

This is a repository copy of *Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning in poor comprehenders*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/85989/>

Version: Submitted Version

Article:

Henderson, Lisa-Marie orcid.org/0000-0003-3635-2481 (2013) *Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning in poor comprehenders*. *Scientific Studies of Reading*. pp. 177-198. ISSN 1532-799X


<https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2011.652721>

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.



Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning in poor comprehenders

Journal:	<i>Scientific Studies in Reading</i>
Manuscript ID:	HSSR-2011-0088.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Reading comprehension, Semantic processing, Vocabulary, Suppression, Semantic priming

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning in poor comprehenders

Running head: Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

For Peer Review Only

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

Abstract

This study examined three processes crucial to reading comprehension (*semantic access*, *integration* and *inhibition*) to identify causes of comprehension impairment. Poor comprehenders were compared to chronological-age (CA) controls and vocabulary-age (VA) controls. When listening to homonym primes (“bank”) versus unrelated primes, controls were faster to name pictures related to dominant (money) and subordinate (river) meanings at 250ms ISI but only showed dominant priming at 1000ms ISI whereas poor comprehenders only showed dominant priming. When listening to subordinately-biased sentences ending in homonyms (“John fished from the bank”) versus control sentences, all groups showed priming when naming subordinate (appropriate) pictures at 250ms ISI: VA controls and poor comprehenders also showed priming when naming dominant (inappropriate) pictures. At 1000ms ISI, controls showed appropriate priming whereas poor comprehenders only showed inappropriate priming. These findings suggest that poor comprehenders have difficulties accessing subordinate word meanings which can manifest as a failure to inhibit irrelevant information.

Author Note

This research was funded by a 1+3 Economic and Social Research Council studentship to the first author. We would like to thank the children and schools who participated and Charles Hulme and Hannah Nash for their valuable comments.

For Peer Review Only

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 In order to succeed in education, it is vital to have proficient reading and listening
4 skills. Hence it is crucial to understand the causes of comprehension failure in order to
5 identify children with comprehension difficulties and put interventions in place. Children
6 who have intact reading accuracy and fluency but impairments in the comprehension of
7 written and spoken language (known as 'poor comprehenders') have been the subject of much
8 research yet they are seldom identified within school systems (Cain & Oakhill, 2006; Nation,
9 Cocksey, Taylor & Bishop, 2010). Since language comprehension is a multifaceted process
10 that involves many of the skills that are fundamental to human cognition (Kintsch, 1988,
11 1998) comprehension can fail for a variety of reasons and it is not yet clear what leads
12 children to develop a 'poor comprehender profile'.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 In order to achieve a coherent understanding of text or discourse, it is necessary to
24 recognise individual words, retrieve their meanings, integrate these meanings with
25 surrounding context and inhibit irrelevant information (Perfetti, 2007). These processes
26 become particularly important when we comprehend ambiguous words that can take on
27 different meanings in different contexts. For example, we can light a *match*, go to a football
28 *match*, and meet our *match*. *Match* is a homonym; a word that has a single spelling and
29 pronunciation but multiple meanings. Homonyms are highly frequent in the English language
30 (Rodd, Gaskell & Marslen-Wilson, 2004) and pose a challenge for the comprehender because
31 a single meaning has to be activated and selected on the basis of lexical or contextual factors
32 while other unrelated meanings are inhibited. Studying the time-course of homonym
33 resolution can thus provide insights into the semantic processes that are crucial for
34 comprehension. Using ambiguity resolution as a framework, this study investigates semantic
35 access, integration and inhibition in typically developing (TD) children and examines how
36 these processes can breakdown to cause the poor comprehender profile.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 The semantic priming paradigm (McNamara, 2005; Neely, 1991; Swinney, 1979;
52 Taft, 1991) has been used to investigate processing of ambiguous words. 'Semantic priming'
53 refers to the fact that target stimuli (words/pictures) are responded to faster and more
54 accurately if they are preceded by a prime word or target to which they are semantically
55
56
57
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 related. This effect provides an index of the semantic information that has been retrieved on
4
5 encountering the prime. By varying the inter-stimulus interval (ISI) between prime and target
6
7 it is possible to investigate priming at different time-points after encountering a homonym and
8
9 hence how access to homonym meanings changes over the time course of processing.

10
11 Semantic priming studies suggest that the multiple meanings of words are accessed
12 immediately after presentation (Barnes et al., 2004; Duffy, Kambe & Rayner, 2001;
13 Henderson, Clarke & Snowling, 2011; Simpson & Burgess, 1985; Simpson & Foster, 1986;
14 Swinney, 1979; Gorfein, 2001). Priming occurs when homonyms are presented as words in
15 isolation (bank – money/river) or as final words in sentence primes (John fished from the
16 bank – money/river) and when the inter-stimulus interval (ISI) from the offset of the prime to
17 the onset of the target is short. Later in processing (when the ISI is longer), one meaning is
18 selected based on lexical factors such as meaning frequency and/or contextual factors. When
19 sentence context is available, meaning frequency interacts with context (Duffy et al., 2001;
20 MacDonald, Pearlmutter, & Seidenberg, 1994; Tabossi & Sbisa, 2001): if a sentence prime is
21 biased towards a subordinate meaning (John fished from the bank) then priming for both
22 context appropriate (river) and inappropriate (money) targets is likely to emerge at short ISIs
23 followed by a maintenance of priming for the context appropriate (subordinate) meaning at
24 long ISIs. However, if a sentence prime is strongly biased towards the dominant meaning
25 (John stole from the bank), priming for inappropriate subordinate targets may not be observed
26 at any ISI.

27
28 The extant research suggests that poor comprehenders have difficulties in many tasks
29 that require access to word meaning. Efficient access to word meaning requires fluency of
30 retrieval in addition to breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge (Tannenbaum, Torgensen
31 & Wagner, 2006). Poor comprehenders are slower and less accurate at naming pictures with
32 low frequency names, but show similar effects of word length on picture naming (Nation,
33 Marshall, & Snowling, 2001). They have been reported to show reduced semantic priming for
34 categorically-related words that are not highly associated (*bed – desk*) when compared with
35 decoding-matched controls (Nation & Snowling, 1999) and to have difficulty making
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 synonym judgements for word pairs low in imageability (*fast – quick*) (Nation & Snowling,
4
5 1998a). According to Perfetti's (2007) lexical quality hypothesis, the ability to comprehend a
6
7 text is strongly related to the variability in the quality of the word representations that are
8
9 encountered. High lexical quality is characterised by "well-specified and partly redundant
10
11 representations of form (orthography and phonology) and flexible representations of meaning,
12
13 allowing for rapid and reliable meaning retrieval" (p. 357). Within this view, although poor
14
15 comprehenders have adequate phonological and orthographic representations of words, low-
16
17 quality representations (or limited access to them) leads to inadequate comprehension.
18

19
20 The precise nature of the semantic deficit in poor comprehenders and how it interacts
21
22 with higher-level comprehension processes is unclear. One view is that knowledge of
23
24 individual words in a text or discourse is all-or-none and when meanings are not available this
25
26 will impede reading comprehension (Anderson & Freebody, 1981). In contrast, Nation and
27
28 Snowling (1998a) suggest that the relationship between reading comprehension and semantic
29
30 skills might be best explained by the speed or efficiency of semantic access, arguing "...if
31
32 semantic access is slow or effortful then less capacity will be available for comprehension"
33
34 (p. 98). This is evidenced by poor comprehenders being slower than decoding-matched
35
36 controls at reading low-frequency and exception words (which are read with greater support
37
38 from semantics), making synonym judgments, and producing exemplars in semantic fluency
39
40 tasks (Nation & Snowling, 1998a). To further test the hypothesis that poor comprehenders
41
42 have difficulties with fluency of semantic access, this study examines whether they show a
43
44 slower time course of access to and selection of homonym meanings when homonyms are
45
46 presented in isolation, without the support of surrounding context.
47

48
49 There is also evidence that poor comprehenders are poor at integrating word
50
51 meanings in context to form coherent sentence representations, consistent with findings that
52
53 they show weak inferencing skills (Cain & Oakhill, 1999; Cain, Oakhill & Elbro, 2003).
54
55 Nation and Snowling (1998b) compared the performance of poor comprehenders and
56
57 decoding-matched controls on a task in which printed words were primed by spoken
58
59 sentences. Both groups showed faster naming responses for target words preceded by related
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 sentences compared to words in isolation, but the benefit of context was smaller for poor
4
5 comprehenders. Whether the reduced facilitation reported in this study arose from less
6
7 efficient integration of words at the sentence level, slower semantic access at the word level
8
9 or a failure to use predictive strategies remains unclear.

