

**The Mental Lexicon**  
**A meta-analytic review of morphological priming in Semitic languages**  
--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	ML-23008R2	
<b>Full Title:</b>	A meta-analytic review of morphological priming in Semitic languages	
<b>Short Title:</b>	Meta-analysis on Semitic morphological priming	
<b>Article Type:</b>	Article	
<b>First Author:</b>	Lily Xu	
<b>Other Authors:</b>	Elizabeth Solá-Llonch Huilei Wang Megha Sundara	
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Lily Xu University of California Los Angeles Los Angeles, CA UNITED STATES	
<b>Funding Information:</b>	National Science Foundation (BCS-2214017)	Megha Sundara
<b>Section/Category:</b>	Article	
<b>Keywords:</b>	roots; templates; word patterns; Bayesian modelling	
<b>Manuscript Classifications:</b>	20.09: Modelling; 10.05.06: Psycholinguistics	
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>Two types of discontinuous morphemes are thought to be the basic building blocks of words in Semitic languages: roots and templates. However, the role of these morphemes in lexical access and representation is debated. Priming experiments, where reaction times to target words are predicted to be faster when preceded by morphologically-related primes compared to unrelated control primes, provide conflicting evidence bearing on this debate. We used meta-analysis to synthesise the findings from 229 priming experiments on 4710 unique Semitic speakers. With Bayesian modelling of the aggregate effect sizes, we found credible root and template priming in both nouns and verbs in Arabic and Hebrew. Our results show that root priming effects can be distinguished from the effects of overlap in form and meaning. However, more experiments are needed to determine if template priming effects can be distinguished from overlap in form and morphosyntactic function.</p>	
<b>Author Comments:</b>	<p>Much of our discussion right now is focused on how morphological priming could be accounted for in whole word models (exemplified by LDL). This is an alternative to representing morphemes directly in the lexicon. We explicitly discuss why this approach (where morphological priming is solely due to form and meaning overlap) cannot account for the root priming results we observed in the meta-analysis (where root priming is still found even when form and meaning overlap is taken into account).</p> <p>We have now added additional sentences in the discussion to clearly identify the kinds of theories of Semitic morphology that our results provide support for:</p> <p>regarding roots: "The findings from these two experiments provide empirical support for the independent representation of roots as nonlinear, abstract sublexical units, which nevertheless play a crucial role in lexical processing. This aligns with the traditional approach to Semitic morphology of treating roots as morphemes (Holes, 2004; McCarthy, 1979)."</p> <p>regarding templates: "These findings are compatible with proposals where templates are not independent morphemes but are bundles of morphosyntactic information, whose surface realisation can be derived from constraints on prosodic structure (e.g., Kastner, 2019)."</p> <p>Above are the parts of the discussion where we address the wider context and</p>	

	theoretical impact of our findings.
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>	

1  
2  
3  
4 **A meta-analytic review of morphological priming in Semitic languages**  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Article word count: 10483

## Abstract

Two types of discontinuous morphemes are thought to be the basic building blocks of words in Semitic languages: roots and templates. However, the role of these morphemes in lexical access and representation is debated. Priming experiments, where reaction times to target words are predicted to be faster when preceded by morphologically-related primes compared to unrelated control primes, provide conflicting evidence bearing on this debate. We used meta-analysis to synthesise the findings from 229 priming experiments on 4710 unique Semitic speakers. With Bayesian modelling of the aggregate effect sizes, we found credible root and template priming in both nouns and verbs in Arabic and Hebrew. Our results show that root priming effects can be distinguished from the effects of overlap in form and meaning. However, more experiments are needed to determine if template priming effects can be distinguished from overlap in form and morphosyntactic function.

**Abstract word count:** 144

**Keywords:** roots, templates, word patterns, Bayesian modelling

## 1 Introduction

A central question in linguistics concerns morphology's role in lexical representation and its contribution to lexical access. In some accounts, sublexical units — morphemes — are explicitly represented in the mental lexicon and play an active role in moderating lexical access (e.g., Smolka et al., 2014, 2019; Stockall & Marantz, 2006; Taft, 1988, 2004; Taft & Forster, 1975). In contrast, in whole-word approaches, words are represented as unanalyzed sequences in the mental lexicon, without any internal structure (e.g., Blevins, 2016; Lukatela et al., 1980; Milin et al., 2017; Seidenberg & Gonnerman, 2000), and two lexical representations with shared morphology are typically related by analogy (e.g., Bybee & McClelland, 2005) or overlap in meaning and form (Baayen et al., 2019; Gonnerman et al., 2007; Heitmeier et al., 2022). Thus, in whole-word models, although morphemes are not represented in the lexicon, effects of morphological relatedness emerge from the fact that words that are morphologically related typically share meaning and are similar in form.

A third alternative, referred to as dual-route models, have some words stored whole while others are generated from stored morphemes (e.g., Berent & Pinker, 2007; Clahsen et al., 1992). Specifically, only regular and productive processes are thought to be involved in generating words from stored morphemes, whereas words resulting from irregular, unproductive processes are stored whole. While the distinction between productive and unproductive morphological processes is not categorical (see Albright & Hayes, 2003; Nieder et al., 2021 for discussion), a morphemic representation is most often argued for when words involve productive, transparent, and regular processes.

In this paper we evaluate the empirical evidence that bears on the representation of morphemes in Semitic languages, which are unique for their extensive use of nonconcatenative

1  
2  
3  
4 morphology. To address this question, we use a meta-analytic approach to aggregate evidence  
5 from 36 sets of studies investigating regular and productive morphological processes in Arabic,  
6 Hebrew, and Maltese. In all studies included here, lexical representations were probed using the  
7 psycholinguistic technique of priming.  
8  
9

10 In priming paradigms, prior experience with a stimulus item during the course of the  
11 experiment typically results in heightened activation and preferential retrieval of a related target  
12 lexical entry, reflected in faster times for lexical decision or naming latency for target words  
13 when compared to a baseline where targets are preceded by unrelated primes. Thus, faster  
14 reaction times or naming latencies are interpreted as evidence for a shared representation  
15 between the prime and the target. The strongest priming effects are found when prime and target  
16 are identical (i.e., identity priming), but priming effects are also observed with only partial (e.g.,  
17 meaning, form, morphological) overlap. Manipulating the extent and type of relationship  
18 between the prime and the target in a priming paradigm can provide a window into the structure  
19 of the mental lexicon.  
20  
21

22 In this paper, we present a meta-analysis of morphological priming effects for  
23 nonconcatenative morphemes (i.e., roots and templates) in Semitic languages. We used Bayesian  
24 modelling to examine the overall effect sizes for data aggregated from all relevant studies,  
25 focusing on what these results might contribute towards our understanding of the role of  
26 morphology in lexical access and representation. With this approach, we were able to quantify  
27 the evidence to evaluate whether morphological priming by root and template morphemes is  
28 consistently observed and whether such priming effects are independent of the effects obtained  
29 where there is overlap in just form and meaning.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

### 1.1 Priming of abstract morphemes in Semitic languages

Semitic languages present interesting test cases for evaluating morphological priming effects because of their extensive system of nonconcatenative, or nonlinear, morphology.

Traditionally, the majority of Semitic words are decomposed into two discontinuous morphemes, called roots and templates (Holes, 2004; McCarthy, 1979; *inter alia*). Roots are sequences of two to four (usually three) consonants which carry the main lexical semantic information. Templates, also called word patterns, encompass prosodic information and often include affixes and a fixed sequence of vowels called a vocalic melody; they are associated with morphosyntactic information such as part of speech, number, and voice, as well as some semantic information. Importantly, both roots and templates are abstract morphemes by default because they cannot be extracted linearly from speech. Table 1 displays the Arabic root  $\chi$ -*b*-*z*, related to baking and bread, combined with one verbal and two nominal templates:

Word	Meaning	Template	Morphosyntactic information
$\chi$ <i>abaz</i>	‘to bake’	CaCaC	verb-3.M.SG.PAST
$\chi$ <i>ab:a:z</i>	‘baker’	CaC:a:C	M.SG noun relating to a profession
$ma\chi$ <i>baz</i>	‘bakery’	maCCaC	M.SG noun relating to location

Table 1: Arabic root  $\chi$ -*b*-*z*, in combination with various templates

Although the morphological status of Semitic roots and templates is far from uncontroversial (Bat-El, 1994, 2003; Kastner, 2019; Ussishkin, 1999, 2005), there is substantial psycholinguistic evidence from priming experiments that roots play an important role in lexical

1  
2  
3  
4 access (Prunet, 2006). Robust priming based on root overlap has been observed in both Arabic  
5 and Hebrew for nouns and verbs in a variety of methodological paradigms, including masked  
6 visual priming (Boudelaa & Marslen-Wilson, 2000, 2005; Deutsch et al., 1998; Frost et al., 1997;  
7 cf. Kastner et al., 2018), parafoveal preview (Deutsch et al., 2000 et seq.), and cross-modal  
8 priming (Boudelaa & Marslen-Wilson, 2015; Frost et al., 2000). In fact, robust root priming  
9 effects are observed even in Arabic-learning children as early as second grade (Shalhoub-Awwad  
10 & Leikin, 2016).

11  
12 Strong root priming effects are also found in Maltese. Though a Semitic language,  
13 Maltese has had extensive contact with Indo-European languages (Sicilian, Italian, and English)  
14 and has developed a lexicon split between native Semitic words and loan words. Root priming  
15 has been found in Maltese for verbs (Geary & Ussishkin, 2018; Twist, 2006; Ussishkin et al.,  
16 2015) and for nouns (Nieder et al., 2021) using masked visual, cross-modal, and auditory  
17 priming paradigms.

