This is the authors' copy of the final unpublished version of this manuscript.

Please cite as:

Masapollo, M., & Guenther, F.H. (in press). Engaging the articulators enhances perception of concordant visible speech movements. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences*.

Engaging the articulators enhances perception of concordant visible speech movements

Matthew Masapollo¹ & Frank H. Guenther^{1,2}

¹ Department of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences, Boston University, 635

Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215

² Department of Biomedical Engineering, Boston University, 44 Cummington Mall, Room 403,

Boston, MA 02215

To whom correspondence should be addressed. Email: mmasapol@bu.edu

Funding: Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Institute On Deafness And Other Communication Disorders of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number R01DC002852. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Competing Interests: All authors declare no conflict of interest.

Abstract

Purpose: This study aimed to test whether (and how) somatosensory feedback signals from the vocal tract affect concurrent unimodal visual speech perception.

Method: Participants discriminated pairs of silent visual utterances of vowels under three experimental conditions: (1) normal (baseline) and while holding either (2) a bite block or (3) a lip tube in their mouths. To test the specificity of somatosensory-visual interactions during perception, we assessed discrimination of vowel contrasts optically distinguished based on either their mandibular (English /ɛ/-/æ/) or labial (English /u/-French /u/) postures. In addition, we assessed perception of each contrast using dynamically-articulating videos and static (single-frame) images of each gesture (at vowel midpoint).

Results: Engaging the jaw selectively facilitated perception of the dynamic gestures optically distinct in terms of jaw height, whereas engaging the lips selectively facilitated perception of the dynamic gestures optically distinct in terms of their degree of lip compression and protrusion. Thus, participants perceived visible speech movements in relation to the configuration and shape of their own vocal tract (and possibly their ability to produce covert vowel-production-like movements). In contrast, engaging the articulators had no effect when the speaking faces did not move, suggesting that the somatosensory inputs affected perception of time-varying kinematic information rather than changes in “target” (movement end-point) mouth shapes.

Conclusions: These findings suggest that orofacial somatosensory inputs associated with speech production “prime” pre-motor and somatosensory brain regions involved in the sensorimotor control of speech, thereby facilitating perception of concordant visible speech movements.

47 **Keywords:** visual speech perception; lip-reading; somatosensory feedback; perception-action
48 coupling; DIVA model of speech production; motor theory of speech perception

1. Introduction

The central goal of research on sensorimotor integration for speech processing is to explicate the mechanisms of perception, how perception influences articulatory and phonatory movements, and how those movements in turn affect perception (Hickok, Houde & Rong, 2011). Work to date has firmly established that sensory feedback signals play a critically important role in guiding and coordinating speech movements (see Guenther, 2016, Chapters 5 & 6, for a thorough review). Over the years, numerous studies have consistently demonstrated that speakers (both adult and child) automatically adjust their movements of unimpeded articulators to compensate for unexpected perturbations in auditory (e.g., Houde & Jordan, 1998; Stuart, Kalinowski, Rastatter & Lynch, 2002; Villacorta, Perkell, & Guenther, 2007; Cai, Beal, Ghosh, Tiede, Guenther & Perkell, 2012; MacDonald, Johnson, Forsythe, Plante & Munhall, 2012; Mollaei, Shiller, Baum & Gracco, 2016; Abur, Lester-Smith, Daliri, Lupiani, Guenther & Stepp, 2018) or somatosensory feedback (e.g., Tremblay, Shiller & Ostry, 2003; Nasir & Ostry, 2006; Golfinopoulos, Tourville, Bohland, Ghosh & Guenther, 2011). Thus, the evidence indicates that speakers effectively monitor their own self-generated auditory and somatosensory feedback online to guide, correct and fine-tune vocal production parameters.

Moreover, and of particular relevance to the present research, there is now a growing body of evidence that orofacial somatosensory inputs associated with speech production can feed back to influence concurrent speech *perception* (Sams, Mottonen, & Sihvonen, 2005; Ito, Tiede & Ostry, 2009; Sato, Troille, Ménard, Cathiard, & Gracco, 2013; Yeung & Werker, 2013; Bruderer, Danielson, Kandhadai, & Werker, 2015). To take one well-cited example, Ito *et al.* (2009) created a “head”– “had” auditory series, in which the “head” (/hɛd/) versus “had” (/hæd/) distinction was specified by small, incremental changes in the first (*F1*) and second (*F2*) formant frequencies of

the vocalic portion of the signal. They then presented a group of listeners with randomized sequences of the series and asked them to identify each member as an exemplar of the word “head” or “had.” While the subjects listened to the members of the series, the researchers used a robotic device to stretch their facial skin on each side of the mouth in either an upward or downward direction. During a baseline (control) condition, listeners consistently identified stimuli on one side of the continuum as /hɛd/ and those one on the other side of the continuum as /hæd/. However, the location of the “head” – “had” boundary systematically shifted in the experimental conditions depending on the direction of the skin stretch perturbation. Specifically, when subjects’ skin was stretched and perturbed upwards, as is normally evoked during the production of vowel /ɛ/, they were more likely to report “hearing” the spectrally ambiguous members in the middle of the series as the word “head” than “had.” Conversely, when their skin was stretched downwards, as is normally evoked during the production of the vowel /æ/, subjects were more likely to report “hearing” the spectrally ambiguous members of the series as the word “had” than “head.” In other words, the somatosensory feedback they received from the facial skin deformation biased perceptual judgments toward the concordant articulations (i.e., an *assimilation* effect).

