Task-specific iconic gesturing during spoken discourse in aphasia

Brielle C. Stark, PhD & Caroline Cofoid, B.A.

Indiana University Bloomington

Department of Speech, Language and Hearing Sciences

200 S Jordan Avenue, Bloomington IN 47405 USA

Corresponding author:

Brielle C. Stark, PhD

bcstark@iu.edu

Neither author has a conflict of interest.

There is no funding to report for this work.

Abstract

Purpose: In persons living with aphasia, we will explore the relationship between iconic gesture production during spontaneous speech and discourse task, spoken language, and demographic information.

Method: Employing the AphasiaBank database, we coded iconic gestures in N=75 speakers with aphasia during two spoken discourse tasks: a procedural narrative, which involved participants telling the experimenter how to make a sandwich (“Sandwich”), and a picture sequence narrative, which had participants describe the picture sequence to the experimenter (“Window”). N=43 produced a gesture during both tasks, and we further evaluate data from this subgroup as a more direct comparison between tasks.

Results: More iconic gestures, at a higher rate, were produced during the procedural narrative. For both tasks, there was a relationship between iconic gesture rate, modeled as iconic gestures per word, and metrics of language dysfluency extracted from the discourse task, and a metric of fluency extracted from a standardized battery. Iconic gesture production was correlated with aphasia duration, which was driven by performance during only a single task (Window), but not with other demographic metrics, such as aphasia severity or age. We also provide preliminary evidence for task differences shown through the lens of two types of iconic gestures.

Conclusions: Whilst speech-language pathologists have utilized gesture in therapy for post-stroke aphasia, due to its possible facilitatory role in spoken language, there has been considerably less work in understanding how gesture differs across naturalistic tasks, and how we can best utilize this information to better assess gesture in aphasia, and improve multimodal treatment for aphasia. Further, our results contribute to gesture theory, in particular about the role of gesture across naturalistic tasks, and its relationship with spoken language.

Introduction

Gesture is a powerful tool that accompanies and, sometimes, replaces speech. Gestures lie along a continuum (Kendon's Continuum; McNeil, 1992), ranging from gestures with no linguistic association, to gestures associated with speech ('language-like gestures'), to gestures conveying meaning in the absence of speech ('pantomimes'), and gestures holding independent status as symbolic forms ('emblems,' e.g., the "OK" sign).

Gesturing in Aphasia

In the case of persons living with acquired aphasia – a language disorder – gesturing may serve a particularly communicative purpose, as a means of compensating for spoken language difficulties or, indeed, as a mechanism to overcome word finding difficulties (reminiscent of what Luria termed inter-systemic reorganization (Luria, 1970) (Dipper et al., 2015; Hadar & Butterworth, 1997; Krauss, 1998; Rose & Douglas, 2001). There is emerging evidence that people with aphasia use gestures to accompany/be redundant with (Kong et al., 2017) or supplement (e.g., disambiguate, add) (Dipper et al., 2015) speech. The relationship between language and gesture has also been explored in neurotypical populations, more often finding that gesture is redundant with speech (Dargue et al., 2019; Holle & Gunter, 2007; Hostetter, 2011; Kelly et al., 1999).

In this study, we focus on iconic gestures. Iconic gestures are language-like gestures which are related to the content of speech and have a form (e.g., motion, hand-shape, location) that is related to this content; they typically are not meaningful in the absence of speech (Hadar & Butterworth, 1997). Iconic gestures are highly common in aphasia. Indeed, a study in N=95 persons with aphasia demonstrated that all subjects employed at least one type of iconic gesture during a fictional story retell (Cinderella story), further emphasizing reliance on iconic gesture to convey, disambiguate,

or add meaning during discourse by persons with otherwise impoverished spoken language (Sekine & Rose, 2013b).

Theories of Gesture's Relationship with Language in Aphasia

There are several theories that have been used to describe gesture use in aphasia. The Sketch model suggests that, when gesturing gets harder, speakers will rely relatively more on speech, and, alternatively, that when speaking gets harder, speakers will rely relatively more on gestures (de Ruiter et al., 2012; de Ruiter, 2006). This theory shares similarities with Growth Point theory, which postulates that gesture and language share pre-linguistic conceptual stage resources before diverging – with language taking a linguistic path, and gesture a motoric one (McNeil, 1992). Broadly, these theories fit with evidence comparing iconic gesture usage in aphasia to gesture usage in matched samples of persons without aphasia, finding almost always that persons with aphasia gesture more often whilst also producing less speech (Sekine & Rose, 2013b). In an alternative hypothesis, the Lexical Retrieval hypothesis, gestures are thought to directly facilitate lexical retrieval processes (Krauss, 1998; Krauss & Hadar, 2001). Iconic gestures, in particular, are thought to originate in the processes that precede conceptualization / formulation of the preverbal message, and as such can precede even in cases of blockages or damage to later stages. Importantly, this theory hypothesizes that the imagistic information from iconic gesture may facilitate lexical retrieval by “defining the conceptual input to the semantic lexicon; by maintaining a set of core features while reselecting a lexical entry; and by means of directly activating phonological word-forms” (Hadar & Butterworth, 1997). Indeed, iconic gesturing has been shown to improve object naming (Rose & Douglas, 2001) and occur alongside word finding problems (Kong et al., 2015a; Pritchard et al., 2013).

Notably, gesture is also thought to reflect underlying thoughts and knowledge not verbalized in speech (Church & Goldin-Meadow, 1986; Goldin-Meadow & Alibali, 2013), which allow persons with aphasia to communicate and demonstrate competence despite a language production barrier.

The Relationship of Iconic Gesture with Spoken Language Fluency

Not surprisingly, given the theories above, language dysfluency is thought to correlate with greater gesture use in aphasia. Most research evaluating the relationship between language dysfluency and iconic gesture in aphasia use has focused on the differing frequency of iconic gesture use stratified by aphasia type. That is, a comparison of iconic gesturing in persons with non-fluent as compared to fluent aphasia (a dichotomous type of fluency classification), or a comparison of iconic gesturing in persons with aphasia types based on standardized testing batteries (i.e., a classificationist type of fluency classification, e.g., Broca's, Conduction, Wernicke's). In general, this research has been mixed, with some studies finding significantly more iconic gesture use in non-fluent populations, primarily Broca's aphasia (Goldblum, 1978; Hadar, 1991; but see, Cicone et al., 1979) whilst other studies have observed a high incidence of iconic gestures across all aphasia types (Feyereisen, 1983; Sekine & Rose, 2013a).

Cicone et al. (1979) found that people with non-fluent aphasia produced fewer gestures (yet these were clear and informative), which contrasted with the frequent gestures produced by people with fluent aphasia, which were vague. In a relatively large sample of people with aphasia completing a story retell task, people with Broca's aphasia (a type of non-fluent aphasia) produced overall more gestures, and were more likely to produce iconic gestures (Sekine & Rose, 2013b). In a single case study of a person with conduction aphasia (a type of fluent aphasia), it was found that, when recounting a cartoon, the individual with conduction aphasia produced more iconic

gestures than a comparison sample of controls during word searching behavior (Pritchard et al., 2013). Interestingly, this individual produced a similar frequency of iconic gestures compared with control participants when the person with aphasia was producing fluent, errorless language. In a larger sample of persons with aphasia and matched controls, iconic gestures were produced in similar frequencies and forms by both groups, but the aphasia group utilized iconic gestures alongside their otherwise semantically impoverished language (Pritchard et al., 2015). Whilst this evidence seems relatively straightforward (emphasizing the use of more gestures, in particular iconic type, by persons with non-fluent and/or Broca's aphasia), some studies have provided alternative findings. For example, one study found that persons with Wernicke's aphasia (a fluent type) produce more iconic gestures per unit of time (Carlomagno & Cristilli, 2006).

Overall, it is difficult to draw conclusions based on iconic gesture frequency and rate by evaluations leveraging aphasia type because of the vast intra-group differences in language ability *within* aphasia types (Dalton & Richardson, 2019; Stark & Fukuyama, 2020). For example, iconic gestures likely rely on some intact pre-linguistic components, such as pre-linguistic conceptual knowledge (Hadar & Butterworth, 1997). Some persons with Wernicke's aphasia can present with impoverished pre-linguistic conceptual ability, whilst other persons with Wernicke's aphasia can present with relatively intact pre-linguistic conceptual ability (Kertesz, 2007). This makes drawing overarching conclusions about gesture usage stratified by aphasia type inherently difficult and, perhaps, not meaningful.

Instead, evaluations of gesture use, in particular iconic gesture use, may be more sensitively investigated by evaluating the relationship of gesture with metrics of language derived from the task itself (e.g., dysfluencies), and with some extra-task metric of fluency that provides a category or metric of fluency, as opposed to an aphasia type. Restricting gesture use in neurotypical adults

has demonstrated reduced speech fluency, measured by an association of gesture use (or non-use) with time spent pausing, number of words, number of pauses, mean pause length, and number of hesitations (Graham & Heywood, 1975), with relative frequency of non-juncture filled pauses in speech with spatial content (Rauscher et al., 1996), and with a slower speech rate (Morsella & Krauss, 2004). A study by Kong et al. (2015) evaluated N=48 Cantonese speaking persons with aphasia, comparing gesture use with several linguistic measures produced during narrative tasks, including type-token ratio, percentage of simple utterances, percentage of complete utterances, and percentage of dysfluency (defined as repetitions of words or syllables, sound prolongations, pauses, self-corrections, and interjections, as a proportion of total utterances). Those who tended to produce higher numbers of gestures were also those who demonstrated a higher proportion of dysfluencies, and a lower number of complete and simple utterances. There was not a significant difference between high/low gesture groups in regards to lexical diversity (type-token ratio) (Kong et al., 2015). A more recent study by Kong et al. (2017) further emphasized the relationship between dysfluency and gesture use in Cantonese speakers with aphasia, finding that percentages of complete sentences and dysfluency strongly predicted the gesturing rate in aphasia. Both Kong et al. (2015, 2017) and other studies evaluating language dysfluency's relationship with gesture in aphasia (e.g., Sekine & Rose, 2013b) have collapsed across gesture types, so further work evaluating iconic gesture's relationship with language dysfluency in aphasia is warranted.

The Role of Task in Gesture Use

While the literature has made clear that iconic gestures are heavily used in aphasia, there exist critical gaps. The primary gap targeted by our project is on task-specificity of iconic gesture use in aphasia. Most studies evaluating iconic gesture in aphasia have focused on gesturing during a single narrative task (e.g., fictional story retell) (Kistner et al., 2019; Pritchard et al., 2015; Sekine

& Rose, 2013a). However, restricting evaluation of iconic gestures to a single narrative task likely lends us an impoverished understanding of how, when and why iconic gestures are employed in naturalistic contexts. For example, speakers (without aphasia) gesture more when a task is cognitively or linguistically complex (Kita & Davies, 2009). Indeed, evidence from participants with amnesia and healthy comparison participants suggest that both subject groups gesture at lower rates during procedural discourse tasks compared to autobiographical/episodic narratives, likely because autobiographical/episodic narratives reflect rich episodic details (Hilverman et al., 2016a). Persons with aphasia have also been shown to use more iconic gestures during a cartoon narration task compared with a spontaneous conversation (de Beer et al., 2019), supporting the Gesture as Simulated Action framework, which predicts that speakers gesture more when speech is based on imagery (Hostetter & Alibali, 2019).

