Electrophysiological Signature of Verb Argument Processing: ERP Priming Study *Kimberly Skvarla, +Sara Mohr BA., +&Aneta Kielar Ph.D. THE UNIVERSITY * Neuroscience, University of Arizona OF ARIZONA + Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences, University of Arizona

The girl sends <u>a letter</u> to the boy

or unrelated verb?



& Department of Linguistics, University of Arizona



COLLEGE OF SCIENCE Neuroscience & Cognitive Science

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA





Discussion

- The behavioral effects showed significant priming effect for patient condition, indicating that participants were faster in responding to the related patients in the context of related verbs than to the unrelated patients
- The ERPs showed N100 effect associated with early visual processing of unpredictable stimulus
- In the 300-500 ms time window processing of agent, patient and feature information elicited N400 effect
- The N400 effect was the strongest for verb-agent condition. It started at 350 ms post-stimulus onset and continued till 450 ms
- The N400 effect for verb-patient condition was weaker and effects for verb-feature conditions lasted till 500 ms poststimulus onset
- These results indicate that participants automatically access information about verb thematic roles by 300 ms post-stimulus onset
- Lexical information about agents is accessed earlier compared to patients and features
- This experiment is part of a larger study that will compare the same results across young controls, older controls, and participants with aphasia.

References

[1] Adlam et. al. (2010). Neurocase, 16, 193-207. [2] Baayen et. al. (1995). Linguistic Data Consortium, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA. [3] Bentin, et. al. (1985). Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology, 60(4), 343-355. [4] Boland (1993) Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 22 (2), 133-152. [5] Cho-Reyes & Thompson (2012) Aphasiology, 26, 1250-1277. [6] Donchin & Coles (1988) Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 11(3), 357-427 [7] Dunn, L.M., & Dunn, D.M. (2007). San Antonio, TX: Pearson, Inc.[8] Ferretti et al., (2001). Journal of Memory and Language, 44, 516-547. [9] Friederici & Frish (2000). Journal of Memory and Language, 43, 476-507. [10] Hillyard & Picton (1987). In F. Plum (Ed.), Handbook of physiology; Sec. I. The nervous system: Vol. 5. Higher functions of the brain (Part 2, pp. 519-584). Bethesda, MD: American Physiological Society. [11] Kay et. al. (1992). Psychology Press. [12] Kutas & Van Petten (1988) Greenwich, CT JAI Press. [13] Kutas & Van Petten (1991). *Memory & Cognition*, 19 (1), 95-112.. [14] McRae et. al. (1997). Language and

Cognitive Processes, 12(2&3), 137-176. [15] Shapiro & Levine (1990). Brain and Langauge, 45, 423-447. [16] Tabullo et. al. (2015). Psychology & Neuroscience, 8(4), 509-528. [17] Thompson (2011).Northwestern University. [18] Trueswell et. al. (1993). Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 19 (3), 528-553.