# Looking for the Phonological Mapping Negativity (in all the wrong places)

Massimiliano Canzi massimiliano.canzi@uni-konstanz.de

June 24 2021

Methods 0000000 Experiment 1

Experiment 2 0000000

General Discussion 00000000

#### Section 1

Four years ago...

Can event-related potential data inform information flow order in speech perception?

Can event-related potential data inform information flow order in speech perception? i.e. what the extent of top-down mediation is during speech perception.

- Interactive models of speech perception (e.g. TRACE)
- Feed-forward / modular models of speech perception (e.g. Cohort model)

• Elman, J. L., & McClelland, J. L. (1988). Cognitive penetration of the mechanisms of perception: Compensation for coarticulation of lexically restored phonemes. Journal of Memory and Language, 27(2), 143-165.

- Elman, J. L., & McClelland, J. L. (1988). Cognitive penetration of the mechanisms of perception: Compensation for coarticulation of lexically restored phonemes. Journal of Memory and Language, 27(2), 143-165.
- Magnuson et al. (2003). Lexical effects on compensation for coarticulation: The ghost of Christmash past. Cognitive Science, 27(2), 285-298.

- Elman, J. L., & McClelland, J. L. (1988). Cognitive penetration of the mechanisms of perception: Compensation for coarticulation of lexically restored phonemes. Journal of Memory and Language, 27(2), 143-165.
- Magnuson et al. (2003). Lexical effects on compensation for coarticulation: The ghost of Christmash past. Cognitive Science, 27(2), 285-298.
- McQueen, J. M. (2003). The ghost of Christmas future: didn't scrooge learn to be good?: Commentary on Magnuson et al. (2003). Cognitive Science, 27(5), 795-799.

- Elman, J. L., & McClelland, J. L. (1988). Cognitive penetration of the mechanisms of perception: Compensation for coarticulation of lexically restored phonemes. Journal of Memory and Language, 27(2), 143-165.
- Magnuson et al. (2003). Lexical effects on compensation for coarticulation: The ghost of Christmash past. Cognitive Science, 27(2), 285-298.
- McQueen, J. M. (2003). The ghost of Christmas future: didn't scrooge learn to be good?: Commentary on Magnuson et al. (2003). Cognitive Science, 27(5), 795-799.
- McQueen, et al. (2009). No lexical-prelexical feedback during speech perception or: Is it time to stop playing those Christmas tapes?. Journal of Memory and Language, 61(1), 1-18.

Compensation for coarticulation: (Mann & Repp 1981)

Compensation for coarticulation: (Mann & Repp 1981)

 $\bullet$  /t-k/ perceived more often as /k/ following /s/

Ganong effect (Ganong 1980)

Compensation for coarticulation: (Mann & Repp 1981)

- $\bullet$  /t-k/ perceived more often as /k/ following /s/
- $\circ$  /t-k/ perceived more often as /t/ following /J/

Ganong effect (Ganong 1980)

General Discussion

# Elman & McClelland (1988)

Introduction

Compensation for coarticulation: (Mann & Repp 1981)

- /t-k/ perceived more often as /k/ following /s/
- $\circ$  /t-k/ perceived more often as /t/ following / $\int$ /

Ganong effect (Ganong 1980)

• Ambiguous phonemes are solved more often with the choice that makes a word vs. a non-word

Introduction

#### Compensation for coarticulation: (Mann & Repp 1981)

- /t-k/ perceived more often as /k/ following /s/
- /t-k/ perceived more often as /t/ following /ʃ/

#### Ganong effect (Ganong 1980)

- Ambiguous phonemes are solved more often with the choice that makes a word vs. a non-word
- e.g. Christma/s-\( \)/ more often solved as Christma/s/.

Introduction

#### Compensation for coarticulation: (Mann & Repp 1981)

- /t-k/ perceived more often as /k/ following /s/
- /t-k/ perceived more often as /t/ following /ʃ/

#### Ganong effect (Ganong 1980)

- Ambiguous phonemes are solved more often with the choice that makes a word vs. a non-word
- e.g. Christma/s-\( \)/ more often solved as Christma/s/.
- Effect stronger at phoneme boundary.

 $Christma/s-\int//t-k/capes$ 

Christma/s-\( \frac{1}{t-k}\) capes

Cool, huh?

Can event-related potential data inform information flow order in speech perception?

Can event-related potential data inform information flow order in speech perception? i.e. what the extent of top-down mediation is during speech perception.

Event-related potentials (ERP) are measured brain responses that are direct result of a sensory, cognitive or motor event (Luck 2005)

Event-related potentials (ERP) are measured brain responses that are direct result of a sensory, cognitive or motor event (Luck 2005)

Event-related potential components are measured with electro-encephalography (**EEG**) equipment.

