

When A Man Says He Is Pregnant: ERP Evidence for A Rational Account of Speaker-contextualized Language Comprehension

Hanlin Wu¹ (hanlin.wu@link.cuhk.edu.hk)

Zhenguang G. Cai^{1,2} (zhenguangcai@cuhk.edu.hk)

¹Department of Linguistics and Modern Languages, The Chinese University of Hong Kong,
Hong Kong SAR

²Brain and Mind Institute, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR

Author notes: This work was supported by the General Research Fund (Grant number: 14600220), University Grants Committee, Hong Kong. The authors thank Xiaohui Rao for her assistance during data collection and helpful discussion.

ABSTRACT

Spoken language is often, if not always, understood in a context that includes the identities of speakers. For instance, we can easily make sense of an utterance such as “I’m going to have a *manicure* this weekend” or “The first time I got *pregnant* I had a hard time” when the utterance is spoken by a woman, but it would be harder to understand when it is spoken by a man. Previous event-related potential (ERP) studies have shown mixed results regarding the neurophysiological responses to such speaker-mismatched utterances, with some reporting an N400 effect and others a P600 effect. In an experiment involving 64 participants, we showed that these different ERP effects reflect distinct cognitive processes employed to resolve the speaker-message mismatch. When possible, the message is integrated with the speaker context to arrive at an interpretation, as in the case of violations of social stereotypes (e.g., men getting a manicure), resulting in an N400 effect. However, when such integration is impossible due to violations of biological knowledge (e.g., men getting pregnant), listeners engage in an error correction process to revise either the perceived utterance or the speaker context, resulting in a P600 effect. Additionally, we found that the social N400 effect decreased as a function of the listener’s personality trait of openness, while the biological P600 effect remained robust. Our findings help to reconcile the empirical inconsistencies in the literature and provide a rational account of speaker-contextualized language comprehension.

INTRODUCTION

A fundamental aspect of spoken language is its dual nature: it carries the linguistic content that conveys the explicit message and also the extra-linguistic cues that often reveal the speaker's identity (Scott, 2019). For example, listeners can easily make sense of sentences such as "I'm going to have a *manicure* this weekend" and "The first time I got pregnant I had a hard time" when spoken by a woman; however, it would be harder for them to understand if the same sentences are spoken by a man, as the idea that men getting a manicure or getting pregnant violates people's social stereotypical understanding or biological knowledge. These examples highlight how language must be understood in a broader context that involves the identity of the speaker to achieve successful comprehension, but the mechanism is insufficiently explored. In this paper, we investigate whether listeners rationally consider the speaker context during online language comprehension.

Speaker Identity as Contexts in Language Comprehension

It has been well established that the identities of speakers constitute an important context in which language is comprehended (Brown-Schmidt et al., 2015). The speaker context usually influences language comprehension by providing information regarding the speaker's demographics (Creel & Bregman, 2011), including aspects of age (e.g., Kim, 2016; Walker & Hay, 2011; Wu et al., 2024), gender (e.g., Lattner & Friederici, 2003), socioeconomic status (e.g., Van Berkum et al., 2008), and language backgrounds (e.g., Cai, 2022; Cai et al., 2017; Martin et al., 2016).

Studies show that a speaker's identity, as evidenced by their dialectal accents, modulates listeners' interpretation of word meanings. Cai et al., (2017) showed that listeners had more access to the American meaning of cross-dialectally ambiguous words when spoken by an American English speaker than by a British English speaker. For example, a word such as *bonnet* is more likely to be interpreted as a part of vehicles when spoken in a British accent, and as a type of hat in an American accent. Similarly, an EEG study by Martin et al. (2016) found that participants listening to speech in either a British or American accent showed greater difficulty in comprehension, reflected by larger EEG deflections, when words mismatched the speaker's demographic identity indicated by their accents (e.g., British words spoken in an American accent). Similar effects have been found in the recognition of individual words (e.g., Kim, 2016; Walker & Hay, 2011; Wu et al., 2024) as well as the comprehension of sentence meaning (e.g., Lattner & Friederici, 2003; Van Berkum et al., 2008).

The contextual effects of speaker identity have been attributed to the existence of the *speaker model*—a mental model that listeners construct to capture the attributes of the speaker. This model contains the listener’s beliefs and knowledge about the speaker, such as their age, gender, and socioeconomic status, which are used to interpret the speaker’s utterances. For example, Cai et al. (2017) found that the speaker context effect did not depend on the accentedness of each word token. Listeners still had more access to the American meaning of word tokens that were morphed to be accent-neutral as long as they believed that the word tokens were produced by an American English speaker. This suggests that the contextual effect of speaker identity originates from a higher-level model of the speaker rather than the surface acoustic details of the speech. The speaker model account is also supported by findings that listeners’ speech comprehension can be influenced by an introduction to the speaker’s identity (e.g., Johnson et al., 1999), or simply a photo of the speaker (e.g., Hay et al., 2006; Hernández-Gutiérrez et al., 2021).

Neural Markers for Speaker-contextualized Language Comprehension

Over the past decades, research using EEG has explored how speaker identities contextualize language comprehension. In an early study, Lattner and Friederici (2003) exposed participants to implausible self-referent utterances where the speech content mismatched people’s traditional expectations toward the speaker in terms of their gender. For example, they contrasted the sentence “I like to play *soccer*” spoken by a woman versus a man. They found that the critical word “soccer” elicited a larger P600 deflection when spoken by a woman, demonstrating the influence of the social stereotypes that associate soccer more with men than women. In a subsequent study, Van Berkum et al. (2008) expanded on this by including contrasts of age and socioeconomic status, in addition to gender. For example, they used sentences such as “Every evening I drink some *wine* before I go to sleep” spoken by a child versus an adult. They found that the critical word “wine” elicited a larger N400 deflection, instead of a P600, when spoken by a child. They argued that the N400 effect reflected early integration of the message with the speaker’s identity and suggested that the P600 effect observed by Lattner and Friederici (2003) was due to inefficient control of stimuli.

The finding of Van Berkum et al. (2008) has been replicated in studies showing N400 effects when the linguistic content mismatches the speaker context, mostly by violating social stereotypes (Martin et al., 2016; Péliissier & Ferragne, 2022; van den Brink et al., 2012). It has also been supported by studies showing that the N400, reflecting lexical-semantic processing, is modulated by the speaker context (Bornkessel-Schlesewsky et al., 2013; Brothers et al., 2019;

Foucart et al., 2019; Foucart & Hartsuiker, 2021; Grant et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2024) or by whether the speaker context is available or not (Hernández-Gutierrez et al., 2021).

However, some studies report a P600 effect instead of an N400 in response to the speaker-message mismatch. Using Van Berkum's paradigm, Foucart et al. (2015) found a P600 (also termed late positive potential) when the speech content mismatched the speaker context. Similarly, van den Brink et al. (2012) observed an N400 effect early in the experiment but a P600 later on. Van Berkum et al. (2008) also noted that while their study showed an overall N400 effect, gender contrasts specifically elicited an additional P600. Other studies show that the speaker context modulates P600 effects related to grammatical (Caffarra et al., 2020; Hanulíková et al., 2012; Hanulíková & Carreiras, 2015; Zhou et al., 2019) and lexical-semantic processing (Foucart et al., 2019; Regel et al., 2010).

Overall, the literature shows inconsistency regarding N400 and P600 as neural markers for speaker-contextualized language comprehension. Both N400 and P600 effects have been taken as indexing the cross-domain integration of the speaker context and the language content. The observation of N400 effects suggests early-stage integration, with speaker contexts processed simultaneously with sentence semantics (Martin et al., 2016; Pélissier & Ferragne, 2022; Van Berkum et al., 2008; van den Brink et al., 2012). In contrast, the observed P600 effect suggests a later-stage integration, where speaker properties are processed after the construction of speaker-independent sentence semantics (Caffarra et al., 2020; Foucart et al., 2015; Lattner & Friederici, 2003). However, we argue that the N400 and P600 effects may not reflect the distinction between earlier and later integration, but rather reflect a mechanism of rational inference during language processing.

N400 and P600 in Rational Language Processing

The functions of the N400 and P600 components have been a classic topic in cognitive neuroscience, particularly in language comprehension studies. It is suggested that N400 and P600 have distinct functions. The N400 may reflect automatic, implicit processing of meaning, while the P600 is associated with controlled, attention-related processes contributing to conflict resolution in general (Rabovsky et al., 2018). Notably, the relative magnitudes between the N400 and the P600 have been proposed to reflect a process of rational inference during language interpretation (Li & Ettinger, 2023; Ryskin et al., 2021).

