

Gender context effects on homophone words

Elsa Spinelli

Université René Descartes, Paris, France

F.-Xavier Alario

Harvard University, Cambridge, USA

We examined whether a context marked for grammatical gender can constrain the processing of homophone words in French. Homophones whose different meanings are associated with words of different genders (e.g., /sɛl/, meaning *salt* masculine or *saddle* feminine) were used in two cross-modal semantic priming experiments. In the first experiment, in which homophones were presented in isolation, facilitation was found for targets related to both the masculine (e.g., “poivre”, *pepper*) and the feminine (e.g., “cheval”, *horse*) meanings of the homophones. In the second experiment, in which homophones were presented with a gender-marked definite article (e.g., /lasɛl/, *the saddle*), facilitation was found for targets related to the meaning matching the gender information given by the article (e.g., “cheval”). No facilitation was found for targets related to the meaning mismatching the gender information (e.g., “poivre”). These findings are discussed in relation to the locus of the gender-context effect and the representation of homophone words.

A number of languages in the world have grammatical gender. In these languages the form of certain items (e.g., determiners) is dependent on certain grammatical or semantic properties of other items in the utterance (Corbett, 1991). The need to conform to these rules surely imposes a burden of processing on the speaker who has to keep track of the relations between items during the production of speech. On the other hand, the

Requests for reprints should be sent to Elsa Spinelli, Laboratoire de Psychologie Expérimentale, Université René Descartes (Paris V), 71, Avenue Edouard Vaillant, 92774 Boulogne Billancourt CEDEX, France. Email: elsa.spinelli@psycho.univ-paris5.fr

We thank Gareth Gaskell and two anonymous reviewers for their comments on a previous version of the manuscript. We also thank Brad Mahon and Christian Fullgrabe for proofreading. Both authors were supported by post-doctoral fellowships from the Fyssen foundation.

presence of such specific markers in spoken utterances could help listeners by providing specific cues for decoding what they hear (for example during pronoun reference interpretation in English: Arnold, Eisenband, Brown-Schmidt, & Trueswell, 2000; but see also Greene, McKoon, & Ratcliff, 1992). In this study we assessed the role of a gender-marked context on the processing of homophone words whose different meanings are associated with different genders. The presence or absence of a context effect on the perception of these words should shed light both on the locus of the effect and on the representation of homophone words. Our study was conducted in French, a language with a number of words like /sel/, that can either be a masculine word (meaning “salt”) or a feminine word (meaning “saddle”).

Numerous studies have evaluated the role of linguistic context on the activation of lexical candidates (Onifer & Swinney, 1981; Seidenberg, Tanenhaus, Leiman, & Bienkowski, 1982; Simpson, 1981; Tabossi, 1988; Tabossi, Colombo, & Job, 1987; Tanenhaus, Leiman & Seidenberg, 1979). Among those, the investigation of ambiguous words has primarily sought to determine whether perceiving an ambiguous word in a biased context produces access to all of its meanings—*exhaustive access*—or whether the context constrains the activation process by favouring the appropriate meaning—*selective access*. Syntactic contexts (e.g., «they all ...» vs. «the ...» followed by the target ROSE) have consistently been shown to produce exhaustive access to all meanings of ambiguous homophone words (Seidenberg et al., 1982; Tanenhaus et al., 1979). However, studies involving semantic contexts have alternatively shown exhaustive access (Onifer & Swinney, 1981) or selective access (Simpson, 1981; Tabossi, 1988; Tabossi et al., 1987), possibly modulated by the relative frequencies of the different meanings (Hogaboam & Perfetti, 1975). Simpson (1994) concluded his survey of this field by suggesting that the diversity of results is presumably due to variability in the nature of biasing contexts. In studies yielding different outcomes, the lead-in prime sentence that typically precedes the ambiguous word could be priming different features of the target word’s meaning through different mechanisms. It has for instance been proposed that selective access is only produced when *specific* features of the ambiguous word are strongly primed by the context (Tabossi, 1988; Tabossi et al., 1987).

