When do we plan agreement?

Evidence from agreement attraction and unaccusatives

888 Defense, April 15, 2025

Utku Turk
University of Maryland, College Park

why should you even care?

- our syntactic knowledge guides what we say and how we speak

- what do humans compute vs. how do humans compute
  ➢ when do humans compute

- we are in a place to streamline the question of when

Planning

octopus below spoon swim

The octopus below the spoon is swimming.

Kempen & Hoenkamp 1987, Bock 1989, Ferreira 2003, Momma et al. 2016, Momma & Ferreira 2019

octopus below spoon swim

The octopus below the spoon is swimming.

octopus
boil

below spoon

The octopus below the spoon is boiling.

Kempen & Hoenkamp 1987, Bock 1989, Ferreira 2003, Momma et al. 2016, Momma & Ferreira 2019



The octopus below the spoon is boiling.

syntax can license advance planning of the verb
prior to the other intervening elements

Kempen & Hoenkamp 1987, Bock 1989, Ferreira 2003, Momma et al. 2016, Momma & Ferreira 2019

Planning

Features



The octopus below the spoon is boiling.

Levelt 1989, Levelt et al. 1999, Schriefers et al. 2002, Faroqi-Shah 2023, Slevc 2023



The octopus below the spoon is boiling.

eager agreement





The octopus below the spoon is boiling.

eager agreement



lazy agreement



Planning

Features

Attraction

+SG +SG

The key to the cell was rusty.

Bock & Miller 1991, Wagers et al. 2009, Kandel & Phillips 2022

+SG +SG

The key to the cell were rusty.



Bock & Miller 1991, Wagers et al. 2009, Kandel & Phillips 2022

+SG +*PL* +PL

The key to the *cells* were rusty.

speakers systematically produce erroneous agreement
especially with nearby number-mismatching noun

Bock & Miller 1991, Wagers et al. 2009, Kandel & Phillips 2022

+SG +PL +PL

The key to the cells were rusty.





speakers systematically produce erroneous agreement

Bock & Miller 1991, Wagers et al. 2009, Kandel & Phillips 2022


octopus
is boil
below spoons
t_1
t_2


BOIL
octopus
+ SG
…
+ SG
…
The octopus
___ boiling.


octopus
boil
below spoons
is
t_1
t_2


BOIL
octopus
+SG
…
spoons
+PL
+…
?+SG/PL?
…
The octopus
below the spoons
___ boiling.

octopus | below spoons | is swim



octopus | below spoons | is swim





Planning | Features | Attraction | Experiments

melt

melt

melt

melt

melt

melt

melt

melt

Exp1: ePWI experiment (N=74)

- Similar to Momma & Ferreira (2019)
  - 12 entities and 24 objects
  - 12 unergative and 12 unaccusative scenes
  - Relatedness (2: related x unrelated)

- Unlike Momma & Ferreira (2019)
  - Attractor number (2: PL x SG)
  - 6 more entities
  - 12 additional objects
  - 12 additional control scenes

- 144 trials, repeated measures, PCIbex+Prolific



People are good at agreement



- Why are they suddenly good at agreement?
  - Attractors are not in the “controller” response set
  - Visual cue makes the head more salient
  - Non-restrictive attractors
  - Uncertainty associated with verb retrieval

Roelofs 2001, Nozari & Omaki 2022, Kim & Xiang 2024

Exp2: picture description experiment materials (N=54+40)

- What changed?
  - Only 6 entities, used as head and the attractor
  - No visual cue directly on the head
  - Attractors have communicative intent
  - No controls: less verbs to remember



Materials

- 6 Entities
- 12 unergative & 12 unaccusative scenes
- 4 Conditions
  - Attractor number (2: PL x SG)
  - Head number (2: PL x SG)
- Latin square design
- 144 (scene-entity pairs) in 4 conditions put in 2 lists
- 18 scenes per number condition per participant
- PCIbex + SONA



Comparable attraction across verb types



Pause likelihood as a timing index



Pause likelihood as a timing index (even in Exp1)



Take home messages

✔ Attraction “outputs” are comparable in both verb types

→ Attraction is late

✔ Pause likelihood reflects the agreement computation

✔ Subjecthood and modifier status matter for attraction


Planning
Features
Attraction
Experiments
Onset t

What about real time measures?





