Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen

Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft

**Acceptability Judgements About  
Contrastive Dialogues Involving Ellipsis:  
A Pilot Study**

Thesis submitted for the degree of Master of Arts

Supervised by

Prof. Dr. Michael Franke and

Jun.-Prof. Dr. James Griffiths

Summer Term 2023

Miriam Schiele

miriam.schiele@student.uni-tuebingen.de

Matriculation Number: 6098290

Käthe-Kollwitz-Straße 15

72074 Tübingen

Date of Submission: September 23rd, 2023

Table of contents

1. Introduction 3

1.1 Background and motivation 3

1.2 Research questions and objectives 4

1.3 Significance of the study 5

1.4 Scope and limitations 6

2. Literary review 7

2.1 Theoretical frameworks of ellipsis 7

2.2 Fragment theory and its linguistic foundations 7

2.3 The role of emphasis in sentence comprehension 9

2.4 Acceptability judgement tasks (AJTs) in linguistics 9

2.5 Comparison of written and auditory stimuli 9

2.6 Previous studies on functional and lexical stimuli 11

3. Data and method 12

3.1 Study design 12

3.2 Selection of stimuli 12

3.3 Recording of stimuli 13

3.4 Data collection 14

3.5 Participant recruitment and characteristics 14

3.6 Data analysis 14

4. Results 14

5. Discussion 14

5.1 Interpretation of the findings 14

5.2 Comparison with previous studies and theoretical predictions 15

5.3 Implications for the understanding of German fragments 15

6. Conclusions 15

6.1 Summary of findings 15

6.2 Contributions to the field 15

6.3 Limitations of the study 15

6.4 Suggestions for future research 15

7. References 16

8. Appendix 17

8.1 Abbreviations, symbols and other notational conventions 17

8.2 List of critical items 18

8.3 List of filler items 20

Abstract

This research co

# 1. Introduction

X

## 1.1 Background and motivation

The pronunciation of a sentence holds significance, encompassing not only the stressed words but also the contents emphasized in the conversation. However, it is reasonable to assume that the perception of naturalness by native speakers may not solely depend on the stressed word but also on its associated meaning as well as the structure of the sentence. This becomes particularly intriguing in dialogues that involve contrastive focus and incomplete sentences as answers, as illustrated in the following example (1).

1. A: Peter hat AB 18 Uhr im Kino gearbeitet.

‘Peter worked at the cinema FROM 6pm.’

B: Nein, BIS 18 Uhr.

‘No, UNTIL 6pm.’

(own example)

1. A: Peter hat ab 18 Uhr im KINO gearbeitet.

‘Peter worked at the CINEMA from 6pm.’

B: Nein, BIS 18 Uhr.

‘No, UNTIL 6pm.’

(own example)

Speaker B's response in (1) lacks a complete sentence structure. Therefore, to understand the intended meaning of speaker B’s response, the reader must construct a complete sentence using both speaker A’s preceding utterance and speaker B’s response. Hence, the reader can derive the following sentence: *Peter worked at the cinema until 6pm*. For an in-depth analysis of the processing of such incomplete utterances, see chapter 2.1.

However, for the reader to grasp its intended message, they need to first identify the word *bis* ‘until’ as contrasting with something else and then discern the intended meaning behind speaker B's response. If the reader is not primed for the contrast through orthographic marking, understanding speaker B's response could become even more challenging. This becomes particularly evident when speaker A emphasizes a word other than *bis*, as demonstrated in example (2).

In the dialogue (2), emphasis is being placed on the word *Kino* ‘cinema’. Since speaker B’s utterance is focused on a part of speaker A’s utterance that is not emphasized in the conversation, the reader is confronted with the contrast unexpectedly. It is yet to determine to what extent native speakers struggle more to interpret dialogues without emphasis on the contrastive words such as (2) in comparison to dialogues such as (1). Additionally, other factors that might influence the acceptability ratings of such dialogues should be analyzed. The following section will present the factors and hypotheses investigated in the present paper.

## 1.2 Research questions and objectives

The present paper aims to determine the most effective medium for reliably obtaining judgments about such dialogues involving contrastive focus and fragment answers. By examining the effects of different stimulus characteristics, we seek to deepen our understanding of how modality, emphasis, and fragment type contribute to the perceived acceptability of fragments. In this section, the research questions and hypotheses of the study are presented.

