**Literature on auditive stimuli / acceptability judgment studies**

Sedarous & Namboodiripad (2020)

* Argue that audio stimuli are better suited for judgment task than written stimuli
* Provide guidelines, data, R script for conducting acceptability experiments
* Why use audio stimuli?
  + Written stimuli limits the research, participation pools, languages to be investigated, etc.
  + Prosody and sentence processing are intertwined during reading. It is not possible to ensure that participants are positing the same default prosody.
  + Audio stimuli allow for more direct comparisons of production and comprehension
* How to record audio stimuli?
  + Soundproof / sound-attenuated booth / quite location
  + High-quality microphone
  + Record directly in Praat (or other software)
  + Record sentences by condition (e.g., all SOV sentences together)
  + Inhale and exhalte between each sentence
  + Say each sentence 2-3 times
  + Check intonational contours to ensure that they are consistent
  + Normalize loudness of files to control for volume mismatches
  + Do not segment sound files too close to the beginning/end to avoid jarring onsets and offsets but not including inhalation/exhalation sounds
* How to explain the task for participants?
  + Make clear the register of language
  + Give examples beforehand of the range of sentences (from ungrammatical word-salad to perfectly acceptable unremarkable sentences)
  + If relevant, give a sentence known to be prescriptively dispreffererd and explicitly state that, while these types are not proper, they are perfectly fine in everyday conversation (especially for non-Standard varieties)
* How to set up the experiment in praat? Pp. 8-9 In Qualtics? Pp. 9-13
* How to add and randomize blocks? Pp. 13-14
* How to distribute and output data? P. 14
* How to use penncontroller for ibex? Pp. 14-17
* How to plot and analyze data? See Section 8 of Gibson, Piantadosi, and Fedorenko (2011)

Bross 2019

* As little variation as possible (e. g. same tense, same sentence structure, definiteness)
* In addition to your sentences of interest, include some grammatical and some completely ill-formed sentences -> can be used as anchor values against which to interpret the actual data and to check whether participants filled our the questionnaire randomly or not
* Present participants with acceptable and unacceptable sentences at the beginning of the study (as recommended by Sedarous & Namboodiripad 2019: 6)
* Use filler sentences to cover the true propose of the study (Cowart’s (1997:52) advice: “The best strategy is to include a balanced list of fillers that includes approximately equal numbers of sentences at a wide range of acceptability values.”)

Carlson, Frazier & Clifton

* How does prosody impact language processing?
* Prosodic packaging approach: prosodic boundaries structure the linguistic input into perceptual and memory units, with the consequence that material in earlier packages is less accessible for linguistic processing than material in the current package -> holds true for all constructions, regardless of linguistic dependency
* Specialized role approach: prosodic boundaries determines(?) hierarchical structure, but pitch accents determines accessibility of a constituent
* Experiment 1: testing the prosodic packaging hypothesis / prosodic boundaries
  + asked participants to give their interpretations of the sentence they heard, not an acceptability rating)
  + failed to reach significance, failed to support predictions of hypothesis
* Experiment 2a: same as 1 but asked whether participants understood the sentences
* Experiment 2b: same as 1/2a but disambiguated sentences and asking whether participants understood the sentences
* Experiment 3: testing the influence of pitch accent on interpretation of ambiguous replacives
  + Hypothesis: If more prominence, as conferred by the pitch accent, results in greater accessibility in a discourse representation, then accented phrases should more often be chosen as the correlate of a replacive than unaccented phrases
  + Set-up similar to Exp. 1 but including pitch accents
  + Position of pitch accent significantly affected the choise of correlate of the replacive
* Fore more, see also “Literature on ellipsis processing” (includes studies of ellipsis processing with auditive stimuli)

**Literature on contrastive focus**

Vallduvi 1992

* The information component
* For definition of focus (or look up an oxford handbook)

Tomioka (To appear)

* Contrastive topic, mostly based on Japanese data

Zimmermann (2008)

* Contrastive focus, mostly based on Chadic data
* Contrastive focus marking […] indicate[s] […] acontrast between the information conveyed by the speaker in asserting α and the assumed expectation state of the hearer: the speaker marks the content of α as— in her view—unlikely to be expected by the hearer, thus preparing the scene for a swifter update of the common ground

Steube (2001)

* Coorigendum and corrigens in German
* But not in the style of James’ example (1)

Wagner (1999)

