Do Tagalog comprehenders use agreement to guide their predictions in sentence processing? How are identical morphological cues used across different syntactic contexts?

1. Sentence processing is predictive
   - Comprehenders actively form filler-gap dependencies (FGDs) and do not wait for bottom-up information about the gap site
   - Evidence comes mostly from verb-medial and verb-final languages, like English [1], Dutch [2], and Japanese [3]
   - Evidence from verb-initial Chamorro: prediction is conservative, with disambiguating agreement [4]

2. Morphosyntactic cues in Tagalog
   - Tagalog is a verb-initial language spoken in the Philippines
   - Verbs may agree with either the subject or object [5]
     1. *kumakain* ng langka 'ang bata' Subject agreement (~Agent voice)
        'The child is eating jackfruit'
     2. *kumakain* ng langka 'ang bata' Object agreement (~Patient voice)
        'The child will eat the jackfruit'
     - The only extractable argument is the one the verb agrees with [6]
     3. *bata* na *kumakain* ng langka Subject RC
        'child that eat a怎么做 verbiage jackfruit'
     4. *langka* na *kumakain* 'ang bata' Object RC
        'jackfruit that eat a怎么做 verbiage child'
     5. *bata* na *kaka* 'ang langka Intended: Jackfruit that the child is eating Subject RC
        'child that eat a怎么做 verbiage jackfruit'
     6. *langka* na *kaka* 'ang langka Intended: child that will eat the FGD JACKFRUIT Subject RC
        'jackfruit that the child will eat'

3. O-agreement cue validity depends on FGD-type
   - DESIGN: 2 (Agreement: S, O) x 2 (Gapsize Match: +, -)
     - 32 items: wh-questions (WHQ), ay-topicalizations (AY), relative clauses (RC), and no-FGD declarative fillers
   - Acceptability judgment task (n = 64) using a 7-point scale
     - High cue validity across the board: log difference between blue and yellow
       - Subject agreement
       - Object agreement
   - Relational interactions in (3): WHQ, χ(1) = 3.9, p = .04; AY, χ(1) = 23.9, p < .01; RC, χ(1) = 9.4, p = .002
   - Strong MISMATCH PENALTY (blue - yellow) for S-AGR across the board
   - Weak and variable mismatch penalty for O-AGR
   - **Cue validity scale** (agreement is most valid) WHQ >> AY > RC (agreement is least valid)

4. Stops-Making-Sense task (n = 85): Design
   - DESIGN: 2 (Agreement: S, O) x 2 (Plausibility: +, -)
     - Three experiments (WHQ, RC, AY, 24 items each) combined in one session and randomized with 24 fillers (no FGD-declaratives)
   - Bootstrapping over participants (n = 10,000) to estimate sampling distribution of d’
       - Modified self-paced reading: at each region, participants decided if the sentences made sense up to that point
     - Result: Mean d’ in [11]: Match: [1.78, 2.08]; Mixed evidence: [1.25, 1.78]; Strong evidence: [1.63, 2.10]

5. S- and O-agreement trigger predictive parsing
   - S-AGR: d’ > 0, at the verb -> active dependency formation
   - O-AGR: d’ > 0, before the co-arg -> active dependency formation

6. CONCLUSION
   - Strong evidence for agreement used as a cue for predictive parsing, as in [4]: d’ > 0 before fully disambiguating co-argument
   - Mixed evidence for sensitivity to FGD-specific cue-validity
   - Acceptability ratings may simply be a poor proxy for cue-validity
   - Differences in structural complexity may be relevant
   - Ay-topicalization is a single-dependency [11]
   - WH-questions and RCs are structurally related, and have more complicated dependencies [12]