What is the Starting Point?

1. Affective Primacy Hypothesis
2. Meaning is $\{not/morethan\}$ truth conditions
3. The affective (qua, non-TC meaning) is lexically represented?

•

And this is the thing that is going to happen... it boils down to the representation of narrow content....two dimensional semantic accounts, but that doesn't solve the problem of the formalizm

Is valence represented

1. Zajonc (1980) and the affective primacy hyptohesis
   How important is affect/emotion to decision making? How important is emotion in object recognition?
   How important is emotion in word recognition? —¿
   Zajonc's intuition was that Affect, is necessary for adaptive behavior
2. Questions about Affective meaning:
   2.1. Is affect part of the literal meaning?
      i. In light of affect / expressive meaning, can we maintain TC accounts of meaning?
      ii. many years of TC menaing proponents who stumble in the face of this kind of data
         A. Davidson's "derangement" (1986)
         B. Kaplan, Kratzer on "Oops" and "ouch"
   2.2. Which notion of 'affect' is relevant to the present study?
      i. valence as an feature of lexical meaning? $\rightarrow$ first, IS valence lexically represented?
      ii. valence as an indication of an affective (=physiological) response
      iii. valence = affective semantic knowledge?
   2.3. How is affective meaning (=affective semantic knowledge) psychologically represented?
      i. Is it part of the lexicon? ...How is the lexicon represented? as part of long-term memory? How is long-term memory behaviorally distinguished from other kinds of memory?
      ii.
3. Questions about non-Affective Meaning:
   3.1. What is the best way to categorize the non-affectual component of verb meaning?
      - Expressive/Non-TC meaning (a.o.t. affective dimension)
      -
   3.2. Psychological/Physical vs. Abstract/Concrete
      - Löhr (2021), Dunn (2015)
      - effects of ambiguity, polysemy on concreteness/abstractions
      - France is a hexagon and a democracy / France is a hexagonal democracy
   3.3. Theories of abstract vs concrete concepts:
      - **Dual-Coding theory** (Paivio 1991; Barsalou et al 2008)
         – Abstract concepts are associated with fewer sensorimotor-introspective reprsentations, thus rely on other representational forms (language, dis-embodied); concrete concepts are represented both by language and sensorimortor-introspective information

    - Thus, concrete faster than abstract
  - **Context Availiability** (Schwanenflugel 1992)
    - For abstract concepts, you need enough contextual/general world knowledge information to sufficiently characterize meaning (especially out of context)
  - **Metaphorical** (Lakoff & Johnson 1999)
    - Abstract concepts are represented via metaphorical mappings to concrete concepts
    - Thus, they rely on concrete concepts conceptually

4. What is meaning?
   - Expressive/Non-TC meaning (a.o.t. affective dimension)
   -
5. What is the goal of the study?

   5.1. Is affect (=VALENCE) lexically encoded?
   5.2.
6. How does affect interact with conceptual representations?
7. Do conceptual representations *Always* trigger a physiological response?
8. Does the valence of a lexical item incur (correspond) with a physiological response?

first the verbs need to be normed for the strength of their valence

1. What are the goals of this project?

   1.1.
   1.2.
   1.3.

1 Groundwork

First things first. Define what we mean when we say “affect”:

2 Current State of Knolwedge

2.1 The relationship between Concreteness and valence: Abstract concepts are rated as more emotional than concrete ones

The “v-relationship”
Warriner et al (2013)
Traditional

- abstract concepts are a heterogenous group

2.2 What we know from neuroscience

2.2.1 Early Posterior Negativity (EPN)

- Between 200-300 ms after stimulus onset, a negative deflection in visual cortices for emotion versus neutral words
- Associated with increated attention to emotional stimuli
- Observed for adjectives (Herbert, Kissler, Junghofer, Peyk, & Rockstroh, 2006), nouns (Kissler et al., 2007), and verbs (Schacht & Sommer, 2009a; Schacht & Sommer, 2009b)

2.2.2 Late positive complex (LPC)

- Increased centro-parietal possitivity
- associated with more elaborated semantic processing

2.2.3 Caveates

- Is it a response to the stored semantic representation of emotional content (semantic valence) or is is a marker of the conditioned association between a stimulus and a some (emotional) visual feature of the word?
- Differences between syntactic category? Palazova at al (2013) versus Kanzke and Kotz (2007): the latter found no late interaction between emotion and concreteness for nouns, tho the former did for verbs...

2.3 Summaries of papers suggested by reviewers

2.3.1 De Deyne et al (2014): Graded structure in adjective categories

- RQ: Are adjective categories graded? What determines their structure?

2.3.2 Kousta et al (2011)

-

2.4 Palazova et al (2013): erp and verbs

- Valence versus concreteness in verbs?
- Behavioral responses in the lexical decision task were faster to concrete than to abstract words, and RTs *increased* for positive/negative valenced abstract words compared to neutral concrete words.

2.5 Winter (2022)

-

3 Suggested Experiments

3.1 Norming

- concreteness rating (replaces physical/psychological dimension)
- valance rating
-
- semantic similarity

3.2 Evaluative Priming

- Task Manipulation: Concreteness, Valence
  - Prime (+valence, -valence, 0 valence) x Condition (congruent,incongruent)
  - Prime (concrete, abstract) x Condition (congruent,incongruent)
- Dependent variable: Response time, error rates
- Predictions:
  - H1:

3.3 Statistical Model

-