Register

AsPredicted Preregistration

Have any data been collected for this study already?:
Please choose

> No, no data have been collected for this study yet

What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?:

> How is interpretation of weak scalar items modulated by prior exposure to language which explicitly encodes a strong scalar alternative meaning?
>
> The null hypothesis: for a given scale, exposure to strong scalar alternative meanings does not affect the degree to which weak scalar items receive an upper-bounded interpretation.
>
> The "meaning blocking" hypothesis: for a given scale, exposure to strong scalar alternative meanings attenuates the degree to which weak scalar items receive an upper-bounded interpretation.
>
> The "meaning priming" hypothesis: for a given scale, exposure to strong scalar alternative meanings increases the degree to which weak scalar items receive an upper-bounded interpretation

Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.:

> The key dependent variable is "degree of upper-bounded interpretation". For a given sentence (presented in bold), participants are asked about the likelihood with which the speaker of that sentence intended an upper-bounded meaning (presented as an italicized sentence) - by responding on a continuous sliding scale bounded by the endpoints "very unlikely" and "very likely".

How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?:

For the six scales of interest (or/and, some/all, hard/impossible, looks-like/is (an X), cardinal numerals, good/excellent), participants are assigned to one of two conditions:

A 'no-prime' condition: before interpreting the weak scalar item of interest, participants do not see any trials where they are asked to interpret sentences containing a semantically-encoded upper-bounded meaning from the scale or a strong scalar alternative. Instead, they see three sentences which do not contain any material from the semantic scale of interest.

A 'strong prime' condition: before interpreting the weak scalar item of interest, participants see three trials where they are asked to interpret sentences containing a strong scalar alternative. (Not a necessary condition for exploring the main hypothesis).

Participants are assigned to exactly one condition for each of the six scales, such that they are assigned to three 'no-prime' conditions and three 'strong prime' conditions.

Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.:

For each of the six scales, linear regression predicting the response, coded as a 0-100 scale (0 = "very unlikely", 100 = "very likely"). Predictors will be prime type (none, 'strong').

Any secondary analyses?:

None

How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.:

For each of the six scales, 50 observations in each condition (600 observations total). 50 participants.

Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., data exclusions, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?):

Data from participants who fail two or more control items will be excluded. "Failure" is defined as answering in the lower half of the scale on control items where the bolded sentence uncontroversially implies the italicized sentence (high_right controls), or answering in the upper half of the scale on control items where the bolded sentence clearly does not imply the italicized sentence (low_right controls). There are three high_right and three low_right controls in the study.

Continue editing (/project/mkpf8/drafts/5ba4ff1515b1070019b4dbac/)   Register