
**Hallucinations:**
- **No corpus evidence and No Low DGS-Feedback Response:**
  - Strong Corpus Evidence and High Positive DGS-Feedback Response:
    - DGS-Feedback System
      - developed to address the DGS community
      - up to now 279 persons contributed to the DGS-Feedback system (February 2018)
      - registration to obtain metadata on person and sign language skills
      - heterogeneous group of participants e.g. deaf, hard of hearing, CODAs, interpreters, early learners and late learners

Analyzing Stage of Corpus-based Lexicographic Work:
- with an increasing number of tokens available analysis stage of dictionary making started
- data analysis and documentation of relevant facts about the sign
- generalisation (lemma establishment, Svenén, 2009)
- description of a sign's meanings and grouping them into senses (word sense disambiguation - WSD; cf. Atkins & Rundell, 2008:269)
- description of form variants and regional distribution of signs (McKee & McKee, 2013; Zwitserlood et al., 2013; Featon et al. 2015)
- corpus data is a starting point
- corpus data is always a priority over DGS-Feedback data
- corpus data can only provide positive evidence and areas of uncertainty remain
- data from the DGS-Feedback supplement corpus data findings and thus support lexicographic work

**Sampling of the DGS-Feedback:**
- the system is open to all members of the DGS community
- up to now 279 persons contributed to the DGS-Feedback system (February 2018)
- registration to obtain metadata on person and sign language skills
- heterogeneous group of participants e.g. deaf, hard of hearing, CODAs, interpreters, early learners and late learners

**Participants’ Comments on Sign Use**
- The DGS-Feedback data is a valuable addition to the corpus findings.
- The benefits of findings are: confirmation of uncertain sign use and showing certain characteristics of a sign (e.g. regional use, form variation, age effects).
- Question types 1 and 2 were designed to verify or disprove non-corpus data. With corpus-based lexicographic work there is a need for new question types.
- When analysing data from both sources several factors need to be considered as we have shown in examples 2, 4 and 6.

**Conclusion**
- strong corpus evidence would always lead to inclusion of the sense into the dictionary
- high positive DGS-Feedback response also confirms the finding
- corpus data has priority over DGS-Feedback data
- corpus data can only provide positive evidence and areas of uncertainty remain
- cases from the DGS-Feedback supplement corpus data findings and thus support lexicographic work

**Structure of the Survey**
- different question types
  - type 1: words or for different meanings of one sign form
  - type 2: asks for different signs used for the same concept
  - a questionnaire (work package) consists of several question pages (questions) and a question consists of several question items
  - feedback
    - first question type released
    - 42 work packages released
      - over 100 returns: 14 with 71 different sign forms
      - most returns from type 1 work packages (first presented to new users)
    - stimuli: a clip of a single sign, written German equivalents and if necessary a signed context
    - three response options: I use the sign (used), I know the sign (known), I do not know the sign (unknown)
  - at the end of each question users may bring other meanings to our attention (by writing or webrecording)

**Analysis of DGS-Feedback Data**
- Distribution of corpus informants using 'bracketing'
  - Distribution of corpus informants using 'bracketing' on Monday, May 1st, 2015
  - Distribution of corpus informants using 'bracketing' on Monday, May 1st, 2016

**Strong Corpus Evidence and High Positive DGS-Feedback Response**
- Number of corpus tokens: 147
- Total number of responses: 147
- Known: 14
- Unknown: 103

**Weak Corpus Evidence and Low Positive DGS-Feedback Response**
- Number of corpus tokens: 130
- Total number of responses: 104
- Known: 10
- Unknown: 94

**No Corpus Evidence and No Low DGS-Feedback Response**
- Number of corpus tokens: 0
- Total number of responses: 0
- Known: 0
- Unknown: 0

**No Corpus Evidence and High Positive DGS-Feedback Response**
- Number of corpus tokens: 15
- Total number of responses: 15
- Known: 15
- Unknown: 0

**Strong Corpus Evidence and Low Positive DGS-Feedback Response**
- Number of corpus tokens: 15
- Total number of responses: 15
- Known: 15
- Unknown: 0

**Weak Corpus Evidence and High Positive DGS-Feedback Response**
- Number of corpus tokens: 71
- Total number of responses: 103
- Known: 103
- Unknown: 0

**No Corpus Evidence and High Positive DGS-Feedback Response**
- Number of corpus tokens: 0
- Total number of responses: 0
- Known: 0
- Unknown: 0
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