


# THE SEMANTICS & PSYCHOLOGY OF NEGATION: THE AUSTRALIAN PLAN, NEGATION AS FAILURE, AND CARD SELECTION TASKS

GREG RESTALL\*



University of  
St Andrews

SIFA ★ SEPTEMBER 2023

This TALK IS BASED ON JOINT WORK WITH FRANCESCO BERTO

# MY PLAN

1. SCENE SETTING
2. TRUTH CONDITIONS FOR NEGATION
3. TAKING TWO DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES
4. CARD SELECTION TASKS
5. WHERE TO GO FROM HERE

# MY PLAN

1. SCENE SETTING

2. TRUTH CONDITIONS FOR NEGATION

3. TAKING TWO DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES

4. CARD SELECTION TASKS

5. WHERE TO GO FROM HERE



This is joint work with  
my colleague Francesco Berto.



## Negation on the Australian Plan

Francesco Berto<sup>1,2</sup> · Greg Restall<sup>3</sup>

Received: 25 November 2017 / Accepted: 30 March 2019 / Published online: 22 April 2019  
© The Author(s) 2019

### Abstract

We present and defend the Australian Plan semantics for negation. This is a comprehensive account, suitable for a variety of different logics. It is based on two ideas. The first is that negation is an exclusion-expressing device: we utter negations to express incompatibilities. The second is that, because incompatibility is modal, negation is a modal operator as well. It can, then, be modelled as a quantifier over points in frames, restricted by accessibility relations representing compatibilities and incompatibilities between such points. We defuse a number of objections to this Plan, raised by supporters of the American Plan for negation, in which negation is handled via a many-valued semantics. We show that the Australian Plan has substantial advantages over the American Plan.

**Keywords** Negation · Compatibility semantics · Kripke semantics · Non-classical logics · Many-valued logics · Modal logics

---

✉ Francesco Berto  
fb96@st-andrews.ac.uk; F.Berto@uva.nl

Greg Restall  
restall@unimelb.edu.au

<sup>1</sup> Department of Philosophy, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, UK

<sup>2</sup> Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (ILLC), University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>3</sup> Department of Philosophy, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

We are interested in the  
Semantics of logical  
vocabulary, and how  
this connects with what  
we do in our thought  
and talk.

Journal of Philosophical Logic  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10992-019-09510-2>



## Negation on the Australian Plan

Francesco Berto<sup>1,2</sup> · Greg Restall<sup>3</sup>

Received: 25 November 2017 / Accepted: 30 March 2019 / Published online: 22 April 2019  
© The Author(s) 2019

### Abstract

We present and defend the Australian Plan semantics for negation. This is a comprehensive account, suitable for a variety of different logics. It is based on two ideas. The first is that negation is an exclusion-expressing device: we utter negations to express incompatibilities. The second is that, because incompatibility is modal, negation is a modal operator as well. It can, then, be modelled as a quantifier over points in frames, restricted by accessibility relations representing compatibilities and incompatibilities between such points. We defuse a number of objections to this Plan, raised by supporters of the American Plan for negation, in which negation is handled via a many-valued semantics. We show that the Australian Plan has substantial advantages over the American Plan.

**Keywords** Negation · Compatibility semantics · Kripke semantics · Non-classical logics · Many-valued logics · Modal logics

---

✉ Francesco Berto  
fb96@st-andrews.ac.uk; F.Berto@uva.nl

Greg Restall  
restall@unimelb.edu.au

<sup>1</sup> Department of Philosophy, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, UK

<sup>2</sup> Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (ILLC), University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

<sup>3</sup> Department of Philosophy, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

We are interested in the  
Semantics of logical  
vocabulary, and how  
this connects with what  
we do in our thought  
and talk.

To day I'll talk about  
the Semantics of negation  
and some connections  
with the psychology of  
reasoning

# MY PLAN

1. SCENE SETTING

2. TRUTH CONDITIONS FOR NEGATION

3. TAKING TWO DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES

4. CARD SELECTION TASKS

5. WHERE TO GO FROM HERE

$\neg A$  is true if and only if  $A$  is not true.

