



University of Dundee

The interplay of implicit causality, structural heuristics, and anaphor type in ambiguous pronoun resolution

Järvikivi, Juhani; van-Gompel, Rutger; Hyönä, Jukka

Published in:
Journal of Psycholinguistic Research

DOI:
[10.1007/s10936-016-9451-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-016-9451-1)

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Järvikivi, J., van Gompel, R. P. G., & Hyönä, J. (2017). The interplay of implicit causality, structural heuristics, and anaphor type in ambiguous pronoun resolution. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 46(3), 525-550. DOI: 10.1007/s10936-016-9451-1

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Discovery Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Journal of Psycholinguistic Research

The interplay of implicit causality, structural heuristics, and anaphor type in ambiguous pronoun resolution --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	JOPR-D-16-00023R1	
Full Title:	The interplay of implicit causality, structural heuristics, and anaphor type in ambiguous pronoun resolution	
Article Type:	Original Research	
Keywords:	Implicit causality; Visual-world eye tracking; Pronoun resolution; Language comprehension; Finnish	
Corresponding Author:	Juhani Järvikivi University of Alberta CANADA	
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:		
Corresponding Author's Institution:	University of Alberta	
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:		
First Author:	Juhani Järvikivi	
First Author Secondary Information:		
Order of Authors:	Juhani Järvikivi Roger Van Gompel Jukka Hyönä	
Order of Authors Secondary Information:		
Funding Information:	Suomen Akatemia (106418)	Dr. Juhani Järvikivi
	Leverhulme Trust (F/00143E)	Dr. Roger Van Gompel
Abstract:	<p>Two visual-world eye-tracking experiments investigating pronoun resolution in Finnish examined the time course of implicit causality information relative to both grammatical role and order-of-mention information.</p> <p>Experiment 1 showed an effect of implicit causality that appeared at the same time as the first-mention preference. Furthermore, when we counterbalanced the semantic roles of the verbs, we found no effect of grammatical role, suggesting the standard observed subject preference has a large semantic component. Experiment 2 showed that both the personal pronoun hän and the demonstrative tämä preferred the antecedent consistent with the implicit causality bias; tämä was not interpreted as referring to the semantically non-prominent entity. In contrast, structural prominence affected hän and tämä differently: we found a first-mention preference for hän, but a second-mention preference for tämä.</p> <p>The results suggest that semantic implicit causality information has an immediate effect on pronouns resolution and its use is not delayed relative to order-of-mention information. Furthermore, they show that order-of-mention differentially affects different types of anaphoric expressions, but semantic information has the same effect.</p>	

Running head: Semantic and structural factors in anaphor resolution

The interplay of implicit causality, structural heuristics, and anaphor type in ambiguous
pronoun resolution

Juhani Järvikivi ¹, Roger P.G. van Gompel ² & Jukka Hyönä ³

¹ Department of Linguistics, University of Alberta

² School of Psychology, University of Dundee

³ Department of Psychology, University of Turku

Address all correspondence to:

Juhani Järvikivi

4-55 Assiniboia Hall

University of Alberta

Edmonton T6G 2E7

CANADA

Tel: (780)-492-5697

Fax: (780)-492-0806

E-mail: jarvikiv@ualberta.ca

[Click here to view linked References](#)

Abstract

1
2 Two visual-world eye-tracking experiments investigating pronoun resolution in Finnish
3
4 examined the time course of implicit causality information relative to both grammatical role
5
6 and order-of-mention information.
7

8
9 Experiment 1 showed an effect of implicit causality that appeared at the same time as
10
11 the first-mention preference. Furthermore, when we counterbalanced the semantic roles of the
12
13 verbs, we found no effect of grammatical role, suggesting the standard observed subject
14
15 preference has a large semantic component. Experiment 2 showed that both the personal
16
17 pronoun *hän* and the demonstrative *tämä* preferred the antecedent consistent with the implicit
18
19 causality bias; *tämä* was not interpreted as referring to the semantically non-prominent entity.
20
21 In contrast, structural prominence affected *hän* and *tämä* differently: we found a first-mention
22
23 preference for *hän*, but a second-mention preference for *tämä*.
24
25
26
27

28
29 The results suggest that semantic implicit causality information has an immediate
30
31 effect on pronouns resolution and its use is not delayed relative to order-of-mention
32
33 information. Furthermore, they show that order-of-mention differentially affects different
34
35 types of anaphoric expressions, but semantic information has the same effect.
36
37
38
39
40

41 *Keywords.* Implicit causality, Visual-world eye-tracking, pronoun resolution, comprehension,
42
43 Finnish
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Past research has shown that in the absence of disambiguating cues such as gender (e.g., Arnold, Eisenband, Brown-Schmidt, & Trueswell, 2000) people use several sources of information during pronoun resolution (see Garnham, 2001, for an overview). Many studies indicate that people often rely on heuristic strategies that may be related to the structure of the sentence. In particular, people tend to assign an ambiguous pronoun to the subject and/or the first-mentioned referent in the previous clause (e.g., Crawley, Stevenson, & Kleinman, 1990; Frederiksen, 1981; Gernsbacher & Hargreaves, 1988; Järvikivi, Van Gompel, Hyönä, & Bertram, 2005), although this preference can be modulated by the type of pronoun (e.g., personal vs. demonstrative pronoun, Kaiser & Trueswell, 2008). Other researchers have shown that semantic factors also play an important role. In particular, Garvey and Caramazza (1974) noticed that many interpersonal verbs differ in terms of whether they attribute the inferred cause of the event to their subject or object. This is especially the case when stimulus-experiencer and experiencer-stimulus verbs, such as *fear* or *frighten* are followed by the causal connective *because*. Garvey, Caramazza, and Yates (1975) showed that when participants continued sentences such as *John feared/frightened Bill, because he...*, they usually produced continuations consistent with the implicit cause of the described experience. Thus, participants assumed that John feared Bill because there was something about Bill that caused this fear (and something about John with *frighten*), and this influenced whom they took to be the referent of the pronoun. This preference to attribute the cause of an event to a particular entity has been termed the *implicit causality bias*. Ensuing work on implicit causality has often distinguished interpersonal verbs in terms of whether they have the property of attributing the cause to the first (N1) or second (N2) noun, especially in work based on English. Several studies have shown that implicit causality affects the online processing of pronouns as well (e.g., Garnham, Traxler, Oakhill, & Gernsbacher, 1996; Koornneef & Van Berkum, 2006; Stewart, Pickering, & Sanford, 2000).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

An issue of particular interest for psycholinguists has been the timing of the implicit causality effect in pronoun resolution. According to the *integration account* (Garnham et al., 1996; Stewart et al., 2000), the effect of implicit causality information does not occur during initial pronoun resolution, but occurs when semantic information in the second clause is integrated with the first. It claims that “there should be no differential activation of the names of the participants in the main event, with differently biased verbs, until it is known whether the subordinate clause is congruent or incongruent with the bias of the verb in the main clause” (Garnham et al., 1996, p. 521). (Note that the predictions of the integration account are not specific to main-subordinate clause order, but see Miltsakaki, 2002 for a different account.) According to a strong version of the integration account, integration of the two clauses does not occur until the end of the second clause (Garnham et al., 1996), though it is possible to assume a weaker version, according to which the processor checks at an earlier point whether implicit causality information is congruent with disambiguating information in the second clause. The integration account assumes that the use of implicit causality information is an inferential process that is delayed relative to the use of other sources of information. Evidence for this comes from a series of probe-recognition experiments by Garnham et al. (2006), who found effects of implicit causality at the end of the sentence, but not immediately after the pronoun. In contrast, immediately after the pronoun, there was an effect of gender on probe recognition, and probes were recognized faster when they corresponded to the first than the second name in the antecedent clause. This suggests that gender and first-mention affect pronoun resolution earlier than implicit causality. Similarly, a self-paced reading study by Stewart et al. (2000) showed no evidence for an early effect of implicit causality. Instead, they found late facilitation for sentences with congruent implicit and explicit causes.