Evaluating task effects is clinically and theoretically meaningful. It is well acknowledged that spoken language is task-specific, i.e., that the microlinguistic and functional (macrostructural) aspects of spoken language shift according to task demands (Dalton & Richardson, 2019; Li et al., 1996; Shadden et al., 1990; Stark, 2019a; Ulatowska et al., 1981). For that reason, it is best practice to employ a variety of tasks to most comprehensively evaluate spoken language ability (Brookshire & Nicholas, 1994; Stark, 2019a). It follows that employing a variety of tasks to assess a person's co-speech gesturing is important.

Further, evaluating the extent to which task influences gesture can lend valuable information toward planning treatment, e.g., provide information to the clinician regarding typical gesture use, as well as atypical or inaccurate gesture use at a task-specific level. Presently, gesture-based or gesture-integrative therapies are few, and these therapies have largely not resulted in significant improvement in spoken language in aphasia (Rose et al., 2013). One such reason may be our lack

of understanding about task-specific gesturing. Therefore, directly comparing gesture use between tasks in the same person will allow us to understand gesture use more sensitively and comprehensively, as well as the relationship between task and gesture. Doing so in naturalistic tasks can also lend critical insight about how gesture is used in a spontaneously communicative sense, rather than in a more heavily constrained or structured task. Finally, if we can understand the extent to which gestures are produced across a range of naturalistic tasks in aphasia, and how these gestures relate to spoken language competency, we can more accurately formulate predictive hypotheses regarding language recovery. For example, we can answer clinically critical questions like: to what extent does iconic gesturing during narrative in the acute phase of aphasia predict communicative success in the chronic stage of aphasia (or indeed, predict in which individual's aphasia will resolve)?

Evaluating task-specific gesturing also has critical importance for theories related to gesture use in typical populations, as well as those with language impairments. Some discourse tasks employ pictures, which in turn may facilitate different patterns of gesturing—for example, a trend toward more concrete/deictic gestures, rather than iconic gestures. In tandem, picture-oriented tasks may elicit more nouns and simpler language structure than other tasks (Stark, 2019a). For speakers with more severe aphasia, certain tasks can elicit more spoken output than less structured tasks (Stark & Fukuyama, 2020). It is therefore of interest to compare gesture usage across tasks with varying cognitive and linguistic complexity, and to evaluate the interaction between gesture production, task, and the linguistic and cognitive characteristics of speakers. For example, iconic gesturing may be used more often, and with a greater success rate, when tasks do not involve other visual stimuli (e.g., picture descriptions), as iconic gestures may 'stand in' for the absent visual, concrete imagery. But, this may only hold true for individuals who have impoverished post-

183 conceptual linguistic processes, but not necessarily those who have impoverished pre-conceptual
184 knowledge.

185 **Research Questions**

186 In this study, we address some of these research gaps, comparing iconic gestures made by
187 persons with aphasia during two monologic discourse tasks: a procedural narrative and an
188 expository, picture sequence description. We investigate two research questions:

- 189 1. To what extent does frequency and rate of iconic gesture differ between two spoken
190 discourse tasks, i.e., is there a main effect of task on gesture?
- 191 2. To what extent does frequency and rate relate to spoken language, and is this relationship
192 specific to task?

193

Methodology and Design

Participants

Participant data were collected from AphasiaBank, a password protected database for researchers interested in spoken discourse use in aphasia (MacWhinney et al., 2011). Inclusion criteria included members of the Aphasia subset within AphasiaBank, all of whom had acquired brain damage and aphasia (or latent aphasia) as per clinical assessment and standardized testing scores. Included participants spoke English as their primary language and had audiovisual data for both tasks (N=303 persons had data for the picture sequence task, and N=234 persons for the procedural task; N=233 people had data for both tasks). In AphasiaBank, some participants have data for multiple timepoints (tagged as ‘a’ [first timepoint], ‘b’ [second timepoint], and so on). For this study, we included data from only the first timepoint for each participant.

We then excluded participants for whom their video (for either task) did not show the entirety of both upper limbs, or where the angle of the video did not allow for complete gesture viewing. This was necessary to ensure accurate gesture coding. We then excluded persons with aphasia who did not produce an iconic gesture during at least one task of interest. With these exclusion criteria, ~N=98 were excluded. Finally, participants were excluded if they were given a picture aid for the “Sandwich” procedural discourse (described in more detail in section *Stimuli*). This decision was made because not every individual was given this additional visual support (roughly ~20% of the database received a picture during the Sandwich task, ~N=60). As we wanted to evaluate the difference in gesture usage between discourse genres, and only the picture sequence task was meant to include a visual aid, inclusion of those individuals with a visual aid during the procedural “Sandwich” task was inconsistent.

Following the parameters described above, this study included a total of N=75 persons with aphasia, who are further described in Table 1.

TABLE 1 HERE

Stimuli

To evaluate our first research question (evaluate a main effect of task on iconic gesture frequency and rate), gestures were analyzed during two spontaneous speech discourse tasks, drawn from the AphasiaBank protocol (MacWhinney et al., 2011), called the “Sandwich” and the “Window” tasks. These two tasks were chosen (1) based on prior research out of our lab implicating cognitive and linguistically different requirements per task (Stark, 2019b; Stark & Fukuyama, 2020), and (2) because these tasks are less frequently explored in aphasia gesture research.

The “Sandwich” task was a procedural narrative, in which participants described how to make a peanut butter and jelly sandwich. As noted earlier, this task did not include any visual aids. The instructions for the Sandwich task were as follows: “Let’s move on to something a little different. Tell me how you would make a peanut butter and jelly sandwich.” If no response in 10 seconds was given, the examiner gave a second prompt: “If you were feeling hungry for a peanut butter and jelly sandwich, how would you make it?” If no response was given, the examiner utilized a set of Troubleshooting questions (available on aphasia.talkbank.org).

The “Broken Window” task (shortened, here, to ‘Window’) was a descriptive task (specifically, a picture sequence description), in which participants described a sequence of four pictures: a boy kicking a soccer ball through a picture window, knocking over a lamp and surprising a sitting man (Menn et al., 1998). The instructions for the Window task were as follows: “Now I’m going to show you these pictures.” The examiner then presents picture series. “Take a little time to look at these pictures. They tell a story. Take a look at all of them, and then I’ll ask

239 you to tell me the story with a beginning, a middle, and an end. You can look at the pictures as you
240 tell the story.” If no response was given in 10 seconds, the examiner gave a second prompt: “Take
241 a look at this picture (point to first picture) and tell me what you think is happening.” If needed,
242 the examiner pointed to each picture sequentially, giving the prompt: “And what happens here?”
243 For each panel, if no response, the examiner provided the prompt: “Can you tell me anything about
244 this picture?” If no response was given to any of these prompts, the examiner utilized a set of
245 Troubleshooting questions (available on aphasia.talkbank.org).

246 **Gesture Coding**

247 *Gesture Types*

248 Iconic gestures represent meaning that is closely related to the semantic content of the speech that
249 they accompany – indeed, these forms of gesture can only be interpreted within the context of
250 speech, unlike other gestures which are imitations of motor actions (i.e., pantomimes) or carry
251 culturally-specific meaning on their own (i.e., emblems) (McNeill, 1992). We drew our definition
252 and coding parameters from Sekine and Rose (2013), classifying viewpoint, referential, and
253 metaphoric gesture types as iconic. Viewpoint gestures are those that depict a concrete action,
254 event, or object as though the speaker is observing it from afar (observer viewpoint) or as though
255 he is the character/object itself (character viewpoint) (McNeill, 1992). Referential gestures are
256 those that place objects, places, or characters in the story, into the space in front of a speaker where
257 any concrete object is absent, typically taking the form of a pointing gesture or of the hand
258 ‘holding’ some entity (Gullberg, 2006). Metaphoric gestures convey meaning in a non-literal,
259 abstract way, and are typically regarded as a form of iconic gesture with abstract content (Kita,
260 2014). Note that, during our gesture coding, we did not differentiate between referential and

metaphoric gestures. These were scored as a single type (referential + metaphoric type). Examples of iconic gestures demonstrated in this study are shown in Table S1.

Note that we also coded three other gesture types, which are not reported in detail here, but can be found in Table S2. These were concrete deictic (i.e., a concrete referent in the physical environment, such as a picture; McNeil, 1992), emblem (i.e., a culturally-specific gesture where form and meaning can usually be understood without speech; Kendon, 1980), and number (i.e., using the speakers fingers to represent numbers; Cicone et al., 1979).

Gesture Coding

Gestures were coded using the online Browsable Database on AphasiaBank. The Browsable Database time locks each spoken utterance with the video of the participant, allowing the experimenter to watch the video whilst also reading verbatim transcribed speech. Author CC was the primary coder. She watched all videos through once prior to coding. Then, she watched each video in 10 second chunks, tallying frequencies by gesture type (viewpoint, referential + metaphoric, concrete deictic, number, and emblem). Each video was coded in this way twice, to check for coding consistency. A unit of gesture was defined as the duration from the start of a movement until the hand(s) returned to its resting position (McNeill, 1992). If the hand(s) did not return to the resting position, gestures were divided by either a pause in the movement or an obvious change in shape or trajectory (Jacobs & Garnham, 2007). Note that many gesture types were not recorded for the purposes of this study, including beats and other non-gesture movements (e.g., self-adjusting, touching hair, touching table).

Raters and Reliability

The primary rater (author CC) trained two additional undergraduate raters in gesture coding. These raters practiced coding on a random sample of ten subjects (they trained on a combination of

samples from an aphasia group and a neurotypical group from AphasiaBank). Author CC then cross-checked coding to establish inter-rater reliability of at least 80% agreement on these practice samples. Any disagreements were discussed between all raters and a consensus was arrived at. Following resolution of any outstanding issues, raters were then assigned approximately 25 total individuals (22% of total sample, not including any samples used to practice) to rate. Though reliability was established on a training set, we further established inter-rater reliability on 10% of this sample (N=3 subjects). Inter-rater reliability exceeded a Pearson's correlation of $r > .75$ between primary rater CC and each auxiliary rater, for frequency of each gesture type. In sum, all raters trained on a training set prior to rating achieving >80% agreement across the entire training set), and then inter-rater agreement was calculated for 10% of the study sample, demonstrating that training set reliability extended to the study sample. Given complexities and idiosyncrasies of gesture rating (e.g., some level of subjectivity, as described by McNeil 1992), we consider this favorable evidence of rater reliability, whilst also acknowledging the small 'n' on which reliability was computed.

Spoken Language Data and Fluency

To evaluate our second research question (evaluate the relationship between iconic gesture frequency and rate with spoken language), we acquired information about spoken language produced during the discourse tasks, and extracted extra-task information about language fluency from a standardized testing battery.

Our primary interest was to measure the relationship between iconic gesture and language dysfluency, by task. When gesture is prohibited in neurotypical speakers, more dysfluencies (e.g., pauses, slower speech rate, false starts, fillers) are produced. In persons living with aphasia, increased frequency of gesture is thought to improve lexical retrieval. That is, gestures are

produced in higher rates when language is particularly dysfluent. Here, we postulate that production of iconic gestures will accompany greater dysfluencies, in accordance with this hypothesis. For the purposes of this study, we explore common dysfluencies found in aphasic speech, and which have been previously evaluated in studies of gesture use in persons with aphasia and neurotypical participants (Carlomagno & Cristilli, 2006; de Beer et al., 2019; Feyereisen, 1983; Kong et al., 2017; Kong et al., 2015; Rauscher et al., 1996): hesitations, comprised of filled and unfilled pauses of greater than three seconds, false starts, and fillers; and words per minute, a metric of speaking rate. Hesitations were computed as a proportion of total words produced, inclusive of retracings and repetitions. We likewise evaluated metrics of gross language output, including speaking time and total utterances, to evaluate the relationship of iconic gesture with speech. To obtain this spoken language data, we extracted variables from each task's language sample using CLAN (MacWhinney, 2018).

