

INPLASY PROTOCOL

To cite: Harel-Arbeli et al. The cognitive cost of using context in spoken language recognition. Inplasy protocol 202120057. doi: 10.37766/inplasy2021.2.0057

Received: 18 February 2021

Published: 18 February 2021

Corresponding author:
Tami Harel Arbeli

tamiyyy@gmail.com

Author Affiliation:
University of Haifa

Support: None.

Review Stage at time of this submission: Preliminary searches.

Conflicts of interest:
None declared.

The cognitive cost of using context in spoken language recognition

Harel-Arbeli, T¹; Ben-David, BM²; Palgi, Y³.

Review question / Objective: What is the cognitive cost of using contextual cues in spoken word recognition?

Condition being studied: The use of context in spoken language recognition.

Information sources: electronic databases, grey literature, hand search, contact with authors.

INPLASY registration number: This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 18 February 2021 and was last updated on 18 February 2021 (registration number INPLASY202120057).

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective: What is the cognitive cost of using contextual cues in spoken word recognition?

Condition being studied: The use of context in spoken language recognition.

METHODS

Participant or population: Human adults.

Intervention: The use of context in spoken language recognition.

Comparator: Comparison of cognitive cost of language understanding with or without contextual cues.

Study designs to be included: Experimental.

Eligibility criteria: Adults over 18 years of age.

Information sources: electronic databases, grey literature, hand search, contact with authors.

Main outcome(s): A scoping review of the literature examining cognitive cost of context use. Identifying the nature and extent of the evidence gathered in different methodologies.

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis: No formal quality assessment (a scoping review).

Strategy of data synthesis: Tabular and narrative commentary.

Subgroup analysis: Methodologies (correlation studies vs. manipulations such as dual task studies), Type of stimuli presentation (quiet/noise, normal/distorted).

Sensitivity analysis: Not necessary for scoping review.

Language: No restriction.

Country(ies) involved: Israel.

Keywords: context use, prediction in language processing, cognitive resources.

Contributions of each author:

Author 1 - Tami Harel-Arbeli.

Author 2 - Boaz M. Ben-David.

Author 3 - Yuval Palgi.