The speech focus position effect on jaw-finger coordination in a pointing task

Amélie Rochet-Capellan, Rafael Laboissière, Arturo Galvan, Jean-Luc Schwartz

► To cite this version:

Amélie Rochet-Capellan, Rafael Laboissière, Arturo Galvan, Jean-Luc Schwartz. The speech focus position effect on jaw-finger coordination in a pointing task. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 2008, 51 (6), pp.1507-1521. 10.1044/1092-4388(2008/07-0173 . hal-00282323

HAL Id: hal-00282323

<https://hal.science/hal-00282323>

Submitted on 27 May 2008

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

The speech focus position effect on jaw-finger coordination in a pointing task

Amélie Rochet-Capellan ^{a)}, Rafael Laboissière ^{b,c,d)}, Arturo Galván ^{d)}, Jean-Luc Schwartz ^{a)}

^{a)} GIPSA-Lab, Département Parole et Cognition (ICP) UMR CNRS 5216 - INPG – Université Stendhal, Grenoble, France

^{b)} INSERM, U864, Espace et Action, Bron, France

^{c)} Université Claude Bernard, Lyon 1, IFR19, IFR25, UMR-S864, Bron, France

^{d)} Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences, Munich, Germany

Suggested running head: Focus position and jaw-finger coordination in a pointing task

¹-Corresponding author: amelie.rochet-capellan@gipsa-lab.inpg.fr, tel. (+33)(0)476574827, fax. (+33)(0)4.76.82.43.35, INP Grenoble, 46 avenue Félix Viallet, 38031 GRENOBLE CEDEX 1, France

Abstract

Purpose: This paper investigates jaw-finger coordination in a task involving pointing to a target while naming it with a 'CVCV (e.g. /'papa/) vs. CV'CV (e.g. /pa'pa/) word. According to our working hypothesis, the pointing apex (gesture extremum) would be synchronized with the apex of the jaw opening gesture corresponding to the stressed syllable.

Method: Jaw and finger motions were recorded using Optotrak. The effects of stress position on jaw-finger coordination were tested across different target positions (near vs. far) and different consonants in the target word (/t/ vs. /p/). Twenty native Portuguese Brazilian speakers participated in the experiment (all conditions).

Results: Jaw response starts earlier and finger-target alignment period is longer for CV'CV words than for 'CVCV ones. The apex of the jaw opening gesture for the stressed syllable appears synchronized to the onset of the finger-target alignment period (corresponding to the pointing apex) for 'CVCV words, and with the offset of that period for CV'CV ones.

Conclusions: For both stress conditions, the stressed syllable occurs within the finger-target alignment period due to tight finger-jaw coordination. This result is interpreted as an evidence for an anchoring of the speech deictic site (*part of speech that shows*) in the pointing gesture.

Key-words: Deixis, Pointing, Jaw, finger-jaw coordination, speech-hand coordination, Optotrak measurements, focus, stress

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Hand and mouth often work together in human behaviors, mainly in alimentation and communication. This link has motivated a large body of research. For example, Iverson and Thelen (1999) showed that spontaneous co-occurrence of hand and mouth movements appears right after birth. Then, around 6 to 8 months, hand and mouth start to mutually entrain each other in rhythmic activities characterized by manual and oral babbling. Gestures and speech are then produced sequentially at around 9 to 14 months and eventually synchronized at the age of 16 to 18 months. Interplay of hand and mouth motor control is also observed in adults' behavior. For example, when speakers open their mouth while grasping an object such as a fruit, the apertures of both the grasp and the mouth are adapted to the size of the object (Gentilucci *et al.*, 2001). The *observation* of an action realized by one part of the body, e.g. bringing a fruit to the mouth, also affects the *production* of an action realized by the other, e.g. uttering a syllable (see Gentilucci *et al.*, 2004; Gentilucci, 2003). Hand and mouth are also coupled in adults' rhythmic activities. For example, Kelso *et al.* (1981) found a 1 to 1 ratio between the frequency of the repetition of the word "stack" and the simultaneous repetition of a flexion-extension motion of the index finger. In addition, the co-occurrence of hand and mouth movements is clearly observable in face-to-face communication. The origin of this co-occurrence seems to be motor rather than purely perceptual, since gestures are produced even in situations in which the interlocutor can't perceive them, such as in phone calls (Iverson and Goldin-Meadow, 1998).

According to McNeill (2000), a variety of gestures can occur in communication, ranging from *gesticulations*, which are global, non-conventionalized, and speech-dependent, to *signs* in signed languages, which are segmented, analytic, conventionalized, and performed without speech. This paper focuses on a particular type of gesture that can accompany speech in

communication, namely *pointing* gestures. The global aim here is to link deixis, the component of language that allows referring to objects, with the capacity of synchronizing gesture and voice to show objects. This synchronization may depend on the properties of the motor coordination between hand and mouth, arising from pre-linguistic links between the two motor systems.

Pointing gesture and language

Our interest in pointing gestures and more particularly in their coordination with speech originates mainly from five observations reported in the literature. The first observation is that pointing gestures are the principal medium of shared attention, a basic function required for language acquisition (Tomasello *et al.*, 2007). The second observation is that pointing gestures appear to be universal (Butterworth, 2003), despite variability in the form of the gesture across cultures (Haviland, 2000; Wilkins, 2003). The third observation is that pointing gestures are the first and the dominant communicative actions in infant communication. At 12 months, pointing gestures constitute 60% of infants' manual communicative gestures and are often accompanied by vocalizations (Butterworth, 2003). The fourth observation is that pointing gestures are at the cutting edge of language development. Goldin-Meadow and Butcher (2003) showed that the age at which children associate a pointing gesture with a word having complementary meanings determines the age of two-words productions (see also Volterra *et al.*, 2005; Pizzuto *et al.*, 2005 for similar conclusions). The fifth and last observation is that pointing gestures have been put forward as the canonical form of language demonstrative words (Haviland, 2000; Diessel, 1999). Drawing evidence from developmental and comparative psychology, Diessel (2006) argues that demonstrative words such as "this" or "that" serve the basic communicative function of joint (or shared) attention rather than a specific grammatical function. He provides evidences for considering demonstrative words as

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

particular linguistic objects, defending their universal character and especially their specific and close link with pointing gestures.

Altogether, this body of research on the relationships between pointing gestures and language in general, and between pointing gestures and deixis in particular, led Abry *et al.* (2004) to consider the connection between hand and voice in deixis as a crucial step in language emergence. They proposed to derive speech and language from the necessity to localize the objects we need to talk about, which requires the hand and mouth coordination. Hence, the understanding of speech-showing and hand-pointing coordination could be considered as a key step to understand the emergence of language deixis.

In this framework, this paper investigates the effect of the position of the emphasized part of speech, namely speech focus (*the part of speech that shows*), on jaw-finger coordination in a task involving pointing at a target with the hand/finger while naming it.

Processes underlying speech-pointing synchronization

At least since McNeill’s work (1981), it is well known that speech and hand gestures are coordinated in on-line face-to-face interactions. This phenomenon has motivated studies about the processes involved in speech-hand coordination, around, among others, the question of the interaction vs. modularity of the two systems. Most often, these studies used a dual-task paradigm: the participant provided both a verbal and a gestural response to a stimulus. The hand and speech dynamics in this dual task are compared to hand dynamics in a gesture-only task and speech dynamics in a speech-only task. For example, in Holender (1980), the task was to name a letter that appeared on a screen and press a key while in Castiello *et al.* (1991), it was to pronounce “tah” in response to a visual stimulus that indicated an object to grasp.