18  
19 In contrast, the psycholinguistic evidence for templates in Semitic languages is much  
20 more mixed. Compared to root priming, template priming effects are generally reported to be  
21 less robust and exhibit greater variation, both within and across languages. In Arabic, for  
22 example, facilitatory effects have been observed in visual word identification for both verbal and  
23 nominal templates (Boudelaa & Marslen-Wilson, 2005, 2011), but only with specific time  
24 intervals between the prime and the target (Stimulus-Onset Asynchrony, SOA). Additionally,  
25 nominal template priming has been reported to vary with the type frequency of the root  
26 (Boudelaa & Marslen-Wilson, 2011) and to be less robust in children (Shalhoub-Awwad, 2020).  
27  
28 Further, not all nominal templates show priming effects: productive nominal templates show  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 template priming effects, but non-productive ones do not (Boudelaa & Marslen-Wilson, 2000,  
5  
6 2015).  
7

8 In Hebrew, there is a further asymmetry between the template priming effects found for  
9 nouns versus verbs. Significant priming effects have been reported for Hebrew verbal templates,  
10 but generally not for nominal templates (verbal templates: Deutsch et al., 1998; nominal  
11 templates: Deutsch et al., 2005; Frost et al., 1997). The lack of nominal template priming effects  
12 in Hebrew has been attributed to a few different factors. First, Deutsch et al. (1998) point out that  
13 verbal and nominal templates differ greatly in type frequency: there are only 7 verbal templates  
14 in Hebrew and over 100 nominal templates, so each individual verbal template appears more  
15 frequently than any individual nominal template. Additionally, they argue that the meaning  
16 derived from nominal templates is less transparent. We also know that although all verbs can be  
17 decomposed into roots and templates, this is not always the case for nouns. However, because  
18 the same factors also hold for other Semitic languages (particularly Arabic), it is difficult to  
19 reconcile these accounts of the template priming asymmetry in Hebrew with the absence of the  
20 asymmetry in Arabic. Deutsch et al. (2018) supply a third possible account, arguing that  
21 potential facilitative effects of nominal templates may be obscured in previous experiments due  
22 to the competition between templates and roots, since roots have been shown to exert a stronger  
23 influence on lexical access. In sum, the findings from Hebrew template priming studies suggest  
24 that, minimally, there are differences in the robustness of root priming and templatic priming of  
25 verbs versus nouns, with only nominal template priming affected by methodological differences.  
26

27 Template priming effects are weakest in Maltese. There have been two studies on verbal  
28 template priming in Maltese, with neither finding evidence of priming (Twist, 2006; Ussishkin et  
29 al., 2015). These findings may be impacted by the fact that many verbs in the language are non-  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Semitic loans that take suffixes rather than verbal templates (Twist, 2006), so verbal templates in  
5  
6 Maltese have comparatively lower type frequency than in other Semitic languages. However,  
7  
8 since there are so few studies on Maltese, it is hasty to conclude that there is a definite difference  
9 in template priming in Maltese compared to Hebrew and Arabic.  
10  
11

12  
13 To summarise, while root priming has been robustly observed in both nouns and verbs in  
14 Arabic, Hebrew, and Maltese, there is no clear evidence for template priming in Semitic  
15 languages. Verbal template priming is typically demonstrated in both Arabic and Hebrew, but  
16 not Maltese. In contrast, nominal template priming is generally observed in Arabic, but not  
17 Hebrew, possibly due to differences in methodology or lexical frequency. However, there are  
18 also many papers that report results contradictory to the overall trends summarised above. The  
19 question is thus: how can we isolate the effect of interest (i.e., root and template priming) from  
20 the effects of different methodologies and cross-linguistic variation?  
21  
22

23  
24 In this paper we used meta-analysis to synthesise the large literature on root and template  
25 priming effects in Semitic languages in order to tease apart the influence of methodological  
26 variables (task and modality of presentation) from lexical factors (e.g., word class) to get at  
27 cross-linguistic patterns. To evaluate effect sizes for the meta-analysis, we used Bayesian  
28 modelling, which is useful for integrating evidence from individual studies, both significant and  
29 non-significant, to estimate the strength of the effect size. Additionally, the large sample sizes in  
30 a meta-analysis are particularly useful because priming experiments generate reaction time data  
31 that are known to be noisy. Finally, because of the variability in the designs of individual  
32 experiments, we are able to make novel comparisons (e.g., across languages) which are not  
33 possible in any individual report.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 1.2 Is Semitic morphology represented in the mental lexicon?

Priming studies are often used to provide evidence to distinguish between alternate theories of morphological representation. For instance, robust root priming effects are typically used to further accounts where morphological structure is independently represented (e.g., Boudelaa & Marslen-Wilson, 2005, 2011; Deutsch et al., 1998; Frost et al., 1997; Geary & Ussishkin, 2018). However, root priming can also be attributed to the overlap in form and the shared meaning between the prime and the target. Therefore, to distinguish between the two proposals we need to evaluate whether root priming effects are independent of both form and semantic overlap.

In the priming literature, experiments target specific relationships between primes and targets to isolate the role of morphological overlap. Isolating the role of morphological overlap from semantic overlap typically involves a comparison of facilitation by primes that share the same root as the target, but which have either a transparent semantic relationship (e.g., Hebrew *madrix* ‘guide’ and *hadraxa* ‘guidance’) or an opaque semantic relationship (e.g., Hebrew *drixut* ‘alertness’ and *hadraxa* ‘guidance’). In some studies in Arabic and Hebrew, root-related prime-target pairs with an opaque semantic relationship have been reported to prime as much as pairs with a transparent semantic relationship (Boudelaa & Marslen-Wilson, 2000, 2005; Frost et al., 1997), but in other studies they have been found to prime less than pairs with a transparent semantic relationship (Bentin & Feldman, 1990; Boudelaa & Marslen-Wilson, 2013; Frost et al., 2000). Thus the evidence in support of morphological priming by roots in the absence of semantic overlap is mixed.

Similarly, a comparison of priming by root-related words versus those with form overlap of 2-3 non-root consonants also presents an ambiguous picture. In some studies root priming

1  
2  
3  
4 effects are larger than form priming effects (Boudelaa & Marslen-Wilson 2005, 2013, 2015;  
5  
6 Deutsch et al. 2000 et seq.; Frost et al. 1997, 2000), but in others they are not (Abu-Rabia &  
7  
8 Awwad, 2004). So, it is also unclear whether morphological root overlap effects are entirely  
9  
10 independent from effects of form overlap.  
11  
12

13 Since template priming is less robust than root priming, the evidence from template  
14 priming experiments in support of any one account of morphological representation is even less  
15  
16 persuasive. Some of these mixed findings from priming studies undoubtedly stem from  
17  
18 differences in methodology, lexical factors, or cross-linguistic variation. Therefore, aggregating  
19  
20 evidence across a large number of experiments in this area, as we did here with the meta-  
21  
22 analysis, can be particularly helpful in determining whether morphological priming effects exist  
23  
24 independent of semantic and form overlap.  
25  
26  
27

## 30 31 32 2 Methods

### 33 34 35 36 2.1 *Paper identification and selection*

37 We initially collated 82 papers on psycholinguistic studies of nonconcatenative  
38 morphology, including journal publications, conference proceedings, book chapters, and  
39  
40 unpublished dissertations. This selection included papers known to the authors (10 papers) and  
41  
42 papers identified by systematic searches of databases (60), reference lists (8), and researcher's  
43  
44 websites (4). After deciding to focus on only priming and parafoveal preview studies, we  
45  
46 excluded papers that used other methodologies (19). One additional paper did not have a  
47  
48 retrievable abstract or text, leaving a total of 62 papers.  
49  
50  
51

52 After screening paper abstracts, we excluded papers that did not evaluate  
53  
54 nonconcatenative morphology (7) or those that did not test native speakers of Semitic languages  
55  
56 (1). Papers with less common priming methodologies were also excluded (3); this included two  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 studies using masked auditory priming, a newer priming methodology with results that are more  
5 difficult to interpret. We also decided to discard studies that focused on priming in children (4)  
6 or dyslexic participants (1). We then examined the full text of the remaining 46 papers to  
7 determine their eligibility for the meta-analysis, resulting in an additional 10 studies being  
8 excluded because they focused only on irregular (non-trilateral) roots (2), only used nonce word  
9 primes (1), did not report data critical for the meta-analysis (5), or because their control  
10 conditions would actually be categorised as template priming by the definition used in this meta-  
11 analysis (2). This left a total of 36 papers eligible for the meta-analysis. The PRISMA flowchart  
12 and decision spreadsheet for this meta-analysis can be found on this project's [OSF page](#).  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

## 2.2 Data entry

31 Every experimental and control condition pair constituted a row in the meta-analysis  
32 spreadsheet, and was coded for a number of dimensions following previous meta-analyses  
33 (Sundara et al., 2021; for a full list and explanation of coded variables see Bergmann et al.,  
34 35  
36 2018). For example, Boudelaa & Marslen-Wilson (2011) report two experiments on  
37 38  
39 morphological priming in Arabic. Both experiments had 5 experimental conditions, each  
40 41  
42 compared to a control condition; each experiment provided data for 5 rows of our spreadsheet  
43 44  
45 and we treated this paper as containing ten experimental comparisons in total. Each row coded  
46 47  
48 the specific properties of a single experimental condition.  
49  
50

51 The relevant dimensions for the present analysis were: (1) background information on the  
52 paper, including a unique study ID for each paper, citation, DOI, and whether the paper was peer  
53 reviewed; (2) participants' information, including country of origin, native language, dialects,  
54 55  
56 age, and gender; (3) modality of presentation of targets and primes; (4) whether visual primes  
57 58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

were masked or nonmasked; and (5) the mean and standard deviations of the reaction times to experimental and control conditions. When standard deviations were not reported, we estimated them from ANOVA results (see section 2.2.2 below for details).


Additionally, we also coded each experimental and control condition pair for: (a) word class of stimuli (nouns or verbs); (b) description of the stimuli, such as the number of total targets, the number of targets per condition, the number of trials, as well as the productivity of the roots and templates when available; and (c) the relationship between primes and targets based on the description of the stimuli or a comparison of the stimulus set, when available. The coding of the relationship between primes and targets for each condition allowed us to identify six types of overlap which we used in our meta-analysis: root overlap with and without meaning overlap, template overlap with and without morphosyntactic function overlap, meaning, and form. See the supplemental materials on [OSF](#) for examples.

We use ‘template’ in this meta-analysis to refer to word pairs that have a complete overlap of prosodic structure (or prosodic template) regardless of their segmental composition or morphosyntactic function. We chose not to code for ‘word pattern’, as this term is often used inconsistently in the literature to refer to overlap in prosodic structure either with or without additional overlap in vocalic melody or morphosyntactic function; instead, we chose to separate word patterns into three kinds of overlap: overlap in prosodic structure only (template overlap), vocalic melody (form overlap), and morphosyntax (function overlap). Thus, we are assuming that templatic morphemes always have complete prosodic overlap, but we do not assume that segmental material or morphosyntactic function is an inherent part of the morpheme.

