American Sign Language Linguistic Research Project



Documentation for Download of ASLLRP Signs Segmented from Continuous Signing Corpora

Carol Neidle and Augustine Opoku

Boston University, Boston, MA

Report No. 24, American Sign Language Linguistic Research Project

http://www.bu.edu/asllrp/

© June 2023, Boston University

1. Introduction

The American Sign Language Linguistic Research Project (ASLLRP) makes available a variety of resources for computational and linguistic research and education related to American Sign Language (ASL); see the References. In particular, the ASLLRP Sign Bank, available online from https://dai.cs.rutgers.edu/dai/s/signbank, enables searching and viewing ASL signs, as produced in a variety of ways by multiple ASL signers, both in citation form and in sentential context. The isolated sign datasets can currently be downloaded from that website; the ASLLRP Sign Bank examples segmented from our continuous signing corpora have also now been made available for download. These signs have been linguistically annotated in a consistent way across the ASLLRP datasets, and the annotations are also available for download.

The purpose of this document is to provide information about the csv files that that accompany the downloadable **signs segmented from the ASLLRP continuous signing corpora**.

1.1. Explanation of the spreadsheets

Below is an explanation of what is contained in each of the columns of the spreadsheets associated with the signs segmented from the ASLLRP continuous signing corpora.



1.2. Format of the video files

For each sign, video files are listed in different columns of the spreadsheets and provided separately for download of (1) the sign itself; (2) the containing utterance, and (3) the master video containing that utterance among others. Depending on your research interests, you may wish to download only (1), or only (1) and (2). The video files provided in (3) are extremely large and may not be needed, depending on your research focus.

The videos are provided either as .mov or .mp4 files—in h264 (Constrained Baseline) or mpeg4 (Simple Profile) formats, respectively. The files are formatted with 29.97002997002997 frames per second.

The rest of this report replicates explanations also provided in [7].

2. Special characters as they appear in the spreadsheet

For technical reasons related to processing of special characters, you will find, in the Excel file, the representation of a text string in between quotation marks represented with backward slashes around the relevant string followed by the quotation marks. So, for example, the gloss "WHAT" (in quotation marks) is displayed in the *Excel* spreadsheet as \WHAT\"". Similarly, the gloss for the classifier LCL"path-turn-around" is included in the *Excel* spreadsheet as LCL\path-turn-around\"". The CSV file may actually look a little bit different, with, for example, the following appearing for "WHAT": "\"WHAT\"".

Note that for the handshape labels in the provided spreadsheets, those containing the symbol "/" in the Appendix have that symbol replaced by '__'.

3. Explanation of glossing conventions and glosses in the 3 columns

3.1. English-based text used for gloss labels

The text used for gloss labels, although based on English words (to assist mnemonically), should not be interpreted to have any inherent significance. In some cases, when there is more than one common usage, the label may consist of two English words separated by a slash, as in **BETWEEN/SHARE** or **BOX/ROOM** or **AVOID/FALL-BEHIND**.

Note that spaces are not allowed in gloss text. When two English words are used for a gloss, they are connected by a hyphen, as in **GIVE-UP**.

3.2. Phonological Variation vs. Lexical Variation

When there are differences in sign production that are purely phonological, i.e., that can occur generally in the language and that are not specific to the specific lexical item, the same gloss label is used, although we annotate the handshapes as they occur. For example, there are signs that normally begin or end with a '1' handshape that sometimes occur with a 'D' handshape instead. To reiterate: where this is purely a phonological variation, we do not gloss the signs differently on this basis. Examples include **ALARM** and **DRY**, as shown in Figure 1, among others. Note that all of the example signs included here can be viewed from the online ASLLRP Sign Bank: https://dai.cs.rutgers.edu/dai/s/signbank.

There are other cases where the allowed variability in handshape is specific to a particular sign. Such cases are considered to involve lexical variants, and these productions **do** have distinct textbased glosses, although they are grouped under a single "main entry". For example, the sign for **COP** can use one of two handshapes, and this variation is specific to this sign, so these are considered two lexical variants—each involving a different handshape—of the main entry "**COP**". Thus, they have different text labels (see § 3.3) but are classified as variants of the same sign, i.e., the same "main entry"), as shown in Figure 2.

1 D	ALARM	¢ 🎍		¢ 🏓
		ø		\$
		and the second s		es.
	DRY		R	4

Figure 1. Illustration of phonological handshape variation

	Main entry	Entry/variant	
C sml-C/3	СОР	СОР	
	СОР	COP_2	

Figure 2. Illustration of lexical variations distinguished by handshape

3.3. Conventions for distinguishing gloss labels

There are various strategies for providing distinct text-based gloss labels, whether for different lexical variants or for distinct signs that can have similar English translation; and there is no significance to which option is chosen:

- It could be a distinct English-based label (e.g., CABINET vs. CUPBOARD).
- There could be a numerical suffix, such as above, with COP vs. COP_2.
- Sometimes there is a prefix marking the difference in handshape (e.g., CORNER vs. (1)CORNER, as in Figure 3).

