation of
27 the target word (e.g., CAT) as well as the coactivation of non-target representations (BAT
28 and RAT). Under a ballistic account, these levels of co-activation would then remain fixed
29 throughout execution of the plan. Additionally, if planning representations are not abstract,
30 but highly detailed, the plan could specify the stored phonetic properties of diverse
31 exemplars (‘cat’ with a long vowel and heavy release of /t/ vs. a short vowel and
32 unreleased stop). Under such accounts, the extent of lexical effects on phonetic variation
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 ¹ Note that interactive mechanisms are not the only level of analysis at which such effects
55 can be explained; in the general discussion, we consider the relationship between such
56 accounts and those based on communicative goals.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 specifically depends the state of lexical access at the moment when articulation begins.

4
5 Such mechanisms therefore predict a fixed relationship between planning measures (e.g.,
6
7 picture-naming latencies) and articulatory measures (e.g., spoken word durations):
8
9

10 wherever these levels interact, they should always interact, and interact to the same
11
12 degree.
13

14
15 Though such an assumption conveniently constrains the scope of language planning
16
17 models, production cannot entirely fit within that 'ballistic' characterization. For instance,
18
19 Levelt (1983) noted that speakers often interrupt their word errors before completing
20
21 them, something that should be impossible if the articulation process became ballistic after
22
23 the onset of a word. Our question, then, is whether speech planning more generally
24
25 continues beyond the point of response initiation, as opposed to such interruptions
26
27 representing a special case. Specifically, we contrast ballistic accounts with more dynamic
28
29 accounts that allow interaction to continue during production. For example, in systems that
30
31 operate in cascade, later stages of processing can begin before earlier stages are complete
32
33 (McClelland, 1979; see Dell, 1986, for a seminal application to production). If such
34
35 cascading allows the articulation of a word to begin before lexical access is complete, then
36
37 the dynamics of any remaining planning processes may influence articulation independent
38
39 of the state of the planning system at the moment of response initiation. This can create
40
41 situations in which measures of planning and articulation effects may diverge.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Among frameworks incorporating interaction, a second key assumption is that the
50
51 strength of interaction between lexical access and articulation is fixed. For example,
52
53 exemplar theories have modelled interactive effects by assuming that the lexicon stores
54
55 detailed phonetic properties; a strict exemplar approach therefore predicts that such
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 effects should hold constant regardless of whether exemplar retrieval took more or less
4 time (see Fink & Goldrick, 2015, for discussion). Although other theories may emphasize
5 the dynamics of lexical access, they nonetheless assume that the relative timing of planning
6 and articulation remains constant. For example, the minimal planning unit hypothesis
7 (Kawamoto, Kello, Jones, & Bame, 1998) posits that responses are always initiated after
8 some fundamental constituent has been planned (though the underlying planning may take
9 more or less time; see Kawamoto, Liu, & Kello, 2015, for a review).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 In contrast to those fixed interactive accounts, another kind of account assumes a
21 temporal coupling of lexical access and articulation can vary. For example, the flexible
22 cascade hypothesis (Kello, MacWhinney, & Plaut, 2000) postulates that the amount of
23 temporal overlap between planning and articulation changes dynamically depending on
24 the speed of processing. The idea, in a nutshell, is that although the neural structure of the
25 production system always has the capacity to support cascading and interactive effects, the
26 emergence of these effects depends on the speed of processing in a given task. Speakers
27 can hasten production by initiating speech based on partial information; so all else being
28 equal, when response initiation occurs earlier, there is predicted to be greater overlap
29 between planning and articulation, yielding more robust lexical effects on articulation
30 (Kello, 2004).

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 In the current study, we examine the presence of interactivity and its flexibility in
48 the context of *long-distance* interactive effects on articulation, by assessing the conditions
49 under which conceptual and lexical processes may modulate articulatory processing. We
50 begin by discussing the idea of flexible coordination of those planning processes and
51 articulation, reviewing evidence for such long-distance effects, and considering how the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 dynamic and flexible nature of interaction might contribute to the mixed findings reported
4
5
6 in the literature.

8 **Evidence for the flexible coordination of planning and articulation**

10
11 Outside of the context of interactive effects, there is evidence that the relative timing
12
13 of planning and articulation can vary. For example, Kawamoto and colleagues propose that
14
15 speakers can initiate responding as soon as the first phoneme of a target is phonetically
16
17 encoded (see Kawamoto et al., 2015, for a review). In support of this claim, results from
18
19 reading aloud suggest that when the initial phoneme has been primed, response initiation
20
21 frequently (~1/4 of trials) occurs prior to presentation of the target word. However, in
22
23 other tasks, response initiation may occur after larger chunks of the target word have been
24
25 planned (e.g., the syllable or phonological word; Meyer, Roelofs, & Levelt, 2003). Such
26
27 variable results lead some to argue that phonetic plans are continuously assembled and
28
29 articulated, rather than being articulated on a unit-by-unit basis (e.g., Pluymaekers,
30
31 Ernestus, and Baayen, 2005). Critically, these data provide evidence that speakers'
32
33 response decision criteria may be fairly flexible—consistent with theories claiming that the
34
35 coupling of lexical access and articulation is not fixed.
36
37
38
39
40

42 **Long-distance interactive effects on articulation**

44
45 Several studies have shown that cascade enables interactions between consecutive
46
47 stages of production processing, such that disruptions to one stage influence the stage
48
49 immediately following. For example, the co-activation of a target and its semantic
50
51 neighbors during lexical selection influences phonological encoding, such that the partial
52
53 activation of the phonological properties of semantic neighbors biases phonological errors
54
55 towards semantically related as opposed to unrelated words (e.g., a slip from CAT to RAT is
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 more likely than a slip from CAT to MAT; for a review, see Goldrick, 2006). Cascade
4
5 similarly allows partial activation of phonological representations to influence phonetic
6
7 processing. For example, the partial activation of target phonetic properties causes speech
8
9 errors to systematically deviate away from an error outcome, towards the intended target
10
11 (e.g., in a slip from DOG to TOG, the voice onset time of /t/ tends to be more /d/-like than a
12
13 canonical /t/; for a review, see Goldrick, Keshet, Gustafson, Heller, & Needle, 2016).
14
15
16

17
18 Putting these two effects together, we would expect disruptions in lexical selection
19
20 to cascade into phonological encoding, and then subsequently disrupt articulatory
21
22 processing. However, the evidence for such long-distance interactions is mixed. Kello et al.
23
24 (2000) utilized the Stroop paradigm (MacLeod, 1991)—which has been argued to disrupt
25
26 lexical selection process (Roelofs, 2014)— to test for effects of disrupted lexical selection
27
28 on word durations. While the authors replicated the finding of semantic interference in
29
30 RTs—slower responses on incongruent trials (RED written in blue ink) compared to
31
32 congruent trials (RED written in red ink)—they failed to detect any effect on durations.
33
34 After changing their task to include a response deadline, though, the interactive effects
35
36 emerged: when participants suffered impaired lexical selected on incongruent trials, they
37
38 not only slowed their responses but also increased word durations.
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 However, in a direct replication, Damian (2003; Experiment 3) failed to detect any
46
47 effect of Stroop interference on word durations, even under time pressure (see Damian &
48
49 Freeman, 2008, for similar results in typewritten output). Damian implemented two
50
51 additional paradigms to rigorously test for long-distance interactive effects. In Experiment
52
53 1, Damian used the picture-word interference paradigm (Rosinski, Golinkoff, & Kukish,
54
55 1975), where picture naming is slower in the context of semantically related distractor
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 words than in the context of unrelated words. This has (controversially) been argued to
4
5 result from disruptions to lexical selection (e.g., Roelofs, 1992; cf. Mahon, Costa, Peterson,
6
7 Vargas, & Caramazza, 2007). In Experiment 2, participants repeatedly named sets of
8
9 pictures that were either unrelated or blocked by semantic category. Word production is
10
11 slower and more error-prone in the semantically blocked condition, which has been argued
12
13 to result from disruptions to lexical selection by inducing competition from semantically
14
15 related words (Damian, Vigliocco, & Levelt, 2001) and/or directly reducing the accessibility
16
17 of previous competitors (Oppenheim, Dell, & Schwartz, 2010). In both tasks, only RTs were
18
19 modulated by the presence of semantic interference, even under time pressure.
20
21
22
23
24