More in line with our concerns, Levelt *et al.* (1985), and later Feyereisen (1997) used the double task paradigm in order to study pointing gestures. The dual task was to point at an object with the hand while verbally designating it using a “that *object*” or “this *object*” utterance (e.g. “this lamp”). According to Levelt *et al.* (1985), pointing gestures present a double interest for the study of speech and hand synchronization: first, they are strictly dependent on the message being expressed and, second, the moment at which they reach their target (now referred to as the pointing apex) can be easily detected.

Among others, Levelt *et al.*’s results showed that for utterances like “this lamp”, the voice-onset tends to be synchronized with the pointing apex. Hence, putting the target further from the subject delays both the pointing apex and the voice-onset. The voice-onset also occurs later in the dual task (when it is accompanied by the pointing gesture) than in the speech-only task. On the other hand, the timing of the pointing apex is essentially the same in both gesture-only and dual tasks. The authors interpret these results as evidence for an adaptation of speech commands to brachiomanual commands rather than the reverse. A delayed verbal response in a dual task as regards a speech-only task is also put forward in Holender (1980), Castiello *et al.* (1991), and Feyereisen (1997).

However, all these studies measured the verbal response delay using the acoustic signal only, without considering the speech articulators. As we will discuss in the next section, the processes of speech-hand coordination might be better described and understood through the dynamical interplay between the orofacial articulation and the hand-finger systems.

Jaw-hand coordination rather than voice-hand coordination

The motivation for investigating the articulatory motions in speech-hand coordination stems

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

from two kinds of arguments. First, at a methodological level, speech is also a gestural system much like pointing. Following Stetson (1951), a great number of studies have focused on the articulators' motions, characterizing speech as the outcome of a motor system. As suspected by Castiello *et al.* (1991) and Holender (1980), some motor events might happen before the voice onset. Hence, it is legitimate to investigate when articulators start to move relative to the pointing gesture. In addition, at a theoretical level, speech-pointing coordination has been assumed to emerge in the course of ontogeny from a developmental meeting between the jaw and arm-hand motor control (Ducey-Kaufmann *et al.*, in press). According to MacNeilage and Davis's Frame-then-Content scenario of speech development, speech motor control begins in young babies with the mastering of the opening/closing oscillations of the jaw, which provides the *speech-frame* (MacNeilage and Davis, 2000). The independent and coordinated control of the tongue and the lips (the *content*) would be mastered later. In this frame-then-content sequence experimentally observed in the course of ontogeny (Munhall and Jones, 1998; Green *et al.*, 2002), the jaw is considered as the carrier of speech gestures. Yet, MacNeilage and Davis did not consider the role of manual gestures in speech acquisition. Different studies put forward a link between the motor control development of brachiomanual and orofacial gestures. Supporting evidences for this link comes from the relationship between the frequencies of hand and jaw oscillations in babbling (Petitto *et al.*, 2001; Iverson and Thelen, 1999; Ducey-Kaufmann, 2007), what Ducey-Kaufmann *et al.* (in press) referred to as the *sign-frame* and the *speech-frame*, respectively. According to them, the relationship between the frequencies of the two systems would evolve toward a developmental meeting point between the *speech frame* and the *sign frame*. This meeting point is suggested to be the basis of speech-hand coordination and the background for the production of the first words. These two sets of methodological and theoretical arguments, lead us to propose a jaw-hand rather than a voice-hand investigation framework for studying speech and manual pointing coordination

170 An attraction between the speech focus and the hand focus

171 The question of interest in the present study concerns the candidate *sites* for the speech and
172 pointing gesture coordination: which part of the hand gesture is synchronized with which part of
173 the speech utterance? According to McNeill (1992), in speech-hand coordination, the hand
174 gesture stroke is executed in synchrony with the semantically co-expressive word. Moreover,
175 verbal deixis can be prosodic as well as grammatical (e.g. Løevenbruck *et al.*, 2005). When
176 considering the communicative aim of speech-hand association in deixis, it seems reasonable to
177 assume that *the part of the discourse that shows* should occur synchronously with *the part of the*
178 *gesture that shows*. Thus, synchronization of speech and hand pointing in face-to-face
179 communication could result in an attraction between the speech focus (the indexical word
180 and/or the stressed part of the utterance) and the pointing focus (the moment at which the
181 arm-hand-finger system is aligned with the target). This hypothesis is compatible with Levelt
182 *et al.*'s (1985) results, which show a tendency towards synchrony between voice-onset
183 corresponding to the demonstrative word ("this" or "that") and the hand-pointing apex.
184 Nevertheless, Levelt *et al.* did not vary the position of the speech deictic site, which was;
185 systematically at the beginning of the utterance (e.g. "*this* lamp" vs. "*that* lamp"). In this paper,
186 we propose to vary the position of speech focus in a simple way by varying the stressed syllable
187 in CVCV utterances. Our aim is to study how this variation influences the jaw-hand
188 coordination in a task consisting in pointing to a target while naming it with a CVCV word. Our
189 main hypothesis is that the hand pointing apex should be synchronized with the extremum (or
190 apex) of the jaw opening gesture corresponding to the stressed syllable, either the first syllable
191 in 'CVCV utterances (e.g. /'papa/) or the second syllable in CV'CV utterances (e.g. /pa'pa/). This
192 alignment could be reached either through adaptation of the jaw movement to a constant hand
193 movement in both 'CVCV and CV'CV sequences, or through a mutual adaptation, involving a
194 modification of both jaw and hand motions across word stress conditions.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

Methods

Participants and language

Brazilian Portuguese was chosen because it is one of the languages in which it is possible to find pairs of words that differ only by stress position (e.g. 'CVCV vs. CV'CV). The subjects were twenty native Portuguese Brazilian speakers (4 men and 16 women) aged 18 to 37 years (mean: 28.3, standard deviation: 5.3). They were paid 8 euros per hour for their participation. The participants were all right-handed, had no reported history of speech or hearing pathology and were unaware of the purpose of the experiment.

Experimental design

The experiment involved a hand-pointing task associated to the utterance of a CVCV disyllable. The main factor was the stress position in the CVCV disyllable: stress on the first vs. the second syllable, e.g. /'papa/ vs. /pa'pa/. The consonant was either /p/ or /t/. The vowel /a/ was selected because it requires a large jaw opening gesture. Moreover, two spatial targets were used for the pointing gesture (near vs. far). The variation of both the consonant and the target position contributed to focus participants' attention on the task. Hence, the experimental design consisted of three within-subjects two-level crossed factors: stress position (first vs. second), consonant (/t/ vs. /p/) and target position (near vs. far).

----- Figure 1 -----

Procedure

The participants were seated at a table. The targets to point at and the item to pronounce were projected simultaneously on a white screen in front of them using a projector (Figure 1, top).

