1. Reconstruct the mental and emotional context = acts as a cue
2. Report everything even that that seems unimportant = avoids personal opinions
3. Recall event in different orders = fills in the gaps
4. Recount from several diff perspectives = focuses in specific parts

😊 Kohnken (1999) – meta-analysis showed only 4 out of 42 did not show significant advantage for the cognitive interview.

Attention- Lectures 4-6:

Selection and Attention Models (audition):

- William James (1980) – attention is taking possession of the mind, focusing on an essence and withdrawing from others. It is a subjective experience. All theories should be able to explain our experience in terms of what we attend and do not attend.

- Information processing approach - Cherry (1953) – the cocktail party phenomenon, the ability to focus on one particular conversation whilst ignoring others. Used a dichotic listening procedure, different messages were played into each ear and pps had to shadow one (repeated aloud). = found this easy.

What do they remember from the unattended ear? Shown to have little knowledge of the meaning but do recognize physical and acoustic properties.

😊 Moray (1959) – support cherry, pps unable to recognize words presented to the unattended ear over 35 times.

- Broadbent’s Filter Model (1957) – claimed the brain had a limited capacity to process information so only a limited amount can be processed to the level of ‘meaning’. A filter selects the stimuli for processing.

😊 Broadbent (1954) – pps listened to three pairs of digits presented simultaneously to each ear, each pair was separated by 500ms. The digits were recalled by ear not by sequence. When asked to recall in sequence, performance decreased unless large interval time was given.

THE THEORY – a limited perceptual channel can only accept one stimulus at a time but the sensory store can hold more. The filter then swings from left to right (representing two sources of stimuli) allowing one stimulus at a time, this selection can be set by the observer. This explains inability to recall in sequence as it takes time for the filter to switch attention. Only stimuli selected are processed for meaning = unable to distinguish unattended items.
If different schemas can be used concurrently, little disruption to dual task perf. of not dual costs occur and the SAS is needed.
Weber and Cutler (2004) – competition between words before the uniqueness point is even larger than originally thought, and competition higher in non-native languages =supports idea that finding one unique is important, familiarity is too.

Zwiterlood (1989) – context plays important role in word recognition as well! Pps heard the beginning of a word that was at the end of a sentence and were asked to identify the word... performance was high with the contextual sentence and random when not. =context helps find uniqueness point!

The mental lexicon:

- Lexical entries contain info about semantics of the word. But some words have more than one meaning... do we activate all meanings or contextually appropriate?

Swinney (1979) – initially we activate all meanings and context has no influence, but after 300ms we eventually activate the correct one. Used a priming task where pps had to choose a word half way through the sentence.

Duffy (1988) – ambiguous words take longer to read than unambiguous words =likely multiple meanings are activated and it takes time to activate. (Ambiguous words can vary in frequency however, higher frequency quicker activate despite multiple meanings). Context also important is maintaining easy correct activation.

- Do we access syntactic info about a word while our search process?

Tanenhaus (1979) – yes we do.

Language comprehension:

- Two main properties of sentences: semantics (meaning), syntax (rules of language).

Parsing =analysing grammatical rules, Pragmatics (analysing meaning)

- Difficulties in Parsing:

Global ambiguities – sentences can have more than one structural representation thus multiple interpretations

Local ambiguities – various interpretations are possible in parts of the sentence.

=use prosodic cues to determine interpretation (stress, intonation and duration of speech).

Theories of Parsing:

- Syntax-first approach, The garden path model – Frazier and Rayner (1982) – assumes that only one syntactic structure is initially considered (the simplest) therefore meaning does not influence the selection process
The simplest structure is one with minimal attachment (less major parts) and with the principle of late closure (incoming words seem to attach to a phrase). If in conflict, minimal attachment is used.

1. Minimal attachment – wish to build the simplest structure consistent with rules of grammar. Should compare sentences that violate and follow the hypothesis, which is understood fastest?

2. Late closure – we wish to attach every incoming word to the current phrase for as long as possible (less confusion).

- **Ferreira and Clifton (1986)** – found support that we do not use semantics when constructing a structure for language, they presented pps with two sentences, one was ambiguous when following the minimal attachment rule, the other was not, however, both took equally long to read =the ambiguity (meaning) didn’t influence following these principles (support for garden path model).

- **Spivey (2002)** – if you solve the ambiguity by changing the visual image paired with a sentence, they do not follow late closure and this new context changes their response (towel, apple, box) =context impacts syntax interpretation.

- **Constraint-based theories** – all information is immediately available and use in language comprehension. This limits the possible interpretations.

  - **MacDonald (1994)** – theory is based on connectionist architecture. Competing analyses of the sentence are activated at the same time, the highest activation claims to be the correct syntactic structure, readers are confused if the wrong one is activated.

    - Supported by **Pickering and Taxler (1998)** – two sentences which were syntactically identical could both lead readers to identify the wrong syntactic structure equally... however, verb bias (the knowledge that certain verbs work certain ways in certain sentences) made one sentence easily read correctly and not the other despite their structure being the same =other factors influence initial identification of structure thus comprehension.

- Seems efficient that we use all information available and that there is flexibility on our decisions.

- Doesn’t provide a process as to how we generate syntactic structures.

- Garden path theory suggests that the effects claimed by this model only arise as the second stage of parsing occurs quickly after syntactic only interpretation, and that the experiments above are in fact investigating the second stage.