* German contrastive focus, but from a phonetic perspective
* a contrastively focused constituent gives an alternative answer to an explicit or implicit statement provided by the previous discourse situation (p. 1529)
* Contrastive focus has been characterized phonologically with a L + H\* pitch for English and German, other propose a postfocal metrical deaccentuation for contrast in German (p. 1529)
* correction contrast is characterized acoustically as an increase in duration on the focal word plus a postfocal flattening of the F0-contour (p. 1529)
* results clearly indicate a preference for those environments where a deaccentuation of the postfocal domain and a further durational increase of the focal syllable was employed (p. 1532)
* study light on previous attempts to isolate a specific ‘contrastive accent’ as it appears to be the case that the impression of contrast is neither a local nor a purely intonational phenomenon but involves several factors

Konietzko & Winkler (2010)

* Contrastive ellipsis

**Literature on ellipsis processing**

Merchant 2001

* Brechtbau, Signatur: GJ 600.412 b
* 1999 version ausleihbar in UB

Merchant 2004

* Does the propositional content of fragments come from usual mechanisms (ellipsis approach, pursued since earliest attempts in generative grammar, argued for in this article) or a novel method of generating and interpreting such fragments (direct interpretation approach)?
  + Sluicing = the sentential portion of a constituent question is elided, leaving only the wh-phrase (p. 664)
  + Ellipsis in minimalism pp. 670-673
  + Similar fragment answer to MA project pp. 687-689. However, yes/no questions instead of declarative sentence
* Gives evidence that fragments answers are derived from full sentential structures, subject to ellipsis, and that fragment moves from its base position

Merchant 2019

* Reviews several approaches to the syntax of ellipsis and evidence in favor and against them

Harris & Carlson (2018)

* Propose that sental-final default locations for focus interfere with the identification of focus in non-default positions from overtly marked constituents
* Key findings
  + a strong bias to pair the remnant with the most local plausible correlate in production
  + marking a non-local correlate with contrastive pitch accent moderates, but does not fully overturn, the bias for local correlates in comprehension
* background
  + enduring focus: Locations that typically bear default focus continue to provide potential locations for focus, regardless of overt markers of focus. (p. 483)
  + Basic tasks of the processor in ellipsis processing (p. 485)
    1. Parse the remnant by constructing the appropriate phrase structure for the remnant given the input.
    2. Locate the correlate, if any, from the antecedent clause.
    3. Construct the elided phrase by regenerating or copying a structure at Logical Form.
  + Locality bias: Contrast the remnant with the nearest constituent (of the appropriate type) in the preceding clause (Harris, 2015; Harris & Carlson, 2016)
* Experiment 1
  + Research question: does Locality bias would persist in sentences bearing clear, contrastive pitch accents?
  + Method: Unambiguous sentences, crossing accent location (subject vs. object) and remnant type (subject vs. object), asking participants to rate the naturalness of the sentences on a 7-point Likert scale
  + Result: default focus position, that is, the most deeply embedded constituent, is entertained as a possible focus position even when it is not explicitly marked as such
* Experiment 2
  + Research question: 1. How general is the Locality bias and can it be expressed as a bias against subject correlates/for object correlates? 2. Does Locality effect manifest solely in the case of syntactic ambiguity?
  + Method: Unambiguous sentences, crossing accent location (non-local accent vs. local accent) and remnant type (local vs. non-local vs. non-local relative clause), asking participants to rate the naturalness of the sentences on a 7-point Likert scale

Ein Bild, das Text, Screenshot, Schrift, Reihe enthält.

Automatisch generierte Beschreibung Ein Bild, das Text, Screenshot, Schrift, Reihe enthält.

Automatisch generierte Beschreibung

* + Results: non-local *the president* was rates as less acceptable than the local *a book,* which did not differ in acceptability from the non-local relative clause *a book that did*. Non-local accent (pitch accent on relative clause head) was rated less acceptable overall than local accent.

Harris (2023)

* Investigates processing of ellipses by using pupillometry
* Ellipsis in question: *let alone*
* i. e., investigating how contrastive pitch accent location interacts with global preferences for local correlates in the *let alone* construction
* introduction to *let alone* ellipses on pp. 117-118
* introduction to pupillometry experiment on pp. 120-124
  + 20 items from Experiment 1 in Harris & Carlson (2018)
  + 2x2 design with remnant type (ObjectRem vs. SubjectRem) and pitch accent location (ObjectPA vs. SubjectPA)
* Results:
  + When an object remnant was preceded by a pitch accented subject, the greatest effect on pupil change was observed
  + Pitch accent location in the subject remnant conditions, in contrast, appeared to have no effect. In other words, prosodic parallelism did affect the pupillary response, but failed to completely reverse the effect of locality
* conclusions:
  + if prosodic parallelism and global locality preferences conflict, a penalty for non-local correlate-remnant pairings is observed
  + reflects the prioritization of syntactic over prosodic information in the interpretation of ellipsis. While pitch accent type and location clearly guides processing expectations, it would appear that the syntactic information has a more robust effect when it comes to interpreting ellipsis.