1
2
3 219 A black square pasted on the midline of the table, close to the participant's sagittal plane,
4
5 220 indicated the finger resting position. The participants were informed that a word and a red
6
7 221 smiley sign (the target) would appear on the screen. The target appeared to the participant's
8
9 222 right (Figure 1, bottom) either near (10 cm from midline) or far (50 cm from midline). In
10
11 223 order to make the joint gesture/pronunciation task more natural, participants were instructed
12
13 224 to use the word displayed as the name of the person represented by the smiley target.
14
15 225 Participants were instructed to simultaneously point with the index finger at and name the
16
17 226 target as soon as the color of the smiley sign changed from red to green. Prior to the
18
19 227 experiment, participants were briefly trained to become familiar with the task: they were
20
21 228 asked to simultaneously point at and name objects in the room. They also practiced reading
22
23 229 CVCV sequences aloud in order to make sure that they understood the stress instruction
24
25 230 properly. The experiment was divided into four blocks. One block contained 4 practice trials
26
27 231 followed by 40 experimental trials, 5 for each combination of stress position, consonant, and
28
29 232 target position. The order of the trials was randomized for each block and each participant.
30
31 233 Blocks were separated by 30s rest periods. In order to reduce anticipatory responses to the go
32
33 234 signal (smiley target becoming green), the red smiley duration was varied from trial to trial
34
35 235 (2.5 s mean, 0.15 s standard deviation, normally distributed). The green smiley target lasted
36
37 236 on the screen for 1 s in each trial.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

238 Data recording and post-processing

239 Finger and jaw movements were recorded using Optotrak (Northern Digital, Inc.), an
240 optoelectronic position measurement system that tracks the three-dimensional motion of
241 infrared-emitting diodes (IREDs). The positions were sampled at 100 Hz. IRED locations are
242 illustrated on Figure 1 (top). Two IREDs were pasted on the tip of participants' right
243 forefinger, one on the middle of the nail and the other on the medial side next to the nail. In so

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

244 doing, at least one of the IREDs was visible by the cameras during the pointing movement,
245 even when participants supinated their hands at the motion apex. A third IRED was attached
246 to the participants' chin. It tracked a flesh point rather than the jaw itself. However,
247 considering the phonetic material in question (stop consonants associated with an open
248 vowel), the motion of this flesh point is a relevant indicator of jaw motion. Head motion was
249 measured by three IREDs attached to a plastic triangle, which was fixed by a strap around the
250 participant's head. The coordinates of the moving IREDs were projected into a fixed
251 referential, defined by three IREDs pasted on the table. Jaw position was then computed in
252 the head moving reference frame. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was applied separately
253 to each of the three 3-D trajectories of the two finger IREDs and the jaw IRED. The first
254 principal component explained most of the variance for each IRED and for all participants:
255 98.8% (standard error = 0.2%) and 98.3% (standard error = 0.3%) for the two finger IREDs and
256 95.6% (standard error = 0.5%) for the jaw IRED. This component was chosen to represent
257 finger and jaw movements. Signals were low-pass filtered at 15 Hz with a Butterworth. The
258 sound was simultaneously recorded and sampled at 16 kHz.

259

260 The recorded utterances were checked against the correct phonetic and stress instructions.
261 Trials with speech production errors were excluded from the dataset (in average, 4.1 trials per
262 subject, with a maximum of 11 errors for one participant, see table 1, first row). Correct trials
263 for which jaw or finger gestures were initiated before the go-signal were also discarded. This
264 mainly concerned one participant who made 39 initiation errors (Table 1, second row). For
265 the remaining data, trials for which the two finger IREDs were partially hidden from the
266 Optotrack cameras were not considered for the analysis (8.2 trials in average, see table 1, third
267 row). By default, the middle IRED was chosen for the analysis. When this IRED was masked
268 and the left one was visible, the left IRED was taken for the analysis (the mean correlation

between the two finger IREDs is above .99 for each of the three coordinates x, y, and z). Similarly, trials for which the jaw IRED was partially hidden were discarded from the analysis, which mainly concerned one participant for 12 trials (Table 1, fourth row). A three within-subject factors ANOVA shows that stress position, consonant and target position do not significantly affect either the number of utterance and initiation errors, or the number of trials with hidden finger or jaw IREDs.

Labeling and Measurements

Figure 2 displays an example of signals and labeling for a /pa'pa/ trial. Onset and offset events of the finger and jaw movements correspond to 10% of peak velocity. All times correspond to the elapsed times from the go signal to the event.

----- Figure 2 -----

For the jaw (Figure 2, second row), the analysis was focused on the two opening strokes for the /a/ vowels. J_{I1} and J_{A1} are the initiation and apex times for the first opening stroke (stroke onset and offset, respectively). Similarly, J_{I2} and J_{A2} are the initiation and apex times for the second opening stroke. For the finger, the trajectory can be split into three parts: the forward stroke, the plateau and the return stroke (see Figure 2, last row). The forward stroke corresponds to the pointing gesture toward the target. It starts at P_I (initiation time of pointing gesture) and ends at P_A (apex time of pointing gesture). The pointing plateau is the amount of time during which the finger remains pointed at the target. It starts at P_A and ends at P_R (onset time of the return stroke). The return stroke corresponds to the finger return back movement to its rest position. This stroke was not considered here since it is not really part of the pointing task. Note that Levelt *et al.* (1985) only investigated the pointing forward stroke. Yet, the observation of a plateau in the apex position shows that the finger-pointing task does

not end with the alignment of the finger and the target but rather with the onset of the return stroke. In our study, for the finger motion analysis we considered both the forward stroke and the plateau.

Hypotheses

Under the assumption that there is a tight temporal coordination of jaw and finger pointing gestures, the apex of the jaw opening gesture corresponding to the stressed syllable should be synchronized with the pointing apex. This might induce a significant effect of the stress position on the delay between the apex of the first jaw opening gesture, J_{A1} , and the apex of the pointing gesture, P_A , that should be shorter in the first-syllable stress condition than in the second-syllable stress one. The increase in the delay between J_{A1} and P_A in the second-syllable stress condition would result in the apex of the second jaw opening gesture, J_{A2} , being closer to P_A . This should occur regardless of the target position and of the utterance consonant. Hence, the effect of stress position on the timing of the pointing apex relatively to the two jaw opening gestures apices should be similar for the two target positions and the two consonants. Finally, the effect of stress position on jaw-finger coordination could result from either an adaptation of jaw movement to hand movement (or the converse) or a mutual adaptation between the two motor systems. This can be evaluated through the analysis of the effect of stress position on timing, duration and amplitude of finger and jaw gestures.

Results

Figure 3 shows the mean temporal position of jaw and finger events, computed for the 20 participants, depending on stress position, consonant and target position. The effects of the experimental variations on each measured variable were tested using three-way (stress

position, consonant, and target position) within-subject ANOVAs. The p-value for the significance level was fixed at 0.05.

----- Figure 3 -----

Absolute and relative timing of finger and jaw motions

Initiation times

The pointing motion starts on average 322 ms after the go signal (see P_I values on Figure 3). There is no significant main effect of any of the three factors on P_I . Contrastively, the initiation of the first jaw stroke (J_{II}) occurs significantly earlier in the second-syllable stress condition (476 ms) than in the first-syllable stress one (539 ms) ($F(1, 19) = 15.9$, $p < .001$), and for /t/ (488 ms) as compared to /p/ (527 ms), ($F(1, 19) = 13.5$, $p < .01$). Neither the interaction between stress position and consonant, nor that between stress position and target position is significant. Hence, the onset of the jaw movement (J_{II}) depends on stress position and occurs later than the onset of the finger movement (P_I). Analysis of $J_{II} - P_I$ delay shows that J_{II} is closer to P_I in the second-syllable stress condition (149 ms) than in the first-syllable stress one (223 ms) ($F(1, 19) = 14.1$, $p < .01$), and for the /t/ (166 ms) as compared to /p/ (206 ms) ($F(1, 19) = 13.3$, $p < .01$). Furthermore, $J_{II} - P_I$ is significantly shorter for the near (176 ms) than for the far (195 ms) target position ($F(1, 19) = 10.9$, $p < .01$). Interaction effects on $J_{II} - P_I$ are not significant. Hence, the jaw starts to move after the finger but significantly closer to the beginning of the finger movement when stress is on the second rather than on the first syllable. Moreover, the effect of stress position on the delay between P_I and J_{II} results from an effect on J_{II} : the stress position has no significant effect on P_I .

