

Syllabus for LING 48P: Sentence Processing

Pavel Logačev

Spring 2018

E-mail: pavel.logacev@boun.edu.tr

Office Hours: by appointment

Office: Room 308, John Freely Hall

Web: Moodle

Class Hours: Tue, 15:00-18:00

Class Room: JF 332

Course Description

The aim of this course is to introduce you to the fundamental questions in sentence processing research, and to familiarize you with many interesting phenomena in this domain. We will focus on the processing of written sentences, and in this context we will discuss garden-path sentences, the effects of sentence complexity, similarity-based interference, as well as so-called good-enough processing and the effects of task demands on syntactic parsing.

Course Structure and Grading

- Attendance and participation will account for 20% of your course grade. Please attend and participate in class.
- Weekly assignment: I would like you to read the assigned papers and submit three *substantial* comments or questions each week, except during the first week. We will discuss them in class. The weekly assignment will account for 30% of the grade.
- The final 50% of the grade will be based on a term paper (5 to 10 pages) on a topic of your choosing.
- Everyone will present the key points of one regular paper at least once. The presentation is will not be graded, but it is required.
- Everyone will present the key points of a current issues paper. The presentation is will not be graded, but it is required.

Course Policy

- Attendance and participation will really be graded. Please show up for class. If you cannot attend, let me know that you will not attend and **why**. While attendance is not formally recorded, I do take it very seriously.
- Please abide by the commonly agreed-upon rules of citation in your writing.
- Please switch off your phones, or set them to silent mode.
- Don't cheat and try to learn stuff.

Tentative Schedule

Week 1, 05.02 - 09.02: Introduction

- + Altmann, G.T.M. (1998). Ambiguity in sentence processing. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 2 (4), 146-151.
- + Ferreira, F., & Cokal, D. (2016). Sentence Processing. *Neurobiology of Language*.

Week 2, 12.02 - 16.02: Serial Models

- + Staub, A. (2015). Reading Sentences: Syntactic Parsing and Semantic Interpretation. *The Oxford Handbook of Reading*, (1), 521.
- + Frazier, L. (1987). Sentence Processing: A Tutorial Review. *Attention and Performance XII. The Psychology of Reading*.

Week 3, 19.02 - 23.02: Parallel Models

- + Gibson, E., & Pearlmutter, N. J. (1998). Constraints on sentence comprehension. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. 2 (7).
- + Macdonald, M. C., & Seidenberg, M. S. (2006). Constraint satisfaction approaches to lexical and sentence comprehension. *Handbook of Psycholinguistics*.

Week 4, 26.02 - 02.03: More on Constraint-based Models

- + Willits, J. A., Amato, M. S., & MacDonald, M. C. (2015). Language knowledge and event knowledge in language use. *Cognitive Psychology*, 78, 1-27.

Week 5, 05.03 - 09.03: What does 'serial' mean?

- + Lewis, R. L. (2000). Falsifying serial and parallel parsing models: empirical conundrums and an overlooked paradigm. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 29(2), 241-248.
- + Gibson, E., & Pearlmutter, N. J. (2000). Distinguishing Serial and Parallel Parsing. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 29(2), 231-240.
- + Sturt, P., Pickering, M. J., & Crocker, M. W. (2000). Search strategies in syntactic reanalysis. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 29(2), 183-194.

Week 6, 12.03 - 16.03: Distance and Complexity

- + Gibson, E. (2000). The dependency locality theory: A distance-based theory of linguistic complexity. In *Image, language, brain: Papers from the first mind articulation project symposium* (pp. 95-126).

Week 7, 19.03 - 23.03: Surprisal

- + Levy, R. (2008). Expectation-based syntactic comprehension. *Cognition*, 106(3), 1126-1177.

Week 8, 26.03 - 30.03: Memory

- + Lewis, R. L., Vasishth, S., & Van Dyke, J. A. (2006). Computational principles of working memory in sentence comprehension. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 10, 447-454
- + Martin, A. E., & McElree, B. (2011). Direct-access retrieval during sentence comprehension: Evidence from sluicing. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 64(4), 327-343.

Week 9, 02.04 - 06.04: Interference and Illusory Licensing

- + Vasishth, S., Brussow, S., Lewis, R. L., & Drenhaus, H. (2008). Processing polarity: How the ungrammatical intrudes on the grammatical. *Cognitive Science*, 32(4), 685-712.

Week 10, 09.04 - 13.04: Good-enough processing

- + Ferreira, F., & Patson, N. D. (2007). The 'good enough' approach to language comprehension. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 1(1-2), p. 71-83.
- + Ferreira, F., Christianson, K., & Hollingworth, A. (2001). Misinterpretations of garden-path sentences: Implications for models of sentence processing and reanalysis. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 30(1), 3-20.

Spring Break, 16.04 - 20.04: —

Week 11, 23.04 - 27.04: Even more good-enough processing

- + 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.
- + Christianson, K., Hollingworth, A., Halliwell, J. F., & Ferreira, F. (2001). Thematic Roles Assigned along the Garden Path Linger. *Cognitive Psychology*, 42(4), 368-407.

Week 12, 30.04 - 04.05: Current issues

- + Suckow, K., & van Gompel, R. P. G. (2018). Number attraction affects reanalysis in sentence processing. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 33(1), 1-11.
- + Yanilmaz, A., & Drury, J. E. (2018). Prospective NPI licensing and intrusion in Turkish. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 33(1), 111-138.
- + Staub, A., Dillon, B., & Clifton, C. (2016). The Matrix Verb as a Source of Comprehension Difficulty in Object Relative Sentences. *Cognitive Science*, 1-24.

Week 13, 07.05 - 11.05: Current issues

- + Qian, Z., Garnsey, S., & Christianson, K. (2018). A comparison of online and offline measures of good-enough processing in garden-path sentences. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 33(2), 227-254.
- + Dillon, B., Andrews, C., Rothello, C. M., & Wagers, M. A new argument for co-active parses during language comprehension. A Study of the Processing Costs of Aspectual Coercion Forced by Durative Modifiers. Ms.