


# Degraded speech comprehension: The influence of predictability, attention and speech rate



Pratik Bhandari  
Department of Psychology  
Saarland University

A thesis submitted for the degree of  
*Doctor of Philosophy*

September 2022

Dedicated to Aama-Baa

# Acknowledgements

Oh this is hard! PhD and the journey until here. How could I have done it without the wonderful people in my life?

Jutta and Vera have been amazing mentors. The German word “doktormutter” describes what they have been to me, academically, better than the English word “supervisor” does. Words don’t do justice: It is rare to find a supervisor who understands your

The interdisciplinary discussions in Vera’s lab have pushed me beyond my comfort zone to learn about different dimensions of human and machine language. It has been an honor and a pleasure to be her student, to have worked with her. I couldn’t have learnt

Pratik Bhandari  
Universität des Saarlandes,  
Saarbrücken  
10 March 2021

# Abstract

Some abstract here

# Contents

<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Research goals . . . . .	5
1.2 Research contributions . . . . .	8
1.3 Overview of the thesis . . . . .	10
1.4 Dissimilation of research findings . . . . .	12
<b>2 Background</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1 Speech distortion and degradation . . . . .	16
2.2 Prediction and comprehension of degraded speech . . . . .	18
2.2.1 Predictive language processing . . . . .	18
2.2.2 Facilitatory effect of predictability . . . . .	21
2.2.3 Limits of predictive language processing . . . . .	23
2.3 Adaptation to degraded speech . . . . .	25
2.4 Summary . . . . .	26
<b>3 General methods</b>	<b>28</b>
3.1 Experimental materials . . . . .	28
3.1.1 Stimulus sentences . . . . .	28
3.1.2 Speech processing . . . . .	29
3.2 Data collection on the web . . . . .	34
<b>4 General statistical approach</b>	<b>36</b>
4.1 Linear mixed effects models . . . . .	36
4.1.1 Linear regression and its limitations . . . . .	37

*Contents*

4.2	Model selection and Running mixed effects models in R . . . . .	40
4.3	Summary . . . . .	41
<b>5</b>	<b>Predictability effects of degraded speech are reduced as a function of attention</b>	<b>42</b>
5.1	Introduction . . . . .	43
5.2	Background . . . . .	44
5.3	Experiment 1 . . . . .	46
5.4	Methods . . . . .	46
5.4.1	Participants . . . . .	46
5.4.2	Materials . . . . .	47
5.4.3	Procedure . . . . .	47
5.5	Analyses . . . . .	48
5.6	Results and discussion . . . . .	49
5.7	Experiment 2 . . . . .	51
5.8	Methods . . . . .	52
5.8.1	Participants and Materials . . . . .	52
5.8.2	Procedure . . . . .	52
5.9	Analyses . . . . .	52
5.10	Results and discussion . . . . .	52
5.11	Conclusion . . . . .	56
5.12	Summary . . . . .	60
<b>6</b>	<b>Semantic predictability facilitates comprehension of degraded speech in a graded manner</b>	<b>61</b>
6.1	Introduction . . . . .	62
6.2	Background . . . . .	63
6.3	Methods . . . . .	68
6.3.1	Participants . . . . .	68
6.3.2	Materials . . . . .	68
6.3.3	Procedure . . . . .	69
6.4	Analyses . . . . .	70
6.5	Results and discussion . . . . .	71
6.6	Conclusion . . . . .	72
6.7	Summary . . . . .	74

*Contents*

<b>7 Comprehension of degraded speech is modulated by the rate of speech</b>	<b>75</b>
7.1 Introduction . . . . .	75
7.2 Background . . . . .	75
7.2.1 Comprehension of degraded speech . . . . .	76
7.2.2 Comprehension of fast and slow speech . . . . .	77
7.2.3 Comprehension of degraded speech at varying rates of presentation . . . . .	79
7.2.4 Study aims . . . . .	81
7.3 Experiment 7A . . . . .	82
7.4 Methods . . . . .	82
7.4.1 Participants . . . . .	82
7.4.2 Materials . . . . .	82
7.4.3 Procedure . . . . .	83
7.5 Analyses . . . . .	84
7.6 Results and discussion . . . . .	84
7.7 Experiment 7B . . . . .	86
7.8 Methods . . . . .	86
7.8.1 Participants and Materials . . . . .	86
7.8.2 Procedure . . . . .	86
7.9 Analyses . . . . .	86
7.10 Results and discussion . . . . .	87
7.11 Conclusion . . . . .	88
<b>8 Discussion and conclusion</b>	<b>92</b>
8.1 Summary of the main findings . . . . .	92
8.2 Theoretical and practical implications . . . . .	93
8.3 Limitation . . . . .	93
8.4 Concluding remarks . . . . .	94
<b>9 Ethics and funding</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>A Experimental items</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>98</b>

# List of Figures

1.1	Schematic representation of the noisy channel model of communication	1
1.2	Bayesian network representation of the noisy channel model of communication . . . . .	3
3.1	Distribution of cloze probability ratings of target words in low, medium and high predictability sentences . . . . .	29
3.2	Spectrograms of clear speech, and degraded speech arranged with a decreasing number of noise vocoding channels (8, 6, 4 and 1 band) for the sentence ‘Er löest die Aufgabe.’ . . . . .	31
3.3	Schematic representation of waveforms of fast, normal, and slow speech rates for the sentence ‘Er löest die Aufgabe’ with the duration of each speech rates in second. Note the circled portion of the waveform, which exemplifies that PSOLA eliminates and duplicates the parts of the original waveform to create fast and slow speech respectively. . . . .	33
5.1	Mean response accuracy across all conditions in Experiment 1. Accuracy increased only with an increase in the number of noise-vocoding channels. There is no change in accuracy with an increase or decrease in target word predictability. Error bars represent standard error of the means. . . . .	50
5.2	Mean response accuracy across all conditions in Experiment 2. Accuracy increased with an increase in number of noise-vocoding channels and target word predictability. Error bars represent standard error of the means. . . . .	53

# List of Tables

3.1	Cloze probabilities of high, medium and low predictability sentences	29
3.2	Boundary frequencies (in Hz) for 1, 4, 6 and 8 channels noise-vocoding conditions . . . . .	32
5.1	Response accuracy (mean and standard error of the mean) across all levels of speech degradation and target word predictability in Experiment 1 . . . . .	49
5.2	Estimated effects of the model accounting for the correct word recognition in Experiment 1 . . . . .	51
5.3	Response accuracy (mean and standard error of the mean) across all levels of speech degradation and target word predictability in Experiment 2 . . . . .	53
5.4	Estimated effects of the model accounting for the correct word recognition in Experiment 2 . . . . .	55
5.5	Estimated effects of the best-fitting model accounting for the correct word recognition in both experiments . . . . .	56


## List of Abbreviations

<b>HP</b>	.....	High predictability
<b>MP</b>	.....	Medium predictability
<b>LP</b>	.....	Low predictability
<b>ch</b>	.....	channels
<b>DE</b>	.....	German
<b>EN</b>	.....	English
<b>MEG</b>	.....	Magnetoencephalography
<b>ERP</b>	.....	Event Related Potential
<b>SPIN</b>	.....	Speech In Noise
<b>SNR</b>	.....	Signal to Noise Ratio
<b>PSOLA</b>	....	Pitch synchronous overlap add technique
<b>SD</b>	.....	Standard deviation

# 1

## Introduction

One of the features that distinguishes us, humans, from other species is our ability to communicate using verbal language (Hauser et al., 2002; Lieberman, 2013; Pinker & Jackendoff, 2005). We speak. We listen. We understand. This seemingly straightforward path of communication goes through plenty of hindrances. One of them is an adverse listening condition caused by background noise and speech distortion (e.g., Chen & Loizou, 2011; Fontan et al., 2015). Human comprehenders rely on top-down predictive processes and bottom-up auditory processes to understand spoken language. Language comprehension in adverse listening conditions is aptly described by the noisy channel model of communication (Gibson et al., 2013, 2019; Levy, 2008; C. E. Shannon, 1948) schematically represented in Figure 1.1 below.



**Figure 1.1:** Schematic representation of the noisy channel model of communication

The speaker produces an utterance  $u_i$  with a meaning  $m_i$  that she intends to send. The utterance is encoded into a signal and is sent through a channel of transmission. During transmission, some external noise disrupts the signal. The

## 1. Introduction

receiver (e.g., a listener) perceives the signal as  $u_p$  and decodes it to recover the meaning as  $m_p$ . The human language comprehension system is assumed to be engaged in an optimal Bayesian decoding that uses all the sources of information (e.g., a prior semantic knowledge, context information, world knowledge, etc.) and infers the intended meaning from the perceived utterance that it receives from a noisy channel of communication (Gibson et al., 2013; Levy, 2008; cf. Markman & Otto, 2011).

For successful communication to take place, the message recovered by the listener must be approximately equal to the message intended to be sent by the speaker. Let's take an example. X sees a spherical object flying towards Y. So, she intends to warn him about it: a “spherical object which is played by two teams of 11 players each in a big playground” is about to hit Y. To convey this message, X utters BALL. Due to an external noise, X's (i.e., the speaker's) utterance is distorted, so Y (i.e., the listener) perceives the utterance as HALL. The listener then interprets that the speaker's message is intended to point him to the “building where lectures take place in their university” which they were trying to find. (In this case of unsuccessful communication, or due to the listener wrongly identifying the intended message of the speaker, Y gets hit by a ball.)


We assume that the goal of a listener is to identify the message  $m_i$  that is most likely from the perceived utterance  $u_p$ , taking into account the external noise ( $N$ ), and the prior likelihood of the speaker uttering  $u_i$ . This can be formally expressed as:

$$\hat{m}_p = \operatorname{argmax}_{m_p} P(m_p, u_p, N, u_i, m_i) \quad (1.1)$$

These sequence of events from the intended message  $m_i$  to the perceived message  $m_p$  can be graphically represented in a Bayesian network (Bruineberg et al., 2021; Darwiche, 2010; Pearl, 1985) in Figure 1.2 (cf. Figure 1.1).

Figure 1.2 models the dependencies among the events, which shows that the external noise and the speaker's utterance are *independent*, however, the listener's

## 1. Introduction



**Figure 1.2:** Bayesian network representation of the noisy channel model of communication

perception of the uttered message is also dependent on the noise. The communication in the noisy channel, represented as a Bayesian network, can now be expressed as:

$$\hat{m}_p = \operatorname{argmax}_{m_p} P(m_p|u_p) * P(u_p|u_i, N) * P(u_i|m_i) * P(m_i) \quad (1.2)$$

Equation (1.2) can be interpreted easily from its corresponding representation in Figure 1.2.

It shows:

- $P(m_p|u_p)$ : the probability of inferring a meaning  $m_p$  (e.g., a building where lectures take place) from a perceived utterance  $u_p$  (e.g. /hall/)
- $P(u_p|u_i, N)$ : bottom-up auditory information, i.e., the probability of the listener hearing a particular utterance  $u_p$  (e.g., /hall/) given that the speaker has uttered an utterance  $u_i$  (e.g., /ball/) in the noisy channel  $N$  (e.g., background noise, signal distortion, etc.)
- $P(u_i|m_i)P(m_i)$ : prior information (e.g., top-down semantic knowledge, information about the speaker, etc.), i.e., the probability of a speaker uttering  $u_i$  with an intended message  $m_i$  with the probability that the intended message is  $m_i$

The channel of transmission can become noisy due to factors like background noise present in a conversation, a poor signal transmission of a telephone call that

## 1. Introduction

distorts the speaker’s speech, hearing loss of a listener, hearing aid or cochlear implant worn by a listener, and so on. To understand speech in such a noisy channel of communication, a listener puts different weights on the distorted bottom-up auditory input  $P(u_p|u_i, N)$  vs her prior information  $P(u_i|m_i)P(m_i)$  (e.g., knowledge about the speaker, world, context information, etc.).

Studies in clean speech comprehension and reading comprehension have demonstrated that listeners and readers use prior knowledge and context information to form semantic predictions about the linguistic events that are yet to be encountered.

Let’s take the following sentence, for example:

- (1) The day was breezy so the boy went outside to fly ...

Most readers would expect the final words to be *a kite* in this sentence (DeLong et al., 2005; cf. Nieuwland et al., 2020). Here, the words up to the final word of the sentence provide a context: A reader can utilize their knowledge about what a *boy* would ideally do *outside* on a *breezy* day. It leads the reader to predict that the sentence continuation is most likely *a kite* and not some improbable words like *a rocket*. Similar results are observed in the auditory domain as well. Listeners use context information from what they have heard, and form predictions about an upcoming word (e.g., Altmann & Kamide, 2007; Ankener, 2019). That is, human language comprehension is predictive in nature such that listeners engage in predictive language processing (Section 2.2.1, Kuperberg & Jaeger, 2016; Pickering & Gambi, 2018). In a noisy channel, listeners’ engagement in predictive processing is influenced by the noise in the signal (Obleser et al., 2007; Sheldon et al., 2008a).

Based on the theoretical accounts of the noisy channel model of communication and the predictive language processing (Christiansen & Chater, 2015; Ferreira & Lowder, 2016; Friston, Parr, et al., 2020; Hale, 2001; Levy, 2008; McClelland & Elman, 1986; Norris et al., 2016; Pickering & Gambi, 2018), this thesis investigates the interaction between top-down predictive and bottom-up auditory processes. We examine how top-down predictive processes facilitate language comprehension in a noisy channel that is created by **acoustic degradation of speech**. We examine

## 1. Introduction

the nature of predictability effects in a noisy channel. We investigate what the optimal level of noise in the signal is, i.e., the optimal level of speech degradation, for the effect of top-down predictive processes to be most efficient or facilitatory for language comprehension. By manipulating different factors of top-down as well as bottom-up processes (e.g., speech rates, attention allocation to different parts of the speech stream), we examine their role in aiding (or interfering) the comprehension of degraded speech. While doing so, we address the following research goals.

### 1.1 Research goals

#### (1) Replication of the predictability effect in a noisy channel

Almost all the disciplines of cognitive science — anthropology, computer science, linguistics, neuroscience, and psychology — are suffering the so-called replication crisis (Aarts et al., 2015; Cockburn et al., 2020; Ebersole et al., 2016; Minocher et al., 2021; Sanderson & Roberts, 2008). The results of an experiment do not hold up consistently when conducted again by another group of researchers. For example, in a multi-lab collaborative study, Nieuwland et al. (2020) did not find the same N400 effect at English articles (a/an) that DeLong et al. (2005) had reported 15 years earlier. The first goal of this thesis is to test if we can replicate the facilitatory effect of semantic predictability in language comprehension in a noisy channel (e.g., Obleser et al., 2007; Sheldon et al., 2008a). Replication of the predictability effect in comprehension of degraded speech will help gather evidence in the favor of this *effect of interest*. It will also provide a reliable foundation to test if (and how) other factors (e.g., speed of information processing) influence and interact with the facilitatory effect of predictability.

#### (2) Nature of prediction

There are at least two schools of thought which argue that prediction is either all-or-nothing or probabilistic in nature (Coltheart, 2004; Kuperberg & Jaeger, 2016; Luke & Christianson, 2016). These debates are generally

## *1. Introduction*

centered around reading comprehension and clean speech comprehension. The discussion about the nature of prediction in a noisy channel like degraded speech is sparse. Specifically, in degraded speech comprehension, only one study has empirically investigated the theoretical postulation that prediction is restricted only for highly predictable sentence endings (StrauSS et al., 2013). Therefore, the second goal of this thesis is to examine the nature of the predictability effect. With carefully designed experiments and materials, this thesis aims to test the distinction between all-or-nothing and probabilistic predictions in degraded speech comprehension.

### **(3) Boundary conditions of predictive language processing**

Several authors claim that predictive processing is the fundamental nature of human cognition, and thus, by definition, also of language processing (A. Clark, 2013; Friston, Parr, et al., 2020; Friston, Sajid, et al., 2020; Kuperberg, 2021; Lupyan & Clark, 2015). At the same time, an increasing number of studies are showing boundary conditions as well as prerequisite conditions for predictive language processing (K. D. Federmeier et al., 2010; Huettig & Guerra, 2019; Huettig & Mani, 2016; Mishra et al., 2012). For example, attention can reverse the effect of predictability in non-speech auditory perception (cf. Kok et al., 2012). In a noisy channel (i.e., degraded speech), attention to a part or parts of a speech stream can modulate or limit the predictability effect as different parts of the speech stream contain different linguistic units; each linguist unit (e.g., each word in a sentence) carries its own meaning that serves the entire message (e.g., the entire sentence). Therefore, the third goal of this thesis is to examine the role of auditory attention that can act as a prerequisite for semantic predictions, or limit the automaticity of predictive processing in degraded speech comprehension.

This thesis aims to test whether attention to different parts of degraded speech stream aids, or hampers facilitatory effects of top-down predictions.

## *1. Introduction*

### **(4) Adaptation to degraded speech**

Despite the difficulty in understanding speech in a noisy channel, listeners rapidly adapt to degraded speech (Rosen et al., 1999). When the properties of speech vary in the dimension of both acoustic-phonetic cues as well as lexical-semantic cues, adaptation can be difficult. The fourth goal of this thesis is to examine if listeners adapt to degraded speech when both degradation level and predictability of speech are varied. We test if an adaptation to the bottom-up perceptual property of speech is influenced by its top-down semantic property.

### **(5) Speed of information processing**

Unlike visual scene which opens in spatial dimension, speech signal flows in temporal dimension. This poses a challenge to the listeners to process information at different speed and timescales; more time is available to process the information in slow speech while less time is available for fast speech (Lerner et al., 2014). Listeners build up the meaning representation as they process the speech to predict upcoming linguistic unit. The fifth goal of this thesis is to examine whether a change in information flow, i.e., speech rate, affects facilitatory effect of predictability. We test if an increase or decrease in speech rate impedes the intelligibility of speech over a noisy channel, and whether it impedes or further aids the predictability effect in the noisy channel.

### **(6) Metric for measurement of language comprehension**

In the study of speech perception and language comprehension, different researchers have used different measurement metrics (Amichetti et al., 2018; Obleser et al., 2007; Peelle, 2013; Sheldon et al., 2008a). The measurement is inconsistent across studies which becomes a problem especially when the effect of context in comprehension is under discussion: cross-study comparison does not give a clear picture of the predictability effect in this case. Therefore, the sixth goal of this thesis is to establish and consistently use a

## *1. Introduction*

sensitive metric for the measurement of language comprehension that takes into account whether participants (in)correctly use the context-evoking word in a sentence.

Studies addressing the research goals outlined above will primarily contribute to elaborating and developing the existing theories of predictive language processing, and furthering the understanding of spoken language comprehension in a noisy channel, especially degraded speech comprehension. Below we present the contributions of the research presented in this thesis.

## **1.2 Research contributions**

The research reported in this thesis examines theoretical questions of predictive language processing and its boundary conditions when spoken language comprehension takes place through a noisy channel. It contributes to the studies of speech perception, language comprehension, predictive coding, language science, audiology, psycholinguistics, psychology, and broadly to cognitive science. In an applied setup, this informs translational/clinical researchers about language comprehension in [cochlear implantees](#).

- **Graded effect of predictability**

We replicate the previous finding of the predictability effect showing that predictability facilitates comprehension of degraded speech at moderate levels of degradation (e.g., [Obleser et al., 2007](#)). Additionally, in the existing debate of all-or-nothing vs graded prediction, our findings indicate that prediction across the noisy channel of degraded speech is graded in nature rather than being restricted to a narrow space of highly predictable sentence endings. Goals 1 and 2 correspond to this research contribution which is brought about by the experiments described in Chapters [5](#) and [6](#).

- **Attention in predictive language processing**

We show that predictive processing is not always automatic and it cannot

## *1. Introduction*

all by itself cannot explain how listeners understand speech in a noisy channel. Although top-down predictions facilitate comprehension, we show that attention to the context is a prerequisite for such contextual facilitation. Only when listeners attend to the context information and form its meaning representation, then the top-down predictions can facilitate comprehension of degraded speech. Without proper attention to the context, predictability effects cannot be observed. Goal 3 corresponds to this research contribution which is brought about by the experiment described in Chapter 5.

- **Absence of perceptual adaptation**

We show that listeners do not adapt to degraded speech when lexical-semantic cues are taken into consideration. This is in contrast with the previous findings of speech perception experiments some of which disregard the trial-by-trial variation in sentence context (e.g., Davis et al., 2005; Erb et al., 2013). When listeners are engaged in a linguistic task in which the lexical cues vary on every trial, their cognitive resources are strained by lexical-semantic cues rather than acoustic-phonetic cues. Thus, they do not show any adaptation effect; every trial is effectively a novel trial for them. Goal 4 corresponds to this research contribution which is brought about by the experiments described mainly in Chapters 6 and 7.

- **Change in information flow and its effect on top-down prediction**

We show that different rates of information flow — increase or decrease in the rate of speech — have different effects on language comprehension. Intelligibility of speech decreases with both increase and decrease of speech rate. But the increase in speech rate is particularly detrimental to comprehension of degraded speech as it increases the difficulty in processing sentences with less predictable endings. This is one of the few studies highlighting the role of speed of flow of information in the contextual facilitation of degraded speech. Goal 5 corresponds to this research contribution which is brought about by the experiment described in Chapter 7.

## *1. Introduction*

- **A metric of language comprehension**

We propose and successfully use a metric of language comprehension that reflects listeners' use of context information. This metric does not merely measure how many words are correctly identified. Rather, it considers the fact that in the study of effect of predictability, how well a context is recognized should also be taken into account. Thus it measures word recognition accuracy in the sentences in which context is correctly recognized. The use of such a metric improves interpretation of contextual facilitation across studies, which lacks in the extant literature. Goal 6 corresponds to this research contribution which is brought about by consistent use of this metric in Chapters 6 and 7.

## **1.3 Overview of the thesis**

The central theme of this thesis is the study of predictive processing in the process of language comprehension across a noisy channel. On the grounds of predictive language processing and the noisy channel model of communication, we investigate how and to what extent listeners use context information while listening to degraded speech. We replicate and extend prior findings, which claim that at the moderate levels of speech degradation, predictability facilitates language comprehension. We further examine the boundary conditions of predictive processing and examine how different rates of information flow moderate predictability effects. We test for the presence of perceptual adaptation and find evidence against the learning effect and adaptation to degraded speech.

**Chapter 2** provides a background on the rest of the chapters. It provides an overview of degraded speech comprehension and predictive language processing. The current status of the debate on these topics is also presented.

**Chapter 3** describes the stimuli used in all the experiments in this thesis. It describes the process of stimuli creation, and speech processing, and also provides an overview of online data collection.

## 1. Introduction

**Chapter 4** describes the statistical tests employed for data analyses. Binomial logistic mixed effects modeling is performed on the data from all the experiments. This chapter provides a background on this statistical procedure, and how it is operated on the statistical software R.

**Chapter 5** presents two experiments that address the first and the third research goal. These experiments are conducted to examine the predictability effect in degraded speech comprehension, and the role of auditory attention in it. Participants in both experiments are presented with the speech degraded at different levels of degradation and sentences of different levels of predictability. Participants in Experiment 1A are asked to type in only the final word of a sentence; this did not bind their attention to the sentence context. While the participants in Experiment 1B are asked to type in the entire sentence that they heard which required them to attend to the sentence context as well. We replicate the previously reported predictability effects in the noisy channel only when participants attended to the entire sentence including the context. We show that at moderate levels of degradation, top-down predictions cannot be generated when insufficient attention is given to context. We discuss the limitation in the existing theories of predictive language processing, which commit to the automaticity of prediction. We show the importance of *attention* in language comprehension. We end this chapter with the note that the measurement of language comprehension can be further refined, and the nature of the predictability effect tested.

**Chapter 6** addresses the first, the second, the fourth, and the sixth research goals. The predictability effect partially replicated in Chapter 5 is further examined in this chapter. We use a refined metric of measurement of language comprehension that takes into consideration whether listeners correctly identified the context. We observe predictability effects at a moderate level of speech degradation, thereby consistently replicating the facilitatory effect of predictability. We find the predictability effects to be graded in nature, and discuss it in the light of existing theories of predictive processing. We also show that regardless of the certainty about the next-trial degradation level, listeners do not adapt to degraded speech

## *1. Introduction*

when its lexical-semantic property varies every trial. At the end of this chapter, we note the intrinsic difficulty of processing degraded speech, and open the question that the predictability effects could be further enhanced (or limited) with more (or less) time available to process the degraded speech.

**Chapter 7** addresses the questions opened in Chapter 6. In two experiments, it addresses the fourth, the fifth, and the sixth research goals. We use the same metric of measurement of language comprehension as Chapter 6, which takes into account listeners' correct identification of the context. Listeners are presented with a moderately degraded speech at which the predictability effect is observed in Chapter 6. In Experiment 7A, the moderately degraded speech is presented at normal and fast speech rates. And in Experiment 7B, the speech rates are normal and slow. For fast speech, however, both intelligibility, as well as the predictability effect, are reduced which is driven by the difficulty in processing words that are less predictable from the context. And although more time is available to process the context of the degraded speech at a slow speech rate, there is no increase in the facilitatory effect of predictability with a reduced speech rate; instead, intelligibility is reduced in slow speech compared to normal speech. This chapter ends with a discussion on the limitations of predictive processing that are driven by the constraints in cognitive resources.

**Chapter 8** summarizes the findings of all the studies. It presents the theoretical implications of this thesis and the future direction it points to. The general limitations of the studies are briefly discussed.

**Chapter 9** presents ethical approval that was obtained to run the experiments on the human subjects. The source that provided funding to conduct the research presented in this thesis is disclosed.

