Running head: Structural priming persists for one month in young adults

Structural priming persists for (at least) one month in young adults, but not in healthy older adults

Evelien Heyselaar¹ Katrien Segaert^{2,3}

1. Behavioural Science Institute, Radboud University, The Netherlands

2. School of Psychology, University of Birmingham, UK

3. Centre for Human Brain Health, University of Birmingham, UK

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Evelien Heyselaar, Communication & Media, Radboud University, Houtlaan 4, 6525XZ, Nijmegen, The Netherlands.

Contact: e.heijselaar@maw.ru.nl

Abstract

Implicit learning theories suggest that we update syntactic knowledge based on prior experience (e.g., (Chang et al., 2006). To determine the limits of the extent to which implicit learning can influence syntactic processing, we investigated whether structural priming effects persist up to one month post-exposure, and whether they persist less long in healthy older (compared to younger) adults. We conducted a longitudinal experiment with three sessions: Session A, session B (one week after A), and session C (four weeks after B). For young adults, we found passive priming effects to persist and accumulate across sessions (one week and four weeks). However, for older adults the effects persisted for one week but not four. This suggests that for young adults, who unlike older adults experience no age-related decline in implicit memory, the limit to the duration of structural priming persistence is longer than four weeks. In a second longitudinal experiment with two sessions one-week apart we found that priming in session A affected syntactic processing in a different, independent task in session B, both for young and older adults. Experiment 2 suggests that implicit persistence of the learned syntax is not limited to a specific context or task. Together, our findings give insight into how structural priming can contribute to language change throughout the lifespan, showing that implicit learning is a pervasive and robust mechanism that contributes to syntactic processing.

Keywords: long-term structural priming; cumulative structural priming; implicit learning; healthy ageing; cognitive decline

Structural priming refers to the tendency of language users to repeat syntactic structures across utterances. This phenomenon has been observed for different syntactic structures (Bernolet et al., 2016; Bock, 1986; Bock & Griffin, 2000), in different languages (Bock, 1986; Hartsuiker & Kolk, 1998; Sung, 2015), and using different priming modalities (Branigan et al., 1999b, 2000; Hartsuiker et al., 2008). The continued investigation into structural priming is fueled by two main theoretical concerns: Firstly, the presence (or absence) of priming can be revealing with respect to the nature of the representations that underlie language use (Pickering & Ferreira, 2009). Structural priming behaviour has therefore been a major contributor to suggestions that language comprehension and production may trade on the same (or similar) processing mechanisms (Kathryn et al., 2007; Segaert et al., 2012). Secondly, it has been proposed that structural priming may play a role in language acquisition and language change (Chang, 2008). The repetition of recently heard or produced syntactic structures may serve to strengthen representations of a given structure, aiding in the language acquisition process (Tomasello, 2006), and may also alter the long-term probability of using a given syntactic structure, thereby contributing to language change (e.g., Chang, 2008; Dell & Chang, 2014). Understanding the extent to which structural priming can explain observations from language acquisition and language change depends on how priming effects persist over time and over different contexts.

In the present study we investigate: 1) Whether structural priming effects persist for one week and/or four weeks, 2) If the persistence effect is similar for young and older, healthy adults. Recent studies have shown a disconnect in the structural priming effects between these two age groups (Heyselaar et al., 2017, 2020), which we will further elaborate on below. Additionally, we will investigate whether 3) The effects found in aims 1 and 2 are task-specific, or whether structural priming affects syntactic processing in a different, independent context, and 4) If priming effects transfer across contexts similarly for young and older, healthy adults.

Our language use is adaptive and driven by past experience. As language users, we develop processing preferences, which are continuously adapting. This phenomenon can be observed in our language use in multiple ways. First, the probability of producing primed structures increases throughout the length of an experimental session, which we will refer to as the *cumulative priming effect*. The cumulative

priming effect shows development of the structure preferences on a trial-by-trial basis within a single experimental session, providing information about the rate of learning over time (Hartsuiker & Westenberg, 2000; Jaeger & Snider, 2013; Martin & Saffran, 1997). This is in contrast to the consecutive, *short-term priming effect*, which is traditionally calculated by looking at the probability of producing the primed structure in the immediately following target sentence. Second, changes in the probability of producing primed structures can be observed between experimental sessions separated by a time interval, which is referred to in this article as the *long-term priming effect*. Further investigations into the cumulative priming effect and into long-term priming effects are of interest for the following reason: If studies of structural priming are going to be informative with respect to language acquisition and language change, it is necessary to observe how structural priming persists over a broader temporal timeframe and broader scope of language use than the relationship between the individual prime and target sentences (i.e. short-term priming).

Cumulative and long-term priming effects are demonstrated to rely on implicit learning mechanisms (Chang et al., 2006; Hartsuiker et al., 2008; Jaeger & Snider, 2013; Kutta et al., 2017), as participants seem to be unaware both of the priming manipulation and of the fact that they have indeed changed their structural preferences (Bock, 1986; Bock & Griffin, 2000). The current models of structural priming differ in the mechanisms they propose to explain this implicit learning, however, they all propose some type of learning account where participants update their structural preferences based on both prior and recent experience (Chang et al., 2006; Jaeger & Snider, 2013; Reitter et al., 2011). These ‘updates’ are never completely lost, even with intervening time or stimuli (e.g., Bock & Griffin, 2000; Branigan et al., 1999a, 2000; Hartsuiker et al., 2008; Kaschak, 2007; Kaschak et al., 2011; Reitter, 2008), allowing a build-up over time with repeated exposures. The time-course of the structural priming effect, for long-term priming, could therefore be hypothesised to behave in two different ways. Firstly, if a single 30-minute experimental session is influential enough to show changes in structural preferences, then these changes due to learning must not be very strong and therefore could be over-written as soon as the participant steps out of the lab. In contrast, if structural priming is indeed an important component of

the language acquisition process (Tomasello, 2006), then any changes in structural preferences should survive beyond the experimental session.