In a gender-marked language like French, each noun is either feminine or masculine. Determiners, among other words, follow a gender agreement rule, so that the gender of a noun that follows the determiner form “le” (respectively “la”) is always masculine (respectively feminine). Hence, the constraint imposed by a gender-marked context is deterministic and it aims directly at one specific feature of the noun. Furthermore, the extraction of this unitary constraint might not require elaborating a sentential representation of the context, as is the case in a number of the examples

discussed earlier—e.g., in studies examining the influence of the syntactic structure or meaning of a context.

Recent studies have suggested effects of gender on word recognition. Grosjean, Dommergues, Cornu, Guillelmon, and Besson (1994) compared lexical decision times to nouns preceded by a non gender-marked adjective or preceded by a gender-marked determiner and the same adjective (e.g., “/ʒoli/ table” vs. “une_{fe}m /ʒoli/ table”). Faster responses were found for the gender-marked context condition, a result that was interpreted as an indication that gender marking of articles serves as a cue for noun recognition. Bates, Devescovi, Hernandez, and Pizzamiglio (1996) also showed robust gender priming (see also Bates, Devescovi, Pizzamiglio, D’Amico, & Hernandez, 1995). For example, they found that subjects were slower to shadow noun targets preceded by gender-incongruent primes than nouns preceded by gender-unmarked primes. In addition, the gender-congruent condition resulted in faster responses than the unmarked condition.

Inhibitory effects in gender-incongruent conditions have usually been interpreted as occurring at a post-lexical processing stage (Bates et al., 1996; Friederici & Jacobsen, 1999). Therefore they might not provide insights about normal lexical access. By contrast, facilitatory effects in gender-congruent conditions could be indicative of a direct impact of the gender-marked context on the process of lexical access. However, before reaching such a conclusion, a number of potential limitations of the studies mentioned above has to be taken into consideration. For example, it is not clear that the inclusion of the incorrect gender-mismatching conditions in the experiments by Bates et al. (1996) did not induce some task-specific strategy (e.g., post-lexical checking) that might have influenced even the congruent trials. Also, since nouns are rarely used in French without any article, the results of Grosjean and collaborators do not make clear whether it is indeed the presence of the article itself—and not its gender information—that produces the effect.

Dahan, Swingley, Tanenhaus, and Magnuson (2000) conducted an eye-tracking study using French to assess the impact of gender on lexical access. In their experiments, participants were instructed auditorily to mouse-click on pictures of objects displayed on a computer screen while their eye movements were monitored. The probability of a subject fixating on a given picture was taken to indicate the activation of the lexical representation of the picture’s name. When participants heard instruction sentences that did not include gender information—e.g., “cliquez sur les . . .” (“click on the . . .”, where “the” is plural but not gender-marked)—the probability of fixation was higher for pictures with names that shared initial phonemes with the target, compared to pictures that had unrelated names. For example, if the instruction was “cliquez sur les boutons”

(/but̃/) participants would look more to a picture of a bottle (/butej/) than to a picture of a dog (/ʃjɛ/). This result was interpreted as evidence that a cohort of candidates defined by their initial phonemes is activated by the speech signal (see also Allopena, Magnuson, & Tanenhaus, 1998). Interestingly, when a gender-marked article preceded the target noun—e.g., “cliquez sur le ...” (“click on the ...”, where “the” is marked for masculine gender)—the members of the phonological cohort that were not of the marked gender received no more fixations than the unrelated competitors. This result indicates that a gender-marked article that precedes a noun can influence lexical activation.