Complementary to the linguistic information extracted from the discourse tasks, we also used a metric of language fluency obtained from a neuropsychological test battery as a means of evaluating extra-task spoken language fluency (i.e., a metric of language fluency derived from a different task, and scored based on a standardized scale). Specifically, we extracted extra-task information about language fluency from the Fluency, Grammatical Competence, and Paraphasias of Spontaneous Speech score (we will call this the "Fluency" score for short) of the Western Aphasia Battery – Revised (WAB-R). The Fluency score is obtained by first having subjects answer conversational questions (e.g., "Have you been here before?" and "What is your occupation?"), followed by having subjects describe a picture. The test administrator then ranks subjects' fluency from 0 to 10, described below. Using these Fluency scores, we created three fluency groups: a group containing subjects with low fluency ("low fluency" group, scores 0-4), a

group containing subjects that are fluent but whose speech is characterized by errors, jargon, and empty speech (“fluency with errors” group, scores 5-7), and a group whose subjects are highly fluent with few errors (“high functional fluency” group, scores 8-10). The fluency descriptions from the WAB-R are briefly described (Kertesz, 2007):

- Low fluency group (scores 0 – 4): A score of 0 reflects no words or short, meaningless utterances; a score of 1 reflects recurrent, brief, stereotypic utterances with varied intonation, where emphasis or prosody may carry some meaning; a score of 2 reflects single words, usually errors (paraphasias), with speech being effortful and hesitant; a score of 3 reflects longer, recurrent stereotypic or automatic utterances lacking in information; and a score of 4 reflects halting, telegraphic speech containing mostly single words, paraphasias, some prepositional phrases, with severe word-finding difficulty. A stipulation for a score of 4 is that no more than two complete sentences may be present (excepting automatic sentences).
- Fluent with errors group (scores 5 – 7): A score of 5 reflects telegraphic but more fluent speech, containing some grammatical organization, though still with marked word-finding difficulty and paraphasias; a score of 6 reflects more propositional sentences with normal syntactic patterns, coupled with paraphasias (optional) and significant word-finding difficulty and/or hesitations; and a score of 7 reflects fluent, phonemic jargon with semblance to English syntax and rhythm, alongside varied phonemes and neologisms.
- High functional fluency group (scores 8 – 10): A score of 8 reflects circumlocutory, fluent speech, with moderate word-finding difficulty, with or without paraphasias, and may present with semantic jargon; a score of 9 reflects mostly complete, relevant sentences, with occasional hesitations and/or paraphasias and some word-finding difficulty; and a score of 10 reflects sentences of normal length and complexity, without definite slowing, halting or paraphasias.

Analyses and Research Questions

All analyses were conducted in SPSS 27. The data were, overall, not normal in distribution, and we therefore employed non-parametric statistics (specifically: Spearman correlation, Chi-square tests, Wilcoxon Signed Rank tests for repeated measures, and Kruskal-Wallis H tests of independent samples). Specific tests are described in more detail in each appropriate section. All analyses were corrected for multiple comparisons using Bonferroni correction; specific correction p-values are noted in the text. The current study was not pre-registered, which we acknowledge as a limitation.

Recall that we had two primary research questions. The first research question is theoretically driven: Do iconic gesture frequency and rate significantly differ between two narrative tasks, i.e., is there a main effect of task on gesture, similar to the effect of task demonstrated on the speech of persons living with aphasia (Stark, 2019a; Stark & Fukuyama, 2020)? The second research question is also theoretically driven, given prior work examining the relationship of iconic gesture with spoken language in aphasia (Dipper et al., 2011; Pritchard et al., 2015; Sekine & Rose, 2013a). Therefore, our second research question is: To what extent are task-specific iconic gesture frequency and rate related to spoken language? As such, the primary dependent variables of this study were iconic gesture *frequency* (i.e., how many gestures were produced) and *rate* (i.e., how many gestures were produced per spoken word, including repetitions/retracings of words and paraphasias with no known targets) (see Table 1).

In addition to evaluating our primary research questions, we explore the relationship of iconic gesture frequency with demographic variables (e.g., age). We additionally provide exploratory analyses that divide iconic gestures into two types ([1] viewpoint and [2] referential + metaphoric), which is motivated by differences in theoretical constructs between gesture types.

Given that the study of gesture in aphasia is a blossoming field, it remains unclear the extent to which factors like gesture type and/or discourse task may be meaningful in delineating the relationship of spoken language and gesture usage in this population. We did not explicitly differentiate between referential and metaphoric gestures for the purposes of this study, and thus they will be presented as a combined group. The goal of this exploratory analysis is to provide preliminary evidence for future investigations about the relationship of iconic gesture type frequency with task, and with language variables, in PWA.

Results

Below, we present analyses for the whole (N=75) sample. Additionally, we present results for a smaller sample (N=43), who gestured during both Window and Sandwich tasks; we call this sample the “matched” group. We present both sets of results to provide future researchers with a wealth of data. Throughout the results, we will draw attention to instances where the findings from these two groups diverge.

Relationship Between Iconic Gesture and Demographic Information

We evaluated the relationship between iconic gesture frequency and demographic and neuropsychological information. After multiple comparison correction using Bonferroni correction ($p < .01$, 5 comparisons), none of the following significantly associated with total iconic gesture frequency, summed across the two tasks: aphasia severity (measured by Western Aphasia Battery Revised Aphasia Quotient) (Kertesz, 2007) ($N=75$, $r_s=.10$, $p=.38$), years of speech-language therapy ($N=75$, $r_s=.21$, $p=.07$), education ($N=75$, $r_s=.21$, $p=.08$), or age ($N=75$, $r_s=-.26$, $p=.02$). Aphasia duration – that is, the amount of time one has lived with aphasia – did significantly correlate with total iconic gesture frequency ($N=75$, $r_s=.36$, $p=.002$), indicating that persons with more chronic aphasia tended to produce iconic gestures more frequently. Further exploration by

discourse task suggested that the relationship between aphasia duration and gesture frequency was most related to iconic gesturing on the Window task ($N=75$, $r_s=.37$, $p=.001$) and not the Sandwich task ($N=75$, $r_s=.21$, $p=.07$). Hemiparesis could be one reason why gestures are not produced frequently, or at a high rate (although, this typically is not the case, e.g., Kong et al., 2015). We evaluated the impact of physical status (no motor impairment; unilateral hemiparesis; unilateral hemiplegia) on iconic gesture frequency pooled across tasks, finding no significant difference in iconic gesture frequency across different motor impairments (Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test, $N=74$ [1 missing datapoint], $W=2.16$, $p=.34$). We also performed an explorative analysis on the impact of gender on iconic gesture frequency, as there is evidence from psychology that women tend to employ more nonverbal communication (Hall & Gunnery, 2013), finding no significant difference in iconic gesture frequency between males and females (Mann-Whitney U-Test, $N=75$, $U=.63$, $p=.53$).

We likewise evaluated the relationship of gesture rate with demographic and neuropsychological information. After multiple comparison correction using Bonferroni correction ($p<.01$, 5 comparisons), average iconic gesture rate (i.e., rate averaged across tasks) was found to not significantly associate with aphasia severity ($N=75$, $r_s=-.19$, $p=.10$), age ($N=75$, $r_s=-.28$, $p=.01$), or education ($N=75$, $r_s=-.11$, $p=.36$), but significantly with years of speech-language therapy ($N=75$, $r_s=.37$, $p=.001$) and aphasia duration ($N=75$, $r_s=.40$, $p<.001$). Further exploration by task indicated that aphasia duration was positively related to gesture rate for each task (Window, $N=75$, $r_s=.40$, $p<.001$; Sandwich, $N=75$, $r_s=.25$, $p=.03$), whilst the relationship between years of speech-language therapy and gesture rate was driven by performance on the Sandwich task (Window, $N=75$, $r_s=.22$, $p=.06$; Sandwich, $N=75$, $r_s=.31$, $p=.007$). We did find a significant relationship between motor impairment and gesture rate (Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis

Test, $N=74$ [$N=1$ missing data], $W=13.85$, $p=.001$). Pairwise comparisons (corrected at Bonferroni $p<.01$ for 3 comparisons) in $N=74$ showed that persons with hemiplegia tended to gesture at a higher rate than persons with no motor impairment ($p<.001$), which seems counterintuitive but makes sense in the context that those with hemiplegia also tend to be those who produce fewer words ($W=7.47$, $p=.02$; where persons with hemiplegia produced significantly fewer words than those with no motor impairment, $p=.006$). We did not find a significant difference in gesture rate between males and females (Mann-Whitney U-Test, $N=75$, $U=-1.87$, $p=.06$).

Note that our matched group ($N=43$) had a similar correlation matrix. Correlation tables between demographic variables, language variables, and gesture variables, are shown in Table S3 ($N=75$ group) and Table S4 ($N=43$ group).

Main Effect of Task on Iconic Gesture

Here, we evaluate our primary research question, which is the main effect of task on iconic gesture frequency and rate. Of our entire sample ($N=75$), 57.3% of subjects made an iconic gesture during the Window task, whilst 100% made an iconic gesture during the Sandwich task (Table 2).

TABLE 2 HERE

Employing Wilcoxon Signed Rank tests, which is a nonparametric repeated measures analysis, we identified a significant difference between tasks in gesture frequency ($N=75$, $Z=3.45$, $p=.001$; $N=43$, $Z=4.98$, $p<.001$) and gesturing rate ($N=75$, $Z=7.36$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $Z=5.42$, $p<.001$) (Bonferroni, $p<.025$, 2 comparisons per group) (Table 3). For a distribution of gesture frequency and rate in all subjects ($N=75$), see Figure 1. These results demonstrate a clear main effect of task, specifically greater iconic gesture frequency and rate during the Sandwich task.

FIGURE 1 HERE

An exploratory analysis to identify the extent to which iconic gesture type frequency differed between tasks demonstrated that referential + metaphoric gestures were produced significantly more often during the Sandwich task ($N=75$, $Z=-6.48$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $Z=-4.73$, $p<.001$), and this was also true for viewpoint gestures, which were made more often during the Sandwich task ($N=75$, $Z=-6.33$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $Z=-3.97$, $p<.001$) (Bonferroni, $p<.025$, 2 comparisons per group). This finding shows that not a single iconic gesture type drove the difference in gesture frequency between the tasks.

Further exploratory analyses of iconic gesture rate in the whole group demonstrated that referential + metaphoric gestures were produced at a significantly higher rate during the Sandwich task ($N=75$, $Z=6.43$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $Z=-4.63$, $p<.001$) and this was likewise the case for viewpoint gestures ($N=75$, $Z=-6.91$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $Z=-4.76$, $p<.001$) (Bonferroni, $p<.025$, 2 comparisons per group). This finding again suggests that not a single iconic gesture type drove the difference in gesture rate between the tasks.

TABLE 3 HERE

Relationship Between Iconic Gesture and Spoken Language

Relationship of Iconic Gesture with Fluency Variables Extracted from Discourse

Our second research prerogative was to identify relationships between spoken language and iconic gesture frequency and rate. Given a main effect of task, we evaluated the relationship between iconic gesture and language variables, stratified by task.

