UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

SANTA CRUZ

VOICE QUALITY AND TONE AT THE PHONETICS AND PHONOLOGY INTERFACE

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

LINGUISTICS

by

Mykel Loren Brinkerhoff

June 2025

The Dissertation of Mykel Loren Brinkerhoff
is approved:

_____

Professor Grant McGuire, Chair

_____

Professor Jaye Padgett

_____

Professor Ryan Bennett

_____

Professor Marc Garellek

_____

Peter Biehl
Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

Abstract

Voice Quality and Tone at the phonetics and phonology interface

by

Mykel Loren Brinkerhoff

Theses have elements. Isn't that nice?

To myself,

Mykel Loren Brinkerhoff,

the only person worthy of my company.

Acknowledgments

I want to "thank" my committee, without whose ridiculous demands, I would have graduated so, so, very much faster.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Every dissertation should have an introduction. You might not realize it, but the introduction should introduce the concepts, backgrouand, and goals of the dissertation.

Title	Author
War And Peace	Leo Tolstoy
The Great Gatsby	F. Scott Fitzgerald

Table 1.1: A normalsize table. There has been a complaint that table captions are not single-spaced. This is odd because the code indicates that they should be.

Table 1.2: A small table.

Title	Author
War And Peace	Leo Tolstoy
The Great Gatsby	F. Scott Fitzgerald

Chapter 2

Vowels and suprasegmentals in Santiago Laxopa Zapotec

2.1   Introduction

Santiago Laxopa Zapotec (SLZ; *Dilla'xhunh Laxup* [diʒaˀʐun lːaʂupʰ]) is a Northern Zapotec language spoken by approximately 1000 people in the municipality of Santiago Laxopa, Ixtlán,Oaxaca, Mexico and in diaspora communities throughout Mexico and the United States (Adler & Morimoto 2016, Adler et al. 2018, Foley, Kalivoda & Toosarvandani 2018, Foley & Toosarvandani 2020).

2.2 Vowels

2.2.1 Voice Quality

2.3 Tones

Chapter 3

On using Residual H1* for voice quality research

3.1 Introduction

It is well understood that the term voice quality refers to and describes the manner in which the vocal folds vibrate during speech production. Many languages make use of voice quality to convey paralinguistic information by "indexing the biological, psychological, and social characteristics of the speaker" (Laver 1968, Podesva 2016). In addition to using voice quality to convey paralinguistic information, many languages use voice quality to convey phonemic distinctions (Garellek 2019).

It has long been established that voice quality contrasts have correlates in the

acoustic signal (Fischer-Jørgensen 1968, Buder 1999, Kent & Ball 1999). For example, Fischer-Jørgensen (1968) found that a strengthened fundamental correlated with breathy voice in Gujarati. In order to normalize the amplitude of the fundamental and counter-act some of the effects of high-pass filtering and differences in sound pressure in the signal, she proposed that you could subtract the amplitude of a higher harmonic, in this case, the second harmonic (H2), from the amplitude of the fundamental (H1). This measure, H1-H2, has since been used in many studies to measure not only breathy voice but other voice quality contrasts as well (Garellek 2019, Chai & Garellek 2022).

Despite the large amount of evidence in support of H1-H2, it is not without its problems (Chai & Garellek 2022). One of the main problems is that using H2 and other normalizations (e.g., H1-A3) are really just attempts at trying to understand the relative strength of the fundamental to higher harmonic energy. Furthermore, Sundberg (2022) found that H1 and H2 are affected differently by subglottal pressure, compromising some of the original reasoning behind the use of H1-H2 from Fischer-Jørgensen (1968). Furthermore, it is not uncommon for researchers to find that H1-H2 is not always the best measure to distinguish voice quality contrasts. For example, Esposito (2010) found that in Santa Ana del Valle Zapotec H1-H2 was only effective in distinguishing the voice quality contrasts in female speakers of the language and male speakers were better distinguished by H1-A3. Furthermore, Garellek & Esposito (2021)

found that the prominence of the cepstral peak, a type of harmonic measurement of noise, was a better measure to distinguish voice quality contrasts in White Hmong than H1-H2 and other measures of the spectral-slope.

Chai & Garellek (2022) found that in addition to the issues mentioned above, errors in measuring H1-H2 is uncomfortably high. This is primarily due to the need to precisely measure two different harmonic amplitudes and when there are errors in calculating H1 this is turn leads to errors in calculating H2 (Arras 1998). An example of this is type of error propagation is that when there are errors in measuring the fundamental frequency, which is especially common with non-modal phonation, errors are introduced into measuring harmonics because they are based on the fundamental. Despite algorithms correcting for vowel height, a common error that occurs with calculating and measuring the fundamental frequency is when a high fundamental frequency co-occurs with a low first formant. This situation causes errors in tracking the fundamental frequency and the first formant. A final issue that can occur with measuring the harmonics is in contexts where the vowel is nasalized. Simpson (2012) shows that in these nasalized context, the first nasal pole (P0) can increase the amplitude of H2 and, when the fundamental frequency is high, H1 is instead increased.

This collection of errors leads Chai & Garellek (2022) to propose a new measure, residual H1*. This measure is calculated by first regressing H1 on energy and then subtracting the product of energy and the energy factor from H1. Chai & Garellek ar-

gue that this measure better reflects the initial purpose of using H1-H2. Furthermore, they find that residual H1*: (i) provides better differentiation between phonation types in !Xóõ; (ii) was more robust for measuring creak in Mandarin with respect to different utterance positions; and (iii) has a stronger relationship to the open quotient than H1*H2*.