The final dataset had results from 4710 participants in 103 experiments. These numbers were calculated from the complete experiments as defined by the individual studies. However,

we coded each experimental condition as its own experiment for the purposes of our meta-analysis; by this definition, our meta-analysis had observations from 9886 participants in 229 experiments. Hereafter, we will report the number of participants and experiments using the latter definition.

The experiments evaluated root and template priming in three languages (Arabic, Hebrew, and Maltese) using 4 modalities: auditory, cross-modal (auditory-visual), nonmasked visual, and masked visual. The distributions of participants and language of study against the modality are presented in Figure 1.



**Figure 1.** Distribution of the number of participants across different priming modalities (auditory, cross-modal, masked visual, and nonmasked visual) in Arabic, Hebrew, and Maltese. Data from root priming experiments are shown in panel A while data from template priming experiments are in panel B.

1  
2  
3  
4 **2.2 Derived variables**  
5  
6

7 **2.2.1 Effect size**  
8  
9

10 A standardised effect size measure was calculated to index the extent of facilitation in  
11 reaction time (i.e., priming effect) in every experimental condition compared to its respective  
12 control condition. We used Hedge's  $g$ , which is calculated by dividing the difference in sample  
13 means by the pooled and weighted standard deviation of the two means. Hedge's  $g$  is interpreted  
14 similarly to Cohen's  $d$ , another common effect size measure, but is different in that Hedge's  $g$  is  
15 weighted by sample sizes; as a result, the meta-analytic estimates are affected more by studies  
16 with larger sample sizes (Shadish & Haddock, 2009). Effect size calculations were carried out  
17 with the `esc_mean_sd()` function from the `esc` package (Lüdecke, 2019). Hedge's  $g$  was the  
18 dependent variable throughout the paper.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

33 **2.2.2 Standard deviation**  
34  
35

36 In about half of the included experiments, we had to derive standard deviation because  
37 standard deviation values (or standard errors or 95% confidence intervals) were not reported in  
38 either the text or figures. We did not estimate standard deviations from planned comparisons or  $t$ -  
39 tests because these measures were generally reported only for significant effects, whereas meta-  
40 analysis uses both significant and non-significant reported effects. Instead, missing standard  
41 deviation values were estimated from ANOVA results (either from group means, sample sizes,  
42 and  $F$ -statistic or MSE, when available). Because the  $F$ -statistic is the variance between samples  
43 divided by the variance within samples (the pooled standard deviation across conditions), we  
44 were able to estimate the standard deviation of each condition when the samples are  
45 homogenous, i.e., had the same variance. Thus, bootstrapping the standard deviation in this way  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 necessarily required an assumption of homogeneity of variance between all conditions within the  
5 same experiment.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

### 2.3 Analyses

14 Analyses were done using the *brms* package (Bürkner, 2017) in R (R Core Team, 2021).  
15  
16 To aggregate evidence for priming effects across studies, we used hierarchical Bayesian analyses  
17 to model the Hedge's  $g$  measures derived from all the experimental data. A random intercept of  
18 experimental comparison nested within paper was included in all models to capture the residual  
19 variance caused by non-uniform factors, such as language, testing method, research team, and  
20 population. We also took the uncertainty in the effect size in the original paper into consideration  
21 by modelling the effect size derived from a Normal distribution parameterized by the mean and  
22 standard error of Hedge's  $g$ , as described in section 2.2.2. Throughout the paper, we used a  
23 Normal (0,1) prior on standard deviations and no prior on coefficients because we did not have  
24 prior belief about whether we would find an effect, but also did not expect large effect sizes. A  
25 sensitivity analysis ([available in the supplemental materials on the OSF page](#)) showed little  
26 variation in posterior distributions for a range of prior values.  
27  
28

43 We report the median value of the posterior distribution for each parameter of interest,  
44 along with values denoting the upper and lower limits of the 95% Credible Interval, from which  
45 we can make inferences about the likelihood of the values of the parameter. Because priming  
46 results in faster reaction times in experiment conditions when compared to the control  
47 conditions, priming or facilitation is represented by negative effects sizes in this paper. An  
48 aggregate effect size is credible if the interval does not include zero. In cases where the 95%  
49 credible interval includes zero, we also report the posterior probability of the effect size, which  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 corresponds to the proportion of credible values less than zero and represents the probability of  
5 having any nonzero priming effect.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

### 11 3 Results 12


13 In the sections that follow, we first (section 3.1) answered two questions about potential  
14 publication bias in the priming literature: is there any evidence for selective submission or  
15 publication bias, and if researchers have tried out different statistical analyses or modified  
16 eligibility specifications and then selectively reported only those that produce significant results.  
17  
18 Next, we determined whether there is root or template priming, and how priming may be  
19 affected by methodological variables (section 3.2). The variables investigated were: modality of  
20 presentation, masking, stimulus onset asynchrony, and the task presented to subjects - naming  
21 latency versus lexical decision. Finally, we assessed substantive moderators thought to affect  
22 root (section 3.3) and template priming (section 3.4), including language and word class. In  
23 sections 3.3 and 3.4, we also evaluated the proposal that root and template priming effects may  
24 be attributed to just overlap in form and meaning (for roots) or morphosyntactic function (for  
25 templates).  
26  
27

#### 28 **3.1 Evaluating bias in the morphological priming literature** 29

##### 30 *3.1.1 Evidence for selective submission or publication bias* 31

32 In order to detect publication bias resulting from selective recruitment practices or small-  
33 study effects (Sterne & Egger, 2001; Sterne & Harbord, 2004), we first used a funnel plot, in  
34 which Hedge's  $g$  is plotted against 1/Standard Error (Figure 2). Any asymmetries in the funnel  
35 plot signal that results which did not confirm *a priori* hypotheses failed to get published. These  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

asymmetries are most likely to be found in the bottom of the funnel plot where power is low, but estimates of effect size are large (Vasisht et al., 2018).



**Figure 2.** Funnel plot of the effect size (Hedge's g) against 1/Standard Error. Each dot represents a single experiment in the meta-analysis. The red dotted line indicates the median effect size, while the paler lines indicate the 95% Credible Interval.

We can see in Figure 2 that outliers contribute substantially to the asymmetry in our funnel plot; low-powered studies (low on the vertical axis) skewed towards the left on the horizontal axis, with large negative effect sizes. This shows a bias where other studies with low power might have been conducted but not published if they resulted in non-significant effects. The left skew of the distribution was confirmed by a Bayesian implementation of Egger's test (Egger et al., 1997), which is a linear regression of effect size estimates normalised using standard error weighted by its inverse variance. The estimate for this model's intercept was

negative and excluded zero ( $\beta = -2.27$ , 95% CrI [-3.61, -0.94],  $p(\beta < 0) = 1$ ). Furthermore, the model intercept has a 97% probability of being negative even when the three outliers (clusters at and below -2) were excluded from the analysis. In other words, experiments that confirmed the *a priori* hypothesis that root and template overlap facilitates target recognition have been favoured in the published literature.

### 3.1.2 No evidence of *p*-hacking

Next, we carried out a *p*-curve analysis using the *pcurve()* function from the *dmetar* package (Harrer et al., 2019). This was done to evaluate whether there is evidence of “*p*-hacking”, where researchers try out different statistical analyses or modify eligibility specifications and then selectively report those that produce significant results.

In a *p*-curve analysis, the distribution of *p*-values below 0.05 are examined to determine whether they are (a) more likely to have arisen from a series of studies testing a robust underlying effect (a right-skewed *p*-curve), (b) indistinguishable from those which would arise under a null underlying effect (flat *p*-curve), or (c) the likely result of extensive *p*-hacking, and therefore of questionable evidentiary value (left-skewed *p*-curve). We found evidence of right-skewness ( $p < 0.001$ ) with a power of 0.71 (95% CrI [0.61, 0.79]), indicating that there were enough studies included in the meta-analysis to provide a reasonably-powered estimate of the right-skewness of the *p*-value distribution. This confirms the absence of *p*-hacking in the root and template priming experiments aggregated in the meta-analysis. Instead, a robust underlying effect has been documented in the literature.

1  
2  
3  
4 **3.2 Overall effect size and methodological factors influencing the size of the priming effect**  
5

6 **3.2.1 Is there root and template priming?**  
7

8 To assess the extent of root and template priming, we calculated the aggregate meta-  
9 analytic effect sizes for all priming experiments involving either root or template overlap  
10 separately. Note that priming effects have negative effect sizes because experimental conditions  
11 with related primes are expected to facilitate lexical access of related items and therefore result  
12 in faster reaction times relative to control conditions.  
13  
14

15 Aggregating across 87 experiments with root overlap on 3930 participants, we found a  
16 medium effect size for root priming. The pooled effect size was -0.45, with 95% Credible  
17 Interval (CrI) = [-0.52, -0.39] and  $p(\beta < 0) = 1$ . That is, we can be 100% confident that the effect  
18 size is negative, and 95% confident that the size of the effect is between -0.52 and -0.39;  
19 henceforth we only report  $p$ -direction in cases where the 95% Credible Interval includes 0. A  
20 forest plot showing the effect sizes for individual experiments evaluating root priming as well as  
21 the pooled effects is available on the [OSF page](#).  
22  
23

24 Based on 63 experiments with template overlap on 1604 participants (this set has partial  
25 overlap with the root-related experiments), we also found evidence of a medium effect size for  
26 template priming, The overall effect size was -0.37 (95% CrI [-0.50, -0.23]). Thus, the template  
27 priming effect was somewhat smaller than the root priming effect and had a lot more variation,  
28 but was still robust. A forest plot for template priming is also available on the [OSF page](#).  
29  
30  
31

32 **3.2.2 Methodological factors**  
33  
34


35 **3.2.2.1 Root priming effects are smallest with visual primes, do not vary with masking of**  
36 **the visual prime, and are minimally affected by SOA.** To determine if root priming effects  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

were modulated by the methodology of the priming experiment, we compared effect sizes for the 3 most widely used paradigms without masked primes: auditory priming, where both primes and targets are presented auditorily (5 experiments, 204 subjects); cross-modal priming, where primes are presented auditorily and targets are visual (10 experiments, 412 subjects); and visual priming, where primes and targets are both presented visually (11 experiments, 720 subjects).