In terms of **Situations**

$s \Vdash \neg A$  if and only if  $s \nVdash A$

In terms of truth values

$\nu(\neg A) = 1$  if and only if  $\nu(A) \neq 1$

(i.e., when  $\nu(A) = 0$ )

## Generalising Truth Values

$$v(\neg A) = 1 \text{ if and only if } v(A) = 0$$

$$v(\neg A) = 0 \text{ if and only if } v(A) = 1$$

## Generalising Truth Values

$$v(\neg A) = 1 \text{ if and only if } v(A) = 0$$

$$v(\neg A) = i \text{ if and only if } v(A) = i$$

$$v(\neg A) = 0 \text{ if and only if } v(A) = 1$$

If the intermediate value is taken to be neither true nor false, we have a truth-value gap.

## Generalising Truth Values

$$v(\neg A) = 1 \text{ if and only if } v(A) = 0$$

$$v(\neg A) = i \text{ if and only if } v(A) = i$$

$$v(\neg A) = 0 \text{ if and only if } v(A) = 1$$

If the intermediate value is taken to be both true and false, we have a truth-value glut.

## Generalising Truth Values

$v(\neg A) = 1$  if and only if  $v(A) = 0$


$v(\neg A) = n$  if and only if  $v(A) = n$

$v(\neg A) = b$  if and only if  $v(A) = b$


$v(\neg A) = 0$  if and only if  $v(A) = 1$

If you really want, you can have two intermediate values for 'both' and 'neither' —   gluts & gaps.


( If you wonder how to evaluate the other logical operators in schemes like this, meditate on these Hasse diagrams. Conjunction is greatest lower bound, disjunction, least upper bound, as usual.)



In the relevant logic tradition, this scheme  
for negation (generalising beyond two truth values)  
is called the **AMERICAN PLAN**, because it\* comes  
from the work of the two American logicians




J. MICHAEL DUNN



NUEL BELNAP

\*In this tradition, at least. The idea arose elsewhere, too.



The distinctive feature of these semantic schemes is that truth and falsity are treated on a par as distinct (though connected) semantic statuses.

There are other ways to generalise Boolean negation.

$S \vdash \neg A$  if and only if  $S \nvdash A$ .

# Beth/Kripke Semantics for Intuitionistic logic

$s \Vdash \neg A$  iff for every  $t \geq s$ ,  $t \Vdash A$ .

# The Routley Star Semantics

$s \Vdash \neg A$  if and only if  $\star \nVdash s \not\vdash A$ .

The General Scheme....

$s \Vdash \neg A$  iff for every  $t$  where  $s \sqsubset t$ ,  $t \not\Vdash A$ .

This scheme, in which negation is given a truth-conditional semantics by way of a context-shift 'compatibility' relation has become known as the **AUSTRALIAN** plan, because it arose\* in the work of Australian logicians



Valerie Plumwood  
(then Rantley)



Richard Sylvan  
(then Rantley)

\* In this tradition, at least. The idea arose elsewhere, too.

The distinctive feature of these semantic schemes  
is that **truth** and **falsity** are treated differently.  
Falsity ( truth of a negation), arises out of truth  
of (in)compatibility.

These two plans are very different,  
and some take them to be in conflict.

## There is More to Negation than Modality

Michael De<sup>1</sup> · Hitoshi Omori<sup>2</sup>

Received: 17 February 2016 / Accepted: 20 January 2017  
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2017

**Abstract** There is a relatively recent trend in treating negation as a modal operator. One such reason is that doing so provides a uniform semantics for the negations of a wide variety of logics and arguably speaks to a longstanding challenge of Quine put to non-classical logics. One might be tempted to draw the conclusion that negation is a modal operator, a claim Francesco Berto (*Mind*, 124(495), 761–793, 2015) defends at length in a recent paper. According to one such modal account, the negation of a sentence is true at a world  $x$  just in case all the worlds at which the sentence is true are *incompatible* with  $x$ . Incompatibility is taken to be the key notion in the account, and what minimal properties a negation has comes down to which minimal conditions incompatibility satisfies. Our aims in this paper are twofold. First, we wish to point out problems for the modal account that make us question its tenability on a fundamental level. Second, in its place we propose an alternative, non-modal, account of negation as a contradictory-forming operator that we argue is superior to, and more natural than, the modal account.

**Keywords** Negation · Compatibility · Modality · Contradictory

This research was funded by the European Research Council under the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC Grant agreement nr 263227. Hitoshi Omori is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS).