In contrast, the *focusing account* claims that implicit causality information affects the

1 very earliest stages of pronoun resolution together with other sources of information. Support
2 for this account comes from several probe-recognition studies that have found very early
3 effects of implicit causality information appearing on or shortly after the pronoun (Greene &
4 McKoon, 1995; McDonald & MacWhinney, 1995; McKoon et al., 1993). However, it has
5 been argued that the results of these studies may be due to the probe-recognition task and
6 may not reflect normal language processing (Gordon, Hendrick, & Ledoux Foster, 2000).
7 More recently, several studies using other methods also seem to favor the focusing over the
8 integration account. Koornneef and Van Berkum (2006) found that implicit causality
9 information had an effect shortly after people read a gender-marked pronoun in experiments
10 using self-paced reading and eye-tracking (Koornneef & Van Berkum, 2006), while in an
11 ERP study Van Berkum, Koornneef, Otten and Nieuwland (2007) found a P600 effect
12 appearing 400-700ms after the onset of a gender-marked pronoun which mismatched with the
13 verb bias. Their results suggest that implicit causality information may be used very rapidly
14 when the pronoun is encountered, though it should be noted that these experiments only used
15 pronouns with gender cues, so participants may have relied on gender rather than implicit
16 causality for pronoun interpretation. Perhaps most interesting, using visual-world eye-
17 tracking, Pyykkönen and Järvikivi (2010) showed that implicit causality influenced attention
18 even before listeners encountered the causal conjunction (*because*) preceding the pronoun. In
19 their study implicit causality affected participants' attention to discourse participants
20 immediately after they heard the implicit causality verb. This shows that implicit causality
21 was activated before the pronoun. Recently Cozijn et al. (2011) also observed implicit
22 causality effects in the segment consisting of the connective *because* and the pronoun, which
23 may have occurred either because implicit causality affected activation before the pronoun or
24 while people processed the pronoun. However, it should be noted that finding implicit
25 causality effects before the pronoun do not necessarily imply that it was also immediately
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

used to resolve it.

1
2
3 Previous studies have mostly looked at the absolute time course of the use of implicit
4 causality information. Although some of these studies suggest that implicit causality has an
5 early effect on pronoun resolution (e.g., Koorneef & Van Berkum, 2006; Van Berkum et al.,
6 2007), these results do not necessarily rule out the integration account if one assumes that
7 integration of semantic information of the second clause with that of the first occurs rapidly,
8 as soon as disambiguating information in the second clause (gender) is encountered. In order
9 to distinguish integration from focusing, we think it is much more informative to study the
10 *relative* time course of implicit causality information during pronoun resolution. The
11 integration account claims that implicit causality information exerts an effect on pronoun
12 resolution during the integration stage, following an earlier processing stage during which
13 various other factors affect the activation of the potential antecedents. Among the many
14 factors that affect pronoun resolution, heuristics such as the first-mention and subject
15 preference are often assumed to have an immediate effect on activation. For example,
16 Gernsbacher (1990) and Gernsbacher and Hargreaves (1988) showed that the first-mentioned
17 entity was more activated than the second-mentioned entity even before or in the absence of a
18 pronoun. As previously mentioned, Garnham et al. (2006) found first-mention effects before
19 implicit causality effects, though it is unclear to what extent the results of their probe-
20 recognition experiments reflect natural sentence processing. In many experiments, the first-
21 mention preference is confounded with the subject preference, because in English, the first-
22 mentioned entity is generally the grammatical subject. However, there is evidence that in
23 Finnish, which allows object before subject word order and therefore allows researchers to
24 disentangle the first-mention and subject preference, the subject preference is very early
25 (Järvikivi et al., 2005; Kaiser & Trueswell, 2008). Thus, if the use of implicit causality
26 information is an inferential process that affects integration processes, whereas the first-
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 mention and subject preference affect the immediate activation of discourse referents, then
2 implicit causality effects should be delayed relative to effects of first mention and
3
4 subjecthood. In contrast, if implicit causality affects the very earliest stages of pronoun
5 resolution, then there should be no evidence for a delay.
6
7

8
9
10 Until now, most research has tried to contrast the integration and focusing account
11 using sentences that were either disambiguated by gender or semantic plausibility. This may
12 make it difficult to distinguish between the two accounts. On the one hand, because gender or
13 semantics disambiguates the pronoun, they may be such strong resolution cues that any
14 immediate effect of implicit causality is masked, resulting in late effects only. For example,
15 Arnold et al. (2000) observed that the first-mention preference disappeared when the pronoun
16 was gender-unambiguous. On the other hand, disambiguating information may force
17 comprehenders to resolve the pronoun very quickly, and therefore, subsequent integration
18 may occur very rapidly too. This may result in early effects of implicit causality even though
19 they occur during integration. Ambiguous pronoun resolution may be a better test case of the
20 integration account, because there is no disambiguating information which may force
21 comprehenders to resolve the pronoun (Cozijn et al., 2011; McKoon, Greene, & Ratcliff,
22 1993). As a result, integration should occur later too, so according to the integration account,
23 implicit causality would have a late effect.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Thus, in order to test the two accounts, we used the visual-world eye-tracking method
46 (Tanenhaus, Spivey-Knowlton, Eberhard, & Sedivy, 1995) to investigate how comprehenders
47 resolve ambiguous pronouns. In this method, participants listen to short texts containing
48 pronouns, while their eye movements to pictures of the potential antecedents of the pronouns
49 are recorded. Previous research has shown that various factors such as gender disambiguation
50 at the pronoun and discourse focus, order of mention and grammatical role of the potential
51 antecedents of a pronoun all affect fixations to the pictures of the potential antecedents (e.g.,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Arnold et al., 2000; Järvikivi et al., 2005; Kaiser & Trueswell, 2008; Pyykkönen & Järvikivi,
 2 2010). The results of these studies suggest that if people resolve the pronoun as referring to a
 3 particular character, the likelihood of looking at this character after the pronoun is increased
 4 relative to the likelihood of looking at other characters. We used Finnish as the language of
 5 investigation. Finnish does not have gender marking; for example, the personal pronoun *hän*
 6 ‘he/she’ and the demonstrative pronoun *tämä* ‘this’ can refer to both males and females.

14 We conducted two visual-world experiments to investigate the time course of implicit
 15 causality information relative to the subject and first-mention preference. Järvikivi et al.
 16 (2005) showed that both subjecthood and first mention had rapid effects on pronoun
 17 resolution in Finnish. The focusing account predicts that the effects of implicit causality on
 18 pronoun interpretation should be no later than those of subjecthood and first mention,
 19 whereas the integration account suggests that implicit causality effects may be delayed
 20 relative to structurally-based effects. Experiment 1 compared the effects of grammatical role
 21 and order-of-mention with implicit causality on resolution of the personal pronoun *hän*, while
 22 Experiment 2 compared the effects of implicit causality information on the personal pronoun
 23 *hän* against the demonstrative pronoun *tämä*.