We also compared results from masked visual priming, where both primes and targets are presented visually, but the primes are masked (47 experiments, 1852 subjects).

Overall, there was credible root priming in all paradigms (Figure 3A). The largest effect size was found in auditory priming experiments ( $\beta = -0.98$ , 95% CrI [-1.23, -0.73]), followed by cross-modal ( $\beta = -0.68$ , 95% CrI [-0.85, -0.51]), with the smallest effect size in visual, regardless of whether the visual primes were nonmasked ( $\beta = -0.49$ , 95% CrI [-0.64, -0.35]) or masked ( $\beta = -0.44$ , 95% CrI [-0.51, -0.37]).


Moreover, the paradigms were credibly different. Root priming was credibly larger in auditory priming compared to cross-modal priming experiments ( $\beta = -0.30$ , 95% CrI [-0.59, -0.02]), and credibly smaller in visual priming experiments compared to cross-modal priming experiments ( $\beta = -0.23$ , 95% CrI [-0.40, -0.06]). However, there was no credible difference in the extent of visual priming whether primes were masked or nonmasked ( $\beta = -0.05$ , 95% CrI [-0.20, 0.09],  $p(\beta < 0) = 0.77$ ).




**Figure 3.** Effect sizes for root priming (panel A) and template priming (panel B) plotted as a function of priming methodology. Point estimates are the medians of the posterior distribution for each group, with error bars marking the boundaries of the 95% Credible Interval. Each dot represents a single experiment's effect size in the model; the horizontal red dashed line marks an effect size of zero.

Within masked visual priming paradigms, the timing between the onset of the prime and the onset of the target, referred to as the Stimulus Onset Asynchrony (SOA), has been reported to affect the magnitude and type of priming. To evaluate SOA effects, we first generated a histogram of the number of subjects tested as a function of the SOA (Figure 4). Next, we exploited the natural breaks in the wide range of SOAs included in this meta-analysis to divide the experiments investigating masked priming into 5 bins: 30-35ms (10 experiments, 254 subjects), 40-45ms (15 experiments, 790 subjects), 45-50ms (13 experiments, 518 subjects), 60-65ms (4 experiments, 126 subjects), and 75-80ms (4 experiments, 114 subjects). Root priming

with 100% credibility was observed for all SOA bins (30-35ms:  $\beta = -0.31$ , 95% CrI [-0.50, -0.13]; 40-45ms:  $\beta = -0.51$ , 95% CrI [-0.62, -0.40]; 45-50ms:  $\beta = -0.32$ , 95% CrI [-0.45, -0.19]; 60-65ms:  $\beta = -0.70$ , 95% CrI [-0.97, -0.43]; 75-80ms:  $\beta = -0.62$ , 95% CrI [-0.90, -0.34]). As shown in Figure 5A, the 30-35ms and 45-50ms bins had the smallest magnitude of root priming and were not credibly different from each other. There were larger effects of root priming at an SOA of 40-45ms compared to 30-35ms ( $\beta = -0.19$ , 95% CrI [-0.41, 0.02],  $p(\beta < 0) = 0.96$ ). Effects of priming were also greater at SOAs of 60-65ms and 75-80ms compared to the 30-35ms group, with 99% and 95% confidence, respectively, although this comparison is less reliable because there were very few experiments with the longest SOAs.



**Figure 4.** Number of participants in masked visual priming experiments across the range of Stimulus Onset Asynchrony (SOA) values (ms) investigating roots (panel A) and templates (panel B).



**Figure 5.** Effect sizes for different SOA values in root priming (panel A) and template priming experiments (panel B). Point estimates are the medians of the posterior distribution for each group, with error bars marking the boundaries of the 95% Credible Interval. Each dot represents a single experiment's effect size in the model; the horizontal red dashed line marks an effect size of zero.


**3.2.2.2 Template priming is affected by SOA but not prime and target modality.** The extent to which template priming is modulated by methodology was also evaluated by comparing effect sizes across 3 paradigms: auditory priming (7 experiments, 262 subjects), cross-modal priming (14 experiments, 576 subjects), and visual priming (31 experiments, 1206 subjects). Because all visual priming experiments on template priming used masked primes, we are unable to distinguish the effects of modality of presentation from that of prime masking.

Template priming was also credible in all paradigms, as shown in Figure 3B. The effect size was the largest numerically for auditory priming ( $\beta = -0.75$ , 95% CrI [-1.18, -0.33]), followed by cross-modal ( $\beta = -0.57$ , 95% CrI [-0.86, -0.28]), with the smallest effects in (masked) visual priming ( $\beta = -0.35$ , 95% CrI [-0.55, -0.15]). However, there was only a credible difference in effect size when auditory priming was compared to visual priming ( $\beta = -0.40$ , 95% CrI [-0.88, 0.06],  $p(\beta < 0) = 0.96$ ), though the larger effect size in auditory priming needs to be interpreted with caution. This paradigm was used least often, therefore its effect size estimate is the most unstable, as indicated by the very large credible interval (see the supplementary materials on [OSF](#) for Bayesian estimates of more nuanced comparisons between methods).

We also examined the effect of SOA on masked visual template priming experiments. The same 5 SOA bins (Figure 4B) were used here as with root priming: 30-35ms (4 experiments, 101 subjects), 40-45ms (10 experiments, 468 subjects), 45-50ms (13 experiments, 517 subjects), 60-65ms (2 experiments, 63 subjects), and 75-80ms (2 experiments, 57 subjects). Unlike for root priming, credible template priming with 100% credibility was only observed in two SOA bins (40-45ms:  $\beta = -0.35$ , 95% CrI [-0.55, -0.16]; 45-50ms:  $\beta = -0.47$ , 95% CrI [-0.65, -0.30]), with near credible priming observed for SOAs of 60-65ms ( $\beta = -0.37$ , 95% CrI [-0.84, 0.10],  $p(\beta < 0) = 0.94$ ). There was no credible priming effect for the shortest SOA of 30-35ms ( $\beta = 0.01$ , 95% CrI [-0.34, 0.36],  $p(\beta > 0) = 0.52$ ) or the longest SOA of 75-80ms ( $\beta = 0.02$ , 95% CrI [-0.47, 0.49],  $p(\beta < 0) = 0.52$ ). The results are shown in Figure 5B.

**3.2.2.3 No difference in root or template priming effects found with lexical decision or naming tasks.** Finally, we evaluated if there were any differences in effect size related to the dependent variables measured in these priming experiments. Reaction times measured in a

lexical decision task were by far the most common dependent variable in the priming experiments included in this meta-analysis, with naming latencies used in some others. Since all experiments measuring naming latencies involved masked visual priming (roots: 4 experiments, 192 subjects; templates: 4 experiments, 192 subjects), we compared their effect size to reaction times measured in lexical decision tasks that also only involved masked visual priming (roots: 43 experiments, 1660 subjects; templates: 27 experiments, 1014 subjects). As shown in Figure 6A, we found comparable, credible root priming effects using reaction times from lexical decision tasks ( $\beta = -0.44$ , 95% CrI [-0.52, -0.37]) and for naming latencies ( $\beta = -0.36$ , 95% CrI [-0.59, -0.13]). As shown in Figure 6B, we also found credible template priming for both tasks (lexical decision:  $\beta = -0.34$ , 95% CrI [-0.47, -0.20]; naming:  $\beta = -0.41$ , 95% CrI [-0.73, -0.09]). For both root and template priming, there were no credible differences between the two tasks. In all following analyses, we combine experiments using both tasks.



**Figure 6.** Effect sizes of root (panel A) and template priming (panel B) for lexical decision and naming latency tasks. Point estimates are the medians of the posterior distribution for each group, with error bars marking the boundaries of the 95% Credible Interval. Each dot represents a single experiment's effect size in the model; the horizontal red dashed line marks an effect size of zero.

### 3.3 Substantive effects on root priming

#### 3.3.1 Root priming does not differ across word class or language

We now turn to a discussion of the effects of language and word class on root priming.

Unfortunately, even with a dataset of almost 87 experiments from 3930 participants, the data were too unevenly distributed to evaluate the interaction of method, word class, and language.

Because there were too few auditory priming experiments, we did not include them in the analyses in this section. Instead, we first evaluated the interaction of word class and language only within visual priming experiments, where root priming effects were the smallest. We combined experiments with masked and nonmasked visual primes because there were no credible differences in root priming effects regardless of masking. We then conducted this analysis for cross-modal priming experiments as well to see if any effects of language and word class are modulated by modality of prime presentation.

Since there were very few studies investigating root priming in Maltese, we only compared priming effects in Arabic and Hebrew. We compared root priming in Arabic nouns (12 experiments, 454 subjects) and verbs (10 experiments, 288 subjects) with root priming effects in Hebrew nouns (25 experiments, 1577 subjects) and verbs (8 experiments, 258 subjects).

The effect sizes for root priming in both languages for nouns and verbs are presented in Figure 7. None of the credible intervals included 0, therefore root priming was credible in nouns and in verbs in both Arabic and Hebrew. Furthermore, there was no credible effect of language ( $\beta = 0.07$ , CrI = [-0.11, 0.26],  $p(\beta > 0) = 0.78$ ) or word class ( $\beta = -0.14$ , CrI = [-0.39, 0.11],  $p(\beta < 0) = 0.87$ ) or their interaction ( $\beta = 0.24$ , CrI = [-0.10, 0.58],  $p(\beta > 0) = 0.92$ ).




Figure 7. Root priming effect sizes for nouns and verbs in Arabic (panel A) and Hebrew (panel B) for all visual priming experiments. Point estimates are the medians of the posterior distribution for each group, with error bars marking the boundaries of the 95% Credible Interval. Each dot represents a single experiment's effect size in the model; the horizontal red dashed line marks an effect size of zero.