The majority of work, thus far, looking into the time-course of the long-term priming effect has been conducted by Kaschak and colleagues. In their studies, they conducted structural priming experiments by first introducing a bias towards one structure over another in a Bias phase, and then testing the participants' tendencies in a following Priming phase. The results indicated that participants increased their use of the biased structure, even with a week intervening the Bias and Priming phases (Kaschak, 2007). Further experiments observed that this effect was not modality dependent: Whether the participants read sentences and described pictures aloud, or typed their answer into a computer, or conducted the Priming phase in a different room compared to the Bias phase, they always showed a significant effect of the change in bias, even with a week between the phases (Kaschak, 2007; Kaschak et al., 2014; Kaschak, Kutta, & Jones, 2011; Kutta & Kaschak, 2012). The only experiment challenging the robustness of these effects, was when their Bias phase and Prime phase used different tasks (Kaschak et al., 2014): In the Bias phase, the participants had to type sentence completions, whereas in the Priming phase they had to type picture descriptions (Experiment 3 & 4), or vice versa (Experiment 5 & 6). For all four experiments, they saw a significant transfer across tasks if the Bias and Prime phase were completely immediately after each other. However, if there was a week in-between, the effect disappeared. The authors explain this result as highlighting the importance of the encoding-retrieval match for optimal memory performance. For accurate memory retrieval, the circumstances surrounding the retrieval process must match (to some extent) to the circumstances in which the memory was initially encoded. The need for this is heightened when a delay intervenes between encoding (i.e. Bias phase) and retrieval (i.e. Priming phase). The authors explain that, as the tasks were different, the participants didn't retrieve the bias they had learned in the Bias phase when conducting the Priming phase. In the same study, participants also showed a weaker priming effect if the Bias phase was read aloud but the Priming phase was typed, again suggesting a strong memory-link underlying this priming behaviour. Kaschak and colleagues (2011) draw parallels to having a conversation with a person – you will remember the conversational context, preferences, etc. of your interlocutor so that when you have

another conversation with them, those preferences come forward. However, these conversational preferences will not necessarily influence how you communicate with everyone, and hence you may show weaker, if any, preferences with a novel interlocutor. Speaking somewhat against this, are the findings of Hwang and Shin (2019): They showed that cumulative priming is a processing mechanism that is not specific to one language, and therefore likely would transcend specific conversation partners. Chinese speakers integrated cumulative learning within Chinese into future syntactic choices made in Chinese as well as English.

In the current research article we aim to take our search for the possible limits on implicit learning of syntax a step further. Kaschak and colleagues investigated whether structural preferences were affected by a change in bias occurring one week prior. We investigated if a change in bias between alternative structures can persist and affect syntactic production for longer than one week. When participants leave the experiment, their ongoing language experience will continue to shape their bias towards syntactic structures, potentially overwriting the bias established within the experiment (Chang et al., 2006). The longer the time interval, the more the participant's syntactic preferences will return to the bias as present in daily language use (and thus as measured in our baseline bias measurement at the start of the experiment). In Experiment 1, we include 3 sessions. In Session A, we measure the baseline bias of two alternative structures (actives (e.g., *The man hugs the woman*) vs. passives (e.g., *The woman is hugged by the man*)) and then change this bias in a priming phase. In Session B and Session C, we investigate, with a one week and a four week interval, whether the change in bias survives the time interval and affects syntactic production. By comparing the same-day, one-week, and four-week intervals, we can determine how robust these syntactic biases are, even after extended exposure to real-world biases. In addition to the long-term effects, we will examine the rate of learning within each session as measured by the cumulative priming effect.

In addition to investigating whether a change in structural bias can persist for one week and four weeks in young adults (18 - 30 years), in Experiment 1 we investigate how long a change in bias would persist in healthy older adults (60 - 85 years). There is a growing consensus that implicit memory declines in

healthy aging (Bäckman et al., 2006; Maki et al., 1999; Neger et al., 2014; Raz et al., 2003, *inter alia*).¹

As such, if components of structural priming are indeed supported by implicit memory, one would expect a decrease in structural priming ability with increasing age. A recent study indeed showed a significant decrease in cumulative priming in healthy, older adults, which correlated with their performance in standardised implicit learning tasks (Heyselaar et al., 2020). However, this study only looked at the cumulation of structural preferences within a single session (i.e., cumulative priming), and hence to what extent older participants will show a decline in the retention of these structural preferences across sessions (i.e., long-term priming) is still unknown. Investigating this issue further is of high interest for the field of healthy cognitive ageing, but for the purpose of the present article we want to highlight that it is also highly informative about the implicit learning mechanisms driving syntactic processing and language change. As implicit learning ability (procedural memory) is known to decrease with age, it follows that if implicit learning is indeed a major mechanism supporting syntactic production and language change (Chang, 2008; Dell & Chang, 2014; Tomasello, 2006), then one would expect to see less robust long-term priming in healthy older (compared to young) adults. This, in turn, may partly explain observations that with increasing age, language users produce less syntactically complex sentences (Kemper, 1986).

In addition to establishing the possible limits of the implicit learning of syntax over time across the lifespan (Experiment 1), it is also important to examine whether implicit learning of syntax is robust across different contexts and tasks. Evidence to the contrary (Kaschak et al., 2014) is problematic for broad claims on implicit learning mechanisms driving these effects. In Experiment 2, we will use a different, independent task between the bias and priming phase. The tasks are furthermore completed in a different context: They are presented as different experiments, with different experimenters, and completed in different rooms. It is again an open question whether the effects will be comparable between age groups, and as such we will additionally include older, healthy adults in this second experiment.

¹ Although there are also studies that suggest the opposite. These differences are mainly due to methodological choices. For a discussion, please see Heyselaar et al., 2020.

Experiment 1 - Methods

All data and models are available on the Open Science Framework (osf.io/zdw76)

Participants

Twenty-nine young (M_{Age} : 19.4 years, SD_{Age} : 0.82; 2 Male) and 29 older adults (M_{Age} : 72.8 years, SD_{Age} : 5.37; 9 Male) were recruited from the Research Participation Scheme and the Patient and Lifespan Cognition participant database of the School of Psychology at the University of Birmingham, UK. Young adults received university credits for their participation; older adults were paid. All participants were required to have British English as their mother tongue. No participants reported having any neurological deficits, psychiatric disorders, dyslexia or any other language disorders. Older adult participants completed the Montreal Cognitive Assessment (MoCA) test either prior to signing up, or before the experiment started. All older adult participants scored above 26 out of 30 (scores < 26 indicate risk of mild cognitive impairment or dementia; Smith et al., 2007). The study was approved by the research ethics board of the University of Birmingham (ERN_15-0866).

Study Design and Task

Figure 1 depicts an overview of the design of Experiment 1. All participants completed three test sessions, each consisting of a Baseline Phase followed by a Priming Phase. Session A and B were separated by one week (± 1 day) and Session B and C were separated by four weeks (± 2 days).

Figure 1. Overview of the design of Experiment 1, with three sessions each consisting of a Baseline Phase and a Priming Phase.

Baseline Phase Task. In the baseline phase, participants were asked to describe pictures. During each trial one picture was presented. Twenty pictures eliciting intransitive sentences were alternated with 20 pictures eliciting transitive sentences (actives or passives). The baseline trials therefore allowed us to measure the baseline preference of active versus passive structures. In session A, the baseline structure preference was measured before any influence from the Priming Phase. In session B and C, the structure preference was measured again to examine whether the Priming Phase of the previous session (one week or one month earlier) had biased the structure preference, indicating *long-term priming*.