25 These conflicting duration results suggest that direct interactions between lexical
26
27 processes and articulation are, if present, weak and difficult to detect. Such subtlety may
28
29 inherently arise from the architecture of the production system, reflecting restrictions on
30
31 the strength of interaction and the representational distance between lexical and phonetic
32
33 representations in the network (see Dell & O'Seaghdha, 1991; Rapp & Goldrick, 2000, for
34
35 related discussion). Concretely, if co-activation at the lexical level must travel through at
36
37 least two subsequent levels of representation (phonological and phonetic) in order to
38
39 impact articulation, each of which is subject to a selection process that reduces the
40
41 influence of partially activated competitors, then the influence of lexical disruptions may be
42
43 washed out before it can impact motor execution.
44
45
46
47
48

49 Another possibility (which is not mutually exclusive) is that interactions between
50
51 lexical access and articulation are not fixed, but can vary. As reviewed above, speakers'
52
53 response decision criteria may be fairly flexible. Such criteria might vary not only across
54
55 task conditions (as argued by Kello et al. 2000 and Kello 2004), but also across individual
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 trials (e.g., post-error slowing; see Notebaert, Houtman, Van Opstal, Gevers, Fias, & Verguts,
4
5 2009, for a recent review). If the temporal overlap between planning and articulation is
6
7 determined by these variable response criteria, then we anticipate variation in interactive
8
9 effects both within and across studies—which may explain previous difficulties detecting
10
11 long-distance interactive effects.
12
13

14
15 A third possibility is that the lack of consistent results reflects between-participant
16
17 variation in the effectiveness of the experimental manipulations. Recent studies suggest
18
19 that the degree to which lexical selection is disrupted in tasks such as picture word
20
21 interference (Shao, Meyer, & Roelofs, 2013) and semantic blocking (Crowther & Martin,
22
23 2014; Hughes & Schnur, 2015) is modulated by individual differences in executive
24
25 functions. This, along with other sources of naturally occurring variation across different
26
27 samples of participants, may further reduce the likelihood of detecting the already weak
28
29 effects of long-distance interactions.
30
31
32
33

34
35 Finally, a key issue largely unexamined in previous work is whether long-distance
36
37 interactive effects arise solely at response initiation (reflecting a ballistic lexical access
38
39 process) or also arise following response initiation (as predicted by dynamic accounts that
40
41 allow interaction to continue during production). No studies of long-distance interactions
42
43 have *directly* examined the extent to which effects in articulatory measures are
44
45 independent of effects observed during planning. However, Kello (2004) conducted parallel
46
47 analyses of RTs and word durations in reading aloud, which may provide a useful clue.
48
49 Orthographic variables (frequency, neighborhood size, and spelling-sound consistency)
50
51 exerted stronger effects on RTs when there was no pressure to respond quickly. In
52
53 contrast, the influence of orthographic variables on word duration increased under time
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 pressure. Although they did not directly test the relationship between these measures,
4
5 their diverging results suggest that some effects in word duration are not reducible to
6
7 effects arising during planning.
8
9

10 **The current study**

11
12 The current study aims to clarify the literature on long-distance interactions by
13
14 addressing the possibility that lexical effects on phonetic variation could arise at multiple
15
16 time points (at and/or after response initiation), and also examining whether such lexical
17
18 effects can vary in strength across trials. To that end, we simultaneously consider
19
20 information about the timing of response initiation and articulation (measured by the
21
22 acoustic duration of words). In two experiments, we manipulate the semantic properties of
23
24 the context in which production occurs, utilizing paradigms that are well known to
25
26 modulate RTs as a function of semantic context.
27
28
29
30
31

32 We then analyze word durations, using multiple regression analyses to examine the
33
34 extent to which duration effects are reducible to effects on planning (as indexed by by-trial
35
36 RT and speakers' overall response speeds; for related analytical approaches, see Buz &
37
38 Jaeger, 2015; Heller & Goldrick, 2014, 2015). If the production system is ballistic, such that
39
40 all interactive effects are fixed at the moment articulation is initiated, then planning
41
42 measures and articulatory durations should be positively correlated: as planning time
43
44 increases, articulatory duration should also increase. Furthermore, there should be no
45
46 independent effect of semantic context (over and above the effect context has on
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 planning)². In contrast, if interactive effects arise after the initiation of the response, after
4
5
6 controlling for planning effects there will be independent effects of semantic context on
7
8 durations.
9

10
11 If interactive effects are present, comparison of effects across different trials will
12
13 allow us to assess the flexibility of such interactions. To the extent that such effects are
14
15 fixed, any independent effects of semantic context should either appear across all trials in
16
17 both experiments or in neither. Alternatively, if faster processing yields greater overlap
18
19 between processes (Kello et al., 2000; Kello, 2004), then interactive effects should increase
20
21 with faster reaction times.
22
23

24
25 Finally, as discussed above, participants may vary in their susceptibility to the
26
27 manipulations of semantic context intended to modulate planning. When planning
28
29 processes are relatively unaffected by a manipulation, then articulation should be
30
31 consequently unaffected, preventing the interactive potential of the production system
32
33 from being detected. Thus, a sample group that includes less susceptible participants may
34
35 fail to demonstrate direct lexical effects on articulation, even if the potential for such effects
36
37 is an inherent feature of the structure of the language production system. We therefore
38
39 consider whether the strengths of direct lexical effects on word durations may be
40
41 moderated by measures of individual variation.
42
43
44
45

46
47 We utilized two paradigms to modulate lexical and conceptual processing. In
48
49 Experiment 1, we consider the continuous picture naming paradigm, where speakers
50
51

52
53 ² As noted by an anonymous reviewer, this analytic method is conservative; effects
54
55 occurring after response initiation could have identical effects to independent effects
56
57 occurring prior to response initiation. Our results are therefore biased against finding any
58
59 interactive effects after response initiation.
60

1
2
3 simply named one picture after another in a pseudorandom order (Howard, Nickels,
4 Coltheart, Cole-Virtue, 2006). Crucially, the stimulus list includes exemplars of many
5
6 different semantic categories, with exemplars of the same category separated by several
7
8 trials. Many studies have shown that RTs increase linearly with each successive exemplar
9
10 of a given semantic category, indicating cumulative semantic interference. This
11
12 interference effect has been argued to arise during lexical selection (e.g., Belke, 2013; Belke
13
14 & Stielow, 2013; Howard, et al., 2006; Oppenheim, Dell, Schwartz, 2010; but see Navarrete,
15
16 Mahon, & Caramazza, 2010, for an alternative account). Experiment 2 used the blocked
17
18 cyclic naming paradigm (Damian et al., 2001), where participants name blocks of pictures
19
20 that are either blocked by semantic category or mixed; this is the same paradigm in which
21
22 Damian (2003, Experiment 2) previously failed to detect semantic effects on articulation.
23
24 Numerous studies have shown that people are slower to name pictures in semantically
25
26 blocked compared to mixed contexts, indicating cumulative semantic interference during
27
28 lexical selection (e.g., Breining, Nozari, & Rapp, 2015; Crowther & Martin, 2014; Damian et
29
30 al., 2001; Schnur, Schwartz, Brecher, & Hodgson, 2006; c.f. Navarrete, Del Prato, & Mahon,
31
32 2012, for further discussion).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Experiment 1: Continuous Picture Naming

In our first experiment, participants simply named a sequence of pictured objects one after another, where that sequence has been subtly manipulated to include multiple members of several semantic categories. This continuous picture naming paradigm (Howard et al., 2006) has been shown to reliably induce semantic interference during lexical selection, so we examine whether these effects extend to articulatory processing, as indexed by word durations.

