

By-Rosenberg, Sheldon

The Recall of Verbal Material Accompanying Semantically Well-Integrated and Semantically Poorly-Integrated Sentences.

Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Center for Research on Language and Language Behavior.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Bureau No-BR-6-1784

Pub Date 1 Feb 69

Contract-OEC-3-6-061784-0508

Note-9p.; Report included in Studies in Language and Language Behavior, Progress Report No. VIII.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.55

Descriptors-*Association (Psychological), Cognitive Processes, Information Storage, Psycholinguistics, *Recall (Psychological), *Semantics

This study was designed to test the hypothesis that the recall of verbal material (critical material) accompanying semantically well integrated (SWI) sentences will be superior to the recall of verbal material accompanying semantically poorly integrated (SPI) sentences. This hypothesis was based upon the conclusion derived from previous research that SWI sentences were stored more efficiently than SPI sentences. With the assistance of norms of sequential associative dependencies in active declarative sentences, complex sentences were constructed which contained two underlying sentences: a matrix sentence and an embedded sentence. Under the SWI condition, one of the underlying sentences was an SWI string, while under the SPI condition one was an SPI string. The critical material (identical for both levels of semantic integration) was contained in the second underlying sentence. The location of the critical material (the matrix or the underlying sentence) was varied. A standard study-test (written recall) procedure was used in a 2 x 2 factorial design with five trials and lists consisting of ten sentences each. The results indicated superior recall for both the SWI and the critical material, and were interpreted in terms of a storage hypothesis. (Author/DO)

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BR-6-1784

PA-48

OE-BR

THE RECALL OF VERBAL MATERIAL ACCOMPANYING SEMANTICALLY
WELL-INTEGRATED AND SEMANTICALLY POORLY-INTEGRATED SENTENCES¹

Sheldon Rosenberg

Center for Research on Language and Language Behavior
The University of Michigan

This study was designed to test the hypothesis that the recall of verbal material (critical material) accompanying semantically well-integrated (SWI) sentences will be superior to the recall of verbal material accompanying semantically poorly-integrated (SPI) sentences. This hypothesis was based upon the conclusion derived from previous research that SWI sentences are stored more efficiently than SPI sentences. With the assistance of norms of sequential associative dependencies in active declarative sentences, complex sentences were constructed which contained two underlying sentences: a matrix sentence and an embedded sentence. Under the SWI condition, one of the underlying sentences was an SWI string, while under the SPI condition one was an SPI string. The critical material (identical for both levels of semantic integration) was contained in the second underlying sentence. The location of the critical material (i.e., whether it was the matrix or the embedded underlying sentence) was varied. A standard study-test (written recall) procedure was used in a 2 x 2 factorial design with 5 trials and lists consisting of 10 sentences each. The results indicated superior recall for both the SWI and the critical material, and were interpreted in terms of a storage hypothesis.

Previous research (Rosenberg, in press) indicates that semantically well-integrated (SWI) sentences (as determined from norms of associative dependencies in sentences) are recalled better than semantically poorly-integrated (SPI) sentences, and that this difference in recall is due to a tendency during learning to recode the words in SWI sentences into larger chunks than the words in SPI sentences. Further evidence for a strong storage factor in the superior recall of SWI material comes from a study by Rosenberg (1968) of the recall and recognition of associatively related and associatively unrelated nouns embedded in sentences in connected discourse. The importance of chunking in learning, as Miller (1956, a, b) has pointed out, is that it reduces the load on memory by reducing the number of units to be stored. Thus, from this standpoint, it can be concluded that Ss exposed to SWI sentences have less to remember than Ss exposed to SPI sentences.