Priming Phase Task. In the priming phase, participants completed a priming experiment, similar to Segaert, Menenti, Weber and Hagoort (2011). Prime pictures were coloured, followed by a target picture which was greyscale. Participants were instructed to describe pictures with one sentence, naming the green actor before the red actor if the actors were depicted in colour. This allowed us to manipulate, for colour-coded primes, whether the prime sentence produced had an active (e.g., *the man kisses the woman*) or a passive (e.g., *the woman is kissed by the man*) syntactic structure. For grayscale target pictures we then measured which structure (active or passive) participants chose to produce.

There were 38 passive prime trials (a passive picture followed by a transitive greyscale target) and 38 active prime trials (an active picture followed by a transitive greyscale target), all randomized in one experimental session. We also included 20 filler trials (an intransitive picture followed by an intransitive greyscale target). In total, therefore, we had 96 trials consisting of 152 transitive pictures and 40 intransitive pictures. No picture was repeated within participants across the three sessions.

In the priming phase, we measure the whether the proportion of passives produced increases from the start to the end of the experimental session, indicating cumulative learning (i.e. *cumulative priming*).

Materials Baseline Phase and Priming Phase

The pictures were created by Menenti, Gierhan, Segaert, and Hagoort (2011). The picture set depicts 40 transitive events such as *to chase*, *to interview* or *to serve* with a depiction of the agent and patient of this action. Each transitive picture has three versions: one grayscale version and two colour-coded versions with a green and a red actor. Each transitive event is depicted by two pairs of adults and two pairs of children. One male and one female actor are shown in each picture, and each event is depicted with each of the two actors serving as the agent. To prevent participants forming strategies, the position of the agent (left or right) is randomized. Fillers elicit intransitive sentences, depicting events such as *running*, *singing*, or *bowing* with one actor (in grayscale or green).

Procedure and trial timing

The Baseline Phase and Priming Phase were presented as one continuous task in Experiment 1. The difference from the Baseline Phase to the Priming Phase was not obvious to the participants.

The timing of each trial (Baseline and Priming Phase) was as follows: Participants were initially presented with the infinitive form of a verb (to be used in an upcoming utterance; e.g. “to run”, “to chase”, etc.) for 500ms. After 500ms of black screen a coloured picture would appear. Participants were instructed to describe the picture following the rules described above. The picture was presented until the participant responded (with a time-out after 12 seconds). There was an intertrial interval of 1500 - 2000ms (jittered) before the next verb was presented. Coloured and greyscale pictures were alternated until all pictures were described. No verbs were repeated within a trial. Each experimental session took a total of 45 minutes to complete.

The experiment was completed on a Dell Latitude E5470 Laptop (14" screen) using E-Prime (Schneider et al., 2002).

Data analysis

Responses were manually coded by the experimenter as either active or passive. Trials in which the descriptions did not match one of the coded structures were discarded (4.35% of the young adult data, 6.21% of the older adult data). Target responses were included in the analysis only if 1) both actors were named and the correct verb was used and 2) the structures used were active or passive. Detailed information can be found below on how we performed the analyses for each phase of the experiment. We used a binomial response variable to code *Target* (active (0) or passive (1)). We used a custom contrast to compare Session B to Session A, and Session C to Session B.

Experiment 1 - Results

The Baseline Phase reveals long-term priming one-month post-exposure for young adults and one-week post-exposure for older adults

The Baseline Phase was analyzed with mixed effects models, using the lme4 package (version 1.1-23 – Bates et al., 2012) in R (R Core Development Team, 2011). We attempted to use a maximal random-effects structure as described by Barr et al. (2013): The repeated measures nature of the data was modelled by including a per-participant and per-item random adjustment to the fixed intercept (“random intercept”). We attempted to include as many random adjustments to the fixed effects (“random slopes”) as justified by the main effects of the model. The final model included a main effect of *Session*, with *Session* as a random slope for both per-participant and per-item random intercepts. For the older adults, including any random slopes resulted in a singular fit and thus the final model only included random intercepts in addition to the main effect of *Session*. We used a custom contrast to compare Session B to Session A, and Session C to Session B. Table 1 reports the model output.

Table 1.

Summary of the binomial mixed effects model for the Baseline Phase.

A. Young Adults					
	Estimate	SE	z value	p value	
Intercept	-6.56	0.51	-12.77	< .001	***
Session B vs Session A	5.43	1.73	3.14	.002	**
Session C vs Session B	3.30	0.90	3.69	< .001	***
N = 2493, log-likelihood = -231.8					
B. Older Adults					
	Estimate	SE	z value	p value	
Intercept	-4.19	0.39	-10.61	< .001	***
Session B vs Session A	1.11	0.37	3.04	.002	**
Session C vs Session B	-0.10	0.33	-0.28	.776	
N = 2626, log-likelihood = -312.3					
	< .001	***	< .01	**	< .05 *

Figure 2. The percent of passive responses in the Baseline Phase for the older and young adults for all three sessions for Experiment 1. Error bars represent standard error.

The percent of passive responses in the baseline phase (as illustrated in Figure 2) are numerically quite small, which is expected. In English (the language of the experiment), passives account for approximately 12% of transitive sentences (Cornelis, 1996). As illustrated in Figure 2, and supported by the statistical output reported in Table 1, there is a significant increase in passive production in the Baseline Phase for both young and older adults for Session B compared to Session A ($p = .002$; 1.5% increase for young adults; 3.7% increase for older adults). This is a result of the change in bias for active versus passive preferences established in the Priming Phase of Session A, which survived the one-week interval (replicating Kaschak, Kutta, & Schatschneider, 2011).

Interestingly, only the young adults showed a significant increase in passive production in Session C compared to Session B ($p < .001$; 0.6% increase), whereas the older adults did not ($p = .776$; 2.5% decrease). Looking at Figure 2, it appears as if the older adults have reverted back to their initial passive preference as measured in Session A. Indeed, a *post-hoc* comparison between Session A and C revealed no significant differences ($B = -0.26, p = .106$).

Running a model with a session by group interaction reveals the same results: An overall main effect of Session C vs Session B ($p = .039$) and an interaction between Group and Session C vs Session B ($p = .006$).

The Priming Phase reveals cumulative learning for young adults and older adults

In the Priming Phase, we examined the trial-by-trial development of the syntactic preference for active versus passive structures. To accurately capture the probability of producing a passive structure on the current trial, we calculated the *Cumulative Passive Proportion*. This variable was calculated as the proportion of passives produced on the target trials that occurred before the current Trial Number.