Other evidence in favor of action’s effect on speech perception comes from studies showing that silently articulating syllables improves concurrent perception of concordant syllables but not discordant syllables (Sams *et al.*, 2005; Sato *et al.*, 2013). For example, in one experiment, Sams *et al.* (2005) instructed subjects to silently mouth either the syllable “pa” or “ka” in synchrony with an acoustic stimulus specifying a CV syllable, and then identify the syllable they heard. The results showed that there was an effect of the uttered syllable on perception. Subjects were more accurate at identifying the acoustic stimulus when the uttered syllable was phonetically-congruent with the heard syllable. Conversely, subjects were less accurate when the uttered

95 syllable was phonetically-incongruent with the heard syllable (see Sato *et al.*, 2013, for similar
96 results). Sams *et al.* (2005) invoked the Analysis by Synthesis (AxS) theory of speech perception
97 (Stevens, 1960, 2002; Skipper, van Wassenhove, Nusbaum, & Small, 2007; Kuhl, Ramirez,
98 Bosseler, Lin, & Imada, 2014) and suggested that the subjects were internally simulating the
99 sensory consequences of the produced vocal tract maneuvers, which in turn, biased perception
100 toward the concordant syllable in the form of an efference copy from the motor system (i.e., a
101 *facilitation* effect).

102 There are other reports, however, in the developmental literature that somatosensory inputs
103 from the vocal tract can *inhibit*, rather than facilitate, concurrent speech perception (Yeung &
104 Werker, 2013; Bruderer, Danielson, Kandhadai, and Werker (2015). For example, Bruderer *et al.*
105 (2015) reported that preventing articulatory maneuvers consistent with what speech sounds were
106 being perceived interfered with phonetic discrimination in preverbal infants. Specifically, 6-
107 month-old English-learning infants were found to discriminate a non-native Hindi dental-retroflex
108 stop contrast (/ḍ/-/ḍ/) while sucking on a “gum-teether” pacifier that allowed free tongue motion
109 but failed when sucking on a “flat-tongue” pacifier that prevented tongue tip motion. (Note that
110 these researchers used ultrasound methodology to confirm the hypothesized teether effects on
111 tongue position and motion.) This result was especially surprising because infants this age have
112 not yet acquired the fine-grained articulatory control necessary to produce such segments.¹ One
113 possible explanation of these findings is that the simultaneous activation of motor and perceptual
114 representations for speech leads to the inhibition of those representations during concurrent
115 perception (Yeung & Werker, 2013; cf. Sams *et al.*, 2005; Galantucci, Fowler, & Goldstein, 2009;

¹ A complementary result was obtained by Yeung and Werker (2013), who found that 4-to-5-month-old infants’ ability to cross-modally match audio-visual vowels was also disrupted by teething toys that constrained the shape and movements of the lips.

Sato et al., 2013). However, Hickok and Poeppel (2016) argued for an alternative explanation; namely, that the “flat-tongue” teether may have drawn more attention away from the task than the “gum-teether”, which in turn, led to the failure to discriminate. Whatever the reason for the inhibition effect reported by Bruderer *et al.* may turn out to be, the aforementioned findings raise the intriguing possibility that speech is perceived in relation to the shape and configuration of one’s own vocal tract and ability to act, even prior to the acquisition of well specified speech production targets.

Whereas these and other psychophysical experiments have demonstrated complex *somatosensory-auditory* interactions during phonetic perception at a behavioral level, neuroimaging studies indicate that *visual* speech cues in talking faces influence blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) responses in premotor cortex, primary motor cortex, and somatosensory cortex above and beyond acoustic speech cues alone (Matchin, Groulx & Hickok, 2014). Specifically, Matchin *et al.* (2014) used functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) methods to examine BOLD activity patterns while subjects passively listened to or lip-read a speaker silently talk (with no overt motor task). These researchers found inferior frontal gyrus (pars opercularis), dorsal motor cortex, and inferior parietal lobe to be more active during the lip-reading task than the listening task. Skipper, Nusbaum and Small (2005) also reported that activity in pre-motor and primary motor cortical regions during bimodal (auditory-visual) speech perception was modulated by the visual salience of speech stimuli. Furthermore, Sundara, Namasivayam, and Chen (2001) demonstrated using transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) that perception of (silent) visual speech, but not acoustic speech, elicits enhanced motor-evoked potentials in the vocal tract muscles recruited to articulate speech. Thus, understanding the contribution of potential *somatosensory-visual* interactions during speech processing may yield additional key insights into

action effects on phonetic perception.

The purpose of the present research was to investigate whether, and if so, how, the somatosensory system is involved in the perceptual processing of unimodal visual speech. We addressed this question by examining whether engaging the articulators influences concurrent discrimination of visual speech using either dynamically-articulating videos (Experiment 1) or still pictures (Experiment 2) of a speaker. Previous studies have shown that perceivers have some ability to lip-read from photographs of faces (Rosenblum, 2005), and that the processing of dynamic and static visual speech cues are carried out by similar neural substrates (Calvert & Campbell, 2003). A finding that facial somatosensory inputs modulate perception of dynamic, but not static, facial displays would indicate that the somatosensory system is especially involved in tracking time-varying characteristics of seen speech. In contrast, a finding that proprioceptive inputs modulate perception of both dynamic and static visual speech would suggest that the somatosensory system is involved in extracting configural information about the filter state of the vocal tract.

To test the specificity of somatosensory-visual interactions during phonetic perception, we also experimentally manipulated the position of subjects' lips or jaw and tested whether this affected their discrimination of two optically distinct vowel contrasts (see details below) that involve dramatic movements of either the lips or the jaw in their production. Subjects discriminated both contrasts under one of three experimental conditions: (1) normal (baseline, i.e., no oral-motor manipulation) and while holding either (2) a bite block between the upper and lower teeth or (3) a tube between the lips. If there are somatosensory-visual interactions during visual speech perception, then engaging the jaw should selectively influence (i.e., facilitate or inhibit) discrimination of gestures optically distinguished by their mandibular postures, whereas engaging

the lips should selectively influence discrimination of gestures optically distinguished by their labial postures. In addition, if engaging the articulators selectively affects how perceivers track orofacial speech movements, rather than changes in “target” mouth shapes, then there should only be an effect of condition during discrimination of the dynamic facial displays (Experiment 1), but not the static facial displays (Experiment 2). Alternatively, if engaging the articulators influences perception of both configural and time-varying phonetic information, then there should be an effect of condition across both experiments, regardless of the type of facial displays used. Yet another possibility is that simultaneously engaging the articulators during concurrent perception may simply increase attentional processing load, which in turn, will lead to a decline in overall discrimination performance, regardless of which specific articulator is activated.