✉ Hitoshi Omori  
hitoshiomori@gmail.com

Michael De  
mikejde@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Department of Philosophy, University of Konstanz, Konstanz, Germany

<sup>2</sup> Department of Philosophy, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan



## Negation on the Australian Plan

Francesco Berto<sup>1,2</sup>  · Greg Restall<sup>3</sup>

Received: 25 November 2017 / Accepted: 30 March 2019 / Published online: 22 April 2019  
© The Author(s) 2019

### Abstract

We present and defend the Australian Plan semantics for negation. This is a comprehensive account, suitable for a variety of different logics. It is based on two ideas. The first is that negation is an exclusion-expressing device: we utter negations to express incompatibilities. The second is that, because incompatibility is modal, negation is a modal operator as well. It can, then, be modelled as a quantifier over points in frames, restricted by accessibility relations representing compatibilities and incompatibilities between such points. We defuse a number of objections to this Plan, raised by supporters of the American Plan for negation, in which negation is handled via a many-valued semantics. We show that the Australian Plan has substantial advantages over the American Plan.

**Keywords** Negation · Compatibility semantics · Kripke semantics · Non-classical logics · Many-valued logics · Modal logics

✉ Francesco Berto  
fb96@st-andrews.ac.uk; F.Berto@uva.nl

Greg Restall  
restall@unimelb.edu.au

<sup>1</sup> Department of Philosophy, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, UK

<sup>2</sup> Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (ILLC), University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

My task here is not to adjudicate this  
dispute, but to explore one of the  
ways the distinctive features of the  
Australian Plan Semantics can  
be applied.

Before that, let's see another tradition in  
the Semantics of negation: **NEGATION AS FAILURE**,  
from logic programming & database theory

## NEGATION AS FAILURE

Keith L. Clark

Department of Computer Science & Statistics

Queen Mary College, London, England

## ABSTRACT


A query evaluation process for a logic data base comprising a set of clauses is described. It is essentially a Horn clause theorem prover augmented with a special inference rule for dealing with negation. This is the negation as failure inference rule whereby  $\sim P$  can be inferred if every possible proof of  $P$  fails. The chief advantage of the query evaluator described is the efficiency with which it can be implemented. Moreover, we show that the negation as failure rule only allows us to conclude negated facts that could be inferred from the axioms of the completed data base, a data base of relation definitions and equality schemas that we consider is implicitly given by the data base of clauses. We also show that when the clause data base and the queries satisfy certain constraints, which still have to be determined, the query evaluator is sound.

Treat a database  $D$  as verifying  $\neg A$  if  
and only if  $D$  fails to verify  $A$ .

(This looks a lot like Boolean Negation,  
but this is a database, not a world.)

Which of these approaches is CORRECT?

I am *not* the person  
to give you a direct  
answer to that kind  
of question.



Logical Pluralism

JC Beall and Greg Restall

# MY PLAN

1. SCENE SETTING
2. TRUTH CONDITIONS FOR NEGATION
3. TAKING TWO DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES
4. CARD SELECTION TASKS
5. WHERE TO GO FROM HERE



**Why don't we have both?**

I will propose a view from which both

NEGATION AS FAILURE and an

AUSTRALIAN PLAN semantics for

negation can explain different


aspects of the psychology of

reasoning with negations.

# THE FRAMEWORK

SFTA

# THE FRAMEWORK



# THE FRAMEWORK

$S \models A$

An agent's  
evidence base

A judgement

Evidence bases are  
not worlds.

Judgements are not  
sets of worlds.

# THE FRAMEWORK

$S \models A$

ACCORDING TO  $S$ ,  $A$  holds (or is given).

An agent's  
evidence base

A judgement

Evidence bases are  
not worlds.

Judgements are not  
sets of worlds.

**D**

**3**

**B**

**7**


*a*

*b*

*c*

*d*

<i>s</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>a</i>	✓	-	-	-
<i>b</i>	-	-	✓	-
<i>c</i>	-	✓	-	-
<i>d</i>	-	-	-	✓



<i>s</i>	<b>D</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>
<i>a</i>	✓	-	-	-
<i>b</i>	-	-	✓	-
<i>c</i>	-	✓	-	-
<i>d</i>	-	-	-	✓

*s* ⊥- **D***a*    *s* ⊥- **3***b*

**D**

**3**

**B**

**7**

*a*

*b*

*c*

*d*

<i>s</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>a</i>	✓	-	-	-
<i>b</i>	-	-	✓	-
<i>c</i>	-	✓	-	-
<i>d</i>	-	-	-	✓

*sH* *D<sub>a</sub>*   *sH* *3<sub>b</sub>*   *sH* *D<sub>b</sub>*   *sH* *7<sub>b</sub>*

**D**

**3**

**B**

**7**

a

b

c

d

When does this evidential  
situation support a negative  
judgement, like  $\neg 7b$  or  $\neg D_b$ ?