For the analysis, we used a generalized additive mixed model (GAMM), using the *mgcv* package (version 1.8-22; Wood, 2017) as previous experiments have shown that cumulative priming mirrors a growth-curve more than a linear correlation over the length of the experimental session (Heyselaar et al., 2015, 2020; Segaert et al., 2016). Unlike ANOVAs or generalized mixed-effects regression (GLMER), GAMM does not assume linearity (although it can find a linear form if supported by the data). Instead, GAMM strikes a balance between model fit and the smoothness of the curve using either error-based or likelihood-based methods in order to avoid over- or under-fitting. Thus, the data guide the functional form (Hastie & Tibshirani, 1990). The p -value provided therefore indicates whether or not the growth of the curve is significantly different from zero (i.e., no growth). Additionally, GAMM also allows the inclusion of random effects to capture the dependencies between repeated measures.

The final model included *Session*, *Trial Number* (modelled with smoother), and the interaction between *Trial Number* and *Session* (modelled with a smoother). The smoothers used were the default underlying base functions, specifically thin plate regressions. We included per-participant and per-item random smooths, with *Trial Number* as a random slope for both.

Table 2 reports the model output.

Table 2.

Summary of the general additive mixed effects model for the Priming Phase.

A. Young Adults					
Parametric Coefficients	Estimate	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i> value	<i>p</i> value	
Intercept	0.04	0.01	4.12	< .001	***
Session B vs Session A	0.02	0.01	12.14	< .001	***
Session C vs Session B	0.02	0.01	11.62	< .001	***
Smooth Terms	edf	Ref. df	F value	<i>p</i> value	
Trial Number	1.00	1	16.15	< .001	***
Trial by (Session B vs A)	1.00	1	0.16	.688	
Trial by (Session C vs B)	1.00	1	0.24	.625	
Random smooth for Participants	52.38	288	27.95	< .001	***
Random smooth for items	6.37	1118	0.01	.301	
N = 6325					
B. Older Adults					
Parametric Coefficients	Estimate	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i> value	<i>p</i> value	
Intercept	0.06	0.01	4.01	< .001	***
Session B vs Session A	0.01	0.01	6.42	< .001	***
Session C vs Session B	-0.01	0.01	-1.73	.084	
Smooth Terms	edf	Ref. df	F value	<i>p</i> value	
Trial Number	1.00	1.00	3.51	.061	
Trial by (Session B vs A)	2.38	2.96	19.19	< .001	***
Trial by (Session C vs B)	1.00	1.00	12.13	< .001	***
Random smooths for Participants	134.37	288	28.07	< .001	***
Random smooth for items	7.74	1322	0.01	.268	
N = 5511 < .001 *** < .01 **					

Young Adults. The parametric coefficient portion of Table 2 illustrates the difference in intercept points between the sessions. As illustrated in Figure 3, this means that Session B overall had a higher proportion of passive utterances than Session A, and Session C overall had a higher proportion of passive utterances

than Session B. This again suggests that there is long-term priming from session A to Session B one week later, and from session C to Session B four weeks later (in line with findings from the Baseline Phase).

The Smooth Terms portion of Table 2 shows the change in bias for active versus passive preference on a trial-by-trial basis. The lack of a significant interaction between Trial Number and the difference in Session A and Session B for the young adults means that the rate of change was not significantly different between these two sessions. Therefore, for the young adults, they learned exactly the same way within Session A and within Session B ($p = .688$) (again, the only difference being that for Session B their baseline preference for passives was already significantly higher ($p < .001$)). This finding extended to the growth curve four weeks later, with no difference in the rate of learning within Session C and within Session B ($p = .625$) (again, the baseline preference for passives is higher in Session C than Session B ($p < .001$)). Overall, the data shows that within each session, there is cumulative learning which changes the bias for active versus passive structures. The change in bias for the young adults is robust, with a 1-week interval and even with a four-week interval. The learning which happens within a session is built upon further in the next session. These data suggest that the passive bias may survive even longer than four weeks, as our data show no indication of a decrease in the rate of learning.

Figure 3. The Cumulative Passive Proportion per Trial for Experiment 1. Analysis starts at Trial 37 as previous trials belonged to the Baseline Phase/Practice session. Error cloud represents standard error.

Older Adults. For the older adults, the data reveal a different story. There is a significant difference between Session B and Session A in terms of the starting point (intercept) of the proportion of passives produced, suggesting that there is long-term priming lasting 1 week (in line with findings from the Baseline Phase). However, the rate of learning is significantly different ($p < .001$) between sessions. As illustrated in Figure 3, during Session A, the rate of learning is positive, as expected. However, throughout Session B, the rate of learning seems to decrease toward the end of Session B. For Session C, there seems to be no change in the proportion of passives produced throughout the session. Additionally, the intercept for Session C starts lower than the intercept for Session B, which is contrary to the results seen for the young adults. Together, this suggests that for older adults there is cumulative learning in session A, which is robust enough to last for one week. However, although the intercept for Session B starts significantly higher (as shown in the results for the Baseline Phase above), it seems that there is little learning in Session B. The reason for this difference is hard to determine from these results. Running a model with a session by group interaction as parametric coefficients reveals a significant difference between groups for both the Session B vs Session A contrast ($p = .002$) and for the Session C vs Session B contrast ($p < .001$).

Intermediate discussion Experiment 1

Both young and older adults show cumulative learning in the first session and robust long-term priming one-week later as a result. However, when extending these results to include a four-week interval, a disconnect starts to emerge between the age groups. For young adults, cumulative learning takes place in all sessions and builds further from one session to the next, with long-term priming effects lasting (at least) one month. The lack of a significant decrease in learning in these results suggest that the change in bias can survive for even longer than four weeks, for the young adults. For the older adults however, we see a difference in the rate of learning in Session B compared to Session A, namely, fewer passives

are produced throughout Session B instead of more, although the changed bias survives, as indicated by the higher baseline phase (as shown in Figure 2) and the higher intercept in the priming phase for Session B compared to Session A (as shown in Figure 3). In session C, we see no significant evidence of our bias manipulation for older adults in either the baseline phase (Figure 2) nor in the intercept for the priming phase (Figure 3). Overall, the results of Experiment 1 thus replicate and extend the findings of Kaschak and colleagues (2011). Our findings demonstrate that implicit learning is an important mechanism contributing to syntactic production. When implicit learning declines, as it does in healthy ageing, syntactic production is affected accordingly.

An alternative explanation for the findings in Experiment 1 is that participants remember the task from the previous session. As explicit memory decreases with age, it is therefore logical that the older adults may not have remembered enough to replicate their previous performance in subsequent sessions. This explanation would suggest that our results cannot speak to the underlying implicit learning mechanisms for syntactic priming. Therefore, in Experiment 2, we attempt to replicate our results but use different independent tasks and contexts for the Baseline and Priming Phase. Any learning taking place in the Priming Phase which would affect the following Baseline Phase, would thus be implicit and independent of the context. Since only two sessions are required to answer this specific research question, in Experiment 2 we only included Session A and Session B (one-week interval).