2. Experiment 1

2.1 Material and Methods

2.1.1 Subjects

Forty-eight participants (11 males; age range: 18-32 yrs, mean: 21.2 yrs [$SD = 3.1$]) from Boston University completed this experiment for pay. All were native, monolingual American English speakers who reported normal hearing, normal (or corrected-to-normal) vision, and no history of speech, language or other neurological disorder.

2.1.2 Stimuli

As already mentioned, two vocalic contrasts were selected to provide maximal opportunity for observing somatosensory-visual interactions during phonetic perception. Specifically, we used close back rounded English /u/ versus French /u/, and open-mid front English /ɛ/ versus near-open front English /æ/. Previous cross-language vowel production studies (e.g., MacLeod, Stoel-Gammon & Wassink, 2009; Noiray, Cathiard, Ménard, & Abry, 2011) have demonstrated that

French speakers produce more extreme /u/ gestures, with a greater degree lip rounding (lip compression and protrusion) and tongue backness, compared to English speakers. Consequently, English /u/ and French /u/ are optically distinct in terms of their lip postures. As for the other contrast, English /ɛ/ and /æ/ gestures are optically distinct in terms of their mandibular position; the production of /æ/ involves a greater degree of jaw lowering than /ɛ/.

The stimulus vowels were produced by a native female speaker of the source languages (a simultaneous English-French bilingual speaker from Montreal, Quebec, and an English monolingual speaker from Austin, TX, respectively). We recorded both model speakers producing stop-initial CV (/gV) syllables instead of isolated vowels to facilitate cross-stimulus splicing for other bimodal (auditory-visual) vowel perception experiments. The speakers were instructed to produce clear and distinct vowels embedded at the end of the carrier phrase, “I’m going to tell you about ____.” The speakers produced multiple “runs” of each vowel; each run consisted of ten repetitions of the target vowel in the carrier phrase. The productions were audio-visually recorded using a digital camcorder (Panasonic AG-DVX100B; 29.97 frames/sec and 1,400 × 1,000 pixels; audio at 44.1 kHz) from a straight, face-on view in a sound-treated booth.

The duration, fundamental frequency (F_0), and first (F_1) and second (F_2) formant frequencies of the vowel in each of the recorded syllables were measured using Praat (Boersma & Weenink, 2019). Five different video tokens of each vowel were selected as stimuli based on their visual similarity in head position and facial expression. In addition, we selected tokens that were roughly matched in the duration of their vocalic portions. Figure 1 shows example video frames of the visible vocal tract configuration of the model speakers during the production of each vowel type (at 20%, 50% and 80% of the acoustic vowel duration). Using Adobe Premiere (San Jose,

CA), the video-only stimuli were created by removing the audio track from the AV video recordings of the model speakers' productions.

-- Insert Figure 1 about here --

2.1.3 Procedure and design

Subjects completed a categorical same-different (AX) discrimination test for each of the two vowel contrasts in a unimodal visual-only mode (see, e.g., Masapollo *et al.*, 2017, Experiment 2). The order of the two contrasts was counterbalanced to counteract potential fatigue effects. Prior to the start of each AX test, subjects were informed that they would see a speaker articulating two different types of vowels, and that their task was to try to differentiate between these two different types of vowels. They were also told that each sequence contained either two different instances of the same vowel type (same pairs) or instances of two different vowel types (different pairs). On each trial, subjects watched a sequence of two unimodal viseme tokens, and then judged whether they were the “same” or “different” by pressing one of two buttons on a response pad. For each *same* trial, different tokens of the *same* vowel type were paired (e.g., two different English /ɛ/ tokens or two different English /æ/ tokens were paired). For each *different* trial, tokens from the two *different* vowel types were paired (e.g., an English /ɛ/ token was paired with a English /æ/ token). Thus, subjects had to indicate whether pairs of physically different stimuli were members of the *same* vowel set or members of the two *different* vowel sets.

Each of the two AX tests contained 180 trials organized into two blocks. Subjects saw every possible type of pairing of the 10 tokens per stimulus set, separated by an inter-stimulus interval of 1,500-ms, in both presentation orders. Each block had 90 trials, which consisted of each possible pairing (i.e., 50 different-type trials and 40 same-type trials). Because these within-category pairs did not consist of physically identical pairings, subjects had to generalize across

small optical differences to perceptually group (or categorize) the stimuli. Several practice trials were included at the start of the experiment to confirm that subjects understood the instructions and were able to perform the task. Subjects took a short break after they completed the first AX test. No feedback was provided.

To test the specificity of a somatosensory influence on visual vowel discrimination, subjects were randomly assigned to one of three experimental conditions (16 in each): baseline without any oral-motor manipulations, with a tube inserted between the lips, or with a bite block inserted between the upper and lower teeth. The tube was intended to selectively restricted lip movements, whereas the bite block was intended to selectively restricted mandibular movements. The subjects in the lip tube condition were instructed to hold a PVC pipe (2.7-mm-diameter; 4.2-mm in length) between their lips while keeping their lips in a fixed, rounded (i.e., compressed and protruded) position. The subjects in the bite block condition were instructed to hold an athletic mouth guard (Under Armour, Baltimore, MD) between their upper and lower teeth while keeping their jaw in a fixed, closed position. Given these articulatory configurations, we hypothesized that if there is a visual-somatosensory interaction during concurrent speech perception, then engaging the lips would influence perception of the English /u/-French /u/ contrast (relative to baseline), whereas engaging the jaw would influence perception of the English /ɛ/-/æ/ contrast (relative to baseline). Subjects in the baseline group were given no explicit instruction to impede oral-facial movements, and thus were free to move their articulators in whatever spontaneous manner they chose.²

Subjects were tested individually in a quiet laboratory room that was dimly lit. The experiment was programmed using the SuperLab 5.0 software package (Cedrus Corporation, San

² Note that we did not video record the subjects while they performed the discrimination task, and, therefore, did not measure any covert vowel production-like movements that they might have produced while viewing the videos.