## **1.4 Dissimilation of research findings**

Some of the findings reported in this thesis are presented and published, in part, elsewhere as means of dissemination of scientific findings. The list of presentations

## 1. Introduction

and publications that report on parts of the research described in this thesis is outlined below.

- Bhandari, P., Demberg, V., & Kray, J. (2022). The effect of speech rate on contextual facilitation of degraded speech comprehension. *Architectures and Mechanisms for Language Processing*, 2022-09-07–2022-09-09.
- Bhandari, P., Demberg, V., & Kray, J. (2022). Predictability effects in degraded speech comprehension are reduced as function of attention. *Architectures and Mechanisms for Language Processing*, 2022-09-07–2022-09-09.
- Bhandari, P., Demberg, V., & Kray, J. (*under review*) Speaking fast and slow: How speech rate affects contextual facilitation in degraded speech comprehension.
- Bhandari, P., Demberg, V., & Kray, J. (2022). Predictability effects in degraded speech comprehension are reduced as a function of attention. *Language and Cognition*, 1-18. doi:[10.1017/langcog.2022.16](https://doi.org/10.1017/langcog.2022.16)
- Bhandari, P., Demberg, V., & Kray, J. (2022). The effect of speech rate in comprehension of degraded speech. *International Max Planck Research School (IMPRS) Conference*, 2022-06-01–2022-06-03.
- Bhandari, P., Demberg, V., & Kray, J. (2022). Predictability effects are reduced as a function of attention. *Annual Convention of American Psychological Association*, 2022-05-25–2022-05-28.
- Bhandari, P., Demberg, V., & Kray, J. (2021). Semantic predictability facilitates comprehension of degraded speech in a graded manner. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12:714485. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.714485
- Bhandari, P., Demberg, V., & Kray, J. (2021). Predictability facilitates comprehension but not adaptation to degraded speech in a graded manner. *Conference of the Society for the Neurobiology of Language*, 2021-10-05–2021-10-08.

## *1. Introduction*

- Bhandari, P., Demberg, V., & Kray, J. (2021). Predictability facilitates comprehension of degraded speech in a graded manner. *Annual Meeting of Cognitive Neuroscience Society*, 2021-03-13–2021-03-16.

# 2

## Background

In the previous chapter, we outlined the theoretical background and the research goals of the studies in this dissertation. We stated that the central theme of this thesis is to investigate the interaction between top-down predictive processes and bottom-up auditory processes in language comprehension. Grounding on the noisy channel model of communication and predictive language processing, the studies in this thesis manipulate the auditory processes  $P(u_p|u_i, N)$ , and prior information  $P(u_i, m_i)$  in the form of semantic context available in a sentence. In this chapter, we provide background on the noisy channel that was created and used to introduce variations in bottom-up processing in the studies presented in this thesis. We also elaborate on the predictive language processing in the noisy channel, and the evidence of its limits and nature. Understanding these fundamental concepts of top-down and bottom-up processes is essential for the chapters that follow; these concepts are briefly reiterated in the following chapters wherever relevant. Additionally, in this chapter we outline the gaps in previous research that this thesis fills in.

## *2. Background*

### **2.1 Speech distortion and degradation**

Most of the existing frameworks of spoken language comprehension are inspired from the experiments that are conducted with clean speech, the condition of “artificial normalcy” (Matty et al., 2012). However, spoken language communication generally takes place outside the artificial normalcy, alongside different sources of noise and disruption. Probabilistic models of language comprehension, like the noisy channel model of communication (Gibson et al., 2013, 2019; Levy, 2008; C. E. Shannon, 1948) in Figures 1.1 and 1.2] shows that the speech signal uttered by the speaker gets disrupted and distorted due to the noise ( $u_i \rightarrow u_p \leftarrow N$ ) . Distortion can occur at these three points or sources: encoding, transmission, and decoding (Matty et al., 2012). Speech can be distorted while encoding the utterance  $u_i$  due to the variability in speakers’ production, like accented speech or slow and fast speech. Distortion can arise while decoding the signal  $u_p$  due to the listener-related factors, like hearing loss or auditory processing disorder. It can also be a result of an external noise that appears during the transmission, like ambient noise, or poor medium of transmission (e.g., distortion in the telephone line). These different sources of distortion make a listening condition adverse by affecting the time and frequency related properties/cues of the speech signal, i.e., temporal envelope cues and spectral details of speech respectively. The temporal envelope cues are the slow variations in the amplitude of the speech signal over time (Moon et al., 2014; Moon & Hong, 2014) while the spectral details are the frequency specific information about the speech. The temporal envelope cues reflect the prosodic information of the speech, and are used in the lexical-semantic and syntactic processing (Greenberg, 1996; Schneider & Pichora-Fuller, 2001; Sheldon et al., 2008b). The spectral details provide information about the sound production reflecting the resonant properties of the vocal tract, frequency range of the speech signal, energy distribution across frequency bands, etc. (Roberts et al., 2011; Shannon et al., 1995; Shannon et al., 2004).

## *2. Background*

In an experimental setup, a noisy channel can be created artificially by digital signal processing (see Section 3.1.2) to investigate the response of the speech perception system to the distorted speech and to study language comprehension in an adverse listening condition. For example, expansion or compression of speech signal acts upon the temporal property of the speech and makes it slow or fast (i.e., change its speed), and an optimal level of speech expansion/compression does not distort the spectral property of speech (see Section 3.1.2). In addition to speech compression and expansion in Chapter 7, throughout the studies in this thesis, we implement noise vocoding to manipulate the spectral property of speech and create a noisy channel of communication.

Noise vocoding removes the spectral details of the speech signal in a controlled manner only leaving intact its temporal and periodicity cues (see Section 3.1.2). This method of speech degradation was initially developed as a means to reduce the information in speech signal to be transmitted through the telephone line (Clendeninn, 1940; Dudley, 1939). Shannon and colleagues later modified and used this technique as an analogue to cochlear implant such that number of channels used in a cochlear implant are similar to the number of noise vocoding channels in terms of their speech output and intelligibility (Loizou et al., 1999; Shannon et al., 1995; Shannon et al., 2004; cf. Orena & Colby, 2021). Therefore, in addition to being a method of speech distortion to parametrically vary and control the quality of speech signal in a graded manner, noise vocoding is also a method of distortion that is used to understand the speech perception and language comprehension in cochlear implantees (e.g., Patro & Mendel, 2020; Shannon et al., 2004; M. Winn, 2016)

One of the main factors that determines the intelligibility of degraded speech is the number of noise vocoding channels.<sup>1</sup> The higher the number of noise vocoding channels, the more is the frequency specific information available in the degraded speech, consequently, higher is the intelligibility compared to the speech that is degraded with lesser number of noise vocoding channels. For example, listeners

---

<sup>1</sup>Throughout this thesis, speech distortion by noise vocoding is referred to as speech degradation, or spectral degradation of speech.

## *2. Background*

are shown to rate 8 channels noise vocoded speech to be more intelligible and less effortful compared to 2 channels noise vocoded speech (e.g., [Obleser & Kotz, 2011](#); [Sohoglu et al., 2012](#)). In our studies, we create noisy channel of different levels of degradation and intelligibility by noise vocoding the speech signal through 1, 4, 6 and 8 channels. The details of the artificial distortions are described in Chapter 3.

## **2.2 Prediction and comprehension of degraded speech**

In addition to the quality of speech signal, listeners rely also on the context information and form top-down predictions to understand speech in adverse listening condition. Below, we first review the role of predictions in language comprehension in general, then we discuss the role of top-down predictive processes in comprehension of degraded speech in particular.

### **2.2.1 Predictive language processing**

Research from various domains of cognitive (neuro)science, like emotion, vision, odor, and proprioception (the sensation of one's body position and movement, [Tuthill & Azim, 2018](#)), has shown that perception and cognition can be described under the framework of predictive processing; they primarily operate by predicting upcoming events ([A. Clark, 2013](#); [Marques et al., 2018](#); [Seth, 2013](#); [Stadler et al., 2012](#); cf. [Bowers & Davis, 2012](#); [Jones & Love, 2011](#); [Pierce & Ollason, 1987](#)). Despite a long-standing skepticism and doubt about the usefulness of prediction in language ([Forster, 1981](#); [Jackendoff, 2002](#); [Van Petten & Luka, 2012](#)), human language comprehension too has been claimed to be predictive in nature from as early as mid-twentieth century (e.g., [McCullough, 1958](#); [Miller et al., 1951](#); [Morton, 1964](#)) which in recent days has received an overwhelming support from computational linguistics, psycholinguistics and cognitive neuroscience of language (e.g., [DeLong et al., 2005](#); [Demberg et al., 2013](#); [Heyselaar et al., 2021](#); [Lupyan & Clark, 2015](#); [Pickering & Gambi, 2018](#)). Empirical evidence from a number of

## 2. Background

studies suggests that readers and listeners predict upcoming words in a sentence when the words are predictable from the preceding context (Kuperberg & Jaeger, 2016; Nieuwland, 2019; for reviews, Staub, 2015). For instance, predictable words are skipped and read faster compared to the words that are less predictable from the context (Ehrlich & Rayner, 1981; Frisson et al., 2005; Staub, 2011). Applying visual world paradigm, studies have demonstrated that individuals show anticipatory eye movements towards a picture of an object (e.g., *cake*) that is predictable from the preceding sentence context (e.g., *The boy will eat a...*) even before hearing the final target word (Altmann & Kamide, 1999; Ankener et al., 2018; Kamide et al., 2003). Similar results have been observed in a virtual world set-up with naturalistic scenes (e.g., Heyselaar et al., 2021). The sentence-final word in a highly constraining sentence (e.g., “*She dribbles a ball.*”) elicits a smaller N400 amplitude<sup>2</sup> than a less constraining sentence (e.g., “*She buys a ball.*”, K. Federmeier et al., 2007; Kutas & Hillyard, 1984). Similarly, event-related words (e.g., “*luggage*”) elicited reduced N400 compared to event-unrelated words (e.g., “*vegetables*”) which were not predictable from the context (e.g., in an event of “*travel*”, Metusalem et al., 2012). In sum, as the sentence context builds up, listeners make predictions about upcoming words in the sentence, and these in turn facilitate language comprehension. That is, individuals use the context available to them to generate predictions which aids understanding written and spoken language.

### But, what is prediction?

The history of *prediction* in language science is rocky (Husband & Bovolenta, 2020). People have been skeptical that language processing is predictive in nature. Different people mean different things whey they use the word prediction. As Kuperberg & Jaeger (2016) put it, *prediction* has become a loaded term; it is used alogside other similar terms like *integration* (K. D. Federmeier, 2007),

---

<sup>2</sup>N400 is a negative-going EEG component that peaks around 400 ms post-stimulus, and it is considered as a neural marker of context-based semantic unexpectedness (Kutas & Federmeier, 2011).

## 2. Background

*anticipation, expectation, (Van Petten & Luka, 2012) preparedness (Ferreira & Chantavarin, 2018), etc.*

In this thesis, we use the word prediction in the following minimal sense. As a sentence unfolds, listeners encounter the context information in the sentence and they form its meaning representation, i.e., an internal representation of the context. Before they hear the next word, i.e., before they encounter new bottom-up information, they generate an expectation<sup>3</sup> about the new word based on the meaning representation of the context. They could form prediction about only the semantic feature of the next word or they could predict the exact word (meaning prediction vs word form prediction).

In reading studies and clean speech comprehension, there are opposing views, whether comprehenders predictively pre-activate the upcoming linguistic unit solely based on the top-down information (i.e., predictive *pre-activation*) or whether they wait for the bottom-up information to activate the representation (e.g., phonological, or semantic representation) of the new information and its neighbors<sup>4</sup>, then use the top-down information to select the best representation. To clarify it further, let's take the example sentence (1) presented in Chapter 1 on page 4: *The day was breezy so the boy went outside to fly a\_\_\_\_\_*. Upon listening this context, the listeners can form a high degree of belief that the next word will be ‘kite’. Before even hearing it, listeners preactivate the representation of “kite” in their mental lexicon. Alternatively, they could wait until they hear the auditory input “kite”, which activates “kite” and its phonological (and/or semantic) neighbors in the mental lexicon, then use the top-down information to select the most likely word that completes the sentence. Either way, top-down processes facilitate comprehension.

While listening in an adverse listening condition, it is unlikely that a listener follows the latter strategy of waiting for the bottom-up input to activate the repre-

---

<sup>3</sup>Henceforth, we use the word expectation and prediction interchangeably.

<sup>4</sup>The Neighborhood Activation Model of Luce & Pisoni (1998) proposes that an auditory input of a word activates its neighborhood words, which can be similar acoustically. The neighborhood density is supposed to be dependent on the word frequency as well.

## 2. Background

sentations and then select the most likely one based on the top-down information (Kuperberg & Jaeger, 2016). When speech is distorted, it is difficult to form the context representation in the first place (cf. cue based retrieval, Kaufeld, 2021; A. E. Martin, 2016). Once a listener has formed a meaning representation of the context, she cannot afford to again wait for the bottom-up input to activate phonological and/or semantic representations of upcoming words; the uncertainty about the bottom-up information is persistent (see the phoneme restoration effect (Warren, 1970), the McGurk effect (McGurk & MacDonald, 1976), and the Ganong effect (Ganong, 1980) in speech perception). Thus, once the listener has formed a representation of the context, she uses this top-down information to predictively preactivate what the upcoming word can be. Such predictive preactivation can take different forms: it can be probabilistic (graded) or deterministic (all-or-nothing) prediction. This differences in the nature of prediction is discussed below.

### 2.2.2 Facilitatory effect of predictability

We have discussed above that individuals make predictions about not-yet-encountered linguistic units based on available context information as a sentence unfolds: Top-down predictive and bottom-up perceptual processes interact dynamically in language comprehension. When the bottom-up perceptual input is less reliable, for example, in an adverse listening condition, it has been shown that listeners rely more on top-down processes by narrowing down the predictions to smaller sets of semantic categories or words (Corps & Rabagliati, 2020; Strauß et al., 2013). Obleser and colleagues (Obleser et al., 2007; Obleser & Kotz, 2010), for instance, used sentences of two levels of semantic predictability (high and low) and systematically degraded speech signal by passing it through various numbers of noise vocoding channels ranging from 1 to 32 in a series of behavioral and neuroimaging studies (see also Hunter & Pisoni, 2018). They found that semantic predictability facilitated language comprehension only at moderate levels of speech degradation. That is, participants relied more on sentence context when the speech signal was degraded though *intelligible enough*, than when it was not degraded, or when it

## *2. Background*

was highly degraded. At such moderate levels of speech degradation, accuracy of word recognition was found to be higher for words in high predictability sentences than the words in low predictability sentences (Obleser & Kotz, 2010). For the extremes, i.e., when the speech signal was highly degraded (making the speech almost completely unintelligible) or when it was the least degraded (rendering the speech intelligible), the word recognition accuracy was similar across both levels of sentence predictability, meaning that predictability did not facilitate language comprehension. Sheldon et al. (2008b) estimated that for both younger and older adults, the number of noise vocoding channels required to achieve 50% accuracy varied as a function of sentence context. To achieve the same level of accuracy as highly constraining sentences, a higher number of channels (i.e., more bottom-up information) was required in less constraining sentences. They also concluded that when the speech is degraded, word recognition is facilitated by predictability and sentence context. Taken together, these studies conclude that at moderate levels of degradation, participants rely more on the top-down predictions generated by a sentence context and less on the bottom-up perceptual processing of unclear, less reliable, and degraded speech signal (Obleser, 2014). However, these studies are agnostic about the nature of prediction, i.e., if it is probabilistic or deterministic.

### **Nature of prediction**

A debate in the literature of predictive language processing pertains to this question: Is prediction probabilistic, or is it an all-or-nothing phenomenon? For instance, garden path phenomenon was explained as a parser's irreversible prediction about the sentence structure which if fails (or, if it turns out to be incorrect), then the parser reanalyzes the sentence, and reformulates another prediction (e.g., Ferreira & Clifton Jr, 1986; see also Demberg et al., 2013; Slattery et al., 2013). In recent days, the support for the probabilistic nature of prediction comes, for example, from ERP studies that show an inverse and graded relationship between the magnitude of

## 2. Background

N400 effect evoked by a word and its predictability measured by cloze probability<sup>5</sup> (e.g., DeLong et al., 2005; K. D. Federmeier et al., 2007), or *surprisal*<sup>6</sup> (Frank et al., 2015; cf. Brothers et al., 2015).

These discussions come from reading studies and spoken language comprehension in clear speech. Although a few frameworks of language processing speculate that language comprehension in adverse listening condition can be predictive (e.g., Lowder & Ferreira, 2016; Ryskin et al., 2018), so far, only StrauSS et al. (2013) have investigated the nature of prediction in degraded speech comprehension. They proposed an “expectancy searchlight model” which suggests that listeners form *narrowed expectations* from a restricted semantic space only when the sentence endings are highly predictable. They rule out the graded nature of predictability. However, their approach to predictability was confounded by verb-noun association (discussed in Chapter 6). In contrast to their study, we systematically vary the predictability of target word, and examine the graded vs. probabilistic nature of prediction in degraded speech comprehension. We argue that the facilitatory effect of predictability is graded in nature; it is not an all-or-nothing phenomenon focused solely on highly predictable sentence endings.

### 2.2.3 Limits of predictive language processing

It is important to note and acknowledge that the ubiquity and universality of predictive language processing has not gone unquestioned (Huettig & Mani, 2016). Apart from the debate on the nature of prediction, which we will come to later in this chapter, there is compelling evidence that questions the necessity of prediction in language comprehension. For example, Mishra et al. (2012) showed that literacy is a key factor that limits listeners’ prediction about upcoming word. In a visual world paradigm study, they found that individuals with lower literacy

---

<sup>5</sup>Cloze probability of a word is the proportion of participants who provide that word as the next word of a sentence, in an offline norming task, given the preceding words of the sentence (Staub et al., 2015; Taylor, 1953). Its value ranges from 0 to 1.

<sup>6</sup>Surprisal is a measure of the change in probability mass (or simply put, the change in expectation) as predictions are proven wrong with an encounter of new words in a sentence, discourse, etc. (Hale, 2001; Smith & Levy, 2008).

## 2. Background

showed less anticipatory eye movements compared to the individuals with higher literacy. They bolstered their finding in a neuroimaging study claiming that learning to read fundamentally changes the neural circuitry (Hervais-Adelman et al., 2019). It is therefore plausible that such structural change in the brain is manifested in linguistic behavior. Similarly, Scholman et al. (2020) demonstrated that literacy is predictive of readers' sensitivity to discourse signals available in the context for the prediction of upcoming content. Cognitive aging has also been shown to be a limiting factor in generating predictions. Smaller N400 amplitude and latency in older adults compared to younger adults have been shown as an evidence of inability of older adults to engage in predictive language processing (K. Federmeier et al., 2002). Furthermore, among older adults, those with lower working memory scores are shown to be further disadvantaged when it comes to the use of context information (K. D. Federmeier et al., 2010). Another line of argument that critiques the predictive processing comes from the observations of Huettig & Guerra (2019). They analyzed participants' anticipatory eye movements in the visual world paradigm and showed that listeners predict the target word only in an *artificial* set-up of long preview time coupled with slow speech (cf. Fernandez et al., 2020; Heyselaar et al., 2021).

In this thesis, we study additional top-down and bottom-up processes that can interact with, and potentially limit the facilitatory effect of predictability. For example, current theories of predictive processing are poor in explaining the role of *attention* in semantic prediction (e.g., Christiansen & Chater, 2015; Ferreira & Lowder, 2016; Friston, Sajid, et al., 2020; Kuperberg & Jaeger, 2016; Pickering & Gambi, 2018). For example, in their prediction-by-production account, Pickering & Gambi (2018) emphasize that listeners use their speech production mechanism in speech perception and comprehension, to predict what a speaker is going to say next. Their framework attempts to paint a big picture of prediction — using the motor system — but it does not consider how a listener's strategy of attending to only a part of speech stream in adverse listening condition influences linguistic predictions. We argue that attention to context information is critical in forming

## *2. Background*

semantic predictions, especially in degraded speech comprehension (cf. Kok et al., 2012). By manipulating listeners' attention allocation to parts of speech stream and information content in the sentences, we show that attention to context information is a pre-requisite for the listeners to generate predictions. We also investigate the effect of bottom-up processes, like speech rate on top down processes (i.e., predictability effect in degraded speech comprehension). The extant findings on the effects of speech rate on the facilitatory effect of predictability have been mixed both in clear and degraded speech comprehension (e.g., Aydelott & Bates, 2004; Goy et al., 2013; Iwasaki et al., 2002; M. B. Winn & Teece, 2021). We demonstrate that there is a scope for current theories of predictive language processing to incorporate the instances of varying predictability effects at fast and slow speech rate, as well as the effects of attention in degraded speech comprehension.

### **2.3 Adaptation to degraded speech**

Listeners quickly adapt to novel speech with artificial acoustic distortions (Dupoux & Green, 1997). With a repeated exposure to distorted speech, listeners' comprehension improves over time (Guediche et al., 2014; for reviews, see Samuel & Kraljic, 2009). When the noise condition, like level of speech degradation is constant throughout the experiment, listeners adapt to it and the performance (e.g., word recognition) improves with as little as 20 minutes of exposure (Rosen et al., 1999). For example, Davis et al. (2005)Experiment 1 presented listeners with 6 channels noise vocoded speech and found an increase in the proportion of correctly reported words over the course of experiment. Similarly, Erb et al. (2013) presented participants with 4 channels noise vocoded speech and reached a similar conclusion. In these experiments, only one speech degradation level (6 or 4 channels noise vocoded speech) was presented in one block. There was no uncertainty about the next-trial speech degradation from the participants' perspective. Additionally, semantic feature (i.e., target word predictability) was not varied. When multiple types or levels of degraded speech signals are presented in a (pseudo-)randomized order within a block, then a listener is uncertain about the signal quality of any

## *2. Background*

upcoming trial. This can influence perceptual adaptation such that it might be totally absent with the change in the characteristics of auditory signal throughout an experiment (Mattys et al., 2012). In addition, trial-by-trial variability in the characteristics of distorted speech can impair word recognition (Sommers et al., 1994; see also Dahan & Magnuson, 2006). Only a limited number of studies has looked at how the (un)certainty about next-trial speech quality, and semantic feature influence adaptation. For example, in a word-recognition task, Vaden et al. (2013) presented words at +3dB SNR and +10dB SNR in a pseudo-random order; the goal was to minimize the certainty about the noise level within the block. They proposed that an adaptive control system might be involved to optimize the task performance when the listeners are uncertain about an upcoming trial (Eckert et al., 2016; Vaden Jr et al., 2016; Vaden et al., 2015). However, we cannot make a firm conclusion about perceptual adaptation *per se* from their studies as they do not report the change in performance over the course of experiment. Similarly, Obleser and colleagues (Hartwigsen et al., 2015; Obleser et al., 2007; Obleser & Kotz, 2010) also presented listeners with noise vocoded sentences (ranging from 2 to 32 channels noise vocoding) in a pseudo-randomized order but did not report the presence or absence of perceptual adaptation. On the one hand, repeated exposure is shown to lead to perceptual adaptation to degraded speech. On the other hand, uncertainty about the speech quality is speculated to impair word recognition. We argue that a trial-by-trial variation in higher level semantic feature of speech hinders listeners' perceptual system to retune itself to adapt to the lower level auditory features of the degraded speech (cf. Nahum et al., 2008). In contrast to prior studies, we show that listeners do not adapt to degraded speech despite a repeated exposure to the same degraded speech as long as its semantic predictability is uncertain.

## **2.4 Summary**

In this chapter, we provided an overview of the concepts that will be repeated in the following chapters. We introduced the concept of speech distortion and degradation. Digital signal processing methods used in this process will be discussed in Chapter

## *2. Background*

3 (Section 3.1.2). Importantly, we provided an overview of how predictive language processing aids language comprehension, as well as its limitations. We discussed perceptual adaptation to degraded speech, and the role of uncertainty about next-trial in adaptation. At each step, we presented the motivation behind the studies in this thesis, and the gaps in the literature these studies fill in. In the next chapter, we will discuss the methods that are common in all the experiments (Chapters 5, 6, and 7) in developing materials and collecting data.

# 3

## General methods

In this chapter we provide an overview of the experimental materials that are used in the experiments described in Chapters 5, 6, and 7. Sentences used as experimental material were common to all the experiments, and the signal processing method was also common. Here, we also present an overview of online data collection.


### 3.1 Experimental materials

As a part of a study in the research project A4 of SFB1102, sentences of different levels of predictability were created. Digital recordings of the sentences were degraded by noise vocoding and used in all experiments reported in this thesis. Speech was also distorted by its compression and expansion. Below we briefly describe how the sentences of different levels of predictability were obtained, and what methodology was used to create distorted versions of the speech.

#### 3.1.1 Stimulus sentences

With an aim to create sentences of three levels of predictability (low, medium, and high), a triplet of 120 sentences — total of 360 sentences — were created from 120 nouns. Out of 120 nouns, 6 were repeated. All sentences were in present tense consisting of pronoun, verb, determiner, and object. These sentences were in

### 3. Methods



**Figure 3.1:** Distribution of cloze probability ratings of target words in low, medium and high predictability sentences

Subject-Verb-Object form (e.g., *Er fängt den Ball*. EN: He catches the ball.). Some of these sentences were taken from Obleser & Kotz (2010). For each sentence, cloze probability ratings were collected from a group of young adults ( $n = 60$ ; age range = 18 – 30 years). Mean cloze probabilities of low, medium, and high probability sentences are shown in Table 3.1 and the distribution of cloze probability across low, medium, and high predictability sentences is shown in Figure 3.1. The cloze probabilities of the target words in each sentence is shown in Appendix A.

