UNIVERSITY of York

This is a repository copy of When comprehension elicits incomprehension: Deterioration of semantic categorisation in the absence of stimulus repetition.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper: <u>https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/120632/</u>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Nathaniel, Upasana, Thompson, Hannah Elizabeth, Davies, Emma et al. (5 more authors) (2018) When comprehension elicits incomprehension: Deterioration of semantic categorisation in the absence of stimulus repetition. The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology. pp. 1817-1843. ISSN 1747-0226

https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2017.1363793

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

Figures



Figure 1: Mean response sensitivity (*d'*) in Experiment 1 (Thematic-matching), for the first and second half of each category (within-category fatigue) and across the testing session (across-category fatigue), split by strong and weak targets, at the two presentation speeds. Error bars show *SE* of the mean.



Figure 2: Mean response sensitivity (*d'*) in Experiment 2 (Taxonomic-matching), for the first and second half of each category (within-category fatigue) and across the testing session (across-category fatigue). Error bars show *SE* of the mean.



Figure 3: Mean response sensitivity (d') in Experiment 3 (Feature-matching), for the first and second half of each category (within-category fatigue) and across the testing session (across-category fatigue). Error bars show *SE* of the mean.



Figure 4: Mean response sensitivity (*d'*) in Experiment 4 (Effect across modalities), shown individually for the pictures and words modality in the interleaved and non-interleaved conditions, in the first and second half of each category (within-category decline), Error bars show *SE* of the mean.



Figure 5: Mean response sensitivity (*d'*) in Experiment 5 (Effect of divided attention), shown individually for the strong/weak targets, in the two conditions (single/dual), and split by first and second half of each category (within-category fatigue) and across the testing session (across-category fatigue). Error bars show *SE* of the mean.



Figure 6: Mean response sensitivity (*d'*), shown individually for the first and second half of each category (within-category fatigue) and across the testing session (across-category fatigue), for Experiments 1, 2, 3 and 5 (single condition), at the presentation speed of 1.1 seconds. Error bars show SE of the mean.



Figure 7: Average percentage of hits and false alarms for items within each category and across participants in Experiments 1 (Thematic-matching), 2 (Taxonomic-matching), 3 (Feature-matching) and 5 (Divided attention: single condition).



Figure 8: Mean response sensitivity (*d'*), shown individually for the first and second half of each category (within-category fatigue) and split by strong and weak trials, for Experiments 1, 4 and 5. Error bars show SE of the mean.



Figure 9: Mean response sensitivity (*d'*) for the first and second half of each category (within-category performance), split by strong and weak targets for patients and controls. Error bars show *SE* of the mean.

Tables

Table 1: Summary of significant results for response sensitivity from GLM and repeated-measures ANOVA analysis, examining effects of speed and relatedness, plus within-category and across-category changes in performance, in Experiment 1: Thematic-matching.

	Experiment 1: Thematic-matching				
		GLM (RT covariate)	ANOVA		
Fixed effects:	df	Wald χ2, p	F, p		
Across-category	(1, 23)	p > .1	p > .1		
Within-category	(1, 23)	p > .1	<i>p</i> > .1		
Relatedness	(1, 23)	52.45, p < .001	50.26, p < .001		
Speed	(1, 23)	40.25, p < .001	38.57, p < .001		
Interactions:					
Within-category x Relatedness	(1, 23)	29.31, p < .001	28.09, p < .001		
Speed x Relatedness	(1, 23)	17.62, p < .001	16.89, p < .001		
Speed x Within-category	(1, 23)	p > .1	p > .1		
Across-category x Relatedness	(1, 23)	3.24, p = .072	3.10, p = .091		

Footnote: Table presents two parallel analyses employing (i) mixed effects modelling (i.e., GLM preserving performance information for each category for each participant and treating participants as a random effect – this allowed RT per category to be included as a covariate of no interest) and (ii) analysis of variance. Other interaction terms were non-significant (p > .1).

Table 2: Summary of significant results for response sensitivity from GLM and repeated-measures ANOVA analysis, examining effects of across-category and within-category changes in performance, in Experiment 2: Taxonomic-matching.

		Experiment 2: Taxono	omic-matching
		GLM (RT covariate)	ANOVA
Fixed effects:	df	Wald χ2, p	F, p
Across-category	(1, 23)	p > .1	p > .1
Within-category	(1, 23)	24.89, p < .001	23.85, p < .001
Interactions:			
Across-category x Within-category	(1, 23)	p > .1	p > .1

Footnote: Table presents two parallel analyses employing (i) mixed effects modelling (i.e., GLM preserving performance information for each category for each participant and treating participants as a random effect – this allowed RT per category to be included as a covariate of no interest) and (ii) analysis of variance.