Rasekhi & Harris (2021)

* investigate importance of each factor used to interpret clausal ellipsis
* in Persian
* focus on Locality and Parallelism
* necessary for ellipsis processing based on definition by Harris & Carlson
  + Locality
    - See Harris 2015 and Harris & Carlson 2016 for Locality bias
    - “processer prefers to contrast the remnant with the closest possible DP, typically the object” (p. 4), re-formulation of locality bias defined in literature mentioned above
    - See also Frazier & Clifton 1998, Carlson et al. 2009
    - Violating this preference leads to a processing cost (p. 5)
    - “licensing of ellipsis is sensitive to information status of constituents […] One information structural explanation of the Locality bias is that the closest DP is preferred not because it is linearly more accessible, but because it bears pitch accent by default” (p. 5)
    - **“In silent reading, comprehenders thus default to the object DP as the location for contrastive accent. However, information structural factors, such as explicit and implicit marking of pitch accent or the location of a contrastive adjective (11), may overturn the default, so that a remnant is paired with a non-local correlate” (p. 5)**
    - In German: usually disambiguated morphologically by e. g. der/den
  + Parallelism
    - e. g. both with DP object, similar thematic roles, matched prosodic weight
    - In general: processing advantage when conjuncts are parallel,
    - With ellipsis: comprehension cost if subjects differ in number (singular or plural)
    - Dimensions of parallelism: structural, prosodic, semantic
    - DP Parallelism Hypothesis: The processor favors analyses in which DPs that share internal properties (have similar syntactic, prosodic, and semantic features) share external properties (appear in similar structural positions within their respective clauses or phrases), and vice versa (p. 6)
    - Morphological Parallelism: The processor favors correlate-remnant pairings for which the DPs are maximally similar along semantic and morphological dimensions. (p. 7) [especially for German]
* See general discussion for discussion effect of Locality and Parallelism in online versus offline processing
* results
  + information structure and parallelism strongly influence correlate resolution in both tasks, but that a weaker preference for a local correlate emerges in scrambling in the sentence completion task.

Griffiths 2019

* criticism to Merchant’s movement-based analysis 2004

Phillips & Parker 2014

* review studies that have used experimental methods from psycholinguistics to address questions about ellipsis
* discuss contrasts but not mentioning contrastive focus

Frazier & Clifton 1998

* about sluicing
* Experiment 1
  + Sentences with explicit vs implicit argument (*typed something* vs *typed*)
  + Sentences with argument vs sentences with an adjunct (*typed something* vs *typed somewhere)*
  + sentences with explicit antecedent are read more quickly than sentences with implicit antecedent (true for argument and adjunct)
* Experiment 2
  + How does a processor choose from among multiple explicit antecedents?
  + Hypothesis 1: participants choose the lower NP *someone* in the following sentence as antecedent

*Somebody claimed that the president fired someone, but nobody knows who*

* + Hypothesis 2: in sentences like the following, where the lower NP is blocked (because *Fred* is not indefinite), participants take longer to read the sentence

*Somebody claimed that the president fired Fred, but nobody knows who.*

* + Here, focus = the role a sentence constituent plays in the information structure of a sentence, most commonly the role of conveying novel information
  + Slower reading in unambiguous condition

Frazier 2018

* Ellipsis and psycholinguistics
* <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198712398.013.11>

Dillon, Frazier & Clifton 2018

* Experiments that show that
  + appositive relative clauses and nominal appositives are syntactically sited in a fashion comparable to restrictive relative clauses
  + appositive phrases do not substantially reduce the availability of the syntactic material that precedes the appositive phrase as might have been expected if processing an appositive involved shifting attention to a higher structure, away from local preceding constituents

Yoshida 2018

* parsing strategies
* <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198712398.013.20>

See Griffiths for licensing conditions for ellipsis

**Literature on ellipsis and prepositional phrases**

* Look up