**Table 3.1:** Cloze probabilities of high, medium and low predictability sentences

Predictability	Cloze probability		
		Mean $\pm$ SD	Range
Low	$0.022 \pm 0.027$	0.00 0.09	
Medium	$0.274 \pm 0.134$	0.1 0.55	
High	$0.752 \pm 0.123$	0.56 1.00	

#### 3.1.2 Speech processing

All 360 sentence were spoken by a female native speaker of German at a normal rate. The recordings were digitized at 44.1kHz with 32-bit linear encoding. Spoken sentences used in Chapter 5, 6, 7, and 8 were degraded by noise vocoding. In addition

### 3. Methods

to degradation by noise vocoding, the sentences were distorted by compression and expansion of speech signal in Chapter 7.


#### Noise-vocoding

Noise vocoding is used to parametrically vary and control the quality of speech signal in a graded manner. It distorts a speech signal by dividing it into specific frequency bands corresponding to the number of vocoder channels. The frequency bands are analogous to the electrodes of cochlear implant (Loizou et al., 1999; Shannon et al., 1995; Shannon et al., 2004). The amplitude envelope, i.e., the fluctuations of amplitude, within each frequency band is extracted and the spectral information within it is replaced by noise. This makes the vocoded speech difficult to understand although temporal characteristics and periodicity of perceptual cues are preserved (Rosen et al., 1999).

The spectral degradation conditions of 1, 4, 6, and 8 channels were achieved for each of the 360 recorded sentences using a customized script originally written by Darwin (2005) in Praat software (Boersma, 2001). The speech signal was divided into 1, 4, 6, and 8 frequency bands between 70 and 9,000Hz. The boundary frequencies were approximately logarithmically spaced following cochlear-frequency position functions (Erb, 2014; Greenwood, 1990; Rosen et al., 1999). The amplitude envelope of each band was extracted and applied to band-pass filtered white noise in the same frequency ranges; the upper and lower bounds for band extraction are specified in Table 3.2. Each of the modulated noise was then combined to produce degraded speech. Scaling was performed to equate the root-mean-square value of the original undistorted speech and the final degraded speech. This resulted into four levels of degradation: 1, 4, 6, and 8 channels noise vocoded speech.

Spectrograms of clear speech and noise-vocoded speech for the sentence *Er löest die Aufgabe* are shown in Figure 3.2. It shows that with a decrease in the number of noise vocoding channels, the information in speech signal reduces and becomes noise-like.

### 3. Methods



**Figure 3.2:** Spectrograms of clear speech, and degraded speech arranged with a decreasing number of noise vocoding channels (8, 6, 4 and 1 band) for the sentence 'Er löest die Aufgabe.'

### 3. Methods

**Table 3.2:** Boundary frequencies (in Hz) for 1, 4, 6 and 8 channels noise-vocoding conditions

Number of channels	Boundary frequencies	9000	1304	3504	9000	4813	9000	3504	5634	9000
1	70									
4	70	423								
6	70	268	633	1304	2539					
8	70	207	423	764	1304	2156				


The main motivation to degrade speech signal by noise-vocoding is two fold: On the practical side, noise-vocoding simulates the frequency selectivity with cochlear implant or sensory-neural hearing loss. This provides an insight to the speech perception and language comprehension in special population (older adults with hearing loss, patients with cochlear implants). On the experimental side, noise-vocoding preserves the temporal periodicity cues of the speech; we can investigate the importance of specific suprasegmental cues in speech perception. Noise-vocoding reduces the fine structure cues that carry the pitch-related suprasegmental information, and allows the study of temporal amplitude envelope cues, which carry the suprasegmental information involved in lexical processing; noise-vocoding preserves these cues. Most importantly, it allows a fine-grained control over speech intelligibility by varying the number of vocoder channels.

### Speech compression and expansion

Temporal compression and expansion is used as a method to simulate fast and slow speech, to study the effect of acoustic degradation (which is the change in speech rate) and increase or decrease in information flow. As early as the mid-twentieth century, investigators have reported that intelligibility does not drop significantly when speech is speeded up to 2 times the normal speech rate (e.g., Garvey, 1953). Speech rate was increased by chopping physical tapes. Digital algorithms like pitch-synchronous overlap-add technique (PSOLA, Charpentier & Stella, 1986; Moulines & Charpentier, 1990) developed in the 1980s and later (e.g., Verhelst & Roelands, 1993) now allow us to speed up and slow down the speech rate in a controlled fashion. In Chapter 7, we used Praat software that utilizes uniform

### 3. Methods

time-compression algorithm (PSOLA) to create slow and fast speech with the compression factor of 1.35 and 0.65 respectively. Schematic representation of waveforms of different speech rates — normal, slow and fast — is shown in Figure 3.3.



**Figure 3.3:** Schematic representation of waveforms of fast, normal, and slow speech rates for the sentence ‘Er löest die Aufgabe’ with the duration of each speech rates in second. Note the circled portion of the waveform, which exemplifies that PSOLA eliminates and duplicates the parts of the original waveform to create fast and slow speech respectively.

PSOLA creates fast or slow speech in three steps: analysis, modification, and synthesis (Charpentier & Stella, 1986; Taleb, 2020). In the analysis step, it first sets pitch marks in an audio file, then creates segments of it (i.e., it segments the signal into successive analysis windows centered around those pitch marks). Then in the modification step, depending on the time-compression/expansion factor, it deletes (or duplicates) those segments and sets a new set of pitch marks. Finally, in the synthesis step, it adds the new segments back to the audio file (i.e., it rearranges the analysis window) and creates the fast or slow speech as required. The distortion of phonemic properties of speech signals are minimal when accelerating and slowing

### *3. Methods*

down within the range of factor 2 or below ([Moulines & Charpentier, 1990](#); cf. [Longster, 2003](#)).

We create fast and slow versions of 120 high and 120 low predictability sentences. These 480 recordings are then passed through 4 channels noise vocoding to use as experimental materials. As discussed [earlier](#), the main aim of the manipulation of this bottom-up process is to investigate the effect of change in the rate of information flow (i.e., change in the speech rate), on the top-down processes of contextual facilitation in degraded speech comprehension.

## **3.2 Data collection on the web**

Traditionally, behavioral experiments with human participants are conducted in a laboratory setup. In recent years, there has been a surge of experiments that are conducted on the web ([Reips, 2021](#)). The first generation of online experiments to study human cognition began in the mid 1990s (for reviews, [Musch & Reips, 2000](#)) with the advent of internet ([Berners-Lee et al., 1992](#)). [Welch & Krantz \(1996\)](#) was the first online experiment that was conducted in 1995 as a part of tutorials in auditory perception ([Musch & Reips, 2000](#)). In their survey of researchers, [Musch & Reips \(2000\)](#) discovered that until 2000, there were already at least 2 psycholinguistics experiments conducted online, one of which studied the effect of context in shallow vs. deep encoding of words. Despite the difficulty in conducting online experiments, and skepticism of journals towards publishing results of online experiments, [Musch & Reips \(2000\)](#) expressed optimism:

At the moment, the number of Web experiments is still small, but a rapid growth can be predicted on the basis of the present results. We would not be surprised if within the next few years, a fair proportion of psychological experiments will be conducted on the Web. (p. 85)

And by 2021, there has been a significant growth in online experiments as technical and technological barriers are greatly reduced. There are many software and online platforms which psychologists and psycholinguists can use with minimal knowledge of computer programming to design, host and run their experiments,

### *3. Methods*

and retrieve these data in a fairly structured format (A. L. Anwyl-Irvine et al., 2020; Peirce et al., 2019; Prolific, 2014; see also, A. Anwyl-Irvine et al., 2021; Eyal et al., 2021). Online experiments have demonstrated advantages over laboratory experiments (Gadiraju et al., 2017; Johnson et al., 2021). For example, a large pool of participants is available online which is usually not possible in laboratory experiments. Similarly, the participants in online experiments are more diverse than those in laboratory experiments. Taking these advantages into consideration, psychologists and psycholinguists have conducted online experiments for almost 3 decades now. Scientists who only conducted laboratory experiments, or who conducted online experiments only occasionally were forced to conduct their experiments almost exclusively on the web due to the restrictions imposed by covid-19 lockdown (Gagné & Franzen, 2021; Reips, 2021). Since Welch & Krantz (1996)'s auditory perception experiment, a number of experiments have been conducted online in auditory domain (Leensen & Dreschler, 2013; Seow & Hauser, 2022; van Os et al., 2021; Woods et al., 2017) replicating laboratory findings (e.g., Cooke & Garcia Lecumberri, 2021). The experiments reported in this thesis were also conducted online.

Initially, our experiments were designed to be conducted both in laboratory and online. As the laboratory was shut down due to covid-19 pandemic-related lockdown (M. Schmitt, personal communication, March 16, 2020), we moved the laboratory experiments to the online platform. We recruited participants online via Prolific Academic (Prolific, 2014). We used Prolific's filters to recruit only native speakers of German residing in Germany who reported to not have had any hearing loss, speech-language disorder, and cognitive impairment. Participants were redirected to the experiments that were designed and hosted in Lingoturk (Pusse et al., 2016). Lingoturk is a local hosting platform that manages crowdsourcing experiments — it runs the experiments and stores the data. We report the details of each experiment in Chapters 5, 6, and 7.

# 4

## General statistical approach

### 4.1 Linear mixed effects models

Linear mixed effects model (LME), as the name suggests, is a linear regression model that consists of both fixed effects and random effects. It allows to model the underlying structure of the data which includes the standard fixed effects like the levels of speech degradation and the levels of target word predictability as well as random effects like items and participants. These random effects are assumed to be random samples drawn from the general population. In this thesis, the dependent variable (or an *outcome*, or a *response* variable) is binary (correct vs incorrect response). So, we use binomial logistic mixed effects models with crossed random effects to model the data (Baayen et al., 2008).

A linear mixed effects model can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} y = & \alpha + u_\alpha + w_\alpha + (\beta_1 + u_{\beta_1} + w_{\beta_1}) \cdot x_1 + \\ & (\beta_2 + u_{\beta_2} + w_{\beta_2}) \cdot x_2 + \dots + \\ & (\beta_n + u_{\beta_n} + w_{\beta_n}) \cdot x_n \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where,

#### 4. Statistics

- $y$  is the dependent variable, like participant's response (correct vs. incorrect)
- $\alpha$  is the Intercept.
- Fixed effects:  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_n$  are the coefficients (or effects) of  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ .
- $\mathbf{u} = \langle u_\alpha, u_{\beta_1}, u_{\beta_2}, \dots, u_{\beta_n} \rangle$  : Varying intercept and slopes for random effect term like, *subject*.
- $\mathbf{w} = \langle w_\alpha, w_{\beta_1}, w_{\beta_2}, \dots, w_{\beta_n} \rangle$  : Varying intercept and slopes for random effect term like, *item*.

In contrast to linear regression models, mixed effects models allow to simultaneously account for the effects of two random variables, like item and participants. The variance in the categorical dependent variable is also preserved which would otherwise be eliminated by averaging in linear regression models. We discuss these issues and the motivation to use mixed effects model in this thesis in more detail below in this chapter.

##### 4.1.1 Linear regression and its limitations

In linear regression, a dependent variable (or an *outcome*) is modeled as a function of one or more independent predictor variables (or *factors*, or *explanatory* variables). That is, an outcome  $y$  is modeled as a function of explanatory variables  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \dots, x_n$ , and an error term  $\varepsilon$ .

$$y = \alpha + \beta_1 \cdot x_1 + \beta_2 \cdot x_2 + \dots + \beta_n \cdot x_n + \varepsilon \quad (4.2)$$

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) which is also a form of linear regression ([Chatterjee & Hadi, 2012](#); [Vasisht et al., 2022](#)) compares the means and variances of two or more conditions. As expressed in Equation (4.2) regression models can only model fixed effects. Although ANOVA can take into account one random effect at a time, it still averages out the variance in the second random effect. These problems of using ANOVA in language sciences have been pointed out since as early as the 1960s ([H. H. Clark, 1973](#); [Coleman, 1964](#)). We elaborate them in the context of the data of our experiments as follows.

#### *4. Statistics*

### **Modeling two random effects simultaneously, and Variability in the data**

As mentioned above, a simple linear regression model, including ANOVA, does not model the effect of two random effects simultaneously which a mixed effects model does. In traditional ANOVA approach, researchers often resort into running two separate regression models ([Lorch & Myers, 1990](#)) by averaging raw data across participants, and items. Averaging eliminates the variability in the data. Additionally, comparing the means of a categorical variable (correct vs. incorrect responses) even when transformed into accuracy or proportion scale is hard to interpret sensibly as compared to a continuous variable like reaction time (for discussion see [Bolker et al., 2009](#); [Jaeger, 2008](#)). The statistical remedy for these both problems in analyzing the data of our experiments is to apply mixed effects models.

### **Non-independence of observations**

Some of the assumptions made for regression models are violated in our data. One of them being non-independence of observations, i.e., all data points are independent from one another. This assumption is violated in an unbalanced design, and at times even for a balanced design. Same participant responds to multiple trials of the same experimental condition within an experiment. Although the design itself is balanced, after removal of outliers and/or trials which are not appropriate for comprehension measures (for details see [Section 6.2](#)), the number of trials in an analysis are unequal for each participant, item, and experimental condition. This introduces a bias in the regression model ([Jaeger, 2008](#)). A mixed effects model is best suited for such unbalanced data.

### **Common mean for each predictor**

An intrinsic property or feature of linear regression model is that it assumes a common mean for each predictor. It has been shown that this is in fact not true in real data: the effect of a predictor can vary depending on random variables like participant, or item. Mixed effects models take into account such inter-participant and inter-item variability present in the data. For example, in mixed effects

#### 4. Statistics

models, the random effects term with only varying intercept, e.g., participant as an intercept, assumes that if there are 100 participants then the mean accuracy of those 100 participants is only a subset of possible global accuracies drawn from a set of population mean. When a slope, e.g., levels of predictability, is included to the random effects structure in addition to the varying intercept (e.g., participants), then the model assumes that the effect of predictability on response accuracy varies across participants. Such variance across participants (or across items) is present in real data, and can be modeled in a mixed effects model, but not in a linear regression model.

#### Bounded output variable

Linear models assume an output variable to not be bounded within a narrow range, and to be in a continuous scale. In our data, the output variable (correct vs incorrect response) has bounded outcomes on  $[0, 1]$ . To fit a linear model, it can be transformed into a proportion scale. Even though it is a continuous variable, the proportion scale (i.e., response accuracy) has a range  $(0, 1)$ . Additionally, the transformation of discrete variables brings a host of problems we have already discussed above (e.g., loss of variability by averaging raw data). Binomial logistic mixed effects models, on the other hand, transform<sup>1</sup> the output variable into a *logit* scale, log with base  $e$ , i.e.  $\ln$ , with a range  $(-\infty, +\infty)$ . Therefore, these mixed effects models do not violate the model assumptions regarding the range of outcome variable.

Thus, Equation (4.1) can also be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} \ln\left(\frac{p}{1-p}\right) = & \alpha + u_\alpha + w_\alpha + (\beta_1 + u_{\beta_1} + w_{\beta_1}) \cdot x_1 + \\ & (\beta_2 + u_{\beta_2} + w_{\beta_2}) \cdot x_2 + \\ & \dots + (\beta_n + u_{\beta_n} + w_{\beta_n}) \cdot x_n \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Such transformation is brought about by a generalized linear mixed effects model with a canonical logit link function (Malik et al., 2020).

#### 4. Statistics

This is equivalent to,

$$p = \frac{\exp(\ln(\frac{p}{1-p}))}{1 + \exp(\ln(\frac{p}{1-p}))} \quad (4.4)$$

where,

$$\ln(\frac{p}{1-p}) = \text{logit}(p) \quad (4.5)$$

Log-odds of correct response obtained from Equation (4.3) can also be transformed into probability of correct response. Equations (4.4), and (4.5) provide the relationship between probability, logits (or log-odds), and odds ( $\frac{p}{1-p}$ ).

We have presented the advantages of mixed effects models over linear (regression) models. We use binomial logistic mixed effects model as our main statistical analysis tool in all experiments reported in this thesis. Below we discuss how the model that best fit for our data was selected.

## 4.2 Model selection and Running mixed effects models in R

Underlying structure of given data can be explained by different approximate statistical models. We intend to select a model that best fits our data. ‘Best fit’ can be objectively measured by Akaike Information Criterion , Bayesian Information Criterion, and Likelihood Ratio Test among others (Akaike, 1973; Schwarz, 1978).

In this thesis, we first build a complex (or maximal) model by including all predictors (target word predictability, speech degradation level, speech rate), their interactions, and co-variates (e.g., trial number) in the fixed effects (cf. Bondell et al., 2010). The model is fitted with a maximal random effects structure that included random intercepts for each participant and item (Barr et al., 2013). By-participant and by-item slopes included in the model are discussed in the Analysis sections of Chapters 5, 6, and 7.

#### *4. Statistics*

Model selection was based on the backward-selection heuristics on the fixed effects (cf. Matuschek et al., 2017). To find the best fitting model for the data, non-significant higher-order interactions were excluded from the fixed-effects structure in a stepwise manner. Similarly, random effects not supported by the data that explained zero variance according to singular value decomposition were excluded to prevent overparameterization (Bates, Kliegl, et al., 2015). This gave a more parsimonious model which was then extended separately with: i) item-related correlation parameters, ii) participant-related correlation parameter, and iii) both item- and participant-related correlation parameters. Among the parsimonious model and extended models, the model with smallest AIC was selected as the best fitting model for our data (Grueber et al., 2011; Richards et al., 2011).

Data preprocessing and analyses were performed in R-Studio (Version 3.6.1; R Core Team, 2019; Version 3.6.3; R Core Team 2020; Version 4.1.3; R Core Team, 2022). Accuracy was analyzed with Generalized Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) with lmerTest (Kuznetsova et al., 2017) and lme4 (Bates, Mächler, et al., 2015) packages. Binary responses (correct responses coded as 1 and incorrect responses coded as 0) for all participants were fit with a binomial logistic mixed effects model. Contrast coding of each factors and the model description are presented in the Analysis section of the chapters that follow.

### **4.3 Summary**

In this chapter, we introduced the statistical tool used for data analysis in this thesis. We discussed the limitations in traditional linear regression based models like ANOVA, and outlined the motivations to use mixed effects models. To capture the variability of our data without averaging out across participant or item, and to account for the effect of two random effects — participant and item — simultaneously, we fit mixed effects models to our data.

Details of each dataset corresponding to each experiment are presented in the Chapters 5, 6, and 7.

# 5

## Predictability effects of degraded speech are reduced as a function of attention

In adverse listening conditions, when the bottom-up perceptual input is degraded, listeners tend to rely upon context information, and form top-down semantic predictions. This provides a contextual facilitation in understanding the degraded speech. Importantly, it is affected also by the allocation of attention to the context in a top-down manner. The aim of this study was to examine the role of attention in understanding linguistic information in an adverse listening condition, i.e., when the speech was degraded. To assess the role of attention we varied task instructions in two experiments in which participants were instructed to listen to short sentences and thereafter to type in the last word they heard or to type in the whole sentence. We were interested in how these task instructions influence the interplay between top-down predictions and bottom-up perceptual processes during language comprehension. The sentences varied in the degree of predictability (low, medium, and high) as well as in the levels of speech degradation (1-, 4-, 6-, and 8-channel noise-vocoding). Results indicated better word recognition for highly predictable sentences for moderate, though not for high, levels of speech degradation, but only when attention was directed to the whole sentence

## 5. Attention-prediction interplay

### 5.1 Introduction

When there is noise in the signal, the listeners overcome the difficulty of understanding speech by using context information. The ‘context information’ can be an information in a given situation about a topic of conversation, semantic and syntactic information of a sentence structure, world knowledge, visual information, or even information of neighboring phonemes (Altmann & Kamide, 2007; Kaiser & Trueswell, 2004; Knoeferle et al., 2005; Xiang & Kuperberg, 2015; for reviews, see Ryskin & Fang, 2021; Stilp, 2020). For example, in the *phoneme restoration effect* (Samuel, 1996; Warren, 1970), a phoneme of one or more words in a sentence is replaced with white noise or a coughing sound. Participants were unable to notice such ‘noisy’ words in a sentence, as they perceptually restored the missing sound in those words from the context information. To utilize the context information in a sentence, listeners must attend to it and build up a meaning representation of what has been said.

Processing and comprehending degraded speech is more effortful and requires more attentional resources than clear speech (Eckert et al., 2016; Hunter & Pisoni, 2018; Peelle, 2018; Wild et al., 2012). In this chapter we examine how attention modulates the predictability effects brought about by context information at different levels of spectral degradation of speech. We address the existing unclarity in the literature regarding the distribution of attentional resources in an adverse listening condition: On the one hand, listeners can attend throughout the whole stream of speech and may thereby profit from the context information to predict sentence endings. On the other hand, listeners can focus their attention on linguistic material at a particular time point in the speech stream and, as a result, miss critical parts of the sentence context. If the goal is to understand a specific word in an utterance, there is a trade-off between allocating attentional resources to the perception of that word vs. allocating resources also to the understanding of the linguistic context and generating predictions.

## 5. Attention-prediction interplay

The study reported in this chapter was conducted with an aim to investigate how the allocation of attentional resources induced by different task instructions influences language comprehension and, in particular, the use of context information in communication through a noisy channel, i.e., when the speech is degraded. To examine the role of attention on predictive processing under degraded speech, we ran two experiments in which we manipulated the task instructions. In [Experiment 1](#), participants were instructed to only repeat the final word of the sentence they heard, while in [Experiment 2](#), they were instructed to repeat the whole sentence, and by this drawing attention to the entire sentence including the context. In both experiments, we varied the degree of predictability of sentence endings as well as the degree of speech degradation.

## 5.2 Background

As we have discussed earlier in [Chapter 1](#) and [2](#), it is generally agreed upon that human language processing is predictive in nature and comprehenders generate expectations about upcoming linguistic materials based on the context available to them (for reviews, see [Kuperberg & Jaeger, 2016](#); [Nieuwland, 2019](#); [Pickering & Gambi, 2018](#); [Staub, 2015](#)). When the bottom-up speech signal is less informative in an adverse listening condition, listeners tend to rely more on top-down lexical-semantic cues from the context to support speech perception and language comprehension ([Amichetti et al., 2018](#); [Ganong, 1980](#); [McGurk & MacDonald, 1976](#); [Obleser & Kotz, 2010](#); [Sheldon et al., 2008b](#); [Warren, 1970](#)). However, it is not just the quality of speech signal that determines and influences the reliance and use of predictive processing; attention to the auditory input is important as well. Auditory attention allows a listener to focus on the speech signal of interest (for reviews, see [Fritz et al., 2007](#); [Lange, 2013](#)). For instance, a listener can attend to and derive information from one stream of sound among many competing streams as demonstrated in the well-known *cocktail party effect* ([Cherry, 1953](#); [Hafter et al., 2007](#)). When a participant is instructed to attend to only one of the two or more competing speech streams in a diotic or dichotic presentation, response accuracy

## 5. Attention-prediction interplay

to the attended speech stream is higher than to the unattended speech (e.g., Tóth et al., 2020). Similarly, when a listener is presented with a stream of tones (e.g., musical notes varying in pitch, pure tones of different harmonics) but attends to any one of the tones appearing at a specified time point, this is reflected in a larger amplitude of N1 (e.g., Lange & Röder, 2010; see also, Sanders & Astheimer, 2008) which is the first negative going ERP component peaking around 100 ms post-stimulus considered as a marker of auditory selective attention (Näätänen & Picton, 1987; Thornton et al., 2007). Hence, listeners can draw attention to and process one among multiple competing speech streams, as well as orient their attention in temporal dimension within an unfolding sound stream.

So far, most previous studies have investigated listeners' attention within a single speech stream by using acoustic cues like accentuation and prosodic emphasis. For example, J. Li et al. (2014) examined whether the comprehension of critical words in a sentence context was influenced by a linguistic attention probe such as "ba" presented together with an accented or a de-accented critical word. The N1 amplitude was larger for words with such attention probe than for words without a probe. These findings support the view that attention can be flexibly directed either by instructions towards a specific signal or by linguistic probes (X. Li et al., 2017; see also, Brunelliére et al., 2019). Thus, listeners are able to select a part or segment of stream of auditory stimuli to selectively allocate their attention to.

The findings on the interplay of attention and prediction mentioned above come from studies most of which used a stream of clean speech or multiple streams of clean speech in their experiments. They are not informative about the attention-prediction interplay in degraded speech comprehension. Specifically, we do not know what role attention to a segment of speech stream plays in the contextual facilitation of degraded speech comprehension. The studies that report predictability effects in degraded speech comprehension do not systematically examine the role of attention (e.g., Amichetti et al., 2018; Obleser & Kotz, 2010; Sheldon et al., 2008b). Their conclusions that *semantic predictability facilitates comprehension of degraded speech* are based on listeners' attention to the entire sentence, which

## *5. Attention-prediction interplay*

is not compared to any other experimental condition manipulating attentional allocation. Therefore, in two experiments, we examined whether context-based semantic predictions are automatic during effortful listening to degraded speech, when participants are instructed to report only the final word of the sentence, or the entire sentence. We varied the task instructions to the listeners from [Experiment 1](#) to [Experiment 2](#) which required them to differentially attend to the target word (not binding the context), or to the target word including the context. We hypothesized that when listeners pay attention only to the contextually predicted target word, they do not form top-down predictions, i.e., there should not be a facilitatory effect of target word predictability. In contrast, when listeners attend to the whole sentence, they do form expectations such that the facilitatory effect of target word predictability will be observed replicating the prior behavioral findings (e.g., [Obleser & Kotz, 2010](#)).

