

17 December 2018

Stefano Coretta

17/12/2018

1 Stimuli for English experiment

| labial | | velar | |
|--------|--------|-------|--------|
| teep | teepus | teek | teekus |
| teeb | teebus | teeg | teegus |
| turp | turpus | turk | turkus |
| turb | turbus | turg | turgus |
| tarp | tarpus | tark | tarkus |
| tarb | tarbus | targ | targus |

Frame sentences:

- I'll say 'X' this Thursday
- You'll say 'X' this Monday
- She'll say 'X' this Sunday
- We'll say 'X' this Friday
- They'll say 'X' this Tuesday

1.1 Check nonce words


```
## # A tibble: 10 x 4
##   Spelling FreqCount `LogFreq(Zipf)` `LogFreqBNC(Zipf)`
##   <chr>      <dbl>          <dbl>          <dbl>
## 1 turk       162            2.91            3.23
## 2 teak       114            2.76            3.05
## 3 tarp        33            2.23            1.3
## 4 teek         5            1.47            1
## 5 tark         4            1.39            1.3
## 6 turb         4            1.39            1
## 7 terp         3            1.3             1
## 8 targ         2            1.17            1.47
## 9 teeg         2            1.17            1
## 10 teep        2            1.17            1.3
```

Out of 24 words stimuli, 10 appear in SUBTLEX-UK (either they are phonological matches or full


matches). Two of these 10 have a log frequency > 2.5 (*Turk, teak*). Note that the spelling for these words would be *turk* and *teek* in the experiment.

2 3D tongue surface of [s] and [z]

I recorded myself in Bloomington with the 3D ultrasound machine while uttering five tokens of sustained [s] and five tokens of sustained [z]. A single 3D frame has been extracted from each token. The following plots show the output of a 3D GAM fitted to the tongue surfaces of [s] and [z] (tip on the right).



[z]



There is a deeper groove in [z] compared to [s], and some lowering/advancing of the tongue root. Note that the tongue data have not been rotated.

2.1 Volume increase

The volume increase of [z] relative to [s] is 12.08 cm³. This estimate is based on the predicted GAM data on a surface which corresponds to the actual imaged surface. If I remember correctly, Steven Lulich estimated that a volume increase of 20 cm³ is ideal for maintenance of voicing in a voiced fricative.

3 A Bayesian analysis of the voicing effect in pre-stress vowels (/ə'CV/)

```
## Compiling the C++ model
```


```
## Start sampling
```

Davis & Van Summers (1989) report means and standard deviations of the duration of reduced unstressed vowels followed by a voiceless or a voiced stop (*atop/adopt*). We can use a Bayesian measurement error model which takes into account the standard deviation of the vowel durations (since we don't have the individual data points that make up the means). The data is based on three speakers, the consonant following the reduced vowel can be labial, alveolar, or velar. A model was fitted to vowel duration (and standard deviation) with the following predictors: C2 voicing (voiceless vs. voiced), C2 place of articulation (labial vs. alveolar vs. velar), and a by-speaker random intercept. The following weakly informative priors have been used: a normal distribution

for the intercept with mean 50 and SD = 25, a normal distribution with mean 0 and SD = 20 for the estimates of C2 voicing and C2 place, and a normal distribution with mean 0 and SD = 25 for the by-speaker random intercept.

```
## Family: gaussian
## Links: mu = identity; sigma = identity
## Formula: v_duration | se(sd) ~ voice + place + (1 | speaker)
## Data: davis1989 (Number of observations: 18)
## Samples: 4 chains, each with iter = 2000; warmup = 1000; thin = 1;
##           total post-warmup samples = 4000
##
## Group-Level Effects:
## ~speaker (Number of levels: 3)
##           Estimate Est.Error l-90% CI u-90% CI Eff.Sample Rhat
## sd(Intercept)    22.17    10.04    10.41    42.27      1884 1.00
##
## Population-Level Effects:
##           Estimate Est.Error l-90% CI u-90% CI Eff.Sample Rhat
## Intercept         47.65     11.44    29.27    65.91      1446 1.00
## voicevoiced         6.32      3.01     1.37    11.22      3233 1.00
## placealveolar     -5.71      4.55   -13.19     1.79      2789 1.00
## placevelar        -9.76      2.95   -14.65    -4.95      3368 1.00
##
## Samples were drawn using sampling(NUTS). For each parameter, Eff.Sample
## is a crude measure of effective sample size, and Rhat is the potential
## scale reduction factor on split chains (at convergence, Rhat = 1).
```