For our study, we tested residual H1* with data from Santiago Laxopa Zapotec. This language has a complex interaction between tone and phonation types that has led traditional spectral-tilt measures not adequately to capture the differences in phonation in previous studies. We find that residual H1* can adequately capture differences in voice quality and is a more robust measure of voice quality than H1-H2. Adding credence to the use of this measure in voice quality research.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 3.2 provides a brief overview of the Santiago Laxopa Zapotec language. Section 3.3 describes the methods used in data collection, data processing, and statistical modeling used in this study. Section 3.4 presents the results of the study. Section 3.5 concludes the paper.

3.2 Santiago Laxopa Zapotec

Santiago Laxopa Zapotec is a Northern Zapotec language of the Oto-manguean language family (Adler & Morimoto 2016, Adler et al. 2018, Foley, Kalivoda & Toosarvandani 2018, Foley & Toosarvandani 2020, Sichel & Toosarvandani 2020a,b, Brinker-

hoff, Duff & Wax Cavallaro 2021, 2022). It is spoken by 981 people in the municipality of Santiago Laxopa, Ixtlán, Oaxaca, Mexico (*Santiago Laxopa* 2022) and a small number of other speakers in diaspora throughout Mexico and the United States. Similar to other Oto-manguean languages, Santiago Laxopa Zapotec is laryngeally complex, which refers to how these languages make use of contrastive tone and contrastive voice quality (Silverman 1997a,b, Blankenship 1997, 2002).

Santiago Laxopa Zapotec exhibits the standard five-vowel inventory, which is further distinguished by the use of a four-way contrast in voice quality. This variety is unique because it is a Northern Core Zapotec that has developed breathy voice in addition to the two types of laryngealization that characterize the rest of the Zapotec languages, namely checked and rearticulated (see Ariza-García (2018) for a typological study of voice quality distinctions in Zapotec languages).

Santiago Laxopa Zapotec is also tonal with three level tones (H, M, and L) and two contours (MH and HL) appearing in nominals (Brinkerhoff, Duff & Wax Cavallaro 2022).[1] The language has a complex interaction between tone and phonation types. Every tone can appear with every phonation type, with two exceptions being that breathy voice cannot appear with the high tone and checked voice cannot appear with the rising contour tone.

These interactions between voice quality and tone present a rich environment for

---

[1] The tonal system of Santiago Laxopa Zapotec for verbs and other lexical categories are still being evaluated.

testing the reliability of voice quality measures in laryngeally complex languages.

3.3   Methods

3.3.1   Elicitation

Ten native speakers of SLZ (five female; five male) participated in a wordlist elicitation. Elicitation was performed in the pueblo of Santiago Laxopa, Ixtlán, Oaxaca, Mexico during the summer of 2022 on a Zoom H4n handheld recorder (16-bit, 44.5 kHz).

The wordlist consisted of 72 items repeated three times each in isolation and the carrier sentence *Shnia' X chonhe lhas* "I say X three times". Between these 72 words, there were 11 words with breathy voice, 9 with rearticulated voice, 10 with checked voice, and 42 with modal. Thirteen of the 72 words were disyllabic and contained the same voice quality in each syllable. Of those 13, only five contained mixed voicing.

3.3.2   Data Processing

Each vowel of the target words in the carrier sentence condition was labeled following Garellek (2020) for where the vowel began and ended. Each vowel in the word list was annotated for speaker, word, vowel, tone, voice quality, and utterance number. This labeling was conducted for each of the vowels located in the target word from

the elicitation list of the carrier sentences.

These vowels were then extracted and fed into VoiceSauce for acoustic measuring (Shue, Keating & Vicenik 2009). The formants were measured using Snack (Sjölander 2004), while the fundamental frequency (*f0*) was measured using the STRAIGHT algorithm (Kawahara, Cheveigne & Patterson 1998). Spectral slope measures were corrected for formants and bandwidths (Hanson 1997, Iseli, Shue & Alwan 2007). Each vowel was measured with ten equal time intervals, resulting in 22890 data points in total.

The data was cleaned of outliers following the same steps taken by Chai & Garellek (2022) in their study. The H1*, H1*–H2*, and *f0* values were z-scored by speaker to reduce the variation between the speakers and provide a way to directly compare the different measures on the same scale. Data points with an absolute z-score value greater than 3 were considered outliers and excluded from the analyzes. Within each vowel category, we calculated the Mahalanobis distance in the F1-F2 panel. Each data point with a Mahalanobis distance greater than 6 was considered an outlier and excluded from the analysis. This is comparable to what was done in Garellek & Esposito (2021), Seyfarth & Garellek (2018), and Chai & Ye (2022).

Time points whose $f0$, F1, or F2 values were outliers were also excluded from H1* and H1* - H2* analyzes because H1 * and H1 * - H2 * are calculated based on $f0$, F1, and F2. Energy was excluded if it had a value of zero and then log-transformed to

11

normalize its right-skewed distribution. Afterward, the resulted log-transformed data was z-scored and any data point with a z-score larger than 3 was excluded. This outlier removal resulted in 1918 datapoints being removed.

After the outliers were removed, we calculated residual H1* for the remaining data points following Chai & Garellek (2022). First, a linear mixed effects model was generated with the z-scored H1* as the response variable and the z-scored energy as fixed effect. The uncorrelated interaction of the z-scored energy by speaker was treated as random. The energy factor resulting from this linear mixed-effects model was extracted. Finally, the z-scored H1* had the product of the z-scored energy and the energy factor subtracted from it, giving us the residual H1* measure.

