Island, resumption, lab 1

Ling499a Feb 9th, 2009
Islands for movement

**STRONG ISLANDS**: always works; universal

1. Complex NP island
   - I believe the claim that John kissed *someone*.
   - *Who*$_1$ did you believe [ the claim that John kissed t$_1$ ]?

2. RC island
   - I saw the girl who kissed *someone*.
   - *Who*$_1$ did you see [$_{RC}$ the girl$_2$ who t$_2$ kissed t$_1$ ]?
Islands for movement

**STRONG ISLANDS**: always works; universal

3. Adjunct clause island
   - I got angry because the girl kissed **someone**.
   - *Who₁ did you get angry [because the girl kissed t₁]?

4. Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC)
   - I saw the girl and **her friend**.
   - *Who₁ did you see [the girl and t₁]?
Islands for movement

**WEAK ISLANDS**: selective; not universal

- WH-island
  - I wondered when John kissed *someone*.
  - Who₁ did you wonder when John kissed t₁?
What exactly are islands violations of?

• Chomsky’s Subjacency:
  – conditions on movement operations

• Bad PF representation:
  – Sluicing
  – Resumption

• External, non-grammatical factors:
  – Memory capacity constraint (Kluender, et al)
  → we’ll come back to this in a few weeks
Subjacency

- Movement cannot cross more than one bounding node in one step
  - Condition on derivations / move operations
- Bounding nodes are DP and IP

- Can you test how well this works?
- Michael asks: Why?
Bad trace approaches

• **Main idea:**
  - If you just totally delete the structure w/ bad trace, or pronounce it, island violation goes away.
  - These data suggest that movement itself is fine, but the structure left by movement is bad for some reason
Bad trace approaches

• Sluicing: PF deletion of IP under wh-movement

a. John kissed someone, but I don’t know who₁ (John kissed t₁)

b. John saw the girl who kissed someone, but I don’t know who₁ (John saw the girl who kissed t₁)
Bad trace approaches

- Resumption: replace traces w/ pronouns

a. Who did John kiss $t_1$?
b. *Who$_1$ did John see $[_{RC} \text{the boy who kissed } t_1]$?

a’. *Who$_1$ did John kiss her$_1$?
b’. Who$_1$ did John see $[_{RC} \text{the boy who kissed } her$_1$]?
Lab project 1!!!

• Does resumption really rescue island violations in English?

• **Goal**: actually construct an acceptability judgment study yourself, collect and analyze data
Alexopoulou & Keller 2007

(11) Nonisland condition (bare clause)
   a. Who will we fire 0/him?  (zero embedding)
   b. Who does Mary claim we will fire 0/him?
   c. Who does Jane think Mary claims we will fire 0/him?  (double)

(12) Nonisland condition (that-clause)
   a. Who does Mary claim that we will fire 0/him?  (single)
   b. Who does Jane think that Mary claims that we will fire 0/him?  (double)

(13) Weak-island condition (whether-clause)
   a. Who does Mary wonder whether we will fire 0/him?  (single)
   b. Who does Jane think that Mary wonders whether we will fire 0/him?  (double)

(14) Strong-island condition (relative clause)
   a. Who does Mary meet the people that will fire 0/him?  (single)
   b. Who does Jane think that Mary meets the people that will fire 0/him?  (double)
Figure 1. Effects of embedding and resumption on object extraction in English in experiment 1.
Your task

**Step 1**
- Make **3 sets** of baseline, island violation and resumption sentences (by next class)
- Use Google Doc

**Step 2**
- Collect data from **3 native speakers**
- Report data to me using excel
- Write 1-page report based on group results
More details on sentence making

(A subset of) A&K’s conditions (2x2 design)

• Non-island
  – Who₁ does Jane think that Mary claims that we will fire \_₁ ?
  – Who₁ does Jane think that Mary claims that we will fire him₁ ?

• RC island
  – Who₁ does Jane think that Mary meets the people that will fire \_₁ ?
  – Who₁ does Jane think that Mary meets the people that will fire him₁ ?
Design constraints

• Each set of sentences needs to be lexically matched (more or less)
• Use embedded, d-linked wh-questions
• The sentences need to be easy to contextualize / pragmatically felicitous
• Most importantly, it needs to be made clear that the pronouns are intended as resumptive pronouns, not some random pronoun referring to a third-person/object
Let’s make a sample set

- Non-island
  a.
  b.

- Island
  a.
  b.

Take a look at materials from Phillips et al (2005)
Plans now 1

• **Write your three sets of sentences on GoogleDoc by Thursday**
• **We’ll discuss them in class, as well as other guidelines and design considerations**
• **...instead, we’ll drop the wh-in-situ topic!**
• **I will print out copies of AJT and give them to you next Tuesday (17\(^{th}\)), so you can collect data**
Plans now 2

• Send me your data in an excel file (more on this next Tuesday) by next Thursday (19\textsuperscript{th})

• I will send you the group results on the same day (19\textsuperscript{th})

• You will write up one page report by 26\textsuperscript{th}
For thursday

• Make sentences
• Read Crocker