Acoustic and articulatory vowel variation as quality shift and increased variance in anticipatory and carryover vowel-to-vowel coarticulation

Andrea DEME^{1,2} – Márton BARTÓK^{1,2} – Tamás Gábor CSAPÓ^{2,3} – Tekla Etelka GRÁCZI^{2,4} –



Alexandra MARKÓ^{1,2}

1 = Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary 2 = MTA-ELTE "Lendület" Lingual Articulation Research Group, Hungary 3 = Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Hungary 4 = Research Institute for Linguistics , Hungary *deme.andrea@btk.elte.hu

Introduction

V-TO-V COARTICULATION: Vs in VCV sequences are produced with one single underlying diphthongal gesture to which the C's gesture is superimposed (Öhman 1966).



V-to-V coarticulation induced contextual variation of vowels is hypothesized to be dependent on several factors.

Accent related effects on V-to-V induced vocalic variation

Prosodically strong locations (lexical stress, pitch-accent, edge of prosodic domain) condition articulatory "strengthening" (increased spatio-temporal magnitude of gestures) \rightarrow resistance H: increased coarticulatory resistance... hypo

- Fowler (1984): acoustic distances across contexts are smaller if stressed (nonwords)
- Cho (2004): articulatory distances of coart'd and non-coart'd tokens is smaller if accented ('plausible' words)

...and aggression.

While several studies demonstrated \mathcal{C} . aggression and resistance are the "two sides of the same coin" in C-V coarticulation (e.g., Recasens & Rodríguez, 2016),

• Deme et al. (2019): distances and across context dispersion (see below) showed divergent results, esp. for the two domains of production (real words)

Direction effects on V-to-V V-to-V induced vocalic variation

V-to-V effects differ as a function of direction of coarticulation.

Carryover effects exceed that of anticipatory

• in /i/ and /a/ in articulation (Cho, 2004).

 in open /æ/ (Mok 2011) and /i u a/ (Mok 2012) in acoustics.

 no increased aggression was found in articulation in V-to-V (Cho, 2004).

≡i ≜e °a ≜o ⊡u

(a) Ndebele

000

Ø

(b) Shona

How do we determine coarticulatory effects and coarticulatory variability?

- Previous studies: in quality shift, as determined by distances of tokens.
- However, contextual variability is very often represented visually by dispersion ellipses, i.e., across context variability or dispersion, SD.

Questions

direction

hypo

Q1: Does V-to-V induced variation in vowels depend on the direction of coarticulation (carryover vs. anticipatory)?

(coart. direction hypo.) 💥

Q2: Are V-to-V effects influenced by prosodic position of the target vowel

(i.e., sentence level accent / pitch-accent)?

(coart. resistance hypo.)

Q3: Does prosodic strengthening of the trigger vowel have an effect on variation in the target vowel, i.e. does pitch-accent induce greater coarticulatory agression? (coart. agression hypo.)



Manuel (1990: 8): across context

"scatter" of vowels

Mok (2012:194): "phoneme size" Manuel (1990: 17): "target spaces"

633

(c) Sotho

F1 500 in

... if measured

- both in **dispersion** (across-context variance), and quality shift (distances),
- in both domains of production, and
- in Hungarian.

Participants and material

Methods

Recordings, measures, analyses

Audio + EMA (AG 501).

Parameters:

- F_{2onset} , $F_{2offset}$, and F_{2mid} (acoustics),
- Horiz. dorsum pos. as a mean of tbo1 and tbo2 (articulation).
- Speaker diff.s normalized using rel. position to their max. and min.
- x-displacement (Cho, 2004).



Statistics

Linear mixed effects models (random intercept & slopes for speakers); post hoc (Tukey). (R: ImerTest, Ismeans)



- 9 female speakers of Hungarian.
- Target and trigger (i.e. context) Vs: /i u/ (in /p/-context) (nonsense words after Cho, 2004 and Mok, 2011; 2012)
- Actually, 6 different words per speaker read in min. 6 rep.

(IPA)			Context /i/		Context /u/	
	Targ acc	Coart. dir.	асс	unacc	асс	unacc
target /i/	unacc	Anticipatory	—	'pip i p <u>i</u> pi	V /	ˈpip i p <u>u</u> pu
		Carryover	ˈ <u>pi</u> p i pipi	'pip <u>i</u> pi	ˈp <u>u</u> p i pipi	ˈpup <u>u</u> p i pi
	acc	Anticipatory		'p i p <u>i</u> pipi		ˈp i p <u>u</u> pupu
		Carryover	_	- //200	-	
target /u/	unacc	Anticipatory		'pup u p <u>i</u> pi	-	ˈpup u pu
		Carryover	ˈp <u>i</u> p u pupu	'pip <u>i</u> p u pu	ˈp <u>u</u> pupu	ˈpup <u>u</u> pu
	acc	Anticipatory	- \	'p u p <u>i</u> pipi		ˈp u pupu
		Carryover		-//	—	-

Results





Dispersion



Direction: in /i/ (carryover > anticipatory)

Resistance: /i/ is more centralised(!) if accented; /u/ is more peripheral.

- Cho, T 2004. Prosodically conditioned strengthening and vowel-tovowel coarticulation in English. J Phon 32: 141-176 Deme, A, Bartók, M, Gráczi, TE, Csapó, T, Markó, A 2019. V-to-V
- coarticulation induced acoustic and articulatory variability of vowels: The effect of pitch-accent. In: Interspeech 2019: 3317-3321.
- Fowler, CS 1981. Production and perception of coarticulation among stressed and unstressed vowels. J Speech Hear Res 24: 127–139. Manuel, S 1990. The role of contrast in limiting vowel-to-vowel coarticulation in different languages. J Acost Soc Am 88, 1286-1298.
- Mok, PK. 2011 Effects of vowel duration and vowel quality on vowelto-vowel coarticulation. Lang Speech 54: 527-544.
- Mok PK. 2012. Does Vowel Inventory Density Affect Vowel-to-Vowel Coarticulation? Lang Speech 56(2). 191–209.
- Öhman, S. 1966. Coarticulation in VCV utterances: Spectrographic measurements. J Acoust Soc Am 39, 151-168. Recasens, D. 1984. Vowel-to-vowel coarticulation in Catalan VCV
- sequences. J Acoust Soc Am 76, 1624–1635.

Direction: in /u/ (carryover > anticipatory)



But note that

- dispersion (unifromty of targets) seem to show accent effects, as it revealed increased resistance and aggression not seen in distances data, while
- distances (magnitude and character of quality-shift) revealed direction effects not seen in dispersion data.

The authors acknowledge the kind help of Zsófia Weidl, Zsófia Puzder, Valéria Krepsz, Ákos Búza, Anne Hermes, Doris Mücke, Theo Klinker,. The research was funded by by the Bolyai János Research Scholarschip of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the ÚNKP-20-5 New National Excellence Program of the Ministry for Innovation and Technology from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund, and the Thematic Excellence Program of the Ministry for Innovation and Technology.

Aggression: in /u/ (carryover > anticipatory) **Resistance:** in /u.

Conclusions

Accent related effects are less clear than suggested previously. May be due to...

- Hungarian being an obligatory sytactic focus marking language
- Coarticulatory effects of /i/ and /u/ interactions being smaller than that of /i/ and /a/ (Cho 2004)...



What is resistance, and how should we measure it? Contextual (in)variance, or shift in acoustic / articulatory quality of vowels (centralisation)?