In the study described below, we evaluated whether gender information can constrain the activation of fully ambiguous words: homophones with two different genders (e.g., /sɛl/). Although gender-marked context effects have been reported, it is not obvious that the processing of homophone words will be sensitive to such a context. Homophones can be thought of as words sharing a single phonological representation connected to two meanings (Gottlob, Goldinger, Stone, & Van Orden, 1999). If gender-marked contexts affect the activation of candidates at the word form level (see discussion in Dahan et al., 2000), the assumption that homophones have a single representation at this level predicts that no effect of gender context should be observed with these words. By contrast, the observation of a gender effect with homophones would provide evidence that they have distinct representations at the level at which gender effects occur. This could either mean that homophones do not share a common phonological representation or that the gender effect is located at a different level of processing—for example, the activation of word meanings.

In the experiments we report, participants heard homophone words as auditory primes. Immediately after hearing one of these primes, they performed a lexical decision on a visually presented target that was either semantically related or unrelated to one of the meanings of the prime. In Experiment 1, homophones were presented auditorily in isolation. In Experiment 2, they were preceded by a definite article (“the”), marked for one of the two possible genders (in French /lə_{masc} or /la_{fem}). The use of homophones with different genders avoids violations of the gender agreement rule. Furthermore, any context effect found in our experiments will be unambiguously attributed to gender: as the auditory stimulus unfolds, the two potential candidates differing by their gender (/sɛl_{masc}/ meaning “salt” and /sɛl_{fem}/ meaning “saddle”) remain equally compatible with the input.

EXPERIMENT 1

Method

Participants. Thirty-two native French speakers with normal or corrected vision and no reported hearing impairment participated in this experiment.

Stimuli and design. Thirty-two pairs of homophones of different gender (e.g., /sɛl/: a masculine word meaning *salt* and a feminine word meaning *saddle*) were selected as experimental primes. The two meanings of the homophones differed slightly in frequency. The average frequency of the words corresponding to the primary (more frequent) meaning of the homophones was 75 occurrences per million. It was 14 for the secondary (less frequent) meaning.¹ The primary and secondary status were confirmed by a verbal association test submitted to 50 subjects. Responses related to the primary meaning of the homophones were given in 64.1% of the trials, compared with 27.6% responses related to the secondary meaning. The primes were recorded onto a DAT and then down-sampled to a computer. For each prime an individual file was created. The end of the file coincided with the offset of the prime word.

For each homophone prime, we selected four target words to be presented visually. The first was semantically related to the primary meaning of the homophone (e.g., “poivre”, pepper, semantically related to the primary meaning of /sɛl/_{masc}). The second target was semantically related to the secondary meaning (e.g., “cheval”, horse, semantically related to the secondary meaning of /sɛl/_{fem}). The two other target words were unrelated to the homophone and served as baseline. The related and unrelated targets were individually matched in frequency (90 vs. 80 occurrences per million respectively), number of letters (5.9 letters for both groups) and number of syllables (1.7 syllables for both groups). A lexical decision pre-test conducted with 10 participants revealed no difference in reaction times between the related and unrelated targets, neither for the primary meaning [related = 546 ms; unrelated = 544 ms; both $t_s < 1$] nor for the secondary meaning [related = 545 ms; unrelated = 553 ms; $t_1(9) = 1.54, p = 0.25; t_2(31) < 1$]. The prime and target words are presented in the Appendix.

Thirty-two other non-experimental auditory word-primes were associated with 32 pseudowords. Moreover, 64 other auditory words were

¹ The frequency values of heterographic homophones are those of the BRULEX database (Content, Mousty, & Radeau, 1990) and those of the homographs are from the Frequency Dictionary of French words (Juilland, Brodin, & Davidovitch, 1971). The frequency of a few items could not be found.

presented with their corresponding unrelated targets (32 words, 32 pseudowords) in order to obtain a proportion of 12.5% related pairs. We created four experimental lists so that each participant received all priming conditions but heard each prime only once.

Procedure. The experiment was controlled by Psyscope (Cohen, MacWhinney, & Flatt, 1993). Participants were tested individually. In each trial, the auditory prime was presented through headphones and the visual target was displayed on the centre of the computer screen precisely at the offset of the auditory prime. Participants were asked to perform a lexical decision on the visual target. Reaction times (RTs) were measured from onset of visual target presentation to response.

