

Does informativity modulate linearization preferences in reference production?



Muging Li; Noortje J. Venhuizen; Torsten Kai Jachmann; Heiner Drenhaus; Matthew W. Crocker

INTRODUCTION

What influences how we order information in our utterances?

- Structural preferences [1]
- \bullet Referential informativity \propto Referential Entropy Reduction (RER)
 - Level of uncertainty reduced in identifying the intended referent [2]
 - Higher RER \rightarrow smaller referential scope \rightarrow more informative
- Other factors, e.g., visual salience, priming, etc. [3,4]

Does informativity modulate linearization preferences?

- 1. Does RER affect linearization at all?
- 2. If so, which ordering is preferred?



Maximal informativity hypothesis: high informative first [5,6,7]

(Simulated) partner

EXPERIMENTS



RESULTS

Three groups of subjects:

- Consistent Pre-nominal
- Consistent Post-nominal
- Varied

Logistic mixed effect regression:

Structure $\sim 1 + \text{Condition} + (1 + \text{Cond I Subject}) + (1 + \text{Cold I Item})$

With a more interactive setup in Exp3, more subjects belong to Group Varied.



- Stimuli: animals performing actions (flexible ordering in German)
- Conditions: Animal-informative vs. Action-informative

Experiment 1: Speaker maze task

◆ 80 subjects, 24 critical trials + 24 fillers

Experiment 2: Listener task + Speaker maze task (in two blocks)

- ◆ Perspective changing → more informative? [8]
- ◆ 160 subjects, 12 critical speaker trials + 12 fillers

Experiment 3: Listener task + Speaker maze task (in turn by trial)

- \bullet More interactive \rightarrow more informative?
- ◆ 80 subjects, 24 critical speaker trials + 12 fillers

Structure Pre-nominal Post-nominal

CONCLUSIONS

Does informativity modulate linearization preferences in reference production?

What's next?

- In-lab free production experiments with a real confederate
- Group difference & individual difference?

Some speculations:

- Attention intensity [9]
- No, many participants used a fixed syntactic structure.
- Yes, the remaining participants produced varied syntactic structures, reflecting a maximal informativity strategy: the more informative property is more likely to be encoded first.
- If the setup is more interactive, more participants can + vary their syntactic encodings.
- Visual perception capacity [10]
- Sensitivity to priming (linguistic knowledge and experiences; nonverbal reasoning skills) [11]
- Perspective changing skills (working memory; inhibition control) [12]

REFERENCES

1.Pechmann (1989) *Linguistics* 2.Tourtouri et al. (2019) J Cult Cogn Sci 3. Tarenskeen, Broersma & Geurts (2015) Front Psychol 4.Goudbeek & Krahmer (2012) Top Cogn Sci 5.Fukumura (2018) *J Mem Lang* 6. Rubio-Fernández (2016) Front Psychol

7.Frank & Goodman (2012) Science 8.Sikos et al. (2021) Proc Annu Conf Cogn Sci Soc 9.Unsworth & Miller (2021) Curr Dir Psychol Sci 10. Eayrs & Lavie (2018) J Exp Psychol Hum Percept Perform 11. Kidd (2012) Appl Psycholinguist 12.Wardlow (2013) *Psychon Bull Rev*

IndiPrag + XPrag 2023

SFB 1102 - Information Density and Linguistic Encoding

Contact: muqingli@coli.uni-saarland.de