42 Experiment 1

46 Experiment 1 investigated the influence of implicit causality information on the processing of
 47 the gender-neutral 3rd-person singular pronoun *hän* in Finnish. First, we investigated the
 48 relative time course of implicit causality information compared to order-of-mention (first-
 49 mention preference) and grammatical role (subject preference). As shown by the example
 50 sentences in Table 1, we tested this by crossing the variables verb bias and word order. The
 51 first clause contained either a stimulus-experiencer verb with a bias towards the subject (e.g.,
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

1 *pelotti* ‘frightened’) or an experiencer-stimulus verb with an object bias (e.g., *pelkäsi*,
 2 ‘feared’). All the subject and object biased verbs used in the experiment had the same verb
 3 root. For example, the verb pair *inhosi* ‘despised-3rd person-sg’ and *inhotti* ‘disgusted-3rd
 4 person-sg’), object and subject biasing, respectively, shared the underlying root *inhot-*
 5 ‘>despise/loath’ (Finnish verbs are always morphologically complex, so the usual citation
 6 form is the 1st infinitive, in this case *inhota* ‘to loath/despise’). Word order was manipulated
 7 by either presenting the first clause in subject-verb-object (SVO) or object-verb-subject
 8 (OVS) order. In addition, we added four conditions where the grammatical roles filled by
 9 each person/character (e.g., Vladimir Putin and George Bush) were counterbalanced within
 10 items, so that each person/character acted as the grammatical subject in half the conditions
 11 and as the grammatical object in the other half. The second clause, which was identical in all
 12 eight conditions, started with the connective *koska* ‘because’ immediately followed by the
 13 gender-neutral personal pronoun *hän*, which could refer to either person/character.
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30

31 The integration account suggests that any effects of implicit causality should arise late
 32 relative to effects of order-of-mention and grammatical role. In contrast, the focusing account
 33 predicts that implicit causality information should have an influence from the earliest point
 34 we observe pronoun resolution effects. Because the subject had the semantic role of stimulus
 35 and the object the role of experiencer in half the conditions (SVO), whereas the semantic
 36 roles were reversed in the other half (OVS), the experiment also allowed us to investigate
 37 whether the subject preference is structural, i.e., independent of the semantic roles of the
 38 participants in the event. If we observe an overall subject preference, this would indicate that
 39 the subject preference is not due to its semantic role. But if there is no overall subject
 40 preference, this would suggest that the subject preference has a semantic origin and is not a
 41 structural effect. In most studies on anaphor resolution, structural and semantic prominence
 42 are confounded, that is, syntactic subjects are almost always prototypical semantic agents and
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

1 objects are patients (but see Stevenson, Crawley, & Kleinman, 1994). However, Pyykkönen,
 2 Matthews, and Järvikivi (2010) showed that 3-year-old children's pronoun interpretation in
 3 English is sensitive to verb transitivity, i.e., the degree to which the subject and object have
 4 prototypical agent and patient like properties (Hopper & Thompson, 1980; Kako, 2006).
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9 Moreover, Schumacher, Roberts, and Järvikivi (submitted) showed that agentivity, rather
 10 than subjecthood, better predicted the resolution of German third person pronoun *er* and
 11 demonstrative *der*. These results suggest that the subject preference may be due to semantic
 12 properties.
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21

22 *Method*

23
 24 *Participants.* Forty-eight students from the University of Turku participated in the
 25 experiment. All were native speakers of Finnish and had normal or corrected-to-normal
 26 vision. None reported hearing problems.
 27
 28
 29
 30

31 *Materials and design.* Thirty-two experimental materials were constructed, consisting
 32 of single spoken sentences. The sentences contained a main clause followed by a subordinate
 33 clause and appeared in four experimental and four counterbalancing conditions, as shown in
 34 Table 1. The main clause mentioned two well-known persons or cartoon characters (e.g.,
 35 *Vladimir Putin* and *George Bush*) and a location (e.g., *the White House*). The persons and
 36 cartoon characters were celebrities, politicians and other prominent figures in the Finnish
 37 media. The subject was always in nominative-singular and the object in partitive-singular
 38 case. The subordinate clause began with *koska* 'because' followed *hän* 'he/she'; an adverbial
 39 phrase (e.g., *kuluneen viikon aikana* 'during the past week') that did not bias reference to
 40 either interpretation followed the pronoun. Subsequent words also did not strongly bias a
 41 particular interpretation of the pronoun.
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56

57
 58 In order to ensure a strong implicit causality bias either to the subject or the object,
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

1 the experimental verbs were selected as follows: 30 intuitively neutral, 30 subject-biased
 2 stimulus-experiencer, and 30 object-biased experiencer-stimulus verbs were selected to be
 3
 4 tested in a first norming study. The verbs were embedded in sentences of the form *name1*
 5 *verb name2, because ...* (Garvey & Caramazza, 1974). Each verb was presented in both SVO
 6
 7 and OVS order. Two experimental lists were constructed, each containing all 90 verbs, half in
 8
 9 SVO and half in OVS order. Participants saw each verb in only one word order. Fifteen
 10
 11 participants completed the sentences in a pencil and paper task. Completions were
 12
 13 categorized as subject or object referring. Completions in which reference was not to the
 14
 15 subject or object (7.0%) and ambiguous completions (2.1%) were excluded. We selected 16
 16
 17 pairs of verbs that shared the same verb stem and had opposing biases (e.g., *pelätä* ‘fear’ and
 18
 19 *pelottaa* ‘frighten’; *inhota* ‘loath/despise’ and *inhottaa* ‘disgust’; *hätkähtää* ‘startle’ and
 20
 21 *hätkäyttää* ‘startle’, with object and subject biases, respectively), with at least 62.5% of
 22
 23 completions favoring either the subject or object in the expected direction. Each pair was
 24
 25 used twice in the visual-world experiment. Next, we conducted a second norming study in
 26
 27 which we put the selected verbs in exactly the same sentences, using both SVO and OVS
 28
 29 orders, as in the visual-world experiment (i.e. we used the same persons/characters and added
 30
 31 a locative phrase), but cut off after *koska* ‘because’. None of the persons/characters
 32
 33 mentioned in the sentences appeared more than once. Twenty-four participants completed the
 34
 35 sentences. All showed 70% or more completions in the expected direction.

46 For presentation in the visual-world experiment, the experimental sentences and
 47
 48 fillers were read aloud by a male native speaker of Finnish and recorded onto a computer
 49
 50 hard disc. In order to control for the time between the offset of the first clause and onset of
 51
 52 the conjunction a 600 ms pause was inserted between the offset of the first clause and the
 53
 54 onset of the second clause using Praat (Boersma, 1992). This is similar to average clause
 55
 56 boundary pauses in natural speech (e.g., Butterworth & Goldman-Eisler, 1979; Van Donzel,
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

1999).

1
2 The subject, object and location were presented as separate 150 X 150 pixel pictures.
3
4 See Figure 1 for an example. In order to ensure that the participants could not rely on the two
5
6 pictures of the mentioned protagonists alone, an additional filler picture was added depicting
7
8 a character that was not mentioned in the experimental sentences. This character was always
9
10 a well-known person and it was mentioned in half of the filler sentences. The pictures were
11
12 presented in a quadrangular format. The same four pictures were used within-items. The
13
14 position of the pictures was counterbalanced between items. The pictures were photographs
15
16 of well-known persons, depicting the face and part of the upper body, or, in the case of
17
18 cartoon characters, drawings depicting the entire character. After the eye-tracking
19
20 experiment, we asked each participant whether they thought there were characters in the
21
22 experiment that they did not know. All reported knowing all or, in rare cases, most of the
23
24 characters. In cases where they did not know a character, they knew at least two of the
25
26 depicted characters, so they were still able to determine who was who. Most of these cases,
27
28 however, concerned the filler trials.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The 32 experimental materials had eight conditions, defined by word order (SVO vs.
37
38 OVS) x verb bias (stimulus vs. experiencer) x person/character counterbalancing (e.g., *Putin*
39
40 first or second mentioned). The materials were counterbalanced across eight lists and
41
42 randomized; each list began with a filler item and each participant encountered one version of
43
44 each experimental item, with an equal number of items in all conditions. Each list included
45
46 32 filler sentences. Half of the fillers mentioned all three characters depicted in the scenes,
47
48 the other half mentioned two characters. All fillers mentioned the location depicted in the
49
50 scene. The fillers mimicked the structure of the experimental items using either subject-object
51
52 structures or conjoined subjects. However, all fillers used agent-patient verbs and none
53
54 included pronominal reference to any of the characters. Six participants were randomly
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

assigned to each list.

