

Systematicity in gesture production, perception may support sign language emergence

When communicating in a new medium, like silent gesture, people must adopt and adapt novel strategies to ensure successful communication with partners. It has been argued that initial productions are inconsistent and unstructured, with systematicity instead emerging through interaction and transmission (Motamedi et al., 2019). In support of this claim, studies on sign language emergence have shown that homesigners, as well as signers of young and established sign languages systematically vary handshape to code transitivity in production, but gesturers do not (Brentari et al., 2012, 2017). However, perception studies show that non-signers can resolve abstract syntactic-semantic information, like distributivity, telicity, and phi-features (Marshall & Morgan, 2015; Strickland et al., 2015; Schlenker & Chemla, 2018), from gesture and sign on first exposure, suggesting that some aspects of the visual signal are analyzable. Further, we argue that the recurrent emergence of handshape as a transitivity marker across unrelated sign languages suggests that these aspects may be systematic. To help reconcile these disparate findings, we conducted silent gesture production and perception experiments. We modeled handshape to uncover specific visual aspects of the signal that may undergird transitivity categorization.

Methods: We elicited silent gestures from 6 non-signing participants who represented 46 unique events involving the manipulation (transitive) or movement (intransitive) of a variety of objects ($6 * 46 = 276$ gestures). Gestures representing transitive events were considered transitive, otherwise intransitive (*inherent transitivity*). Next, we collected 20 descriptions of the meanings of these gestures from 95 non-signers on Amazon Mechanical Turk (Turkers; $276 * 20 = 5,520$ sentences; Fig. 1a). Gestures were annotated for 6 handshape features, individually linked to transitivity marking in sign languages (Fig. 1b). We then labeled the sentences for transitivity (1 = 'transitive') and calculated a mean 'perceived transitivity' score for each gesture. A gesture was considered transitive if its proportion of transitive responses was greater than the median proportion of all transitive responses, otherwise intransitive (*perceived transitivity*). We performed two analyses: We trained linear support vector classifiers to predict (1) whether a given gesture is inherently in/transitive and (2) whether it is perceived in/transitive. In each analysis, we used a 6-fold leave-one-out paradigm: The data were randomly split into 6 partitions, trained on 5 of the partitions and tested on the 6th, producing an accuracy score. This was repeated 6 times, such that each partition was the test set once. We computed mean accuracy and compared it against chance using the probability mass function of the binomial distribution. Finally, we averaged the weights for each predictor across all 6 Folds in each analysis to assess handshape parameter importance.

Results: Turkers were 91.3% accurate at guessing the transitivity of the gestures (chance = 50%, $p < 0.001$). Likewise, classifiers trained on production and perception data were roughly equally good at predicting the inherent and perceived transitivity of the silent gestures: 71.38% and 73.91% accurate, respectively, both significant at $p < 0.001$ (Figs. 2a, 2b). Three handshape parameters, *Finger complexity*, *Flexion*, and *One- or two-handed*, characterized both the production and perception of transitivity distinctions. Further, these features had the same relative weighting (i.e., *One- or two-handed* > *Flexion* > *Finger Complexity*; Fig. 2c).

Interpretation: Non-signers produce transitivity cues, which are perceived accurately by other non-signers outside of a communicative context. Handshape parameters accurately predict a significant amount of both the production and perception of transitivity distinctions across a diversity of events, indicating handshape variation as a general strategy for transitivity (de)coding in silent gesture. Further, the same handshape parameters are informative in both production and perception, with the same relative weighting, suggesting an embodied solution to the emergence of transitivity in new sign languages in addition to communicative history (interaction and transmission).




Figure 1: (a) **Experimental design:** An inherently transitive gesture, depicting *Someone put a book on its side*, with Turker response sentences and annotated for transitivity. Gesture was perceived to be transitive. Handshape was annotated for features in (b); (b) **Handshape parameters:** 'Finger complexity' & 'Joint complexity' = measures of ease of articulation w.r.t. fingers and joints (each scored 1 to 3); 'Flexion' = degree of curvature of the profiled fingers (1 to 6); 'Flexion of unselected fingers (USF flexion)' = degree of curvature of the backgrounded fingers (-1 to 1); 'Aperture change' = whether the hand opens/closes (categorical); 'One- or two-handed' = whether the production involved one or two hands (categorical).




Figure 2: Violin plots showing distribution of classifier accuracies for the production (a) and perception (b) analyses. Red line indicates chance in both. (c) Average model coefficients for the best predictors. Three were most informative for the production analysis, five for the perception analysis. Positive values correspond with 'transitive' items. Some features, like 'Joint complexity' had near-0 weights (uninformative) and were omitted.

References

- Brentari, D., Coppola, M., Cho, P. W., & Senghas, A. (2017). Handshape complexity as a precursor to phonology: variation, emergence, and acquisition. *Language Acquisition*, 24(4), 283–306.
- Brentari, D., Coppola, M., Mazzoni, L., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2012). When does a system become phonological? Handshape production in gesturers, signers, and homesigners. *NLLT*, 30(1), 1–31.
- Marshall, C. R., & Morgan, G. (2015). From gesture to sign language: Conventionalization of classifier constructions by adult hearing learners of BSL. *Top. Cogn. Sci.*, 7(1), 61–80.
- Motamedi, Y., Schouwstra, M., Smith, K., Culbertson, J., & Kirby, S. (2019). Evolving artificial sign languages in the lab: From improvised gesture to systematic sign. *Cognition*, 192, 103964.
- Schlenker, P., & Chemla, E. (2018). Gestural agreement. *NLLT*, 1–39.
- Strickland, B., Geraci, C., Chemla, E., Schlenker, P., Kelepir, M., & Pfau, R. (2015). Event representations constrain the structure of language: Sign language as a window into universally accessible linguistic biases. *PNAS*, 112(19), 5968–5973.