**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

* To do: decide which critical items to use in study (only 30 maximum)
* To do: set up study on magpie (helpful link for audio files: https://magpie-reference.netlify.app/#audio)