

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
ABSTRACT	xi
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Scope of study	1
1.2 Research Questions, predictions	3
1.3 Organization of the dissertation	5
2 Background	7
2.1 Brief primer on lexical verbs, classifier constructions, and pantomime:	7
2.2 Argument structure	8
2.2.1 Brief primer on argument structure	8
2.2.2 Argument structure in the visual modality	9
2.3 Iconicity in formal domains	37
2.3.1 Iconicity in spoken languages	39
2.3.2 Case: Iconicity of telicity in SLs	43
2.4 Emergence of grammatical features in visual communication systems	48
2.4.1 Case: Argument structure & directionality	49
2.4.2 Case: Constituent order	53
2.5 Nature of coding, emergence of grammatical features: Holistic or compositional?	57
2.6 Summary of background	66
2.7 Proposal: Iconicity of argument structure and its emergence	68
3 Transparency of transitivity: Classifier constructions and pantomimes	69
3.1 Statement of problem, hypotheses, some (more) relevant background	69

	Page
3.2 Stimuli Creation	72
3.2.1 Experiment 1a: Action Naming	72
3.2.2 Experiment 1b: Best Pantomime	77
3.3 Experiment 2a: Transitivity Classing	87
3.3.1 Methods	87
3.3.2 Data preprocessing	90
3.3.3 Results & Discussion	93
3.4 Experiment 2b: Iconicity Rating	97
3.4.1 Methods	98
3.4.2 Results	101
3.5 Main analyses	104
3.5.1 Top-down: Classing behavior explained by previous linguistic/ conceptual experience	104
3.5.2 Bottom-up: Classing behavior explained by perceptual features of the stimuli	113
3.6 Conclusion & Future Directions	138
4 Transparency of transitivity: ASL Lexical Verbs	141
4.1 Statement of problem, hypotheses, some (more) relevant background .	141
4.2 Experiment 3: Transitivity classing	143
4.2.1 Methods	143
4.2.2 Results	145
4.3 Main analyses	155
4.3.1 Top-down: Classing behavior explained by previous linguistic/ conceptual experience	155
4.3.2 Bottom-up: Classing behavior explained by perceptual features of the stimuli	160
4.4 Discussion	171
5 General Discussion	178
5.1 Synthesis of all results	178

	Page
5.1.1 Transitivity Classing	178
5.1.2 Accuracy	180
5.1.3 Iconicity Scores	183
5.1.4 Top-down	184
5.1.5 Bottom-up	186
5.2 Putting it all together	190
5.2.1 Argument structure in pantomime, ASL:	190
5.2.2 Iconicity in formal domains, argument structure:	193
5.2.3 Emergence of grammatical features in visual communication systems: Holistic of compositional?	197
5.3 Future directions	199
5.3.1 Potential improvements to the current studies	200
5.3.2 Reaching, grasping	201
5.4 Conclusion	205
REFERENCES	207
A Details, Study 1	219
A.1 Study 1a, action list	219
A.2 Study 1b, full results	221
B Discussion of full participant group (CC and Pantomime experiments) . . .	224
B.1 (Whole Group) Study 2a results:	224
B.2 (Whole Group) Accuracy:	226
B.3 (Whole Group) Consistency, explained by iconicity & accuracy: . . .	233
B.4 (Whole Group) Consistency, explained phonetic features	236
C Full Results: ML analysis of classifier constructions and pantomimes	238
C.1 Production	238
C.1.1 Pantomimes: Ground Truth	238
C.1.2 Pantomimes: Ground Truth, best productions	241
C.1.3 Classifier Constructions: Ground Truth	243

	Page
C.2 Perception	245
C.2.1 Pantomimes: Winning non-signer labels	245
C.2.2 Classifier Constructions: Winning non-signer labels	246
C.3 Production & Perception	247
C.3.1 Pantomimes: Accurate winning non-signer labels	247
C.3.2 Classifier Constructions: Accurate winning non-signer labels . .	248
D Ancillary Machine Learning Analyses (classifier constructions and pantomimes):	250
D.1 Train five pantomimers, test sixth:	250
D.2 Train X concepts, test Y concepts:	253
D.3 Train pantomimes, test classifier constructions:	256
D.4 Informativeness of handshape complexity measures	257
E Ground truth labels for ASL-LEX verbs	264
F Full results of AMT study, lexical verbs	275