The measures were then assigned according to their position in the vowel (first, middle, and third) for statistical modeling.

3.3.3 Statistical modeling

Three linear mixed-effects regression models were fitted, one each for the z-scored H1*-H2* and residual H1*. Each model had tone and interaction between voice quality and position in the vowel as fixed effects, and vowel and interaction between speaker, word, and repetition as random intercepts.

$$Measure \sim Phonation*Position+Tone+(1|Speaker:Word:Repetition)+(1|Vowel)$$

$$(3.1)$$

The tone and the interaction between voice quality and position in the vowel were selected as fixed effects for several reasons. The first is that five unique tones appeared in the data and it is well established that tone interacts with voice quality in different ways (see Esposito & Khan 2020, Garellek 2019 for discussion). By treating tone as a fixed effect in our model, we can account for these interactions. The interaction between voice quality and position in the vowel as a fixed effect was included to account for the temporal differences that between the two different laryngealizations; checked and rearticulated vowels. Checked vowels in Zapotec languages have a glottal occlusion or a short period of creaky voice located at the right edge of the vowel. This is in contrast to rearticulated vowels, where there is a glottal occlusion or creaky voice in the middle of the vowel. Because this difference between checked and rearticulated vowels is temporal in nature, we can account for this difference through the interaction of voice quality and position in the vowel.[2]

The interaction between speaker, word, and repetition was treated as a random intercept because this allows us to take into account that each speaker said each word on the elicitation list three times. This intercept accounts for not only the intra-speaker

---

[2]Tone and voice quality are closely linked . By including only the positional interaction with voice quality we can avoid collinear interactions that appear when we try to include tone in the interaction.

variability, but also the inter-speaker variability during each time the word was uttered. Treating a vowel as a random intercept allows us to capture the fact that each voice quality occurred with different vowels during elicitation.

3.4 Results

3.4.1 H1*-H2*

Figure 3.1 shows the mean H1*-H2* values for each voice quality at each of the ten vowel intervals. We see that the breathy, checked, and rearticulated all have values lower than the modal at each of the first nine intervals. In the final interval, breathy and rearticulated are essentially equal to the modal value. In contrast, checked's value remains lower than the modal's value throughout the entire vowel.

Figure 3.1: H1*-H2* across the duration of the vowel. Points represent the mean of each measure across the ten intervals. The error bars around each point represent ±1.96 Std. Error. A line was plotted over each to show how the acoustic measure functions across the ten intervals.

3.4.2 Residual H1*

Figure 3.2 shows the mean residual H1* values for each voice quality at each of the ten vowel intervals. In contrast to Figure 3.1, we see that breathy has a higher residual H1* measure than modal throughout the duration of the vowel, which is consistent with other observations for breathy voice (Fischer-Jørgensen 1968). Checked and rearticulated both have lower values than the modal at each of the 10 intervals. In addition, it shows that the checked voice has a lower residual H1 * value than the rearticulated voice at intervals 8 through 10. The rearticulated voice has a lower residual H1 * value than the checked voice at intervals 1 through 7, showing the temporal distinction between these two voice qualities.


Figure 3.2: Residual H1* across the duration of the vowel. Points represent the mean of each measure across the ten intervals. The error bars around each point represent ±1.96 Std. Error. A line was plotted over each to show how the acoustic measure functions across the ten intervals.

3.4.3 Model Comparison

In order to asses the robustness of the models we compared the residual H1* linear mixed-effects model to the H1*-H2* linear mixed-effects model. This was carried out using two methods: direct comparison of the outputs of the two models in the same way as Chai & Garellek (2022) and the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC).

Table 3.1 shows the results of the comparison of the linear mixed-effects models for H1*-H2* and residual H1 *. In comparing these models, we find that the residual H1* model performed better than the H1*-H2* model in distinguishing voice quality contrasts in Santiago Laxopa Zapotec. This is supported by the larger absolute value of the coefficient estimate, the lower standard error and the higher t-value of the residual H1* to distinguish breathy, checked and rearticulated vowels from modal vowels.

Table 3.1: Model comparison between H1*–H2* and Residual H1* in distinguishing Santiago Laxopa Zapotec voice quality.

Voice Quality Contrast	Model	β	Std. Error	t-value	p-value	
Breathy vs Modal	H1*-H2*	-0.03569	0.04210	-0.84781	0.39656	
	Res. H1*	0.14997	0.03175	4.72315	<0.001	***
Checked vs Modal	H1*-H2*	-0.14120	0.04050	-3.48623	<0.001	***
	Res. H1*	-0.38554	0.03061	-12.59335	<0.001	***
Rearticulated vs Modal	H1*-H2	-0.13719	0.04964	-2.76340	0.00574	**
	Res. H1*	-0.48437	0.03740	-12.95239	<0.001	***

Table 3.2 shows the results of the AIC comparison between the H1*-H2* and residual H1* models. The residual H1* model had a lower AIC than the H1 * -H2 * model, indicating that the residual H1* model is a better fit for the data than the H1*-H2* model. Even though AIC comparison is usually conducted on nested models, it is still

a useful tool for comparing non-nested models (Burnham & Anderson 2004b, Burnham, Anderson & Huyvaert 2011, Burnham & Anderson 2004a).