**D**

**3**

**B**

**7**

a

b

c

d

Well, it depends on what you mean.

'A lifetime's worth of wisdom'  
Steven D. Levitt, co-author of *Freakonomics*

# The International Bestseller

## Thinking, Fast and Slow



Daniel Kahneman

Winner of the Nobel Prize



I'll take for granted that there are different kinds of cognitive processes involved in our information processing, including in our treatment of negation & negative judgements.

'A lifetime's worth of wisdom'  
Steven D. Levitt, co-author of *Freakonomics*

# The International Bestseller

## Thinking, Fast and Slow



Daniel Kahneman

Winner of the Nobel Prize



Let's work with two levels  
of information processing.

$S \nparallel_1 A$  — fast  
**SYSTEM 1**

$S \nparallel_2 A$  — slow  
**SYSTEM 2**

because we're interested in  
the psychology of  
reasoning.

Immediate, fast reaction judgement

$s \Vdash_1 A$  ( $A$  a basic judgement) iff  $s \Vdash A$

$s \Vdash_1 \neg A$  if and only if  $s \nVdash_1 A$

Immediate, fast reaction judgement

$S \Vdash_1 A$  ( $A$  a basic judgement) iff  $S \Vdash A$

$S \Vdash_1 \neg A$  if and only if  $S \nVdash_1 A$

(At least when  $A$  is a basic judgement.

I leave it an open question whether

System 1 can deliver claims such as  $\neg\neg Da$ )

**D**

**3**

**B**

**7**

a

b

c

d

$s \Vdash_1 D_a$     $s \Vdash_1 \neg 3_a$     $s \Vdash_1 \neg B_a$     $s \Vdash_1 \neg 7_a$

**D**

**3**

**B**

**7**

a

b

c

d

$s \Vdash_1 D_a$     $s \Vdash_1 \neg 3_a$     $s \Vdash_1 \neg B_a$     $s \Vdash_1 \neg 7_a$

$s \Vdash_1 \neg D_b$     $s \Vdash_1 3_b$     $s \Vdash_1 \neg B_b$     $s \Vdash_1 \neg 7_b$

**D**

**3**

**B**

**7**

a

b


c

d

s II Da    s II 73a    s II 7Ba    s II 7a




But clearly, these are not all alike,  
if you know about the Card Setup  
& you think for a little bit.



a



b



c





d

s II Da    s II 73a    s II 7Ba    s II 7fa



Card a doesn't have a 3 on this  
side, but it might on the other.



a

b

c

d

$s \Vdash D_a$     $s \nVdash \neg 3_a$     $s \Vdash \neg B_a$     $s \nVdash \neg 7_a$



Card a doesn't have a 3 on this  
side, but it might on the other.

If the evidence base contains the constraint that  
each card has a letter on one side & a number on the other...  
Some reasoning can deliver this negative judgement.

**D**

**3**

**B**

**7**

a

b

c

d

$s \frac{1}{2} \uparrow D_a$

$s \frac{1}{2} \uparrow 3_a \quad s \frac{1}{2} \uparrow B_a \quad s \frac{1}{2} \uparrow 7_a$

We think these sorts of distinctions take a  
bit more work to make. They seem more  
like slow thinking: **System 2**.

## System 2 , Show retraction judgement

$s \Vdash_2 A$  ( $A$  a basic judgement) iff  $s \Vdash A$



$s \Vdash_2 \neg A$  if and only if  $t \Vdash_2 \neg A$ , for  
any  $t$  compatible with  $s$ .

## System 2, Strong reaction judgement

$S \Vdash_2 A$  ( $A$  a basic judgement) iff  $S \Vdash A$

$S \Vdash_2 \neg A$  if and only if  $t \Vdash_2 \neg A$ , for  
any  $t$  compatible with  $S$ .

This requires each evidence base to not only support basic judgements, but a compatibility relation between evidence bases — and System 2 reflection must operate on those hypothetical evidence bases!



a

b

c

d

s	D	B	3	7
a	✓	-	-	-
b	-	-	✓	-
c	-	✓	-	-
d	-	-	-	✓



t | D B 3 7

a	✓	-	✓	-
b	-	-	✓	-
c	-	✓	-	-
d	-	-	-	✓



u | D B 3 7

a	✓	-	-	✓
b	-	-	✓	-
c	-	✓	-	-
d	-	-	-	✓



a could have  
a 3 on the other  
Side

or it might  
be a 7.