Apices times

The pointing apex (P_A) occurs 16 ms later in the far (749 ms) than in the near (733 ms) target condition. The effect of target position is significant ($F(1, 19) = 9.2$, $p < .01$). Stress position

and consonant type do not have any significant effect on P_A . By contrast, the stress position significantly influences the apices times of the jaw opening gestures. The apex of the first jaw opening gesture (J_{A1}) occurs 101 ms earlier in the second-syllable stress condition (620 ms) than in the first-syllable stress one (721 ms), ($F(1, 19) = 54.0$, $p < .0001$). A similar delay across stress conditions is observed for the apex of the second jaw opening gesture (J_{A2}) which occurs on average 108 ms earlier in the second-syllable stress condition (900 ms) than in the first-syllable stress one (1008 ms), ($F(1, 19) = 54.8$, $p < .0001$). Target position effect is also significant for both J_{A1} ($F(1, 19) = 7.1$, $p < .05$) and J_{A2} ($F(1, 19) = 5.9$, $p < .05$). The apices of both jaw opening gestures occur earlier in the near (665 ms for J_{A1} and 949 ms for J_{A2}) than in the far (677 ms for J_{A1} and 959 ms for J_{A2}) target condition. The increase of the target distance thus delays the apices of the two jaw opening gestures by about 10 ms. This delay is equivalent to the non-significant delay observed for the onset of the jaw movement, J_{I1} , and seems to partly compensate for the 16 ms delay observed for the pointing apex, P_A . Finally, the consonant has no significant effect on the apices times of the two jaw opening gestures.

In addition, the delay observed for J_{A1} in the first-syllable stress condition compared with the second-syllable one results in J_{A1} being closer to P_A in the first case. The study of $J_{A1} - P_A$ shows that P_A occurs about 11 ms after J_{A1} in the first-syllable stress condition and about 129 ms after J_{A1} in the second-syllable stress one. This effect of stress position is significant ($F(1, 19) = 52.3$, $p < .0001$). On the other hand, neither the target position nor the consonant have a significant effect on $J_{A1} - P_A$. In order to better characterize the temporal relationships between finger and jaw apices, we computed the position of pointing apex, P_A , relatively to the apices of the two jaw opening gestures, J_{A1} and J_{A2} :

$$P_{A/J} = \frac{P_A - J_{A1}}{J_{A2} - J_{A1}}, \text{ in percent.}$$

A value of 0% for $P_{A/J}$ corresponds to a case for which P_A occurs at the same time as J_{A1} . A value of 100% corresponds to a case for which P_A is synchronized with J_{A2} . Figure 4 (left) shows $P_{A/J}$ means and standard errors against stress conditions. It appears that $P_{A/J}$ mean is greater when the second syllable is stressed (47%) rather than the first one (5%) ($F(1, 19) = 66.0, p < .0001$). The effects of target position and consonant type as well as the interactions are not significant. In line with the jaw-finger synchronization hypothesis, stress position influences the relative times of the apices of the jaw opening gestures and of the pointing gesture. While the pointing apex is very close in time to the apex of the first jaw opening gesture when the first syllable is stressed, it occurs at about an equal distance in time from the apices of the two jaw opening gestures when the second syllable is stressed. Strikingly, in this last condition, the pointing apex seems closely synchronized with the initiation of the second opening gesture of the jaw, J_{I2} . In average, P_A occurs just 1 ms after J_{I2} when the second syllable is stressed and 175 ms before J_{I2} when the first syllable is stressed (see Figure 3). Moreover, in the second-syllable stress condition, the apex of the second jaw opening gesture is very close to P_R , the onset of the pointing gesture return stroke (that is, the offset of the pointing plateau).

----- Figure 4 -----

Offset of the pointing plateau (P_R) relative to the jaw apices

P_R occurs later when the second syllable is stressed (906 ms) rather than the first one (860 ms) ($F(1, 19) = 16.0, p < .001$) as well as when the target is far (901 ms) as compared to when it is near (864 ms) ($F(1, 19) = 28.0, p < .0001$). The consonant factor as well as all the interactions is not significant. The pointing plateau duration ($P_R - P_A$) is significantly greater when the second syllable is stressed (157 ms) rather than the first one (127 ms) ($F(1, 19) = 14.1, p < .01$). It is also significantly greater when the target is far (152 ms) rather than near (132 ms) ($F(1, 19) = 13.9, p < .01$). As for P_R , neither the consonant factor, nor the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

interactions are significant. Analysis of the $J_{A2} - P_R$ interval shows that P_R occurs 5 ms after J_{A2} in the second-syllable stress condition and 148 ms before J_{A2} in the first-syllable stress condition. This effect of stress position on $J_{A2} - P_R$ is significant ($F(1, 19) = 89.3, p < .0001$). The delay between J_{A2} and P_R is also greater when the target is near (85 ms) rather than far (58 ms) ($F(1, 19) = 16.9, p < .001$) but does not depend on the consonant. Interactions on $J_{A2} - P_R$ are not significant. Similarly to what was done for the pointing apex, we computed the position of P_R relative to the apices of the two jaw opening gestures:

$$P_{R/J} = \frac{P_R - J_{A1}}{J_{A2} - J_{A1}}, \text{ in percent.}$$

Figure 4 (right) shows that $P_{R/J}$ is close to 100% for the second-syllable stress condition (104%) while it is close to 50% for the first-syllable stress condition (51%). $P_{R/J}$ is also greater when the target is far (82%) compared to when it is near (73%) and for /t/ (79%) as compared to /p/ (76%). The three main effects are significant (stress position: $F(1, 19) = 102.9, p < .0001$; target position: $F(1, 19) = 12.4, p < .01$; consonant: $F(1, 19) = 4.9, p < .05$) but none of the interactions are. When the first syllable is stressed, the finger leaves its apex position before the apex of the second jaw opening gesture, at about an equal distance in time from the apices of the two jaw opening gestures. Actually, as mentioned in the previous section, in the first-syllable stress condition, the finger even leaves its apex position 175 ms before the apex of the second jaw opening stroke. By contrast, in the second-syllable stress condition, the finger leaves its apex position just after the apex of the second jaw opening gesture is reached.

In summary, the pointing apex, P_A , is close to the apex of the first jaw opening gesture, J_{A1} , when the first syllable is stressed while it occurs at about the midpoint between the apices of the two jaw opening gestures, J_{A1} and J_{A2} , when the second syllable is stressed. In the second-syllable stress condition, the jaw events (J_{I1}, J_{A1}, J_{I2} and J_{A2}) occur earlier than in the first-

syllable stress condition and the onset of the pointing gesture return (P_R) is delayed. These two facts result in J_{A2} being close to P_R . By contrast, the timing of the pointing forward stroke does not depend on stress position. The increase of the target distance delays the pointing apex but does not significantly influence its time position relatively to the apices of the jaw opening motions: P_{AJ} is approximately the same in the two target conditions. This originates from the fact that the apices of the jaw opening gestures are delayed when the target is far compared to when it is near. Regardless of the experimental conditions, the stress in speech always occurs sometime during the pointing plateau, either at the plateau onset for 'CVCV words or at the plateau offset for CV'CV words. This results in the entire pointing plateau occurring before the onset of the second jaw opening stroke when the first syllable is stressed and after it when the second syllable is stressed. More precisely, the pointing plateau occurs during the jaw closure stroke after the stressed vowel in the first-stress syllable condition and during the jaw opening stroke toward the stressed vowel when the second syllable is stressed. The finger and jaw motion will now be investigated in detail in order to further characterize the impacts of stress, target and consonant on each system separately.