The present study was designed to test an obvious implication of this conclusion, namely, that the recall of verbal material accompanying SWI sentences will be superior to the recall of verbal material accompanying SPI sentences. This was accomplished by combining two underlying sentences through embedding. One of these sentences -- the critical sentence -- was an SPI string, while the other was either an SWI string or another SPI string. Thus, in the sentences The doctor who fired the janitor cured the patient and The doctor who fired the janitor shook the author, the critical sentence is The doctor fired the janitor, while the SWI and SPI context sentences are, respectively, The doctor cured the patient and The doctor shook the author. However, for purposes of comparison, the location of the critical and context predicates was varied, i.e., the critical predicate was part of either the embedded sentence or the matrix sentence.

The hypothesis tested in this experiment, then, was that the recall of the critical verbal material would be enhanced by the presence of an SWI context. The simple underlying sentences were constructed with the assistance of norms of sequential associative dependencies in active declarative sentences (Rosenberg & Koen, 1968). To produce these norms, Ss were given sentence frames that contained a subject noun, and spaces for them to associate (to the subject noun) a verb and another noun (e.g., "The dog _____ the _____."). The norms consist of frequency counts of the verb-object combinations that accompanied each of the subject nouns.

Method

Subjects. The Ss for this study were 80 paid undergraduate volunteers who were assigned in rotation to four groups of 20 Ss each as they appeared for the experiment. The Ss were tested in groups of from 3 to 12 with a mean of 6 Ss per session.

Materials. Two lists of 10 sentences were constructed for each condition to increase the generality of the results. All sentences were of the form The thief who delivered the tape stole the money. Each sentence in the SWI condition had a counterpart in the SPI condition that contained the same subject noun and an identical predicate. For example, the SPI counterpart of the SWI sentence: The thief who delivered the tape stole the money was The thief who delivered the tape passed the wagon. In this example, stole the money and passed the wagon

represent (along with the subject noun), respectively, the SWI and SPI contexts, while the predicate common to each of these sentences (delivered the tape) represented what was referred to earlier as the critical material. The predicates of the SWI and SPI contexts were made comparable in length (average number of letters) and in the Thorndike and Lorge (1944) frequency of their content words. The majority of the words used in the sentences of this study were listed as A or AA in the Thorndike and Lorge norms.

For each sentence in the SWI condition, the context predicate was selected from the top of the associative frequency hierarchy for the subject noun of the sentence using the Rosenberg and Koen (1968) norms, while the critical predicate (and the context predicate for the SPI counterpart) were constructed from responses at the bottom of the associative frequency hierarchy for the same subject noun. In order to control for length and word frequency, sometimes it was necessary to use a word in a critical or SPI predicate that did not occur at all in the norms as a response to the subject noun. In one condition (Condition A), the critical predicate was embedded in the SWI and SPI contexts, while in another condition (Condition B), its location was reversed. In constructing each of the experimental lists, an attempt was made to reduce intralist associative relationships to a minimum. In brief, then, the basic conditions of the experiment can be designated as SWI-A (e.g., The doctor who fired the janitor cured the patient), SWI-B (e.g., The doctor who cured the patient fired the janitor), SPI-A (e.g., The doctor who fired the janitor shook the author), and SPI-B (e.g., The doctor who shook the author fired the janitor).

Each list of sentences was printed in a booklet, one sentence to a page, that measured 8 1/2 by 2 1/4 inches. There was a cover sheet on the front of each booklet and a blank lined card attached to the back for use during the written recall task. Each S received five booklets, one for each trial.

Procedure. A study-test written recall procedure was employed in this experiment. All Ss were tested in a sound-insulated research classroom. Detailed instructions in the use of the booklets, and for the learning and written recall tasks, were recorded on magnetic tape and presented to the Ss after they were seated at tables. The tape also contained verbal signals for turning the pages of the booklets and for the beginning and the end of the recall period. Since the instructions were identical for all conditions, it was possible to test Ss from more than one condition simultaneously. The Ss were told that their task

Rosenberg

was to learn verbatim as many of the sentences as they could in any order, and to record in writing as many of the sentences as they could remember during the recall period. In addition, they were told that it was not necessary to record the sentences they remembered in the order in which the sentences had appeared in the booklet. They were urged to write down everything they could remember, and to guess at words they could not recall. There were five different orders of the sentences in each condition, and five different arrangements of these orders from trial to trial. Thus, for any given S, no order of sentences occurred more than once within the packet of five booklets.