Table 3.2: AIC for the H1*-H2* and residual H1* models.

Model	AIC	Δ AIC
H1*-H2* model	43386.99	11214.54
Residual H1* model	32172.45	0

3.5 Conclusion

In conclusion, we find that residual H1* is a more robust measure of voice quality than H1-H2 in Santiago Laxopa Zapotec. This is supported by the results of the linear mixed-effects models, which show that residual H1* is better at distinguishing breathy, checked, and rearticulated vowels from modal vowels. This is further supported by the AIC comparison, which shows that the residual H1* model is a better fit for the data than the H1*-H2* model. These results lend credence to the claims of Chai & Garellek (2022) and support the use of residual H1* in voice quality research, especially in laryngeally complex languages.

Chapter 4

The acoustic space of voice quality in Santiago Laxopa Zapotec

4.1 Introduction

This chapter details a study of the acoustic dimension of voice quality in Santiago Laxopa Zapotec (SLZ) using a Multidimensional Scaling (MDS) analysis of acoustic data. MDS is a statistical method to reduce the dimensionality of a dataset to visualize the relationships between data points. In this study, MDS is used to visualize the acoustic space of voice quality in SLZ. The results of this analysis provide insight into the acoustic correlates of voice quality in SLZ and contribute to our understanding of the phonetic properties of this underdocumented language.

This study is based on the work conducted by Keating et al. (2023) on the acoustic space of voice quality in 11 languages. However, this study focuses on a single language, SLZ, and provides a detailed analysis of the acoustic properties of voice quality in this language. The results of this study will contribute to our understanding of the phonetic properties of SLZ and how the acoustic properties of voice quality in this language compare to other languages.

4.2   Methods

4.2.1   Participants

This study uses data collected from 10 native speakers of SLZ during the summer of 2022. Participants were recruited from the community of Santiago Laxopa, Oaxaca, Mexico. All participants were native speakers of SLZ. The participants were between the ages of 18 and 60 years and consisted of 5 males and 5 females.

4.2.2   Recordings

The participants were asked to perform a word list elicitation task consisting of 76 words. These words were selected to elicit a wide range of voice quality types, including modal, creaky, and breathy voice. The words were selected based on previous research conducted as part of the Zapotec Language Project at the University

of California, Santa Cruz (*Zapotec Language Project — University of California, Santa Cruz* 2022). Because participants were not literate in SLZ, the word list was prompted for them by asking them "How do you say [word in Spanish]?" in Zapotec by myself and another researcher. Participants were asked to respond with the desired word in the carrier phrase *Shnia' [WORD] chonhe lhas* "I say [WORD] three times." which was repeated three times. These utterances were recorded in a quiet environment using a Zoom H4n digital recorder. The recordings were saved as 16-bit WAV files with a sampling rate of 44.1 kHz.

4.2.3   Acoustic measuring

These resulting audio files were then processed in Praat to isolate the vowel portion of each word. The onset of the vowel was set to the second glottal pulse after the onset and the offset of the vowel was set to the last glottal pulse before the decrease in amplitude at the end of the vowel (Garellek 2020). The vowel was then extracted and saved as a separate file for analysis.

These vowels were fed into VoiceSauce (Shue, Keating & Vicenik 2009) to generate the acoustic measures for the studies discussed in this dissertation. Because many of the acoustic measures are based on the fundamental frequency; this measure was calculated using the STRAIGHT algorithm from (Kawahara, Cheveigne & Patterson 1998). The STRAIGHT algorithm estimates the fundamental frequency at

one-millisecond (ms) intervals. Once the fundamental frequency is estimated, VoiceSauce then uses an optimization function to locate the harmonics of the spectrum, finding their amplitudes.

VoiceSauce then uses the Snack Sound toolkit (Sjölander 2004) to find the frequencies and bandwidths of the first four formants, also at one-millisecond intervals. The amplitudes of the harmonics closest to these formant frequencies are located and treated as the amplitudes of the formants. These formant frequencies and bandwidths are used to correct the harmonic amplitudes for the filtering effects of the vocal tract, using Iseli, Shue & Alwan's 2007 extension of the method employed by Hanson (1997). Each vowel was measured across ten equal time intervals, resulting in 22890 data points in total. These measures were then z-scored by speaker to reduce the variation between speakers and provide a way to directly compare the different measures on the same scale.

4.2.4   Data processing

Data points with an absolute z-score value greater than 3 were considered outliers and excluded from the analyses in the dissertation. Within each vowel category, the Mahalanobis distance was calculated in the F1-F2 panel. Each data point with a Mahalanobis distance greater than 6 was considered an outlier and excluded from the analysis.

Energy was excluded if it had a value of zero and then log-transformed to normalize its right-skewed distribution. Afterward, the resulting log-transformed data was z-scored and any data point with a z-score larger than 3 was excluded. This outlier removal resulted in 1918 datapoints being removed.

After removal of the outliers, I calculated residual H1* for the remaining data points following Chai & Garellek (2022). First, a linear mixed effects model was generated with the z-scored H1* as the response variable and the z-scored energy as fixed effect. The uncorrelated interaction of the z-scored energy by speaker was treated as random. The energy factor resulting from this linear mixed-effects model was extracted. Finally, the z-scored H1* was the product of the z-scored energy and the energy factor subtracted from it.

