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Abstract

Publications on the interpretation of the elliptical phenomenon of fragment answers have used the acceptability judgments of syntactically parallel evidence in order to justify contrasting claims. One of the approaches assumes syntactic factors to be responsible for the unacceptability of certain fragment answers. In the present paper, I will show that these judgments do not derive from syntactic factors. They rather stem from the pragmatic properties of the introducing elaborating ‘Yes’ and correcting ‘No’, which lead to a divergence of the required processing effort. My empirical investigation is based on a questionnaire of 40 native speakers of English. The result of my study is that the acceptability judgments reflect the variation in processing effort caused by elaboration or correction.

1 Introduction

Merchant (2004) and Culicover & Jackendoff (2005) each put forward a theory of analysing fragments. These two theories differ in that Merchant assumes syntactic structure to be present but invisible in answers like the ones in (1B) and (2B) below. Culicover & Jackendoff, on the other hand, deny the existence of such syntactic structure. In the course of their respective argumentation it turns out that both approaches are based on very similar evidence, which is used to different ends. This evidence can be seen in (1) and (2) below.

(1) A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks?
   B:   * No, Charlie.

   Merchant 2004, 708

(2) A: John met a guy who speaks a very unusual language.
   B:   Yes, Albanian.

   Culicover & Jackendoff 2005, 245

In spite of the fragment answers being almost identical, the judgments of the replies in (1) and (2) are not the same. Why does the data receive such contrasting acceptability judgments? Even though both fragments contain island violations? As this data marks the deciding point between the two theories, it is especially important to explain how these different judgements come about. In this paper, I will investigate said judgments. My hypothesis is that the introducing ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ are producing the conflicting judgements. It is their respective
pragmatic property that is responsible for different types of judgments for the same types of sentences.

In order to prove this hypothesis, I will outline the two theories of fragments offered by Merchant and Culicover & Jackendoff as well as the theories available on the notion of islands in Chapter 2. This investigation will explain the relevance of the above examples, and it will also show that none of the theories is able to account for the discrepancy between the judgments of the fragments answers.

In Chapter 3, I will turn to investigating the replies in (1B) and (2B) further. I will specify five criteria in which they differ and show that only one of these criteria can account for the clashing acceptability judgments, namely the difference between the introducing ‘Yes’ and ‘No’. This difference leads to a contrast in necessary processing efforts, for which I will suggest the relevant pragmatic mechanisms.

The empirical investigation presented in Chapter 4 serves two purposes. The first one is that of verifying the difference between fragment answers of the types given in (1B) and (2B). Furthermore, in contrast to the examples cited above, the design of the question/answer-pairs allows investigating only one specific factor at a time. The results show that among other factors, ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ lead to considerable differences in acceptability. What follows is a detailed discussion of the results and their implications and an evaluation of the investigation.

I conclude the paper with summarising both theoretical and empirical issues and suggesting steps required in future research.

2 Fragments

Fragments are an instance of ellipsis, which is a phenomenon that often occurs in natural language. It refers to the omission of linguistic material. The material that is omitted, deleted or unpronounced, however, is still understood. (Winkler 2006, 109) The question inherent to all elliptical constructions is how the meaning of the silent part can be inferred. The interpretation of elliptical constructions “depends on their relation to an antecedent clause in the discourse.” (Culicover & Jackendoff 2005, 234)

How do we understand things we do not hear? Finding an answer to this question seems especially challenging for fragments as the one in B’s reply in (2) below, where the ‘missing’ information is not contained within the same sentence but actually in another speaker’s utterance. We can easily understand the reply. The question, however, is how.
There are a great number of approaches to different elliptical phenomena. Some of them are in favour of a (movement and) deletion-account, others claim that no movement takes place. Of the second group, there are some who are more syntax-oriented and therefore assume silent structure, and others who represent a what-you-see-is-what-you-get-account.

Merchant (2004) is a representative of the (Movement and) Deletion Account and suggests first movement of the remaining material out of a full sentential structure and then deletion of everything but the remnant(s). Culicover & Jackendoff (2005), on the other hand, advocate a Non-deletion Account in Simpler Syntax and do not assume an underlying full sentential structure but simply a base-generated syntactic structure consisting of the fragment only. Both accounts acknowledge the fact that syntactic constraints apply in the ellipsis site and in spite of Culicover & Jackendoff’s rather semantics-based take, syntax also plays a role in their reasoning. I show how both approaches work in 2.1.1 and 2.2.1 and present the arguments for each in the following sections (2.1.2 and 2.2.2). After that, in order to be able to address the conflicting data of Merchant and Culicover & Jackendoff, I give a short overview on the syntactic theory concerning islands (2.3), since both examples under discussion contain such islands. Subsequently, I show that existing descriptions of islands fail to account for the differing judgments of the data (section 2.3.3). In 2.4, I then turn to actually discussing the island data from both Merchant (2.4.1) and Culicover & Jackendoff (2.4.2). This culminates in testing the two competing approaches with the opponent’s data and showing that neither approach is able to account for the differing acceptability judgments.

2.1 The Movement and Deletion-Account

I will give an overview over both Merchant’s syntax-based analysis of fragments and the evidence from which he deduces his analysis in this section. In doing so, I will ignore Merchant’s (To appear 2010) paper, in which he revises the generality of his analysis because it does not explain the differing acceptability judgements of elaborating and correcting fragments.

---

2.1.1 Movement and Deletion

Merchant (2004, 672ff.) suggests that in utterances like B’s reply in (3) below, ‘John’ is first moved to the beginning of the structure of ‘She saw John’ as in topicalization, leaving behind a trace t in its original position. This trace is coindexed with ‘John’ because they are connected due to the movement (cf. section 2.4.1 below).

(3) A: Who did she see?
    B: John (, she saw ti).


In the resulting sentence ‘John, she saw’ the TP is deleted. In order to account for this, Merchant introduces an [E] feature. [E] “serves as the locus of all the relevant properties that distinguish the elliptical structure from its non-elliptical counterpart” (Merchant 2004, 670). It ensures the identification of the elided material on the level of semantics. On a syntactic level, [E] triggers movement into Spec-FP. Phonologically, [E] ensures non-spell out of that part of the structure that is c-commanded by [E]. The intermediate CP layer is introduced in order to account for the ungrammaticality of island examples, which will be discussed in section 2.5.1 below. As usually assumed in Minimalism, the movement of the fragment DP applies in a successive cyclic way (cf. e.g. Radford 2004, 321f., also see section 2.4.2). This means that it moves through an intermediate Spec-CP position on its way up to the Spec-TP position, which is its final landing site. This movement is indicated by arrows in Figure 1 below.
Merchant (2004) puts forward a lot of evidence supporting his analysis. First, he presents evidence for ellipsis in fragments which shows that there is more structure than can be seen or heard; then, he goes on to show that movement constraints apply in fragments, which means that it is plausible to stipulate fragments to be a product of both ellipsis and movement.

### 2.1.2 The Arguments

Merchant (2004) provides several pieces of evidence in favour of his movement and deletion hypothesis. The first big group of examples supports his claim that ellipsis is involved in fragments. The first sub-group illustrates that in languages like Greek, German, Korean, English, Hebrew, Russian and Urdu, fragment answers realize the same case features as their counterparts in non-elliptical structures. I will repeat Merchant’s German and English examples (49), (50) and (53) in (4), (5) and (6) below. (The asterisk indicates that both the versions with and without the bracketed part are ungrammatical whereas in the grammatical reply, both versions are possible.)

(4) A: Wem folgt Hans?
   
   B: (Hans folgt) Dem Lehrer.
   
   B’: * (Hans folgt) Den Lehrer.
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(5) A: Wen sucht Hans?
   B: (Hans sucht) Den Lehrer.
   B’: * (Hans sucht) Dem Lehrer.

(6) A: Whose car did you take?
   B: (I took) John’s (car).
   B’: * (I took) John (car).

Merchant 2004, 677f.

These observations support an analysis of fragments based on syntax-based ellipsis accounts since case is assigned to a complement by its head. In order to receive case, the relevant lexical item has to originate in a position next to the case-assigning head. Merchant also gives a number of examples to show that Binding Principles apply in fragment answers as they do in full sentential structures, of which I quote (59) and (60) in (7) and (8) below. The indices _i_ indicate that two lexical items refer to the same entity, and asterisks again show that both the versions with and without the bracketed part are ungrammatical.

(7) A: Who did John_i try to shave?
   B: (John_i tried to shave) Himself_i.
   B’: * (John_i tried to shave) Him_i.

(8) A: Who does John like?
   B: (John_i likes) Himself_i.
   B’: * (John_i likes) Him_i.

Merchant 2004, 680

These two cases exemplify what Merchant shows using examples (57) - (71) from both English and Greek: Not only case marking effects but also binding effects show in fragment answers. Binding Theory (cf. e.g. Haegeman 1995) provides a framework which explains the restrictions that apply to referential, pronominal and anaphoric expressions like ‘him’ or ‘himself’. As these are described on the basis of their position within a structure, it seems plausible to posit the existence of such structure whenever binding constraints apply. Similar effects can be observed in fragments when it comes to scopal facts or bound pronouns. Fragment answers show the same effects as their non-elliptical, fully sentential
equivalents. (Merchant 2004, 681ff.) For the present purpose, however, the above evidence sufficiently illustrates the point.

The second group of Merchant’s evidence supports his claim for movement in fragments. He shows that the same constraints apply to fragment answers as do to other instances of A’-movement like topicalization or wh-movement. Bare DP answers, e.g., are only possible in languages that allow preposition stranding. This is shown in examples (9) and (10), which are modified versions of Merchant’s (72) and (78).

(9)  
A: Who was Peter talking with?  
A’: With whom was Peter talking?  
B: With Mary.  
B’: Mary.

(10)  
A: Mit wem hat Anna gesprochen?  
with whom has Anna spoken  
A’: * Wem hat Anna mit gesprochen?  
B: Mit dem Hans.  
with the Hans  
B’: * Dem Hans.  
* the-Dative Hans

Pied-piping languages like English allow for bare DP answers whereas in German, a non-pied-piping language, the proposition is required. This corroborates Merchant’s movement claim since the same principles are valid in full sentential structures containing movement.

More evidence for movement comes from different items that can neither be preposed nor appear as fragment answers as can be seen in sentences (11) through (13). (Merchant’s (93), (105) and (144)

(11)  
A: What does no-one believe?  
B: That I am taller than I really am (, no-one believes).  
B’: * I am taller than I really am (, no-one believes).
A: What didn’t Max read?
B: This book (, Max didn’t read).
B’: * Any book (, Max didn’t read).

A: Was wolltest du?
B: Das (wollte ich).
B’: * Es (wollte ich).

These pieces of evidence from complementiser deletion, polarity items and pronominals fortify Merchant’s claim that movement and then PF-deletion take place on the full sentential structure of fragments.

Merchant presents a number of solid facts from all sorts of languages and various phenomena. That makes his argumentation seem both thorough and convincing. Culicover & Jackendoff, however, argue in favour of a more semantics-oriented approach to the interpretation of fragments.

2.2 The Simpler Syntax-Account

In this section, I will first outline Culicover & Jackendoff’s approach to fragments, which uses a mechanism called Indirect Licensing. Secondly, I will present arguments against Merchant’s approach, which lead Culicover & Jackendoff to their solution.

When doing so, I will jump back and forth between Culicover & Jackendoff’s (2005) Simpler Syntax and Culicover’s (2009) Natural Language Syntax. This is legitimate because Culicover’s book is based on the Simpler Syntax framework (cf. e.g. the introductory chapter, 1-9) and Culicover himself admits to “draw[ing] from material from Chapter 7 of Simpler Syntax” (Culicover 2009, 436) in his chapter on fragments.

2.2.1 Indirect Licensing: Non-Deletion

Culicover & Jackendoff (2005) do not assume an underlying full syntactic structure in a fragment but claim that it is interpreted with respect to the meaning of a preceding clause, not with respect to its structure. In order to account for Merchant’s arguments, Culicover & Jackendoff introduce the concept of Indirect Licensing. This means that “the fragment is not part of a larger syntactic structure, but it behaves as though it is. And it is interpreted as
though it occupies a particular position in a syntactic structure, even though it doesn’t” (Culicover 2009, 448). The interpretation of the fragment, however, takes place on a semantic level, which they call Conceptual Structure. Culicover & Jackendoff suggest three steps to understanding the meaning of a DP fragment. First, we have to find that part of the antecedent that matches the fragment; it is called the target. Then, the part of the CS representation of the antecedent that correlates with the target has to be identified. And thirdly, a representation that replaces the interpretation of the fragment with that of the target has to be constructed. (Culicover 2009, 448)

In order to show how the interpretation of a fragment works in the Simpler Syntax framework, I will illustrate this mechanism with Culicover’s example (6) repeated in (14) below.

(14) A: Harriet has been drinking something.
    B: Yeah, scotch.

Culicover’s (24) with the syntactic the CS representation of both the fragment and its antecedent and the substitution procedure is given in (15).

(15) fragment:
    Syntax: \[DP \text{scotch}\]^3
    CS: \text{SCOTCH} [BEVERAGE]

antecedent:
    Syntax: \[S \text{Harriet} [VP \text{drink} [DP \text{something}]]\]
    CS: \text{DRINK} (AGENT: HARRIET, THEME: [BEVERAGE])

---

^2 CS is short for Conceptual Structure, which in Culicover and Jackendoff’s framework is the term used for the meaning level of an utterance. “Conceptual Structure is one aspect of human cognitive representations in terms of which thought takes place.” (Culicover & Jackendoff 2005, 20)

^3 Note that I am making Culicover’s NP a DP here in accordance with Radford 1997, 151-154. I am not only treating the existential uses of nouns as DPs but also generic interpretations and proper names.
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**substitution procedure:**

1. ‘scotch’ syntactically matches the direct object ‘something’ of the antecedent.
2. ‘something’ corresponds to the THEME: [BEVERAGE] in the CS.
3. ‘scotch’ is a [BEVERAGE] so it matches semantically.
4. Substitute CS of ‘scotch’ for interpretation of complement of ‘drink’ in antecedent, yielding

   \[
   \text{SCOTCH [BEVERAGE]} = \text{THEME: [BEVERAGE]}
   \]

5. **result:** DRINK (AGENT: HARRIET, THEME: SCOTCH [BEVERAGE])


‘Scotch’ and ‘something’ are both DPs carrying the same case features, which allows for identifying ‘something’ as the target. Since ‘something’ is the direct object of the verb ‘drink’, it refers to something that can be drunk and therefore has the semantic feature [BEVERAGE] just as ‘scotch’ does. That is why the interpretation of the fragment can be inserted in the CS representation of the target in the antecedent, which leads to the full interpretation of the fragment under 5. above. Of course, Culicover & Jackendoff have good reasons to introduce this mechanism as responsible for the interpretation of fragments. These reasons, which are mainly cases that contradict Merchant’s evidence from sections 2.1.2, are shown in the next section.

**2.2.2 The Arguments**

I will now describe Culicover & Jackendoff’s reasons and evidence against Merchant’s account and for assuming that the interpretation of fragments takes place on a semantic level rather than on a syntactic one. Culicover (2009) presents sentences which consist of more than one CP. His examples (10), (11) and (12) are quoted in (16), (17) and (18) below, where I added the italicised paraphrases of B’s reply.

(16) A: I hear that Harriet’s been drinking again.

   B: Yeah, scotch.

   \[
   \text{Yeah, Harriet’s been drinking scotch.}
   \]

(17) A: Ozzie mistakenly believes that Harriet’s been drinking again.

   B: Yeah, scotch.

   \[
   \text{Yeah, Ozzie mistakenly believes that Harriet’s been drinking scotch.}
   \]
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(18) A: Ozzie doubts that Harriet’s been drinking again.
   B: *Yeah, scotch.
      *Yeah, Ozzie doubts that Harriet’s been drinking scotch.
      *Yeah, Harriet’s been drinking scotch.
      

If you compare the italicised paraphrases of the fragment answers in (16) and (17), you can see that in (16), ‘scotch’ is only inserted in the embedded CP whereas in (17), ‘scotch’ refers to the entire meaning of the highest CP. Since both sentences in A have the same syntactic structure, this difference in meaning cannot be accounted for in a syntax-based analysis of fragments but only in a semantic one. The reply in (18B) seems completely impossible and meaningless, which again cannot be explained by its syntactic structure since it is parallel to that of sentences (16B) and (17B). The difference between the three seems to lie in the meaning of the verbs of the higher CP, ‘hear’, ‘mistakenly believe’ and ‘doubt’. Therefore, Culicover & Jackendoff (2005) consider it unnecessary to assume any more syntactic structure than that of the overt constituents. (Culicover & Jackendoff 2005, 258ff., and Culicover 2009, 442f.)

The next pieces of evidence against a syntax-based account come from instances in which the fragment’s form does not match that of the antecedent. Consider Culicover’s (2009) example (13) given in (19) and (20) below with the ungrammatical outcome of inserting the fragment into the antecedent in italics.

(19) A: What did you do to Susan?
   B: Kiss her.
      *I kissed her to Susan.
      *I kissed Susan to her.

(20) A: What’s that frog doing in my tomato sauce?
   B: Swimming.
      *That frog is doing swimming in my tomato sauce.
      (cf. That frog is doing the backstroke in my tomato sauce.)
      
      Culicover & Jackendoff 2005, 242
Even though I think that in (20) it would be possible to explain why in the fragment ‘swimming’ replaces ‘doing’, these examples still make a valid point: Due to syntactic constraints, fragments cannot just be inserted in their antecedents. This means that even though syntactic constraints apply in fragments (cf. section 2.2.2), fragments cannot be explained by merely assuming non-overt syntactic structure.

Culicover & Jackendoff (2005, 242f.) then present data which take this argument even further. In their examples in (11) partly quoted in (21) through (23) below, the syntactic structure of the antecedent is totally incompatible with the fragment. Again, the attempts to insert the fragment into the antecedent are given in italics.

(21) A: Why don’t you fix me a drink?
    B: In a minute, okay?
       *I don’t fix you a drink because in a minute?
       *Why don’t I fix you a drink in a minute?

(22) A: Harriet’s been drinking again.
    B: How stupid!
       *Harriet’s been drinking again how stupid.

(23) A: Are you hungry?
    B: How about a cookie?
       *I am hungry about a cookie?


All these examples are idiomatic expressions. Culicover & Jackendoff use them in order to illustrate their claim because the fragment is responding to the semantic interpretation of the idiom, and not to its syntactic form. The idiomatic expressions have the intended meaning, but they cannot get this meaning from the syntax.

Hardt (1993) investigates examples of VP ellipsis that show similar phenomena. As in Culicover & Jackendoff’s examples, the antecedent structure is incompatible with the fragment.
(24) Martha and John wanted to dance with each other, but Martha couldn’t because her husband was there.

*Martha and John wanted to dance with each other, but Martha couldn’t dance with each other because her husband was there.

Hardt 1993

(25) Wendy is eager to sail around the world and Bruce is eager to climb Kilimanjaro, but neither of them can because money is too tight.

*Wendy is eager to sail around the world and Bruce is eager to climb Kilimanjaro, but neither of them can sail around the world and climb Kilimanjaro because money is too tight.

Webber 1978

These sentences again show that the antecedent cannot just be inserted in the elliptical phrase. Culicover & Jackendoff’s example sentences present clear evidence that a purely syntactic approach to the analysis of fragments fails to account for a lot of data.

In this paper, I am tackling the question as to why structurally similar examples get different judgements by Merchant and Culicover & Jackendoff. In order to understand the claims made in connection to these examples, it is important to clarify the notion of islands and island violations, which I will do in the next section. The last section of this chapter will then be concerned with the conflicting evidence Merchant and Culicover & Jackendoff present.

2.3 Islands

The two examples under discussion ((1) and (2)) come from Merchant’s and Culicover & Jackendoff’s argumentation for their respective approach. Both arguments are connected to island effects. That is why in this section, I will give a short overview of these island effects.