**ERP** (and EEG) offer unparalleled temporal resolution,

**ERP** (and EEG) offer unparalleled temporal resolution, opening a direct window into cognitive processes of online language processing and **speech perception**.

**ERP** (and EEG) offer unparalleled temporal resolution, opening a direct window into cognitive processes of online language processing and **speech perception**.

The original goal of my thesis was that to **design** a handful of **ERP experiments to investigate lexical feedback** and top-down processes of speech perception.

**ERP** (and EEG) offer unparalleled temporal resolution, opening a direct window into cognitive processes of online language processing and **speech perception**.

The original goal of my thesis was that to **design** a handful of **ERP experiments to investigate lexical feedback** and top-down processes of speech perception. But how?

• Mismatch Negativity (MMN)

\* Originally named Phonological Mismatch Negativity

Introduction

- Mismatch Negativity (MMN)
- Phonological Mapping\* Negativity (PMN)

\* Originally named Phonological Mismatch Negativity

Introduction

- Mismatch Negativity (MMN)
- Phonological Mapping\* Negativity (PMN)
- N400
- \* Originally named Phonological Mismatch Negativity

Introduction

- Mismatch Negativity (MMN)
- Phonological Mapping\* Negativity (PMN)
- N400
- P600
- \* Originally named Phonological Mismatch Negativity

#### MMN

The mismatch negativity (MMN) is a cross-sensorial ERP component often observed in frontocentral regions of the scalp between 150 and 250 ms post stimulus onset

#### MMN

The mismatch negativity (MMN) is a cross-sensorial ERP component often observed in frontocentral regions of the scalp between 150 and 250 ms post stimulus onset

The mismatch negativity reflects the perception of a deviant stimulus in a sequence of standard stimuli (e.g. Garrido et al., 2009)

#### MMN

The mismatch negativity (MMN) is a cross-sensorial ERP component often observed in frontocentral regions of the scalp between 150 and  $250~\mathrm{ms}$  post stimulus onset

The mismatch negativity reflects the perception of a deviant stimulus in a sequence of standard stimuli (e.g. Garrido et al., 2009)

In the aud- itory domain, a deviant stimulus can be identified by differences in pitch, duration, stress and frequency range (Erlbeck et al., 2014)

N400

The N400 (Kutas & Hillyard 1980) is part of the normal brain response to words and other meaningful stimuli.

N400

The N400 (Kutas & Hillyard 1980) is part of the normal brain response to words and other meaningful stimuli.

nurse

The N400 (Kutas & Hillyard 1980) is part of the normal brain response to words and other meaningful stimuli.

nurse doctor

The N400 (Kutas & Hillyard 1980) is part of the normal brain response to words and other meaningful stimuli.

nurse doctor |

The N400 (Kutas & Hillyard 1980) is part of the normal brain response to words and other meaningful stimuli.

nurse doctor | pizza

The N400 (Kutas & Hillyard 1980) is part of the normal brain response to words and other meaningful stimuli.

nurse doctor  $\mid$  pizza pineapple

The N400 (Kutas & Hillyard 1980) is part of the normal brain response to words and other meaningful stimuli.

nurse doctor | pizza pineapple

• Other paradigms include cloze-probability mismatch (e.g. Connolly and Phillips 1994)

The Phonological Mapping (or Mismatch) Negativity,  $\mathbf{PMN}$  is an event-related potential component hypothesized to index phonological mismatch and mapping

The Phonological Mapping (or Mismatch) Negativity, **PMN** is an event-related potential component hypothesized to index phonological mismatch and mapping (e.g. Connolly and Phillips 1994; Connolly et al. 2001)

However, while some studies (e.g. Connolly and Phillips 1994) have linked the PMN to phonological mapping during the lexical selection stage of speech perception..

However, while some studies (e.g. Connolly and Phillips 1994) have linked the PMN to phonological mapping during the lexical selection stage of speech perception..

others (e.g. Newman & Connolly) report that the PMN is a marker of acoustic and pre-lexical information.