Pedro, CA), which controlled the presentation of the stimuli, and collected subjects' responses. The stimuli were presented on a 22-in. flat screen monitor about 0.58 m (23 in) in front of the subject.

2.1.4 Data Analysis

We employed a signal detection theory analysis to assess perceptual sensitivity; the dependent measure was A' -prime (Grier, 1971). A' is an unbiased index of discrimination performance that ranges from 0.50 (chance) to 1.0 (perfect discrimination). The following formula (from Grier, 1971) was used to compute each score: $A' = 0.5 + (H - FA)(1 + H - FA)/[4H(1 - FA)]$, where H = proportion of hits (i.e., the proportion of trials in which subjects correctly responded to a category difference between two vowel stimuli) and FA = proportion of false alarms (i.e., the proportion of trials in which subjects incorrectly responded to a category difference between two vowel stimuli). The data were used to calculate separate A' scores for each subject for each vowel contrast (English /u/-French /u/ vs. English /ɛ/-/æ/) in each experimental condition (baseline vs. lip tube vs. bite block).

2.2 Results

Subjects' mean A' scores as a function of experimental condition (baseline vs. bite block vs. lip tube) and vowel contrast (English /u/-French /u/ vs. English /ɛ/-/æ/) are presented in Figure 2. To examine whether there was a visual-somatosensory interaction during discrimination, these scores were submitted to a 3×2 mixed analysis of variance (ANOVA) with experimental condition (baseline vs. lip tube vs. bite block) as a between-subjects factor, and vowel contrast (English /u/-French /u/ vs. English /ɛ/-/æ/) as a within-subjects factor. A significant main effect of vowel contrast was observed [$F(1, 45) = 40.439, p < .001, \eta^2 = .473$], such that discrimination was better for the English /ɛ/-/æ/ contrast [mean (M) = .89, standard deviation (SD) = .06] compared to the

English /u/-French /u/ contrast [$M = .82$, $SD = .08$], likely indicating that it is easier to discriminate
a cross-category viseme contrast than a within-category viseme contrast. The effect of condition
did not reach statistical significance [$F(2, 40) = 2.744$, $p = .075$, $\eta^2 = .109$]. Critically, however,
there was a highly significant interaction between condition and vowel contrast [$F(2, 45) = 6.193$,
 $p = .004$, $\eta^2 = .216$]. Post-hoc t -tests revealed that the mean A' scores for the English /u/-French
/u/ contrast were significantly higher in the lip tube condition ($M = .87$, $SD = .05$; $t(30) = 2.905$, p
 $= .007$, *Cohen's d* = 1.09), but not in the bite block condition ($M = .80$, $SD = .08$; $t(30) = .285$, $p =$
 $.777$), when compared to baseline ($M = .79$, $SD = .09$). In contrast, the mean A' scores for the
English /ɛ/-/æ/ contrast were marginally higher in the bite block condition ($M = .92$, $SD = .05$; $t(30)$
 $= 1.921$, $p = .064$, *Cohen's d* = .74), but not in the lip tube condition ($M = .89$, $SD = .05$; $t(30) =$
 $.835$, $p = .410$), when compared to baseline ($M = .87$, $SD = .08$).³

-- Insert Figure 2 about here --

2.3 Discussion

The results of Experiment 1 revealed an interaction between vowel contrast and experimental
condition. Subjects who held a tube in their mouths showed enhanced discrimination of the vocalic
gestures that were visually distinguished by their degree of lip movements when compared to
baseline. In contrast, subjects who held a bite block in their mouths showed enhanced
discrimination of the vocalic gestures that were visually distinguished by their degree of jaw
movements when compared to baseline. Thus, engaging the lips or jaw led to heightened
discrimination of visible speech movements involving the concordant articulator during
perception.

³ See Supplementary Materials for further details regarding analyses of stimulus order effects (see, e.g., Masapollo *et al.*, 2018).

This facilitation effect is broadly consistent with other findings described earlier that silently articulating syllables enhances identification of concordant syllables specified acoustically (Sams *et al.*, 2005; Sato *et al.*, 2013). Although our subjects were not instructed to produce phonetic gestures during concurrent perception, they still had to internally control the shape, position and motion of their articulators in response to the present manipulations while watching the two model speakers talk. Furthermore, because they were perceiving speech under impoverished conditions (i.e., they had to decode the speech signal in the absence of acoustic cues), our subjects may have been mentally simulating the sensory consequences of moving their lips or jaw to help discriminate the visual stimuli. Such an account would be consistent with the AxS perspective on speech perception, which posits that the generation of an internal model improves perceptual processing of a concordant speech stimulus (i.e., a facilitatory priming effect), especially when the speech signal is ambiguous or degraded (Skipper *et al.*, 2007; Sato *et al.*, 2013).

However, a much simpler interpretation of these results can be offered: the present manipulations may have biased attention toward properties of the environment that were congruent with the actions being performed. In other words, activating the lip muscles with the lip tube may have selectively biased attention toward perceived visible lip actions, whereas activating the jaw muscles with the bite block may have selectively biased attention toward perceived visible jaw actions. Moreover, it could be that it was not perception of the kinematic information itself that was affected by engaging the articulators. Perhaps these manipulations were instead affecting perception of static facial features (i.e., mouth shapes) rather than dynamic facial motion. Experiment 2 was conducted to address these competing accounts.