10
11 The paradigm used by Nation and Snowling (1998b) required children to read aloud
12
13 words and to make explicit use of context. Counter to their findings, recent eye tracking
14
15 studies which measure early and implicit sensitivity to context, have suggested that poor
16
17 comprehenders may be as sensitive to sentence context as controls matched on decoding in
18
19 both written (van der Schoot et al., 2009) and spoken (Nation, Marshall & Altmann, 2003)
20
21 language. It follows that the difficulties which have been reported at the sentence level may
22
23 be due to a difficulty at a later stage of processing such as with maintaining relevant mental
24
25 representations in memory over time without interference from irrelevant information.

26
27 Consistent with this idea, another line of research suggests that poor comprehenders
28
29 can access relevant information and show sensitivity to context but have difficulties inhibiting
30
31 irrelevant semantic information (Cain, 2006; Gernsbacher & Faust, 1991; Gernsbacher,
32
33 Varner & Faust, 1990; Nation et al., 2003; Pimperton & Nation, 2010). Gernsbacher et al.
34
35 (1990) used a meaning judgement task where adult participants read sentences and then
36
37 decided whether a target word was related to the sentence. The critical sentences ended with
38
39 homonyms and were followed by target words related to the sentence-incongruous meaning
40
41 (He dug with a spade - ACE). This condition was compared against a non-ambiguous control
42
43 condition (He dug with a shovel - ACE). When target words were presented immediately after
44
45 the sentence, all participants responded more slowly to probes following ambiguous than
46
47 unambiguous words. However, when probes were delayed by 850ms, this pattern was
48
49 obtained only for less-skilled comprehenders. Gernsbacher et al (1990) concluded that “less
50
51 skilled comprehenders have less rapid (and therefore less efficient) suppression mechanisms”
52
53 (p. 440). Gernsbacher and Faust (1991) found that skilled and less-skilled comprehenders
54
55 were equally effective at deciding that the probe word matched the sentence meaning (He
56
57 dealt the spade ACE). They argued that group differences were attributable to “suppression
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

(of inappropriate or irrelevant information), not enhancement (of appropriate or relevant information)" (Gernsbacher, 1997, p. 178). Using Gernbacher's experimental design, Barnes, Faulkner, Wilkinson and Dennis (2004) replicated these findings comparing 12-year-old poor comprehenders with a history of early hydrocephalus and controls matched on word reading. However, group differences in general cognitive ability were not controlled leaving open the possibility that could provide an explanation for their finding that poor comprehenders were less successful at inhibiting inappropriate meanings of ambiguous words, despite showing intact contextual facilitation.

An alternative explanation of the findings of Gernsbacher et al' (1990) results is in terms of enhancement of relevant information rather than inhibition of irrelevant information. According to McNamara's (1997) 'knowledge-based' account of lexical ambiguity resolution, activation of prior knowledge plays a pivotal role in the formation of a coherent mental representation of text or discourse, so that weak inhibition can be construed as the consequence of inefficient access to relevant semantic knowledge. Thus, McNamara (1997; McNamara & McDaniel, 2004) proposed a computational model that relies solely on competition for facilitation between related units of information rather than using negative links between alternative representations of word meaning. This model demonstrated that the number of activated associations to the relevant meaning of a sentence-final homonym predicted the rate of loss of activation for the irrelevant meaning. The model assumes that skilled comprehenders activate more relevant knowledge, leading to a rapid deactivation of irrelevant meanings. In contrast, poor comprehenders activate less relevant knowledge. Although this may be sufficient to allow the relevant meaning to reach the threshold required to understand the sentence, it is not sufficient to deactivate the irrelevant meaning. In this way, reduced access to relevant knowledge can interfere with the formation of sentence-level representations.

Using cross-modal semantic priming we examined three candidate causes of comprehension difficulty in poor comprehenders: (1) a difficulty in accessing meaning at the

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 word-level, (2) intact access to word meaning but a lack of sensitivity to sentence context, and
4
5 (3) intact access to word meaning and sensitivity to context but a difficulty with the inhibition
6
7 of context-inappropriate information. In Experiment 1, participants listened to homonym
8
9 primes or unrelated primes; in Experiment 2 participants listened to subordinately-biased
10
11 sentence primes ending in homonyms or control sentence primes. In each experiment
12
13 participants then named picture targets depicting dominant and subordinate associates of the
14
15 homonyms¹. An ISI of 250ms was used to measure priming at an early point in processing
16
17 (Barnes et al., 2004; Simpson & Foster, 1986) and an ISI of 1000ms was used to measure a
18
19 later point in processing (Barnes et al., 2004; Booth, Harasaki & Burman, 2006). We
20
21 investigated how the same children access and select homonym meanings when sentence
22
23 context is and is not available, allowing us to consider the influence of word-level semantic
24
25 processing difficulties on sentence-level processing. Poor comprehenders were compared to
26
27 chronological-age (CA) controls to ensure any group differences in semantic priming could
28
29 not be attributed to differences in reading accuracy, phonological decoding, age or nonverbal
30
31 ability. Vocabulary-age (VA) controls were also included to ensure group differences were
32
33 not simply due to reduced receptive vocabulary knowledge.
34

35
36 The age range of 8-11 years was selected since approximately 7.5 – 10% of children
37
38 at this age may be categorised as poor comprehenders (Nation & Snowling, 1997; Stothard &
39
40 Hulme, 1995). A previous study with 50 TD children aged 8-11 years used the same materials
41
42 and methodology as the present study and did not find any significant correlations between
43
44 priming effects and age, suggesting there are minimal developmental changes in this age
45
46 range (Henderson, unpublished PhD thesis): dominant and subordinate priming effects were
47
48 obtained at 250ms ISI but only dominant priming was evident at 1000ms ISI. When listening
49
50 to subordinate-biased sentences vs. control sentences, children showed significantly faster
51

52
53 ¹ One problem for “multiple-access” views of word recognition is the “backward priming effect”. On this view,
54
55 priming effects observed for multiple meanings at short ISIs may emerge because participants, upon encountering
56
57 the target stimulus, develop a backwards inference to the preceding prime. It has been argued that, unlike the
58
59 lexical decision task, the naming task is not as susceptible to backward priming effects. Seidenberg, Waters,
60
Sanders & Langer (1984) measured both naming and lexical decision times for the second words of
asymmetrically related word pairs, such as “stick – lip” which were highly related only in the backward direction
(SOA=500ms). Only lexical decision revealed backward priming effects. Hence, the naming task was used here in
an effort to reduce the influence of backward priming.

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 responses when naming subordinate and dominant (inappropriately related) picture targets at
4
5 250ms ISI; only subordinate priming was found at 1000ms ISI.
6

Experiment 1

7
8
9 Experiment 1 examined the time course of access to homonym meanings when
10
11 homonyms were presented in isolation. A pre-test confirmed that children were familiar with
12
13 both meanings of each homonym. It was hypothesised that both groups of typical readers
14
15 (CA- and VA-controls) would show priming for dominant and subordinate meanings of
16
17 homonyms at 250ms ISI but only dominant priming at 1000ms ISI (Henderson et al., 2011;
18
19 Simpson & Burgess, 1985; Simpson & Foster, 1986). If poor comprehenders have difficulties
20
21 in accessing word meanings, it was predicted they would show reduced priming at the short
22
23 ISI, particularly for subordinate meanings. If this reduced priming effect is purely due to
24
25 weaker vocabulary knowledge then poor comprehenders should differ only from CA controls.
26
27 However, if poor comprehenders also differ to VA controls, despite being matched on
28
29 receptive vocabulary knowledge and familiarity with the stimulus set, then this suggests a
30
31 difficulty in the on-line fluent retrieval of low frequency word-meanings. Alternatively, if
32
33 poor comprehenders have difficulty inhibiting one meaning whilst selecting another, then this
34
35 should lead to intact priming at the short ISI but sustained priming for both dominant and
36
37 subordinate meanings at the long ISI.
38

