

Multimodal Shannon Game with Images

Vilém Zouhar^{U E}

Sunit Bhattacharya^U

Ondřej Bojar^U

^EETH Zürich

^UInstitute of Formal and Applied Linguistics, Charles University

{zouhar, bhattacharya, bojar}@ufal.mff.cuni.cz

Abstract

The Shannon game has long been used as a thought experiment in linguistics and NLP, asking participants to guess the next letter in a sentence based on its preceding context. We extend the game by introducing an optional extra modality in the form of image information. To investigate the impact of multimodal information in this game, we use human participants and a language model (LM, GPT-2).

We show that the addition of image information improves both self-reported confidence and accuracy for both humans and LM. Certain word classes, such as nouns and determiners, benefit more from the additional modality information. The priming effect in both humans and the LM becomes more apparent as the context size (extra modality information + sentence context) increases. These findings highlight the potential of multimodal information in improving language understanding and modeling.



Code: github.com/zouharvi/mmsg



Annotation demo: vilda.net/s/mmsg?uid=demo

1 Introduction

The Shannon Game (Shannon, 1951)¹ is a classic experiment that aims to demonstrate the predictability of the English language. Originally designed as a method for estimating the perplexity of a language, the game involves asking participants to predict the first letter of a text. Participants can choose from any of the 26 letters or space, the correct character is revealed and they are asked to guess the next (second) letter, and so on. When considering the game at the word level (Figure 1), it can be viewed as a variant of greedy autoregressive language modelling. As with autoregressive language modelling, the Shannon Game can be framed as the task of repeatedly predicting the probability of the next word given the previous context.

⁼Co-first authors.

¹Not to be confused with Shannon’s Switching Game.




Figure 1: Sentence “Several plates of food are set on a table.” presented with an image. Given the first 3 words, the participant now has to think of the next word, rate their confidence and after food is revealed, self-evaluate how close they were.

Numerous studies show that humans find it easier to process words that are probable given the context (Huang and Rao, 2011; Lupyan and Clark, 2015; Clark, 2013). This phenomenon was widely studied in humans using the *cloze procedure* (Taylor, 1953), where participants are presented with incomplete sentences and are asked to fill in the blanks using the context from both the left and right sides. The Shannon Game can therefore be seen as a version of the cloze task, where the word is to be predicted without the right-side context. Some studies have also investigated the impact of priming on word predictability using the cloze task (Kutas and Hillyard, 1984). However, these studies have been limited to the single, textual modality. In this article, we aim to address this gap and explore priming in multimodal conditions for both humans and Language Models (LMs), such as GPT-2 (Radford et al., 2019).

We compare LM and human prediction capabilities in both text-only and multimodal settings. To this goal, we extend the Shannon Game to include an extra visual modality and investigate the relationship between self-reported confidence and accuracy of next word prediction in humans and the LM. Additionally, we relate the psycholinguistic concept of *priming* to the neural language modelling concept of *prompting*.

2 Related Work

Early research on the impact of contextual information on lexical prediction during reading relied on sentence prediction tasks (Fischler and Bloom, 1979; Kleiman, 1980). This concept was first introduced as a Shannon Game by Goldman-Eisler (1958), while the earliest versions involving images were proposed by Attneave (1954); Barlow et al. (1961); Kersten (1987). In fact, reading and sentence prediction have been compared to a *psycholinguistic guessing game* (Goodman, 1969; Cairns and Kamerman, 1975; Goodman, 2014). We posit that a task like next word prediction in a sentence provides an interesting opportunity to study the impact of context in language processing and predictability. With the exploration of predictive processing in reading (Wlotko and Federmeier, 2015), we can utilize these developments to design our experiment.

The effect of context is pervasive and present at multiple levels of processing (Willems and Peelen, 2021). Previous fMRI studies (Mummary et al., 1999; Rissman et al., 2003) have demonstrated that the brain’s response to a given word depends on the preceding linguistic context. Ames et al. (2015) explore the impact of contextual information, in the form of visual data, on discourse comprehension and Altmann and Mirković (2009) provide a comprehensive cognitive explanation of how visual context affects language processing, reporting that the “eyes move toward whatever in the visual scene that unfolding word could refer to.” Several psycholinguistically motivated studies (Barca and Pezzulo, 2012; Vanderwart, 1984) have investigated the role of general context in lexical prediction and how cross-modal priming (with images and text) works in lexical decision tasks. However, these studies did not explicitly investigate semantic priming for a cloze task. We attempt to do so in a cross-modal setting. Our aim is to explore the extent of semantic priming in a Shannon Game setting when priming is done using an image or information extracted from that image, in the direction of Cho et al. (2021). Hence, the Multimodal Shannon Game with images can also be perceived as an autoregressive image captioning task, where the output is generated word-by-word, and its accuracy can be easily measured (Hossain et al., 2019).