3 Experiment 2

Experiment 2 was designed to achieve two goals. The first goal was to test whether the effect of engaging the articulators enhanced perceivers' ability to track visually perceived speech *movements* or changes in visible vocal tract *position and configuration*, independent of a kinematic form. Toward this end, we investigated whether identical manipulations would influence perception of stilled speech. Our logic was as follows: If engaging the articulators facilitated perception of subtle changes in vocal tract posture, then we should observe effects comparable to those observed in Experiment 1 when the dynamically articulating visemes are replaced with stilled speech face image sequences. Specifically, the two oral-motor manipulations should each lead to better discrimination of images depicting static vocalic gestures produced with the *concordant* articulator compared with images of gestures produced with a different articulator. If, on the other hand, the manipulations facilitated perception of concordant orofacial speech *movements*, then we should fail to elicit such effects during the discrimination of resting face images showing the same differences in "target" (i.e., movement end-point) lip and jaw position.

The second goal of Experiment 2 was to rule out the possibility that articulator activation simply biases attention toward that articulator during concurrent face perception. If this is the case, then the manipulations used in Experiment 1 should lead to the same overall pattern of results, because controlling the posture of an articulator should bias attention toward that articulator while viewing another person's face, regardless of whether it has a motion path.

3.1 Material and Methods

3.1.1 Subjects

Forty-seven participants (15 males; age range: 18-31 yrs, mean: 21.6 yrs [$SD = 3.0$]) from Boston University completed this experiment. All were native, monolingual American English speakers

who reported normal hearing and normal (or corrected-to-normal) vision. The experiment took approximately one hour, and subjects were paid for their participation.

3.1.2 Stimuli

The stimuli consisted of static single-frame images of the model speakers' visible vocal tract configuration during the production of the two vowel contrasts. The stimuli were created by taking a screen shot of the visual vowel tokens at vowel midpoint (see Figure 1, center panels). The images were presented for an equal amount of time as the corresponding video tokens in Experiment 1. Thus, any differences in task performance could not be attributed to an effect of shorter stimulus presentation.

3.1.3 Procedure and design

The experimental protocol for Experiment 2 matched the procedures used in Experiment 1, except that subjects were instructed to discriminate static images depicting vocalic gestures, as opposed to dynamically articulating videos, of the model speakers producing the two different vowel contrasts.

3.1.4 Data Analysis

As in Experiment 1, the dependent variable was the mean A' score (see calculation details above) averaged across subjects for each vowel contrast (English /u/-French /u/ vs. English /ε/-/æ/) in each experimental condition (baseline vs. lip tube vs. bite block).

3.2 Results

The critical question in Experiment 2 was whether engaging the lips or jaw would boost concurrent visual discrimination of *stilled* phonetic gestures produced with the concordant articulator compared to those produced with the discordant articulator. To address this question, we examined subjects' mean A' scores for each experimental condition as a function of vowel contrast, which

are displayed in Figure 3. These scores were submitted to an ANOVA with experimental condition (baseline vs. lip-tube vs. bite-block) as a between-subjects factor, and vowel contrast (English /u/-French /u/ vs. English /ε/-/æ/) as a within-subjects factor. A significant main effect of vowel contrast was observed [$F(1, 44) = 35.899, p < .001, \eta^2 = .449$], such that discrimination was again better for the English /ε/-/æ/ contrast [$M = .92, SD = .04$] compared to the English /u/-French /u/ contrast [$M = .86, SD = .06$]. Critically, however, there was no significant main effect of condition [$F(2, 44) = .012, p = .998, \eta^2 = .001$] or interaction between condition and vowel contrast [$F(2, 44) = 1.309, p = .280, \eta^2 = .056$].⁴⁴

-- Insert Figure 3 about here --

In a second analysis, task performance was directly compared across Experiments 1 and 2. Mean A' scores were submitted to a three-way ANOVA with experiments (1 vs. 2) and condition (baseline vs. lip-tube vs. bite-block) as between-subjects factors, and vowel contrast (English /u/-French /u/ vs. English /ε/-/æ/) as a within-subjects factor. A significant main effect of experiment was observed [$F(1, 88) = 7.860, p = .006, \eta^2 = .082$], such that overall task performance was better in Experiment 2 [$M = .89, SD = .04$] compared to Experiment 1 [$M = .86, SD = .05$]. This is perhaps unsurprising given that direct visual comparisons of the visemes may have been made easier by the removal of the oral-facial kinematic cues (see also, Masapollo *et al.*, 2018). As in Experiment 1, a highly significant main effect of vowel contrast was also observed [$F(1, 88) = 55.525, p < .001, \eta^2 = .387$], such that discrimination was better for the English /ε/-/æ/ contrast [$M = .91, SD = .05$] compared to the English /u/-French /u/ contrast [$M = .84, SD = .07$]. There was one significant interaction, the three-way experiment $\times$ condition $\times$ vowel contrast interaction

⁴ See Supplementary Materials for further details regarding analyses of stimulus order effects (see, e.g., Masapollo *et al.*, 2018).

[$F(2, 88) = 4.175, p = .019, \eta^2 = .087$]. There were no other reliable main effects or interactions ($p > .135$, in all instances).

3.3 Discussion

The results of Experiment 2 suggest that the oral-motor manipulations in Experiment 1 affected subjects' perception of *time-varying kinematic* information in talking faces, rather than visible changes in “target” mouth shapes. When dynamic facial cues were not present, these manipulations did not facilitate perception of visemes produced with the concordant articulator compared to those produced with the discordant articulator.⁵ Thus, the present manipulations appear to affect perceptual mechanisms that operate on dynamic visual-facial motion information. Finally, these findings are also inconsistent with the hypothesis that articulator activation generally biased visual attention toward that articulator during concurrent face perception.

