**Priming Non-Maximality**

Summary of 16/09 + Experiment Proposal

Experimental items x Study

***Studies* (5, with different groups of subjects):** Each study is defined by the particular combination of **Predicate types (**Collective/Distributive/Baseline) in the 4 experimental items (+ Fillers, see next section).

* *Study 1* - **All Collective** – *How accessible are non-maximal readings of collective predicates*? Point to have into account: Priming effects of Collective predicates (i.e., accessing might become easier after seeing Max readings of Collective predicates).
* *Study 2 –* **All Distributive** – *How accessible are non-maximal readings of distributive predicates*? (Follow-up of Marty et al 2015). Again: There could be priming effects (specially if there is an actual competition between Phantom and Maximal readings).

**% True responses in targets: Study 1 vs Study 2**🡪 Differences of accessibility of NM readings for different predicates.

Table 1



* *Study 3 –* **Baseline** (for NonMax Distributive) – *Is it possible to prime phantom readings?* Control for Study 2.

**% True responses in targets: Study 2 vs Study 3**🡪 Priming of NM readings of distributive predicates.

* *Study 4 –* **All Collective Priming** – *Is it possible to prime phantom readings of distributive predicates by forcing all possible readings of collective predicates (maximal and non-maximal)?* Point to have into account: A priming effect here could be due strictly to non-maximal readings.

**% True responses in targets: Study 2 vs Study 4**🡪 Differences of priming between Distributive and Collective predicates. Priming specifically of Collective predicates (independently of the “type” of reading).

**% True responses in targets: Study 3 vs Study 4**🡪 Difference between priming by Collective predicates and not priming at all (get rid of some sort of effect due to non-maximal “readings” in general, independently of the predicates).

* *Study 5 –* **Max Collective Priming**– *Is it possible to prime phantom readings of distributive predicates only by forcing maximal readings of collective predicates?*

**% True responses in targets: Study 2 vs Study 4 vs Study 5**🡪 Priming effects of maximal collective readings on non-maximal distributive readings. [Collective predicates by themselves might activate non-maximal readings. The similarity between 4 and 5 allow us to measure the existence of ambiguity]

***Items*** can belong to 4 **Conditions** (False/Max/NonMax/NonMaxD), depending on the readings that the pictures make true. While the three first conditions share the **Picture type** (1 or 2), NonMaxD presents always a different Picture\*Predicate combination.

The particular combination of **Picture type** across Conditionsis controlled across subjects (some of them see 1-2 configuration, and some 2-1; see Table 2). Notice that the combination Predicate\*Picture supposes particular predicates, such as “be connected to” or “form a circle”.

Table 2



Notice that this design allows us to control for: Influences of predicate and image priming (by contrasting NonMax vs NonMaxD; see carefully: sometimes is indistinguishable).

Fillers

Fillers serve to control potential influences of the images in the performance (i.e. association between truth-values and particular images).



Predictions



* Presentation of distributive predicates with images that make maximal readings true (priming) and false (anti-priming) could lead to an increasing of non-maximal readings in targets (phantom readings).> 2 vs 3
* Collective predicates by themselves activate non-maximal readings, even in the cases where maximal readings would also be true.