

Experimental Phonology (LING 217)

Winter

Instructor: Claire Moore-Cantwell

MW 10:00-11:50 Bunche Hall 2121

General Info

INSTRUCTOR: Claire Moore-Cantwell

EMAIL: moore.cantwell@ucla.edu

OFFICE HOURS: MW 2:00 - 3:00 Campbell 2126b

Course website: <https://bruinlearn.ucla.edu/courses/155693>

Description

This course will provide a sampling of experimental work in phonology, along with discussion of practical topics related to experimental work, such as statistical methods and data presentation. This course aims to give students a foothold to begin developing work that uses experimental techniques to distinguish between alternative theories of phonology, as well as its relationship to the linguistic system and other cognitive systems.

Prerequisites: *Ling 200A, or instructor permission.*

Requirements

- Class Discussion: Please complete each reading and submit comments on Perusall by 11:59pm the day before class (Friday night for Monday classes). You should be prepared to discuss the paper in class as well, engaging in discussion questions posed by me or the article's presenter.

- Article Presentations: Each student will present 2-3 papers in class. Presentations should include:
 - A brief summary of the paper. Assume everyone present has read the abstract of the paper, but not necessarily more.
 - A critique of the paper's theoretical background, design and analysis of experiment(s), and conclusions. What impressed you about the paper? What flaws does it have, and are they theoretical or design flaws? Are you convinced of the authors' conclusions?
 - Discussion questions/points for the group. Please include one or two (or more if you're feeling adventurous) general discussion points that relate the contents of the paper back to the context of the course in general. Examples: "Do the results of this paper tell us anything about how we should conduct wug-tests in the future?" "What is the best way to combat the replication crisis in your own work?"
- Final Project: You will turn in a final paper at the end of the course which will consist of a design for an experiment, as well as discussion of conclusions you could draw from several different possible patterns of results. You should include a relevant theoretical hypothesis, and specifics of design details including sample stimuli. A presentation day will be scheduled sometime in December for you to present your design to your fellow classmates.

Accommodations Note

If you have a disability or ongoing medical condition, and require accommodations for this course, you should contact the Centre for Accessible Education (CAE), <https://www.cae.ucla.edu>. Other concessions can be made in this course in order to fully support you as a student and as a person. **Please let me know as soon as possible** if you need to miss class or assignments because of reasons such as physical illness or injury, mental health concerns, religious observance, work to support yourself or a family member, or caretaking responsibilities. For foreseeable conflicts, such as religious observance, you must notify me in advance, preferably at least one week in advance. For unforeseeable conflicts, like illness, injury, mental health concerns, or sudden changes in job/caretaking schedule, let me know as soon as possible.

Week	Day	Date	Topic	Reading
1	Mon	9 Jan	Intro	
	Weds	11 Jan	Productivity tests	Albright and Hayes (2003) Ernestus and Baayen (2003)
2	Mon	16 Jan	Productivity tests	Hayes et al. (2009) Becker et al. (2011)
	Weds	18 Jan	Using the web for experiments	Paolacci and Chandler (2014) Sprouse (2011)
3	Mon	23 Jan	More productivity tests	Griner (2001) Zhang et al. (2009)
	Weds	25 Jan	Mixed Effects modeling Bring your computer	Barr et al. (2013) Matuschek et al. (2017)
4	Mon	30 Jan	Multiple factors contributing to wug-test results <i>Meet with me about your final paper</i>	Prasada and Pinker (1993) Guion et al. (2003)
	Weds	1 Feb	Artificial language learning	Finley and Badecker (2009) Moreton and Pertsova (2014)
5	Mon	6 Feb	Artificial language learning	Kittredge and Dell (2016) Warker et al. (2008) Goldrick (2004)
	Weds	8 Feb	Lexical Frequency effects	Colombo (1992) File-Muriel (2010)
6	Mon	13 Feb	Grammar-driven misperception and mispronunciation	Berent et al. (2009) Davidson and Shaw (2012)
	Weds	15 Feb	Acquisition experiments	Jusczyk et al. (1993) Jusczyk et al. (1999)

