

Motion in speech and gesture in a CLIL context

Christina Piot^{1,2}, Julien Perrez¹, Maarten Lemmens²

University of Liège¹, University of Lille²

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

- Motion events
 - Components: Figure – Ground – Path – Manner
 - Types: Self-propelled motion events (SPME) - Caused motion events - Caused location events - Location events
- The linguistic expression of motion events
 - Verb-framed languages (e.g., French) vs. Satellite-framed languages (e.g., Dutch)
- Co-speech gesture
 - Part of the communication process
 - Universal and language-specific characteristics
- → The typological differences between V-languages and S-languages are reflected in co-speech gesture

(McNeill 1985, 2005; Kendon 1980, 1994, Alibali et al. 2000; Gullberg 2010; Graham & Argyle 1975, Rogers 1978 & Riseborough 1981 mentioned in Kendon 1994; Cassel et al. 1999; McNeill & Duncan 2000; Talmy 2000; Kita & Özyürek 2003; Brown & Chen 2013)

- Thinking for Speaking: while acquiring their first language, children learn a specific way of thinking for speaking (Slobin 1991)
- Motion events – Co-speech gesture – Thinking for speaking
 - Different patterns of thinking for speaking in L1 and L2 = necessity to learn the L2 pattern to master the language (Stam 1998, mentioned in Stam 2010)
 - Learning/Acquisition of the L2 multimodal pattern

1.2. Research question

- How do native French speakers and native Dutch speakers and CLIL French-speaking learners of express motion events in both speech and gesture?

2. Method

2.1. Participants

- 11 native French speakers
- 9 native Dutch speakers
- 12 CLIL French-speaking learners of Dutch (Proficiency level: ranging between CEFR A1 and B2)

2.2. Task

- *Tweet Zoo* divided into 15 fragments

2.3. Analysis

Speech		Co-speech gestures	
Verb	Neutral/Manner/Path/ Manner and path/ Manner and path (prefix)	Type	Iconic/ Deictic/Metaphoric/ Pragmatic/Beat
Satellite	Manner/Path/Location/ Combination	Semantic components in deictic and iconic gestures	Manner/Path/Ground /Location/Combination
Construction	e.g. MANNERV + PATHS		
Boundary crossing	Yes/No		

(Levy & McNeill mentioned in McNeill 2006; Kendon 2004; Woerfel 2019)

- Synchronization between substantive gestures and linguistic units (Stam 2006)

- Multimodal Construction: semantic components in linguistic units and substantive gestures

3. Main results, Discussion & Conclusion

3.1. Types of events

- FR: SPME > Caused motion > Location > Action
- DU2: SPME > Action > Caused motion > Location
- DU: SPME > Caused motion > Action > Location

3.2. Constructions - SPME

- The most frequent **construction** used by L2 learners = same as in their L1: $PATH_V+PATH_S$ vs. $MANNER_V+PATH_S$ in Dutch L1
- **MANNER $PATH_V$ (PREFIX)**: difficult for learners but they still use **MANNER V**

3.3. Types of gesture

- FR: Iconic > Deictic > Pragmatic > Beat
- DU2: Iconic > Pragmatic > Deictic > Beat
- DU: Iconic > Deictic > Pragmatic > Beat
- More **pragmatic** gestures in L2 than in L1 (// Piot (2019))

3.4. Semantic components - SPME

- **PATH G**
 - Most frequent semantic component in both French and Dutch (// Alferink (2015)), a bit more frequent in French.
 - Most frequent semantic component in DU2 as well even though it is less prevailing.
- **MANNER G** : more frequent in DU2: sometimes compensation gesture.
- Conflated gesture (**MANNER $PATH_G$**): not very frequent here and similar in the three groups.

3.5. Multimodal Constructions – SPME

- Most frequent multimodal construction in French and Dutch L2: same one ($PATH_V+PATH_S+PATH_G$) vs. in Dutch L1 ($MANNER $PATH_V$ (PREFIX)+PATH_S+PATH_G$)
- $MANNER_V+PATH_S+PATH_G$ in French, Dutch and Dutch L2
- Synchronization **PATH G**
 - Verb: Dutch L1 > French L1 > Dutch L2

4. Further research

- More data
- Boundary crossing gesture
- Conflated gesture vs. 2 gestures
- L2 learners' evolution

For more details, examples, and references, you can download the poster presentation here:

