

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES .....	16
LIST OF TABLES .....	18
ABSTRACT .....	20
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION .....	22
1.1 Specific Goal.....	22
1.2 How Comprehension Studies Can Be Used To Investigate Questions About Linguistic Information .....	23
1.3 Evidence That Argument Structure Information Is Relevant To Comprehension .....	25
1.4 The Relationship Between Argument Structure and Event Structure.....	26
1.5 Is Event Structure Information Relevant To Comprehension? .....	28
1.6 Prior Psycholinguistic Studies that Bear on the ESP Hypothesis.....	29
1.7 How To Reliably Categorize Verb Phrases as Telic or Atelic.....	32
1.8 How the ESP Hypothesis Is Tested in the Current Experiments .....	33
1.9 Implications of the Research.....	38
CHAPTER 2. A GUIDE TO UNDERSTANDING TELICITY AND KNOWING IT WHEN YOU SEE IT .....	40
2.1 What is Event Structure?.....	40
2.1.1 Vendler's Event Typology .....	42
2.1.2 Verb Argument Structure.....	45
2.1.3 The Relationship Between Event Structure and Argument Structure.....	50

TABLE OF CONTENTS - *Continued*

2.1.4 Unaccusativity.....	52
2.1.4.1 <i>Ne</i> -cliticization as evidence for unaccusativity.....	55
2.1.4.2 Auxiliary selection as evidence for unaccusativity.....	55
2.1.4.3 Impersonal passive constructions as evidence for unaccusativity .....	56
2.1.4.4 Japanese numeral quantifier float as evidence for unaccusativity .....	58
2.1.4.5 English resultatives as evidence for unaccusativity.....	60
2.1.5 The Relationship Between Unaccusativity and the Semantic Notion of Telicity.....	62
2.1.6 The Compositional Nature of Event Structure.....	65
2.1.7 Summary of the Review of Event Structure and Argument Structure Literature .....	66
2.2 How to Categorize Verb Phrases as Telic or Atelic.....	67
2.2.1 Step 1: Isolating the Verb Phrase to be Tested .....	67
2.2.2 Step 2: Preparing to Avoid Common Pitfalls in Applying the Telicity Tests.....	69
2.2.2.1 Aspectual coercion.....	69
2.2.2.2 Other irrelevant interpretations .....	73
2.2.3 Step 3: Applying a Minimum of Three Tests from the Event Structure Literature .....	75
2.2.3.1 The imperfective paradox test.....	76
2.2.3.2 “In an hour” versus “for an hour” .....	79

TABLE OF CONTENTS - *Continued*

2.2.3.3 The “It took an hour to” test.....	80
2.2.3.4 Homogeneity test.....	81
2.2.4 Conclusions about Making Telicity Categorizations .....	82
2.3 Conclusion of Chapter 2 .....	82
CHAPTER 3. A QUESTIONNAIRE STUDY FOR CATEGORIZING VERB PHRASES ACCORDING TO THEIR EVENT TYPE.....	
3.1 Introduction.....	84
3.1.1 Question Type 1: “For an hour” Versus “In an hour” Forced Choice .....	85
3.1.2 Question Type 2: The Imperfective Paradox Test Passages with Questions .....	87
3.1.3 Question Type 3: “It took an hour to” Judgments .....	89
3.2 Methods.....	91
3.2.1 Participants.....	91
3.2.2 Procedure .....	91
3.2.3 Materials.....	94
3.2.4 Design .....	96
3.2.5 Predictions.....	98
3.3 Preliminary Results and Discussion.....	100
3.4 Conclusions .....	105