Results and discussion

Errors occurred in 2.7% of the trials and these were excluded from the RT analysis. To reduce the impact of outliers, the RT data were inverse-transformed (Ratcliff, 1993). Table 1 provides a summary of the results, where the means are retransformed (i.e., they are harmonic means). The data were analysed with two-way repeated measures analyses of variance (ANOVAs) conducted by participants (F_1) and by items (F_2), and where the main factors were *relation*—semantically related, unrelated—and *meaning level*—primary, secondary.

The main effect of *relation* was significant, with faster responses in the related than in the unrelated condition [related = 540 ms, unrelated = 568 ms; $F_1(1, 31) = 32.7$, $MSE = 7.99E-9$, $p < .01$; $F_2(1, 31) = 11.2$, $MSE = 2.8E-8$, $p < .01$]. The effect of *meaning level* was significant by participants [primary = 547 ms, secondary = 561 ms; $F_1(1, 31) = 4.23$, $MSE = 1.56E-8$, $p < .04$; $F_2(1, 31) = 2.12$, $MSE = 2.80E-8$, $p = .16$] and there was no interaction between *relation* and *meaning level* [$F_1(1, 31) < 1$; $F_2(1, 31) < 1$]. The analyses conducted on the error-rates revealed no effect of *meaning level* [both $F_s < 1$]. There was an effect of *relation* with more errors in the related than in the unrelated condition [$F_1(1, 31) = 7.15$,

TABLE 1

Harmonic mean reaction times (RT, in ms), standard deviations (SD), and percentage of errors (% error) in the conditions of Experiment 1, where homophones are presented in isolation.

	<i>Related</i>			<i>Unrelated</i>			<i>Priming effect</i>
	<i>RT</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>% error</i>	<i>RT</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>% error</i>	
Primary meaning	532	77	3	562	69	3	30
Secondary meaning	548	91	5	574	101	0	26

$MSE = .002, p < .02; F_2(1, 31) = 4.73, MSE = .004, p < .04$]. The test of the interaction effect did not reach significance [$F_1(1, 31) = 2.63, MSE = .005, p < .12, ns; F_2(1, 31) = 2.26, MSE = .005, p < .14 ns$]; note however that a descriptive analysis of the data show that the effect of *relation* on the error rates was mainly observed in the secondary-meaning condition.

The results of Experiment 1 show that when homophones are presented in isolation the primary and the secondary meanings—associated with different genders—are both activated. Contrary to previously reported results, we did not find larger priming for the primary than for the secondary meaning. This could be due to the fact that the difference in frequency between the primary and secondary meanings was not very large—recall that frequency was not manipulated per se in this experiment. Alternatively, the absence of differential priming effects could be linked to the difference of error rates observed for the secondary-meaning condition, where participants produced more errors—and faster response latencies—in the related than in the unrelated conditions. This apparent trade-off between speed and accuracy—which was not observed in the primary-meaning condition—could lead to a larger-than-expected priming effect on the response latencies of the secondary-meaning condition. In any case, this characteristic of the data does not undermine our approach. Experiment 1 clearly established a priming effect for the *primary* meaning. In the following experiment, we examined if such priming could still be obtained when a gender-marked context favours the secondary meaning of the homophone. For that purpose, homophones were presented with the article corresponding to the secondary meaning—e.g., participants heard “la selle” (the_{fe}m saddle) as a prime. If gender can induce a constraint on the processing of homophone words, the facilitation for the target related to the primary meaning (e.g., “pepper”) should not be observed when the definite article favours the secondary meaning.

EXPERIMENT 2

Method

Participants. Forty-eight native speakers of French volunteered for this experiment. None had participated in the previous experiment.