## **5.3 Experiment 1**

This experiment was designed such that processing the context was not strictly necessary for the task. Listeners were asked to report the noun of the sentence that they heard which was in the final position of the sentence. This instruction did not require listeners to pay attention to the context which preceded the target word.

## **5.4 Methods**

### **5.4.1 Participants**

We recruited 50 participants online via Prolific Academic ([Prolific, 2014](#)). One participant whose response accuracy was less than 50% across all experimental conditions was removed. Among the remaining 49 participants ( $M$  age  $\pm SD = 23.31 \pm 3.53$  years; age range = 18-30 years), 27 were male and 22 were female. All participants were native speakers of German and did not have any speech-language disorder, hearing loss, or neurological disorder (all self-reported). All

## *5. Attention-prediction interplay*

participants received 6.20 Euro as monetary compensation for their participation in the approximately 40 minutes long experiment.

### **5.4.2 Materials**

Materials used in the experiment were created by the method described in Chapter 3 (Section 3.1). That is, there were 120 unique sentences in each of these 3 categories: low predictability, medium predictability and high predictability. Mean cloze probabilities of the target words of low, medium and high predictability sentences were  $0.022 \pm 0.027$  ( $M \pm SD$ ; range = 0.00 – 0.09),  $0.274 \pm 0.134$  ( $M \pm SD$ ; range = 0.1 – 0.55), and  $0.752 \pm 0.123$  ( $M \pm SD$ ; range = 0.56 – 1.00) respectively. All 360 sentences were then noise-vocoded through 1, 4, 6, and 8 channels to create degraded speech.

### **5.4.3 Procedure**

Participants were asked to use headphones or earphones. A sample of vocoded speech not used in the practice trial or the main experiment was provided so that the participants could adjust the volume to their preferred level of comfort at the beginning of the experiment. The participants were instructed to listen to the sentences and to type in the target word (noun) by using the keyboard. The time for typing in the response was not limited. They were also informed at the beginning of the experiment that some of the sentences would be ‘noisy’ and not easy to understand, and in these cases, they were encouraged to guess what they might have heard. Eight practice trials with different levels of speech degradation were given to familiarize the participants with the task before presenting all 120 experimental trials with an intertrial interval of 1,000 ms.

Each participant had to listen to 40 high predictability, 40 medium predictability, and 40 low predictability sentences. Levels of speech degradation were also balanced across each predictability level, so that for each of the three predictability conditions (high, medium, and low predictability), ten 1-channel, ten 4-channel, ten 6-channel, and ten 8-channel noise-vocoded sentences were presented, resulting

## 5. Attention-prediction interplay

in 12 experimental lists. The sentences in each list were pseudo-randomized so that no more than three sentences of the same degradation and predictability condition appeared consecutively. The lists are presented in Appendix B.

## 5.5 Analyses

Out of 5880 trials from 49 participants, there were only five correct responses, one each from 5 participants at 1-channel. Therefore, the 1-channel speech degradation condition was excluded from the analyses.

Accuracy was analyzed using Generalized Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) following the procedure described in Chapter 4 (Section 4.2) with lmerTest (Kuznetsova et al., 2017) and lme4 (Bates, Mächler, et al., 2015) packages. Binary responses (categorical: correct and incorrect) for all participants were fit with a [binomial linear mixed-effects model](#). Correct responses were coded as 1 and incorrect responses were coded as 0. Number of channels (categorical: 4-channel, 6-channel, and 8-channel noise-vocoding), target word predictability (categorical: high predictability sentences, medium predictability sentences, low predictability sentences), and the interaction of number of channels and target word predictability were included in the fixed effects.

We first fitted a model with maximal random effects structure that included random intercepts for each participant and item (Barr et al., 2013). Both by-participant and by-item random slopes were included for number of channels, target word predictability, and their interaction, which was supported by the experiment design. Based on the previous findings on perceptual adaptation (e.g., Cooke et al., 2022; Davis et al., 2005; Erb et al., 2013), we further added trial number (centered) in the fixed effect structure to control for whether the listeners adapted to the degraded speech. We applied treatment contrast for number of channels (8-channel as a baseline) and sliding difference contrast for target word predictability (low predictability vs. medium predictability, and low predictability vs. high predictability).

## 5. Attention-prediction interplay

## 5.6 Results and discussion


Mean response accuracies (in percentage) for all experimental conditions aggregated across all participants and items are shown in Table 5.1 and Figure 5.1. It shows that accuracy increases with an increase in the number of noise-vocoding channels, i.e., with the decrease in speech degradation. However, accuracy does not increase with an increase in target word predictability. These observations aligned with the results of the statistical analyses (Table 5.2).

**Table 5.1:** Response accuracy (mean and standard error of the mean) across all levels of speech degradation and target word predictability in Experiment 1

Number of channels	Target word predictability	Mean	Standard error
4	High	62.65	2.24
	Medium	63.43	2.03
	Low	63.99	1.83
6	High	95.60	0.94
	Medium	95.54	1.05
	Low	95.16	1.10
8	High	98.16	0.84
	Medium	96.75	1.04
	Low	97.91	0.97

There was a significant main effect of number of channels, indicating that response accuracy for the 8-channel vocoded speech was higher than for both 4-channel ( $\beta = -3.50$ , SE = .22,  $z(4,410) = -16.19$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and 6-channel vocoded speech ( $\beta = -.70$ , SE = .21,  $z(4,410) = -3.29$ ,  $p = .001$ ), that is, when the number of channels increased to 8, listeners gave more correct responses (see Figure 5.1). There was, however, no significant main effect of target word predictability ( $\beta = .30$ , SE = .36,  $z(4,410) = .84$ ,  $p = .40$ , and  $\beta = .50$ , SE = .43,  $z(4,410) = 1.16$ ,  $p = .25$ ), and no interaction between number of channels and target word predictability (all  $ps > .05$ ). There was also no significant main effect of trial number ( $\beta = .001$ , SE = .002,  $z(4,410) = .48$ ,  $p = .63$ ) suggesting that the listeners' performance did not improve over time. These results indicated a decrease in response accuracy with an increase in speech degradation from the 8-channel to the

## 5. Attention-prediction interplay



**Figure 5.1:** Mean response accuracy across all conditions in Experiment 1. Accuracy increased only with an increase in the number of noise-vocoding channels. There is no change in accuracy with an increase or decrease in target word predictability. Error bars represent standard error of the means.

6-channel noise-vocoding condition, and from the 8-channel to the 4-channel noise-vocoding condition. However, response accuracy did not increase with an increase in target word predictability, and the interaction between number of channels and target word predictability was also absent, in contrast to previous findings (e.g., Obleser et al., 2007; Obleser & Kotz, 2011; see also Hunter & Pisoni, 2018). These results suggest that the task instruction, which asked participants to report only the final word, indeed led to neglecting the context. Although participants were able to neglect the context, there was still uncertainty about the speech quality of the next trial; hence, they could not adapt to the different levels of degraded speech. To confirm that the predictability effect (or contextual facilitation) is replicable and dependent on attentional focus, we conducted a second experiment in which we changed the task instruction to draw participants' attention to decoding the whole sentence.

## 5. Attention-prediction interplay

**Table 5.2:** Estimated effects of the model accounting for the correct word recognition in Experiment 1

Fixed effects	Estimate	Std. Error	<i>z</i> value	<i>p</i> value
Intercept	4.17	.25	16.73	<.001
Noise condition (4-channel)	-3.50	.22	-16.19	<.001
Noise condition (6-channel)	-.70	.21	-3.29	<.001
Target word predictability (Low-Medium)	.30	.36	.84	.40
Target word predictability (High-Low)	.50	.43	1.16	.25
Noise condition (4-channel) × Target word predictability (Low-Medium)	-.22	.39	-.57	.57
Noise condition (6-channel) × Target word predictability (Low-Medium)	-.34	.44	-.76	.44
Noise condition (4-channel) × Target word predictability (High-Low)	-.54	.45	-1.18	.24
Noise condition (6-channel) × Target word predictability (High-Low)	.04	.50	.09	.03
Trial number	.001	.002	.48	.63

## 5.7 Experiment 2

Following up on Experiment 1, we conducted Experiment 2 on a separate group of participants with a different task instruction. This experiment was intended to test the hypothesis that the facilitatory effect of top-down predictions is observed only when the listeners' attention is unrestricted so that the context information is also included within the attentional focus of the listener.

## *5. Attention-prediction interplay*

## **5.8 Methods**

### **5.8.1 Participants and Materials**

We recruited 48 participants ( $M$  age  $\pm SD = 24.44 \pm 3.5$  years; age range = 18–31 years; 32 males) online via Prolific Academic. The same stimuli were used as in Experiment 1.

### **5.8.2 Procedure**

Participants were presented with sentences at a comfortable volume level. They were asked to use headphones or earphones, and a prompt was presented before the experiment began to adjust the volume to their level of comfort. Eight practice trials were presented, followed by 120 experimental trials. In contrast to Experiment 1, the participants were instructed to report the entire sentence by typing in what they heard. We did not limit the response time.


## **5.9 Analyses**

We followed the same data analysis procedure as in Experiment 1. The 1-channel speech degradation condition was excluded from the analysis. For the analysis and results of two experiments to be comparable, we did not consider whether listeners reported other words in a sentence correctly; only the final words of the sentences (target words) were considered as either correct or incorrect responses. As in Experiment 1, we report the results from the maximal model supported by the design.

## **5.10 Results and discussion**

Mean response accuracy for different conditions is shown in Table 5.3 and Figure 5.2. We found that accuracy increased when the number of noise-vocoding channels increased, as well as when the target word predictability increased. The results of statistical analysis confirmed these observations (Table 5.4).

## 5. Attention-prediction interplay



**Figure 5.2:** Mean response accuracy across all conditions in Experiment 2. Accuracy increased with an increase in number of noise-vocoding channels and target word predictability. Error bars represent standard error of the means.

**Table 5.3:** Response accuracy (mean and standard error of the mean) across all levels of speech degradation and target word predictability in Experiment 2

Number of channels	Target word predictability	Mean	Standard error
4	High	62.71	2.14
	Medium	59.58	1.88
	Low	58.13	1.88
6	High	96.88	0.93
	Medium	92.29	1.21
	Low	91.46	1.12
8	High	98.54	0.86
	Medium	95.21	1.19
	Low	95.00	1.23

We again found a main effect of number of channels, such that response accuracy at 8-channel was higher than for both 4-channel ( $\beta = -3.51$ ,  $SE = .24$ ,  $z(4,320) = -14.64$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and 6-channel noise-vocoding ( $\beta = -.65$ ,  $SE = .22$ ,  $z(4,320) = -2.93$ ,  $p = .003$ ). Similar to Experiment 1, the main effect of trial number was not significant ( $\beta = .002$ ,  $SE = .002$ ,  $z(4,320) = 1.11$ ,  $p = .27$ ) indicating that the

## *5. Attention-prediction interplay*

response accuracy did not increase over the course of the experiment.

In contrast to Experiment 1, there was also a main effect of target word predictability: Response accuracy in high predictability sentences was significantly higher than in low predictability sentences ( $\beta = 1.42$ , SE = .47,  $z(4,320) = 3.02$ ,  $p = .003$ ). We also found a statistically significant interaction between speech degradation and target word predictability ( $\beta = -1.14$ , SE = .50,  $z(4,320) = -2.30$ ,  $p = .02$ ). Subsequent subgroup analyses of each channel condition showed that the interaction was driven by the difference in response accuracy between high predictability sentences and low predictability sentences in the 8-channel ( $\beta = 1.42$ , SE = .62,  $z(1,440) = 2.30$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ) and 6-channel noise-vocoding conditions ( $\beta = 1.14$ , SE = 0.34,  $z(1,440) = 3.31$ ,  $p < .001$ ); at 4 channel, the difference in response accuracy between high and low predictability sentences was not significant ( $\beta = .28$ , SE = .18,  $z(1,440) = 1.59$ ,  $p = .11$ ).

In contrast to Experiment 1, these results indicate an effect of target word predictability; that is, response accuracy was higher when the target word predictability was high as compared to low. Also, the interaction between target word predictability and speech degradation, which was not observed in Experiment 1, showed that semantic predictability facilitated the comprehension of degraded speech already at moderate levels (like 6- or 8-channel). In line with the findings from Experiment 1, response accuracy was better with a higher number of channels.

We combined the data from both experiments in a single analysis to test whether participants' response accuracy changes across the experiments, that is, to test whether the difference between experimental manipulations is statistically significant. We ran a binomial linear mixed-effects model on response accuracy and followed the same procedure as in Experiments 1 and 2. A full random effects structure supported by the study design was modeled. The model summary is shown in Table 6. The model revealed that there was no significant main effect of experimental group ( $\beta = .04$ , SE = .26,  $z(8,730) = .15$ ,  $p = .88$ ) indicating that the overall response accuracy did not change with the change in instructions from Experiments 1 and 2. However, the critical interaction between experimental

## 5. Attention-prediction interplay

**Table 5.4:** Estimated effects of the model accounting for the correct word recognition in Experiment 2

Fixed effects	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	p value
Intercept	4.09	.24	16.79	<.001
Noise condition (4-channel)	-3.51	.24	-14.64	<.001
Noise condition (6-channel)	-.65	.22	-2.93	.003
Target word predictability (Low-Medium)	-.08	.34	-.23	.82
Target word predictability (High-Low)	1.42	.47	3.02	.003
Noise condition (4-channel) × Target word predictability (Low-Medium)	.02	.38	.05	.96
Noise condition (6-channel) × Target word predictability (Low-Medium)	-.13	.43	-.31	.76
Noise condition (4-channel) × Target word predictability (High-Low)	-1.14	.50	-2.30	.02
Noise condition (6-channel) × Target word predictability (High-Low)	-.23	.57	-.41	.68
Trial number	.002	.002	1.11	.27

group and target word predictability was statistically significant ( $\beta = .46$ , SE = .20,  $z(8,730) = 2.34$ ,  $p = .02$ ), that is, the effect of predictability was larger in the group that was asked to type in the whole sentence (Experiment 2) than in the group that was asked to type only the sentence-final target word (Experiment 1). Together, these findings suggest that the change in task instruction, which draws attention either to the entire sentence or only to the final word, is critical to whether the context information is used under degraded speech. But degraded speech comprehension is not reduced by binding listeners' attention allocation to one part of the speech stream. The model summary is shown in Table 5.5.

## 5. Attention-prediction interplay

**Table 5.5:** Estimated effects of the best-fitting model accounting for the correct word recognition in both experiments

Fixed effects	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	p value
Intercept	4.19	.20	20.72	<.001
Noise condition (4-channel)	-3.56	.20	-18.19	<.001
Noise condition (6-channel)	-.59	.18	-3.28	.001
Target word predictability (Low-Medium)	.13	.26	.50	.62
Target word predictability (High-Low)	.98	.34	2.93	<.003
Experimental group	.04	.26	.15	.88
Noise condition (4-channel) × Target word predictability (Low-Medium)	-.12	.29	-.40	.69
Noise condition (6-channel) × Target word predictability (Low-Medium)	-.30	.34	-.87	.38
Noise condition (4-channel) × Target word predictability (High-Low)	-.84	.35	-2.42	.02
Noise condition (6-channel) × Target word predictability (High-Low)	-.11	.38	-.29	.77
Noise condition (4-channel) × Experimental group	-.10	.25	-.41	.68
Noise condition (6-channel) × Experimental group	-.10	.28	-.36	.72
Target word predictability (High-Low) × Experimental group	-.47	.20	2.34	.02
Trial number	.001	.001	.93	.35

## 5.11 Conclusion

The main goals of the present study were to investigate whether online semantic predictions are formed in comprehension of degraded speech when task instructions

## 5. Attention-prediction interplay

encourage attention to the processing of the context information, or only to the critical target word. The results of two experiments revealed that attentional processes clearly modulate the use of context information for predicting sentence endings when the speech signal is degraded.

In contrast to the first experiment, the results of the second experiment show an interaction between target word predictability and degraded speech. This is in line with existing studies that found a facilitatory effect of predictability at different levels of speech degradation when the participants were instructed to pay attention to the entire sentence (e.g., Obleser et al., 2007). Obleser and colleagues reported that at 8-channel noise-vocoded speech, key word recognition<sup>1</sup> was higher in high predictability sentences than low predictability sentences. Listeners were required to attend to the entire sentence in those studies as well. Therefore, the findings of Experiment 2 replicate this facilitatory effect of predictability that was observed in Obleser and colleagues' behavioral experiments.

The important new finding that our study adds to the present literature is that this effect may be weakened or lost when listeners are instructed to report only the final word of the sentence that they heard (Experiment 1). The lack of predictability effect (or contextual facilitation) can most likely be attributed to listeners not successfully decoding the meaning of the verb of the sentence, as the verb is the primary predictive cue in our stimuli (e.g., Sie *jongliert* die Bälle) for the target word (noun: *Bälle*). Findings from auditory attention literature also support this explanation: When listeners' attention is focused on one feature of an auditory stimuli, the rest are not attended to and they are not accessed (filter mechanism, Lange, 2013; change detection, Sanford et al., 2006; Sturt et al., 2004)

Hence, this small change in task instructions from Experiment 1 to Experiment 2 sheds light on the role of top-down regulation of attention in using context for language comprehension in adverse listening conditions. In a noisy channel created by degraded speech, language comprehension is generally effortful, so that

---

<sup>1</sup>Notice the difference in measurement metric. They calculated response accuracy as the number of correct keywords identified, while we calculated it as the correct identification of the sentence-final target word.

## *5. Attention-prediction interplay*

focusing attention on only a part of the speech signal seems beneficial in order to enhance stimulus decoding. However, the results of this study also show that this comes at the cost of neglecting the context information that could be beneficial for language comprehension. Our findings hence demonstrate that there is a trade-off between the use of context for generating top-down predictions vs. focusing all attention on a target word. Specifically, the engagement in the use of context and generation of top-down predictions may change as a function of attention (see also J. Li et al., 2014). This claim is also corroborated by the significant change in predictability effects (or contextual facilitation) from Experiment 1 to Experiment 2, in the combined dataset.

Findings from the irrelevant-speech paradigm also support our conclusion. It has been shown that the predictability of unattended speech has no effect on the main experimental task (e.g., memorization of auditorily presented digits). Wöstemann & Obleser (2016) did not find predictability effects when the participants ignored the degraded speech (see also Ellermeier et al., 2015). An alternative explanation of ‘participants neglecting the context’ could be that the participants did not listen to the context at all, or they heard but did not process the context. However, irrelevant-speech paradigm studies show that listeners cannot avoid listening to the speech presented to them; to-be-ignored speech has been shown to interfere with the main experimental task (e.g., Lecompte, 1995). It is not implausible that the listeners listened to the context but did not do a deep processing (cf. Ferreira & Lowder, 2016). This is not incompatible with our first explanation, as in either case, attention to the final word leaves the listeners with limited resources to process and form a representation of the context information.

Considering the theoretical accounts of predictive language processing (Friston, Parr, et al., 2020; Kuperberg & Jaeger, 2016; McClelland & Elman, 1986; Norris et al., 2016; Pickering & Gambi, 2018), one would expect that listeners automatically form top-down predictions about upcoming linguistic stimuli based on prior context. Also, when speech is degraded, top-down predictions render a benefit in word recognition and language comprehension (e.g., Sheldon et al., 2008a, 2008b). Results of

## 5. Attention-prediction interplay

our study revealed new theoretical insights by showing that this is not always the case. Top-down predictions are dependent on attentional processes (see also Kok et al., 2012), directed by task instructions; thus, they are not *always* automatic, and predictability does not *always* facilitate comprehension of degraded speech. To this point, our findings shed light on the growing body of literature indicating limitations of predictive language processing accounts (Huettig & Guerra, 2019; Huettig & Mani, 2016; Mishra et al., 2012; Nieuwland et al., 2018).

Results from both experiments show that the effect of trial number is not significant. In contrast to previous studies (e.g., Davis et al., 2005; Erb et al., 2013) we did not observe adaptation to noise-vocoded speech. In those studies, there was certainty about the speech quality of the next trial, as the participants were presented with only one level of spectral degradation (only 4-channel or only 6-channel noise-vocoding), and crucially with no specific regard to semantic predictability. On the contrary, in our study, listeners were always uncertain about the speech quality of the next trial as well as its semantic predictability. Because of this changing context, the perceptual system of the participants may not retune itself (Goldstone, 1998; Mattys et al., 2012). However, there was no experimental condition, in Experiments 1 and 2, in which participants were certain about the next-trial speech degradation. It cannot be completely discarded that a certainty about speech degradation would retune the perceptual system, and listeners would adapt to the degraded speech. This is one of the limitations in the current study.

One could object the metric of calculating accuracy in Experiment 2, but it should be noted that for a valid comparison of the results between two experiments, we can only consider the accuracy of the sentence-final target word in Experiment 2. Participants response of the words preceding the sentence-final target word in Experiment 1 is not available; if fact, it is the whole point of the instruction given to the participants in Experiment 1. Hence, we find some discrepancy between the results of prior studies (Obleser et al., 2007; Obleser & Kotz, 2010) and our study (Experiment 1). Nonetheless, the conclusion from these studies are consistent: as long as listeners attend to the sentence context, semantic context facilitates

### *5. Attention-prediction interplay*

language comprehension. However, such facilitatory effect is not observed when the degradation is at an extreme level, like 1-channel noise-vocoding.

In conclusion, this study provides a novel insight into the modulatory role of attention regulation in the interaction between top-down predictive and bottom-up auditory processes. We show that task instructions affect distribution of attention to the degraded speech signal. This, in turn, means that when insufficient attention is given to the context, top-down predictions cannot be generated, and the facilitatory effect of predictability is substantially reduced. The findings of this study indicate limitations to predictive processing accounts of language comprehension.

## **5.12 Summary**

This chapter reported studies which replicated the previous finding that semantic predictability facilitates language comprehension when speech degradation is not at an extreme level. That is, when the channel of transmission  $N$  is noisy, listeners put less weight on the degraded auditory input  $P(u_p|u_i, N)$  and more weight on the prior  $P(u_i|m_i)$  derived from the context information that facilitates language comprehension. Importantly, we showed in this chapter that the contextual facilitation (i.e., facilitatory effect of predictability) is observed only when the listeners attend to the entire sentence, including the context. In the next chapter, we further investigate this effect, specifically, we examine the granularity of predictability effect at moderate level of speech degradation. We also examine whether (un)certainty about next-trial speech degradation and predictability influences perceptual adaptation to degraded speech.

# 6

## Semantic predictability facilitates comprehension of degraded speech in a graded manner

In the previous chapter we concluded that in a noisy channel, predictability facilitates comprehension of degraded speech only when listeners attended to the context. A few lacunae in the study in Chapter 5 warrant further examination and exploration of its the conclusion. Firstly, there was an implicit assumption that all the noun-correct responses were borne out of correct identification of the context evoking words (i.e., verbs). Instructions to the participants and the experimental design were made to test the effect of attention to context vs attention only to the target word such that we could not test if participants identified the context correctly in [Experiment 1A](#). Secondly, we also did not consider if listeners adapted to the degraded speech, and how such an adaptation, if present, could influence contextual facilitation. And most importantly, we only showed that there is a difference between high and low predictability sentences — the granularity of predictability was not tested. Therefore, the aims of the study presented in this chapter are to address these limitations and examine if listeners form narrowed expectations or whether predictions are generated across a wide range of probable sentence endings in a graded manner. We also take into account the accuracy of context identification

## *6. Graded effect of predictability*

(not just the accuracy of target word identification) as well as the possible learning effect due to an adaptation to the degraded speech. The results showed that in contrast to the “narrowed expectations” view postulated for predictive processing of degraded speech, listeners probabilistically preactivate upcoming words from a wide range of semantic space, not limiting only to highly probable sentence endings. We also did not find any learning effect. We speculate that when there is a trial-by-trial variation in semantic feature (e.g., sentence predictability), listeners do not adapt to low-level perceptual property (e.g., speech quality).

### **6.1 Introduction**

In the literature of speech perception and sentence processing, studies have argued that prediction is either probabilistic and graded, or it is an all-or-nothing phenomenon (Coltheart, 2004; Kuperberg & Jaeger, 2016; Luke & Christianson, 2016). Very few studies have investigated such theoretical questions within the domain of adverse listening conditions, specifically in degraded speech comprehension (e.g., Strauß et al., 2013; see also Corps & Rabagliati, 2020; van Os et al., 2021). Strauß et al. (2013) posited that listeners cannot preactivate less predictable sentence endings in an adverse listening condition. They proposed that the facilitatory effect of predictability is limited to only highly predictable sentence endings at a moderate level of spectral degradation of speech. Although many studies support the general idea of Strauß and colleagues that predictability facilitates comprehension of degraded speech (e.g., Hunter & Pisoni, 2018; Obleser & Kotz, 2010; Sheldon et al., 2008a), there have been no studies so far after Strauß and colleagues’, to our knowledge, which examined the nature of predictability specifically in degraded speech comprehension.

