MAJOR FINDINGS

- Offline results show small island effects
- Bimodal distribution of participant ratings show variability in acceptability
- Online results show no FGE in either possible gap site
  - Baseline differences heading into critical region

- Variation in judgment and differences in island magnitude should be considered in island theory
- Differences between offline and online measures deserve further exploration
- Raises questions as to how definiteness might interact with processing

BACKGROUND

Definite Islands
- Who did Irina see a picture of _?
- Who did Irina see the picture of _?
- Who did Irina see that picture of _?
- Previous approaches:
  - Syntactic (Davies and Dubinsky, 2003)
  - Semantic (Simonenko, 2015)
  - Pragmatic (BCI; Goldberg, 2006)

Processing Islands
- Sprouse et al. (2016) factorial design to separate out the “island effect”
- Use of filled-gap effect (FGE) paradigm by Traxler & Pickering (1996) finds evidence that speakers do not posit gaps inside of islands

Filled-Gap Effect (Stowe, 1986)
- My brother wanted to know if Ruth will bring us home to _ at Christmas
- My brother wanted to know who Ruth will bring us home to _ at Christmas

MAIN QUESTIONS

- How large is the definite island effect?
- Offline - How does the size of definite islands compare to other islands?
- Online - Do we see evidence of a FGE in self-paced reading?

THE STUDIES

EXP 1 — 2x2, DISTANCE BY DEFINITENESS

SHORT:
The journalist guessed who promoted _ the ridiculously scandalous photo of Einstein.

LONG:
The journalist guessed who Charlie promoted _ the ridiculously scandalous photo of _. 

FILLER:
The journalist guessed that Charlie promoted [a/the] ridiculously scandalous photo of Einstein and Max Planck to _.

EXP 2 — 2x2, FILLERTYPE BY DEFINITENESS

FILLER:
The journalist guessed that Charlie promoted [a/the] ridiculously scandalous photo of Einstein and Max Planck to the scientific magazine.

EXP 1A/1B: ACCEPTABILITY JUDGMENT

- 24 experimental items, 72 total
- Participants were given a 7-point scale
- Recruited through Prolific Academic and run on IbexFarm
- Open-ended questions were used to screen for bots
- Data were z-transformed for mixed effects and the interaction as well as fixed effects and subject and item as a random slope and intercept for distance
- Random predictors
- Model included random slopes for both distance and definiteness might interact
- Significant interaction in 1b (direct)
- Marginal interaction in 1a (embedded) and significant interaction in 1b (direct)

EXP 2: SELF-PACED READING

- 24 experimental items, 40 filler
- Participants (N=45) were recruited through Prolific Academic and run on IbexFarm
- 24 experimental items, 40 filler
- Presented with “+” for 1500ms before each item
- Open-ended questions were used to screen for bots
- Data were log transformed for mixed effects linear regression

CRITICAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definiteness</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase/Def</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+1 SPILLOVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definiteness</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase/Def</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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