Stimuli and procedure. The stimuli were the same as those of Experiment 1 except that in Experiment 2 the auditory primes were preceded by their corresponding definite article. Homophone primes were preceded by the definite articles corresponding to the *secondary meaning* of the homophones. All the auditory stimuli were re-recorded. An equal

TABLE 2

Harmonic mean reaction times (RT, in ms), standard deviations (SD), and percentage of errors (% error) in the conditions of Experiment 2, where homophones are presented with a gender-marked article favouring the secondary meaning.

	<i>Related</i>			<i>Unrelated</i>			<i>Priming effect</i>
	<i>RT</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>% error</i>	<i>RT</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>% error</i>	
Primary meaning	556	91	2	558	88	2	2
Secondary meaning	549	91	5	576	102	4	27

number of masculine and feminine articles was used in the experimental lists. The procedure paralleled that of Experiment 1.

Results and Discussion

The same analyses as in Experiment 1 were conducted. Errors (3.2%) were removed. The data are presented in Table 2. In the RT analysis we found a main effect of *relation*, with faster responses to the related than to the unrelated condition [$F_1(1, 47) = 9.34$, $MSE = 1.00E-8$, $p < .01$; $F_2(1, 31) = 5.45$, $MSE = 1.36E-8$, $p < .03$]. No main effect of *meaning level* was found [both $F_s < 1.19$]. The interaction between the two factors was significant [$F_1(1, 47) = 12.1$, $MSE = 6.32E-9$, $p < .01$; $F_2(1, 31) = 4.43$, $MSE = 1.32E-8$, $p = .04$]. The analysis of planned comparisons showed a semantic facilitation effect only in the secondary meaning condition [related = 549; unrelated = 576; $F_1(1, 47) = 26.8$, $p < .01$; $F_2(1, 31) = 9.97$, $p < .01$]. In the primary meaning condition, no difference was found [related = 556; unrelated = 558; both $F_s < 1$]. Analyses conducted on errors revealed no effect of *relation* [both $F_s < 1$]. An effect of *meaning level* was found [$F_1(1, 47) = 7.44$, $MSE = .004$, $p < .01$; $F_2(1, 31) = 5.33$, $MSE = .004$, $p < .03$]. There was no interaction between the two factors [both $F_s < 1$].

In this experiment, where homophone words were preceded by the definite article corresponding to the secondary meaning, we found evidence of activation for the secondary meaning, but no evidence of activation for the primary meaning. That is, we only found evidence of activation for the meaning consistent with the gender information given by the form of the article.²

² An alternative interpretation for the results of Experiment 2 would be that the gender of the determiner directly activated the visual targets, and therefore that the effects we observe are not related to the processing of homophones. This explanation is possible if the gender of the visual targets is distributed unevenly between the related and unrelated conditions. Specifically, it would require that the visual targets in the related condition are more (or less) often of the gender of the homophone prime than the visual targets in the unrelated condition. As can be seen in the list of materials, this was not the case.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

We conducted two cross-modal semantic priming experiments to examine whether a context marked for grammatical gender can constrain the activation of the meanings of homophone words. In the first one, where homophones were presented in isolation, faster lexical decisions were found for target words related to the primary and to the secondary meanings of the homophones, compared with unrelated words. In the second experiment homophones were preceded by a gender-marked context (a definite article, either feminine /la/ or masculine /lə/) that corresponded to the secondary meaning of the homophone. This time facilitation was only observed for targets related to the meaning favoured by the gender context. Thus, a gender-marked context can induce selective access during the recognition of homophone words. In the following we discuss the implications of this observation for the locus of the gender context effect and the representation of homophone words.

As argued in the Introduction, the observation of a gender context effect during the processing of homophones is incompatible with the joint assumption that gender context effects occur at the form level and that homophones share a single form representation. Under these assumptions, the information carried by the context could not favour one candidate over the other—as was the case for the cohort-related candidates in the Dahan et al. (2000) study—since the two homophones have a common representation at the level where the effect occurs. Therefore, at least one of the two assumptions described above needs to be modified in order to account for the data we report.

