Lexical Competition Correlates with Articulatory Enhancement in ASL Kathleen Currie Hall, Oksana Tkachman, & Yurika Aonuki

Department of Linguistics, University of British Columbia

Research Question & Hypothesis

Q: How does lexical competition affect the production of signs? H: Greater neighbourhood density will correlate with increased visible amplitude.

Background: Lexical competition

- Lexical competition: networks of phonologically related words
- Spoken languages: neighbours are words with 1-sound differences

Methodology

- ASL-Lex (Caselli et al. 2017):
 - Database of ~1000 signs of ASL
 - Articulated by a single deaf native signer
 - Each signed in isolation
- ASL-SignBank (Hochgesang et al. 2019):
 - Database of ~2000 ASL signs
 - Articulated by deaf native signers
 - Each signed in isolation





Signed languages: neighbours are words that share some characteristic(s)



Fig. 1: Example of phonological neighbourhood for the word *speech* in English, with **three minimal pairs** shown and **seven near-minimals** highlighted (Chan & Vitevitch 2009).

Fig. 2: Example of phonological neighbourhood for **the sign FALSE** in Kenyan Sign Language (Morgan 2017: 108). "FALSE has **three true minimal pairs**, at least **seven near-minimals**, and an **uncounted number of 3-difference pairs**."

Background: Articulatory Enhancement

Increased distinctiveness of a signal is most likely to happen when there is the greatest chance of miscommunication (cf. Lindblom 1990)
Has various effects on both recognition and production, though effects can vary with discourse context, phonological context, measurement type...:

- Included only signs that also occur in ASL-Lex
- "Minimal" Neighbourhood Density (ND)
 - Taken from ASL-Lex
 - The number of signs that share <u>at least one</u> of 5 characteristics with a given sign (# of hands, major location, major movement, selected fingers, finger flexion)
 - Most similar to measures used by other sign ND studies
 - Thought to better "capture the phonological structure of the lexicon" (Caselli et al. 2017: 9)
- Removed:
 - Compounds, atypical handedness or location, clipped videos
- Total signs analyzed:
 - 691 videos for ASL-Lex and 644 for ASL-SignBank
- Optical flow analysis:
 - FlowAnalyzer software (Barbosa 2013)
 - Visible amplitude (VA) of each sign computed as in Fig. 4
- Linear model:
 - Visible amplitude ~ number of hands + major location + minor location + major movement + ND



Fig. 3: (a) General vowel dispersion cf. Munson & Solomon (2004); (b, c) Specific distancing from a neighbour cf. Wedel et al. (2018) and Baese-Berk & Goldrick (2009)

Measuring "Visible Amplitude" (VA)

- Analogous to acoustic amplitude
- Amount of energy produced by motions that comprise a sign

Compare to model without ND

Results



ASL-SignBank (right):

- ND is a significant predictor (p = 0.015)
- Effect is in expected direction, though small

Discussion

ASL-Lex (left):

- ND is a significant predictor
 (p = 0.009)
- Effect is in expected direction, though small



Residuals of Min. ND | Others

- Affected by e.g. number of hands, type / shape of movement
- Calculated from a video of a sign by applying *Optical Flow Analysis* (OFA; Horn & Schunck 1981, Barbosa et al. 2008)



Fig. 4: (a) Frame 1; (b) Frame 2; (c) Optical flow field; (d) Calculating magnitudes of individual vectors in the field. To calculate magnitude of frame-step, average the magnitudes (z-values) from (d). To calculate VA, square the magnitudes across frame-steps, sum them, divide by the number of frame-steps, and take the square root.

References



Baese-Berk, M., & Goldrick, M. (2009). Mechanisms of interaction in speech production. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, *24*, 527-554. Barbosa, A. V., Yehia, H. C., & Vatikiotis-Bateson, E. (2008). Linguistically valid movement behavior measured non-invasively. In R. Goecke, P. Lucey, & S. Lucey (Eds.), *Auditory and visual speech processing -- AVSP08* (pp. 173-177). Moreton Island, Australia: Causal Productions. Caselli, N., Sevcikova Sehyr, Z., Cohen-Goldberg, A., & Emmorey, K. (2017). ASL-Lex: A lexical database of American Sign Language. *Behavior Research Methods*, *49*(2), 784-801. doi: doi:10.3758/s13428-016-0742-0 Chan, K. Y., & Vitevitch, M. S. (2009). The influence of the phonological neighborhood clustering coefficient on spoken word recognition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *35*(6), 1934-1949. Hochgesang, J. A., Crasborn, O., & Lillo-Martin, D. (2019). ASL Signbank. Retrieved from <u>https://aslsignbank.haskins.yale.edu/</u> Horn, B. K. P., & Schunck, B. G. (1981). Determining optical flow. *Artificial Intelligence*, *17*, 185-203. Lindblom, B. (1990). Explaining phonetic variation: A sketch of the H&H theory. In W. J. Hardcastle & A. Marchal (Eds.), *Speech production and speech modelling* (pp. 403-439). Dordrecht: Kluwer. Morgan, H. E. (2017). *The Phonology of Kenyan Sign Language (Southwestern Dialect).* (PhD Doctoral dissertation), University of California, San Diego. Munson, B., & Solomon, N. P. (2004). The effect of phonological neighborhood density on vowel articulation. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *47*(5), 1048-1058. Wedel, A., Nelson, N. R., & Sharp, R. (2018). The phonetic specificity of contrastive hyperarticulation in natural speech. *Journal of Memory and Language, 100*, 61-88. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2018.01.001

- Lexical competition may affect articulation in signed languages in a manner similar to that in spoken languages.
- Increased competition is associated with increased magnitude of movements in signs.
- Wedel et al. (2016): spoken language effects better captured by lexical-item-specific measures than generalized ND – how can we capture this in signed languages?
- Note: a similar analysis of the "maximal" ND measure in ASL-Lex (neighbours share 4 of 5 characteristics) showed no significant effect of ND in either database.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA



Humanities Conseil de recherches e Canada sciences humaines du C

