Introduction
Goals of a semantic fieldworker

• Provide analyses for natural language phenomena which accurately capture their truth conditions and pragmatic felicity conditions.

• Do this solely on the basis of responses that language consultants give to tasks that the fieldworker sets.

• ‘Semantic fieldworkers’ include not only formal semanticists, but anyone interested in meaning, including typologists, grammar-writers, those writing pedagogical materials, …
Questions about semantic fieldwork

? What types of tasks should consultants be asked to perform?
? When should which type of task be used?
? How does one best conduct each type of task?
? What can we conclude about truth and felicity conditions from the responses a consultant makes to each type of task?
? In what form should stimuli be given to consultants?

Focus of today’s talk

? In what form should stimuli be given to consultants?

• We focus on the providing of information about the discourse context.

? Are certain types of linguistic phenomena more suited to particular methods for presenting contexts?

Proposal:

• Phenomena which involve reference to interlocutors’ epistemic states are particularly well served by the storyboard technique.

• This includes establishing ‘out-of-the-blue’ contexts, which require controlling for (lack of) shared knowledge between interlocutors.
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Semantic fieldwork tasks
Three useful tasks

• Acceptability judgment
• Elicited production
• Translation
Acceptability judgment tasks

• Present the speaker with a state of affairs paired with an utterance in the target language; they judge its acceptability.

• Example: Trying to establish whether a verb without overt aspectual marking can report an event which is in progress at the utterance time:

(1) Context: You witness that Tali’ is pushing around a neighbouring kid. You rush to inform Tali’s mother: “Come to check quickly...”

# thaygal-an ni Tali’ laqi’ qasa.
bully-LV ERG Tali’ child that
Intended for ‘Tali’ is bullying that child.’

Consultant’s comment: (Laughing a lot) “This sentence is very inappropriate.”

(Atayal; Chen 2018:78)
Acceptability is a theory-neutral concept, and usually easy for speakers to judge.

A judgment of ‘unacceptable' does not tell you \textit{why} the utterance is unacceptable.

- If you have established that the utterance is syntactically well-formed and felicitous (e.g., it does not contain unsatisfied presuppositions), then a judgment of ‘unacceptable' suggests that the sentence is false in this context.

In this way, we make progress towards establishing the truth conditions of the utterance.
Elicited production tasks

- The speaker volunteers a target language utterance in response to a stimulus.


- Speakers look at drawings featuring spatial configurations and answer "Where is the …?"
Elicited production tasks

http://fieldmanuals.mpi.nl/volumes/1992/bowped/
Elicitated production tasks

• BowPed uses single pictures as stimuli.

• Stimuli can also be verbal context descriptions, or a series of pictures (“storyboard”; Burton & Matthewson 2015).
(2) Scenario: Your friend didn’t come to work today. Usually, if he’s not in, he has a very good reason. Someone asks you why your friend didn’t come in. You make a wild guess.

English sentence to translate: “Maybe he’s sick.”

Tlingit translation offered:

Gwál yanéekw.
DUB IMPFV.3s.sick
‘Maybe he’s sick.’

(Tlingit; Cable 2017:628-629)
Truth and felicity conditions cannot be established based on expressions which are uttered, or understood, in isolation.

Utterances are only true or false, felicitous or infelicitous, with respect to particular discourse contexts.

Semantic fieldworkers therefore should provide consultants with contextual information for all kinds of fieldwork tasks, including acceptability judgment, elicited production, and translation tasks!

(See also Tonhauser & Matthewson 2017)
How to present contexts?

? What are the best methods for providing contextual information?

? Are certain types of linguistic phenomena more suited to particular methods for presenting contexts?

• Important desideratum: The fieldworker and the speaker need to have the same context in mind!
Context presentation methods
Three useful methods

• Verbal description
• Single images
• Storyboards (and videos)
**Verbal description**

- See examples (1) and (2) above.

✔ Verbal descriptions work well for lots of phenomena. In principle, usable for *any* phenomena (as long as there is a shared language).

! Risk: The consultant envisions extra context beyond what the fieldworker has in mind. Remember: fieldworker and consultant must share the context in which an utterance is judged/produced/translated.