In regards to task-related differences in spoken language, Wilcoxon Signed Rank tests evaluating repeated measures demonstrated that the Window task had a significantly longer speaking time than the Sandwich task ($N=75$, $Z=-2.65$, $p=.008$; $N=43$, $Z=-2.88$, $p=.004$), but there were no significant differences between the two tasks for any other language metric: total

utterances ($N=75$, $Z=-2.01$, $p=.045$; $N=43$, $Z=-2.10$, $p=.036$), words per minute ($N=75$, $Z=-.75$, $p=.46$; $N=43$, $Z=-.27$, $p=.79$), or proportion hesitations ($N=75$, $Z=.69$, $p=.49$; $N=43$, $Z=1.49$, $p=.14$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group). We show descriptive statistics and statistical information for the $N=75$ whole group and the $N=43$ matched group in Table 4.

TABLE 4 HERE

Gesture Frequency's Relationship with Language Fluency Variables.

For the Sandwich task, we identified a significant relationship between gesture frequency and speaking time ($N=75$, $r_s=.62$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $r_s=.65$, $p<.001$) and total utterances ($N=75$, $r_s=.69$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $r_s=.63$, $p<.001$), but not words per minute ($N=75$, $r_s=.10$, $p=.39$; $N=43$, $r_s=.07$, $p=.67$) or proportion hesitations ($N=75$, $r_s=-.08$, $p=.49$; $N=43$, $r_s=.06$, $p=.72$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group). As an exploratory analysis, we evaluated the correlation between language metrics and frequency of gesture types (viewpoint; referential + metaphoric), finding that viewpoint gesture frequency during the Sandwich task significantly correlated with speaking time ($N=75$, $r_s=.63$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $r_s=.56$, $p<.001$) and total utterances ($N=75$, $r_s=.59$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $r_s=.59$, $p<.001$), but not with our fluency variables: words per minute ($N=75$, $r_s=-.17$, $p=.16$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.19$, $p=.21$) or proportion hesitations ($N=75$, $r_s=.18$, $p=.13$; $N=43$, $r_s=.32$, $p=.04$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group). Referential + metaphoric gesture frequency during Sandwich also significantly correlated with speaking time ($N=75$, $r_s=.30$, $p=.008$; $N=43$, $r_s=.42$, $p=.005$) and total utterances [only for large group] ($N=75$, $r_s=.42$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $r_s=.35$, $p=.02$) and, in contrast to viewpoint gesture frequency, approached a significant correlation with proportion hesitations ($N=75$, $r_s=-.29$, $p=.013$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.24$, $p=.13$)

and words per minute ($N=75$, $r_s=.27$, $p=.019$; $N=43$, $r_s=.28$, $p=.07$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group).

For the Window task, we found a significant relationship between gesture frequency and speaking time [only for large group] ($N=75$, $r_s=.34$, $p=.003$; $N=43$, $r_s=.29$, $p=.06$) and total utterances [only for large group] ($N=75$, $r_s=.45$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $r_s=.32$, $p=.03$), but not words per minute ($N=75$, $r_s=-.09$, $p=.44$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.24$, $p=.13$), or proportion hesitations ($N=75$, $r_s=-.13$, $p=.25$; $N=43$, $r_s=.006$, $p=.97$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group).

As an exploratory analysis, we evaluated the correlation between language metrics and frequency of gesture types (viewpoint; referential + metaphoric), finding that viewpoint gesture frequency during the Window task significantly correlated with total utterances [only for large group] ($N=75$, $r_s=.36$, $p=.001$; $N=43$, $r_s=.21$, $p=.18$) but not speaking time ($N=75$, $r_s=.23$, $p=.04$; $N=43$, $r_s=.15$, $p=.33$), words per minute ($N=75$, $r_s=-.10$, $p=.39$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.21$, $p=.19$) or proportion hesitations ($N=75$, $r_s=-.01$, $p=.92$; $N=43$, $r_s=.19$, $p=.24$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group). Referential + metaphoric gesture frequency significantly correlated with total utterances ($N=75$, $r_s=.45$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $r_s=.40$, $p=.007$) as well as speaking time ($N=75$, $r_s=.39$, $p=.001$; $N=43$, $r_s=.40$, $p=.008$), but not words per minute ($N=75$, $r_s=-.07$, $p=.57$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.14$, $p=.36$) or proportion hesitates ($N=75$, $r_s=-.29$, $p=.01$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.30$, $p=.06$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group).

These results support a relationship between frequency of iconic gestures (regardless of gesture type) and gross speech output, but not necessarily with metrics of speech fluency. This was the case for both tasks.

Gesture Rate's Relationship with Language Fluency Variables.

We then evaluated the relationship between gesture rate and language variables, finding that gesture rate during the Sandwich task demonstrated a significant relationship with our fluency variables, words per minute [only for large group] ($N=75$, $r_s=-.47$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.36$, $p=.017$) and proportion hesitations [only for large group] ($N=75$, $r_s=.34$, $p=.003$; $N=43$, $r_s=.37$, $p=.02$), but did not significantly correlate with our gross output variables, speaking time ($N=75$, $r_s=-.06$, $p=.64$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.16$, $p=.32$) or total utterances ($N=75$, $r_s=-.21$, $p=.07$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.26$, $p=.09$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group). Exploratory analyses demonstrated that viewpoint gesture rate did not significantly associate with speaking duration ($N=75$, $r_s=.04$, $p=.71$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.06$, $p=.70$) or total utterances ($N=75$, $r_s=-.13$, $p=.25$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.10$, $p=.53$); approached a significant relationship with words per minute in the matched group and was significantly related to words per minute in the whole group ($N=75$, $r_s=-.49$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.37$, $p=.015$); and was significantly, positively related to proportion hesitations ($N=75$, $r_s=.43$, $p<.001$; $N=43$, $r_s=.44$, $p=.003$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group). Referential + metaphoric gesture rate was not significantly associated with speaking duration ($N=75$, $r_s=-.007$, $p=.95$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.001$, $p>.99$), total utterances ($N=75$, $r_s=-.05$, $p=.68$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.16$, $p=.32$), words per minute ($N=75$, $r_s=-.11$, $p=.33$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.08$, $p=.63$), or proportion hesitations ($N=75$, $r_s=-.03$, $p=.83$; $N=43$, $r_s=.007$, $p=.97$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group). In general, these results support a relationship between language fluency variables and gesture rate during the Sandwich task, which may be in large part driven by viewpoint gesture rate.

We then evaluated the relationship between gesture rate and language variables during the Window task, finding a significant correlation with words per minute [only for matched group] ($N=75$, $r_s=-.19$, $p=.097$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.54$, $p<.001$) and total utterances [only for large group] ($N=75$,

$r_s=.34$, $p=.003$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.04$, $p=.82$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group). We did not identify a significant relationship with speaking time ($N=75$, $r_s=.24$, $p=.04$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.01$, $p=.94$) or proportion hesitations ($N=75$, $r_s=-.03$, $p=.82$; $N=43$, $r_s=.32$, $p=.03$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group). Exploratory analyses demonstrated that viewpoint gesture rate during Window did not significantly associate with speaking duration ($N=75$, $r_s=.06$, $p=.62$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.04$, $p=.79$) or total utterances ($N=75$, $r_s=.21$, $p=.07$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.06$, $p=.70$), but was significantly related to language fluency in the matched group for words per minute ($N=75$, $r_s=-.07$, $p=.53$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.37$, $p=.013$) and proportion hesitations ($N=75$, $r_s=.06$, $p=.63$; $N=43$, $r_s=.37$, $p=.01$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group). This pattern was similar for referential + metaphoric gesture rate, which did not significantly associate with speaking duration ($N=75$, $r_s=.12$, $p=.29$; $N=43$, $r_s=.02$, $p=.91$) or words per minute ($N=75$, $r_s=.02$, $p=.84$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.19$, $p=.23$) but which approached a significant relationship with total utterances ($N=75$, $r_s=.27$, $p=.02$; $N=43$, $r_s=.04$, $p=.79$) and was significantly related to proportion hesitations [whole group only] ($N=75$, $r_s=-.27$, $p=.019$; $N=43$, $r_s=-.24$, $p=.13$) (Bonferroni correction, $p<.0125$, 4 comparisons per subject group). Therefore, it appears that gesture rate's relationship with language may be influenced by both types of iconic gesture.

Globally, these results support a relationship between iconic gesturing rate and speech, with some task specificity: a relationship of gesture rate with speech fluency in the Sandwich task, and with both speech fluency and gross speech output in the Window task.

Relationship of Iconic Gesture with Extra-task Fluency

As a complementary analysis to evaluate language fluency, we evaluated the relationship of iconic gesture with an extra-task metric of spoken language fluency by evaluating iconic gesture

use in three fluency groups (from the large group [N=75] and matched group [N=43]) derived from a standardized aphasia battery: low fluency (N=75 group, 22 subjects; N=43 group, 12 subjects), fluent with errors (N=75 group, 21 subjects; N=43 group, 13 subjects), and high functional fluency (N=75 group, 32 subjects; N=43 group, 18 subjects). To do so, we computed Kruskal-Wallis H tests of independent samples (sometimes also called the "one-way ANOVA on ranks"), evaluating significant differences in gesture rate and frequency by fluency group per task (corrected at Bonferroni, $p < .025$, 2 comparisons per subject group). Note that fluency groups did not significantly differ by age (N=75, $H = .88$, $p = .65$; N=43, $H = .14$, $p = .93$), though did significantly differ by aphasia duration in the large subject group (N=75, $H = 7.59$, $p = .02$; N=43, $H = 5.57$, $p = .06$) (corrected at Bonferroni, $p < .025$, 2 comparisons per subject group).

Gesture Frequency's Relationship with Fluency Group.

We did not identify a significant fluency group effect on iconic gesture frequency for either Window (N=75, $H = .32$, $p = .85$; N=43, $H = 4.76$, $p = .09$) or Sandwich (N=75, $H = 5.09$, $p = .08$; N=43, $H = 4.64$, $p = .10$) (corrected at Bonferroni, $p < .025$, 2 comparisons per subject group).

As an exploratory analysis, we looked at the relationship between fluency groups and iconic gesture type frequency (viewpoint, referential + metaphoric) by task. For the Window task, we did not identify a significant effect of fluency group on referential + metaphoric gesture (N=75, $H = .015$, $p = .99$; N=43, $H = .33$, $p = .85$) or viewpoint gesture (N=75, $H = .46$, $p = .79$; N=43, $H = 2.41$, $p = .30$) (corrected at Bonferroni, $p < .025$, 2 comparisons per subject group). For the Sandwich task, there was no effect (whole group) yet a significant effect (matched group) of fluency group on referential + metaphoric gesture frequency (N=75, $H = 5.43$, $p = .066$; N=43, $H = 7.74$, $p = .021$), but no significant effect of fluency group was identified for viewpoint gesture frequency (N=75, $H = .496$, $p = .78$; N=43, $H = .895$, $p = .64$) (corrected at Bonferroni, $p < .025$, 2 comparisons per subject

group). Pairwise comparisons corrected at Bonferroni $p < .017$ (3 comparisons) for the referential + metaphoric gestures made during the Sandwich task by the matched group ($N=43$) demonstrated that this effect was driven by a difference between low fluency and high functional fluency groups ($p = .029$), where the low fluency group produced significantly more referential + metaphoric gestures. The fluent with errors and the high functional fluency group did not differ significantly on referential + metaphoric gestures produced during Sandwich ($p = .14$), and nor did the low and fluent with errors differ significantly on referential + metaphoric gestures ($p > .99$). Therefore, results suggest that referential + metaphoric gestures, more than viewpoint gesture frequency or total iconic gesture frequency, were produced significantly more often by the low fluency group during the Sandwich task.