Table 3: Summary of significant results for response sensitivity from GLM and repeated-measures ANOVA analysis, examining effects of across-category and within-category changes in performance, in Experiment 3: Feature-matching.

		Experiment 3: Specific feature-matching				
		GLM (RT covariate)	ANOVA			
Fixed effects:	df	Wald χ2, p	F, p			
Across-category	(1, 23)	p > .1	p > .1			
Within-category	(1, 23)	13.43, p < .001	12.87, p = .001			
Interactions:						
Across-category x Within-category	(1, 23)	6.18, p = .013	5.93, p = .025			

Footnote: Table presents two parallel analyses employing (i) mixed effects modelling (i.e., GLM preserving performance information for each category for each participant and treating participants as a random effect – this allowed RT per category to be included as a covariate of no interest) and (ii) analysis of variance.

Table 4: Summary of significant results for response sensitivity from GLM and repeated-measures ANOVA analysis, examining effects of modality and interleaving, plus within-category changes in performance, in Experiment 4: Cross-modality alternative-forced-choice decisions.

		Experiment 4: Across modalities					
		GLM (RT covariate)	ANOVA				
Fixed effects:	df	Wald χ2, p	F, p				
Within-category	(1, 21)	p > .1	p > .1				
Modality	(1, 21)	p > .1	p > .1				
Interleaved	(1, 21)	15.72, p < .001	15.03, p = .001				
Interactions:							
Modality x Interleaved	(1, 21)	7.39, p = .007	6.59, p = .018				
Interleaved x Within-category	(1, 21)	4.85, p = .028	4.48, p = .046				
Modality x Within-category	(1, 21)	p > .1	p > .1				
Modality x Interleaved x Within-category	(1, 21)	p > .1	p > .1				

Footnote: Table presents two parallel analyses employing (i) mixed effects modelling (i.e., GLM preserving performance information for each category for each participant and treating participants as a random effect – this allowed RT per category to be included as a covariate of no interest) and (ii) analysis of variance.

Table 5: Summary of significant results for response sensitivity from GLM and repeated-measures ANOVA analysis, examining effects of condition (single/dual), relatedness, plus within-category changes in performance, in Experiment 5: Effect of divided attention.

	Experiment 5: Divided attention					
		GLM (RT covariate)	ANOVA			
Fixed effects:	df	Wald χ2, p	F, p			
Across-category	(1, 23)	3.79, p = .052	2.52, p = .127			
Within-category	(1, 23)	p > .1	p > .1			
Condition (single/dual)	(1, 23)	6.81, p = .009	7.55, p = .012			
Relatedness	(1, 23)	401.28, p < .001	327.25, p < .001			
Interactions:						
Relatedness x Within-category	(1, 23)	6.60, p = .010	9.59, p = .005			
Condition x relatedness x within-category	(1, 23)	3.55, p = .060	2.59, p = .123			

Footnote: Table presents two parallel analyses employing (i) mixed effects modelling (i.e., GLM preserving performance information for each category for each participant and treating participants as a random effect – this allowed RT per category to be included as a covariate of no interest) and (ii) analysis of variance. Other interaction terms were non-significant (p > .1).

Table 6: Summary of significant results from GLM and repeated-measures ANOVA analysis, examining across-category and within-category changes in performance across Experiments 1 (Thematic-matching), 2 (Taxonomic-matching), 3 (Feature-matching), and 5 (Effect of divided attention, single condition).

	Cross-Experiment comparison				
		GLM (RT covariate)	ANOVA		
Fixed effects:	df	Wald χ2, p	F, p		
Experiment	(1, 92)	72.64, p < .001	27.79, p < .001		
Across-category	(1, 92)	p > .1	p > .1		
Within-category	(1, 92)	15.53, p < .001	14.83, p < .001		
Interactions (all n.s.):		p > .1	p > .1		

Footnote: Table presents two parallel analyses employing (i) mixed effects modelling (i.e., GLM preserving performance information for each category for each participant and treating participants as a random effect – this allowed RT per category to be included as a covariate of no interest) and (ii) analysis of variance. Experiment was included as a between-subjects factor.

Table 7: Summary of significant results from GLM and repeated-measures ANOVA analysis, examining relatedness and within-category performance across Experiments 1 (Thematic-matching), 4 (Words modality), and 5 (Effect of divided attention).