This sort of considered reflection of  
alternatives seems to model the  
way we reason about negations  
when we take our time.

→ fast, easy, System 1 NEGATION AS FAILURE  
(overgenerates)

This sort of considered reflection of alternatives seems to model the way we reason about negations when we take our time.

↙ Slow, difficult, System 2 AUSTRALIAN PLAN compatibility negation (accurate)

# MY PLAN


1. SCENE SETTING

2. TRUTH CONDITIONS FOR NEGATION

3. TAKING TWO DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES

4. CARD SELECTION TASKS


5. WHERE TO GO FROM HERE



a



b



c



d

Every card has a letter on one side & a number on the other  
Which cards must you flip to verify "If a card has a D on  
one side there is a 3 on the other"?

REASONING ABOUT A RULE

273

## REASONING ABOUT A RULE

BY

P. C. WASON


*From Psycholinguistics Research Unit, University College London*

Two experiments were carried out to investigate the difficulty of making the contrapositive inference from conditional sentences of the form, "if P then Q." This inference, that not-P follows from not-Q, requires the transformation of the information presented in the conditional sentence. It is suggested that the difficulty is due to a mental set for expecting a relation of truth, correspondence, or match to hold between sentences and states of affairs. The elicitation of the inference was not facilitated by attempting to induce two kinds of therapy designed to break this set. It is argued that the subjects did not give evidence of having acquired the characteristics of Piaget's "formal operational thought."

Quarterly J. Exp. Psych. 1968

### INTRODUCTION


This investigation is concerned with the difficulty of making a particular type



a



b



c



d

Every card has a letter on one side & a number on the other  
Which cards must you flip to verify "If a card has a D on  
one side there is a 3 on the other"?

REASONING ABOUT A RULE

## REASONING ABOUT A RULE

BY

P. C. WASON

*From Psycholinguistics Research Unit, University College London*


Two experiments were carried out to investigate the difficulty of making the contrapositive inference from conditional sentences of the form, "if P then Q." This inference, that not-P follows from not-Q, requires the transformation of the information presented in the conditional sentence. It is suggested that the difficulty is due to a mental set for expecting a relation of truth, correspondence, or match to hold between sentences and states of affairs. The elicitation of the inference was not facilitated by attempting to induce two kinds of therapy designed to break this set. It is argued that the subjects did not give evidence of having acquired the characteristics of Piaget's "formal operational thought."

Fewer than 10% of  
273 the participants  
answered  
correctly  
(a & d).

Quarterly J. Exp. Psych. 1968

## INTRODUCTION


This investigation is concerned with the difficulty of making a particular type



a



b



c



d

Every card has a letter on one side & a number on the other  
Which cards must you flip to verify "If a card has a D on  
one side there is a 3 on the other"?

REASONING ABOUT A RULE

## REASONING ABOUT A RULE

BY

P. C. WASON

*From Psycholinguistics Research Unit, University College London*


Two experiments were carried out to investigate the difficulty of making the contrapositive inference from conditional sentences of the form, "if P then Q." This inference, that not-P follows from not-Q, requires the transformation of the information presented in the conditional sentence. It is suggested that the difficulty is due to a mental set for expecting a relation of truth, correspondence, or match to hold between sentences and states of affairs. The elicitation of the inference was not facilitated by attempting to induce two kinds of therapy designed to break this set. It is argued that the subjects did not give evidence of having acquired the characteristics of Piaget's "formal operational thought."

Fewer than 10% of  
273 the participants  
answered  
correctly  
(a & d).

Quarterly J. Exp. Psych. 1968

## INTRODUCTION

This investigation is concerned with the difficulty of making a particular type



Perhaps surprisingly, performance is much better if you negate the consequent. "If a card has a D on one side there isn't a 3 on the other." (Choose a & b.)

*Br. J. Psychol.* (1973), 64, 3, pp. 391-397  
Printed in Great Britain

391

## MATCHING BIAS IN THE SELECTION TASK

BY J. ST B. T. EVANS AND J. S. LYNCH

*Psychology Section, City of London Polytechnic*

A previous study (Evans, 1972) found that subjects tend to match rather than alter named values when constructing verifying and falsifying cases of conditional rules. It was suggested that this tendency ('matching bias') might account for the responses normally observed in Wason's (1968, 1969) 'selection task'. This suggestion was tested by giving subjects the selection task with conditional rules in which the presence and absence of negative components was systematically varied, to see whether subjects consistently attempted to verify the rules (Wason's theory) or whether they continued to choose the matching values despite the presence of negatives, which would reverse the logical meaning of such selections. Significant matching tendencies were observed on four independent measures, and the overall pattern, with matching bias cancelled out, gave no evidence for a verification bias, indicating instead that the logically correct values were most frequently chosen.