4. General Discussion

In the present research, we investigated whether and how somatosensory inputs from the vocal tract influence perception of *visual* speech. Recent studies (Ito *et al.*, 2009; Bruderer *et al.*, 2015) have provided evidence that manipulating the configuration and/or motion of the articulators shifts or constrains perception of some *acoustic* properties of speech. The present experiments extend this work by providing the first evidence, to our knowledge, that engaging the articulators also influences perception of dynamic visual information in talking faces. Specifically, we found in Experiment 1 that engaging the lip muscles facilitated perception of concordant vocalic gestures optically distinct in terms of their degree of lip rounding (English /u/ – French /ʊ/), whereas engaging

⁵ The finding that the present oral-motor manipulations did not influence the perception of static visual speech may be indirectly related to other findings showing that the acoustic and visual information for speech perception includes dynamic (time-varying) information (such as formant transitions and oral facial kinematic patterns) as well as static “target” information (e.g., Strange, 1989; Viswanathan, Magnuson, & Fowler, 2014; Masapollo *et al.*, 2018; Masapollo, Zhao, Franklin & Morgan, 2019).

the jaw muscles facilitated perception of concordant vocalic gestures optically distinct in terms of their degree of jaw lowering (English /ɛ/ – English /æ/). By comparison, in Experiment 2, when the dynamically-articulating visemes were shown under static conditions, those same oral-motor manipulations had no effect on discrimination performance. Thus, when the configuration and motion of the vocal tract is constrained, the perception of *time-varying* concordant visual speech movements is systematically affected, rather than perception of “target,” movement-endpoint mouth shapes.

Taken together, these findings are inconsistent with the hypothesis that increased attentional load (or other task-related processing load) associated with the present oral-motor manipulations would lead to a decline in overall discrimination performance, regardless of which specific articulator was being engaged. Rather, these findings serve to further bolster previous claims that during speech processing, perceivers analyze segmentally-relevant information in relations to one’s own vocal tract and ability to act (Sams *et al.*, 2005; Ito *et al.*, 2009; Sato *et al.*, 2013; Bruderer *et al.*, 2015). Manipulating the configuration and motion of the articulators had a consequence on how our subjects processed dynamic visual articulatory information. Specifically, subjects showed heightened discrimination of vocalic visemes that were congruent with the intrinsic *motor properties* of the articulator being engaged. Consistent with the AxS perspective on speech perception (Stevens, 1960, 2002; Skipper *et al.*, 2007; Kuhl *et al.*, 2014), these results may be interpreted as evidence that somatosensory feedback from the articulators may “prime” pre-motor, primary motor, and somatosensory brain regions involved in the sensorimotor control of speech, thereby facilitating perception of concurrent speech movements via an efference copy from the motor system.

The present findings may also be related to the finding that when transcranial magnetic stimulation is applied to parts of the primary motor cortex controlling the lips or tongue during concurrent auditory speech perception, it facilitates identification of labial /b/, /p/ or dental /d/, /t/ stop consonants (D-Ausilio, Pulvermuller, Salams, Bufalari, Begliomini, & Fadiga, 2009). That is, the “priming” of a motor representation for a given phoneme seems to bias perceptual judgments toward the congruent articulation. D-Ausilio and colleagues argued that such findings are compatible with the motor theory of speech perception (Galantucci *et al.*, 2006), which posits that the motor system is recruited during speech perception and that the “object” of perception is articulatory or gestural in nature. However, we would like to suggest an alternative interpretation of these findings from the perspective of the DIVA model of speech production (Guenther, 2016). According to this model, during the planning and execution of speech movements, neurons in ventral motor cortex send inputs to neurons in auditory cortex (i.e., Heschl’s gyrus, posterior superior temporal gyrus) which encode the time-varying sensory expectations associated with those movements. Such inputs would allow speakers to effectively monitor their own self-generated auditory feedback for production errors. Consistent with this idea, Wise, Greene, Buchel, and Scott (1999) found, using positron emission tomography (PET) methods, reduced superior temporal gyrus activations during speech production compared to a passive listening task. This account would seem to reinforce our interpretation of the present findings, as well as those reported by D-Ausilio *et al.* (2009). That is, speech perception might be selectively affected by the concurrent activation of the motor system because, by activating the motor programs for speech, the motor system affects the neural activity of the perceptual system (via an efference copy).

While it is tempting to conclude on the basis of the present results that engaging the articulators enhanced perception of concordant visible speech movements, this conclusion may still need to be qualified. An alternative interpretation is that the present manipulations affected higher-level cognitive processes (e.g., phonetic categorization) rather than low-level sensory discrimination *per se*. Theoretical accounts that focus on explicating the role of particular task demands on speech perception, such as those of Werker and Tees (1983), Macmillan, Goldberg and Braida (1988), and more recently Strange (2011), propose that when an experimental task places greater demands on verbal working memory, subjects often “label” stimuli in terms of their distance from salient (or “easy-to-remember”) reference points within perceptual space. By this account, working memory fades quickly, and when the ISI is increased perceivers must encode stimuli in terms of phonetic categories to complete the task. Consistent with this view, Pisoni (1973) found that sensitivity to auditory vowel stimuli within a phoneme category was higher at shorter inter-stimulus intervals (ISIs) compared to longer ISIs, purportedly because it was easier for listeners to compare acoustic details when the amount of time that each stimulus was stored in memory was shorter (cf. Werker & Logan, 1985). It is possible, then, that the subjects tested in the present experiments were interpreting the stimuli in terms of discrete labels in “face space” due to the memory demands imposed by the relatively long ISI (i.e., 1,500 ms). Thus, it is not entirely clear from the foregoing results whether the oral-motor manipulations affected perceptual processes or working memory and phonetic categorization processes.