! The more one tries to control for contextual factors, the longer (and hence harder to understand and remember) verbal descriptions get.
Single images

• See BowPed example above.

• Can also be used for complex semantic phenomena, e.g. quantifier scope or distributivity.
Bruening (2008): ‘The Scope Fieldwork Project’

A: 
(3) Every bird is sitting in a tree.
   \(\forall > \exists\) reading: True in A, true in B.
   \(\exists > \forall\) reading: True in A, false in B.
   Accepting in A, rejecting in B would suggest unambiguous \(\exists > \forall\) reading.
(4) Three dogs chased two cats.
Context B only supports a distributive reading.
Accepting in A, rejecting in B suggests distributive reading unavailable.
Single images

✔ Can capture at least some types of complex context, while avoiding a long verbal description.

✔ Lessen the potential for contact-language influence.

❗ Still might be vulnerable to the consultant imagining extra contextual factors, that the fieldworker is not aware of.
Storyboards

• Storyboard: A series of pictures which tell a story.

• **Targeted construction storyboards:** Designed to create contexts which support particular truth and/or felicity conditions. (Burton & Matthewson 2015, [www.totemfieldstoryboards.org](http://www.totemfieldstoryboards.org)).

• ≠ e.g., Berman and Slobin's (1994) Frog Stories project, where children told a story based on the pictures in a published storybook.

• There is at least one separate targeted construction storyboard for each research question.
Working with storyboards

*Original methodology:*

- Use the pictures to elicit a spontaneous narrative.
- Follow up with elicitation tasks. Crucial for hypothesis testing!
- Follow-up elicitation enables the collection of negative data, and the checking of forms which did not spontaneously arise when the story was first told.

*Using storyboards more flexibly:*

- Use the pictures to provide a discourse context for ordinary elicitation tasks (acceptability judgment tasks, translation tasks, etc.).

Example: ‘Bill vs. the weather’

- Vander Klok (2018, t.a.): Designed to elicit epistemic modals with past temporal perspective.

- One sunny day, Bill arrives at work with a backpack full of weather-protection items (umbrella, etc.). The next day, his colleague asks him why he had brought each item the day before, and he responds that ‘It might have rained/snowed/been windy.’

- The modal has past temporal perspective: Yesterday morning, it was epistemically possible for Bill (i.e., Bill believed it was possible) that there would be bad weather later that day. At the utterance time the next day, it is no longer epistemically possible for Bill that it was bad weather yesterday (since he knows that it turned out to be sunny).
Bill gets to his office soaking wet. His colleague asks why he is so wet. He replies that he forgot his umbrella.
Storyboard pros, and one con

✔ (In the original methodology,) elicit fluent, natural speech, with lessened potential for translation interference.

✔ Allow very precise contexts to be set up, minimizing the risk of the consultant imagining a different context than the researcher intends.

✔ Enable researchers to use consistent stimuli across different speakers and languages.

✔ Fun, and easily transferable to materials for language teaching.

! More time-consuming to create than verbal context descriptions.
A brief word about videos!

✔ In principle, everything we said about the advantages of storyboards also applies to video.

! Videos are much more time-consuming to prepare than storyboards.

! Storyboards allow speakers to go at their own pace; video would need to be paused.
Given the con, we have to ask ...

? When do we *need* to use storyboards?
Proposal
Proposition: Controlling for interlocutors' belief states in discourse contexts is more easily and robustly done with storyboards than with verbal descriptions or single images.

A belief state cannot easily be represented in a single picture, and can quickly become too complex to describe verbally.

In a storyboard, a character's belief state can be naturally conveyed by what they say, and how they interact with other characters.
Complexity of verbal descriptions

- Many cases where verbal contexts get too long involve belief states.
- Remember ‘Bill vs. the weather’? Testing for epistemic modals with past temporal perspective, done verbally, looks something like this:

(5) Context: Polina is about to leave for work. As she leaves her apartment, her neighbor’s son runs past her through the hallway. She then hears a loud bang. She fears that the boy might have fired a gun and calls the police. The next day, the boy’s mother tells her that the boy only used a firecracker. She is quite upset because she had to deal with the police and a youth welfare officer. She wants to know why Polina even called the police. Polina justifies herself:

‘Your son could have shot somebody.’ (German; Chen et al. 2017:245)

- Especially tricky if there is incomplete control of a contact language.
Complexity of verbal descriptions

Interlocutors’ shared knowledge of referents:

• Sadlier-Brown (2014): The impact of interlocutors’ shared knowledge on word order alternations in Nata (Bantu).

