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 prefrently negated words (e.g. unauthorized, unintentional) despite their high frequency of occurrence in language use [7].

**Aim and research questions**

- Two ERP experiments in visual and auditory modalities to investigate affirmatives (authorized), prefixal negation (unauthorized) and sentential negation (not authorized) in sentential contexts such as example (1):

  1) The White House announced that the new Obama biography was authorized/unauthorized/not authorized and the details in the book were correct/wrong in fact.

- ERPs time-locked to the critical word (underlined), the congruency of which was determined by the adjective (bold) in the first part of the sentence. We asked the following questions:

  **Visual study:**
  - Is there a delay in the integration of negated meanings?
  - Is prefrental negation processed similarly to the negated form or the affirmative form?

  **Auditory study:**
  - Is auditory presentation of sentences more natural and easier than visual processing?

**Results**

**Visual**

- **Affirmative**
- **Sentential negation**
- **Prefixal negation**

The White House announced that the new Obama biography was authorized/unauthorized/not authorized and the details in the book were correct/wrong in fact.

**Auditory**

- **Affirmative**
- **Sentential negation**
- **Prefixal negation**

The White House announced that the new Obama biography was not authorized and the details in the book were correct/wrong in fact.

**Conclusion**

- 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.
- Prefrental negation was the most difficult form to process in both studies, hence 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**

**EEG recording and processing**

- Offline referenced to average of both mastoids
- Filters of 0.01 and 40 Hz
- 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 modeling, multiple models of various complexity compared, model with lowest AIC reported
- Regions of interest (anterior/central/posterior) and hemisphere (left/med/right) added as predictors
- Subject and electrode as random factors

**Open questions**

- Prefrental negation more difficult than sentential negation. Why? Unnatural use?
- Early possibility for prefrental 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]?