Methods

Participants

We recruited 90 participants at Northwestern University using the Linguistics Department subject pool and flyers around campus. Each received course credit or \$10 compensation. They reported learning no language other than English before age 5 and no history of cognitive impairment.

Materials and Design

Participants performed a version of the continuous picture naming task (Howard et al., 2006) administered via SuperLab 4.5, where they named a sequence of pictures as quickly and accurately as possible. Ninety colored line drawings were drawn from Rossion and Pourtois' (2004) database, depicting 5 exemplars from each of 18 semantic categories (average word frequency of 65.3 words per million; SUBTLEX, Brysbaert & New, 2009). Between participants, the stimulus lists were counterbalanced to ensure that each item appeared at every ordinal position within its category (1-5).

Each participant saw stimuli from 9 semantic categories (plus filler trials drawn from non-target categories at the beginning of each test). These were subdivided into 3

1
2
3 blocks, with items drawn from 3 categories in rotation (e.g., a block containing birds, fruits,
4 and vehicles might begin OWL - APPLE - CAR - PEACOCK - ORANGE - PLANE). While
5
6 and vehicles might begin OWL - APPLE - CAR - PEACOCK - ORANGE - PLANE). While
7
8 dissimilar to the design of Howard et al. (2006), this consistent lag of 2 trials between
9
10 category members is known to elicit the standard cumulative semantic interference effect
11
12 (Runnqvist, Strijkers, Alario, & Costa, 2012; Schnur, 2014).
13
14

15 Within trials, we followed Howard et al.'s (2006) design. A fixation cross appeared
16
17 in the center of the screen for 500 ms, followed by a blank interval of 250 ms. The target
18
19 appeared onscreen and remained visible for 2000 ms, during which time the participant
20
21 named the item aloud. The screen then blanked again for an inter-trial interval of 500 ms.
22
23

24 *Data processing*

25
26
27 The data for experiments 1 and 2 were collected using an AKG C420 headmounted
28
29 microphone, connected to a MOTU 8Pre digital audio interface. In this and the following
30
31 experiments, word durations were extracted from stereo recordings. These contained
32
33 audio markers time-locked to stimulus onsets on the right channel, plus participant speech
34
35 on the left. After segmenting the recordings into trials using the audio markers, speech
36
37 onsets and offsets were identified using intensity thresholds. Each trial was first equalized
38
39 to an average root mean square intensity of 0.02 Pascal. The Praat Intensity function then
40
41 estimated the intensity contour of the normalized signal. Speech onsets were located by
42
43 sampling this contour at 1-millisecond (ms) increments to detect when the normalized
44
45 signal passed a 55 dB threshold. Speech offsets were located in the same fashion, except
46
47 that sampling began from trial's end. Duration was defined as the difference between
48
49 speech onset and offset. The first author and a research assistant manually corrected these
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 boundaries to avoid false triggers due to lip smacks, breathing, and/or low amplitude
4
5 segments.
6
7

8 **Results**

9
10 Initial filler trials from each block were excluded from analysis. Removing errors
11
12 (including incorrect responses, non-canonical responses, dysfluencies, and technical
13
14 errors) eliminated 11.2% of the data. Trials with RTs below 200 ms and above 2000 ms
15
16 were removed (0.3%), as were those with RTs more than three standard deviations from a
17
18 given subject's mean (0.5%). RTs were log transformed before analysis to correct for
19
20 positive skew. Analysis confirmed the presence of cumulative semantic interference in RTs:
21
22 there was a linear increase in RTs across ordinal positions within each semantic category
23
24 (see Fink, 2016).
25
26
27
28

29
30 Word durations were log-transformed to compensate for positive skew. Log
31
32 durations more than 3 standard deviations from a participant's mean were removed,
33
34 eliminating an additional 0.2% of the data³. Analysis of the remaining 3,539 observations is
35
36 described below.
37
38

39 *Model structure*

40
41 A single mixed-effects regression model was constructed to test for effects of
42
43 response timing and response selection difficulty on word durations. To examine the
44
45 coupling of planning and articulation, fixed effects of interest included 1.) by-participant
46
47 overall speed and 2.) trial-level RT. To examine any independent effects of the semantic
48
49 manipulation, the model also included 3.) ordinal position within a semantic category (1-
50
51
52

53
54 ³ Note that Experiment 2—which does not include hand-correction of response
55
56 durations—excluded word durations below 100 ms and above 2000 ms. No such word
57
58 durations were observed in Experiment 1.
59
60

1
2
3 5). To account for individual differences in the effectiveness of the semantic manipulation,
4 there was a fixed effect of 4.) by-participant RT interference size. We also examined how
5 these different measures interacted, specifically by including the two-way interactions of
6 5.) ordinal position by trial-level RT and 6.) ordinal position by RT interference size.
7
8 Several control variables were also included as fixed effects: 7.) experimental block (1-3),
9 8.) item class (manmade = -0.5, natural = 0.5), and 9.) a block by ordinal position
10 interaction. All of these predictors were centered to avoid co-linearity. The inter-
11 correlations among fixed effects were low ($rs \leq 0.13$), with the exception of by-participant
12 speed and trial-level RT ($r = 0.43$). We therefore report the simple correlations between
13 these predictors and duration to confirm that the direction of their effects is not a spurious
14 result of their high inter-correlation. Following the model selection procedure
15 recommended by Bates, Kliegl, Vasishth, and Baayen (2015)⁴, random effects included
16 intercepts for both participants and items; by-participant slopes for ordinal position, block,
17 trial-level RT and class; plus correlation terms.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The by-participant predictors for overall speed and RT interference size were created using simple linear regressions, where participants' continuous naming RTs were predicted by ordinal position only. Specifically, intercepts and beta coefficients were extracted from those RT models and input into the current duration analysis. We note that a more conservative analysis would extract best linear unbiased predictors (BLUPS; Baayen, 2008) from a complete, mixed-effects model of the RT data. Such an approach

⁴ This procedure combines principle components analysis and nested model comparisons to avoid problems of overparameterization that typically threaten the convergence and interpretability of models with maximal random effects structures.

1
2
3 estimates the influence of the target predictor, ordinal position, while also taking into
4
5 account variance from other sources (e.g., block number). However, our participants
6
7 demonstrated little variance when their ordinal position effects were estimated by this
8
9 method, rendering the approach unfeasible. (n.b. This provides some initial evidence that
10
11 individual differences do not make a substantial contribution to this RT effect.)
12
13
14

15 *Relationship between planning measures and duration*

16
17
18 Consistent with an influence of the input to articulatory processes on duration, there
19
20 was a reliable effect of by-participant speed; participants who responded slower overall
21
22 tended to produce longer word durations ($\beta=0.054$, s.e.=0.013, $\chi^2(1)=14.31$, $p<0.001$;
23
24 correlation of by-participant speed and duration: $r=0.18$, 95% CI=0.15, 0.22). While the
25
26 overall effect of trial-level RT patterned in a negative direction, such that faster responses
27
28 had longer durations, the effect was not reliable ($\beta=-0.018$, s.e.=0.016, $\chi^2(1)=1.24$, $p=0.27$;
29
30 mean within-participant correlation of trial-RT and duration: $r=-0.04$, s.e.=0.02).
31
32
33
34

35 *Effects of semantic context*

36
37 As shown in Figure 1, there was a significant effect of ordinal position on word
38
39 durations ($\beta=0.005$, s.e.=0.002, $\chi^2(1)=4.33$, $p<0.05$), such that semantic interference
40
41 slowed the articulation of target picture names. Because this effect remained significant
42
43 after including planning measures as covariates, we can conclude that it reflects the
44
45 influence of lexical co-activation on articulation after response initiation.
46
47
48

49 The two-way interaction of ordinal position and trial-level RT did not significantly
50
51 affect durations ($\beta=0.002$, s.e.=0.007, $\chi^2(1)=0.07$, $p=0.80$, suggesting that across-trial
52
53 changes in the temporal overlap between planning and articulation may not modulate
54
55 these lexical effects on articulation.
56
57
58
59
60

Contribution of individual differences

The two-way interaction between ordinal position and the size of RT interference had no reliable effect on word durations ($\beta=0.0003$, $s.e.=0.001$, $\chi^2(1)=0.09$, $p=0.77$). The size of semantic interference effect in durations was apparently consistent across participants, regardless of whether their RTs indicated large semantic effects prior to response initiation.