The estimated effect of voicing is 6.32 ms with a 90% credible interval 1.37-11.22 ms. A credible interval indicates the range of values within which there is a given probability of finding the true estimate (a 90% credible interval says in which range there is a 90% probability that the true effect is contained within that interval). The following plot shows the posterior distributions of C2 voicing and place (the shaded areas are 90% credible intervals). The posterior distribution of the predictor C2 voicing suggest a small positive effect of voicing on unstressed vowel duration.




4 Italian EGG: vowel and voicing duration

This section briefly reports the results from the EGG study on voicing duration and vowel height in Italian. The following figures show the duration of vowels by vowel height, and the duration of voicing corresponding to the vowel by vowel height. The stimuli (/CVCo/) contained only voiceless stops, and voicing refers to the voicing of the vowel flanked by singleton voiceless stops. Vowel durations decrease with vowel height. The vowels are: low /a/, mid-low /ɔ/, mid-high /e/, high /u, i/. Voicing durations also decrease with vowel height, possibly with the exception of the mid-low vowel (/ɔ/), which has a voicing duration similar to the low vowel (/a/). Two linear-mixed models have been fitted to vowel duration and voicing duration. The general pattern is that voicing duration decreases by a smaller degree than vowel duration with increasing vowel height. Also, non-low vowels have longer voicing during the closure of the consonant following the vowel, compared to the low vowel /a/. Longer voicing during closure in non-low vowels could be linked with differences in laryngeal configurations: for example, Koenig et al. (2011) find that voice onset happens at higher intra-oral pressures when the vowel is high compared to when the vowel is low (they compared /i, ɪ/ vs. /a/). These results indicate a certain temporal independence between supralaryngeal and laryngeal gestures at vowel offset: possibly, the speaker exercises more control over the phasing of the lingual gestures than the phasing of vocal fold vibration. I also have results on other measures which I will include in a next report.

Vowel duration by vowel height



Voicing duration by vowel height



```

## Linear mixed model fit by REML. t-tests use Satterthwaite's method [
## lmerModLmerTest]
## Formula:
## v1_duration ~ height + c2_place + height:c2_place + speech_rate_c +
## (1 | speaker) + (1 | word)
## Data: ita_egg
## Control: lmerControl(optimizer = "Nelder_Mead")
##
## REML criterion at convergence: 26199.8
##
## Scaled residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -6.8899 -0.6542 -0.0449  0.6013  4.1760
##
## Random effects:
## Groups   Name      Variance Std.Dev.
## word     (Intercept) 27.04    5.20
## speaker  (Intercept) 115.03   10.73
## Residual                176.93  13.30
## Number of obs: 3253, groups: word, 43; speaker, 19
##
## Fixed effects:
##                                Estimate Std. Error      df t value
## (Intercept)                   98.2018    3.9809   48.2609  24.668
## heightmid-low                 -13.0657    4.4253   30.9825  -2.953
## heightmid-high                -18.5312    4.4257   30.9951  -4.187
## heighthigh                   -31.8662    3.8330   31.0005  -8.314
## c2_placecoronal                9.9362    4.4257   30.9943   2.245
## c2_placevelar                  4.7546    4.9475   30.9802   0.961
## speech_rate_c                -12.8447    0.6791 3093.5464 -18.915
## heightmid-low:c2_placecoronal  5.8422    6.2583   30.9833   0.934
## heightmid-high:c2_placecoronal -5.5431    6.6387   30.9968  -0.835
## heighthigh:c2_placecoronal    -4.2523    5.4208   31.0040  -0.784
## heightmid-low:c2_placevelar    2.5631    6.6377   30.9780   0.386
## heightmid-high:c2_placevelar  -2.5813    6.6379   30.9815  -0.389
## heighthigh:c2_placevelar      -2.8746    5.8543   30.9855  -0.491
##                                Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)                   < 2e-16 ***
## heightmid-low                  0.005965 **
## heightmid-high                  0.000217 ***
## heighthigh                      2.17e-09 ***
## c2_placecoronal                 0.032038 *
## c2_placevelar                   0.343992
## speech_rate_c                   < 2e-16 ***
## heightmid-low:c2_placecoronal  0.357774