(6) Context: Your family owns one healthy cow, which your brother Masato has helped raise. Your brother lives far away in Dar es Salaam. One morning you hear that a neighbouring chief is coming into town for a feast the following night. You go to work for the day. You come home in the afternoon and are surprised to find a lot of blood in the backyard and the family's cow gone. You ask your parents ‘Where did the blood come from?’ and your mother replies:

a. n-tó-sintʃ-ir-ire     o-mu-témi     a-η-όόmbɛ
   1PL.SM-PST-slaughter-APPL-PFV PPF-C1-chief PPF-C9-cow BEN-THEME
   'We slaughtered the cow for the chief.'

b. # n-tó-sintʃ-ir-ire     a-η-όόmbɛ     o-mu-témi
   1PL.SM-PST-slaughter-APPL-PFV PPF-C9-cow PPF-C1-chief #THEME-BEN
Context (continued): You say “Oh no, Masato will be very sad.” The next day, the blood is still in the backyard. Having heard of the chief’s visit and the accompanying feast, your brother arrives home in the evening. He enters and exchanges greetings with the family. He has not yet noticed the cow is missing.

a. # n-tó-sintʃ-ir-ire  
   1PL.SM-PST-slaughter-APPL-PFV  PPF-C1-chief  PPF-C9-cow  # BEN-THEME
   'We slaughtered the cow for the chief.'

b. n-tó-sintʃ-ir-ire  
   1PL.SM-PST-slaughter-APPL-PFV  PPF-C9-cow  PPF-C1-chief  THEME-BEN

• Sadlier-Brown: The non-canonical THEME-BEN word order is used only when:
  (a) the theme referent is shared knowledge between speaker and addressee, and
  (b) the context does not make clear that the shared knowledge referent is the intended referent.
Storyboard version of the study

Sadlier-Brown (2015):

- Participants view storyboards on a computer.
- Each panel has accompanying audio.
- Participants advance through the panels at their own pace via clicking.
- At the end of each storyboard, participants look at a paper rating sheet.
- They rate four possible final sentences on ‘how natural they would sound’, on a scale of 1 to 6.
I bought the woman a dollhouse.
I bought the woman the dollhouse.
I bought a dollhouse for the woman.
I bought the dollhouse for the woman.

(Sadlier-Brown 2015)
Is the storyboard method better?

• Our hypothesis predicts that the storyboard method of eliciting Sadlier-Brown’s contrasts is preferable to the verbal description method.

• Difficult to tell in the Sadlier-Brown case, as her purpose was not to compare elicitation methodologies and only one speaker was involved in her first study.

• We will argue for our hypothesis on the basis of two small pilot studies involving de re de dicto contrasts and out-of-the-blue contexts.
The de re de dicto contrast

Maier (2009):

(9) John believes the president of PepsiCo is rich.

De dicto reading: John believes whoever is the president of PepsiCo is rich, on the basis of, say, his general belief that presidents of large corporations are always rich.

Does not require that John has any idea who the president of PepsiCo is. Therefore, in the belief report, we cannot substitute the president of PepsiCo with Indra Nooyi, even if Indra Nooyi is in fact the current president of PepsiCo.
The de re de dicto contrast

Maier (2009):

(10) John believes the president of PepsiCo is rich.

**De re reading:** John believes of a certain individual who is the actual president of PepsiCo, that she is rich. On this reading, the report is felicitous if John talked to Indra Nooyi at a party about her yacht, and believes “Wow, this woman is rich”.