In this chapter, our main aim is to replicate the previous findings of these predictability effects, and extend them further by testing if listeners form narrowed expectations while listening to moderately degraded speech. In line with Strauß et al. (2013)’s argument, listeners can form predictions that are restricted to

## 6. Graded effect of predictability

only highly probable sentence endings. On the opposite, listeners can generate expectations about an upcoming word based on how likely the word is to appear in the context, and hence form a probabilistic prediction. We also test the presence of perceptual adaptation and its effect on contextual facilitation. We set a metric of measurement of language comprehension that considers whether listeners correctly identified the context information.

## 6.2 Background

### Predictability effects in degraded speech perception

We discussed in Chapter 2 (Section 2.2.2) that some studies (Obleser et al., 2007; Obleser & Kotz, 2010; Sheldon et al., 2008a; see also, Hunter & Pisoni, 2018) have already shown the facilitatory effect of predictability in comprehension of degraded speech. For example, Obleser and colleagues compared high and low predictability sentences and observed contextual facilitation, in terms of the difference in response accuracy between high and low predictability sentences, at 8 channels and 4 channels noise vocoded speech in their (2007) and (2010) studies respectively. However, these neuroimaging studies were not designed to test the nature of predictability effects.

In a modified experimental design, StrauSS et al. (2013) varied the target word predictability by manipulating its expectancy (i.e., how expected the target word is given the verb) and typicality (i.e., co-occurrence of target word and the preceding verb). They reported that at a moderate level of spectral degradation, N400 responses at highly predictable (strong-context and high-typical) words were smallest. In contrast, they found that the N400 effect (in terms of the amplitude of the N400 component) were largest at the strong-context, low typical words and the weak-context, low-typical words; the responses at the latter two were not statistically different from each other. The authors interpreted these findings as a facilitatory effect of sentence predictability which might be limited to only highly predictable sentence endings at a moderate level of spectral degradation. They proposed it as an *expectancy searchlight model*, and suggested that listeners

## 6. Graded effect of predictability

form *narrowed expectations* from a restricted semantic space when the sentence endings are highly predictable. Their model posits that when the sentence endings are less predictable, listeners cannot preactivate those less predictable sentence endings in an adverse listening condition. This is contrary to the view that readers and listeners form a probabilistic prediction of upcoming word in a sentence. For example, Nieuwland et al. (2018)<sup>1</sup> showed in a large-scale replication study of DeLong et al. (2005) that the N400 amplitude at the sentence-final noun is directly proportional to its cloze probability across a range of high- and low-cloze words (see also, Kochari & Flecken, 2019; Nicenboim et al., 2020). Heilbron et al. (2021) also showed that a probabilistic prediction model outperforms a constrained guessing model in predicting listeners' neural activities (MEG and EEG recordings), suggesting that linguistic prediction is probabilistic and it is not limited only to the highly predictable sentence endings, but it operates broadly in a wide range of probable sentence endings. However, when put in perspective with our research question, these studies were conducted in conditions without noise or degraded speech. And those studies that examined degraded speech comprehension, used only two levels of semantic predictability (high and low). The granularity and the nature of prediction remain yet to be tested in degraded speech comprehension.

## Adaptation to degraded speech

We discussed in Chpater 2 that studies have shown evidence for perceptual adaptation to artificially distorted speech. When exposed to noise vocoded speech, listeners' word recognition accuracy increased over the course of experiment (Davis et al., 2005; Erb et al., 2013) These studies have only used one noise-vocoded speech (e.g., 4 channels, or 6 channels) as stimuli, and presented such degraded speech in a single block. From a participant's (listener's) perspective, there was no uncertainty about the degradation level of next trial speech, i.e., the *global channel context* was certain or predictable. Additionally, there was no variation in semantic feature, especially, target word predictability.

---

<sup>1</sup>However, Nieuwland et al. (2018) could not replicate DeLong et al. (2005)'s finding that comprehenders predict word-form – English articles *a/an*.

## *6. Graded effect of predictability*

Listeners gradually map the representation of degraded lexicons around their “true” (or clear) schema/exemplars on repeated exposure (Goldstone, 1998; Nosofsky, 1986). With repeated exposure, the representation of degraded input comes closer to the exemplar, thereby, improving the performance. This feature mapping mechanism proposes that listeners map the whole feature of the sensory input. However, the higher level features of speech (e.g., semantic property like predictability) can also influence the acoustic realization of a degraded word, i.e., bottom-up processing of the degraded speech and perceptual adaptation (Gold & Watanabe, 2010; Goldstone, 1998). Listeners can assign weight to different dimensions of a speech stimuli (acoustic-phonetic and/or lexico-semantic). Performance improves over time when listeners give more attentional weight to acoustic-phonetic dimension (cf. Haider & Frensch, 1996).

Thus, when multiple levels of degraded speech signals are presented in a block in a (pseudo-)randomized order, then the listener is uncertain about the quality of next-trial’s speech. If such multiple levels of degradation are due to the presentation of multiple channels of noise vocoded speech, then the global channel context is unpredictable or uncertain. This can render perceptual adaptation totally absent with the change in the auditory features of the speech signal throughout the experiment (Mattys et al., 2012). Additionally, such trial-by-trial variability in the characteristics of speech signal can also impair word recognition (Sommers et al., 1994; see also, Dahan & Magnuson, 2006). Very few studies have examined the influence of (un)certainty about next-trial speech quality, and semantic feature in perceptual adaptation. For example, Vaden et al. (2013) presented participants words in background noise at +3dB SNR and +10dB SNR, instead of a degraded speech, in a pseudo-random order. They argued that an adaptive control system is involved to optimize task performance when there is an uncertainty about next trial. Obleser and colleagues (Hartwigsen et al., 2015; Obleser et al., 2007; Obleser & Kotz, 2010) presented listeners with multiple noise-vocoded speech (ranging from 2 to 32 channels noise vocoding) in a pseudo-random order, but they did not report presence or absence of perceptual adaptation. As previously mentioned

## 6. Graded effect of predictability

in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3), there are two conflicting findings in the literature on perceptual adaptation: On the one hand, repeated exposure to degraded speech leads to perceptual adaptation, and consequently improves word recognition over the course of experiment. On the other hand, uncertainty about next-trial speech quality impairs word recognition.

### Measurement of language comprehension

How we measure language comprehension has rarely been guided by any specific theoretical motive in the existing literature. There is a discrepancy across studies in how language comprehension in degraded speech is quantified. Some studies that reported contextual facilitation in degraded speech comprehension used proportion of correctly reported *final* words only (e.g., Hunter & Pisoni, 2018; Obleser & Kotz, 2010; Sheldon et al., 2008a). Obleser et al. (2007) quantified language comprehension as the proportion of correctly identified key words in SPIN sentences. Erb et al. (2013) and Hakonen et al. (2017) used *report scores* (Peelle, 2013) that measure proportion of correctly recognized words per sentence as an index of language comprehension. Such inconsistencies make cross-study comparison difficult. Additionally, none of these measures take into account if listeners have correctly identified the context (cf. Amichetti et al., 2018; Marrufo-Pérez et al., 2019) which should be the most important factor to be considered in the first place.

### The present study

Stemming from the results of Chapter 5, and from the motivation driven by the open questions outlined in the beginning of this chapter, the goals of the study in this chapter were threefold: The first goal was to replicate the facilitatory effect of predictability, and examine the nature of predictability, i.e., to test if listeners form narrowed expectations. Obleser and colleagues (e.g., Obleser et al., 2007; Obleser & Kotz, 2010) have shown predictability effects (or contextual facilitation) to appear only at a moderate level of speech degradation by using only two levels of predictability (low and high). Our use of three levels of target word predictability

## 6. Graded effect of predictability

(low, medium and high) will let us test the narrowed expectations view (Strauß et al., 2013) by also taking into account the accuracy of context. If the listeners form narrowed predictions only for the target words with high cloze probability, then the facilitatory effect of semantic prediction will be observed only at these highly predictable sentence endings. Listeners' response to the target words with medium and low cloze probability would be quite similar as these two fall out of the range of narrow prediction. However, if the listeners' predictions are not restricted to highly predictable target words, then they form predictions across a wide range of context proportional to the probability of occurrence of the target word. In addition to highly predictable sentence endings, listeners will also form predictions for less predictable sentence endings. Such predictions will depend on the probability of occurrence of the target words. In other words, listeners form predictions also for less expected sentence endings; and the semantic space of prediction depends on the probability of occurrence of those sentence endings. The addition of sentences with medium cloze target words thus allows us to differentiate whether listeners form all-or-nothing prediction restricted to high cloze target words, or a probabilistic prediction for words across a wide range of cloze probability.

There is a variation in the sentences we use, i.e., they are low, medium and high predictability sentences, and they are degraded at different levels of spectral degradation. So our second goal was to investigate the role of uncertainty about next-trial speech features on perceptual adaptation by varying the global channel context on the comprehension of degraded speech. To study this, we presented sentences of different levels of predictability blocked by each channel conditions (*predictable channel context*), and pseudo-randomized across all channels (*unpredictable channel context*). Based on previous findings, we expected that in the unpredictable channel context (i.e., when sentences are presented in a random order of spectral degradation) participants' word recognition performance will be worse than in the predictable channel context (i.e., when the sentences are blocked by noise-vocoding, Garrido et al., 2011; Sommers et al., 1994; Vaden et al., 2013).

## 6. Graded effect of predictability

To further examine perceptual adaptation, we also considered the effect of trial number in the analyses.

And third, we aimed at measuring language comprehension with a metric that reflects the participants' correct or incorrect identification of the context. If participants do not understand the context and we only measure the recognition of final word, this might not truly reflect the effect of contextual facilitation.

## 6.3 Methods

### 6.3.1 Participants

We recruited a group of participant via Prolific Academic and assigned them to the *predictable channel context* ( $n = 50$ ;  $\pm SD = 23.6 \pm 3.2$  years; age range = 18 – 30 years; 14 females). We created *unpredictable channel context* group from participants ( $n = 48$ ;  $\bar{x} \pm SD = 24.44 \pm 3.5$  years; age range = 18 – 31 years; 16 females) from [Experiment 1B](#). All participants were native speakers of German residing in Germany. We recruited only those participants who had reported to not have any hearing disorder, speech-language disorder, or neurological disorder.

### 6.3.2 Materials

We used the same stimuli described in Chapter 3 (Section 3.1). We used 120 sentences each for low predictability, medium predictability, and high predictability sentences that differed in the cloze probability of sentence final target words. Their mean cloze probabilities were  $0.022 \pm 0.027$  ( $\bar{x} \pm SD$ ; range = 0.00 – 0.09) for low predictability sentences,  $0.274 \pm 0.134$  ( $\bar{x} \pm SD$ ; range = 0.1 – 0.55) for medium predictability sentences, and  $0.752 \pm 0.123$  ( $\bar{x} \pm SD$ ; range = 0.56 – 1.00) for high predictability sentences.

In the unpredictable channel context, each participant was presented with 120 unique sentences: 40 low predictability, 40 medium predictability, and 40 high predictability sentences. Channel condition (i.e., degradation level) was also balanced across each sentence type, i.e., in each of low, medium, and high predictability

## *6. Graded effect of predictability*

sentences, 10 sentences passed through each noise vocoding channels — 1, 4, 6, and 8 — were presented. This resulted into 12 experimental lists. The sentences in each list were pseudo-randomized, that is, not more than three sentences of same noise condition (i.e., same noise vocoding channel), or same predictability condition appeared consecutively. This randomization confirmed the uncertainty of next-trial speech quality (or degradation) in the global context of the experiment.

The same set of stimuli and experimental lists were used in the predictable channel context. Each participant was presented with 120 unique sentences blocked by channel conditions, i.e., blocked by noise vocoding channels. There were four blocks of stimuli, one for each channel condition (i.e., degradation level). Thirty sentences were presented in each of the four blocks. In the first block, all sentences were 8 channels noise vocoded, followed by the blocks of 6 channels, 4 channels, and 1 channel noise vocoded speech consecutively ([Sheldon et al., 2008a](#)). Within each block, 10 low predictability, 10 medium predictability and 10 high predictability sentences were presented. All the sentences were pseudo-randomized so that not more than three sentences of the same predictability condition appeared consecutively in each block. This confirmed there was a certainty of next-trial speech quality (within each block) and an uncertainty of next-trial sentence predictability across all four blocks.

### **6.3.3 Procedure**

Participants were asked to use earphones or headphones. A prompt to adjust loudness was displayed at the beginning of the experiment: A noise vocoded sound not used in the main experiment was presented, and participants were asked to adjust the loudness at their level of comfort. One spoken sentence was presented in each trial with an inter-trial interval of 1000ms. Eight practice trials were presented before presenting 120 experimental trials. They were asked to enter what they had heard (i.e., to type in the entire sentence). Guessing was encouraged. The response was not timed. The experiment was about 40 minutes long.

## *6. Graded effect of predictability*

### **6.4 Analyses**

In the sentences used in our experiment, verbs evoke predictability of the sentence-final noun. Therefore, the effect of predictability (evoked by the verb) on language comprehension can be rightfully measured if we consider only those trials in which participants identify the verbs correctly. Verb-correct trials were considered as the sentence in which participants identified the context independent of whether they correctly understood the sentence final target noun. Morphological inflections and typos were considered as correct. We first filtered out those trials in which verbs were not identified correctly, i.e., trials with incorrect verbs. Therefore, we excluded 2469 out of 5760 trials in unpredictable channel context and 2374 out of 6000 trials in predictable channel context from the analyses. The 1 channel noise vocoding condition was dropped from the analyses as there were no correct responses in any of the trials in this condition.

We analyzed response accuracy with generalized linear mixed models following the procedure described in Chapter 4 (Section 4.2). Binary responses (correct/incorrect) for all participants in both groups (predictable channel context and unpredictable channel context) were fit with a binomial logistic mixed-effects model (Jaeger, 2006, 2008). Noise condition (categorical; 4, 6, and 8 channels noise vocoding), target word predictability (categorical; high predictability, medium predictability, and low predictability), global channel context (categorical; predictable channel context and unpredictable channel context), and the interaction of noise condition and target word predictability were included in the fixed effects. We applied treatment contrast for noise condition (8 channels as a baseline; factor levels: 8 channels, 4 channels, 6 channels) and sliding difference contrast for target word predictability (factor levels: medium predictability, low predictability, high predictability) and channel context (factor levels: unpredictable, predictable).

## *6. Graded effect of predictability*

### **6.5 Results and discussion**

We observed that the mean response accuracy increased with an increase in number of noise vocoding channels from 4 to 6 to 8, and with an increase in target word predictability from low to medium to high (see Figure X.X). This trend was consistent across both the channel contexts; Figure X.X and Figure Y.Y show this trend for predictable channel context (i.e., blocked design) and unpredictable channel context (i.e., randomized design) respectively. Mean accuracies across all conditions are given in Table X and Y, and Figure X.X.

These observations are confirmed by the results of statistical analyses (Table XYZ). We found a significant main effect of channel condition indicating that the response accuracy was higher in the 8 channels than in the 4 channels ( $\beta = -2.87$ , SE = .22,  $z(6917) = -13.1$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and 6 channels ( $\beta = -.66$ , SE = .19,  $z(6917) = -3.42$ ,  $p < .001$ ). There was a significant main effect of target word predictability suggesting that response accuracy was lower at low predictability sentences than both high predictability sentences ( $\beta = 2.18$ , SE = .3,  $z(6917) = 7.2$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and medium predictability sentences ( $\beta = -.52$ , SE = .27,  $z(6917) = -1.97$ ,  $p = .049$ ). We also found a significant interaction between channel condition and target word predictability ( $\beta = -.71$ , SE = .29,  $z(6917) = -2.44$ ,  $p = .015$ ).

We performed a subgroup analyses on each noise channel condition which revealed that the interaction was driven by the effect of predictability at 4 channels: The accuracy at high predictability sentences was higher than medium predictability sentences ( $\beta = 1.14$ , SE = .37,  $z(1608) = 3.1$ ,  $p < .001$ ), which in turn was also higher than low predictability sentences ( $\beta = 1$ , SE = .24,  $z(1608) = 4.2$ ,  $p < .001$ ). There was no significant difference in response accuracy between low predictability and high predictability sentences at both 6 channels ( $\beta = .33$ , SE = .32,  $z(2590) = 1.04$ ,  $p = .3$ ) and 8 channels ( $\beta = -.014$ , SE = .32,  $z(2719) = -.04$ ,  $p = .97$ ).

We also found a significant main effect of global channel context which showed that the response accuracy was higher in predictable channel context than in unpredictable channel context ( $\beta = -.27$ , SE = .14,  $z(6917) = -2.02$ ,  $p = .04$ ).

## *6. Graded effect of predictability*

Further, to test the effect of practice on adaptation to degraded speech, we added trial number as a fixed effect in the maximal model. Note that there were 30 trials in each block in the predictable channel context (i.e., blocked design). For comparability, we divided unpredictable channel context (i.e., randomized design) into four blocks in the analysis. We did not find a significant main effect of trial number indicating that the response accuracy did not change throughout the experiment ( $\beta = -.0004$ , SE = .01,  $z(6917) = -.05$ ,  $p = .97$ ). It remained constant within each block in the predictable channel context ( $\beta = -.02$ , SE = .01,  $z(3291) = -1.43$ ,  $p = .15$ ) as well as in the unpredictable channel context ( $\beta = .01$  SE = .01,  $z(3291) = 1.05$ ,  $p = .29$ ).

## **6.6 Conclusion**

The present study had three goals: i) to examine if previously reported facilitatory effect of semantic predictability is restricted to only highly predictable sentence endings; ii) to assess the role of perceptual adaptation on the facilitation of language comprehension by sentence predictability; and iii) to use and establish a sensitive metric to measure language comprehension that takes into account whether listeners benefited from the semantic context of the sentence they have listened to.

Results of our study showed the expected interaction between predictability and degraded speech, that is, language comprehension was better for high-cloze than for low-cloze target words when the speech signal was moderately degraded by noise vocoding through 4 channels, while the effect of predictability was absent when speech was not intelligible (noise vocoding through 1 channel). These results are fully in line with Obleser & Kotz (2010); we partly included identical sentences from their study in the present study (see Appendix A). Importantly, in contrast to their study, we had also created sentences with medium-cloze target words (which were intermediate between high-cloze and low-cloze target words) and found that the effect of predictability was also significant when comparing sentences with medium-cloze target words against sentences with low-cloze target words at 4 channels

## *6. Graded effect of predictability*

noise vocoding condition. Recognition of a target word was dependent on its level of predictability (measured by cloze probability), and correct recognition was not just limited to high-cloze target words. These significant differences in response accuracy between medium-cloze and low-cloze target words, and between medium-cloze and high-cloze target words at noise-vocoding through 4 channels show that the sentence-final word recognition is facilitated by semantic predictability in a graded manner. This is in line with the findings from the ERP literature where it has been observed that semantic predictability, in terms of cloze probability of target word of a sentence, modulates semantic processing, indexed by N400, in a graded manner (DeLong et al., 2005; Nieuwland et al., 2018; Wlotko & Federmeier, 2012).

The interpretation of the observed graded effect of semantic predictability at the moderate level of spectral degradation (i.e., at noise-vocoding through 4 channels) provides a novel insight into how listeners form prediction when the bottom-up input is compromised. That is, in an adverse listening condition, listeners rely more on top-down semantic prediction than on bottom-up acoustic-phonetic cues. However, such a reliance on top-down prediction is not an all-or-nothing phenomenon; instead, listeners form a probabilistic prediction of the target word. The effect of target word predictability on comprehension is not sharply focused solely on high-cloze target words like a ‘searchlight’ as proposed by Strauß and colleagues. But rather it is spread across a wide range including low-cloze and medium-cloze target words. As the cloze probability of the target words decreases from high to low, the focus of the searchlight becomes less precise.

We did not find learning effects at the trial-by-trial level of perceptual adaption: it may be that the adaptation was hampered by variation in higher-level semantic features (i.e., target word predictability). We also argue that for the examination of semantic predictability effects during language comprehension, the analyses of response accuracy should be based on the trials in which context evoking words are correctly identified in the first place to make sure that listeners make use of the contextual cues instead of analyzing general word recognition scores.

## *6. Graded effect of predictability*

### **6.7 Summary**

This chapter investigated the nature of predictability effect that was tested earlier in Chapter 5. The studies provide a novel insight into predictive language processing when bottom-up signal quality is compromised and uncertain: We show that while processing moderately degraded speech, listeners form top-down predictions across a wide range of semantic space that is not restricted within highly predictable sentence endings. In contrast to the *narrowed expectations* view, comprehension of words ranging from low- to high-cloze probability, including the medium-cloze probability, is facilitated in a graded manner while listening to a moderately degraded speech. Regardless of (un)certainty about the next-trial speech quality, we find that listeners do not adapt to degraded speech when semantic predictability varies, i.e., higher level semantic features interfere with the lower level perceptual properties. In the next chapter, we investigate the effect of changes in the lower-level bottom-up processing on top-down semantic predictions. Specifically, we examine how the change in speech rate moderates semantic predictions at a moderate level of speech degradation.

# 7

## Comprehension of degraded speech is modulated by the rate of speech

### 7.1 Introduction

### 7.2 Background

Language comprehension depends on the features and quality of speech signal which is hampered in adverse listening conditions when speech is distorted, for example, due to change in rate of speech, and spectral degradation of speech. Studies have shown that individuals can benefit from sentence context to compensate for distorted speech, at least when the level of speech degradation is at an intermediate level (Bhandari et al., 2021; e.g., Obleser & Kotz, 2010), and at varying speech rate (Aydelott & Bates, 2004; cf. Goy et al., 2013). The goal of the present study is to examine if sentence context can provide benefit when speech that is degraded at an intermediate level is presented at different rates (from slow, normal, and fast); speech in day-to-day conversation is distorted and presents itself at varying rate (e.g., Krause & Braida, 2004). In the following, we first summarize the impact of speech degradation in language comprehension, and its interaction with sentence context, and then the influence of speech rate on language comprehension, and its interaction with sentence context.

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

### **7.2.1 Comprehension of degraded speech**

There are a number of studies showing that speech intelligibility and language comprehension is hampered when the bottom-up input is less intelligible due to spectral degradation of the speech signal (Davis et al., 2005; Shannon et al., 1995). These studies have used noise vocoding as a methods of speech degradation. Here the speech signal is first divided into a specific number of frequency bands that corresponds to the number of vocoder channels. The amplitude envelope within each frequency band is extracted, and the spectral information within it is replaced by noise. The resulting vocoded speech contains temporal cues of the original speech, but it is difficult to understand – the lesser the number of vocoder channels, the lesser is the intelligibility. More attentional resources are required to process and comprehend such degraded speech as compared to clean speech (Eckert et al., 2016; e.g., Wild et al., 2012).

Listeners rely more on top-down predictions when the speech signal is less intelligible due to spectral degradation. Hence, they use the context information of the sentence to narrow down their predictions to a smaller set of semantic categories or words (Strauß et al., 2013; see also, Corps & Rabagliati, 2020). However, it is important that the context itself is ‘intelligible enough’ which is the case when the speech is only moderately degraded. For example, Obleser and colleagues (Obleser et al., 2007; Obleser & Kotz, 2010; Obleser & Kotz, 2011) found that at moderate levels of speech degradation, target words (the sentence final words) were better recognized when it was predictable from the sentence context than when it was unpredictable. When the speech signal is clear or only very mildly degraded, there is typically no effect of predictability on comprehension, as even unpredictable words can be understood well in this condition (intelligibility is at ceiling). In contrast, when the speech signal is extremely degraded (for instance at 1 channel noise vocoding), no facilitation from the context can be observed as the context itself cannot be understood and hence it cannot help with comprehension (Bhandari et al., 2021; Obleser & Kotz, 2010).

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

Taken together, these studies show that semantic predictability facilitates comprehension of degraded speech at a moderate level of spectral degradation, for example, at 4 channels noise vocoding, when the speech is intelligible enough for the listeners to understand and form meaning representation of the context to generate predictions about upcoming word in a sentence.

### **7.2.2 Comprehension of fast and slow speech**

A change in speech rate manipulates the speech signal without producing any spectral degradation (Charpentier & Stella, 1986; Moulines & Charpentier, 1990; Schlueter et al., 2014). Understanding fast speech is more effortful compared to normal and slow speech, (e.g., Müller et al., 2019; M. B. Winn & Teece, 2021; see also, Simantiraki & Cooke, 2020), and its intelligibility and comprehension are reduced (Fairbanks & Kodman Jr., 1957; Peelle & Wingfield, 2005; Schlueter et al., 2014). The comprehension deficit in fast speech has been linked to speed of processing (Gordon-Salant & Fitzgibbons, 1995; Tun, 1998; see also, Rönnberg et al., 2013) given the limited time available to decode and understand the information in the fast speech. It has also been suggested that the decoding and identification of incoming information in the fast speech puts a high demand on available cognitive resources (e.g., Rodero, 2016) such that processing rapidly flowing information exhausts the cognitive resource required for language processing (Gordon-Salant & Fitzgibbons, 2004; Janse, 2009). Hence, intelligibility and comprehension of fast speech is reduced compared to normal speech. In contrast, the central auditory-language comprehension system is shown to be flexible to process slow speech without reducing intelligibility (Lerner et al., 2014; see also, Vagharchakian et al., 2012). However, some earlier studies have casted doubt on the processing advantage of slow speech (Kemper & Harden, 1999; e.g., Nejime & Moore, 1998; see also, Liu & Zeng, 2006; Love et al., 2009). In sum, compression and expansion of speech have differential effects on speech intelligibility and language comprehension. Intelligibility and comprehension of fast speech is reduced while that of slow speech is generally increased compared to normal speech.