Experiment 2 - Methods

This experiment was preregistered under DOI: [10.17605/OSF.IO/8VRJH](https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/8VRJH)

Participants

Thirty-one young (M_{Age} : 19.1 years, SD_{Age} : 0.91; 7 Male) and 31 older (M_{Age} : 73.3 years, SD_{Age} : 6.52; 13 Male) adults were recruited from the Research Participation Scheme and the Patient and Lifespan Cognition participant database of the School of Psychology at the University of Birmingham. Participant criteria and payment was the same as in Experiment 1.

Study Design

Figure 4 depicts an overview of the design of Experiment 2. All participants completed two test sessions (Session A and B) consisting of a Baseline Phase “Storytelling Task” followed by a Priming Phase “Picture Description Task”. Session A and B were separated by one week (+/- 1 day).

Figure 4. Overview of the design of Experiment 2, with two sessions each consisting of two independent tasks: 1) a Baseline Phase, i.e. Storytelling task, and 2) a Priming Phase, i.e. Picture Description Task.

Tasks and cover story

To ensure that participants did not suspect that the two tasks were related to each other, they were portrayed as separate experiments. As the data collection was part of an undergraduate student project, the cover story was that two student groups were both working on a research project with a task that required a week interval, and hence if the participant had signed up for both it would help with the logistics if they did the tasks back-to-back. This way, we ensured that the Baseline Phase (‘Storytelling Task’) always occurred immediately before the Priming Phase (‘Picture Description Task’). The two tasks were administered by different experimenters in different rooms, to emphasize the idea that they were not related. Before each task, participants signed informed consent and received task instructions.

Baseline Phase – “Storytelling Task”. For the Baseline Phase, we created a Storytelling task. Participants were presented with 4 cartoon cards on a screen with a white background (see Figure 4). Their task was to create a story linking the 4 cards together, using one sentence per card. The participants thus had to think of a link between the cards, generate a storyline, and decide on an order to describe the individual cards. If actors and/or objects were present, they had to name all of them. If a verb was present, they had to use this verb in their sentence. The aim of this task was to measure at least 20 transitive (active/passive) sentences (out of a total of 72 presented cards). For the example card series depicted in Figure 4, a possible story description could be: “A girl got hurt when cutting flowers; She was then comforted by a boy; A woman serves a man; She prepared a delicious surprise pizza.” From this example, we observe one passive structure and one active structure.

The Storytelling Task allows us to measure the baseline preference of active versus passive structures. In session A, the baseline structure preference is measured before any influence from the Priming Phase. In session B, the structure preference is measured again to examine whether the Priming Phase of the previous session (one week earlier) has biased the structure preference, indicating *long-term priming*. Crucial in Experiment 2 is that the two tasks (Baseline vs. Priming phase) are unrelated.

Materials. The card deck for the Storytelling task included 36 transitive pictures with actors of which 50% were adults and 50% were children. The location of the agent (left or right) and identity of the agent (man/woman/girl/boy) were counterbalanced across the deck. We also included 36 filler pictures, which consisted of an object with a verb written underneath. Some of these verbs could be used to create an intransitive sentence, some could be used to make a dative sentence. Participants described 72 cards in total, divided across 18 trials.

Priming Phase - Picture Description Task. This task was identical to the task used in the Priming Phase of Experiment 1, using the same materials. In the priming phase, we measured whether the proportion of passives produced increases from the start to the end of the experimental session, indicating cumulative learning (i.e. *cumulative priming*).

Procedure and trial timing

The Baseline Phase (Storytelling task) and Priming Phase (Picture Description Task) were portrayed to participants as independent tasks and took place in a different environment (e.g. different testing lab, different experimenters). The experiments were presented using E-Prime (Schneider et al., 2002).

The card series with 4 cards in the Storytelling task (Baseline Phase) remained on screen until the participant finished their story description and clicked to move on to the next screen. The Storytelling Task took between 10 and 20 minutes to complete, depending on how long the participant chose to take.

The timing of each trial in the Picture Description Task (Priming Phase) was identical to Experiment 1. The Picture Description Task took a total of 45 minutes to complete.

Data analysis

Responses were manually coded by the experimenter as active, passive or other. For the Baseline Phase (i.e. Storytelling Task), the exclusion criterion was that participants had to produce at least 20 transitive sentences; no participants were discarded. In the Baseline Phase, for the young adults, 54.9% of the sentences were coded as active, 0.8% of the sentences were coded as passive and 44.3% of the sentences were coded as other. For the older adults, 53.4% of the sentences were coded as active, 2.5% of the sentences were coded as passive and 44.1% of the sentences were coded as other for older adults. Sentences coded as other were discarded. For the Priming Phase (Picture Description Task), trials in which the descriptions did not match one of the coded structures were discarded (2.61% of the younger data, 2.87% of the older data). Target responses were included in the analysis if 1) both actors and the verb were named, and 2) the structures used were active or passive. Detailed information can be found below on how we performed the analyses for each phase of the experiment. We used a binomial response variable to code *Target* (active (0) or passive (1)).

Experiment 2 - Results

The Baseline Phase reveals long-term priming one-week post-exposure in an independent task and context, for young and older adults

The Baseline Phase was analyzed using mixed effects models, similarly to Experiment 1. The final model included a main effect of *Session*, with a per-participant random intercept. As participants were given 4 cards at once, it was difficult afterward to determine which sentence belonged to which card, and hence we did not include a per-item random intercept. We used sum-contrast coding to compare Session B to Session A. Table 3 reports the model output.

Table 3.
Summary of the binomial mixed effects model for the Baseline Phase.

A. Young Adults					
	Estimate	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i> value	<i>p</i> value	
Intercept	-6.14	0.68	-8.98	< .001	***
Session B vs Session A	-0.77	0.22	-3.53	< .001	***
N = 2488, log-likelihood = -148.5					
B. Older Adults					
	Estimate	<i>SE</i>	<i>z</i> value	<i>p</i> value	
Intercept	-4.82	0.49	-9.87	< .001	***
Session B vs Session A	-0.48	0.12	-4.00	< .001	***
N = 2494, log-likelihood = -313.2 < .001 ***					

As illustrated in Figure 5, and supported by the statistical output reported in Table 3, there is a significant increase in passive production in the Baseline Phase for Session B compared to Session A, for both young and older adults ($p < .001$; 1.7% increase for young adults; 2.9% increase for older adults). This is a result of the change in bias for active versus passive preferences established in the Priming Phase of Session A, which survived the one-week interval. This replicates our results from Experiment 1, and demonstrates that the long-term learning effect translates across tasks and experiment contexts.

Figure 5. The percent of passive responses in the Baseline Phase for the Old and Younger adults in Experiment 2. Error bars represent standard error.

