“That Sounds Unlikely”: Syntactic Probabilities Affect Pronunciation
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Abstract
The probability of encountering a particular syntactic configuration, given a particular verb (i.e. “verb bias” or “subcategorization preference”) affects language comprehension (Trueswell, Tanenhaus, & Kello, 1993). A recent study (Gahl & Garnsey 2004) of sentences with temporary direct object / sentential complement ambiguities shows that such probabilities also affect language production, specifically pronunciation. In this paper, we extend that finding to a new sentence type – sentences with initial subordinate clauses with temporary closure ambiguities, such as If the tenants beg [, the landlord will let them stay | the landlord, he will let them stay]. We show systematic differences in the pronunciation of sentences with high vs. low probability structures, given their verbs. We briefly discuss the implications of this finding for research on sentence comprehension and pronunciation variation.
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Introduction
The probability of encountering a particular syntactic configuration, given a particular verb is often referred to as “verb bias” or “subcategorization preference” and has been shown to affect language comprehension (Trueswell et al., 1993). Verb biases are normally thought of as generalizations over usage. Do such probabilities affect the language production system during the production of individual utterances? A recent study shows that they do: Examining sentences with temporary direct object / sentential complement (DO/SC) ambiguities, such as The divorce lawyer argued the issue [was irrelevant | with her colleague], Gahl and Garnsey (2004) found systematic differences in the pronunciation of sentences with high vs. low probability structures, given their verbs.

The only other studies, to our knowledge, to check for effects of verb bias on pronunciation (Blodgett, 2004; Kjelgaard & Speer, 1999) did not find such effects. This discrepancy could be due to the sentence types examined in those studies, viz. sentences with initial transitive or intransitive subordinate clauses, such as When Roger leaves [the house is empty | the house, it’s empty]. Such sentences – sometimes referred to as “Closure sentences” – are typically pronounced with a prosodic boundary at the end of the subordinate clause. This boundary tends to be more salient than boundaries in DO/SC sentences. Warren (1985), for example, reports that the duration of verbs at clause boundaries is lengthened, on average, by a factor of 1.08 in DO/SC sentences, but by a factor of 1.51 in Closure sentences. Perhaps the salient boundaries in Closure sentences eclipse microvariation of the sort described in Gahl and Garnsey (2004). On the other hand, the absence of probability-based variation in Kjelgaard and Speer’s and Blodgett’s materials may be due to the fact that these studies used recordings made by a trained speaker intentionally producing particular boundary types in the ToBI standard (Beckman & Hirschberg, 1994; Beckman, Hirschberg, & Shattuck-Hufnagel, 2005; Silverman et al., 1992). Such deliberate, tightly controlled pronunciation may not show the same range of variation found in naive productions. Perhaps less controlled pronunciation of Closure sentences does reflect structural probabilities.

Many more verbs participate in transitivity alternations than in the DO/SC alternation (cf. Levin, 1993). Therefore, closure sentences allow us to study the workings of a larger part of the lexicon than do DO/SC sentences, as well as to examine pronunciation variation in strongly marked prosodic boundaries.

How might structural probabilities affect the pronunciation of Closure sentences? Gahl and Garnsey (2004) predicted that phonetic characteristics of boundaries
would tend to be exaggerated for low-probability boundaries, and minimized for high-probability boundaries. This prediction was confirmed. Thus, Gahl and Garnsey found greater degrees of pre-pausal lengthening near low-probability clause boundaries than near high-probability clause boundaries.\(^1\) These predictions were motivated by earlier findings that high lexical frequency and high lexical transitional probability – the probability of a word given a neighboring word – promote phonetic reduction (Bell et al., 2003; Gregory, Raymond, Bell, Fosler-Lussier, & Jurafsky, 1999; Jurafsky, Bell, Gregory, & Raymond, 2001).

Clause boundaries in Closure sentences occur either immediately following the verb (Early Closure, i.e. intransitive: *When Roger leaves, the house is empty*), or following the direct object (Late Closure, i.e. transitive: *When Roger leaves the house, it is empty*). In both cases, speakers tend to insert pauses at the boundary and lengthen the words immediately before the boundary (the verb in Early Closure sentences, the direct object in Late Closure sentences), compared to its baseline duration (Kjelgaard & Speer, 1999; Schaefer, Speer, Warren, & White, 2000; Warren, 1985; Warren, Grabe, & Nolan, 1995). If structural probabilities have similar effects in these sentences as in DO/SC sentences, we should expect words near low-probability boundaries to be lengthened more than those near high-probability boundaries.

In this paper, we offer evidence showing that this is the case. Our results support the notion that verb biases affect language production, as well as comprehension. Our results have implications for research on sentence processing and probabilistic pronunciation variation.

**Method**

**Participants**

Twenty undergraduate students (ten male, ten female) at the University of Illinois participated in the experiment for payment. All were native speakers of English without reported hearing problems.