Theories of rational language processing propose that language comprehension involves probabilistic inference, where comprehenders integrate prior expectations with incoming information to arrive at the most likely interpretation. Accounts such as the noisy-channel

model assume that comprehenders model the perceived input as not perfect but often contaminated with noise such as environmental distraction, or production/perception errors (Levy, 2008). When the interpretation is extremely implausible, comprehenders tend to detect an error and try to correct it by revising their perceived input. One way to investigate how people rationally deal with noisy input is the interpretation of implausible sentences. Gibson et al. (2013) argued that people comprehend implausible sentences by considering the likelihood that the sentence has been noise-corrupted from an otherwise plausible one. For example, “The mother gave the candle the daughter” may be noise-corrupted from an intended sentence such as “The mother gave the candle *to* the daughter” due to “to” being omitted in production or perception. Likewise, “The mother gave the daughter *to* the candle” may be noise-corrupted from “The mother gave the daughter the candle” due to the accidental insertion of “to” (see also Cai et al., 2022). In addition, there is also evidence that the probability of structural revision in implausible sentence comprehension further depends on the speaker’s identity. For example, Gibson et al., (2017) found that when the implausible sentences are spoken by non-native speakers, they have a higher chance to be interpreted in a plausible way than spoken by native speakers.

Importantly, this rational inference process is reflected in brain potentials. Using EEG, Ryskin et al. (2021) found that the relative magnitudes of N400 and P600 are modulated by the plausibility of the perceived language input. When the input has extremely low plausibility and is detected as an error, such as speech errors or mishearing, the P600 is more salient, reflecting an error correction process. Conversely, when no explicit error is detected, the N400 becomes more salient, indexing the difficulty of lexical-semantic processing. This pattern has also been replicated by computational modelling (Li & Ettinger, 2023).

The Current Study

Back to the empirical inconsistency regarding the neural markers of speaker-contextualized language comprehension, we find that the N400 effect is associated with the violations of listeners’ social stereotypes toward the speaker population. In contrast, the P600 effect typically emerges when the mismatch violates listeners’ biological knowledge. For example, Foucart et al. (2015) found a P600 effect using stimuli in which the speech content mismatched the speaker context by presenting biologically implausible situations, such as “Today I am feeling sick, I will need to visit my *paediatrician* again” spoken by an adult compared to a child, or “I have *erection* problems due to stress” spoken by a woman compared to a man. Similarly, the stimuli used by Van Berkum et al. (2008) and van den Brink et al. (2012) for the gender contrast

included items violating people's biological knowledge, possibly accounting for the P600 effects.

We term these utterances *biologically implausible utterances*, in which the speech content mismatches the speaker context in terms of people's biological knowledge. Conversely, we termed the other type of utterances *socially implausible utterances* in which the speech content mismatches the speaker context in terms of people's social stereotypical expectations, such as "I'm going to have a *manicure* this weekend" spoken by a man compared to a woman. In line with rational language processing, we propose that the N400 effect is associated with the integration of social stereotypes as in socially implausible utterances. The P600 effect emerges when such integration is not possible, thus triggering an error correction process, as in biologically implausible utterances.

We hypothesize that upon hearing a socially implausible utterance, listeners tend to show an N400 effect, reflecting an effortful integration of the speech content and the speaker context which carries listeners' social stereotypes toward the speaker population. In contrast, upon hearing a biologically implausible utterance, listeners tend to show a P600 effect, reflecting an attempt to correct the errors detected in their perception for a possible interpretation.

Furthermore, we hypothesize that the N400 effect, related to the integration of social stereotypes, should be modulated by the listener's personality traits such as *openness* (also known as *openness to experience*, Digman, 1990; or *open-mindedness*, Soto & John, 2017; Zhang et al., 2022). This trait refers to an individual's willingness to adjust their existing attitudes and behaviours when exposed to new ideas or situations, distinguishing those who seek novelty and variety from those who prefer routine and tradition (Flynn, 2005; McCrae, 1996). Studies show that individuals with higher openness levels are less likely to hold stereotypical views (Chen & Palmer, 2018; Crawford & Brandt, 2019; Flynn, 2005; Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). Therefore, the magnitude of the N400 elicited by social implausibility should be larger among listeners who have lower openness scores, and vice versa. In contrast, we hypothesize that the P600 effect relates to error correction and is not subject to modulations by a listener's openness. Thus, the magnitude of the P600 elicited by biological implausibility should be comparable among listeners with various openness scores.

METHOD

Participants

We recruited 64 neurologically healthy participants (32 females, 32 males; mean age = 22.97 years, $SD = 1.98$ years) who were native speakers of Mandarin Chinese. Four participants were excluded from data analysis due to excessive artefactual contamination (see EEG Recording and Preprocessing), resulting in a final sample size of 60 participants. All participants provided informed consent before the experiment began. The study protocol was approved by the Joint Chinese University of Hong Kong-New Territories East Cluster Clinical Research Ethics Committee.

Design

We adopted a 2 (Plausibility: plausible vs implausible) \times 2 (Type: social vs biological) factorial design. Plausibility was manipulated within both participants and items. Type was manipulated within participants and between items.

Materials

We constructed 80 Mandarin self-referential sentences (see Table 1 for examples; see Table S1 in Supplementary Materials for the full list) that fell into eight categories, each with 10 sentences. We designed these sentences following a set of rules. First, the speaker-contextualized plausibility always emerged at a critical word (either disyllabic or trisyllabic, italicized in the examples). Second, the critical word was always preceded by a word or words of at least three syllables (equivalent to three characters) to ensure that listeners had constructed the speaker context before encountering the critical word (McAleer et al., 2014; Scharinger et al., 2011). Third, the critical word was always followed by at least three characters before the sentence ended to eliminate the influence of the sentence wrap-up effect. In addition to these rules, social and biological sentences were matched on the frequencies of the critical words ($t(75.50) = 0.027, p = 0.978$) using SUBTLEX-CH (Cai & Brysbaert, 2010) and the lengths of the critical words ($t(77.32) = -0.553, p = 0.582$).

Table 1. Examples of Stimuli with English translations

Category	Example (English translation)
Socially plausible with	
male speakers	在工作单位我一般都是穿 <u>西服</u> 打领带。 (At the workplace I usually wear a <i>suit</i> and a tie.)
female speakers	这个周末我要先去做 <u>美甲</u> 然后理发。 (This weekend I'm going to get a <i>manicure</i> and then a haircut.)
adult speakers	我最近 <u>上班</u> 压力太大需要休息。 (I've been <i>working</i> too hard lately and I need a break.)
child speakers	他把我的 <u>玩具</u> 抢走了我要去找妈妈告状。 (He took my <i>toys</i> away from me and I'm going to tell mummy about it.)
Biologically plausible with	
male speakers	我需要定期去医院检查 <u>前列腺</u> 的健康状况。 (I need to go to the hospital to check my <i>prostate</i> on a regular basis.)
female speakers	我第一次 <u>怀孕</u> 的时候过得很艰难。 (The first time I got <i>pregnant</i> I had a hard time.)
adult speakers	我发现我脸上的 <u>老年斑</u> 越来越多了我正在寻找新的治疗方法。 (I noticed that I'm getting more and more <i>age spots</i> on my face and I am looking for new treatments.)
child speakers	我在等我的 <u>乳牙</u> 掉下来然后我要把它扔到房顶上。 (I'm waiting for my <i>milk tooth</i> to fall out and then I'm going to throw it on the roof.)

For each target sentence, we generated two versions of audio using the voices of two speakers. The sentence content was plausible with one speaker's identity and implausible with the other. We included two dimensions of contrasts, gender and age, to capture the speaker

characteristics. For gender-contrast sentences, one speaker was a male adult, and the other a female adult. For age-contrast sentences, one speaker was either a male or female adult, and the other a male or female child. To ensure that the speech audio minimized differences other than the manipulated gender and age, we used Microsoft Azure text-to-speech technology to generate audio files, controlling for potential confounds such as volume, accent, and speech rate, which are often inevitable with human speakers. The duration of the critical word was matched between the two audio versions ($t(79) = -0.512, p = 0.610$). The plausible utterances are those where the speaker's gender/age matched the sentence content (e.g., a socially or biologically male sentence spoken by a male speaker); the implausible utterances were those where the speaker's gender/age mismatched the content (e.g., a socially or biologically male sentence spoken by a female speaker). The implausibility effect was generally calculated by comparing participants' responses to implausible utterances with responses to plausible control utterances. We also constructed 80 gender- and age-neutral utterances as fillers.

Procedure

Before the EEG experiment, we conducted a plausibility rating test including 30 participants (15 females, 15 males, mean age = 23.57 years, $SD = 3.23$ years) who were not included in the EEG experiment. Participants were individually tested in a laboratory environment in which they listened to all the audio sentences one by one and rated how plausible they thought it was for the speaker in the audio to say this sentence on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = extremely implausible, 4 = neutral, 7 = absolutely plausible). After the rating test, they completed the Big Five Inventory-2 (BFI-2, Mandarin version, Zhang et al., 2022), of which the subscore of Openness was later used in the analyses.