What about real time measures in Exp2?



✔ People are slower to start uttering plural heads

🤯 Number of the attractor only matters for unaccusatives

🤔 How do we reconcile “Late Attraction”, but “Early Agreement”?

Attraction as a linearization problem







octopus
SG-boil

below spoons

t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4

The octopus below the spoons are boiling.

Evidence from pause likelihood

Self-monitoring + accessing the word form



More marked existing plural head disallows self-monitoring

Handling agreement + accessing the word form

What did we find?

- ✔ Unaccusative specific number effect on the onset timing
- ✔ Verb-insensitive number effect on pause likelihood
- ✔ Verb-insensitive attraction effects

What can we speculate?

- Morpho-syntactic diacritic specification (agreement) is early
- Access to morpho-phonological form is late
- Attraction effects are due to linearization mistakes in production

Where to go from here?

- Exp to verify early planning without semantic interference

- Testing attraction in a language where number is more mechanistic than English

- Exp to check different agreements
  - Inherent features and agreement, i.e. gender in Dutch/Czech
  - Fusional unacc-unerg and number marking in Spanish/Laz

References

Bock, J. K. (1986). Syntactic persistence in language production. Cognitive psychology, 18(3), 355-387.

Bock, K., & Miller, C. A. (1991). Broken agreement. Cognitive psychology, 23(1), 45-93.

Eberhard, K. M., Cutting, J. C., & Bock, K. (2005). Making syntax of sense: Number agreement in sentence production. Psychological review, 112(3), 531.

Faroqi-Shah, Y. (2023). A reconceptualization of sentence production in post-stroke agrammatic aphasia: the synergistic processing bottleneck model. Frontiers in language sciences, 2, 1118739.

Ferreira, V. S. (2003). The persistence of optional complementizer production: Why saying “that” is not saying “that” at all. Journal of Memory and Language, 48(2), 379-398.

Kandel, M., & Phillips, C. (2022). Number attraction in verb and anaphor production. Journal of Memory and Language, 127, 104370.

Kempen, G., & Hoenkamp, E. (1987). An incremental procedural grammar for sentence formulation. Cognitive science, 11(2), 201–258.

Kim, S. J., & Xiang, M. (2024). Incremental Discourse-Update Constrains Number Agreement Attraction Effect. Cognitive Science, 48(9), e13497.

Levelt, W. J. (1993). Speaking: From intention to articulation. MIT press.

Levelt, W. J., Roelofs, A., & Meyer, A. S. (1999). A theory of lexical access in speech production. Behavioral and brain sciences, 22(1), 1–38.

Momma, S., Slevc, L. R., & Phillips, C. (2016). The timing of verb selection in Japanese sentence production. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 42(5), 813.

Momma, S., & Ferreira, V. S. (2019). Beyond linear order: The role of argument structure in speaking. Cognitive psychology, 114, 101228.

Nozari, N., & Omaki, A. (2022). An investigation of the dependency of subject-verb agreement on inhibitory control processes in sentence production.

Roelofs, A. (2001). Set size and repetition matter: Comment on Caramazza and Costa (2000). Cognition, 80(3), 283-290.

Schriefers, H., Jescheniak, J. D., & Hantsch, A. (2002). Determiner selection in noun phrase production. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 28(5), 941.

Slevc, L. R. (2023). Grammatical encoding. In Language production (pp. 4-31). Routledge.

Wagers, M. W., Lau, E. F., & Phillips, C. (2009). Agreement attraction in comprehension: Representations and processes. Journal of memory and language, 61(2), 206–237.