TABLE OF CONTENTS - *Continued*

CHAPTER 4. EFFECTS OF TELICITY AND TRANSITIVITY IN SELF-PACED	
READING EXPERIMENTS .....	106
4.1 Introduction.....	106
4.2 Methods.....	108
4.2.1 Participants.....	109
4.2.2 Materials.....	109
4.2.3 Procedure .....	111
4.2.4 Verb Categorization.....	112
4.2.5 Predictions.....	115
4.3 Results .....	115
4.4 Discussion.....	124
CHAPTER 5. EFFECTS OF TELICITY AND TRANSITIVITY IN SPEAKER	
CHANGE MONITORING EXPERIMENTS.....	127
5.1 Introduction.....	127
5.2 Post-hoc Analyses of Previous Speaker Change Monitoring Studies:	
Experiments 1 and 2.....	131
5.2.1 Methods.....	131
5.2.1.1 Participants.....	132
5.2.1.2 Materials.....	132
5.2.1.3 Procedure .....	134

TABLE OF CONTENTS - *Continued*

5.2.1.4 Verb categorizations .....	136
5.2.1.5 Predictions.....	138
5.2.2 Results from Post-hoc Analyses .....	138
5.2.3 Discussion of Post-hoc Analyses .....	143
5.3 Experiment 3 .....	144
5.3.1 Methods.....	144
5.3.1.1 Participants .....	144
5.3.1.2 Materials.....	144
5.3.1.3 Procedure .....	146
5.3.2 Results .....	147
5.3.3 Discussion of Experiment 3 .....	151
5.4 Experiment 4 .....	152
5.4.1 Methods.....	152
5.4.1.1 Participants .....	152
5.4.1.2 Materials.....	152
5.4.1.3 Procedure .....	152
5.4.2 Results .....	153
5.4.3 Discussion of Experiment 4 .....	157
5.5 Mislocations in Speaker Change Word Identification .....	158
5.5.1 Speaker Change Mislocations on Filler Trials.....	158

TABLE OF CONTENTS - *Continued*

5.5.2 Speaker Change Mislocations for Reduced and Unreduced Relative	
Clause Sentences .....	162
5.5.3 Speaker Change Mislocations in WH-gap Sentences .....	163
5.5.4 Discussion of Speaker Change Word Identification Errors .....	164
5.6 Conclusions Based on All Four Speaker Change Monitoring Experiments .....	165
CHAPTER 6. EFFECTS OF TELICITY AND TRANSITIVITY IN THE WORD	
MAZE EXPERIMENT .....	169
6.1 Introduction.....	169
6.2 Methods.....	171
6.2.1 Participants.....	171
6.2.2 Materials.....	171
6.2.3 Procedure .....	173
6.2.4 Predictions.....	176
6.3 Results .....	176
6.4 Discussion.....	179
CHAPTER 7. EVENT STRUCTURE IN LANGUAGE COMPREHENSION	
MODELS .....	186
7.1 Introduction.....	186
7.2 How Telicity Could Reduce the RRE in Existing Processing Models .....	187
7.2.1 The Garden Path Model.....	187

TABLE OF CONTENTS - *Continued*

7.2.1.1 Basics of the garden path model .....	187
7.2.1.2 How the garden path model accounts for the RRE.....	188
7.2.1.3 How telicity could fit into the garden path model .....	189
7.2.2 Construal .....	189
7.2.2.1 The basics of construal.....	189
7.2.2.2 How construal accounts for the RRE.....	191
7.2.2.3 How telicity could fit into the construal model.....	191
7.2.2.4 Could telicity reduce the RRE under the construal model? .....	193
7.2.3 Late Assignment of Syntax Theory (LAST).....	193
7.2.3.1 The basics of LAST .....	193
7.2.3.2 How LAST accounts for the RRE.....	193
7.2.3.3 How telicity could reduce the RRE in LAST .....	197
7.2.4 Phillips' Incremental Grammatical Search Model.....	198
7.2.4.1 The basics of Phillips' (1996) model.....	198
7.2.4.2 How Phillips' model accounts for the RRE .....	199
7.2.4.3 How telicity could fit into Phillips' model.....	200
7.2.4.4 Why obligatory transitivity would reduce the RRE in Phillips' model .....	201
7.2.4.5 Could telicity reduce the RRE in Phillips' model?.....	202
7.2.5 Pritchett's (1992) Theta Attachment Model .....	204
7.2.5.1 The basics of Pritchett's model.....	204