In the EEG experiment, participants were individually tested in a soundproof booth designed for EEG signal acquisition. We created four item lists, each containing only one of the two audio recordings of an item. Each participant was randomly assigned to one of the four lists, and the trial order for each participant was randomized. During the experiment, participants' EEG signals were recorded while they listened to the audio. Each trial began with a fixation cross on the center of the screen for 1000 ms. The audio was then played while the fixation cross remained on the screen until 1000 ms after the utterance offset. Each trial was followed by an interval of 3600 ms. To ensure their attentive listening, participants were required to answer a yes/no probe question about the content of the utterance in 50% of the filler trials.

EEG Recording and Preprocessing

The electroencephalography (EEG) was collected using 128 active sintered Ag/AgCl electrodes positioned according to an extended 10-20 system. All electrodes were referred online to the left earlobe. Signals were recorded using a g.HIamp amplifier and digitalized at a sampling rate of 1200 Hz. All electrode impedances were maintained below 30 k Ω throughout the experiment. EEG data preprocessing was performed using customized scripts and the FieldTrip toolbox (Oostenveld et al., 2011) in MATLAB. The raw EEG data were bandpass-filtered offline at 0.1-30 Hz (Luck, 2014; Tanner et al., 2015), resampled at 500 Hz, and re-referenced to the average of the left and right earlobes (A1 and A2). Principal component analysis (PCA) was performed on bandpass-filtered (1-30 Hz) continuous data (Luck, 2022) to identify and remove ocular artifacts, with the number of independent sources set at 30 (Winkler et al., 2011). The data were then epoched from 200 ms before to 1200 ms after the onset of the critical word and baseline-corrected by subtracting the mean amplitude from 200 ms to 0 ms before the critical word onset. Epochs with amplitudes exceeding $\pm 100 \mu\text{V}$ were considered to contain artifacts and thus excluded (8.37%). The data of 4 participants (4 males) with more than 40% of trials containing artifacts were excluded, leaving a total of 60 participants (32 females, 28 males; mean age = 22.97 years, $SD = 2.05$ years) for further analyses.

RESULTS

Plausibility rating

Linear mixed-effects (LME) modelling was conducted on the plausibility rating data of all 30 participants in the rating test. Plausibility (plausible = -0.5, implausible = 0.5) and Type (social = -0.5, biological = 0.5) were included as fixed-effect predictors. Subject and Item were included as random-effect predictors (see Table S2 for model structures). For all LME analyses, we used the maximal random-effect structure justified by the data and determined by forward model comparison ($\alpha = 0.2$, see Matuschek et al., 2017).

As demonstrated in Figure 1, the results showed a significant main effect of Plausibility ($\beta = -3.59$, $SE = 0.19$, $t = -19.15$, $p < 0.001$), a significant main effect of Type ($\beta = -0.83$, $SE = 0.12$, $t = -6.58$, $p < 0.001$), and a significant interaction between Plausibility and Type ($\beta = -1.31$, $SE = 0.24$, $t = -5.37$, $p < 0.001$). Plausible utterances (mean rating = 6.37) generally had a higher rating than implausible ones (mean rating = 2.78). Social utterances (mean rating = 4.99) generally had a higher rating than biological ones (mean rating = 4.16). The absolute size of the implausibility effect, calculated by the rating difference between plausible and

implausible utterances, was smaller for social utterances (-2.94) than for biological utterances (-4.25).




Figure 1. Plausibility rating results.

To test whether a listener's personality trait of openness could predict their perception of the plausibility of each type of utterance, we additionally included Openness (a scaled continuous variable) as a fixed-effect predictor interacting with Plausibility and Type (see Table S2 for model structures). The results showed a significant three-way interaction among Plausibility, Type, and Openness ($\beta = -0.28$, $SE = 0.12$, $t = -2.35$, $p = 0.026$). Separate analyses of social and biological utterances showed a significant interaction between Plausibility and Openness for social utterances ($\beta = 0.31$, $SE = 0.15$, $t = 2.13$, $p = 0.043$), suggesting that the social implausibility effect decreased as a function of openness scores. In contrast, this interaction did not reach statistical significance for biological utterances ($\beta = 0.03$, $SE = 0.18$, $t = 0.18$, $p = 0.860$), showing no evidence of an impact of Openness on the biological implausibility effect (Figure 4A).

Overall, ratings indicated that biological implausibility effects were more pronounced than social implausibility effects, and only social implausibility effects were (negatively) predicted by listeners' personality traits of openness.

EEG Amplitude

We focused our analyses of EEG amplitude on the time windows of 300-600 ms and 600-1000 ms after the critical word onset, corresponding to the typical time windows of N400 (e.g., Kutas & Hillyard, 1980) and P600 (e.g., Lattner & Friederici, 2003) respectively. LME models were applied to the mean amplitudes within these windows for each trial, as LME methods are considered more robust than traditional ANOVA-based approaches in amplitude analyses (Frömer et al., 2018; Heise et al., 2022). We first analyzed the topography of speaker-contextualized implausibility effects, which guided the selection of a region of interest (ROI) for subsequent analyses.

Topography analyses. To explore the topography of speaker-contextualized implausibility effects on EEG amplitudes, we conducted analyses of posteriority and laterality (see also Martin et al., 2016). As depicted in Figure 2A, scalp sites were selected and divided into four regions: left-anterior, right-anterior, left-posterior, and right-posterior. Each region consisted of 17 sites (Table S5), with the mean amplitudes collapsed across all sites.




Figure 2. (A) Regions included in the topography analysis; (B) The region used in the ROI analysis; (C) Topographies of social and biological implausibility effects during 300-600 ms and 600-1000 ms windows after the critical word onset.

To determine whether speaker-contextualized implausibility effects differed in magnitude between anterior and posterior sites, we conducted a posteriority analysis. We fit LME models with Plausibility, Type, and Posteriority (anterior = -0.5, posterior = 0.5) as interacting fixed-effect predictors (see Table S3 for model structures). Our focus was on the three-way interaction among Plausibility, Type, and Posteriority. In the time window of 300-600 ms after the critical word onset, there was a marginally significant interaction among Plausibility, Type, and Posteriority ($\beta = 0.91$, $SE = 0.47$, $t = 1.92$, $p = 0.054$), suggesting a trend of difference in the scalp topographies between social and biological implausibility effects. Separate analyses of social and biological utterances showed a significant interaction between Plausibility and Posteriority for social utterances ($\beta = -0.66$, $SE = 0.33$, $t = -2.02$, $p = 0.044$), suggesting larger implausibility effects over posterior sites (-0.90 μV) compared to anterior sites (-0.22 μV). However, this interaction was absent for biological utterances ($\beta = 0.25$, $SE = 0.34$, $t = 0.74$, $p = 0.460$), suggesting comparable implausibility effects between posterior (0.22 μV) and anterior sites (-0.02 μV). In the time window of 600-1000 ms after the critical word onset, there was a significant interaction among Plausibility, Type, and Posteriority ($\beta = 1.67$, $SE = 0.55$, $t = 3.03$, $p = 0.002$), suggesting a difference in the scalp topographies between social and biological implausibility effects. Separate analyses showed a significant interaction between Plausibility and Posteriority for biological utterances ($\beta = 1.31$, $SE = 0.40$, $t = 3.27$, $p = 0.001$), with larger implausibility effects over posterior sites (1.45 μV) than over anterior sites (0.16 μV). However, this interaction was absent for social utterances ($\beta = -0.38$, $SE = 0.38$, $t = -0.99$, $p = 0.321$), suggesting comparable implausibility effects between posterior (-0.98 μV) and anterior sites (-0.60 μV).

Similarly, to determine whether implausibility effects differed between the two hemispheres, we conducted a laterality analysis. We fit the models with Plausibility, Type, and Laterality (left = -0.5, right = 0.5) as interacting fixed-effect predictors (see Table S3 for model structures). Again, our focus was on the three-way interaction among Plausibility, Type, and Laterality. In the time window of 300-600 ms after the critical word onset, the interaction among Plausibility, Type, and Laterality did not reach statistical significance ($\beta = 0.33$, $SE = 0.48$, $t = 0.68$, $p = 0.495$). Separate analyses of social and biological utterances showed no significant interaction between Plausibility and Laterality for either social utterances ($\beta = -0.11$, $SE = 0.33$, $t = -0.32$, $p = 0.749$) or biological utterances ($\beta = 0.22$, $SE = 0.34$, $t = 0.64$, $p = 0.523$), suggesting comparable implausibility effects over left and right sites for both social utterances (-0.51 μV versus -0.61 μV) and biological utterances (-0.01 μV versus 0.21 μV).

