

- (4) Context: Jane was baby-sitting for her sister. **[VP content condition]**
NEAS 1: She wasn't smart to leave the baby unattended. (QUD-NAI in Context)
NEAS 2: She wasn't smart to keep an eye on the baby at all times. (QUD-AI in Context)

For each adjective, there were 3 pairs of two-sentence target stimuli in each condition, for a total of 120 target stimuli. Participants were presented with 10 target stimuli (and 6 control stimuli) and asked whether the subject (e.g. Jane) VPed (e.g. turned up the volume).

Results: Ordinal mixed-effects models on response with by-participant and by-item random intercepts and random slopes for QUD-NAI revealed significant differences between QUD-NAI and QUD-AI in the context ($\beta = 2.1$, $SE = 0.37$, $z = 5.72$, $p < .001$) and the VP content ($\beta = 3.28$, $SE = 0.35$, $z = 9.5$, $p < .001$) conditions. As predicted by the QUD-based analysis, responses were higher (indicating projection of the VP implication) for QUD-NAI than QUD-AI discourses.

Exp 2 (n = 94): Target stimuli consisted of 60 three-sentence discourses, as in (5): the first and third sentences were identical to the QUD-AI stimuli from Exp 1, i.e. compatible with implicative interpretations. The second sentence contradicted the VP implication of the NEAS: consequently, the NEAS was acceptable as part of the discourse only under an implicative interpretation. The experiment also included 60 minimal variants with *enough* in the NEAS (hypothesized to be acceptable) and eight control stimuli in which the last sentence was not acceptable. Participants read 18 discourses and were asked whether the last sentence sounded good as part of the discourse.

- (5) Jane was baby-sitting for her sister. She left the baby unattended. She wasn't smart to keep an eye on the baby at all times.

Results: An ordinal mixed-effects model on response with by-participant and by-item random intercepts revealed significant differences between the target stimuli and both the *enough*-variants ($\beta = 1.82$, $SE = 0.23$, $z = 8.03$, $p < .001$) and the controls ($\beta = -5.68$, $SE = 0.46$, $z = -12.38$, $p < .001$). Utterances of NEAS with an implicative interpretation (mean rating: 4.24) are degraded compared to the fully acceptable *enough*-variants (mean: 5.86) but acceptable compared to the unacceptable control stimuli (mean: 1.09). Speaker variation was substantial: target stimuli were judged to be unacceptable (mean < 4) by 36% of participants and fully acceptable (mean > 5.5) by 28%.

Exp 3 (n = 82): Target stimuli consisted of the 30 NEAS from the context condition of Exp 1, which were shown there to be compatible with both factive and implicative interpretations. The target stimuli were presented in a minimal, non-biasing context: participants were asked to imagine that they overhear Debby utter the NEAS (e.g. *Jane wasn't smart to turn up the volume*) and responded to the question of whether Debby thinks that the subject (e.g. Jane) VPed (e.g. turned up the volume). In a separate task (parallel to Exp 2), each participant judged the acceptability of NEAS in discourses that only permitted either factive or implicative interpretations.

Results: The ordinal responses were coded for whether they indicate a factive interpretation (5-7) or not (1-3). A mixed-effects logistic regression model predicting a factive interpretation from random by-participant and by-item intercepts revealed a significant intercept ($\beta = 1.81$, $SE = 0.36$, $z = 5$, $p < .001$), as well as significant main effects of the mean acceptability rating for each participant on the factive ($\beta = 0.95$, $SE = 0.16$, $z = 5.81$, $p < .001$) and implicative ($\beta = -0.77$, $SE = 0.14$, $z = -5.49$, $p < .001$) items. NEAS with non-biasing VP contents uttered in a non-biasing context are more likely to receive a factive interpretation, even when speaker variation in the acceptability of the factive and implicative interpretations is taken into account, suggesting that the interpretation of the evaluative adjectives biases NEAS towards a factive interpretation.

Conclusions: Projective implications of NEAS need not be lexically specified (e.g. Heim 1983, van der Sandt 1992) but depend on the QUD, the interlocutor and the evaluative adjective meaning.