

---

## Verbal implicit causality and discourse connectives in Romanian sentence production.

---

Sofiana I. Lindemann & Mădălina G. Matei

*Transilvania University Brasov*

sofiana.chiriacescu@unitbv.ro, m.matei@unitbv.ro

This is the first study exploring the way in which different Romanian classes of verbs affect production in terms of upcoming discourse relations and next mention preferences. We explore how these effects interact with connectives.

**Participants.** 56 monolingual native Romanian speakers participated.

**Materials and Design.** Two same-gendered human referents were introduced and we manipulated the verb class and the continuation type (“because” vs. “full stop”). The verbs belonged to one of the four classes: Stimulus-Experiencer (SE), Experiencer-Stimulus (ES), Agent-Patient (AP), Patient-Agent (PA) (Goikoetxea et al. 2008). Participants added one sentence continuation to each item. The 1886 continuations were annotated with respect to (i) choice of subsequent mention and (ii) discourse relations. We expect to obtain more subject continuations for SE verbs and more object continuations for ES verbs (Hartshorne et al. 2013) and overall more explanation continuations (Bott & Solstad, 2014).

**Preliminary Results.** First, SE verbs were more subject-biased (at least 70%) than the ES verbs. These effects were amplified in the because-condition: 91% of SE verbs were subject-biased and 91% of ES verbs were object-biased. The PA verbs showed a robust tendency of the initial object to be re-mentioned (89%), irrespective of the presence of the connective “because”. The AP verbs, on the contrary, showed a similar pattern (70%) only for the “full-stop” condition. The presence of the connective “because” reversed this tendency in favour of the subject (76%). Second, while the presence of the connective “because” is a strong predictor of the discourse relation to be used (i.e. at least 80% explanations), the distribution of the discourse relations associated with the four verb types following a full stop reveals differences in terms of strength and coherence type. PA verbs prefer explanations in 92% of cases, while ES and SE verbs prefer them in 66% and 52% of cases respectively. For AP verbs, participants preferred elaborations (47%) and results (23%) rather than explanations (25%).

**References:** • Bott, O., & Solstad, T. (2014). From verbs to discourse—a novel account of IC. In Hemforth, B. et al. (eds.), *Psycholinguistic approaches to meaning and understanding across languages*, 213–251. NY: Springer. • Goikoetxea, E. et al. (2008). Normative study of the implicit causality of 100 interpersonal verbs in Spanish. *BRM*, 40, 760–772. • Hartshorne, J. K., & Snedeker, J. (2013). Verb argument structure predicts IC: The advantages of finer-grained semantics. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 28 (10), 1474–1508. • Ferstl, E. C., Garnham, A., & Manouilidou, C. (2011). IC bias in English: a corpus of 300 verbs. *Behavior Research Methods*, 43(1), 124–135.