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**RESEARCH QUESTION:** Do the verb’s retrieval cues target attachment sites, leading to interference from multiple clauses?

### 1. Similarity-based Interference

- **Cue-based retrieval** guides resolution of subject-verb dependencies [1, 2]
  - Parser launches a search for the subject at the verb, guided by certain retrieval cues
- **Similarity-based interference** occurs when multiple candidates in memory match the verb’s retrieval cues
  - What kind of cues are used for retrieval?
    - Semantic properties, structural position, and case shown to be relevant cues for retrieval [2, 3]

### 2. Attachment sites or subjects?

- Interference could be due to multiple subjects or multiple attachment sites for the verb
- Subject properties often correlate with clausal properties
  - Nominative case in finite clauses; accusative case in non-finite [3]
  - Multiple subjects correlate with multiple clausal attachment sites
    - When the parser encounters a DP, it projects an accompanying T,
      which serves as an attachment site for the verb

### 3. Experiment 1a

- Manipulate complexity of intervener with PP modifiers: increased activation leads to greater competition at retrieval [3, 4]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Complex Subject</th>
<th>Complex Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval site</td>
<td>(was)</td>
<td>(was)</td>
<td>(was)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>-11 ms</td>
<td>-22 ms</td>
<td>-32 ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>1000 ms</td>
<td>998 ms</td>
<td>1007 ms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prediction:** Slower reading times at retrieval site in Complex Subject and Complex Clause conditions

### 4. Experiment 1b

- **Hypothesis:** The verb’s retrieval cues target both arguments and attachment sites; clauses should also give rise to interference
  - DP: The student who knew the exam was important was studying,
  - TP: T was +NOM +5G
  - The student…TP
  - The exam…

### 5. Experiment II

- Used pre-head modifiers to keep number of clause-final modifiers constant and avoid anti-locality effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Complex Subject</th>
<th>Complex Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval site</td>
<td>(was)</td>
<td>(was)</td>
<td>(was)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>VS</td>
<td>VS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause</td>
<td>-11 ms</td>
<td>-22 ms</td>
<td>-32 ms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>1000 ms</td>
<td>998 ms</td>
<td>1007 ms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prediction:** Slower reading times at retrieval site in Complex Subject and Complex Clause conditions

### FUTURE DIRECTIONS:

- **Match / Mismatch paradigm instead of elaboration**
  - Vary tense or aspect of embedded clause to match matrix verb’s cues
- **Examine languages with richer Tense / Aspect / Mood morphology**
  - E.g. subjunctive vs. indicative in Spanish
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