

Supplementary data for:

Johnston, T., Cresdee, D., Schembri, A., & Woll, B. (in press). FINISH variation in and grammaticalization in a signed language: how far down this well-trodden pathway is Auslan (Australian sign language)? *Language Variation and Change*.

These tables supply the results for Rbrul runs as described in each Table Title. The data is relevant to the discussion after footnote/endnote marker ^x (immediately after Table 7 in the paper).

Dataset (auxiliaries only): application value each FINISH-type sign (each FINISH versus the rest)

Factor group	Factor	Tokens	GOOD vs others	Weight	FINALLY vs others	Weight	FIVE vs others	Weight
Formational								
Hands	One hand	37	81%	.65	5%	.37	14%	.38
	Two hand	87	58%	.34	13%	.63	30%	.62
Usage or semantics								
Telicity	Atelic	50	62%	.50	6%	.50	32%	.50
	Telic	74	66%	.50	14%	.50	20%	.50
IAktionsart	State	2	50%	.27	50%	.91	0%	<0.001
	Activity	48	63%	.60	4%	.16	33%	.98
	Accomplishment	29	66%	.53	14%	.41	21%	.97
	Achievement	45	67%	.62	13%	.40	20%	.96
Text-type	Monologic	84	64%	.48	83%	.49	27%	.55
	Dialogic	40	65%	.52	15%	.54	20%	.45
Grammar								
Modifier position	Pre	57	70%	.64	14%	.99	16%	.29
	Post	63	59%	.49	7%	.99	33%	.52
	Verb elided	4	75%	.37	0%	<0.001	25%	.70
Social								
Idiosyncrasy	Individual ID							
Nativeness	Near Native	40	68%	.53	5%	.37	26%	.52
	Native	84	63%	.47	13%	.63	24%	.48
Age	Old	43	67%	.45	12%	.58	21%	.50
	Middle	40	70%	.60	10%	.55	20%	.38
	Young	41	56%	.45	10%	.37	24%	.62
Dialect	Northern	49	67%	.53	8%	.46	25%	.48
	Southern	75	63%	.47	12%	.54	25%	.52
Sex	Male	53	64%	.49	11%	.48	25%	.51
	Female	71	65%	.51	10%	.52	25%	.49

Dataset (all token): application value function (function versus content uses)

Factor group	Factor	Tokens	FUNCTION VS CONTENT	Weight
Formational				
Hands	One hand	83	51%	.52
	Two hand	312	47%	.48
Variants	FINISH.GOOD	218	50%	.55
	FINISH.FINALLY	93	25%	.25
	FINISH.FIVE	84	68%	.72
Usage or semantics				
Telicity	Atelic	112	65%	.50
	Telic	236	42%	.50
Aktionsart	State	21	29%	.31
	Activity	91	74%	.74
	Accomplishment	66	70%	.73
	Achievement	170	31%	.30
Text-type	Monologic	264	51%	.57
	Dialogic	131	41%	.43
Social				
Nativeness	Near Native	131	48%	.54
	Native	264	47%	.46
Age	Old	127	51%	.54
	Middle	151	49%	.46
	Young	117	49%	.50
Dialect	Northern	154	47%	.50
	Southern	241	51%	.54
Sex	Male	186	46%	.49
	Female	209	49%	.51

Dataset (all tokens): application value auxiliaries (auxiliaries compared with non-auxiliary uses)

Factor group	Factor	Tokens	auxiliaries vs non-auxiliaries	Weight
Formational				
Hands	One hand	75	51%	0.60
	Two hand	273	32%	0.40
Variants	FINISH.GOOD	194	42%	0.61
	FINISH.FINALLY	79	17%	0.29
	FINISH.FIVE	75	43%	0.61
Usage and semantics				
Aktionsart	State	21	9%	0.19
	Activity	91	54%	0.73
	Accomplishment	66	46%	0.65
	Achievement	170	27%	0.46
Text-type	Monologic	233	37%	0.50
	Dialogic	115	36%	0.50
Social				
Nativeness	Near Native	110	37%	0.51
	Native	238	36%	0.49
Age	Old	109	40%	0.52
	Middle	135	30%	0.44
	Young	104	39%	0.53
Dialect	Northern	134	37%	0.49
	Southern	214	36%	0.51
Sex	Male	161	33%	0.47
	Female	187	39%	0.53

Dataset (auxiliaries tokens only): comparing anterior and completive uses (linguistic factors only)

Factor group	Factor	Tokens	COMPLETIVE VS. ANTERIOR	Weight
Formational				
Hands	One hand	33	21%	.40
	Two hand	85	41%	.60
Variants	FINISH.GOOD	76	30%	.40
	FINISH.FINALLY	12	58%	.70
	FINISH.FIVE	30	40%	.41
Usage or semantics				
Telicity	Atelic	48	35%	.50
	Telic	70	36%	.50
Aktionsart	State	-	-	-
	Activity	48	35%	.51
	Accomplishment	29	28%	.45
	Achievement	41	42%	.54
Grammar				
Modifier position	Pre	56	47%	.64
	Post	62	23%	.37

Dataset (auxiliaries tokens only): comparing anterior and completive uses (social factors only)

Factor group	Factor	Tokens	ANTERIOR VS. COMPLETIVE	Weight
Usage or semantics				
Text-type	Monologic	82	43%	.70
	Dialogic	36	19%	.30
Social				
Nativeness	Near Native	37	38%	.56
	Native	81	35%	.44
Age	Old	41	32%	.47
	Middle	39	26%	.33
	Young	38	50%	.70
Dialect	Northern	47	40%	.51
	Southern	71	32%	.49
Sex	Male	50	43%	.62
	Female	68	26%	.39