Keeping the assumption that homophones have a common phonological representation requires revising the locus of the gender effect. One possibility would be that the effect of context is located at the level of word meaning, where the two unrelated meanings of homophones necessarily have distinct representations. In this case, perceiving the homophone in isolation would produce the activation of the shared phonological representation which in turn would activate both meanings. When the homophone is preceded by a gender-marked context, this information would be used to favour the appropriate meaning. Under this interpretation, it is the meanings of words, and not their forms, that are sensitive to the context. This would require that grammatical gender information—masculine or feminine—is stored at the meaning level. For example, word meanings could be tagged with a grammatical gender node. However, this hypothesis would go against the received view that grammatical gender is a lexical property, as opposed to a semantic property in languages where gender categories are not clearly defined in semantic terms (as is the case in French). More importantly, this hypothesis would complicate the

representation of word meanings for bilinguals. Since a given word can have different genders in different languages, it would seem that the representation of the *meaning* of these words would have to be language specific. For instance, a French–Spanish bilingual would need two concepts of the object *banana* because the word *banana* is feminine in French and masculine in Spanish.

Another possibility would be to revise the assumption that homophones have a single phonological representation (for a discussion of the representation of homophones in the speech production system, see Jescheniak and Levelt (1994), and Caramazza, Costa, Miozzo, and Bi (2001). If we hypothesise that homophones are represented as two phonological nodes, each one associated with a gender, then these representations could be sensitive to the gender-marked context. Perceiving the homophone in isolation would produce the activation of the two phonological representations which in turn would activate their corresponding meanings. By contrast, when the homophone is preceded by a gender-marked context, this information would be used to favour the appropriate form. As a consequence only the appropriate meaning would receive a significant amount of activation. In other words, the gender context effect would happen at the phonological level, although it was measured through the activation of word meanings.

At the form level, the effect of gender could be explained as a by-product of lexical competition. Cohort-related candidates would compete for recognition irrespective of their gender, and gender information could provide additional activation to the congruent candidates. These extra-activated lexical items (e.g., feminine candidates) would become stronger competitors among the cohort of candidates, and they would be better able to inhibit candidates from the other gender (e.g., sel_{masc}). This would result in an absence of activation of the meaning of the gender-mismatching homophone. However, a difficulty with this account must be pointed out: if gender were providing extra activation to the congruent interpretation of the homophone, a larger priming effect should be expected for the gender-consistent meaning with a gender-marked context (Exp 2) than without it (Exp 1)—assuming no other factor comes into play in the comparison. However, response latencies and priming in the secondary meaning conditions of Experiments 1 and 2 remained virtually identical. A rather different interpretation of the effect of gender could then be that gender information extracted from the determiner—e.g., feminine from /la/—is used to discard the gender mismatching candidate—e.g., sel_{masc} . A mechanism of this type would work in an *all-or-none* fashion: when a feminine determiner is processed, only feminine words compete for recognition. That is to say, the cohort of phonologically related

candidates considered for selection would be restricted to those that have a gender that matches the context.³

In conclusion, the data we report provide evidence that a gender-marked context constrains the meanings that are accessed during the perception of homophones. This pattern seems better explained by locating the gender context effect at the level of word form activation. It further suggests that homophone words do not share a common representation at this level.