Wason & Johnson-Laird (1972) review a number of recent studies about the reasoning patterns generally obtained in Wason's 'selection task'. That task was

## Reasoning about a rule

PC Wason - Quarterly journal of experimental psychology, 1968 - journals.sagepub.com

Two experiments were carried out to investigate the difficulty of making the contra-positive inference from conditional sentences of the form, "if P then Q." This inference, that not-P ...

☆ Save ⚡ Cite Cited by 4339 Related articles All 9 versions




There is a vast literature on card selection tasks!

It is not our aim to get to the bottom of all of it.


We want to see how contemporary work in  
the Semantics of negation can be tested for  
cognitive significance.

Insight 1: Reasoning accurately about negations  
(and falsity) involves generalising over  
compatible evidence bases, and this  
is complicated. It is not surprising  
that we find this difficult.



$$\begin{array}{llll}
 s \Vdash_1 \neg Da & s \Vdash_1 \neg 3a & s \Vdash_1 \neg Ba & s \Vdash_1 \neg 7a \\
 s \Vdash_1 \neg Db & s \Vdash_1 \neg 3b & s \Vdash_1 \neg Bb & s \Vdash_1 \neg 7b
 \end{array}$$


Insight 2: If System 1 judgements about negations are quick-and-dirty negation-as-failure judgements, it's not surprising that we overgenerate answers.



a



b



c



d

How can we account for greater success in the negated consequent form of the task:

"If there is a D on one side of the card  
there isn't a 3 on the other"?

Here we might use some concepts from Berto's 2022 book **Topics of Thought**.

Judgements do not only have truth conditions – they also have topics.

Negation is topic-transparent.

$$t(\neg A) = t(A).$$


So is the material conditional.


$$t(A \rightarrow B) = t(A) \oplus t(B).$$

## Topics of Thought

*the logic of knowledge, belief, imagination*

FRANCESCO BERTO






a



b



c




d

"If there is a D on one side of the card  
there isn't a 3 on the other"?



$$t(Dx \rightarrow \neg 3x) = t(Dx) \oplus t(3x)$$

$$t(Dx \rightarrow 3x) = t(Dx) \oplus t(3x)$$



"If there is a D on one side of the card  
there isn't a 3 on the other"?

If our pre-reflective quick judgement of relevance  
is guided by topic (in this sense) then it is not surprising  
that we might pick a & b (at least) in this scenario,  
whether we check  $Dx \rightarrow \neg 3x$  or  $Dx \rightarrow 3x$ , since  
being a D & being a 3 is clearly on topic.



a


b

c

d

"If there is a D on one side of the card  
there isn't a 3 on the other"?


If we stop there, to consider only the clearly D and 3 cards, without considering the other sides of c & d, we chance on the right answer of the  $D_2 \rightarrow 73_2$  task, but err on the  $D_2 \rightarrow 3_2$  task.



a



b



c



d

"If there is a D on one side of the card  
there isn't a 3 on the other"?

Combining topic sensitivity with negation as failure  
(System 1) judgements brings every card into salience,  
which could explain why people are prone to overgenerate  
answers in either case,

**D**

**3**

**B**

**7**

a

b

c

d

Contemporary work in the philosophy of logic can give us new ideas about possible cognitive mechanisms at play in our reasoning judgements, whether fast or slow.

**D**

**3**

**B**

**7**

a

b

c

d

Contemporary work in the philosophy of logic can give us new ideas about possible cognitive mechanisms at play in our reasoning judgements, whether fast or slow.

There does not need to be a one-size-fits-all approach. Pluralism seems fitting here!

# MY PLAN

1. SCENE SETTING
2. TRUTH CONDITIONS FOR NEGATION
3. TAKING TWO DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES
4. CARD SELECTION TASKS
5. WHERE TO GO FROM HERE?

This work is only just beginning!

1. Read through existing results with logically-informed eyes.
2. Examine the logical literature for cognitively significant tools.
3. Make conjectures, and test them.
4. Refine the conjectures & repeat...

