GENERAL RESEARCH QUESTION: Does temporariness of the concepts encoded by adjectives influence prenominal adjectival order?

ADJECTIVE ORDER RESTRICTIONS (AOR)
- AORs are a contested research field and are known to be sensitive to a variety of factors, e.g., semantic subclasses, morphosyntactic features, genericity, or weight (cf. e.g. Alexiadou et al. 2007)
- AORs are primarily sensitive to a layered, semantic-syntactic shell around a noun: relative qualifying (RQ) >> absolute qualifying (AQ) >> classificatory (CLASS) (cf. Rijkhoff 2003; Svenonius 2008)

A factor also suspected to play a role in this respect is temporariness vs permanence, especially the distinction between individual-level (IL) and stage-level (SL) predicates (Cinque 2010; Ramaglia 2011; for IL-SL see Fernald 2008; Maienborn 2003)
- In particular for adjectives that are ambiguous as regards their potential IL-SL-readings, it has been argued that SLs systematically occur further from the noun than ILs (cf. Cinque 2010; Larson 1998) -- such as evaluative adjectives (like nice or eger) and deverbals in -bar (German -bar)
- Yet, the interplay of modification zones and temporality is unclear

STUDY I: evaaluatives in German
- 100-split task in German: given the presented context, which of two possible follow-up sentences sounds better / more natural to you? Distribute 100 points over the two options!
- Items: two possible AANs in follow-ups
- Critical: A1 and A2 are both time-stable (IL), but belong to different modification zones (general hierarchy (GH))

EXAMPLE (IL-CONTEXT, CRITICAL GROUP ITEM) AND POSSIBLE SCORE
»Peters Schulkamerad Jochen ist allgemein ein ganz stiller Junge,«

STUDY II: deverbals in -bar (German)
- Rating task: given the introductory sentence, how well does a follow-up sentence go with it in terms of its meaning? Rate on a scale from 1-6 (‘very good’-‘very bad’)
- Critical: introductory sentences contain an AAN-sequence (A1A2AQ>>CLASS) and A1AQ>>CLASS and depending on group, respectively) -- the follow-up always states that the concept encoded by the -bar-adjective momentarily does not hold
- Control: 3 types of fillers -- i) semantically inconspicuous (FO), ii) inference violation (FI), iii) entailment violation (FE)

EXAMPLE (‘IL-CONTEXT’, CRITICAL ITEM) AND POSSIBLE RATING
»Die Druckerei Schmidt vertreibt mit der CK-7 eine umweltfreundliche nachbestellbare Kartusche.«
→ Aufgrund eines Website-Fehlers kann diese derzeit nicht geordert werden.

RESULTS -- STUDY I
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1A2N</th>
<th>A2A1N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS -- STUDY II
| IL-SL-comparison is insignificant: |
|---|---|
| t(56)=-.914, p>.365 | It. means (SL (M=49.65, SD=10.87); IL (M=47.44, SD=8.04)) |
| t(22)=-.499, p>.623 | GH-scores differ significantly from IL- and SL-items |
| It. means [F(2, 33)=6.16, p<.005] | Post Hoc: no significant difference between SL and IL |
| Subj. means [F(2, 54)=29.58, p<.001] | significant difference between GH and IL/SL |

SUMMARY
Study 1:
- No difference between IL-/SL-items within RQ-zone
- Significant difference between GH and IL as well as SL
Study 2:
- No difference between IL-/SL-bar-adjectives, irrespective of the assumed modification zone

possible explanations:
- a) and b) corroborate the hypothesis
- c) is unexpected — possibly the IL-readings are too dominant in the employed -bar-adjectives
- Possibly, the distinction is thus too subtle and the fillers used in study 2 have distorted the picture — the strong inference- and entailment-violations may have made test subjects insensitive to temporal distinctions
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