2.3.1 Preliminaries

In the framework of Chomsky’s Minimalist Program, wh-questions are assumed to be derived by movement of a wh-element into the specifier position of a CP, a movement type generally referred to as A’-movement. This movement then leaves behind a trace t in the original position of the moved element. (Cf. e.g. Radford 2004, 188ff.) Evidence for assuming this movement comes from languages like Chinese for example, in which the Wh-element stays
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in situ (Radford 2004, 18) and from case-matching in languages that carry overt case like
German for example (compare Merchant 2004, 12). An example of each is given in (26) and
(27) below, the exact translations are given in Italics and the equivalent English sentence can
be found below.

(26) (i) Wáng Shuò qù Fālánkèfú.
Wang Shuo go Frankfurt
Wang Shuo goes to Frankfurt.

(ii) Wáng Shuò qù nǎr?
Wang Shuo go where
Where does Wang Shuo go?

(27) (i) Franz mag den Elefanten.
Franz(Nom) likes the(Acc) elephant (Acc)
Franz likes the elephant.

(ii) Wen mag Franz t?
Who(Acc) likes Franz(Nom)
Who does Franz like t?

In the Chinese examples in (26), you can see that the statement in (i) has the same word order
as the question in (ii). This is one piece of evidence that leads Radford (amongst other
Minimalist syntacticians) to assuming that there is a link between a wh-element and the
position an equivalent non-wh-element is found in. The case-marking examples in (27)
further this argument because if ‘Wen’ in (27ii) gets assigned accusative case by the verb
‘mag’, then it has to originate in a complement position of ‘mag’. Culicover and Jackendoff (2005) also acknowledge this link even though they abandon the
assumption of movement. They postulate chains with a head and a tail instead of movement.
In (27ii), the chain exists between the head ‘Wen’ and the tail marked by t. This head/tail-
relation is another way of accounting for the link between a wh-word in a question and the

---

4 This paragraph serves to give a very brief insight into the concept of Wh-movement; it is in no way designed to
fully exhaust the topic. What is important in connection to the Island Effects is that in object-questions, there is a
link between the empty object position and the Wh-element.
position its equivalent would occupy in a statement. (Cf. Culicover & Jackendoff 2005, 301ff.) Culicover expresses this relation as in (28) below.

(28) CS-chain

Two syntactic constituents X and Y form a CS-chain when

(a) X c2commands Y and

(b) X and Y are both linked to the same element or a linked set of elements of a

CS representation

Culicover 2009, 327

The difference between Radford’s account and Culicover & Jackendoff’s account is that Culicover and Jackendoff identify the link on a semantic level, whereas Radford places it on a syntactic level. For the present purposes, however, it suffices to make a note of the fact that both accounts assume a relation between the two positions.

2.3.2 Islands and Syntactic Theory

Szabolcsi & den Dikken (2003) define Islands as a “cover term for nodes which obstruct syntactic movement, i.e. antecedent-trace dependencies” (213). That is why I explained the notions of wh-movement and head-tail relations in the above section: Islands block movement/head-tail relations between an element from inside the island and any position outside the island. The so-called Island Constraints were first observed by Ross (1967). He describes several types of extraction islands and comes up with a number of constraints: The wh-island constraint, the complex NP constraint, the left branch constraint, the sentential subject constraint and the coordinate structure constraint. Below, I am using both explanations and examples by Culicover (2009) for illustration; I am only adjusting the notation to the one I am using throughout the paper.

(29) The wh-island constraint: Nothing may be extracted out of an indirect question.

Example: * Who, did you wonder [CP what Sandy said to t₁]?
(30) **The complex NP constraint**: No element contained in a sentence dominated by an NP may be extracted from that NP.
   Example: * Which book do you know [NP/DP the man [CP who wrote ti]]

(31) **The left branch constraint**: The specifier of NP or AP cannot be extracted from NP or AP.
   Example: * How will you buy [NP/DP ti many [cars]]

(32) **The sentential subject constraint**: No element can be extracted from an S that is itself a subject.
   Example: * Where would [subject S/CP for me to put the money ti] be safest?

(33) **The coordinate structure constraint** (CSC): In a coordinate structure, (a) no conjunct may be moved, (b) nor may any element contained in a conjunct be moved out of that conjunct.
   Example: * Who did you see [coordinate structure Sandy and ti]?

Another attempt to explain these constraints was undertaken by Chomsky (1973), who describes movement as subject to a Subjacency Condition as stated in (34) below.

(34) **Subjacency Condition**

   Movement cannot cross more than one bounding node, where **bounding nodes** are IP and NP.

   Haegeman 1994, 402

In connection with this condition, the notion of successive cyclic movement comes in. Successive cyclic movement means that each type of moved element has to stop in empty and appropriate intermediate positions leaving behind a trace. Appropriate positions are positions of the same type as both original and final landing site. So in A’-movement, the moved elements move from their original position up to their final A’-position via all intermediate

---

5 Even though I am using DP rather than NP throughout this text, it seems advisable to refer to this constraint as ‘The complex NP constraint’ because that is what it is known as. Consequently, I am also reproducing the constraints as in Culicover (2009) and Haegeman (1994) without changing or commenting on this.
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A’-positions. (cf. e.g. Radford 2004, 188ff. and Radford 1997, 267ff.) In order for successive cyclic movement to take place, all appropriate intermediate positions, Spec-CP-positions in this case, have to be empty. In order to illustrate A’-movement, consider (35), an example of topicalization, a type of A’-movement very similar or even identical to the one Merchant assumes for fragments. I will give a labelled bracketing-version of the sentence in which arrows indicate movement.

(35) [CP [Such behaviour], [IP we cannot tolerate t_i in a civilised society]]

Movement
cf. Radford 1997, 532

As (35) shows the one step mechanism, let me now present a more complex example in which successive cyclic A’-movement takes place in (36) below.

(36) [CP1 [Such behaviour], [IP1 he said [CP2 t’, that [IP2 we cannot tolerate t_i here]]]]

Movement Step 2 Movement Step 1

In (36), ‘such behaviour’ originates in the complement position of the verb ‘tolerate’ in the lower IP2. In order to achieve the topicalization, it is first moved into the Spec-CP position of the embedded CP2, from which it is then moved into the Spec-CP position of CP1, where it is also spelled out. This movement process leaves behind traces\(^6\) in the original position as well as all intermediate landing sites.\(^7\)

There are islands that do not inhibit all kinds of extraction, and that is where the differentiation of strong versus weak islands comes into play. Szabolcsi & den Dikken use Cinque’s (1990) diagnostic given in (29) below to keep them apart.

(37) Cinque’s Diagnostic of Strong versus Weak Islands

Among the domains that do not allow all standard extractions, those that allow a PP-gap are weak islands, and those that can at best contain a DP-gap are strong islands.

Szabolcsi & den Dikken 2003, 214

\(^6\) Culicover & Jackendoff (2005) do not assume movement but tail-head relations as described in 2.4.1. Their take does not include any connection to intermediate positions. (cf. 372ff.)

\(^7\) If an intermediate position is already occupied by another element, the A’-movement can be blocked. Consider an instance of wh-movement, which is another type of A’-movement, in (i) below.

(i) * [CP1 How do you wonder [CP2 whether he is feeling t_i?]]

Here, ‘whether’ occupies Spec-CP2 and thus blocks movement of ‘how’ via this position.
The next task is now to check whether the conflicting examples under discussion both contain islands of the same type according to the theories presented.

2.3.3 Islands in the Examples

First, let me repeat the bare fragment DPs of B’s reply from Merchant’s and Culicover & Jackendoff’s examples with the addition of all information relevant to check them against the above constraints.

![Diagram of (38)]

\[(38) \text{[CP1 Charlie, [IP1 Abby speaks [NP/DP the same B. language [CP2 t’ that [IP2 t; speaks]]]]} \]

Movement Step 2

Movement Step 1
cf. Merchant 2004, 708

\[(39) \text{[CP1 Albanian, [IP1 John met [NP/DP a guy [CP2 t’ who [IP2 speaks t;]]]]} \]

Movement Step 2

Movement Step 1
cf. Culicover & Jackendoff 2005, 245

According to Ross’s (1967) constraints as explained in Culicover (2009), both examples are subject to the Complex NP Constraint given in (30) above. In (38), the complex NP is ‘the same Balkan language that Charlie speaks’. CP2 is dominated by an NP/DP, which means that nothing contained in the CP can be extracted from the NP/DP and therefore, movement of ‘Charlie’ into the higher Spec-CP position should be blocked. In (39), ‘a guy who speaks Albanian’ is the complex NP, out of which no material can be extracted. That is why under this reasoning, both examples should be equally infelicitous.

The Subjacency Condition as stated by Haegeman (1994, 402) and quoted in (34) also implies that both examples should be infelicitous. In (38), ‘Charlie’ would have to cross two bounding nodes, namely IP1 and NP/DP with Movement Step 2. The exact same is true for ‘Albanian’ in (39).

According to Cinque’s diagnostic in (37), the two examples under discussion repeated in (38) and (39) below both contain strong islands. Merchant’s example in (39) contains a “definite complex DP[s] with [a] relative clause[s]” (Szabolcsi & den Dikken 2003, 215) and Culicover & Jackendoff’s example given in (32) is a “tensed wh-clause” (Szabolcsi & den Dikken 2003, 215), which also is a strong island.

The fully sentential counterparts of both (38B) and (39B) are ungrammatical. They exhibit the same characteristics under three different syntactic approaches to islands. So even though
Merchant’s and Culicover & Jackendoff’s examples are not identical, they both fall under the same constraints. That is why a syntactic account does not succeed to elucidate the differing acceptability judgements. Before I turn to finding another explanation for them, however, let us first take a closer look at the evidence Merchant and Culicover & Jackendoff give in connection to islands.

2.4 Evidence from Islands

This section presents both Merchant’s and Culicover & Jackendoff’s evidence they draw from island effects. Since this evidence is highly contradictory, I will first give the relevant argumentation for the two approaches separately and then, in the third section, I will apply the two approaches to the data under discussion. This will show that neither approach is fit to explain the contradictory judgements of the fragments containing lexical material from islands.

2.4.1 Movement and Deletion

One of Merchant’s arguments in favour of a syntax-based analysis of fragments comes from island facts. He shows that island constraints apply in both topicalization and fragment answers as in (40), which means that nothing can be moved out of a relative clause. (Italics indicate accent.)

(40) A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks?
   B: * No, Charlie, (, Abby speaks the same Balkan language that t\(_i\) speaks).

cf. Merchant 2004, 708

Here, the fragment DP ‘Charlie’ cannot substitute for ‘Ben’ as island constraints do not permit movement of ‘Charlie’ out of the relative clause ‘that Charlie speaks’. As the accented constituent is embedded in an island, the fragment version of the answer is impossible. ‘No, Charlie’ could only be the answer to the matrix, not to the embedded sentence, meaning ‘No, Charlie speaks the same Balkan language that Ben speaks’ where ‘Charlie’ substitutes for ‘Abby’.

The detailed structure of B’s reply is given in Figure 2 below.
As already shown in 2.2.1, ‘Charlie’ is first moved to the beginning of the structure of ‘Abby speaks the same Balkan language that Charlie speaks’. This movement is triggered by two features of [E] (see Merchant 2004, 707, for details). It leaves behind a trace $t_2$ in its original position in the relative clause, which is coindexed with ‘Charlie’. In order to account for the unacceptability of fragments like the one in (40B), Merchant claims that “intermediate traces of island-escaping XPs are defective, marked with *” (Merchant 2004, 706). This intermediate trace is left behind in the Spec-TP position. After movement of ‘Charlie’ via Spec-CP into Spec-FP as indicated by arrows in Figure 2, the TP is deleted, as indicated by < > in the diagram. This phonologic deletion takes place due to the [E] feature carried by the e-commanding C-node. (cf. Merchant 2004, 6700ff. and 707ff.) Culicover & Jackendoff (2005), however, found evidence contradictory to Merchant’s, which supports their Non-Deletion Approach.
2.4.2 Indirect Licensing

Culicover & Jackendoff (2005) present a number of question/answer and statement/comment sequences that indicate that the constraints posited by Merchant do actually not apply to fragments. I will leave aside all except the one that this paper is focusing on: a statement/comment sequence in which the fragment comment contains a lexical item that originates inside the relative clause of the antecedent. Culicover & Jackendoff’s example (14bii) is given in (41) below.

(41) A: John met a guy who speaks a very unusual language.
    B: Yes, Albanian.

cf. Culicover & Jackendoff 2005, 245

B’s comment poses a problem to Merchant’s account since it would stem from an ungrammatical topicalization. Culicover (2009), however, can easily accommodate the felicity of the example.

In (43) below, I try to apply Culicover’s substitution procedure to example (41). First, the syntactic and the conceptual structure of both fragment and antecedent are given in (42).

(42) **fragment:**
    Syntax: [DP Albanian]
    CS: ALBANIAN [LANGUAGE]

    **antecedent:**
    Syntax: [S John [VP meet[DP guy [who speak [a very unusual language]]]]]
    CS: MEET (AGENT: JOHN, THEME: GUY (SPEAK (AGENT: GUY, THEME: VERY UNUSUAL LANGUAGE [LANGUAGE])))

Due to the lack of more complex examples that the one described in 2.3.1, the structure of the antecedent is rather a sketch than a precise application of Culicover & Jackendoff’s procedure because the procedure itself remains rather sketchy. I still hope that (42) and (43) succeed to approximate the Simpler Syntax approach.

The substitution then proceeds as follows:
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(43) substitution procedure:

1. ‘Albanian’ syntactically matches the direct object ‘a very unusual language’ of the antecedent.
2. ‘a very unusual language’ corresponds to the THEME: [LANGUAGE] in the CS.
3. ‘Albanian’ is a [LANGUAGE] so it matches semantically.
4. Substitute CS of ‘a very unusual language’ for interpretation of complement of ‘speak’ in antecedent, yielding

   ALBANIAN [LANGUAGE] = THEME: [LANGUAGE]

5. result: MEET (AGENT: JOHN, THEME: GUY (SPEAK (AGENT: GUY, THEME: ALBANIAN [LANGUAGE])))

   cf. Culicover 2009, 449

The Indirect Licensing mechanism perfectly shows why Culicover & Jackendoff’s example in (41) is felicitous. The question is, however, if the Simpler Syntax account also manages to show why Merchant’s parallel example is infelicitous and if Merchant’s Movement and Deletion account can explain the felicity of (41).

2.4.3 The Conflicting Evidence

I now apply Merchant’s mechanism to Culicover & Jackendoff’s example, and Culicover & Jackendoff’s mechanism to Merchant’s example. This will show that neither approach is able to account for the difference in felicity of those two parallel examples.

Let me start with testing Merchant’s Movement and Deletion approach. I will first repeat Culicover & Jackendoff’s example in (44) below, this time adding a full sentential version with the topicalised element from the fragment.

(44) A: John met a guy who speaks a very unusual language.

   B:   Yes, Albanian.

   B’: *Yes, Albanian, John met a guy who speak ti.

As can be seen in B’, the sentential counterpart of the fragment is ungrammatical.

The detailed structure of B’s reply is given in Figure 3 below.
Since intermediate island-escaping traces are defective, the defective trace *t₂ in Spec-CP leads to a crash: In Merchant’s reasoning, the structure of (44) is ungrammatical. This means that from Merchant’s syntax-based point of view, the difference in acceptability between Merchant’s and Culicover & Jackendoff’s example cannot be explained.

Culicover & Jackendoff (2005) contradict Merchant’s ungrammaticality judgement of (40) in their footnote 10, 244f. Their parallel fragment example, however, does not contain ‘No’ as Merchant’s, but ‘Yes’. Furthermore, they “find [Merchant’s example] reasonably acceptable” (244), but not perfect. I think the fact that it can be understood does not indicate that it is well-formed. This plus the results of my experiment (see section 4.4, especially subsection 4.4.2) is reason enough for me to take the difference for granted and investigate it further.

(45) below repeats Merchant’s island example, which I will apply Culicover’s substitution procedure to. In order to account for a potential difficulty in the substitution procedure, let me call the higher verb ‘speak₁’ and verb inside the relative clause ‘speak₂’.

(45) A: Does Abby speak₁ the same Balkan language that Ben speaks₂?
B: * No, Charlie.
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Syntactic and conceptual structure of fragment and antecedent and the substitution procedure are given in (46). The accent is indicated by *Italics* as in (45).

(46) **fragment:**
Syntax: \([DP \text{Charlie}]\)

CS: CHARLIE [HUMAN]

**antecedent:**
Syntax: \([_S \text{Abby} [VP \text{speak}_1 [DP \text{same Balkan language [that Ben speak}_2]]]]\)

CS: \(Q (\text{SPEAK}_1 (\text{AGENT: ABBY [HUMAN]}, \text{THEME: SAME BALKAN LANGUAGE (SPEAK}_2 (\text{AGENT: BEN [HUMAN]}))))\)

**substitution procedure:**
1. ‘Charlie’ syntactically matches both the subject ‘Ben’ and the subject ‘Abby’ of the antecedent
2. ‘Ben’ corresponds to the AGENT: [HUMAN] in the CS (mind that there are two).
3. ‘Ben’ and ‘Abby’ both have the characteristic [HUMAN] so they both match the fragment DP ‘Charlie’ semantically.
4. Problem: Substitute CS of ‘Charlie’ for interpretation of complement of ‘speak\(_1\)’ or ‘speak\(_2\)’ in antecedent?, yielding
   \[
   \text{CHARLIE [HUMAN]} = \text{AGENT: [HUMAN]}
   \]
   This problem is solved because the ambiguity is blocked by the accent placed on ‘Ben’ in the antecedent. This accent already implies that what is really under discussion is whether it is ‘Ben’ speaking the same Balkan language that Abby speaks or not.
5. **result:** \(\text{SPEAK}_1 (\text{AGENT: ABBY [HUMAN]}, \text{THEME: SAME BALKAN LANGUAGE (SPEAK}_2 (\text{AGENT: CHARLIE [HUMAN]})))\)

Due to the accent, the potential ambiguity of (45) cannot be responsible for the infelicity of the example (also cf. section 3.1). And Culicover’s Indirect Licensing procedure does not account for the difference in felicity either.

Neither account is able to explain the observed difference in felicity. This outcome poses a problem to both approaches because if island constraints only randomly apply in fragment answers, they cannot be used as evidence in either way until further investigation on the
nature of these constraints took place. In the following, I will take a closer look at the difference between the two examples and pin down the decisive factor.

3 The Differences

As I showed in section 2, the fragment answers involving island extraction by Merchant and Culicover & Jackendoff are syntactically identical. There are, however, some differences between the two. I will now discuss these differences and then focus on one: The difference between accepting ‘Yes’ and rejecting ‘No’. Merchant’s example is introduced by ‘No’ and Culicover & Jackendoff’s by ‘Yes’. That is why I will take a closer look at the pragmatic differences between ‘Yes’ and ‘No’. When doing so, I will only discuss examples like the two fragment answers repeated in (1) and (2) below. I thereby exclude answers which only consist of ‘Yes’ or ‘No’.

3.1 Ambiguity

Let me first repeat examples (1) and (2) from above:

(1) A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks?
    B: * No, Charlie.

    Merchant 2004, 708

(2) A: John met a guy who speaks a very unusual language.
    B: Yes, Albanian.

    Culicover & Jackendoff 2005, 245

One difference between the two fragment answers is that Merchant’s is ambiguous. ‘Charlie’ could substitute for either ‘Ben’ (as intended) or ‘Abby’. If, in accordance with the Island Constraint presented in 2.3.2, we assume that it is difficult if not impossible to extract from an island, the reading in which ‘Charlie’ corrects ‘Abby’ would be much easier to get. On the other hand, it would be possible to save Merchant’s answer by creating a certain context that eliminates the ambiguity. Imagine two lists of people, maybe with differing mother tongues. List A contains Abby (amongst others) and list B contains Ben and Charlie (amongst others). Now the task is to match each person from list A with a person from list B who speaks the
same Balkan language. The larger context could be something like an exchange program for example. This context would disambiguate the reply ‘No, Charlie.’ Consider the two parallel examples in (3) and (4). They only differ in that their fragment answers are positive and negative respectively.