Manuscript received April 2001

Revised manuscript received November 2001

REFERENCES

- Alloppenna, P.D., Magnuson, J.S., & Tanenhaus, M.K. (1998). Tracking the time course of spoken word recognition using eye movements: Evidence for continuous mapping models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *38*, 419–439.
- Arnold, J.E., Eisenband, J.G., Brown-Schmidt, S., & Trueswell, J.C. (2000). The rapid use of gender information: Evidence of the time course of pronoun resolution from eye-tracking. *Cognition*, *76*, B13–B26.
- Bates, E., Devescovi, A., Pizzamiglio, L., D'Amico, S., & Hernandez, A. (1995). Gender and lexical access in Italian. *Perception and Psychophysics*, *57*, 847–862.
- Bates, E., Devescovi, A., Hernandez, A., & Pizzamiglio, L. (1996). Gender priming in Italian. *Perception and Psychophysics*, *58*, 992–1004.
- Caramazza, A., Costa, A., Miozzo, M., & Bi, Y. (2001). The specific-word frequency effect: Implications for the representation of homophones. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *27*, 1430–1450.
- Cohen, J.D., MacWhinney, B., & Flatt, M. (1993). PsyScope: An interactive graphic system for designing and controlling experiments in the psychology laboratory using Macintosh computers. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, *25*, 257–271.
- Content, A., Mousty, P., & Radeau, M. (1990). Brulex. Une base de données lexicales informatisée pour le Français écrit et parlé. *L'Année Psychologique*, *90*, 551–566.
- Corbett, G. (1991). *Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahan, D., Swingle, D., Tanenhaus, M., & Magnuson, J.S. (2000). Linguistic gender and spoken-word recognition in French. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *42*, 465–480.
- Friederici, A.D., & Jacobsen, T. (1999). Processing grammatical gender during language comprehension. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *28*, 467–484.

³ We are assuming in this discussion that the effects of the context are indeed due to gender information extracted from the processing of the determiner and not to a more “shallow” form-based mechanism. It could in fact be proposed that the representations of the (frequently used) definite determiner and that of the homophone are strongly linked, thus forming a single representational unit. In this case, the perception of /lasel/ would have no reason to activate the meaning of the masculine counterpart /lasel/. However, this view is unlikely because a number of adjectives can “break” the representational unit by being used pre-nominally—e.g., “la grande selle”, *the big saddle*. Still, an empirical test of this hypothesis could be conducted by using different types of gender-marked contexts, such as less frequent determiners or adjectives.

- Gottlob, R.G., Goldinger, S.D., Stone, G.O., & Van Orden, G.C. (1999). Reading homographs: Orthographic, Phonologic and Semantic Dynamics. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *25*, 561–574.
- Greene, S.B., McKoon, G., & Ratcliff, R. (1992). Pronoun resolution and discourse models. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *18*, 266–283.
- Grosjean, F., Dommergues, J.-Y., Cornu, E., Guillelmon, D., & Besson, C. (1994). The gender-marking effect in spoken word recognition. *Perception and Psychophysics*, *56*, 590–598.
- Hogaboam, T.W., & Perfetti, C.A. (1975). Lexical ambiguity and sentence comprehension. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, *14*, 265–274.
- Jescheniak, J.D., & Levelt, W.J.M. (1994). Word frequency effects in speech production: Retrieval of syntactic information and of phonological form. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *20*, 824–843.
- Juilland, A.G., Brodin, D., & Davidovitch, C. (1971). *Frequency dictionary of French words*. The Hague, Mouton.
- Onifer, W., & Swinney, D.A. (1981). Accessing lexical ambiguity during sentence comprehension: Effects of frequency of meaning and contextual bias. *Memory and Cognition*, *9*, 225–236.
- Ratcliff, R. (1993). Methods for dealing with reaction time outliers. *Psychological Bulletin*, *114*, 510–532.
- Seidenberg, M.S., Tanenhaus, M.K., Leiman, J.M., & Bienkowski, M. (1982). Automatic access of the meanings of ambiguous words in context: Some limitations of knowledge-based processing. *Cognitive Psychology*, *14*, 489–537.
- Simpson, G.B. (1981). Meaning dominance and semantic context in the processing of lexical ambiguity. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, *20*, 120–136.
- Simpson, G.B. (1994). Context and the processing of ambiguous words. In M.A. Gernsbacher (Ed.), *Handbook of psycholinguistics* (pp. 359–374) San Diego: Academic Press.
- Tabossi, P. (1988). Accessing lexical ambiguity in different types of sentential context. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *27*, 324–340.
- Tabossi, P., Colombo, L., & Job, R. (1987). Accessing lexical ambiguity: Effects of context and dominance. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, *49*, 161–167.
- Tanenhaus, M.K., Leiman, J.M., & Seidenberg, M.S. (1979). Evidence for multiple stages in the processing of ambiguous words in syntactic context. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, *18*, 427–440.