	Cross-experiment relatedness comparison					
		GLM (RT covariate)	ANOVA			
Fixed effects:	df	Wald χ2, p	F, p			
Experiment	(1, 67)	6.83, p = .033	4.38, p = .016			
Within-category	(1, 67)	7.16, p = .007	7.09, p = .010			
Relatedness	(1, 67)	289.14, p < .001	299.72, p < .001			
Interactions:						
Relatedness x Experiment	(1, 67)	265.26, p < .001	45.72, p < .001			
Relatedness x Within-category	(1, 67)	10.83, p = .001	11.12, p = .001			
Within-category x Experiment	(1, 67)	p > .1	2.84, p = .066			

Footnote: Table presents two parallel analyses employing (i) mixed effects modelling (i.e., GLM preserving performance information for each category for each participant and treating participants as a random effect – this allowed RT per category to be included as a covariate of no interest) and (ii) analysis of variance. Experiment was included as a between-subjects factor. Other interaction terms were non-significant (p > .1).

Table 8: Background neuropsychological data for each patient

	Max score	Control mean	Cut-off	EKD	ONY	YHE	SSR	RTJ	NNZ	NHY	NGW	ESU	NNF	LHN	HNA
Semantic tasks:															
WPM	64	64	63	64	63	62*	52*	63	64	62*	64	62*	60*	62*	63
CCT pictures	64	59	53	58	60	61	54	61	53	57	56	45*	45*	44*	31*
CCT words	64	61	57	63	58	60	57	56*	61	52*	53*	59	29*	43*	39*
Synonym Judgement	96	95	91	90*	87*	81*	87*	81*	78*	76*	74*	66*	71*	59*	57*
Object use: canonical	37	36	34	NA	36	37	33*	37	37	35	35	37	29*	31*	32*
Object use: non-canonical	37	34	29	NA	32	29	22*	32	26*	22*	21*	34	14*	13*	14*
Ambiguity: cues	60	60	59	NA	52*	54*	47*	57*	50*	51*	40*	43*	39*	35*	46*
Ambiguity: miscues	60	59	57	NA	50*	45*	39*	54*	42*	34*	22*	30*	27*	23*	19*
Executive tasks:															
Trail making	23	23	17	23	23	22	23	21	19	5*	12*	1*	16*	23	2*
RCPM	36	33	28	32	29	33	34	33	21*	30	24*	19*	31	29	31
BSRA	54	33	28	39	45	30	31	39	31	23*	26*	24*	18*	7*	21*
Phonological deficits:															
Cookie theft WPM		NA		NA	58	37	0*	38	54	37	12	60	9	18	0*
PALPA - repetition	80	NA	73	NA	NA	77	1*	7*	74	79	75	78	42*	71	0*

* Denotes impaired performance. NA = not available. Patients are arranged according to composite semantic severity scores; this is a single factor extracted from WPM = word picture matching, CCT = Camel and Cactus Task (both from Bozeat et al., 2000), and synonym judgement. RCPM = Raven's Coloured Progressive Matrices (Raven, 1962). BSRA = Brixton Spatial Attainment Task (Burgess & Shallice, 1997). PALPA = Psycholinguistic Assessments of Language Processing in Aphasia (Kay, Lesser, & Coltheart, 1992). Cookie theft description assesses fluency (words-per-minute; Goodglass & Kaplan, 1983)

Table 9: Summary of significant results from the GLM analysis for SA patients and age-matched controls – looking at the effects of group, relatedness, set and within-category performance, for our key dependent measures- response sensitivity, response accuracy and response times.

		SA patients vs. age-matched controls					
		GLM (RT covariate)	ANOVA				
Fixed effects:	df	Wald χ2, p	F, p				
Group	(1,23)	3.19, p = .074	5.51, p = .027				
Relatedness	(1,23)	126.95, p < .001	287.58, p < .001				
Set	(1,23)	p > .1	p > .1				
Within-category	(1,23)	p > .1	p>.1				
Interactions:							
Group x Relatedness	(1,23)	8.08, p = .004	p > .1				
Group x Set	(1,23)	3.42, p = .064	p > .1				
Relatedness x Within-category	(1,23)	4.77, p = .029	p > .1				

Footnote: Table presents analyses employing (i) mixed effects modelling for response sensitivity (i.e., GLM preserving performance information for each category for each participant and treating participants as a random effect – this allowed RT per category to be included as a covariate of no interest).