Control variables

No other effects approached significance ($\chi^2(1)\leq 2.15$, $p\geq 0.14$). Results for all fixed effects predictors are provided in the Appendix.

Summary

Experiment 1 demonstrated simultaneous effects of response timing and response selection difficulty on articulation during continuous picture naming. In terms of response timing, we found that the global measure of response speed predicted word durations, while the trial-level measure did not. This provides some evidence that articulation reflects the output of planning processes. Critically, over and above these effects, the semantic ordinal position manipulation generated cumulative semantic interference not only in RTs, but also in word durations. This suggests that lexical co-activation can continue to influence articulation after response initiation. Given the absence of interactions between trial-level RT and semantic context in predicting word durations, these results do not provide strong support for the claim that the temporal overlap between processes increases with faster processing speed. Finally, there was no evidence that individual differences in the effectiveness of the semantic manipulation modulated these effects,

1
2
3 though, as noted above, our ability to detect such variation in articulatory effect was
4
5 limited by the homogeneity in the strength of our participants' RT effects.
6
7

8 **Experiment 2: Blocked Cyclic Picture Naming**

9
10 Our second experiment utilized the blocked-cyclic naming paradigm (Belke et al.,
11
12 2005) to investigate the relationship between lexical access and articulation. Because this
13
14 block-wise design is more conspicuous than the continuous one (Experiment 1),
15
16 participants may be able to engage top-down control to resist the accumulation of semantic
17
18 interference (Belke & Stielow, 2013). Within any block, participants repeatedly name a
19
20 limited set of items across several cycles, and this constrained response set may allow
21
22 more strategic preparations, such as active inhibition of non-target responses. As a result,
23
24 Experiment 2 allows us to examine the coordination of planning and articulatory processes
25
26 under conditions subject not only to semantic interference, but also to control processes
27
28 intended to moderate that interference.
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Methods**

35 *Participants*

36
37 96 undergraduate students were recruited from the Psychology Department subject
38
39 pool at the University of California San Diego. All reported to be native speakers of English,
40
41 with no history of language or psychological disorder, and normal or corrected-to-normal
42
43 vision and hearing. 2 participants were excluded from the analyses below due to a technical
44
45 error in their response recordings.
46
47
48
49
50

51 *Materials and Procedure*

52
53 Similar to Experiment 1, the data reported here were originally collected for a
54
55 separate study of cumulative semantic interference effects on RTs (Oppenheim, in prep).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The PsyScope (Cohen, MacWhinney, Flatt, & Provost, 1993) experiment began with a
4 familiarization phase, where participants named a series of 96 line drawings, including 72
5 critical items (6 members each of 12 categories; from Schnur et al, 2006) and 24 fillers
6 representing four additional semantic categories (from Szekely et al, 2003). Items were
7 pseudorandomly organized into four blocks of 24 trials, each followed by a self-paced
8 break. On each trial, after the voicekey triggered or 3000ms had passed, the picture's
9 desired name appeared below it for 750ms; participants were instructed to use this name
10 in the remainder of the experiment.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 In the test phase of the experiment, participants encountered the same 96 line
23 drawings, this time organized into mixed vs. semantically homogeneous blocks. Mixed
24 blocks were composed of 6 items belonging to 6 different semantic categories (e.g., *dog*,
25 *arm*, *stapler*); homogeneous blocks contained 6 items from a single semantic category (e.g.,
26 *dog*, *goat*, *horse*). Each block began with a filler item, followed by six critical items that were
27 repeated in different orders across four cycles (24 test trials per block). Each trial ended
28 when the voicekey was triggered, or after 2000ms if no response had been detected. Self-
29 paced breaks were offered between blocks.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The test phase was divided into two halves, each containing 6 homogeneous and 6
43 mixed blocks. Though it is beyond the scope of this article, these blocks were arranged in
44 two formats: half of the participants saw the block types clustered, the other half saw them
45 interleaved.
46
47
48
49
50

51 *Data Pre-Processing*

52 RTs were collected online using a Shure SM10a headmounted microphone,
53
54 connected to an ioLab response box, implementing a delayed-threshold voice-key. Word
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 durations were automatically extracted from the Marantz PMD 661 stereo recordings using
4
5 the procedure outlined in Experiment 1, except that boundaries were not hand-corrected
6
7 due to the large scale of the data set (over fifty thousand observations). It is likely that the
8
9 large number of observations will reduce the impact of boundary-marking errors.
10
11 Additionally, any errors that occur will be blind to condition, and so should not introduce
12
13 any systematic bias in our analyses.
14
15
16

17 18 **Results**

19
20 An initial data cleaning process removed fillers, incorrect responses, and recording
21
22 errors (6.0%). From there, RTs below 200 ms and above 2000 ms were removed (0.1%), as
23
24 were RTs more than 3 standard deviations from the participant mean (1.3%). We then
25
26 excluded durations below 100 milliseconds and above 2000 milliseconds (0.1%) and log
27
28 transformed the data to compensate for positive skew. Outlier trimming removed data
29
30 points more than 3 standard deviations from each subject's mean log duration, eliminating
31
32 an additional 0.6% of trials, thus leaving 50,839 observations for this analysis.
33
34
35

36 37 *Model structure*

38
39 Fixed effects of interest included 1.) by-participant overall speed, 2.) log trial-level
40
41 RT, 3.) semantic context (blocked=-0.5 vs. mixed=0.5), 4.) by-participant RT interference
42
43 size, and the two-way interactions of 5.) semantic context by trial-level RT and 6.) semantic
44
45 context by RT interference. If semantic interference affects articulation in this task, then we
46
47 should expect longer durations in semantically homogeneous blocks compared to mixed
48
49 blocks. Additional fixed effects were added as control variables: 7.) experiment format
50
51 (clustered block types= -0.5 vs. interleaved block types=0.5), 8.) block within the
52
53 experiment (1-12), 9.) cycle within the block (1-4), 10.) the number of trials since the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 picture was last named (repetition lag, 1-9), and 11.) whether an item had been named in a
4
5 previous block. The two-way interactions of semantic context with 12.) block, 13.) cycle,
6
7 and 14.) repetition lag were also allowed. Inter-correlations among the fixed effects were
8
9 relatively low ($r_s \leq 0.22$); however, to maintain parallelism with the first experiment, we
10
11 report simple correlations for overall speed and trial-level reaction time. Random effects
12
13 included intercepts for 15.) participants and 16.) items; by-participant slopes for 17.)
14
15 semantic context, 18.) whether an item was previously named, 19.) cycle, 20.) block, 21.)
16
17 trial-level RT, and the two-way interactions of 22.) context by previous naming and 23.)
18
19 context by block; and by-item slopes for 24.) experimental format, 25.) overall speed, 26.)
20
21 context, 27.) trial-level RT, 28.) the size of RT interference, and the two way interactions of
22
23 29.) context by previous naming, 30.) context by block, and 31.) context by trial-level RT.