Moreover, it is unknown whether the present manipulations influence speech processing *across sensory modalities*. It could be that the facilitation/priming effect observed in Experiment 1 is limited to the visual domain. Evidence substantiating this hypothesis comes from an fMRI study (Skipper *et al.*, 2005) showing that the presence of visual speech movements modulated

activity in brain regions associated with speech production and proprioception, presumably because the optical signal provides more direct information about the configuration and motion of some articulators. That visual speech cues influence BOLD activity in motor and somatosensory cortices above and beyond auditory speech cues alone (Matchin *et al.*, 2014) raises the possibility that the facilitation effect observed for visual vowel perception will not generalize to auditory vowel perception.

Alternatively, the present manipulations may enhance perceivers' ability to track and extract dynamic articulatory information reflected in both the acoustic and optical speech signals. Consistent with this view, other studies already discussed have reported that the shape and/or motion paths of the articulators influences concurrent auditory speech perception (Ito *et al.*, 2009; Bruderer *et al.*, 2015). A finding that the present manipulations also enhance perception of unimodal auditory-only vowels would be compatible with the direct realist perspective of speech perception, which posit that auditory and visual information jointly specify distal vocal tract gestures and that articulatory information is detected in each modality (e.g., Fowler, 2004; Galantucci, Fowler & Turvey, 2006; Best, Goldstein, Nam, & Tyler, 2016; Masapollo *et al.*, 2017, 2018).

In sum, the present findings provide evidence that manipulating the configuration and motion of the articulators influences concurrent perception of visible articulatory movements. Somatosensory inputs from the vocal tract selectively enhanced perception of concordant phonetic gestures. These findings increase our understanding of perception-action linkages for speech by showing that perception involves processes that relate visual articulatory information to the perceiver's current vocal tract posture and potential for action. Such findings have important

494 implications for theories of speech production and perception, which must explicate the nature of
495 the complex interplay between the articulatory-motor and speech perception systems.

496 **Acknowledgements**

497 We are grateful to Barbara Holland and Farwa Faheem for assistance with subject recruitment,
498 data collection and analysis. This work benefited from helpful discussions with, or comments
499 from, Julia Irwin, David Ostry, Linda Polka, Henny Yeung, Lauren Franklin, Christina Zhao, Janet
500 Werker, and members of the audience at the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Society for the
501 Neurobiology of Language.

References

- Abur, D., Lester-Smith, R.A., Daliri, A., Lupiani, A.A., Guenther, F.H., & Stepp, C.E. (2018). Sensorimotor adaptation of voice fundamental frequency in Parkinson's disease. *PLoS ONE*, 13(1): e0191839. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0191839>
- Best, C. T., Goldstein, L. M., Nam, H., & Tyler, M. D. (2016). Articulating what infants attune to in native speech. *Ecological Psychology*, 28, 216–261.
- Bruderer, A.G., Danielson, D.K., Kandhadai, P., & Werker, J.F. (2015). Sensorimotor influences on speech perception in infancy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(44), 13531-13536.
- Cai, S., Beal, D.S., Ghosh, S.S., Tiede, M.K., Guenther, F.H., & Perkell, J.S. (2012). Weak responses to auditory feedback perturbation during articulation in persons who stutter: Evidence for abnormal auditory-motor transformation. *PLoS One*, 7(7), e41830. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0041830
- Calvert, G. A., & Campbell, R. (2003). Reading speech from still and moving faces: The neural substrates of visible speech. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 15, 57–70.
- D-Ausilio, A., Pulvermuller, F., Salams, P., Bufalari, I., Begliomini, C., & Fadiga, L. (2009). The motor somatotopy of speech perception. *Current Biology*, 19(5), 381-385.
- Fowler, C. A. (2004). Speech as a supramodal or amodal phenomenon. In G. A. Calvert, C. Spence, & B. E. Stein (Eds.), *The handbook of multisensory processes* (pp. 189–201). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Galantucci, B., Fowler, C.A., & Turvey, M.T. (2006). The motor theory of speech perception reviewed. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 13(3), 361-377.
- Galantucci, B., Fowler, C.A., & Goldstein, L. (2009). Perceptuomotor compatibility effects in

525 speech. *Attention, Perception & Psychophysics*, 71(5), 1138-1149.

526 Golfinopoulos, E., Tourville, J.A., Bohland, J.W., Ghosh, S.S., & Guenther, F.H. (2011). fMRI
 527 of unexpected somatosensory feedback perturbation during speech. *NeuroImage*, 55, 1324-
 528 1338.

529 Grier, J.B. (1971). Nonparametric indexes for sensitivity and bias: computing formulas.
 530 *Psychological Bulletin*, 75, 424-429.

531 Guenther, F.H. (2016). *Neural Control of Speech*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

532 Hickok, G., Houde, J., & Rong, F. (2011). Sensorimotor integration in speech processing:
 533 computational basis and neural organization. *Neuron*, 69, 407-422.

534 Hickok, G. & Poeppel, D. "How do chinchillas, pigeons, and infants perceive speech? Another
 535 Comment on Skipper et al." *Talking Brains*, 18 Nov. 2016,
 536 <http://www.talkingbrains.org/2016/11/how-do-chinchillas-pigeons-and-infants.html>

537 Houde, J.F., & Jordan, M.I. (1998). Sensorimotor adaptation in speech production. *Science*, 279,
 538 1213-1216.

539 Ito, T., Tiede, M., & Ostry, D.J. (2009). Somatosensory function in speech
 540 perception. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106 (4), 1245-1248.

541 Kuhl, P. K., Ramirez, R., Bosseler, A., Lin, J.-F., & Imada, T. (2014). Infants' brain responses to
 542 speech suggest Analysis by Synthesis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
 543 111, 11238-11245.

544 MacDonald, E.N, Johnson, E.K., Forsythe, J., Plante, P., & Munhall, K.G. (2012). Children's
 545 development of self-regulation in speech production. *Current Biology*, 22, 113-117.