Gesture Rate's Relationship with Fluency Group.

We identified a significant difference in gesture rate by fluency group during the Window task ($N=75$, $H=2.30$, $p = .32$; $N=43$, $H=15.14$, $p = .001$) and Sandwich task ($N=75$, $H=5.98$, $p = .05$; $N=43$, $H=8.63$, $p = .013$). Note that, for both tasks, only the $N=43$ group showed a significant relationship between fluency group and gesture rate, thus post hoc pairwise comparisons were done only for this group. Pairwise comparisons (corrected at Bonferroni $p < .017$, 3 comparisons) for gesture rate by fluency group on the Window task demonstrated a significantly higher gesture rate in the low fluency group compared with the fluent with errors group ($p = .001$), and high functional fluency group ($p < .001$) (Figure 2, top). There was not a significant difference between the fluent with errors and high functional fluency groups ($p = .84$). Exploration of pairwise comparisons (corrected at Bonferroni $p < .017$, 3 comparisons) for gesture rate by fluency group on the Sandwich task demonstrated the same pattern, with the low fluency group producing a significantly higher gesture rate compared with the fluent with errors group ($p = .012$) and compared

with the high functional fluency group ($p=.008$) (Figure 2, bottom). Again, there was not a significant difference between the fluent with errors and high functional fluency groups ($p=.98$). Altogether, these results demonstrate that the low fluency group produced more gestures per word.

We then conducted exploratory analyses to evaluate the relationship between the fluency groups and gesture rate by gesture type (viewpoint, referential + metaphoric) and task. We did not identify a significant difference between fluency groups in rate of referential + metaphoric gestures, for either Window ($N=75$, $H=.21$, $p=.90$; $N=43$, $H=2.25$, $p=.33$) or Sandwich ($N=75$, $H=1.26$, $p=.53$; $N=43$, $H=.43$, $p=.81$) tasks. We identified a significant difference between fluency groups in the rate of viewpoint gestures produced during the Window task for the matched group ($N=75$, $H=2.29$, $p=.32$; $N=43$, $H=9.04$, $p=.01$) but for neither subject group during the Sandwich task ($N=75$, $H=3.84$, $p=.15$; $N=43$, $H=5.19$, $p=.08$) (corrected at Bonferroni, $p<.025$, 2 comparisons per subject group). Pairwise comparisons evaluating the rate of viewpoint gestures produced during the Window task for the matched group (corrected at Bonferroni $p<.017$, 3 comparisons) showed significant differences between the low fluency group and the fluent with errors group ($p=.01$) and between the low fluency group and the high functional fluency group ($p=.006$). In both cases, the low fluency group demonstrated a higher viewpoint gesture rate during Window. There was not a significant difference between the fluent with errors and the high functional fluency group ($p=.96$).

In summary, total iconic gesture rate was higher in persons from the low fluency group, and when looking specifically at rates of gesture types, this seemed to be driven by the viewpoint gesture, particularly in the Window task.

FIGURE 2 HERE

Discussion

We evaluated the relationship of iconic gesturing with demographic, language, and task variables in a large group of persons with post-stroke, chronic aphasia (PWA). Below, we will discuss how these results fit in within overarching, theoretical hypotheses of gesture, as well as prior findings of iconic gesture usage in aphasia. We will end with discussing clinical implications of this work.

Regarding demographic correlates of iconic gesture use, aphasia chronicity was correlated with iconic gesture usage, and this correlation was driven by iconic gesture frequency produced during the Window task. That is, those individuals who were living with aphasia for a longer period of time were those who tended to use a higher frequency of iconic gestures during the Window task. Generally, this may speak to gestures serving as a compensatory, or supportive, addition to their spontaneous speech (Dipper et al., 2015). But, more specifically, we identified a significant relationship with aphasia duration only in the Window task and not the Sandwich task, which may suggest an interaction of task demands, aphasia duration, and iconic gesture use. Further evaluation directly contrasting more tasks of varying types (e.g., narrative, procedural, expository, descriptive), and cognitive and linguistic demands (e.g., visual aid, verbal working memory use, semantic memory use, episodic memory use) will enhance our understanding of this possible, clinically-relevant interaction. As we do not yet understand the extent to which iconic gesture use changes over time – there is a paucity of longitudinal studies on iconic gesture in aphasia recovery (Braddock, 2007) – cross sectional designs such as the one suggested may facilitate hypothesis creation for future, longitudinal designs.

Notably, we did not identify a significant relationship between aphasia severity and iconic gesture frequency, which complements prior research, which identified a relationship between

aphasia severity and concrete deictic gestures but not iconic gestures (Sekine & Rose, 2013b). That is, severe aphasia does not preclude iconic gesture use, which has clinical ramifications for assessment of gesture and treatment utilizing gesture as a predominant or complementary communicative modality (Rose et al., 2013).

Innovatively, we evaluated the main effect of task on iconic gesture in aphasia. Task has been shown to influence spoken language in persons with and without aphasia (Dalton & Richardson, 2019; Fergadiotis et al., 2011; Fergadiotis & Wright, 2011; Li et al., 1996; Shadden et al., 1990; Stark, 2019a; Ulatowska et al., 1981; Wright & Capilouto, 2009) and it is perhaps not surprising that we identified a main effect of task on iconic gesture frequency and rate in our subject group of persons with aphasia. Specifically, subjects produced statistically more iconic gestures, and gestured at a greater rate, during the procedural narrative task (Sandwich) than during the picture sequence, expository task (Window). There is a tradition in the gesture literature to use procedural tasks to evaluate gesture, especially in clinical samples (Cocks et al., 2007; Hilverman et al., 2016b; Pritchard et al., 2015) and our current work underscores this trend, as the procedural task (Sandwich) tended to associate with more iconic gestures and a higher gesture.

One explanation for the difference in iconic gesture production by task is shared knowledge (or common ground). That is – one task, the picture sequence task – provided a visual cue that was available to both the primary speaker and the other interlocutor (i.e., experimenter). Because the picture sequence was available to both persons in the experiment room, it may have been the case that fewer iconic gestures were produced because of shared knowledge (Bottenberg & Lemme, 1991; Campisi & özyürek, 2013; but see, Brenneise-Sarshad et al., 1991). Additionally, gestures tend to be smaller (Hoetjes et al., 2015; Kuhlen et al., 2012) and lower in the visual field (Hilliard & Cook, 2016) when sharing common ground. In the case of a shared visual cue, iconic gestures

may not have been favored by either subject group because of a reliance on other types of gestures – specifically, concrete deictic gestures (Sekine & Rose, 2013b). Whilst we did not report on other gestures produced during these tasks here, as we wanted to focus on iconic gesture usage, we did collect data on concrete deictic (e.g., pointing) gestures, finding that many gestures produced by the aphasia group included pointing to specific parts of the Window picture (Table S2). We postulated earlier, in the introduction, that iconic gesturing may be used more often, and with a greater success rate, when tasks do not involve other visual stimuli (e.g., picture descriptions), as they stand in for the concrete imagery that may otherwise facilitate lexical access. It may likewise be that the presence of a visual support systematically varied task demands. For example, the picture may constrain what the participants said, and also decrease memory demands. Prior work demonstrates that rich episodic detail gives rise to more gestures (Hilverman et al., 2016a). Finally, the Sandwich task may have employed more spatial words and imagery given its procedural nature; iconic gesture frequency has been shown to positively correlate with lexical items related to space and movement (Atit et al., 2013; Hostetter & Alibali, 2019; Kita & Lausberg, 2008; Pritchard et al., 2015). Therefore, it may be the case that these two tasks are not directly comparable because of cognitive demands and task constraint, but results do seem to support the notion that more iconic gestures, at a greater rate, are produced during a narrative where no visual aids are present, which complements prior evidence.

For our second research question, we evaluated the relationship between spoken language and iconic gesture. There are a variety of theories exploring the relationship between spoken language and iconic gesture. These theories hypothesize, respectively, that gestures are used more frequently when spoken language production is made more difficult, or otherwise impaired (de Ruiter, 2006; McNeill, 1992) and that using gestures facilitate lexical retrieval (Krauss, 1998).

Because of the main effect of task, we evaluated relationships between iconic gesture and language by task. During the Window task, we did not identify a significant relationship between language variables and iconic gesture frequency, but did identify a relationship between iconic gesture rate and speaking rate. Specifically, with increasing speaking rate during the Window task, we observed a reduced gesture rate. This finding is complementary to the result that the low fluency group (recall, a group identified as low fluency from a standardized testing battery) produced significantly higher rates of iconic gestures during Window. That is, we identified that iconic gesture rate during the Window task associated with two metrics of dysfluency, one task-specific and one extra-task (standardized battery), together denoting that, at least for this task and its cognitive-linguistic demands, gesture rate was strongly, negatively related to spoken language fluency. During the Sandwich task, we identified a significant relationship between gross language and iconic gesture frequency, such that more iconic gestures were produced alongside longer speaking times and long utterances. The positive correlation between gross language and iconic gesture frequency in the Sandwich task may reflected increased task demands (e.g., no visual material available, limited common ground), culminating in more gestures produced. In regards to the relationship of iconic gesture with dysfluency during the Sandwich task, gesture rate approached a significant relationship with task-specific metrics of fluency (speaking rate, hesitations), and was significantly related to extra-task fluency (from standardized testing battery), complementing the profile shown in the Window results.

Together, these results support an overall relationship between iconic gesture rate and spoken language, especially fluency, which lends support for hypotheses related to shared pre-conceptual space for gesture and speech, as well as for a role of iconic gesture in enhancing lexical retrieval. It should be noted that most metrics of fluency are influenced by measures of grammatical

competence, lexical retrieval, and speech production, or a combination of these linguistic processes (Gordon & Clough, 2020), which speaks to the complexity of identifying the extent to which iconic gesture (for example) influences each linguistic process (e.g., grammatical competence, lexical retrieval, speech production). This work enhances prior work evaluating fluency based on aphasia types (e.g., non-fluent vs fluent, Broca's vs. Wernicke's) by evaluating task-specific linguistic information as well as a standardized metric of spoken language fluency. Sekine & Rose (2013b) correlated the Spontaneous Speech Fluency score (a composite score of the Fluency score described here, in addition to an Informational Content score), with iconic gesture frequency in their sample of persons with aphasia during a story retell narrative, finding a small-medium, significant, negative correlation between gesture frequency and Spontaneous Speech Fluency score. Their sample was larger, which may have contributed to improved power and identification of a small-medium relationship between an extra-task metric of fluency and iconic gesture frequency. Recall that we did not identify a relationship between gesture frequency and Fluency score. Note, too, that Sekine & Rose (2013b) did not evaluate the relationship between gesture rate and their metric of fluency, however. It should be noted that there is some difference in these comparisons. We chose the Fluency score – rather than the Spontaneous Speech Fluency score – because the former did not incorporate Informational Content. Informational Content score speaks more to the communication / functional value of the speech than the fluency, and the Informational Content score is typically highly related to the overall aphasia severity (Kertesz, 2007). Despite nuances, there is a clear relationship between iconic gesture (be it frequency or rate) and spoken language fluency.

