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**Method**

**Participants:** 32 students at Seoul National University

**Task:** Participants listened to a context sentence (1–4), then wrote a continuation.

**Materials:** 4 conditions (see 1–4 below) ; 70 items (42 experimental; 28 fillers)

1. **Broad focus prosody (Cond1)**
     C-HON-NOM C-HON-DAT book-ACC hand-PAST-DECL
   - ‘Mr. Chelswu handed a book to Mr. Yengswu.’

2. **Focus on source/subject: morphology only (Cond2)**
   - Chelswu-ssi-nun Yengswu-ssi-eykey chayk-ulken-ess-ta.  
     C-HON-TC Y-HON-DAT book-ACC hand-PAST-DECL
   - ‘Mr. Chelswu, handed a book to Mr. Yengswu.’

3. **Focus on source/subject: morphology & prosody (Cond3)**
   - CHELSWU-SSI-NUN Yengswu-ssi-eykey chayk-ulken-ess-ta.  
     C-HON-TC Y-HON-DAT book-ACC hand-PAST-DECL
   - ‘Mr. Chelswu handed a book to Mr. Yengswu.’

4. **Focus on goal/non-subject: morphology & prosody (Cond4)**
     C-HON-NOM C-HON-DAT-TC book-ACC hand-PAST-DECL
   - ‘Mr. Chelswu handed a book to Mr. Yengswu.’

**Prosodic analyses**

Fig.1. Duration (in ms) of critical regions. Pause after contrastive -nun.

Fig.2. Prosodic analyses, F0 range. Greater F0 range with contrastive -nun.

**Questions and Predictions**

- **Cond2 vs Cond1:** How does morphology alone on the source/subject affect topic selection in the continuation?
  - Previous (written) work showed no effect (Kim et al., 2013; Ueno & Kehler, 2010).

- **Cond3 vs Cond2 (1 and 4):** How do morphology and prosody together on the source/subject affect topic selection in the continuation?
  - If increased salience promotes increased selection for topic, 
    - more source selections for topic
  - If focus highlights a reference set with alternatives, 
    - more continuations with contrastive (parallel) coherence relation 
    - more selections from source reference set (alternative or original source) for topic

- **Cond4 vs Cond2 (1 and 4):** How do morphology and prosody together on the goal/non-subject affect topic selection in the continuation?
  - If increased salience promotes increased selection for topic, 
    - more goal selections for topic
  - If focus highlights a reference set with alternatives, 
    - more continuations with contrastive (parallel) coherence relation 
    - more selections from goal reference set (alternative or original goal), especially as the focus, while maintaining current (source/subject) topic

**Results**

**Fig.3. Referential patterns: Sentential subject of continuation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%Source reference: Cond2 vs Cond1</th>
<th>21% vs. 25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t(41) = .003; p = .904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig.4. Coherence relations vary by condition**

- **Condit3**
  - Source coherence relations were found only in Cond3 and Cond4

**Appendix: Examples of Contrastive Continuations**

1. **Cond1 – Alt-Source subject continuation (4%)**
     C-HON-NOM Y-HON-DAT book-ACC hand-PAST-DECL
   - ‘Mr. Chelswu handed a book to Mr. Yengswu.’

2. **Cond2 – Alt-Goal subject (28%)**
     C-HON-NOM Y-HON-DAT book-ACC hand-PAST-DECL
   - ‘Mr. Chelswu handed a book to Mr. Yengswu.’

- **Cond3 – Alt-Source subject (7%)**
    C-HON-NOM Y-HON-DAT book-ACC hand-PAST-DECL
  - ‘Mr. Chelswu handed a book to Mr. Yengswu.’

- **Cond4 – Alt-Goal subject (21%)**
    C-HON-NOM Y-HON-DAT book-ACC hand-PAST-DECL
  - ‘Mr. Chelswu handed a book to Mr. Yengswu.’

**Conclusion**

- **Contrastive prosody plus contrastive morphology together produce contrastive focus, which in turn affects discourse coherence and topic management.**
- **Contrastive morphology alone does not.**