Method

Participants

39
40
41
42
43 Table 1 shows the assessment profiles of the participants. Seventeen poor
44
45 comprehenders were selected using the following criteria: (i) single-word reading (Word
46
47 Reading, BAS-II, Elliot et al., 1996) and text reading accuracy (NARA-II, Neale, 1997) above
48
49 a standard score of 90, (ii) reading comprehension on the NARA-II at a standard score of 89
50
51 or below, and (iii) a 1 SD discrepancy (15 standard points) between reading comprehension
52
53 and single-word reading (n=15) or if the discrepancy was between 10–14 standard points then
54
55 there had to be a 1SD discrepancy between reading comprehension and text reading accuracy
56
57 (n=2).
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 The poor comprehenders were pairwise matched to 17 TD CA controls from the same
4 classrooms for age, single-word reading, nonword decoding (Graded Nonword Reading Test;
5 Snowling et al., 1996), text reading accuracy, the number of stories read on the NARA-II, and
6 nonverbal ability (Matrices, BAS-II; Elliot et al., 1996). The poor comprehenders performed
7 significantly worse on receptive vocabulary (BPVS-II; Dunn et al., 1997) than CA controls.
8 The poor comprehenders were significantly older than the group of 17 TD VA controls but
9 were closely matched on receptive vocabulary. The groups did not significantly differ on a
10 verbal working memory task (WMTB-C Listening Recall; Pickering & Gathercole, 2001).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

Materials

19
20
21 Through pre-testing with 27 children (7–10 years), homonyms were selected for the
22 experiments if (a) an associate was provided on a word association task that could be depicted
23 as a picture, (b) a dominant meaning was produced over subordinate by at least 70% of
24 children, and (c) a subordinate meaning was produced over dominant at most 30% of the time
25 and at least 5% of the time. The final stimulus set comprised 22 homonym prime – dominant
26 target pairs, 22 homonym prime – subordinate target pairs, 22 unrelated prime – dominant
27 target pairs, and 22 unrelated prime – subordinate target pairs. The stimuli can be made
28 available by contacting the authors.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37
38 Black and white line drawings (with at least 80% naming agreement in the pre-
39 testing) were chosen to represent dominant and subordinate associates of each homonym; 27
40 from Snodgrass and Vanderwaart's (1980) database and 17 from www.clipart.com. Picture
41 names for dominant and subordinate conditions were matched for length and frequency (MRC
42 Psycholinguistic Database, Version, 2.00, Wilson, 1988). The majority of the prime-target
43 pairs were functionally related (3/22 were categorically related for the dominant condition and
44 2/22 were categorically related for the subordinate condition).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Unrelated unambiguous primes were matched to the homonym primes for
53 phonological and orthographic neighbourhood size and frequency using the Children's
54 Printed Word Database (www.essex.ac.uk/psychology/cpwd), and for concreteness,
55
56
57
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

familiarity, imageability and age of acquisition using the MRC Psycholinguistic Database (Version, 2.00, Wilson, 1988). Table 2 shows example stimuli.

Design

Participants were presented with all 88 trials for each ISI. ISI conditions were administered on different days in a counterbalanced order with at least one week between testing. The trials were divided into two blocks separated by a 10 minute break. Pictures and homonyms were only encountered once in each block. The relatedness proportion was 50%. Related or unrelated conditions did not occur more than three times consecutively.

Procedure

Participants were instructed to listen to each word and name the picture as quickly and carefully as possible (Figure 1). A microphone connected to a voice key measured naming RT from the onset of the picture. The experimenter recorded item accuracy.

Meaning familiarity post-test

To measure participants' familiarity with the homonyms used in the experiment, a post-test was administered using E-prime (Schneider Eschman, & Zuccolotto, 2002). Children heard each homonym three times; once with a dominant picture, once with a subordinate picture, and once with an unrelated picture. Children responded yes/no if they thought the word-picture pair was related or not. Filler items ensured that 50% of the item pairs were related. Two lists with opposite orders were counterbalanced across participants where the same word did not appear in succession. The number of unfamiliar dominant and subordinate meanings and number of incorrect responses to unrelated items were very low. There were no group differences for the number of incorrect responses to unrelated (poor comprehenders 0.18/22, SD=0.39; CA controls 0.12, SD=0.33; VA controls 0) or dominant items (poor comprehenders 0.41, SD=0.62; CA controls 0.12, SD=0.33; VA controls 0.12, SD=0.33). The poor comprehenders showed significantly more incorrect responses to subordinate items than the CA controls ($p < .05$) but not the VA controls ($p > .05$) (poor comprehenders 1.41, SD=1.28; CA controls 0.41, SD=0.62; VA controls 1.0, SD=1.37).

Results

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

Mean picture naming RTs and naming errors for correct responses are shown in Table 3. Naming errors were low and were not analysed further. RTs were removed from the data set on a participant-by-participant basis if (1) the participant was unfamiliar with the homonym meaning in the post-test, (2) the microphone had falsely recorded an item, and (3) pictures were named incorrectly. Extreme RTs were not removed (Ulrich & Miller, 1994). For the 250ms ISI, significantly more items were removed for the poor comprehenders (mean 8.56%, SD=6.37%) than the CA controls (mean 4.76%, SD=3.01%) ($p<.05$) but the poor comprehenders and VA controls (mean 7.47%, SD=4.21%) did not significantly differ ($p>.05$), $F(2, 50)=3.17$, $p<.05$. For the 1000ms ISI, marginally more items were removed for poor comprehenders (mean 9.06%, SD=6.79%) than CA controls (mean 5.41%, SD=3.22%) ($p=.06$) but there was no difference between poor comprehenders and VA controls (mean 6.35%, SD=4.31%) ($p>.05$), $F(2, 50) = 2.30$, $p = .06$.

The RT data show that poor comprehenders were slower in all conditions compared with CA but not VA controls. All groups were faster to name dominant targets if they were preceded by related homonyms than unrelated primes at both 250 and 1000ms ISIs. At 250ms ISI the control groups were also faster to name subordinate targets if they were related to homonym primes but the poor comprehenders did not show subordinate priming. To confirm this pattern, the data were entered into a mixed-design ANOVA for each ISI separately². The within-subjects variables were Association (dominant, subordinate) and Relatedness (related, unrelated), and the between-subjects variable was Group (poor comprehenders, CA controls, VA controls). Picture naming RT (by participants) was the dependent variable.

250ms ISI

Poor comprehenders were slower to name pictures than CA controls ($t(32)=2.78$, $p<.01$) but not VA controls ($t(32)=1.04$, $p>.05$) (Group, $F(2, 48)=3.95$, $p<.05$,

² We first carried out a 4-way mixed-design ANOVA including ISI as an additional within-subject factor. There was a significant ISI x Association x Relatedness interaction, $F(1, 48) = 10.83$, $p < .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .18$, which justifies our decision to separate the analysis by ISI condition and test specific hypotheses about each ISI in turn. The ISI x Association x Relatedness x Group interaction was not significant, $F(2, 48) = 0.17$, $p > .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$.

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 $\eta_p^2=.14$). Pictures were named faster if they were preceded by homonym than unrelated
4
5 primes (Relatedness, $F(1, 48)=26.58, p<.001, \eta_p^2=.36$) and if the pictures were dominant than
6
7 subordinate associates of the homonyms (Association, $F(1, 48)=11.50, p<.001, \eta_p^2=.19$). The
8
9 Association \times Relatedness \times Group interaction did not reach significance, likely due to large
10
11 variability (see Table 3) particularly for the VA controls and poor comprehenders ($F(2,$
12
13 $48)=1.80, p>.05, \eta_p^2=.07$). However, the Association \times Relatedness \times Group interaction was
14
15 significant when the VA controls were omitted from the analysis ($F(1, 32)=4.71, p<.05,$
16
17 $\eta_p^2=.13$) justifying the examination of Group influences on priming effects using planned
18
19 contrasts. All groups showed dominant priming (poor comprehenders mean difference
20
21 135ms; 95% CI 39–232ms, $t(16)=-2.99, p<.01$; CA controls mean difference 66ms; 95% CI
22
23 21–112ms, $t(16)=-3.09, p<.01$; VA controls mean difference 129ms; 95% CI 58–198ms,
24
25 $t(16)=3.91, p<.01$) but only the control groups showed subordinate priming (poor
26
27 comprehenders mean difference 33ms; 95% CI -50ms – 117ms), $t(16)<1$; CA controls mean
28
29 difference 69ms; 95% CI 9 – 129ms, $t(16)=-2.44, p<.05$; VA controls mean difference 71ms
30
31 95% CI 0.68–143ms, $t(16)=2.10, p<.05$).