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1 Top 20 intransitive pantomimes	84
3.2 Top 20 transitive pantomimes	85
3.3 Post-hoc: Tallies of consistently classed classifier constructions, pantomimes and lexical verbs	92
3.4 Top five least and most iconic classifier constructions and pantomimes . . .	99
3.5 Table of correlations, top-down analysis	112
3.6 Table of correlations, top-down analysis: by transitivity type	112
3.7 Example decomposition of handshape codes into component features . .	115
3.8 Table of feature classes for machine learning analysis	120
3.9 Classifier preprocessing: Simulated feature vectors	123
3.10 Summary of machine learning results	127
3.11 Common most informative features across production analysis of pan- tomimes.	128
3.12 Common most informative features across production analysis of classifier constructions	129
3.13 Common most informative features across production analyses (pantomimes and classifier constructions).	129
3.14 Common most informative features across perception analysis of pan- tomimes. Items in bold also appeared in the corresponding production analysis.	131
3.15 Common most informative features across perception analysis of classifier constructions. Items in bold also appeared in the production analysis. . .	131
3.16 Common most informative features across perception analysis of pan- tomimes and classifier constructions.	132
3.17 Common most informative features across perception analysis of pan- tomimes. Features in bold are shared with perception analysis.	132

Table	Page
3.18 Common most informative features across perception analysis of classifier constructions.	133
3.19 Common most informative features across perception analysis of pantomimes and classifier constructions.	133
4.1 Tallies of consistently lexical verbs	148
4.2 Sample results from ASL-LEX study	149
4.3 Table of correlations, top down analysis (lexical verbs)	158
4.4 Table of results, ASL-LEX machine learning analysis	169
5.1 Tallies of consistently classed classifier constructions, pantomimes and lexical verbs	178
5.2 Summary of top-down results across all three stimulus types	186
5.3 Summary of top-down results across all three stimulus-types, separated out by transitivity type	187
5.4 Aggregate bottom-up results	191
B.1 (Whole Group) Tallies of consistently classed classifier constructions and pantomimes	225
B.2 Post-hoc cf. Whole Group: Tallies of consistently classed classifier constructions, pantomimes and lexical verbs	225
B.3 Raw label counts: classifier constructions and pantomimes	232
C.1 Common cross-fold extracted features; pantomimes, production	239
C.2 Common cross-fold extracted features; pantomimes, best productions	241
C.3 Common cross-fold extracted features; classifier constructions, production	243
D.1 Common cross-fold extracted features; train five pantomimers, test sixth	251
D.2 Ancillary analysis: Train five pantomimers, test sixth	252
D.3 Mock-up of train on X-concept, test on Y-concept scheme	255

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
2.1 Diagram of an agreement verb	10
2.2 Handshape diagrams	15
2.3 C-handshape and various signs it appears in	17
2.4 Handshape contrasts in transitive and intransitive classifier constructions	18
2.5 Handshape complexity	23
2.6 Character, observer and mixed character/observer viewpoints	25
2.7 Example handshapes used in Hassemer & Winter's experiment	36
2.8 Telicity marking	45
3.1 Example stills from action video dataset	73
3.2 Example stills from pantomime dataset	78
3.3 Example stills from classifier construction dataset	80
3.4 Post-hoc: Pantomime and Classifier Construction accuracy, individual-level	94
3.5 Confusion matrices: Target group performance	96
3.6 Histogram of iconicity scores; classifier constructions and pantomimes	100
3.7 Mean iconicity of pantomimes and classifier constructions	101
3.8 Iconicity differences between transitive and intransitive items	102
3.9 Top-down analysis: accuracy and consistency	109
3.10 Top-down analysis: accuracy and iconicity	110
3.11 Top-down analysis: accuracy and iconicity	111
3.12 Result: bottom-up	127
4.1 Non-signer classing accuracy; 4 classes	151
4.2 Non-signer classing accuracy; 2 classes	152
4.3 Non-signer accuracy on lexical verb transitivity classes	154

Figure	Page
4.4 Non-signer accuracy on lexical verb transitivity classes	154
4.5 Histogram of iconicity scores; ASL lexical verbs	155
4.6 Correlation between accuracy and consistency, lexical verbs	160
4.7 Correlation between consistency and lexical iconicity, lexical verbs . .	161
4.8 Correlation between accuracy and iconicity scores, lexical verbs . . .	161
4.9 Feature classes and their composite features used in machine learning analysis	165
4.10 Machine learning analysis of ASL lexical verbs, non-signer labels . . .	169
4.11 Machine learning analysis of ASL lexical verbs, ground truth labels .	170
5.1 Accuracy across all three stimulus types	180
5.2 Accuracy across all three stimulus types, sorted by transitivity	181
5.3 Histogram of iconicity scores	182
5.4 Mean iconicity of pantomimes, classifier constructions, and lexical verbs	183
5.5 Result: bottom-up (PNs, CCs, and Lex)	188
B.1 Pantomime and Classifier Construction accuracy, Whole group, indi- vidual analysis	227
B.2 Confusion matrices for CC and PN accuracy, all items	230
B.3 Confusion matrices for CC and PN accuracy, consistently classed items	231
B.4 Correlation between consistency and accuracy, pantomimes and classi- fier constructions	234
B.5 Correlation between consistency and lexical iconicity, pantomimes and classifier constructions	234
B.6 Whole vs. Target group classifier performance	237
C.1 Classifier performance on pantomime stimuli using ground-truth labels	240
C.2 Classifier performance on pantomime stimuli using ground-truth labels; best 72 pantomimes only	242
C.3 Classifier performance on classifier construction stimuli using ground- truth labels	244
C.4 Classifier performance on pantomime stimuli using non-signer-derived labels	245