**Materials and design**

The materials consisted of Early/Late Closure sentence pairs, such as *When the python escaped the zoo (it) had to be closed to the public*, some of which were based on the sentences in Kjelgaard and Speer (1999). The main consideration in selecting the verbs for the subordinate clause was strong verb bias, either towards transitive (Late Closure) or intransitive (Early Closure). Estimates of verb bias were based on corpus counts (Gahl, Jurafsky, & Roland, 2004). Ten Transitive Bias verbs and ten Intransitive Bias verbs were selected.

The two sets of verbs did not differ significantly in frequency or length in letters, phonemes, or syllables (all \(t(18) < 1.6, p > .15\)), or in plausibility as subjects for the verbs they appeared with, as estimated by the method described in (Keller, Lapata, & Ouriopoula, 2002).

The ambiguous noun phrases (e.g. *The python escaped the zoo...*) did not differ in frequency, length in letters, phonemes, or syllables, or in estimated plausibility as objects of the verbs they appeared with (all \(t(18) < 1.5, p > .15\)).

The forty experimental sentences were pseudorandomly interleaved with 177 filler sentences of various syntactic structures, which represented stimuli for two other experiments.

**Procedure**

Sentences were recorded in a sound booth as 16-bit digital sound files at a sampling rate of 44.1 kHz and resampled to 22.1 kHz. Participants were told to read each sentence silently first, until they felt confident that they understood it and could say it without difficulty. They were also told that there was no limit on the amount of time they could take to read and record the sentences, and that the recordings would be used as stimuli in a comprehension experiment. If participants felt that they had not said a sentence in a natural manner, they were asked to repeat it. When speakers misspoken or hesitated or used a noticeably exaggerated pronunciation after recovering from a garden-path (“oh, I get it... When the python escaped THE ZOO, it...”), the experimenter asked them to repeat the sentence in question.

All measurements were performed using the Praat software package (Boersma & Weenik, 2002-2005), based on listening and on visual inspection of the waveform and spectrogram. All durations were measured by a group of three Psychology undergraduate students and one

---

\(^1\) Strictly speaking, the probability estimates are based on frequencies of syntactic patterns, such as clauses or direct objects, whereas the boundaries in question are prosodic, not syntactic.
We measured the duration of the verb, the silence following the verb, and the ambiguous noun phrase from its beginning up to the beginning of the next word. The duration of each region was measured from the release of the initial stop for words that started with stops, and from the onset of the initial segment for all other words. When a region began with a stop, the stop’s closure was included as part of the preceding silence, since it would have been impossible to identify the beginning of the closure portion of a stop in a period of silence. For analogous reasons, we treated the closure of a region-final stop as the endpoint of that region. This means that the postverbal silence includes the closure portion of any verb-final stops.

All measures were submitted to repeated measures analyses of variance (ANOVA) with speakers (F1) and verbs (F2) as random factors and List (randomly assigned presentation list 1 or 2), Item-group (randomly assigned verb group 1 or 2), Bias (Transitive or Intransitive) and Syntax (Early or Late Closure) as factors. Nonsignificant effects that were of no theoretical interest are not reported here. Effects are reported as significant when at or below the .05 level of significance.

Participants were free to choose which parts of the sentences they wished to accent. Inspection of the data revealed that there were regularities in the location of accent: Speakers tended to accent the subject of the subordinate clause if that subject was a personal name (for example, When TIM cooks…); otherwise, they tended to accent either the verb (in Early-closure sentences) or the following noun phrase (in Late-closure sentences). Half of the subjects of the subordinate clauses in our materials were personal names. As Schafer and Jun (2001) note, the presence of focal accent on subject noun phrases affects variation in verb durations and might therefore mask the effect under investigation here. We therefore decided to remove sentences with personal names from the analysis. This left a total of 20 sentences, 5 in each combination of verb bias and syntactic structure. This subset of the materials also did not differ significantly in frequency, length, or plausibility of the verbs and their NP arguments across the Transitive Bias and Intransitive Bias items (all p > .15).

**Predictions**

If structural probabilities have similar effects in these sentences as in DO/SC sentences, we should expect words near low-probability boundaries to be lengthened more than those near high-probability boundaries. We therefore make two specific predictions: (1) Intransitive tokens of Transitive Bias verbs (i.e. in Early Closure sentences) will be lengthened more than intransitive tokens of Intransitive Bias verbs; (2) Direct objects of Intransitive Bias verbs (i.e. in Late-closure sentences) will be lengthened more than those of Transitive Bias verbs.

**Results**

The results of the duration measurements are summarized in Table 2, collapsing across lists and item-groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntax</th>
<th>Bias</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Silence</th>
<th>NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Closure</td>
<td>Intransitive</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Closure</td>
<td>Intransitive</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transitive</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistent with earlier studies, the pronunciation of sentences with Early Closure (*If the tenants beg, the
landlord is going to...) and Late Closure (If the tenants beg the landlord, he is going to...) differed, yielding a main effect of Syntax: Intransitive verb tokens and any postverbal pauses were longer than transitive ones (424 vs. 310 ms, F1(1,19) = 345.3, p < .001, F2 (1,8) = 239.6, p < .001 for the verb; 222 vs. 43 ms, F1(1,19) = 34.0, p < .001, F2 (1,8) = 149.0, p < .001 for the postverbal pause). Noun phrases representing direct objects (If the tenants beg the landlord, he...) were longer than main clause subjects (If the tenants beg, the landlord might...) (665 vs. 398 ms, F1(1,19) = 260.4, p < .001, F2(1,8) = 215.6, p < .001). These patterns are similar to those reported elsewhere (e.g. Warren, 1985).