24
25
26
27
28
29
30 Unlike in Experiment 1, the current by-participant predictors were generated using
31
32 BLUPs from the full mixed effects model of participants' RT data, rather than beta
33
34 coefficients from simple regressions. The RT model had the same fixed effects structure as
35
36 the duration model, except for the absence of any by-participant predictors. Its random
37
38 effect structure was determined using the same model selection procedure as in
39
40 Experiment 1 (Bates et al., 2015); it included intercepts for participants and items, plus by-
41
42 participant and by-item slopes for all fixed effects. As noted above, BLUPs from mixed
43
44 effects models surpass other regression techniques because each individual estimate is
45
46 made in light of the entire data set; the random effects are assumed to reflect samples from
47
48 a larger population (Baayen, 2008). This approach was possible in the current experiment
49
50 because there was more variation across participants in the target semantic effect on RTs.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This provides some initial support for a substantial contribution of individual differences to
4
5 performance in this task.
6
7

8 *Relationship between planning measures and duration*

9

10 Consistent with Experiment 1, we observed an effect of by-participant speed, such
11
12 that generally faster responders produced shorter durations ($\beta=0.50$, $s.e.=0.024$, $\chi^2=4.31$,
13
14 $p<0.05$; correlation of speed and duration: $r=0.14$, 95% CI=0.13, 0.14). In contrast to the
15
16 non-significant trend in Experiment 1, trial-level RTs echoed this positive relationship,
17
18 such that faster responses also tended to exhibit shorter word durations ($\beta=0.054$,
19
20 $s.e.=0.014$, $\chi^2=14.44$, $p<0.001$; mean within-participant correlation of trial-RT and
21
22 duration: $r=0.10$, $s.e.=0.009$). Both results are consistent with an influence of the input to
23
24 articulatory processes on duration.
25
26
27
28

29 *Effects of semantic context*

30
31

32 In contrast to Experiment 1, we found no overall effect of semantic context on word
33
34 durations ($\beta=-0.0001$, $s.e.=0.003$, $\chi^2<0.01$, $p=0.99$). Regardless of whether pictures were
35
36 blocked by semantic category or intermixed, durations did not vary. Semantic context had
37
38 no reliable interaction with trial-level RT or any of the control variables ($\chi^2\leq 2.36$, $p\geq 0.12$).
39
40
41

42 *Contribution of individual differences*

43

44 Critically, the magnitude of effects of semantic context on participants' naming
45
46 latencies modulated the effect of semantic context on their word durations ($\beta=0.005$,
47
48 $s.e.=0.002$, $\chi^2=9.93$, $p<0.01$). As shown in Figure 2, participants who were more susceptible
49
50 to the context manipulation, as indexed by the size of their RT interference effects, were
51
52 more likely to show similar interference during articulation. In other words, if lexical co-
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 activation was especially intense during planning, it was more likely to continue affecting
4
5 processing after response initiation.
6
7

8 *Control variables*

9
10 Two control variables influenced word durations. Consistent with previous work
11
12 (e.g., Bell et al., 2009), an effect of repetition lag indicated the presence of repetition
13
14 priming—naming *cat* reduced the duration of subsequent namings of that *cat*—which
15
16 dissipated over intervening trials ($\beta=0.0013$, $s.e.=0.0004$, $\chi^2(1)=11.79$, $p<0.001$). There was
17
18 also a marginal effect of experimental format, such that word durations were longer when
19
20 semantic blocks (mixed vs. homogeneous) alternated as opposed to being grouped
21
22 together. No other effects reached significance ($\chi^2\leq 1.02$, $p\geq 0.31$). Results for all fixed
23
24 effects predictors are provided in the Appendix.
25
26
27
28

29 **Summary**

30
31 Experiment 2 exhibited the consistent coupling of planning and articulation
32
33 predicted by the planning-drives-articulation hypothesis. As in Experiment 1, we found an
34
35 independent effect of semantic interference on word durations; however, there were also
36
37 important differences. There was no overall effect of semantic context on articulation in
38
39 Experiment 2. This contrastive result may reflect engagement of top-down cognitive
40
41 control in the current blocked naming task (Belke & Stielow, 2013; see also Oppenheim et
42
43 al., 2010: 237-238 for similar discussion), which could have dampened the activation of
44
45 semantically related items, thereby preventing them from influencing processing after
46
47 response initiation.
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 Importantly, an interaction between semantic context and our estimates of
55
56 participants' overall RT interference size revealed that a subset of participants—those
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 whose RTs revealed greater susceptibility to semantic manipulations—*did* exhibit
4
5 interference in their durations. (This may, in fact, be another consequence of the
6
7 engagement of top-down control; such strategic processes may exhibit more between-
8
9 participant variability than the automatic control processes engaged in Experiment 1.) Our
10
11 ability to detect this interaction for word durations in Experiment 2 most likely stems from
12
13 the presence of greater variability in its RT context effect. Consistent with greater
14
15 variability across participants, the RT model for Experiment 2 retained the random by-
16
17 participant slope for semantic context, indicating significant variation in the effect size; in
18
19 contrast, the by-participant slope for ordinal position was algorithmically dropped from
20
21 the RT model for Experiment 1 during stepwise model reduction (Fink, 2016). In general,
22
23 the interaction between semantic context and RT interference size demonstrates how
24
25 consideration of individual variation can enhance our ability to detect long-distance
26
27 interactive effects.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **General Discussion**

35
36
37 To account for articulatory consequences of factors influencing lexical access,
38
39 theories of production propose that there is interaction between lexical access and
40
41 articulatory process. But, perhaps as an artifact of the historical division between cognitive
42
43 and motor research, even interactive theories tend to assume a fixed separation between
44
45 planning and articulation modules. In the current work, we examined two implicit
46
47 assumptions of many interactive theories. First, we explored whether the relationship
48
49 between lexical access and articulatory processing is ballistic, or whether ongoing planning
50
51 continues to influence articulation after a response has been initiated. Two experiments
52
53 revealed that semantic interference effects affected phonetic variation after response
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 initiation. After taking into account effects at response initiation (reflected by RTs), we
4
5 observed significant effects of semantic context on word durations, supporting the
6
7 presence of long-distance interactions between lexical selection and articulatory
8
9 processing. Detection of these effects in the blocked-cyclic naming paradigm was made
10
11 possible by taking into account variation in semantic interference effects across
12
13 participants. (Note that an important question is whether such variation ultimately
14
15 represents *stable* differences between individuals, or simply reflects situation-specific
16
17 variation in performance.)
18
19
20
21