1
2 *Apparatus.* An SR Research EYELINK II eye tracker was used to monitor
3
4 participants' eye movements. A monocular registration with a 500 Hz sampling rate was
5
6 used. The spatial accuracy was better than 0.5 degrees.
7

8
9 *Procedure.* Prior to the experiment, the eye tracker was calibrated. Before each trial
10
11 the calibration was checked by presenting a fixation point in the center of the screen. After
12
13 the participant had fixated on the fixation point, the pictures appeared on the screen. The
14
15 auditory presentation of the sentence started 50 ms after the appearance of the pictures and
16
17 lasted for 12 to 14.5 s. One second after the offset of the sound, the pictures disappeared and
18
19 the fixation point reappeared. The participants were seated in front of a 20-inch computer
20
21 screen, at a distance of approximately 65 cm. They were instructed to look at the pictures
22
23 while listening to the sentences for comprehension. To ensure that the participants attended to
24
25 the stories and scenes, they were occasionally asked to coherently continue the previously
26
27 heard sentence using the participants and the location in the sentence. Each participant
28
29 produced 10 continuations, half of which were in filler and half in experimental trials. Six
30
31 practice trials preceded the first experimental trial.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 In line with the focusing account, we hypothesise a main effect of implicit causality
40
41 congruence that we expect to arise relatively early on after the pronoun and before any
42
43 disambiguating information becomes available to the participants. Moreover, if it is semantic
44
45 rather than grammatical role of the antecedent that guides pronoun resolution, as we
46
47 hypothesized above, we expect to find no effect of subjecthood. Instead, based on earlier
48
49 findings (Gernsbacher & Hargreaves, 1988; Järvikivi et al., 2005), we should observe a first-
50
51 mention preference.
52
53

54 *Results*

55
56
57
58 For each 20 ms time frame following the pronoun onset, we determined whether participants
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

fixated the subject or object character. In 12.9% of the cases, participants were already fixating one of the characters at the pronoun onset. Because such fixations can result from any number of reasons, including but not limited to anticipatory processes, we assume that they do not inform us about pronoun resolution processes. We therefore excluded these trials from further analysis (the excluded trials showed no differences between conditions: $\chi^2(1) < 1$). More generally, such contingent analyses have been recommended to reduce baseline differences and spurious rate effects caused by prior looks in visual world experiments and to ensure that the results are in fact driven by the phenomenon under scrutiny, here pronoun resolution (Heller, Grodner, & Tanenhaus, 2008; Järvikivi et al., 2005). To visualize the results, we plotted the grand average percentage of looks to the characters of interest relative to all looks for each 20ms time segment (therefore the percentages do not add up to 100%): Figure 2 presents the percentage of looks to the critical characters during the semantically neutral region that did not bias the pronoun towards either interpretation (0-1500 ms after pronoun onset) by Implicit Causality Congruence (looks to the character that was congruent with the implicit causality bias, i.e. the stimulus, vs. the character that was incongruent with the bias, i.e. the experiencer) and Grammatical Role (looks to the subject vs. looks to the object character), and Figure 3 for the factors Order-of-mention (looks to the first-mentioned vs. second-mentioned character) and Grammatical Role. For the statistical analyses, we followed the prior literature on pronoun resolution and aggregated these time frames into larger segments of 200 ms (e.g., Arnold et al., 2000; Järvikivi et al., 2005), which allowed us to inspect the relative timecourse of the effects in more detail than larger windows. We analyzed the fixations from 300 ms onwards to allow recognition of the pronoun and programming of saccades (the average offset of the pronoun was at 240 ms), because there were no significant effects during the first 300 ms.

We conducted analyses of variance (ANOVAs) with order-of-mention (1st-mentioned

1 vs. 2nd-mentioned character), grammatical role (subject vs. object antecedent), and implicit
2 causality congruence (antecedent consistent vs. inconsistent with verb bias) as within-
3 participants and within-items factors (Table 1) and arcsine transformed proportions of
4 fixations on the pictures of the grammatical subject and object as the dependent measure
5 (Table 2). Participant list and item group were included as between-participants and between-
6 items factors (Pollatsek & Well, 1995).
7
8
9

10 We found a marginal effect of implicit causality congruence in the 900-1100 ms time
11 window, suggesting a preference for antecedents that were consistent with the verb bias over
12 antecedents that were inconsistent with it (Figure 1). This effect became statistically
13 significant in the next two time segments (1100-1300 and 1300-1500 ms). In the 1100-1300
14 ms segment there was also a main effect of order-of-mention that was significant by items
15 and marginally significant by participants, indicating that participants preferred the first-
16 mentioned to the second-mentioned character (Figure 3). This effect became significant in the
17 last 1300-1500 ms time segment. There was also a grammatical role by order-of-mention
18 interaction in the first analysis window (300-500 ms), which was only marginally significant
19 in the item analysis. This effect was due to people looking less at the first-mentioned object
20 character than any other character. This very early effect did not occur in any other time
21 window and was not observed in our earlier study in Finnish (Järvikivi et al., 2005),
22 suggesting that it may be spurious. Inspection of Figure 3 also suggests that from about 500
23 ms, participants looked more at the first-mentioned subject than all other potential referents,
24 perhaps suggesting that the first-mentioned subject is particularly salient. However, this
25 conclusion was not supported by statistical analyses, which showed no interaction between
26 order-of-mention and grammatical role in any of the segments ($F_s < 1.70$). Finally, there was
27 no grammatical role effect in any time segment.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Discussion

1
2 The results showed an effect of implicit causality on how listeners resolved the Finnish
3 personal pronoun *hän*. The effect appeared well before any disambiguating information was
4 available. Most importantly, this effect appeared at the same time, if not earlier, than the first-
5 mention preference, suggesting that implicit causality information was used as soon as people
6 started resolving the pronoun. This is consistent with the predictions of the focusing account
7 (e.g., Koorneef & Van Berkum, 2006; Van Berkum et al., 2007), but not with those of the
8 integration account (e.g., Garnham et al., 2006; Stewart et al., 2000). Notably, we found no
9 effect of grammatical role. When we counterbalanced the semantic roles of the verbs, the
10 subject preference found previously for *hän* (Järvikivi et al., 2005; Kaiser and Trueswell,
11 2008) was lost. This suggests that what has traditionally been taken to be an effect of
12 grammatical role is (at least partly) semantic in nature.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

Experiment 2

31
32
33
34
35 Experiment 2 investigated whether the early effects of implicit causality that we observed
36 with the personal pronoun *hän* in Experiment 1 also occur with a different anaphoric
37 expression, the demonstrative pronoun *tämä*. We therefore compared the processing of *hän*
38 and *tämä* using the same sentences as in Experiment 1. As shown in Table 3, the first clause
39 always had SVO order and contained either a stimulus-experiencer or experiencer-stimulus
40 verb. The second clause started with *koska* ‘because’ followed by either *hän* or *tämä*. Four
41 additional conditions were added to counterbalance the grammatical role filled by each
42 person/character. In order to reduce the number of conditions, we did not use OVS order.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 *Tämä* can be a demonstrative pronoun, denoting close proximity, or a discourse
56 deictic, roughly equivalent to English *this*, e.g., *This is Peter; Peter had stolen a biscuit*
57 (Kaiser & Trueswell, 2008). *Tämä* can also be used as a pronoun to refer to male and female
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 referents that have been most recently mentioned out of two or more possible antecedents
2 (Hakulinen & Karlsson, 1988), or to less prominent, non-subject, antecedents in the discourse
3
4 (Halmari, 1996; Kaiser, 2000; Kaiser & Trueswell, 2008), often signaling a topic shift or a
5
6 shift in focus (e.g., Hedberg, 2000). This is consistent with linguistic theories that claim that
7
8 demonstrative pronouns signal referents that are less accessible than personal pronouns do
9
10 (e.g., Ariel, 1990; Gundel et al., 1993). If the use of *tämä* indeed signifies that its antecedent
11
12 may be inaccessible or less available, it should preferentially be interpreted as referring to the
13
14 object, because it is less prominent than the subject due to the first-mention preference (but
15
16 not due to the subject preference, given that Experiment 1 showed no grammatical role
17
18 effects). In other words, the results should be different from those with *hän* in Experiment 1,
19
20 which showed a first-mention preference. Furthermore, if semantic prominence has a similar
21
22 effect, there should also be a preference to interpret *tämä* as referring to a semantically less
23
24 prominent entity, the entity that is inconsistent with the implicit causality bias. In other
25
26 words, whereas *hän* should refer to entity that is most prominent due to both first mention
27
28 and due to implicit causality information (as in Experiment 1), preferences for *tämä* should
29
30 be reversed. Assuming that we observe such reversed prominence effects with *tämä*, the
31
32 question is whether the use of implicit causality information is delayed relative to that of the
33
34 first-mention preference.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 However, research by Kaiser and Trueswell (2008) suggests that preferences for *hän*
45
46 and *tämä* are not complementary. Whereas *hän* was strongly biased towards subject
47
48 antecedents, *tämä* showed very little preference for the object. Instead, *tämä* exhibited a
49
50 strong second-mention preference. They argued that this supported the form-based
51
52 hypothesis: Each anaphoric expression is sensitive to different factors. Hence, the effect of
53
54 implicit causality on *tämä* may not be the reverse of its effect on *hän* (as hypothesized
55
56 above); instead both may preferentially be interpreted as congruent with the implicit causality
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 bias. Thus, the question would be whether the time course of implicit causality is similar that
2 of the first-mention preference for *hän* and the second-mention preference for *tämä*.
3
4
5
6