Model Specifications: Pause + disfluency + attraction

Parameter	Specification
Family	`bernoulli("probit")`
Formula	error ~ 1 + verb_type * sem_type * dist_num + (1 + verb_type * sem_type * dist_num | subject) + (1 + verb_type * sem_type * dist_num | head)
Intercept Prior	Student's t(3, 0, 2.5)
Coefficient Prior	Normal(0,1)
σ **Prior** (Random Effects)	Cauchy^{+}(0,1)
ρ **Prior**(Correlations)	LKJ(2)
Chains	12000 (2000 warmup)

Model Specifications: onset + preverbal

Parameter	Specification
Family	`exgaussian()`
Formula	`duration ~ 1 + verb_type * dist_num * sem_type + l_pres + (1 + verb_type * dist_num * sem_type | subject_id) + (1 | head)`
Intercept Prior	Normal(1000, 50) / Normal(800,20) for preverbal
Coefficient Prior	Normal(50, 10)
σ **Prior (Random Effects)**	Cauchy^{+}(50, 10)
σ **Prior (Residual)**	Cauchy^{+}(50, 10)
Chains	12000 (2000 warmup)
Backend	cmdstanr
Cores	8

Why exGaussian, but no tail parametrization?



- Momma & Ferreira (2019): inverse Gaussian, only mean is parametrized, tail difference is due to mean variance

- Roeser et al. (2024): mixture (two gaussians) distribution, only variance parameterization, mean is thought as “decision time” and was not shifted

My assumption:

- it is about the trials that starts late: so definitely mean parameterization
- The distribution in a mixture though, so definitely mean variance should not derive tail, tail should be independent

Model Specifications: contrasts

Predictors	+0.5	−0.5
Verb-Type	Unaccusative	Unergative
Semantic Relatedness	Related	Unrelated
Attractor Number	Plural	Singular

Procedure: Exp1

- Distractors come 150ms before
- Prompted to utter sentence with pictures
- 5 seconds to utter sentence
- Repeated measures
  - Participants saw all conditions (144 trials)
- PCIbex (unlike Momma & Ferreira 2019)
- ~38% excluded



Exclusions in Exp1



Full Picture of Attraction in Exp1



Attraction Model in Exp1 when the attractor is plural



Attraction Model in Exp1 with unaccusatives



Attraction Model in Exp1 with unergatives



Pause Likelihood results in Exp1



Pause Likelihood model in Exp1



Onset Results in Exp1(nested)



Onset Results in Exp1



Onset Latency model in Exp1 with semantically related distractors



Onset Latency model in Exp1 with semantically unrelated distractors



Preverbal results in Exp 1(nested)



Preverbal results in Exp 1



Preverbal model in Exp 1



Why we needed Exp2? DDM Answer





Why Unaccusatives were slower? Not due to “identifiability”



Procedure: Exp2

- 500ms cross
- 1500 ms picture explorations
- 4000 milliseconds of “square” = recording
- ~28% exclusion for attraction
- ~39% exclusion for timing



Exclusions in Exp2



Attraction model in Exp2 with singular heads



Attraction model in Exp2



Pause likelihood model in Exp2 with singular heads



Pause likelihood model in Exp2 with plural heads



Pause likelihood model in Exp2



Onset model in Exp2 with plural heads



Onset model in Exp2 with singular heads



Preverbal results in Exp2



Preverbal model in Exp2



Codability and early planning in Exp2

We fit a preliminary model to our onset latency data using this entropy-based codability measure as a predictor, including an interaction term with verb type. While the model revealed strong evidence for a main positive effect of codability ($\hat{\beta} = 31.44$; $CI = [-3.98; 67.06]$; $P(\beta > 0) = .96$), we did not find strong evidence for its interaction with verb type ($\hat{\beta} = 28.52$; $CI = [-39.93; 97.46]$; $P(\beta > 0) = .79$). However, in more complex models, we observed a weak effect of a three-way interaction between

codability, verb type, and attractor number ($\hat{\beta} = 98.19$; $CI = [-86.92; 282.38]$; $P(\beta > 0) = .85$).