In this direction, Bhattacharya et al. (2022) conducted an experiment on human participants with translation enhanced by image modality, which is parallel to our experiment with language modelling using the same modality. Finally, some researchers (Hladká et al., 2009, 2011) have utilized the *Games With a Purpose* methodology (Von Ahn and Dabbish, 2008) to frame tasks that are difficult for computers but relatively easy for humans as games. Similarly, we frame our experiment as a game that participants reportedly enjoy.

3 Priming and Prompting

Priming is a psychological and linguistic phenomenon where the presentation of a stimulus affects the processing of another stimulus in the future. This effect has been widely studied in various contexts and has been defined as the facilitative effect of an encounter with a stimulus on subsequent processing of the same or a related stimulus (Tulving et al., 1982). One of the most important paradigms of priming is semantic priming, where the response to a stimulus is faster if it is preceded by something semantically related. For example, the reaction to the word “dog” in a sentence would be faster if a semantically related prime, like “cat”, were presented previously in the sentence (Meyer and Schvaneveldt, 1971; Shelton and Martin, 1992).

Prompting is a relatively new paradigm in neural language modeling where pretrained language models are trained to perform several downstream tasks by using an appropriate “prompting function” (Liu et al., 2021). In this paradigm, a pretrained language model is conditioned on extra information in the context, in addition to the previous words, to model $p(w_i|w_{<i}, C)$.

We use the Multimodal Shannon Game (MMSG) framework to assess the hypothesis that semantic priming manifests itself in the same way in humans as it does in large autoregressive language models. Specifically, that the additional visual information (in whichever form) helps in the next word prediction task in the same way for both humans and LMs. The results of this study contribute to our understanding of how multimodal information can be used to improve language modeling and documentation of the semantic priming effects.

No image	No extra information was shown and the participants could only use the left context.
Original	The full original image was shown.
Labels all	The full original image was shown with bounding boxes and labels (Figure 3b).
Labels crop	The detected parts of the image were cropped and the snippets shown with labels (Figure 3c).
Labels text	Only the list of labels of objects in the image was shown (Figure 3d).

Table 1: Possible multimodality configurations.




Figure 2: Annotation pipeline for Multimodal Shannon Game with images. The loop ends when the end of sentence is reached.




Figure 3: The 4 configurations of multimodality for the same sentence (“Several plates of food are set on a table.”). Given the first 3 words, the participant now has to think of the next word, rate their confidence and after *food* is revealed, self-evaluate how accurate they were. The configuration *no image* is not shown.

#	Confidence	Accuracy
0	You have no idea about the next word.	Could not be more wrong (wrong area and POS)
1	You know at least e.g. what part-of-speech the next word probably is.	Very wrong but some aspects close (e.g. POS)
2	You know roughly what areas of words to expect.	Wrong but the idea was roughly right
3	You know the next word or some variations of it.	Very close (same area and POS)
4	You know the next word precisely.	Exact match

Table 2: Description of the **confidence** and **accuracy** scale shown to the participants.

4 Experiment setup

Methodology. The MMSG experiment consists of asking participants to predict the next word based on the previous (left) context, optionally given a related image information (see example in Figure 1). We consider five configurations as described in Table 1. All participants saw each of the 17 sentences (listed in Appendix B) with a randomly generated configuration. *No image* corresponds to vanilla autoregressive LM while *Original* corresponds to a multimodal LM which also processes an image. *Labels all*, *labels crop* and *labels text* correspond to pipelines that use an image object detector as an intermediate step. Examples of configurations are shown in Figures 1 and 3.

Participants. We enrolled 24 volunteers from the academic environment, aged 24 to 40 years of various nationalities. They were all non-native English speakers with advanced language proficiency (C1 and C2 levels).