Once these steps were completed, the mean of the fifth and sixth intervals was taken for each vowel and speaker. This is similar to what Keating et al. (2023) did by taking the middle of the vowel for their analysis. The reason for this choice is to minimize the effect of the onset and offset of the vowel on the acoustic measures which are more likely to be affected by the surrounding consonants and should give us the most accurate representation of the vowel quality. Because z-scores were used, this resulted in measures that were negative, which presents a problem for MDS analyses. To correct for this, I added the absolute value of the minimum z-score to each measure. This results in a dataset that still preserves the relative differences in the scores while

providing a dataset that is all positive for the MDS analysis.

4.2.5   Statistical analysis

Using a multidimensional scaling (MDS) analysis is a statistical method of reducing the dimensionality of a dataset to visualize the relationships between the data points (Kruskal & Wish 1978). This is especially true when there are many variables that are could contribute to the data. In the case of voice quality this is especially true. As shown in Kreiman et al. (2014, 2021) and Garellek (2020) voice quality is pscyhoacoustically complex and a single measure is not enough to capture the full range of voice quality. Instead, what is required is multiple measures that function as cues for the different types of voice quality. For example, a vowel that is characterized as having a breathy voice has an elevated spectral-slope and a lowered harmonics-to-noise ratio than modal voice. A creaky voice is characterized as having a lowered spectral-slope and a lowered harmonics-to-noise ratio.

Because MDS analyses of many variables can result in rather unmeaningful results, I chose to focus on the speaker x voice quality interaction. This provides us with the opportunity to see how the speakers differ in their production of the different voice qualities. This means that each speakers production of the four phonation contrasts is represented as a single point in the MDS plot. This is similar to what Keating et al. (2023) did in their study of the acoustic space of voice quality in 11 languages. Except

23

that they compared the language x voice quality interaction. Both of these interactions show us similar information, one shows us within a language, while the other shows us between languages.

The MDS analysis was conducted in R using the 'metaMDS' function in the 'vegan' package. The Manhattan distance was used to estimate the physical differences between the pairs of speaker x voice quality. Because the distances are non-Euclidean, the MDS analysis was conducted using the non-metric option.

This algorithm resulted in a solution that involves a number of different dimensions. The number of dimensions that are retained directly affects how well the original data is captured. To many dimensions and the data is overfit, to few and the data is underfit. To determine the number of dimensions to retain, I used a scree plot to plot the stress of each dimension. The 'elbow' of the curve was identified as the correct number of dimensions for the analysis. Figure 4.1 shows that most of the data is captured in a two-dimensional space. With the third dimension, some more subtle information about the voice quality is added.

Scree Plot for the MDS solution

Figure 4.1: Scree plot for the MDS analysis.

4.3 Results

4.3.1 Acoustic space of voice quality

As mentioned above results of the MDS analysis can be represented in a two-dimensional space, as shown in Figure 4.2. In this and all subsequent plots, breathy voice is represented by black, checked voice with orange, rearticulated voice with green, and modal voice with blue. Overall, we see that breathy voice is located to the left of the plot, checked and rearticulated voice are tending to the right, and modal voice is located in the center along the first dimension. The second dimension shows

a modal and nonmodal split with modal voice at the bottom of the plot and nonmodal voice at the top.

Figure 4.2: Two-dimensional MDS solution showing the first and second dimensions.

As mentioned above, the third dimension adds more information about voice quality. The addition of the third dimension helps to spread the groups along the first dimension, as shown in Figure 4.3. We see that breathy vowels are located at the top of the plot and the two types of creaky voice (checked and rearticulated) are at the bottom of the plot.

When the third dimension is added to the second, we see that breathy voices becomes separated from the other nonmodal voice qualities, as shown in Figure 4.4.

Figure 4.3: Two-dimensional MDS solution showing the first and third dimensions.

4.3.2 Acoustic correlates of voice quality

An additional step to the MDS analysis involves testing which acoustic measures contribute the most weight to the different dimensions. Table 4.1 shows the results of this test. In each of the three dimensions of the MDS analysis, the acoustic measures that have the highest weight are in boldface. In the case of the first and second dimensions (D1 and D2), the acoustic measures that have weights higher than those of other parameters are in boldface (weights > 4.0). In the case of the third dimension (D3), the acoustic measures that have weights higher than those of other parameters

Figure 4.4: Two-dimensional MDS solution showing the second and third dimensions.

are in boldface (weights > 3.0).

We see that for D1, the acoustic measures that have the highest weight on the first dimension are the amplitudes for the first three formants (i.e., A1*, A2*, A3*) and HNR < 500 Hz (i.e., a harmonics-to-noice ratio for everything from 0 to 500 Hz). For D2, the acoustic measures that have the highest weight are H1*-A1*, H1*-A2* (i.e., spectral-slope measures) and the amplitudes of the first two formants. For D3, we see that HNR < 1500 HZ, HNR < 2500 Hz, and HNR < 3500 Hz and Residual H1* and H2* have the highest weights.

Table 4.1: Weight of each acoustic measure along each dimension of the three-dimensional MDS solution (D1, D2, D3). Parameters that have weights higher than those of other parameters on each dimension are in boldface (weights > 4.0 for D1 and D2, and weights > 3.0 for D3).