First, as has been shown by the examples (1) and (2), dialogues that incorporate orthographic marked contrasting words are contrasted with dialogues, in which another word than the contrasting word is orthographically marked in the preceding utterance. The present paper aims to investigate which dialogues are perceived as more natural by native speakers. It is hypothesized that stimuli emphasizing the contrasting words are regarded as more natural by native speakers. This prediction is grounded in the assumption that emphasizing the contrasting elements enhances their salience and facilitates comprehension, leading to increased acceptability. For an overview of the role of emphasis in sentence comprehension, see chapter 2.3.

Furthermore, a comparison is made between (1) and (2) on the one hand and their verbal counterparts one the other hand. That is, the sentences (1) and (2) are recorded by native speakers and differ in where the prosodic emphasis is placed. Building upon the notion that the majority of our language interactions occur through spoken and heard communication rather than written and read forms, a second hypothesis posits that, generally, auditory stimuli are more likely to be accepted by native speaker than written stimuli. Given that fragments, in particular, are prevalent in everyday speech, we anticipate that presenting them auditorily will create a more authentic and engaging context, leading to heightened acceptability ratings compared to written stimuli. For an in-depth discussion of auditory stimuli in acceptability ratings, see chapter 2.5.

Last, dialogues such as (1) and (2) are compared to dialogues, in which the contrastive words do not have functional meaning but lexical meaning. That is, instead of prepositions such as *bis* ‘until’ and *ab* ‘from’,the contrastivefocus is placed on nouns such as *Bruder* ‘brother’ and *Vater* ‘father’ as in (3). See also (4) as the equivalent to (3) but with emphasis on Buch ‘book’, which is not contrasting with speaker B’s response.

1. A: Peter hat seinem BRUDER ein Buch geschenkt.

‘Pete gave a book to his BROTHER.’

B: Nein, seinem VATER.

‘No, his FATHER.’

(own example)

1. A: Peter hat seinem Bruder ein BUCH geschenkt.

‘Pete gave a BOOK to his brother.’

B: Nein, seinem VATER.

‘No, his FATHER.’

(own example)

Thus, it is hypothesized that stimuli with lexical words in contrastive focus such as *Bruder* ‘brother’ and *Vater* ‘father’ receive higher acceptability ratings than stimuli with functional words in contrastive focus such as *ab* and *bis.* Previous studies that compare functional and lexical words in stimuli are summarized in chapter 2.6.

## 1.3 Significance of the study

In the following section, the significance of the present study is demonstrated by exploring the implications of the findings for theoretical frameworks and practical applications.

Absatz zu frameworks und wie fragments helfen können zwischen move and delete und insitu zu unterscheiden. Verweis auf die jeweiligen Kapitel, wo die frameworks erklärt werden.

Absatz zu acceptability judgements

Surprisingly, acceptability judgments have been underutilized in previous studies, especially in assessing the acceptability of fragments. While previous research has shed light on the comprehension of fragments and the role of focus and ellipsis, the specific focus on acceptability judgments has remained largely unexplored. Therefore, this study will be the first of its kind to systematically examine and compare different media for collecting acceptability judgments about fragments. By determining the best medium for reliably obtaining these judgments, our research will contribute to a deeper understanding of the nature of fragments and provide valuable insights for future studies in linguistics and psycholinguistics.

## 1.4 Scope and limitations

Additionally, we will address the limitations inherent in our research design, acknowledging the potential constraints and areas for further investigation.

Include Paragraph on limitations, z. B. keine Erhebung zu regionalen Unterschieden oder Unterschieden in den accetability judgements von unterschiedlichen Altersgruppen (laut Literatur sind das signifikante Faktoren, nochmal nachschauen)

The present paper is subdivided as follows. Chapter 2 delves into the theoretical background of fragments, focus, and ellipsis comprehension, providing a more detailed explanation of our hypotheses. Chapter 3 centers on the study design and participant information. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study, while chapter 5 explores and addresses any confounding factors related to the findings. Lastly, chapter 6 concludes with a summary of the study and offers insights into potential avenues for future research.

# 2. Literary review

This chapter provides an overview of the theoretical frameworks of ellipsis and fragment theory, emphasizing the relevance to the present investigation. We discuss the methodological approach of acceptability judgment tasks, which allow us to capture native speakers' intuitions about the grammaticality and acceptability of linguistic constructions. Moreover, previous the role of emphasis in sentence comprehension is discussed and research on written and auditory stimuli as well as functional and lexical stimuli is reviewed to establish a strong foundation for our own empirical analysis and contribute to the broader understanding of these linguistic phenomena.