Overall, implausible utterances elicited distinct neurophysiological responses under social and biological conditions. Socially implausible utterances elicited a larger negative deflection, while biologically implausible utterances elicited a larger positive deflection. As shown in Figure 2C, both social and biological implausibility effects were more pronounced over posterior sites than anterior sites, while no particular hemispheric asymmetry was found. These results aligned with the classic central-posterior distribution of N400 and P600 effects in spoken language comprehension.

ROI analyses. Based on the topographies of social and biological implausibility effects, we selected an ROI (Figure 2B) consisting of 59 central-posterior sites (see Table S5 for the full list) with mean amplitudes collapsed within the ROI. Our primary focus was to compare listeners' neural responses to social and biological implausibilities. We fit LME models with Plausibility and Type as interacting fixed-effect predictors for the mean amplitude over 300-600 ms and 600-1000 ms windows after the critical word onset (see Table S4 for model structures). As shown in Figure 3, the results revealed a significant interaction between Plausibility and Type over 300-600 ms ($\beta = 1.16$, $SE = 0.50$, $t = 2.32$, $p = 0.021$) and over 600-1000 ms ($\beta = 2.44$, $SE = 0.59$, $t = 4.14$, $p < 0.001$). For the 300-600 ms time window, separate analyses showed a significant main effect of Plausibility for social utterances ($\beta = -0.89$, $SE = 0.32$, $t = -2.80$, $p = 0.005$) but no effect of Plausibility for biological utterances ($\beta = 0.27$, $SE = 0.34$, $t = 0.81$, $p = 0.419$), suggesting that socially implausible utterances elicited an N400 effect compared to their plausible control, which was not observed for biologically implausible utterances. For the 600-1000 ms window, separate analyses showed significant main effects of Plausibility for both social utterances ($\beta = -1.01$, $SE = 0.37$, $t = -2.75$, $p = 0.006$) and biological utterances ($\beta = 1.43$, $SE = 0.54$, $t = 2.66$, $p = 0.011$), suggesting that the N400 effect elicited by socially implausible utterances extended into the later time window. In contrast, biologically implausible utterances elicited a P600 effect compared to biologically plausible controls.




Figure 3. Brain potentials elicited by social and biological utterances during 300-600 ms and 600-1000 ms after the critical word onset; shaded areas represent SEs.

To determine whether social and biological implausibility effects were predicted by listeners' personality traits of openness, we fit LME models with Plausibility, Type, and Openness as interacting fixed-effect predictors (see Table S4 for model structures). The results showed a significant three-way interaction among Plausibility, Type, and Openness during the 300-600 ms window ($\beta = -1.12$, $SE = 0.46$, $t = -2.41$, $p = 0.016$), but not during the 600-1000 ms window ($\beta = -0.88$, $SE = 0.53$, $t = -1.65$, $p = 0.099$). Separate analyses of social and biological utterances showed that Plausibility significantly interacted with Openness for social utterances during 300-600 ms ($\beta = 0.71$, $SE = 0.32$, $t = 2.24$, $p = 0.026$), but not during 600-1000 ms ($\beta = 0.51$, $SE = 0.37$, $t = 1.38$, $p = 0.167$). This suggested that the social implausibility effect of N400 decreased as a function of a listener's score of openness. In contrast, this interaction did not reach statistical significance for biological utterances during either 300-600 ms ($\beta = -0.40$, $SE = 0.34$, $t = -1.16$, $p = 0.245$) or 600-1000 ms ($\beta = -0.36$, $SE = 0.48$, $t = -0.75$, $p = 0.459$), showing no evidence for the impact of a listener's openness scores on the biological implausibility effect (Figure 4B).

Finally, to determine the offset of the N400 and the P600 effects elicited by social and biological implausibilities, respectively, we conducted paired-sample t -tests on six consecutive 100 ms time windows from 600 ms to 1200 ms after the critical word onset. The obtained p

values were adjusted using the false discovery rate (FDR) method to reduce the chance of Type I error. The social N400 effect ended around 900 ms after the critical word onset (800-900 ms: $t(59) = -3.18$, adjusted $p = 0.013$; 900-1000 ms: $t(59) = -1.85$, adjusted $p = 0.103$), and the biological P600 effect ended around 1000 ms (900-1000 ms: $t(59) = 2.46$, adjusted $p = 0.025$; 1000-1100 ms: $t(59) = 1.81$, adjusted $p = 0.090$) after the critical word onset.




Figure 4. (A) Social and biological implausibility effects of plausibility rating predicted by openness scores; (B) Social implausibility effect (N400) and biological implausibility effect (P600) predicted by openness scores.

Overall, social and biological implausibilities elicited distinct neural responses. Social implausibility elicited an N400 effect, while biological implausibility elicited a P600 effect. The social N400 effect was predicted by listeners' scores of openness, while the biological P600 effect was not.

DISCUSSION

Our study investigated the neurophysiological correlates of speaker-contextualized language comprehension. Plausibility ratings showed that socially implausible utterances were rated as significantly more plausible than biologically implausible ones. Trial-level amplitudes showed that N400 effects were elicited by socially implausible utterances in which the speech content mismatched the speaker context by violating social stereotypes. In contrast, P600 effects were elicited by biologically implausible utterances in which the speech content mismatched the speaker context by violating biological knowledge. Furthermore, we found that the magnitudes of both social implausibility effects for ratings and social N400 effects were negatively predicted by the listener's openness, while such predictive effects were absent for either the biological plausibility ratings or the biological P600 effects. Our findings explain the empirical inconsistency regarding speaker-contextualized language comprehension and show that listeners rationally consider the speaker context online during spoken language processing.

As discussed in previous studies (Foucart et al., 2015; Van Berkum et al., 2008), it is possible that the speaker dimensions may influence neural responses. The gender contrast may elicit a P600 effect while other contrasts such as age and socioeconomic status may elicit an N400 effect. To test this, we included an additional analysis to see whether the speaker dimension (gender vs age) influenced neural responses. We included Dimension (gender = -0.5, age = 0.5) as a fixed-effect predictor interacting with Plausibility and Type. The results showed that the three-way interaction among Plausibility, Type, and Dimension was not significant for either the 300-600 ms window ($\beta = 0.37$, $SE = 1.02$, $t = 0.36$, $p = 0.720$) or the 600-1000 ms window ($\beta = 1.20$, $SE = 1.17$, $t = 1.02$, $p = 0.309$). These results suggested no significant differences in neural responses between gender- and age-implausible utterances. Thus, the P600 effects observed by previous research in gender contrasts were likely due to biologically implausible utterances, which were included only in the gender contrast, as noted by Van Berkum et al. (2008).

In our study, social implausibility elicited a long-lasting N400 effect until around 900 ms after the critical word onset. This offset aligns with previous studies showing a late offset of N400 elicited by speaker inconsistency during auditory language comprehension (Martin et

al., 2016; Pélissier & Ferragne, 2022). Besides the general longer duration of auditory N400 compared to visual N400 (Hagoort & Brown, 2000), this prolonged effect may reflect the extended time required to integrate the message within the context created by speaker characteristics.

Our findings are best accounted for if we assume a rational account where listeners take into account the speaker's demographics as the context against which they interpret sentences rationally. We outline such a rational account for the interpretation of socially and biologically implausible utterances in Figure 5. Listeners arrive at an interpretation (posterior) based on their world knowledge (prior) and their perception (evidence). The term "perception" here is twofold: On one hand, it includes the listener's perception of the speaker's demographics, which is formed rather swiftly upon hearing the first few syllables of the utterance (McAlear et al., 2014; Scharinger et al., 2011). On the other hand, it includes the listener's perception of the speech content, i.e., the verbally conveyed message. Hearing a socially implausible utterance activates socially stereotypical information that constitutes the prior knowledge used for inference. As social stereotypes have a rather wide distribution and the perception does not deviate too much from it, listeners can make an effortful (as compared to the plausible controls) integration of their prior knowledge of social stereotypes and the perceived evidence, which is reflected by an N400 effect. In contrast, hearing a biologically implausible utterance activates the biological knowledge that is distributed rather narrowly. The listener's perception deviates significantly from their prior biological knowledge, triggering an error correction process, either by revising their perception of the speaker or by correcting the "error" in the speech content, which is reflected by a P600 effect. The listener's openness only modulates social stereotypes (open-minded individuals tend to hold fewer stereotypical views) but not biological knowledge, hence openness scores only predicted the magnitudes of social N400 effects but not the biological P600 effects. It should be noted that biological implausibility, as a trigger for P600 effects, only represents one typical case where error correction is required. It does not exclude other cases that may require similar processing and thus trigger P600 effects. For instance, in the study by Lattner and Friederici (2003), the absence of fillers or a large number of speakers might have led listeners to stop integrating social stereotypes and switch to an explicit error detection process after several trials, resulting in a P600 effect (see also Foucart et al., 2015; Van Berkum et al., 2008 for discussion).