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

There are also a few studies so far that examined the role of predictability for understanding language when speech is fast or slow. For instance, Aydelott & Bates (2004) used a priming paradigm to examine the effects of contextual cues, which were target words embedded in sentences, and compared fast speech to normal speech. Target words were either congruent to the sentence context (100% cloze probability, i.e., in a constraining sentence context), incongruent (0% cloze probability, i.e., in an implausible sentence), or neutral (cloze probability not mentioned). Results indicated no reduction in facilitatory effect of contextual cues (congruent versus neutral target words) at fast speech compared to normal speech. In contrast, they found a reduced inhibitory effect (incongruent versus neutral target words). They argued that the constrained sentence context was easy to process – fast speech did not interfere with the earlier stage of activation of words that matched the context (i.e., in congruent trials). In contrast, the inhibition effect was reduced because there was less time to build up the representation of words in implausible sentence contexts so that less inhibition of the incongruent target word was needed. However, in a replication study of Aydelott & Bates (2004), Goy et al. (2013) found that the facilitatory effect was reduced in fast speech compared to normal speech. They argued that the fast speech slowed down the activation of potential target words that matched the context, which effectively reduced the contextual facilitation. In a recent study, M. B. Winn & Teece (2021) did not observe an increase in contextual facilitation for slow speech compared to normal speech, although the intelligibility was higher for slow speech. In another experiment, Koch & Janse (2016) presented participants with a question-answer sequence of varying length across a wide range of normal and fast speech from Spoken Dutch Corpus (Oostdijk, 2000). They did not find any effect of predictability on word recognition. However, target word predictability and target word position in the sentences were not systematically controlled for in their study.

The effects of predictability at varying rates of presentation have been also investigated with self-paced reading studies. For example, Wlotko & Federmeier (2015) presented participants with context evoking sentences followed by sentences

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

containing a target word that was either expected (mean cloze probability of 74%) or unexpected (either same or different semantic category, both with cloze probability of approximately 0%). They found that the facilitation effect (as reflected in the N400 amplitude) was reduced at the sentences that were presented fast compared to the ones that were presented slow. They suggested that at fast rate of presentation, predictive preactivation of words was not common: There was not enough time to activate proper representation for processing of upcoming word. In the same study, however, when the fast presentation was followed by slow presentation in separate blocks, semantic facilitation effect was not reduced. That is, increase in the flow of information did not always impair the ability to predict (see also, Cole, 2020). They argued that once the brain is engaged in predictive comprehension mode, for example, first in the slow presentation rate, it can then continue to allocate resources in the same mode under faster presentation rate.

In sum, there is already some evidence from studies applying various paradigms that the predictability of the sentence context interacts with the speech rate (Aydelott & Bates, 2004; Sharit et al., 2003; M. B. Winn & Teece, 2021; Wlotko & Federmeier, 2015). Benefits of using context information is not only limited under varying speech rates, but also when it is degraded (Bhandari et al., 2021; Obleser & Kotz, 2010; Sheldon et al., 2008a, 2008b). In the present study we will examine whether context information is still useful when the speech rate is fast (or slow) and degraded at the same time.

### **7.2.3 Comprehension of degraded speech at varying rates of presentation**

Real world listening is often a combination of more than one form of degradation and distortion of speech (Gordon-Salant & Fitzgibbons, 1995; see also, Cooke et al., 2014). For example, speakers' speech rate is variable, and there is a concurrent distortion due to background noise, reverberation, loss of spectral details in transmission, etc. Some of the earliest studies examined the 'devastating' effects of 'combinations of speech wave distortions', but the combination of multiple distortions

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

was not controlled for (Harris, 1960; D. W. Martin et al., 1956). Gordon-Salant & Fitzgibbons (1995) systematically tested the effect of multiple, combined speech distortions. They found that when fast speech was presented in a background noise, or with a reverberation then the word recognition accuracy in these combined distortions was lower than when the speech was presented in any single distortion condition. Adams & Moore (2009) and Adams et al. (2012) also showed that the addition of background noise had a detrimental effect on fast speech comprehension. With an increase in speech rate, listeners required higher signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) to achieve 50% word recognition accuracy across a wide range of speech rate (90 to 250 words per minute, in a step of 9 words per minute) and background noise (+15 dB SNR, +5 dB SNR, and 0 dB SNR). These studies showed that a combination of multiple distortions is worse than a single distortion. It is noteworthy that neither of the distortions mentioned above (e.g., reverberation, background noise) interfere with fine structure of a speech signal which spectral degradation does.

So far, the evidence for the detrimental effects of combination of spectral degradation and speech compression is sparse. Most of the evidence on this comes from cochlear implant users (e.g., Y. Li et al., 2011; Su et al., 2016) as they are the group of listeners whose auditory input is spectrally degraded. Iwasaki et al. (2002) found that a change in speech rate from slow to fast reduced word recognition accuracy in cochlear implantees. Similarly, their speech perception was impaired with increased rate of speech, and it was improved when the speech rate was decreased (e.g., Dincer D'Alessandro et al., 2018). Meng et al. (2019) used both clean speech and spectrally degraded speech from MSP (Mandarin speech perception) and MHINT (Mandarin hearing in noise test) corpora in normal-hearing listeners and cochlear implant users. They found that an increase in speech rate had much severe effect at spectrally degraded speech (4 channels sine-wave vocoded) than at clean speech. To achieve the same level of accuracy, listeners required degraded speech to be much slower than the normal speech. All of these studies indicated that when speech rate is increased, intelligibility and comprehension of degraded speech is reduced. However, these studies did not

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

examine the utility of context information when speech is distorted by more than one means, although the role of context and predictability in any one of these multiple distortions has been extensively discussed in the literature (Aydelott & Bates, 2004; Bhandari et al., 2021; C. Clark et al., 2021; Corps & Rabagliati, 2020; Goy et al., 2013; Obleser & Kotz, 2010; Sheldon et al., 2008a, 2008b; van Os et al., 2021).

Taken together, the utility of semantic predictability in comprehension of degraded speech is fairly established whereas its effects in comprehension of both fast speech as well as slow speech is inconsistent. Whether semantic predictability is beneficial even for degraded speech presented at different rates (fast and slow) has not been investigated yet.

### **7.2.4 Study aims**

We systematically examined if contextual facilitation at a moderate level of degradation varies with a change in speech rate. The aim was to investigate if the increase (or decrease) in speech rate decreases (or increases) the facilitatory effect of semantic predictability that has been observed for moderately degraded speech at a normal speech rate. Semantic predictability was manipulated by varying the cloze probability of target words, and moderate degradation was achieved by noise vocoding of speech through 4 channels; Obleser & Kotz (2010) and Bhandari et al. (2021) have reported 4 channels noise vocoding to be the moderate degradation level at which contextual facilitation is observed. Speech rate was manipulated by compression (or expansion) of the moderately degraded speech, by uniform pitch synchronous overlap-add technique that acts upon the temporal envelope of the speech signal, to make it fast (or slow).

To achieve the goal, we conducted two experiments in which listeners were required to listen to the sentences and type in the entire sentence they hear. Sentence comprehension (word recognition accuracy) for high and low predictability sentences were assessed in fast speech (Experiment 1), and slow speech (Experiment 2). Because the processing demand increases, and a limited time is to be

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

available to process the context and form predictions (e.g., Aydelott & Bates, 2004; Wlotko & Federmeier, 2015), we expected that the contextual facilitation (i.e., the difference between high and low predictability sentences) will be reduced for fast speech compared to normal speech (Experiment 3A). However, for slow speech due to abundance of time to process the degraded speech and the context, and reduction in effortful processing (e.g., M. B. Winn & Teece, 2021), we expected contextual facilitation to be increased compared to normal speech (Experiment 3B). We expected that both increase and decrease in contextual facilitation will be primarily driven by the ease of processing high predictability sentences as compared to low predictability sentences (Aydelott & Bates, 2004; Goy et al., 2013).

## **7.3 Experiment 7A**

### **7.4 Methods**

#### **7.4.1 Participants**

We recruited one group of participant ( $n=101$ ;  $\bar{x} \pm SD = 23.14 \pm XX$  years; age range = 18-31 years; 66 females, 1 preferred not to say) online via Prolific Academic. All participants were native speakers of German residing in Germany. Exclusion criteria for participating in this study were self-reported hearing disorder, speech-language disorder, or any neurological disorder. All participants received monetary compensation for their participation. The German Society for Language Science ethics committee approved the study and participants provided an informed consent in accordance with the declaration of Helsinki.

#### **7.4.2 Materials**

We used the stimuli created by the method described in Section X.X.X in Chapter X.X which consisted of 360 German sentences spoken by a female native German speaker in an unaccented normal rate of speech. Two categories of sentences that differed in the cloze probability of the target words (nouns) appearing the final

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

word of the sentence were created from 120 nouns. Thus, we compared high and low predictability sentences (abbreviated as HP and LP henceforth) which were sentences with low and high cloze target words respectively. This gave 240 sentences that consisted of pronoun, verb, determiner, and object (noun). The mean cloze probabilities of target words for low and high predictability sentences were  $0.022 \pm 0.027$  ( $\bar{x} \pm SD$ ; range = 0.00 - 0.09) and  $0.752 \pm 0.123$  ( $\bar{x} \pm SD$ ; range = 0.56 - 1.00) respectively.

These 240 sentences were passed compressed by a factor of 0.65 using PSOLA built-in in Praat to create fast and slow speech respectively. Speech degradation of all normal, slow and fast speech was achieved by noise vocoding through 4 channels.

Each participant was presented with 120 unique sentences: 60 HP and 60 LP sentences. Speech rate was also balanced across each predictability level. The participants received 30 sentences with normal speed and 30 with fast speed in each of the predictability conditions resulting into 4 experimental lists. The sentences in each list were pseudo-randomized, that is, not more than 3 sentences of same speed, or same predictability condition appeared consecutively.

### **7.4.3 Procedure**

Participants were asked to use headphones or earphones. A sample of noise vocoded speech not used in the practice trial and the main experiment was provided so that the participants could adjust the loudness to a preferred level of comfort at the beginning of the experiment. The participants were instructed to listen to the sentences and to type in the entire sentence by using the keyboard. The time for typing in the response was not limited. They were also informed at the beginning of the experiment that some of the sentences would be ‘noisy’ and not easy to understand, and in these cases, they were encouraged to guess what they might have heard. They were not informed about the speed of speech being slow/fast or normal. Eight practice trials with different levels of speech degradation were given to familiarize the participants with the task before presenting all 120 experimental trials with an inter-trial interval of 1000 ms.

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

### **7.5 Analyses**

We have already conceded in the previous chapter X.X.X that “the effect of predictability (evoked by the verb) on language comprehension can be rightfully measured if we consider only those trials in which participants identify the verbs correctly.” Therefore, we discarded the trials in which verbs were identified incorrectly – XXXX out of XXXX trials.

We preprocessed and analysed data in R-Studio (Version 4.1.1; R Core Team, 2021) following the procedure described in Chapter 4.4.4.

Response accuracy was analyzed with Generalized Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) with lme4 ([Bates, Mächler, et al., 2015](#)) and lmerTest ([Kuznetsova et al., 2017](#)) packages. Binary responses (correct/incorrect) for all participants were fit with a binomial logistic mixed-effects model([Jaeger, 2006, 2008](#)). Target word predictability (categorical; low and high), speech rate, or speed (categorical; xxx and xxx), and the interaction of predictability and speed were included in the fixed effects.

We fitted a model with maximal random effects structure that included random intercepts for each participant and item ([Barr et al., 2013](#)). Both, by-participant and by-item random slopes were included for target word predictability, speed and their interaction.

We applied treatment contrast for target word predictability (low predictability as a baseline; factor levels: low predictability, high predictability) and speed (normal speed as a baseline; factor levels: normal speed, fast speed). The results from the maximal model are shown in Table X.X.X, and are reported below in the Results section.

### **7.6 Results and discussion**

Mean response accuracies across all conditions are presented in Table 2. We found a significant main effect of target word predictability ( $\beta = 2.42$ , SE = .28,  $z = 8.55$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and a significant main effect of speech rate ( $\beta = -0.98$ , SE = .24,  $z =$

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

4.16,  $p < .001$ ). These suggested that participants' response accuracy was higher for the high predictability sentences than for the low predictability sentences, and for normal speech than for fast speech. We also found a significant interaction between target word predictability and speech rate ( $\beta = 1.06$ , SE = .42,  $z = 2.50$ ,  $p = .01$ ). As it can be seen in Figure 1, the effect of target word predictability was reduced at fast speech. These results are shown in Table 3.

Separate planned analyses of each predictability level were performed following the same procedure described above in the Analysis section. The results shown in Table 4 and Table 5 revealed that there was no significant main effect of speech rate at high predictability condition ( $\beta = .02$ , SE = .34,  $z = .05$ ,  $p = .96$ ). At low predictability condition, in contrast, we found a significant main effect of speech rate ( $\beta = -.99$ , SE = .27,  $z = -3.72$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Hence, response accuracy decreased at fast speech only for the low predictability condition.

Separate planned analyses of each speech rate shown in Table 6 and Table 7 revealed that there was significant main effect of predictability in both normal speech ( $\beta = 1.98$ , SE = 0.28,  $z = 7.05$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and fast speech conditions ( $\beta = 2.67$ , SE = .37,  $z = 7.14$ ,  $p < .001$ ), but the effect appeared to be higher for fast speech ( $\beta = 2.67$ ) than for normal speech ( $\beta = 1.98$ ). This, however, is a result of significant reduction in accuracy at low predictability condition at fast speech rather than due to an increase in accuracy at high predictability condition. This can also be seen in Table 2 and Figure 1.

These results indicated an increase in response accuracy with an increase in target word predictability only at a normal speech rate. Fast speech rate significantly affected accuracy at low predictability condition such that the contextual facilitation was essentially reduced. These findings align with previous studies conducted with clean speech that found fast speech to reduce contextual facilitation (e.g., Aydelott & Bates, 2004). The results of the first experiment showed ease of processing high predictability sentences compared to low predictability sentences at moderately degraded fast speech. We conducted another experiment to examine if slowing down the speech rate eases processing of both low and high predictability

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

sentences and increases the contextual facilitation in comprehension of moderately degraded speech.

## **7.7 Experiment 7B**

## **7.8 Methods**

### **7.8.1 Participants and Materials**

We recruited 101 participants ( $\bar{x} \pm SD = 23.49 \pm 3.26$  years; age range = 18-30 years; 60 females, 1 preferred not to say) online via Prolific Academic. Same procedure as Experiment 3A was followed.

We used the same sentences that were used in Experiment 1. However, the auditory recordings were expanded by a factor of 1.35 to create slow speech. All other procedure to create stimuli were identical to Experiment 1 resulting in two sets (one set of normal and one set of slow speech) of 240 sentences (120 high and 120 low predictability sentences) which were passed through 4 channels noise vocoding.

We followed the same steps as Experiment 3A to balance speech rate and predictability conditions and to pseudo-randomize these experimental conditions across all 4 lists.

### **7.8.2 Procedure**

Same procedure as Experiment 3A was followed. We asked participants to report the entire sentence typing in what they heard. And guessing was encouraged.

## **7.9 Analyses**

We followed the same data analyses procedure as in Experiment 3A. Only the trials with verb-correct responses were considered in the analyses of accuracy of sentence-final target-words (i.e., nouns); 5495 out of 12120 trials were removed before the final analyses.

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

Target word predictability (categorical; low and high), speech rate, or speed (categorical; normal and slow), and the interaction of predictability and speed were included in the fixed effects. Treatment contrast was applied to both target word predictability (low predictability as a baseline; factor levels: low predictability, high predictability) and speed (normal speed as a baseline; factor levels: normal speed, slow speed). The results from the maximal model are shown in Table X.X.X, and are reported below in the Results section.

## **7.10 Results and discussion**

Mean response accuracies for all experimental conditions are shown in Table 8. There was a significant main effect of target word predictability indicating that participants' response accuracy was higher for the high predictability condition than for the low predictability condition ( $\beta = 2.58$ ,  $SE = .30$ ,  $z = 8.65$ ,  $p < .001$ ). In contrast to Experiment 1, we did not find a significant main effect of speech rate ( $\beta = -.08$ ,  $SE = .15$ ,  $z = .57$ ,  $p = .568$ ), nor there was a significant interaction between speech rate and target word predictability ( $\beta = .44$ ,  $SE = .27$ ,  $z = 1.65$ ,  $p = .099$ ). These suggested that there was no change in participants' response accuracy with a reduction in speech rate, nor did the contextual facilitation significantly increase or decrease with slowing down of the speech rate. It can be seen in Figure 2 that the effect of target word predictability did not change with speech rate. These results are shown in Table 9.

We conducted separate planned analyses of each predictability level; the procedure was identical to the analyses in Experiment 1. The results presented in Table 10 and Table 11 confirmed the findings of the main analysis reported above – there was no significant main effect of speech rate at both high predictability condition ( $\beta = .39$ ,  $SE = .22$ ,  $z = 1.79$ ,  $p = .073$ ), as well as at low predictability condition ( $\beta = -.11$ ,  $SE = .16$ ,  $z = -.71$ ,  $p = .48$ ). Hence, as opposed to the findings of Experiment 1, response accuracy was not affected by change in speech rate at both high and low predictability sentences.

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

As in Experiment 1, we conducted separate planned analyses of each speech rate. The results as shown in Table 12 and Table 13 revealed that there was a significant main effect of target word predictability at both slow speech rate ( $\beta = 2.55$ , SE = .31,  $z = 8.14$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and normal speech rate ( $\beta = 2.08$ , SE = .27,  $z = 7.68$ ,  $p < .001$ ); the effect appeared to be higher for slow speech ( $\beta = 2.55$ ) than for normal speech ( $\beta = 2.08$ ). This, however, was a result of smaller accuracy at low predictability condition at slow speech rather than due to a higher accuracy at high predictability condition. This can also be seen in Table 8 and Figure 2.

In contrast to Experiment 1, the findings of Experiment 2 did not indicate differential effect of speech rates in the comprehension of high and low predictability sentences. While the results of Experiment 1 showed that speeding up the speech rate significantly reduced the accuracy of low predictability sentences, such a reduction was not observed in Experiment 2 when the speech rate was slowed down. Although listeners' response accuracy was reduced at both fast and slow speech rates as compared to normal speech rate, their ability to utilize context information was only impaired by fast speech.

## **7.11 Conclusion**

The main goals of the present study were to examine if semantic predictability facilitates comprehension of moderately degraded speech at different speech rates given that the ease of processing the sentences varies with their predictability and speed. The results of the two experiments revealed that fast speech selectively impedes the comprehension of low predictability sentences, while slow speech has no effect on contextual facilitation at a moderate level of degradation.

In both the experiments, our results showed a significant main effect of predictability at normal speech rate, i.e., we observed a facilitatory effect of semantic predictability at normal speech rate under moderate degradation level of 4 channels noise vocoding. This replicates the findings from earlier studies like Obleser & Kotz (2010) and Bhandari et al. (2021) in which participants were presented only

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

with normal speech rate, and contextual facilitation was observed at 4 channels noise vocoding. At this moderate degradation level, listeners were able to decode the context and form its meaning representation. Consequently, they generated predictions about the upcoming target word in a sentence even in low predictability condition depending on the contextual constrain of the sentences (Bhandari et al., 2021; see also, Strauß et al., 2013).

The expected interaction between speech rate and target word predictability in Experiment 1 showed that comprehension of degraded speech was significantly impaired for low predictability sentences at fast speech rate. In contrast, there was a little to no effect in comprehension of high predictability sentences at fast speech rate under moderate degradation level. Listening to degraded speech itself requires more attentional resources compared to clean speech (Wild et al., 2012). When presented as a fast speech, spectral degradation imposes additional cognitive demands; and less time is available to process the auditory signal. In such a rapidly unfolding event, it is difficult to decode the context information and form its meaning representation from the degraded speech to form predictions about upcoming target word. This difficulty is heightened when target words are not easily predictable from the context (Aydelott & Bates, 2004). As a result, language comprehension in low predictability condition is impaired more than that in high predictability condition. This detrimental effect on low predictability condition also results in the reduced contextual facilitation in fast speech compared to normal speech observed in Experiment 1.

In contrast to Experiment 1, we did not find the expected interaction between speech rate and target word predictability in Experiment 2, i.e., decrease in speech rate did not differentially affect the comprehension of high or low predictability sentences although the comprehension tended to decrease at slow speech rate compared to normal speech rate. As opposed to Experiment 1, we did not observe a significant change in contextual facilitation at slow speech rate at a moderate degradation level in Experiment 2. Slowing down the speech provides listeners more time to process the information, including the context that is important to

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

generate predictions. However, our findings show that this ease of processing does not benefit intelligibility and comprehension of sentences with highly predictable target words any more than the sentences with less predictable target words. This claim is in line with the results of M. B. Winn & Teece (2021)] who reported that intelligibility does not increase when the speech is slowed down even though there is a difference in the intelligibility between high and low predictability sentences at both normal and slow speech rates.

Accounts from speech perception, and predictive language processing point to a common expectation: contextual facilitation is enhanced when listeners have more time to process the incoming information [CITE]. Additionally, there are conflicting empirical evidence whether increase or decrease of speech rate provides benefit in intelligibility, comprehension, and contextual facilitation. Given these state of affairs, our findings add new theoretical insights with empirical support into the interplay among spectral degradation, speech rate, and semantic prediction. Although reducing the speech rate provides time to process the information (including the context) in the degraded speech, this eases the processing of both high and low predictability to a similar extent. And thus, no increased facilitatory effect is observed at slow speech rate. In contrast, increasing the speech rate adds more cognitive load on the top of the effort required to process degraded speech. This results in difficulty in processing and understanding the rapidly unfolding sentences among which this difficulty is further increased when the target words are not easily predictable.

We note a limitation in our study. We tested only with one expansion factor of 1.35, and one compression factor of 0.65. Although less likely, it can be speculated that when the speech is expanded to a greater degree by including other expansion factors, an increase in facilitatory effect could be observed [cf. ] which was not the case in the current study.

To conclude, we show that processing speed and constraints in attentional and cognitive resources are key factors that influence contextual facilitation of moderately degraded speech. When enough time is available to process information, i.e.,

## *7. Speech rate and predictability effects*

at slow speech, contextual facilitation does neither increase nor decrease. However, at a time crunch of information processing, i.e., at fast speech, contextual facilitation is reduced such that the fast speech is detrimental to understanding words that are not easily predictable from the context.

# 8

## Discussion and conclusion

While there is no doubt that human readers and listeners use context information and form semantic predictions, there have been questions about the ubiquity of predictive nature of language processing, in particular, language comprehension. In this thesis, we examined predictive language processing while listeners are presented with degraded speech. By manipulating top-down and bottom-up processes, we examined the interactions of these two processes in understanding speech in adverse listening conditions. Our findings support the predictive processing account of language comprehension. Below we synthesize the results from the experiments in the preceding chapters, and put forth a nuanced argument in favor of the facilitatory effect of predictability in degraded speech comprehension.

### 8.1 Summary of the main findings

In Chapter 5, we investigated the role of attention to sentence context in semantic prediction. The results showed that listeners can use context information and form predictions about upcoming linguistic units only if they are attending to the context in the sentence. This finding highlights the critical role of attention in prediction in degraded speech comprehension. It also shows that prediction is not

## *8. Discussion and conclusion*

an automatic phenomenon; rather, prediction depends on listeners' attention to the context, and them forming its meaning representation.

In Chapter 6, we further examined the nature of contextual facilitation that was observed in Chapter 5. The results showed that semantic predictability facilitated comprehension of degraded speech at a moderate level of degradation. Importantly, such predictability effect was graded in nature. The latter finding refuted the claims made by 'narrowed expectations' views of StraSSe and colleagues (StrauSS et al., 2013).

In Chapter 7, we examined if the facilitatory effect of predictability at the moderate spectral degradation is influenced by bottom-up factor, like temporal degradation of speech (i.e., fast and slow speech). The findings show that fast speech incurs processing cost when the sentence endings are less predictable from the context, therefore, contextual facilitation is reduced in fast speech. In slow speech, on the other hand, no change is observed in the facilitatory effect, as the listeners are at their optimal level of performance already at the normal speech rate.

Results from Chapters 5 and 6 also showed that listeners do not adapt to degraded speech despite being exposed to it throughout the experiment. The change in target word predictability, i.e., semantic feature of the speech signal potentially interferes in adaptation to lower level perceptual property of the speech.

Taken together, the findings from these three chapters can be stated as: At a normal speech rate, when listeners attend to sentence context, semantic predictability facilitates language comprehension at a moderate level of spectral degradation.

## **8.2 Theoretical and practical implications**

## **8.3 Limitation**

- Iron law /Stanovic's law

## *8. Discussion and conclusion*

### **8.4 Concluding remarks**

Dont introduce new material, e.g., theories, results, data, etc. Reflect on the results, chapters. Create a satisfactory ending.

Sell your wares. You have made original contribution: “My original contribution to knowledge is ...”

Conclusion is more than a summary. Summary is just a part of the conclusion. Give ‘what’ happened in the thesis but also ‘why’. Why do the chapters matter?

How you have contributed to the discipline? Different than contribution to the knowledge. Tell about local context. Position in the world.

What went wrong? What would you do differently?

Future work. It follows from ‘what went wrong’.

Extendability. What / how to extend from your work.

Impact. Impact to the society; social, theoretical, financial, etc. This is different than contribution to knowledge and discipline.

Writing matters. Why should someone give a damn about your thesis?

Don’t underclaim, don’t overclaim. About implications. What does the summary mean, what answers does it provide, does it not provide. Offer a series of pathways to future research. [My thesis has done X, it leads to Y; cite literature.]  
-> repeat recursively.