    (3) A: Did Abby meet a guy that teaches at an American university?  
        B: Yes, Harvard University.

    (4) A: Did Abby meet a guy that teaches at an American university?  
        B: No, Tübingen University.

Example (4) is very similar to Merchant’s example but (4) is not ambiguous since ‘Harvard University’ can only replace ‘an American university’. And even though it might work better than Merchant’s (1), the positive reply in (3) would still be better than (4B). Using focus, however, can help to improve a negative reply.

3.2 Focus

In her article on Sentence Prosody (1995) in *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*, Selkirk discusses the difference between accent and focus. Her Basic Focus Rule quoted in (5) below states the relation between the two.

    (5) Basic Focus Rule

        An accented word is F-marked [Focus-marked].

        Selkirk 1995, 555

In question/answer-pairs like the examples by Merchant and Culicover & Jackendoff in (1) and (2), all information contained within the question has the same status: It is not given in discourse and therefore new. This means that in relation to stress, the Nuclear Stress Rule

    (6) Nuclear Stress Rule

        The most prominent syllable of the rightmost constituent in a phrase P is the most prominent syllable of P.

        Selkirk 1995, 562, cf. also 653
comes into play. Since the first sentences in the examples are questions, the rightmost constituent of the question phrase, i.e. the higher CP or main clause, receives the strongest accent. The Basic Stress Rule then tells us that this very constituent will also be in focus. In Merchant’s example the focus of the phrase would therefore lie on “LANGuage”. This means that “LANGuage” would be expected to be elaborated on or corrected in an answer.

In order to save Merchant’s example, extra pitch accent has to be put on the element that is indeed corrected as indicated by CAPITAL letters in examples (7) and (8) below.

(7)   A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that BEN speaks?
       B: No, CHARLIE.

(8)   A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that BEN speaks?
       B: Yes, and TONY.

The use of stress also is another way of disambiguating Merchant’s example (cf. 3.1 above). Apart from disambiguating, the intonation of the question clearly indicates that ‘Ben’ is at stake. That is why an elaboration or correction of this element in the fragment is expected in the above cases.

3.3 Superset
Another factor contributing to the difference in felicity between the two examples comes from the use of a superset in (A). Merchant’s ‘The same Balkan language’ is the least definite part of the sentence on a meaning level (compared to ‘Ben’ for example). That is why it would be plausible to fill in missing information as to the nature of the Balkan language. Even more so since this least specified item is in the F-marked object position (cf. 3.2). Culicover & Jackendoff’s example uses this very same mechanism in that the fragment answer elaborates on the superset of the question RC. ‘A very unusual language’ is indefinite, and ‘very’ and ‘unusual’ are both words that virtually provoke elaboration. Apparently, these mechanisms are stronger than any possible island restrictions.

In (9) and (10) below, I created replies to Merchant’s question that elaborate on the superset of ‘the same Balkan language’.

(9)   A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks?
       B: Yes, Albanian.
(10) A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks?
   B: No, English.

Question/answer-pair (9) with a positive fragment again works better than the negative one in (10). The examples from the section on ambiguity (3.1) repeated below show the same effect: ‘American university’ is a superset. Still, elaboration in (11B) seems to work much better than correction in (12B).

(11) A: Did Abby meet a guy that teaches at an American university?
   B: Yes, Harvard University.

(12) A: Did Abby meet a guy that teaches at an American university?
   B: *No, Tübingen University.

Both example pairs and the differing felicity of the negative and the positive fragment show that even when a superset is used in the position elaborated on or corrected in the fragment, the difference in felicity between ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ still shows.

3.4 Question/Answer versus Statement/Comment Sequence

The forth difference between Merchant’s and Culicover & Jackendoff’s examples lies in speaker A’s utterance. (1A) is a question and (2A) is a declarative sentence. If speaker (2B) only uttered ‘Yes’ without further elaboration, a correct paraphrase would not be ‘John met a guy who speaks a very unusual language’ but rather – depending on the intonation – ‘Yes, I know/I’ve heard as much’ or ‘Oh, really’. That is why ‘Yes, Albanian’ means ‘Yes, I know, and I know even more: the unusual language is Albanian’. In Merchant’s answer, accepting or rejecting are expected as appropriate reactions to a yes/no-question. Without an appropriate answer, the proposition of the question remains open. Schiffrin makes this same point in her book on discourse markers, in which she describes and investigates their function as “cohesive devices” (1987, 61). According to her, a question “depends on contributions from

---

8 Note here that even without a relative clause, the ‘Yes’ is better than the ‘No’:

(ii) A: Does Abby speak an obscure Balkan language?
   B: Yes, Albanian.
   B’: No, English.

B’ is grammatical, but it is slightly strange.
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both speaker and hearer. […] In asking a [yes/no]-question, a speaker presents a proposition which is incomplete […] as to polarity.” (Ibid, 9)

Consider the example sentences below. Here, I changed Merchant’s questions/answer-pair into a statement/comment-pair and Culicover & Jackendoff’s statement/comment-pair into a question/answer-pair.

(13) A: Abby speaks the same Balkan language that Ben speaks.
    B: *No, Charlie.

(14) A: Abby speaks the same Balkan language that Ben speaks.
    B: Yes, and Tony.

(15) A: Did John meet a guy who speaks a very unusual language?
    B: *No, English.

(16) A: Did John meet a guy who speaks a very unusual language?
    B: Yes, Albanian.

In (14), I used coordination in order to have the fragment DP fit into the very same position as in (13). The resulting fragment is questionable but the transformation still serves to exemplify the overall observation: The No-replies remain infinitely worse than the Yes-replies no matter whether they are answers to questions or comment on statements. The fact that this difference still shows after changing the examples hints at the difference between ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ being more influential than whether (A) is a question or a statement. This leads me to the difference I want to focus on, namely that of a rejecting versus an accepting fragment.

3.5 Yes versus No

The fifth and last difference between Culicover & Jackendoff’s and Merchant’s examples is that Culicover & Jackendoff’s fragment is positive and introduced by ‘Yes’ whereas Merchant’s is negative and introduced by ‘No’. What this difference implies constitutes the main focus of this paper.

As ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ in the answer control the interpretation of the question, the differing acceptability judgments are very likely to stem – at least partly – from the contrast between accepting ‘Yes’ and rejecting ‘No’. I will now first show that ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ are interpreted
directly. When doing so, however, I will only consider answers that include a DP fragment. This means that answers only consisting of ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ are excluded from my argumentation since they do not show the same characteristics as fragments but are anaphoric in a different way.

The direct interpretation of ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ leads to three reasons why interpreting negative fragments involves greater processing effort than interpreting positive ones. The first reason is that rejection in contrast to acceptance leaves the proposition of the question open. The second one is that rejection leads to a greater processing effort since it remains unclear which part of the sentence might get corrected. The third reason, however, is linked to the accommodation of the fragment DP. If it relates to an item contained within a relative clause, the negative answer is infelicitous because the implications raised by ‘No’ are not satisfied.

3.5.1 Preliminaries

In this paragraph, I will show that ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ in short answers get interpreted directly before the rest of the fragment does.

Relevance Theory assumes “two mental mechanisms” (Sperber & Wilson 1995, 185) to be involved in the process of arriving at a proposition, namely “a linguistic input module and a central inferential ability” (Ibid). I will call them LIM and CinA in the following. Even though it remains unclear how exactly they collaborate, it seems obvious that in the unconscious process of identifying the right proposition, the decisive factor is “general encyclopaedic information” (Ibid, 186). Terms like “knowledge of the world” (Brown & Yule 1983, 233) or “background knowledge” (Brown & Yule 1983, 236) refer to the same notion. The decisiveness of this world knowledge seems especially true for examples created and evaluated in linguistic experiments, i.e. without any ‘real’ context.

Sperber and Wilson explain a model of the relation between LIM and CinA with the help of garden path sentence (17). (1995, 187) Let me illustrate this model with the help of Sperber and Wilson’s example sentences (13), (14) and (15) quoted in (17) to (19) below:

(17) I saw that gasoline can explode.

(18) (a) I saw that it is possible for gasoline to explode.
       (b) I saw that can of gasoline explode.

(19) And a brand new gasoline can it was too.

Sperber and Wilson 1995, 184
Sentence (17) is ambiguous, and its two possible paraphrases are shown in (18a&b). Without any context, Sperber & Wilson (1995, 187) predict recipients to prefer the paraphrase given in (18a), in which ‘that’ serves as a complementiser. If someone had to read out sentence (17) with the addition of sentence (19), they would certainly stumble, either when reaching the second ‘can’ and realizing the possible ambiguity in sentence (17) or when reaching ‘it’, at which point the first ‘can’ has to be reinterpreted as a noun.

The fact that people would stumble implies not only that they might not have been aware of the ambiguity of (17), but also that they have to reinterpret the first sentence. Therefore, Sperber & Wilson (1995, 186f.) assume that as soon as LIM receives the first constituent of a sentence, it creates possible semantic representations of the constituent, which are then sent to ClmA. ClmA then sends a feedback signal to LIM, which restricts the possible semantic representations of the second constituent, so that only representations compatible with the first one are created by LIM. So in the processing of sentence (17), at the point when ‘that’ is chosen by ClmA to be a complementiser, only compatible representations of the following lexical material are produced by LIM and then taken into account as possible ‘meanings’ by ClmA. ‘Gasoline’ then would be assigned the meaning of the subject DP GASOLINE (and not the meaning of being part of a compound) and accordingly, ‘can’ would receive the meaning of modal CAN (and not that of being the second part of the compound ‘gasoline can’).

When the reader then realizes that s/he should have interpreted ‘gasoline can’ as a compound noun (after reading sentence (19)), s/he has to go back to ‘that’ and reanalyze it as a demonstrative. (Cf. Sperber & Wilson 1995, 186f.) Starting with ‘that’, all the following constituents would have to be reanalyzed in accordance with this new analysis, and this would lead to the stumbling. What Sperber & Wilson want to show with this example is that even though “input modules have no [direct] access to general encyclopaedic information” (1995, 186), world knowledge might still influence the semantic representations produced by LIM.

[…] [F]or instance, the input module might construct all the linguistically possible interpretations of the first constituent of the sentences, and submit them to the central mechanism, which would, when possible, choose one of them and inform the linguistic module of its choice. As a result, the module’s decoding processes would be partly inhibited; it would retain only those interpretations of the next constituent which are linguistically compatible with the selected interpretation of the first constituent, and so on.

Sperber & Wilson 1995, 186f.

In the paragraph quoted above, Sperber & Wilson avoid precise terms like ‘semantic representation’ and use ‘linguistically possible interpretations’ instead. Still, the whole section which it is part of deals with questions like:
How are the two mechanisms [LIM and CInA] related, and how does the effort made by each affect the overall processing effort? More specifically, does the linguistic input module construct all the possible semantic representations of a sentence, one of which is then selected by central processes?

Sperber & Wilson 1995, 185

This means that they assume a pragmatic mechanism, namely taking matters of ‘world knowledge’ into consideration, to apply on constituent level. This description would perfectly fit my needs of accommodating the idea that ‘No’ and ‘Yes’ are interpreted directly, and what follows is only interpreted afterwards. It would, however, contradict linguistic models like e.g. the T-model (cf. e.g. Radford 2004, 9) in assuming that semantic representations of constituents are constructed before the syntactic structure is ‘completed’. When going back to the example of the garden path sentence (17), it becomes apparent that in this case, Sperber & Wilson, exclude semantics and restrict the influence of CInA to the choice of syntactic categories.

At this point, the account remains somewhat opaque in regard to what exactly goes where when. Nevertheless, it still seems plausible to me that chunks smaller than sentences (for example phases, cf. e.g. Radford 2004, 381-426) get interpreted by CInA during the processing of an utterance. ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ at the beginning of an answer seem large enough chunks for me, especially since they could stand on their own without further information following. That is why I assume that ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ directly receive semantic representation and are sent to the CInA.

3.5.2 Arriving at a Proposition

I will show that ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ have different impact on the construction of a proposition. Belnap’s answerhood thesis claims that “[t]he semantic representation of a question, whether direct or indirect, should give us enough information so as to determine which propositions count as possible answers to it.” (1983, 25) In relation to this, Groenendijk & Stokhof claim

that the requirement that the answerhood thesis makes is to be supplemented by another one, viz. that the notion of standard semantic answer that a theory characterizes, should be such that it forms a suitable basis for a theory of answerhood in general. There are many more kinds of answers than just the standard semantic ones, and all these are related to each other in systematic ways.

Groenendijk & Stokhof 1984, 14

Nevertheless, Belnap’s thesis still points towards an important point: When confronted with a question, we can identify all possible answers but we cannot decide for one of these
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propositions on grounds of the question. This, like Schiffrin’s concept of incomplete propositions of questions (cf. 3.4) points towards a related observation. Luckily for linguists, the person who asks the question\(^9\) displays a similar status of information as the participant of a linguistic experiment who is presented with a question/answer-pair: Both do not know whether the proposition of the question is true. Therefore, it cannot receive a fixed mental representation because I assume this to be possible only for complete propositions. With this incomplete proposition in mind, the recipient is then confronted with ‘No’, and ‘No’ would be the first item to enter their LIM. At this point, all possible semantic representations of ‘No’ would be produced by the LIM and transferred to CInA. CInA, however, cannot make any decisions as to which of them seem plausible and which do not.

In order to illustrate this point, I will now go back to Merchant’s example repeated in (20) below and apply the model described above.

(20) A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks?
   B: * No, Charlie; (, Abby speaks the same Balkan language that t; speaks).

Merchant 2004, 708

Quite a number of possibilities arise: (In the following paraphrases, an DP following ‘No’ would be expected to correct the italicized part of the sentence.) ‘No’ could mean a) that it is not Abby who speaks the same Balkan language that Ben speaks but rather someone else, like e.g. John or Mary, b) that Abby does not speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks but that she actually studies it, c) that Abby does not speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks but a different Balkan language, d) that Abby does not speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks but the same Romance language, e) that Abby does not speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks but the same Balkan dialect, f) that Abby does not speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks but that she speaks the same Balkan language that Charlie speaks. Obviously, the corrections could also be combined (so that it is not, e.g., Abby who speaks the same Balkan language that Ben speaks but rather Mary who

---

\(^9\) Note that Athanasiadou (1994, 562ff.) identifies three subcategories of questions: Type A are questions requesting information, type B questions requesting action and type C are unanswerable questions. As I am only concerned with the first type in this paper, I am leaving aside her distinction between replies, responses and answers and use these words synonymously. (In her categorisation, they correspond to the different types of questions.) I am assuming that all questions are questions of type A and therefore answerable.
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*studies* the same Romance language that Ben speaks), so that an almost infinite number of implications of ‘No’ are produced by LIM and sent to CInA.

CInA lacks related contextual information, and that makes it impossible to choose one of the semantic representations as the most likely one. This means that according to Schiffrin (1987, 9), the proposition is still “incomplete”. In Culicover & Jackendoff’s positive reply (2B), the situation is different in two ways: Firstly, when ‘Yes’ enters LIM, there is only one semantic representation which has to be transferred to CInA, namely that of the proposition being true. And more importantly, when this representation reaches CInA, the proposition is complete and receives a fixed mental representation. Even though elaborations can be made on this proposition, it still holds true that ‘John met a guy who speaks a very unusual language’.

### 3.5.3 Activation of Frames

In the above section, I showed that it is far more difficult to arrive at a proposition when negation is involved. Let me now turn to the notion of ‘frames’, which are another factor that makes negative answers more difficult to process than affirmative ones.

According to Minsky, “[w]hen one encounters a new situation […] one selects from a memory a structure called a Frame.” (1975, 219) I use the notion of ‘frame’ here, since it suffices to illustrate my point even though there are a number of newer and more elaborate concepts (cf. Brown & Yule 1983, 236ff.). Brown & Yule explain the notion of ‘frame’ by using the example ‘house’:

> [I]n a frame representing a typical HOUSE, there will be slots labelled ‘kitchen’, ‘bathroom’, ‘address’, and so on. A particular house existing in the world, or mentioned in a text, can be treated as an instance of the house frame, and can be represented by filling the slots with the particular features of that individual house.  

Brown & Yule 1983, 239

In order to make my point, I have to make certain additions to this idea: In spite of being described as a “fixed representation of knowledge about the world” (Brown & Yule (1983), 239, italics mine), I will postulate the idea of frames of different sizes. In a context in which the proposition of a house is complete, I agree with Brown & Yule’s explanation. This context would lead to the activation of what I call the **narrow frame** of ‘house’.

In a context with an incomplete proposition that implies possible correction of the lexical item ‘house’, however, all known substitutes will have to be activated, too. In this **wide frame**, there will be slots labelled ‘hut’, ‘cave’, ‘den’, ‘cabin’ or ‘cottage’, i.e. alternative housing places. The problem with these wide frames is that they are far more complex than the narrow
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ones. They have to remain open and unrestricted since any sort of substitute could emerge and it is impossible to make accurate predictions as to what is and what is not a plausible substitute. For ‘house’ for example, the above list could be continued endlessly; in a lot of contexts boats or cars, tents or other hideouts or even things that are further away from what comes to mind when confronted with the word ‘house’ could come up. That is why the processing involves greater mental effort when wide frames are involved. It seems quite probable that the further away, the greater the mental effort.

So, I will distinguish between narrow frames, which are active when a certain proposition is complete, and wide frames, which are active if a proposition is still at stake. I will also assume that several frames – wide or narrow – can be activated by one utterance (cf. Wilks 1979, 153) and will stay so until the proposition is completed and transformed into a fixed mental representation.

If we turn now to the question in example (1), the recipient of the answer supposedly has all the relevant frames activated, namely that of a) a female named Abby (probably known and therefore attributed with several properties), b) the speaking of languages, c) likeness, d) Balkan languages, e) languages and f) a male named Ben (probably known just like Abby and therefore also attributed with several properties). These narrow frames would be active if the recipient expected the proposition that ‘Abby speaks the same Balkan language that Ben speaks’ to be true. When confronted with rejecting ‘No’, however, all the wide frames would have to be activated since some part of the question will be corrected – but it is still unclear which. This means that in addition to the information contained in the narrow frames (in case the correction applies to another part of the sentence), after negation the following wide frames would also be active: a) people substituting for Abby, b) verbal activities that can be ‘done’ with languages, c) adjectives describing degrees of similarities, d) families of languages, e) human languages and all possible subcategories, like e.g. dialects or codes and lastly f) people substituting for Ben.

This would, e.g., mean that after hearing/reading ‘Yes’ in (1B’), the narrow frame of all Balkan languages known to the recipient would be activated. Through the use of rejecting ‘No’ in (B), however, not only all Balkan languages would have to activated, but also all other known languages so that a correction of ‘Balkan language’ can take place. If the correction indeed applies to ‘Balkan languages’ as in (B’’), a language from the wide frame is chosen and then the frame is deactivated. Afterwards, the proposition eventually receives a fixed mental representation. Up to this point, the proposition remains incomplete and the size
of the activated frames is much bigger than compared to a (1B’), which is why positive answers are easier to process than negative ones.

3.5.4 Accommodating the DP

In the last two paragraphs, I showed why ‘No’ is more difficult to process than ‘Yes’ when they are followed by a DP. This section will now deal with the accommodation of the DP itself. I will show that DPs preceded by ‘Yes’ are easier to integrate than DPs following ‘No’.

(21) A: Does Abby speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks?
B: * No, Charlie, (, Abby speaks the same Balkan language that t_i speaks).

Merchant 2004, 708

(22) A: John met a guy who speaks a very unusual language.
B: Yes, Albanian, (*, John met a guy who speaks t_i).

