

# Free Choice Questions

---

Tomasz Klochowicz

PALLMYR XIII 19.06.2023

ILLC, University of Amsterdam

## Free Choice Inferences

---

- (1) *You may ride a motorcycle up to 125 cc with power output up to 11 kW, or a motor tricycle with power not exceeding 15 kW [with this driving license]*<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>*The highway code of the UK* p.51 <https://www.highwaycodeuk.co.uk/download-pdf.html>, access: 30.05.2023

- (1) *You may ride a motorcycle up to 125 cc with power output up to 11 kW, or a motor tricycle with power not exceeding 15 kW [with this driving license]*<sup>1</sup>  
↪ You may ride a motorcycle and (you may ride) a tricycle.

$$FC: \Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta) \rightsquigarrow \Diamond\alpha \wedge \Diamond\beta$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The highway code of the UK p.51 <https://www.highwaycodeuk.co.uk/download-pdf.html>, access: 30.05.2023

- (2) *This right **may not** be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes **or** from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.*<sup>2</sup>

$$\times: \neg\Diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta) \rightsquigarrow \neg\Diamond\alpha \vee \neg\Diamond\beta$$

$$DP: \neg\Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta) \rightsquigarrow \neg\Diamond\alpha \wedge \neg\Diamond\beta$$

---

<sup>2</sup> Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 14;  
<https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights> access: 31.05.2023

- (3) *The scope of the case will be at once made manifest by the two questions which were certified for solution. First: May a patentee or his assignee license another to manufacture and sell a patented machine and by a mere notice attached to it limit its [patent's] use by the purchaser or by the purchaser's lessee, to films which are no part of the patented machine, and which are not patented? [...]*<sup>3</sup>
- (4) *May a State prohibit children or foreigners from circulating petitions [...]*?<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> BOSTON STORE OF CHICAGO v. AMERICAN GRAPHOPHONE CO, 246 U.S. 8 (1918)

<sup>4</sup> BUCKLEY v. AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, 525 U.S. 182 (1999)

- (3) *May a State prohibit children or foreigners from circulating petitions [...]?*<sup>3</sup>

FCQ:  $?\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)$

$\rightsquigarrow ?\diamond\alpha \wedge ?\diamond\beta$

$\rightsquigarrow ?(\diamond\alpha \wedge \diamond\beta)$

...

---

<sup>3</sup>BUCKLEY v. AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, 525 U.S. 182 (1999)

# Table of contents

1. Free Choice Inferences
2. Theories of Free Choice
3. The Experiment
4. Results
5. Discussion



# Free Choice Questions

Examples:

1. *May I have ice cream or cake?*
2. *May I visit Big Ben or London Eye with my tourist pass?*
3. *May a State prohibit children or foreigners from circulating petitions?*

Free Choice Questions may be used to ask for permission (1), but also to ask to report it (2) or to establish it (3).

# Free Choice Questions

Examples:

1. *May I have ice cream or cake?*
2. *May I visit Big Ben or London Eye with my tourist pass?*
3. *May a State prohibit children or foreigners from circulating petitions?*

Free Choice Questions may be used to ask for permission (1), but also to ask to report it (2) or to establish it (3).

We will not be considering, similar examples involving ability modals:

- (4) Can you send me your paper or the slides of your presentation?

- (5) A: *May I visit Big Ben or London Eye with my tourist pass?*  
B: Yes.  
B: No.

### Research Questions


1. What do response particles correspond to as responses to FCQs?
2. What is the source (pragmatic/semantic) of the inferences from the response particles?

# Free Choice Questions: response particles


(5) A: *May I visit Big Ben or London Eye with my tourist pass?*

B: Yes.


B: No.



(a)



(b)



(c)

# Theories of Free Choice

---

## Theories of free choice (Aloni, 2022)

1. **Semantic:** Non-classical semantics of a logical operator. e.g. Aloni (2007), or Nygren (2022)
2. **Scalar:** Free Choice as an implicature
  - Neo-Gricean: e.g. Kratzer and Shimoyama (2002), Chemla (2009)
  - Exhaustivity: Fox (2007) and Bar-Lev and Fox (2020)
3. **Non-Scalar Pragmatics:** explain Free Choice by a pragmatic effect Goldstein (2019) or Aloni (2022)

What are the predictions of those theories regarding FCQs?

