ERP studies of visual and auditory processing of negated sentences
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Previous research shows that negation is ignored in initial processing and the event-related potential (ERP) component N400 is insensitive to negation in the presence of semantic priming effects [2-3, 5]. But other evidence has shown that negation can be readily integrated and incongruities in negated sentences can elicit an N400 [6]. Most of this research has focused on negated forms such as not, no or any while little is known about prefixally negated words (e.g. unauthorized, unintentional) despite their high frequency of occurrence in language use [7].

**Summary of findings**

- **Visual:**
  - Affirmative: N400-P600: successful detection of incongruities (N400) followed by re-evaluation of content to repair meaning (P600)
  - Sentential negation: no N400, but a negativity with a longer latency than the typical N400: negation not entirely ignored in processing but negated meaning not fully present in memory either
  - Prefixal negation: sustained anterior negativity: negated meaning needed to be retrieved from working memory, which was taxing

- **Auditory:**
  - Affirmative: N400-P600
  - Sentential negation: no N400 but a P600: re-evaluation of content
  - Prefixal negation: late positivity (P600): re-evaluation of content

**Conclusions**

- Negated sentences were not ignored in early processing [unlike 2-3, 5], nor were they processed the same way as affirmative sentences [unlike 6].
- We found evidence for a more nuanced processing of negation suggesting that incongruities in negated sentences involved different processing mechanisms than those in affirmative sentences. Prefixal negation was the most difficult form to process in both studies, hence it was not likely to be processed the same way as affirmative forms.
- Auditory processing of negated sentences was easier (clearer ERP effects) than word-by-word visual processing.

**Method**

**Material**

- 3 pseudo-randomized lists each including 108 visual (and 102 auditory) items

**Procedure**

- Visual: Counter-balanced, 11 ms before the adjectives and critical words
- Auditory: Counter-balanced, 9 ms before the adjectives and critical words

- Participants: 26 native speakers [18 F, mean age=29.9]
- Open questions:
  - Preferral negation more difficult than sentential negation. Why? Unnatural use?
  - Early positivity for preferral negation in auditory study?
  - Positive effects in negated sentences in auditory study, P600?
- ERP effects in auditory studies later than those in visual study, unlike previous research?
- Pre-N400 negativity in auditory study (affirmatives), an N250 [1,4,7?

**EEG recording and processing**

- Offline referenced to average of both mastoids
- Filters of 0.01 and 40 hr
- ICA for removing eye artifacts
- Epochs of 1000 ms (plus 100 ms baseline)
- Amplitudes for congruent and incongruent conditions analyzed for each negation type and each time-window separately
- Mixed effects modelling, multiple models of various complexity compared, model with lowest AIC reported
- Regions of interest (anterior/central/posterior) and hemisphere (left/mid/right) added as predictors
- Subject and electrode as random factors
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