Acoustic Measure	D1	D2	D3
h1h2	1.03	1.01	0.39
h2h4	1.15	3.98	2.13
h1a1	2.22	**5.15**	1.84
h1a2	2.93	**4.66**	1.00
h1a3	2.37	3.24	0.90
h42k	1.47	0.31	1.59
h2kh5k	3.73	0.73	0.84
h1_resid	1.75	0.97	**4.24**
h2	1.76	0.94	**4.09**
h4	0.79	4.28	0.10
a1	**4.96**	**5.48**	0.17
a2	**5.30**	**4.90**	1.38
a3	**4.54**	2.91	1.11
cpp	4.08	0.10	1.68
hnr05	**5.66**	1.47	1.81
hnr15	3.95	2.68	**3.08**
hnr25	3.15	1.63	**3.42**
hnr35	2.86	0.55	**3.19**
soe	2.09	0.78	0.36
shr	2.39	0.50	0.47
energy	2.22	3.91	0.64

4.4 Discussion

The results of the MDS analysis show that the acoustic space that SLZ's voice quality occupies is similar to that of other languages. Similar to the findings that Keating et al. (2023) found in their study, the first dimension appears to roughly be similar to the open quotient of the glottis as proposed by Gordon & Ladefoged (2001). In this model, voice quality is seen as being simply the results of the glottis being

open or closed. the more open the glottis the more breathy the phonation is. The more closed the glottis the more creaky the phonation. This model from Gordon & Ladefoged (2001) is shown in Figure 4.5.

Open Glottis   Closed Glottis

[h]   Breathy   Modal   Creaky   [ʔ]

Figure 4.5: A diagram showing the relationship between breathy, modal, and creaky phonation types. Based on Gordon & Ladefoged (2001).

As mentioned above, the measures that contribute the most this dimension are the amplitudes of the first three formants and HNR < 500 Hz. It is interesting even though this dimension is similar to the open-quotient model, we do not observe measures that are traditionally associated with this measure (i.e., spectal-slope). Instead of seeing traditional spectral-slope measures, we find the three formant amplitudes which are used to normalize the amplitude of the fundamental like in the measures H1*-A1*, H1*-A2*, and H1*-A3*. This suggests that the first dimension is more about the amplitude of the formants than the spectral-slope of the signal. This is combined with the HNR < 500 Hz which is a measure of the harmonics-to-noise ratio for the first 500 Hz of the signal.

The second dimension divides the space into modal versus non-modal voice quality.

The third dimension adds more information about non-modal voice quality. As seen in Figure 4.3 and Figure 4.4, this third dimension separates breathy voice from

the other non-modal phonation types. The measures that contribute the most to this dimension are the harmonics-to-noise ratio for the first 1500 Hz, 2500 Hz, and 3500 Hz. In addition, the residual H1* and H2* have the highest weights, which is interesting given that residual H1* has been argued to be a more robust measure of the spectral-slope of the signal than the traditional spectral-slope measures (Chai & Garellek 2022, Brinkerhoff & McGuire 2024). Additionally, As discussed in Chapter 3, residual H1* does represent the voice quality in SLZ better than H1*-H2* and H1*-A3*.

This dimension is characterized by the harmonics-to-noise ratio for the first 1500 Hz, 2500 Hz, and 3500 Hz. This suggests that the third dimension is more about the spectral quality of the signal than the amplitude of the formants. This is combined with the residual H1* and H2* which are measures of the spectral-slope of the signal.

Even though I have been talking about the

4.5   Conclusion

This is

Chapter 5

Trees reveal the importance of measures in SLZ

Chapter 6

Testing the laryngeal complexity hypothesis

6.1 Laryngeal Complexity

Some other research was once performed.

6.2

Figure 6.1: A first figure.

Figure 6.2: A second figure.

Chapter 7

Modeling laryngeal complexity

Chapter 8

Conclusion

Bibliography

Adler, Jeff, Steven Foley, Jed Pizarro-Guevara, Kelsey Sasaki & Maziar Toosarvandani. 2018. The derivation of verb initiality in Santiago Laxopa Zapotec. In Jason Merchant, Line Mikkelsen, Deniz Rudin & Kelsey Sasaki (eds.), *A reasonable way to proceed: Essays in honor of Jim McCloskey*, 31–49. Santa Cruz, Berkeley, Chicago: University of California.

Adler, Jeff & Maho Morimoto. 2016. Acoustics of phonation types and tones in Santiago Laxopa Zapotec. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 140(4). 3109–3109. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4969713.

Ariza-García, Andrea. 2018. Phonation types and tones in Zapotec languages: A synchronic comparison. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana* XIV(2). 485–516. https://doi.org/10.30842/alp2306573714220.

Arras, Kai O. 1998. *An Introduction to Error Propagation: Derivation, Meaning and Examples of Equation CY= FX CX FXT*. EPFL-ASL-TR-98-01 R3. Lausanne, Switzerland: Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne (EPFL).

Avelino, Heriberto. 2004. *Topics in Yalálag Zapotec, with particular reference to its phonetic structures.* Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles dissertation. 315 pp.

Black, Cheryl A. 1996. A backwards binding construction in Zapotec. *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session* 40(1). https://doi.org/10.31356/silwp.vol40.01.

Blankenship, Barbara. 1997. *The time course of breathiness and laryngealization in vowels.* Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles dissertation.

Blankenship, Barbara. 2002. The timing of nonmodal phonation in vowels. *Journal of Phonetics* 30(2). 163–191. https://doi.org/10.1006/jpho.2001.0155.

Brinkerhoff, Mykel Loren, John Duff & Maya Wax Cavallaro. 2021. Downstep in Santiago Laxopa Zapotec and the prosodic typology of VSO languages. In *Manchester Phonology Meeting.* Manchester, England.