To model questions we will use the Inquisitive Semantics framework by Ciardelli et al. (2018) with the analysis of response particles by Roelofsen and Farkas (2015):

$$?\varphi \equiv \left[ \underbrace{\varphi}_{\text{Yes}} \ \vee \ \underbrace{\neg\varphi}_{\text{No}} \right]$$

$M, s \models \neg\varphi$  iff for all  $t_{\neq\emptyset} \subseteq s$ :  $M, t \not\models \varphi$

$M, s \models \varphi \vee \psi$  iff  $M, s \models \varphi$  or  $M, s \models \psi$  (Inquisitive disjunction)

To model questions we will use the Inquisitive Semantics framework by Ciardelli et al. (2018) with the analysis of response particles by Roelofsen and Farkas (2015):

$$?\varphi \equiv \left[ \underbrace{\varphi}_{\text{Yes}} \ \vee \ \underbrace{\neg\varphi}_{\text{No}} \right]$$

$M, s \models \neg\varphi$  iff for all  $t_{\neq\emptyset} \subseteq s$ :  $M, t \not\models \varphi$

$M, s \models \varphi \vee \psi$  iff  $M, s \models \varphi$  or  $M, s \models \psi$  (Inquisitive disjunction)




# FCQ in standard Inquisitive Semantics

$M, s \models \neg\varphi$  iff for all  $t_{\neq\emptyset} \subseteq s$ :  $M, t \not\models \varphi$

$M, s \models \varphi \vee \psi$  iff  $M, s \models \varphi$  or  $M, s \models \psi$  (Inquisitive disjunction)

$M, s \models \Diamond\varphi$  iff for all  $w \in s$ :  $[\varphi] \cap R[w] \neq \emptyset$  (Simple modality)

$$?\Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta) \equiv \underbrace{[\Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)]}_{\text{Yes}} \vee \underbrace{[\neg\Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)]}_{\text{No}}$$



## Alt-sensitive Deontic modality:

$M, s \models \Diamond\varphi$  iff for all  $w \in s$ , for all  $Y \in ALT(\varphi) : Y \cap R[w] \neq \emptyset$ )

where  $ALT(\varphi)$  is a set of all maximal subsets of  $[\varphi]$ .


**FC:** Suppose  $M, s \models \Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)$ . Since  $[\alpha] \in ALT(\alpha \vee \beta)$  then for all  $w \in s$ :  $[\alpha] \cap R[w] \neq \emptyset$ , and thus  $M, s \models \Diamond\alpha$ . ✓

**DP:** Suppose  $M, s \models \neg\Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)$ . Then  $\exists \eta \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$  such that for some  $w \in s$ :  $\eta \cap R[w] = \emptyset$ . ✗

# Deontic Inquisitive Logic (Aloni, 2007; Nygren, 2022)

**FC:** Suppose  $M, s \models \Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)$ . Since  $[\alpha] \in ALT(\alpha \vee \beta)$  then for all  $w \in s$ :  $[\alpha] \cap R[w] \neq \emptyset$ , and thus  $M, s \models \Diamond\alpha$ .  $\checkmark$

**DP:** Suppose  $M, s \models \neg\Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)$ . Then  $\exists \eta \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$  such that for some  $w \in s$ :  $\eta \cap R[w] = \emptyset$ .  $\times$




(b)

# Deontic Inquisitive Logic (Aloni, 2007; Nygren, 2022)


**FC:** Suppose  $M, s \models \diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)$ . Since  $[\alpha] \in ALT(\alpha \vee \beta)$  then for all  $w \in s$ :  $[\alpha] \cap R[w] \neq \emptyset$ , and thus  $M, s \models \diamond\alpha$ . ✓

**DP:** Suppose  $M, s \models \neg\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)$ . Then  $\exists \eta \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$  such that for some  $w \in s$ :  $\eta \cap R[w] = \emptyset$ . ✗

Note that if we use **bilateral negation** or **homogeneity**, the prediction changes.