Main entry	Entry/variant	
CORNER	CORNER	CORNER V
CORNER	(1)CORNER	(1)CORNER

Figure 3. Example of lexical variants of main entry CORNER

There is no significance to any of these choices; the only essential consideration is that there needs to be a 1-1 correspondence between a given text label and a distinctive sign production, whether the different productions correspond to lexical variants or distinct signs (main entries). The latter case is illustrated by LATER vs. LATER_2, shown in Figure 4, which are different enough in production to be classified as distinct signs rather than variants of a singles sign. It should be noted, however, that there are cases where it is a close call whether to classify two variants as a distinct entry variants or lexical variants of a single sign. So there is some degree of arbitrariness in these decisions, which nonetheless need to be made. In any case, we have kept our annotations in this respect consistent across the data set.

Main entry	Entry/ variant	
LATER	LATER	
LATER_2	LATER_2	LATER_2

Figure 4. Example of distinct signs (entry variants) with the meaning of 'later'

3.4. Marked number of hands

Sometimes a sign that is normally 1-handed is produced with 2 hands. In that case, the prefix '(2h)' is added to the gloss, and vice versa for signs produced with 1 hand that are normally 2handed: they are marked with the prefix '(1h)'. Example: **GIVE** (1-handed) vs. (2h)**GIVE** (2handed). Occasionally it can require a relatively arbitrary decision as to which of the two variants should be considered to be the unmarked form. But again, we are careful to be consistent across the dataset in how a given sign production is annotated.

3.5. Inflection

There are other cases where inflected forms have annotations reflecting those inflections, but are considered to be lexical variants of the corresponding uninflected forms. Subject and object agreement, for example, is marked on signs in various ways; see ([3-6, 8]) for details. For example, pronoun forms and agreeing verbs, can be marked for 1st, 2nd, or 3rd person subject and/or object agreement by a prefix and/or suffix (e.g., 1p-GIVE-2p, which is classified as a variant under main entry GIVE). Third-person singular and plural object agreement also includes spatial information about reference, e.g. 1p-GIVE:i, where 'i' is an index representing the spatial location associated with the referent, or IX-3p:i, where IX represents the use of the index finger as a 3rd-person pronoun accessing the referential location designated by the index 'i'.

Our annotation conventions were originally developed for continuous signing. Certain distinctions are not discernible in citation-form signs. For example, the sign produced with the index finger and pointing at a specific location can function as a pronoun, a determiner, or an adverbial of location (e.g., **IX-loc:i.**) These can be differentiated in continuous signing, but in citation form, the notation is simplified to **IX:i**.

3.6. Sign Types

Prefixes identify several specific sign types, as illustrated below:

Example sign	Prefix	Marks
fs-UP	fs-	Fingerspelled signs
5"forget it"	#	Loan signs
BCL"put arms around friend" PCL:4 "long line of people"	BBCL, BPCL, DCL, ICL, LCL, PCL, SCL optionally followed by a colon and a handshape label	different types of classifiers: Body, Body Part, Descriptive, Instrument, Locative, Plural, Semantic, respectively
ns-AUSTRALIA	ns-	name signs (can be of any sign type)
ns-nat-AUSTRALIA	ns-nat-	name signs taken from the sign language of the relevant part of the world

Table 1. Prefixes that mark sign type

Compounds are represented by the Variant Labels of their parts, connected by a '+' sign, as in: **TEACH+AGENT** (meaning 'teacher). The '+' sign also has another use, as described below.

3.7. Occurrence Labels and Reduplication

Many signs can be produced with the end portion of the sign repeated one or more times. Sometimes this is associated with a meaning change; it can convey aspectual marking [2] or nominalization [1, 9], e.g.. Often, however, there is no discernible difference in meaning. We consider cases differentiated solely by such reduplication to be instances of the same sign production, i.e., the same sign variant, without regard for meaning differences associated with reduplication. (Therefore, these are also considered to be instantiations of the same main entry.)

We have attempted to represent cases where the sign is produced with more repetitions than are required for the base form of the sign by adding one plus for each such repetition. For example, the sign for 'father' can be produced with a single touch of the forehead, or with 2 touches (FATHER+). If there were 3 touches, that would be FATHER++.¹ This extra duration can alternatively be accomplished by a single touch with finger wiggling (FATHERwg). This is shown in Figure 5.

¹ The number of plusses in the annotations may not be totally consistent. Annotators may not have agreed on what the default production is after which repetitions merited a '+'. We include these occurrence labels because they may be of use, but if these repetitions are to be the basis for research, the annotations should be carefully verified. In any case, any inconsistencies in the number of plusses included in the occurrence labels does not affect the variant and main entry labels.