Figure 5. Schematic representation of speaker-contextualized language comprehension. (A) Upon hearing a socially implausible utterance, listeners integrate their perception of the utterance with their social stereotypes from the speaker context to arrive at an interpretation; (B) Upon hearing a biologically implausible utterance, listeners tend to revise their perception of the speech content or the speaker characteristics.

Our findings raise further questions for future research. While we propose an error correction mechanism for the P600 observed in cases of biological implausibility, the exact nature of these “errors” and their correction process remain unknown. We suggest two potential processes: listeners may either revise the perceived linguistic form to align its content with the speaker’s identity or adjust the perceived speaker identity. Revision of perceived linguistic forms has been demonstrated in Cai et al. (2022), where they showed that listeners estimated the likelihood of an implausible sentence as being corrupted from an otherwise plausible one and sometimes revise the implausible sentence into a plausible sentence (e.g., revising “The

mother gave the candle the daughter” into “The mother gave the candle *to* the daughter”) in order to arrive at a plausible interpretation. However, in our study, the sentences themselves are plausible and they are implausible only when one takes the speaker into account. Thus, a more likely correction process is the revision of the perceived speaker identity. In addition, future research can explore broader personal factors in terms of their influence on rational inference as a part of social cognition. Language is a crucial tool of social communication (Fedorenko et al., 2024) and a core activity of social interaction. Our study shows how the personality trait of openness can influence language processing and modulate its neurophysiological correlates. It would be valuable for future research to include more personality traits and other factors such as political affiliations, education level, and culture.

Conclusion

Our study investigates the neurophysiological correlates of speaker-contextualized language comprehension. The type of neurophysiological response depends on the type of cognitive process triggered by the mismatch between the speech content and the speaker context. A mismatch of social stereotypes elicits an N400 effect, reflecting an effortful semantic integration. In contrast, a mismatch of biological knowledge elicits a P600 effect, reflecting an error correction process. Our findings explain the empirical inconsistency regarding speaker-contextualized language comprehension and provide evidence for a rational account of language processing.

REFERENCES

- Bornkessel-Schlesewsky, I., Krauspenhaar, S., & Schlewsky, M. (2013). Yes, You Can? A Speaker's Potency to Act upon His Words Orchestrates Early Neural Responses to Message-Level Meaning. *PLoS ONE*, 8(7). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0069173>
- Brothers, T., Dave, S., Hoversten, L. J., Traxler, M. J., & Swaab, T. Y. (2019). Flexible predictions during listening comprehension: Speaker reliability affects anticipatory processes. *Neuropsychologia*, 135(May), 107225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2019.107225>
- Brown-Schmidt, S., Yoon, S. O., & Ryskin, R. A. (2015). People as contexts in conversation. In *Psychology of Learning and Motivation - Advances in Research and Theory* (Vol. 62). Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.plm.2014.09.003>
- Caffarra, S., Wolpert, M., Scarinci, D., & Mancini, S. (2020). Who are you talking to? The role of addressee identity in utterance comprehension. *Psychophysiology*, 57(4), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.13527>
- Cai, Q., & Brysbaert, M. (2010). SUBTLEX-CH: Chinese Word and Character Frequencies Based on Film Subtitles. *PLOS ONE*, 5(6), e10729. <https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0010729>
- Cai, Z. G. (2022). Interlocutor modelling in comprehending speech from interleaved interlocutors of different dialectic backgrounds. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 29(3), 1026–1034. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-022-02055-7>
- Cai, Z. G., Gilbert, R. A., Davis, M. H., Gaskell, M. G., Farrar, L., Adler, S., & Rodd, J. M. (2017). Accent modulates access to word meaning: Evidence for a speaker model account of spoken word recognition. *Cognitive Psychology*, 98, 73–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2017.08.003>
- Cai, Z. G., Zhao, N., & Pickering, M. J. (2022). How do people interpret implausible sentences? *Cognition*, 225(March), 105101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2022.105101>
- Chen, P. G., & Palmer, C. L. (2018). The Prejudiced Personality? Using the Big Five to Predict Susceptibility to Stereotyping Behavior. *American Politics Research*, 46(2), 276–307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X17719720>
- Crawford, J. T., & Brandt, M. J. (2019). Who Is Prejudiced, and Toward Whom? The Big Five Traits and Generalized Prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 45(10), 1455–1467. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219832335>

- Creel, S. C., & Bregman, M. R. (2011). How Talker Identity Relates to Language Processing. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 5(5), 190–204. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1749-818X.2011.00276.X>
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Reviews Psychology*, 41, 417–440.
- Fedorenko, E., Piantadosi, S. T., & Gibson, E. A. F. (2024). Language is primarily a tool for communication rather than thought. *Nature*, 630(8017), 575–586. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-024-07522-w>
- Flynn, F. J. (2005). Having an open mind: The impact of openness to experience on interracial attitudes and impression formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(5), 816–826. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.5.816>
- Foucart, A., Garcia, X., Ayguasanosa, M., Thierry, G., Martin, C., & Costa, A. (2015). Does the speaker matter? Online processing of semantic and pragmatic information in L2 speech comprehension. *Neuropsychologia*, 75, 291–303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.06.027>
- Foucart, A., & Hartsuiker, R. J. (2021). Are foreign-accented speakers that ‘incredible’? The impact of the speaker’s indexical properties on sentence processing. *Neuropsychologia*, 158(March), 107902. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2021.107902>
- Foucart, A., Santamaría-García, H., & Hartsuiker, R. J. (2019). Short exposure to a foreign accent impacts subsequent cognitive processes. *Neuropsychologia*, 129, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEUROPSYCHOLOGIA.2019.02.021>
- Frömer, R., Maier, M., & Abdel Rahman, R. (2018). Group-level EEG-processing pipeline for flexible single trial-based analyses including linear mixed models. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 12(FEB), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2018.00048>
- Gibson, E., Bergen, L., & Piantadosi, S. T. (2013). Rational integration of noisy evidence and prior semantic expectations in sentence interpretation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 110(20), 8051–8056. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1216438110>
- Gibson, E., Tan, C., Futrell, R., Mahowald, K., Konieczny, L., Hemforth, B., & Fedorenko, E. (2017). Don’t Underestimate the Benefits of Being Misunderstood. *Psychological Science*, 28(6), 703–712. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617690277>
- Grant, A., Grey, S., & van Hell, J. G. (2020). Male fashionistas and female football fans: Gender stereotypes affect neurophysiological correlates of semantic processing during

- speech comprehension. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 53(August 2019), 100876.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneuroling.2019.100876>
- Hagoort, P., & Brown, C. M. (2000). ERP effects of listening to speech: Semantic ERP effects. *Neuropsychologia*, 38(11), 1518–1530. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932\(00\)00052-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932(00)00052-X)
- Hanulíková, A., & Carreiras, M. (2015). Electrophysiology of subject-verb agreement mediated by speakers' gender. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6(September), 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01396>
- Hanulíková, A., van Alphen, P. M., Goch, M. M., & Weber, A. (2012). When One Person's Mistake Is Another's Standard Usage: The Effect of Foreign Accent on Syntactic Processing. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 24(4), 878–887.
https://doi.org/10.1162/JOCN_A_00103
- Hay, J., Warren, P., & Drager, K. (2006). Factors influencing speech perception in the context of a merger-in-progress. *Journal of Phonetics*, 34(4), 458–484.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2005.10.001>
- Heise, M. J., Mon, S. K., & Bowman, L. C. (2022). Utility of linear mixed effects models for event-related potential research with infants and children. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 54(May 2021), 101070. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2022.101070>
- Hernández-Gutierrez, D., Muñoz, F., Sánchez-García, J., Sommer, W., Abdel Rahman, R., Casado, P., Jimenez-Ortega, L., Espuny, J., Fondevila, S., & Martín-Loeches, M. (2021). Situating language in a minimal social context: how seeing a picture of the speaker's face affects language comprehension. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 16(5), 502–511. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsab009>
- Johnson, K., Strand, E. A., & D'Imperio, M. (1999). Auditory-visual integration of talker gender in vowel perception. *Journal of Phonetics*, 27(4), 359–384.
<https://doi.org/10.1006/jpho.1999.0100>
- Kim, J. (2016). Perceptual Associations Between Words and Speaker Age. *Laboratory Phonology*, 7(1), 18. <https://doi.org/10.5334/labphon.33>
- Lattner, S., & Friederici, A. D. (2003). Talker's voice and gender stereotype in human auditory sentence processing - Evidence from event-related brain potentials. *Neuroscience Letters*, 339(3), 191–194. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3940\(03\)00027-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-3940(03)00027-2)
- Levy, R. (2008). A noisy-channel model of rational human sentence comprehension under uncertain input. *EMNLP 2008 - 2008 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural*