Week	Day	Date	Topic	Reading
7	Mon	20 Feb	Acquisition experiments	Zamuner et al. (2005) Kehoe (2000)
	Weds	22 Feb	The replication crisis and what to do about it	Munafò and Smith (2018) Pashler and Harris (2012) Nosek et al. (2012) Lehrer (2010)
8	Mon	27 Feb	Graphing and Data vis. Bring your own graphs!	
	Weds	1 Mar	Eye-tracking and phonology	Farris-Trimble and Tessier (2019) Mitterer (2011)
9	Mon	6 Mar	EEG and phonology: representations	Wagner et al. (2012) Hestvik and Durvasula (2016)
	Weds	8 Mar	EEG and phonology: phonotactics	Domahs et al. (2013) Steinberg et al. (2011)
10	Mon	13 Mar	EEG combined with other neuroscience techniques	Rossi et al. (2011) Pylkkänen et al. (2002)
	Weds	15 Mar	Designing new experimental paradigms	

References

- Adam Albright and Bruce Hayes. Rules vs. analogy in English past tenses: a computational/experimental study. *Cognition*, 90:119–161, 2003. doi: 10.1016/S0010-0277(03)00146-X.
- Dale J Barr, Roger Levy, Christoph Scheepers, and Harry J Tily. Random effects structure for confirmatory hypothesis testing: Keep it maximal. *Journal of memory and language*, 68(3):255–278, 2013.
- Michael Becker, Nihan Ketrez, and Andrew Nevins. The surfeit of the stimulus: Analytic biases filter lexical statistics in Turkish laryngeal alternations. *Language*, 87(1):84–125, March 2011. doi: 10.1353/lan.2011.0016.
- Iris Berent, Tracy Lennertz, Paul Smolensky, and Vered Vaknin-Nusbaum. Listeners’ knowledge of phonological universals: evidence from nasal clusters. *Phonology*, 26:75–108, 2009. doi: 10.1017/S0952675709001729.
- Lucia Colombo. Lexical stress effect and its interaction with frequency in word pronunci-

- ation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 18(4):987, 1992.
- Lisa Davidson and Jason A Shaw. Sources of illusion in consonant cluster perception. *Journal of Phonetics*, 40(2):234–248, 2012.
- Ulrike Domahs, Safiye Genc, Johannes Knaus, Richard Wiese, and Barış Kabak. Processing (un-) predictable word stress: Erp evidence from turkish. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 28(3):335–354, 2013.
- Mirjam Ernestus and Harald Baayen. Predicting the unpredictable: Interpreting neutralized segments in Dutch. *Language*, 79(1):5–38, 2003. doi: 10.1353/lan.2003.0076.
- Ashley Farris-Trimble and Anne-Michelle Tessier. The effect of allophonic processes on word recognition: Eye-tracking evidence from canadian raising. *Language*, 95(1):e136–e160, 2019.
- Richard J. File-Muriel. Lexical frequency as a scalar variable in explaining variation. *The Canadian journal of linguistics*, 55(1):1–25, 2010.
- Sara Finley and William Badecker. Artificial language learning and feature-based generalization. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 61(3):423–437, 2009.
- Matthew Goldrick. Phonological features and phonotactic constraints in speech production. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 51(4):586–603, 2004.
- Barry Griner. Productivity of japanese verb tense inflection: A case study. Master’s thesis, UCLA, 2001.
- Susan G. Guion, J.J. Clark, Tetsuo Harada, and Ratre P. Wayland. Factors affecting stress placement for English nonwords include syllabic structure, lexical class, and stress patterns of phonologically similar words. *Language and Speech*, 46(4):403–427, December 2003. doi: 10.1177/00238309030460040301.
- Bruce Hayes, Kie Zuraw, Péter Siptár, and Zsuzsa Londe. Natural and unnatural constraints in Hungarian vowel harmony. *Language*, 85(4):822–863, December 2009. doi: 10.1353/lan.0.0169.
- Arild Hestvik and Karthik Durvasula. Neurobiological evidence for voicing underspecification in english. *Brain and Language*, 152:28–43, 2016.
- Peter W. Jusczyk, Anne Cutler, and Nancy J. Redanz. Infants’ preference for the predominant stress patterns of English words. *Child development*, 64(3):675–687, 1993. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1993.tb02935.x.
- Peter W Jusczyk, Elizabeth A Hohne, and Angela Bauman. Infants’ sensitivity to allophonic cues for word segmentation. *Perception & psychophysics*, 61(8):1465–1476, 1999.
- Margaret M Kehoe. Truncation without shape constraints: The latter stages of prosodic acquisition. *Language acquisition*, 8(1):23–67, 2000.
- Audrey K Kittredge and Gary S Dell. Learning to speak by listening: Transfer of phonotactics from perception to production. *Journal of memory and language*, 89:8–22, 2016.
- Jonah Lehrer. The truth wears off: Is there something wrong with the scientific method? *The New Yorker*, Dec 2010.
- Hannes Matuschek, Reinhold Kliegl, Shravan Vasishth, Harald Baayen, and Douglas Bates. Balancing type i error and power in linear mixed models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 94:305–315, 2017.
- Holger Mitterer. The mental lexicon is fully specified: evidence from eye-tracking. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 37(2):496, 2011.