Irrelevant whether John knows that the woman he is talking to is the president of PepsiCo, or that her name is Indra Nooyi, as long as the term used picks out the individual his belief is about. In a de re reading, we can always replace the name or description with a co-referential one.
Thought experiment: De re de dicto

- Let’s pause while we all silently imagine eliciting this contrast from a non-linguist consultant.
De re de dicto storyboards

- De dicto: ‘Willem-Alexander’
- De re: ‘Miranda Smith’
- Premise: Mary is conducting a survey about people’s opinions about who is rich.

(See separate file, slides 1-22)
Predictions according to Maier

(11) John thinks the King of the Netherlands is rich. ✔
    (original description)

(12) John thinks Willem-Alexander is rich. ✗
    (de dicto – not substitutable)

(13) Peter thinks the woman who got out of the limo is rich. ✔
    (description Peter would agree with)

(14) Peter thinks Miranda Smith is rich. ✔
    (de re – substitutable)
Results in a pilot study

(11) John thinks the King of the Netherlands is rich.  
      (original description)  
      ✔

(12) John thinks Willem-Alexander is rich.  
      (de dicto – not substitutable)  
      ✔, ✗, ?

(13) Peter thinks the woman who got out of the limo is rich.  
      (description Peter would agree with)  
      ✔

(14) Peter thinks Miranda Smith is rich.  
      (de re – substitutable)  
      ✔, ✗
How to improve results

• Post-test interviews revealed that participants felt they should get the same answer for both storyboards. This may interfere with the expected contrast.

• Some expressed that they had used logical reasoning, e.g.: “Willem-Alexander is the king. That is objective reality, it is a fact. It is the same person.”

• This is a case where to get clear results, a larger number of participants will be required. The order needs to be randomized and fillers are crucial.

• Work in progress; we cannot yet prove that the storyboard was any more successful than a verbal description. We invite you to try with your friends and family!
Out-of-the-blue contexts
Out of the blue contexts

- When do semanticists make use of out-of-the-blue contexts?

*Tonhauser & Matthewson (2017):*

i. To establish the context-independent meaning of an expression.
   e.g., the default temporal interpretation of an unmarked verb (Smith et al. 2007), or the context-independent contribution of scalar items (van Tiel et al. 2016).

ii. To establish whether an element places constraints on the context.
   e.g., requiring a particular piece of information to be already in the interlocutors' common ground.
The problem with out-of-the-blue

• It might seem that a good way to get out-of-the-blue judgments is to give the consultant utterances without any discourse context.

• But no!

• ‘It is problematic to draw conclusions from utterances presented in isolation, since the researcher has no control or knowledge of what discourse context the consultant may be imagining while performing these tasks’ (Tonhauser & Matthewson 2017; see also Crain & Steedman 1985).

• Remember: The fieldworker and the speaker need to have the same context in mind!
Claims about eliciting out-of-the-blue contexts:

1. Interlocutor ignorance must be explicitly established. (This claim is independent of the method of presenting the context.)

2. Storyboards are the best, or at least a very reliable, way to explicitly establish ignorance.

• We’ll start by looking at some of the best attempts in the literature to establish interlocutor ignorance. We’ll argue that some of the attempts could be made even better.
Example: Testing for Strong Contextual Felicity

*Tonhauser et al.* (2013):

- Elements which are subject to a **Strong Contextual Felicity Constraint** impose a restriction on the discourse context.

- Presupposition triggers, for example, are felicitous in contexts which entail or imply the presupposition, and infelicitous in contexts which don’t.

- For a piece of projective content $m$:
  
  $m$-positive context: context that entails or implies $m$.
  
  $m$-neutral context: context that entails or implies neither $m$ nor $\neg m$. 
Strong Contextual Felicity of ‘too’

(15) Context: Malena is eating her lunch, a hamburger, on the bus going into town. A woman who she doesn’t know sits down next to her and says:

# Ñande-chofeur o-karu empanáda avei.
A1PL.INCL-driver A3-eat empanada too
# ‘Our bus driver is eating empanadas, too.’

(Paraguayan Guaraní; Tonhauser et al. 2013)

• The utterance is set up to be out-of-the-blue / discourse-initial.

• The context is \textit{m-neutral}: It does not entail or imply either that somebody else is eating empanadas besides the driver, or that nobody else is.
Strong Contextual Felicity of ‘too’

(16) Context: Malena is eating her lunch, empanadas, on the bus going into town. A woman she doesn’t know sits down next to her and says:

Ñande-chofeur o-karu empanáda *avei*.