The study period began 8 sec. after a signal to get ready, the exposure interval for each sentence was 8 sec., and the interval between exposure of the last sentence and the beginning of the recall period was 8 sec. The recall period was 4 min., the intertrial interval was 16 sec., and there were five trials.

Results

With the exception of minor spelling errors and changes in the relative pronoun from who to that, all scoring was for verbatim recall. Each S's written recall protocols were scored for the total number of: (1) complete sentences, (2) subject nouns, (3) words (verbs and nouns) from context predicates, and (4) words from critical predicates recalled correctly. The scores for each one of these variables for each S were summed over trials. The means for each of these measures is shown in Table 1, where it can be seen that for each of the dependent variables, performance under the SWI conditions was superior to performance under the SPI conditions. In addition, there was a tendency for recall to be better when the critical material was embedded in the matrix sentences (Condition A) than when it was part of the matrix sentences (Condition B).

 Insert Table 1 about here

A 2 x 2 factorial analysis of variance was carried out for each of the dependent variables. In these analyses (with $p = .05$), only the values of F (1,76) for Semantic Integration reached significance. No other value of F even approached significance. The values of F for Semantic Integration were, for subject

Rosenberg

nouns, context words, critical words and complete sentences, respectively, 6.20 ($p < .025$), 17.68 ($p < .001$), 10.81 ($p < .005$) and 11.01 ($p < .005$). Thus, not only was recall of the SWI material superior to recall of the SPI material, but recall of the critical material was enhanced when it accompanied the SWI material.

The recall data were also examined with respect to one other measure, the probability of recalling a complete predicate given that its subject noun had been recalled within the same sentence. This recall dependency was used to represent the degree of integration within the simple underlying sentences at the time of recall. It was anticipated that if the critical material (which was poorly integrated semantically before learning) was, indeed, learned better under the SWI condition than under the SPI condition, then this should be reflected in the recall dependencies. Of course, in the case of the underlying context sentences, any differences in subject-predicate recall dependencies should be in favor of the SWI condition, since the predicates in these sentences were selected on the basis of the strength of their relationship to the subject nouns. To compute this measure, the number of times a subject noun was recalled correctly (summed over sentences and trials) was divided into the number of times it was accompanied by its predicate. This was done for both the context and critical subject-predicate dependencies, and the results have been summarized in Table 2.

 Insert Table 2 about here

The results shown in Table 2 are in general, consistent with expectation. The recall dependencies for the SWI conditions are higher than they are for the SPI conditions for both the context and the critical materials. However, as one would anticipate, the difference is larger for the context material than for the critical material. In addition, for both levels of Semantic Integration, the recall dependencies for the context sentences are higher than they are for the critical sentences. These differences, however, are greatest for the SWI condition. A three-way analysis of variance (with Underlying Sentence as a within variable) of the recall dependencies revealed $F(1,76) = 12.59$, $p < .005$, for Semantic Integration, $F(1,76) = 53.33$, $p < .001$, for Underlying Sentence, and $F(1,76) = 11.00$, $p < .005$, for the interaction between Semantic Integration and Underlying Sentence. None of the other values of F approached significance. The significant

Rosenberg

interaction appears to be associated with the fact that the effect of Semantic Integration was greater for the context material than for the critical material, and that the differences in recall dependencies between the context and critical material were greater for the SWI condition than they were for the SPI condition. An analysis of the simple effects revealed, however, that the effect of Semantic Integration was significant for both the context ($p < .001$) and the critical material ($p < .05$). An analysis of the simple effects for Underlying Sentence suggests that most if not all of the main effect of this variable is to be found within the SWI condition. The effect of Underlying Sentence was highly significant ($p < .001$) for the SWI groups, whereas for the SPI groups, the effect failed to reach significance at the .05 level. This latter finding can be understood in terms of the fact that for the SPI condition, pre-experimental semantic constraints were weak within both the context and the critical underlying sentences.

