FOR 2373 Spoken Morphology



Julia Muschalik<sup>1</sup>, Dominic Schmitz<sup>1</sup>, Akhilesh Kakolu Ramarao<sup>1</sup>, Dinah Baer-Henney<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup>HHU Department of English Language and Linguistics, <sup>2</sup>Department of Linguistics



# Acoustic duration and typing timing – same, same... but different?

# **Background & Motivation**

 growing evidence that typing is modulated by a (sub)lexical of range variables (e.g., [1]-[9])... which suggests • interaction of central and peripheral processes for

# **The Experiment**

- online **pseudoword** production experiment adapted from Schmitz et al. (2021)
- immediate sentence **copying** paradigm (visual stimulus)
- 4 types of S: non-morphemic, plural, is-/has-clitics

### Hypotheses

nm = pl = has = is (Feed-forward)  $nm \neq pl \neq is \neq has$  (Emergence) nm > pl > is = has (Same same) nm < pl < is = has (Same different)

#### Stimuli

# Analysis

- 121 participants x 48 target words – all erroneous targets
  - = **4877** data points
- generalized additive models [13] with
  - dependent variable: log transformed IKI
  - predictor of interest:

type of S

- comparable typing to what we find in speech (e.g., [3] & [9])
- BUT conditions mixed muddle effects often (e.g., [4], [11]& [12]) and no direct comparison yet



This creature is a glips.

Every day, the glips plays with the blouts.

What happens every day?



Look, this is a blouts.

- also included: typing proficiency (training, hand watch, mean speed), key distance, trial number
- random effects: fingers, pseudoword participant, length & pseudoword



## Discussion

# Typing and articulation are **not the same** – yet not entirely different...

nm = pl = has = is (Feed-forward)

 $nm \neq pl \neq is \neq has$  (Emergence)

nm > pl > is = has (Same same)

nm < pl < is = has (Same different)

• no difference between non-morphemic

and plural S

- lack of processing in pseudowords?
- artifact of copying-paradigm? (cf. [7])
- both confounding factors should be eliminated by future research

• clitics > non-morphemic, plural S

- pure motor disruption?
- comparison of C > ` and ` > S transitions speaks against that
- underlying word boundary effect? previous research suggests (e.g., [4],[7] & [12]) different processing **units** (i.e., words and syllables) appear to be more relevant in written language production

**REFERENCES** [1] Baus, Cristina, Kristof Strijkers, and Albert Costa. 2013. "When Does Word Frequency Influence Written Production?" Frontiers in Psychology 4 (December): 963. [2] Bertram, Raymond, Finn Tonnessen, Sven Strömqvist, Jukka Hyönä, and Pekka Niemi. 2015. "Cascaded Processing in Written Compound Word Production." Frontiers in Human Neuroscience 9 (April): 207. [3] Bonin, Patrick, Marylène Chalard, Alain Méot, and Michel Fayol. 2002. "The determinants of spoken and written picture naming latencies." British Journal of Psychology 93: 89. [4] Fuchs, Susanne and Jelena Krivokapić. 2016. "Prosodic Boundaries in Psychology. [5] Gagné, Christina L. and Thomas L Spalding. 2016. "Written Production of English Compounds: Effects of Morphology and Semantic Transparency." Morphology 26 (2): 133–55. [6] Libben, Gary and Silke Weber. 2014. "Semantic transparency, compounding, and the nature of independent variables." Morphology and meaning 327: 205. [7] Nottbusch, Guido, Angela Grimm, Rüdiger Weingarten, and Udo Will. 2005. "Syllabic Sructures in Typing: Evidence from Deaf Writers." Reading and Writing 18 (6): 497–526. [8] Sahel, Said, Guido Nottbusch, Angela Grimm, and Rüdiger Weingarten. 2008. "Written production of German compounds: Effects of lexical frequency and semantic transparency". Written Language & Literacy 11(2): 211. [9] Scaltritti, Michele, Barbara Arfé, Mark Torrance, and Francesca Peressotti. 2016. "Typing Pictures: Linguistic Processing Cascades into Finger Movements." Cognition 156: 16. [10] Schmitz, Dominic, Dinah Baer-Henney, and Ingo Plag. 2021. "The duration of word-final /s/ differs across morphological categories in English: evidence from pseudowords." Phonetica 78.5-6 (2021): 571-616. [11] Weingarten, Rüdiger, Guido Nottbusch, and Udo Will. 2007. "Morphemes, Syllables and Graphemes in Written Word Production." Multidisciplinary Approaches to Language Production, January. [12] Will, Udo, Guido Nottbusch, and Rüdiger Weingarten. 2006. "Linguistic Units in Word Typing: Effects of Word Presentation Modes and Typing Delay." Written Language & Literacy 9 (1): 153–76. [13] Wood, Simon N. 2017. Generalized Additive Models: An Introduction with R, 2nd ed. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** would like to thank the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) for funding of this research as part of the research unit FOR 2373 – Projects MU 4366/1-1, BA6523/1-1, and PL151/9-1.