A1PL.INCL-driver A3-eat empanada too

‘Our bus driver is eating empanadas, too.’

(Paraguayan Guaraní; Tonhauser et al. 2013)

• The utterance is set up to be out-of-the-blue / discourse-initial.
• The context sets up shared knowledge (the presence of empanadas).

• The context is *m*-positive: It entails that somebody else is eating empanadas besides the driver.

→ The acceptability contrast between *m*-neutral (15) and *m*-positive (16) suggests that *avei* imposes a SCF constraint.
Evaluation of the SCF diagnostic

✔ Explicitly sets up absence of prior discourse.

✔ Has the collection of minimal pairs built in (m-neutral vs. m-positive).

✔ Tonhauser et al. (2013) gathered many useful results in Paraguayan Guaraní and English using this method.

! When we go beyond contrasts which can be set up simply, via e.g. the presence vs. absence of empanadas in the utterance context, verbal descriptions are likely to get long and complex.

! Tonhauser et al. avoid explicit statements about interlocutor (lack of) knowledge: ‘m-neutral contexts were established in this research by stating neither m nor its negation in the context, rather than explicitly stating that neither m nor its negation is known.’
Ignorance must be established

• We believe that a lack of addressee knowledge must be explicitly controlled for, in order to avoid consultants potentially adding extra information in their minds.

• Ignorance cannot safely be assumed on the basis of a piece of information not being mentioned in the context description.
Establishing ignorance through verbal description

- Investigating whether appositive relatives have a Strong Contextual Felicity Constraint:

(17) Context: Raul is new in town. His neighbor Simon invites him to his house for a party and introduces him to Maria. When Simon has walked away, Maria tells Raul:

Simon, che-kichiha-kue, o-ñe’ẽ Aleman.

‘Simon, my ex-boyfriend, speaks German.’

(Paraguayan Guaraní; Tonhauser et al. 2013)

✔ Raul’s newness in town, and the fact that he just got introduced to Maria, establishes Maria’s belief in Raul’s ignorance about her ex-boyfriend.
Not explicitly establishing ignorance

- Investigating whether appositive relatives have a Strong Contextual Felicity Constraint:

(18) Context: *The children in a history class have to give presentations about famous people. Malena has to talk about the pope. She starts with:* (Paraguayan Guaraní; Tonhauser et al. 2013)

Papa Benedícto 16, o-nasē-va’e-kue Alemánia-pe, oi-ko Róma-pe.

Pope Benedict 16 A3-born-RC-NOM.TERM Germany-in A3-live Rome-in

‘Pope Benedict the 16th, who was born in Germany, lives in Rome.’

Will the consultant necessarily assume that the addressees are ignorant of the Pope’s birthplace? If appositives had a SCF constraint, some consultants may accommodate that the class had previously been taught where the Pope was born.
Example: Testing for verum

- Stress on an auxiliary or finite verb in English (and German) emphasizes the truth of the proposition expressed (Höhle 1992 and much subsequent work).

(19) A: Good thing it wasn’t a dark and stormy night when you were camping yesterday.
   B: It WAS a dark and stormy night.

*Verum is infelicitous out-of-the-blue:*

(20) Context: Beginning of a story.
   a. It was a dark and stormy night.
   b. #It WAS a dark and stormy night.
Trying to establish ignorance for verum

- Testing whether the Gitksan (Tsimshianic) particle \( k'ap \) marks verum and therefore is infelicitous in out-of-the-blue contexts.

(21) Context to test: Hector walks into the room and we have some surprising news for him:

\[
\begin{align*}
K'ap & \quad \text{yukw=hl dim nek=s Aidan!} \\
\text{VERUM} & \quad \text{IPFV=CN PROSP marry=PN Aidan}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Aidan is getting married!’

(Gitksan)

- Prediction if \( k'ap \) is verum: Infelicitous.
Elicitation method 1:

- Verbal context description, as on previous slide.
- Consultant accepted the utterance, and commented “Yeah. It means ‘No, he really is.’ You’re not kidding.” Contrary to prediction!
Elicitation method 2:

- Immediately after this, somebody entered the room, so I uttered the sentence to that person. The consultant laughed and emphatically rejected it.

