

Notes regarding MA project

Aim: find the best medium for judgement tests

Materials:

- German sentences involving contrastive focus
- E.g., A: Ich habe gehört, dass Johannes morgen aus Afrika reist.
B: Nein, nach.

Hypotheses:

- (1) If there is a significant difference in acceptability rating, then it is higher for stimuli with orthographic marking than for stimuli without orthographic marking.
- (2) If there is a significant difference in acceptability ratings, then it is higher for stimuli with pitch accent than on the respective word (see below) for stimuli without pitch accent.
- (3) If there is a significant difference in acceptability rating, then it is higher for auditory stimuli than written stimuli.
- (4) If there is a significant difference in acceptability rating, then it is higher for stimuli with at-issue content in contrastive focus than with not-at-issue content in contrastive focus.
- (5) If there is a significant difference in acceptability rating, then it is higher for stimuli with a content word in contrastive focus than with functional word in contrastive focus.

Methods:

- run experiments comparing orthographic/prosodic marking and written or verbal stimuli, with varying levels of issuehood and varying meaning of the word(s) in focus (content or functional)
- hence, four conditions:
 - o written without orthographic marking
 - o written with orthographic marking
 - o auditory without pitch accent
 - o auditory with pitch accent
- all conditions include stimuli with content and functional words at-issue and not-at-issue (see stimuli below)
- use Prolific or clickworker or via university mail for recruiting participants
- use Praat for recording of verbal stimuli
- records hopefully done by Tim Wientzek (yet to ask) and a female speaker (yet to find, perhaps asking Tim Wientzek, if he knows an experienced person)
- Likert scale from 1-7

Design:

- 2 x 2 factor design (marking: with or without, modality: written or verbal)
- Between subject design for written / verbal (Yet to be fully determined)

- Within subject design for with / without marking (Yet to be fully determined)

Analysis:

- Ordinal data (Yet to be fully determined)
- z-score the likert scales (Yet to be fully determined)
- fit LMMS, using R

List of potential stimuli (Yet to be fully determined)

- stimuli differ in issueness and meaning of words (content/functional)
- only propositional-at-issue, not question-at-issue and not coherence-at-issue
- stimuli are adjusted to be in present tense, include the phrase *Hans glaubt...*, and include a transitive verb.
- The word(s) that are to be either orthographically or auditorily marked in the marked condition are written in bold

at-issue and content word

- (1) Hans glaubt, dass Peter hat mit seiner **Mutter** spricht.
Nein, (mit) seinem **Vater**.
- (2) Hans glaubt, dass Peter den **Rotwein** kauft.
Nein, den **Weißwein**.
- (3) Hans glaubt, dass Peter das Haus **verkauft**.
Nein, **vermietet**.
(BA student's write up, adjusted to resemble other stimuli, emphasis added)
- (4) Hans glaubt, dass Peter einen **Hund** hat.
Nein, eine **Katze**.
- (5) Hans glaubt, dass Peter nach Berlin **fährt**.
Nein, **fliegt**.

(own stimuli)

not-at-issue and content word

- (1) Edna, eine **furchtlose** Anführerin, beginnt den Abstieg.
Nein, **feige**. (Koev 2018: 6, own translation and adjusted to resemble other stimuli)
- (2) Hans glaubt, dass Peter, ein **Violinist**, ein Stück von Mozart spielt.
Nein, ein **Gitarrist**. (Koev 2018: 6, own translation and adjusted to resemble other stimuli)
- (3) Hans glaubt, dass Peter, der **Paulas** Ehemann ist, ein Buch schreibt.
Nein, **Lauras** Ehemann.
(Koev 2018: 7, own translation, adjusted to resemble other stimuli, emphasis added)
- (4) Hans glaubt, dass Peter, der als **Lehrer** arbeitet, aus Hamburg kommt.
Nein, **Ingenieur**.
- (5) Hans glaubt, dass Peter, der in **Stuttgart** wohnt, einen Hund hat.
Nein, **München**.

(own stimuli)

at-issue and functional word

(1) Hans glaubt, dass Peter **aus** Afrika reist

Nein, **nach**.

(2) Hans glaubt, dass Peter **gegen** den Bürgermeister ist.

Nein, **für**.

(3) Hans glaubt, dass Peter **mit** seiner Freundin kommt.

Nein, **ohne**.

(BA student's write up, adjusted to resemble other stimuli, emphasis added)

(4) Hans glaubt, dass Peter **trotz** seiner Rückenprobleme Sport betreibt.

Nein, **wegen**.

(5) Hans glaubt, dass Peter **nach** seinem Urlaub seine Mutter anruft.

Nein, **während**.

(own stimuli)

not-at-issue and functional word

(1) Hans glaubt, dass Peter, der **nach** 18 Uhr nach Hause kommt, mit seinem Freund telefoniert.

Nein, **vor**.

(2) Hans glaubt, dass Peter, der **neben** dem Theater wohnt, aus Stuttgart kommt.

Nein, **gegenüber**.

(3) Hans glaubt, dass Peter, der **vor** der Mauer sitzt, einen Brief schreibt.

Nein, **auf**.

(4) Hans glaubt, dass Peter, der **bis** 12 Uhr arbeitet, morgen frei hat.

Nein, **ab**.

(5) Hans glaubt, dass Peter, der **einschließlich** seiner Möbel umzieht, einen neuen Job hat.

Nein, **ohne**.

(own stimuli)

To be determined in the next meeting

- Should all sentences be of the kind A: *Hans glaubt, dass...* B: *Nein, ...?*
- Should B's responses only include one word or one phrase?
 - o E. g. **nach** Afrika
 - o E. g. mit ihrem **Vater**
 - o This is not consistent in all stimuli yet!
- Number of stimuli per condition
- Type and number of filler sentences
 - Once number of all stimuli is determined, reach out to Tim Wientzek