Culicover & Jackendoff 2005, 245

In the Merchant’s question (1A), what is really at stake is whether Abby speaks the same Balkan language that Ben speaks and not whether someone other than Ben speaks the same Balkan language that Abby speaks. That is why Merchant’s answer is infelicitous. The infelicity comes from not really answering the yes/no-question. ‘No’ implies that the proposition of the question is being rejected (and Abby does not speak the same Balkan language that Ben speaks) but ‘Charlie’ is not supposed to contrast with any element of the proposition.\(^\text{10}\) It is supposed to contrast with an element in the sentence that is not particularly in focus. Since ‘Ben’ is contained in the relative clause, the element that matches the fragment DP is not at issue in the yes/no-question. It has to be identified on the basis of some additional information, such as context or focus (cf. sections 3.1 and 3.2 above).

In Culicover & Jackendoff’s example, the proposition of the statement is confirmed and then elaborated on. In this example, the fragment answer could be paraphrased as ‘I know that John met a guy who speaks a very unusual language, and I even know what it is: Albanian’. Due to the fact that Culicover & Jackendoff presents an example including a statement rather than a question, the proposition does not seem at stake here. But even if the statement were transformed into a question (cf. 3.4), the answer would work better than Merchant’s because

\(^{10}\) Compare the above section on ambiguity (3.1), which discusses the fact that ‘Charlie’ would work as a correction of Abby. This, however, is not the reading intended by Merchant.
it is answered by ‘Yes’ and then elaborated on. Additional information is given whereas in Merchant’s fragment answer, the question is answered and then a piece of information irrelevant to the proposition at stake is presented. That is why it is very difficult to accommodate the fragment DP that relates to an item contained within the relative clause, which is not at stake. The negative answer fails because ‘No’ raises the expectations of a correction of an item within the main clause.

Sperber & Wilson (1995, 123f.) describe degrees of relevance in terms of a cost-benefit calculation.

The contextual effects of an assumption in a given context are not the only factor to be taken into account in assessing its degree of relevance. Contextual effects are brought about by mental processes. Mental processes, like all biological processes, involve a certain effort, a certain expenditure of energy. The processing effort involved in achieving contextual effects is the second factor to be taken into account in assessing degrees of relevance. Processing effort is a negative factor: other things being equal, the greater the processing effort, the lower the relevance.

Sperber & Wilson 1995, 124

Implemented on the difference between affirmative and rejecting answers discussed above, No-answers seem to require more of a processing effort than Yes-answers for several reasons: Firstly, ‘No’ on its own leaves the proposition incomplete whereas ‘Yes’ leads to completion of the proposition and transfer into a fixed mental representation. Secondly, the size of the activated frames is more restricted with ‘Yes’ whereas with ‘No’, correction can in principle apply to any part of the preceding sentence and therefore, wide frames are activated for each component of the proposition in question. This is why No-answers necessitate even greater processing efforts; the incomplete proposition plus the wide frames require greater processing effort. The use of ‘No’ in combination with a fragment DP relating to an item in the relative clause thirdly complicates the accommodation of the fragment DP since the content of the relative clause it not at issue in the question.

In order to be able to validate these claims on the difference between ‘Yes’ and ‘No’, it is necessary to eliminate other factors (like ambiguity, focus etc., cf. sections 3.1-3.4) and align the examples. In the following experiment, the test items are fragment answers with ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ which are parallel and therefore comparable.
4 Empirical Investigation

I want to show that ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ are responsible for the differing judgements of the island violation examples used by Merchant and Culicover & Jackendoff. In this chapter of the paper, I describe the experiment I designed in order to prove this hypothesis. I firstly explain how I designed the experiment (4.1) and the questionnaires (4.2 and 4.3). Eventually, in section 4.4, I discuss the results and compare them in the light of the different factors from section 4.1.

4.1 Preliminaries

In order to make the data comparable, I had to make some decisions as to the nature of the fragments and their environment. Since Merchant’s data seems more problematic than Culicover & Jackendoff’s (cf. 3.1-3.3, 3.5), I decided to create test items similar to his question/answer sequence. That is why in the experiment, the fragments form answers to Yes/No questions. In order to have both accepting and rejecting fragments, I use the same question with differing answers. The superset from the question is either elaborated on or corrected in the answer. I am only using that-relative clauses in order to make sure there are no ambiguous interpretations and they are all defining relative clauses. As discussed in 3.2, object positions carry default focus, which is why the experiment answers refer to items in object positions (both in the main clause and in the relative clause).

4.1.1 Factors and Test Conditions

The first question I want the experiment to shed light on is whether ‘Yes’ in fragment answers is easier to understand and therefore preferred over ‘No’. Do elaboration and correction set the frame for the felicity or infelicity of a fragment answer? As I showed in section 3.5, there are three reasons why elaborating fragments containing ‘Yes’ are easier to interpret. The first reason comes from the fact that less processing effort is involved with affirmative answers. On the one hand, the incomplete proposition of a question can only be completed when answered with ‘Yes’; it remains incomplete with ‘No’. On the other hand, narrow frames are activated when confronted with ‘Yes’. When confronted with ‘No’, wide frames are activated and take up more processing capacity. The difference between wide and narrow frames and the fact that correcting DPs only fit in the wide frames is not the only reason why the fragment DPs also play an important role. It is much easier to accommodate an elaborating
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DP especially if the fragment DP is contained in a relative clause and therefore does not refer to any item that is put at stake in the question. That is why Factor 1 for the experiment is Elaboration versus Correction.

The two replies (B) and (B’) answering question (1A) below can be used synonymously. This shows that it is possible with elaborating answers to drop ‘Yes’. It seems, however, difficult to imply correction as it requires a lot of effort to understand (B’’) as having the same meaning as (B’’).

(1) A: Does John speak an unusual language?
   B: Yes, Albanian.
   B’: Albanian.
   B’’: No, English.
   B’’’: English.

Factor 2 of the experiment is that of Overtness versus Covertness. Through this factor, I want to find out whether it is really ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ doing the trick. This means that I will be able to compare test items that contain ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ with others that do not. They are supposed to have exactly the same meaning, but whether they elaborate or correct can only be inferred from the DP. Although it seems very complicated to imply ‘No’, for reasons of consistency I chose to also include items with implicit negation.

The last question I want to address in the experiment is linked to the claims Merchant and Culicover & Jackendoff make in connection with the island examples. I want to try and clarify in how far judgements of fragments correcting or elaborating on a main clause object differ from those relating to relative clause objects. As relative clauses are considered islands (cf. 2.4), I will call them Island Objects or I-Objects; to Factor 3 I will refer as Object versus I-Object. It will also be interesting to see if the differences between Elaboration and Correction will only show with I-Object conditions or also with Object conditions.
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To sum it up, I have now determined three factors the combination of which will make up the test conditions. Factor 1 is concerned with the difference between Correction and Elaboration, Factor 2 deals with the difference of Overtness versus Covertness, and Factor 3 relates to variation of Objects and I-Objects. The combination of these three factors leads to the eight test conditions presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overt Elaboration Object</th>
<th>5 Covert Elaboration Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Overt Elaboration Object</td>
<td>5 Covert Elaboration Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overt Elaboration I-Object</td>
<td>6 Covert Elaboration I-Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overt Correction Object</td>
<td>7 Covert Correction Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Overt Correction I-Object</td>
<td>8 Covert Correction I-Object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Combination of Factors into Test Conditions

4.1.2 Predictions

Considering the three factors, it seems feasible to predict which of the two particular possibilities should be preferred for each. In accordance with section 3.5, it would be plausible for Factor 1 to expect Elaboration to receive better judgements than Correction, not only because ‘Yes’ is easier to process than ‘No’ but also because the DPs are easier to accommodate with Elaboration. In order to take out plausibility as a factor (cf. 5 below), it seems advisable to compare the value of the Object Elaboration conditions minus the value of the I-Object Elaboration conditions with the value of the Object Correction conditions minus the value of the I-Object Correction conditions.

For Factor 2, we can deduce from example (1) above that Covert Elaboration works. Still, it seems more straightforward to overtly state it. As Covert Correction seems very hard to grasp, I expect Overtness to be preferred over Covertness, even more so with Correction than with Elaboration.

In order to make predictions about Factor 3, I have to go back to section 3.2. There, I discussed that default focus lies on objects. As it is more natural to elaborate on or correct items that are in focus, this means that Object conditions will be preferred over I-Object conditions.

The table in Figure (2) below makes clear predictions of the judgements expected for each of the eight test conditions while also stating the responsible factors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Rating Predicted</th>
<th>Factor Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Overt Elaboration Object</td>
<td>highest &lt;br&gt; higher than Condition 3 &lt;br&gt; higher than Condition 5 &lt;br&gt; higher than Condition 2</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Overt Elaboration I-Object</td>
<td>higher than Condition 4 &lt;br&gt; higher than Condition 6 &lt;br&gt; lower than Condition 1</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Overt Correction Object</td>
<td>lower than Condition 1 &lt;br&gt; higher than Condition 7 &lt;br&gt; higher than Condition 4</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Overt Correction I-Object</td>
<td>lower than Condition 2 &lt;br&gt; higher than Condition 8 &lt;br&gt; lower than Condition 3</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Covert Elaboration Object</td>
<td>higher than Condition 7 &lt;br&gt; lower than Condition 1 &lt;br&gt; higher than Condition 6</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Covert Elaboration I-Object</td>
<td>higher than Condition 8 &lt;br&gt; lower than Condition 2 &lt;br&gt; lower than Condition 5</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Covert Correction Object</td>
<td>lower than Condition 5 &lt;br&gt; lower than Condition 3 &lt;br&gt; higher than Condition 8</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Covert Correction I-Object</td>
<td>lowest &lt;br&gt; lower than Condition 6 &lt;br&gt; lower than Condition 4 &lt;br&gt; lower than Condition 7</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Predictions of Ratings

4.2 Fleshing Out the Questionnaire

As the combination of the three factors lead to eight test conditions, eight questionnaires had to be designed. Firstly, I had to decide as to the general presentation and the experiment procedure. Then, the test items had to be designed according to the eight test conditions. The last step, then, was the designing of the filler items.
4.2.1 Preliminaries

The eight questionnaires were completed by 5 subjects each, so that a total of forty native speakers of English rated 16 question/answer-pairs formed in accordance with the eight test conditions. The participants are aged 12 to 82 and 19 speak American English and 18 British English; and one Australian, one New Zealander and one Canadian took part as well.

The experiment was designed as a closed scale task. This seemed appropriate since it is linear and therefore easier to use than magnitude estimation scales (cf. Featherston 2007, 76ff.).

Firstly, the participants were introduced to the type of items they would encounter in the questionnaire through an accompanying e-mail and the introductory page. They were then presented with the scale (Figure 3) and asked to rate B’s answers on a scale from 1 to 7. The scale was also presented at the top of each of the pages containing the test items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Rating Scale

Participants were instructed to use the whole range of the scale, to try and be spontaneous about their judgements and to put them down without changing them later. They were also asked to share some personal data. The test items were presented on five pages, each containing ten items. At the end of the line behind the reply, participants could choose from the numbers one through seven from a dropdown menu. An example page is given in figure 4 below for the reader to get an idea of the construction of the questionnaire. For more detail, please see the appendix.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is</td>
<td>incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A: Did William regret the statement that he loves his guitar better than Martha?</td>
<td>B: No, his cello.</td>
<td>drop down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A: Did Leonard introduce you to the talented mechanic that Marc recommended?</td>
<td>B: At the Café de Paris.</td>
<td>drop down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?</td>
<td>B: No, Mexico.</td>
<td>drop down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A: Did the friendly painter paint a big room of his mother’s house?</td>
<td>B: Yes, the spacious kitchen.</td>
<td>drop down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A: Did Lauren reveal what she really thinks about Karen and Rupert?</td>
<td>B: No, Geraldine and Adam.</td>
<td>drop down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A: Did the well-dressed lady claim anything in respect to her whereabouts at the time of the crime?</td>
<td>B: She needed leave house for her afternoon walk.</td>
<td>drop down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A: Did Paul contact the outstanding teacher that sold a popular book by Jane Austen?</td>
<td>B: The green cherry pit pillow.</td>
<td>drop down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A: Did Alex dislike the musician that was recently hired by Greg?</td>
<td>B: Yes, the dreadful pianist.</td>
<td>drop down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A: Did Ted concede anything regarding his relationship with Melanie?</td>
<td>B: He asked her to marry him years ago.</td>
<td>drop down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A: Did the elderly gardener eat a tasty vegetable from our garden?</td>
<td>B: The ripe tomato.</td>
<td>drop down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Exemplary Questionnaire Page (Questionnaire 8)

The test items were presented in randomized lists of 50 with 32 filler items.

4.2.2 The Test Items

I designed 16 lexical items parallel to the one in (5) below and distributed them over eight different questionnaires. Each questionnaire contained each of the eight test conditions twice and each of the participants only saw each lexical item once. Since the test items are question/answer-pairs, the combination of a certain question with a certain answer determines the test condition. The question defines whether the Fragment DP originates in an Object position or in an I-Object, and the answer defines whether the fragment DP corrects or elaborates. This is illustrated with an exemplary test item in (5) below.
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A’s question
Object Condition: Did the friendly painter paint a big room of his mother’s house?
I-Object Condition: Did Rufus call the friendly painter that painted a big room of his mother’s house?

B’s reply
Overt Elaboration Condition: Yes, the spacious kitchen.
Overt Correction Condition: No, the antique front door.
Covert Elaboration Condition: The spacious kitchen.
Covert Correction Condition: The antique front door.

Figure 5: Exemplary Test Item (Lexical Item 1)

4.2.3 The Fillers

The 32 fillers were designed to serve several purposes and examples can be found in the box below. Firstly, the answers vary in that they contain both overt and covert elaboration and correction. There is also the occasional PP in order to keep the subjects from identifying the test items (Cf. 1, 2a, 4a and 2b in Figure 6 below).

One group of fillers consists of questions similar to the object conditions so that these relatively short questions do not stand out from the multitude of question/answer-pairs (1 below).

The second group of fillers is one of questions with relative clauses without extraction so the readers do not get the idea that all the long and complex questions lead to unacceptable answers (2a and b).

Another group of questions contains complex noun phrases and indirect questions, which are then corrected or elaborated on in the fragment (3). As complex DPs and indirect questions – just like relative clauses – are island, this group of fillers serves the purpose of providing the same type of ungrammaticality.

The fourth group of fillers (4a and b) I used are based on Frazier et al.’s (2009) finding that fragment answers starting with ‘that’ are preferred over ones without ‘that’ for verbs which would typically select complements with ‘that’. These fillers were designed to provide a frame of reference since even if the ones with ‘that’ are preferred, the others are still good.

As the last group of fillers, I chose question/answer-pairs with clear ungrammaticalities in the answers (Examples 5a and b). I designed them to mark the bottom of the scale but they ended up with too high a mean.

I then designed an additional questionnaire in order to find a bottom of the scale.
4.3 Additional Questionnaire

In order to find a proper bottom of the scale, I created a supplementary questionnaire. In this questionnaire, I used five of the grammatical fillers from the original questionnaire and added five new ungrammatical question/answer pairs. These contain phenomena which according to Snyder (2000, 577) show no syntactic satiation effects, which means that in contrast to complex DP test items, participants do not get used to the constructions and rate them much higher towards the end of a questionnaire than at the beginning. From Snyder’s list of possible ungrammaticalities, I chose one item containing want for (see 1 in the box in Figure 7 below), three that trace items (2-4) and one left branch violation (5).

The original fillers serve the purpose of relating the results from the additional questionnaire to those of the original one. Half of the original participants completed the additional questionnaire. I ruled out three of them because their ratings of the five original sentences differed too much from the ones in the original questionnaire. The ratings of the other seventeen participants are comparable to the one in the original questionnaire since the mean of their ratings of the test items in the additional questionnaire is practically identical to the one in the original questionnaire (mean of original questionnaire: 5.6 and mean of additional questionnaire: 5.61176471). This means that the mean of the Snyder (2000)-based test items
can be included as additional data. The trouble, however, is that the mean of these five new ungrammatical examples was even higher than that of the ungrammatical examples from the original questionnaire (3.41176471 versus 2.92539315). That is why the additional questionnaire does not supply us with any data that the comparison of with the means of the test items could provide any new insights.

Still, I will now turn to the results of the questionnaire and start out with describing the means of the test item, which do in themselves provide interesting insights nevertheless.

1 A: Did Daisy want for Justin to meet the good-looking nurse?
   B: No, for Liam to meet.

2 A: Did Leonard claim that Tobias eats salad?
   B: No, that eats soup.

3 A: Did Damon think that Patrick fancies Yvonne?
   B: Yes, and that fancies Eleanor.

4 A: Did Wendy say that Natasha loves Humphrey?
   B: No, that loves Gavin.

5 A: Did Louise wear the green dress?
   B: Yes, and the blue Deborah.

Figure 7: Test Items of Additional Questionnaire

4.4 Results

Despite the rather unsatisfactory results of the additional questionnaire, the results of the complete experiment are very insightful. I will first discuss the overall results and then, in parts 4.4.1-4.4.3, I will isolate the three factors that constitute the test items and discuss the results focusing on these factors. In the last section of the chapter, I will turn to the fillers and show what comparing them to the test items can tell us.

4.4.1 The Test Items

Let me first focus on the means of the judgements for the eight test conditions. In the below chart, you can see that results are ranging from 1.5625 for Condition 8 to 6.7125 for Condition 1. This shows that the full range of the scale was used by the subjects. Comparing the actual results with the predictions made in section 4.1.2 not only shows that <Condition 8 gets the lowest and condition 1 the highest result but that all other predictions prove accurate, too (cf. Figure 8 below).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Predictions Satisfied</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  Overt Elaboration Object| highest
    higher than Condition 3
    higher than Condition 5
    higher than Condition 2 | ✓       |
|                            |                                                           | 6,7125  |
| 2  Overt Elaboration I-Object| higher than Condition 4
    higher than Condition 6
    lower than Condition 1 | ✓       |
|                            |                                                           | 3,175   |
| 3  Overt Correction Object | lower than Condition 1
    higher than Condition 7
    higher than Condition 4 | ✓       |
|                            |                                                           | 4,2375  |
| 4  Overt Correction I-Object| lower than Condition 2
    higher than Condition 8
    lower than Condition 3 | ✓       |
|                            |                                                           | 2,0625  |
| 5  Covert Elaboration Object| higher than Condition 7
    lower than Condition 1
    higher than Condition 6 | ✓       |
|                            |                                                           | 5,3125  |
| 6  Covert Elaboration I-Object| higher than Condition 8
    lower than Condition 2
    lower than Condition 5 | ✓       |
|                            |                                                           | 2,6125  |
| 7  Covert Correction Object | lower than Condition 5
    lower than Condition 3
    higher than Condition 8 | ✓       |
|                            |                                                           | 2,4125  |
| 8  Covert Correction I-Object| lowest
    lower than Condition 6
    lower than Condition 4
    lower than Condition 7 | ✓       |
|                            |                                                           | 1,5625  |

Figure 8: Satisfied Predictions of Ratings
In order for the reader to get a more concrete idea as to the nature of the test conditions and to understand the judgements, the table below offers Lexical Item 1 in all the eight conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Lexical Item 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Overt Elab Object</td>
<td>A: Did the friendly painter paint a big room of his mother’s house? B: Yes, the spacious kitchen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Overt Elab I-Object</td>
<td>A: Did Rufus call the friendly painter that painted a big room of his mother’s house? B: Yes, the spacious kitchen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Overt Corr Object</td>
<td>A: Did the friendly painter paint a big room of his mother’s house? B: No, the antique front door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Overt Corr I-Object</td>
<td>A: Did Rufus call the friendly painter that painted a big room of his mother’s house? B: No, the antique front door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Covert Elab Object</td>
<td>A: Did the friendly painter paint a big room of his mother’s house? B: The spacious kitchen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Covert Elab I-Object</td>
<td>A: Did Rufus call the friendly painter that painted a big room of his mother’s house? B: The spacious kitchen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Covert Corr Object</td>
<td>A: Did the friendly painter paint a big room of his mother’s house? B: The antique front door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Covert Corr I-Object</td>
<td>A: Did Rufus call the friendly painter that painted a big room of his mother’s house? B: The antique front door.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9: Test Conditions realized with Lexical Item 1
The bar chart below shows the means assigned to the eight test condition and permits the direct comparison. The error bars indicate the standard error. They prove that since the error bars of the items only differing in one feature (namely the two choices of one of the factors) never overlap these differences are statistically significant. In Figure 8 above, the relevant conditions can be found in the column named ‘Predictions Satisfied’. Condition 1, e.g., will be compared to Conditions 3, 5, and 2 but not to Condition 4 because they differ in more than one feature. These detailed comparisons will be made in sections 4.4.2-4.4.4. First, I will focus on a more general description of the results.