1000ms ISI

32
33
34
35
36 At the long ISI the main effects of Relatedness and Association were again significant
37
38 (Relatedness, $F(1,48)=4.42, p<.05, \eta_p^2=.08$; Association, $F(1,48)=32.09, p<.001, \eta_p^2=.40$).
39
40 There was a marginal effect of Group, $F(2,48)=4.21, p<.05, \eta_p^2=.12$; the poor comprehenders
41
42 were slower than the CA controls ($t(32)=2.05, p<.05$) but not the VA controls ($t(32)<1$). All
43
44 groups showed significant priming for dominant targets (mean difference 102ms; 95% CI 69–
45
46 136ms) but the subordinate priming effect was in the opposite direction with unrelated targets
47
48 named faster than related targets (mean difference -53ms; 95% CI -80–25ms) (Relatedness \times
49
50 Association interaction, $F(1,48)=63.16, p<.001, \eta_p^2=.57$). No other interactions were
51
52 significant.
53
54

55 To reduce the influence of naming speed on the size of the priming effects (Chapman
56
57 et al., 1994), ratio scores are presented instead of raw differences in Figure 2 to express the
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 priming scores as a proportion of naming speed (Burke, White & Diaz, 1987; Howard, Shaw
4 & Heisey, 1986; Tompkins, Baumgaertner, Lehman, & Fossett, 1997). The pattern of priming
5 remains the same when group differences in naming speed are controlled. It is therefore
6 unlikely that naming speed differences alone account for the results, particularly since the
7 group differences in priming effects were confined to the short ISI.
8
9
10
11
12

Discussion

13
14
15 For the 250ms ISI, both control groups showed significant dominant and subordinate
16 priming; for the 1000ms ISI they only showed dominant priming. This general pattern of
17 priming is consistent with the findings of previous semantic priming studies with homonyms
18 (Henderson et al., 2011; Simpson & Burgess, 1985; Simpson & Foster, 1986). Whilst the
19 younger VA controls showed larger dominant priming than subordinate priming at the short
20 ISI (as in Simpson & Foster, 1986), the size of the dominant and subordinate priming effects
21 was similar for the CA controls. The relative size of priming effects for words differing in
22 meaning frequency is likely to be strongly influenced by the ISI and be characterised by large
23 individual and developmental differences. It is possible that the older CA controls may have
24 shown a stronger frequency effect at shorter ISIs than used in this study (Henderson,
25 unpublished PhD thesis).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Subordinate picture targets were named significantly more slowly when preceded by
38 a homonym prime than an unrelated prime at the 1000ms ISI. This could suggest that the
39 subordinate meanings of the homonyms were inhibited on presentation of the homonym
40 prime which hindered children's ability to retrieve the picture name. Consistent with this,
41 experiments that have incorporated a neutral baseline (in addition to related and unrelated
42 conditions; Simpson & Foster, 1986; Simpson & Burgess, 1985) have reported that
43 subordinate targets are responded to significantly slower when they are preceded by related
44 homonyms than neutral primes, suggesting they are inhibited after their initial activation
45 (Neely, 1977). While it is important to emphasise that strong claims about the presence of
46 'inhibition' of the unselected meaning cannot be made solely on the basis of the present data,
47 using the same materials and ISIs, we have also shown that TD children name subordinate
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 targets significantly more slowly when they are preceded by related-homonym than neutral
4
5 (nonword) primes (Henderson, unpublished PhD thesis).
6

7 Despite showing a large dominant priming effect, the poor comprehenders did not
8
9 show subordinate priming at the short ISI in contrast to CA and VA controls. This finding is
10
11 consistent with the hypothesis that poor comprehenders have difficulty in accessing the
12
13 subordinate meanings of homonyms despite being familiar with them on a receptive
14
15 vocabulary task. The receptive vocabulary task involved simple 'yes-no' judgements about
16
17 word-picture pairs; whilst this is a good test of vocabulary breadth, it may underestimate
18
19 depth - the vocabulary dimension in which poor comprehenders differ most from TD
20
21 children. The finding that poor comprehenders' showed reduced subordinate priming at the
22
23 250ms ISI is consistent with this idea and emphasises the fact that they have impaired
24
25 semantic knowledge for low-frequency words.
26

27 Contrary to the hypothesis of an inhibition deficit there was no evidence that poor
28
29 comprehenders fail to select a single meaning of homonyms and reject other meanings (at
30
31 least when the meanings to be inhibited are subordinate in frequency) since only the dominant
32
33 meaning was primed at the long ISI. It remains possible that poor comprehenders may have
34
35 shown smaller inhibition effects than controls had a neutral baseline condition been included;
36
37 however, the strong form of the inhibition deficit hypothesis was not supported here.
38

Experiment 2

39
40
41 Experiment 2 investigated the time course of semantic access to homonym meanings
42
43 in sentence context. We examined the extent to which poor comprehenders can integrate
44
45 semantic information, select contextually appropriate information and inhibit contextually
46
47 inappropriate information. The same children listened to subordinately biased sentences
48
49 ending in homonyms or control sentences. Following an ISI of 250ms or 1000ms they named
50
51 target pictures depicting the subordinate meaning of the sentence-final homonym
52
53 (appropriately related) or target pictures depicting the dominant meaning of the homonym
54
55 (inappropriately related) (Table 4). Critical sentences in each condition were subordinately
56
57
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 biased on the assumption that this necessitates the inhibition of dominant (inappropriate)
4
5 meanings, which have a higher relative frequency.
6

7 At the 250ms ISI, we predicted that both control groups would show ‘appropriate
8 priming’ for picture targets of subordinate meanings when they were preceded by
9 subordinate-biased than control sentences and ‘inappropriate priming’ for dominant picture
10 targets when they were preceded by subordinate-biased than control sentences. At this ISI
11 both dominant and subordinate meanings should be automatically accessed (Barnes et al.,
12 2004; Henderson et al., 2011). At the 1000ms ISI, we predicted that controls would only show
13 appropriate priming since at this point the context-inappropriate (dominant) meaning should
14 be inhibited.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 At the 250ms ISI, if poor comprehenders have difficulties with integrating semantic
24 information when hearing sentences in order to activate context appropriate information, they
25 should show reduced appropriate priming compared to controls. We also predicted that poor
26 comprehenders should show intact inappropriate priming at this ISI, since they should have
27 little difficulty accessing the dominant (inappropriate) meanings. Based on the impaired
28 semantic integration hypothesis, at the 1000ms ISI, poor comprehenders should continue to
29 show reduced appropriate priming. Alternatively, if their ability to integrate semantic
30 information in sentence context is intact but they have difficulties inhibiting irrelevant
31 information, then they should show appropriate priming accompanied by inappropriate
32 priming in contrast to controls. If group differences in priming are due to poor
33 comprehenders’ weaker vocabulary knowledge then they should differ only from CA and not
34 VA controls.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Method

Design and Materials

48
49
50 The materials were designed to test appropriate and inappropriate priming, using a
51 within-subjects design. The 22 homonyms and 44 pictures from Experiment 1 were used. For
52 each homonym, four sentences were constructed (hence children responded to 88
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 experimental sentences). Each sentence contained four or five words. Half of the sentences
4
5 were used in the appropriate condition, half were used in the inappropriate condition.
6

7 To measure appropriate priming all sentences ended with homonyms. “Control”
8
9 sentences had neutral context and granted either meaning acceptable; “Biased” sentences
10
11 rendered the subordinate meaning appropriate by altering the verb. Control and biased
12
13 sentences were followed by congruent (subordinate) pictures. In a preparatory experiment, we
14
15 ensured that the subordinate picture targets were not primed by the biased versus neutral verbs
16
17 when they were presented as single-word primes. Hence, any priming from the biased
18
19 sentences can be attributed to the integration of the verb with the homonym.
20

21 To measure inappropriate priming, the verbs were identical in both conditions but the
22
23 sentence pairs differed in their final words. “Control” sentences ended with unambiguous
24
25 synonyms that were unrelated to the dominant target whereas “Inappropriate” sentences were
26
27 subordinately biased and ended with homonyms that were inappropriately related to the
28
29 dominant target. Unambiguous and ambiguous word endings for the inappropriate condition
30
31 were matched for length, frequency, imageability and age of acquisition. Sentences were
32
33 recorded by the same speaker as for the single-word task.
34

35 Sentences were divided into blocks so that a homonym only occurred once in each.
36
37 Blocks were separated by 5 minute breaks and counterbalanced for order. No condition
38
39 occurred more than three times consecutively. Six practice items were administered.
40

Procedure

41
42
43 The procedure was the same as for Experiment 1 but children were instructed to listen
44
45 to each sentence. ISI conditions were administered in separate sessions that were
46
47 counterbalanced across participants, with at least a week between each session to reduce the
48
49 influence of item repetition. The sentence task (Experiment 2) was also administered at least
50
51 one week after the single-word task (Experiment 1).
52

Results

53
54
55 The mean picture naming RTs for correct responses and naming errors are shown in
56
57 Table 5. Microphone errors, naming errors and unfamiliar items on the post-test were not
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 included in the analysis of naming RT. For the 250ms ISI, more items were removed for poor
4 comprehenders (mean 11.76%, SD=8.57%) than CA controls (mean 5.95%, SD=3.94%)
5
6
7 ($p < .05$) but there was no difference between the poor comprehenders and VA controls (mean
8
9 9.22%, SD=6.92%) ($p > .05$), $F(2, 50)=3.17$, $p < .05$. For the 1000ms ISI, more items were
10
11 removed for poor comprehenders (mean 11.90%, SD=8.99%) than CA controls (mean 6.36%,
12
13 SD=4.06%) ($p < .05$) but there was no difference between poor comprehenders and VA
14
15 controls (mean 7.48%, SD=6.99%) ($p > .05$), $F(2, 50)=2.99$, $p = .06$.