Annotation environment. The annotation environment used in the MMSG experiment consists of a sequence of screens for each sentence. Each screen starts with one of the five configurations, a blank “_” cursor and the participant being asked to guess the first word and mark their confidence on a numeric scale (Table 2). Upon pressing any of the five buttons, the actual next word is revealed and the participants are presented with a self-evaluation scale (Table 2). Afterwards, they guess the next word and so on until the end of the sentence. The whole experiment instructions are available in Ap-

pendix A. The overall pipeline, for humans and LMs, is shown in Figure 2. See Figure 9 for the user interface thorough the whole pipeline.

The experiment was implemented as a web application, which allowed us to reach more participants at the cost of having no control over the environment.²

Sentences. We selected 16 English sentences of length between 8 to 15 words. This scale was chosen so that the participants are fully focused during the whole session (average of 25 minutes). Furthermore, the smaller scale is required to have a more representative sample for each sentence + configuration tuple. Note that this is not the natural distribution of the sentence length but desirable from an experiment design perspective to be able to compare phenomena across this variable. Because they were taken from an image captioning dataset, some of the “sentences” are actually noun phrases without the main verb, which made the task more challenging for the participants. The full list of the sentences is in Appendix B.

We also added the sentence “To be or not to be.” with an accompanying picture. We assumed that the participants would easily recognize this sentence after the first few words and would continue with a sequence of high ratings. This was meant to calibrate the participants’ ratings and to introduce them to the task.

²The annotation environment was shown on various browser versions of the participants.




Figure 4: Heatmap of confidence \times self-eval scores across configurations. The x-axis is the confidence score. Each cell reports the number of such judgements. Correlations (ρ) are Pearson’s correlation coefficients between the confidence and self-eval scores.




Figure 5: Average confidence and self-eval scores and times. Confidence intervals are 95% from t-distribution. Note the two separate y-axes for two kinds of quantities.




Figure 6: Average prediction confidence and self-eval scores with reaction times with respect to the sentence length for all configurations.

5 Analysis

5.1 Effect of Configurations

The confidence and accuracy averaged for each configuration are shown in Figure 5. The *original* configuration (where the entire image was shown to the participants) yielded both the highest confidence and self-evaluation scores while *no image* configuration the lowest. This shows that the participants were able to utilize the visual information. When distilled to a set of labels (*labels text*) or a series of pictures of individual objects extracted from the image (*labels crop*), it still increased the confidence in their guesses with respect to the *no image* configuration.

The difference in the self-reported accuracy and self-reported confidence for the configurations *labels text* and *labels crop* is minimal. From a theoretical perspective, *labels all* only added extra information in the form of bounding boxes and labels. This had, unfortunately, a slightly detrimental effect in comparison to *original*. The participants agreed that the *original* configuration was the easiest and that the *labels all* was only distracting, in some cases obscuring an important part of the image and possibly suggested different synonyms than used in the sentence.

The distribution of confidence and self-eval scores is shown in Figure 4, which also shows the bipolarity of the ratings. Often the participants were either very sure and were correct (high scores) or the opposite (low scores) with few in-between.

5.2 Effect of Word Position

The first few words had naturally lower confidence and evaluation scores (accuracy), as shown in Figure 6. This is expected on account of the space of all possible predictions due to the limited available context.

For the first word, the participants used mostly one of two strategies: guessing an article or nothing at all. The average confidence and self-evaluation for *no image* was 1.19 and 0.48 and for *original* was 2.14 and 2.16. This is interesting as 10 out of 17 sentences begin with a determiner where the image should not help.

5.3 Effect of Part of Speech

Naturally, some word classes are easier to predict than others. This is shown in Figure 7 where the users performed systematically better on determiners than other POS, like nouns. Finally, for both accuracy and confidence, the *no image* configuration yields the lowest values across all POS. This is counterintuitive because the prediction of a determiner should be based on purely the syntactic properties of the left context and not the multimodality. A possible explanation is the grammatical number disambiguation in the image.

Nouns are of interest because what the object labels represent in configurations like *labels all*, *labels crop* and *labels text* are a sequence of nouns. Nevertheless, For the nouns, we see the *labels text* configuration yields the worst confidence and accuracy score from among other configurations with added modal information. Even though we attempt at semantic priming of the




Figure 7: Average POS prediction confidence and self-evaluation from annotators. Confidence intervals are 95% from t-distribution.