Main entry	Entry/ variant	Occurrence			
FATHER	FATHER	FATHER	FATHER – produced with 1 touch		
FATHER	FATHER	FATHER+	FATHER – produced with 2 touches		
FATHER	FATHERwg	FATHERwg	FATHER – produced with finger wiggling		

Figure 5. Occurrence Label includes marking of Reduplication (+) in row 2

Acknowledgments. Thanks very much to Carey Ballard and Indya-loreal Oliver for their help with annotation and analysis of data, and to Augustine Opoku for his excellent work in developing and maintaining the DAI website. The work reported here has been supported in part by grants from NSF: # 2040638, 1763486, 1763523, 1763569, 2235405, 2212302, 2212301, and 2212303.

Any opinions, findings, or conclusions expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation

1	and a	alt-G_ bent-L	-	bent- I-L-Y	Þ	crvd-3	S
3	et l	alt-M		bent-L	*	crvd-5	·
4	Y	alt-N	et p	bent-M	S	crvd-B	
5	*	alt-P	Ŕ	bent-N	1	crvd-flat-B	
6	X	В		bent-U	S	crvd-L	a la
7	Y	B-L		bent- U-L	T	crvd-sprd-B	1 Alexandre
8	¥	B-xd		bent-v	(crvd-U	R
10		baby-O	•	С	K	crvd-V	X
25	¥.	bent-1	P.	cocked-7	K	crvd-W	2
5-C	8	bent-B	5	cocked-8	Jan Barris	D	1 Alexandre
5-C-L	*	bent-B-L	*	cocked-F	Y	E	
5-C-tt	Y	bent-B-xd	Sec.	cocked-S	1	F	St and a start
A	er	bent-horns	V	cocked-U	er e	fanned- flat-O	

flat-B	•	М	9	tight-C-2	S-
xsflat-G		N	ý	U	ø
flat-O	Ø	0		U-L	est.
flat- O_2	F	O-2-horns	X	V	
full-M	Ø	open-7	\$	Vulcan	V.
G		open-8	-	W	X
horns	Jak .	open-F	¥-	Х	
I	b	R		X-over- thumb	
I-L-Y	par-	R-L		Y	r.
к		S	e		
L	d -	sml-C-3	Ø-		
L-X		т	9		
loose-E		tight-C	<u>F</u>		

References

- [1] Abner, N. (2017) What You See Is What You Get.Get: Surface Transparency and Ambiguity of Nominalizing Reduplication in American Sign Language, 2017 Syntax, pp 317–352. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/synt.12147</u>.
- [2] Klima, E. S., and U. Bellugi (1979) *The Signs of Language*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- [3] Neidle, C. (2002) SignStream[™] Annotation: Conventions used for the American Sign Language Linguistic Research Project, In American Sign Language Linguistic Research Project Report No. 11, Boston University, Boston, MA. <u>http://www.bu.edu/asllrp/asllrpr11.pdf</u>
- [4] Neidle, C. (2007) SignStreamTM Annotation: Addendum to Conventions used for the American Sign Language Linguistic Research Project, In American Sign Language Linguistic Research Project Report No. 13, Boston University, Boston, MA. <u>http://www.bu.edu/asllrp/asllrpr13.pdf</u>
- [5] Neidle, C., B. Bahan, D. MacLaughlin, R. G. Lee, and J. Kegl. (1998) Realizations of Syntactic Agreement in American Sign Language: Similarities between the Clause and the Noun Phrase, *Studia Linguistica 52*, pp 191-226. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9582.00034</u>.
- [6] Neidle, C., and R. G. Lee. (2006) Syntactic agreement across language modalities, In *Studies on Agreement* (Costa, J., and M. C. Figueiredo Silva, Eds.), pp 203–222, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- [7] Neidle, C., and A. Opoku. (2022) Data Sets available through DAI 2. ADDENDUM to C. Neidle & A. Opoku, User's Guide to the American Sign Language Linguistic Research Project (ASLLRP) Interface Version 2. Data Access (DAI) 2 ASLLRP Report No. 18 http://www.bu.edu/asllrp/rpt18/asllrp18.pdf Boston, Boston University, MA. http://www.bu.edu/asllrp/about-datasets.pdf
- [8] Neidle, C., A. Thangali, and S. Sclaroff. (2012) Challenges in Development of the American Sign Language Lexicon Video Dataset (ASLLVD) Corpus. 5th Workshop on the Representation and Processing of Sign Languages: Interactions between Corpus and Lexicon. LREC, Istanbul, Turkey. May 2012. <u>https://open.bu.edu/handle/2144/31899</u>
- [9] Supalla, T., and E. L. Newport. (1978) How many seats in a chair? The derivation of nouns and verbs in ASL, In *Understanding language through sign language research* (Siple, P., Ed.), pp 91-132, Academic Press, New York.