Event-Related Potential Components Reflect Phonological and Semantic Processing of the Terminal Word of Spoken Sentences:

Event-Related Potential Components Reflect Phonological and Semantic Processing of the Terminal Word of Spoken Sentences:

• The piano is out of

Event-Related Potential Components Reflect Phonological and Semantic Processing of the Terminal Word of Spoken Sentences:

• The piano is out of tune

Event-Related Potential Components Reflect Phonological and Semantic Processing of the Terminal Word of Spoken Sentences:

• The piano is out of tune (no mismatch)

Experiment 2 General Discussion 00000000 00000000

### Connolly and Phillips (1994)

Event-Related Potential Components Reflect Phonological and Semantic Processing of the Terminal Word of Spoken Sentences:

- The piano is out of tune (no mismatch)
- The piano is out of

Event-Related Potential Components Reflect Phonological and Semantic Processing of the Terminal Word of Spoken Sentences:

General Discussion

- The piano is out of tune (no mismatch)
- The piano is out of tuna

Event-Related Potential Components Reflect Phonological and Semantic Processing of the Terminal Word of Spoken Sentences:

General Discussion

- The piano is out of tune (no mismatch)
- The piano is out of tuna (N400)

Introduction

Event-Related Potential Components Reflect Phonological and Semantic Processing of the Terminal Word of Spoken Sentences:

- The piano is out of tune (no mismatch)
- The piano is out of tuna (N400)
- The piano is out of

Introduction

### Connolly and Phillips (1994)

Event-Related Potential Components Reflect Phonological and Semantic Processing of the Terminal Word of Spoken Sentences:

- The piano is out of tune (no mismatch)
- The piano is out of tuna (N400)
- The piano is out of pizza

Event-Related Potential Components Reflect Phonological and Semantic Processing of the Terminal Word of Spoken Sentences:

- The piano is out of tune (no mismatch)
- The piano is out of tuna (N400)
- The piano is out of pizza (N400 and PMN)

Event-Related Potential Components Reflect Phonological and Semantic Processing of the Terminal Word of Spoken Sentences:

- The piano is out of tune (no mismatch)
- The piano is out of tuna (N400)
- The piano is out of pizza (N400 and PMN)
- o ...

Experiment 1

Experiment 2

General Discussion

Newman et al. (2003)

Phoneme deletion task to study the PMN:

Experiment 1

Experiment 2

General Discussion

Newman et al. (2003)

Phoneme deletion task to study the PMN:

Delete /k/ from the word "clap"

Newman et al. (2003)

Phoneme deletion task to study the PMN:

Delete /k/ from the word "clap"

• lap

Newman et al. (2003)

Introduction

Phoneme deletion task to study the PMN:

Delete /k/ from the word "clap"

- lap
- aap

Newman et al. (2003)

Introduction

Phoneme deletion task to study the PMN:

Delete /k/ from the word "clap"

- lap
- aap
- dog

**Lewendon et. al (2020)** suggest that the possibility exists that the PMN is an extension of either the Mismatch Negativity (MMN) or N400 components

Introduction

Lewendon et. al (2020) also report that the majority of the literature on the PMN is characterized by contradictory findings and methodological limitations, e.g.

Contrasting theories of the PMN

Introduction

- Contrasting theories of the PMN
- Mixed topographical locations:

Introduction

- Contrasting theories of the PMN
- Mixed topographical locations:
  - Some studies report discovering the PMN in frontal and central sites, ohers in parietal / mid-line / evenly spread across the scalp.

Introduction

- Contrasting theories of the PMN
- Mixed topographical locations:
  - Some studies report discovering the PMN in frontal and central sites, ohers in parietal / mid-line / evenly spread across the scalp.
- Methodological limitations:

Introduction

- Contrasting theories of the PMN
- Mixed topographical locations:
  - Some studies report discovering the PMN in frontal and central sites, ohers in parietal / mid-line / evenly spread across the scalp.
- Methodological limitations:
  - Few participants (usually < 10)

Introduction

- Contrasting theories of the PMN
- Mixed topographical locations:
  - Some studies report discovering the PMN in frontal and central sites, ohers in parietal / mid-line / evenly spread across the scalp.
- Methodological limitations:
  - Few participants (usually < 10)
  - Few trials (usually < 40)

Introduction

- Contrasting theories of the PMN
- Mixed topographical locations:
  - Some studies report discovering the PMN in frontal and central sites, ohers in parietal / mid-line / evenly spread across the scalp.
- Methodological limitations:
  - Few participants (usually < 10)
  - Few trials (usually < 40)
  - Confounding variables

## Research questions

### Research questions

• Is the PMN in response to acoustic, phonetic, phonological, lexical mapping and mismatch, none or a combination of all?

#### Research questions

0000000000000000000000

Introduction

- Is the PMN in response to acoustic, phonetic, phonological, lexical mapping and mismatch, none or a combination of all?
- Is any other ERP component found in response to acoustic, phonetic and phonological mismatch in place of / together wih the PMN?

## Research questions

Why the PMN..

Experiment 1

Experiment 2

General Discussion

# Research questions

Why the PMN.. and why now?