Figure 8: Average POS prediction confidence and accuracy scores from GPT-2. Confidence intervals are 95% from t-distribution.

nouns, the priming via text (*labels text*) is comparatively less effective when analyzed with the confidence and accuracy scores of the human participants

5.4 LM Results

We replicate the experiment on the GPT-2 language model (Radford et al., 2019). In every step, for every word w and model prediction p (distribution across vocabulary), we use $\max p$ (maximum word probability) as the confidence of the model output. The output, despite being a probability formally, is however not calibrated (Jiang et al., 2021). Because GPT-2 is not a visual model, we consider only two configurations: *no image* and *labels text*. Figure 8 shows the results for GPT-2. Slightly higher accuracy and confidence for the *labels text* configuration show that the model is able to make use of the fusion to improve its prediction. It exhibits some similar patterns to humans: lower confidence and accuracy for nouns and verbs and high for determiners. The human-LM Pearson correlation coefficients for both confidence and accuracy decreases when we fuse in the labels (Table 3), suggesting different usage of the extra information in humans and LM.

6 Discussion

Inspired by the 4 central questions (*Why? What? How? When?*) about prediction in language processing proposed by Huettig (2015), we look at the results from the

	<i>no image</i>	<i>labels text</i>
Confidence	0.38	0.25
Accuracy	0.56	0.45

Table 3: Pearson correlation coefficients (micro) between human annotators and GPT-2 predictions.

cognitive perspective. We are primarily interested in the *What?* questions i.e. what cues were relevant for the predictions and what language features are affected the most with change in contextual cues.

Irrespective of the input modality, from the POS experiments it is evident that both the prediction confidence (anticipatory processing by (Kukona et al., 2014)) and accuracy for verbs and nouns improve significantly with an informative multimodal context. We also posit that the extra modality makes the models (and humans) more confident about the content of the sentence and that translates to the added confidence and accuracy of determiners. Note that for GPT-2 the pattern of confidence and accuracy increasing with extra modal information does not fit perfectly with verbs.

In terms of the effects of priming in language models, Sinclair et al. (2022); Prasad et al. (2019) use (syntactic and structural) priming to see how much language models are susceptible to priming effects. Similarly, Misra et al. (2020) explored the effect of semantic priming in BERT. Our formulation of the Multimodal Shannon Game establishes a way to effectively compare the priming effects in humans and LMs on the same benchmark which has not been attempted before. We also find that the priming effect, as explored by us, gets more noticeable with additional context with autoregressive models, which contradicts Misra et al. (2020). However, we do acknowledge that although they looked at the phenomenon of semantic priming, the methodology and the nature of stimuli used in Misra et al. (2020) is radically different.

In summary, we see from the experiments that priming, the effects of which are well studied in humans can be related to prompting in large language models.

7 Summary

In this paper, we introduced the multimodal version of the Shannon Game and ran an experiment on human participants and we arrived at the following conclusions:

- Presence of any visual information has a positive effect on the next word prediction confidence and accuracy.
- Out of all the configurations, the full image (*original*), improved these quantities the most.
- There is a mixed effect of the image configuration and the word POS on these quantities.
- The effects of priming becomes more and more noticeable with growing context length.

We also include a study performed on the GPT-2 language model and find that:

- The GPT-2 model too benefits from the additional modality, though with much greater variation.
- The word POS also has an effect on the confidence and accuracy.
- The correlation on those two quantities between humans and GPT-2 is reduced with an additional modality.

8 Future work

The space of extra modalities with the Shannon Game and the cloze task is underexplored. Video or audio could be compared with still images to determine usefulness and informativity for next-word prediction. The presented multimodal task could also be analyzed with standard psycholinguistic tools, such as EEG or eye-tracking. Importantly, this experiment should be compared to multimodal language models and more recent models, which exhibit new, emergent, properties.

Limitations

We focused on English which may have a different distribution of information within the sentence. For example, a more morphologically rich language with a higher degree of agreement could show to be more predictable. Despite using English sentences, all participants were non-native, albeit proficient, speakers. However, most users of English are non-native³ and focusing on this user base should not be perceived as an out-of-necessity substitution for enrolling native speakers.

Ethics statement

The published data does not contain any identifiable personal information and the authors foresee no ethical concerns. The stimulus data used for the study

was drawn from publicly available datasets and the pre-trained models used for experiments were taken from an open-sourced repository. The authors see no ethical problems about the methodology. However, the authors would invite collaboration on pinpointing the ethical issues when performing experiments that seek to compare human behaviour with algorithmic behavior.