Figure	Page
C.5 Classifier performance on classifier construction stimuli using non-signer-derived labels	246
C.6 Classifier performance on pantomimes using non-signer derived labels; accurate labels only	247
C.7 Classifier performance on classifier constructions using non-signer derived labels; accurate labels only	249
D.1 Ancillary analysis: Train five pantomimers, test sixth	251
D.2 Ancillary analysis: Train X-concepts, test y-concepts	254
D.3 Confusion matrices: train pantomimes, test classifier constructions . .	256
D.4 Pantomimes	260
D.5 Classifier Constructions	260
D.6 Raw counts handshape complexity measures; production	260
D.7 Pantomimes	261
D.8 Classifier Constructions	261
D.9 Raw counts handshape complexity measures; perception	261
D.10 Ancillary analysis: Handshape complexity features only (pantomimes)	262
D.11 Ancillary analysis: Handshape complexity features only (classifier constructions)	263

ABSTRACT

Bradley, Chuck Ph.D, Purdue University, May 2019. Transparency of transitivity in pantomime, sign language. Major Professor: Ronnie B. Wilbur.

This dissertation investigates whether transitivity distinctions are manifest in the phonetics of linguistic and paralinguistic manual actions, namely lexical verbs and classifier constructions in American Sign Language (ASL) and gestures produced by hearing non-signers without speech (i.e., pantomime). A positive result would indicate that grammatical features are (a) transparent and (b) may thus arise from non-linguistic sources, here the visual-praxic domain. Given previous literature, we predict that transitivity is transparent in pantomime and classifier constructions, but opaque in lexical verbs.

We first collected judgments from hearing non-signers who classed pantomimes, classifier constructions, and ASL lexical verbs as *unergative*, *unaccusative*, *transitive*, or *ditransitive*. We found that non-signers consistently judged items across all three stimulus types, suggesting that there is transitivity-related information in the signed signal.

We then asked whether non-signers' judging ability has its roots in a top-down or bottom-up strategy. A top-down strategy might entail guessing the meaning of the sign or pantomime and then using the guessed meaning to assess/guess its transitivity. A bottom-up strategy entails using one or more meaningful phonetic features available in the formation of the signal to judge an item. We predicted that both strategies would be available in classing pantomimes and classifier constructions, but that transitivity information would only be available top-down in lexical verbs, given that the former are argued to be more imagistic generally than lexical verbs. Further, each strategy makes a different prediction with respect to the internal representation

of signs and pantomimes. The top-down strategy would suggest signs and pantomimes are unanalyzable wholes, whereas the bottom-up strategy would suggest the same are compositional.

For the top-down analysis, we correlated lexical iconicity score and a measure of the degree to which non-signers ‘agreed’ on the transitivity of an item. we found that lexical iconicity only weakly predicts non-signer judgments of transitivity, on average explaining 10-20% of the variance for each stimulus class. However, we note that this is the only strategy available for lexical verbs.

For the bottom-up analysis, we annotate our stimuli for phonetic and phonological features known to be relevant to transitivity and/ or event semantics in sign languages. We then apply a text classification model to try to predict transitivity from these features. As expected, our classifiers achieved stably high accuracy for pantomimes and classifier constructions, but only chance accuracy for lexical verbs.

Taken together, the top-down and bottom-up analyses were able to predict non-signer transitivity judgments for the pantomimes and classifier constructions, with the bottom-up analysis providing a stronger, more convincing result. For the lexical verbs, only the top-down analysis was relevant and it performed weakly, providing little explanatory power. When interpreting these results, we look to the semantics of the stimuli to explain the observed differences between classes: pantomimes and classifier constructions both encode events of motion and manipulation (by human hands), the transitivity of which may be encoded using a limited set of strategies. By contrast, lexical verbs denote a multitude of event types, with properties of those events (and not necessarily their transitivity) being preferentially encoded compared to **the** encoding of transitivity. That is, the resolution of transitivity is a much more difficult problem when looking at lexical verbs.

This dissertation contributes to the growing body of literature that appreciates how linguistic and paralinguistic forms may be both (para)linguistic and iconic at the same time. It further helps disentangle at least two different types of iconicities (lexical vs. structural), which may be selectively active in some signs or constructions

but not others. We also argue from our results that pantomimes are not holistic units, but instead combine elements of form and meaning in an *analogous* way to classifier constructions. Finally, this work also contributes to the discussion of how Language could have evolved in the species from a gesture-first perspective: The ‘understanding’ of others’ object-directed (i.e. transitive) manual actions becomes communicative.