22 Second, we examined the degree to which the link between planning and
23
24 articulation is fixed, as many interactive theories assume, or if this link can vary. We found
25
26 no evidence that, within a task, faster RTs (predicted to yield greater overlap between
27
28 planning and articulation) increased interactive effects. This suggests that interactive
29
30 effects arising during lexical selection may be relatively fixed features of the architecture of
31
32 each speaker's production system. However, it is possible that participants did not
33
34 naturally vary their response speeds to the extent needed to yield shifts in interactive
35
36 effects (recall that Kello et al. (2000) externally manipulated response initiation time). If
37
38 Kello et al.'s (2000) finding of greater interactivity with extreme response time
39
40 compression can be replicated (a serious concern given the results of Damian, 2003),
41
42 future studies using this paradigm should examine more closely the conditions under
43
44 which such shifts can occur.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 It is important to note that several effects varied across the two experimental tasks⁵.
4
5
6 In Experiment 2, faster trial-level RTs were coupled with shorter word durations, but a
7
8 non-significant trend in the opposite direction was observed in Experiment 1. This
9
10 difference likely reflects the use of a fixed trial duration in Experiment 1: with a fixed trial
11
12 duration, initiating a response later allowed less time for its completion. Second, when
13
14 participants named pictures just once in a pseudorandom order, we found an overall effect
15
16 of semantic interference on word durations (Experiment 1), but when participants named
17
18 pictures repeatedly in a semantically blocked structure, no such effect emerged until we
19
20 factored in individual variation in the magnitude of the semantic interference that we
21
22 elicited at the lexical level (Experiment 2). This differential modulation suggests that subtle
23
24 downstream effects of lexical disruptions on articulation may only be detected when those
25
26 upstream disruptions are fairly robust to begin with, and may thereby explain some
27
28 discrepancies among previously published results.
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 More generally, the variable influence of different measures of response timing,
36
37 along with variation in interactive effects across tasks and individuals, suggests that
38
39 considering articulation and lexical access in isolation is likely to continue to yield
40
41 inconsistent, inconclusive findings. Interactive theories need to more carefully consider the
42
43 dynamic nature of the production system and its interactions with the broader cognitive
44
45 system (see Fink & Goldrick, 2015, for additional discussion).
46
47
48

49 **Implications for theories based on communicative goals**

50
51 An alternative approach to understanding lexical effects on phonetic variation—
52
53 complementing interactive theories' focus on mechanisms—comes from theories that
54
55

56
57 ⁵ See Fink (2016) for discussion of contrasting results in a semantic classification task.
58
59
60

1
2
3 emphasize the importance of communicative goals in shaping pronunciation variation (e.g.,
4
5 Aylett & Turk, 2004; Buz, Tanenhaus, & Jaeger, 2016; Lindblom, 1990; Scarborough, 2004;
6
7 Scarborough & Zellou, 2013; Wright, 2004; see also Balota, Boland, & Shields, 1989, for
8
9 discussion). For example, speakers tend to hyperarticulate words in unpredictable
10
11 contexts, while reducing predictable words. This can be seen as reflecting a process that
12
13 maximizes articulatory effort in contexts where the probability of successful
14
15 communication is reduced.
16
17
18
19

20 Some of the effects observed in the current experimental tasks could be attributed
21
22 to communicative factors. The lengthening of words when retrieval is difficult (during
23
24 cumulative semantic interference, or for speakers that have great difficulty with semantic
25
26 blocking) could be analogous to the lengthening of determiners (saying *the* as “thiy” vs.
27
28 “thuh”) to signal retrieval difficulties to listeners (Fox Tree & Clark, 1997). This could
29
30 provide a functional motivation for the direct effects of lexical access variables on phonetic
31
32 variation we observe here. However, the independent and sometimes contrasting effects of
33
34 various response timing measures on articulation suggest a need to articulate how such
35
36 communicative factors interact with other constraints on speech production.
37
38
39
40
41

42 Conclusions

43
44 Many interactive accounts have implicitly assumed that all articulatory variation is
45
46 generated by processing prior to response initiation, with a fixed relationship between
47
48 planning and articulatory processes. Our results suggest that lexical effects on articulatory
49
50 outcomes can arise from multiple sources, both before and after a response has been
51
52 initiated. Additional research simultaneously analyzing planning and articulatory measures
53
54 is needed to help constrain the complex empirical landscape of interactive effects.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Acknowledgements

Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NSF, NICHD, or NIDCD.

Thanks to Ann Bradlow, Sid Horton, the Northwestern SoundLab, participants in the LSA 2013 Workshop: "How the brain accommodates variability in linguistic representations," and participants in AMLaP 2013 for helpful discussion and comments.

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Aylett, M. & Turk, A. (2004). The smooth signal redundancy hypothesis: A functional
7
8 explanation for relationships between redundancy, prosodic prominence, and
9
10 duration in spontaneous speech. *Language and Speech*, 47, 31-56.
11
12 doi:10.1177/00238309040470010201
13
14
- 15 Baayen, R. H. (2008). *Analyzing linguistic data: A practical introduction to statistics using R*.
16
17 Cambridge University Press.
18
19
- 20 Baker, R. & Bradlow, A. (2009). Variability in word duration as a function of probability, speech
21
22 style, and prosody. *Language and Speech*, 52, 319-413. doi:10.1177/0023830909336575
23
24
- 25 Balota, D. A., Boland, J. E., & Shields, L. W. (1989). Priming in pronunciation: Beyond pattern
26
27 recognition and onset latency. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 28(1), 14-36.
28
29 doi:10.1016/0749-596X(89)90026-0
30
31
- 32 Bates, D., Kliegl, R., Vasishth, S., & Baayen, H. (2015). Parsimonious mixed models. arXiv
33
34 preprint arXiv:1506.04967.
35
36
- 37 Bell, A., Brenier, J. M., Gregory, M., Girand, C. & Jurafsky, D. (2009). Predictability effects on
38
39 durations of content and function words in conversational English. *Journal of Memory*
40
41 *and Language*, 60, 92-111. doi:10.1016/j.jml.2008.06.003
42
43
- 44 Belke, E. (2013). Long-lasting inhibitory semantic context effects on object naming are
45
46 necessarily conceptually mediated: Implications for models of lexical-semantic
47
48 encoding. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 69, 228-256.
49
50 doi:10.1016/j.jml.2013.05.008
51
52
- 53 Belke, E. & Stielow, A. (2013). Cumulative and non-cumulative semantic interference in
54
55 object naming: Evidence from blocked and continuous manipulations of semantic
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 context. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 66, 2135-2160.

4
5
6 doi:10.1080/17470218.2013.775318

7
8 Breining, B., Nozari, N., & Rapp, B. (2015). Does segmental overlap help or hurt? Evidence
9
10 from blocked cyclic naming in spoken and written production. *Psychonomic Bulletin*
11
12 & Review, 1-7. doi:10.3758/s13423-015-0900-x

13
14
15 Brysbaert, M., & New, B. (2009). Moving beyond Kučera and Francis: A critical evaluation of
16
17 current word frequency norms and the introduction of a new and improved word
18
19 frequency measure for American English. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41, 977-990.
20
21
22 doi:10.3758/BRM.41.4.977

23
24
25 Buz, E., & Jaeger, T. F. (2015). The (in) dependence of articulation and lexical planning
26
27 during isolated word production. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 31, 404-
28
29 424. doi:10.1080/23273798.2015.1105984

30
31
32 Buz, E., Tanenhaus, M. K., & Jaeger, T. F. (2016). Dynamically adapted context-specific
33
34 hyper-articulation: Feedback from interlocutors affects speakers' subsequent
35
36 pronunciations. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 89, 68-86.
37
38
39 doi:10.1016/j.jml.2015.12.009

40
41
42 Cohen, J., MacWhinney, B., Flatt, M., & Provost, J. (1993). PsyScope: An interactive graphic
43
44 system for designing and controlling experiments in the psychology laboratory
45
46 using Macintosh computers. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, &*
47
48 *Computers*, 25, 257-271. doi:10.3758/BF03204507

49
50
51 Crowther, J. E., & Martin, R. C. (2014). Lexical selection in the semantically blocked cyclic
52
53 naming task: the role of cognitive control and learning. *Frontiers in Human*
54
55 *Neuroscience*, 8, 1-20. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2014.00009

1
2
3 Damian, M. F. (2003). Articulatory duration in single-word speech production. *Journal of*
4
5 *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 29, 416.

6
7
8 doi:10.1037/0278-7393.29.3.416
9

10 Damian, M. F., & Freeman, N. H. (2008). Flexible and inflexible response components: A
11
12 Stroop study with typewritten output. *Acta Psychologica*, 128, 91-101.

