Thanks to recent developments in eye-tracking technology, we’ve made immense strides in a relatively short time to better understand the human language and cognitive systems. However, this knowledge has also revealed the many questions that remain to be answered. Eye trackers are pertinent to capture real time language processing that grant us insight into the intricacies of human language and language learning that are inaccessible through more rudimentary tools. For example, in the current incarnation of the visual world paradigm, where eye movements are a reflection of the participants’ subconscious consideration of target items and competing distractors during real time processing, eye tracking technology grants incredibly finer and more continuous data, compared to the behavioral “act-out” data which represent conscious decision making that follows online processing. Glances to the target (as captured by eye trackers) do not always coincide with this behavioral data; such is the case when participants with activated cognitive control reveal significantly fewer glances to the target’s competitor during the trial, even while their behavioral data may remain descriptively the same as that of a participant with latent cognitive control. This suggests that, among homogenous participants, activated cognitive control results in what can be considered less subconscious doubt of an accurate interpretation. Likewise, eye movements can reveal how participants reanalyze syntactic structures when they encounter a syntactic ambiguity or a temporary garden-path sentence. Specifically, the EyeLink 1000, with its accompanying Experiment Builder and Data Viewer software, is among the most trusted models in the field of research. The desktop mount allows a considerable amount of participant movement while still capturing the spatial resolution necessary in these studies that use the visual world paradigm. This model is precise enough to answer a variety of questions but versatile such that it can be used in different settings and with different populations of users.
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