Priming Phase reveals cumulative learning for young and older adults

We again conducted a trial-by-trial analysis of passive production using GAMMs. The final model was the same as that used in Experiment 1. We used a sum-contrast to compare Session B to Session A. Table 4 reports the model output.

Table 4.

Summary of the general additive mixed effects model for the Priming Phase.

A. Young Adults					
Parametric Coefficients	Estimate	SE	t value	p value	
Intercept	0.01	0.12	0.06	.949	
Session B vs Session A	-0.13	0.01	-12.98	< .001	***
Smooth Terms	Edf	Ref. df	F value	p value	
Trial Number	5.47	6.50	2.13	.038	*
Trial by (Session B vs A)	4.93	5.96	4.00	< .001	***
Random smooth for Participants	127.03	308	20.02	< .001	***
Random smooth for items	43.80	1007	0.07	< .001	***
N = 4344					
B. Older Adults					
Parametric Coefficients	Estimate	SE	t value	p value	
Intercept	-0.01	0.15	-0.06	.954	
Session B vs Session A	0.03	0.01	3.36	< .001	***
Smooth Terms	Edf	Ref. df	F value	p value	
Trial Number	8.82	8.93	3.90	< .001	***
Trial by (Session B vs A)	7.14	8.16	12.17	< .001	***
Random smooths for Participants	143.32	308	29.56	< .001	***
Random smooth for items	81.74	1073	0.12	< .001	***
N = 4384 < .001 *** < .05 *					

Although the exact trends over time are different for Experiment 2 compared to Experiment 1 (Figure 6 compared to Figure 3), we again see that the young adults have a higher intercept for Session B compared to Session A and also end higher, suggesting that they produced more passives per trial at the end of Session B compared to the end of Session A. For the older adults, in contrast to Experiment 1, there is no major difference in the rate of learning across the two sessions. The significant difference reported in Table 4 is driven by the initial 24 trials (Trial 1 to 24, analysed via the `plot_diff` function),

which shows a higher intercept for Session A compared to Session B. This suggests that for the older participants there was a similar rate of learning within each experimental session and that the learning persisted across sessions.

Figure 6. The Cumulative Passive Proportion per Trial for Experiment 2. Error clouds represent standard error.

Discussion

In two experiments we examined cumulative learning and long-term structural priming effects in young and older adults. The baseline structure preference was measured before structural preferences were biased in a Priming Phase. After a time interval of one week (Exp. 1 and 2) and four weeks (Exp. 1), we measured the structure preference again in a Baseline Phase to assess long-term priming. For Experiment 1 and 2, we also measured how the structural bias changed from the start to the end of each Priming Phase, to assess cumulative priming within each session. For young adults, we found that the Priming Phase of the previous session (both one week and four weeks earlier) had indeed changed the structural preference (as measured in the Baseline Phase) in a robust way, indicating long-term priming. Within the Priming Phase, priming was found to accumulate over time (in all sessions in Exp. 1, and in 1 out of 2 sessions in Exp. 2). For healthy older adults, who are known to experience age-related decline in implicit memory, priming was also found to accumulate over time (significant in 2 out of 3 sessions in Exp. 1, and in both sessions in Exp. 2). However, for the older adults, the learned changes in structure preferences were less robust over time, lasting for one week but not four. Importantly, for both age groups, implicit learning was shown to not be limited to a specific context and task (Exp. 2).

There are numerous empirical studies showing robust structural priming is possible within a single experimental session. However, if structural priming plays a role in language acquisition and language change, as has been proposed (Chang, 2008; Dell & Chang, 2014; Tomasello, 2006), then these structural biases must be able to survive over time, including between experimental lab sessions. When Kaschak and colleagues (2007) showed that structural preferences survived a one-week interval, it indicated that the structural biases built up in short experiments are more robust than was previously assumed. Several other studies also showed long-term structural priming effects to be robust over time intervals up to one week (Kaschak et al., 2014; Kaschak, Kutta, & Jones, 2011; Kaschak, Kutta, & Schatschneider, 2011; Kutta & Kaschak, 2012). We pushed the limits of this and tested whether a learned change in structural bias could last for as long as four weeks. Indeed, we found (for young adults) that long-term priming is robust enough to last for (at least) one month.

Recent studies have suggested that healthy, older adults may show a significantly less robust structural priming effect, within single sessions (Heyselaar et al., 2017), and have correlated this effect with a decline in implicit learning (Heyselaar et al., 2020). As the major theoretical models proposed to underlie the structural priming effect involve unconscious learning (Chang et al., 2012; Jaeger & Snider, 2013; Reitter et al., 2011), it was an open question whether healthy older adults would also show long-term priming. Indeed, we found a disconnect between the performance in long-term priming between sessions, as well as the accumulation of passive production within sessions, between the younger and older adults. As stated above, there was an increase in structural priming with a one-week interval between sessions, but not four. The theoretical models suggest that structural priming is based on error-based learning. That is, we make predictions about upcoming information (in this case, grammatical structure) and if the input we receive mismatches with our expectations, then the resulting error is used to adjust our expectations, with the aim of increasing the chances of a successful prediction in future utterances. How is this linked to the participants *producing* more passive structures in our experiment? “A learner, given an entire history of linguistic input, can eventually ‘join in’ and start *saying* its prediction” (Dell & Chang, 2014; Hsu et al., 2013). Linking this back to our results, one possible mechanism is that the older adults are *faster* at updating their preferences. This is reflected in their baseline passive preferences increasing more after a week delay (3.7% and 2.9% increase for Experiment 1 and 2 respectively), compared to young adults (1.2% and 1.7% increase respectively). This could be due to bigger prediction errors produced, or that the prediction error itself has more impact in changing existing preferences. This also explains the faster decay rate: This sensitivity to updating your predictions carries on outside the lab, and hence the older participants are more prone to overriding their newly learned biases compared to the young adults. Indeed, there was no significant difference in the priming magnitude between Session A and Session C, suggesting that the structural preferences had returned to baseline sometime one and four weeks after the Priming Phase. In contrast, no substantial decrease in passive preferences was observed for the younger age group, suggesting that participants between 18 and 30 years may maintain these new biases for much longer than four weeks.

There are other marked differences in task performance between the older and younger participants, namely that the older participants showed a higher passive preference in general compared to the younger adults. Additionally, the difference in the passive preference between Session A and B was higher for the older adults (3.7% increase) than the younger adults (1.2% increase). It could be that older adults are more vulnerable to being biased towards infrequent syntactic structures. A similar trend was found in the performance of older adults in a statistical learning task (serial reaction time task; Heyselaar et al., 2020), suggesting that this effect could be due to their declining implicit memory system and may not be language-specific. Patients with amnesia also show a more robust passive priming magnitude after a single session (Heyselaar et al., 2017). Additionally, the robust increase in the Baseline Phase in Experiment 2 did not completely carry over to the Priming Phase. This may be due to our methodological choices for Experiment 2: Between the Baseline and Priming Phase the participants were returned to the waiting room, as they were led to believe that the two sessions were for unrelated experiments. We made this choice to control for any context-based learning (as discussed in our *Interim Discussion*). The drop in performance between the two Phases suggests that older participants do rely on explicit learning in part when learning structural biases. This finding is not novel: It is known that when one memory system fails (such as implicit memory in the older population), other memory systems may be recruited to compensate (Poldrack & Packard, 2003; Ullman & Pullman, 2015).

We can therefore conclude that our findings are in line with our first two hypotheses: 1) We showed that structural priming effects persist for one week and/or four weeks, and that 2) this effect is different for younger, compared to older, healthy adults. However, the question remains whether the effects found in Experiment 1 are task-specific or indeed a representation of the modality-independent implicit learning mechanism.

Previous research has indicated that there may be limits to the extent at which implicit learning drives syntactic production. In one study, Kutta and Kaschak (2012) used a different task, in a different room, for the Baseline and the Prime Phase. Their argumentation was that if an explicit memory system is used, then the structural preferences may be retrieved once the participant returns to the same room and conducts the same task, therefore making the structural preferences task- and location-specific. Indeed,

they found that if a one-week interval separated the Baseline and Prime Phase, no significant structural priming was measured. In order to confidently conclude that implicit (as opposed to explicit) learning played a role in our findings, we also tested whether learning was limited by the experimental context and the task. In Experiment 2 we presented each Phase as a separate experiment, conducted in a different room by different experimenters with seemingly different research goals. We additionally created new stimuli for the Baseline Phase and asked participants to do a different task: Participants were asked to tell a story based on the set of actions depicted on the screen. This yielded more variable and free language production than the highly prescriptive ‘green before red’ task used in the Priming Phase. If the structural priming effects observed in Experiment 1 relied on implicit learning mechanisms, and priming indeed plays a role in language acquisition and change, then any learning should be abstract enough to be applied in a variety of contexts. For example, learning about verbs in a second-language class should not prevent you from applying these newly learned grammatical rules outside of the classroom, in a different task, with different people. Indeed, for both age groups, in Experiment 2 we observed a significant increase in passive preference in the Baseline Phase in Session B (one week later) compared to Session A. This increase in passive preference could only have occurred if the structural bias survived the one-week interval between the Priming Phase of Session A and the Baseline Phase of Session B.

The performance between Experiment 1 and Experiment 2 are not completely identical. This could be due to using a different sample, or, possibly there are elements from our Experiment 1 that were task-specific. There was a difference in cumulative learning between the experiments (Figure 3 and Figure 6). However, the results showed that there is a significant increase in passive preference between Session A and B, and thus we can confidently conclude that the structural preferences built up in the Bias Phase effected participants’ performance in the seemingly unrelated Priming Phase, and hence these structural preferences are task-independent and abstract.

Overall, our findings provide further evidence that the syntactic biases built up during structural priming experiments are robust enough to last for at least a week for young and older adults, and for at least one month for young adults. Furthermore, syntactic priming effects transcend across different experimental

tasks and contexts, both for young and older adults. Together, our findings highlight that structural priming researchers should take caution when recruiting their participants: Participants who have conducted a structural priming study in recent months may conduct a current experiment with altered structural bias, compared to other participants. Additionally, the differences between age groups adds another piece of information regarding the age-related differences in structural priming, an element that has yet to be worked into current models.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Denise Clissett for her work in recruiting and organizing the testing schedule of the older adult participants. We additionally would like to thank our students who conducted the data collection: Katherine Lane, Emilia Robinson, Charlotte Poulisse, Roksana Markiewicz, Beth Meopham, Jodie Bryan, Yasmin Assim, Alfred Vaughan, Katie Whitehouse, Danielle Carney, and Lucy Bower.

References

- Bäckman, L., Nyberg, L., Lindenberger, U., Li, S. C., & Farde, L. (2006). The correlative triad among aging, dopamine, and cognition: current status and future prospects. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 30, 791–807.
- Barr, D. J., Levy, R., Scheepers, C., & Tily, H. J. (2013). Random effects structure for confirmatory hypothesis testing: Keep it maximal. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 68(3), 255–278. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2012.11.001>
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., & Bolker, B. (2012). *lme4: Linear mixed-effects models using S4 classes (2011). R package version 0.999375-42*.
- Bernolet, S., Collina, S., & Hartsuiker, R. J. (2016). The persistence of syntactic priming revisited. *Journal of Memory and Language*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2016.01.002>
- Bock, J. K. (1986). Meaning, sound, and syntax: Lexical priming in sentence production. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 12(4), 575–586.
- Bock, J. K., & Griffin, Z. M. (2000). The Persistence of Structural Priming: Transient Activation or Implicit Learning? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 129(2), 177–192. <https://doi.org/10.10371/D096-3445.129.2.1T/The>
- Branigan, H. P., Pickering, M. J., & Cleland, A. A. (1999a). Syntactic priming in written production: evidence for rapid decay. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 6(4), 635–640. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03212972>
- Branigan, H. P., Pickering, M. J., & Cleland, A. A. (1999b). Syntactic priming in written production: Evidence for rapid decay. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 6(4), 635–640. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03212972>
- Branigan, H. P., Pickering, M. J., Stewart, A., & McLean, J. F. (2000). Syntactic priming in spoken production: linguistic and temporal interference. *Memory & Cognition*, 28(8), 1297–1302.
- Chang, F. (2008). Implicit learning as a mechanism of language change. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 34(2), 115–122. <https://doi.org/10.1515/THLI.2008.009>
- Chang, F., Dell, G. S., & Bock, J. K. (2006). Becoming syntactic. *Psychological Review*, 113(2), 234–272. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.113.2.234>