![Mean of Test Items](image)

*Figure 10: Mean of Test Items*

The result for Condition 1 is very high, which is what you would expect since Condition 1 items are questions without relative clauses and the answers overtly elaborate on the object of the question. As the theories predict (cf. 3.2, 3.5 and also 4.1.2), this should be unproblematic. Condition 2 only scores 3,175 (example (3)), which is quite low considering the fact that it is parallel to Culicover & Jackendoff’s example (2) repeated below (for more detail, see Chapter 3).

(2) A: John met a guy who speaks a very unusual language.  
B: Yes, Albanian.

*Culicover & Jackendoff 2005, 245*
(3) A: Did Rufus call the friendly painter that painted a big room of his mother’s house?  
B: Yes, the spacious kitchen.

Apart from the difference whose influence on acceptability I ruled out in section 3.4, the examples have the same structure. This leads to several possible explanations: either Culicover & Jackendoff’s judgement is wrong or the subjects’ judgements are wrong or 3,175 out of seven is not as bad as it seems. Let’s stick to the last explanation for the time being, and I’ll come back to it when discussing the fillers (in 4.4.5 below).

To me, what seems most surprising is the slightly above medium rating of Condition 3, an example of which is presented in (4) below.

(4) A: Did the friendly painter paint a big room of his mother’s house?  
B: No, the antique front door.

In this group of test items, the question/answer-sequences contain overt corrections of an object, which I did not expect to be problematic (cf. 3.2). Nevertheless, they contain a superset and the Elaborations of it is easier since the wide frame is very hard to define (cf. 3.5.3) Coming back to the above question, this results points at a rating above 3 not being so bad. The rating of Condition 5 seems quite high in comparison to that of Condition 3. Both conditions deviate from the predicted best scoring condition in only one factor. The big difference between them might imply that Factor 1 carries more weight than Factor 2 (compare sections 4.4.2 and 4.4.3 below) and Correction is far more difficult to process than inferring Elaboration from an elaborating DP. This might hint at the size of the activated frames being of great importance (cf. section 3.5.3). The relatively high rating of Condition 5 by itself, however, seems plausible.

Condition 4, 6, 7 and 8 all score between 1,5625 and 2,6125. Therefore, the differences between them are hard to grasp. This so-called floor effect can occur in closed scale ratings. It complicates the comparison of the results that are close together.

In the next three sections, I will focus on a more fine-grained comparison of the conditions differing in one aspect only.
4.4.2 Factor 1: Elaboration versus Correction

As the contrast between Elaboration and Correction constitutes the main focus of this paper, I will start with taking a closer look at Factor 1. The bar chart in Figure 11 below again shows the eight test conditions but this time, the two conditions differing only in Factor 1 are presented next to each other. So Condition 1 is presented next to Condition 3, Condition 2 next to Condition 4, Condition 5 next to 7 and 6 next to 8.

Figure 11: Elaboration versus Correction

This way of arranging the data clearly shows that the means of the Correction conditions amount to approximately half of the values of the means of the Elaboration conditions. The differences in the Object conditions, however, are bigger than those in the I-Object conditions. The reason for this is probably a combination of two effects: On the one hand, the Elaboration conditions work so much better than the Correction conditions and the Object conditions are strongly preferred over the I-Object conditions; on the other hand, the floor effect described in 4.4.1 inhibits the exact representation of nuances between the lower rated conditions. Due to this effect, the differences between both Overt and Covert I-Object conditions are not as big. The table below presents these differences in more detail.
Island Violations in Fragment Answers. The Effects of ‘Yes’ and ‘No’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Overt Elab Obj</th>
<th>Overt Corr Obj</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Overt Obj</td>
<td>6,7125</td>
<td>4,2375</td>
<td>2,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Covert Obj</td>
<td>5,3125</td>
<td>2,4125</td>
<td>2,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Covert I-Obj</td>
<td>3,5375</td>
<td>2,175</td>
<td>1,3625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Covert I-Object</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>1,85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Overt Elab vs. Overt Corr</td>
<td>9,8875</td>
<td>6,3</td>
<td>3,5875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elab vs. Corr</td>
<td>17,8125</td>
<td>10,275</td>
<td>7,5375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12: Detailed Data on Elaboration versus Correction

In order to compare the I-Object conditions, I took out plausibility as a factor by subtracting the values of the I-Object conditions from those of the Object conditions. As predicted in accordance with section 3.5, Elaboration conditions receive far better judgements than Correction conditions. This confirms the claim that Merchant’s and Culicover & Jackendoff’s differing judgements are related to the contrast between ‘Yes’ and ‘No’. Nevertheless, one has to bear in mind that Calculation 6 also reflects the problem of inferring Covert Correction, whereas the inference of Overt Correction seems easier. Calculations 1 and 5, however, show that when leaving out Covertness as a factor, the differences between Elaboration and Correction still show.

Related to the experiment, it is also interesting to note that the understanding of Overt and Covert Elaboration I-Object conditions seems to be acquirable since these conditions show the biggest improvement in round 2 of the questionnaire across subjects. This might be yet another difference between Elaboration and Correction.
### 4.4.3 Factor 2: Overtness versus Covertness

Now, I will turn to the contrast between Overtness and Covertness, which is Factor 2. The bar chart in Figure (13) presents the eight test conditions with the two conditions differing only in Factor 2 next to each other. Condition 1 is adjacent to Condition 5, Condition 2 adjacent to 6, 3 adjacent to 7 and Condition 4 is presented along with Condition 8.

![Overtness vs. Covertness](image)

This bar chart shows that the differences between Overt Elaboration or Correction and Covert Elaboration or Correction vary across the four possible combinations of the factors. The Elaboration Object conditions both score quite high. The predicted difference between them, however, derives from the additional task of inferring the acceptance of the question proposition from the elaborating DP in the Covertness condition. As predicted, the Covert Correction Object condition does not score very high since it is difficult to imply rejection. That is why the difference between the Overt Correction Object condition and the Covert Correction Object condition is bigger than that between the first two conditions. The surprisingly big difference between Covert Elab Object and Overt Corr Object is already discussed in 4.4.1 above.
Island Violations in Fragment Answers. The Effects of ‘Yes’ and ‘No’

For the four I-Object conditions, it can be stated that Overtness scores higher than Covertness. The exact differences might be subject to the floor effect because it could be expected to be at least as big as in the Elab Object conditions. The other explanation would be that at some point of incomprehensibility, things cannot get any worse and it is impossible to make judgements reflecting the subtle differences. Again, the exact differences are presented in a table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Overt Elab Obj</th>
<th>Covert Elab Obj</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Elab Obj</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,7125</td>
<td>5,3125</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Elab I-Obj</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,175</td>
<td>2,6125</td>
<td>0,5625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Corr Obj</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,2375</td>
<td>2,4125</td>
<td>1,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Corr I-Obj</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,0625</td>
<td>1,5625</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Overt Obj vs. Covert Obj</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,95</td>
<td>7,725</td>
<td>3,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Overt vs. Covert</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,1875</td>
<td>11,9</td>
<td>4,2875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Detailed Data on Overtness versus Covertness

The numbers in the table show that the differences between the Object conditions are bigger than those of the I-Object conditions, which are almost identical both with Elaboration and Correction. As anticipated, the Overtness conditions in general score much higher than the Covertness conditions. This is even more so with the Elaboration conditions because Correction seems hard to imply and because Elaboration is generally preferred over Correction (cf. 4.4.2). Whereas Calculation 6 contrasts all Overtness with all Covertness conditions, Calculation 5 takes out the I-Object condition in order to show that even if this difficulty is eliminated, a stark contrast remains between Covertness and Overtness.
4.4.4 Factor 3: Object versus I-Object

Factor 3 marks the contrast between Object and I-Object conditions. The two conditions differing in this factor are displayed right next to each other in the bar chart in Figure (15) below. Condition 1 is next to Condition 2, Condition 3 next to Condition 4, Condition 5 next to Condition 6 and 7 next to Condition 8.

![Object vs. I-Object](image)

Figure 15: Object versus I-Object

The theory on Islands in 2.4 already implied that I-Object conditions would get lower ratings than Object conditions. Whether this is due to Island Violations, as would fit Merchant’s claim, or due to a greater processing effort of more complex structures, as would probably be preferred by Culicover & Jackendoff, is a question that cannot be solved in this paper. The extent of the differences, however, cannot be ignored. Detailed numbers on this can be found in Table 16 below.
Table 16: Detailed Data on Object versus I-Object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Overt Elab Obj</th>
<th>Overt Elab I-Obj</th>
<th>Covert Elab Obj</th>
<th>Covert Elab I-Obj</th>
<th>Overt Corr Obj</th>
<th>Overt Corr I-Obj</th>
<th>Covert Corr Obj</th>
<th>Covert Corr I-Obj</th>
<th>Overt Obj vs. Overt I-Obj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Overt Elab</td>
<td>6,7125</td>
<td>3,175</td>
<td>5,3125</td>
<td>2,6125</td>
<td>4,2375</td>
<td>2,0625</td>
<td>2,4125</td>
<td>1,5625</td>
<td>10,95 + 10,95 = 21,90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Covert Elab</td>
<td>2,7375</td>
<td>2,7375</td>
<td>2,7375</td>
<td>2,7375</td>
<td>2,7375</td>
<td>2,7375</td>
<td>2,7375</td>
<td>2,7375</td>
<td>5,7125 = 5,7125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overt Corr</td>
<td>3,5375</td>
<td>3,5375</td>
<td>2,7375</td>
<td>2,7375</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>9,2625 = 9,2625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Covert Corr</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>0,85 = 0,85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16: Detailed Data on Object versus I-Object

It becomes apparent even at first glance that the differences in Factor 3 are bigger than the ones in Factors 1 and 2. This might be due to the culmination of two effects. On the one hand, in spite of many open questions related to the topic of Islands, it seems clear that they are somehow problematic. On the other hand, the elaboration or correction of focused items is expected, and if this expectation is not met, we are faced with the problems discussed in section 3.5.4.

If it were only Elaboration and Correction making all the difference the value of object conditions with elaboration minus the value of object conditions with correction should equal the value of I-objects with elaboration minus I-objects with correction (cf. Calculation 5). The fact that this is not the case proves the influence of Factor 3. Also, the differences between Elaboration and Correction do not only show with I-Object conditions but also with object conditions. This means that the difference is not only relevant to Merchant’s and Culicover & Jackendoff’s examples but to all examples including Yes/No-questions and adequate answers.
4.4.5 The Test Items and the Fillers

The fact that subjects used the whole scale when judging the test items has the advantage that top and bottom of the scale are contained within the ratings of the test items. I still want to present the results for the fillers at this point since there are striking differences between clear ungrammaticalities as in Group 5 of the fillers and fragment answers referring to items in a relative clause. An overview of these results is presented in the below chart.

![Mean of Test Items and Fillers](image)

Figure 17: Mean of Test Items and Fillers

For reasons of convenience, I repeat below Figure (18) containing the exemplary fillers from section 4.2. As expected, the ratings of the first group of fillers, which resembles the Condition 1 test items, is almost the same as the Condition 1 ratings (cf. example 1 below). The Group 2 fillers with relative clauses without extraction get rated much lower than Condition 1 and Group 1. Even though they are grammatical, they are still more complex due to the relative clause (cf. 2a and b). The rating is comparable to that of Condition 5, in which the subjects had to infer the covert elaboration of an object. This implies that the effort of interpreting a relative clause resembles that of inferring implied acceptance through accommodating an elaborating DP.
The third class of fillers contains islands other than relative clauses, which are then corrected or elaborated on in the fragment answer (cf. 3). These island violations score similar to Condition 2, which contains an overt elaborating I-object. This seems striking since the group of filler contains equal numbers of overt elaborating and correcting fragments. The overt correcting I-object condition (Condition 4), however, scores lower.

Group 4 fillers (4a and b below) scores slightly above a medium mean of judgements. Since these fillers are still considered acceptable (cf. Frazier et al. 2009 and section 4.2), the similar rating of Condition 3 means that those sentences, too, are acceptable even though the medium rating came unexpected for me as discussed in 4.4.1.

The fifth group of fillers with question/answer-pairs containing clear ungrammaticalities in the answers (Examples 5a and b) scored similar to Condition 2. The same is true for the test items from the additional questionnaire and Group 3 fillers (cf. above). This means that understanding the overt elaboration of an I-object seems equally difficult as understanding ungrammaticalities. Coming back to the question as to why Condition 2 scored so low (cf. section 4.4.1), it seems that accommodating an ungrammaticality requires as much effort as accommodating an island violation. This means that sentences with ratings in this range can be understood but are far from perfect. Claiming that the bigger processing required with relative clauses, no matter whether there is an island violation or not does not solve the problem since examples with relative clauses without island violations got better ratings than that (compare Fillers Group 2).

On the other hand, Groups 3 and 5 and the additional fillers got rated higher than Conditions 4, 6, 7 and 8. And even though a floor effect is at work in the low ranging ratings, it still becomes obvious that these four conditions are perceived as incoherent and incomprehensible. The accumulation of problematic factors makes comprehension almost impossible, whereas sentences containing ungrammaticalities seem more graspable.
Island Violations in Fragment Answers. The Effects of ‘Yes’ and ‘No’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did the touchy undertaker receive a birthday present from his brother?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: Yes, the comfortable armchair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>A: Did Maxine adore the designer that helped her choose the pendant lamp for the kitchen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: No, Francis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: Yes, to the opera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A: Did William regret the statement that he loves his guitar better than Martha?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: No, his cello.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>A: Did the chambermaid that stole money from the guests demand anything after she was fired?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: She would get a fair trial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>A: Did Grace reply anything when her mother reproached her for her bad geography mark?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: She was not responsible since it was her teacher’s fault.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>A: Did the pessimistic salesman add anything to the enthusiastic speech given by the company owner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: He and his co-workers ever deserved to get paid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>A: Did Tony come to the conclusion that Rick took his beloved dog?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: No, Rick had anything to do with it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: Exemplary Fillers

4.5 Evaluation

The empirical investigation based on the questionnaire succeeds in producing statistically relevant data and confirming assumed differences. It also makes the differences both more graspable and more meaningful. The fact that I chose a closed scale task, which I consider easier to handle for participants than open scale tasks, proved a disadvantage in connection with the low ratings. Especially the ratings of the Island conditions exhibit little variation and are therefore not easy to compare. In order to avoid such floor effects, it would be advisable to repeat the same experiment with an open scale. On the other hand, the accumulation of dispreferred factors in the low ranging ratings makes the examples virtually incomprehensible, which in turn makes fine gradings practically infeasible.

Especially the Correction conditions turned out difficult to design. In the attempt to make sure that Covert Correction in particular is indeed perceived as Correction, some of the lexical items ended up seeming rather far-fetched. Luckily, I could make some plausibility adjustments so that this does not carry too much weight. Similar future studies should ideally aim for lexical items that work better in that they easily allow for both elaboration and correction without causing this problem. The goal of finding them, however, seems almost impossible to obtain.
Island Violations in Fragment Answers. The Effects of ‘Yes’ and ‘No’

The results confirm the predictions that Elaboration is preferred over Correction, Overtness over Covertness and Objects over I-Objects. This is so because the three separate factors are included in the questionnaires in a way that enables me to deduce their respective significance. Moreover, the difference between ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ could be verified, which has implications for the argumentations of both Merchant (2004) and Culicover & Jackendoff (2005).

In order to make this research more convincing, it would be desirable to design pre-studies in which the three factors are tested separately. This might also simplify matters in the design of the lexical items. And the number of participants should be increased in order to make the results watertight.

5 Conclusion

The interpretation of ellipsis still poses a major challenge in a theory of grammar. The outline of Merchant’s (2004) Movement and Deletion-Approach and Culicover & Jackendoff’s (2005) Non-Deletion Approach with Indirect Licensing showed that in connection with fragments, both provide evidence from island violations. Yet, they use it in support of contrasting claims. Islands can lead to syntactic restrictions. If these restrictions show in fragments (as Merchant claims), this serves as evidence for syntactic structure in elliptical phrases. But if they do not, as Culicover & Jackendoff claim, this strongly suggests the absence of syntactic structure in ellipsis sites. Neither Merchant’s and Culicover & Jackendoff’s approaches nor a theory of islands could clarify the problem of connecting similar evidence to contrasting claims. I identified the decisive factor which leads to the differing acceptability judgments of Merchant’s (2004) and Culicover & Jackendoff’s (2005) examples. In order to do so, I first took a closer look at all the differences between the conflicting examples. They exhibited variations in the following categories: ambiguity, focus, superset, nature of the sequence and elaboration versus correction. Constructing adequate examples permitted showing that the difference between elaborating ‘Yes’ and correcting ‘No’ was the crucial one. I suggested that there is a pragmatic difference between fragment answers introduced by ‘Yes’ and others introduced by ‘No’, and this difference has three causes. With ‘No’, it is more demanding and therefore requires more processing effort to arrive at a proposition, activate the appropriate frame and eventually accommodate the DP.

In order to prove this in an empirical investigation, I combined three factors, namely Elaboration versus Correction, Overtness versus Covertness and Object versus Island-Object.
I designed 16 different question/answer-pairs as test items. Each questionnaire contained items that showed all possible combinations of the three factors. The questionnaires were completed by 40 participants. The ratings confirmed the assumed difference between Elaboration and Correction. All predictions were met by the results. This in turn verified my hypothesis that Elaboration is easier to process than Correction. The other factors proved equally important. Through comparing Overtness and Covertness, it became clear that the difference between Elaboration and Correction is connected to ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ and not just to an elaborating or correcting DP. Besides, I successfully showed that the difference between Elaboration and Correction is not only limited to examples involving island effects but also shows with objects. While I consider the empirical investigation effective, future research could strengthen my findings by testing factors separately and enlarging the number of participants.

The outcome of the empirical investigation amongst other things implies that fragment answers exhibiting island effects should not be cited as evidence by either Merchant (2004) or Culicover & Jackendoff (2005). Culicover & Jackendoff, however, benefit from the outcome since fragments with ungrammatical full sentential paraphrases are possible. The difference in acceptability of the two examples under discussion is produced by pragmatic factors, and the presence of syntactic structure in fragment answers becomes highly implausible.
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The Test Items

SET 1
Did the friendly painter paint a big room of his mother’s house?
Did Rufus call the friendly painter that painted a big room of his mother’s house?
Yes, the spacious kitchen.
No, the antique front door.

SET 2
Did the shy student study an important philosopher from classical antiquity?
Did Jane meet the shy student that studied an important philosopher from classical antiquity?
Yes, the great Aristotle.
No, the brilliant Mozart.

SET 3
Did the clever federal agent enjoy a starter from the cold buffet?
Did Peter see the clever federal agent that enjoyed a starter from the cold buffet?
Yes, the Greek salad.
No, the delicious ice cream.