References

- Gerry TM Altmann and Jelena Mirković. 2009. [Incrementality and prediction in human sentence processing](#). *Cognitive science*, 33(4):583–609.
- Daniel L Ames, Christopher J Honey, Michael A Chow, Alexander Todorov, and Uri Hasson. 2015. [Contextual alignment of cognitive and neural dynamics](#). *Journal of cognitive neuroscience*, 27(4):655–664.
- Fred Attneave. 1954. [Some informational aspects of visual perception](#). *Psychological review*, 61(3):183.
- Laura Barca and Giovanni Pezzulo. 2012. [Unfolding visual lexical decision in time](#). *PloS one*, 7(4):e35932.
- Horace B Barlow et al. 1961. [Possible principles underlying the transformation of sensory messages](#). *Sensory communication*, 1(01).
- Sunit Bhattacharya, Věra Kloudová, Vilém Zouhar, and Ondřej Bojar. 2022. [EMMT: A simultaneous eye-tracking, 4-electrode EEG and audio corpus for multi-modal reading and translation scenarios](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02905*.
- Helen S Cairns and Joan Kamerman. 1975. [Lexical information processing during sentence comprehension](#). *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 14(2):170–179.
- Jaemin Cho, Jie Lei, Hao Tan, and Mohit Bansal. 2021. [Unifying vision-and-language tasks via text generation](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1931–1942. PMLR.
- Andy Clark. 2013. [Whatever next? predictive brains, situated agents, and the future of cognitive science](#). *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 36(3):181–204.
- Ira Fischler and Paul A Bloom. 1979. [Automatic and attentional processes in the effects of sentence contexts on word recognition](#). *Journal of verbal learning and verbal behavior*, 18(1):1–20.
- Frieda Goldman-Eisler. 1958. [Speech production and the predictability of words in context](#). *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 10(2):96–106.
- Kenneth S Goodman. 1969. [Analysis of oral reading miscues: Applied psycholinguistics](#). *Reading research quarterly*, pages 9–30.
- Kenneth S Goodman. 2014. [Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game](#). In *Making sense of learners making sense of written language*, pages 115–124.

