Experiment 1: the effect of silent responses

Null Hyp.: silence following SAs should lead to adding $p$ to the CG. Hyp. A/B: silence shouldn’t lead to adding $p$ to the CG

Methods
- 27 items distributed in 9 lists
- 54 subjects recruited on MTurk
- Ordinal Mixed Effects Models: Move and Response type as fixed effects, plus random intercepts for Subjects and Items

Results
- Confirm, and denials lead to high and low scores across conditions ($p<.001$)
- Interaction Move: Resp. Silence following SAs leads to lower scores than OAs ($p<.001$)
- SAs are less biased than OAs towards adding $p$ to the CG

Experiment 2: the aftermath of denials

Null Hyp.: Denials following $p$, denials are highly disruptive moves, which lead the exchange into a state of crisis (F&B 2010)

Methods
- 18 items distributed in 6 lists (20 fillers)
- 54 subjects recruited on MTurk
- Ordinal Mixed Effects Models: Move and Response type as fixed effects, plus random intercepts for Subjects and Items

Results
- After OAs, combative responses rated higher than welcoming ones ($p<.001$)
- After SAs, welcoming responses rated higher than combative ones ($p<.001$)
- For both response types, SAs pattern in between OAs and PQs

General discussion
- The illocutionary behavior of SAs differ from the one of OAs:
  - When followed by a silent response, SAs do not lead to update the CG as systematically as OAs
  - In the aftermath of denials, it is more natural for authors of SAs to welcome disagreement than it is for authors of OAs

Further research
- Providing an explicit model of the illocutionary profile of SAs (e.g., in F&B 2010 framework)
- Exploring how the discourse behavior of SAs argues in favor/against extant theories on the lexical representation of subjective predicates