- Chang, F., Janciauskas, M., & Fitz, H. (2012). Language adaptation and learning: Getting explicit about implicit learning. *Linguistics and Language Compass*, 6(5), 259–278. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lnc3.337>
- Cornelis, L. (1996). English and Dutch: The passive difference. *Language Sciences*, 18(1-2 SPEC. ISS.), 247–264. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0388-0001\(96\)00018-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0388-0001(96)00018-6)
- Dell, G. S., & Chang, F. (2014). The P-chain: relating sentence production and its disorders to comprehension and acquisition. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 369(1634), 20120394. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0394>
- Hartsuiker, R. J., Bernolet, S., Schoonbaert, S., Speybroeck, S., & Vanderelst, D. (2008). Syntactic priming persists while the lexical boost decays: Evidence from written and spoken dialogue. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 58(2), 214–238. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2007.07.003>
- Hartsuiker, R. J., & Kolk, H. H. J. (1998). Syntactic Persistence in Dutch. *Language and Speech*, 41(2), 143–184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002383099804100202>
- Hartsuiker, R. J., & Westenberg, C. (2000). Word order priming in written and spoken sentence production. *Cognition*, 75(2), B27-39. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10771278>
- Hastie, T. J., & Tibshirani, R. J. (1990). *Generalized Additive Models*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press.
- Heyselaar, E., Hagoort, P., & Segaert, K. (2015). In dialogue with an avatar, language production is identical compared to dialogue with a human partner. *Behavior Research Methods*, 49(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0688-7>
- Heyselaar, E., Segaert, K., Walvoort, S. J. W., Kessels, R. P. C., & Hagoort, P. (2017). The role of nondeclarative memory in the skill for language: Evidence from syntactic priming in patients with amnesia. *Neuropsychologia*, 101, 97–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2017.04.033>
- Heyselaar, E., Wheeldon, L., & Segaert, K. (2020). Structural priming is supported by different components of nondeclarative memory: Evidence from priming across the lifespan. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000955>
- Hsu, A. S., Chater, N., & Vitányi, P. (2013). Language Learning From Positive Evidence,

- Reconsidered: A Simplicity-Based Approach. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 5(1), 35–55.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12005>
- Hwang, H., & Shin, J. A. (2019). Cumulative effects of syntactic experience in a between- and a within-language context: Evidence for implicit learning. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 109(September), 104054. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2019.104054>
- Jaeger, T. F., & Snider, N. E. (2013). Alignment as a consequence of expectation adaptation: Syntactic priming is affected by the prime's prediction error given both prior and recent experience. *Cognition*, 127(1), 57–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2012.10.013>
- Kaschak, M. P. (2007). Long-term structural priming affects subsequent patterns of language production. *Memory & Cognition*, 35(5), 925–937.
- Kaschak, M. P., Kutta, T. J., & Coyle, J. M. (2014). Long and short term cumulative structural priming effects. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 29(6), 728–743.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01690965.2011.641387>
- Kaschak, M. P., Kutta, T. J., & Jones, J. L. (2011). Structural priming as implicit learning: Cumulative priming effects and individual differences. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 18(6), 1133–1139. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-011-0157-y>
- Kaschak, M. P., Kutta, T. J., & Schatschneider, C. (2011). Long-term cumulative structural priming persists for (at least) one week. *Memory & Cognition*, 39(3), 381–388.
<https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-010-0042-3>
- Kathryn, J. B., Dell, G. S., Chang, F., & Onishi, K. H. (2007). Persistent structural priming from language comprehension to language production. *Cognition*, 104(3), 437–458.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2006.07.003>
- Kemper, S. (1986). Imitation of complex syntactic constructions by elderly adults. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 7(3), 277–287. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716400007578>
- Kutta, T. J., & Kaschak, M. P. (2012). Changes in task-extrinsic context do not affect the persistence of long-term cumulative structural priming. *Acta Psychologica*, 141(3), 408–414. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2012.09.007>
- Kutta, T. J., Kaschak, M. P., Porcellini, A., & Jones, J. L. (2017). Implicit and Explicit Memory Factors in Cumulative Structural Priming. *Collabra: Psychology*, 3(1), 1–24.
<https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.59>

- Maki, P. M., Zonderman, A. B., & Weingartner, H. (1999). Age differences in implicit memory: Fragmented object identification and category exemplar generation. *Psychology and Aging, 14*(2), 284–294.
- Martin, N., & Saffran, E. M. (1997). Language and Auditory-verbal Short-term Memory Impairments: Evidence for Common Underlying Processes. *Cognitive Neuropsychology, 14*(5), 641–682. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026432997381402>
- Menenti, L., Gierhan, S. M. E., Segaert, K., & Hagoort, P. (2011). Shared language: overlap and segregation of the neuronal infrastructure for speaking and listening revealed by functional MRI. *Psychological Science, 22*(9), 1173–1182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611418347>
- Neger, T. M., Rietveld, T., & Janse, E. (2014). Relationship between perceptual learning in speech and statistical learning in younger and older adults. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, 8*(September), 628. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2014.00628>
- Pickering, M. J., & Ferreira, V. S. (2009). Structural Priming: A Critical Review. *Psychological Bulletin, 134*(3), 427–459. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.3.427>.Structural
- Poldrack, R. A., & Packard, M. G. (2003). *Competition among multiple memory systems : converging evidence from animal and human brain studies. 1497*, 1–7.
- R Core Development Team. (2011). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*.
- Raz, N., Rodrigue, K. M., Kennedy, K. M., Head, D., Gunning-Dixon, F., & Acker, J. D. (2003). Differential aging of the human striatum: longitudinal evidence. *American Journal of Neuroradiology, 24*, 1849–1856.
- Reitter, D. (2008). *Context Effects in Language Production : Models of Syntactic Priming in Dialogue Corpora*.
- Reitter, D., Keller, F., & Moore, J. D. (2011). A Computational Cognitive Model of Syntactic Priming. *Cognitive Science, 35*(4), 587–637.
- Schneider, W., Eschman, A., & Zuccolotto, A. (2002). *E-Prime: User's Guide*. Psychology Software Incorporated.
- Segaert, K., Menenti, L., Weber, K., & Hagoort, P. (2011). A paradox of syntactic priming: why response tendencies show priming for passives, and response latencies show

- priming for actives. *PloS One*, 6(10). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0024209>
- Segaert, K., Menenti, L., Weber, K., Petersson, K. M., & Hagoort, P. (2012). Shared syntax in language production and language comprehension--an fMRI study. *Cerebral Cortex (New York, N.Y. : 1991)*, 22(7), 1662–1670. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhr249>
- Segaert, K., Wheeldon, L., & Hagoort, P. (2016). Unifying structural priming effects on syntactic choices and timing of sentence generation. *Journal of Memory and Language*.
- Smith, T., Gildeh, N., & Holmes, C. (2007). The Montreal cognitive assessment: Validity and utility in a memory clinic setting. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 52(5), 329–332. <https://doi.org/10.1177/070674370705200508>
- Sung, J. E. (2015). Age-related changes in sentence production abilities and their relation to working-memory capacity: evidence from a verb-final language. *PloS One*, 10(4), e0119424. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0119424>
- Tomasello, M. (2006). Acquiring linguistic constructions. In D. Kuhn & R. Siegler (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology*. Wiley.
- Ullman, M. T., & Pullman, M. Y. (2015). A compensatory role for declarative memory in neurodevelopmental disorders. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 51, 205–222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.01.008>
- Wood, S. (2017). *Package “mgcv.”*