7 *Method*

8
9 *Participants.* Forty-eight new participants from the same population as in Experiment
10
11 1 took part.
12

13
14 *Materials and design.* We used the same 32 experimental materials as in Experiment
15
16 1, but in order to reduce the number of conditions only SVO word order was used in the first
17
18 clause (see Table 3). The pictures and fillers items were the same as in Experiment 1 and the
19
20 materials were prepared in the same way.
21
22

23
24 *Apparatus and procedure.* The apparatus and procedure were the same as in
25
26 Experiment 1.
27

28
29 We hypothesize that if *tämä* is interpreted as referring to less prominent, non-subject
30
31 or last mentioned, antecedents, we should observe more looks to the second-mentioned object
32
33 than the first-mentioned subject antecedent with *tämä* (Kaiser & Trueswell, 2008). That is,
34
35 we expect to find an interaction between order-of-mention (1st vs. 2nd-mention) and type of
36
37 pronoun (*hän* vs. *tämä*). Moreover, if *tämä* is also interpreted as referring to the semantically
38
39 less salient antecedent, we should observe a reversed implicit causality effect for *tämä*
40
41 compared to *hän*, showing as an interaction between type of pronoun and implicit causality
42
43 congruence. In other words, we should find more looks to the *semantic experiencer* than the
44
45 *theme* for *tama*. However, if implicit causality bias is independent of pronoun status (personal
46
47 vs. demonstrative), we expect to find a main effect of implicit causality congruence, as in
48
49 Experiment 1.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Results

As in Experiment 1, in some cases (14.8%) participants were already fixating one of the characters at the pronoun onset. We excluded these trials from further analysis because, as we note above, such fixations can result from any number of reasons, including but not limited to anticipatory processes and we thus assume that they do not inform us about pronoun resolution processes (as for Experiment 1, the excluded trials showed no differences between conditions: $\chi^2(1) < 1$). We excluded trials on which participants fixated either of the critical characters at pronoun onset (14.8%; there were no differences between conditions: $\chi^2(1) < 1$). Figure 4 presents the time course of the effects within the semantically neutral region (300-1500 ms after pronoun onset) for the factors Pronoun (*hän* vs. *tämä*) and Congruency (looks to the character that was congruent with the implicit causality bias, i.e. the stimulus, vs. the character that was incongruent with the bias, i.e. the experiencer) and Figure 5 for the factors Pronoun and Order-of-Mention (looks to first vs. second-mentioned character) for each 20 ms time frame following the pronoun onset. As before, we analyzed the fixations from 300 ms onwards to allow recognition of the pronoun and programming of saccades (the average offset of the pronoun was at 240 ms) and because there were no significant effects during the first 300 ms.

We conducted ANOVAs on arcsine transformed proportions of fixations on the subject and object character with order-of-mention (1st-mentioned vs. 2nd-mentioned character), pronoun (*hän* vs. *tämä*), and implicit causality congruence (antecedent consistent vs. inconsistent with the verb bias) as within-participants and within-items factors (Table 4).

The results showed a main effect of implicit causality bias already in the 300-500 ms segment by participants that became significant for both by participant and by item tests in the next two time segments (500-700 and 700-900 ms), showing an overall preference for antecedents that were consistent with the implicit causality bias over antecedents that were

not. In the fourth time segment (900-1100 ms) the effect was significant by items, but not by participants. The early main effects of implicit causality congruence in combination with the absence of a pronoun by congruence interaction indicated that the effect of implicit causality was consistent for both *hän* (Experiment) and *tämä*.

However, we did find an interaction between the type of pronoun and congruence later in the 1100-1300 and 1300-1500 ms segments. This late interaction indicated that the effect of implicit causality in these segments was modulated by the type of pronoun. Separate ANOVAs for the two pronouns showed that in these late time windows the effect of congruence was not significant for *hän* (all $F_s < 1$), whereas a significant effect of congruence in both of these time segments was observed for *tämä* [1100-1300: $F_1(1, 40)=5.29, p < .05$; $F_2(1, 24)=5.65, p < .05$; 1300-1500: $F_1(1, 40)=6.24, p < .05$; $F_2(1, 24)=6.67, p < .05$], showing a preference for antecedents that were consistent with the implicit causality bias. Thus, there was no evidence that *tämä* is biased towards semantically non-prominent entities.

There was also a marginally significant interaction between order-of-mention and pronoun starting 500-700 ms from the pronoun onset which became significant in the 700-900 ms segment. Separate analyses for the pronouns in the 700-900 ms time segment showed a 1st-mention preference for *hän* that was marginally significant by participants [$F_1(1, 40)=3.84, p = .057$] but not by items [$F_2(1, 24)=1.71, p = .20$]. For *tämä* there was a marginal 2nd-mention preference [$F_1(1, 40)=2.98, p = .092$; $F_2(1, 24)=3.64, p = .068$]. In the next 900-1100 ms segment there was a significant order-of-mention by pronoun interaction. Further analyses showed a marginal second-mention preference for *tämä* [$F_1(1, 40)=2.87, p = .098$; $F_2(1, 24)=3.18, p = .087$], whereas for *hän* there was a marginal 1st-mention preference by participants that was not significant by items [$F_1(1, 40)=2.93, p = .094$; $F_2(1, 24)=1.83, p = .188$]. This interaction was significant also in the last 1300-1500 ms window, showing a

1 significant first-mention preference for *hän* [$F1(1, 40)=4.09, p = .050; F2(1, 24)=3.94, p =$
 2 $.059]$, but no preference for *tämä* [$F1(1, 40)=1.01, p = .322; F2 < 1]$.
 3
 4
 5
 6

7 *Discussion*

8
 9 Experiment 2 showed no evidence that the implicit causality effect was delayed relative to the
 10 order-of-mention effect for *hän* and *tämä*, consistent with the results from Experiment 1. The
 11 earliest significant effect of implicit causality for both by participant and by item tests
 12 occurred at 500-700 ms, whereas the earliest interaction between order-of-mention and
 13 pronoun, which indicated that *hän* and *tämä* were differently affected by order of mention,
 14 occurred at 700-900 ms. These results are consistent with the focusing account (e.g.,
 15 Koorneef & Van Berkum, 2006; Van Berkum et al., 2007), but do not support the integration
 16 account (e.g., Garnham et al., 2006; Stewart et al., 2000)
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

29 The implicit causality effect did not interact with type of pronoun; both *hän* and *tämä*
 30 preferred the entity consistent with the implicit causality bias, so was no evidence that *tämä*
 31 was interpreted as referring to the semantically non-prominent entity. In fact, in the later time
 32 windows (1100-1500 ms) the preference for the entity consistent with the implicit causality
 33 bias was stronger with *tämä* than *hän*. One possible explanation for this might be that *tämä* is
 34 a more marked, less common pronoun than *hän*, and that this more strongly encourages
 35 people to search for the semantically most plausible antecedent.
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45