## 2.1 Theoretical frameworks of ellipsis

Merchant and other frameworks (move and delete, in situ) others?

Discuss terminologies

## 2.2 Fragment theory and its linguistic foundations

Consider (3).

1. Abby and Ben are at a party. Abby asks Ben about who their mutual friend Beth is bringing as a date by uttering: “Who is Beth bringing?” Ben answers:

“Alex.”

(Merchant 2004, p. 661)

Ben’s answer only consists of one word and yet, it can easily be derived that it is intended to convey that Beth is bringing Alex. Linguistic expressions such as Ben’s answer are called fragments (cf. Merchant 2004). According to the sententialist approach as proposed by Merchant (2001), fragments are the only pronounced item in a full-fledged yet unpronounced clause. That is, while clausal ellipsis suppresses the phonological realization of most parts of the sentence, one or more subconstituents of the clause survive ellipsis. These remnants of ellipsis are called fragments.

One specific type of fragments are contrastive fragments. These fragments include focus. According to Krifka (2008), focus can be defined as follows.

1. A property F of an expression α is a Focus property iff F signals
2. That alternatives of (parts of) the expression α or
3. Alternatives of the denotation of (parts of) α are relevant for the interpretation of α.

(Krifka 2008, p. 248, emphasis removed)

While the first case (4a) is concerned with the expression itself, focus as in case (4b) is used to identify the specific part of the sentence that should be replaced by an alternative denotation. The second case will be called contrastive focus in the following. The constituent *Mary* in the antecedent sentence that is replaced by speaker B’s answer is called correlate, where the brackets subscripted with F show the constituent in focus.

1. A: Mary stole the cookie.

B: No, [Peter]F stole the cookie!

(adapted from Krifka 2008, p. 252)

B’: No, [Peter]F!

(own example)

As can be seen in (5B), the contrastive focus placed on *Peter* serves to emphasize ⟦Peter⟧as an “alternative answer to an explicit or implicit statement provided by the previous discourse/situation” (Wagner 1999, p. 1529). The answers (14B) and (14B’) have the same meaning, despite of the fact that (14B’) only consists of one word, i.e., a fragment. In the given example, the context preposition of the utterances by speaker A and B differ, leading to speaker B correcting the information provided by speaker A (cf. Krifka 2008). However, the alternative denotations must be of the same type and be mutually exclusive (cf. Wagner 2012, Krifka 2008).

Include constraint in Griffiths 2019, p. 21, formulated in (63)

* Includes fragment answer, contrast, and focus
* Theory and hypotheses

## 2.3 Acceptability judgement tasks (AJTs) in linguistics

Explore different theoretical frameworks and models that have been proposed to understand sentence acceptability judgments

Include studies that made use of that method

## 2.4 The role of emphasis in sentence comprehension

X

Background on ellipsis comprehension

The processor, i.e., hearer or reader of the dialogue, must finish the following three basic tasks in order to process the ellipsis.

1. Basic tasks of the processor in ellipsis processing:
2. Parse the remnant by constructing the appropriate phrase structure for the remnant given the input.
3. Locate the correlate, if any, from the antecedent clause.
4. Construct the elided phrase by regenerating or copying a structure at Logical Form

(Harris & Carlson 2018, p. 485)

In the example (5B’), that means that first, *Peter* is identified as remnant. Next, *Mary* is retrieved as correlate to *Peter*, as it appears to be a suitable contrasting denotation. Lastly, the elided phrase is contrasted, i.e., *Peter*1 *stole the cookie* t1(cf. Harris & Carlson 2018).

Include literature on emphasis and perhaps at-issueness?

## 2.5 Comparison of written and auditory stimuli

X

Explore different theoretical frameworks and models that have been proposed to understand written and auditory stimuli

Include studies that made use of that method

* Background on auditory and written stimuli and how prosody impacts language processing, especially for fragments?

Recent studies have investigated to what extent prosody impacts language processing. This is especially intriguing for the processing of ellipsis sentences and sentences involving contrastive focus. In the following, ToBI labelling (cf. Beckman & Ayers 1997) will be used for to refer to intonation patterns.

