# Chapter 10 Further Readings

(Note: This bibliography will be updated regularly.)

### Tip-of-the-tongue states

The TOT phenomenon has been used to argue that syntactic and semantic information in the lemma representation is separate from phonological information for words. In this paper, researchers look more closely at the nature of the syntactic/semantic information that remains accessible in a TOT state:

Vigliocco, G., Vinson, D. P., Martin, R. C., & Garrett, M. F. (1999) Is “count” and “mass” information available when the noun is not? An investigation of tip of the tongue states and anomia. Journal of Memory and Language, 404, 534–558.

As suggested in Box 10.3, spending time in a state of failed lexical retrieval can increase the likelihood of failing to retrieve the same word later on. Does this mean that those who are prone to errors of speaking should avoid mistakes at all costs? Not necessarily, conclude researchers who have studied the treatment of patients with neurological disorders:

Middleton, E.L., & Shwartz, M.F. (2012) Errorless learning in cognitive rehabilitation: A critical review. Neuropsychological rehabiliation, 22, 138–168.

### Speech errors and language experience

The following paper uses the SLIP technique to see whether the nature of speech errors is sensitive to short-term statistical learning of frequent sound patterns:

Dell, G. S., Reed, K. D., Adams, D. R., & Meyer, A. S. (2000) Speech errors, phonotactic constraints, and implicit learning: a study of the role of experience in language production. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition, 26, 1355–1367.

### The costs and benefits of syntactic choice

In section 10.4, we discussed how speakers are faced with the task of choosing from competing structures to encode a particular message. One advantage of having a number of syntactic choices is that it allows speakers to plan incrementally, so that the structure of the utterance can be adapted on the fly to accommodate material that has already been uttered. But some languages have relatively free word order, resulting in an even greater proliferation of syntactic choice than is usual in English. This paper looks at language production in English and Russian and concludes that a bounty of choices can lead to delays in planning:

Myachykov, A., Scheepers, C., Garrod, S., Thompson, D., & Fedorova, O. (2013) Syntactic flexibility and competition in sentence production: The case of English and Russian. The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 66, 1601–1619.

And an investigation of Korean speakers also concludes that there are sometimes penalties for syntactic choice and tries to reconcile these new findings with those of Ferreira (1996) which focused on the benefits of syntactic choice (see the discussion on p. 354 of the textbook):

Hwang, H., & Kaiser, E. (2013) Having a syntactic choice is not always better: the effects of syntactic flexibility on Korean production. Language, Cognition and Neuroscience, (ahead-of-print), 1–17. DOI:10.1080/23273798.2013.875212

### Cascaded models of activation

As noted in Chapter 10, there is evidence for cascaded activation, in which phonological activation can begin even before a lemma has been selected. But effects of cascaded activation are not found under all experimental conditions. The following papers investigate some of the conditions that underlie its variability:

Mädebach, A., Jescheniak, J. D., Oppermann, F., & Schriefers, H. (2011) Ease of processing constrains the activation flow in the conceptual-lexical system during speech planning. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 37, 649.

Bonin, P., Roux, S., Barry, C., & Canell, L. (2012) Evidence for a limited-cascading account of written word naming. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 38, 1741.

### The role of monitoring mechanisms

Not all speech errors that are generated “in the mind” actually slip out as errors, suggesting that some of them are filtered out by internal monitoring mechanisms. What kinds of errors are most likely to be caught and stopped? The following papers address this question:

Hartsuiker, R.J. (2006) Are speech error patterns affected by a monitoring bias? Language and Cognitive Processes, 21, 856–891.

Corley, M., Brocklehurst, P. H., & Moat, H. S. (2011) Error biases in inner and overt speech: Evidence from tongue twisters. Journal of experimental psychology: Learning, memory, and cognition, 371, 162–175.

Nooteboom, S.G., & Quené, H. (2013) Heft Lemisphere: Exchanges predominate in segmental speech errors. Journal of Memory and Language, 68, 26–38.

### The scope of planning

It is generally believed that planning the message or conceptual content of an utterance takes place over a fairly large span of content. But in real-time conversation, speakers might be confronted with new or changing information that prompts them to revise the conceptual content on the fly. This paper looks at the timing relationship between eye movements and disfluencies to get a sense of how speakers engage in dynamic message planning as they become aware of new relevant information:

Brown-Schmidt, S., & Tanenhaus, M. (2006) Watching the eyes when talking about size: An investigation of message formulation and utterance planning. Journal of Memory and Language, 54, 592–609.

Is the scope of syntactic planning dependent on the length of phrases or on the nature of the syntactic relationships among linguistic units? This paper argues that planning reflects groupings of units that are structurally dependent on each other.

Lee, E-K., Brown-Schmidt, S., & Watson, D. G. (2013) Ways of looking ahead: Hierarchical planning in language production. Cognition, 129, 544–562.

### Individual differences in language production

Do individual or situational differences in available working memory affect language production? The following paper looks at errors of subject–verb agreement and concludes that they do:

Hartsuiker, R.J., & Barkhuysen, P.N. (2006) Language production and working memory: The case of subject–verb agreement. Language and Cognitive Processes, 21, 181–204.

Can differences in working memory affect the scope of speech planning? The following paper presents some evidence in favor of this idea:

Swets, B., Jacovina, M. E., & Gerrig, R. J. (2014) Individual differences in the scope of speech planning: evidence from eye-movements. Language and Cognition, 6, 12–44.

### Language production and aging

Older adults show more disfluencies in speech and are more likely to fall prey to TOT states than younger adults. This review article surveys some of the research probing the nature of age-related changes in language production:

Mortensen, L., Meyer, A. S., & Humphreys, G. W. (2006) Age-related effects on speech production: A review. Language and Cognitive Processes, 21, 238–290.

### Communicative constraints on language production

Much of the research on language production has emphasized factors that help to reduce the processing burden on speakers. The author of this essay argues that language production needs to be more thoroughly studied from a communicative perspective and suggests that many choices that speakers make are driven by factors that achieve maximum communicative efficiency:

Jaeger, T. F. (2013) Production preferences cannot be understood without reference to communication. Frontiers in psychology, 4, 230.
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