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The Effect of Position on Understanding: Preposed vs Inserted `selon X` (according to X)

Anne-Marie ARGENTI, Michel CHAROLLES

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 adverbiaux (Schreper, 2005) concerning the functioning of the preposed position as a potential frame influencing the following pronominal resolution: a preposed 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepositional Phrase Position</th>
<th>Target Pronoun Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preposed or Inserted</td>
<td>Gender of the NP complement of the evidential PP (here the Speaker) or Previous Grammatical Subject Gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 a work experience…)

Hypothesis

Preposed Position x Subject’s Gender Pronoun VS: Quick « Inside Frame » Reading
Inserted Position x Speaker’s Gender Pronoun VS: Slow « Outside Frame » Reading

Methodology: Self-Paced Reading Paradigm with P2 as Target + Comprehension task
Participants: 24 students (University of Paris III)

RESULTS

Main effect: Shorter Reading time for Target sentence for Subject’s Gender Pronoun *(F(1,23)=7, p=0.01)*
Interaction: Shorter Reading time for Inserted Position x Subject’s Gender Pronoun condition than for others *(F(1,23)=4.45, p=0.046)*

Interpretation

In Preposed Position VS no Reading time difference of Target sentence whatever the Pronoun
Possibly due to the first mention effect reported by Genbauch et al. (1989)

ADJUSTMENT OF a new factor to manipulate protagonist Prominence
Two introductory sentences are added to the previous texts: the first sentence starts with the mention of one of the protagonists, the Speaker or the Subject.

EXPERIMENT 2

Same material with two introductory sentences added

P2 : Vincent/Francine ont préparé un master de gestion à Paris-Dauphine.
(Vincent/Francine is taking a Master in Management at Paris-Dauphine.)

P1 : Les programmes comprennent des enseignements théoriques et des mises en situations…
(The syllabus includes theoretical knowledge and applied skills…)

Counterbalanced Factors: Pronomence x Position x Pronoun

Hypothesis

The Speaker in introduction VS: Same results in Exp. 1
The Subject in introduction VS: In the Preposed Position, shorter Reading time for Subject Gender Pronoun than for Speaker Gender Pronoun

Participants: 64 students (University of Paris III)

RESULTS

Main effect: Shorter Reading of Target sentence for Speaker Gender Pronoun *(F(1,47)=3,6, p=0.067)*
Interaction: Longer Reading for Target sentence for Speaker Gender Pronoun condition than for others *(F(1,252)=4.3, p=0.04)*

Interpretation

No effect of the Prominence manipulated 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 Exp. 2 stimuli are replaced

P1: Il/Elle a mis à contribution proches et relations du secteur en début d’année…
(He/She asked some friends and colleagues for help early this year…)

Hypothesis

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

Participants: 48 students (University of Paris III)

RESULTS

Main effect: as previously *(F(1,47)= 16, p < 0.001)*
No longer any Position x Pronoun Interaction *(F(1,188)= 0.65, p= 0.8)*
Prominence x Pronoun Interaction: Longer Reading for Speaker and Target sentence 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 Verbs 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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