Next, we examined whether root priming effects differ across language and word class when tested using cross-modal priming. The number of experiments available for this comparison was much smaller: 3 experiments on Arabic nouns (120 subjects), none on Arabic verbs, two experiments on Hebrew nouns (120 subjects), and two experiments on Hebrew verbs (60 subjects). Root priming was credible in all of these groups (Arabic nouns:  $\beta = -0.71$ , CrI = [-1.13, -0.29]; Hebrew nouns:  $\beta = -0.90$ , CrI = [-1.39, -0.43]; Hebrew verbs:  $\beta = -0.60$ , CrI = [-1.13, -0.07]). We found that root priming in Arabic nouns was not credibly different from that in

Hebrew nouns ( $\beta = 0.19$ , CrI = [-0.47, 0.83],  $p(\beta > 0) = 0.75$ ), which, in turn, was not different from root priming in Hebrew verbs ( $\beta = 0.29$ , CrI = [-0.48, 1.03],  $p(\beta > 0) = 0.82$ ). No such comparison was possible for auditory priming, where all studies were on Arabic nouns. Though limited by the small number of studies using the cross-modal priming methodology, the converging results indicate that root priming effects are similar in visual and cross-modal priming paradigms, with no differences across languages or word class.

### 3.3.2 Root priming is independent of both semantic and form overlap


Next, we investigated whether root priming is simply a result of shared meaning and form between two root-related words or whether it represents morphological effects that can be disentangled from the two. Independence of root priming from semantic overlap is typically investigated in two different ways, both of which we investigated. Because there were no credible differences across languages and word class, analyses in this section included them all.

In the first way of separating root overlap from meaning overlap, root-related prime-target pairs with a transparent semantic relationship (e.g., Hebrew *madrix* ‘guide’ and *hadraxa* ‘guidance’) are compared to those with an opaque semantic relationship (e.g., Hebrew *drixut* ‘alertness’ and *hadraxa* ‘guidance’). If priming is observed in root-related pairs with an opaque semantic relationship, it cannot be attributed to semantic overlap.

The following analysis (presented in Figure 8) includes only nonmasked priming experiments, and provides a comparison of priming effects in root-related pairs with an opaque (8 experiments, 448 subjects) or transparent (13 experiments, 656 subjects) semantic relationship. As expected, root priming effects were credible when there was a transparent semantic relationship between primes and targets ( $\beta = -0.75$ , CrI = [-0.91, -0.59]). It was also

credibly greater when compared to priming of semantically-opaque, root-related pairs ( $\beta = -0.32$ , CrI = [-0.56, -0.08]), which might be expected given that prime-target pairs with a transparent semantic relationship additionally overlap in meaning. We also replicated differences in root priming effects across methods. Consistent with the finding in section 3.2.2, the extent of root priming differed across methodologies, with the smallest effect in visual priming experiments ( $\beta = 0.35$ , CrI = [-0.09, 0.81],  $p(\beta > 0) = 0.94$ ). Further, there was no interaction between the type of semantic overlap and methodology (auditory vs. cross-modal:  $\beta = 0.40$ , CrI = [-0.25, 1.06],  $p(\beta > 0) = 0.89$ ; auditory vs. visual:  $\beta = 0.23$ , CrI = [-0.41, 0.86],  $p(\beta > 0) = 0.76$ ).

Crucially, however, root priming was still credible when there was an opaque semantic relationship between primes and targets ( $\beta = -0.42$ , CrI = [-0.62, -0.24]). This shows that root priming does not result solely from overlap in meaning. However, there still remains the question of whether the priming in opaque roots is morphological in nature or merely due to form overlap.



1  
 2  
 3  
 4 **Figure 8.** Root priming effect sizes for experiments with either an opaque or transparent  
 5 semantic relation between primes and targets, across modalities. Point estimates are the  
 6 medians of the posterior distribution for each group, with error bars marking the boundaries of  
 7 the 95% Credible Interval. Each dot represents a single experiment's effect size in the model; the  
 8 horizontal red dashed line marks an effect size of zero.  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18

19 To rule out the role of form overlap, we need to compare the extent of priming in cases of  
 20 morphological overlap (which always co-occurs with form overlap) to cases where there is a  
 21 comparable degree of form overlap but no morphological overlap. However, when examining the  
 22 control conditions in the studies that were compared in the analysis presented in Figure 8, nearly  
 23 all of them had a lesser degree of form overlap compared to root-related primes and targets.  
 24  
 25 Therefore, if root priming effects are found to be significantly greater than form priming effects,  
 26 it could well be attributed to the additional shared segments in root priming conditions. Thus we  
 27 need a different method to disentangle morphological effects from both form and meaning  
 28 overlap.  
 29  
 30

31 We now turn to the second way of investigating the independence of root priming from  
 32 meaning overlap: masked visual priming. In masked visual priming experiments, primes are  
 33 presented for such a brief period of time that semantic access is interrupted before the  
 34 presentation of the target, thus minimising semantic priming effects (Frost et al., 1997; Perea et  
 35 al., 1995). First, to confirm that masking the prime minimises the influence of meaning overlap,  
 36 we compared reaction time differences between unrelated control prime-target pairs to root-  
 37 related prime-target pairs (Figure 9A). The root-related pairs were further divided depending on  
 38 whether they had an opaque or transparent semantic relationship. The extent of masked visual  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65

1  
2  
3  
4 priming was comparable regardless of the semantic transparency between primes and targets ( $\beta =$   
5  
6  $-0.12$ , CrI = [-0.48, 0.24],  $p(\beta < 0) = 0.74$ ). This is in contrast with the results from nonmasked  
7  
8 priming (Figure 8), where semantic transparency between primes and targets did affect the extent  
9 of root priming. Therefore, we can confirm that masking visual primes does in fact minimise the  
10 influence of meaning overlap.  
11  
12


13 As all experiments included in the meta-analysis looked at regular, trilateral roots, all  
14 root-related prime-target pairs shared an overlap of 3 segments. Thus, the most conservative test  
15 for a dissociation between morphological overlap and form overlap would entail a comparison of  
16 root priming against the priming effects obtained for morphologically-unrelated prime-target  
17 pairs which also overlap in 3 segments. Furthermore, to distinguish morphological priming  
18 effects from the conjoined effects of form and meaning overlap, this comparison should be done  
19 looking only at masked priming experiments, which minimises any effects of meaning overlap.  
20  
21 If the extent of priming for morphologically-related pairs is found to be greater than the extent of  
22 priming for morphologically-unrelated pairs with an equivalent amount of form overlap, this  
23 would be evidence for a morphological priming effect over and above a combination of form and  
24 meaning overlap. However, we do not have enough experiments to make such a comparison.  
25  
26

27 Instead, we approximated such a comparison by exploiting the variation in the types of  
28 control primes used across masked visual priming experiments. Recall that priming is measured  
29 as the facilitation in reaction time or naming latency relative to some control condition. In the  
30 root priming experiments in our dataset, control stimuli were either completely unrelated to  
31 targets or had some degree of form overlap, where the extent of overlap ranged from one to 3  
32 shared consonants, possibly including some additional vowels. This variation allowed us to  
33 compare the extent of root priming obtained when control primes were completely unrelated to  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 the targets vs the extent of root priming when control prime-target pairs had an overlap of three  
5 segments, comparable to the form overlap in root-related conditions.  
6  
7

8  
9 Looking at masked visual priming experiments, we first examined the effect of the extent  
10 of form overlap in controls (unrelated: 14 experiments, 422 subjects; three-segment overlap: 8  
11 experiments, 375 subjects) for root-related target-prime pairs with a transparent semantic  
12 relationship. There was no credible difference in the extent of root priming whether root-related  
13 conditions were compared to completely unrelated controls or to form-related controls with a 3-  
14 segment overlap ( $\beta = 0.12$ , CrI = [-0.12, 0.35],  $p(\beta > 0) = 0.84$ ), as shown in Figure 9 (see the left  
15 columns of 9A and 9B).  
16  
17

18 For a more direct test, still focusing on masked visual priming experiments, we looked at  
19 the extent of priming found when root-related prime-target pairs with an opaque semantic  
20 relationship where compared to completely unrelated control pairs (10 experiments, 302  
21 subjects) versus when the control prime-target pairs had an overlap of 3 segments (2  
22 experiments, 87 subjects), shown in the right columns of Figure 9A and 9B. Again, there was no  
23 credible difference in the extent of root priming between the two kinds of control conditions ( $\beta =$   
24 -0.12, CrI = [-0.50, 0.26],  $p(\beta < 0) = 0.73$ ). Crucially, as shown in the right column of Figure 9B,  
25 root-related pairs with an opaque semantic relationship still primed credibly even when  
26 compared to control pairs with 3-segment overlap ( $\beta = -0.37$ , CrI = [-0.71, -0.02]), although the  
27 credible interval was large due to the small sample size. This credible priming effect is not  
28 expected if root priming is simply the result of an additive effect of form and meaning overlap.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



**Figure 9.** Root priming effects for experiments where the semantic relationship between primes and targets was transparent vs. opaque compared to unrelated controls (panel A) and controls with 3-segment overlap (panel B). Point estimates are the medians of the posterior distribution for each group, with error bars marking the boundaries of the 95% Credible Interval. Each dot represents a single experiment's effect size in the model; the horizontal red dashed line marks an effect size of zero.

We can be sure that root priming effects reported in the right column of Figure 9B cannot be attributed to overlap in meaning, as these are for prime-target pairs with an opaque semantic relationship in masked visual priming. If root priming is obtained solely because root-related pairs overlap in form and meaning, in cases where meaning overlap is irrelevant (i.e., masked priming of pairs with an opaque semantic relationship), then there should be no facilitation effect of root-related primes when compared to morphologically-unrelated primes with a comparable

amount of form overlap (i.e., 3 segments). Thus, the fact that credible priming is in fact obtained in this context is evidence that morphological relationships, specifically in the form of a shared root, play a special role in lexical representation that is distinct from effects of shared form and meaning.

### 3.4 Substantive effects on template priming


#### 3.4.1 Verbal templates prime more than nominal templates in both Arabic and Hebrew

Next, we examined the effects of language and word class on template priming. As discussed in section 1.1, template priming has been reported to be typically more robust for verbs than nouns. Such effects are often attributed to differences in type frequency, since verbal templates have a higher overall type frequency than nominal ones (e.g., Deutsch et al. 1998).

Based on the findings on methodological effects (section 3.2.2.2), we excluded auditory priming experiments because template priming was credibly different for auditory priming compared to visual priming. We also excluded experiments with masked primes where the SOA was 30-35 ms, 60-65 ms, or 75-80 ms, because there was no credible template priming for these SOA values. Because there were too few studies on Maltese, we were only able to compare template priming effects in Hebrew and Arabic. These 3 exclusions hold for all analyses reported in section 3.4. The final set included 16 template priming experiments on Arabic nouns (730 subjects), 10 on Arabic verbs (357 subjects), 8 on Hebrew nouns (420 subjects), and 9 on Hebrew verbs (382 subjects). The effect sizes are plotted in Figure 10.