Brinkerhoff, Mykel Loren, John Duff & Maya Wax Cavallaro. 2022. Tonal patterns and their restrictions in Santago Laxopa Zapotec.

Brinkerhoff, Mykel Loren & Grant McGuire. 2024. On residual H1* as a measure of voice quality. In Taehong Cho, Sahyang Kim, Jeff Holiday & Sang-Im Lee-Kim (eds.), *Proceedings of the 19th Conference on Laboratory Phonology.* Seoul, Korea: Hanyang Institute for Phonetics and Cognitive Sciences of Language5.

Brunelle, Marc. 2012. Dialect experience and perceptual integrality in phonological registers: Fundamental frequency, voice quality and the first formant in Cham. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 131(4). 3088–3102. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3693651.

Brunelle, Marc & James Kirby. 2016. Tone and Phonation in Southeast Asian Languages. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 10(4). 191–207. https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12182.

Buder, Eugene H. 1999. Acoustic analysis of voice quality: A tabulation of algorithms 1902-1990. In Raymond D. Kent & Martin J. Ball (eds.), *Voice quality measurement*, 119–244. San Diego: Singular Pub. Group.

Bueno Holle, Juan José. 2019. *Information structure in Isthmus Zapotec narrative and conversation* (Topics at the Grammar-Discourse Interface 3). https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.2538324.

Burnham, Kenneth P. & David R. Anderson (eds.). 2004a. *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference.* New York, NY: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/b97636.

Burnham, Kenneth P. & David R. Anderson. 2004b. Multimodel Inference: Understanding AIC and BIC in Model Selection. *Sociological Methods & Research* 33(2). 261–304. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124104268644.

Burnham, Kenneth P., David R. Anderson & Kathryn P. Huyvaert. 2011. AIC model selection and multimodel inference in behavioral ecology: some background, ob-

servations, and comparisons. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 65(1). 23–35. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-010-1029-6.

Campbell, Eric W. 2017. Otomanguean historical linguistics: Past, present, and prospects for the future. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 11(4). e12240. https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12240.

Chai, Yuan & Marc Garellek. 2022. On H1–H2 as an acoustic measure of linguistic phonation type. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 152(3). 1856–1870. https://doi.org/10.1121/10.0014175.

Chai, Yuan & Shihong Ye. 2022. Checked Syllables, Checked Tones, and Tone Sandhi in Xiapu Min. *Languages* 7(1). 47. https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7010047.

Chávez-Peón, Mario E. 2010. *The interaction of metrical structure, tone, and phonation types in Quiaviní Zapotec*. University of British Columbia dissertation. https://doi.org/10.14288/1.0071253.

Esposito, Christina M. 2010. Variation in contrastive phonation in Santa Ana Del Valle Zapotec. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 40(2). 181–198. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025100310000046.

Esposito, Christina M. & Sameer ud Dowla Khan. 2020. The cross-linguistic patterns of phonation types. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 14(12). https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12392.

Fischer-Jørgensen, Eli. 1968. Phonetic Analysis of Breathy (Murmured) Vowels in Gujarati. *Annual Report of the Institute of Phonetics University of Copenhagen* 2. 35–85. https://doi.org/10.7146/aripuc.v2i.130674.

Foley, Steven, Nick Kalivoda & Maziar Toosarvandani. 2018. Forbidden clitic clusters in Zapotec. In Daniel Edmiston, Marina Ermolaeva, Emre Hakgüder, Jackie Lai, Kathryn Montemurro, Brandon Rhodes, Amara Sankhagowit & Michael Tabatowski (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fifty-third Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 87–102.

Foley, Steven & Maziar Toosarvandani. 2020. Extending the Person-Case Constraint to Gender: Agreement, Locality, and the Syntax of Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1162/ling_a_00395.

Garellek, Marc. 2019. The phonetics of voice. In William F. Katz & Peter F. Assmann (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of phonetics* (Routledge Handbooks in Linguistics), 75–106. Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY: Routledge.

Garellek, Marc. 2020. Acoustic Discriminability of the Complex Phonation System in !Xóõ. *Phonetica* 77(2). 131–160. https://doi.org/10.1159/000494301.

Garellek, Marc & Christina M. Esposito. 2021. Phonetics of White Hmong vowel and tonal contrasts. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association*. 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025100321000104.

Garellek, Marc, Patricia Keating, Christina M. Esposito & Jody Kreiman. 2013. Voice quality and tone identification in White Hmong. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 133(2). 1078–1089. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4773259.

Gordon, Matthew & Peter Ladefoged. 2001. Phonation types: a cross-linguistic overview. *Journal of Phonetics* 29(4). 383–406. https://doi.org/10.1006/jpho.2001.0147.

Hanson, Helen M. 1997. Glottal characteristics of female speakers: Acoustic correlates. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 101(1). 466–481. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.417991.

Iseli, Markus, Yen-Liang Shue & Abeer Alwan. 2007. Age, sex, and vowel dependencies of acoustic measures related to the voice source. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 121(4). 2283–2295. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2697522.

Kawahara, Hideki, Alain De Cheveigne & Roy D. Patterson. 1998. An instantaneous-frequency-based pitch extraction method for high-quality speech transformation: revised TEMPO in the STRAIGHT-suite. In *5th International Conference on Spoken Language Processing (ICSLP 1998)*, paper 0659–. ISCA. https://doi.org/10.21437/ICSLP.1998-555.

Keating, Patricia, Marc Garellek & Jody Kreiman. 2015. Acoustic properties of different kinds of creaky voice. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*.

