0 The present study

(1) **Main question:** How do Tagalog speakers use morphological cues to construct filler-gap dependencies in real-time?

(2) **Upshot:** Agreement facilitates FGD-processing in Tagalog (at least, in S-extractions). We maintain that it strengthens the parser's commitment to a hypothesis by providing indefeasible evidence about the gap's location

1 The experiment

(3) **Task:** Stops Making Sense task. It took about 25-45 mins to complete.

(4) **Participants:** 80 Tagalog speakers were recruited from the University of the Philippines-Diliman (18-35; 40 F and 40 M; $M_{age} = 23.33; SD_{age} = 4.53$). Participants received a Starbucks gift card, valued at 400 PHP ($\approx$8.50 USD).

(5) **Design:** 2 (AGREEMENT: Present, Absent) $\times$ 2 (PLAUSIBILITY: Plausible, Implausible)

(6) **Items:** 12 non-reversible semantically transitive verbs

(a.) 12 item sets distributed via Latin square that compares -um-marked verbs and iteratives

(b.) 12 item sets distributed via Latin square that compares -in-marked verbs and recent perfectives

(c.) 48 distractor items involving other filler-gap dependencies (relativization and long-distance topicalization)

2 Results and discussion

(7) Linear mixed-effects models were estimated in R using lme4 at each region for the two extraction-types.

(a.) **Dependent measure:** DISCRIMINABILITY SCORE, defined as the difference between the empirical logits of implausible sentences and the empirical logits of plausible sentences

(b.) **Fixed effect:** AGREEMENT

(c.) **Random intercepts estimated for participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-extraction Verb Intercept</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>81.86</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-extraction Agreement</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>86.56</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-extraction Verb+1 Intercept</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>81.37</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-extraction Agreement</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>89.91</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-extraction Verb Intercept</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>73.06</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-extraction Agreement</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>78.24</td>
<td>-.86</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-extraction Verb+1 Intercept</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>81.46</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-extraction Agreement</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>88.95</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) **At the verb:** For S-extraction, implausible sentences are rejected more than plausible sentences ($p < .001$), especially when there is agreement ($p = .02$). For O-extraction, implausible sentences are rejected more than plausible sentences ($p < .001$), but agreement did not mediate this effect ($p = .09$).

(9) **At the co-argument (V+1):** For both S- and O-extraction, implausible sentences are rejected more than plausible sentences, as suggested by the positive coefficient of the intercept. However, it is no longer mediated by Agreement ($p = .37$).

(10) For S-extraction, agreement facilitated FGD-processing by providing indefeasible evidence about the gap's location.

(11) For O-extraction, there was no evidence that agreement facilitated FGD-processing. Why?

(a.) Subject advantage?

(b.) Alternative parse? Some people find S-extraction with O-agreement a licit form of extraction. What is the source of variation: age or dialectal differences?

(c.) (a) and (b), plus the structure of Tagalog uh-questions: the relation between the filler and the gap is further mediated via predication

Please direct comments and questions to jpguevar@ucsc.edu. If interested in the morphosyntactic details of Tagalog, you can download a longer version of the handout at http://people.ucsc.edu/~jpguevar/CUNY2016.pdf.