

Analysis

Zhaosen Guo

7/10/2021

Intro

For the given psycholinguistics experiment data, I have generated this R Markdown file for easier access to the data, codes, and explanations. This file can also generate reports in html/pdf when pressing the “Knit” option in RStudio.

(FYI, a R Markdown cheat sheet is included in the folder.)

Here are the required libraries:

```
library(tidyverse)
library(lme4)
library(lmerTest)
```

We will be running the following mixed-effect models with variables and parameters -

Language	Independent Variable (Fixed effect)	Dependent Variable	Random Effects	Link
English	sentence context (scope & negation)	sentence length (ms)	subjects & keywords	jump
Japanese	sentence context (scope & negation)	sentence length (ms)	subjects & keywords	jump
English	sentence context (scope & negation)	fundamental frequency (Hz)	subjects & keywords	jump
Japanese	sentence context (scope & negation)	fundamental frequency (Hz)	subjects & keywords	jump
English	sentence context (scope ##w/out “Wool” & negation)	sentence length (ms)	subjects & keywords	jump
English	sentence context (scope ##w/out “Wool” & negation)	fundamental frequency (Hz)	subjects & keywords	jump

Models

Context vs SentenceLength, English

[back to top](#)

First, import the data set.

```
data.SenLen.Eng <- read_csv("data/SentenceLengthEnglish.csv")
```

The code below shows that the class types of the data are not correct.

```
sapply(data.SenLen.Eng, class)
```

```
subject      sentence      context sentence_length      maxF0
"character" "character" "character"     "numeric"      "numeric"
meanF0          F1          F2          F3      keyword
"numeric"     "numeric"    "numeric"     "numeric"      "character"
last_word_len
"numeric"
```

Change them from character class to factor class.

```
col_target <- c("subject", "sentence", "context", "keyword")
data.SenLen.Eng[col_target] <- lapply(data.SenLen.Eng[col_target], as.factor)
```

Now the mixed-effect model:

```
model.SenLen.Eng<- lmer(data = data.SenLen.Eng,
                           sentence_length ~ context +
                               (1 + context||keyword) +
                               (1 + context||subject), REML = FALSE,
                           control=lmerControl(check.conv.singular = .makeCC(action = "ignore",
                           tol = 1e-04))
summary(model.SenLen.Eng)
```

Linear mixed model fit by maximum likelihood . t-tests use Satterthwaite's method [lmerModLmerTest]

Formula:

```
sentence_length ~ context + (1 + context || keyword) + (1 + context || subject)
```

Data: data.SenLen.Eng

```
Control: lmerControl(check.conv.singular = .makeCC(action = "ignore",
tol = 1e-04))
```

```
AIC      BIC      logLik deviance df.resid
3741.2   3836.3   -1843.6    3687.2      223
```

Scaled residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.9073	-0.3670	-0.0913	0.2323	10.2280

Random effects:

Groups	Name	Variance	Std.Dev.	Corr
subject	contextall > not	3.980e+04	199.51107	
	contextmost/many > not	3.049e+04	174.61672	0.99
	contextnot > all	1.111e+05	333.24640	0.86 0.79
	contextnot > most/many	3.147e+04	177.40585	0.92 0.96 0.58
subject.1	(Intercept)	2.807e+00	1.67548	
keyword	contextall > not	2.449e+04	156.47752	

```

contextmost/many > not 2.857e+04 169.03330 0.67
contextnot > all      5.364e+03  73.24233 1.00 0.67
contextnot > most/many 2.813e+04 167.71720 0.67 1.00 0.67
keyword.1 (Intercept)    3.396e-03  0.05827
Residual                  1.154e+05 339.68167
Number of obs: 250, groups: subject, 25; keyword, 5

Fixed effects:
            Estimate Std. Error      df t value Pr(>|t|)    
(Intercept)     1964.541    106.266     4.013 18.487 4.92e-05 ***
contextmost/many > not   36.135     162.287     4.142  0.223   0.834  
contextnot > all       29.971     82.819     6.112  0.362   0.730  
contextnot > most/many 107.914    162.246     4.224  0.665   0.541  
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
          (Intr) cnt/>n cntx>a
cntxtmst/>n -0.575
cntxtnt>all -0.590  0.421
cntxtn>mst/ -0.580  0.910  0.392

```

From the last section of the “Fixed effects” above, we can see that none of the context level displayed statistical significance in influencing the sentence length.