- Elliott Moreton and Katya Pertsova. Pastry phonotactics: Is phonological learning special. In *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Northeast Linguistic Society, City University of New York*, pages 1–14. Graduate Linguistics Students' Association Amherst, MA, 2014.
- Marcus R Munafò and G Davey Smith. Repeating experiments is not enough. *Nature*, 553 (7689):399–401, 2018.
- Brian A Nosek, Jeffrey R Spies, and Matt Motyl. Scientific utopia: Ii. restructuring incentives and practices to promote truth over publishability. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(6):615–631, 2012.
- Gabriele Paolacci and Jesse Chandler. Inside the turk: Understanding mechanical turk as a participant pool. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(3):184–188, 2014.
- Harold Pashler and Christine R Harris. Is the replicability crisis overblown? three arguments examined. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7(6):531–536, 2012.
- Sandeep Prasada and Steven Pinker. Generalization of regular and irregular morphological patterns. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 8:1–56, 1993.
- Liina Pylkkänen, Andrew Stringfellow, and Alec Marantz. Neuromagnetic evidence for the timing of lexical activation: An meg component sensitive to phonotactic probability but not to neighborhood density. *Brain and language*, 81(1-3):666–678, 2002.
- Sonja Rossi, Ina B Jürgenson, Adriana Hanulíková, Silke Telkemeyer, Isabell Wartenburger, and Hellmuth Obrig. Implicit processing of phonotactic cues: evidence from electrophysiological and vascular responses. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 23(7):1752–1764, 2011.
- Jon Sprouse. A validation of amazon mechanical turk for the collection of acceptability judgments in linguistic theory. *Behavior research methods*, 43(1):155–167, 2011.
- Johanna Steinberg, Hubert Truckenbrodt, and Thomas Jacobsen. Phonotactic constraint violations in german grammar are detected automatically in auditory speech processing: A human event-related potentials study. *Psychophysiology*, 48(9):1208–1216, 2011.
- Monica Wagner, Valerie L Shafer, Brett Martin, and Mitchell Steinschneider. The phonotactic influence on the perception of a consonant cluster/pt/by native english and native polish listeners: A behavioral and event related potential (erp) study. *Brain and language*, 123(1):30–41, 2012.
- Jill A Warker, Gary S Dell, Christine A Whalen, and Samantha Gereg. Limits on learning phonotactic constraints from recent production experience. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 34(5):1289, 2008.
- Tania S Zamuner, Annemarie Kerkhoff, and JPM Fikkert. Acquisition of voicing neutralization and alternations in dutch. 2005.
- Jie Zhang, Yuwen Lai, and Craig Turnbull-Sailor. Opacity, phonetics, and frequency in taiwanese tone sandhi. In *Current issues in unity and diversity of languages: Collection of papers selected from the 18th International Congress of Linguists*, pages 3019–3038. Linguistic Society of Korea, 2009.