Therefore, there is mounting evidence that discourse task affects spontaneous iconic gesture usage in persons with and without aphasia. We provide one of the few studies directly contrasting

740 iconic gesture usage across two tasks in the same group of subjects, with hope that more work
741 follows our own in exploring these task-specific gesture relationships. Exploring task-specific
742 gesture relationships across all gesture types (i.e., along Kendon's continuum) gets at a more
743 naturalistic evaluation of gesture, which allows us to jump from highly constrained experimental
744 investigations of gesture to more naturalistic evaluation of gesture. While the main purpose of the
745 current study was to look at task-related differences in iconic gesturing, Table S2 makes clear that
746 there are likely other task-related differences in other types of gestures (e.g., concrete deictic), and
747 a future, multivariate investigation of the relationship between task and gesture type would be
748 highly valuable in determining typical spontaneous gesture patterns in persons with aphasia.

749 We did not evaluate the informational relationship of each of iconic gestures to their respective
750 speech (i.e., to disambiguate, to add information, to be redundant), but further evaluation of the
751 informational relationship between speech and iconic gesture type is necessary to better understand
752 the possible task-specific facilitatory effects of each iconic gesture type. The informational
753 relationship of gesture with speech may also differ by aphasia type. In one study, people with non-
754 fluent aphasia primarily used gesture to replace verbal communication whilst those with fluent
755 aphasia used gesture redundantly with verbal communication (Behrmann & Penn, 1984). In
756 another study, different patterns of gesture use in a Broca's aphasia group, Wernicke's aphasia
757 group, and neurotypical control group showed that gesture played a dominate role in enhancing
758 communication, rather than facilitating lexical retrieval, among the speakers with aphasia (Kong
759 et al., 2017). Note that these studies did not constrain their evaluation of gesture to iconic gesture.
760 Further, evaluation of other important metrics describing the relationship between gesture and
761 speech, such as temporal ordering (Hadar et al., 1998a; Hadar & Butterworth, 1997), will elucidate
762 task effects on iconic gesturing.

Future work should focus on how task-specific, and extra-task linguistic ability, predict iconic gesture usage, and how that differs according to task demands. Doing so can provide evidence about the level of breakdown in the language system in aphasia. Rose & Douglas (2001) explored this in reference to gesture's facilitatory effects in object naming, finding that individuals with phonological access, storage, or encoding difficulties showed improved naming abilities when iconic gestures were present, versus those with a semantic impairment or a motor speech disorder (e.g., apraxia of speech). Complementary work evaluating a wordless cartoon retelling in a single case study of a person with conduction aphasia, who had difficulties with phonological encoding, demonstrated production of meaningful iconic gestures, suggesting an intact pre-linguistic conceptual as well as semantic system (Cocks et al., 2011). Further, it may be damage to the very earliest part of speech production – pre-linguistic conceptualization – that predicts the use, informativeness, and correctness of iconic gestures. Persons with aphasia and concomitant pre-linguistic conceptual impairments (e.g., non-verbal design copying, spatial rotation mentalization) have been shown to produce gestures less frequently than those with relatively intact conceptual abilities (Hadar et al., 1998), further suggesting that it is the pre-linguistic conceptualization that is critical for gesturing (especially iconic). Unfortunately, we could not stratify iconic gesture use by pre-linguistic conceptual ability in the current dataset, as the AphasiaBank corpus does not provide this data. There are additional future avenues that would be fruitful: as Clough & Duff (2020) note, no experimental studies in aphasia have examined how encouraging or constraining gesture affects the fluency of verbal output, or indeed, whether listener perceptions of fluency are influenced by gesture use. Creating a comprehensive picture in regards to the impact of gesturing on fluency in aphasia, by also taking into account different tasks and the use of encouraging or restraining gesture, will be a valuable addition to the current literature.

Interestingly, while gesture has a considerable role in multimodal communication and countless studies have demonstrated increased gesture use by persons living with aphasia, gesture has received comparatively little focus in the speech-language therapy literature, with mixed evidence for its use as a part of (or standalone) therapy (Rose et al., 2013). One such reason for the relatively limited scope of studies evaluating gesture therapy is a school of thought that co-speech gesturing in persons living with aphasia may inhibit linguistic productivity (e.g., Constraint-Induced Language Theory; Cherney et al., 2008). Nonetheless, there remains a decisive issue in the aphasia therapy literature: whilst evidence supports the use of behavioral therapy to improve aphasia, the mechanisms of therapy that promote change remain unclear (Brady et al., 2016). The review by Rose et al. (2013) emphasizes that gestures should be included in clinical assessments in aphasia, and a recent review by Clough & Duff (2020) further emphasizes that a potent means of better understanding the mechanisms of successful behavioral therapy is to comprehensively evaluate multimodal communication (i.e., gesture alongside written and spoken language) in persons with neurogenic communication disorders.

In sum, we need to better understand how and when spontaneous gestures are used, language system characteristics that associate with specific types of gestures (i.e., intact pre-linguistic semantic ability and iconic gesture usage), how gestures differ across tasks and communication scenarios, and the informational and temporal relationship between gesture and speech. A lot of work has been done to clarify spontaneous gesture frequency in aphasia (de Ruiter, 2006; Dipper et al., 2011, 2015; Hogrefe et al., 2016; Kistner et al., 2019; Krauss & Hadar, 2001; Pritchard et al., 2013; Rose et al., 2017; Scharp et al., 2007; Sekine & Rose, 2013b), with Clough & Duff (2020)'s recent review detailing this, but an enhanced investigation of the role of gesture in spontaneous speech – especially across more naturalistic elicitation methods – is both under-

researched and necessary to comprehensively understand the role of gesture in a variety of naturalistic situations. A comprehensive evaluation of gesture should ideally comprise tasks spanning the cognitive and linguistic spectra: constrained tasks (e.g., ask a person to demonstrate, with gesture, how to use a picture object or perform a pictured action), semi-constrained tasks (e.g., structured discourse tasks provided here, where there are clear, structured instructions and, in one case, imagery), and unstructured tasks (e.g., observation of gesture use in conversation with a trusted conversation partner).

Limitations

We acknowledge limitations in the current study. Limb apraxia (and other forms of apraxia, i.e., ideational, ideomotor) data is not available in AphasiaBank, and we therefore could not evaluate the extent to which apraxia influenced iconic gesture frequency or rate during each task (Borod et al., 1989). This study was not pre-registered, but future studies mining databases such as AphasiaBank should consider pre-registration to improve replicability and reliability of proposed analyses. The AphasiaBank sample, while large, is not representative across aphasia (e.g., no global or isolation aphasia in this sample). The AphasiaBank sample includes only those with chronic aphasia (in some cases, many years post-stroke), and therefore the conclusions drawn in this study may not apply to those with more acute or subacute aphasia. Finally, AphasiaBank is a rich resource for studying discourse in aphasia, and has been leading the way in advocating for increased rigor in spoken language discourse analysis in aphasia – however, we did have to exclude participants because of video camera angle, and in almost all scenarios (because of the experimental tasks), there was a table present directly in front of the speaker, which has been shown to greatly constrain gesture usage because of the availability of the table on which to rest the hands and make gesture coding (e.g., differentiation into unique strokes) difficult (Jacobs &

832 Garnham, 2007). Future work in gesture and multimodal communication work should apply the
833 same methodological rigor to the study of gesture that we do to speech, taking into consideration
834 some of these critical components (e.g., room and video set-up). A final limitation was that we
835 chose to code referential and metaphoric gestures as a single category (referential + metaphoric),
836 which did not allow us to evaluate the differences in referential and metaphoric gestures by task.
837 Future work should evaluate differences between metaphoric and referential gesture usage in PWA
838 across task types.

840 We would like to acknowledge Rachel Andros and Sarah Moats for their help with gesture rating.

References

- 841 Atit, K., Göksun, T., Ormand, C. J., Manduca, C. A., Resnick, I., Shipley, T. F., & Tikoff, B.
842 (2013). Spatial gestures point the way: A broader understanding of the gestural referent.
843 *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, 1786–1791.
- 844 Behrmann, M., & Penn, C. (1984). Non-verbal communication of aphasic patients. *British Journal*
845 *of Disorders of Communication*, 19, 155–168.
846 <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/16718129>
- 847 Borod, J. C., Fitzpatrick, P. M., Helm-Estabrooks, N., & Goodglass, H. (1989). The relationship
848 between limb apraxia and the spontaneous use of communicative gesture in aphasia. *Brain*
849 *and Cognition*, 10(1), 121–131. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0278-2626\(89\)90079-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0278-2626(89)90079-1)
- 850 Bottenberg, D., & Lemme, M. (1991). *Effect of shared and unshared listener knowledge on*
851 *narratives of normal and aphasic adults*.
- 852 Braddock, B. A. (2007). *Links between language, gesture and motor skill: A longitudinal study of*
853 *communication recovery in Broca's aphasia*. Univ. Missouri-Columbia.
- 854 Brady, M., Kelly, H., Godwin, J., Enderby, P., & Campbell, P. (2016). Speech and language
855 therapy for aphasia following stroke. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 6.
856 <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000425.pub4>. www.cochranelibrary.com
- 857 Brenneise-Sarshad, R., Nicholas, L. E., & Brookshire, R. H. (1991). Effects of Apparent Listener
858 Knowledge and Picture Stimuli on Aphasic and Non-Brain-Damaged Speakers' Narrative
859 Discourse. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 34(1), 168–176.
860 <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3401.168>
- 861 Brookshire, R., & Nicholas, L. (1994). Speech sample-size and test-retest stability of connected
862 speech measures for adults with aphasia. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing*

863 *Research*, 37(2), 399–407.

864 Campisi, E., & özyürek, A. (2013). Iconicity as a communicative strategy: Recipient design in
865 multimodal demonstrations for adults and children. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 47(1), 14–27.
866 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.12.007>

867 Carlomagno, S., & Cristilli, C. (2006). Semantic attributes of iconic gestures in fluent and non-
868 fluent aphasic adults. *Brain and Language*, 99(1–2), 104–105.
869 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2006.06.061>

870 Cherney, L. R., Patterson, J. P., Raymer, A., Frymark, T., & Schooling, T. (2008). Evidence-based
871 systematic review: effects of intensity of treatment and constraint-induced language therapy
872 for individuals with stroke-induced aphasia. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing*
873 *Research*, 51(5), 1282–1299. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2008/07-0206\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2008/07-0206))

874 Church, R. B., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (1986). The mismatch between gesture and speech as an
875 index of transitional knowledge. *Cognition*, 23(1), 43–71. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(86)90053-3)
876 0277(86)90053-3

877 Cicone, M., Wapner, W., Foldi, N., Zurif, E., & Gardner, H. (1979). The relation between gesture
878 and language in aphasic communication. *Brain and Language*, 8(3), 324–349.
879 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X\(79\)90060-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X(79)90060-9)

880 Clough, S., & Duff, M. C. (2020). The Role of Gesture in Communication and Cognition:
881 Implications for Understanding and Treating Neurogenic Communication Disorders. In
882 *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* (Vol. 14, p. 323). Frontiers Media S.A.
883 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2020.00323>

884 Cocks, N., Dipper, L., Middleton, R., & Morgan, G. (2011). What can iconic gestures tell us about
885 the language system? A case of conduction aphasia. *International Journal of Language and*

886 *Communication Disorders*, 46(4), 423–436. <https://doi.org/10.3109/13682822.2010.520813>

887 Cocks, N., Hird, K., & Kirsner, K. (2007). The relationship between right hemisphere damage and

888 gesture in spontaneous discourse. *Aphasiology*, 21(3–4), 299–319.

