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Abstract: This paper presents preliminary results from new experiments using the 
SENTENCE-MATCHING PARADIGM Forster (1979), Freedman & Forster (1985), also Bley-
Vroman & Masterson (1989), investigating native-speakers’ and L2 learners’ knowledge 
of constraints on clitic placement in French. Our purpose is three fold: (i) to shed more 
light on the contrasts between native-speakers and L2 learners observed in previous 
experiments, especially Duffield & White (1999), and Duffield, White, Bruhn de 
Garavito, Montrul & Prévost (2002); (ii), to address specific criticisms of the sentence-
matching task leveled by Gass (2001); (iii), to provide a firm empirical basis for follow-
up experiments with L2 learners.

0. Introduction

The sentence-matching task (SMT) is a relatively simple instrument: subjects are 
asked to decide whether a pair of consecutively presented sentences are identical 
in form, as they are in (1a), or not, as in (1b). Psycholinguistic interest in the 
SMT lies in the fact that in most instances grammatical pairs are matched reliably 
more quickly than ungrammatical ones; for example, the pair in (1a) is matched 
significantly more quickly than (1c) (non-matching pairs such as (1b) are simply 
distractors). Differences in response latencies thus provide an implicit measure of 
grammaticality.

(1)  a. Alex has seen the dog.  
    Alex has seen the dog.

b. Alex has seen the dog.  
    Alex has seen the cat.

c. Alex has saw the dog.  
    Alex has saw the dog.

The utility of this implicit measure has not escaped second language 
researchers, where explicit meta-linguistic judgments may be less likely to reflect 
underlying competence than is the case for native speakers (Birdsong (1989) for 
this and other reasons, Bley-Vroman & Masterson (1989) propose sentence 
matching as a valuable adjunct to traditional GJ tasks in L2 research).
1.1 The absence of the grammaticality effect

What is arguably of greater theoretical interest are those cases where the sentence-matching task apparently ‘fails’: that is, where superficially ungrammatical constructions are treated in terms of response latency as though they were grammatical. These results have been taken by some researchers as evidence of the ‘underlying grammaticality’ of such constructions, especially where there is independent theoretical evidence to support this claim; see, for example, Freedman & Forster (1985), Forster & Stevenson (1987), Clahsen & Hong (1995). This is also the case in the present experiment.¹

One such construction, studied in Duffield & White (1999) and Duffield et al (2002), is what may be termed the ‘*medial French causative’ (*MFC), where an accusative (subject) clitic appears in medial position between the higher causative verb and the lower predicate with which it is thematically associated, as in (2a). With respect to the surface grammar, this structure is ungrammatical; however, in previous SMT experiments, *MFCs were treated by native-speakers no differently from their grammatical counterpart (2b), and in clear contrast to comparable ungrammatical pairs, as exemplified in (2c), which elicited reliably longer response latencies.

(2) a. *Je fais le voir.
    I make him see-inf.
    ‘I make him see.’

b. Je le fais voir.
    I him make see-inf.
    ‘I make him see.’

c. *Je fais voir le aujourd’hui.
    I make see him today
    ‘I make him see (today).’

¹ A reviewer asked whether there are any specific properties (i.e., categories, features, or operations) common to all constructions that failed to show grammaticality effects in SMTs. In pre-Minimalist vocabulary, the answer is affirmative (if somewhat loose): sentences may be underlyingly grammatical if they involve a non-surface grammatical level of representation—e.g., LF (post reconstruction), or s-structure where Operator-Binding takes place at LF—that differs from the surface representation. It is harder to capture this in a purely derivational framework.
The absence of a grammaticality effect in this case could be dismissed as a task or item effect, were it not for the following considerations. First, in all other comparable conditions in the same experiment, native-speakers’ results yielded strong, reliable effects of grammaticality. This was true, for example, of contrasting pairs of sentences involving restructuring verbs such as *pouvoir, vouloir*, etc., illustrated in (3).