```

```

## heightmid-high:c2_placecoronal 0.410123
## heighthigh:c2_placecoronal      0.438737
## heightmid-low:c2_placevelar     0.702029
## heightmid-high:c2_placevelar    0.700028
## heighthigh:c2_placevelar        0.626873
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

##
## Correlation matrix not shown by default, as p = 13 > 12.
## Use print(x, correlation=TRUE) or
##     vcov(x)           if you need it

voice_lm_1 <- lmer(
  voice_duration ~
    height +
    c2_place +
    height:c2_place +
    speech_rate_c +
    (1+height|speaker) +
    (1|word),
  data = ita_egg,
  REML = FALSE
)
summary(voice_lm_1)

## Linear mixed model fit by maximum likelihood . t-tests use
## Satterthwaite's method [lmerModLmerTest]
## Formula:
## voice_duration ~ height + c2_place + height:c2_place + speech_rate_c +
## (1 + height | speaker) + (1 | word)
## Data: ita_egg
##
##      AIC      BIC   logLik deviance df.resid
## 23995.1 24144.4 -11972.5  23945.1      2873
##
## Scaled residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -5.0557 -0.6324 -0.0455  0.5932  4.0413
##
## Random effects:
##   Groups   Name                Variance Std.Dev. Corr
##   word     (Intercept)          17.00    4.123
##   speaker  (Intercept)        331.40   18.204
##           heightmid-low       13.75    3.708  -0.30
##           heightmid-high      54.59    7.389  -0.77  0.44

```



```

##           heighthigh      68.37      8.269    -0.71    0.01    0.59
## Residual                208.88    14.453
## Number of obs: 2898, groups:  word, 43; speaker, 18
##
## Fixed effects:
##
##              Estimate Std. Error      df t value
## (Intercept)      124.48559      5.01065    30.31622    24.844
## heightmid-low      -4.82679      3.75949    44.80670    -1.284
## heightmid-high     -13.62001      4.05136    52.25330    -3.362
## heighthigh        -24.94753      3.72296    54.80420    -6.701
## c2_placecoronal      2.30641      3.66162    41.56815     0.630
## c2_placevelar       2.27648      4.09534    41.62924     0.556
## speech_rate_c     -12.83599      0.80254 2607.56721   -15.994
## heightmid-low:c2_placecoronal  2.72970      5.17487    41.45696     0.527
## heightmid-high:c2_placecoronal -2.89677      5.48999    41.49424    -0.528
## heighthigh:c2_placecoronal    0.04385      4.48594    41.61930     0.010
## heightmid-low:c2_placevelar   -0.04639      5.48957    41.48065    -0.008
## heightmid-high:c2_placevelar  -7.07893      5.48825    41.44124    -1.290
## heighthigh:c2_placevelar    -7.87100      4.84632    41.65160    -1.624
##
##              Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept)      < 2e-16 ***
## heightmid-low      0.20578
## heightmid-high      0.00145 **
## heighthigh        1.18e-08 ***
## c2_placecoronal      0.53221
## c2_placevelar       0.58128
## speech_rate_c      < 2e-16 ***
## heightmid-low:c2_placecoronal  0.60066
## heightmid-high:c2_placecoronal  0.60056
## heighthigh:c2_placecoronal    0.99225
## heightmid-low:c2_placevelar    0.99330
## heightmid-high:c2_placevelar    0.20426
## heighthigh:c2_placevelar      0.11190
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

##
## Correlation matrix not shown by default, as p = 13 > 12.
## Use print(x, correlation=TRUE) or
##      vcov(x)      if you need it

```

References

- Davis, Stuart & W. Van Summers. 1989. Vowel length and closure duration in word-medial VC sequences. *Journal of Phonetics* 17. 339–353.
- Koenig, Laura L., Susanne Fuchs & Jorge C. Lucero. 2011. Effects of consonant manner and vowel height on intraoral pressure and articulatory contact at voicing offset and onset for voiceless obstruents. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 129(5). 3233–3244.