Detailed description of finger forward and jaw opening strokes

Finger forward stroke

The previous analysis showed that the pointing onset, P_I , does not depend on the experimental condition while the pointing apex, P_A , occurs significantly later when the target is far than when it is near. This timing pattern implies a greater duration of the forward stroke (computed as $P_A - P_I$) when the target is far (431 ms) rather than near (406 ms) ($F(1, 19) = 26.3$, $p < .0001$, see Figure 5, first row, right). Neither the effect of stress position, nor the effect of consonant on the duration of the pointing forward stroke are significant. The amplitude of this stroke (computed as the distance between the pointing spatial positions at P_A and P_I , Figure 5,

first row, left) is also greater when the target is far (423 mm) compared to when it is near (275 mm) ($F(1, 19) = 2222.0$, $p < .0001$). The 2 mm difference observed in the first-syllable stress condition (348 mm) compared to the second-syllable stress one (350 mm) is also significant ($F(1, 19) = 8.3$, $p < .01$) but does not significantly interact with target position. The consonant does not have a significant effect on the amplitude of the pointing forward stroke. Hence, the pointing forward stroke is mainly influenced by target position: the alignment of the finger with the target requires greater amplitude and duration when the target is far compared to when it is near. This leads to consider that the pointing forward stroke is “target-driven”: its main objective is the alignment of the finger with the target. Consequently, the speech system may have to adapt in order to achieve the relative timing pattern between the apices of finger and jaw opening gestures, as previously observed.

---- Figure 5 ----

Jaw opening strokes

As described above, the initiations and apices events of the jaw opening strokes clearly depend on the experimental conditions. The duration of the first opening stroke (computed as $J_{A1} - J_{I1}$, Figure 5, second row, right) is 39 ms greater when the first syllable is stressed (183 ms) rather than the second one (144 ms) ($F(1, 19) = 26.2$, $p < .0001$). It is also 37 ms greater for /t/ (182 ms) compared to /p/ (145 ms) ($F(1, 19) = 14.5$, $p < .01$). The interaction between stress position and consonant is also significant: the effect of stress position is larger for /p/ (first-syllable: 168 ms, second-syllable: 122 ms) than for /t/ (first-syllable: 197 ms, second-syllable: 167 ms), ($F(1, 19) = 5.5$, $p < .05$). However, target position does not significantly influence the duration of the first opening stroke. Similarly, the amplitude of the first jaw stroke (distance between the jaw spatial positions at J_{I1} and J_{A1} , Figure 5, second row, left) is greater when the first syllable is stressed (12.5 mm) than when the second one is (9.6 mm) ($F(1, 19) = 21.1$, $p < .001$). Consonant also has a significant effect: the mean

1
2
3 468 amplitude of the first opening gesture is greater for /p/ (11.7 mm) than for /t/ (10.3 mm)
4
5 469 ($F(1, 19) = 9.7, p < .01$). Neither target position, nor the interactions is significant. Contrary to
6
7
8 470 the first opening stroke, the duration of the second opening stroke ($J_{A2} - J_{I2}$, Figure 5, third
9
10 471 row, right) is greater when the second syllable is stressed (152 ms) rather than the first one
11
12 472 (100 ms) ($F(1, 19) = 42.1, p < .0001$) and for /p/ (138 ms) as compared to /t/ (114 ms)
13
14 473 ($F(1, 19) = 47.1, p < .0001$). There is a significant interaction between stress position and
15
16 474 consonant ($F(1, 19) = 8.2, p = .05$): the effect of stress position is greater for /t/ (first-syllable:
17
18 475 84 ms, second-syllable: 145 ms) than for /p/ (first-syllable: 117 ms, second-syllable: 159 ms).
19
20 476 Target position does not significantly influence $J_{A2} - J_{I2}$. A similar pattern is observed for the
21
22 477 amplitude of the second stroke (difference between jaw spatial positions at J_{I2} and J_{A2} ,
23
24 478 Figure 5, third row, left) which is greater when the second syllable is stressed (7.5 mm) rather
25
26 479 than the first one (3.2 mm) ($F(1, 19) = 40.3, p < .0001$) and for /p/ (6.7 mm) compared to /t/
27
28 480 (4.0 mm) ($F(1, 19) = 45.8, p < .0001$). There is also a significant interaction between stress
29
30 481 position and consonant ($F(1, 19) = 5.7, p < .05$): the effect of stress position is greater for /t/
31
32 482 (first: 1.6 mm, second: 6.4 mm) than for /p/ (first: 4.8 mm, second: 8.7 mm). There is no
33
34 483 significant effect of target position. These results show that in order to produce stress as
35
36 484 instructed, speakers increase both the duration and the amplitude of the jaw opening stroke
37
38 485 corresponding to the stressed syllable. The specific articulatory configurations of /p/ and /t/
39
40 486 result in significant effects of the consonant factor on the amplitude and the duration of the
41
42 487 jaw opening strokes. However, these effects of consonant appear to have no influence on the
43
44 488 timing of the apices of the jaw opening gesture. Finally, the target position does not have a
45
46 489 significant effect on the amplitude and the duration of the jaw opening strokes: increase in
47
48 490 distance to the target induces a delay around 10 ms for all jaw events studied here. These
49
50 491 results support the view that the timing of the pointing apex relatively to the timing of the
51
52 492 apices of the jaw opening gestures mainly originates from an adaptation of the jaw.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

493

494
495
496
497
498

499
500

501
502
503

504
505
506
507
508
509

510
511
512
513
514

515

516
517

In summary, the analyses show that jaw-finger coordination basically consists in synchronizing the pointing apex with the apex of the first jaw opening gesture when the first syllable is stressed, and synchronizing the onset of the finger return gesture with the apex of the second jaw opening gesture when the second syllable is stressed. This pattern seems to rely on four types of adaptation:

(1) An adaptation of the finger pointing forward stroke to the spatial target: amplitudes and durations increase when the target is far rather than near;

(2) An adaptation of the jaw to the phonetic goal: specific durations and amplitudes correspond to /p/ vs. /t/, and amplitudes and durations are greater for stressed vs. unstressed syllables;

(3) An adaptation of the jaw to the pointing forward stroke. When the first syllable is stressed, whichever the spatial target is, the apex of the jaw opening gesture corresponding to the stressed syllable is synchronized with the pointing apex. When the second syllable is stressed, the delay between the apices of the two jaw opening gestures decreases, possibly allowing synchronization between the pointing apex and the onset of the jaw opening gesture corresponding to the second syllable;

(4) An adaptation of the duration of the pointing plateau, possibly compensating for the incomplete finger-jaw apex synchrony when the second syllable is stressed. In this condition, the increase of the duration of the pointing plateau allows for the apex of the jaw opening stroke corresponding to the stressed syllable to occur within the finger to target alignment period.

These results will now be discussed in the light of previous observations on speech-hand coordination and within the framework of the jaw-hand/finger coordination hypothesis.