(b)



(c)

Exhaustivity operator: FC:  $Exh(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta))$  DP:  $Exh(\neg\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta))$

Hamblin sets (vs. Horn's scales):

$$Alt(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)) = \{\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta), \diamond\alpha, \diamond\beta, \diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta)\}$$

$$Alt(\neg\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)) = \{\underline{\neg\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)}, \neg\diamond\alpha, \neg\diamond\beta, \neg\diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta)\}$$

Exhaustivity operator: FC:  $Exh(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta))$  DP:  $Exh(\neg\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta))$

Hamblin sets (vs. Horn's scales):

$$Alt(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)) = \{\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta), \diamond\alpha, \diamond\beta, \diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta)\}$$

Exhaustification of FC:

1. Take all maximal sets of alternatives, that can be assigned **false** with the prejacent:  $\{\diamond\alpha, \diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta)\}$ ,  $\{\diamond\beta, \diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta)\}$ ;
2. *Innocent Exclusion*: Exclude the intersection of those sets:  
 $\{\diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta)\}$

# Exhaustivity (Fox, 2007; Bar-Lev and Fox, 2020)

Exhaustivity operator: FC:  $Exh(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta))$  DP:  $Exh(\neg\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta))$

Hamblin sets (vs. Horn's scales):

$$Alt(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)) = \{\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta), \diamond\alpha, \diamond\beta, \diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta)\}$$


Exhaustification of FC:

1. Take all maximal sets of alternatives, that can be assigned **false** with the prejacent:  $\{\diamond\alpha, \diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta)\}, \{\diamond\beta, \diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta)\}$ ;
2. *Innocent Exclusion*: Exclude the intersection of those sets:  
 $\{\diamond(\alpha \wedge \beta)\}$
3. Take all maximal sets of alternatives, that can be assigned **true** with the prejacent and negations of excluded alternatives:  
 $\{\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta), \diamond\alpha, \diamond\beta\}$ ;
4. *Innocent Inclusion*: Include the intersection of those sets. ✓

# Exhaustivity and questions

How should we exhaust FCQs?<sup>4</sup>

$$\cdot \text{?Exh}(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)) \equiv \underbrace{\text{Exh}(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta))}_{\text{Yes}} \vee \underbrace{\neg\text{Exh}(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta))}_{\text{No}}$$



(b)

---


<sup>4</sup>Fox (2018, 2020) proposes his own theory of questions based on partition semantics. The approach has analogical issues like the one mentioned above. For the sake of time, we do not discuss this approach here.



# Exhaustivity and questions

How should we exhaust FCQs?<sup>4</sup>

- $?Exh(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)) \equiv \underbrace{Exh(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta))}_{\text{Yes}} \vee \underbrace{\neg Exh(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta))}_{\text{No}}$
- $? \diamond(\alpha \vee \beta) \equiv \underbrace{\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)}_{\text{Yes}} \vee \underbrace{\neg \diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)}_{\text{No}}$



(a)

---

<sup>4</sup>Fox (2018, 2020) proposes his own theory of questions based on partition semantics. The approach has analogical issues like the one mentioned above. For the sake of time, we do not discuss this approach here.

# Exhaustivity and questions

How should we exhaust FCQs?<sup>4</sup>

- $?Exh(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)) \equiv \underbrace{Exh(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta))}_{\text{Yes}} \vee \underbrace{\neg Exh(\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta))}_{\text{No}}$
- $? \diamond(\alpha \vee \beta) \equiv \underbrace{\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)}_{\text{Yes}} \vee \underbrace{\neg \diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)}_{\text{No}}$
- $Exh(? \diamond(\alpha \vee \beta))$
- $Exh(Exh(? \diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)))$

---

<sup>4</sup>Fox (2018, 2020) proposes his own theory of questions based on partition semantics. The approach has analogical issues like the one mentioned above. For the sake of time, we do not discuss this approach here.

# Homogeneity (Goldstein, 2019)

*“Disjunctions are homogeneous with respect to modal status...”*

(Goldstein, 2019, p.35)

HAS:  $\diamond\varphi$  is defined only if all the alternatives in  $\llbracket\varphi\rrbracket$  have the same truth value, where  $\llbracket\alpha \vee \beta\rrbracket = \llbracket\alpha\rrbracket \cup \llbracket\beta\rrbracket$

HDS:  $\alpha \vee \beta$  is defined only if either both  $\diamond\alpha$  and  $\diamond\beta$  or both  $\neg\diamond\alpha$  and  $\neg\diamond\beta$  are (**non-emptily**) supported. ( $\approx$  split  $[\vee]^+$ )

- Negation is from weak Kleene table ( $\approx$  bilateral)

# Homogeneity (Goldstein, 2019)

*“Disjunctions are homogeneous with respect to modal status...”*

(Goldstein, 2019, p.35)

HAS:  $\diamond\varphi$  is defined only if all the alternatives in  $\llbracket\varphi\rrbracket$  have the same truth value, where  $\llbracket\alpha \vee \beta\rrbracket = \llbracket\alpha\rrbracket \cup \llbracket\beta\rrbracket$

HDS:  $\alpha \vee \beta$  is defined only if either both  $\diamond\alpha$  and  $\diamond\beta$  or both  $\neg\diamond\alpha$  and  $\neg\diamond\beta$  are (**non-emptily**) supported. ( $\approx$  split  $[\vee]^+$ )

- Negation is from weak Kleene table ( $\approx$  bilateral)

FC: At least one is permitted  $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}}$  both are permitted.


