TOWARDS INTERCHANNEL CORRELATION BETWEEN CEPHALIC AND MANUAL MOVEMENTS IN A RUSSIAN MULTIMODAL DISCOURSE[1]

N.V. Sukhova[*][**], Yu.V. Nikolaeva[*][***]

sukhova.natalya@gmail.com, julianikk@gmail.com

[*] Lomonosov Moscow State University,

[**] NUST MISiS (Russia, Moscow)

[***] Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of the Sciences

(Russia, Moscow)

There are studies on multimodal communication in different disciplines nowadays coming from general explorations into the nature of such communication (cf. McNeill 2000; Müller et al. 2013; Seyfeddinipur, Gullberg 2014) to more specific works which entail investigations on kinetic activity of hands (Beattie 2016 and many others), head (see Hadar et al. 1985; Bull 1987; Kousidis et al. 2013) and other parts of body in their relation to speech (Turchyn et al. 2018) or in isolation.

This paper discusses the correlation between two kinetic channels: manual (movements of hands) and cephalic (head movements) ones. The correlation is both formal and functional. From the formal point of view we track cephalic turns and the manual gestures which overlap with them. Functionally, we are looking at the meaning of those movements with correlate with each other in these two channels along the phases of the discourse (Telling / Conversation / Retelling).

The material is from our corpus resource called "Russian Pear Chats and Stories" (see www.multidiscourse.ru): Recording 22 (duration 18 minutes) – 3 individual videos with total duration 54 minutes (Pear Chat – Pears22[2]).

We focus on **cephalic turns** in the discourse, that are turns of a head to the right or to the left and the position when the participant returns his/her head in an enface position (as it is called in our corpus 'straightening of a head').

The manual gestures are elaborated in more detail having the phases of preparation, stroke and retraction annotated (Litvinenko et al. 2017).

The physical form of the manual and cephalic movements determines the way we annotate them[3] and define their functional potential (communicative role in the discourse). The roles are different and they lie on the imaginary axis where one extreme is the most formally and functionally (potentially) signifi-

---

[2] For more technical details of our corpus, please, visit www.multidiscourse.ru .

[3] The schema is realized in ELAN programme.

cant movements, e.g. a gesture (UpDown[4] movement; a gesture of the hands depicting a bicycle) through less significant, e.g. the so-called adaptors ('Let one's fingers through one's hair' movement; fidgeting movement of hands) to those movements which change the cephalic or manual postures (e.g. Turn-Left; changing the location of the hands from one neutral position to the other).

Here we present the analysis of cephalic turns (and straightenings) and their correlation with manual gestures (cf.: other types of hand movements). We have 54 minutes (3 videos of 18 minutes long each) with a detailed cephalic annotation in 8 ELAN tiers for both cephalic and manual movements. Thus, the interchannel analysis goes in terms of:

1) cephalic turns (left/right/repeated/straight; duration);

2) their collocations with other cephalic movements (which head movements can combine with turns);

3) manual correlates with cephalic turns (gestural phases);

4) the mode of interchannel correlation (overlap / absence of overlap)

5) the place of cephalic-manual 'units' in the discourse (listening/speaking phase);

6) their functions (gesture/adaptor/posture change; functional meanings).

The conclusions are drawn on the statistical analysis of the above-mentioned parameters and discussed alongside the framework of our corpus project.

References

Beattie G. (2016). Rethinking body language. How hand movements reveal hidden thoughts. London, New York: Routledge.

Hadar U., Steiner, T.J., Clifford F. (1985). Head movement during listening turns in conversation. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior 9, pp. 214-228.

Kousidis S., Malisz, Z., Wagner P., Schlangen D. (2013). Exploring annotations of head gesture forms in spontaneous human interaction. In: TiGER 2013, Tilburg Gesture Research Meeting.

Litvinenko A.O., Nikolaeva Yu.V., Kibrik A.A. (2017). Annotation of Russian manual gestures: theoretical and practical issues // Komputernaya linguistika i intellectual'nye tehnologii [Computational Linguistics and Intellectual Technologies]. Papers from Annual International Conference ' Dialogue' (2017). Issue 16 (23). 2nd Vol. – M.: RUH. – pp. 255-268.

McNeill D. (ed.) (2000). Language and Gesture (Language Culture and Cognition). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Müller C., Cienki A., Fricke E., Ladewig, S., McNeill D., Teßendorf S. (2013). Body – Language – Communication. An International Handbook on Multimodality in Human Interaction. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Seyfeddinipur M., Gullberg M. (Eds.) (2014). From gesture in conversation to visible action as utterance: Essays in honor of Adam Kendon. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Turchyn S., Moreno I. O., Cánovas C. P., Steen F., Turner M., Valenzuela J., Ray S. 2018. Gesture Annotation with a Visual Search Engine for Multimodal Communication Research. IAAI-18.

---

[4] We have tagged all movements based on the formal physical approach.