16
17 At the 250ms ISI, all groups were faster to name subordinate picture targets if they
18
19 were preceded by subordinate-biased sentences than control sentences ('appropriate
20
21 priming'). The VA controls and poor comprehenders were also faster to name dominant
22
23 picture targets if they were preceded by subordinate-biased sentences than control sentences
24
25 ('inappropriate priming'); the CA controls showed a numerically smaller inappropriate
26
27 priming effect. At the 1000ms ISI, the control groups only showed appropriate whereas the
28
29 poor comprehenders only showed inappropriate priming. The picture naming RT data were
30
31 entered into a mixed-design ANOVA for each ISI separately³. The within-subjects variables
32
33 were Sentence Context (subordinate-biased, control) and Picture Congruence (Appropriate,
34
35 Inappropriate). The between-subjects variable was Group (poor comprehenders, CA controls,
36
37 VA controls).

250ms ISI

38
39
40
41
42 There was a trend for the poor comprehenders to name the pictures slower than CA
43
44 controls ($p < .05$) but not VA controls ($p > .05$) (Group, $F(2, 48)=2.52$, $p = .09$, $\eta^2 = .10$).
45
46 Children were faster to name picture targets when they were preceded by biased than control
47
48 sentences (Sentence Context, $F(1, 48)=43.24$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .47$). Although there were no
49
50 significant interactions, the CA controls showed a numerically small (non-significant)
51
52

53
54
55 ³ We first carried out a 4-way mixed-design ANOVA including ISI as an additional within-subject
56
57 factor. There was a significant main effect of ISI, $F(1, 48)=10.16$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .18$, and significant
58
59 interactions between Context x Appropriateness, $F(1, 48)=4.19$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .08$, Context x ISI,
60
 $F(1, 48)=17.60$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .27$, Context x ISI x Group, $F(2, 48)=3.37$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .12$, and Context x
Appropriateness x Group, $F(2, 48)=2.91$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .11$, which justifies separate ANOVAs to test
specific hypotheses about each ISI.

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 inappropriate priming effect ($t(16)<1$) in contrast to the VA controls ($p<.01$) and poor
4
5 comprehenders ($p<.05$). There were no other significant main effects or interactions.

1000ms ISI

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
There was a trend for poor comprehenders to name the pictures slower than the CA controls ($p<.05$) but not the VA controls ($p>.05$) (Group, $F(2, 48)=2.99, p=.06, \eta^2=.11$). There were significant interactions between Picture Congruence \times Group ($F(2, 48)=3.25, p<.05, \eta^2=.12$) and Sentence Context \times Picture Congruence ($F(1,48)=6.16, p<.05, \eta^2=.11$) and a marginal Sentence Context \times Group interaction ($F(2,48)=3.01, p=.06, \eta^2=.11$). These interactions were qualified by a Sentence Context \times Picture Congruence \times Group interaction ($F(2, 48)=4.91, p<.05, \eta^2=.17$). Controls showed significant appropriate priming (CA mean difference 89ms, SD=149ms, 95% CI 11–166ms, $t(16)=2.45, p<.05$; VA mean difference 57ms, SD=91ms, CI 10-104ms, $t(16)=2.60, p<.05$) but no inappropriate priming (CA mean difference -67ms, SD=187ms, 95% CI -163–29ms, $t(16)=1.47, p>.05$, VA mean difference -89ms, SD=126ms, 95% CI -154ms–24ms, $t(16)=2.92, p<.01$). In contrast, poor comprehenders did not show significant appropriate priming (mean difference 29ms, SD=178ms, 95% CI -62ms–121ms, $t(16)<1$) but showed significant inappropriate priming (mean difference 92ms, SD=129ms, 95% CI 25–158ms, $t(16)=2.94, p<.01$). There were no other significant main effects or interactions. The pattern of results for each condition and ISI remains consistent when expressed as prime ratio scores (Figure 3).

Discussion

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
At the 250ms ISI, controls were faster to name subordinate picture targets when they were preceded by subordinately-biased sentences than control (neutral) sentences ('appropriate priming') consistent with our hypothesis. Only the younger VA controls were faster to name dominant picture targets when they were preceded by subordinately-biased sentences than control sentences ('inappropriate priming'). The absence of inappropriate priming for the CA controls at 250ms ISI is somewhat inconsistent with previous studies (Barnes et al., 2004; Gernsbacher et al., 1990; Swinney, 1979). However, direct comparisons

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 are problematic since studies have differed in the samples, tasks (e.g., meaning judgement,
4 lexical decision) and ISI/SOA conditions used. The finding that the younger VA controls
5 showed early inappropriate priming is suggestive of developmental changes in the time course
6 of the priming effects with an earlier onset of priming with increasing school-age. Had a
7 shorter ISI been included here is possible that the CA controls would also have shown
8 inappropriate priming at an earlier point in processing than measured here. Using the same
9 methodology and stimuli, Henderson et al (2011) also reported that TD children (mean 11.5
10 years) did not show inappropriate priming at the same ISI.

11
12 Counter to the hypothesis that poor comprehenders have difficulty integrating
13 semantic information in sentence context they showed appropriate priming for subordinate
14 targets at the 250ms ISI, similar to controls, even though they had not shown it at the same ISI
15 in the single-word condition. Poor comprehenders also showed inappropriate priming at the
16 250ms ISI. Since this pattern of inappropriate priming was more akin to that demonstrated by
17 the younger VA controls it suggests that poor comprehenders show a developmental lag in the
18 speed with which contextually inappropriate meanings reduce in activation.

19
20 At the 1000ms ISI, poor comprehenders no longer showed appropriate priming but
21 instead showed significant inappropriate priming in stark contrast to both control groups.
22 Although this finding clearly suggests that poor comprehenders have difficulties inhibiting
23 inappropriate meanings, the pattern of results is inconsistent with the inhibition deficit
24 hypothesis which predicts both inappropriate and appropriate priming. Gernsbacher and
25 colleagues (Gernsbacher et al., 1990; Gernsbacher & Faust, 1991) reported that less-skilled
26 comprehenders showed intact 'context facilitation' when responding to context relevant
27 targets, but impaired 'suppression' when rejecting context irrelevant targets (see also Barnes
28 et al., 2004). When viewed together with the lack of subordinate priming for poor
29 comprehenders in the single-word experiment, the heightened inappropriate priming in poor
30 comprehenders is likely to be a consequence of a deficit within the semantic system. More
31 specifically, a difficulty in accessing subordinate meanings at the word-level could account
32

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 for the persistence of inappropriate (dominant) meanings and the reduction in appropriate
4
5 (subordinate) meanings over time.
6

General Discussion

7
8
9 Previous studies have found that poor comprehenders show word-level semantic
10 deficits characterised by inefficient retrieval of semantic knowledge, particularly for low -
11 frequency and less imageable words (Nation & Snowling, 1998a, 1999; Nation et al., 2001).
12
13 Other research suggests that poor comprehenders may have decreased sensitivity to sentence
14 context (Nation & Snowling, 1998b) or specific problems with the inhibition of irrelevant
15 semantic information (Barnes et al., 2004; Cain, 2006; Gernsbacher et al., 1990; Gernsbacher
16 & Faust, 1991). We investigated semantic access and selection of homonym meanings at the
17 word level (where meaning selection is shaped by meaning frequency) and at the sentence
18 level (where meaning selection is influenced by the ability to integrate semantic information
19 from sentences and inhibit irrelevant meanings). The pattern of data obtained is clear and
20 provides new information on the nature of the semantic deficit in poor comprehenders.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Experiment 1 explored whether poor comprehenders are able to access multiple
32 meanings of homonyms early in the time course of processing and select a single meaning
33 based on meaning frequency. The results suggest a difficulty with early semantic access; the
34 poor comprehenders did not show subordinate priming at 250ms despite being familiar with
35 subordinate meanings on a control task where they were required to explicitly access the
36 meanings. Counter to the inhibition deficit hypothesis, poor comprehenders did not have
37 difficulties inhibiting redundant (subordinate) information; they showed selective priming for
38 dominant meanings at the long ISI.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 These results build on previous evidence of poor vocabulary knowledge in poor
49 comprehenders and suggest, in line with the lexical quality hypothesis (LQH; Perfetti, 2007)
50 that their semantic network is characterised by poorly coded semantic representations,
51 particularly for less frequent meanings, despite adequate decoding and phonological-level
52 skills (Nation & Snowling, 1998a; Nation & Snowling, 1999). Although poor comprehenders
53 and controls were familiar with the homonyms, they differed in the ease with which their
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 subordinate meanings were retrieved; according to the LQH , this lack of flexibility has
4
5 consequences for comprehension. To explore this further, future studies could use a masked
6
7 prime condition to measure automatic priming effects at an even earlier point in processing to
8
9 provide further evidence for the view that poor comprehenders' deficit lies in the automatic
10
11 access to meaning.