DP: Both are not permitted.

# Homogeneity (Goldstein, 2019)

**FC:** At least one is permitted  $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}}$  both are permitted.

**DP:** Both are not permitted.

**FCQ:** Either both are permitted or both are forbidden.<sup>5</sup>



Is homogeneity semantic or pragmatic?

*“This paper offers a new **semantic** analysis of Free Choice...”*

(Goldstein, 2019, p.1) \_\_\_\_\_

<sup>5</sup>Trivalent homogeneous polar questions by Enguehard (2021) with homogeneity deontic modality yields the same results.

- Neglect-zero as a pragmatic enrichment.
- Enriched disjunction is satisfied if both disjuncts are non-emptily supported.
- Bilateral negation
- Adding inquisitive disjunction is theoretically motivated by Anttila (2021)<sup>6</sup>

$$\text{FC: } [\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)]^+ \models \diamond\alpha \wedge \diamond\beta$$

$$\text{DP: } [\neg\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)]^+ \models \neg\diamond\alpha \wedge \neg\diamond\beta$$


---

<sup>6</sup>It is also possible to adopt the ? operator by Enguehard (2021) instead, which will yield the same predictions.

FC:  $[\Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)]^+ \models \Diamond\alpha \wedge \Diamond\beta$


DP:  $[\neg\Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)]^+ \models \neg\Diamond\alpha \wedge \neg\Diamond\beta$

FCQ:  $[\Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)]^+ \equiv [\Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)]^+ \vee [\neg\Diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)]^+$




# Interim Summary


Theory	FC	Source	DP	Source	FCQ	Source
InqSem	×	sem	✓	sem	a	sem
Deontic InqL	✓	sem	×	sem	b	sem
Exhaustivity	✓	gram	✓	gram+pragm	a/b	gram/prag
Homogeneity	✓	sem/prag	✓	sem	c	sem/prag
BSML	✓	prag	✓	sem+prag	c	sem+prag



(a)



(b)



(c)



# The Experiment

---


# Example of an experimental trial



*Bill is in London at a tourist office. He wants to know more about the tourist pass they offer. He asks the employee of the office:*

BILL: Am I allowed to go to **Big Ben or the London Eye** with this pass?

EMPLOYEE: **Yes**



Was the employee's answer accurate given the picture?

Accurate


Inaccurate

# Materials

Three contexts:



**Control contexts:** The left context is a TRUE control for the “Yes” particle and the FALSE control for the “No” particle.



**Target context** for both “Yes” and “No” particles.


$$2 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 + 24 = 72$$

- Two **scenarios**
- Four **pairs of items** for each scenario
- Three **contexts** (both allowed, one allowed, neither allowed).
- Two **response particles** ("Yes" and "No")
- 24 **filler items**

# Results


---

## Results: error rate on fillers




No participants were excluded.

## Results: acceptance rate



## Results: acceptance rate




All differences were significant ( $p < 0.001$ ).

In both cases, the TARGET condition is still significantly closer (more similar) to the FALSE condition than to the TRUE condition ( $p < 0.001$ ).



# Results: TARGET acceptance rate




**Figure 1:** Distribution of participants by mean accepted rate for TARGET conditions "Yes" and "No" particles. There are **Non-Free Choice participants**, but no Non-Dual Prohibition participants.

## Results: acceptance rate


- The “Yes” answer to an FCQ corresponds to **Free Choice** .
- The “No” answer to an FCQ corresponds to **Dual Prohibition** .
- Acceptance rates of FC and DP are lower than for the controls.
- We did not find any differences between scenarios/speech acts.
- There are **Non-Free Choice participants** , but no Non-Dual Prohibition participants.