13
14
15 doi:10.1016/j.actpsy.2007.10.002
16

17
18 Damian, M. F., Vigliocco, G., & Levelt, W. J. (2001). Effects of semantic context in the naming
19
20 of pictures and words. *Cognition*, 81, B77-B86. doi:10.1016/S0010-0277(01)00135-

21
22
23 4
24

25 Dell, G. S. (1986). A spreading-activation theory of retrieval in sentence production.

26
27 *Psychological Review*, 93, 283-321. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.93.3.283
28

29
30 Dell, G. S., & O'Seaghdha, P. G. (1991). Mediated and convergent lexical priming in language
31
32 production: A comment on Levelt et al (1991). *Psychological Review*, 98, 604-614.

33
34
35 doi:10.1037/0033-295X.98.4.604
36

37 Fink, A. (2016). *The role of domain-general executive functions, articulation, and*
38
39 *conceptualization in spoken word production*. Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern
40
41 University.
42

43
44 Fink, A., & Goldrick, M. (2015). The influence of word retrieval and planning on phonetic
45
46 variation: Implications for exemplar models. *Linguistics Vanguard*, 1, 215-225.

47
48
49 doi:10.1515/lingvan-2015-1003
50

51 Finkbeiner, M., & Caramazza, A. (2006). Now you see it, now you don't: On turning semantic
52
53 interference into facilitation in a Stroop-like task. *Cortex*, 42, 790-796.

54
55
56 doi:10.1016/S0010-9452(08)70419-2
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Fowler, C. A., & Housum, J. (1987). Talkers' signaling of "new" and "old" words in speech and listeners' perception and use of the distinction. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 26, 489-504. doi:10.1016/0749-596X(87)90136-7
- Fox Tree, J. E., and Clark, H. H. (1997). Pronouncing "The" as "Thee" to signal problems in speaking. *Cognition*, 62, 151-167. doi:10.1016/S0010-0277(96)00781-0
- Garrett, M. F. (1980). Levels of processing in sentence production. In B. Butterworth (Ed.) *Language production* (vol. 1, pp. 177-220). New York: Academic Press.
- Goldinger, S.D. (1998). Echoes of echoes? An episodic theory of lexical access. *Psychological Review*, 105, 251-279. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.105.2.251
- Goldrick, M. (2006). Limited interaction in speech production: Chronometric, speech error, and neuropsychological evidence. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 21, 817-855. doi:10.1080/01690960600824112
- Goldrick, M., Baker, H. R., Murphy, A., & Baese-Berk, M. (2011). Interaction and representational integration: Evidence from speech errors. *Cognition*, 121, 58-72. doi:j.cognition.2011.05.006
- Goldrick, M., & Blumstein, S. E. (2006). Cascading activation from phonological planning to articulatory processes: Evidence from tongue twisters. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 21, 649-683. doi:10.1080/01690960500181332
- Goldrick, M., Keshet, J., Gustafson, E., Heller, J., & Needle, J. (2016). Automatic analysis of slips of the tongue: Insights into the cognitive architecture of speech production. *Cognition*, 149, 31-39. doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2016.01.002

1
2
3 Heller, J. R., & Goldrick, M. (2014). Grammatical constraints on phonological encoding in
4
5 speech production. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 21, 1576-1582.

6
7
8 doi:10.3758/s13423-014-0616-3
9

10
11 Heller, J. R., & Goldrick, M., (2015). Corrigendum to “Grammatical constraints on
12
13 phonological encoding in speech production”. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 22,
14
15 1475. doi:10.3758/s13423-015-0928-y
16

17
18 Howard, D., Nickels, L., Coltheart, M., & Cole-Virtue, J. (2006). Cumulative semantic
19
20 inhibition in picture naming: Experimental and computational studies. *Cognition*,
21
22 100, 464-482. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2005.02.006
23

24
25 Hughes, J. W., & Schnur, T. T. (2015). Selection demands and working memory mediate
26
27 interference during naming. *Front. Psychol. Conference Abstract: Academy of Aphasia*
28
29 *53rd Annual Meeting*. doi: 10.3389/conf.fpsyg.2015.65.00074
30

31
32 Kahn, J. M., & Arnold, J. E. (2012). A processing-centered look at the contribution of
33
34 givenness to durational reduction. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 67, 311-325.
35
36 doi:10.1016/j.jml.2012.07.002
37

38
39 Kahn, J. M., & Arnold, J. E. (2015). Articulatory and lexical repetition effects on durational
40
41 reduction: speaker experience vs. common ground. *Language, Cognition, and*
42
43 *Neuroscience*, 30, 103-119. doi:10.1080/01690965.2013.848989
44
45

46
47 Kawamoto, A. H., Kello, C. T., Jones, R., & Bame, K. (1998). Initial phoneme versus whole-
48
49 word criterion to initiate pronunciation: Evidence based on response latency and
50
51 initial phoneme duration. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and*
52
53 *Cognition*, 24, 862. doi:10.1037/0278-7393.24.4.862
54
55

- 1
2
3 Kawamoto, A. H., Liu, Q., & Kello, C. T. (2015). The segment as the minimal planning unit in
4
5 speech production and reading aloud: Evidence and implications. *Frontiers in*
6
7 *Psychology*, 6: 1457. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01457
8
9
- 10 Kello, C.T. (2004). Control over the time course of cognition in the tempo-naming task.
11
12 *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 30, 942-
13
14 955. doi:10.1037/0096-1523.30.5.942
15
16
- 17 Kello, C. T., Plaut, D. C., & MacWhinney, B. (2000). The task dependence of staged versus
18
19 cascaded processing: An empirical and computational study of Stroop interference
20
21 in speech production. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 129, 340–360.
22
23 doi:10.1037/0096-3445.129.3.340
24
25
- 26 Lam, T. Q., & Watson, D. G. (2014). Repetition reduction: Lexical repetition in the absence of
27
28 referent repetition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and*
29
30 *Cognition*, 40, 829. doi:10.1037/a0035780
31
32
- 33 Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT
34
35 Press.
36
37
- 38 Lindblom, B. (1990). Explaining phonetic variation: A sketch of the H&H theory. In W. J.
39
40 Hardcastle & A. Marchal (Eds.), *Speech production and speech modeling* (pp. 403–
41
42 439). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
43
44
- 45 Logan, G. D., & Cowan, W. B. (1984). On the ability to inhibit thought and action: A theory of
46
47 an act of control. *Psychological Review*, 91, 295-327. doi:10.1037/0033-
48
49 295X.91.3.295
50
51
- 52 Mahon, B. Z., Costa, A., Peterson, R., Vargas, K. A., & Caramazza, A. (2007). Lexical selection
53
54 is not by competition: a reinterpretation of semantic interference and facilitation
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 effects in the picture-word interference paradigm. *Journal of Experimental*
4
5
6 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 33, 503. doi:10.1037/0278-
7
8 7393.33.3.503
9

10 MacLeod, C. M. (1991). Half a century of research on the Stroop effect: an integrative
11
12 review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109, 163. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.109.2.163
13
14

15 McClelland, J. L. (1979). On the time relations of mental processes: An examination of
16
17 systems of processes in cascade. *Psychological Review*, 86, 287-330.
18
19
20 doi:10.1037/0033-295X.86.4.287
21

22 Meyer, A. S., Roelofs, A., & Levelt, W. J. (2003). Word length effects in object naming: The
23
24 role of a response criterion. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 48, 131-147.
25
26
27 doi:10.1016/S0749-596X(02)00509-0
28

29 Navarrete, E., Del Prato, P., & Mahon, B. Z. (2012). Factors determining semantic facilitation
30
31 and interference in the cyclic naming paradigm. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3, 1-15.
32
33
34 doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00038
35