Contrastive focus has been characterized phonologically with a L+H\* pitch for English and German (cf. Wagner 1999). This leads to the hypothesis that prosodically marking contrasting words may allow the hearer to access the words quicker and more easily, leading to an easier understanding of the contrast. Carlson et al. (2009) investigated whether pitch accent affects how ambiguous replacive sentences such as (7) are interpreted.

1. a. ROGER insisted that Alice was reliable // not ANDREW[.]

b. Roger insisted that ALICE was reliable // not ANDREW[.]

c. ROGER insisted that ALICE was reliable // not ANDREW.

(Carlson et al. 2009, p. 1077)

Indeed, they found that pitch accent significantly influenced participants’ choice of the correlate of the replacive, i.e., whether the expression *Andrew* is used to replace *Roger* or *Alice*. There are two main differences between the sentences used in the study by Carlson et al. (2009) and the sentences used in the present study. First, the former uses replacive sentences, while the latter uses fragment answers. Since both are forms of ellipsis, it is still reasonable to compare the results. Second, the former uses ambiguous sentences, while the latter uses sentences disambiguated using case marking. Although the prosodic marking is not used to choose the current correlate, it allows the hypothesis that contrasting words with emphasis are easier to understand(?) and therefore, the first hypothesis holds that stimuli with emphasis on contrasting words are rated more natural than stimuli without any orthographic marking or with prosodic marking on a word other than the contrasting word. Additionally, the same should hold for words with orthographic markings since they are also emphasized and therefore more easily accessible in the discourse representation.

🡪See more papers on sentence comprehension (literature overview)

## 2.6 Previous studies on functional and lexical stimuli

X

Falls es dazu nichts in der Literatur gibt, dann Subchapter löschen und ebenso bei Beispiel (3) herausnehmen

2.7 Gaps in existing literature

X

Identify the gaps or limitations in the current literature and highlight the need for your research

Vielleicht auch weglassen und die Inhalte bei Significance of study erzählen

# 3. Data and method

This chapter presents an overview of the study design, stimuli selection, recording procedures, data collection, participant recruitment and characteristics, and data analysis methods. We discuss the rationale, procedures, and considerations involved in each aspect.

## 3.1 Study design

The experiment was conducted using a 2 (modality: written or auditory) x 2 (emphasis: with or without emphasis) x 2 (fragment-type: functional or lexical word) study design. A between-subject design was employed to examine the effects of modality, while a within-subject design was utilized to investigate the influence of emphasis and fragment-type. The chosen study design aims to mitigate participant perplexity or skepticism arising from varying modalities and to ensure that any observed differences in results for stimuli with different emphasis and fragment types are attributable to their influencing factors rather than participant variability. This design selection safeguards against potential confounding factors, reducing individual differences and increasing the sensitivity to detect effects.

In the study, participants were asked to rate dialogues in the naturalness. The questionnaire was an ordinal response task on a 7-point Likert scale. The scale ranged from 1, representing fully acceptable structures to 7, indicating full unacceptability.

After a welcoming page, participants were presented with three examples with vary acceptability ratings (10-12) to familiarize participants with the rating scale and to ensure that all participants understand that the study aims to determine what sentences would be acceptable in daily speech contrary to written language (cf. Sedarous & Namboodiripad 2020).

1. A: Was mag Peter?

B: Peter mag Ingwer.

(adapted from Sedarous & Namboodiripad 2020, p. 7)

1. A: Was hat Peter gestern gemacht?

B: Vater Fußball gestern.

(ibid.)

1. A: Hat Peter inzwischen aufgegeben?

B: Nein, das Handtuch, das würde er bestimmt nie werfen!

(adapted from Wierzba et al. 2023)

Participants are instructed that their acceptability ratings should be based on only speaker B’s response to speaker A’s utterance. While (10) is described to the participants as *fully acceptable*, (11) is identified as *fully inacceptable* and (12) is used as an example of an utterance that is *neither acceptable nor acceptable*.

After the introductory pages, participants were randomly assigned to either only written or auditory stimuli and then presented with four conditions of each variable, i.e., with and without emphasis of contrasting words as well as functional and lexical fragments.

At the end of the questionnaire, participants were asked to indicate their age, level of education, where they grew up, and native language/dialect.