³lemongrad.com/english-language-statistics

- Barbora Hladká, Jirí Mírovský, and Jan Kohout. 2011. [An attractive game with the document:\(im\) possible? The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics](#), 96:5.
- Barbora Hladká, Jiří Mírovský, and Pavel Schlesinger. 2009. [Designing a language game for collecting coreference annotation](#). In *Proceedings of the Third Linguistic Annotation Workshop (LAW III)*, pages 52–55.
- MD Zakir Hossain, Ferdous Sohel, Mohd Fairuz Shiratuddin, and Hamid Laga. 2019. [A comprehensive survey of deep learning for image captioning](#). *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 51(6):1–36.
- Yanping Huang and Rajesh PN Rao. 2011. [Predictive coding](#). *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 2(5):580–593.
- Falk Huettig. 2015. [Four central questions about prediction in language processing](#). *Brain research*, 1626:118–135.
- Zhengbao Jiang, Jun Araki, Haibo Ding, and Graham Neubig. 2021. [How can we know when language models know? on the calibration of language models for question answering](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 9:962–977.
- Daniel Kersten. 1987. [Predictability and redundancy of natural images](#). *JOSA A*, 4(12):2395–2400.
- Glenn M Kleiman. 1980. [Sentence frame contexts and lexical decisions: Sentence-acceptability and word-relatedness effects](#). *Memory & Cognition*, 8(4):336–344.
- Anuenue Kukona, Pyeong Whan Cho, James S Magnuson, and Whitney Tabor. 2014. [Lexical interference effects in sentence processing: Evidence from the visual world paradigm and self-organizing models](#). *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 40(2):326.
- Marta Kutas and Steven A Hillyard. 1984. [Brain potentials during reading reflect word expectancy and semantic association](#). *Nature*, 307(5947):161–163.
- Pengfei Liu, Weizhe Yuan, Jinlan Fu, Zhengbao Jiang, Hiroaki Hayashi, and Graham Neubig. 2021. [Pre-train, prompt, and predict: A systematic survey of prompting methods in natural language processing](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.13586*.
- Gary Lupyan and Andy Clark. 2015. [Words and the world: Predictive coding and the language-perception-cognition interface](#). *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(4):279–284.
- David E Meyer and Roger W Schvaneveldt. 1971. [Facilitation in recognizing pairs of words: Evidence of a dependence between retrieval operations](#). *Journal of experimental psychology*, 90(2):227.
- Kanishka Misra, Allyson Ettinger, and Julia Taylor Rayz. 2020. [Exploring BERT’s sensitivity to lexical cues using tests from semantic priming](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03010*.
- Catherine J Mummery, Tim Shallice, and CJ Price. 1999. [Dual-process model in semantic priming: A functional imaging perspective](#). *Neuroimage*, 9(5):516–525.
- Grusha Prasad, Marten Van Schijndel, and Tal Linzen. 2019. [Using priming to uncover the organization of syntactic representations in neural language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.10579*.
- Alec Radford, Jeff Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, and Ilya Sutskever. 2019. [Language models are unsupervised multitask learners](#).
- Jesse Rissman, James C Eliassen, and Sheila E Blumstein. 2003. [An event-related fMRI investigation of implicit semantic priming](#). *Journal of cognitive neuroscience*, 15(8):1160–1175.
- Claude E Shannon. 1951. [Prediction and entropy of printed english](#). *Bell system technical journal*, 30(1):50–64.
- Jennifer R Shelton and Randi C Martin. 1992. [How semantic is automatic semantic priming? Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, memory, and cognition](#), 18(6):1191.
- Arabella Sinclair, Jaap Jumelet, Willem Zuidema, and Raquel Fernández. 2022. [Structural persistence in language models: Priming as a window into abstract language representations](#). *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:1031–1050.
- Wilson L Taylor. 1953. [“cloze procedure”: A new tool for measuring readability](#). *Journalism quarterly*, 30(4):415–433.
- Endel Tulving, Daniel L Schacter, and Heather A Stark. 1982. [Priming effects in word-fragment completion are independent of recognition memory](#). *Journal of experimental psychology: learning, memory, and cognition*, 8(4):336.
- Mary Vanderwart. 1984. [Priming by pictures in lexical decision](#). *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 23(1):67–83.
- Luis Von Ahn and Laura Dabbish. 2008. [Designing games with a purpose](#). *Communications of the ACM*, 51(8):58–67.
- Roel M Willems and Marius V Peelen. 2021. [How context changes the neural basis of perception and language](#). *Isience*, 24(5):102392.
- Edward W Wlotko and Kara D Federmeier. 2015. [Time for prediction? the effect of presentation rate on predictive sentence comprehension during word-by-word reading](#). *Cortex*, 68:20–32.




Figure 9: prediction and self-evaluation of a single word based on the information of “To be,” and the image.

Appendix

A Participant Instructions

The following text was shown to participants (formatting and list removed):

In this experiment you’re going to be predicting the next word in a sentence, starting with the first word. Your task is to think about the next word (a specific word) and then click a number corresponding to how confident you are in your prediction.

Afterwards, the word is shown and you should evaluate how close your prediction was. Some of the sentences may be accompanied by images, labelled images, a set of labels or snippets of items (you may need to scroll down to see all). You should use these to improve your prediction.

The whole session should not last longer than 20-30 minutes. Please take breaks only after you just finished your sentence, before clicking next sentence. This is important as we are evaluating also the reaction times. Do not close this window throughout the experiment as your progress would be lost.

B Sentences

The following sentences were used in the experiment in fixed order:

0. To be or not to be, that is the question
1. A girl with some food and drink at a table.
2. Man and son standing on the beach side with a self assembled kite.
3. A medium sized home kitchen with wood cabinets.
4. Several plates of food are set on a table.
5. A woman slashing down a snowy hill on skis.
6. An Adidas advertisement depicts a male and a female tennis player on the court.
7. A small brown teddy bear sitting on top of a box.
8. A macbook laptop next to a phone, backpack, and various books.
9. A person sits in a small boat on the water.
10. People watching an on screen presentation of a gentleman in a suit.
11. Food trucks are parked around small oval tables.
12. A couple of black cows standing on the top of a grassy hill.
13. A group of young children riding skis down a snow covered mountain.
14. Young children sharing a laptop in a messy room with several laptops, books, and papers.
15. A black sculpture of a torso is on the floor next to a TV.
16. United States President Barack Obama gives a speech in front of American and Russian flags.