

Register

AsPredicted Preregistration

Have any data been collected for this study already?:

Please choose

Yes, at least some data have been collected for this study already

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 an upper-bounded meaning?

The null hypothesis: for a given scale, exposure to upper-bounded 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 upper-bounded meanings attenuates the degree to which weak scalar items receive an upper-bounded interpretation.

The "meaning priming" hypothesis: for a given scale, exposure to upper-bounded 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, palatable/delicious), 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.

An 'exhaustive prime' condition: before interpreting the weak scalar item of interest, participants see three trials where they are asked to interpret sentences containing a semantically-encoded upper-bounded meaning from that same scale.

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 'exhaustive prime' conditions.

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

Mixed effects linear regression predicting response coded as a 0-100 scale (0 = no implicature, 100 = implicature). Fixed effects: prime type ('none', 'exhaustive', with 'none' reference level), scale, and their interaction. Random effects: by-subject and by-item random intercepts and slopes for prime type and scale.

Any secondary analyses?:

The secondary analysis will investigate the extent to which interpretation of explicitly upper-bounded meanings (in priming trials) differ from interpretation of weak scalar items (in critical trials). For that analysis, the results will be subsetting such that only data from participants in 'exhaustive' prime trials (and responses from those participants in the corresponding critical trial) will be considered.

The analysis is specified as follows:

Mixed effects linear regression predicting response coded as a 0-100 scale (0 = no implicature, 100 = implicature). Fixed effects: trial type (prime, critical), scale, and their interaction. Random effects: by-subject and by-item random intercepts and slopes for trial type and scale.

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?):

A clarification: some data have been collected for this study already, insofar as pilot studies have been run on some of the scales of interest to confirm that the paradigm is generally intelligible to participants.

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 \(/project/mkpf8/drafts/5ba4ffa215b1070018b4d54e/\)](/project/mkpf8/drafts/5ba4ffa215b1070018b4d54e/)

[Register](#)

Copyright © 2011-2018 Center for Open Science (<https://cos.io>) | Terms of Use (https://github.com/CenterForOpenScience/centerforopenscience.org/blob/master/TERMS_OF_USE.md) | Privacy Policy (https://github.com/CenterForOpenScience/centerforopenscience.org/blob/master/PRIVACY_POLICY.md) | Status (<https://status.cos.io/>) | API (<https://developer.osf.io/>) TOP Guidelines (<http://cos.io/top/>) | Reproducibility Project: Psychology (<https://osf.io/ezcuj/wiki/home/>) | Reproducibility Project: Cancer Biology (<https://osf.io/e81xl/wiki/home/>)



(<http://twitter.com/OSFramework>)



(<https://www.facebook.com/CenterForOpenScience/>)



(<https://groups.google.com/forum/#!forum/openscienceframework>) (<https://www.github.com/centerforopenscience>)