## Research questions

Why the PMN.. and why now?

• The PMN might play an important role in future investigations of architectures of grammar (placed in between acoustic and lexical processing)

## Research questions

00000000000000000000

Introduction

### Why the PMN.. and why now?

- The PMN might play an important role in future investigations of architectures of grammar (placed in between acoustic and lexical processing)
- Clinical studies have used the PMN as a marker of phonological processing abilities (Robson et al. 2017). However, it is not clear what processes sexactly the PMN stands for.

Section 2

Methods

# Experimental design

# Experimental design

Three neuro-imaging experiments designed to introduce new contexts in which to probe the elicitation of the PMN ERP component.

# Experimental design

Three neuro-imaging experiments designed to introduce new contexts in which to probe the elicitation of the PMN ERP component.

Experiments 1, 2 (and 3) were designed to simultaneously work independently while also being fully comparable.

Hardware:

#### Hardware:

• 64 active pin-type **BioSemi** electrodes / **ActiView** 

#### Hardware:

- 64 active pin-type **BioSemi** electrodes / **ActiView**
- Neurobehavioral Systems' **Presentation**

Software:

 $\bullet$  MATLAB (2018b; 2019a; 2019b)

- $\bullet$  MATLAB (2018b; 2019a; 2019b)
- EEGLAB (Delorme & Makeig 2004)

- MATLAB (2018b; 2019a; 2019b)
- EEGLAB (Delorme & Makeig 2004)
- ERPLAB (Lopez-Calderon & Luck, 2014)

- MATLAB (2018b; 2019a; 2019b)
- EEGLAB (Delorme & Makeig 2004)
- ERPLAB (Lopez-Calderon & Luck, 2014)
- R (4.1) (R Core Team 2021)

Statistical analyses:

#### Statistical analyses:

• Exploratory channel-level multivariate testing with package ERP (Causeur et al. 2020) and the Adaptive Factor Adjustment (AFA) procedure (Sheu et al. 2016)

#### Statistical analyses:

- Exploratory channel-level multivariate testing with package ERP (Causeur et al. 2020) and the Adaptive Factor Adjustment (AFA) procedure (Sheu et al. 2016)
- Mean amplitude modelling with mixed-effect models & package lme4 (Bates et al. 2015)

Data visualisation:

#### Data visualisation:

 $\bullet$  Grand-Average / difference ERP plots with ggplot2 (Wickham 2016)

#### Data visualisation:

- $\bullet$  Grand-Average / difference ERP plots with <code>ggplot2</code> (Wickham 2016)
- Cubic spline interpolation scalp maps with package akima (Akima and Gebhardt 2020)

ods Experiment 1 000000000

Experiment 2 0000000

General Discussion

# Reproducibility



# Reproducibility



Data, code and model summaries are freely available on GitHub at the repository mcanzi/phd\_codedata



Data, code and model summaries are freely available on GitHub at the repository mcanzi/phd\_codedata

PhD thesis has been submitted and will be available through open access following thesis defense (in August) and corrections.

Methods 0000000 Experiment 1

Experiment 2 0000000 General Discussion 00000000

## Section 3

# Experiment 1

• Participants were trained to learn three pairs of tri-syllabic nonce words in a computerized training phase (e.g.  $pitabu\ dipida$ )

- Participants were trained to learn three pairs of tri-syllabic nonce words in a computerized training phase (e.g. *pitabu dipida*)
  - $\bullet$  Transitional probabilities within the two items of each nonce-word pair was 1.0

- Participants were trained to learn three pairs of tri-syllabic nonce words in a computerized training phase (e.g. *pitabu dipida*)
  - $\bullet$  Transitional probabilities within the two items of each nonce-word pair was 1.0
- Participants were tested on their knowledge of the experimental stimuli in a computerized task

- Participants were trained to learn three pairs of tri-syllabic nonce words in a computerized training phase (e.g. pitabu dipida)
  - $\circ~$  Transitional probabilities within the two items of each nonce-word pair was 1.0
- Participants were tested on their knowledge of the experimental stimuli in a computerized task
- During EEG data collection, stimuli were played back to participants during a passive listening task, however..