(3) a. Je veux le voir.
    I want him see-inf.
    ‘I want to see him.’

b. *Je le veux voir.

Second, the same subjects’ judgments of the relevant items in a subsequent (traditional) offline GJ task showed a uniform rejection of these *MFC sentences, showing that the absence of a grammaticality effect in the SM task was not due to poorly chosen stimuli.

Third, experiments using separate materials and a different instrument—a self-paced reading task—have shown independently that this construction is rather marked in processing terms. Dwivedi & Hoover (1996), and Hoover & Dwivedi (1998), have shown that readers prefer to associate a clitic with the verb that immediately follows it, a preference which yields longer processing times for (grammatical) initial French causatives (2b) over comparable causative sentences without clitics. We return to this point directly.

Fourth—the focus of the earlier papers—L2 learners did in fact show reliable grammaticality effects for the *MFC condition; in this respect, they appeared to outperform native-speakers.

Finally, as mentioned earlier, there are theoretical grounds for considering the *MFC construction to be underlying grammatical. Most recent generative analyses of Romance causative constructions assume that French *faire* + *infinitive* constructions remain fundamentally biclausal, where the lower clause contains all

---

2 Note that here the expected judgments are reversed: medial placement of the clitic is grammatical, initial placement is ungrammatical.

3 At the point of presentation of the second verb.
of the functional architecture of a normal matrix clause, including clitic projections, and where the surface (initial) position of the clitic is derived by A’-movement from this lower (medial) clitic projection. This derivation is illustrated in (4) below. For relevant discussion see Sportiche (1996), Roberts (1997), Guasti (1993), Guasti (1996); also Vinka (2002).

(4) [ je le_i fait [ ... [CIP-Acc le_i ... [VP pro_i voir ] ] ] ]

1.1.1 Gass’ (2001) criticisms

Notwithstanding the preceding discussion, the SMT has been vulnerable to criticism on various counts. Early critics, notably Crain & Fodor (1987), called for a radical reinterpretation of the original findings with native-speakers, claiming that a low-level factor of ‘correctability’ better explained the early data than any appeal to more interesting theoretical notions such as underlying grammaticality.  

More recently, Gass (2001) has criticized many of the previous experiments involving L2 learners on separate grounds, both methodological and empirical. Gass’ principal criticisms are based on the observed contrast between previous work and her own experiments using SM. Those contrasts may be briefly summarized. First, in Gass’ own initial experiment, L2 learners showed no reliable grammaticality effect in any structural condition (adverb placement, subject-verb agreement, clitic placement), nor were grammatical sentences always matched faster than ungrammatical sentences by native-speakers. Second, in a follow-up experiment, intermediate learners of French did not perform significantly differently from beginning learners who—according to Gass—could not be presumed able to construct any higher-level structural representations whatsoever. Third, the L2 results from Gass’ first experiment did not reliably correlate with the same subjects’ offline judgments of grammaticality (indeed, a small but reliable ‘reverse grammaticality effect’ was observed). Finally, Gass

4 Crain & Fodor’s position on SM is uncompromisingly harsh: ‘…this overgeneration account of the matching task results is incorrect [:] the relevant difference between the two sentence types is whether the ungrammaticality tends to be spontaneously corrected by subjects. This correctability account of the data is of absolutely no theoretical interest, but unfortunately it appears to be correct (Crain & Fodor 1987:123-124) [our italics].’ An equally firm reply to Crain & Fodor’s account is provided by Forster & Stevenson (1987).
criticized certain aspects of the experimental design of previous experiments, including choice of materials and timing issues.

Setting aside for a moment the non-trivial methodological issues, Gass’ other criticisms reduce to two essential points: first, in Gass’ own studies, the SMT failed to yield any reliable grammaticality effects, casting doubt on the replicability of earlier results; second, mismatches were observed between subjects’ results in offline GJ tasks vs. those on the SMT, again suggesting (to Gass) that SM does not provide a reliable measure of grammaticality.

