**to do**

Note:

* Date in header determines when the task was assigned/thought of
* “Done”/”to do” determines whether the task has been finished yet

May 10th

* done: read papers that James has send and write notes in literature overview
* done: find prior work on conducting experiments on contrast
* done: find prior work on contrast dialogues like the one James has send

May 11th

* done: translate stimuli to German and ask Michael about (1) reisen or anreisen and (2) nach or nach Afrika
* done: Prepare an initial proposal for an experiment
* done: discuss number and style of stimuli with Michael/James

May 24th

* done: Meeting with Michael
* done: Stimuli heraussuchen
  + content word vs. functional word
  + at issue vs. not at issue
  + aus Literatur entnehmen oder ggfs. auch selbst generieren
  + 2-3 Beispiele pro Bedingung (written/verbal and with/without marking)
* done: Hypothesen formulieren
  + Was wird als Faktor, der die Grammatikalitätsurteile beeinflusst, vermutet und inwiefern äußert er sich?
  + Hypothesen zu content und functional words überlegen: Inwiefern ist entscheidend, ob es sich um ein content oder functional word handelt?
  + Hypothesen zu Issue meaning überlegen: Inwiefern ist entscheidend, ob das entsprechende Wort at issue oder not at issue ist?
* later: filler sentences
  + Zuerst gilt, die Art der filler sentences zu bestimmen und herauszufinden, wie schwer es ist, solche zu generieren. Danach gilt es, die Anzahl der filler sentences festzulegen
  + mögliche filler sentences überlegen (im Anhang von älteren Studien nachschauen, welche Items sie hatten bzw. selbst welche generieren)
* done: Audio-Aufnahmen
  + professionelle Sprecher:innen finden: Hendrix-Sun hat mir Tim Wientzek als Kontakt weitergeleitet ([tim.wientzek@uni-tuebingen.de](mailto:tim.wientzek@uni-tuebingen.de))
  + um geeignete Räumlichkeiten und professionelles Mikrofon kümmern und entsprechendes Training vorher machen (falls ich es selbst einspreche)

June 1st

* done: Hypothesen
  + *If there is a significant difference* entfernen
  + Hypothesen in der Form von: (We hypothesize that) acceptability ratings are higher with orthographic marking than without.
* done: Stimuli
  + gleicher Satz sollte für alle vier Konditionen funktionieren (at-issue, not-at-issue, content word, functional word)
  + *hanHHans glaubt…* entfernen (kann immer noch wieder eingefügt werden)
  + allealle Antworten nur mit einem Wort statt mit der Phrase, d. h.

*Nein, nach* statt *Nein, nach Afrika*

*Nein, Vater* statt *Nein, mit seinem Vater*

* + darauf achten, dass alle Sätze in etwa genauso häufig genutzte und „übliche“ Worte enthalten und keine ausgefallenen/neuen Wörter
* to do done: verschiedene Vorschläge
  + mehrerFokus auf written/auditive and with/without marking
  + Untersuchung von issueness und content/functional word sind nur Vorschläge
  + Ob issueness mittels Appositionen oder mittels vorangestellter Frage untersucht werden oder gar nicht, muss noch entschieden werden (als Vorschläge einreichen)
    - Als Appositionen:  
      Peter, der nach Berlin **fliegt**, besucht seinen Freund.

Nein, **fährt**.

* + - Als Frage:  
      Wohin fliegt Peter?

Peter **fliegt** nach Berlin.

Nein, **fährt**.

* + mehrere Listen mit Stimuli (einmal Appositionen, einmal Fragen)

June 9th (Meeting with James and Michael)

* dene: determine speakers
  + better to have female speakers
  + James proposed that he’ll ask his wife who is an expert to see to what extent the gender difference is important for the present study and will send an email 🡪 update: both females and males would work
  + As of now, probably Roman Pertl and I will do the recordings
* Z-score versus ordinal data
  + James said that Sam Featherston often runs 2 x 2 experiments that have almost the same stimuli and uses standard filler items (assuming that the relation between the critical and filler items is the same) and then z-score the results using the standard deviation and average only for the standard fillers for each of the participants and then you can compare results across experiments
  + To do: look up some of Sam Featherston’s studies and check the materials
* done: revise study design
  + 2 x 2 x 2 design
    - Modality: Written / auditory
    - Marking: With / without marking, i.e., orthographic or pitch accent on correlate
    - Fragment-type: Functional / lexical
  + Distinction between at-issue and not-at-issue is not as important for the present study
  + Background: movability of items (include this background to introduction part of thesis)
* done: revise stimuli
  + *Hans glaubt*… can be excluded
  + Subclauses and preceding questions can be excluded (issueness is not tested as a factor)
  + Use case marking: use common nouns instead of names in contrastive focus that are marked with a certain case, e.g. *dem Lehrer* (masculine and dative for both the antecedent and the fragment)
  + Keep distinction between lexical and functional words, e.g., *von* and *seiner Schwester* (instead of *Paula* because it includes case marking)
    - In the lexical condition, you do not have to include a prepositional phrase, e.g., *Peter isst den Kuchen. Nein, den Apfel.*
    - Comparison between a non-movable functional head and a phrase
  + All lexical items in contrastive focus should either all have a preposition or not have a preposition
  + Do not have the fragment correspond to the final word/phrase. Instead, include an adjunct such as *yesterday* or *on Wednesday*
  + Make sure that stimuli are not ambiguous
  + Make sure that stimuli in different context (look up literature maybe?)
  + Struggle with aggressiveness of speaker B’s responses
    - Either use different particles instead of *Nein*, e.g., *Hä? Naja, … Ähm, …*
    - Or include examples in the introductory part to the study and emphasize that even if it is rude, it is to be considered acceptable
    - Also in the introductory part, include some inacceptable, acceptable and something in the middle (better to use a filler item instead of a critical item)
  + 30 critical items (where items include variants for each condition) and 30 filler items
  + Potential fillers
    - Non-fragments but contrast, i.e., full sentences in the response
    - Different functional words, i.e., not prepositions
    - Dialogues without contrast, e.g., B: Yes, with Bill.

June 19th

* Done: revise Stimuli and double-check items with James and Michael
* Done: agree on a date to record auditory stimuli with Roman
* Done: organize critical and filler items in folders
* Done: start writing the literature review and study design
* To do perhaps: revise hypotheses (see Michael’s mail)
* done: start formulating the introductory part to the study, including fully acceptable, fully unacceptable, and neither acceptable nor unacceptable examples

June 24th

* Done: record stimuli with Roman
* Done: edit stimuli
* Done: neutralize/control audio files for volume
* Done: combine audio files of part a (Roman) and part b (me)

June 28th

* done: decide which critical items to use in study (only 30 maximum)
* 7-8 for each condition but there are only 30 filler items
* Therefore, 7 per condition (28 critical items in total) and 28 filler items
* To do: set up study on magpie (helpful link for audio files: <https://magpie-reference.netlify.app/#audio>)
* To do: revise read me file in experiments, esp. about stimuli, the sorting of it and what items were excluded for the study
* To do: double-check if all stimuli with/without emphasis are identical and all stimuli written/auditory
* done: revise number of stimuli in MA writing
* to do: orthographic marking in study mit capitals and boldness, damit man auch bei kurzen Wörtern wie Präpositionen direkt sieht, was markiert ist. In der MA aber nur capitals, damit es übersichtlich bleibt. Im Kapitel selection of stimuli erklären, wie orthographic marking in der Studie ausfiel