46 In contrast, the interaction between order-of-mention and type of pronoun (500-900
 47 ms) suggests that structural prominence affected *hän* and *tämä* in opposite ways. Similar to
 48 Experiment 1, there was a first-mention preference for *hän*, though the effect was less
 49 pronounced (perhaps because of the smaller number of observations in Experiment 2). In
 50 contrast, *tämä* exhibited a preference for the second-mentioned entity.
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

General Discussion

1
2 We set out to investigate the time course of implicit causality information in ambiguous
3 pronoun resolution during spoken language comprehension. Our visual-world eye-tracking
4 experiments showed consistent effects of implicit causality. In Experiment 1, the implicit
5 causality effect occurred at the same time or even earlier than the first-mention preference,
6 which had a similar time course as in our previous study in Finnish (Järvikivi et al., 2005).
7 Similarly, in Experiment 2, the implicit causality effect was slightly earlier than the first-
8 mention effect on *hän* and *tämä* (indicated by the order-of-mention by pronoun interaction).
9 In both experiments, the implicit causality effects occurred during the semantically neutral
10 region, before the main verb. Thus, the use of implicit causality was not delayed until the end
11 of the subordinate clause, as predicted by the strong version of the clausal integration account
12 (Garnham et al., 1996). Furthermore, there was no evidence for a delay in the use of implicit
13 causality information relative to other information, as suggested by a weaker version of the
14 integration account. The results are in accordance to the focusing account, which follows the
15 assumption that implicit causality has an immediate effect on pronoun resolution. Implicit
16 causality information should have an effect at the earliest point at which pronoun
17 interpretation preferences start to arise.

18
19 In contrast to many previous studies, the early implicit causality effects that we
20 observed were found before language comprehenders encountered disambiguating
21 information such as gender or plausibility information. If a pronoun is disambiguated, the
22 disambiguation may force rapid integration of the first and second clause, so implicit
23 causality biases may be found early even if they occur during integration. But because our
24 pronouns were ambiguous, this account does not explain the current results.

25
26 However, it should be noted that, although the implicit causality effects were clearly
27 not delayed relative to order-of-mention information, they did not occur during the
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 presentation of the pronoun, but appeared from around 500 ms after the pronoun onset. The
2 most obvious reason for this is that it takes some time for listeners to determine an antecedent
3 for the pronoun and before this is reflected in eye-movement behavior. Also, compared to
4 unambiguous - e.g., gender-marked - pronouns, where grammatical information may force
5 immediate resolution, ambiguous pronoun resolution may take more time to complete,
6 because it is a more knowledge-based process, that relies on multiple sources of information,
7 none of which provides a categorical disambiguation (Frank, Koppen, Noordman, & Vonk,
8 2007).

9 Experiment 1, which counterbalanced the semantic roles of the grammatical subject
10 and object, showed no overall effect of grammatical role. Thus, when we used stimulus-
11 experiencer rather than agent-patient verbs and controlled for semantic roles, the effect of
12 grammatical role disappeared. This suggests that the standard subject preference reported in a
13 number of studies may in fact have a large semantic component. The present results are in
14 line with other recent studies. Kehler, Kertz, Rohde, and Elman's (2008) off-line studies
15 suggest that the subject preference may arise as a consequence of a more general quest for
16 discourse-based coherence relations in pronoun interpretation. More importantly, Pyykkönen
17 et al. (2010) showed that even at the age of three, English children's pronoun interpretation
18 was modulated by the degree of verb transitivity (Hopper & Thompson, 1980; Kako, 2006),
19 i.e., whether the subject and object had many agent and patient-like properties (as with *hit*) or
20 only a few (as with *see*; see also Rose, 2005). Together with these studies, our results indicate
21 that semantic prominence is an important component of referent salience affecting anaphor
22 resolution.

23 Finally, Experiment 2 showed a dissociation between order-of-mention vs. implicit
24 causality information and the type of anaphor: Whereas the demonstrative *tämä* preferred the
25 second-mentioned antecedent, as predicted by theories that assume that demonstrative
26

1 pronouns refer to less prominent entities (e.g., Ariel, 1990; Givón, 1983; Gundel et al., 1993),
2 it did not show a preference for the semantically less prominent antecedent. In fact, although
3 both *hän* and *tämä* showed a preference for the antecedent consistent with implicit causality
4 information in early time windows. In later time windows (1100-1500 ms), this preference
5 lasted longer for *tämä* than for *hän*, perhaps because the use of a more marked, less common
6 pronoun may more strongly encourage people to search for the most plausible antecedent.
7 The different effects of order-of-mention and implicit causality information on *hän* and *tämä*
8 are consistent with Kaiser and Trueswell (2008), who argued that rather than being affected
9 by the same determinants of salience, people use different sources of information in assigning
10 an antecedent to different anaphoric expressions. In other words, in their view, a further
11 dimension is needed whereby different anaphoric expressions may be sensitive to various
12 sources of information to a different degree. Our results are in line with this interpretation:
13 Whereas order-of-mention affected *hän* and *tämä* in opposite ways (in line with Kaiser and
14 Trueswell, 2008), our results showed that *hän* and *tämä* both preferred antecedents consistent
15 with implicit causality (though the preference was somewhat stronger with *tämä*).

16 To summarize, the present results showed that the effect of implicit causality is not
17 delayed relative to that of order-of-mention information in ambiguous pronoun resolution.
18 Rather, the results suggest that people start using semantic information as soon as they
19 attempt to resolve an ambiguous pronoun. Furthermore, in line with other recent studies, we
20 showed that implicit causality was used before people had enough information to integrate
21 the two clauses. Finally, because the implicit causality effects occurred before the pronoun
22 was disambiguated, our results are difficult to interpret as reflecting early integration.
23 Therefore, our results are inconsistent with the integration account and consistent with the
24 focusing account of implicit causality in pronoun resolution.

References

- 1
2 Ariel, M. (1990). *Accessing noun-phrase antecedents*. London & New York: Routledge.
3
4
5 Arnold, J.E., Eisenband, J.G., Brown-Schmidt, S., & Trueswell, J.C. (2000). The rapid use of
6
7 gender information: Evidence of the time course of pronoun resolution from eye-
8
9 tracking. *Cognition*, 76, B13-B26.
10
11
12 Boersma, P. (2001). PRAAT, a system for doing phonetics by computer. *Glott International*,
13
14 5, 341-345.
15
16
17 Butterworth, B., & Goldman-Eisler, F. (1979). Recent studies on cognitive rhythm. In A. W.
18
19 Siegman & S. Feldstein (Eds.), *Of Speech and Time: Temporal Speech Patterns in*
20
21 *Interpersonal Contexts* (pp.211-224). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
22
23
24 Cozijn, R., Commandeur, E., Vonk, W., & Noordman, L. G. (2011). The time course of the
25
26 use of implicit causality information in the processing of pronouns: A visual world
27
28 paradigm study. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 64(4), 381-403.
29
30
31 Crawley, R., Stevenson, R., & Kleinman, D. (1990). The use of heuristic strategies in the
32
33 interpretation of pronouns. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 4, 245-264.
34
35
36 Ferreira, F., & Clifton, C.E. (1986). The independence of syntactic processing. *Journal of*
37
38 *Memory and Language*, 25, 348-368.
39
40
41 Frank, S. L., Koppen, M., Noordman, L. G. M., & Vonk, W. (2007). Coherence-driven
42
43 resolution of referential ambiguity: A computational model. *Memory & Cognition*, 35,
44
45 1307-1322.
46
47
48 Frazier, L. (1987). Sentence processing: A tutorial review. In M. Coltheart (ed.), *Attention*
49
50 *and Performance XII* (pp. 559-586). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
51
52
53 Frederiksen, J. (1981). Understanding anaphora: Rules used by readers in assigning
54
55 pronominal referents. *Discourse Processes*, 4, 323-347.
56
57
58 Garnham, A. (2001). *Mental models and the interpretation of anaphora*. Hove: Psychology
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Press.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Garnham, A., Traxler, M., Oakhill, J., & Gernsbacher, M. A. (1996). The locus of implicit causality effects in comprehension. *Journal of Memory & Language*, 35, 517-543.
- Garvey, C., & Caramazza, A. (1974). Implicit causality in verbs. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 5, 459-464.
- Garvey, C., Caramazza, A., & Yates, J. (1975). Factors influencing assignment of pronoun antecedents. *Cognition*, 3, 227-243.
- Gernsbacher, M. A., & Hargreaves, D. (1988). Accessing sentence participants: The advantage of first mention. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 27, 699-717.
- Givón, T. (1983). *Topic continuity in discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Greene, S. B., & McKoon, G. (1995). Telling something we can't know: Experimental approaches to verbs exhibiting implicit causality. *Psychological Science*, 6, 262-270.
- Gundel, J., Hedberg, N., & Zacharski, R. (1993). Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions. *Language*, 69, 274-307.
- Halmari, H. (1996). On accessibility and coreference. *PRAGMATICS AND BEYOND NEW SERIES*, 155-178.
- Hedberg, N. (2000). The referential status of clefts. *Language*, 891-920.
- Heller, D., Grodner, D., & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2008). The role of perspective in identifying domains of reference. *Cognition*, 108, 831-836.
- Hopper, P. J., & Thompson, S. A. (1980). Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language*, 56(2), 251-299.
- Järvikivi, J., Van Gompel, R. P. G., Hyönä, J., & Bertram, R. (2005). Ambiguous pronoun resolution: contrasting the first-mention and subject-preference accounts. *Psychological Science*, 16, 260-264.
- Kaiser, E. (2000) Pronouns and demonstratives in Finnish: Indicators of Referent Salience. In