- Language Processing, Proceedings of the Conference: A Meeting of SIGDAT, a Special Interest Group of the ACL, October*, 234–243. <https://doi.org/10.3115/1613715.1613749>
- Li, J., & Ettinger, A. (2023). Heuristic interpretation as rational inference: A computational model of the N400 and P600 in language processing. *Cognition*, 233(December 2022), 105359. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2022.105359>
- Luck, S. J. (2014). An introduction to the ERP technique, second edition. In *MIT Press*. MIT Press. <https://books.google.com.hk/books?id=y4-uAwAAQBAJ>
- Luck, S. J. (2022). *Applied Event-Related Potential Data Analysis*. [https://socialsci.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Psychology/Book%3A_Applied_Event-Related_Potential_Data_Analysis_\(Luck\)](https://socialsci.libretexts.org/Bookshelves/Psychology/Book%3A_Applied_Event-Related_Potential_Data_Analysis_(Luck))
- Martin, C. D., Garcia, X., Potter, D., Melinger, A., & Costa, A. (2016). Holiday or vacation? The processing of variation in vocabulary across dialects. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, 31(3), 375–390. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2015.1100750>
- Matuschek, H., Kliegl, R., Vasishth, S., Baayen, H., & Bates, D. (2017). Balancing Type I error and power in linear mixed models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 94, 305–315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2017.01.001>
- McAlear, P., Todorov, A., & Belin, P. (2014). How do you say “hello”? Personality impressions from brief novel voices. *PLoS ONE*, 9(3), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0090779>
- McCrae, R. R. (1996). Social Consequences of Experiential Openness. *Psychological Bulletin*, 122(3), 323–337. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0033-2909.120.3.323>
- Oostenveld, R., Fries, P., Maris, E., & Schoffelen, J. M. (2011). FieldTrip: Open source software for advanced analysis of MEG, EEG, and invasive electrophysiological data. *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience*, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2011/156869>
- Pélissier, M., & Ferragne, E. (2022). The N400 reveals implicit accent-induced prejudice. *Speech Communication*, 137, 114–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SPECOM.2021.10.004>
- Rabovsky, M., Hansen, S. S., & McClelland, J. L. (2018). Modelling the N400 brain potential as change in a probabilistic representation of meaning. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2(9), 693–705. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-018-0406-4>
- Regel, S., Coulson, S., & Gunter, T. C. (2010). The communicative style of a speaker can affect language comprehension? ERP evidence from the comprehension of irony. *Brain Research*, 1311, 121–135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2009.10.077>

- Ryskin, R., Stearns, L., Bergen, L., Eddy, M., Fedorenko, E., & Gibson, E. (2021). An ERP index of real-time error correction within a noisy-channel framework of human communication. *Neuropsychologia*, *158*(March), 107855.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2021.107855>
- Scharinger, M., Monahan, P. J., & Idsardi, W. J. (2011). You had me at “Hello”: Rapid extraction of dialect information from spoken words. *NeuroImage*, *56*(4), 2329–2338.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.04.007>
- Scott, S. K. (2019). From speech and talkers to the social world: The neural processing of human spoken language. *Science*, *366*(6461), 58–62.
https://doi.org/10.1126/SCIENCE.AAX0288/ASSET/3A06224C-ECC1-4773-A61F-7ABE1627C6C1/ASSETS/GRAPHIC/366_58_F3.JPEG
- Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2008). Personality and prejudice: A meta-analysis and theoretical review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *12*(3), 248–279.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868308319226>
- Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). The next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2): Developing and assessing a hierarchical model with 15 facets to enhance bandwidth, fidelity, and predictive power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *113*(1), 117–143.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000096>
- Tanner, D., Morgan-Short, K., & Luck, S. J. (2015). How inappropriate high-pass filters can produce artifactual effects and incorrect conclusions in ERP studies of language and cognition. *Psychophysiology*, *52*(8), 997. <https://doi.org/10.1111/PSYP.12437>
- Van Berkum, J. J. A., Van Den Brink, D., Tesink, C. M. J. Y., Kos, M., & Hagoort, P. (2008). The neural integration of speaker and message. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *20*(4), 580–591. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2008.20054>
- van den Brink, D., Van berkum, J. J. A., Bastiaansen, M. C. M., Tesink, C. M. J. Y., Kos, M., Buitelaar, J. K., & Hagoort, P. (2012). Empathy matters: ERP evidence for inter-individual differences in social language processing. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *7*(2), 173–183. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsq094>
- Walker, A., & Hay, J. (2011). Congruence between ‘word age’ and ‘voice age’ facilitates lexical access. *Laboratory Phonology*, *2*(1), 219–237.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/LABPHON.2011.007>
- Winkler, I., Haufe, S., & Tangermann, M. (2011). Automatic Classification of Artifactual ICA-Components for Artifact Removal in EEG Signals. *Behavioral and Brain Functions*, *7*(1), 30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1744-9081-7-30>

- Wu, H., Duan, X., & Cai, Z. G. (2024). Speaker Demographics Modulate Listeners' Neural Correlates of Spoken Word Processing. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 1–19.
https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn_a_02225
- Zhang, B., Li, Y. M., Li, J., Luo, J., Ye, Y., Yin, L., Chen, Z., Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2022). The Big Five Inventory–2 in China: A Comprehensive Psychometric Evaluation in Four Diverse Samples. *Assessment*, 29(6), 1262–1284.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/10731911211008245>
- Zhou, P., Garnsey, S., & Christianson, K. (2019). Is imagining a voice like listening to it? Evidence from ERPs. *Cognition*, 182(September 2017), 227–241.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.10.014>

Supplementary Materials

Table S1. Experimental items with English translations

Category	Sentence	English translation
SM	我经常参加 <u>橄榄球</u> 比赛并且带着球队赢得冠军。	I play a lot of <u>rugby</u> and have led my team to championships.
SM	在工作单位我一般都是穿 <u>西服</u> 打领带。	At the workplace I usually wear a <u>suit</u> and a tie.
SM	过生日的时候我经常收到 <u>领带</u> 这样的礼物。	On my birthday I often receive a <u>tie</u> as a gift.
SM	明天晚上我要和我 <u>太太</u> 一起吃晚餐。	I'm having dinner with my <u>wife</u> tomorrow night.
SM	我每周末都在健身房训练 <u>搏击</u> 和格斗。	Every weekend I train <u>grappling</u> and fighting at the gym.
SM	我上个月找到了一份 <u>汽修</u> 的工作。	I got a job as an <u>auto mechanic</u> this past month.
SM	我作为一名 <u>军人</u> 我的职责就是保家卫国。	My duty as a <u>soldier</u> is to protect my country.
SM	我最喜欢的运动是 <u>拳击</u> 和足球。	My favourite sports are <u>boxing</u> and playing soccer.
SM	我这辈子的爱好就是 <u>抽烟</u> 喝酒和赌博。	My hobbies in life are <u>smoking</u> , drinking and gambling.
SM	我在商场做 <u>保安</u> 的时候遇到过一些紧急事件。	I had some emergencies when I was working as a <u>security guard</u> at the mall.
SF	我放松的方式是和 <u>姐妹们</u> 去购物。	My way to relax is to go with my <u>girlfriends</u> for shopping.
SF	今天吃晚饭的时候我 <u>丈夫</u> 建议我换个工作。	Today at dinner my <u>husband</u> suggested that I get a new job.
SF	我喜欢穿浅色的 <u>吊带</u> 来搭配我的新鞋。	I like to wear light-coloured <u>camisoles</u> to match my new shoes.
SF	见重要客户前我都会精心 <u>化妆</u> 确保形象完美。	Before meeting important clients I put on <u>makeup</u> carefully to make sure I look perfect.
SF	我今天预约做 <u>美容</u> 的时间是下午两点。	My appointment for a <u>beauty treatment</u> today is at 2:00 pm.
SF	我真希望自己能变成 <u>麦当娜</u> 那样迷人的人。	I wish I looked like <u>Madonna</u> and as glamorous as she does.
SF	我过生日朋友们经常送我 <u>口红</u> 作为礼物。	My friends often give me <u>lipstick</u> as a gift on my birthday.
SF	为了开始锻炼身体我决定参加 <u>健美操</u> 试听课。	To start working out I decided to take an <u>aerobics</u> trial class.
SF	这个周末我要先去做 <u>美甲</u> 然后理发。	This weekend I'm going to get a <u>manicure</u> and then a haircut.
SF	我每次穿 <u>高跟鞋</u> 走在街上都觉得特别自信。	It makes me feel so confident every time I wear <u>high heels</u> on the street.
SA	我今年 <u>退休</u> 了心里有点悲伤。	I was kind of sad when I <u>retired</u> this year.
SA	我今天和大家讨论 <u>伦理</u> 和道德问题有很多收获。	I have learned a lot from discussing <u>ethical</u> and moral issues with everyone today.
SA	我今天带了一瓶 <u>洋酒</u> 去参加朋友的派对。	I brought a bottle of <u>liquor</u> to a friend's party today.

