**Summary Meeting with Benjamin’s 12-10-2015**

**(Some of these notes were taken by Benjamin)**

**Before this meeting, I'd one first design ready and I'd tested the images and sentences with 5 native speakers. Many of the problems below appeared after to these trials.**

* **Problem of ignorance inferences**

(People don’t understand why we say "between 5 and 7" when the number of dots is so clearly 6)

Not really a problem, except that it might flatten results

Mora's suggestion; first present the sentence (2 sg), then the picture (the sentence remains on the screen)  
>> Good idea I think

* **Problem of quantity of collective predicates in each study**.

Groups 5 and 6 (originally, C-C1-D2 and C-D1-D2): We’ll compare D2 (Target 2) in both groups. However, in Group 5 (C-C1-D2), subjects are seeing 48 trials with the same collective predicate, while in Group 6 (C-D1-D2) they only see 32. Any priming difference between the groups could be due to just the amount of repetition.

Solution: Eliminate D1 in Group 6 and replace for 16 new Collective primes, distributed between True and False. >> Notice that this D1 condition was included to be able to see differences of priming between different predicates and we will loose that, but it’s not particularly important.

Then only difference between groups 5 and 6 is the presence, in Group 5, of a collective picture that makes non-maximal readings true. **>> C-C1-D2 vs. C-X-D2**

Idea behind: if there is ambiguity for collectives, then in group 5 one might suppose that the non-maximal reading will be made more salient by the "collective target 1", which should increase non-maximal readings for target 2 (distributive) compared to group 6

* **Problems with predicate type and selection**
* *Type A of picture-predicate pair*

"arranged in a circle, on a circle" might be problematic in giving rise to distributive reading, since it could be that there is already a circle over the one/where the dots are arranged.

Solution: Try "as a circle", as a "triangle". Maybe don't use circles because it's hard for 4 dots to form a circle (but 3 can form a triangle, 4 a square). – Why not “form a circle”?

Notice that falsity in FALSE primes has to be related with the meaning of modified numerals and NOT with the predicate itself. In other words, a picture cannot make false a sentence such as "Between 4 and 6 dots form a triangle" only because there is no "triangle" present in the image, but because the number of dots that form a triangle is smaller than 4. Importantly, this restricts the lower bound in our numerals.

* *Type B of picture-predicate pair*

due to problems with "their closest circle">> "their letter" (works very well when you see the pictures).

SEE: Is there a “group” reading in this case, which makes the distributive predicate less distributive, favoring non-maximal interpretations?

- we decided on actual numbers (4-6 and 5-7, probably depending on the particular predicate)