889 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687030600911393>

890 Dalton, S. G., & Richardson, J. D. (2019). A Large-Scale Comparison of Main Concept Production

891 Between Persons With Aphasia and Persons Without Brain Injury. *American Journal of*

892 *Speech-Language Pathology*, 28, 293–320. <https://doi.org/10.23641/asha>

893 Dargue, N., Sweller, N., & Jones, M. P. (2019). When our hands help us understand: A meta-

894 analysis into the effects of gesture on comprehension. *Psychological Bulletin*, 145(8), 765–

895 784. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000202>

896 de Beer, C., de Ruiter, J. P., Hielscher-Fastabend, M., & Hogrefe, K. (2019). The Production of

897 Gesture and Speech by People With Aphasia: Influence of Communicative Constraints.

898 *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 62(12), 4417–4432.

899 https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_JSLHR-L-19-0020

900 de Ruiter, J. (2006). Can gesticulation help aphasic people speak, or rather, communicate?

901 *Advances in Speech Language Pathology*, 8(2), 124–127.

902 <https://doi.org/10.1080/14417040600667285>

903 de Ruiter, J., Bangerter, A., & Dings, P. (2012). The Interplay Between Gesture and Speech in the

904 Production of Referring Expressions: Investigating the Tradeoff Hypothesis. *Topics in*

905 *Cognitive Science*, 4(2), 232–248. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-8765.2012.01183.x>

906 Dipper, L., Cocks, N., Rowe, M., & Morgan, G. (2011). What can co-speech gestures in aphasia

907 tell us about the relationship between language and gesture? *Gesture*, 11(2), 123–147.

908 <https://doi.org/10.1075/gest.11.2.02dip>

909 Dipper, L., Pritchard, M., Morgan, G., & Cocks, N. (2015). The language-gesture connection:
 910 Evidence from aphasia. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics*, 29(8–10), 748–763.
 911 <https://doi.org/10.3109/02699206.2015.1036462>

912 Fergadiotis, G., & Wright, H. (2011). Lexical diversity for adults with and without aphasia across
 913 discourse elicitation tasks. *Aphasiology*, 25(11), 1414–1430. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11103-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11103-011-9767-z)
 914 011-9767-z.

915 Fergadiotis, G., Wright, H. H., & Capilouto, G. J. (2011). Productive vocabulary across discourse
 916 types. *Aphasiology*, 25(10), 1261–1278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2011.606974>

917 Feyereisen, P. (1983). MANUAL ACTIVITY DURING SPEAKING IN APHASIC SUBJECTS.
 918 *International Journal of Psychology*, 18(1–4), 545–556.
 919 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207598308247500>

920 Goldblum, M. C. (1978). Les troubles des gestes d’accompagnement du langage au cours des
 921 lésions corticales unilatérales. *Du Contrôle Moteur à l’organisation Du Geste*, 383–395.

922 Goldin-Meadow, S., & Alibali, M. W. (2013). Gesture’s Role in Speaking, Learning, and Creating
 923 Language. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64(1), 257–283. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143802)
 924 psych-113011-143802

925 Gordon, J. K., & Clough, S. (2020). How fluent? Part B. Underlying contributors to continuous
 926 measures of fluency in aphasia. *Aphasiology*, 34(5), 643–663.
 927 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2020.1712586>

928 Graham, J. A., & Heywood, S. (1975). The effects of elimination of hand gestures and of verbal
 929 codability on speech performance. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 5(2), 189–195.
 930 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420050204>

931 Gullberg, M. (2006). Handling Discourse: Gestures, Reference Tracking, and Communication

932 Strategies in Early L2. *Language Learning*, 56(1), 155–196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0023->
933 8333.2006.00344.x

934 Hadar, U., Wenkert-Olenik, D., Krauss, R., & Soroker, N. (1998a). Gesture and the processing of
935 speech: Neuropsychological evidence. *Brain and Language*, 62(1), 107–126.
936 <https://doi.org/10.1006/brln.1997.1890>

937 Hadar, U., Wenkert-Olenik, D., Krauss, R., & Soroker, N. (1998b). Gesture and the processing of
938 speech: Neuropsychological evidence. *Brain and Language*, 62(1), 107–126.
939 <https://doi.org/10.1006/brln.1997.1890>

940 Hadar, Uri. (1991). Speech-related body movement in aphasia: Period analysis of upper arms and
941 head movement. *Brain and Language*, 41(3), 339–366. <https://doi.org/10.1016/0093->
942 934X(91)90160-3

943 Hadar, Uri, & Butterworth, B. (1997). Iconic gestures, imagery, and word retrieval in speech.
944 *Semiotica*, 115(1–2), 147–172. <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.1997.115.1-2.147>

945 Hall, J. A., & Gunnery, S. D. (2013). Gender differences in nonverbal communication. In J.A. Hall
946 & L. Knapp (Eds.), *Handbooks of communication science. Nonverbal Communication* (pp.
947 639–669). DE GRUYTER. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110238150.639>

948 Hilliard, C., & Cook, S. W. (2016). Bridging gaps in common ground: Speakers design their
949 gestures for their listeners. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning Memory and*
950 *Cognition*, 42(1), 91–103. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xlm0000154>

951 Hilverman, C., Cook, S. W., & Duff, M. C. (2016a). Hippocampal declarative memory supports
952 gesture production: Evidence from amnesia. *Cortex*, 85, 25–36.
953 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.09.015>

954 Hilverman, C., Cook, S. W., & Duff, M. C. (2016b). Hippocampal declarative memory supports

955 gesture production: Evidence from amnesia. *Cortex*, 85, 25–36.
 956 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.09.015>
 957 Hoetjes, M., Koolen, R., Goudbeek, M., Krahmer, E., & Swerts, M. (2015). Reduction in gesture
 958 during the production of repeated references. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 79–80, 1–
 959 17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2014.10.004>
 960 Hogrefe, K., Rein, R., Skomroch, H., & Lausberg, H. (2016). Co-speech hand movements during
 961 narrations: What is the impact of right vs. left hemisphere brain damage? *Neuropsychologia*,
 962 93, 176–188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.10.015>
 963 Holle, H., & Gunter, T. C. (2007). The role of iconic gestures in speech disambiguation: ERP
 964 evidence. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 19(7), 1175–1192.
 965 <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.2007.19.7.1175>
 966 Hostetter, A. B. (2011). When Do Gestures Communicate? A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological*
 967 *Bulletin*, 137(2), 297–315. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022128>
 968 Hostetter, A. B., & Alibali, M. W. (2019). Gesture as simulated action: Revisiting the framework.
 969 *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 26(3), 721–752. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-018->
 970 1548-0
 971 Jacobs, N., & Garnham, A. (2007). The role of conversational hand gestures in a narrative task.
 972 *Journal of Memory and Language*, 56(2), 291–303.
 973 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2006.07.011>
 974 Kelly, S. D., Barr, D. J., Church, R. B., & Lynch, K. (1999). Offering a Hand to Pragmatic
 975 Understanding: The Role of Speech and Gesture in Comprehension and Memory. *Journal of*
 976 *Memory and Language*, 40(4), 577–592. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1999.2634>
 977 Kendon, A. (1980). Gesticulation and Speech: Two aspects of the process of utterance. In *The*

978 *Relationship of Verbal and Nonverbal Communication* (pp. 207–227). De Gruyter.
979 <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110813098.207>

980 Kertesz, A. (2007). *Western Aphasia Battery - Revised*. The Psychological Corporation.

981 Kistner, J., Dipper, L. T., & Marshall, J. (2019). The use and function of gestures in word-finding
982 difficulties in aphasia. *Aphasiology*, 33(11), 1372–1392.
983 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2018.1541343>

984 Kita, S. (2014). Production of speech-accompanying gesture. In M. Goldrick, V. Ferreira, & M.
985 Miozzo (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language production* (pp. 451–459). Oxford
986 University Press. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2014-14212-027>

987 Kita, Sotaro, & Davies, T. S. (2009). Competing conceptual representations trigger co-speech
988 representational gestures. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 24(5), 761–775.
989 <https://doi.org/10.1080/01690960802327971>

990 Kita, Sotaro, & Lausberg, H. (2008). Generation of co-speech gestures based on spatial imagery
991 from the right-hemisphere: Evidence from split-brain patients. *Cortex*, 44(2), 131–139.
992 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2006.04.001>

993 Kong, A. P.-H., Law, S.-P., & Chak, G. W.-C. (2017). A Comparison of Coverbal Gesture Use in
994 Oral Discourse Among Speakers With Fluent and Nonfluent Aphasia. *Journal of Speech,*
995 *Language, and Hearing Research*, 60(7), 2031–2046. https://doi.org/10.1044/2017_JSLHR-
996 L-16-0093

997 Kong, A. P. H., Law, S. P., Wat, W. K. C., & Lai, C. (2015a). Co-verbal gestures among speakers
998 with aphasia: Influence of aphasia severity, linguistic and semantic skills, and hemiplegia on
999 gesture employment in oral discourse. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 56, 88–102.
1000 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2015.06.007>

1001 Kong, A. P. H., Law, S. P., Wat, W. K. C., & Lai, C. (2015b). Co-verbal gestures among speakers
 1002 with aphasia: Influence of aphasia severity, linguistic and semantic skills, and hemiplegia on
 1003 gesture employment in oral discourse. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 56, 88–102.
 1004 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2015.06.007>

1005 Krauss, R. M. (1998). Why do we gesture when we speak? *Current Directions in Psychological*
 1006 *Science*.

1007 Krauss, R. M., & Hadar, U. (2001). The role of speech-related arm/hand gestures in word retrieval.
 1008 In R. Campbell & L. Messing (Eds.), *Gesture, Speech, and Sign* (pp. 93–116). Oxford
 1009 University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198524519.003.0006>

1010 Kuhlen, A. K., Galati, A., & Brennan, S. E. (2012). Gesturing integrates top-down and bottom-
 1011 up information: Joint effects of speakers' expectations and addressees' feedback. *Language*
 1012 *and Cognition*, 4(1), 17–41. <https://doi.org/10.1515/langcog-2012-0002>

1013 Li, E. C., della Volpe, A., Rittenman, S., & Williams, S. E. (1996). Variation in grammatic
 1014 complexity across three types of discourse. *Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and*
 1015 *Audiology*, 20(3), 180–186.

1016 Luria, A. (1970). *Traumatic aphasia: Its syndromes, psychology and treatment* (Vol 5). Walter de
 1017 Gruyter.

1018 MacWhinney, B. (2018). *Tools for Analyzing Talk Part 2: The CLAN Program* (Issue 2000).
 1019 <https://talkbank.org/manuals/CLAN.pdf>
<https://doi.org/10.21415/T5G10R>

1020 MacWhinney, B., Forbes, M., & Holland, A. (2011). AphasiaBank: Methods for Studying
 1021 Discourse. *Aphasiology*, 25(11), 1286–1307.
 1022 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2011.589893>.AphasiaBank

1023 McNeill, D. (1992). *Hand and mind: What gestures reveal about thought*. University of Chicago

1024 Press.

1025 Menn, L., Reilly, K. F., Hayashi, M., Kamio, A., Fujita, I., & Sasanuma, S. (1998). The Interaction
 1026 of Preserved Pragmatics and Impaired Syntax in Japanese and English Aphasic Speech. *Brain*
 1027 *and Language*, 61(2), 183–225. <https://doi.org/10.1006/BRLN.1997.1838>

1028 Morsella, E., & Krauss, R. M. (2004). The role of gestures in spatial working memory and speech.
 1029 *American Journal of Psychology*, 117(3), 411–424. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4149008>

1030 Pritchard, M., Cocks, N., & Dipper, L. (2013). Iconic gesture in normal language and word
 1031 searching conditions: A case of conduction aphasia. *International Journal of Speech-*
 1032 *Language Pathology*, 15(5), 524–534. <https://doi.org/10.3109/17549507.2012.712157>

1033 Pritchard, M., Dipper, L., Morgan, G., & Cocks, N. (2015). Language and iconic gesture use in
 1034 procedural discourse by speakers with aphasia. *Aphasiology*, 29(7), 37–41.
 1035 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2014.993912>

1036 Rauscher, F. H., Krauss, R. M., & Chen, Y. (1996). GESTURE, SPEECH, AND LEXICAL
 1037 ACCESS: The Role of Lexical Movements in Speech Production. *Psychological Science*,
 1038 7(4).