With respect to the first point, it is quite clear that experimental results are only valid to the extent that they are replicable: the main purpose of the present set of experiments is to show such replicability. However, it is equally clear that failure to replicate on any given occasion does not by itself invalidate an earlier finding. We will not speculate here on the reasons for the failure of SM in Gass’ experiments. What is crucial to notice, however, is that her experiments L2 learners’ results failed globally to show any reliable grammaticality effect; by contrast, in Duffield et al. (2002), and several other papers, the SM task elicited reliable grammaticality effects for L2 learners and native speakers overall and in most subconditions: it was only in one specific subcondition (*MFC) that native speakers’ results failed to yield a reliable effect.5

The validity of the second point, concerning the mismatches between online and offline results in Gass’ experiments, rests on the premise that offline acceptability judgments provide a reliable litmus test of grammaticality. Without wishing to belabour the point here—see Duffield (2003, 2004) for extended discussion—we reject this premise. In fact, if it were valid, there would be no real point in using other instruments such as SM to assess grammaticality, since whenever a systematic divergence were found between results, the traditional GJ results would immediately be deferred to (as is the case in Gass’ paper).

5 Such cases of local failure are much more profitably viewed in terms of a (statistically) reliable interaction between grammaticality and condition than in terms of an unreliable main effect of grammaticality (as Gass would have it).
If this brief response is adequate, what remains from Gass’ paper is an even greater urgency to successfully replicate the earlier results, and to develop an experimental design that allows us to better understand the grammaticality effect in SM. With this in mind, we conducted two follow-up experiments: the first, a near copy of the restructuring and causative sub-conditions of Duffield et al.’s larger experiment; the second, an extension of the causative conditions, using transitive causatives, contrasting *medial-accusative with *medial-dative clitics, as exemplified in (5) and (6) below:

(5)  
| a.  | Je la fais suivre par son frère.  |
|     | I her make follow by her brother |
|     | ‘I make her brother follow her.’  |
| b.  | *Je fais la suivre par son frère. |

(6)  
| a.  | On lui fait regarder la télévision. |
|     | one her makes watch the television |
|     | ‘She is made to watch television.’  |
| b.  | *On fait lui regarder la télévision. |

Before discussing these experiments, it is necessary to address an important—but hitherto unclarified—methodological issue, namely, the locus of the (absent) effect.

1.1.2 The locus of the effect

In the SMT, the grammaticality effect (GE) is operationally defined as the difference between the mean response latency for grammatical items in a particular condition, and that for the corresponding ungrammatical items (GE=RT_{UGR}-RT_{GR}). In principle, the absence of such an effect in medial causatives might come about in one of two ways: either because of some processing difficulty with the grammatical pairs, producing inhibition, or because of relatively greater ease of processing with the ungrammatical ones, producing facilitation.
Figure 1. Contrasting Effects of Inhibition and Facilitation

In the ideal case, if the absence of any GE were due to inhibition, we would expect to see longer response latencies for grammatical pairs for those forms vis-à-vis other comparable grammatical pairs (Fig. 1: LH diagram); conversely, if this were due to facilitation of the ungrammatical pairs, we would expect to see shorter latencies for these vis-à-vis other comparable ungrammatical pairs (Fig. 1: RH diagram). Clearly, only the latter result supports the idea of underlying grammaticality. However, the results of the Hoover & Dwivedi study mentioned above would lead us to expect an inhibition-based account instead.

In Duffield et al. (2002), native speakers’ results showed both inhibition for the grammatical causatives (-37 msecs) and facilitation for the ungrammatical medial causatives (+51 msecs), when compared to the overall means (Fig. 2: LHS). However, when the results from medial causatives—cf. (2a)/(2b) above—were compared, more locally, with those of ‘final’ causatives —(2b/2c)—only a strong facilitation effect (+140 msecs) was found (Fig. 2: RHS). This offers some apriori support for the underlying grammaticality interpretation.
2. Experiments

2.1 Design

We conducted two experiments, using the same experimental set-up reported in Duffield et al. (2002) but with some modifications in the materials with respect to: the number of separate conditions in each experiment (reduced); the proportion of fillers/distracter items to test items (reduced); the number of test items per condition (increased); and the number of subjects tested (increased). We also paid particular attention to balancing the gender/number properties of the pronominal clitics in the test items \{le, la, les; lui, leur\}.