Context vs SentenceLength, Japanese

back to top

Import and process the data:

```

data.SenLen.Jap <- read_csv("data/SentenceLengthJapanese.csv")
data.SenLen.Jap[, col_target] <- lapply(data.SenLen.Jap[, col_target], as.factor)

```

Model:

```

model.SenLen.Jap <- lmer(data = data.SenLen.Jap,
                           sentence_length ~ context +
                             (1 + context || keyword) +
                             (1 + context || subject), REML = FALSE,
                           control=lmerControl(check.conv.singular = .makeCC(action = "ignore",
                           tol = 1e-09))

```

Warning: Model failed to converge with 1 negative eigenvalue: -1.4e-02

```
summary(model.SenLen.Jap)
```

```

Linear mixed model fit by maximum likelihood . t-tests use Satterthwaite's
method [lmerModLmerTest]
Formula:
sentence_length ~ context + (1 + context || keyword) + (1 + context || 
subject)
Data: data.SenLen.Jap

```

```

Control: lmerControl(check.conv.singular = .makeCC(action = "ignore",
tol = 1e-04))

      AIC      BIC  logLik deviance df.resid
2894.0   2983.1  -1420.0    2840.0     173

Scaled residuals:
    Min      1Q  Median      3Q     Max
-2.5317 -0.5746 -0.1197  0.5512  4.5462

Random effects:
Groups      Name        Variance Std.Dev. Corr
subject    contextall > not    9.441e+04 307.26019
           contextmost/many > not 1.683e+05 410.30193 1.00
           contextnot > all     9.691e+04 311.31009 0.99  0.99
           contextnot > most/many 1.007e+05 317.29146 0.93  0.95  0.89
subject.1 (Intercept) 3.049e+00  1.74600
keyword    contextall > not 1.266e+05 355.87074
           contextmost/many > not 1.618e+04 127.20175 -0.30
           contextnot > all     1.110e+05 333.10654  1.00 -0.23
           contextnot > most/many 2.655e+04 162.95350 -0.30  1.00 -0.23
keyword.1 (Intercept) 5.501e-04  0.02345
Residual            5.622e+04 237.10412

Number of obs: 200, groups: subject, 20; keyword, 5

Fixed effects:
            Estimate Std. Error      df t value Pr(>|t|)    
(Intercept) 2825.8693  218.7972  3.6743 12.915 0.00034 ***
contextmost/many > not  22.9642   230.6549  4.2104  0.100  0.92525
contextnot > all       29.8974   48.5664  3.0828  0.616  0.58063
contextnot > most/many  0.2576   241.8675  4.6671  0.001  0.99919
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
  (Intr) cnt/>n cntx>a
cntxtmst/>n -0.824
cntxtnt>all -0.351  0.334
cntxtn>mst/ -0.819  0.961  0.305

```

Similar to the English result, there's no significant correlation between sentence context and sentence length in Japanese.

Context vs Fundamental Frequency (F0), English

[back to top](#)

```

model.meanF0.Eng <- lmer(data = data.SenLen.Eng,
                           meanF0 ~ context +
                             (1 + context||keyword) +

```

```

(1 + context||subject), REML = FALSE,
control=lmerControl(check.conv.singular = .makeCC(action = "ignore",
summary(model.meanF0.Eng)

```

Model for the mean fundamental frequency during the sentence (meanF0):

Linear mixed model fit by maximum likelihood . t-tests use Satterthwaite's method [lmerModLmerTest]

Formula: meanF0 ~ context + (1 + context || keyword) + (1 + context || subject)

Data: data.SenLen.Eng

Control: lmerControl(check.conv.singular = .makeCC(action = "ignore",
tol = 1e-04))

AIC	BIC	logLik	deviance	df.resid
2221.6	2316.6	-1083.8	2167.6	223

Scaled residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.5773	-0.5823	-0.0529	0.4831	3.4514

Random effects:

Groups	Name	Variance	Std.Dev.	Corr
subject	contextall > not	1.760e+03	4.195e+01	
	contextmost/many > not	1.649e+03	4.061e+01	0.98
	contextnot > all	1.861e+03	4.314e+01	1.00
	contextnot > most/many	2.035e+03	4.511e+01	0.99
subject.1	(Intercept)	7.697e-03	8.773e-02	
keyword	contextall > not	5.402e+01	7.349e+00	
	contextmost/many > not	4.308e-07	6.564e-04	-1.00
	contextnot > all	9.769e+00	3.125e+00	1.00
	contextnot > most/many	1.563e-06	1.250e-03	-0.53
keyword.1	(Intercept)	0.000e+00	0.000e+00	
Residual		2.038e+02	1.428e+01	