12
13 Consistent with our findings, Nation and Snowling (1999) suggested that the semantic
14
15 deficit in poor comprehenders reflects weaker activation of abstract semantic associations.
16
17 They reported that the poor comprehenders showed semantic priming for functionally related
18
19 prime-target pairs and for categorically related items that were highly associated but they did
20
21 not show priming for categorically related items that were not commonly associated. In the
22
23 present experiments, the majority of prime-target pairs in both the dominant and subordinate
24
25 conditions were functionally related. Therefore, our results suggest that poor comprehenders
26
27 may not always show priming for functionally related pairs, that is, when these relationships
28
29 involve subordinate meanings of homonyms.
30

31
32 The finding that subordinate priming was absent at 250ms in poor comprehenders is
33
34 similar to the results of Frenck-Mestre and Prince (1997, Experiment 1b) which utilised a
35
36 single-word semantic priming task with lexical decision. They found that advanced French
37
38 learners of English exhibited significant priming for both dominant and subordinate targets
39
40 when they were preceded by homonym primes compared to unrelated primes at 100 and
41
42 300ms SOAs, whereas less proficient French learners of English showed priming only for
43
44 dominant meanings at both SOAs. This lack of priming for subordinate meanings occurred
45
46 despite an off-line recognition task that showed that the less proficient group was familiar
47
48 with the subordinate meanings. This concurs with our view that impoverished knowledge of
49
50 later acquired subordinate meanings and/or an impaired ability to retrieve them may underpin
51
52 the lack of early subordinate priming in poor comprehenders.

53
54 Rodd, Gaskell, and Marslen-Wilson (2004) implemented a distributed model in which
55
56 semantic representations of ambiguous words were modelled as stable states within semantic
57
58 space. In this network, the initial pattern of activation generated when encountering a
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 homonym is a “blend” between the word’s different meanings; recurrent connections “clean
4
5 up” this pattern of activation by continuously modifying it until it becomes a stable *attractor*
6
7 *state* that corresponds to a single meaning. The frequencies of the meanings and the initial
8
9 activation of the network determine which of the attractors is settled into. For poor
10
11 comprehenders, if dominant meanings have even higher relative meaning frequencies than
12
13 subordinate meanings (compared to TD controls) then the initial blend of activation on
14
15 encountering a homonym will be more heavily weighted by the dominant meanings and the
16
17 likelihood of priming for subordinate meanings will be reduced.

18
19 Despite showing difficulties in accessing subordinate meanings, poor comprehenders
20
21 were as sensitive to subordinately biased sentence contexts as controls at the 250ms ISI (see
22
23 also Nation et al., 2003; van der Schoot et al., 2009). At first glance this seems surprising,
24
25 since the poor comprehenders had difficulties accessing subordinate meanings in the absence
26
27 of supporting context. One possibility, compatible with the LQH, is that weaker
28
29 representations are more ‘context-bound’ (Perfetti, 2007) and therefore poor comprehenders
30
31 may rely *more* on sentence context than controls when accessing subordinate information. It
32
33 follows that the low quality semantic representations of poor comprehenders may impede
34
35 comprehension by increasing the attentional demands of word identification and deflecting
36
37 attention away from the goal of reading (i.e., to comprehend).

38
39 Consistent with this view, poor comprehenders were not able to maintain their
40
41 sensitivity to subordinate sentence context at the 1000ms ISI, in contrast to the control groups.
42
43 Furthermore, they had clear difficulties inhibiting contextually inappropriate information
44
45 (Barnes et al., 2004; Gernsbacher & Faust, 1991; Gernsbacher et al., 1990) and hence showed
46
47 priming for inappropriate meanings that was not present in the controls. We propose that the
48
49 persistence of inappropriate priming is a consequence of the deficit in accessing subordinate
50
51 meanings observed in single-word context. Although the poor comprehenders were able to
52
53 activate appropriate (subordinate) meanings immediately after hearing the subordinate
54
55 sentence, these meanings may not have reached a sufficiently high level of activation relative
56
57 to the level of inappropriate (dominant) meanings to render the inappropriate (dominant)
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 meanings unavailable. This explains why the dominant (inappropriate) meaning persisted in
4
5 activation at the 1000ms ISI whereas the subordinate (appropriate) meaning lost activation.
6
7 This view is partly compatible with McNamara's (1997) hypothesis that the level of
8
9 activation of irrelevant meanings is determined by the level of activation of the relevant
10
11 meanings. However, we are not arguing here that there is a "fixed cap" of activation that must
12
13 be distributed across competing representations; rather we are arguing that the crucial
14
15 determinant of which representation is selected for further processing is the relative difference
16
17 in activation between the two representations. For poor comprehenders who have
18
19 impoverished subordinate representations, dominant meanings are likely to have an even
20
21 higher relative meaning frequency than subordinate meanings. It follows that activation of the
22
23 relevant (subordinate) meanings may have had to reach a significantly greater threshold to
24
25 enable deactivation of the inappropriate (dominant) for poor comprehenders than controls.
26
27 Hence, our results suggest that an inhibition deficit is too specific an explanation for
28
29 comprehension failure in poor comprehenders because it neglects the role of semantic
30
31 knowledge in influencing higher-level comprehension processes.
32

33
34 Taking a similar approach to the definition and recruitment of poor comprehenders to
35
36 the present study, Pimperton and Nation (2010) compared poor comprehenders and decoding-
37
38 matched controls on both verbal and non-verbal versions of a proactive interference task
39
40 designed to assess their ability to suppress no-longer-relevant information from working
41
42 memory. The poor comprehenders showed domain-specific suppression deficits,
43
44 demonstrating impairments relative to the controls in the verbal (but not the nonverbal)
45
46 version of the task. Together with the present findings, this suggests that difficulties with
47
48 inhibition are likely to be a consequence of failing to sufficiently activate relevant information
49
50 and be part of broader oral language impairment. It is also important to note that we obtained
51
52 differences in priming despite the groups being well matched on verbal working memory,
53
54 whereas Pimperton and Nation (2010) reported difficulties with inhibition on a working
55
56 memory task. This strengthens the argument that difficulties with inhibition observed in poor
57
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

1
2
3 comprehenders are likely to be independent of working memory skill and are more likely to
4
5 be a consequence of difficulties with semantic activation.
6

7 The present findings have implications for children with reading comprehension
8
9 impairment who may have weaknesses in the efficiency with which word meanings can be
10
11 accessed. For such children, intervention strategies that focus on vocabulary instruction and
12
13 encourage children to activate vocabulary knowledge during reading and listening are likely
14
15 to be beneficial (Clarke, Snowling, Truelove & Hulme, 2010). Furthermore, our findings
16
17 suggest that poor comprehenders' difficulties with accessing word meaning may be
18
19 particularly pronounced in implicit on-line tasks and in naturalistic conditions (when no cues
20
21 are provided to initiate activation of word meaning).
22

