Dear Lenka,

Ten minutes ago I wrote your name in big letters on my to do list, as I realised that I have not gotten back to you. My sincere apologies! My co-authors were more than happy to share the stimuli. It is my fault that I then didn’t immediately send the materials to you.

I have attached a zipped folder that contains all of the individual pictures that we used, plus a powerpoint file that shows the order of pictures as we presented them (we always had the same order), and a document with three pages of 20 pictures that were the addressee task sheets.

As you’ll see in the ppt file in the folder, there was always one blank page between the pictures. This was because we didn’t want the signers to be able to continue looking at the picture as they were describing it. They looked at the picture (on a laptop to their side, not visible to the addressee), then clicked for the next page, which was blank, turned to the addressee and described the picture.

The addressee task was to select the described picture from the array or to say that the described picture was not part of the array. There are three pages of 20 pictures, and each page corresponded to 11, 11, 10 pictures respectively of the total 32 pictures. In between the sets we had slides that said “end part 1” and “end part 2”, in which we gave the addressee the new addressee sheet. (We laminated these sheets.) We asked the addressee to turn the sheet over, facing down, on their lap while the signer provided the description and to only look at it to make the selection. The addressee made the selection (or not) so that the experimenter could see it and note down whether it was correct or not. The signer should not be able to see the addressee sheet or the selections made.

We also had “start” and “end” pages at the very beginning and end. We presented it in html actually, and had a white background (I’m not sure how the ppt ended up with a black background actually).

For our final analysis, we didn’t include the pictures with many objects or the pictures with people in them.

Please let me know whether you or your students have any questions!

Best wishes - and apologies again for the delay!

Pamela

Dear Pamela,

we have discussed the process of your study and we have some questions

1) INSTRUCTIONS – how were the instructions transmit to deaf participants? Directly by deaf researcher/co-worker in sign language or by some prepared video in sign language (to to ensure the transmission of the same information to every participants)? And the most important what the instructions contained? How were the participants instructed (for example not to sign juste single frozen sign etc.), what did they knew about the aim of your study? For us is important to know it.

2) ADDRESSEES – I suppose that their task/role was to be a deaf communication partner for signer and you have verified that signer signed understandably (for deaf community), but you write, that *All addressees were able to correctly pick the pictures described by signers.* So what do you mean now, it was really important to verify it with 12 different addressees? I think I understand your target, but wasn´t it a “waste” of respondents? Weren´t they dissapointed, that they couldn´t sign (I mean the addressees)?

3) pictures with many objects or the pictures with people – why you didn´t include them for final analysis? What was the reason? The pictures were unclear or you will use them in the future? Or we have to remove them at the beginnig?

4) DATA ON RESPONDENTS – PERSONAL DATA – did you ask something more than gender, age and age of exposition to sign language? I mean education, deaf school, places of residence etc.

5) PAIRS: SIGNER-ADDRESSEE – how did you put participants together – approximately same age? Same sex? Or it wasn´t important? How they sat – do you have a little video or screenshot of the whole scene (if they were opposite to each other, or juste a little bit rotated)?

6) SESSION – how long did it také approximately? And did you survey some participant´s reflexion about it?

Thank you for your time and for your answers, I hope you understand our questions, my english is not very good.

Next we will discuss aims of your study and annotation etc. and we try to install cameras etc. in our little studio.

Thank you for everything,

Sincerely

Lenka

Dear Lenka,

I’m so sorry! I know you’ve been waiting for my reply. I’m sorry to have kept you waiting!

1) INSTRUCTIONS – how were  the instructions transmit to deaf participants? Directly by deaf researcher/co-worker in sign language or by some prepared video in sign language (to to ensure the transmission of the same information to every participants)? And the most important what the instructions contained? How were the participants instructed (for example not to sign juste single frozen sign etc.), what did they knew about the aim of your study? For us is important to know it.

The instructions were given to participants in person by a deaf research assistant. The signer (i.e. describer of the pair) was told that they should describe each picture so that the addressee would be able to identify the described picture from a set of pictures. We did not give any further information about what their descriptions should be like, but one intention of the addressee task was so that signers would provide enough detail in their description that the addressee would be able to pick out the correct picture from the set. Sometimes it happened that the addressee asked a clarification question, and the signer repeated part of the description. We only analysed the first description, however.

2) ADDRESSEES – I suppose that their task/role was to be a deaf communication partner for signer and you have verified that signer signed understandably (for deaf community), but you write, that *All addressees were able to correctly pick the pictures described by signers.*So what do you mean now, it was really important to verify it with 12 different addressees? I think I understand your target, but wasn´t it  a “waste” of respondents? Weren´t they dissapointed, that they couldn´t sign (I mean the addressees)?

Indeed, the addressee ensured that the data collection was in a discourse context, and - as mentioned above - ensured that the signed descriptions would be such that the addressees would be able to identify the picture described (and thus contained enough information about the locative relationships and number of objects). This task was only one in a larger set of tasks/stimuli that the signer and addressee pair participated in for our data collection at the time, and the addressee also had signing parts/opportunities.

3) PICTURES WITH MANY OBJECTS OR THE PICTURES WITH PEOPLE – why you didn´t include them for final analysis? What was the reason? The pictures were unclear or you will use them in the future? Or we have to remove them at the beginnig?

The pictures with people we excluded because these pictures were described in a different way compared to the other pictures. Signers elaborated much more with the people pictures, giving not just a locative description, but attributing intentions and talking about where they might be going and why. The many pictures we excluded because we were interested in spatializations (spatialized locative predicates) and the pictures with many objects primarily elicited types of predicates like “in a mess”, “scattered”.

4) DATA ON RESPONDENTS – PERSONAL DATA – did you ask something more than gender, age and age of exposition to sign language? I mean education, deaf school, places of residence etc.

Yes, we also collected demographic information about all the participants, including gender, age, age of learning sign language, where/with whom they learned sign language, schools they attended, language of education at the schools, education levels, places of residence now and in the past, involvement in the deaf community, contact with members of the deaf community, family members who are deaf, use of sign language with family/friends/colleagues at home/work/other places, knowledge of any other sign languages, handedness.

5) PAIRS: SIGNER-ADDRESSEE – how did you put participants together – approximately same age? Same sex? Or it wasn´t important? How they sat – do you have a little video or screenshot of the whole scene (if they were opposite to each other, or juste a little bit rotated)?

The signer/addressee pair always knew each other, usually they were friends, and usually they were quite similar in age. Sometimes the pairs were the same sex, sometimes different, but this was not controlled in any way. They sat directly opposite each other, and a table/chair with the laptop showing stimulus materials was next to the signer and turned away from the addressee. The signer looked to the side to view the stimulus, clicked on the screen/mouse to give a blank screen, then turned to the addressee to describe.

6) SESSION – how long did it také approximately? And did you survey some participant´s reflexion about it?

I can’t remember how long this task took exactly, but I think the descriptions themselves only took about 10 minutes. Like I said above, we collected a bigger set of data at the time. We didn’t ask for participants’ reflexion about the tasks.

Apologies again for the delay in replying to you!

All the best,

Pamela