

# A description of syntactic priming assignment

[Psychology](#)



Firstly, lexical priming is dealing with the time in processing a word like manager - is believed to be lesser if the participant has been exposed to a related word like secretary; still the concept of categorization is about how the cognitive system recognizes a relationship between two stimuli, namely, an individual must be familiar with the workplace setting so as to identify that the secretary is normally an assistant to the manager; and the Syntax is the rules for combining words into sentences, so that a sentence makes sense. Syntactic priming Syntactic priming is important in sentence processing.

It provides better understanding about how the mechanisms of comprehension and production work for human in acquiring language. It tells that the processor of syntactic priming employs different knowledge sources by using bottom-up processing (by visually viewing a sentence) and top-down processing (by perceptually inferring knowledge and experiences related to a sentence), as well as by analyzing the characteristics, the plausibility and the compact ability of the words, with respect to the context and punctuation used in a sentence.

Syntactic priming normally occurred when sentences are syntactically identical, as to illustrate: (1) The teacher gave the student the exercise. 2) The boy showed the girl the letter. Both sentences are using the double-object prime sentence construction. Besides, syntactic priming manifests itself efficiently in many ways, for instance, an individual will read (1) faster, more fluently and more likely to produce sentence structure like (1) after he/she gets exposure to (2).

Furthermore, related laboratory findings provide evidences that syntactic priming effect might be found in priming in corpora, production-to-production priming and comprehension-to-comprehension priming. Related laboratory findings In priming in corpora, Giles & Possessed (1975) believed that there was a general tendency for a human to adapt his/her speech style to his/her audience's listening style in order to build a strong rapport with one another due to social integration.

However, in production-to-production priming, Pickering and Braining (1995) argued that syntactic priming influences which sentence structure an individual chooses to produce because the underlying message that he/she wishes to convey can be expressed in more than one syntactic form, such as (3) a. The vendor sold some souvenirs to a tourist. B. The vendor sold a tourist some souvenirs. Nevertheless, Miller and Carrey (1967) emphasized that the comprehension of a sentence was actually relied on the structure of the previous comprehension which seemed superficially identical but indeed had different syntactic structure.

Miller and Caress comprehension-to-comprehension priming reasoning was supported by the event-related brain potentials (Reps) experiment carried out by Shootout and Holcomb (1 992), again, revised by Urbana and Picketing (1995). Reps were meant to find out whether priming occurred with sentences like (4) and (5): (4) a. While the lady was eating the steak went cold. B. While the lady was eating the steak the soup went cold. Although the movie was frightening the girls love it. B.

Although the movie was frightening the girls the boys love it. They found that in a range of “ garden-path” constructions, the disambiguating word elicited a characteristic positive deflection in the waveform between about 500 milliseconds and 800 milliseconds post-stimulus, which meant the time needed to process the assassinating word of ‘ the steak” in (AAA) was lesser when an individual was expose to the sentence of (AAA) compared with (b). (Urbana, T. P. , & Picketing, M J, 1995).

Outside of Laboratory Settings Heterodyne, Evasively and Chimps (2003) carried out three studies which aims to identify syntactic priming effects in young children, specifically four and five-year-old children. In one of the studies, the experimenters presented a picture and described it to the children. The children then repeated as what the experimenter described, and then was presented a new picture to be scribed. In this case, it was found that the children were more likely to repeat a particular syntactic structure that has been previously used by the experimenter.

In the second study, the experimenters utilized a similar procedure except that the children were not required to repeat the experimenters’ descriptions of the picture. The results of the second study were found to be comparable to the first study. However, in the third study, the experimenters presented a block of pictures after the children heard the experimenters’ descriptions. Throughout the whole block, it was found that those children were more inclined to repeat a similar form previously used by the experimenters.