SET 4
Did the lazy mafia boss choose a nice pasta dish from the menu?
Did Amy arrest the lazy mafia boss that chose a nice pasta dish from the menu?
Yes, the savoury spaghetti.
No, the Hawaiian liquor.

SET 5
Did the elderly gardener eat a tasty vegetable from our garden?
Did Jeff marry the elderly gardener that ate a tasty vegetable from our garden?
Yes, the ripe tomato.
No, the old yoghurt.
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**SET 6:**
Did the boring broker purchase a valuable piece of jewellery by the young designer?
Did Vanessa know the boring broker that purchased a valuable piece of jewellery by the young designer?
Yes, the stunning necklace.
No, the comfortable jeans.

**SET 7**
Did the amiable fireman buy a weatherproof garment of good quality?
Did James encounter the amiable fireman that bought a weatherproof garment of good quality?
Yes, the oversized raincoat.
No, the entertaining DVD.

**SET 8**
Did the outstanding teacher sell a popular book by Jane Austen?
Did Paul contact the outstanding teacher that sold a popular book by Jane Austen?
Yes, the much-loved ‘Pride and Prejudice’.
No, the green cherry pit pillow.

**SET 9**
Did the crazy pickpocket steal an expensive car with leather seats?
Did Sally date the crazy pickpocket that stole an expensive car with leather seats?
Yes the black Porsche.
No, the rickety bike.

**SET 10**
Did the absent-minded handyman leave a vital tool at his workshop?
Did Emma accompany the absent-minded handyman that left a vital tool at his workshop?
Yes, the handy hammer drill.
No, the home-made tuna sandwich.

**SET 11**
Did the reliable postman own a good-natured dog of considerable size?
Did Katherine greet the reliable postman that owned a good-natured dog of considerable size?
Yes, the drooling Saint Bernard.
No, the extensive record collection.
SET 12
Did the irritating artist draw a fascinating building with several steeples?
Did Sam recognize the irritating artist that drew a fascinating building with several steeples?
Yes, the colourful castle.
No, the sunny beach scene.

SET 13
Did the French carpenter restore an elegant piece of furniture from the 16th century?
Did Matthew esteem the French carpenter that restored an elegant piece of furniture from the 16th century?
Yes, the exquisite coffee table.
No, the empty garage.

SET 14
Did the retired baker borrow an essential ingredient for the wedding cake?
Did Brian phone the retired baker that borrowed an essential ingredient for the wedding cake?
Yes, the roasted hazelnuts.
No, the huge grandfather clock.

SET 15
Did the annoying bookseller recommend a useful guide book for a backpacking holiday?
Did Claire invite the annoying bookseller that recommended a useful guide book for a backpacking holiday?
Yes, the new ‘Lonely Planet’.
No, the faded map.

SET 16
Did the troublesome class read an influential drama by Shakespeare?
Did Mary teach the troublesome class that read an influential drama by Shakespeare?
Yes the famous ‘Macbeth’.
No, the creepy vampire novel.
This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1 A: Did Abby ask Jim what he wore to the dance?
   B: Yes, his uncle’s old suit.

2 A: Did Leonard introduce you to the talented mechanic that Marc recommended?
   B: At the Café de Paris.

3 A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
   B: No, Mexico.

4 A: Did the elderly gardener eat a tasty vegetable from our garden?
   B: The old yoghurt.

5 A: Did Bill explain to you why his sister has been behaving so oddly?
   B: His brother.

6 A: Did the pessimistic salesman add anything to the enthusiastic speech given by the company owner?
   B: He and his co-workers ever deserved to get paid.

7 A: Did the friendly painter paint a big room of his mother’s house?
   B: No, the antique front door.

8 A: Did Alex dislike the musician that was recently hired by Greg?
   B: Yes, the dreadful pianist.

9 A: Did Lindsay deny anything when questioned by the police?
   B: She met with a stranger.

10 A: Did Jane meet the shy student that studied an important philosopher from classical antiquity?
    B: No, the brilliant Mozart.
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
<td></td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 A: Did Maude invite the miserable lumberjack to her birthday party?  
B: To her wedding.  

12 A: Did the newly-hired chef ask himself the question whether the restaurant should offer a special meal of the day?  
B: No, the fancy bar.  

13 A: Did the amiable fireman buy a weatherproof garment of good quality?  
B: Yes, the oversized raincoat.  

14 A: Did Jeannie go to a hotel in Northern Austria?  
B: Yes, the recommendable spa.  

15 A: Did Maxine adore the designer that helped her choose the pendant lamp for the kitchen?  
B: No, Francis.  

16 A: Did the attentive receptionist take care of the coats?  
B: No, he minded help the guests.  

17 A: Did Vanessa know the boring broker that purchased a valuable piece of jewellery by the young designer?  
B: The comfortable jeans.  

18 A: Did Sabrina mourn her aunt that she used to stay with when she was little?  
B: No, her favourite uncle.  

19 A: Did Paul contact the outstanding teacher that sold a popular book by Jane Austen?  
B: Yes, the much-loved ‘Pride and Prejudice’.  

20 A: Did Anna e-mail you the time when they would pick us up at the station?  
B: Yes, she e-mailed me at all.
B’s reply is incoherent
B’s reply is odd but comprehensible
B’s reply is perfectly natural

21 A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
   B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

22 A: Did Amy arrest the fat mafia boss that chose a nice pasta dish from the menu?
   B: The savoury spaghetti.

23 A: Did Jerry give away the reason why he took so many pictures of the Japanese tourists in front of the Eiffel tower?
   B: No, the Tower Bridge.

24 A: Did the clever federal agent enjoy a starter from the cold buffet?
   B: The Greek salad.

25 A: Did Ted concede anything regarding his relationship with Melanie?
   B: He asked her to marry him years ago.

26 A: Did Tony come to the conclusion that Rick took his beloved dog?
   B: No, Rick had anything to do with it.

27 A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
   B: Yes, to the opera.

28 A: Did the crazy pickpocket steal an expensive car with leather seats?
   B: No, the rickety bike.

29 A: Did the strong butcher save the little kittens from drowning?
   B: In the rain barrel.

30 A: Did Kim mention what Wayne built the tiny garden shed with the crooked roof for?
   B: Yes, the artistic roof.
31 A: Did Grace reply anything when her mother reproached her for her bad geography mark?
   B: She was not responsible since it was her teacher’s fault.

32 A: Did Sam recognize the irritating artist that drew a fascinating building with several steeples?
   B: The colourful castle.

33 A: Did Lauren reveal what she really thinks about Karen and Rupert?
   B: No, Geraldine and Adam.

34 A: Did the French carpenter restore an elegant piece of furniture from the 16th century?
   B: The empty garage.

35 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.

36 A: Did the forgetful clown learn a Slavic language?
   B: No, English.

37 A: Did Mary teach the troublesome class that read an influential drama by Shakespeare?
   B: Yes, the famous ‘Macbeth’.

38 A: Did the good-natured computer programmer go to see a doctor?
   B: Yes, the formidable neurologist.

39 A: Did the reliable postman own a good-natured dog of considerable size?
   B: The drooling Saint Bernard.

40 A: Did the well-dressed lady claim anything in respect to her whereabouts at the time of the crime?
   B: She need leave house for her afternoon walk.
1 B’s reply is incoherent

41 A: Did Dean organize the wonderful wedding in the park?
   B: No, the edge of the cliff. dropdown

2 B’s reply is odd but comprehensible

42 A: Did Emma accompany the absent-minded handyman that left a vital tool at his workshop?
   B: No, the home-made tuna sandwich. dropdown

3 B’s reply is perfectly natural

43 A: Did William regret the statement that he loves his guitar better than Martha?
   B: No, his cello. dropdown

44 A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?
   B: Chinese martial arts. dropdown

45 A: Did the annoying bookseller recommend a useful guide book for a backpacking holiday?
   B: Yes, the new ‘Lonely Planet’. dropdown

46 A: Did John fancy the plumber that was in the fashionable design magazine?
   B: Yes, he has talked about him yet. dropdown

47 A: Did the chambermaid that stole money from the guests demand anything after she was fired?
   B: She would get a fair trial. dropdown

48 A: Did Brian phone the retired baker that borrowed an essential ingredient for the wedding cake?
   B: The huge grandfather clock. dropdown

49 A: Did Lorelai doubt the fact that Luke was fond of Sookie’s three course meal?
   B: Yes, with the carrot soup. dropdown

50 A: Did the touchy undertaker receive a birthday present from his brother?
   B: Yes, the comfortable armchair. dropdown
Questionnaire 2

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s): (Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1 A: Did Jerry give away the reason why he took so many pictures of the Japanese tourists in front of the Eiffel tower?
B: No, the Tower Bridge.

2 A: Did Leonard introduce you to the talented mechanic that Marc recommended?
B: At the Café de Paris.

3 A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
B: No, Mexico.

4 A: Did Peter see the clever federal agent that enjoyed a fresh fruit from the bowl?
B: The red apple.

5 A: Did the newly-hired chef ask himself the question whether the restaurant should offer a special meal of the day?
B: No, the fancy bar.

6 A: Did Anna e-mail you the time when they would pick us up at the station?
B: Yes, she e-mailed me at all.

7 A: Did James encounter the amiable fireman that bought a weatherproof garment of good quality?
B: Yes, the oversized raincoat.

8 A: Did Alex dislike the musician that was recently hired by Greg?
B: Yes, the dreadful pianist.

9 A: Did the chambermaid that stole money from the guests demand anything after she was fired?
B: She would get a fair trial.

10 A: Did Jeff marry the elderly gardener that ate a tasty vegetable from our garden?
B: The old yoghurt.
11 A: Did Maude invite the miserable lumberjack to her birthday party?
   B: To her wedding.

12 A: Did Kim mention what Wayne built the tiny garden shed with the crooked roof for?
   B: Yes, the artistic roof.

13 A: Did the shy student study an important philosopher from classical antiquity?
   B: The great Aristotle.

14 A: Did Jeannie go to a hotel in Northern Austria?
   B: Yes, the recommendable spa.

15 A: Did Maxine adore the designer that helped her choose the pendant lamp for the kitchen?
   B: No, Francis.

16 A: Did the well-dressed lady claim anything in respect to her whereabouts at the time of the crime?
   B: She need leave house for her afternoon walk.

17 A: Did the fat mafia boss choose a nice pasta dish from the menu?
   B: The Hawaiian liquor.

18 A: Did Sabrina mourn her aunt that she used to stay with when she was little?
   B: No, her favourite uncle.

19 A: Did the boring broker purchase a valuable piece of jewellery by the young designer?
   B: Yes, the stunning necklace.

20 A: Did the pessimistic salesman add anything to the enthusiastic speech given by the company owner?
   B: He and his co-workers ever deserved to get paid.
B's reply is incoherent
B's reply is odd but comprehensible
B's reply is perfectly natural

21 A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

22 A: Did Rufus call the friendly painter that painted a big room of his mother’s house?
B: No, the antique front door.

23 A: Did Lauren reveal what she really thinks about Karen and Rupert?
B: No, Geraldine and Adam.

24 A: Did the outstanding teacher sell a popular book by Jane Austen?
B: No, the green cherry pit pillow.

25 A: Did Ted concede anything regarding his relationship with Melanie?
B: He asked her to marry him years ago.

26 A: Did Tony come to the conclusion that Rick took his beloved dog?
B: No, Rick had anything to do with it.

27 A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
B: Yes, to the opera.

28 A: Did the irritating artist draw a fascinating building with several steeples?
B: The sunny beach scene.

29 A: Did the strong butcher save the little kittens from drowning?
B: In the rain barrel.

30 A: Did Abby ask Jim what he wore to the dance?
B: Yes, his uncle’s old suit.
31 A: Did Lindsay deny anything when questioned by the police?
   B: She met with a stranger.

32 A: Did the troublesome class read an influential drama by Shakespeare?
   B: No, the creepy vampire novel.

33 A: Did Bill explain to you why his sister has been behaving so oddly?
   B: His brother.

34 A: Did Katherine greet the reliable postman that owned a good-natured dog of considerable size?
   B: The drooling Saint Bernard.

35 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.

36 A: Did the forgetful clown learn a Slavic language?
   B: No, English.

37 A: Did the absent-minded handyman leave a vital tool at his workshop?
   B: The handy hammer drill.

38 A: Did the good-natured computer programmer go to see a doctor?
   B: Yes, the formidable neurologist.

39 A: Did Matthew esteem the French carpenter that restored an elegant piece of furniture from the 16th century?
   B: The empty garage.

40 A: Did John fancy the plumber that was in the fashionable design magazine?
   B: Yes, he has talked about him yet.
1. B’s reply is incoherent
2. B’s reply is odd but comprehensible
3. B’s reply is perfectly natural

41. A: Did Dean organize the wonderful wedding in the park?
   B: No, the edge of the cliff.

42. A: Did Claire invite the annoying bookseller that recommended a useful guide book for a backpacking holiday?
   B: Yes, the new ‘Lonely Planet’.

43. A: Did Lorelai doubt the fact that Luke was fond of Sookie’s three course meal?
   B: Yes, with the carrot soup.

44. A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?
   B: Chinese martial arts.

45. A: Did Sally date the crazy pickpocket that stole an expensive car with leather seats?
   B: No, the rickety bike.

46. A: Did the attentive receptionist take care of the coats?
   B: No, he minded help the guests.

47. A: Did Grace reply anything when her mother reproached her for her bad geography mark?
   B: She was not responsible since it was her teacher’s fault.

48. A: Did the retired baker borrow an essential ingredient for the wedding cake?
   B: Yes, the roasted hazelnuts.

49. A: Did William regret the statement that he loves his guitar better than Martha?
   B: No, his cello.

50. A: Did the touchy undertaker receive a birthday present from his brother?
   B: Yes, the comfortable armchair.
This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i)  A: How are you?
     B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did Kim mention what Wayne built the tiny garden shed with the crooked roof for?</th>
<th>B: Yes, the artistic roof.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A: Did Leonard introduce you to the talented mechanic that Marc recommended?</td>
<td>B: At the Café de Paris.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?</td>
<td>B: No, Mexico.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A: Did James encounter the amiable fireman that bought a weatherproof garment of good quality?</td>
<td>B: The entertaining DVD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A: Did William regret the statement that he loves his guitar better than Martha?</td>
<td>B: No, his cello.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A: Did John fancy the plumber that was in the fashionable design magazine?</td>
<td>B: Yes, he has talked about him yet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A: Did the fat mafia boss choose a nice pasta dish from the menu?</td>
<td>B: The savoury spaghetti.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A: Did Alex dislike the musician that was recently hired by Greg?</td>
<td>B: Yes, the dreadful pianist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A: Did Lindsay deny anything when questioned by the police?</td>
<td>B: She met with a stranger.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A: Did Jeff marry the elderly gardener that ate a tasty vegetable from our garden?</td>
<td>B: The ripe tomato.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 A: Did Maude invite the miserable lumberjack to her birthday party?
   B: To her wedding.

12 A: Did Bill explain to you why his sister has been behaving so oddly?
   B: His brother.

13 A: Did the boring broker purchase a valuable piece of jewellery by the young designer?
   B: The comfortable jeans.

14 A: Did Jeannie go to a hotel in Northern Austria?
   B: Yes, the recommendable spa.

15 A: Did Maxine adore the designer that helped her choose the pendant lamp for the kitchen?
   B: No, Francis.

16 A: Did the well-dressed lady claim anything in respect to her whereabouts at the time of the crime?
   B: She need leave house for her afternoon walk.

17 A: Did Peter see the clever federal agent that enjoyed a starter from the cold buffet?
   B: No, the delicious ice cream.

18 A: Did Sabrina mourn her aunt that she used to stay with when she was little?
   B: No, her favourite uncle.

19 A: Did the shy student study an important philosopher from classical antiquity?
   B: No, the brilliant Mozart.

20 A: Did Tony come to the conclusion that Rick took his beloved dog?
   B: No, Rick had anything to do with it.
B’s reply is incoherent

B’s reply is odd but comprehensible

B’s reply is perfectly natural

21 A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
    B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

22 A: Did Rufus call the friendly painter that painted a big room of his mother’s house?
    B: Yes, the spacious kitchen.

23 A: Did Lorelai doubt the fact that Luke was fond of Sookie’s three course meal?
    B: Yes, with the carrot soup.

24 A: Did the outstanding teacher sell a popular book by Jane Austen?
    B: Yes, the much-loved ‘Pride and Prejudice’.

25 A: Did the chambermaid that stole money from the guests demand anything after she was fired?
    B: She would get a fair trial.

26 A: Did the attentive receptionist take care of the coats?
    B: No, he minded help the guests.

27 A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
    B: Yes, to the opera.

28 A: Did Katherine greet the reliable postman that owned a good-natured dog of considerable size?
    B: No, the extensive record collection.

29 A: Did the strong butcher save the little kittens from drowning?
    B: In the rain barrel.

30 A: Did the newly-hired chef ask himself the question whether the restaurant should offer a special meal of the day?
    B: No, the fancy bar.
1 B’s reply is incoherent

2 B’s reply is odd but comprehensible

3 B’s reply is perfectly natural

31 A: Did Grace reply anything when her mother reproached her for her bad geography mark?
   B: She was not responsible since it was her teacher’s fault.

32 A: Did the troublesome class read an influential drama by Shakespeare?
   B: Yes, the famous ‘Macbeth’.

33 A: Did Abby ask Jim what he wore to the dance?
   B: Yes, his uncle’s old suit.

34 A: Did Sally date the crazy pickpocket that stole an expensive car with leather seats?
   B: Yes, the black Porsche.

35 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.

36 A: Did the forgetful clown learn a Slavic language?
   B: No, English.

37 A: Did the retired baker borrow an essential ingredient for the wedding cake?
   B: The huge grandfather clock.

38 A: Did the good-natured computer programmer go to see a doctor?
   B: Yes, the formidable neurologist.

39 A: Did Matthew esteem the French carpenter that restored an elegant piece of furniture from the 16th century?
   B: The exquisite coffee table.

40 A: Did Anna e-mail you the time when they would pick us up at the station?
   B: Yes, she e-mailed me at all.
B’s reply is incoherent

B’s reply is odd but comprehensible

B’s reply is perfectly natural

41 A: Did Dean organize the wonderful wedding in the park?
B: No, the edge of the cliff.

dropdown

42 A: Did the irritating artist draw a fascinating building with several steeples?
B: The colourful castle.

dropdown

43 A: Did Lauren reveal what she really thinks about Karen and Rupert?
B: No, Geraldine and Adam.

dropdown

44 A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?
B: Chinese martial arts.

dropdown

45 A: Did Claire invite the annoying bookseller that recommended a useful guide book for a backpacking holiday?
B: The faded map.

dropdown

46 A: Did the pessimistic salesman add anything to the enthusiastic speech given by the company owner?
B: He and his co-workers ever deserved to get paid.

dropdown

47 A: Did Ted concede anything regarding his relationship with Melanie?
B: He asked her to marry him years ago.

dropdown

48 A: Did the absent-minded handyman leave a vital tool at his workshop?
B: No, the home-made tuna sandwich.

dropdown

49 A: Did Jerry give away the reason why he took so many pictures of the Japanese tourists in front of the Eiffel tower?
B: No, the Tower Bridge.

dropdown

50 A: Did the touchy undertaker receive a birthday present from his brother?
B: Yes, the comfortable armchair.

dropdown
Questionnaire 4

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incoherent</td>
<td>but comprehensible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1 A: Did Lauren reveal what she really thinks about Karen and Rupert?
   B: No, Geraldine and Adam.

2 A: Did Leonard introduce you to the talented mechanic that Marc recommended?
   B: At the Café de Paris.

3 A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
   B: No, Mexico.

4 A: Did Amy arrest the fat mafia boss that chose a nice pasta dish from the menu?
   B: Yes, the savoury spaghetti.

5 A: Did Abby ask Jim what he wore to the dance?
   B: Yes, his uncle’s old suit.

6 A: Did the attentive receptionist take care of the coats?
   B: No, he minded help the guests.

7 A: Did the friendly painter paint a big room of his mother’s house?
   B: The antique front door.

8 A: Did Alex dislike the musician that was recently hired by Greg?
   B: Yes, the dreadful pianist.

9 A: Did Grace reply anything when her mother reproached her for her bad geography mark?
   B: She was not responsible since it was her teacher’s fault.