Both experiments manipulated the (surface) grammaticality of the pairs, the construction type involved, the position of the clitic with respect to the two verbs \{initial, medial (final)\}, and the number and gender of the clitic \{masc., fem.; singular, plural\}.

Experiment I re-examined the contrast between causative and restructuring verbs, previously exemplified in (2) and (3) above. Experiment II probed a contrast within the class of causative constructions: in contrast to Experiment I, which involved an INTRANSITIVE lower predicate, Experiment II examined clitic placement with two classes of TRANSITIVE causatives, contrasting the faire + infinitive construction with the so-called faire par construction, as was illustrated in (5) and (6) above. Though converging with respect to the grammatical (initial)
placement of the clitic, these two constructions are distinguished by the morphological case and understood grammatical relation of the clitic pronoun. In the *faire par* construction, the clitic is interpreted as the object of the lower clause and realized with accusative case (just like subject pronouns of intransitive lower verbs discussed earlier). By contrast, in the transitive *faire + infinitive* construction in (6), the clitic is interpreted as the lower clause subject but is realized with dative, rather than accusative case.

Investigating transitive causatives enables us to tease apart two possible interpretations of facilitation in *MFC constructions, supposing this (non)-effect is replicated. A grammatical interpretation of the *MFC effect would predict that pairs containing *medial accusative clitics should be treated as underlyingly grammatical, independently of their grammatical relation (subject/object). An alternative ‘shallow syntactic processing’ account—along the lines proposed in Clahsen & Felser (forthcoming)—might predict that medial clitic placement would be accepted only where the order is congruent with canonical thematic relations (SUBJ. (AGENT)_1-VERB_1-SUBJ. (AGENT)_2-VERB_2): that is to say, it predicts that (2b) and (6b) pairs should pattern together, with (5b) pairs showing a significant GE.

2.1 Subjects

We tested 35 adult native-speakers of French at two university sites in Canada and Europe.

2.1 Results

Data from 29 subjects—pending statistical analysis—reveals the following. First with respect to Experiment I, Fig. 3 (LHS) shows that the core result of previous experiments appears to have been entirely replicated. In contrast to the grammaticality effects observed in both restructuring conditions (EF), as well as in the (immediately comparable) final causative condition (H), absolutely no GE is observed in the crucial *MFC condition (G); indeed, the interaction between

---

6 Results from five subjects were excluded due to high error rates in matching, or exceptionally slow mean response latencies. One test item (from restructuring condition F) was also excluded. The final analysis was based on the response latencies of the remaining subjects/items that fell within 2 standard deviations of each subject’s individual overall mean for correctly matched items.
clitic position and construction type seems even sharper than before. Moreover, the most immediate comparison between causative conditions G and H once more suggests the absence of a GE as due to facilitation of the ungrammatical pairs in G—as predicted by the underlying grammaticality account—rather than to inhibition of the grammatical pairs.

![Figure 3: Preliminary Results: Experiments I & II](image)

The results of Experiment II, with transitive causatives, are somewhat harder to interpret at this point, given that the accusative condition (I) appears to show not only (predicted) facilitation for the ungrammatical forms but also a surprising inhibition of the grammatical pairs. This obviously requires further investigation. However, the main result here is the contrast between the accusative condition (I), where no GE is observed, and the dative condition (J), which apparently shows a robust grammaticality effect. This suggests that case, rather than thematic roles or surface grammatical relations, determines the acceptability of medial causatives; if so, this speaks against any shallow processing explanation of the result, and is more consistent with the grammatical account developed here.

*Contra* Gass (2001), SM can tell us something interesting and valuable about competence grammar and competent parsing.
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