36 Navarrete, E., Del Prato, P., Peressotti, F., & Mahon, B. Z. (2014). Lexical selection is not by
37
38 competition: Evidence from the blocked naming paradigm. *Journal of Memory and*
39
40 *Language*, 76, 253-272. doi:10.1016/j.jml.2014.05.003
41
42

43 Navarrete, E., Mahon, B. Z., & Caramazza, A. (2010). The cumulative semantic cost does not
44
45 reflect lexical selection by competition. *Acta Psychologica*, 134, 279-289.
46
47
48 doi:10.1016/j.actpsy.2010.02.009
49

50 Notebaert, W., Houtman, F., Van Opstal, F., Gevers, W., Fias, W., & Verguts, T. (2009). Post-
51
52 error slowing: an orienting account. *Cognition*, 111, 275-279.
53
54
55 doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2009.02.002
56
57

- 1
2
3 Oppenheim, G. M. (in prep). *Persistent semantic interference in picture naming: Tests of an*
4
5 *incremental learning account.*
6
7
8 Oppenheim, G. M., Dell, G. S., & Schwartz, M. F. (2010). The dark side of incremental
9
10 learning: A model of cumulative semantic interference during lexical access in
11
12 speech production. *Cognition*, 114, 227-252. doi:10.1016/j.cognition.2009.09.007
13
14
15 Pierrehumbert, J. (2002). Word-specific phonetics. In C. Gussenhoven & N. Warner (Eds.)
16
17 *Laboratory Phonology 7* (pp. 101-139). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
18
19
20 Pluymaekers, M., Ernestus, M., & Baayen, R. H. (2005). Lexical frequency and acoustic
21
22 reduction in spoken Dutch. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 118,
23
24 2561-2569. doi:10.1121/1.2011150
25
26
27 Rapp, B. & Goldrick, M. (2000). Discreteness and interactivity in spoken word production.
28
29 *Psychological Review*, 107, 460-499. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.107.3.460
30
31
32 Rossion, B., & Pourtois, G. (2004). Revisiting Snodgrass and Vanderwart's object pictorial
33
34 set: The role of surface detail in basic-level object recognition. *Perception*, 33, 217-
35
36 236. doi:10.1068/p5117
37
38
39 Rosinski, R. R., Golinkoff, R. M., & Kukish, K. S. (1975). Automatic semantic processing in a
40
41 picture-word interference task. *Child Development*, 247-253. doi:10.2307/1128859
42
43
44 Roelofs, A. (1992). A spreading-activation theory of lemma retrieval in speaking. *Cognition*,
45
46 42, 107-142. doi:10.1016/0010-0277(92)90041-F
47
48
49 Roelofs, A. (2014). Tracking eye movements to localize Stroop interference in naming:
50
51 Word planning versus articulatory buffering. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*
52
53 *Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 40, 1332-1347. doi:10.1037/a0036575
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Runnqvist, E., Strijkers, K., Alario, F. X., & Costa, A. (2012). Cumulative semantic
4
5 interference is blind to language: Implications for models of bilingual speech
6
7 production. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 66, 850-869.
8
9 doi:10.1016/j.jml.2012.02.007
10
11
12 Scarborough, R. (2004). *Coarticulation and the structure of the lexicon*. Doctoral
13
14 dissertation, University of California Los Angeles.
15
16
17 Scarborough, R., & Zellou, G. (2013). Clarity in communication: "Clear" speech authenticity
18
19 and lexical neighborhood density effects in speech production and perception. *The*
20
21 *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 134, 3793-3807.
22
23 doi:10.1121/1.4824120
24
25
26
27 Schnur, T. T. (2014). The persistence of cumulative semantic interference during
28
29 naming. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 75, 27-44. doi:10.1016/j.jml.2014.04.006
30
31
32 Schnur, T. T., Schwartz, M. F., Brecher, A., & Hodgson, C. (2006). Semantic interference
33
34 during blocked-cyclic naming: Evidence from aphasia. *Journal of Memory and*
35
36 *Language*, 54, 199-227. doi:10.1016/j.jml.2005.10.002
37
38
39 Shao, Z., Meyer, A. S., & Roelofs, A. (2013). Selective and nonselective inhibition of
40
41 competitors in picture naming. *Memory and Cognition*, 41, 1200-1211.
42
43 doi:10.3758/s13421-013-0332-7
44
45
46
47 Seyfarth, S. (2014). Word informativity influences acoustic duration: Effects of contextual
48
49 predictability on lexical representation. *Cognition*, 133, 140-155.
50
51 doi:j.cognition.2014.06.013
52
53
54 Székely, A., D'amico, S., Devescovi, A., Federmeier, K., Herron, D., Iyer, G., Jacobsen, T., &
55
56 Bates, E. (2003). Timed picture naming: Extended norms and validation against
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 previous studies. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 35, 621-
4
5 633. doi:10.3758/BF03195542
6
7


8 Wright, R. (2004). Factors of lexical competition in vowel articulation. In J. J. Local, R.
9
10 Ogden, & R. Temple (Eds.), *Laboratory Phonology VI* (pp. 75–87). Cambridge:
11
12 Cambridge University Press.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Mirroring the classic RT effect (e.g. Howard et al., 2006), mean word durations (ms; error bars show standard errors) for continuous picture naming in Experiment 1 increase as a function of a words ordinal position within its semantic category.


Figure 2. Best unbiased linear predictors (BLUPs) of RT interference size (x-axis), extracted from mixed effects model of RT data. These reliably predicted the presence of semantic interference in durations (ms; y-axis). Dotted line shows linear regression fit (standard error of regression shown in grey).

Figure 1



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 2



Appendix

Table A1. Results for full set of fixed effects predictors, Experiment 1

Predictor	Beta	S.E.	Chi-sq	P-value
Ordinal Position	0.005	0.002	4.33	0.04*
RT Interference	-0.003	0.006	0.24	0.63
Trial-level RT	-0.018	0.016	1.24	0.27
Speed	0.054	0.013	14.31	<0.001***
Class	0.044	0.038	1.31	0.25
Block	0.010	0.007	2.15	0.14
Ordinal Position x RT Interference	0.0003	0.001	0.09	0.77
Ordinal Position x Trial-level RT	0.002	0.007	0.07	0.80
Ordinal Position x Block	0.005	0.003	2.15	0.14

. marginally significant at the level of $0.05 < \alpha < 0.10$

* significant at the level of $\alpha = 0.05$

** significant at the level of $\alpha = 0.01$

*** significant at the level of $\alpha = 0.001$

Table A2. Results for full set of fixed effects predictors, Experiment 2

Predictor	Beta	S.E.	Chi-sq	P-value
Semantic Context	-0.0001	0.003	<0.01	0.99
RT Interference	-0.007	0.011	0.40	0.52
Trial-level RT	0.054	0.014	14.44	<0.001***
Speed	0.050	0.024	4.31	0.04*
Repetition Lag	0.001	0.0004	11.54	<0.001***
Block	-0.002	0.002	1.02	0.31
Cycle	0.0002	0.001	0.02	0.89
Named in Previous Block	-0.0003	0.001	0.52	0.46
Experimental Format	0.071	0.037	3.61	0.06.
Semantic Context x RT Interference	0.005	0.002	9.93	0.002**
Semantic Context x Trial-level RT	0.018	0.012	2.36	0.12
Semantic Context x Block	-0.0006	0.003	0.04	0.85
Semantic Context x Cycle	-0.002	0.002	1.22	0.27
Semantic Context x Previous Naming	-0.009	0.012	0.56	0.46

. marginally significant at the level of $0.05 < \alpha < 0.10$

* significant at the level of $\alpha = 0.05$

** significant at the level of $\alpha = 0.01$

*** significant at the level of $\alpha = 0.001$