All in all, conclusions mean: Why does the thesis matter? Don’t give new material. Give a link between chapters.

Don’t say what you think, say what the data speaks.

9:57 1. Conclusions spring form the thesis 11:33 2. Sell your wares 12:52 3. A PhD conclusion is more than a summary 14:11 4. Significance to the discipline 15:39 5. What went wrong? 16:41 6. Future work 17:41 7. Impact, relevance and consequences 19:25 8. Writing matters 22:57 9. Don’t underclaim and don’t overclaim 25:29 10. Don’t rely on the examiner’s benevolence

# 9

## Ethics and funding

**Ethics:** The studies presented in this thesis involved human subjects. All subjects were recruited following the recommendations of the American Psychological Association. All subjects provided an informed consent in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. The ethics committee of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Sprache (DGfS; EN: German Society for Language Science) provided ethical approval for the experiments conducted.

**Funding:** The research presented in this thesis was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG; EN: German Research Foundation) under the research grant SFB1102 (Sonderforschungsbereiche; EN: Collaborative Research Center), Project ID 232722074.

# Appendices

# A

## Experimental items

This is a list of high, medium and low predictability sentences used in all the experiments mentioned in Chapters 5, 6, and 7.

-> Insert table here <-

# Bibliography

- Aarts, A. A., Anderson, J. E., Anderson, C. J., Attridge, P. R., Attwood, A., Axt, J., Babel, M., Bahník, ., Baranski, E., Barnett-Cowan, M., Bartmess, E., Beer, J., Bell, R., Bentley, H., Beyan, L., Binion, G., Borsboom, D., Bosch, A., Bosco, F. A., ... Zuni, K. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac4716>
- Adams, E. M., Gordon-Hickey, S., Morlas, H., & Moore, R. (2012). Effect of rate-alteration on speech perception in noise in older adults with normal hearing and hearing impairment. *American Journal of Audiology*, 21(1), 22–32. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1059-0889\(2011/10-0023\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1059-0889(2011/10-0023))
- Adams, E. M., & Moore, R. E. (2009). Effects of speech rate, background noise, and simulated hearing loss on speech rate judgment and speech intelligibility in young listeners. *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology*, 20(1), 28–39. <https://doi.org/10.3766/jaaa.20.1.3>
- Akaike, H. (1973). Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle. In B. N. Petrov & F. Csaksi (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd international symposium on information theory* (pp. 267–281). Akademiai Kaido.
- Altmann, G. T. M., & Kamide, Y. (1999). Incremental interpretation at verbs: restricting the domain of subsequent reference. *Cognition*, 73(3), 247–264. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0010-0277\(99\)00059-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0010-0277(99)00059-1)
- Altmann, G. T. M., & Kamide, Y. (2007). The real-time mediation of visual attention by language and world knowledge: Linking anticipatory (and other) eye movements to linguistic processing. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 57(4), 502–518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2006.12.004>
- Amichetti, N. M., Atagi, E., Kong, Y.-Y., & Wingfield, A. (2018). Linguistic Context Versus Semantic Competition in Word Recognition by Younger and Older Adults With Cochlear Implants. *Ear & Hearing*, 39(1), 101–109. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000469>
- Ankener, C. S. (2019). *The influence of visual information on word predictability and processing effort* [Doctoral dissertation]. Saarland University; Saarländische Universitäts-und Landesbibliothek.

### A. Experimental items

- Ankener, C. S., Sekicki, M., & Staudte, M. (2018). The influence of visual uncertainty on word surprisal and processing effort. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 2387. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02387>
- Anwyl-Irvine, A. L., Massonnié, J., Flitton, A., Kirkham, N., & Evershed, J. K. (2020). Gorilla in our midst: An online behavioral experiment builder. *Behavior Research Methods*, 52(1), 388–407. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-019-01237-x>
- Anwyl-Irvine, A., Dalmaijer, E. S., Hodges, N., & Evershed, J. K. (2021). Realistic precision and accuracy of online experiment platforms, web browsers, and devices. *Behavior Research Methods*, 53(4), 1407–1425. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-020-01501-5>
- Aydelott, J., & Bates, E. (2004). Effects of acoustic distortion and semantic context on lexical access. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 19(1), 29–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01690960344000099>
- Baayen, R. H., Davidson, D. J., & Bates, D. M. (2008). Mixed-effects modeling with crossed random effects for subjects and items. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 59(4), 390–412. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2007.12.005>
- Barr, D. J., Levy, R., Scheepers, C., & Tily, H. J. (2013). Random effects structure for confirmatory hypothesis testing: Keep it maximal. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 68(3), 255–278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2012.11.001>
- Bates, D., Kliegl, R., Vasishth, S., & Baayen, H. (2015). Parsimonious Mixed Models. *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.04967>
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1). <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>
- Berners-Lee, T., Cailliau, R., Groff, J. F., & Pollermann, B. (1992). World-wide web: The information universe. *Internet Research*, 2(1), 52–58. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb047254>
- Bhandari, P., Demberg, V., & Kray, J. (2021). Semantic predictability facilitates comprehension of degraded speech in a graded manner. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 714485. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.714485>
- Boersma, P. (2001). Praat, a system for doing phonetics by computer. *Glot. Int.*, 5(9), 341–345.
- Bolker, B. M., Brooks, M. E., Clark, C. J., Geange, S. W., Poulsen, J. R., Stevens, M. H. H., & White, J. S. S. (2009). Generalized linear mixed models: a practical guide for ecology and evolution. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 24(3), 127–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2008.10.008>

### A. Experimental items

- Bondell, H. D., Krishna, A., & Ghosh, S. K. (2010). Joint variable selection for fixed and random effects in linear mixed-effects models. *Biometrics*, 66(4), 1069–1077.
- Bowers, J. S., & Davis, C. J. (2012). Bayesian just-so stories in psychology and neuroscience. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(3), 389–414. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026450>
- Brothers, T., Swaab, T. Y., & Traxler, M. J. (2015). Effects of prediction and contextual support on lexical processing: Prediction takes precedence. *Cognition*, 136, 135–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2014.10.017>
- Bruineberg, J., Dolega, K., Dewhurst, J., & Baltieri, M. (2021). The emperor's new markov blankets. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 1–63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X21002351>
- Brunellièvre, A., Auran, C., & Delrue, L. (2019). Does the prosodic emphasis of sentential context cause deeper lexical-semantic processing? *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 34(1), 29–42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2018.1499945>
- Charpentier, F. J., & Stella, M. G. (1986). Diphone synthesis using an overlap-add technique for speech waveforms concatenation. *ICASSP, IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing - Proceedings*, 2015–2018. <https://doi.org/10.1109/icassp.1986.1168657>
- Chatterjee, S., & Hadi, A. S. (2012). Multiple linear regression. In *Regression analysis by example* (pp. 57–91). John Wiley & Sons.
- Chen, F., & Loizou, P. C. (2011). Predicting the intelligibility of vocoded speech. *Ear and Hearing*, 32(3), 331.
- Cherry, E. C. (1953). Some experiments on the recognition of speech, with one and with two ears. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 25(5), 975–979. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1907229>
- Christiansen, M. H., & Chater, N. (2015). The Now-or-Never bottleneck: A fundamental constraint on language. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 39, 1–72. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X1500031X>
- Clark, A. (2013). Whatever next? Predictive brains, situated agents, and the future of cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(3), 181–204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x12000477>
- Clark, C., Guédiche, S., & Lallier, M. (2021). Compensatory cross-modal effects of sentence context on visual word recognition in adults. *Reading and Writing*, 34(8), 2011–2029. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-021-10132-x>
- Clark, H. H. (1973). The language-as-a-fixed-effect fallacy: A critique of language

### A. Experimental items

- statistics in psychological research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 12(4), 335–359. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371\(73\)80014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(73)80014-3)
- Clendeninn, P. (1940). The vocoder. *Nature*, 145(3665), 157. <https://doi.org/10.1038/145157a0>
- Cockburn, A., Dragicevic, P., Besançon, L., & Gutwin, C. (2020). Threats of a replication crisis in empirical computer science. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(8), 70–79. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3360311>
- Cole, A. (2020). *The effects of prediction and speech rate on lexical processing* (p. 35) [Masters thesis, University of Maryland]. <https://doi.org/10.13016/37my-jxp7>
- Coleman, E. B. (1964). Generalizing to a language population. *Psychological Reports*, 14(1), 219–226. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1964.14.1.219>
- Coltheart, M. (2004). Are there lexicons? *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A: Human Experimental Psychology*, 57(7), 11531171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02724980443000007>
- Cooke, M., & Garcia Lecumberri, M. (2021). Estimating the performance gap between lab and remote speech perception experiment. *Acoustical Society of America Journal*, 149(4), A111–A111.
- Cooke, M., King, S., Garnier, M., & Aubanel, V. (2014). The listening talker: A review of human and algorithmic context-induced modifications of speech. *Computer Speech and Language*, 28(2), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csl.2013.08.003>
- Cooke, M., Scharenborg, O., & Meyer, B. T. (2022). The time course of adaptation to distorted speech. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 151(4), 2636–2646.
- Corps, R. E., & Rabagliati, H. (2020). How top-down processing enhances comprehension of noise-vocoded speech: Predictions about meaning are more important than predictions about form. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 113, 104114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2020.104114>
- Dahan, D., & Magnuson, J. S. (2006). *Spoken word recognition* (pp. 249–283). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-012369374-7/50009-2>
- Darwiche, A. (2010). Bayesian networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 53(12), 80–90. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1859204.1859227>
- Darwin, C. (2005). *Praat scripts for producing shannon AM speech*. [http://www.lifesci.sussex.ac.uk/home/Chris\\_Darwin/Praatscripts/](http://www.lifesci.sussex.ac.uk/home/Chris_Darwin/Praatscripts/).
- Davis, M. H., Johnsruude, I. S., Hervais-Adelman, A., Taylor, K., & McGettigan,

### A. Experimental items

- C. (2005). Lexical Information Drives Perceptual Learning of Distorted Speech: Evidence From the Comprehension of Noise-Vocoded Sentences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 134(2), 222–241. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.134.2.222>
- DeLong, K. A., Urbach, T. P., & Kutas, M. (2005). Probabilistic word pre-activation during language comprehension inferred from electrical brain activity. *Nature Neuroscience*, 8(8), 1117–1121. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nn1504>
- Demberg, V., Keller, F., & Koller, A. (2013). Incremental, predictive parsing with psycholinguistically motivated tree-adjoining grammar. *Computational Linguistics*, 39(4), 1025–1066.
- Dincer D'Alessandro, H., Boyle, P. J., Ballantyne, D., De Vincentiis, M., & Mancini, P. (2018). The role of speech rate for Italian-speaking cochlear implant users: insights for everyday speech perception. *International Journal of Audiology*, 57(11), 851–857. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14992027.2018.1498139>
- Dudley, H. (1939). The vocoder. *Bell Laboratories Record*, 18(4), 122–126.
- Dupoux, E., & Green, K. (1997). Perceptual adjustment to highly compressed speech: Effects of talker and rate changes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 23(3), 914–927. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.23.3.914>
- Ebersole, C. R., Atherton, O. E., Belanger, A. L., Skulborstad, H. M., Allen, J. M., Banks, J. B., Baranski, E., Bernstein, M. J., Bonfiglio, D. B. V., Boucher, L., Brown, E. R., Budiman, N. I., Cairo, A. H., Capaldi, C. A., Chartier, C. R., Chung, J. M., Cicero, D. C., Coleman, J. A., Conway, J. G., ... Nosek, B. A. (2016). Many Labs 3: Evaluating participant pool quality across the academic semester via replication. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 67, 68–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.10.012>
- Eckert, M. A., Teubner-Rhodes, S., & Vaden, K. I. (2016). Is Listening in Noise Worth It? The Neurobiology of Speech Recognition in Challenging Listening Conditions. *Ear & Hearing*, 37(1), 101S–110S. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000300>
- Ehrlich, S. F., & Rayner, K. (1981). Contextual effects on word perception and eye movements during reading. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 20(6), 641–655. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371\(81\)90220-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(81)90220-6)
- Ellermeier, W., Kattner, F., Ueda, K., Doumoto, K., & Nakajima, Y. (2015). Memory disruption by irrelevant noise-vocoded speech: Effects of native language and the number of frequency bands. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 138(3), 1561–1569.

### A. Experimental items

- Erb, J. (2014). *The neural dynamics of perceptual adaptation to degraded speech* (p. 211) [Doctoral dissertation]. Universität Leipzig.
- Erb, J., Henry, M. J., Eisner, F., & Obleser, J. (2013). The Brain Dynamics of Rapid Perceptual Adaptation to Adverse Listening Conditions. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 33(26), 10688–10697. <https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.4596-12.2013>
- Eyal, P., David, R., Andrew, G., Zak, E., & Ekaterina, D. (2021). Data quality of platforms and panels for online behavioral research. *Behavior Research Methods*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-021-01694-3>
- Fairbanks, G., & Kodman Jr., F. (1957). Word intelligibility as a function of time compression. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 29(5), 636–641.
- Federmeier, K. D. (2007). Thinking ahead: The role and roots of prediction in language comprehension. *Psychophysiology*, 44(4), 491–505. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2007.00531.x>
- Federmeier, K. D., Kutas, M., & Schul, R. (2010). Age-related and individual differences in the use of prediction during language comprehension. *Brain and Language*, 115(3), 149–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2010.07.006>
- Federmeier, K. D., Wlotko, E. W., De Ochoa-Dewald, E., & Kutas, M. (2007). Multiple effects of sentential constraint on word processing. *Brain Research*, 1146(1), 75–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2006.06.101>
- Federmeier, K., McLennan, D., Ochoa, E. de, & Kutas, M. (2002). The impact of semantic memory organization and sentence context information on spoken language processing by younger and older adults: An ERP study. *Psychophysiology*, 39(02), 133–146.
- Federmeier, K., Wlotko, E. W., De Ochoa-Dewald, E., & Kutas, M. (2007). Multiple effects of sentential constraint on word processing. *Brain Research*, 1146, 75–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2006.06.101>
- Fernandez, L. B., Engelhardt, P. E., Patarroyo, A. G., & Allen, S. E. M. (2020). Effects of speech rate on anticipatory eye movements in the visual world paradigm: Evidence from aging, native, and non-native language processing. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 73(12), 2348–2361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747021820948019>
- Ferreira, F., & Chantavarin, S. (2018). Integration and Prediction in Language Processing: A Synthesis of Old and New. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(6), 443–448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721418794491>
- Ferreira, F., & Clifton Jr, C. (1986). The independence of syntactic processing. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 25(3), 348–368.

### A. Experimental items

- Ferreira, F., & Lowder, M. W. (2016). *Prediction, Information Structure, and Good-Enough Language Processing* (Vol. 65, pp. 217–247). Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.plm.2016.04.002>
- Fontan, L., Tardieu, J., Gaillard, P., Woisard, V., & Ruiz, R. (2015). Relationship Between Speech Intelligibility and Speech Comprehension in Babble Noise. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 58(3), 977–986. [https://doi.org/10.1044/2015\\_jslhr-h-13-0335](https://doi.org/10.1044/2015_jslhr-h-13-0335)
- Forster, K. I. (1981). Priming and the effects of sentence and lexical contexts on naming time: Evidence for autonomous lexical processing. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 33(4), 465–495.
- Frank, S. L., Otten, L. J., Galli, G., & Vigliocco, G. (2015). The ERP response to the amount of information conveyed by words in sentences. *Brain and Language*, 140, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2014.10.006>
- Frisson, S., Rayner, K., & Pickering, M. J. (2005). Effects of contextual predictability and transitional probability on eye movements during reading. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and Cognition*, 31(5), 862–877. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0278-7393.31.5.862>
- Friston, K. J., Parr, T., Yufik, Y., Sajid, N., Price, C. J., Holmes, E., & Square, Q. (2020). Generative models, linguistic communication and active inference. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 118, 42–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2020.07.005>
- Friston, K. J., Sajid, N., Quiroga-Martinez, D. R., Parr, T., Price, C. J., & Holmes, E. (2020). Active listening. *Hearing Research*, xxxx, 107998. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2020.107998>
- Fritz, J. B., Elhilali, M., David, S. V., & Shamma, S. A. (2007). Auditory attention - focusing the searchlight on sound. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 17(4), 437–455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2007.07.011>
- Gadiraju, U., Möller, S., Nöllenburg, M., Saupe, D., Egger-Lampl, S., Archambault, D., & Fisher, B. (2017). Crowdsourcing versus the laboratory: Towards human-centered experiments using the crowd. In D. Archambault, H. Purchase, & T. HoSSfeld (Eds.), *Evaluation in the crowd. Crowdsourcing and human-centered experiments* (pp. 6–26). Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66435-4\\_2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66435-4_2)
- Gagné, N., & Franzen, L. (2021). *How to run behavioural experiments online: Best practice suggestions for cognitive psychology and neuroscience*.
- Ganong, W. F. (1980). Phonetic categorization in auditory word perception. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 6(1),

### A. Experimental items

110.

- Garrido, M. I., Dolan, R. J., & Sahani, M. (2011). Surprise Leads to Noisier Perceptual Decisions. *I-Perception*, 2(2), 112–120. <https://doi.org/10.1068/i0411>
- Garvey, W. D. (1953). The intelligibility of speeded speech. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 45(2), 102–108. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054381>
- Gibson, E., Bergen, L., & Piantadosi, S. T. (2013). Rational integration of noisy evidence and prior semantic expectations in sentence interpretation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(20), 8051–8056. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1216438110>
- Gibson, E., Futrell, R., Piantadosi, S. P., Dautriche, I., Mahowald, K., Bergen, L., & Levy, R. (2019). How efficiency shapes human language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 23(5), 389–407. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.02.003>
- Gold, J. I., & Watanabe, T. (2010). Perceptual learning. *Current Biology*, 20(2), R46–R48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2009.10.066>
- Goldstone, R. L. (1998). Perceptual learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49(1), 585–612. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.585>
- Gordon-Salant, S., & Fitzgibbons, P. J. (1995). Recognition of multiply degraded speech by young and elderly listeners. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 38(5), 1150–1156.
- Gordon-Salant, S., & Fitzgibbons, P. J. (2004). Effects of stimulus and noise rate variability on speech perception by younger and older adults. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 115(4), 1808–1817. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1645249>
- Goy, H., Pelletier, M., Coletta, M., & Pichora-Fuller, M. K. (2013). The Effects of Semantic Context and the Type and Amount of Acoustic Distortion on Lexical Decision by Younger and Older Adults. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 56(6), 1715–1732. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2013/12-0053\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2013/12-0053)
- Greenberg, S. (1996). Auditory processing of speech. In N. J. Lass (Ed.), *Principles of experimental phonetics* (pp. 362–407). Mosby, St. Louis.
- Greenwood, D. D. (1990). A cochlear frequency-position function for several species—29 years later. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 87(6), 2592–2605. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.399052>
- Grueber, C. E., Nakagawa, S., Laws, R. J., & Jamieson, I. G. (2011). Multi-model inference in ecology and evolution: challenges and solutions. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 24(4), 699–711. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14>

### A. Experimental items

20-9101.2010.02210.x

- Guediche, S., Blumstein, S. E., Fiez, J. A., & Holt, L. L. (2014). Speech perception under adverse conditions: Insights from behavioral, computational, and neuroscience research. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, 7(Jan), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnsys.2013.00126>
- Hafter, E. R., Sarampalis, A., & Loui, P. (2007). Auditory Attention and Filters. In *Auditory perception of sound sources* (Vol. 29, pp. 115–142). [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-71305-2\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-71305-2_5)
- Haider, H., & Frensch, P. A. (1996). The role of information reduction in skill acquisition. *Cognitive Psychology*, 30(3), 304–337.
- Hakonen, M., May, P. J. C., Jääskeläinen, I. P., Jokinen, E., Sams, M., & Tiitinen, H. (2017). Predictive processing increases intelligibility of acoustically distorted speech: Behavioral and neural correlates. *Brain and Behavior*, 7(9), e00789. <https://doi.org/10.1002/brb3.789>
- Hale, J. (2001). A probabilistic earley parser as a psycholinguistic model. *Second Meeting of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*.
- Harris, D. J. (1960). Combinations of distortion in speech. *Archives of Otolaryngology*, 72(2), 227–232.
- Hartwigsen, G., Golombok, T., & Obleser, J. (2015). Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation over left angular gyrus modulates the predictability gain in degraded speech comprehension. *Cortex*, 68, 100–110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2014.08.027>
- Hauser, M. D., Chomsky, N., & Fitch, W. T. (2002). The Faculty of Language: What Is It, Who Has It, and How Did It Evolve? *Science*, 298(5598), 1569–1579. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.298.5598.1569>
- Heilbron, M., Armeni, K., Schoffelen, S., Jan-Mathijs, Hagoort, P., & de Lange, F. P. (2021). A hierarchy of linguistic predictions during natural language comprehension. *bioRxiv*, 2020–2012. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.12.03.410399>
- Hervais-Adelman, A., Kumar, U., Mishra, R. K., Tripathi, V. N., Guleria, A., Singh, J. P., Eisner, F., & Huettig, F. (2019). Learning to read recycles visual cortical networks without destruction. *Science Advances*, 5(9), eaax0262.
- Heyselaar, E., Peeters, D., & Hagoort, P. (2021). Do we predict upcoming speech content in naturalistic environments? *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 36(4), 440–461. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2020.1859568>
- Huettig, F., & Guerra, E. (2019). Effects of speech rate, preview time of vi-

### A. Experimental items

- sual context, and participant instructions reveal strong limits on prediction in language processing. *Brain Research*, 1706(June 2017), 196–208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2018.11.013>
- Huettig, F., & Mani, N. (2016). Is prediction necessary to understand language? Probably not. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 31(1), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2015.1072223>
- Hunter, C. R., & Pisoni, D. B. (2018). Extrinsic cognitive load impairs spoken word recognition in high-and low-predictability sentences. *Ear and Hearing*, 39(2), 378–389. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000493>
- Husband, E. M., & Bovolenta, G. (2020). Prediction failure blocks the use of local semantic context. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 35(3), 273–291. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2019.1651881>
- Iwasaki, S., Ocho, S., Nagura, M., & Hoshino, T. (2002). Contribution of speech rate to speech perception in multichannel cochlear implant users. *Annals of Otology, Rhinology and Laryngology*, 111(8), 718–721. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000348940211100811>
- Jackendoff, R. (2002). *Foundations of language: How language connects to the brain, the world, evolution, and thinking*. Oxford University Press.
- Jaeger, T. F. (2006). *Redundancy and syntactic reduction in spontaneous speech* (p. 231) [Doctoral dissertation]. Standford University.
- Jaeger, T. F. (2008). Categorical data analysis: Away from ANOVAs (transformation or not) and towards logit mixed models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 59(4), 434–446. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2007.11.007>
- Janse, E. (2009). Processing of fast speech by elderly listeners. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 125(4), 2361–2373. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3082117>
- Johnson, B. P., Dayan, E., Censor, N., & Cohen, L. G. (2021). Crowdsourcing in cognitive and systems neuroscience. *The Neuroscientist*, 10738584211017018. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10738584211017018>
- Jones, M., & Love, B. C. (2011). Bayesian fundamentalism or enlightenment? on the explanatory status and theoretical contributions of bayesian models of cognition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34(4), 169–188. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X10003134>
- Kaiser, E., & Trueswell, J. (2004). The role of discourse context in the processing of a flexible word-order language. *Cognition*, 94(2), 113–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2004.01.002>
- Kamide, Y., Altmann, G. T. M., & Haywood, S. L. (2003). The time-course

### *A. Experimental items*

- of prediction in incremental sentence processing: Evidence from anticipatory eye movements. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 49(1), 133–156. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0749-596x\(03\)00023-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0749-596x(03)00023-8)
- Kaufeld, G. (2021). *Investigating spoken language comprehension as perceptual inference* (p. 183) [Doctoral dissertation]. Max Planck Research School (IM-PRS) for Language Sciences.
- Kemper, S., & Harden, T. (1999). Experimentally disentangling what's beneficial about elderspeak from what's not. *Psychology and Aging*, 14(4), 656–670. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.14.4.656>
- Knoeferle, P., Crocker, M. W., Scheepers, C., & Pickering, M. J. (2005). The influence of the immediate visual context on incremental thematic role-assignment: evidence from eye-movements in depicted events. *Cognition*, 95(1), 95–127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2004.03.002>
- Koch, X., & Janse, E. (2016). Speech rate effects on the processing of conversational speech across the adult life span. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 139(4), 1618–1636. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4944032>
- Kochari, A. R., & Flecken, M. (2019). Lexical prediction in language comprehension: a replication study of grammatical gender effects in Dutch. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 34(2), 239–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2018.1524500>
- Kok, P., Rahnev, D., Jehee, J. F. M., Lau, H. C., & De Lange, F. P. (2012). Attention reverses the effect of prediction in silencing sensory signals. *Cerebral Cortex*, 22(9), 2197–2206. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhr310>
- Krause, J. C., & Braida, L. D. (2004). Acoustic properties of naturally produced clear speech at normal speaking rates. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 115(1), 362–378. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1635842>
- Kuperberg, G. R. (2021). Tea with milk? A hierarchical generative framework of sequential event comprehension. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 13(1), 256–298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12518>
- Kuperberg, G. R., & Jaeger, T. F. (2016). What do we mean by prediction in language comprehension? *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 31(1), 32–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2015.1102299>
- Kutas, M., & Federmeier, K. D. (2011). Thirty Years and Counting: Finding Meaning in the N400 Component of the Event-Related Brain Potential (ERP). *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62(1), 621–647. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.131123>
- Kutas, M., & Hillyard, S. A. (1984). Brain potentials during reading reflect word

### A. Experimental items

- expectancy and semantic association. *Nature*, 307(5947), 161–163. <https://doi.org/10.1038/307161a0>
- Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). lmerTest Package: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 82(13). <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13>
- Lange, K. (2013). The ups and downs of temporal orienting: A review of auditory temporal orienting studies and a model associating the heterogeneous findings on the auditory N1 with opposite effects of attention and prediction. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 7, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00263>
- Lange, K., & Röder, B. (2010). Temporal orienting in audition, touch, and across modalities. *Attention and Time*, 393–405.
- Lecompte, D. C. (1995). An irrelevant speech effect with repeated and continuous background speech. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 2(3), 391–397.
- Leensen, M. C. J., & Dreschler, W. A. (2013). Speech-in-noise screening tests by internet, Part 3: Test sensitivity for uncontrolled parameters in domestic usage. *International Journal of Audiology*, 52(10), 658–669. <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2013.803610>
- Lerner, Y., Honey, C. J., Katkov, M., & Hasson, U. (2014). Temporal scaling of neural responses to compressed and dilated natural speech. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 111(12), 2433–2444. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jn.00497.2013>
- Levy, R. (2008). Expectation-based syntactic comprehension. *Cognition*, 106(3), 1126–1177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.05.006>
- Li, J., Xia, R., Ying, D., Yan, Y., & Akagi, M. (2014). Investigation of objective measures for intelligibility prediction of noise-reduced speech for Chinese, Japanese, and English. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 136(6), 3301–3312. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4901079>
- Li, X., Zhang, Y., Li, L., Zhao, H., & Du, X. (2017). Attention is shaped by semantic level of event-structure during speech comprehension: An electroencephalogram study. *Cognitive Neurodynamics*, 11(5), 467–481. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11571-017-9442-4>
- Li, Y., Zhang, G., Kang, H., Liu, S., Han, D., & Fu, Q.-J. (2011). Effects of speaking style on speech intelligibility for Mandarin-speaking cochlear implant users. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 129(6), EL242–EL247. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3582148>
- Lieberman, P. (2013). The unpredictable species. In *The unpredictable species*. Princeton University Press.

