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INTRODUCTION
Centering theory (Grosz et al., 1983, Walker et al., 1998) establishes a structural relationship between the form of referential expressions and attentional focus. It predicts specifically that highly focused entities tend to be realized with less marked forms (e.g. pronouns) and that factors such as grammatical status or surface position affect prominence. The experiments reported here aimed to test a claim put forward in linguistic studies on French evidential adverbials (Schrepfer, 2005) concerning the functioning of the preposed position as a potential frame influencing the following pronoun resolution: a prepositional phrase (PP), but not an inserted one, frames an informational bloc in which antecedents are easily accessed compared to antecedents located outside the bloc.

EXPERIMENT 1
Counterbalanced Factors: Position of Pronoun Condition

Prepositional Phrase Position

Target Pronoun Gender

Preposed or Inserted

Gender of the NP complement of the evidential PP (here the Speaker) or Previous Grammatical Subject Gender

Material

P1 : Selon Francine, Vincent a trouvé un stage dans une agence de publicité.
(According to Francine, Vincent found an advertising agency internship.)

P2 : Elle apprécie que les cursus étudiants incluent une expérience professionnelle.
(He/She appreciates the fact that the curriculum includes work experience...)

P1 : Vincent a trouvé, selon Francine, un stage dans une agence de publicité.
(Vincent found, according to Francine, an advertising agency internship.)

P2 : Elle apprécie que les cursus étudiants incluent une expérience professionnelle.
(He/She appreciates the fact that the curriculum includes work experience...)

Methodology: Self-Paced Reading Paradigm with P2 as Target + Comprehension task

Participants: 24 students (University of Paris III)

RESULTS

Hypothesis

Main effect: Shorter Reading time of Target sentence for Subject’s Gender Pronoun (F(1,23)=7, p=0.01)

Interaction: No significant main effect. However, a significant interaction effect (F(1,188)=0.65, p=0.8)

Prominence x Pronoun Interaction: Longer Reading for Inserted Position x Subject’s Gender Pronoun condition (F(1,188)=6.96, p=0.01)

Interpretation

Without opinion verbs, Reading of Target utterances depends on antecedents’ prominence given by their grammatical status and their number of occurrences

EXPERIMENT 2
Counterbalanced Factors: Position x Pronoun Condition

Same material with two introductory sentences added

P3 : Vincent/Francine prépare un manuel de gestion à Paris-Dauphine.
(Vincent/Francine is writing a manual on Management and Paris-Dauphine.)

P4 : Les programmes comprennent des enseignements théoriques et des mises en situation.
(The syllabus includes theoretical knowledge and applied skills...)

Methodology: Same as Experiment 1

Participants: 64 students (University of Paris III)

RESULTS

Main effect: In the Preposed Position, shorter Reading time for Subject Gender Pronoun than for Speaker Gender Pronoun (F(1,18)=3.6, p=0.007)

Prominence x Pronoun Interaction: Long and Inserted Pronoun condition for both targets (F(1,252)=4.3, p=0.04)

Interpretation

No effect of the Prominence manipulation factor

Possibly due to interaction between the meaning of the evidential PP and opinion verbs such as appreciate, find, think, hope... systematically used in Target sentences

EXPERIMENT 3
Target sentences of Expt. 2 stimuli are replaced

Hypothesis

Expected Effect of antecedent Prominence on the Pronoun resolution of Target sentence as predicted in Expt. 2

Participants: 48 students (University of Paris III)

RESULTS

Main effect: No significant main effect (F(1,47)=16, p=0.01)

Prominence x Pronoun Interaction: Longer Reading for Subject in introduction x Speaker Gender Pronoun condition (F(1,188)=6.96, p=0.01)

Interpretation

Without opinion verbs, Reading of Target utterances depends on antecedents’ prominence given by their grammatical status and their number of occurrences

SUMMARY

In our first experiment, results were similar to those obtained by Gordon et al. (1993) in their 5th test with the Repeated Name Penalty Paradigm, results they interpreted as indicating that “an initial and non subject” or a “non-initial and subject” entity equally provides prominence. Our second experiment, however, suggests that the rather robust effect obtained with our material was probably not only a question of surface order. Our third experiment shows the importance of the verbal phrase in our preceding results. Altogether, these experiments confirm the importance of antecedent prominence in pronominal resolution as pointed out by Centering Theory and suggest a new factor of prominence, besides surface order and grammatical status, namely the semantic affinity between Evidential Preposition and subsequent Verb Phrases whose Subject pronoun is the mentioned Speaker. The Speaker’s point of view signaled by the PP seems to prime opinion VP, possibly changing the narrative from an objective story about the previous Grammatical Subject to a story concerning the subjectivity of the Speaker. This
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