## Results: acceptance rate


- The “Yes” answer to an FCQ corresponds to **Free Choice (c)**.
- The “No” answer to an FCQ corresponds to **Dual Prohibition (c)**.
- There are **Non-Free Choice participants consistently choosing (a)**, but no Non-Dual Prohibition participants.



(a)



(b)



(c)

# Interpretation of reaction times data

Various studies observed the **delay effect**: computing a **scalar implicature** takes longer than computing the literal meaning (e.g. Bott and Noveck, 2004; Bott et al., 2012).

Performing a pragmatic weakening e.g. suspending presupposition (Schwarz, 2013) or neglect-zero (Ramotowska et al., 2022) takes longer than computing the meaning using the pragmatic effect. (**reversed delay effect**).

Bott et al. (2019) as well as Ramotowska et al. (2022) showed that it **takes longer to process zero-models** than non-zero-models at least in the domain of quantifiers.

## Predictions:

- **Semantic** solutions predict that *FC* and *DP* are literal inferences, and thus TARGET should take as long as TRUE or FALSE.

## Predictions:

- **Semantic** solutions predict that *FC* and *DP* are literal inferences, and thus TARGET should take as long as TRUE or FALSE.
- **Implicature-based** solutions claim that only *FC* is an implicature. They predict that it should take longer than the other inferences. Moreover, they predict a **delay effect** for it.

## Predictions:

- **Semantic** solutions predict that *FC* and *DP* are literal inferences, and thus TARGET should take as long as TRUE or FALSE.
- **Implicature-based** solutions claim that only *FC* is an implicature. They predict that it should take longer than the other inferences. Moreover, they predict a **delay effect** for it.
- **Homogeneity**, is considered a pragmatic presupposition. TARGET contexts violate it so this approach predicts longer RTs for them. Moreover, suspending the presupposition is difficult, i.e. **reversed delay effect** for *FC*.

## Predictions:

- **Semantic** solutions predict that *FC* and *DP* are literal inferences, and thus TARGET should take as long as TRUE or FALSE.
- **Implicature-based** solutions claim that only *FC* is an implicature. They predict that it should take longer than the other inferences. Moreover, they predict a **delay effect** for it.
- **Homogeneity**, is considered a pragmatic presupposition. TARGET contexts violate it so this approach predicts longer RTs for them. Moreover, suspending the presupposition is difficult, i.e. **reversed delay effect** for *FC*.
- **Neglect-zero** effect used in BSML predicts that considering zero models (TARGETS) should take **longer** the non-zero controls. Suspending neglect-zero should take longer, than using it: **reversed delay effect**.




## Predictions regarding reaction times data

Data	Yes		No	
	RT	Delay	RT	Delay
InqSem	const	no	const	no
Deontic InqL	const	no	const	no
Exhaustivity	longer	yes	shorter	no
Homogeneity	longer	reversed	longer	?no
BSML	longer	reversed	longer	?no

## Results: reaction times

We removed 24 outliers which lay further than 3 standard deviations from the mean (longer than 27 seconds), leaving us with 2856 trials with a mean reaction time of 4.3 seconds and a standard deviation of 3 seconds.




We observed two effects on the test trials:

**Negation effect:** The items with the “No” particle as the answer, took significantly longer ( $\beta \approx 0.3\text{sec}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

**Target effect:** The items with the context where only one alternative is allowed took significantly longer ( $\beta \approx 1.4\text{sec}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

## Results: reaction times




## Results: reaction times

Since longer reaction times for TARGET may have multiple sources, we can compare the test items to **filler items**, and see if we can find the same effect there:

**Negation effect**, is significant and similar in size to the one found on test items ( $\beta \approx 0.3\text{sec}$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).

**Target effect**, but it is much smaller in size ( $\beta \approx 0.2\text{sec}$ ) and barely significant ( $p \approx 0.03$ ).

# Results: reaction times



## Results: reaction times




Figure 2: Interaction of contexts and filler/test.

Delay effect (centred reaction times):


- ×FC **No delay:** rejecting TARGET conditions for “Yes” particle took as long as accepting them ( $\beta \approx -0.1\text{sec}$ ,  $p > 0.1$ ).
- ?DP **Reversed delay:** Rejecting TARGET conditions for “No” particle takes significantly shorter than accepting; however, this difference is barely significant. ( $\beta \approx 1.2 \text{ sec}$   $p = 0.0183$ )<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Since we only consider 9% of the “No” responses to TARGET(42 trials and 17 participants), the significance is expected to be low. Moreover, the impact of outliers increases.