1 P. Baker, A. Hardie, T. McEnery and A. Siewierska (eds.), *Proceedings of the*
2 *Discourse Anaphora and Anaphor Resolution Conference*. Lancaster, UK: University
3
4 Center for Computer Corpus Research on Language, Technical Papers vol.12, 20-27.
5
6

7 Kaiser, E., & Trueswell, J. (2008). Interpreting pronouns and demonstratives in Finnish:
8
9 Evidence for a form-specific approach to reference resolution. *Language and*
10
11 *Cognitive Processes*, 23, 709-748.
12
13

14 Kako, E. (2006). Thematic role properties of subjects and objects. *Cognition*, 101, 1-42.
15

16
17 Kehler, A., Kertz, L., Rohde, H., & Elman, J. L. (2008). Coherence and coreference revisited.
18
19 *Journal of Semantics*, 25, 1-44.
20
21

22 Koornneef, A. W., & Van Berkum, J. J. A. (2006). On the use of verb-based implicit
23
24 causality in sentence comprehension: Evidence from self-paced reading and eye
25
26 tracking. *Journal of Memory & Language*, 54, 445-465.
27
28

29 McDonald, J. L., & MacWhinney, B. (1995). The time-course of anaphor resolution: Effects
30
31 of implicit verb causality and gender. *Journal of Memory & Language*, 34, 543-566.
32
33

34 McKoon, G., Greene, S.B., & Ratcliff, R. (1993). Discourse models, pronoun resolution, and
35
36 the implicit causality of verbs. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning,*
37
38 *Memory, and Cognition*, 19, 1040-1052.
39
40

41 Miltsakaki, E. (2002). Toward an Aposynthesis of Topic Continuity and Intrasentential
42
43 Anaphora. *Computational Linguistics*, 28, 319-355.
44
45

46 Pollatsek, A., & Well, A. D. (1995). On the use of counterbalanced designs in cognitive
47
48 research: A suggestion for a better and more powerful analysis. *Journal of*
49
50 *Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, & Cognition*, 21, 785-794.
51
52

53 Pyykkönen, P. & Järvikivi, J. (2010). Activation and persistence of implicit causality
54
55 information in spoken language comprehension. *Experimental Psychology*, 57(1), 5-
56
57
58 16.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Pyykkönen, P., Matthews, D., & Järvikivi, J. (2010). Three-year-olds are sensitive to semantic prominence during online language comprehension: A visual world study of pronoun resolution. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 25(1), 115 - 129.
- Rose, R. L. (2005). The relative contribution of syntactic and semantic prominence to the salience of discourse entities. PhD thesis, Northwestern University.
- Schumacher, P. B., Roberts, L., & Järvikivi, J. (submitted). Agentivity drives real-time pronoun resolution: Evidence from German *er* and *der*.
- Stevenson, R. J., Crawley, A., & Kleinman, D. (1994). Thematic roles, focus and the representation of events. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 9, 519-548.
- Stewart, A. J., Pickering, M. J., & Sanford, A. J. (2000). The time course of the influence of implicit causality information: Focusing versus integration accounts. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 42, 423-443.
- Tanenhaus, M.K., Spivey-Knowlton, M.J., Eberhard, K.M., & Sedivy, J.C. (1995). Integration of visual and linguistic information in spoken language comprehension. *Science*, 268, 1632-1634.
- Trueswell, J. C., Tanenhaus, M. K., & Garnsey, S. (1994). Semantic influences on parsing: Use of thematic role information in syntactic ambiguity resolution. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 33, 285-318.
- Van Berkum, J. J. A., Koornneef, A. W., Otten, M., & Nieuwland, M. S., (2007). Establishing reference in language comprehension: An electrophysiological perspective. *Brain Research*, 1146, 158-171.
- Van Donzel, M. (1999). Prosodic aspects of information structure in discourse. Thesus: The Hague.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by a grant from The Academy of Finland (grant no. 106418) awarded to the first author and a grant from the Leverhulme Trust (F/00143E) to the second author.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure Captions


Figure 1. An example picture used in Experiment 1 and 2. The picture corresponds to the example materials in Table 1 and 3.


Figure 2. Percentage of looks (out of all looks) to subject and object characters in Experiment 1 as a function of implicit causality congruence, i.e., whether the implicit causality bias was congruent or incongruent with the grammatical role of the character, and time (300-1500 ms) after pronoun onset.


Figure 3. Percentage of looks (out of all looks) to subject and object characters in Experiment 1 as a function of order-of-mention (1st-mentioned, 2nd-mentioned) and time (300-1500 ms) after pronoun onset.


Figure 4. Percentage of looks (out of all looks) to characters with congruent and incongruent grammatical role and implicit causality bias in Experiment 2 as a function of the pronoun (*hän*, *tämä*) and time (300-1500 ms) after pronoun onset.

Figure 5. Percentage of looks (out of all looks) to 1st-mentioned and 2nd-mentioned characters in Experiment 2 as a function of the pronoun (*hän*, *tämä*) and time (300-1500 ms) after pronoun onset.












Table 1. Examples of the materials in Experiment 1. The conditions resulted from crossing the variables word order (main clause in SVO or OVS word order) and verb bias (subject-biased or object-biased verb in the main clause, i.e., an experiencer-stimulus or stimulus-experiencer verb). In addition, four conditions were added where the grammatical roles filled by each person/character were counterbalanced within items so that each person/character acted as the grammatical subject in half the conditions and as the grammatical object in the other half, resulting in eight versions of each item. Implicit causality congruence refers to which character the implicit causality bias of the verb in the main clause is consistent with. Abbreviations: nom = nominative case; ptv = partitive case; sub = subject; obj = object.