As expected, we found a credible effect of word class such that there was greater priming for verbs than nouns ( $\beta = -0.49$ , CrI = [-0.80, -0.19]). Surprisingly, the effect of language was not credible ( $\beta = 0.11$ , CrI = [-0.21, 0.43],  $p(\beta > 0) = 0.75$ ), nor was the interaction of language with

word class ( $\beta = 0.03$ , CrI = [-0.44, 0.51],  $p(\beta > 0) = 0.56$ ). In fact, we found a small but credible effect of template priming in Hebrew nouns ( $\beta = -0.18$ , CrI = [-0.33, -0.03]), despite the fact that the findings of individual studies on nominal template priming in Hebrew are inconsistent.



**Figure 10.** Template priming effect sizes as a function of word class (noun or verb) in Arabic (panel A) and Hebrew (panel B). Point estimates are the medians of the posterior distribution for each group, with error bars marking the boundaries of the 95% Credible Interval. Each dot represents a single experiment's effect size in the model; the horizontal red dashed line marks an effect size of zero.

1  
2  
3  
4 *3.4.2 Mixed evidence that template priming is independent of morphosyntactic overlap*  
5  
6

7 Analogous to semantic overlap between root-related pairs, template priming effects could  
8 potentially be attributed to the shared morphosyntactic function of primes and targets. Similar to  
9 the differences in semantic transparency in root-related pairs, template-related pairs can also  
10 differ in whether they share the same morphosyntactic function. For example, the Arabic words  
11 *χuduu* ‘submission’ and *ħuduuθ* ‘happening’ share the template CVCVVC as well as the  
12 morphosyntactic property of being verbal nouns. However, *suzuun* ‘prisons’ also has the same  
13 prosodic template, but denotes the plural form of a noun instead of a gerund and thus is an  
14 example of a single template being associated with multiple morphosyntactic functions.  
15  
16

17 To disambiguate the effect of morphosyntactic overlap from template overlap, we  
18 compared the extent of priming for template-related pairs with (30 experiments, 1287 subjects)  
19 and without (2 experiments, 80 subjects) shared morphosyntactic function. Because there were  
20 differences in the extent of template priming across word class, we further subdivided template-  
21 related pairs with morphosyntactic overlap into those involving nouns (18 experiments, 836  
22 subjects) versus verbs (12 experiments, 451 subjects).  
23  
24

25 As shown in Figure 11, there was no credible priming when template-related pairs did not  
26 share morphosyntactic function ( $\beta = -0.19$ , 95% CrI [-0.77, 0.38],  $p(\beta < 0) = 0.75$ ), but we found  
27 credible effects for morphosyntactically-related pairs regardless of whether they shared nominal  
28 templates ( $\beta = -0.29$ , 95% CrI [-0.46, -0.12]) or verbal templates ( $\beta = -0.70$ , 95% CrI [-0.92, -  
29 0.48]). Morphosyntactically-related verb pairs primed credibly more than both related noun pairs  
30 ( $\beta = -0.41$ , 95% CrI [-0.69, -0.14]) and morphosyntactically-unrelated pairs ( $\beta = -0.51$ , 95% CrI  
31 [-1.07, 0.04],  $p(\beta < 0) = 0.97$ ). Additionally, there was no credible difference in the extent of  
32 priming between morphosyntactically-related noun pairs and -unrelated pairs ( $\beta = -0.10$ , 95%  
33  
34

4 CrI [-0.64, 0.44],  $p(\beta < 0) = 0.64$ ), despite the fact that the former primes credibly and the latter  
5 does not. This is due to the small sample size of the latter group, causing a very large credible  
6 interval which subsumes the credible interval of the former group (see Figure 11). While we  
7 currently do not find credible priming for template-related pairs without shared morphosyntactic  
8 function, we cannot dismiss the potential that, with more experiments, this effect may indeed end  
9 up credible, though with a small effect size like that of the morphosyntactically-related noun  
10 group.  
11

12 The effect of word class on template priming (i.e., that verbal templates prime more than  
13 nominal ones) is likely due to type frequency, which is higher for verbal templates. This may  
14 also explain the absence of priming in template-related pairs without morphosyntactic overlap. In  
15 the two experiments that make up this group (from the same paper: Boudelaa & Marslen-Wilson,  
16 2015), the templates were of varying productivity. Since one of the experiments was on nouns  
17 and the other on verbs, we could not assess the effect of morphosyntactic overlap and word class  
18 simultaneously. Therefore, we need experiments where word class and, more importantly, type  
19 frequency is carefully controlled before we can make any claims about whether template priming  
20 effects arise independent of overlap in morphosyntactic function.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65




Figure 11. Template priming effect sizes plotted as a function of whether there was morphosyntactic overlap between prime-target pairs. Point estimates are the medians of the posterior distribution for each group, with error bars marking the boundaries of the 95% Credible Interval. Each dot represents a single experiment's effect size in the model; the horizontal red dashed line marks an effect size of zero.


### 3.4.3 Template priming is independent of form overlap

Next, we present analyses to dissociate template overlap from form overlap. The most conservative test would entail a comparison of the extent of template priming (33 experiments, 1407 subjects) with the extent of priming between pairs of words with a near complete overlap in prosodic structure (full overlap would by our definition constitute template overlap). There were only three such experiments (99 subjects).

1  
2  
3  
4 Since prosodic information is minimally represented in the orthographies of Arabic and  
5 Hebrew, one might expect distinct form priming results from visual priming experiments versus  
6 those from cross-modal priming experiments. In the former, primes are presented visually (using  
7 orthography) whereas in the latter, primes are auditory. However, since we had only 3  
8 experiments with near complete form overlap between prime-target pairs (two visual and one  
9 cross-modal) we were not able to make this distinction.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 As shown in Figure 12, no credible priming was found for prime-target pairs with solely  
19 form overlap ( $\beta = 0.14$ , 95% CrI [-0.33, 0.62],  $p(\beta > 0) = 0.73$ ), whereas priming for template-  
20 related pairs was credible ( $\beta = -0.46$ , 95% CrI [-0.61, -0.31]) and was additionally credibly  
21 greater than the priming for pairs with just form overlap ( $\beta = -0.60$ , 95% CrI [-1.09, -0.11]).  
22 These results show that template priming effects cannot be reduced to effects of form overlap,  
23 because form overlap, even when it involves both partial prosodic overlap and sometimes  
24 segmental form overlap, did not result in priming.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 The general finding from many different languages is that form overlap alone between  
36 primes and targets typically does not result in a facilitation effect and often even results in an  
37 inhibition effect (e.g., Slowiaczek & Hamburger, 1992; see Dufour, 2008 for review). We found  
38 that overlap of (partial) prosodic information and segmental form caused neither facilitation nor  
39 inhibition (Figure 12). Similarly, we previously indirectly confirmed that the 3-segment overlap  
40 in morphologically-unrelated control pairs also caused neither facilitation nor inhibition, since  
41 there was no credible difference in the root priming effect when root-related pairs were  
42 compared to completely unrelated versus form-related controls (Figure 9).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



**Figure 12.** Template priming effects compared to the effects when prime-target pairs overlap in form alone. Point estimates are the medians of the posterior distribution for each group, with error bars marking the boundaries of the 95% Credible Interval. Each dot represents a single experiment's effect size in the model; the horizontal red dashed line marks an effect size of zero.

We are not able to examine whether template priming is credible when both morphosyntactic and form overlap are controlled for using our dataset. More experiments are required to make this comparison, specifically those investigating priming in template-related pairs without morphosyntactic overlap with respect to form-related pairs where the extent of overlap is comparable to that in templates.

Additionally, it may be useful to use priming experiments to investigate the potentially different contributions that various subparts of the traditional ‘word pattern’ may make for morphological priming. For example, the Arabic word pattern *ta-CaaCaC* can be further decomposed into a combination of the prosodic template CVVCVC, the vocalic melody [-aa-a-],

1  
2  
3  
4 the prefix *ta-*, and the morphosyntactic function of being a past tense reciprocal verb. In our  
5 coding of template overlap, we used a very broad definition of template, which includes any  
6 word pair that has a complete overlap in prosodic template, whereas the actual experiments often  
7 used some combination of the 4 subparts. More experiments controlling for the various subparts  
8 of the traditional word pattern are needed.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

## 15 4 General Discussion

### 16

### 17

### 18

19 In this paper, we aggregated data from 4710 unique participants in 229 experiments on  
20 Semitic languages to assess the evidence for priming by nonconcatenative morphemes, namely  
21 roots and templates. With Bayesian modelling of the meta-analytic effect size, we were able to  
22 draw inferences about experimental design for future studies, cross-linguistic differences in root  
23 and template priming, and implications for their representations. We discuss each in turn.  
24  
25

26 First, the findings from the meta-analysis provide useful guidance for future priming  
27 experiments. Nonconcatenative morphological priming effects were largest when using the  
28 auditory priming methodology, followed by cross-modal priming, and were smallest when using  
29 visual priming. In contrast, priming effects were insensitive to task, with similar effect sizes for  
30 naming and lexical decision. Additionally, only template priming, not root priming, was sensitive  
31 to SOA; in masked visual priming, template priming was credible only when the SOA was  
32 between 40 and 50ms.  
33  
34

35 Second, we found credible root priming in both Arabic and Hebrew for nouns and verbs,  
36 with no consistent differences in the effect sizes across language or word class. We also found  
37 converging evidence for a dissociation of root priming from priming due to overlap in form and  
38 meaning. The most compelling evidence in support of the dissociation came from credible  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 priming in two experiments where root-related pairs had an opaque semantic relationship and  
2 control conditions had a 3-segment overlap. In such cases, the opaque semantic relationship  
3 precludes overlap in meaning, and the 3-segment overlap in the control conditions had form  
4 overlap comparable to the root-related conditions. Thus, credible priming in such cases cannot be  
5 attributed to the effects of overlap in either form or meaning. The findings from these two  
6 experiments provide empirical support for the independent representation of roots as nonlinear,  
7 abstract sublexical units, which nevertheless play a crucial role in lexical processing. This aligns  
8 with the traditional approach to Semitic morphology of treating roots as morphemes (Holes,  
9 2004; McCarthy, 1979).