## 3.2 Selection of stimuli

A total of 56 critical items were included in the study. Among the critical items, 28 items were written items with equal distribution across the four conditions, i.e., with and without orthographic marking as well as lexical or functional fragment types. The remaining 28 items were auditory items with equal distribution across the four conditions, i.e., with and without prosodic marking on the contrasting words as well as lexical or functional fragment types. Therefore, each condition is exemplified by 7 items. This balanced design allows for a systematic examination of the effects of emphasis and fragment types on the experimental variables. The list of written critical and filler items can be found in the appendix, while their verbal equivalents can be found here. An overview of all conditions is shown in (1-4), repeated here as (13-15).

1. A: Peter hat AB 18 Uhr im Kino gearbeitet.

‘Peter worked at the cinema FROM 6pm.’

B: Nein, BIS 18 Uhr.

‘No, UNTIL 6pm.’

(own example)

1. A: Peter hat ab 18 Uhr im KINO gearbeitet.

‘Peter worked at the CINEMA from 6pm.’

B: Nein, BIS 18 Uhr.

‘No, UNTIL 6pm.’

(own example)

1. A: Peter hat seinem BRUDER ein Buch geschenkt.

‘Pete gave a book to his BROTHER.’

B: Nein, seinem VATER.

‘No, his FATHER.’

(own example)

1. A: Peter hat seinem Bruder ein BUCH geschenkt.

‘Pete gave a BOOK to his brother.’

B: Nein, seinem VATER.

‘No, his FATHER.’

(own example)

The items with the functional fragments include the contrasting prepositions *bis* ‘until’and *ab ‘*from’, *mit* ‘with’ and *ohne* ‘without’ as well as *nach* ‘after’ and *vor* ‘before’. For the lexical fragments, the contrasting nouns all denoted human referents to minimize the influence of extraneous factors.

Prior, fully acceptable, fully unacceptable, and neither acceptable nor unacceptable examples were given in the introductory part to the study.

Critical items were adjusted to be in past tense to ensure that the word in contrastive focus is not in final position, as this position is claimed to be a default location (cf. Harris & Carlson 2018). Moreover, stimuli with lexical fragments included ditransitive verbs, while stimuli with functional fragments, i.e., prepositional phrases, included transitive verbs to maintain a similar sentence length in both conditions. Furthermore, for stimuli with lexical fragments, only masculine nouns marked with dative case were chosen to stand in contrastive focus to ensure that the reader or hearer can unambiguously identify the correlate of the fragment. Lastly, the contrasting words are either orthographically or prosodically marked in the condition with emphasis on the one hand, but in the condition without emphasis, on the other hand, the stimuli either do not contain any orthographic marking or the nuclear accent is not on the contrasting word but on the default position (cf. Féry 2011).

The filler items involve dialogues in which non-fragmental contrast such as (14) as well as dialogues without any contrast such as (15). The order of critical and filler items was randomly arranged, with each item being presented on its own individual page.

1. A: Peter hat die Süddeutsche gelesen.

B: Nein, er hat die FAZ gelesen.

(own stimuli)

1. A: Peter hat in der Mensa zu Mittag gegessen.

B: Ja, zusammen mit Freunden.

(own stimuli)

Fillers include dialogues without contrastive focus and dialogues with non-fragmental contrast. The fillers show varying acceptability, i.e., A = fully acceptable, B = somewhat acceptable, C = neither acceptable nor unacceptable, D = somewhat unacceptable, and E = fully unacceptable.

All stimuli, i.e., critical and filler items, were adjusted to be in past tense and start with *Peter*.

## 3.3 Recording of stimuli

X

* Explain the F0s and pitch accents in stimuli (see Carlson et al. 2009, p. 1077 as example)
* Voice actor
* Recorded in Praat
* Saved as wav file
* Normalized/Controlled for loudness using the plugin (https://www.praatvocaltoolkit.com/normalize.html)

## 3.4 Data collection

Detail the methods and procedures employed for collecting acceptability judgements from native speakers, e.g., prolific or clickworker or mail

## 3.5 Participant recruitment and characteristics

Pilot study showed that sex and education play no significant role but age and geography must be controlled for (in CLEFS project summary gelesen, Quelle heraussuchen)

## 3.6 Data analysis

X

Provide details about the data, including corpus composition and size

Participants’ Likert scale responses were z-scored and analyzed using Linear Mixed Models, using R

Describe any qualitative analysis conducted to identify linguistic patterns and factors that influence fragment acceptability

# 4. Results

Using [split into more subchapters?]