SA	我最近 <u>上班</u> 压力太大需要休息。	I've been <u>working</u> too hard lately and I need a break.”);
SA	我每天晚上都会先喝一杯 <u>威士忌</u> 再上床睡觉。	Every night I have a glass of <u>whiskey</u> before I go to bed.
SA	我喜欢晚上去 <u>酒吧</u> 喝酒放松。	I love going to <u>bars</u> at night to drink and relax.
SA	我已经 <u>订婚</u> 一年了希望能尽快结婚。	I've been <u>engaged</u> for a year and hope to get married soon.
SA	每周六我都会和其他人聚在一起聊 <u>哲学</u> 和政治。	Every Saturday I meet with other people and talk about <u>philosophy</u> and politics.
SA	我在给我的 <u>跑车</u> 换轮胎的时候把手弄伤了。	I hurt my hand on my <u>sports car</u> while I was changing a tire on it.
SA	他们推荐的 <u>股票</u> 都还不错我赚了很多钱。	They recommended some good <u>stocks</u> and I made a lot of money.
SC	我们经常在一起玩 <u>过家家</u> 的游戏。	We often play <u>house</u> together.
SC	我最喜欢看 <u>卡通片</u> 和读童话故事。	I like watching <u>cartoons</u> and reading fairy tales the most.
SC	他把我的 <u>玩具</u> 抢走了我要去找妈妈告状。	He took my <u>toys</u> away from me and I'm going to tell mummy about it.
SC	我每天晚上必须得抱着我的 <u>小熊</u> 才能睡着。	I have to hold my <u>teddy bear</u> every night to fall asleep.
SC	我从去年开始就不用 <u>奶瓶</u> 喝奶了。	Since last year I haven't used a <u>milk bottle</u> to drink my milk.
SC	昨天我帮我的 <u>洋娃娃</u> 剪了头发。	I cut my <u>doll's</u> hair yesterday.
SC	我从昨晚开始不再咬着 <u>奶嘴</u> 睡了。	I stopped biting my <u>pacifier</u> to sleep since last night.
SC	我刚拿到 <u>零花钱</u> 一小时不到就全都花掉了。	I just got my <u>pocket money</u> and spent it all in less than an hour.
SC	我每天都会在学校学习 <u>写字</u> 和画画。	I learn to <u>write</u> and draw at school every day.
SC	我每天要做的 <u>作业</u> 特别多每天都要做到很晚。	I have a lot of <u>homework</u> to do every day and I have to stay up late every day.
BM	我需要定期去医院检查 <u>前列腺</u> 的健康状况。	I need to go to the hospital to check my <u>prostate</u> on a regular basis.
BM	医生说我的 <u>阴囊</u> 里有肿块要我做进一步的检查。	The doctor said I had a lump in my <u>scrotum</u> and wanted me to have further tests.
BM	每天起了床之后我都要把我的 <u>胡子</u> 刮干净。	Every day I get my <u>beard</u> shaved after I get up.
BM	精神压力大的时候我会有 <u>勃起</u> 方面的问题。	I have problems with <u>erection</u> when I am stressed.
BM	在医院做了检查发现我的一个 <u>睾丸</u> 是畸形的。	A test at the hospital found that one of my <u>testicles</u> was malformed.
BM	十六岁那年我通过手术对我 <u>包皮</u> 过长的部分进行了切除。	When I was sixteen I had surgery to remove the part of my <u>foreskin</u> that was too long.
BM	她们都说我的 <u>喉结</u> 很好看很有魅力。	They all say that my <u>laryngeal knot</u> is very nice and attractive.
BM	我成为一名 <u>父亲</u> 的时候觉得肩上的责任更重了。	The time I became a <u>father</u> I felt a greater responsibility on my shoulders.

BM	我作为孩子的 <u>爸爸</u> 一定要给他树立一个好榜样。	I must set a good example as a <u><i>dad</i></u> to my child.
BM	在备孕期间我为了提高 <u>精子</u> 质量把烟和酒都戒了。	During my preparation for pregnancy I quit smoking and drinking to improve my <u><i>sperm</i></u> quality.
BF	医生说我的 <u>阴道</u> 有炎症需要用抗生素。	The doctor said I had inflammation in my <u><i>vagina</i></u> and needed antibiotics.
BF	我不喜欢他们总盯着我的 <u>胸部</u> 而不看我的眼睛。	I don't like how they always stare at my <u><i>boobs</i></u> and not look me in the eye.
BF	我前几天刚去了医院的 <u>妇产科</u> 做了检查。	I just went to the <u><i>gynaecologist</i></u> at the hospital the other day for a checkup.
BF	我作为家里年龄最大的 <u>姐姐</u> 应该把弟弟妹妹都照顾好。	I'm supposed to take care of all my siblings as the oldest <u><i>sister</i></u> in the family.
BF	我一直想成为一个 <u>妈妈</u> 因为我太喜欢孩子了。	I've always wanted to be a <u><i>mom</i></u> because I love kids so much.
BF	我第一次 <u>怀孕</u> 的时候过得很艰难。	The first time I got <u><i>pregnant</i></u> I had a hard time.
BF	昨天医生在我的 <u>子宫</u> 里发现了一个肿瘤。	A tumour was found in my <u><i>uterus</i></u> by the doctor yesterday.
BF	因为我的 <u>乳房</u> 正在发育男人们总盯着我看。	Because my <u><i>breasts</i></u> are growing men are always staring at me.
BF	我每次来 <u>月经</u> 的时候都特别难受。	Every time I get my <u><i>period</i></u> it's really hard.
BF	医生对我的 <u>卵巢</u> 做了超声检查结果一切正常。	The doctor did an ultrasound on my <u><i>ovaries</i></u> and everything came back normal.
BA	我最近进入 <u>更年期</u> 了经常感觉很烦躁。	I have recently entered <u><i>menopause</i></u> and often feel irritable.
BA	我脸上的 <u>皱纹</u> 是岁月留下的痕迹。	I have <u><i>wrinkles</i></u> on my face from the years.
BA	我头顶的 <u>白发</u> 这几年越来越多了。	I have more and more <u><i>grey hair</i></u> on my head in the past few years.
BA	我发现我的 <u>女儿</u> 特别聪明。	I have noticed that my <u><i>daughter</i></u> is exceptionally bright.
BA	我刚做完 <u>糖尿病</u> 检查正在等待结果。	I just had a <u><i>diabetes</i></u> test and am waiting for the results.
BA	我从去年开始戴 <u>老花镜</u> 了因为视力越来越差。	I've been wearing <u><i>presbyopic glasses</i></u> since last year because my vision is getting worse.
BA	我发现我脸上的 <u>老年斑</u> 越来越多了我正在寻找新的治疗方法。	I have noticed that I am getting more and more <u><i>age spots</i></u> on my face and I am looking for new treatments.
BA	我一直在注意控制自己的 <u>血压</u> 每天都需要定时吃降压药。	I have been taking care of my <u><i>blood pressure</i></u> and I need to take antihypertensive pills regularly every day.
BA	我从去年开始 <u>脱发</u> 变得越来越严重。	I started having <u><i>hair loss</i></u> last year which has become worse and worse.
BA	今年我的 <u>孙女</u> 出生了我终于当爷爷了。	This year my <u><i>granddaughter</i></u> was born and I finally became a grandfather.
BC	我在等我的 <u>乳牙</u> 掉下来然后我要把它扔到房顶上。	I'm waiting for my <u><i>milk tooth</i></u> to fall out and then I'm going to throw it on the roof.
BC	我今天接受了 <u>儿科</u> 医生的营养检查他让我多吃蔬菜补充维生素。	I had a nutritional checkup with my <u><i>paediatrician</i></u> today and he told me to eat more vegetables for vitamins.

BC	我好像开始进入 <u>青春期</u> 了我开始长胡子了。	It seems like I'm starting to reach <u>puberty</u> and I'm starting to grow a beard.
BC	我希望我 <u>长大</u> 以后能够保护妈妈。	I hope when I <u>grow up</u> I'll be able to protect my mom.
BC	我是四年前才 <u>断奶</u> 的妈妈告诉我的。	It was only four years ago that I was <u>weaned</u> as my mom told me.
BC	前年我刚学会 <u>走路</u> 的时候爸爸妈妈都特别高兴。	When I first learned to <u>walk</u> the year before my mom and dad were really happy.
BC	我是前年才学会 <u>说话</u> 的妈妈说我开口说话比别人晚。	I only learned to <u>talk</u> the year before last and my mom said I spoke later than others.
BC	我在医院里查出了 <u>儿童</u> 营养不良医生说这是挑食导致的。	I've been diagnosed with <u>juvenile</u> malnutrition in the hospital and the doctor said it was caused by picky eating.
BC	我正在处于身体 <u>发育</u> 的年龄妈妈说要注意补充营养。	I am at the age of physical <u>development</u> and my mom says I need to pay attention to nutrition.
BC	我现在正在 <u>换牙</u> 的过程中妈妈说我应该喝牛奶补钙。	I'm in the process of <u>changing teeth</u> and my mom says I should drink milk for calcium.