23 In conclusion, the present findings suggest that access to semantic representations is
24
25 modulated by individual differences in the relative frequencies of different word meanings
26
27 and by context. We have shown that 8-11 year-old children can access multiple meanings of
28
29 homonyms early in the time course of semantic processing, before selecting a single meaning
30
31 on the basis of lexical frequency and context. Poor comprehenders found it harder to access
32
33 semantic information, particularly subordinate meanings. In turn, this had adverse effects on
34
35 their sentence-level representations, compromising their ability to inhibit irrelevant
36
37 information and maintain activation of context appropriate information. These results
38
39 elucidate the semantic deficit in poor comprehenders and cast doubt on the view that a deficit
40
41 in inhibition is for them a core cognitive impairment. Rather, difficulties with inhibition are
42
43 more likely to be the consequence of word-level semantic difficulties.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Anderson, R. C., & Freebody, P. (1981). Vocabulary knowledge. In J. Guthrie (ed.), *Comprehension and Teaching: Research Reviews* (pp. 77-117). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Barnes, M.A., Faulkner, H., Wilkinson, M., & Dennis, M. (2004). Meaning construction and
- Booth, J.R., Harasaki, Y., & Burman, D.D. (2006). Development of lexical and sentence level context effects for dominant and subordinate word meanings of homonyms. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 35, 531 – 554.
- Burke, D.M., White, H., & Diaz, D.L. (1987). Semantic priming in young and older adults: Evidence for age constancy in automatic and attentional processes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 13, 79 – 88.
- Cain, K. (2006). Individual differences in children's memory and reading comprehension: An investigation of semantic and inhibitory deficits. *Memory*, 14, 553 – 569.
- Cain, K., & Oakhill, J.V. (1999). Inference making ability and its relation to comprehension failure. *Reading and Writing*, 11, 489 – 503.
- Cain, K., & Oakhill, J.V. (2006). Profiles of children with specific reading comprehension difficulties. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 683 – 696.
- Cain, K., Oakhill, J. V., & Elbro, C. (2003). The ability to learn new word meanings from context by school-age children with and without language comprehension difficulties. *Journal of Child Language*, 30, 681-694.
- Clarke, P. J., Snowling, M. J., Truelove, E., & Hulme, C. (2010). Ameliorating children's reading comprehension difficulties: A randomised controlled trial. *Psychological Science*, 21(8), 1106-1116.
- Dunn, L.M., Dunn, L.M., Whetton, C., & Burley, J. (1997). *The British picture vocabulary scale-II*. Windsor, UK: NFER-Nelson.
- Duffy, S.A., Kambe, G., & Rayner, K. (2001). The effect of prior disambiguating context on the comprehension of ambiguous words: Evidence from eye movements. In: Gorfein,

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

- 1
2
3 D.S. (Ed.), *On the consequences of meaning selection*. American Psychological
4 Association, Washington DC. Pp. 105 – 117.
5
6
7 Elliot, C.D., Smith, P., & McCulloch, K. (1996). *British ability scales (2nd ed.)*. Windsor, UK:
8 NFER.
9
10
11 French-Mestre, C., & Prince, P. (1997). Second language autonomy. *Journal of Memory and*
12 *Language*, 37, 481 – 501.
13
14 Gernsbacher, M.A. (1997). Group differences in suppression skill. *Aging, Neuropsychology*
15 *and Cognition*, 4, 175 – 184.
16
17
18 Gernsbacher, M.A., & Faust, M.E. (1991). The mechanism of suppression: A component of
19 general comprehension skill. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning,*
20 *memory, and cognition*, 17, 245-262.
21
22
23 Gernsbacher, M.A., Varner, K.R., & Faust, M. (1990). Investigating differences in general
24 comprehension skill. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and*
25 *Cognition*, 16, 430-445.
26
27
28
29
30
31 Gorfain, D.S. (2001). An activation-selection view of homograph disambiguation: A matter of
32 emphasis? In: Gorfain, D.S. (Ed.), *On the consequences of meaning selection*.
33 American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, pp. 105-117.
34
35
36
37 Henderson, L.M. (unpublished PhD thesis). *Online semantic processing in children: Insights*
38 *from poor comprehenders and autism spectrum disorder*. Submitted in fulfilment of a
39 Doctorate in Philosophy at the University of York (December, 2009).
40
41
42
43 Henderson, L.M., Clarke, P.J., & Snowling, M.J. (2011). Accessing and selecting word
44 meaning in autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*,
45 advance on-line publication.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

- 1
2
3 Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition*. Cambridge University Press,
4
5 Cambridge, UK.
6
7 MacDonald, M.C., Pearlmutter, N.J., & Seidenberg, M.S. (1994). Lexical nature of syntactic
8
9 ambiguity resolution. *Psychological Review*, 101, 676-703.
10
11 McNamara, D. S. (1997). Comprehension skill: A knowledge-based account. *Proceedings of*
12
13 *the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 508–513).
14
15 Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
16
17 McNamara, D.S., & McDaniel, M.A. (2004). Suppressing irrelevant information: Knowledge
18
19 activation or inhibition? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory,*
20
21 *and Cognition*, 30(2), 465-482.
22
23 McNamara, T.P. (2005). *Semantic priming: Perspectives from memory and word recognition*.
24
25 New York: Psychology Press.
26
27 Nation, K., Cocksey, J., Taylor, T., & Bishop, D.V.M. (2010). A longitudinal investigation of
28
29 the early reading and language skills in children with poor reading comprehension.
30
31 *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 51(9), 1031 – 9.
32
33 Nation, K., Marshall, C.M., & Altmann, G.T.M. (2003). Investigating individual differences
34
35 in children's real-time sentence comprehension using language-mediated eye
36
37 movements. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 86, 314 – 329.
38
39 Nation, K., Marshall, C., & Snowling, M.J. (2001). Phonological and semantic contributions
40
41 to children's picture naming skill: Evidence from children with developmental
42
43 reading disorders. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 16 (2-3), 241 – 259.
44
45 Nation, K. & Snowling, M.J. (1998a). Semantic processing and the development of word
46
47 recognition skills: evidence from children with reading comprehension difficulties.
48
49 *Journal of Memory & Language*, 39, 85-101.
50
51 Nation, K. & Snowling, M.J. (1998b). Individual differences in contextual facilitation:
52
53 Evidence from dyslexia and poor reading comprehension. *Child Development*, 69 (4),
54
55 996-1011.
56
57
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

- 1
2
3 Nation, K. & Snowling, M. J. (1999). Developmental differences in sensitivity to semantic
4 relations among good and poor comprehenders: evidence from semantic priming.
5
6 Cognition, 70, B1-13.
7
8
- 9 Neale, M.D. (1997) *Neale Analysis of Reading Ability – Second Revised British Edition*
10
11 (*NARA II*) London: NFER Nelson.
12
- 13 Neely, J.H. (1991). Semantic priming effects in visual word recognition: A selective review of
14 current findings and theories. In D. Besner & G.W. Humphreys (Eds.), *Basic*
15 *processes in reading, visual word recognition* (pp. 264-336). New Jersey: Lawrence
16 Erlbaum Associates.
17
18
- 19 Perfetti, C. (2007). Reading ability: Lexical quality to comprehension. *Scientific Studies of*
20
21 *Reading, 11 (4)*, 357 – 383.
22
23
- 24 Pickering, S. & Gathercole, S. (2001). Working memory test battery for children (WMTB-C).
25
26 Pearson.
27
28
- 29 Pimperton, H. & Nation, K (2010). Suppressing irrelevant information from working
30 memory: Evidence for domain-specific deficits in poor comprehenders. *Journal of*
31 *Memory and Language, 62*, 380 – 391.
32
33
- 34 Rodd, J.M., Gaskell, M.G., & Marslen-Wilson, W.D. (2004). Modelling the effects of
35 semantic ambiguity in word recognition. *Cognitive Science, 28*, 89-104.
36
37
- 38 Schneider, W., Eschman, A., & Zuccolotto, A. (2002). *E-prime user's guide*. Pittsburgh:
39 Psychology Software Tools.
40
41
- 42 Seidenberg, M.S., Waters, G.S., Sanders, M., & Langer, P. (1984). Pre- and post-lexical loci
43 of contextual effects on word recognition. *Memory & Cognition, 12*, 315 – 328.
44
45
- 46 Simpson, G.B., & Burgess, C. (1985). Activation and selection processes in the recognition of
47 ambiguous words. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and*
48 *Performance, 11*, 28-39.
49
50
- 51 Simpson, G.B., & Foster, M.R. (1986). Lexical ambiguity and children's word recognition.
52
53 *Developmental Psychology, 22*, 147-154.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Accessing, integrating and inhibiting word meaning

