





Fig. 1: Results of Study 1

**Design.** We constructed contexts crossing the proposition checked ( $\neg p$  vs.  $p$ ) and the degree of certainty about the checked proposition (90% vs. 60%). 30 participants (native speakers of Canadian English) were requested to choose between a stacked negation HiNQ and a focus PosQ. **Results.** As shown in Fig.1, stacked negation HiNQs were selected at approximately the same rate as focus PosQ in the  $\neg p$ -conditions but were significantly dispreferred in favor of focus PosQs in the checking  $p$ -conditions. That is, an asymmetric selection pattern was found, as predicted by Romero & Han (2004) but not by AnderBois (2011).

**STUDY 2. Predictions.** Given Study 1, we assume that there is a difference between checking  $p$  vs.  $\neg p$  and that this is somehow reflected in the LFs. Still, AnderBois (2011) may be right that the outer reading is the default and that the inner reading needs an NPI trigger. The question arises, how bare HiNQ like (1) compare in acceptability to PPI-HiNQs like (2) and to NPI-HiNQs like (3) across  $p$ - and  $\neg p$ -contexts. While the behavior of PPI-HiNQs and NPI-HiNQs is in principle expected to be the same under both analyses (control conditions), Romero & Han (2004) and AnderBois (2011) make different predictions for bare HiNQs; see Table 1. **Design.** We crossed 2 types of contexts (S checking  $p$  vs.  $\neg p$ ) with 3 types of HiNQs (either containing the PPI *some* or the NPI *any* or a plain indefinite). In a pilot study, 48 participants (native speakers of American English) rated the acceptability of the question in the context on a scale from 1 to 7. **Results of the pilot.** A linear mixed effects regression model showed no interaction between context type and question type ( $p > 0.1$ ) including control conditions. Similar results obtained when we re-run the experiment twice making the proposition checked more prominent and including content questions after some trails to ensure participants read the entire context. Since the control conditions did not behave as expected, we did not run the planned study.

	PPI-HiNQ	bare HiNQ		NPI-HiNQ
		Romero & Han (2004)	AnderBois (2011)	
S checking $p$	✓	✓	✓	#
S checking $\neg p$	#	✓	??	✓

Table1: Predictions by the two competing analyses

**STUDY 3. Predictions.** HiNQs with the NPI *either* have been observed to be somewhat degraded (Hartung 2006, Sailor 2013). We compare the acceptability of HiNQs with *either* with that of HiNQs with the NPI *yet*, the latter of which is undisputed. If *either* is acceptable in HiNQs, we expect to find no difference between *either* and *yet*, and moreover no difference between questions with High and Low Negation. **Design.** High vs. Low Negation questions are presented in contexts in which they are felicitous. The 2 question types (High vs. Low Negation questions) are crossed with 2 NPIs (*either* vs. *yet*). Participants will have to rate the acceptability of the question in the context on a scale from 1 to 7. We plan to contrast native speakers of American English with native speakers of Canadian English to detect a possible dialectal variation reported in Sailor (2013).

**REFERENCES** AnderBois 2011. Issues and alternatives. UCSC diss. ♦ Hartung 2006. Forms of Negation in Polar Questions. Uni Tübingen MA thesis. ♦ Ladd 1981. A first look at the semantics and pragmatics of negative questions and tag questions, *CLS 17*. ♦ Northrup. 2014. Grounds for commitments, UCSC diss. ♦ Repp 2013. Common ground management: modal particles, illocutionary negation and VERUM. In Gutzmann & Gaertner, eds. ♦ Romero & Han 2004. On negative yes/no questions. *L&P 27*. ♦ Sailor 2013. Questionable Negation, handout for LSA.