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
Recent evidence from computational modelling, however, calls into question whether it is necessary for morphemes to be independently represented to account for morphological priming effects in related word pairs with an opaque semantic relationship. For example, the Linear Discriminative Learner (Baayen et al., 2018) is a model that can capture morphological relationships between words by mapping between form and meaning only. Chuang et al. (2021) used the LDL to successfully model morphological priming in Dutch (Creemers et al., 2020), where there was equal facilitation regardless of whether the meaning relationship between pairs of morphologically-related words was transparent (e.g., *afwerpen* ‘throw off’ paired with the target *werpen* ‘throw’) or opaque (e.g., *ontwerpen* ‘design’). Their model was additionally able to capture the absence of facilitation in prime-target pairs that share form overlap that did not constitute a morpheme (e.g., *aanscherpen* ‘sharpen’). It should be noted, however, that the extent of form overlap in the form-related control condition in Creemers et al. (as in the majority of experiments in this meta-analysis) is smaller than the form overlap when words share morphemes (e.g., *erpen* vs. *werpen*). It is unclear whether similar priming and modelling results

would still be obtained if the extent of form overlap was comparable between the form-related controls and the morphologically related words.

Despite its limitations, Baayen et al.'s modelling demonstrates the possibility of accounting for priming effects without the independent representation of morphemes. Whether such an approach can be extended to account for the robust root priming effects described in this meta-analysis remains to be determined. There are several reasons why this might not be straightforward. Because the Linear Discriminative Learner relies on *n*-grams to encode information about form overlap, one obvious challenge is the fact that roots are made up of non-adjacent consonants. More generally, this highlights the challenge of encoding form overlap in cases of nonconcatenative root and template overlap (cf. Nieder et al., 2022 for an attempt to model plural templates in Maltese). When primes and targets are presented in the visual modality, at least for roots, this particular problem is alleviated because roots are often represented contiguously in the orthography, at least in Arabic and Hebrew, and one could model form overlap effects based on letter *n*-grams. Such a solution cannot account for results from either cross-modal or auditory priming experiments, however. This is problematic because we have shown that there are no qualitative differences in root priming effects related to modality of stimulus presentation. Thus, not only would it be unparsimonious to posit different representations to account for visual and cross-modal compared to auditory priming, but there is no empirical support for such a distinction.

Another challenge for modelling root priming is that, with almost no exceptions, the extent of form overlap in form-related conditions is less than the extent of form overlap in root-related conditions. In our meta-analysis, we were able to circumvent this limitation by carefully matching the extent of form overlap among the controls to the extent of form overlap due to

1  
2  
3  
4 shared roots. But there were only two experiments where the extent of form overlap was  
5 comparable, resulting in an imprecise estimate of the effect size. To carefully tease apart the role  
6 of form overlap from root overlap, we need more experiments where there is a comparable  
7 amount of form overlap in both the form-related and root-related conditions.  
8  
9

10  
11 Like root priming, template priming was also credible in both Arabic and Hebrew, for  
12 both nouns and verbs, although the effect was smaller than for root priming. The finding that  
13 nominal templates prime credibly in Hebrew is perhaps surprising given that there are numerous  
14 studies reporting no evidence of nominal template priming (Deutsch et al., 2005; Frost et al.,  
15 1997; *inter alia*). It is possible that template priming effects are not consistently detected in  
16 individual experiments given their smaller effect size, but that the priming effect was credible in  
17 this paper due to the increased statistical power of a meta-analytic approach. While credible, the  
18 priming effect for nominal templates was smaller than the priming effect for verbal templates.  
19 This is in contrast to root-priming, where there were no differences in effect size between nouns  
20 and verbs.  
21  
22

23  
24 It has been proposed that nominal template priming, at least in Hebrew, is relatively weak  
25 due to the lower productivity of nominal templates (e.g., Deutsch et al., 1998). We were unable  
26 to systematically evaluate this claim across experiments because there are few empirical  
27 investigations of the effects of productivity on template priming (for exceptions see Boudelaa &  
28 Marslen-Wilson, 2011, 2015). Further, because stimulus lists were unavailable for about half the  
29 experiments included in the meta-analysis, and we had no access to trial-level data, we were also  
30 unable to assess productivity effects on priming. To determine whether differences in  
31 productivity are at the core of the template priming difference between nouns and verbs, we need  
32  
33

1  
2  
3  
4 both additional empirical studies as well as shared access to raw data at the level of individuals  
5 and trials.  
6  
7

8  
9 Unlike for root priming, our meta-analysis did not provide evidence in support of a clear  
10  
11 dissociation between template priming and priming due to overlap in form and morphosyntactic  
12  
13 function. In this meta-analysis, we used template overlap to refer to complete overlap in prosodic  
14  
15 structure, regardless of segmental and morphosyntactic overlap. There was evidence that  
16  
17 template priming effects could not be reduced to effects of form overlap only; while credible  
18  
19 priming was found in template-related words, no priming was found between words with partial  
20  
21 overlap in both prosodic structure and vowels. However, there was no clear evidence in support  
22  
23 of the independent representation of templates; there was no credible priming in the two  
24  
25 experiments where the effect of template overlap without overlap in morphosyntactic function  
26  
27 was evaluated. These findings are compatible with proposals where templates are not  
28  
29 independent morphemes but are bundles of morphosyntactic information, whose surface  
30  
31 realisation can be derived from constraints on prosodic structure (e.g., Kastner, 2019). To better  
32  
33 understand the relationship between shared morphosyntactic function and form, and to  
34  
35 investigate whether it is possible to distinguish these from overlap in prosodic template, we need  
36  
37 more empirical investigations. More generally, this raises the question of how (if at all) shared  
38  
39 morphosyntactic functions are represented in the lexicon.  
40  
41

42 Finally, even with the very large sample size in the meta-analysis, we were unable to  
43  
44 make any general conclusions about Maltese. There were only 3 experiments on Maltese: two  
45  
46 investigating root priming and one on template priming, though we did see that root priming in  
47  
48 Maltese was credible (see supplemental materials on [OSF](#) for details). Whether or not template  
49  
50

1  
2  
3  
4 priming in Maltese is really different from the other Semitic languages (e.g., Ussishkin et al.,  
5  
6 2015) needs to be investigated in future research.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 **5 Conclusion**  
12  
13

14 In this meta-analysis, we aggregated data from 4710 unique participants in 229  
15 experiments on morphological priming effects in Semitic languages. Using Bayesian modelling,  
16 we established that robust priming effects are present for both roots and templates in Semitic  
17 languages, albeit smaller for templates than roots. In terms of methodological factors, priming  
18 effects were credible in all methodologies for both roots and templates, with the largest effects  
19 found with auditory priming. More substantively, root priming did not differ across word class or  
20 language, while template priming was modulated by word class. We observed a larger template  
21 priming effect in verbs than in nouns in both Arabic and Hebrew. Furthermore, we found robust  
22 root priming effects which were demonstrably independent from effects of both form and  
23 meaning overlap. In contrast, while we found credible template priming that was distinct from  
24 the effects of form overlap, more empirical work, especially that on the relationship between  
25 prosodic template overlap and morphosyntactic function, is needed. Overall, the meta-analysis  
26 provided compelling evidence for the psychological reality of nonconcatenative morphemes,  
27 particularly roots, which cannot be dismissed as an epiphenomenon resulting from overlap in  
28 form and meaning. Broadly, this underscores the importance that models of morphological  
29 processing need to be able to account for the abstract nature of nonlinear morphemes.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

**Disclosure of interest:** The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

**Data availability statement:** The data that support the findings of this study and all supplemental material are openly available on OSF at <http://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/2WR5T>

## References

Abu-Rabia, S. & Awwad, J. (2004). Morphological structures in visual word recognition: The case of Arabic. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 27(3), 321–336.

Albright, A., & Hayes, B. (2003). Rules vs. analogy in English past tenses: A computational/experimental study. *Cognition*, 90(2), 119-161.

Baayen, R. H., Chuang, Y. Y., Shafaei-Bajestan, E., & Blevins, J. P. (2019). The discriminative lexicon: A unified computational model for the lexicon and lexical processing in comprehension and production grounded not in (de) composition but in linear discriminative learning. *Complexity*, vol. 2019, Article 4895891.

Bat-El, O. (1994). Stem modification and cluster transfer in Modern Hebrew. *Natural Language and Linguistics Theory*, 12, 571-596.

Bat-El, O. (2003). The fate of the consonantal root and the binyan in Optimality Theory. *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes*, (32), 31-60.

Bentin, S. & Feldman, L. B. (1990). The contribution of morphological and semantic relatedness to repetition priming at short and long lags: Evidence from hebrew. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 42(4), 693-711.

Bergmann, C., Tsuji, S., Piccinini, P. E., Lewis, M. L., Braginsky, M., Frank, M. C. & Cristia, A. (2018). Promoting replicability in developmental research through meta-analyses: Insights from language acquisition research. *Child Development*, 89, 1996-2009.

Berent, I. & Pinker, S. (2007). The dislike of regular plurals in compounds: Phonological or morphological? *The Mental Lexicon*, 2(2), 129-181.

Blevins, J. P. (2016). *Word and Paradigm Morphology*. Oxford University Press.