## Results: delay effect



## Discussion

---

## Conclusions:

1. The “Yes” answer to a *FCQ* corresponds to **Free Choice**.
2. The “No” answer to a *FCQ* corresponds to **Dual Prohibition**.
3. Both these inferences most likely have a pragmatic source (lower acceptance rate + longer reaction times).
4. We did not observe any (reversed) delay effect.

## Conclusions:


1. The “Yes” answer to a FCQ corresponds to **Free Choice**.
2. The “No” answer to a FCQ corresponds to **Dual Prohibition**.
3. Both these inferences most likely have a pragmatic source (lower acceptance rate + longer reaction times).
4. We did not observe any (reversed) delay effect.

## Potential weaknesses:

- Not much data on delay effect for “No”
- More trials with default rejection than acceptance (2:1) + Yes-bias.
- Difference in reaction times may have various explanations.

# Theory vs. data

Theory	FC	Source	DP	Source	FCQ	Source
InqSem	×	sem	✓	sem	×	sem
Deontic InqL	✓	sem	×	sem	×	sem
Exhaustivity	✓	gram	✓	gram/prag	×?	sem/prag
Homogeneity	✓	sem/prag	✓	sem	✓	sem/prag
BVML	✓	prag	✓	sem+prag	✓	sem+prag



# Theory vs. data

Data	Yes		No	
	RT	Delay	RT	Delay
InqSem	const	no	const	no
Deontic InqL	const	no	const	no
Exhaustivity	longer	<b>yes</b>	shorter	no
Homogeneity	longer	reversed	longer	?no
BSML	longer	reversed	longer	?no

# Conclusions

- × **Semantic** theories are not consistent with the results.
- ? **Exhaustification** may have an explanation for FCQs, but it seems very convoluted. Moreover, it is inconsistent with the lack of delay effect and longer reaction times for both targets.

# Conclusions

- × **Semantic** theories are not consistent with the results.
- ? **Exhaustification** may have an explanation for FCQs, but it seems very convoluted. Moreover, it is inconsistent with the lack of delay effect and longer reaction times for both targets.
- ✓ **Homogeneity** with pragmatic interpretation explains the behaviour of FCQs and longer reaction times for the TARGET conditions. However, the predicted reversed delay effect was not observed.



# Conclusions

- × **Semantic** theories are not consistent with the results.
- ? **Exhaustification** may have an explanation for FCQs, but it seems very convoluted. Moreover, it is inconsistent with the lack of delay effect and longer reaction times for both targets.
- ✓ **Homogeneity** with pragmatic interpretation explains the behaviour of FCQs and longer reaction times for the TARGET conditions. However, the predicted reversed delay effect was not observed.
- ✓ **BSML** with inquisitive disjunction explains the behaviour of FCQs and longer reaction times in terms of neglect-zero. However, the predicted reversed delay effect was not observed.

# Conclusions

- × **Semantic** theories are not consistent with the results.
- ? **Exhaustification** may have an explanation for FCQs, but it seems very convoluted. Moreover, it is inconsistent with the lack of delay effect and longer reaction times for both targets.
- ✓ **Homogeneity** with pragmatic interpretation explains the behaviour of FCQs and longer reaction times for the TARGET conditions. However, the predicted reversed delay effect was not observed.
- ✓ **BSML** with inquisitive disjunction explains the behaviour of FCQs and longer reaction times in terms of neglect-zero. However, the predicted reversed delay effect was not observed.
- ✓ BSML can explain the Non-Free Choice participants through suspension of neglect-zero. We would expect that the Homogeneity presupposition cannot be globally “suspended”.

## Further research

1. Other possible answers to Free Choice Questions (e.g. involving cancellation)
2. Embedded Free Choice Questions: *Mary knows whether Bill may go to the park or to the beach.*
3. Scalar Questions and Homogeneity Questions:
  - Did **some** students pass the exam?
  - Did **the boys** go to the park?
  - Did you **stop** smoking?
4. Relation between FCQ, wh-questions and indefinites:
  - *May I have **a cookie**?*
  - Which cookie may I have?
  - Which boy may have which cookie?

Thank you!

