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**Question addressed in the present study**

Is quantifier scope computed immediately and automatically as the quantifiers are encountered or is it left underspecified until disambiguating information has been reached (Sanford & Sturt)?

**Scope conflict**

- Factors affecting scope preferences: a) construction biases (inverse linking), b) distributivity (all vs. every)

  - (1) involves scope conflict: inverse linking (⇒ inverse scope), but non-distributive all (⇒ linear scope)


      Exactly one geometrical object on all cards is a circle.

    2. In (1b) both factors bias towards inverse scope, no conflict arises

- The second quantifier appears after a complete predication in (1)/(2), but before the predicate in (3a)/(3b) (cf. Sanford & Garrod)

  - Automatic scope resolution even without a concrete scenario?

**Materials and design of the study**

- **i-link**: Genau ein Kreis ist auf allen Karten zu finden.

  Exactly one circle is on all cards to find.

- **sent**: Genau ein Kreis ist auf jeder Karte zu finden.

  Exactly one circle is on every card to find.

  - The same contrast as in (1a)/(1b) can be observed in (2a)/(2b) and (3a)/(3b).

- **contr**: Auf allen/jedem Bild(ern) sollst du nennen!

  You should name all/every picture(s) should you name!

**Exp. 1: Combined self-paced reading/verification paradigm**

**Exp. 1 (N=40): reading stage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Sent</th>
<th>I-link</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>sent conditions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No RT difference between all and every in controls (p &gt; .10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent: scope conflict ⇒ slower RTs on all than on every</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i-link conditions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No scope computation before processing the verbal predicate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exp. 2 (N=30): Eyetracking**

- **Task**: read sentence, uncover cards, decide at each whether the sentence is true/false or more information is needed (cf. Conroy)

  - Immediate full interpretation: Indication of scope conflict as soon as all is encountered, well before the disambiguation.

  - Underspecification: Indication of scope conflict only at the disambiguation (i.e. at the 2nd card).

**Hypotheses and predictions**

- Judgments revealed scope conflict in all conditions, but not in every condition (Sanford: Task effect at quantifier; p < .01; f = .10)

  - Same scope distributions in sent and i-link ( funciona-al; p < .01)

  - Yes, go on RTS: QQ-conditions slower than controls

  - Verification strategy seems to be in place already at first card

**Exp. 1 (N=40): verification stage**

- In (1b) both factors bias towards inverse scope, no conflict arises

- These two card displays disambiguate the scope readings

  - yes: yes; no: no; yes: yes
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