

experimental lists, rotating original bias and contextual evidence in trials following a Latin Square (see Tab. 3 for conditions). Each participant performed 7 trials in each of the 6 conditions. Participants read two captions attached to two pictures (see example below), which presented short fictional scenarios, and selected from a list of five PolQs the one that sounded most natural or used the category “Other” if none of the choices fitted. The captions were the same across conditions but the pictures varied to generate three different original epistemic biases in the first case (i.e. p , neutral, $\neg p$ with respect to the proposition p expressed by the PolQs), and three different evidence biases in the second case (i.e. p , neutral, $\neg p$).

		ORIGINAL BIAS			
			p	Neutral	$\neg p$
EVIDENCE BIAS	$\neg p$		Inner/OuterHiNQ	LowNQ	//
	Neutral		OuterHiNQ	PosQ	//
	p		//	PosQ	really-PosQ

Table 3. Overview of the experimental conditions tested

We advance two hypotheses:

Hyp I. The four question types (4a), (4b), (4c) and (4d,e) need to be distinguished (both in German and in English).

Hyp II. Evidence bias and original epistemic bias are two different kinds of bias, each impacting on the choice of question in a different way.

Example of a template: p = “It is raining”

CAPTION 1: “If it doesn't rain tomorrow, you will surely go to the beach. The forecast for the next morning indicates:”

p = 90% raining Neutral = 50% raining / 50% sun $\neg p$ = 90% sun

CAPTION 2: “The day after, your flatmate Sam comes from the outside and enters your bedroom...”

$\neg p$ = ...with sunglasses and diver's mask Neutral = ...saying: “What are we gonna do today?” p = ...with an umbrella

TASK: “What question would you ask to find out if it's raining? Select the sentence that sounds most natural and pronounce it”: “Is it raining?”, “Really? Is it raining?”, “Is it not raining?”, “Isn't it raining?”, “Other ways of asking if it is raining”.

7. RESULTS. Data collected support three main results:

(i) Each combination of evidence bias and original epistemic bias has impacted significantly on the choice of the question type, both in English and in German, see Tab. 4 and Tab. 5 which list the most frequent choices. Hence, both factors seem to play a crucial role, in contrast with what is claimed by the accounts where both kinds of bias are merged (e.g. [7]).

(ii) LowNQs and HiNQs are truly different types of PQs – i.e. they are selected in different conditions – unlike what is assumed by [7], [3] and [1].

(iii) Interestingly, the preferred choices are very similar in both languages. Unexpectedly (with respect to the provisions offered by [6]), however, PosQs and Really-PosQs appear to be equally good PolQs in conditions with no original bias and positive contextual evidence. Possibly, these two forms are disambiguated by prosody. Only one cross-linguistic difference is observed: in German, participants do not have a preference over HiNQ and LowNQ in conditions in which a positive original bias is combined with negative contextual evidence but in English, HiNQs are the prime choice.

7. REFERENCES. [0] AnderBois (2011). *Issues and Alternatives*. Diss. UC S. Diego. [1] Asher & Reese (2007). “Intonation and Discourse: Biased Questions”. In S. Ishihara, S. Jannedy & A. Schwarz (eds.), *Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure*, 8:1-38. [2] Büring & Gunlogson. (2000). *Aren't Positive and Negative Polar Questions the Same?* Ms. UCSC. [3] Krifka (forth). *Negated Polarity Questions as Denegations of Assertions*. In Kiefer et al. (eds.), *Contrastiveness and scalar implicatures*. Springer. [4] Ladd (1981). “A First Look at the Semantics and Pragmatics of Negative Questions and Tag Questions”. *Proceedings of CLS*, 17:164-171. [5] Roelofsen, et al. (2012). *Positive and negative questions in discourse*. *Proceedings of SuB 17*: 455-472. [6] Romero & Han (2004). *On Negative Yes/No Questions*. *L&P* 27:609-6. [7] van Rooij & Šafařová (2003). *On polar questions*. *Proceedings of SALT* 13.

		ORIGINAL BIAS			
			p	Neutral	$\neg p$
CONTEXTUAL EVIDENCE	p		//	PosQ / Really-PosQ	Really-PosQ
	Neutral		HiNQ	PosQ	//
	$\neg p$		LowNQ / HiNQ	LowNQ	//

Table 4. Overview of the PQs selected in each condition in German

		ORIGINAL BIAS			
			p	Neutral	$\neg p$
CONTEXTUAL EVIDENCE	p		//	PosQ / Really-PosQ	Really-PosQ
	Neutral		HiNQ	PosQ	//
	$\neg p$		HiNQ	LowNQ	//

Table 5. Overview of the PQs selected in each condition in English