518

519 Discussion

520 The change in stress position from a 'CVCV to a CV'CV clearly influences the jaw-finger
521 coordination. However it does so though in a different way than we have predicted. There are
522 bidirectional adaptations from the jaw to the hand and from the hand to the jaw, which are
523 superimposed on the intrinsic target-driven behaviors corresponding to each system. We shall
524 discuss these three components (intrinsic behavior, jaw to hand and hand to jaw adaptations)
525 separately, and conclude on the way the two systems could be coupled in a dynamic system
526 approach.

527

528 A pointing task and a speech task

529 Obviously, the first point that must be made in this discussion is that, apart from any link
530 between speech and hand gestures, the hand and speech systems reach their respective targets
531 regardless of the individual requirements on each system. In the pointing task, the target must
532 be designated and the movement must be adapted to the target position, which involves larger
533 and longer movements when the target is far compared to when it is near. In the speech task, a
534 speaker has to utter the right consonants with the right stress pattern, which involves an
535 increase of the amplitude and/or the duration of the opening gesture for the stressed syllable.
536 The phonetic identity of the consonant (labial vs. coronal) influences the initiation times of
537 the jaw opening strokes but not their apices' times. It also affects the amplitude and duration
538 of the jaw opening strokes. Asymmetry in the jaw cycles for labial and coronal constrictions
539 in CV syllables is a phenomenon also observed in the repetition of CVCV words when speech
540 rate is increased. One possible explanation for this finding is that, for anatomical reasons, the
541 position of the jaw has a stronger influence on the position of the lower lip than on the
542 position of the tongue (Rochet-Capellan and Schwartz, 2007a).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

The jaw meets the hand

As regards the first and major connection between the two systems, it appears that speech adapts to the hand rather than the reverse and that this adaptation is related to the jaw movements. Our prediction was that the synchronization between the apex of the jaw opening stroke corresponding to the stressed syllable and the apex of the pointing gesture would be a stable attraction point for jaw-finger coordination. This appears to be the case only when the first syllable is stressed. In this case, the observed large delay between the beginning of the pointing gesture and the beginning of the first jaw opening gesture is in accordance with previous results obtained using the dual-task paradigm (see Introduction section). When the second syllable is stressed, the delay between the onsets of the pointing gesture and the jaw movement is reduced due to an early onset of the jaw movement. However, this is not enough for the apex of the pointing gesture to be synchronized with the apex of the second jaw opening gesture. It could seem surprising that when the second syllable is stressed, the onset of the jaw movement occurs 148 ms (on average) after the onset of the hand movement, while the apex of the second jaw opening stroke occurs 151 ms after the apex of the pointing gesture. Initiating the first jaw opening gesture at the same time as the pointing gesture could be sufficient for the apex of the second jaw opening gesture to be synchronized with the apex of the pointing gesture. The hand then compensates this failed synchronization during its return to rest phase, as we shall discuss later. However, in terms of jaw adaptation, the synchronization seems partly unachieved. This does not mean that there is no meeting point between the jaw and the hand when the second syllable is stressed. In this condition, the jaw produces the first cycle early enough to entirely incorporate the pointing plateau inside the second cycle. Therefore, the general working hypothesis that “*the part of the discourse that shows is related to the part of the gesture that shows*” is verified. The movement of the jaw is

organized such that the pointing plateau unambiguously occurs within the appropriate temporal domain of the spoken utterance that is the jaw cycle corresponding to the stressed syllable. This specifies the “deictic sites” we were looking for.

There seems to exist another meeting point that we had not predicted: when the second syllable is stressed, the finger reaches its apex more or less exactly at the same time as the jaw reaches its highest position, which is likely to closely correspond to the consonantal contact time for the second syllable (between the lips for /p/, or between the tongue and the palate for /t/). Interestingly, this is reminiscent of the synchrony put forward by Attina *et al.* (2006) between the hand target and the achievement of the consonantal closure in cued speech. This manually-augmented speech communication system involves hand positions and finger configurations added to the speech flow at a syllabic rhythm providing complementary information for deaf people to almost perfectly understand oral communication. In their study of cued speech production by French speakers, Attina and colleagues found a clear synchrony between the apices of hand movements achieving their adequate position for a given syllable, and the consonantal closure times in the corresponding speech.

In summary, “the jaw meets the hand” in the sense that the jaw adapts the onset of its movement in order for the pointing plateau to occur within the jaw cycle for the stressed syllable. This adaptation depends on the specific pointing and speech requirements. It occurs within a temporal window providing two possible meeting points for the pointing gesture apex: one corresponding to the apex of the first jaw opening gesture (when the first syllable is stressed) and another corresponding to the onset of the second jaw opening gesture (when the second syllable is stressed). The adaptation is achieved through the adequate delay of the onset of the jaw movement. If the target to point at is far, the pointing stroke is longer by about 16 ms

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

and the onset of the jaw movement is delayed by about 10 ms.

The hand meets the jaw

There is also a clear hand/finger adaptation to the movement of the jaw. It appears that the hand waits for the apex of the jaw opening stroke corresponding to the stressed vowel to occur before initiating its return stroke. This is illustrated by the observed significant effect of stress position on the pointing plateau offset. To our knowledge, this is the first experimental evidence of such adaptation of the pointing gesture to speech. This could be the way the hand “corrects” for the lack of jaw-finger synchrony at the apex time that is by providing another meeting point thanks to the expansion of the plateau duration. This ensures that the jaw opening gesture apex corresponding to the stressed syllable does occur within the pointing plateau in all cases.

Two coupled dynamic systems with synchronization sites

Altogether there appears to be a bidirectional link between the hand/finger and the jaw. This could be implemented by a series of local adaptations from one to the other, driven by specific temporal commands. The fact that there are simultaneous specific requirements for both systems rather suggests a kind of coupling between two dynamic systems, with the stress command specifying the adequate sites of synchronization. Actually, in the debate about modularity vs. interactivity of the motor control of speech and hand-pointing systems, it has been assumed that when the speech and the hand systems move at the same time, the brain would coordinate them as a single structure. In this framework, Kelso *et al.* (1981) showed that rhythmic tasks involving speech and hand movements displayed preferential phasing relationships between the articulators and the hand, as two coupled oscillator systems. Hence, according to these authors, speech-hand coordination should be described inside a coupled-

oscillators modeling framework, such as the “Haken-Kelso-Bunz” (HKB) model introduced by Haken *et al.* (1985) for bimanual coordination. Other contributions to the dynamic system approach of speech-hand coordination showed that the link between the two systems is not absolute (Smith *et al.*, 1986) and also depends on high-level cognitive factors (see Treffner and Peter, 2002, for an improvement of the HKB model using intentional and attentional factors). However, all these contributions support the view that the two systems could be linked through their relative oscillatory frequencies. In addition, developmental studies suggested a ratio of 2 to 1 between the preferential oscillatory frequencies of the jaw and the hand performing pointing gestures (Ducey-Kaufmann *et al.*, in press, Ducey-Kaufmann, 2007). This implies that at most two syllables could be achieved within one pointing gesture without influencing the pointing gesture. In a preliminary study (Rochet-Capellan *et al.*, 2007b), we showed that for a task consisting of pointing and naming a target with a 1-, 2-, 3- vs. 4-CV syllable word twice in rapid succession (e.g. /pa/+gesture and /pa/+gesture again), the delay between the apices of the two pointing gestures is the same for 1- and 2-CV words while it significantly increases from 2- to 3-CV words. This preliminary result provides some kind of confirmation of the 2 to 1 preferential ratio.