Main clause	Subordinate clause	Grammatical Role	Order-of-mention	Implicit causality congruency
SVO: <i>Vladimir Putin pelotti George Bushia Valkoisessa talossa</i>	<i>koska hän oli kuluneen viikon aikana antanut useaan otteeseen ymmärtää, ettei maiden Irakin suhteissa olisi näkemyseroja</i>	Subject: Putin Object: Bush	1 st mentioned: Putin 2 nd mentioned: Bush	Congruent: Putin Incongruent: Bush
"Vladimir Putin (nom-sub) frightened George Bush (ptv-obj) at the White House"	"because he had during the past week given many times the impression that there would be no differences of opinion concerning the countries' relations with Iraq"			
SVO: <i>Vladimir Putin pelkäsi George Bushia Valkoisessa talossa</i>	<i>koska hän oli kuluneen viikon aikana antanut useaan otteeseen ymmärtää, ettei maiden Irakin suhteissa olisi näkemyseroja</i>	Subject: Putin Object: Bush	1 st mentioned: Putin 2 nd mentioned: Bush	Congruent: Bush Incongruent: Putin
"Vladimir Putin (nom-sub) feared George Bush (ptv-obj) at the White House"	"because he had during the past week given many times the impression that there would be no differences of opinion concerning the countries' relations with Iraq"			
OVS: <i>Vladimir Putinia pelotti George Bush Valkoisessa talossa</i>	<i>koska hän oli kuluneen viikon aikana antanut useaan otteeseen ymmärtää, ettei maiden Irakin suhteissa olisi näkemyseroja</i>	Subject: Bush Object: Putin	1 st mentioned: Putin 2 nd mentioned: Bush	Congruent: Bush Incongruent: Putin
"Vladimir Putin (ptv-obj) frightened George Bush (nom-sub) at the White House"	"because he had during the past week given many times the impression that there would be no differences of opinion concerning the countries' relations with Iraq"			
OVS: <i>Vladimir Putinia pelkäsi George Bush Valkoisessa talossa</i>	<i>koska hän oli kuluneen viikon aikana antanut useaan otteeseen ymmärtää, ettei maiden Irakin suhteissa olisi näkemyseroja</i>	Subject: Bush Object: Putin	1 st mentioned: Putin 2 nd mentioned: Bush	Congruent: Putin Incongruent: Bush
"Vladimir Putin (ptv-obj) feared George Bush (nom-sub) at the White House"	"because he had during the past week given many times the impression that there would be no differences of opinion concerning the countries' relations with Iraq"			

Table 2. Results from the time course analyses in Experiment 1 for six consecutive 200 ms time segments starting 300 ms after the pronoun onset.

<i>Main Effects</i>	Time Segment After Pronoun Onset (ms)											
	300-500		500-700		700-900		900-1100		1100-1300		1300-1500	
	<i>F1</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F2</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F1</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F2</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F1</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F2</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F1</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F2</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F1</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F2</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F1</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F2</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>
(1) Grammatical Role	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	1.91 (.17) .001	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
(2) Order-of-mention	2.03 (.16) .001	2.92 (.10) † .001	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	1.02 (.32) .003	1.36 (.26) .003	3.03 (.09) † .004	4.38 (.05) * .004	6.57 (.014) * .025	7.95 (.009) ** .005
(3) Implicit causality Congruence	< 1	< 1	2.45 (.13) .001	3.02 (.09) † .002	3.39 (.07) † .002	2.54 (.12) .003	3.74 (.06) † .003	3.65 (.07) † .004	5.24 (.03) * .003	4.12 (.05) * .005	6.56 (.014) * .004	6.73 (.016) * .006
<i>Interactions</i>												
(1) x (2)	4.55 (.04) * .001	2.95 (.099) † .002	1.52 (.23) .001	< 1	< 1	< 1	1.33 (.26) .002	1.70 (.21) .003	< 1	1.12 (.30) .003	< 1	< 1
(1) x (3)	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
(2) x (3)	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	2.18 (.15) .001	1.31 (.26) .003
3-way	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1

Notes: *F1*: *df* = (1, 40); *F2*: *df* = (1, 24); † *p* < .1; * *p* < .05

Table 3. Examples of the materials in Experiment 2. As in Experiment 1, we counterbalanced the grammatical roles of two persons/characters in the first clause, resulting in eight versions of each item. Implicit causality congruence refers to with which character in the main clause the implicit causality bias of the verb is consistent. Abbreviations: nom = nominative case; ptv = partitive case; sub = subject; obj = object.

Main clause	Subordinate clause	Pronoun	Order-of-mention	Implicit causality congruence
SVO: <i>Vladimir Putin pelotti George Bushia Valkoisessa talossa</i>	<i>koska hän oli kuluneen viikon aikana antanut useaan otteeseen ymmärtää, ettei maiden Irakin suhteissa olisi näkemyseroja</i>	Hän 's/he'	1 st mentioned: Putin 2 nd mentioned: Bush	Congruent: Putin Incongruent: Bush
"Vladimir Putin (nom-sub) frightened George Bush (ptv-obj) at the White House"	"because he had during the past week given many times the impression that there would be no differences of opinion concerning the countries' relations with Iraq"			
SVO: <i>Vladimir Putin pelkäsi George Bushia Valkoisessa talossa</i>	<i>koska hän oli kuluneen viikon aikana antanut useaan otteeseen ymmärtää, ettei maiden Irakin suhteissa olisi näkemyseroja</i>	Hän 's/he'	1 st mentioned: Putin 2 nd mentioned: Bush	Congruent: Bush Incongruent: Putin
"Vladimir Putin (nom-sub) feared George Bush (ptv-obj) at the White House"	"because he had during the past week given many times the impression that there would be no differences of opinion concerning the countries' relations with Iraq"			
SVO: <i>Vladimir Putin pelkäsi George Bushia Valkoisessa talossa</i>	<i>koska tämä oli kuluneen viikon aikana antanut useaan otteeseen ymmärtää, ettei maiden Irakin suhteissa olisi näkemyseroja</i>	Tämä 'this'	1 st mentioned: Putin 2 nd mentioned: Bush	Congruent: Putin Incongruent: Bush
"Vladimir Putin (nom-sub) frightened George Bush (ptv-obj) at the White House"	"because this had during the past week given many times the impression that there would be no differences of opinion concerning the countries' relations with Iraq"			
SVO: <i>Vladimir Putin pelkäsi George Bushia Valkoisessa talossa</i>	<i>koska tämä oli kuluneen viikon aikana antanut useaan otteeseen ymmärtää, ettei maiden Irakin suhteissa olisi näkemyseroja</i>	Tämä 'this'	1 st mentioned: Putin 2 nd mentioned: Bush	Congruent: Bush Incongruent: Putin
"Vladimir Putin (nom-sub) feared George Bush (ptv-obj) at the White House"	"because this had during the past week given many times the impression that there would be no differences of opinion concerning the countries' relations with Iraq"			

Table 4. Results from the time course analyses in Experiment 2 for six consecutive 200 ms time segments starting 300 ms after the pronoun onset.

<i>Main Effects</i>	Time Segment After Pronoun Onset (ms)											
	300-500		500-700		700-900		900-1100		1100-1300		1300-1500	
	<i>F1</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F2</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F1</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F2</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F1</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F2</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F1</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F2</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F1</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F2</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F1</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>	<i>F2</i> (<i>p</i>) <i>MS_e</i>
(1) Order-of-mention	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
(2) Pronoun	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	1.93 (.18) .001	1.88 (.19) .001	< 1	< 1
(3) Implicit causality Congruence	2.37 (.13) .002	4.33 (.048) * .002	5.24 (.023) * .003	8.21 (.009) ** .003	5.29 (.03) * .003	8.23 (.008) ** .003	2.49 (.12) .006	4.62(.04) * .005	1.17 (.29) .002	1.88 (.18) .002	2.06 (.16) .009	2.35 (.14) .014
<i>Interactions</i>												
(1) x (2)	< 1	< 1	3.90 (.055)† .002	2.25 (.065) † .006	5.91 (.02) * .001	4.99 (.04) * .005	4.97 (.04) * .007	4.97 (.04) * 172.070	3.53 (.07) † .001	2.40 (.14) .003	4.42 (.04) * .007	2.97 (.097) † .015
(1) x (3)	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
(2) x (3)	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	1.27 (.27) .004	1.28 (.27) .007	4.90 (.03) * .001	4.00 (.057) † .002	5.60 (.02) * .007	4.67 (.04) * .012
3-way	1.07 (.31) .001	1.48 (.24) .002	3.16 (.08) † .002	2.47 (.13) .003	2.40 (.13) .002	2.53 (.13) .004	2.80 (.096) † .003	3.21(.08) † .004	2.31 (.14) .001	4.14 (.053) † .001	1.82 (.18) .003	1.73 (.20) .004

Notes: *F1*: *df* = (1, 40); *F2*: *df* = (1, 24); † *p* < .1; * *p* < .05; ** *p* < .01.