

Appendix

For both experiments, acceptability judgments (1-7) were entered into a mixed-effect linear regression analysis using the *lme4* package (Bates et al. 2015) in *R* (R Development Core Team 2008). The predictors Gapping and Embedding Complexity were centred such that the intercept reflects the general mean for Gapping and the No Embedding conditions as the reference conditions for Embedding Complexity. “Gapping” thus reflects the main effect of the factor Gapping, “Embedding” and “Factivity” represent the effects of the embedded conditions (Embedding No Factive and Embedding Factive) versus the No Embedding conditions¹. The fully maximal model² including random intercepts and slopes for Gapping and Embedding Complexity for Items as well as Subjects produced singular fits. We, therefore, simplified the model³ by excluding correlations between random intercepts and slopes as well as the No Embedding vs. Embedding No Factive from the random effects (Barr et al. 2013). The model’s fixed effects are given in Table 1 (Experiment 1) and Table 2 (Experiment 2).

Table 1: Summary of the model’s fixed effects for Experiment 1.

	Estimate	Std. Error	df	t-value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	5.81897	0.20704	30.77809	28.105	< 2e-16 *** ⁴
Gapping	-0.01290	0.08906	14.01905	-0.145	0.88692
Factivity	-1.94502	0.26201	37.94556	-7.423	6.68e-09 ***
Embedding	-0.30698	0.09627	503.95164	-3.189	0.00152 **
Gapping:Factivity	-0.03716	0.22505	25.25369	-0.165	0.87017
Gapping:Embedding	-0.05470	0.19217	507.31359	-0.285	0.77604

Table 2: Summary of the model’s fixed effects for Experiment 2.

	Estimate	Std. Error	df	t-value	Pr(> t)
(Intercept)	8.74282	0.15721	62.20000	55.612	< 2e-16 ***
Gapping	0.22635	0.08632	19.90000	2.622	0.016365 *
Factivity	-1.44845	0.22895	49.40000	-6.326	7.11e-08 ***
Embedding	-0.29076	0.10204	983.80000	-2.849	0.004471 **
Gapping:Factivity	1.15048	0.28415	40.50000	4.049	0.000226 ***
Gapping:Embedding	0.44493	0.20427	980.90000	2.178	0.029637 *

References

- Barr, Dale J., Roger Levy, Christoph Scheepers & Harry J. Tily. 2013. Random effects structure for confirmatory hypothesis testing: Keep it maximal. *Journal of Memory and Language* 68(3). 255-278.
- Bates, Douglas, Martin Maechler, Ben Bolker & Steve Walker. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using *lme4*. *Journal of Statistical Software* 67(1). 1-48.
- R Development Core Team. 2008. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing* (R Foundation for Statistical Computing). Vienna.

¹ No Embedding vs. Embedding No Factive and No Embedding vs. Embedding Factive, respectively.

² $m1 = \text{lmer}(\text{Judgment} \sim \text{Gapping} * (\text{NoEmb_Fact} + \text{NoEmb_NoFact}) + (\text{Gapping} * (\text{NoEmb_Fact} + \text{NoEmb_NoFact} | \text{Subj}) + (\text{Gapping} * (\text{NoEmb_Fact} + \text{NoEmb_NoFact} | \text{Item}), \text{data}=d)$

³ $m2 = \text{lmer}(\text{Judgment} \sim \text{Gapping} * (\text{NoEmb_Fact} + \text{NoEmb_NoFact}) + (\text{Gapping} * \text{NoEmb_Fact} || \text{Subj}) + (\text{Gapping} * \text{NoEmb_Fact} || \text{Item}), \text{data}=d)$

⁴ Code: ‘***’ $p < .001$, ‘**’ $p < .01$, ‘*’ $p < .05$.