Present quantitative findings

# 5. Discussion

Since

## 5.1 Interpretation of the findings

X

discuss any significant findings or trends in quantitative findings

Present qualitative findings, proving interpretations and insights

## 5.2 Comparison with previous studies and theoretical predictions

X

Highlight similarities and differences

## 5.3 Implications for the understanding of German fragments

X

Discuss the broader implications of your findings for the field of fragment acceptability and related research areas

# 6. Conclusions

This paper gives an overview of the

## 6.1 Summary of findings

X

Main findings of the research

## 6.2 Contributions to the field

X

Highlight contributions of your research to the existing body of knowledge

## 6.3 Limitations of the study

X

Discuss any limitations or potential biases that may have affected your research

What could not be answered?

## 6.4 Suggestions for future research

X

What aspects need further research?

# 7. References

X

Insert references from Zotero

# 8. Appendix

## 8.1 Abbreviations, symbols and other notational conventions

? questionable/marginal acceptability

# infelicitous

\* ungrammatical

1 … *t*1 syntactic movement

XPi … YPi coreference

// intonational phrase boundary

CAPITALSemphasis (orthographical marking or pitch accent)

[…]F focused position

⟦…⟧ denotation/semantic representation

L+H\* pitch accent

A, B, … speaker

AJT acceptability judgment tasks

A-movement argument movement

ASG adposition stranding generalization

CLMM cumulative link mixed model

dat dative

iff if and only if

ISG island sensitivity generalization

MDA move-and-delete approach

p-omission preposition-omission

p-stranding preposition-stranding

SQA syntactic question approach

## 8.2 List of critical items

1. A: Peter hat seinem BRUDER ein Buch geschenkt.  
    B: Nein, seinem VATER.
2. A: Peter hat seinem Bruder ein BUCH geschenkt.  
    B: Nein, seinem VATER.
3. A: Peter hat dem POLIZISTEN seinen Ausweis gezeigt.  
    B: Nein, dem TÜRSTEHER.
4. A: Peter hat dem Polizisten seinen AUSWEIS gezeigt.  
    B: Nein, dem TÜRSTEHER.
5. A: Peter hat seinem CHEF den neuen Mitarbeiter vorgestellt.  
    B: Nein, seinem KOLLEGEN.
6. A: Peter hat seinem Chef den neuen MITARBEITER vorgestellt.  
    B: Nein, seinem KOLLEGEN.
7. A: Peter hat seinem SOHN ein Eis gekauft.  
    B: Nein, seinem NEFFEN.
8. A: Peter hat seinem Sohn ein EIS gekauft.  
    B: Nein, seinem NEFFEN.
9. A: Peter hat dem MALER ein Getränk angeboten.  
    B: Nein, dem GÄRTNER.
10. A: Peter hat dem Maler ein GETRÄNK angeboten.  
     B: Nein, dem GÄRTNER.
11. A: Peter hat seinem KOLLEGEN Urlaubsbilder gezeigt.  
     B: Nein, seinem NACHBARN.
12. A: Peter hat seinem Kollegen URLAUBSBILDER gezeigt.  
     B: Nein, seinem NACHBARN.
13. A: Peter hat seinem CHEF eine E-Mail geschickt.  
     B: Nein, seinem ANWALT.
14. A: Peter hat seinem Chef eine E-MAIL geschickt.  
     B: Nein, seinem ANWALT.
15. A: Peter hat dem KELLNER Trinkgeld gegeben.  
     B: Nein, dem TÜRSTEHER.
16. A: Peter hat dem Kellner TRINKGELD gegeben.  
     B: Nein, dem TÜRSTEHER.
17. A: Peter hat seinem FREUND einen Witz erzählt.  
     B: Nein, seinem BRUDER.
18. A: Peter hat seinem Freund einen WITZ erzählt.  
     B: Nein, seinem BRUDER.
19. A: Peter hat seinem SCHÜLER ein Lob gegeben.  
     B: Nein, seinem SOHN.
20. A: Peter hat seinem Schüler ein LOB gegeben.  
     B: Nein, seinem SOHN.
21. A: Peter hat seinem ANWALT den Vertrag überreicht.  
     B: Nein, seinem BRUDER.
22. A: Peter hat seinem Anwalt den VERTRAG überreicht.  
     B: Nein, seinem BRUDER.
23. A: Peter hat seinem NEFFEN Werkzeug geschenkt.  
     B: Nein, seinem NACHBARN.
24. A: Peter hat seinem Neffen WERKZEUG geschenkt.  
     B: Nein, seinem NACHBARN.
25. A: Peter hat seinem VORGESETZTEN einen Kaffee gebracht.  
     B: Nein, seinem MITBEWOHNER.
26. A: Peter hat seinem Vorgesetzten einen KAFFEE gebracht.   
     B: Nein, seinem Mitbewohner.
27. A: Peter hat seinem ENKELKIND ein Fahrrad geschenkt.  
     B: Nein, seinem PATENKIND.
28. A: Peter hat seinem Enkelkind ein FAHRRAD geschenkt.