Keating, Patricia, Jianjing Kuang, Marc Garellek, Christina M. Esposito & Sameer ud Dowla Khan. 2023. A cross-language acoustic space for vocalic phonation distinctions. *Language* 99(2). 351–389. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2023.a900090.

Kent, Raymond D. & Martin J. Ball (eds.). 1999. *Voice quality measurement.* San Diego: Singular Pub. Group. 492 pp.

Klatt, Dennis H. & Laura C. Klatt. 1990. Analysis, synthesis, and perception of voice quality variations among female and male talkers. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 87(2). 820–857. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.398894.

Kreiman, Jody, Bruce R. Gerratt, Marc Garellek, Robin Samlan & Zhaoyan Zhang. 2014. Toward a unified theory of voice production and perception. *Loquens* 1(1). e009. https://doi.org/10.3989/loquens.2014.009.

Kreiman, Jody, Yoonjeong Lee, Marc Garellek, Robin Samlan & Bruce R. Gerratt. 2021. Validating a psychoacoustic model of voice quality. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 149(1). 457–465. https://doi.org/10.1121/10.0003331.

Kruskal, Joseph & Myron Wish. 1978. *Multidimensional Scaling.* SAGE Publications, Inc. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412985130.

Laver, John D. M. 1968. Voice Quality and Indexical Information. *British Journal of Disorders of Communication* 3(1). 43–54. https://doi.org/10.3109/13682826809011440.

Lee, Felicia. 2006. *Remnant raising and VSO clausal architecture: A case study of San Lucas Quiaviní Zapotec.* Vol. 66 (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory (SNLT)). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-4308-2.

Merrill, Elizabeth D. 2008. Tilquiapan Zapotec. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 38(01). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025100308003344.

Nellis, Donald G. & Barbara E. Hollenbach. 1980. Fortis versus Lenis in Cajonos Zapotec Phonology. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46(2). 92–105. https://doi.org/10.1086/465639.

Operstein, Natalie. 2017. Suppletion in Zapotec. *Linguistics* 55(4). https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2017-0010.

Podesva, Robert J. 2016. Stance as a Window into the Language-Race Connection: Evidence from African American and White Speakers in Washington, DC. In H. Samy Alim, John R. Rickford & Arnetha F. Ball (eds.), *Raciolinguistics: How Language Shapes Our Ideas About Race*, 203–220. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190625696.003.0012.

Santiago Laxopa. 2022. *Santiago Laxopa: Economy, Employment, Equity, Quality of Life, Education, Health and Public Safety.* Data México. https://datamexico.org/en/profile/geo/santiago-laxopa (25 April, 2022).

Seyfarth, Scott & Marc Garellek. 2018. Plosive voicing acoustics and voice quality in Yerevan Armenian. *Journal of Phonetics* 71. 425–450. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2018.09.001.

Shue, Yen-Liang, Patricia Keating & Chad Vicenik. 2009. VOICESAUCE: A program for voice analysis. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 126(4). 2221. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3248865.

Sichel, Ivy & Maziar Toosarvandani. 2020a. Pronouns and Attraction in Sierra Zapotec. In Andrew Hedding & Morwenna Hoeks (eds.), *Syntax and semantics at Santa Cruz, Volume IV* (Syntax & Semantics at Santa Cruz (SASC) 4). Santa Cruz, CA: Linguistics Research Center.

Sichel, Ivy & Maziar Toosarvandani. 2020b. The featural life of nominals. lingbuzz/005523.

Sicoli, Mark. 2007. *Tono: A linguistic ethnography of tone and voice in a Zapotec region (Mexico)*. University of Michigan dissertation.

Sicoli, Mark A. 2010. Shifting voices with participant roles: Voice qualities and speech registers in Mesoamerica. *Language in Society* 39(4). 521–553. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404510000436.

Silverman, Daniel. 1997a. Laryngeal complexity in Otomanguean vowels. *Phonology* 14(2). 235–261. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0952675797003412.

Silverman, Daniel. 1997b. *Phasing and recoverability* (Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics). New York: Garland Pub. 242 pp.

Simpson, Adrian P. 2012. The first and second harmonics should not be used to measure breathiness in male and female voices. *Journal of Phonetics* 40(3). 477–490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2012.02.001.

Sjölander, Kåre. 2004. *Snack Sound Toolkit.* Stockholm, Sweden: KTH.

Sundberg, Johan. 2022. Objective Characterization of Phonation Type Using Amplitude of Flow Glottogram Pulse and of Voice Source Fundamental. *Journal of Voice* 36(1). 4–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvoice.2020.03.018.

Thurgood, Graham. 2002. Vietnamese and tonogenesis: Revising the model and the analysis. *Diachronica* 19(2). 333–363. https://doi.org/10.1075/dia.19.2.04 thu.

Uchihara, Hiroto. 2016. Tone and registrogenesis in Quiaviní Zapotec. *Diachronica* 33(2). 220–254. https://doi.org/10.1075/dia.33.2.03uch.

Wayland, Ratree & Allard Jongman. 2003. Acoustic correlates of breathy and clear vowels: the case of Khmer. *Journal of Phonetics* 31(2). 181–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0095-4470(02)00086-4.

Zapotec Language Project — University of California, Santa Cruz. 2022. https://zapotec.ucsc.edu/ (6 December, 2022).

Appendix A

Some Ancillary Stuff

Ancillary material should be put in appendices, which appear after the bibliography.