Finally, the systematic delay of the speech gesture relative to the pointing gesture, together with the large adaptation of speech to the hand gesture, suggest that the speech response could be anchored in the pointing gesture through the online monitoring of the hand movement. This could explain why Levelt *et al.* (1985) observed an effect of pointing perturbation on speech only if the perturbation occurred at the beginning of the hand gesture. Thus, the speech response would be carried by the pointing gesture, in agreement with the proposal that the manual activity drives the coordination with the oral system (Iverson and Thelen, 1999). This hypothesis would need further investigation, especially about the question of the information

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

used by the speech system to initiate its response.

Conclusion

Taken together, the results agree with the idea that speech focus is anchored in the pointing gesture for deictic expressions. This anchoring seems to be supported by a synchronization of the *speech-frame* (the jaw cycle) with the *sign-frame* (the pointing gesture) as suggested in the “Vocalize to Localize” framework for the origins of language. This results from two independent levels of speech adaptation. First, the effects of stress position and consonant order show an “internal” adaptation of the jaw opening gestures to the phonetic goal. In addition, the effect of spatial target position suggests an “external” adaptation for the synchronization with the pointing gesture within the adequate deictic site.

Further investigation will be needed to better understand the coordination of the jaw and hand in deictic tasks. But the interesting point about this study is that there *is* a coordination, implemented in a more or less complex way in the speaker’s brain, and that this coordination can be put forward and studied by analyzing online behavior in various linguistic tasks involving pointing using the voice and the hand.

Acknowledgement

This work is part of the “Patipapa” project funded by the French Ministry of Research (Action Concertée Incitative “Systèmes Complexes en Sciences Humaines et Sociales”). Rafael Laboissière works as a researcher at CNRS. We also wish to thank Christian Abry and Coriandre Vilain for insightful discussions, Marion Dohen for proofreading this manuscript, and the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

References

- Abry, C., Vilain, A., and Schwartz, J. (2004). Introduction : Vocalize to Localize? A call for better crosstalk between auditory and visual communication systems researchers : From meerkats to humans. *Interaction Studies*, 5(3): 313-325.
- Attina, V., Cathiard, M.-A., and Beautemps, D. (2006). Temporal measures of hand and speech coordination during French Cued Speech production, In: S. Gibet, N. Courty, & J.-F. Kamp (Eds.): GW 2005, *Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 3881, (pp. 13-24). Springer-Verlag.
- Butterworth, G. (2003). Pointing is the royal road to language for babies. In: S. Kita (Ed.), *Pointing: Where Language, Culture, and Cognition meet* (pp. 9–33). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Castiello, U., Paulignan, Y., and Jeannerod, M. (1991). Temporal dissociation of motor responses and subjective awareness. A study in normal subjects. *Brain*, 114 (Pt 6)(NIL): 2639–55.
- Diessel, H. (1999). Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammaticalization. *Typological Studies in Language*, 42, John Benjamins.
- Diessel, H. (2006). Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17: 463-489.
- Ducey-Kaufmann, V. (2007). *Le cadre de la parole et le cadre du signe : un rendez-vous développementale (The speech frame and the sign frame: a developmental rendez-vous)*, PhD thesis, Sciences du langage, Université Stendhal, Institut National Polytechnique, Grenoble.
- Ducey-Kaufmann, V., Abry, C., and Vilain, C. (In press). When the speech frame meets the sign frame in a developmental framework. In *Emergence of Language Abilities : Ontogeny and phylogeny*, Lyon, France. ELA.
- Feyereisen, P. (1997). The competition between gesture and speech production in dual-task paradigms. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 36(1): 13–33.

- 694 Gentilucci, M. (2003). Grasp observation influences speech production. *European Journal*
695 *of Neuroscience*, 17: 179-184.
- 696 Gentilucci, M., Benuzzi, F., Gangitano, M., Grimaldi, S. (2001). Grasp with hand and
697 mouth: a kinematic study on healthy subjects. *Journal of Neurophysiology*. 86: 1685-
698 1699.
- 699 Gentilucci, M., Santunione, P., Roy, A.C., Stefanini, S. (2004). Execution and observation of
700 bringing a fruit to the mouth affect syllable pronunciation. *European Journal of*
701 *Neuroscience*, 19: 190-202.
- 702 Goldin-Meadow, S. and Butcher, C. (2003). Pointing toward two-word speech in young
703 children. In S. Kita (Ed.), *Pointing: Where language, culture, and cognition meet* (pp. 85-
704 107). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 705 Green, J., Moore, C., and Reilly, K. (2002). The sequential development of jaw and lip
706 control for speech. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 45: 66–79.
- 707 Haken, H., Kelso, J. A. S., and Bunz, H. (1985). A theoretical model of phase transitions in
708 human hand movements. *Biological Cybernetic*, 51(5): 347–356
- 709 Haviland, J. B. (2000). Pointing, gesture spaces, and mental maps. In D. McNeill (Ed.),
710 *Language and gesture* (pp. 13–46).
- 711 Holender, D. (1980). Interference between a vocal and a manual response to the same
712 stimulus. In G. Stelmach and J. Requin (Eds.), *Tutorials in Motor Behavior* (pp. 421–432).
713 North Holland Publishing Company.
- 714 Iverson, J. and Goldin-Meadow, S. (1998). Why people gesture as they speak. *Nature*,
715 396:228.
- 716 Iverson, J. and Thelen, E. (1999). Hand, mouth, and brain : The dynamic emergence of speech
717 and gesture. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 6: 19–40.
- 718 Kelso, J. A. D., Tuller, B. and Harris, K. S. (1981). A “Dynamic Pattern” perspective on the
719 control and coordination of movement. In P.F. MacNeilage (Ed.), *The production of*
720 *speech* (pp. 137-173). New York: Springer-Verlag.

- 721 Levelt, W. J. M., Richardson, G. and Heij, W. L. (1985). Pointing and voicing in deictic
722 expressions. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 24: 133–164.
- 723 Løevenbruck, H., Baciú, M., Segebarth, C. and Abry, C. (2005). The left inferior frontal gyrus
724 under focus: an fMRI study of the production of deixis via syntactic extraction and
725 prosodic focus. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 18: 237–258.
- 726 MacNeilage, P. and Davis, B. (2000). On the origins of intenal structure of word forms.
727 *Science*, 288: 527–531.
- 728 McNeill, D. (1981). Action, thought and language. *Cognition*, (10) :201–208.
- 729 McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 730 McNeill, D. (2000). Introduction. In D. McNeill (Ed.), *Language and gesture* (pp. 1–10).
- 731 Munhall, K. and Jones, J. (1998). Articulatory evidence for syllabic structure. *Behavioral and*
732 *Brain Science*, 21: 524–525.
- 733 Petitto, L., Holowka, S., Sergio, L. and Ostry, D. (2001). Language rhythms in baby hand
734 movement. *Nature*, 413(6851): 35–36.
- 735 Pizzuto, E., Capobianco, M. and Devescovi, A. (2005). Gestural-vocal deixis and
736 representational skills in early language development. *Interaction Studies. Social*
737 *Behaviour and Communication in Biological and Artificial Systems*, 6(2): 223–252.
- 738 Rochet-Capellan, A. and Schwartz J-L. (2007a). An articulatory basis for the Labial-to-
739 Coronal effect: /pata/ seems a more stable articulatory pattern than /tapa/. *Journal of*
740 *Acoustic Society of America*, 121(6): 3740-3754.
- 741 Rochet-Capellan, A., Schwartz J-L., Laboissière, R. and Galván, A. (2007b). Two CV
742 syllables for one pointing gesture as an optimal ratio for jaw-arm coordination in a deictic
743 task: A preliminary study. In *proceedings of EurocogSci07, the European cognitive*
744 *Science conference*, pp. 608-613, Delphi, Greece.
- 745 Stetson, R. H. (1951). *Motor Phonetics* (North-Holland, Amsterdam), 2nd ed.
- 746 Smith, A., McFarland, D. H. and Weber, C. M. (1986). Interactions between speech and
747 finger movements: an exploration on the dynamic pattern perspective. *Journal of Speech*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

748 *and Hearing Research*, 29(4): 471–80.