- 1
2
3 Snodgrass, J.G., & Vanderwaart, M. (1980). A standardised set of 260 pictures: Norms for
4 name agreement, image agreement, familiarity and visual complexity. *Journal of*
5 *Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 6, 174 – 215.
6
7
8
9 Snowling, M.J., Stothard, S.E., & McLean, J. (1996). *The Graded Non-word Reading Test*.
10 Reading: Thames Valley Test Company.
11
12
13 Swinney, D.A. (1979). Lexical access during sentence comprehension: (Re)consideration of
14 context effects. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour*, 18(6), 645-659.
15
16
17 Tabossi, P., & Sbisa, S. (2001). Methodological issues in the study of lexical ambiguity
18 resolution. In: D.S. Gorfein, Editor, *On the Consequences of Meaning Selection:*
19 *Perspectives on Resolving Lexical Ambiguity*, APA, Washington, DC. pp. 67 – 86.
20
21
22
23 Taft, M. (1991). *Reading and the mental lexicon*. East Sussex, UK: Lawrence Erlbaum
24 Associates.
25
26
27
28 Tompkins, C.A., Baumgaertner, A., Lehman, M.T., & Fossett, T.R.D. (1997). Suppression
29 and discourse comprehension in right brain-damaged adults: a preliminary report.
30 *Aphasiology*, 11, 505 – 519.
31
32
33
34 Tannenbaum, K.R., Torgesen, J.K., & Wagner, R.K. (2006). Relationships between word
35 knowledge and reading comprehension in third-grade children. *Scientific Studies of*
36 *Reading*, 10(4), 381 – 398.
37
38
39
40 Ulrich, R., & Miller, J. (1994). Effects of truncation on reaction time analysis. *Journal of*
41 *Experimental Psychology: General*, 123, 34-80.
42
43
44 van der Schoot, M., Vasbinder, A.L., Horsley, T.M., Reijntjes, A., & van Lieshout, E.C.
45 (2009). Lexical ambiguity resolution in good and poor comprehenders: An eye
46 fixation and self-paced reading study in primary school children. *Journal of*
47 *Educational Psychology*, 101, 21 – 36.
48
49
50
51
52 Wilson, M. (1988). MRC Psycholinguistic Database – machine-usable dictionary, version
53 2.00. *Behaviour Research Methods Instruments & Computers*, 20, 6 – 10.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1. Example of a subordinate – related trial from Experiment 1.




Figure 2. Mean dominant and subordinate priming ratios for 250ms and 1000ms ISIs for poor comprehenders (PC) and controls. Prime ratios were calculated by the difference between unrelated and related conditions divided by the unrelated condition (for dominant and subordinate conditions separately). Standard error bars are shown.




Figure 3. Mean appropriate and inappropriate priming ratios for 250ms and 1000ms ISIs for poor comprehenders (PC) and controls. Prime ratios were calculated by the difference between neutral or control and biased or inappropriate conditions divided by the neutral or control condition. Standard error bars are shown.

Table 1. Descriptive measures for the poor comprehenders, CA controls and VA controls

	Poor comprehenders (<i>n</i> = 17)		CA controls (<i>n</i> = 17)		VA controls (<i>n</i> = 17)		<i>F</i>
	Mean (SD)	Range	Mean (SD)	Range	Mean (SD)	Range	
Age (yrs)	10.10 (0.59)	8.92 – 11	10.06 (0.71)	9 – 11.33	9.01 (0.85)	7.66 – 10.16	12.23**, VA<PC/CA
Receptive vocab age (years)	8.79 (1.34)	6.75 – 10.83	10.52 (1.48)	8.66 – 13.66	8.85 (1.12)	7.25 – 11.58	9.45**, CA<VA/PC
Word Reading (ss)	106.06 (11.08)	86 – 124	109.25 (16.29)	90 – 145	106.94 (11.86)	87 – 129	< 1
Nonword reading (out of 25)	18.94 (4.94)	11 - 25	18.31 (4.78)	9 – 25	18.82 (3.34)	10 – 25	< 1
Text reading accuracy (ss)	101.29 (9.57)	85 – 115	105.56 (12.47)	86 – 129	103.06 (10.38)	85 – 121	< 1
Text reading fluency (ss)	103.71 (11.44)	82 – 125	110.29 (11.51)	93 – 130	106.29 (9.41)	85 – 124	1.60, <i>ns</i>
Text comprehension (ss)	84.82 (4.79)	69 – 89	101.69 (7.25)	91 – 113	100.12 (6.36)	90 – 116	37.94**PC<VA/CA
N stories read NARA-II (6 max)	5 (1.0)	3 – 6	4.94 (1.10)	3 – 6	4.53 (0.87)	3 – 6	1.14, <i>ns</i>
Nonverbal IQ (T score)	50.00 (11.31)	32 – 72	47.71 (6.34)	34 – 59	52.82 (5.73)	43 – 64	1.67, <i>ns</i>
Verbal Working Memory (ss)	95.88 (17.62)	59 – 122	99.53 (11.42)	77 – 117	95.59 (12.79)	76 – 117	0.41, <i>ns</i>



Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

For Peer Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2. Example stimuli for Experiment 1.

Word Prime	Dominant Picture Target	Subordinate Picture Target
Related = "bulb"		
Unrelated = "cake"		

For Peer Review Only

Table 3. Mean picture naming RT (in ms) and mean naming errors (out of 22) for dominant and subordinate conditions and raw priming scores (in ms) for each ISI condition in Experiment 1.

	Dominant			Subordinate		
	Related	Unrelated	Priming	Related	Unrelated	Priming
250ms ISI – Naming RT						
VA Controls	960 (197)	1089 (260)	129	995 (204)	1066 (257)	71
CA Controls	824 (137)	890 (184)	66	923 (173)	992 (252)	69
PCs	1001 (199)	1137 (315)	136	1133 (239)	1166 (298)	33
250ms ISI – Naming Errors						
VA Controls	0.47 (0.62)	0.41 (0.71)	-.06	0.35 (0.49)	0.41 (0.71)	.06
CA Controls	0.18 (0.39)	0.24 (0.56)	.06	0.12 (0.33)	0.18 (0.39)	.06
PCs	0.31 (0.79)	0.50 (0.73)	.19	0.31 (0.87)	0.50 (0.97)	.19
1000ms ISI – Naming RT						
VA Controls	910 (172)	994 (156)	84	1079 (219)	1015 (185)	-64
CA Controls	795 (139)	879 (178)	84	927 (226)	884 (180)	-43
PCs	916 (179)	1057 (280)	141	1074 (241)	1022 (288)	-52
1000ms ISI – Naming Errors						
VA Controls	0.12 (0.33)	0.24 (0.44)	.12	0.12 (0.33)	0.29 (0.59)	.17
CA Controls	0 (0)	0.18 (0.39)	.18	0.24 (0.44)	0.29 (0.69)	.05
PCs	0.18 (0.39)	0.41 (0.79)	.23	0.24 (0.44)	0.41 (0.71)	.17

Note. PCs = poor comprehenders

Table 4. Example stimuli for Experiment 2



Condition	Sentence Prime	Target
Appropriate		
Subordinate-Biased	“Helen planted the bulb”	
Control	“Bill bought the bulb”	
Inappropriate		
Subordinate-Biased	“David planted the bulb”	
Control	“Ann planted the seed”	

Table 5. Mean picture naming RT (in ms) and mean naming errors (out of 22) for appropriate and inappropriate priming conditions and raw priming scores (in ms) for each ISI condition in Experiment 2.

250ms ISI						
	Appropriate			Inappropriate		
	Neutral	Biased	Priming	Control	Inappropriate	Priming
<i>Naming RT</i>						
VA Controls	1231 (305)	1107 (294)	124	1251 (365)	1139 (316)	112
CA Controls	1012 (317)	919 (314)	93	981 (341)	956 (325)	25
PC	1124 (250)	1032 (202)	92	1159 (290)	1053 (234)	106
<i>Naming Errors</i>						
VA Controls	0.06 (0.24)	0.06 (0.24)	0	0.29 (0.47)	0.41 (0.71)	-.12
CA Controls	0.06 (0.24)	0.06 (0.24)	0	0 (0)	0 (0)	0
PC	0.24 (0.56)	0.06 (0.24)	.18	0.53 (0.72)	0.41 (0.71)	.12
1000ms ISI						
<i>Naming RT</i>						
VA Controls	1054 (245)	996 (224)	58	1023 (264)	1112 (259)	-89
CA Controls	932 (278)	844 (187)	88	864 (198)	931 (304)	-67
PC	1092 (181)	1063 (213)	29	1075 (226)	983 (197)	92
<i>Naming errors</i>						
VA Controls	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.06 (0.24)	-.06
CA Controls	0.06 (0.24)	0 (0)	.06	0 (0)	0.06 (0.24)	-.06
PC	0.24 (0.44)	0.18 (0.39)	.06	0.29 (0.47)	0.18 (0.39)	.11

Note. PC = poor comprehender