- Participants were trained to learn three pairs of tri-syllabic nonce words in a computerized training phase (e.g. pitabu dipida)
  - Transitional probabilities within the two items of each nonce-word pair was 1.0
- Participants were tested on their knowledge of the experimental stimuli in a computerized task
- During EEG data collection, stimuli were played back to participants during a passive listening task, however...
  - In 33% of total trials (400 total trials), the first syllable of the second nonce-word of each pair would be manipulated to break expectations

pitabu

pitabu dipida

pitabu dipida pitabu

pitabu dipida pitabu **ba**pida

pitabu dipida pitabu **ba**pida pitabu

pitabu dipida pitabu **ba**pida pitabu **bu**pida

pitabu dipida pitabu **ba**pida pitabu **bu**pida

• Stimuli were synthesized using Mac OS Text-to-Speech

pitabu dipida pitabu **ba**pida pitabu **bu**pida

- Stimuli were synthesized using Mac OS Text-to-Speech
- $\bullet$  Vowel, syllable and word length were controlled for (each syllable was 200 ms long)

pitabu dipida pitabu **ba**pida pitabu **bu**pida

- Stimuli were synthesized using Mac OS Text-to-Speech
- Vowel, syllable and word length were controlled for (each syllable was 200 ms long)
- Speaker and pitch contours were the same for all stimuli.

22 Participants (F = 13) took part to the experiment.

ullet 22 right-handed adults

General Discussion

# Participants

- 22 Participants (F = 13) took part to the experiment.
  - ullet 22 right-handed adults
  - 22 BrE speakers

22 Participants (F = 13) took part to the experiment.

- 22 right-handed adults
- 22 BrE speakers
- $\bullet$  Age (M = 22, 18-25)

- 22 Participants (F = 13) took part to the experiment.
  - 22 right-handed adults
  - 22 BrE speakers
  - $\bullet$  Age (M = 22, 18-25)
  - Normal or corrected to normal vision and hearing

- 22 Participants (F = 13) took part to the experiment.
  - 22 right-handed adults
  - 22 BrE speakers
  - $\bullet$  Age (M = 22, 18-25)
  - Normal or corrected to normal vision and hearing
  - No reported use of psychoactive medications

## Results

### Results

### Other effects

• Small negative effect between 150-200 ms for mismatch condition (fronto-central)

#### Other effects

- Small negative effect between 150-200 ms for mismatch condition (fronto-central) (MMN?)
- Bigger positive effect between 500-700 ms for mismatch condition (centro-parietal)

#### Other effects

- Small negative effect between 150-200 ms for mismatch condition (fronto-central) (MMN?)
- Bigger positive effect between 500-700 ms for mismatch condition (centro-parietal) (**P600?**)

No instance of **PMN** (in any of its forms) was found)

Possible explanations:

#### Possible explanations:

• PMN is more "higher-level" than previously theorized

Experiment 1

Experiment 2 0000000

#### Discussion

#### Possible explanations:

- PMN is more "higher-level" than previously theorized
- $\bullet$  Methodological limitations of Exp. 1

## Section 4

Experiment 2

### Methods

0

0

0

0

# Methods

#### Results

#### Results

## Section 5

General Discussion

| Methods | Experiment 1      | Experiment 2 | General Discussion<br>o●oooooo |
|---------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| 0000000 | 000000000         | 0000000      | 0000000                        |
|         |                   |              |                                |
|         |                   |              |                                |
|         |                   |              |                                |
|         |                   |              |                                |
|         |                   |              |                                |
|         |                   |              |                                |
|         |                   |              |                                |
|         |                   |              |                                |
|         |                   |              |                                |
|         | Methods<br>000000 | 1            |                                |

| Introduction 000000000000000000000000000000000000 | Methods<br>0000000 | Experiment 1 00000000 | Experiment 2 0000000 | General Discussion<br>00•00000 |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|
|   |                    |                       |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                       |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                       |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                       |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                       |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                       |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                       |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                       |                      |                                |

| Introduction                            | Methods<br>0000000 | Experiment 1 | Experiment 2 | General Discussion<br>000●0000 |
|---|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| 000000000000000000000000000000000000000 | 0000000            | 00000000     | 0000000      | 0000000                        |
|   |                    |              |              |                                |
|   |                    |              |              |                                |
|   |                    |              |              |                                |
|   |                    |              |              |                                |
|   |                    |              |              |                                |
|   |                    |              |              |                                |
|   |                    |              |              |                                |
|   |                    |              |              |                                |

| Introduction 000000000000000000000000000000000000 | Methods<br>0000000 | Experiment 1 000000000 | Experiment 2 0000000 | General Discussion<br>0000•000 |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|
|   |                    |                        |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                        |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                        |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                        |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                        |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                        |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                        |                      |                                |
|   |                    |                        |                      |                                |

# Thank you!

Special thanks to my supervisors **Dr Wendell Kimper**, **Dr Patrycja Strycharczuk** and to all the RAs: Hui Chen, Lauren Forrest, Chloe Gornall, Tristan Hill, Yuerong Shen, Ellen Symonds, Xinrong Wang, Ziyun Zhang

#### References



Questions?