Number of obs: 250, groups: subject, 25; keyword, 5

Fixed effects:

	Estimate	Std. Error	df	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	168.773	9.546	23.201	17.681	5.83e-15 ***
contextmost/many > not	3.515	5.307	5.351	0.662	0.535
contextnot > all	-4.913	3.438	4.074	-1.429	0.225
contextnot > most/many	6.879	5.155	4.835	1.334	0.241

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Correlation of Fixed Effects:

(Intr)	cnt/>n	cnty>a
cntxtmst/>n	-0.486	
cntxtnt>all	-0.343	0.772
cntxtn>mst/	-0.327	0.827
	0.787	

```

model.maxF0.Eng <- lmer(data = data.SenLen.Eng,
                         maxF0 ~ context +
                           (1 + context||keyword) +
                           (1 + context||subject), REML = FALSE,
                         control=lmerControl(check.conv.singular = .makeCC(action = "ignore",
                         tol = 1e-04))

```

Model for the max fundamental frequency during the sentence (maxF0):

Warning: Model failed to converge with 1 negative eigenvalue: -7.6e-03

```
summary(model.maxF0.Eng)
```

Linear mixed model fit by maximum likelihood . t-tests use Satterthwaite's method [lmerModLmerTest]

Formula: maxF0 ~ context + (1 + context || keyword) + (1 + context || subject)

Data: data.SenLen.Eng

Control: lmerControl(check.conv.singular = .makeCC(action = "ignore",
tol = 1e-04))

AIC	BIC	logLik	deviance	df.resid
2761.7	2856.8	-1353.9	2707.7	223

Scaled residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.0396	-0.6609	-0.1358	0.6050	2.6685

Random effects:

Groups	Name	Variance	Std.Dev.	Corr
subject	contextall > not	3.343e+03	5.782e+01	
	contextmost/many > not	3.375e+03	5.810e+01	0.77
	contextnot > all	3.138e+03	5.601e+01	1.00 0.82
	contextnot > most/many	4.378e+03	6.616e+01	0.90 0.97 0.93
subject.1	(Intercept)	1.057e-03	3.252e-02	
keyword	contextall > not	0.000e+00	0.000e+00	
	contextmost/many > not	2.266e+01	4.760e+00	NaN
	contextnot > all	5.223e-07	7.227e-04	NaN 0.54
	contextnot > most/many	1.114e+01	3.338e+00	NaN 1.00 0.54
keyword.1	(Intercept)	0.000e+00	0.000e+00	
Residual		2.060e+03	4.538e+01	

Number of obs: 250, groups: subject, 25; keyword, 5

Fixed effects:

	Estimate	Std. Error	df	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	263.061	12.695	25.294	20.721	<2e-16 ***
contextmost/many > not	-11.968	11.923	11.262	-1.004	0.337
contextnot > all	-4.653	7.482	148.169	-0.622	0.535
contextnot > most/many	3.832	10.406	16.172	0.368	0.717

Signif. codes:	0 '***'	0.001 '**'	0.01 '*'	0.05 '.'	0.1 ' '

```

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
  (Intr) cnt/>n cntx>a
cntxtmst/>n -0.382
cntxtnt>all -0.338  0.399
cntxtn>mst/ -0.180  0.628  0.422

```

For the models above, there's no significant correlation between sentence context and fundamental frequencies in English.

Context vs Fundamental Frequency(F0), Japanese

[back to top](#)

```

model.minF0.Jap <- lmer(data = data.SenLen.Jap,
                         minF0 ~ context +
                           (1 + context||keyword) +
                           (1 + context||subject), REML = FALSE,
                           control=lmerControl(check.conv.singular = .makeCC(action = "ignore",
                           tol = 1e-04))
summary(model.minF0.Jap)