### A. Experimental items

- Liu, S., & Zeng, F.-G. (2006). Temporal properties in clear speech perception. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 120(1), 424–432. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2208427>
- Loizou, P. C., Dorman, M., & Tu, Z. (1999). On the number of channels needed to understand speech. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 106(4), 2097–2103. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.427954>
- Longster, J. A. (2003). *Concatenative Speech Synthesis : A Framework for Reducing Perceived Distortion when using the TD-PSOLA Algorithm* [Doctoral dissertation]. Bournemouth University.
- Lorch, R. F., & Myers, J. L. (1990). Regression analyses of repeated measures data in cognitive research. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 16(1), 149.
- Love, T., Walenski, M., & Swinney, D. (2009). Slowed speech input has a differential impact on on-line and off-line processing in children's comprehension of pronouns. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 38(3), 285–304. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-009-9103-9>
- Lowder, M. W., & Ferreira, F. (2016). Prediction in the processing of repair disfluencies. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 31(1), 73–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2015.1036089>
- Luce, P. A., & Pisoni, D. B. (1998). Recognizing spoken words: The neighborhood activation model. *Ear and Hearing*, 19(1), 1.
- Luke, S. G., & Christianson, K. (2016). Limits on lexical prediction during reading. *Cognitive Psychology*, 88, 22–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2016.06.002>
- Lupyan, G., & Clark, A. (2015). Words and the World. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(4), 279–284. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721415570732>
- Malik, W. A., Marco-Llorca, C., Berendzen, K., & Piepho, H. P. (2020). Choice of link and variance function for generalized linear mixed models: a case study with binomial response in proteomics. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods*, 49(17), 4313–4332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610926.2019.1599021>
- Markman, A. B., & Otto, A. R. (2011). Cognitive systems optimize energy rather than information. *Behav. Brain Sci*, 34(207), 10–1017.
- Marques, T., Nguyen, J., Fioreze, G., & Petreanu, L. (2018). The functional organization of cortical feedback inputs to primary visual cortex. *Nature Neuroscience*, 21(5), 757–764. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-018-0135-z>

### A. Experimental items

- Marrufo-Pérez, M. I., Eustaquio-Martn, A., & Lopez-Poveda, E. A. (2019). Speech predictability can hinder communication in difficult listening conditions. *Cognition*, 192, 103992. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2019.06.004>
- Martin, A. E. (2016). Language processing as cue integration: Grounding the psychology of language in perception and neurophysiology. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 120.
- Martin, D. W., Murphy, R. L., & Meyer, A. (1956). Articulation reduction by combined distortions of speech waves. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 28(4), 597–601. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1918111>
- Mattys, S. L., Davis, M. H., Bradlow, A. R., & Scott, S. K. (2012). Speech recognition in adverse conditions: A review. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 27(7-8), 953–978. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01690965.2012.705006>
- Matuschek, H., Kliegl, R., Vasishth, S., Baayen, H., & Bates, D. (2017). Balancing type i error and power in linear mixed models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 94, 305–315.
- McClelland, J. L., & Elman, J. L. (1986). The TRACE model of speech perception. *Cognitive Psychology*, 18(1), 1–86. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285\(86\)90015-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(86)90015-0)
- McCullough, C. M. (1958). Context aids reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 11(4), 225–229.
- McGurk, H., & MacDonald, J. (1976). Hearing lips and seeing voices. *Nature*, 264(5588), 746–748.
- Meng, Q., Wang, X., Cai, Y., Kong, F., Buck, A. N., Yu, G., Zheng, N., & Schnupp, J. W. H. (2019). Time-compression thresholds for Mandarin sentences in normal-hearing and cochlear implant listeners. *Hearing Research*, 374, 58–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2019.01.011>
- Metusalem, R., Kutas, M., Urbach, T. P., Hare, M., McRae, K., & Elman, J. L. (2012). Generalized event knowledge activation during online sentence comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 66(4), 545–567. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2012.01.001>
- Miller, G. A., Heise, G. A., & Lichten, W. (1951). The intelligibility of speech as a function of the context of the test materials. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 41(5), 329–335.
- Minocher, R., Atmaca, S., Bavero, C., McElreath, R., & Beheim, B. (2021). Estimating the reproducibility of social learning research published between 1955 and 2018. *Royal Society Open Science*, 8(9), 210450.
- Mishra, R. K., Singh, N., Pandey, A., & Huettig, F. (2012). Spoken language-

### A. Experimental items

- mediated anticipatory eye- movements are modulated by reading ability - Evidence from Indian low and high literates. *Journal of Eye Movement Research*, 5(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.16910/jemr.5.1.3>
- Moon, I. J., & Hong, S. H. (2014). What is temporal fine structure and why is it important? *Korean Journal of Audiology*, 18(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.7874/kja.2014.18.1.1>
- Moon, I. J., Won, J. H., Park, M. H., Ives, D. T., Nie, K., Heinz, M. G., Lorenzi, C., & Rubinstein, J. T. (2014). Optimal combination of neural temporal envelope and fine structure cues to explain speech identification in background noise. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 34(36), 12145–12154. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1025-14.2014>
- Morton, J. (1964). The effects of context on the visual duration threshold for words. *British Journal of Psychology*, 55(2), 165–180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1964.tb02716.x>
- Moulines, E., & Charpentier, F. (1990). Pitch-synchronous waveform processing techniques for text-to-speech synthesis using diphones. *Speech Communication*, 9(1990), 453–467.
- Müller, J. A., Wendt, D., Kollmeier, B., Debener, S., & Brand, T. (2019). Effect of speech rate on neural tracking of speech. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00449>
- Musch, J., & Reips, U.-D. (2000). A brief history of web experimenting. In *Psychological experiments on the internet* (pp. 61–87). <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-012099980-4/50004-6>
- Näätänen, R., & Picton, T. (1987). The N1 wave of the human electric and magnetic response to sound: A review and an analysis of the component structure. *Psychophysiology*, 24(4), 375–425. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.1987.tb00311.x>
- Nahum, M., Nelken, I., & Ahissar, M. (2008). Low-level information and high-level perception: The case of speech in noise. *PLoS Biology*, 6(5), 0978–0991. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0060126>
- Nejime, Y., & Moore, B. C. J. (1998). Evaluation of the effect of speech-rate slowing on speech intelligibility in noise using a simulation of cochlear hearing loss. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 103(1), 572–576. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.421123>
- Nicenboim, B., Vasishth, S., & Rösler, F. (2020). Are words pre-activated probabilistically during sentence comprehension? Evidence from new data and a Bayesian random-effects meta-analysis using publicly available data. *Neuropsy-*

### *A. Experimental items*

*chologia, 142*, 107427. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2020.107427>

Nieuwland, M. S. (2019). Do ‘early’ brain responses reveal word form prediction during language comprehension? A critical review. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 96*, 367–400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2018.11.019>

Nieuwland, M. S., Barr, D. J., Bartolozzi, F., Busch-Moreno, S., Darley, E., Donaldson, D. I., Ferguson, H. J., Fu, X., Heyselaar, E., Huettig, F., Husband, E. M., Ito, A., Kazanina, N., Kogan, V., Kohút, Z., Kulakova, E., Mézière, D., Politzer-Ahles, S., Rousselet, G., ... Von Grebmer Zu Wolfsturn, S. (2020). Dissociable effects of prediction and integration during language comprehension: Evidence from a largescale study using brain potentials. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0522>

Nieuwland, M. S., Politzer-Ahles, S., Heyselaar, E., Segaert, K., Darley, E., Kazanina, N., Von Grebmer Zu Wolfsturn, S., Bartolozzi, F., Kogan, V., Ito, A., Mézière, D., Barr, D. J., Rousselet, G. A., Ferguson, H. J., Busch-Moreno, S., Fu, X., Tuomainen, J., Kulakova, E., Husband, E. M., ... Huettig, F. (2018). Large-scale replication study reveals a limit on probabilistic prediction in language comprehension. *eLife, 7*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.7554/elife.33468>

Norris, D., McQueen, J. M., & Cutler, A. (2016). Prediction, Bayesian inference and feedback in speech recognition. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience, 31*(1), 4–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2015.1081703>

Nosofsky, R. M. (1986). Attention, similarity, and the identification–categorization relationship. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 115*(1), 39.

Obleser, J. (2014). Putting the Listening Brain in Context. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 8*(12), 646–658. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12098>

Obleser, J., & Kotz, S. A. (2010). Expectancy Constraints in Degraded Speech Modulate the Language Comprehension Network. *Cerebral Cortex, 20*(3), 633–640. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhp128>

Obleser, J., & Kotz, S. A. (2011). Multiple brain signatures of integration in the comprehension of degraded speech. *NeuroImage, 55*(2), 713–723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.12.020>

Obleser, J., Wise, R. J. S., Alex Dresner, M., & Scott, S. K. (2007). Functional Integration across Brain Regions Improves Speech Perception under Adverse Listening Conditions. *Journal of Neuroscience, 27*(9), 2283–2289. <https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.4663-06.2007>

### *A. Experimental items*

- Oostdijk, N. (2000). The spoken Dutch corpus: Overview and first evaluation. *2nd International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC 2000, January 2000.*
- Orena, A. J., & Colby, S. (2021). *Recognizing voices through a cochlear implant: A systematic review.*
- Patro, C., & Mendel, L. L. (2020). Semantic influences on the perception of degraded speech by individuals with cochlear implants. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 147*(3), 1778–1789. <https://doi.org/10.1121/10.0000934>
- Pearl, J. (1985). Bayesian networks: A model of self-activated memory for evidential reasoning. *Proceedings of the 7th Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, 329–334.*
- Peelle, J. E. (2013). Cortical responses to degraded speech are modulated by linguistic predictions. *Proceedings of Meetings on Acoustics Ica2013, 19*, 060108.
- Peelle, J. E. (2018). Listening effort: How the cognitive consequences of acoustic challenge are reflected in brain and behavior. *Ear and Hearing, 39*(2), 204–214. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AUD.0000000000000494>
- Peelle, J. E., & Wingfield, A. (2005). Dissociations in perceptual learning revealed by adult age differences in adaptation to time-compressed speech. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 31*(6), 1315–1330. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.31.6.1315>
- Peirce, J., Gray, J. R., Simpson, S., MacAskill, M., Höchenberger, R., Sogo, H., Kastman, E., & Lindeløv, J. K. (2019). PsychoPy2: Experiments in behavior made easy. *Behavior Research Methods, 51*(1), 195–203. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-01193-y>
- Pickering, M. J., & Gambi, C. (2018). Predicting while comprehending language: A theory and review. *Psychological Bulletin, 144*(10), 1002–1044. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000158>
- Pierce, A. G. J., & Ollason, J. G. (1987). Eight reasons why optimal foraging theory is a complete waste of time. *Oikos, 49*(1), 111–117. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3565560>
- Pinker, S., & Jackendoff, R. (2005). The faculty of language: what's special about it? *Cognition, 95*(2), 201–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2004.08.004>
- Prolific. (2014). *Prolific academic.* <https://www.prolific.co>.
- Pusse, F., Sayeed, A., & Demberg, V. (2016). LingoTurk: Managing crowdsourced tasks for psycholinguistics. *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North*

### A. Experimental items

- American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Demonstrations*, 57–61. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/n16-3012>
- Reips, U.-D. (2021). Web-based research in psychology. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*.
- Richards, S. A., Whittingham, M. J., & Stephens, P. A. (2011). Model selection and model averaging in behavioural ecology: the utility of the IT-AIC framework. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 65(1), 77–89. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-010-1035-8>
- Roberts, B., Summers, R. J., & Bailey, P. J. (2011). The intelligibility of noise-vocoded speech: Spectral information available from acrosschannel comparison of amplitude envelopes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 278(1711), 1595–1600. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2010.1554>
- Rodero, E. (2016). Influence of speech rate and information density on recognition: The moderate dynamic mechanism. *Media Psychology*, 19(2), 224–242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2014.1002942>
- Rönnberg, J., Lunner, T., Zekveld, A., Sörqvist, P., Danielsson, H., Lyxell, B., Dahlström, Ö., Signoret, C., Stenfelt, S., Pichora-Fuller, M. K., & Rudner, M. (2013). The Ease of Language Understanding (ELU) model: Theoretical, empirical, and clinical advances. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, 7(31), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnsys.2013.00031>
- Rosen, S., Faulkner, A., & Wilkinson, L. (1999). Adaptation by normal listeners to upward spectral shifts of speech: Implications for cochlear implants. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 106(6), 3629–3636. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.428215>
- Ryskin, R., & Fang, X. (2021). The many timescales of context in language processing. In *Psychology of learning and motivation* (Vol. 75, pp. 201–243). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.plm.2021.08.001>
- Ryskin, R., Futrell, R., Kiran, S., & Gibson, E. (2018). Comprehenders model the nature of noise in the environment. *Cognition*, 181(July 2017), 141–150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.08.018>
- Samuel, A. G. (1996). Does lexical information influence the perceptual restoration of phonemes? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 125(1), 28.
- Samuel, A. G., & Kraljic, T. (2009). Perceptual learning for speech. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics*, 71(6), 1207–1218. <https://doi.org/10.3758/app.71.6.1207>
- Sanders, L. D., & Astheimer, L. B. (2008). Temporally selective attention modulates early perceptual processing: Event-related potential evidence. *Perception and Psychophysics*, 70(4), 732–742. <https://doi.org/10.3758/PP.70.4.732>

### A. Experimental items

- Sanderson, S. K., & Roberts, W. W. (2008). The evolutionary forms of the religious life: A cross-cultural, quantitative analysis. *American Anthropologist*, 110(4), 454–466. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1433.2008.00078.x>
- Sanford, A. J., Sanford, A. J., Molle, J., & Emmott, C. (2006). Shallow processing and attention capture in written and spoken discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 42(2), 109–130.
- Schlueter, A., Lemke, U., Kollmeier, B., & Holube, I. (2014). Intelligibility of time-compressed speech: The effect of uniform versus non-uniform time-compression algorithms. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 135(3), 1541–1555. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4863654>
- Schneider, B. A., & Pichora-Fuller, M. K. (2001). Age-related changes in temporal processing: Implications for listening comprehension. *Seminars in Hearing*, 22(3), 227–239.
- Scholman, M. C., Demberg, V., & Sanders, T. J. (2020). Individual differences in expecting coherence relations: Exploring the variability in sensitivity to contextual signals in discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 57(10), 844–861.
- Schwarz, G. (1978). Estimating the dimension of a model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 461–464.
- Seow, T. X. F., & Hauser, T. U. (2022). Reliability of web-based affective auditory stimulus presentation. *Behavior Research Methods*, 54(1), 378–392. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-021-01643-0>
- Seth, A. K. (2013). Interoceptive inference, emotion, and the embodied self. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 17(11), 565–573. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.09.007>
- Shannon, C. E. (1948). A Mathematical Theory of Communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(4), 623–656. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb00917.x>
- Shannon, R. V., Fu, Q.-J., & Galvin Iii, J. (2004). The number of spectral channels required for speech recognition depends on the difficulty of the listening situation. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*, 124(0), 50–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03655230410017562>
- Shannon, R. V., Zeng, F.-G., Kamath, V., Wygonski, J., & Ekelid, M. (1995). Speech Recognition with Primarily Temporal Cues. *Science*, 270(5234), 303–304. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.270.5234.303>
- Sharit, J., Czaja, S. J., Nair, S., & Lee, C. C. (2003). Effects of age, speech rate, and environmental support in using telephone voice menu systems. *Human Factors*, 45(2), 234–251. <https://doi.org/10.1518/hfes.45.2.234.27245>

### A. Experimental items

- Sheldon, S., Pichora-Fuller, M. K., & Schneider, B. A. (2008a). Priming and sentence context support listening to noise-vocoded speech by younger and older adults. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 123(1), 489–499. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2783762>
- Sheldon, S., Pichora-Fuller, M. K., & Schneider, B. A. (2008b). Effect of age, presentation method, and learning on identification of noise-vocoded words. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 123(1), 476–488. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2805676>
- Simantiraki, O., & Cooke, M. (2020). Exploring listeners' speech rate preferences. *INTERSPEECH*, 1346–1350. <https://doi.org/10.21437/Interspeech.2020-1832>
- Slattery, T. J., Sturt, P., Christianson, K., Yoshida, M., & Ferreira, F. (2013). Lingering misinterpretations of garden path sentences arise from competing syntactic representations. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 69(2), 104–120.
- Smith, N. J., & Levy, R. (2008). Optimal processing times in reading: A formal model and empirical investigation. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, 30.
- Sohoglu, E., Peelle, J. E., Carlyon, R. P., & Davis, M. H. (2012). Predictive top-down integration of prior knowledge during speech perception. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(25), 8443–8453. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5069-11.2012>
- Sommers, M. S., Nygaard, L. C., & Pisoni, D. B. (1994). Stimulus variability and spoken word recognition. I. Effects of variability in speaking rate and overall amplitude. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 96(3), 1314–1324. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.411453>
- Stadler, W., Ott, D. V. M., Springer, A., Schubotz, R. I., Schütz-Bosbach, S., & Prinz, W. (2012). Repetitive TMS suggests a role of the human dorsal premotor cortex in action prediction. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2012.00020>
- Staub, A. (2015). The Effect of Lexical Predictability on Eye Movements in Reading: Critical Review and Theoretical Interpretation. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 9(8), 311–327. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12151>
- Staub, A. (2011). The effect of lexical predictability on distributions of eye fixation durations. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 18(2), 371–376. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-010-0046-9>
- Staub, A., Grant, M., Astheimer, L., & Cohen, A. (2015). The influence of cloze probability and item constraint on cloze task response time. *Journal of Memory*

### A. Experimental items

- and Language*, 82, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2015.02.004>
- Stilp, C. (2020). Acoustic context effects in speech perception. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 11(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1517>
- StrauSS, A., Kotz, S. A., & Obleser, J. (2013). Narrowed Expectancies under Degraded Speech: Revisiting the N400. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 25(8), 1383–1395. [https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn\\_a\\_00389](https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_00389)
- Sturt, P., Sanford, A. J., Stewart, A., & Dawydiak, E. (2004). Linguistic focus and good-enough representations: An application of the change-detection paradigm. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 11(5), 882–888.
- Su, Q., Galvin, J. J., Zhang, G., Li, Y., & Fu, Q. J. (2016). Effects of within-talker variability on speech intelligibility in Mandarin-speaking adult and pediatric cochlear implant patients. *Trends in Hearing*, 20, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2331216516654022>
- Taleb, N. (2020). *Assessing the intelligibility and acoustic changes of time-processed speech* [Masters thesis, Case Western Reserve University; OhioLINK Electronic Theses; Dissertations Center]. [http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc\\_num=case1586637814204979](http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=case1586637814204979)
- Taylor, W. L. (1953). “Cloze procedure”: A new tool for measuring readability. *Journalism Quarterly*, 30(4), 415–433.
- Thornton, A. R. D., Harmer, M., & Lavoie, B. A. (2007). Selective attention increases the temporal precision of the auditory N100 event-related potential. *Hearing Research*, 230(1-2), 73–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heares.2007.04.004>
- Tóth, B., Honbolygó, F., Szalárdy, O., Orosz, G., Farkas, D., & Winkler, I. (2020). The effects of speech processing units on auditory stream segregation and selective attention in a multi-talker (cocktail party) situation. *Cortex*, 130, 387–400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2020.06.007>
- Tun, P. A. (1998). Fast noisy speech: Age differences in processing rapid speech with background noise. *Psychology and Aging*, 13(3), 424–434. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0882-7974.13.3.424>
- Tuthill, J. C., & Azim, E. (2018). Proprioception. *Current Biology*, 28(5), R194–R203.
- Vaden Jr, K. I., Kuchinsky, S. E., Ahlstrom, J. B., Teubner-Rhodes, S. E., Dubno, J. R., & Eckert, M. A. (2016). Cingulo-opercular function during word recognition in noise for older adults with hearing loss. *Experimental Aging Research*, 42(1), 67–82.

### A. Experimental items

- Vaden, K. I., Kuchinsky, S. E., Ahlstrom, J. B., Dubno, J. R., & Eckert, M. A. (2015). Cortical activity predicts which older adults recognize speech in noise and when. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 35(9), 3929–3937.
- Vaden, K. I., Kuchinsky, S. E., Cute, S. L., Ahlstrom, J. B., Dubno, J. R., & Eckert, M. A. (2013). The cingulo-opercular network provides word-recognition benefit. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 33(48), 18979–18986. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1417-13.2013>
- Vagharchakian, L., Dehaene-Lambertz, G., Pallier, C., & Dehaene, S. (2012). A temporal bottleneck in the language comprehension network. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(26), 9089–9102. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5685-11.2012>
- van Os, M., Kray, J., & Demberg, V. (2021). Recognition of minipairs in (un)predictive sentence contexts in two types of noise. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, 43(43), 2943–2949.
- Van Petten, C., & Luka, B. J. (2012). Prediction during language comprehension: Benefits, costs, and ERP components. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 83(2), 176–190. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2011.09.015>
- Vasisht, S., Schad, D., Bürki, A., & Kliegl, R. (2022). Hypothetical repeated sampling and the t-test. In *Linear mixed models in linguistics and psychology: A comprehensive introduction (DRAFT)*.
- Verhelst, W., & Roelands, M. (1993). Overlap-add technique based on waveform similarity (WSOLA) for high quality time-scale modification of speech. *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*, 2, 554–557. <https://doi.org/10.1109/icassp.1993.319366>
- Warren, R. M. (1970). Perceptual restoration of missing speech sounds. *Science*, 167(3917), 392–393.
- Welch, N., & Krantz, J. H. (1996). The World-Wide Web as a medium for psychoacoustical demonstrations and experiments: Experience and results. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*, 28(2), 192–196. <https://doi.org/10.3758/bf03204764>
- Wild, C. J., Yusuf, A., Wilson, D. E., Peelle, J. E., Davis, M. H., & Johnsrude, I. S. (2012). Effortful listening: The processing of degraded speech depends critically on attention. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(40), 14010–14021. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.1528-12.2012>
- Winn, M. (2016). Rapid release from listening effort resulting from semantic context, and effects of spectral degradation and cochlear implants. *Trends in Hearing*, 20, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2331216516669723>

#### *A. Experimental items*

- Winn, M. B., & Teece, K. H. (2021). Slower speaking rate reduces listening effort among listeners with cochlear implants. *Ear and Hearing*, 42(3), 584. <https://doi.org/10.1097/aud.0000000000000958>
- Wlotko, E. W., & Federmeier, K. D. (2012). Age-related changes in the impact of contextual strength on multiple aspects of sentence comprehension. *Psychophysiology*, 49(6), 770–785. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8986.2012.01366.x>
- Wlotko, E. W., & Federmeier, K. D. (2015). Time for prediction? The effect of presentation rate on predictive sentence comprehension during word-by-word reading. *Cortex*, 68, 20–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2015.03.014>
- Woods, K. J. P., Siegel, M. H., Traer, J., & McDermott, J. H. (2017). Headphone screening to facilitate web-based auditory experiments. *Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics*, 79(7), 2064–2072. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13414-017-1361-2>
- Wöstmann, M., & Obleser, J. (2016). Acoustic detail but not predictability of task-irrelevant speech disrupts working memory. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 10, 538.
- Xiang, M., & Kuperberg, G. (2015). Reversing expectations during discourse comprehension. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 30(6), 648–672. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2014.995679>