The Bias x Syntax interaction was crucial to evaluating our specific predictions. Consistent with our predictions, Transitive Bias verbs in Early Closure sentences were lengthened more, compared to their duration in Late Closure sentences (by 138 ms), than Intransitive Bias verbs in the same contexts (by 91 ms), yielding a significant interaction of Syntax by Bias (F1(1,19) = 26.3, p < .001, F2(1,8) = 9.3, p < .02). Figure 1 shows the amount of verb lengthening observed in early closure sentences for intransitive-bias and transitive-bias verbs, compared to the durations of the same verbs in late-closure sentences. For the postverbal silence, the Bias x Syntax interaction did not reach significance (F1(1,19) = 2.3, n.s.; F2(1,8) < 1, n.s.).

Postverbal NP lengthening in late closure sentences

![Figure 2: Lengthening of postverbal noun phrases in Late Closure sentences, relative to the duration of those phrases in Early Closure sentences, following intransitive-bias verbs and transitive-bias verbs.](image)

Discussion

The probability of encountering a particular syntactic structure given a verb (or “verb bias”), has long been known to affect language comprehension. In addition, a recent paper (Gahl & Garnsey, 2004) showed that the probability of a verb’s taking a direct object vs. a sentential complement also affects language production. In this report, we extended the investigation to a different syntactic pattern, namely sentences with initial subordinate clauses. We found that the pronunciation of high-probability (bias-matching) sentences differed from that of low-probability (bias-violating) sentences, in a pattern similar to that observed by Gahl and Garnsey (2004).

Since accent placement affects duration, could regularities in accent placement have given rise to the observed effects? It is certainly the case that the overall differences between Early Closure and Late Closure sentences in part reflect accent. In our data, intransitive verb tokens tended to be accented, as were noun phrases representing direct objects, a pattern that would reinforce the characteristic lengthening of intransitive verb tokens and direct objects. However, accent placement did not depend on verb bias or on the interaction of bias with syntax: Transitive Bias and Intransitive Bias verbs were accented in 86 and 85 of the 100 intransitive clauses with those verbs; direct objects were accented 69 times (out of a possible 100) following Transitive Bias verbs and 64 times following Intransitive Bias verbs. Thus, accent placement did not vary as a function of bias and therefore cannot explain the observed effects of verb bias.

However, the relationship between stress and verb bias merits further investigation. Some conditions that license intransitive uses of certain heavily Transitive Bias verbs
(Goldberg, 2001) also tend to shift focal accent onto those verbs; hence, accent could reflect verb bias, although it did not do so in our data.

The present findings are subject to limitations: Our analysis was based on only ten verbs. We are currently conducting a follow-up study with full noun phrases (no proper names) and a greater number of verbs. However, the generalizability of our results is supported by the fact that Gahl and Garnsey (2004) found similar effects with a larger number of verbs and sentences of a different type. A second limitation stems from the fact that our findings are based on read speech, whose prosody is known to differ from spontaneous speech (Schafer et al., 2000). It remains to be seen whether the patterns we observed in read speech can also be observed in spontaneous speech.

Our findings have implications for research on pronunciation variation and sentence processing. Research on probabilistic pronunciation variation has until now focused on effects of n-gram probabilities (lexical frequencies and word-to-word transitional probabilities) (Bell et al., 2002; Gregory et al., 1999; Jurafsky et al., 2001). Our findings show that pronunciation also reflects probabilities of syntactic constructs, replicating and extending results reported by Gahl and Garnsey (2004).

Research on sentence comprehension has shown that, generally speaking, bias-violating sentences induce longer processing times and higher error rates than bias-conforming sentences (Garnsey, Pearlmutter, Myers, & Lotocky, 1997; Trueswell et al., 1993). The bulk of this evidence has come from reading. Studies of effects of verb biases on auditory comprehension have shown that prosody and verb biases jointly affect comprehension (Blodgett, 2004). If verb biases themselves affect the production of prosody, it is possible that listeners take this fact into account, such that, for example, strong prosodic cues may facilitate the comprehension of bias-violating sentences. We are currently investigating this possibility. A related possibility is that, if bias-violating sentences are characterized by salient prosodic patterns, prosody may serve as a cue for bias.

A contentious question has been at what point in the comprehension process verb bias comes into play (e.g. Pickering & Traxler, 2003). Given that biases affect production as well as comprehension, it is plausible, in our opinion, to suppose that structural probabilities are part and parcel of speakers’ knowledge of their lexicon and syntax, which underlies both comprehension and production and affects both immediately. This point is discussed further in Gahl and Garnsey (2004).

Our work illustrates that studies of language comprehension and production can inform each other, which we consider a promising direction for future research.
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