546 Macmillan, N.A., Goldberg, R.F., & Braid, L.D. (1988). Resolution for speech sounds:
 547 Basic sensitivity and context memory on vowel and consonant continua. *Journal*

548 of the Acoustical Society of America, 84, 1262-1280.

549 Masapollo, M., Polka, L., & Ménard, L. (2017). A universal bias in vowel perception – by ear or
550 by eye. *Cognition*, 166, 358-370.

551 Masapollo, M., Polka, L., Ménard, L., Franklin, L., Tiede, M., & Morgan, J.L. (2018).
552 Asymmetries in unimodal visual vowel perception: The roles of oral-facial kinematics,
553 orientation and configuration. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception*
554 *and Performance*, 44(7), 1103-1118.

555 Masapollo, M., Zhao, T.C., Franklin, L., & Morgan, J.L. (2019). Asymmetric discrimination
556 of non-speech tonal analogues of vowels. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human*
557 *Perception and Performance*, 45(2), 285-300.

558 Matchin, W., Groulx, K. & Hickok, G. (2014). Audiovisual speech integration does
559 not rely on the motor system: evidence from articulatory suppression, the McGurk
560 effect, and fMRI. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 26 (3), 606-620.

561 Mollaei, F., Shiller, D.M., Baum S.R., & Gracco, V.L. (2016). Sensorimotor control of vocal
562 pitch and formant frequencies in Parkinson’s disease. *Brain Research*, 1646, 269-277.

563 Nasir, S.M., & Ostry, D.J. (2006). Somatosensory precision in speech production. *Current*
564 *Biology*, 16:1918–1923.

565 Pisoni, D. (1973). Auditory and phonetic memory codes in the discrimination of consonants and
566 vowels. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 13(2), 253-260.

567 Rosenblum, L. D. (2005). The primacy of multimodal speech perception. In D. Pisoni & R. Remez
568 (Eds.), *Handbook of speech perception* (pp. 51–78). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

569 Sams, M., Mottonen, R., Sihvonen, T. (2005). Seeing and hearing others and oneself talk.
570 *Cognitive Brain Research*, 23, 429-435.

571 Sato, M., Troille, E., Ménard, L., Cathiard, M.-A., & Gracco, V.L. (2013). Silent articulation
572 modulates auditory and audiovisual speech perception. *Experimental Brain Research*,
573 227(2), 275-288.

574 Skipper, J.I., van Wassenhove, V., Nusbaum, H.C., & Small, S.L. (2007). Hearing lips and seeing
575 voices: how cortical areas supporting speech production mediate audiovisual speech
576 perception. *Cerebral Cortex*, 17(1), 2387-2399.

577 Stevens, K.N. (1960). Toward a model for speech recognition. *Journal of the Acoustical Society*
578 *of America*, 32, 47-55.

579 Stevens, K.N. (2002). Toward a model for lexical access based on acoustic landmarks and
580 distinctive features. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 111(4), 1872-1891.

581 Strange, W. (1989). Evolving theories of vowel perception. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of*
582 *America*, 85(5), 2081–2087.

583 Strange, W. (2011). Automatic selective perception (ASP) of first and second language speech: a
584 working model. *Journal of Phonetics*, 39, 456-466.

585 Stuart, A., Kalinowski, J., Rastatter, M.P., & Lynch, K. (2002). Effect of delayed auditory
586 feedback on normal speakers at two speech rates. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of*
587 *America*, 111, 2237–2241.

588 Sundara M, Namasivayam AK, Chen R. (2001). Observation-execution matching system for
589 speech: a magnetic stimulation study. *NeuroReport*, 12(7):1341–1344.

590 Tremblay, S., Shiller, D.M., & Ostry, D.J. (2003). Somatosensory basis of speech production.
591 *Nature*, 423, 866-869.

592 Villacorta, V.M., Perkell, J.S., & Guenther, F.H. (2007). Sensorimotor adaptation to feedback

593 perturbation of vowel acoustic and its relation to perception. *Journal of the Acoustical*
594 *Society of America*, 122(4), 2306-2319.

595 Viswanathan, N., Magnuson, J.S., & Fowler, C.A. (2014). Information for coarticulation: static
596 signal properties or formant dynamics? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human*
597 *Perception and Performance*, 40(3): 1228-1236.

598 Werker, J.F., & Tees, R.C. (1983). Phonemic and phonetic factors in adult cross-language
599 speech perception. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 75(6), 1866-1878.

600 Werker, J.F., & Logan, J.S. (1985). Cross-language evidence for three factors in speech
601 perception. *Perception and Psychophysics*, 37, 35-44.

602 Wise, R.J., Greene, J., Buchel, C., & Skott, S.K. (1999). Brain regions involved in articulation.
603 *Lancet*, 353, 1057-1061.

604 Yeung, H.H. & Werker, J.F. (2013). Lip movements affect infants' audiovisual speech
605 perception. *Psychological Science*, 24 (5), 603-612.

Figure captions

Figure 1: Sample images of the model speakers' visible vocal tract configuration during the production of each vocalic gesture at 20%, 50% and 80% of vowel duration. Note that, in Experiment 2, the stimuli only consisted of static (single-frame) images of the talking faces taken at 50% of vowel duration (as shown in the center panels). As the images show, French /u/ is executed with a greater degree of visible lip compression and protrusion, and English /æ/ is implemented with a lower mandibular position than English /ε/.

Figure 2: Perceptual sensitivity (mean A' scores) to dynamically-articulating visemes (Experiment 1) as a function of experimental condition (baseline vs. bite block vs. lip tube) and vowel contrast. Chance performance ($A' = 0.5$) is shown by the black horizontal line.

Figure 3: Perceptual sensitivity (mean A' scores) to stilled facial speech images (Experiment 2) as a function of experimental condition (baseline vs. bite block vs. lip tube) and vowel contrast. Chance performance ($A' = 0.5$) is shown by the black horizontal line.