1039 Rose, M., & Douglas, J. (2001). The differential facilitatory effects of gesture and visualisation
 1040 processes on object naming in aphasia. *Aphasiology*, 15(10–11), 977–990.
 1041 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687040143000339>

1042 Rose, M. L., Mok, Z., & Sekine, K. (2017). Communicative effectiveness of pantomime gesture
 1043 in people with aphasia. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*,
 1044 52(2), 227–237. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12268>

1045 Rose, M., Raymer, A., Lanyon, L., & Attard, M. (2013). A systematic review of gesture treatments
 1046 for post-stroke aphasia. *Aphasiology*, 27(9), 1090–1127.

1047 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2013.805726>

1048 Scharp, V. L., Tompkins, C. A., & Iverson, J. M. (2007). Gesture and aphasia: Helping hands?

1049 *Aphasiology*, 21(6–8), 717–725. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687030701192273>

1050 Sekine, K., & Rose, M. L. (2013a). The relationship of aphasia type and gesture production in

1051 people with aphasia. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 22(4), 662–672.

1052 [https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360\(2013/12-0030\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360(2013/12-0030))

1053 Sekine, K., & Rose, M. L. (2013b). The relationship of aphasia type and gesture production in

1054 people with aphasia. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 22(4), 662–672.

1055 [https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360\(2013/12-0030\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360(2013/12-0030))

1056 Shadden, B. B., Burnette, R. B., Eikenberry, B. R., & DiBrezzo, R. (1990). *All discourse tasks are*

1057 *not created equal*.

1058 Stark, B. C. (2019a). A comparison of three discourse elicitation methods in aphasia and age-

1059 matched adults: Implications for language assessment and outcome. *American Journal of*

1060 *Speech-Language Pathology*, 28(3), 1067–1083. [https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_AJSLP-18-](https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_AJSLP-18-0265)

1061 0265

1062 Stark, B. C. (2019b). A comparison of three discourse elicitation methods in aphasia and age-

1063 matched adults: Implications for language assessment and outcome. *American Journal of*

1064 *Speech-Language Pathology*, 28(3). https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_AJSLP-18-0265

1065 Stark, B. C., & Fukuyama, J. (2020). The effect of task: leveraging big data to understand spoken

1066 discourse in speakers with and without aphasia. *Language, Cognition and Neuroscience*, Dec.

1067 <https://doi.org/10.1080/23273798.2020.1862258>

1068 Ulatowska, H. K., North, A. J., & Macaluso-Haynes, S. (1981). Production of narrative and

1069 procedural discourse in aphasia. *Brain and Language*, 13(2), 345–371.

1070 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X\(81\)90100-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934X(81)90100-0)

1071 Wright, H. H., & Capilouto, G. J. (2009). Manipulating task instructions to change narrative

1072 discourse performance. *Aphasiology*, 23(10), 1295–1308.

1073 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687030902826844>

Supplementary

Table S1. Iconic gesture examples from the gesture coding, for the Window task, and for the Sandwich task, demonstrating a variety of gesture forms used.

Table S2. Descriptive statistics of gesture type frequency for all gesture types (i.e., iconic, emblem, concrete deictic, and number) collected as a part of this study in N=75 participants.

Table S3. Correlation table between demographic information, language information extracted from each discourse task, and iconic gestures (collapsed across subtypes; for frequency and rate) in N=75 subjects.

Table S4. Correlation table between demographic information, language information extracted from each discourse task, and iconic gestures (collapsed across subtypes; for frequency and rate) in N=43 subjects (subjects who gestured on both tasks).

Tables and Figures

Table 1: Demographics of subject group (N=75).

Demographics	M(SD) or Frequency
Age (years)	60.70 (11.22)
Education (years)	15.43 (2.58)
Aphasia Severity (WAB AQ)*	73.73 (14.37)
Aphasia duration (years)	5.01 (4.31)
Years of SLP therapy	3.26 (2.44)
Race	8 African American 1 Asian 1 Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Island 62 White
Ethnicity	3 Hispanic or Latinx
Gender [^]	34 females
Handedness (pre-morbid)	3 ambidextrous 7 left-handed 64 right-handed 1 unknown
Language Status	6 childhood bilinguals (English plus 2 nd language by 6 years old) 6 late bilinguals (English plus 2 nd language after 6 years old) 62 monolinguals 1 multilingual (speaks 3 or more languages fluently)
Presence of dysarthria and/or apraxia of speech	43 with apraxia of speech 8 with dysarthria (3 unknown)
Presence of hemiparesis or hemiplegia	23 no motor impairment 21 right-sided hemiplegia (i.e., paralysis) 28 right-sided hemiparesis (i.e., weakness) 2 left-hemisphere hemiparesis (i.e., weakness) 1 unknown
Aphasia etiology	73 stroke, 2 other or unknown
Types of aphasia	27 Anomic 19 Broca's 18 Conduction 0 Global 0 Mixed Transcortical 3 Transcortical Motor 1 Transcortical Sensory 2 Wernicke's 5 Not Aphasic by WAB (i.e., scoring >93.8 on WAB)

WAB AQ = Western Aphasia Battery Aphasia Quotient

SLP = speech-language pathology

*=as measured by Western Aphasia Battery Revised Aphasia Quotient, where 100 = no aphasia

^="gender" is the terminology used by AphasiaBank as of publication, but only two options were given to respondents: male or female. This therefore may not reflect other genders (e.g., non-binary, transgender) reflected in the dataset.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics divided by task for full sample (N=75).

Variable	Window Task M(SD, range)	Sandwich Task M(SD, range)
N using at least 1 gesture	43 (57.3%)	76 (100%)
Task duration (secs)	54.51 (37.33, 10-228)	44.96 (29.00, 5-140)
Iconic gesture frequency	1.84 (2.59, 0-11)	7.11 (4.39, 1-34)
Iconic gesture rate	.03 (.06, 0-.27)	.16 (.09, .03-.41)

Table 3: Demographics for subgroup making an iconic gesture on both tasks (N=43).

Demographics	M(SD) or Frequency
Age (years)	57.94 (10.69)
Education (years)	15.62 (2.53)
Aphasia Severity (WAB AQ)*	73.53 (13.81)
Aphasia duration (years)	5.91 (5.04)
Years of SLP therapy	3.59 (2.69)
Race	5 African American 1 Asian 1 Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Island 36 White
Ethnicity	0 Hispanic or Latinx
Gender^	21 females
Handedness (pre-morbid)	3 ambidextrous 5 left-handed 34 right-handed 1 unknown
Language Status	3 childhood bilinguals (English plus 2 nd language by 6 years old) 5 late bilinguals (English plus 2 nd language after 6 years old) 34 monolinguals 1 multilingual (speaks 3 or more languages fluently)
Presence of dysarthria and/or apraxia of speech	25 with apraxia of speech 3 with dysarthria (1 unknown)
Presence of hemiparesis or hemiplegia	11 no motor impairment 11 right-sided hemiplegia (i.e., paralysis) 19 right-sided hemiparesis (i.e., weakness) 2 left-hemisphere hemiparesis (i.e., weakness)
Aphasia etiology	42 stroke, 1 other or unknown
Types of aphasia	18 Anomic 12 Broca's 10 Conduction 0 Global 0 Mixed Transcortical 0 Transcortical Motor 1 Transcortical Sensory 1 Wernicke's 1 Not Aphasic by WAB (i.e., scoring >93.8 on WAB)

WAB AQ = Western Aphasia Battery Aphasia Quotient

SLP = speech-language pathology

*=as measured by Western Aphasia Battery Revised Aphasia Quotient, where 100 = no aphasia

^="gender" is the terminology used by AphasiaBank as of publication, but only two options were given to respondents: male or female. This therefore may not reflect other genders (e.g., non-binary, transgender) reflected in the dataset.

Table 4: Descriptive and comparative statistics for language and gesture variables divided by task. 43).

Variable	Window Task M(SD, range)		Sandwich Task M(SD, range)		Repeated measures statistics By group (N=75; N=43)
Group	N=75 Whole	N=43 Matched	N=75 Whole	N=43 Matched	
Task duration (secs)	54.51 (37.33, 10-228)	59.67 (31.18, 10-135)	44.96 (29.00, 5-140)	45.86 (25.49, 5-111)	N=75, Z=-2.65, p=.008 N=43, Z=-2.88, p=.004*
Language variables					
Utterances	8.81 (4.71, 2-27)	10.21 (4.83, 3-27)	7.56 (4.25, 2-19)	8.37 (4.02, 2-19)	N=75, Z=-2.01, p=.05 N=43, Z=-2.10, p=.04
Words per minute	65.37 (39.82, 12-194.12)	65.06 (40.29, 17.14-194.12)	62.90 (39.15, 13.17-213.33)	63.24 (31.82)	N=75, Z=-.75, p=.46 N=43, Z=-.27, p=.79
Hesitations (proportion of total words) ^	.41 (1.01, 0-7)	.24 (.46, 0-3)	.23 (.19, 0-.97)	.22 (.18, 0-.68)	N=75, Z=.69, p=.49 N=43, Z=1.49, p=.14
Iconic gesture variables					
Frequency	1.84 (2.59, 0-11)	3.21 (2.71, 1-11)	7.11 (439, 1-34)	7.35 (3.24, 2-15)	N=75, Z=-7.04, p<.001* N=43, Z=4.98, p<.001*
Rate	.03 (.06, 0-.27)	.06 (.06, 0-.27)	.16 (.09, .03-.41)	.15 (.09, .04-.41)	N=75, Z=7.36, p<.001* N=43, Z=5.42, p<.001*

* = significant at p<.007 (Bonferroni correction across 7 repeated measures) per group (whole, matched).

^Hesitations can have a larger proportion than 1 when they occur at a greater rate than total words. Hesitations include filled and unfilled pauses of greater than three seconds, false starts, and fillers.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Distribution of gesture frequency (A) and gesture rate (B) on both tasks (N=75). Data callouts indicate average, whilst each data point (and its relative intensity/shadow) indicate individual subject scores.

Figure 2. Pairwise comparisons of gesture rate by fluency group, during Window task (top) and Sandwich task (bottom), for subgroup of subjects who made at least one iconic gesture on both tasks (N=43).

Learning Outcomes

- 1084 1. The reader will synthesize major hypotheses related to gesture usage in aphasia and how
1085 they relate to performance on specific discourse tasks.
- 1086 2. The reader will understand the difference between iconic gesturing and other language-like
1087 gestures, and the relationship between iconic gestures and spoken language.
- 1088 3. The reader will identify that task-specific gesturing (in particular, iconic gesturing) occurs
1089 in both persons with and without aphasia.