

Annotator demographics and VLFI scores

1 Introduction

This document contains supplementary material for the article “Identifying visual depictions of animate entities in narrative comics: An annotation study”, and provides the basic demographics and Visual Language Fluency Index (VLFI) scores for all annotators in both experiments. Each annotator filled out the Visual Language Fluency Index (VLFI) Cohn [2014] questionnaire as part of the study. The VLFI measures visual language fluency, and a higher score corresponds to greater fluency.

2 Experiment 1: Identifying animate entities using outlines on comic pages

Four stories were selected for annotation, where five participants annotated each story for a total of 20 annotators. All participants were recruited using the online crowd-sourcing platform Prolific. All participants were screened to be UK or US nationals, speak English fluently, and to have achieved at least a bachelor’s degree. No participants annotated more than one story to prevent some annotators from becoming more familiar with the annotation task than others.

It occasionally happens that a participant appears to have completed the given task on the Prolific platform, when in fact they have not. One unreliable participant occurred per story. These participants filled out the VLFI questionnaire, but did not perform the annotation task itself, or struggled to use the annotation tool to the extent that their annotations are nearly unintelligible. A new participant per story was therefore recruited as a replacement to have five sets of annotations per story.

The demographics and VLFI scores of the unreliable annotators are included in the tables below. Unreliable annotators are denoted with a * next to their participant number. The VLFI means and standard deviations with and without the unreliable annotators is given.

No.	Age	Gender	Adult VLFI	Kid VLFI	Full VLFI	Category
1	34	M	19	12	19.25	High average
2*	31	M	6.75	9	11.625	Near average
3	37	F	3	6.75	7.375	Low
4	21	F	1	4	4	Low
5	33	F	11	12.5	12.5	Average
6	32	F	2	1.75	2.875	Low
Mean age: 31.3			VLFI mean/std with participant 2: 9.604/5.585 VLFI mean/std without participant 2: 9.2/6.04			

Table 1: Participant demographics and VLFI scores for Experiment 1, Story 1

No.	Age	Gender	Adult VLFI	Kid VLFI	Full VLFI	Category
1	22	F	6	7.5	7.25	Low
2	36	M	9	14	12.75	Average
3	50	M	7	19	17.5	High average
4	34	NB	1	1	1.5	Low
5	40	F	1	2.75	2.875	Low
6*	45	M	3	13	9.5	Low
Mean age: 37.8			VLFI mean/std with participant 6: 8.56/6.02 VLFI mean/std without participant 6: 8.38/6.02			

Table 2: Participant demographics and VLFI scores for Experiment 1, Story 2

No.	Age	Gender	Adult VLFI	Kid VLFI	Full VLFI	Category
1	51	F	3	9	7	Low
2*	25	F	14	14	15.5	High average
3	21	F	4.5	5.25	5.375	Low
4	35	F	1	1.5	2.5	Low
5	34	M	7	9.75	8.875	Low
6	35	F	1	1.5	1.5	Low
Mean age: 33.5			VLFI mean/std with participant 2: 6.8/4.63 VLFI mean/std without participant 2: 5.05/2.74			

Table 3: Participant demographics and VLFI scores for Experiment 1, Story 3

No.	Age	Gender	Adult VLFI	Kid VLFI	Full VLFI	Category
1	30	F	1	1	2.5	Low
2	23	F	1	9.75	5.875	Low
3	38	F	1	6.5	4.5	Low
4*	28	F	1	1.5	1.75	Low
5	22	F	9	12.75	12.125	Average
6	33	M	5.5	15	14	Average
Mean age: 29			VLFI mean/std with participant 4: 6.8/4.66 VLFI mean/std without participant 4: 7.8/4.47			

Table 4: Participant demographics and VLFI scores for Experiment 1, Story 4

No.	Age	Gender	Adult VLFI	Kid VLFI	Full VLFI	Category
1	62	F	1.25	1.5	2.875	Low
2	21	M	1.25	1	1.625	Low
3	44	M	4.5	8.25	9.875	Low
4	50	M	1.25	20	14.375	Average
5	22	F	1	5.25	3.875	Low
Mean age: 39.8			VLFI mean/std: 6.525/4.84			

Table 5: Participant demographics and VLFI scores for Experiment 2, Story 1

3 Experiment 2: introducing an animacy hierarchy

Participants were again recruited from Prolific, with five participants per story for a total of 20 annotators. Participants were again screened for the criteria of English fluency, UK or US nationality, and having achieved at least a bachelor’s degree. As with the previous experiment, no participants annotated more than one story to prevent some annotators from becoming more familiar with the annotation task than others. Finally, unlike the previous experiment, all annotators completed the annotation task and therefore the recruitment of additional annotators was not required.

No.	Age	Gender	Adult VLFI	Kid VLFI	Full VLFI	Category
1	34	M	1	10.5	7.5	Low
2	21	F	2	3	3.5	Low
3	22	M	1	1.75	2.625	Low
4	32	M	30	19	28.25	Very high
5	37	M	1	5.5	3.75	Low
Mean age: 29.2			VLFI mean/std: 9.125/9.71			

Table 6: Participant demographics and VLFI scores for Experiment 2, Story 2

No.	Age	Gender	Adult VLFI	Kid VLFI	Full VLFI	Category
1	23	F	1	4	5.5	Low
2	25	M	12	14.25	14.625	Average
3	39	F	3	9	6.5	Low
4	34	M	11	9.75	17.125	High average
5	35	M	9.75	9	9.875	Low
Mean age: 31.2			VLFI mean/std: 10.725/4.52			

Table 7: Participant demographics and VLFI scores for Experiment 2, Story 3

No.	Age	Gender	Adult VLFI	Kid VLFI	Full VLFI	Category
1	31	F	1.5	1.5	4.5	Low
2	43	F	1	3	3.5	Low
3	23	F	1	1	3	Low
4	29	M	8.25	2	5.625	Low
5	21	M	5	13	12	Average
Mean age: 29.4			VLFI mean/std: 5.725/3.26			

Table 8: Participant demographics and VLFI scores for Experiment 2, Story 4

References

Neil Cohn. The visual language fluency index: A measure of “comic reading expertise”. *Visual Language Lab: Resources*, 2014.