```

Model for the min fundamental frequency during the sentence (minF0):

```

Linear mixed model fit by maximum likelihood . t-tests use Satterthwaite's
method [lmerModLmerTest]
Formula: minF0 ~ context + (1 + context || keyword) + (1 + context || subject)
Data: data.SenLen.Jap
Control: lmerControl(check.conv.singular = .makeCC(action = "ignore",
tol = 1e-04))

AIC      BIC      logLik deviance df.resid
2100.6   2189.6   -1023.3    2046.6      173

Scaled residuals:
    Min      1Q      Median      3Q      Max 
-3.6233 -0.2898  0.2083  0.5220  1.5242 

Random effects:
Groups      Name           Variance Std.Dev. Corr
subject    contextall > not    1.592e+03 3.991e+01
            contextmost/many > not 1.334e+03 3.652e+01  0.97
            contextnot > all     1.693e+03 4.115e+01  1.00  0.94
            contextnot > most/many 2.124e+03 4.608e+01  0.99  0.99  0.98
subject.1 (Intercept) 0.000e+00 0.000e+00
keyword    contextall > not    1.914e+01 4.375e+00
            contextmost/many > not 2.343e-08 1.531e-04 -1.00
            contextnot > all     1.223e+00 1.106e+00  1.00 -1.00
            contextnot > most/many 6.865e-07 8.285e-04 -0.95  0.95 -0.95
keyword.1 (Intercept) 0.000e+00 0.000e+00
Residual          1.219e+03 3.491e+01

```

```

Number of obs: 200, groups: subject, 20; keyword, 5

Fixed effects:
            Estimate Std. Error      df t value Pr(>|t|)    
(Intercept)    134.536     10.311   15.515  13.048 8.96e-10 ***
contextmost/many > not    15.102      7.916   12.605   1.908   0.0794 .  
contextnot > all       5.868      6.692   12.063   0.877   0.3977  
contextnot > most/many  11.501      7.779   13.621   1.478   0.1621  
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Correlation of Fixed Effects:
          (Intr) cnt/>n cntx>a
cntxtmst/>n -0.440
cntxtnt>all -0.331  0.440
cntxtn>mst/ -0.188  0.456  0.470

```

```

model.maxF0.Jap <- lmer(data = data.SenLen.Jap,
                         maxF0 ~ context +
                           (1 + context||keyword) +
                           (1 + context||subject), REML = FALSE,
                           control=lmerControl(check.conv.singular = .makeCC(action = "ignore",
                           tol = 1e-04))

```

Model for the max fundamental frequency during the sentence (maxF0):

Warning: Model failed to converge with 1 negative eigenvalue: -8.8e-02

```
summary(model.maxF0.Jap)
```

```

Linear mixed model fit by maximum likelihood. t-tests use Satterthwaite's
method [lmerModLmerTest]
Formula: maxF0 ~ context + (1 + context || keyword) + (1 + context || 
  subject)
Data: data.SenLen.Jap
Control: lmerControl(check.conv.singular = .makeCC(action = "ignore",
  tol = 1e-04))

AIC      BIC      logLik deviance df.resid
2100.2   2189.2   -1023.1    2046.2      173

```

Scaled residuals:

Min	1Q	Median	3Q	Max
-2.4419	-0.4916	-0.0873	0.4028	3.7869

Random effects:

Groups	Name	Variance	Std.Dev.	Corr
subject	contextall > not	1858.31	43.108	
	contextmost/many > not	2291.80	47.873	0.99
	contextnot > all	2961.99	54.424	0.98 0.93
	contextnot > most/many	3035.66	55.097	0.99 0.96 0.99

```

subject.1 (Intercept)          0.00  0.000
keyword  contextall > not    136.85 11.698
           contextmost/many > not   5.05  2.247   1.00
           contextnot > all      32.99  5.744  -1.00 -1.00
           contextnot > most/many 29.70  5.450   1.00  1.00 -1.00
keyword.1 (Intercept)          0.00  0.000
Residual                      1114.19 33.379

```

Number of obs: 200, groups: subject, 20; keyword, 5

Fixed effects:

	Estimate	Std. Error	df	t value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	304.742	12.534	12.588	24.313	5.86e-12 ***
contextmost/many > not	-7.520	9.914	6.572	-0.759	0.474
contextnot > all	6.095	12.261	3.520	0.497	0.649
contextnot > most/many	-6.628	10.815	5.734	-0.613	0.563

Signif. codes:	0 '***'	0.001 '**'	0.01 '*'	0.05 '.'	0.1 ','
					1

Correlation of Fixed Effects:

	(Intr)	cnt/>n	cntx>a
cntxtmst/>n	-0.444		
cntxtnt>all	-0.422	0.694	
cntxtn>mst/	-0.294	0.662	0.721

For the models above, there's no significant correlation between sentence context and fundamental frequencies in Japanese