10 A: Did the elderly gardener eat a tasty vegetable from our garden?
    B: No, the old yoghurt.
11 A: Did Maude invite the miserable lumberjack to her birthday party?
   B: To her wedding.

12 A: Did William regret the statement that he loves his guitar better than Martha?
   B: No, his cello.

13 A: Did Paul contact the outstanding teacher that sold a popular book by Jane Austen?
   B: The much-loved ‘Pride and Prejudice’.

14 A: Did Jeannie go to a hotel in Northern Austria?
   B: Yes, the recommendable spa.

15 A: Did Maxine adore the designer that helped her choose the pendant lamp for the kitchen?
   B: No, Francis.

16 A: Did Anna e-mail you the time when they would pick us up at the station?
   B: Yes, she e-mailed me at all.

17 A: Did the clever federal agent enjoy a starter from the cold buffet?
   B: Yes, the Greek salad.

18 A: Did Sabrina mourn her aunt that she used to stay with when she was little?
   B: No, her favourite uncle.

19 A: Did Jane meet the shy student that studied an important philosopher from classical antiquity?
   B: The brilliant Mozart.

20 A: Did John fancy the plumber that was in the fashionable design magazine?
   B: Yes, he has talked about him yet.
21 A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
   B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

22 A: Did the amiable fireman buy a weatherproof garment of good quality?
   B: The oversized raincoat.

23 A: Did Bill explain to you why his sister has been behaving so oddly?
   B: His brother.

24 A: Did Vanessa know the boring broker that purchased a valuable piece of jewellery by the young designer?
   B: No, the comfortable jeans.

25 A: Did the chambermaid that stole money from the guests demand anything after she was fired?
   B: She would get a fair trial.

26 A: Did the well-dressed lady claim anything in respect to her whereabouts at the time of the crime?
   B: She need leave house for her afternoon walk.

27 A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
   B: Yes, to the opera.

28 A: Did the annoying bookseller recommend a useful guide book for a backpacking holiday?
   B: The new ‘Lonely Planet’.

29 A: Did the strong butcher save the little kittens from drowning?
   B: In the rain barrel.

30 A: Did Jerry give away the reason why he took so many pictures of the Japanese tourists in front of the Eiffel tower?
   B: No, the Tower Bridge.
B’s reply is incoherent

B’s reply is odd but comprehensible

B’s reply is perfectly natural

31 A: Did Ted concede anything regarding his relationship with Melanie?
   B: He asked her to marry him years ago.

32 A: Did Brian phone the retired baker that borrowed an essential ingredient for the wedding cake?
   B: No, the huge grandfather clock.

33 A: Did Lorelai doubt the fact that Luke was fond of Sookie’s three course meal?
   B: Yes, with the carrot soup.

34 A: Did the reliable postman own a good-natured dog of considerable size?
   B: Yes, the drooling Saint Bernard.

35 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.

36 A: Did the forgetful clown learn a Slavic language?
   B: No, English.

37 A: Did Emma accompany the absent-minded handyman that left a vital tool at his workshop?
   B: The home-made tuna sandwich.

38 A: Did the good-natured computer programmer go to see a doctor?
   B: Yes, the formidable neurologist.

39 A: Did the French carpenter restore an elegant piece of furniture from the 16th century?
   B: No, the empty garage.

40 A: Did Tony come to the conclusion that Rick took his beloved dog?
   B: No, Rick had anything to do with it.
B’s reply is incoherent

B’s reply is odd but comprehensible

B’s reply is perfectly natural

41 A: Did Dean organize the wonderful wedding in the park?
   B: No, the edge of the cliff.

42 A: Did Mary teach the troublesome class that read an influential drama by Shakespeare?
   B: The famous ‘Macbeth’.

43 A: Did Kim mention what Wayne built the tiny garden shed with the crooked roof for?
   B: Yes, the artistic roof.

44 A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?
   B: Chinese martial arts.

45 A: Did the crazy pickpocket steal an expensive car with leather seats?
   B: The rickety bike.

46 A: Did the pessimistic salesman add anything to the enthusiastic speech given by the company owner?
   B: He and his co-workers ever deserved to get paid.

47 A: Did Lindsay deny anything when questioned by the police?
   B: She met with a stranger.

48 A: Did Sam recognize the irritating artist that drew a fascinating building with several steeples?
   B: Yes, the colourful castle.

49 A: Did the newly-hired chef ask himself the question whether the restaurant should offer a special meal of the day?
   B: No, the fancy bar.

50 A: Did the touchy undertaker receive a birthday present from his brother?
   B: Yes, the comfortable armchair.
Questionnaire 5

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is but comprehensible</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1 A: Did Bill explain to you why his sister has been behaving so oddly?
   B: His brother.    dropdown

2 A: Did Leonard introduce you to the talented mechanic that Marc recommended?
   B: At the Café de Paris.  dropdown

3 A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
   B: No, Mexico.  dropdown

4 A: Did Paul contact the outstanding teacher that sold a popular book by Jane Austen?
   B: No, the green cherry pit pillow.  dropdown

5 A: Did Kim mention what Wayne built the tiny garden shed with the crooked roof for?
   B: Yes, the artistic roof.  dropdown

6 A: Did Tony come to the conclusion that Rick took his beloved dog?
   B: No, Rick had anything to do with it.  dropdown

7 A: Did the elderly gardener eat a tasty vegetable from our garden?
   B: Yes, the ripe tomato.  dropdown

8 A: Did Alex dislike the musician that was recently hired by Greg?
   B: Yes, the dreadful pianist.  dropdown

9 A: Did the chambermaid that stole money from the guests demand anything after she was fired?
   B: She would get a fair trial.  dropdown

10 A: Did Vanessa know the boring broker that purchased a valuable piece of jewellery by the young designer?
    B: Yes, the stunning necklace.  dropdown
11 A: Did Maude invite the miserable lumberjack to her birthday party?
   B: To her wedding.

12 A: Did Lorelai doubt the fact that Luke was fond of Sookie’s three course meal?
   B: Yes, with the carrot soup.

13 A: Did the amiable fireman buy a weatherproof garment of good quality?
   B: No, the entertaining DVD.

14 A: Did Jeannie go to a hotel in Northern Austria?
   B: Yes, the recommendable spa.

15 A: Did Maxine adore the designer that helped her choose the pendant lamp for the kitchen?
   B: No, Francis.

16 A: Did John fancy the plumber that was in the fashionable design magazine?
   B: Yes, he has talked about him yet.

17 A: Did Jane meet the shy student that studied an important philosopher from classical antiquity?
   B: The great Aristotle.

18 A: Did Sabrina mourn her aunt that she used to stay with when she was little?
   B: No, her favourite uncle.

19 A: Did the friendly painter paint a big room of his mother’s house?
   B: The spacious kitchen.

20 A: Did Anna e-mail you the time when they would pick us up at the station?
   B: Yes, she e-mailed me at all.
B’s reply is incoherent

B’s reply is odd but comprehensible

B’s reply is perfectly natural

21 A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

22 A: Did Amy arrest the fat mafia boss that chose a nice pasta dish from the menu?
B: The Hawaiian liquor.

23 A: Did the newly-hired chef ask himself the question whether the restaurant should offer a special meal of the day?
B: No, the fancy bar.

24 A: Did the clever federal agent enjoy a starter from the cold buffet?
B: The delicious ice cream.

25 A: Did Grace reply anything when her mother reproached her for her bad geography mark?
B: She was not responsible since it was her teacher’s fault.

26 A: Did the pessimistic salesman add anything to the enthusiastic speech given by the company owner?
B: He and his co-workers ever deserved to get paid.

27 A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
B: Yes, to the opera.

28 A: Did Emma accompany the absent-minded handyman that left a vital tool at his workshop?
B: The handy hammer drill.

29 A: Did the strong butcher save the little kittens from drowning?
B: In the rain barrel.

30 A: Did Lauren reveal what she really thinks about Karen and Rupert?
B: No, Geraldine and Adam.
31 A: Did Lindsay deny anything when questioned by the police?
   B: She met with a stranger.

32 A: Did the crazy pickpocket steal an expensive car with leather seats?
   B: The black Porsche.

33 A: Did William regret the statement that he loves his guitar better than Martha?
   B: No, his cello.

34 A: Did Sam recognize the irritating artist that drew a fascinating building with several steeples?
   B: The sunny beach scene.

35 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.

36 A: Did the forgetful clown learn a Slavic language?
   B: No, English.

37 A: Did the French carpenter restore an elegant piece of furniture from the 16th century?
   B: Yes, the exquisite coffee table.

38 A: Did the good-natured computer programmer go to see a doctor?
   B: Yes, the formidable neurologist.

39 A: Did Mary teach the troublesome class that read an influential drama by Shakespeare?
   B: No, the creepy vampire novel.

40 A: Did the attentive receptionist take care of the coats?
   B: No, he minded help the guests.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did Dean organize the wonderful wedding in the park?</th>
<th>B: No, the edge of the cliff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did the annoying bookseller recommend a useful guide book for a backpacking holiday?</th>
<th>B: No, the faded map.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did Jerry give away the reason why he took so many pictures of the Japanese tourists in front of the Eiffel tower?</th>
<th>B: No, the Tower Bridge.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?</th>
<th>B: Chinese martial arts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did Brian phone the retired baker that borrowed an essential ingredient for the wedding cake?</th>
<th>B: Yes, the roasted hazelnuts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did the well-dressed lady claim anything in respect to her whereabouts at the time of the crime?</th>
<th>B: She need leave house for her afternoon walk.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did Ted concede anything regarding his relationship with Melanie?</th>
<th>B: He asked her to marry him years ago.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did the reliable postman own a good-natured dog of considerable size?</th>
<th>B: The extensive record collection.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did Abby ask Jim what he wore to the dance?</th>
<th>B: Yes, his uncle’s old suit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did the touchy undertaker receive a birthday present from his brother?</th>
<th>B: Yes, the comfortable armchair.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire 6

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
   (Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1 A: Did Lorelai doubt the fact that Luke was fond of Sookie’s three course meal?
   B: Yes, with the carrot soup.

2 A: Did Leonard introduce you to the talented mechanic that Marc recommended?
   B: At the Café de Paris.

3 A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
   B: No, Mexico.

4 A: Did the fat mafia boss choose a nice pasta dish from the menu?
   B: No, the Hawaiian liquor.

5 A: Did Jerry give away the reason why he took so many pictures of the Japanese tourists in front of the Eiffel tower?
   B: No, the Tower Bridge.

6 A: Did the well-dressed lady claim anything in respect to her whereabouts at the time of the crime?
   B: She need leave house for her afternoon walk.

7 A: Did James encounter the amiable fireman that bought a weatherproof garment of good quality?
   B: The oversized raincoat.

8 A: Did Alex dislike the musician that was recently hired by Greg?
   B: Yes, the dreadful pianist.

9 A: Did Ted concede anything regarding his relationship with Melanie?
   B: He asked her to marry him years ago.

10 A: Did the outstanding teacher sell a popular book by Jane Austen?
    B: The green cherry pit pillow.
11 A: Did Maude invite the miserable lumberjack to her birthday party?
   B: To her wedding.

12 A: Did Abby ask Jim what he wore to the dance?
   B: Yes, his uncle’s old suit.

13 A: Did Peter see the clever federal agent that enjoyed a starter from the cold buffet?
   B: Yes, the Greek salad.

14 A: Did Jeannie go to a hotel in Northern Austria?
   B: Yes, the recommendable spa.

15 A: Did Maxine adore the designer that helped her choose the pendant lamp for the kitchen?
   B: No, Francis.

16 A: Did Tony come to the conclusion that Rick took his beloved dog?
   B: No, Rick had anything to do with it.

17 A: Did the boring broker purchase a valuable piece of jewellery by the young designer?
   B: The stunning necklace.

18 A: Did Sabrina mourn her aunt that she used to stay with when she was little?
   B: No, her favourite uncle.

19 A: Did Jeff marry the elderly gardener that ate a tasty vegetable from our garden?
   B: No, the old yoghurt.

20 A: Did the pessimistic salesman add anything to the enthusiastic speech given by the company owner?
   B: He and his co-workers ever deserved to get paid.
21 A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
   B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

22 A: Did the shy student study an important philosopher from classical antiquity?
   B: Yes, the great Aristotle.

23 A: Did Kim mention what Wayne built the tiny garden shed with the crooked roof for?
   B: Yes, the artistic roof.

24 A: Did Rufus call the friendly painter that painted a big room of his mother’s house?
   B: The antique front door.

25 A: Did Grace reply anything when her mother reproached her for her bad geography mark?
   B: She was not responsible since it was her teacher’s fault.

26 A: Did the attentive receptionist take care of the coats?
   B: No, he minded help the guests.

27 A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
   B: Yes, to the opera.

28 A: Did the absent-minded handyman leave a vital tool at his workshop?
   B: Yes, the handy hammer drill.

29 A: Did the strong butcher save the little kittens from drowning?
   B: In the rain barrel.

30 A: Did William regret the statement that he loves his guitar better than Martha?
   B: No, his cello.
31 A: Did the chambermaid that stole money from the guests demand anything after she was fired?
   B: She would get a fair trial.
32 A: Did Sally date the crazy pickpocket that stole an expensive car with leather seats?
   B: The rickety bike.
33 A: Did the newly-hired chef ask himself the question whether the restaurant should offer a special meal of the day?
   B: No, the fancy bar.
34 A: Did the retired baker borrow an essential ingredient for the wedding cake?
   B: The roasted hazelnuts.
35 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.
36 A: Did the forgetful clown learn a Slavic language?
   B: No, English.
37 A: Did Matthew esteem the French carpenter that restored an elegant piece of furniture from the 16th century?
   B: No, the empty garage.
38 A: Did the good-natured computer programmer go to see a doctor?
   B: Yes, the formidable neurologist.
39 A: Did Katherine greet the reliable postman that owned a good-natured dog of considerable size?
   B: Yes, the drooling Saint Bernard.
40 A: Did John fancy the plumber that was in the fashionable design magazine?
   B: Yes, he has talked about him yet.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did Dean organize the wonderful wedding in the park?</th>
<th>B: No, the edge of the cliff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did the troublesome class read an influential drama by Shakespeare?</th>
<th>B: The creepy vampire novel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did Bill explain to you why his sister has been behaving so oddly?</th>
<th>B: His brother.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?</th>
<th>B: Chinese martial arts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did the irritating artist draw a fascinating building with several steeples?</th>
<th>B: No, the sunny beach scene.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did Anna e-mail you the time when they would pick us up at the station?</th>
<th>B: Yes, she e-mailed me at all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did Lindsay deny anything when questioned by the police?</th>
<th>B: She met with a stranger.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did Claire invite the annoying bookseller that recommended a useful guide book for a backpacking holiday?</th>
<th>B: The new ‘Lonely Planet’.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did Lauren reveal what she really thinks about Karen and Rupert?</th>
<th>B: No, Geraldine and Adam.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A: Did the touchy undertaker receive a birthday present from his brother?</th>
<th>B: Yes, the comfortable armchair.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire 7

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

```
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
B’s reply is incoherent        B’s reply is odd        B’s reply is perfectly natural
B’s reply is but comprehensible
```

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1. A: Did the newly-hired chef ask himself the question whether the restaurant should offer a special meal of the day?
   B: No, the fancy bar.

2. A: Did Leonard introduce you to the talented mechanic that Marc recommended?
   B: At the Café de Paris.

3. A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
   B: No, Mexico.

4. A: Did the outstanding teacher sell a popular book by Jane Austen?
   B: The much-loved ‘Pride and Prejudice’.

5. A: Did Lorelai doubt the fact that Luke was fond of Sookie’s three course meal?
   B: Yes, with the carrot soup.

6. A: Did the attentive receptionist take care of the coats?
   B: No, he minded help the guests.

7. A: Did James encounter the amiable fireman that bought a weatherproof garment of good quality?
   B: No, the entertaining DVD.

8. A: Did Alex dislike the musician that was recently hired by Greg?
   B: Yes, the dreadful pianist.

9. A: Did Grace reply anything when her mother reproached her for her bad geography mark?
   B: She was not responsible since it was her teacher’s fault.

10. A: Did the fat mafia boss choose a nice pasta dish from the menu?
    B: Yes, the savoury spaghetti.
A: Did Maude invite the miserable lumberjack to her birthday party?
B: To her wedding.

A: Did Lauren reveal what she really thinks about Karen and Rupert?
B: No, Geraldine and Adam.

A: Did Peter see the clever federal agent that enjoyed a starter from the cold buffet?
B: The delicious ice cream.

A: Did Jeannie go to a hotel in Northern Austria?
B: Yes, the recommendable spa.

A: Did Maxine adore the designer that helped her choose the pendant lamp for the kitchen?
B: No, Francis.

A: Did the pessimistic salesman add anything to the enthusiastic speech given by the company owner?
B: He and his co-workers ever deserved to get paid.

A: Did the boring broker purchase a valuable piece of jewellery by the young designer?
B: No, the comfortable jeans.

A: Did Sabrina mourn her aunt that she used to stay with when she was little?
B: No, her favourite uncle.

A: Did Rufus call the friendly painter that painted a big room of his mother’s house?
B: The spacious kitchen.

A: Did the well-dressed lady claim anything in respect to her whereabouts at the time of the crime?
B: She need leave house for her afternoon walk.
21 A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
   B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

22 A: Did the shy student study an important philosopher from classical antiquity?
   B: The brilliant Mozart.

23 A: Did William regret the statement that he loves his guitar better than Martha?
   B: No, his cello.

24 A: Did Jeff marry the elderly gardener that ate a tasty vegetable from our garden?
   B: Yes, the ripe tomato.

25 A: Did Lindsay deny anything when questioned by the police?
   B: She met with a stranger.

26 A: Did John fancy the plumber that was in the fashionable design magazine?
   B: Yes, he has talked about him yet.

27 A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
   B: Yes, to the opera.

28 A: Did Matthew esteem the French carpenter that restored an elegant piece of furniture from the 16th century?
   B: Yes, the exquisite coffee table.

29 A: Did the strong butcher save the little kittens from drowning?
   B: In the rain barrel.

30 A: Did Bill explain to you why his sister has been behaving so oddly?
   B: His brother.
31 A: Did Ted concede anything regarding his relationship with Melanie?
   B: He asked her to marry him years ago.

32 A: Did the absent-minded handyman leave a vital tool at his workshop?
   B: The home-made tuna sandwich.

33 A: Did Jerry give away the reason why he took so many pictures of the Japanese tourists in front of the Eiffel tower?
   B: No, the Tower Bridge.

34 A: Did the retired baker borrow an essential ingredient for the wedding cake?
   B: No, the huge grandfather clock.

35 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.

36 A: Did the forgetful clown learn a Slavic language?
   B: No, English.

37 A: Did Sally date the crazy pickpocket that stole an expensive car with leather seats?
   B: The black Porsche.

38 A: Did the good-natured computer programmer go to see a doctor?
   B: Yes, the formidable neurologist.

39 A: Did the irritating artist draw a fascinating building with several steeples?
   B: Yes, the colourful castle.

40 A: Did Anna e-mail you the time when they would pick us up at the station?
   B: Yes, she e-mailed me at all.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 A: Did Dean organize the wonderful wedding in the park?  
B: No, the edge of the cliff.  

42 A: Did Katherine greet the reliable postman that owned a good-natured dog of considerable size?  
B: The extensive record collection.  

