

Prepositional phrase attachment ambiguities  
in declarative and interrogative contexts:

Oral reading data

*Tyler J. Peckenpaugh*

*2019-09-07*

# Contents

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>vi</b>
Prepositional phrase attachment ambiguities in declarative and interrogative contexts:	
Oral reading data . . . . .	vi
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>1 Introduction and background</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Motivations for the current study . . . . .	3
1.2 Structural overview of the ambiguity relevant to this study . . . . .	6
1.3 Interrogativity . . . . .	12
1.4 Prosody of questions vs. declaratives . . . . .	14
1.5 Evidence that prosody can affect syntactic parsing . . . . .	15
1.6 Predictions for the current study . . . . .	17
<b>2 Methodology</b>	<b>20</b>
2.1 Materials . . . . .	21
2.2 Participants recruitment . . . . .	27
2.3 Location . . . . .	28
2.4 Equipment and software . . . . .	28
2.5 Versions of the experiment . . . . .	29
2.6 Procedure . . . . .	29

2.7	Measurements of utterance timing . . . . .	35
2.8	Prosodic judgments . . . . .	38
<b>3</b>	<b>Results and discussion</b>	<b>41</b>
3.1	Data for analysis . . . . .	42
3.2	Prosodic break patterns . . . . .	43
3.3	Discussion of prosodic break patterns . . . . .	54
3.4	Inter-reading time . . . . .	57
<b>4</b>	<b>General discussion</b>	<b>64</b>
4.1	Behavioral correlate for the 2016 intuition and the current hypothesis? . . . . .	65
4.2	On possible explanations for the intuition . . . . .	65
4.3	Conclusions and future directions . . . . .	70
<b>A</b>	<b>Experimental items</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Filler items</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Recruitment notice</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>Instructions to participants</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>Instructions for prosodic coding</b>	<b>85</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>87</b>

# List of Tables

2.1	Illustrative experimental item, constructed in four versions. . . . .	21
2.2	Illustrative filler items, constructed in two versions. . . . .	26
2.3	Distance in characters from fixation to disambiguation of experimental items for the current study. . . . .	34
2.4	EVS-adjusted character distance to disambiguation in experimental items. . . . .	35
2.5	Percent agreement between the original ratings and the second rater (inter-rater) or the second rating by the original rater (intra-rater). . . . .	40
3.1	Number of participants per version-order combination. . . . .	42
3.2	Number of recordings analyzed, as a function of Speech Act and PP2 Status. . . . .	43
3.3	Percent occurrence of OBJ break (frequency of occurrence in parenthesis) as a func- tion of sentence type and Reading. . . . .	44
3.4	Percent occurrence of PP1 break (frequency of occurrence in parenthesis) as a function of sentence type and Reading. . . . .	44
3.5	Percent occurrence of both breaks as a function of sentence type and Reading. . . .	45
3.6	Mixed effects logistic regression model predicting OBJ break occurrence (FULL). . .	49
3.7	Mixed effects logistic regression model predicting OBJ break occurrence (REDUCED). .	49
3.8	Mixed effects logistic regression model predicting PP1 break occurrence (FULL). . .	50
3.9	Mixed effects logistic regression model predicting PP1 break occurrence (REDUCED). .	50
3.10	Mixed effects logistic regression model predicting OBJ break dominance (FULL). . .	51

3.11	Mixed effects logistic regression model predicting OBJ break dominance (REDUCED).	51
3.12	Mixed effects logistic regression model predicting PP1 break dominance (REDUCED).	51
3.13	Mixed effects logistic regression models predicting break dominance in Reading 2 (REDUCED). . . . .	52
3.14	Linear mixed effects regression model predicting wIRT by sentence type with interaction term (FULL). . . . .	60
3.15	Linear mixed effects regression model predicting wIRT by sentence type (REDUCED).	60
4.1	Percent occurrence of break patterns in Reading 2 as a function of sentence type. . .	67
A.1	Experimental items in four versions . . . . .	75
B.1	Filler items with trailing PPs . . . . .	78
B.2	Filler items with no trailing PPs . . . . .	81
D.1	Table of keyboard mappings . . . . .	84

# List of Figures

1.1	Illustrative syntactic tree of a ternary-branching VP. . . . .	7
1.2	Syntactic tree of an illustrative example sentence with a (temporarily) PP1 and a modifier-PP2 (Mod). . . . .	9
1.3	Syntactic tree of an illustrative example sentence with a (temporarily) ambiguous PP1 and an argument-PP2 (Arg). . . . .	10
1.4	Illustrative syntactic tree of the verb phrase for Mod cases. . . . .	18
1.5	Illustrative syntactic tree of the verb phrase for Arg cases. . . . .	18
2.1	Diagram of 4-screen sequence presented for each item, showing the key presses triggering movement between successive screens. . . . .	30
3.1	Break pattern as a function of sentence type and Reading. . . . .	45
3.2	Percent break dominance occurrence as a function of sentence type and Reading. . .	47
3.3	Distributions of R1 delay and R2 delay . . . . .	53
3.4	Plot of pattern proportions as a function of sentence type. . . . .	54
3.5	Distribution of wIRT. . . . .	58
3.6	Mean IRT as a function of sentence type. . . . .	59