READING 目 NOTES

DE VOS ET AL. 2015 28 APPRIL 2020	
DO SIGNED LANGUAGES SHOW THE SAME TURN-TIMING PATTERENS AS SPOKEN LGS?	
Maybe not?	
- SIMULTANEOUS PRODUCTION & COMPREHENSION MAY B	BE EASIER (Emmoney et 21. 2009)
- HIGH INCLIDENCE of OVERLAR REPORTED PREVIOUSLY (Codes & Sulton Space 2011)	
- use of freeze / hold & attention-getters (i.e. preparatory / setween-Tou)	
- Use of Treeze [Nold & SHENTIER - GCHS U.e. preparation] 1st week	
MAY ACCOUNT FOR MUCH PERCEIVED OVERLAP	
METHODS 190 polar questions & wh questions	s ham lo signer sonss
METHODS 190 polar questions & wh questions 7 spontaneous conversational interactions	tions (mostly dysalic)
(3) France COM	
(3) TEMPORAL MEASURES: "Stroke-to-stroke timing	- strake-to-strake
	meza 307
VIII INSTRUCTION HOLD RETERIT	Mean -812 / Medicon 269 Medicon -617
tounthing sentines sentines articulation	
articulation 2) 81911-naive timing	-4 -2 0 2
Segii-reave property	sec transition time
This custom I	Lounch?: -86ms (medion -78)
DISCUSSION	
When we only consider lexical content, timing lover	evall \$ inscepts
Use of gap & orealap) and googs maticallaunching ma	stch known
spoken language averages for polar greations quite well	//
EVIDENCE for a STNGLE SYSTEM UNDERLY.	fing TUPN TAKING IN SIGNED
+ SPOKEN LANGUAGES	
NEXT STEPS?	
- Experimental tests of TRP prediction & sensitivity to gays leverlaps	
- Usability luse of informative preparation	
- More different tripes of szaming communities	