|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Linguistic Structure Ambiguity | |
|  |  | Unambiguous sentence | Ambiguous Sentence |
| Preceding Non-linguistic Conflict | Non-conflictive Flanker | -AMBIGUITY  -CONFLICT | +AMBIGUITY  -CONFLICT |
| Conflictive Flanker | -AMBIGUITY  +CONFLICT | +AMBIGUITY  +CONFLICT |

Examples:

|  |
| --- |
| Temporarily ambiguous target sentences:  **Después de que comieron el pollo se enfrió de una vez.**  **Cuando el escultor acabó la obra tenía diez pies de altura.** |
| Non-ambiguous target sentences:  **Después de que hablaron el pollo se enfrió de una vez.**  **Cuando el escultor volvió la obra tenía diez pies de altura.** |

The analyses will consider whether the preceding [+Conflict] stimulus facilitates a faster reading of the critical regions of the [+Ambiguous] linguistic stimuli, the critical comparison being: [+Conflict, +Ambiguous] vs [-Conflict, +Ambiguous].

In the previous study with the stimuli (just +AMB vs -AMB), the sentences were followed by a comprehension check sentence such as:

**¿Dónde podría exponerse una escultura como esta?**

En un parque

En un estante de libros

But I’m wondering if the confirmation checks need to be so difficult, or if I could use something **true-or-false** based in the confirmation check, since I’m comparing participants’ reading of ambiguous sentences following conflictive flankers to their reading of ambiguous sentences following non-conflict flankers, or do you think I want to get as much information about their interpretation as possible?

**¿Esta escultura tiene más de 15 pies?**

Verdadero

Falso