

Notes regarding MA project

Aim: find the best medium for acceptability judgement tests

Materials:

- German sentences involving contrastive focus
- E.g., A: Peter hat seinem BRUDER ein Buch geschenkt.
B: Nein, seinem VATER.

Hypotheses:

- (1) Acceptability ratings are higher for stimuli with emphasis on the contrasting words than stimuli without emphasis on the contrasting words, i.e.,
 - a. For written stimuli, acceptability ratings are higher for stimuli with orthographic marking than without.
 - b. For auditory stimuli, acceptability ratings are higher for stimuli with pitch accent on the correlate than without.
- (2) Acceptability ratings are higher for auditory stimuli than written stimuli.
- (3) Acceptability ratings are higher for stimuli with a lexical fragment in contrastive focus than with a functional fragment in contrastive focus.

Methods:

- run experiments comparing MODALITY, EMPHASIS, and FRAGMENT-TYPES, as can be seen in the study design and stimuli below
- use Prolific or clickworker or via university mail for recruiting participants
- use Praat for recording of verbal stimuli
- stimuli recorded by Roman Pertl (speaker A) and Miriam (speaker B)
- Likert scale from 1-7

Design:

- 2 x 2 x 2 factor design
 - o MODALITY: written / auditory
 - o EMPHASIS: with / without emphasis, i.e.,
 - for written stimuli: with / without orthographic marking
 - for auditory stimuli: pitch accent on correlate / not on correlate
 - o FRAGMENT-TYPE: functional / lexical word
- Between-subject design for MODALITY
- Within-subject design for EMPHASIS and FRAGMENT-TYPE (4-5 versions of each condition per participant)

Analysis:

- z-score the likert scales
- fit LMMs, using R

Generating of the stimuli:

- Stimuli differ in MODALITY (written / auditory) and EMPHASIS (with / without) and FRAGMENT-TYPE (lexical / functional).
- In the following, only the written stimuli with orthographic marking are listed as examples. The words that are to be either orthographically or prosodically marked in the respective condition are written in capitals.
- Stimuli are adjusted
 - o to be in past tense to ensure that the word in contrastive focus is never in final position
 - o to be of roughly the same length
 - o to include ditransitive verbs for stimuli with lexical fragments and transitive verbs for stimuli with functional fragments to maintain a similar sentence length
 - o to include masculine nouns in dative case as indirect objects in the antecedent clause for stimuli with lexical fragment to ensure disambiguation
 - o The first dialogue in each example resembles the [with emphasis] condition, i.e., either no orthographic marking for written stimuli or nuclear accent on the default position for auditory stimuli (see Féry 2011).
- Responses are all in the form *Nein, X*, where X is one phrase.
- The stimuli with functional fragments include 5 sentences with *ab/bis*, 5 sentences with *mit/ohne*, and 5 sentences with *mit/ohne*
- Fillers include dialogues without contrastive focus and dialogues with non-fragmental contrast. The fillers show varying acceptability: A = fully acceptable, B = somewhat acceptable, C = neither acceptable nor unacceptable, D = somewhat unacceptable, E = fully unacceptable)
- for the list of critical and filler items, see MA > 2 Experiments > 1 Stimuli