SM: socially plausible with male but implausible with female speakers; SF: socially plausible with female but implausible with male speakers; SA: socially plausible with adult but implausible with child speakers; SC: socially plausible with child but implausible with adult speakers; BM: biologically plausible with male but implausible with female speakers; BF: biologically plausible with female but implausible with male speakers; BA: biologically plausible with adult but implausible with child speakers; BC: biologically plausible with child but implausible with adult speakers.

Table S2. LME Models for Plausibility Rating Analysis

Predictor	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Model for main analysis				
Intercept	4.58	0.12	38.65	< 0.001
Plausibility	-3.59	0.19	-19.15	< 0.001
Type	-0.83	0.13	-6.58	< 0.001
Plausibility: Type	-1.31	0.24	-5.37	< 0.001
Model for openness analysis				
Intercept	4.58	0.12	39.15	< 0.001
Plausibility	-3.59	0.19	-19.20	< 0.001
Type	-0.83	0.13	-6.63	< 0.001
Openness	0.15	0.11	1.39	0.174
Plausibility: Type	-1.31	0.24	-5.47	< 0.001
Plausibility: Openness	0.17	0.16	1.10	0.281
Type: Openness	-0.11	0.07	-1.50	0.144
Plausibility: Type: Openness	-0.28	0.12	-2.35	0.026

Model for main analysis: Rating ~ Plausibility*Type + (Plausibility*Type + 1 | Participant) + (Plausibility +1 | Item); Model of openness analysis: Rating ~ Plausibility*Type*Openness + (Plausibility*Type + 1 | Participant) + (Plausibility +1 | Item).

Table S3. LME Models for Topography analysis

Predictor	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Models for posteriority analysis				
N400 (300-600 ms)				
Intercept	-1.01	0.19	-5.19	< 0.001
Plausibility	-0.24	0.32	-0.75	0.454
Type	0.43	0.31	1.41	0.162
Posteriority	0.16	0.23	0.69	0.492
Plausibility: Type	0.68	0.57	1.20	0.232
Plausibility: Posteriority	-0.20	0.25	-0.78	0.436
Type: Posteriority	0.24	0.35	0.67	0.506
Plausibility: Type: Posteriority	0.91	0.47	1.92	0.054
P600 (600-1000 ms)				
Intercept	0.38	0.26	1.45	0.151
Plausibility	0.01	0.38	0.03	0.977
Type	0.89	0.35	2.54	0.013
Posteriority	1.69	0.26	6.49	< 0.001
Plausibility: Type	1.63	0.68	2.38	0.019
Plausibility: Posteriority	0.46	0.28	1.68	0.092
Type: Posteriority	0.83	0.35	2.39	0.019
Plausibility: Type: Posteriority	1.67	0.55	3.03	0.002
Models for laterality analysis				
N400 (300-600 ms)				
Intercept	-1.01	0.19	-5.20	< 0.001
Plausibility	-0.24	0.32	-0.75	0.454
Type	0.43	0.31	1.41	0.162
Laterality	-0.27	0.12	-2.24	0.025
Plausibility: Type	0.68	0.57	1.20	0.233
Plausibility: Laterality	0.06	0.24	0.24	0.811
Type: Laterality	-0.02	0.24	-0.10	0.923
Plausibility: Type: Laterality	0.33	0.48	0.68	0.495
P600 (600-1000 ms)				
Intercept	0.38	0.26	1.45	0.151
Plausibility	0.01	0.38	0.03	0.980
Type	0.89	0.35	2.54	0.013
Laterality	-0.06	0.14	-0.44	0.657
Plausibility: Type	1.63	0.68	2.38	0.019
Plausibility: Laterality	0.19	0.28	0.69	0.490
Type: Laterality	0.04	0.28	0.14	0.891
Plausibility: Type: Laterality	0.13	0.56	0.23	0.819

Model for posteriority analysis (N400): Amplitude ~ Plausibility*Type*Posteriority + (Plausibility*Type + Posteriority + Plausibility: Posteriority + 1 | Participant) + (Plausibility + Posteriority + 1 | Item); Model for posteriority analysis (P600): Amplitude ~ Plausibility*Type*Posteriority + (Plausibility*Type + Posteriority + 1 | Participant) + (Plausibility + Posteriority + 1 | Item); Model for laterality analysis (N400): Amplitude ~ Plausibility*Type*Laterality + (Plausibility*Type + 1 | Participant) + (Plausibility + 1 | Item); Model for laterality analysis (P600): Amplitude ~ Plausibility*Type*Laterality + (Plausibility*Type + 1 | Participant) + (Plausibility + 1 | Item).

Table S4. LME Models for ROI analysis

Predictor	β	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Models for main analysis				
N400 (300-600 ms)				
Intercept	-1.04	0.20	-5.25	< 0.001
Plausibility	-0.32	0.28	-1.12	0.269
Type	0.54	0.34	1.60	0.113
Plausibility: Type	1.16	0.50	2.32	0.021
P600 (600-1000 ms)				
Intercept	1.13	0.27	4.11	< 0.001
Plausibility	0.21	0.35	0.60	0.550
Type	1.28	0.37	3.47	< 0.001
Plausibility: Type	2.44	0.59	4.14	< 0.001
Models for openness analysis				
N400 (300-600 ms)				
Intercept	-1.04	0.20	-5.25	< 0.001
Plausibility	-0.32	0.29	-1.09	0.281
Type	0.54	0.34	1.60	0.113
Openness	-0.15	0.15	-0.98	0.330
Plausibility: Type	1.16	0.51	2.25	0.027
Plausibility: Openness	0.17	0.27	0.65	0.520
Type: Openness	-0.10	0.23	-0.43	0.668
Plausibility: Type: Openness	-1.12	0.46	-2.41	0.016
P600 (600-1000 ms)				
Intercept	1.13	0.27	4.15	< 0.001
Plausibility	0.21	0.35	0.59	0.557
Type	1.28	0.36	3.57	< 0.001
Openness	-0.40	0.24	-1.63	0.109
Plausibility: Type	2.44	0.59	4.14	< 0.001
Plausibility: Openness	0.09	0.33	0.27	0.791
Type: Openness	-0.39	0.26	-1.49	0.137
Plausibility: Type: Openness	-0.88	0.53	-1.65	0.099

Model for main analysis (N400): Amplitude ~ Plausibility*Type + (Plausibility + 1 | Participant) + (Plausibility + 1 | Item); Model for main analysis (P600): Amplitude ~ Plausibility*Type + (Plausibility + Type + 1 | Participant) + (Plausibility + 1 | Item); Model for openness analysis (N400): Amplitude ~ Plausibility*Type*Openness + (Plausibility + 1 | Participant) + (Plausibility + 1 | Item); Model for openness analysis (P600): Amplitude ~ Plausibility*Type*Openness + (Plausibility + 1 | Participant) + (Plausibility + 1 | Item).

Table S5. Sites included in Topology Analysis and ROI Analysis

Region	Sites
Topology analysis	
Left-anterior region	FP1, AF7, AF3, F7, F5, F3, F1, FC5, FC3, FC1, AFp5, AFF7h, AFF5h, AFF3h, FFT7h, FFC5h, FFC3h
Right-anterior region	FP2, AF4, AF8, F2, F4, F6, F8, FC2, FC4, FC6, AFF4h, AFF6h, AFF8h, FFC4h, FFC6h, FFT8h
Left-posterior region	CP5, CP3, CP1, P7, P5, P3, P1, PO7, PO3, O1, TPP7h, CPP5h, CPP3h, PPO7h, PPO5h, PPO3h, POO5
Right-posterior region	CP2, CP4, CP6, P2, P4, P6, P8, PO4, PO8, O2, CPP4h, CPP6h, TPP8h, PPO4h, PPO6h, PPO8h, POO6
ROI analysis	
Central-posterior region	P6, P7, P8, PPO1h, PPO2h, PPO3h, PPO4h, PPO5h, PPO6h, PPO7h, PPO8h, POz, PO3, PO4, PO7, PO8, POO1, POO2, POO5, POO6, POO9h, POO10h, Oz, O1, O2, OI1h, OI2h