749 Tomasello, M., Carpenter, M. and Liszkowski U. (2007). A new look at infant pointing. *Child*
750 *Development*, 78(3):705-722.

751 Treffner, P. and Peter, M. (2002). Intentional and attentional dynamics of speech-hand
752 coordination. *Human Movement Science*, 21(5-6): 641–97.

753 Volterra, V., Caselli, M. C., Capirci, O., and Pizzuto, E. (2005). Gesture and the emergence
754 and development of language. In M. Tomasello and D. Slobin (Eds.), *Beyond nature-*
755 *nurture- Essays in honor of Elizabeth Bates* (pp. 3–40). Mahwah, N. J.: Lawrence Erlbaum
756 Associates.

757 Wilkins, D. (2003). Why pointing with the index finger is not a universal (in sociocultural and
758 semiotic terms). In S. Kita (Ed.), *Pointing: Where language culture and cognition meet*,
759 (pp. 171-215). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

761 **Tables**

762 Table 1:

763 Number of rejected trials over all 20 participants and all experimental conditions: mean
764 number, standard error (Se), minimum and maximum number of utterance errors (incorrect
765 pronunciation), initiation errors (response before the go-signal), correct trials for which the
766 two finger IREDs were partially masked and for which the jaw IRED was partially masked,
767 see text for detail.

	Mean	Se	Min	Max
Utterance error	4.1	0.86	0	11
Initiation error	2.35	1.94	0	39
Masked finger	8.2	1.50	0	21
Masked jaw	0.75	0.60	0	12

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

770
771 **Figures**

772
773 **Figure 1**

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

781

782

783 Figure 5

Figures captions

Figure 1:

Experimental setup (top) and projection dimensions (bottom). The participants pointed at, and named a smiley sign projected on a screen in front of them. Finger and jaw movements were captured using Optotrak (in front of the participant) with two IREDs for the finger, one for the jaw (chin IRED), three for the head (head IRED referential), and three on the table (referential for all moving IREDs). The target name appeared in the midline of the visual field (e.g. /pa'pa/) and the pointing target on the right side, either at a near (10 cm) or a far (50 cm) position.

Figure 2:

Example of signals and labeling for a /pa'pa/ trial. Top panel: acoustic signal; middle panel: jaw trajectory; bottom panel: finger trajectory. Onsets and offsets of strokes are defined as the instant when velocity reaches 10% of the maximum value during the corresponding stroke. J_{I1} , J_{I2} and J_{A1} , J_{A2} respectively correspond to the onset and apex (offset) times of the first and second jaw opening gestures. P_I and P_A correspond to the onset and apex (offset) times of the pointing forward stroke. P_R is the onset time of the finger return movement. Note that, in this example, even though stress position affects the second syllable, the amplitude of the jaw movement is smaller for the second syllable than for the first one. This corresponds to the general pattern observed in this experiment (see jaw opening movement panels in Figure 5).

Figure 3:

Means of the elapsed time from the go signal to the pointing and jaw events relative to stress position (first vs. second syllable), consonant (/t/ vs. /p/) and target position (near vs. far). P_I , P_A and P_R respectively correspond to the onset, the apex and the onset of the return of the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

finger pointing movement. J_{I1} , J_{A1} and J_{I2} , J_{A2} respectively correspond to the onset and the apex of the first and the second jaw opening strokes.

Figure 4.

Means and standard errors of the time of the pointing apex ($P_{A/J}$, left) and of the time of the onset of the pointing return ($P_{R/J}$, right) relative to the apices of the two jaw opening gestures, depending on stress position (first vs. second syllable), target position (near vs. far) and consonant (/t/ vs. /p/).

Figure 5.

Means and standard errors of the amplitude and the duration of the finger forward stroke (first row) and of the two jaw opening strokes (second and third rows) depending on stress position (first vs. second syllable), target position (near vs. far) and consonant (/t/ vs. /p/).

Table 1:

Number of rejected trials. For the 20 participants and all experimental conditions: mean number, standard error (Se), minimum and maximum number of: utterance errors (incorrect pronunciation); initiation errors (response before go-signal); correct trials with the two finger IREDs partially masked and with the jaw IRED partially masked, see text for detail.

	Mean	Se	Min	Max
Utterance error	4.1	0.86	0	11
Initiation error	2.35	1.94	0	39
Masked finger	8.2	1.50	0	21
Masked jaw	0.75	0.60	0	12

Figure 1: Experimental setup (top) and projection dimensions (bottom). The participants pointed at, and named a smiley sign projected on a screen in front of them. Finger and jaw movements were captured using Optotrak (in front of the participant) with two IREDs for the finger, one for the jaw (chin IRED), three for the head (head IRED referential), and three on the table (referential for all moving IREDs). The target name appeared in the midline of the visual field (e.g. /pa'pa/) and the pointing target on the right side, either at a near (10 cm) or a far (50 cm) position.
130x111mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Figure 2: Example of signals and labeling for a /pa'pa/ trial. Top panel: acoustic signal; middle panel: jaw trajectory; bottom panel: finger trajectory. Onsets and offsets of strokes are defined as the instant when velocity reaches 10% of the maximum value during the corresponding stroke. JI1, JI2 and JA1, JA2 respectively correspond to the onset and apex (offset) times of the first and second jaw opening gestures. PI and PA correspond to the onset and apex (offset) times of the pointing forward stroke. PR is the onset time of the finger return movement. Note that, in this example, even though stress position affects the second syllable, the amplitude of the jaw movement is smaller for the second syllable than for the first one. This corresponds to the general pattern observed in this experiment (see jaw opening movement panels in Figure 5).

90x101mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Figure 3: Means of the elapsed time from the go signal to the pointing and jaw events relative to stress position (first vs. second syllable), consonant (/t/ vs. /p/) and target position (near vs. far). PI, PA and PR respectively correspond to the onset, the apex and the onset of the return of the finger pointing movement. JI1, JA1 and JI2, JA2 respectively correspond to the onset and the apex of the first and the second jaw opening strokes.

139x97mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Figure 4. Means and standard errors of the time of the pointing apex (PA/J, left) and of the time of the onset of the pointing return (PR/J, right) relative to the apices of the two jaw opening gestures, depending on stress position (first vs. second syllable), target position (near vs. far) and consonant (/t/ vs. /p/).

111x48mm (300 x 300 DPI)

Figure 5. Means and standard errors of the amplitude and the duration of the finger forward stroke (first row) and of the two jaw opening strokes (second and third rows) depending on stress position (first vs. second syllable), target position (near vs. far) and consonant (/t/ vs. /p/).
111x158mm (300 x 300 DPI)