43 A: Did Abby ask Jim what he wore to the dance?  
B: Yes, his uncle’s old suit.  

44 A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?  
B: Chinese martial arts.  

45 A: Did the troublesome class read an influential drama by Shakespeare?  
B: The famous ‘Macbeth’.  

46 A: Did Tony come to the conclusion that Rick took his beloved dog?  
B: No, Rick had anything to do with it.  

47 A: Did the chambermaid that stole money from the guests demand anything after she was fired?  
B: She would get a fair trial.  

48 A: Did Claire invite the annoying bookseller that recommended a useful guide book for a backpacking holiday?  
B: No, the faded map.  

49 A: Did Kim mention what Wayne built the tiny garden shed with the crooked roof for?  
B: Yes, the artistic roof.  

50 A: Did the touchy undertaker receive a birthday present from his brother?  
B: Yes, the comfortable armchair.
Questionnaire 8

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1. A: Did William regret the statement that he loves his guitar better than Martha?
   B: No, his cello.

2. A: Did Leonard introduce you to the talented mechanic that Marc recommended?
   B: At the Café de Paris.

3. A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
   B: No, Mexico.

4. A: Did the friendly painter paint a big room of his mother’s house?
   B: Yes, the spacious kitchen.

5. A: Did Lauren reveal what she really thinks about Karen and Rupert?
   B: No, Geraldine and Adam.

6. A: Did the well-dressed lady claim anything in respect to her whereabouts at the time of the crime?
   B: She need leave house for her afternoon walk.

7. A: Did Paul contact the outstanding teacher that sold a popular book by Jane Austen?
   B: The green cherry pit pillow.

8. A: Did Alex dislike the musician that was recently hired by Greg?
   B: Yes, the dreadful pianist.

9. A: Did Ted concede anything regarding his relationship with Melanie?
   B: He asked her to marry him years ago.

10. A: Did the elderly gardener eat a tasty vegetable from our garden?
    B: The ripe tomato.
11 A: Did Maude invite the miserable lumberjack to her birthday party?
B: To her wedding.

12 A: Did Jerry give away the reason why he took so many pictures of the Japanese tourists in front of the Eiffel tower?
B: No, the Tower Bridge.

13 A: Did Amy arrest the fat mafia boss that chose a nice pasta dish from the menu?
B: No, the Hawaiian liquor.

14 A: Did Jeannie go to a hotel in Northern Austria?
B: Yes, the recommendable spa.

15 A: Did Maxine adore the designer that helped her choose the pendant lamp for the kitchen?
B: No, Francis.

16 A: Did the attentive receptionist take care of the coats?
B: No, he minded help the guests.

17 A: Did Jane meet the shy student that studied an important philosopher from classical antiquity?
B: Yes, the great Aristotle.

18 A: Did Sabrina mourn her aunt that she used to stay with when she was little?
B: No, her favourite uncle.

19 A: Did the amiable fireman buy a weatherproof garment of good quality?
B: The entertaining DVD.

20 A: Did Tony come to the conclusion that Rick took his beloved dog?
B: No, Rick had anything to do with it.
21  A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
   B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

22  A: Did the clever federal agent enjoy a starter from the cold buffet?
   B: No, the delicious ice cream.

23  A: Did Abby ask Jim what he wore to the dance?
   B: Yes, his uncle’s old suit.

24  A: Did Vanessa know the boring broker that purchased a valuable piece of jewellery by the young designer?
   B: The stunning necklace.

25  A: Did Lindsay deny anything when questioned by the police?
   B: She met with a stranger.

26  A: Did Anna e-mail you the time when they would pick us up at the station?
   B: Yes, she e-mailed me at all.

27  A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
   B: Yes, to the opera.

28  A: Did the reliable postman own a good-natured dog of considerable size?
   B: No, the extensive record collection.

29  A: Did the strong butcher save the little kittens from drowning?
   B: In the rain barrel.

30  A: Did Lorelai doubt the fact that Luke was fond of Sookie’s three course meal?
   B: Yes, with the carrot soup.
B’s reply is incoherent

B’s reply is odd but comprehensible

B’s reply is perfectly natural

31 A: Did the chambermaid that stole money from the guests demand anything after she was fired?
   B: She would get a fair trial.

32 A: Did Brian phone the retired baker that borrowed an essential ingredient for the wedding cake?
   B: The roasted hazelnuts.

33 A: Did Kim mention what Wayne built the tiny garden shed with the crooked roof for?
   B: Yes, the artistic roof.

34 A: Did the annoying bookseller recommend a useful guide book for a backpacking holiday?
   B: The faded map.

35 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.

36 A: Did the forgetful clown learn a Slavic language?
   B: No, English.

37 A: Did Emma accompany the absent-minded handyman that left a vital tool at his workshop?
   B: Yes, the handy hammer drill.

38 A: Did the good-natured computer programmer go to see a doctor?
   B: Yes, the formidable neurologist.

39 A: Did the French carpenter restore an elegant piece of furniture from the 16th century?
   B: The exquisite coffee table.

40 A: Did the pessimistic salesman add anything to the enthusiastic speech given by the company owner?
   B: He and his co-workers ever deserved to get paid.
41 A: Did Dean organize the wonderful wedding in the park?
   B: No, the edge of the cliff.

42 A: Did Sam recognize the irritating artist that drew a fascinating building with several steeples?
   B: No, the sunny beach scene.

43 A: Did the newly-hired chef ask himself the question whether the restaurant should offer a special meal of the day?
   B: No, the fancy bar.

44 A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?
   B: Chinese martial arts.

45 A: Did the crazy pickpocket steal an expensive car with leather seats?
   B: Yes, the black Porsche.

46 A: Did John fancy the plumber that was in the fashionable design magazine?
   B: Yes, he has talked about him yet.

47 A: Did Grace reply anything when her mother reproached her for her bad geography mark?
   B: She was not responsible since it was her teacher’s fault.

48 A: Did Mary teach the troublesome class that read an influential drama by Shakespeare?
   B: The creepy vampire novel.

49 A: Did Bill explain to you why his sister has been behaving so oddly?
   B: His brother.

50 A: Did the touchy undertaker receive a birthday present from his brother?
   B: Yes, the comfortable armchair.
Exemplary Completed and Anonymised Questionnaire 8

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies.
You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues.
Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
A: Did William regret the statement that he loves his guitar better than Martha?
B: No, his cello.

A: Did Leonard introduce you to the talented mechanic that Marc recommended?
B: At the Café de Paris.

A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
B: No, Mexico.

A: Did the friendly painter paint a big room of his mother’s house?
B: Yes, the spacious kitchen.

A: Did Lauren reveal what she really thinks about Karen and Rupert?
B: No, Geraldine and Adam.

A: Did the well-dressed lady claim anything in respect to her whereabouts at the time of the crime?
B: She need leave house for her afternoon walk.

A: Did Paul contact the outstanding teacher that sold a popular book by Jane Austen?
B: The green cherry pit pillow.

A: Did Alex dislike the musician that was recently hired by Greg?
B: Yes, the dreadful pianist.

A: Did Ted concede anything regarding his relationship with Melanie?
B: He asked her to marry him years ago.

A: Did the elderly gardener eat a tasty vegetable from our garden?
B: The ripe tomato.
11 A: Did Maude invite the miserable lumberjack to her birthday party?
B: To her wedding.

12 A: Did Jerry give away the reason why he took so many pictures of the Japanese tourists in front of the Eiffel tower?
B: No, the Tower Bridge.

13 A: Did Amy arrest the fat mafia boss that chose a nice pasta dish from the menu?
B: No, the Hawaiian liquor.

14 A: Did Jeannie go to a hotel in Northern Austria?
B: Yes, the recommendable spa.

15 A: Did Maxine adore the designer that helped her choose the pendant lamp for the kitchen?
B: No, Francis.

16 A: Did the attentive receptionist take care of the coats?
B: No, he minded help the guests.

17 A: Did Jane meet the shy student that studied an important philosopher from classical antiquity?
B: Yes, the great Aristotle.

18 A: Did Sabrina mourn her aunt that she used to stay with when she was little?
B: No, her favourite uncle.

19 A: Did the amiable fireman buy a weatherproof garment of good quality?
B: The entertaining DVD.

20 A: Did Tony come to the conclusion that Rick took his beloved dog?
B: No, Rick had anything to do with it.
B's reply is incoherent

B's reply is odd but comprehensible

B's reply is perfectly natural

21 A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
   B: No, the young children on the whole plane.  5

22 A: Did the clever federal agent enjoy a starter from the cold buffet?
   B: No, the delicious ice cream.  5

23 A: Did Abby ask Jim what he wore to the dance?
   B: Yes, his uncle’s old suit.  2

24 A: Did Vanessa know the boring broker that purchased a valuable piece of jewellery by the young designer?
   B: The stunning necklace.  2

25 A: Did Lindsay deny anything when questioned by the police?
   B: She met with a stranger.  4

26 A: Did Anna e-mail you the time when they would pick us up at the station?
   B: Yes, she e-mailed me at all.  1

27 A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
   B: Yes, to the opera.  7

28 A: Did the reliable postman own a good-natured dog of considerable size?
   B: No, the extensive record collection.  2

29 A: Did the strong butcher save the little kittens from drowning?
   B: In the rain barrel.  4

30 A: Did Lorelai doubt the fact that Luke was fond of Sookie’s three course meal?
   B: Yes, with the carrot soup.  2
B’s reply is incoherent

B’s reply is odd but comprehensible

B’s reply is perfectly natural

31 A: Did the chambermaid that stole money from the guests demand anything after she was fired?
   B: She would get a fair trial.

32 A: Did Brian phone the retired baker that borrowed an essential ingredient for the wedding cake?
   B: The roasted hazelnuts.

33 A: Did Kim mention what Wayne built the tiny garden shed with the crooked roof for?
   B: Yes, the artistic roof.

34 A: Did the annoying bookseller recommend a useful guide book for a backpacking holiday?
   B: The faded map.

35 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.

36 A: Did the forgetful clown learn a Slavic language?
   B: No, English.

37 A: Did Emma accompany the absent-minded handyman that left a vital tool at his workshop?
   B: Yes, the handy hammer drill.

38 A: Did the good-natured computer programmer go to see a doctor?
   B: Yes, the formidable neurologist.

39 A: Did the French carpenter restore an elegant piece of furniture from the 16th century?
   B: The exquisite coffee table.

40 A: Did the pessimistic salesman add anything to the enthusiastic speech given by the company owner?
   B: He and his co-workers ever deserved to get paid.
41 A: Did Dean organize the wonderful wedding in the park?
   B: No, the edge of the cliff. 2

42 A: Did Sam recognize the irritating artist that drew a fascinating building with several steeples?
   B: No, the sunny beach scene. 1

43 A: Did the newly-hired chef ask himself the question whether the restaurant should offer a special meal of the day?
   B: No, the fancy bar. 1

44 A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?
   B: Chinese martial arts. 7

45 A: Did the crazy pickpocket steal an expensive car with leather seats?
   B: Yes, the black Porsche. 7

46 A: Did John fancy the plumber that was in the fashionable design magazine?
   B: Yes, he has talked about him yet. 1

47 A: Did Grace reply anything when her mother reproached her for her bad geography mark?
   B: She was not responsible since it was her teacher’s fault. 7

48 A: Did Mary teach the troublesome class that read an influential drama by Shakespeare?
   B: The creepy vampire novel. 1

49 A: Did Bill explain to you why his sister has been behaving so oddly?
   B: His brother. 1

50 A: Did the touchy undertaker receive a birthday present from his brother?
   B: Yes, the comfortable armchair. 7
Additional Questionnaire 1

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1 A: Did Daisy want for Justin to meet the good-looking nurse?  
B: No, for Liam to meet.

2 A: Did Leonard claim that Tobias eats salad?  
B: No, that eats soup.

3 A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?  
B: Chinese martial arts.

4 A: Did Damon think that Patrick fancies Yvonne?  
B: Yes, and that fancies Eleanor.

5 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?  
B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.

6 A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?  
B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

7 A: Did Wendy say that Natasha loves Humphrey?  
B: No, that loves Gavin.

8 A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?  
B: No, Mexico.

9 A: Did Louise wear the green dress?  
B: Yes, and the blue Deborah.

10 A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?  
B: Yes, to the opera.
Additional Questionnaire 2

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
   (Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Did Louise wear the green dress?</td>
<td>B: Yes, and the blue Deborah.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?</td>
<td>B: No, the young children on the whole plane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Did Leonard claim that Tobias eats salad?</td>
<td>B: No, that eats soup.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?</td>
<td>B: Yes, to the opera.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Did Wendy say that Natasha loves Humphrey?</td>
<td>B: No, that loves Gavin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?</td>
<td>B: No, Mexico.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?</td>
<td>B: Chinese martial arts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Did Daisy want for Justin to meet the good-looking nurse?</td>
<td>B: No, for Liam to meet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Did Damon think that Patrick fancies Yvonne?</td>
<td>B: Yes, and that fancies Eleanor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?</td>
<td>B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Questionnaire 3

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is</td>
<td>incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1 A: Did Wendy say that Natasha loves Humphrey?
   B: No, that loves Gavin.

2 A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?
   B: Chinese martial arts.

3 A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
   B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

4 A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
   B: No, Mexico.

5 A: Did Daisy want for Justin to meet the good-looking nurse?
   B: No, for Liam to meet.

6 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.

7 A: Did Louise wear the green dress?
   B: Yes, and the blue Deborah.

8 A: Did Damon think that Patrick fancies Yvonne?
   B: Yes, and that fancies Eleanor.

9 A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
   B: Yes, to the opera.

10 A: Did Leonard claim that Tobias eats salad?
    B: No, that eats soup.
Additional Questionnaire 4

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B’s reply is but comprehensible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1  A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
   B: Yes, to the opera.

2  A: Did Louise wear the green dress?
   B: Yes, and the blue Deborah.

3  A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
   B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

4  A: Did Leonard claim that Tobias eats salad?
   B: No, that eats soup.

5  A: Did Wendy say that Natasha loves Humphrey?
   B: No, that loves Gavin.

6  A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
   B: No, Mexico.

7  A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?
   B: Chinese martial arts.

8  A: Did Daisy want for Justin to meet the good-looking nurse?
   B: No, for Liam to meet.

9  A: Did Damon think that Patrick fancies Yvonne?
   B: Yes, and that fancies Eleanor.

10 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
    B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.
Additional Questionnaire 5

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
B’s reply is incoherent

B’s reply is odd but comprehensible

B’s reply is perfectly natural

1  A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
   B: No, Mexico.                    dropdown

2  A: Did Wendy say that Natasha loves Humphrey?
   B: No, that loves Gavin.                 dropdown

3  A: Did Daisy want for Justin to meet the good-looking nurse?
   B: No, for Liam to meet.                 dropdown

4  A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.         dropdown

5  A: Did Damon think that Patrick fancies Yvonne?
   B: Yes, and that fancies Eleanor.               dropdown

6  A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
   B: Yes, to the opera.                 dropdown

7  A: Did Leonard claim that Tobias eats salad?
   B: No, that eats soup.                  dropdown

8  A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?
   B: Chinese martial arts.                  dropdown

9  A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
   B: No, the young children on the whole plane.           dropdown

10 A: Did Louise wear the green dress?
    B: Yes, and the blue Deborah.                  dropdown
Additional Questionnaire 6

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues.

Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s): (Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.

2 A: Did Louise wear the green dress?
   B: Yes, and the blue Deborah.

3 A: Did Damon think that Patrick fancies Yvonne?
   B: Yes, and that fancies Eleanor.

4 A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
   B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

5 A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?
   B: Chinese martial arts.

6 A: Did Leonard claim that Tobias eats salad?
   B: No, that eats soup.

7 A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
   B: No, Mexico.

8 A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
   B: Yes, to the opera.

9 A: Did Daisy want for Justin to meet the good-looking nurse?
   B: No, for Liam to meet.

10 A: Did Wendy say that Natasha loves Humphrey?
    B: No, that loves Gavin.
Additional Questionnaire 7

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incoherent</td>
<td>but comprehensible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1  A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?  
    B: Chinese martial arts.

2  A: Did Daisy want for Justin to meet the good-looking nurse?  
    B: No, for Liam to meet.

3  A: Did Louise wear the green dress?  
    B: Yes, and the blue Deborah.

4  A: Did Leonard claim that Tobias eats salad?  
    B: No, that eats soup.

5  A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?  
    B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

6  A: Did Wendy say that Natasha loves Humphrey?  
    B: No, that loves Gavin.

7  A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?  
    B: Yes, to the opera.

8  A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?  
    B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.

9  A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?  
    B: No, Mexico.

10 A: Did Damon think that Patrick fancies Yvonne?  
    B: Yes, and that fancies Eleanor.
Additional Questionnaire 8

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
   B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B’s reply is incoherent
B’s reply is odd but comprehensible
B’s reply is perfectly natural

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1. A: Did Leonard claim that Tobias eats salad?
   B: No, that eats soup.  
   B’s reply is incoherent

2. A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.  
   B’s reply is odd but comprehensible

3. A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
   B: No, Mexico.  
   B’s reply is perfectly natural

4. A: Did Louise wear the green dress?
   B: Yes, and the blue Deborah.  
   B’s reply is odd but comprehensible

5. A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
   B: Yes, to the opera.  
   B’s reply is perfectly natural

6. A: Did Damon think that Patrick fancies Yvonne?
   B: Yes, and that fancies Eleanor.  
   B’s reply is perfectly natural

7. A: Did Daisy want for Justin to meet the good-looking nurse?
   B: No, for Liam to meet.  
   B’s reply is perfectly natural

8. A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
   B: No, the young children on the whole plane.  
   B’s reply is perfectly natural

9. A: Did Wendy say that Natasha loves Humphrey?
   B: No, that loves Gavin.  
   B’s reply is perfectly natural

10. A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?
    B: Chinese martial arts.  
    B’s reply is perfectly natural
Exemplary Completed and Anonymised Additional Questionnaire 8

This questionnaire consists of 50 question-answer pairs with a speaker A asking a question and a speaker B giving a reply as in (i).

(i) A: How are you?
B: Fine, thanks.

Your task is to read the sentences carefully and to decide how much you like the replies. You should treat them as elements of spoken language as they appear in dialogues. Behind each of the replies, you can select your rating of B’s reply from a dropdown menu.

Please use the scale below for your rating. You will also find the scale at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B’s reply is incoherent</td>
<td>B’s reply is odd but comprehensible</td>
<td>B’s reply is perfectly natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please try and use the whole range of the scale. As a general rule, I would like you to rate the sentences spontaneously. Please do not go back to single sentences or go through the questionnaire once more after finishing in order to change your ratings! Rely on your intuition for the judgements and not on what you think is correct according to some expert. This questionnaire is not about right or wrong – you are merely providing an opinion. Please judge all sentences.

All your responses will of course be made anonymous so that neither your names nor your e-mail addresses will appear anywhere.

Before you start, may I ask you to share some personal data? These data only serve a statistical purpose and will also be treated anonymously.

Gender:
Year of Birth:
Handedness:
Nationality:
Mother Tongue(s):
(Please specify variety of English, e.g. American, British, Australian…)
Additional Languages:

Thank you very much for participating!
1 A: Did Leonard claim that Tobias eats salad?
   B: No, that eats soup.

2 A: Did you ever have dinner with the funny actress that made her own hats?
   B: At the French restaurant outside St. Paul’s cathedral.

3 A: Did the committed secretary like Asia?
   B: No, Mexico.

4 A: Did Louise wear the green dress?
   B: Yes, and the blue Deborah.

5 A: Did Sandy go out with the handsome guy that owned the diner around the corner?
   B: Yes, to the opera.

6 A: Did Damon think that Patrick fancies Yvonne?
   B: Yes, and that fancies Eleanor.

7 A: Did Daisy want for Justin to meet the good-looking nurse?
   B: No, for Liam to meet.

8 A: Did the cheerful flight assistant count the passengers in the front row?
   B: No, the young children on the whole plane.

9 A: Did Wendy say that Natasha loves Humphrey?
   B: No, that loves Gavin.

10 A: Did the efficient librarian do any sport?
    B: Chinese martial arts.