APPENDIX

Material used as primes and targets in Experiments 1 and 2 (F = feminine; M = masculine). (Note: the secondary targets “bateau” and “dessin” are repeated. For that reason we were careful to place these items in different experimental lists, so that participants would see them only once)

<i>Articles used in Exp 2</i>	<i>Homophone Primes: Secondary/Primary</i>	<i>Targets</i>			
		<i>Secondary</i>		<i>Primary</i>	
		<i>Related</i>	<i>Control</i>	<i>Related</i>	<i>Control</i>
Le (M)	bal / balle	danse (F)	gorge (F)	tennis (M)	cerise (F)
La (F)	butte / but	colline (F)	couloir (M)	objectif (M)	avantage (M)
La (F)	cape / cap	épée (F)	aveu (M)	mer (F)	lit (M)
Le (M)	chêne / chaîne	gland (M)	flair (M)	vélo (M)	rôti (M)
La (F)	coque / coq	bateau (M)	dessin (M)	poule (F)	pause (F)
La (F)	file / fil	attente (F)	essence (F)	aiguille (F)	ceinture (F)
La (F)	laque / lac	cheveux (M)	conseil (M)	étang (M)	acier (M)
Le (M)	luth / lutte	musique (F)	passage (M)	guerre (F)	oeuvre (F)
La (F)	mûre / mur	ronce (F)	bille (F)	brique (F)	flèche (F)
La (F)	mitte / mythe	placard (M)	ficelle (F)	légende (F)	paresse (F)
Le (M)	parti / partie	vote (M)	code (M)	jeu (M)	joie (F)
La (F)	paire / père	deux (M)	fois (F)	enfant (M)	moment (M)
Le (M)	pot / peau	confiture (F)	mandarine (F)	chair (F)	larme (F)
Le (M)	rêne / reine	traîneau (M)	crevasse (F)	couronne (F)	barrière (F)
Le (M)	rosé / rosée	vin (M)	cou (M)	matin (M)	moyen (M)
La (F)	selle / sel	cheval (M)	départ (M)	poivre (M)	brosse (F)
La (F)	sole / sol	poisson (M)	vacances (F)	parquet (M)	pendule (F)
La (F)	pousse / pouce	plante (F)	membre (M)	doigt (M)	faute (F)
La (F)	barre / bar	métal (M)	musée (M)	café (M)	mari (M)
La (F)	vis / vice	clou (M)	foin (M)	alcool (M)	équipe (F)
Le (M)	watt / ouate	électricité (F)	utilisation (F)	coton (M)	gazon (M)
La (F)	hyenne / yen	fauve (M)	come (F)	monnaie (F)	pêcheur (M)
Le (M)	gêne / gêne	cellule (F)	colonne (F)	embarras (M)	élégance (F)
La (F)	livre / livre	kilo (M)	défi (M)	cahier (M)	copain (M)
La (F)	manche / manche	veste (F)	conte (M)	balai (M)	noyau (M)
Le (M)	moule / moule	gâteau (M)	raisin (M)	frite (F)	plâtre (M)
Le (M)	mousse/mousse	marin (M)	latin (M)	savon (M)	duvet (M)
Le (M)	page / page	serveur (M)	pesanteur (F)	feuille (F)	science (F)
Le (M)	poste / poste	radio (F)	bijou (M)	timbre (M)	barque (F)
La (F)	somme / somme	addition (F)	haricot (M)	sieste (F)	peigne (M)
La (F)	vase / vase	boue (F)	soie (F)	fleur (F)	route (F)
La (F)	voile / voile	bateau (M)	dessin (M)	mariée (F)	mérite (M)