B: Nein, seinem PATENKIND.

1. A: Peter hat seinem TRAINER Feedback gegeben.  
    B: Nein, seinem MITARBEITER.
2. A: Peter hat seinem Trainer FEEDBACK gegeben.  
    B: Nein, seinem MITARBEITER.
3. A: Peter hat AB 18 Uhr im Kino gearbeitet.  
    B: Nein, BIS 18 Uhr.
4. A: Peter hat ab 18 Uhr im KINO gearbeitet.

B: Nein, BIS 18 Uhr.

1. A: Peter hat BIS Mittwoch Urlaub gehabt.

B: Nein, AB Mittwoch.

1. A: Peter hat bis Mittwoch URLAUB gehabt.  
    B: Nein, AB Mittwoch.
2. A: Peter hat AB 16 Uhr eine Besprechung angesetzt.  
    B: Nein, BIS 16 Uhr.
3. A: Peter hat ab 16 Uhr eine BESPRECHUNG angesetzt.  
    B: Nein, BIS 16 Uhr.
4. A: Peter hat BIS August Miete gezahlt.

B: Nein, AB August.

1. A: Peter hat bis August MIETE gezahlt.  
    B: Nein, AB August.
2. A: Peter hat AB 22 Uhr die Präsentation vorbereitet.

B: Nein, BIS 22 Uhr.

1. A: Peter hat ab 22 Uhr die PRÄSENTATION vorbereitet.

B: Nein, BIS 22 Uhr.

1. A: Peter ist OHNE seine Familie nach Hamburg gezogen.

B: Nein, MIT seiner Familie.

1. A: Peter ist ohne seine Familie nach HAMBURG gezogen.  
    B: Nein, MIT seiner Familie.
2. A: Peter hat MIT seinem Bruder Unterschriften gesammelt.  
    B: Nein, OHNE seinen Bruder.
3. A: Peter hat mit seinem Bruder UNTERSCHRIFTEN gesam-

melt.  
 B: Nein, OHNE seinen Bruder.

1. A: Peter hat OHNE sein Team einen Vortrag gehalten.  
    B: Nein, MIT seinem Team.
2. A: Peter hat ohne sein Team einen VORTRAG gehalten.

B: Nein, MIT seinem Team.

1. A: Peter hat heute MIT Pausen drei Stunden gelernt.

B: Nein, OHNE Pausen.

1. A: Peter hat heute mit Pausen drei STUNDEN gelernt.

B: Nein, OHNE Pausen.

1. A: Peter hat OHNE Jacke das Haus verlassen.

B: Nein, MIT Jacke.

1. A: Peter hat ohne Jacke das HAUS verlassen.

B: Nein, MIT Jacke.

1. A: Peter ist VOR dem Regenschauer nach Hause gefahren.  
    B: Nein, NACH dem Regenschauer.
2. A: Peter ist vor dem Regenschauer nach HAUSE gefahren.  
    B: Nein, NACH dem Regenschauer.
3. A: Peter hat NACH dem Termin mit seiner Kollegin gesprochen.

B: Nein, VOR dem Temin.

1. A: Peter hat nach dem Termin mit seiner KOLLEGIN gespro-

chen.

B: Nein, VOR dem Termin.

1. A: Peter hat VOR seiner Mittagspause seine Chefin angerufen.  
    B: Nein, NACH seiner Mittagspause.
2. A: Peter hat vor seiner Mittagspause seine CHEFIN angerufen.  
    B: Nein, NACH seiner Mittagspause.
3. A: Peter hat NACH seinem Urlaub den Handwerker gerufen.

B: Nein, VOR seinem Urlaub.

1. A: Peter hat nach seinem Urlaub den HANDWERKER gerufen.

B: Nein, VOR seinem Urlaub.

1. A: Peter ist VOR seinem Einkauf noch zur Bank gegangen.

B: Nein, NACH seinem Einkauf.