→ Even a verbally-described scenario which the researcher believes clearly establishes a discourse-initial context may not be viewed as such by a consultant.
A better way: Storyboards

- Establishing ignorance is difficult to describe verbally in a foolproof way, as just illustrated. (It’s also often not possible to ‘act out’ a scenario on the spot.)

- In another pilot study, we constructed four storyboards to test verum marking in out-of-the-blue contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verum?</th>
<th>Ignorance clear?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-verum</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad-verum</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See separate file slides 23-47)
Storyboards for testing verum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verum?</th>
<th>Ignorance clear?</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>no verum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-verum</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>verum bad OOTB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>no verum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad-verum</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>✔/✗</td>
<td>verum bad OOTB, some speakers may enrich context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• We predicted that judgments might vary on ‘Sad-verum’ because ignorance is not explicitly enforced.
Results

- These four storyboards were tested on six non-linguist English speakers and one Gitksan speaker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verum?</th>
<th>Ignorance clear?</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>7 ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-verum</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>7 ✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>6 ✔, 1 ✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad-verum</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>✔/✗</td>
<td>4 ✔, 3 ✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- We predicted that judgments might vary on ‘Sad-verum’ because ignorance is not explicitly enforced. This prediction was upheld.
Not just numbers!

• Follow-up interviews supported our hypothesis about the reason for the ‘acceptable’ judgments in Sad-verum.

• “When he emphasised the IS you get the impression they must have discussed the possibility of Charlie being sad earlier so therefore it sounds like the listener will have some context to the statement. Obviously this is an assumption on the reader’s part so that’s why I said it sounds okay because I am assuming they have discussed it.”

• “[Married-verum] could only have been OK if there had been a particular previous conversation and we know there hadn't been. … on [Sad-verum] I felt justified in setting the bar lower on the assumption that the background included contact with, and conversation about, Charlie. The emphasis is right or wrong depending on that conversation.”
1. Ignorance must be explicitly established.

→ If not, the researcher cannot be sure that the consultant has the same context in mind; silent accommodation is possible.
   • Gitksan verum case using verbal description
   • Sad-verum storyboard

2. Storyboards are the best, or at least a very reliable, way to explicitly establish ignorance.

→ Easy to establish ignorance in a few panels. Interlocutor belief states can be controlled for both by showing that there was no prior discourse, and by having the characters express ignorance.
   • Married-verum
Conclusion
All types of elicitation task benefit from providing the consultant with context information.

Questions:

? What is the best way to provide context information to consultants?

? Are certain types of linguistic phenomena more suited to particular methods for presenting contexts?
Summary

**Answers:**

- Phenomena which involve reference to *interlocutors’ epistemic states* are particularly well served by the *storyboard* technique.

- This includes establishing ‘*out-of-the-blue*’ contexts, which require controlling for (lack of) shared knowledge between interlocutors.

- Other phenomena such as quantifier scope or comparative relations can more easily be probed for using verbal context descriptions or single images.
Phenomena such as …

• Phenomena for which storyboards are very useful:
  • presupposition triggers
  • epistemic modals
  • attitude verbs
  • discourse particles
  • verum
  • focus-sensitive elements
  • contrastive focus
  • …
Nothing is a panacea

- Making a storyboard to test a complex semantic question avoids many pitfalls and allows interlocutors’ belief states to be represented.

- This doesn’t mean it’s always easy to get it right!

- Multiple pilot tests may be needed for each new storyboard until you’re sure it works.
When you have storyboards which work …

- Please share them!
- We accept and post storyboards on our website, www.totemfieldstoryboards.org
- See also https://wikis.hu-berlin.de/melatamp/Elicitation_materials
  - https://fieldworkhub.wordpress.com/storyboards/
- Also, we invite you to submit a paper explaining your storyboard to our new online journal, Semantic Fieldwork Methods!
- The first paper is about to appear: Vander Klok on ‘Bill vs. the Weather’.
- https://ojs.library.ubc.ca/index.php/storyboards/index
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