## References

---

- Aher, M. (2013). *Modals in Legal Language*. PhD thesis, Institute of Cognitive Science, University of Osnabrück.
- Aloni, M. (2007). Free choice, modals, and imperatives. *Natural Language Semantics*, 15:65–94.
- Aloni, M. (2022). Logic and conversation: the case of free choice. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 15:5–EA.
- Anttila, A. (2021). *The Logic of Free Choice. Axiomatizations of State-based Modal Logics*. PhD thesis, Master's thesis, Institute for Logic, Language and Computation.
- Bar-Lev, M. E. and Fox, D. (2020). Free choice, simplification, and innocent inclusion. *Natural Language Semantics*, 28(3):175–223.

## References ii

- Bott, L., Bailey, T. M., and Grodner, D. (2012). Distinguishing speed from accuracy in scalar implicatures. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 66(1):123–142.
- Bott, L. and Noveck, I. A. (2004). Some utterances are underinformative: The onset and time course of scalar inferences. *Journal of memory and language*, 51(3):437–457.
- Bott, O., Schlotterbeck, F., and Klein, U. (2019). Empty-set effects in quantifier interpretation. *Journal of Semantics*, 36(1):99–163.
- Chemla, E. (2009). Similarity: Towards a unified account of scalar implicatures, free choice permission and presupposition projection. *Under revision for Semantics and Pragmatics*.
- Ciardelli, I., Groenendijk, J., and Roelofsen, F. (2018). *Inquisitive semantics*. Oxford University Press.

## References iii

- de Leeuw, J. R., Gilbert, R. A., and Luchterhandt, B. (2023). jspsych: Enabling an open-source collaborative ecosystem of behavioral experiments. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 8(85):5351.
- Enguehard, É. (2021). Explaining presupposition projection in (coordinations of) polar questions. *Natural Language Semantics*, 29:527–578.
- Fox, D. (2007). Free choice and the theory of scalar implicatures. *Presupposition and implicature in compositional semantics*, pages 71–120.
- Fox, D. (2018). Partition by exhaustification: Comments on dayal 1996.
- Fox, D. (2020). Partition by exhaustification: Towards a solution to Gentile and Schwarz's puzzle. *Manuscript, MIT*.  
<https://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/TljZGNjZ>.

## References iv

- Goldstein, S. (2019). Free choice and homogeneity. *Semantics and Pragmatics*, 12:23–EA.
- Kratzer, A. and Shimoyama, J. (2002). Indeterminate pronouns: The view from Japanese. In *3rd Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics*.
- Nygren, K. (2022). Free choice in modal inquisitive logic. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, pages 1–45.
- Ramotowska, S., Marty, P., Romoli, J., Sudo, Y., and Breheny, R. (2022). Diversity with universality. In Degano, M., Roberts, T., Sbardolini, G., and Schouwstra, M., editors, *Proceedings of the 23rd Amsterdam Colloquium*.
- Roelofsen, F. and Farkas, D. F. (2015). Polarity particle responses as a window onto the interpretation of questions and assertions. *Language*, pages 359–414.



Schwarz, F. (2013). Maximality and definite plurals-experimental evidence. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung*, volume 17, pages 509–526.

# Exhaustification backup

$$\text{Alt}(\mathcal{Q}) = \{\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta), \neg\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta), \diamond(\alpha \vee \beta) \wedge \neg\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)\}$$

$$\text{Exclusion: } \diamond(\alpha \vee \beta) \wedge \neg\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)$$

$$\text{Inclusion: } \{\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)\} \cap \{\neg\diamond(\alpha \vee \beta)\} = \emptyset$$

Rejecting TARGET conditions took as long as accepting them  
( $\beta \approx 0.1\text{sec}$ ,  $p > 0.1$ ).

# Methods

**Participants:** 60 native speakers of English located in the UK or in the US (*prolific.co*). Participants were informed about their rights and that the study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Amsterdam (FGW-341). The participants were paid £2.25 for their participation.

**Software:** jsPsych (de Leeuw et al., 2023) and *cognition.run*.

## Two scenarios:

- (6) *Ann is about to rent a new apartment. She wants to discuss the terms with her new landlady before drafting a contract. She asks the landlady: (Establishing permission)*
  
- (7) *Bill is in London at a tourist office. He wants to know more about the tourist pass they offer. He asks the employee of the office: (Reporting permission)*

Consent → **Training** → Randomised trials

- 7 filler items
- Feedback after every training item (4 seconds penalty if incorrect)
- Familiarising participants with the design
- Discouraging *politeness* and *precision* readings.

# Results: acceptance rate




Figure 3: Mean accepted rate of participants for "Yes" and "No" particles.