1. A: Peter ist vor seinem Einkauf noch zur BANK gegangen.

B: Nein, NACH seinem Einkauf.

## 8.3 List of filler items

A1 A: Peter hat in der Mensa zu Mittag gegessen. B: Ja, zusammen mit Freunden.

A2 A: Peter hat den geldgierigen Zahnarzt überlistet.   
 B: Ja, erfolgreich.

A3 A: Peter hat den Gegenspieler vorsätzlich gefoult.

B: Ja, den Stürmer.

A4 A: Peter hat die Süddeutsche gelesen.   
 B: Nein, er hat die FAZ gelesen.

A5 A: Peter hat einen Erdbeerkuchen gebacken.   
 B: Nein, er hat einen Schokokuchen gebacken.

A6 A: Peter hat den Kaffee gekocht.   
 B: Nein, er hat den Tee gekocht.

B1 A: Peter hat dem Fürsten jemanden empfohlen.   
 B: Ja, dem Fürsten den Maler.

B2 A: Peter hat dem Gast ein Getränk empfohlen.   
 B: Ja, dem Gast den Wein.

B3 A: Peter hat seinem Neffen ein Geschenk gegeben.   
 B: Ja, seinem Neffen ein Fahrrad.

B4 A: Peter hat geglaubt, dass sein Chef Urlaub hat.   
 B: Nein, er hat geglaubt, sein Chef gibt ihm Urlaub.

B5 A: Peter hat sich gewundert, weil Maria zu Besuch kam.   
 B: Nein, er hat sich gefreut, weil Maria hat Geschenke mitge-

bracht.

B6 A: Peter hat angenommen, dass Franz ihm das Radio

schenkt.   
 B: Nein, er hat angenommen, er verkauft ihm das Radio günsti-

ger.

C1 A: Peter hat dem Kunden etwas gezeigt.

B: Ja, dem Kunden sich selbst im Spiegel.

C2 A: Peter hat den Mann nach etwas gefragt. B: Ja, wen wer in dieser Affäre betrügt.

C3 A: Peter hat seinen Nachbar zu dem Unfall befragt.

B: Ja, wem wer aufgefahren ist.

C4 A: Peter hat gedacht, dass der Politiker bestochen wurde.

B: Nein, in Rottenburg hat Paul gedacht, hat der Händler den   
 Politiker bestochen.

C5 A: Peter hat erzählt, dass Franz einen Unfall hatte.

B: Nein, auf einer Kreuzung hat Paul erzählt, hatte Franz einen   
 Unfall.

C6 A: Peter hat gehört, dass der Lehrer während seinem Urlaub

gekündigt hat.

B: Nein, vor dem Urlaub hat Peter gehört, hat der Lehrer gekün-

digt.

D1 A: Peter hat ihn als kompetenten Begleiter empfohlen. B: Ja, sich selbst.

D2 A: Peter hat Maria einen Brief geschrieben. B: Ja, einander.

D3 A: Peter hat es dem neuen Tenor zugemutet.

B: Nein, der Komponist hat dem neuen Tenor es zugemutet.

D4 A: Peter hat seinem Sohn eine Geschichte vorgelesen.

B: Nein, Peter hat ein Gedicht ihnen vorgelesen.

D5 A: Peter hat Maria eine E-Mail geschickt.

B: Nein, er hat eine SMS ihr geschickt.

D6 A: Peter hat am liebsten die FAZ gelesen.

B: Nein, er liest am liebsten die Süddeutsche, obwohl er lebt

jetzt in Düsseldorf.

E1 A: Peter hat den Rasen gemäht.

B: Ja, obwohl der Hitze.

E2 A: Peter hat den Fernseher eingeschaltet.

B: Ja, um zu sehen eine Fernsehserie.

E3 A: Peter hat seinem Sohn ein Geschenk gemacht

B: Ja, ein Fahrrad in die Schule zum Fahren.

E4 A: Peter glaubt, dass der Drogenbaron den Politiker bestochen

hat.

B: Nein, der Waffenhändler glaubt er, dass den Politiker besto-

chen hat.

E5 A: Peter hat mit Freunden Uno gespielt.   
 B: Nein, beim Stammtisch die Freunde haben mit Vorliebe

Skat gespielt.

E6 A: Peter hat Franz mit einem Geschenk überrascht.

B: Nein, da gerechnet mit hat der Franz natürlich nicht.
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