The polarity of a natural language quantifier (NLQ) has consistently been shown to affect the sets available for reference. 1) Not many of the MPs went to the meeting. 2) Many of the MPs went to the meeting. 2) They argued about immigration.

- Negative (-ive) natural language quantifiers (NLQs) tend to promote reference to a different set than positive (+ive) NLQs. (1'), which refers to the complement set, is preferred after (1) which uses the -ive not. (2') is more likely after (2) which uses +ive many.

- Seen using a range of methods: sentence continuations (Moxey & Sanford, 1987), sentence acceptability ratings (Heinait & Klingvall, 2019; Upadhyay et al., 2019), self-paced reading (Sanford et al., 1996), eye-tracking (Paterson et al., 1998) and event-related potentials (Filik et al., 2011).

- Presupposition denial account (Moxey, 2006) - “shortfall” between expected and denoted amounts.
- Complement set references as “reasons-why-not”.
- ALTERNATIVE THEORY – generic reference to maximal or general set (Corblin, 1996).

- Where a quantifier is monotone decreasing, and a default reference to the reference set would be anomalous, the complement set may become available for reference (Kibble, 1997; Nounen, 2003; Zulaica-Hernández, 2018).

THE CURRENT STUDY
- Examine the production and acceptability of complement set references in Polish.
- Expand range of languages used to examine complement set reference.
- Test predictions of Presupposition Denial Account in a Slavic language.

Experiment 1 – Sentence Continuation
Participants
40 native speakers of polish recruited via Prolific.

Design & Materials
120 sentences, half beginning with Not Many, half beginning with Many.

Procedure
Read each sentence carefully and write a suitable next sentence beginning with “They:” After writing the next sentence answer the question, “Who is your sentence about? 1) The patients who were scared of the dentist, 2) The patients who were not scared of the dentist, 3) Somebody or something else.

Results
Quantifier*set
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Sentence Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neg/Ref set</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg/Comp set</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos/Ref set</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos/Comp set</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experiment 2 – Sentence Rating
Participants
40 native speakers of polish recruited via Prolific.

Design & Materials
120 passages, 2(quantifier) x 2(set) design

Procedure
Read each passage carefully and rate how well the last sentence fits with what came before.

Results
Quantifier*set
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Sentence Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neg/Ref set</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg/Comp set</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos/Ref set</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos/Comp set</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experiment 3 – Sentence Rating
Participants
40 native speakers of polish recruited via Prolific.

Design & Materials
120 passages, 2(quantifier) x 2(set) design

Procedure
Read each passage carefully and rate how well the last sentence fits with what came before.

Results
No 3-way interaction (p = .05)
Quantifier*set
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Sentence Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neg/Ref set</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg/Comp set</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos/Ref set</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos/Comp set</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSIONS
- Sentence continuations followed a very similar pattern to research in English. Complement set references were more common after negative NLQs. Expectation Sentence low & dentysty of the audience to applaud. They booked appointments without hesitation.

- Basic sentence ratings followed a similar pattern with complement set references “fitting” better after negative NLQs. Expectation Sentence low & dentysty of the audience to applaud. They booked appointments without hesitation.

- Supports complement set reference after negative NLQs in Polish. Does not provide evidence for Presupposition Denial Account, however this account has mostly been previously tested with sentence continuation studies and eye-tracking.

- All materials used the explicitly negated quantifier Not Many which may have overridden any more subtle effects found with non-explicit quantifiers such as Few.

- Provides greater insight into the manipulating properties of negative NLQs in pronominal referencing by expanding the range of languages under which complement set referencing is observed.
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