Discussion

The results of the present study are seen to offer further support for the hypothesis that SWI sentences are stored more efficiently than SPI sentences. However, there are two possible objections to this conclusion that are likely to be raised, and therefore should be commented upon here.

First of all, is it not possible that the facilitation associated with the SWI condition was the result of construction during recall (correct guessing on the basis of semantic constraints created by what has already been recalled)? The construction hypothesis could account for both the recall and the recall-dependency data for the SWI underlying sentences. The results of previous research (Rosenberg, 1968; in press), however, offer very little, if any, support for this hypothesis. In the case of one study (Rosenberg, 1968), for example, when opportunities for construction during retrieval of the nouns in SWI strings such as there were some kittens, cats, dogs, and mice outside as well, were very drastically reduced, their retrieval was still superior to the retrieval of the nouns in SPI counterparts (there were some kittens, guns, rocks and oars outside as well).

The second objection has to do with the superior recall of the critical material under the SWI condition. Since more of the words from the SWI contexts were recalled than from the SPI contexts, the Ss in the SWI condition had more

cues available to them during recall for retrieval of the critical material. In other words, the superior recall of the critical material under the SWI condition could have been the result of a retrieval rather than a storage factor. However, while this factor may have made some contribution to the recall of the critical material under the SWI condition, the results for the recall-dependency measure indicate that there must have been a significant storage factor operating as well.

Although no prediction was made concerning the effect of the location of the SWI material upon recall, it would have been reasonable to expect the contiguous occurrence of the material in the underlying SWI sentences (e.g., The doctor who cured the patient...) to result in more efficient storage (of both the context and the critical material) than the noncontiguous occurrence (e.g., The doctor...cured the patient) of this material. The present results, however, do not support this view. They suggest, nevertheless, an intriguing hypothesis, namely, that in processing complex sentences of the sort used here, the information within each complex sentence is recoded back into simple underlying sentences and stored, without reference to location within the surface string, along with a note as to which was the embedded sentence and which the matrix sentence.

¹The research reported herein was performed in part pursuant to Contract OEC-3-6-061784-0508 with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, under the provisions of P.L. 85-531, Cooperative Research, and the provisions of Title VI, P.L. 85-864, as amended. This research report is one of several which have been submitted to the Office of Education as Studies in Language and Language Behavior, Progress Report VIII, February 1, 1959.

References

- Miller, G. A. Information and memory. Scientific American, 1956, 195, 42-46. (a)
- Miller, G. A. The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. Psychological Review, 1956, 63, 81-96. (b)
- Rosenberg, S. Associative facilitation in the recall and recognition of nouns embedded in connected discourse. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1968, 78, 254-260.
- Rosenberg, S. Association and phrase structure in sentence recall. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 1968, in press.
- Rosenberg, S., & Koen, M. J. Norms of sequential associative dependencies in active declarative sentences. In J. C. Catford (Ed.), Studies in language and language behavior, Supplement to Progress Report VI. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Center for Research on Language and Language Behavior. U.S.O.E. Contract OEC-3-6-061784-0508, February 1, 1968.
- Thorndike, E. L., & Lorge, I. The teacher's word book of 30,000 words. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1944.

Table 1
Means for Various Measures of Recall

Group	Subject nouns	Measure		
		Context words	Critical words	Complete sentences
SWI-A	42.04	81.55	77.00	33.60
SWI-B	41.50	79.95	75.80	31.90
SPI-A	40.10	72.65	70.20	28.15
SPI-B	39.55	69.60	66.15	26.35

Table 2
Mean Subject-Predicate Recall Dependencies

Group	Underlying Sentence	
	Context	Critical
SWI-A	.903	.813
SWI-B	.898	.806
SPI-A	.804	.769
SPI-B	.775	.739