1 Boudelaa, S. & Marslen-Wilson, W. D. (2000). Non-concatenative morphemes in language  
2 processing: Evidence from modern standard Arabic. In A. Cutler, J. McQueen, & R.  
3 Zondervan (Eds.), *Proceedings of SWAP (Workshop on Spoken Word Access Processes)*  
4 (vol. 1, pp. 23-26). Max-Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.  
5  
6 Boudelaa, S. & Marslen-Wilson, W. D. (2005). Discontinuous morphology in time: Incremental  
7 masked priming in Arabic. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 20(1), 207–260.  
8  
9 Boudelaa, S. & Marslen-Wilson, W. D. (2011). Productivity and priming: Morphemic  
10 decomposition in Arabic. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 26(4-6), 624-652.  
11  
12 Boudelaa, S. & Marslen-Wilson, W. D. (2013). Morphological structure in the Arabic mental  
13 lexicon: Parallels between standard and dialectal Arabic. *Language and Cognitive  
14 Processes*, 28(10), 1453-1473.  
15  
16 Boudelaa, S. & Marslen-Wilson, W. D. (2015). Structure, form, and meaning in the mental  
17 lexicon: Evidence from Arabic. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 30(8), 955–992.  
18  
19 Bürkner, P. C. (2017). brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *Journal  
20 of statistical software*, 80, 1-28.  
21  
22 Bybee, J. & McClelland, J. L. (2005). Alternatives to the combinatorial paradigm of linguistic  
23 theory based on domain general principles of human cognition. *The Linguistic Review*,  
24 22(2-4), 381-410.  
25  
26 Chuang, Y. Y., Kang, M., Xuefeng, L., & Harald, B. R. (2021). Vector space morphology with  
27 linear discriminative learning. In D. Crepaldi (Ed.), *Linguistic morphology in the mind  
28 and brain* (pp. 167-183). Routledge.  
29  
30 Clahsen, H., Rothweiler, M., Woest, A. & Marcus, G. (1992). Regular and irregular inflection in  
31 the acquisition of German noun plurals. *Cognition*, 45(3), 225-255.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Creemers, A., Davies, A. G., Wilder, R. J., Tamminga, M., & Embick, D. (2020). Opacity,  
2 transparency, and morphological priming: A study of prefixed verbs in Dutch. *Journal of*  
3 *Memory and Language*, 110, Article 104055.

4 Cristia, A. (2018). Can infants learn phonology in the lab? A meta-analytic answer. *Cognition*,  
5 170, 312-327.

6 Deutsch, A., Frost, R. & Forster, K. I. (1998). Verbs and nouns are organized and accessed  
7 differently in the mental lexicon: Evidence from Hebrew. *Journal of Experimental*  
8 *Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 24(5), 1238-1255.

9 Deutsch, A., Frost, R., Pollatsek, A. & Rayner, K. (2000). Early morphological effects in word  
10 recognition in Hebrew: Evidence from parafoveal preview benefit. *Language and*  
11 *Cognitive Processes*, 15(4-5), 487-506.

12 Dufour S. (2008). Phonological priming in auditory word recognition: when both controlled and  
13 automatic processes are responsible for the effects. *Canadian journal of experimental*  
14 *psychology = Revue canadienne de psychologie expérimentale*, 62(1), 33-41.

15 Egger, M., Smith, G. D., Schneider, M., & Minder, C. (1997). Bias in meta-analysis detected by  
16 a simple, graphical test. *British Medical Journal*, 315(7109), 629-634.

17 Farhy, Y. & Verissimo, J. (2019). Semantic effects in morphological priming: The case of  
18 Hebrew stems. *Language and Speech*, 62(4), 737-750.

19 Farhy, Y., Verissimo, J., & Clahsen, H. (2018). Universal and particular in morphological  
20 processing: Evidence from Hebrew. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*,  
21 71(5), 1125-1133.

1  
2  
3  
4 Frost, R., Deutsch, A., Gilboa, O., Tannenbaum, M., & Marslen-Wilson, W. (2000).  
5  
6 Morphological priming: Dissociation of phonological, semantic, and morphological  
7 factors. *Memory & Cognition*, 28(8), 1277-1288.  
8  
9  
10  
11 Frost, R., Forster, K. I., & Deutsch, A. (1997). What can we learn from the morphology of  
12 Hebrew? A masked-priming investigation of morphological representation. *Journal of*  
13  
14 *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 23(4), 829-856.  
15  
16  
17  
18 Geary, J. A. & Ussishkin, A. (2018). Root-letter priming in Maltese visual word recognition. *The*  
19  
20 *Mental Lexicon*, 13(1), 1-25.  
21  
22  
23 Gonnerman, L. M., Seidenberg, M. S., & Andersen, E. S. (2007). Graded semantic and  
24 phonological similarity effects in priming: Evidence for a distributed connectionist  
25 approach to morphology. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 136(2), 323-  
26  
27 345.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Harrer, M., Cuijpers, P., Furukawa, T., & Ebert, D. D. (2019). *dmetar: Companion R Package*  
34  
35  
36 For The Guide 'Doing Meta-Analysis in R' (Version 0.0. 9000) [Computer software].  
37  
38  
39 <http://dmetar.protectlab.org/>  
40  
41 Heitmeier, M., Chuang, Y. Y., & Baayen, R. H. (2022). How trial-to-trial learning shapes  
42  
43 mappings in the mental lexicon: Modelling Lexical Decision with Linear Discriminative  
44  
45 Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.00430*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2207.00430>  
46  
47  
48 Hermana, E. W., Juma, E. J., & AlJassmi, M. (2021). Parafoveal processing of orthographic,  
49  
50 morphological, and semantic information during reading Arabic: A boundary paradigm  
51  
52 investigation. *PLOS ONE*, 16(8), Article e0254745.  
53  
54  
55 Holes, C. (2004). *Modern Arabic: Structures, functions, and varieties*. Georgetown University  
56  
57 Press.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Kastner, I., Pylkkänen, L., & Marantz, A. (2018). The form of morphemes: MEG evidence from  
2 masked priming of two Hebrew templates. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9.

3

4 Kastner, I. (2019). Templatic morphology as an emergent property: Roots and functional heads  
5 in Hebrew. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 37, 571-619.

6

7 Lüdecke, D. (2019). *esc: effect size computation for meta analysis* (Version 0.5.1) [Computer  
8 software]. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=esc>

9

10 Lukatela, V., Gligorijević, B., Kostić, A., & Turvey, M. T. (1980). Representation of inflected  
11 nouns in the internal lexicon. *Memory & Cognition*, 8(5), 415-423.

12

13 McCarthy, J. J., (1979). *Formal Problems in Semitic Phonology and Morphology* [Unpublished  
14 doctoral dissertation]. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

15

16 Milin, P., Feldman, L. B., Ramscar, M., Hendrix, P., & Baayen, R. H. (2017). Discrimination in  
17 lexical decision. *PLOS ONE*, 12(2), Article e0171935.

18

19 Nieder, J., Tomaschek, F., Cohrs, E., & de Vijver, R. V. (2022). Modelling Maltese noun plural  
20 classes without morphemes. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 37(3), 381-402.

21

22 Nieder, J., van de Vijver, R., & Mitterer, H. (2021). Priming Maltese plurals: Representation of  
23 sound and broken plurals in the mental lexicon. *The Mental Lexicon*, 16(1), 69-97.

24

25 Perea, M., Gotor, A., Rosa, E., & Algarabel, S. (1995). *Time course of semantic activation for  
26 different prime-target pairs in the lexical decision task* [Poster presentation]. The 36th  
27 Annual Meeting of the Psychonomic Society, Los Angeles, USA.

28

29 Prunet, J. (2006). External evidence and the Semitic root. *Morphology*, 16(1), 41-67.

30

31 R Core Team. (2021). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation  
32 for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

1 Seidenberg, M. S. & Gonnerman, L. M. (2000). Explaining derivational morphology as the  
2 convergence of codes. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 4(9), 353-361.

3

4 Shadish, W. R., & Haddock, C. K. (2009). Combining estimates of effect size. In H.  
5

6 Cooper, L. V. Hedges, & J. C. Valentine (Eds.), *The handbook of research synthesis and*  
7

8 *meta-analysis* (pp. 257-277). Russell Sage Foundation.

9

10 Shalhoub-Awwad, Y. (2020). The role of nominal word pattern in Arabic reading acquisition:  
11

12 Insights from cross-modal priming. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 24(4), 307-320.

13

14 Shalhoub-Awwad, Y., & Leikin, M. (2016). The lexical status of the root in processing  
15 morphologically complex words in Arabic. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 20(4), 296-310.

16

17 Slowiaczek, L. M., & Hamburger, M. B. (1992). Prelexical facilitation and lexical  
18 interference in auditory word recognition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology:*  
19 *Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 18(6), 1239 –1250.

20

21 Smolka, E., Libben, G., & Dressler, W. U. (2019). When morphological structure  
22 overrides meaning: Evidence from German prefix and particle verbs. *Language,*  
23

24 *Cognition and Neuroscience*, 34(5), 599-614.

25

26 Smolka, E., Preller, K. H., & Eulitz, C. (2014). ‘Verstehen’ (‘understand’) primes ‘stehen’  
27 (‘stand’): Morphological structure overrides semantic compositionality in the lexical  
28 representation of German complex verbs. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 72, 16-36.

29

30 Sterne, J. A. C., & Egger, M. (2001). Funnel plots for detecting bias in meta-analysis: guidelines  
31 on choice of axis. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*, 54(10), 1046-1055.

32

33 Sterne, J. A. C., & Harbord, R. M. (2004). Funnel plots in meta-analysis. *The Stata Journal*, 4(2),  
34

35 127-141.

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

1 Stockall, L., & Marantz, A. (2006). A single route, full decompositional model of morphological  
2 complexity. *The Mental Lexicon*, 1(1), 85-123.

3 Sundara, M., Zhou, Z. L., Breiss, C., Katsuda, H., & Steffman, J. (2021). Infants' developing  
4 sensitivity to native language phonotactics: A meta-analysis. *Cognition*, 221, 104993.

5 Taft, M. (1988). A morphological-decomposition model of lexical representation.  
6 *Linguistics*, 26(4), 657-667.

7 Taft, M. (2004). Morphological decomposition and the reverse base frequency effect. *The  
8 Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A*, 47(4), 745-765.

9 Taft, M., & Forster, K. I. (1975). Lexical storage and retrieval of prefixed words. *Journal of Verb  
10 Learning and Verb Behavior*, 14(6), 638-647.

11 Twist, A. E. (2006). *A psycholinguistic investigation of the verbal morphology of Maltese*  
12 [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Arizona.

13 Ussishkin, A. (1999). The inadequacy of the consonantal root: Modern Hebrew denominal verbs  
14 and output–output correspondence. *Phonology*, 16(3), 401-442.

15 Ussishkin, A. (2005). A fixed prosodic theory of nonconcatenative templatic morphology.  
16 *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 23(1), 169-218.

17 Ussishkin, A., Dawson, C. R., Wedel, A., & Schluter, K. (2015). Auditory masked priming in  
18 Maltese spoken word recognition. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 30(9), 1096-  
19 1115.

20 Vasisht, S., Mertzen, D., Jäger, L. A., & Gelman, A. (2018). The statistical significance filter  
21 leads to overoptimistic expectations of replicability. *Journal of Memory and Language*,  
22 103, 151-175.