TABLE OF CONTENTS - *Continued*

7.2.5.2 How Pritchett's model accounts for the RRE.....	205
7.2.5.3 Could telicity reduce the RRE in Pritchett's model? .....	207
7.2.6 The Competitive Attachment Parser (Stevenson, 1994).....	208
7.2.6.1 The basics of the competitive attachment parser .....	208
7.2.6.2 How telicity could reduce the RRE in the competitive attachment model .....	209
7.2.7 Constraint-based Models.....	211
7.2.7.1 The basics of constraint-based models.....	211
7.2.7.2 How constraint-based models account for the RRE .....	211
7.2.7.3 How telicity could reduce the RRE in a constraint-based model .....	212
7.2.7.4 How linguistic concepts can be explained away using a constraint-based model.....	212
7.2.7.5 Telicity versus unaccusativity in constraint-based models.....	213
7.2.8 Jackendoff's Parallel Competence Architecture as a Processing Model .....	214
7.2.8.1 How Jackendoff's model accounts for the RRE.....	215
7.2.8.2 How telicity could reduce the RRE in Jackendoff's model.....	215
7.3 Recent Hypotheses Related to the Event Structure Processing Hypothesis .....	216
7.3.1 Sanz (2000) .....	216
7.3.2 Friedmann, Taranto, Shapiro, and Swinney (2003).....	219
7.3.3 McKoon and Ratcliff (2003).....	222

TABLE OF CONTENTS - *Continued*

7.4 Which Models are Supported by the Experimental Data in Previous Chapters?.....	225
CHAPTER 8. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS .....	229
8.1 Introduction.....	229
8.2 Findings Supporting the ESP Hypothesis.....	232
8.3 Less Clear Results .....	234
8.4 Towards a Unified Account of the Telicity and Transitivity Effects .....	236
8.4.1 An Account of the Telicity and Transitivity Effects Within LAST.....	238
8.4.2 A Constraint-based Account of the Telicity and Transitivity Effects .....	241
8.4.3 Accounting for the Reactivation of Noun Phrases Following Trace Positions .....	242
8.5 The Possibility that Unaccusativity is the Operative Factor .....	243
8.5.1 Thematic Role Assignment in the Four Verb Types.....	244
8.5.2 A Detailed Review of the Findings for Obligatory Transitive Verbs.....	247
8.5.3 Evidence that the Optionally Transitive Telic Condition is Special.....	248
8.6 Summary of Accounts of the Data .....	250
8.7 How are the Experimental Results in this Dissertation Similar to and Different from Others' Results?.....	251
8.8 Significance of the Findings for Linguistics .....	256
8.9 Significance for Language Processing Models.....	257
8.10 Significance for Language Acquisition Research.....	258

TABLE OF CONTENTS - *Continued*

8.11 Significance for Computational Linguistics .....	259
8.12 Significance for Aphasia Research.....	260
8.13 Summary and Conclusions.....	261
APPENDIX 1. VERB CATEGORIZATIONS FOR POST-HOC ANALYSES OF SELF-PACED READING EXPERIMENTS IN CHAPTER 4.....	263
APPENDIX 2. MATERIAL SENTENCES IN EXPERIMENTS 1 & 2 OF CHAPTER 5 .....	265
APPENDIX 3. SPEAKER CHANGE MONITORING VERBAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXPERIMENT 1 OF CHAPTER 5 .....	269
APPENDIX 4. SPEAKER CHANGE MONITORING VERBAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTS 2 & 4 OF CHAPTER 5 .....	271
APPENDIX 5. SPEAKER CHANGE MONITORING MATERIAL SENTENCES FOR EXPERIMENTS 3 & 4 OF CHAPTER 5 .....	273
APPENDIX 6. SPEAKER CHANGE MONITORING INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXPERIMENT 3 OF CHAPTER 5 .....	275
APPENDIX 7. WORD MAZE MATERIAL SENTENCES .....	276
REFERENCES .....	278