

Phonetic variation in production and perception of speech: a comparative study of two Arabic dialects

Melissa Barkat-Defradas (*) Jalal-Eddin Al-Tamimi (*) & Thami Benkirane (+)

* Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage CNRS - University of Lyon (France) (+) University of Fès (Morocco)

E-mail: melissa.barkat@univ-lyon2.fr; Jalal-Eddin.Al-Tamimi@etu.univ-lyon2.fr; daw_kirane@caramail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a preliminary study of intra-speaker and inter-speaker variability in speech production and perception with an inter-dialect investigation of acoustic vocalic space according to different phonological systems. This work aims at providing an analytic study based on individual data that might account for individual strategies. We have studied variability in vowel production and perception for 20 speakers of two Arabic dialects: Jordanian Arabic and Moroccan Arabic. Results show on the one hand, that vocalic spaces larger for perception than for production for speaker of both Arabic dialects; and on the other hand that the vocalic space in production for Moroccan Arabic seems more centralized than for Jordanian Arabic.

1. INTRODUCTION

Speech variability is a phenomenon that is fairly studied. Despite of speech variability, communication is still possible between speakers speaking different dialects of the same language. We will study here the phonetic variability in production and perception of vocalic segments, in two Arabic dialects: Jordanian Arabic (henceforth JA) and Moroccan Arabic (henceforth MA) attesting respectively 5 and 8 vocalic segments. This work is part of a larger research project (Projet Cognitique : "*Variabilité phonétique en production et en perception de parole : rôle et limites des stratégies individuelles*", directed by René Carré, ENST Paris) which aim is to study inter-speakers' variability, so as to find possible individual strategies (Hombert 1999). We formulate the hypothesis that vocalic space distribution depends on the number of vocalic segments attested in the language. In this paper, we will try to understand the relation between production and perception in speech. We think that perceptual vowel space is different from that of production. Indeed if the position in the vocalic 'triangle' of produced vowels is different from the position of prototypic perceived vowels will correspond to 'hyper-articulated' produced vowels (Johnson 1993). In this paper, we intend to (i) understand the relation between production and perception of vowels, (ii) study speech variability in production and perception of vowels in two Arabic dialects: JA and MA, (iii) observe the differences between vocalic realizations of male and female, (iv) study the distinction between long and short vowels within

Arabic dialects, (iv) examine the effect of pharyngealization on the adjacent vowels both in JA and MA. Each of these different points being analysed for both production and perception.

2. RELATION BETWEEN PRODUCTION AND PERCEPTION

Many linguists have tried to explain the relationships existing between production and perception. Some theories were based on the articulation, such as the Motor Theory of Speech Perception revised by Liberman & Mattingly [1]. According to the authors, hearers use their phonetic knowledge in order to recognize the gesture model corresponding to the acoustical reality of a specific stimulus. Twadell [2], Hockett [3] and Delattre [4] described speech perception as depending on speakers' articulatory habits. Kluender & al. [5] proposed that categorical perception does not depend on speakers' articulatory attitudes but on memorization processes. Fry [6] developed the notion of 'categorical perception'. The author showed there are differences between the categorical perception of consonants and vowels. According to Fry speakers were able to categorize limits between /b d g/ while they were not able to establish exactly the limits between /i e a/. Indeed, vowel categories merge due to the continuum space from which they proceed. This is not the case for consonants that are formed in a discontinuous space. As mentioned earlier, Johnson [7] demonstrated prototypic representations of vowels may correspond to a 'hyper-articulated production'. When comparing the vocalic spaces obtained in production vs. perception, the authors found vocalic space in perception is larger than productions' corresponding to a 'hyper-articulated production'.

3. DIALECTAL VARIABILITY IN ARABIC

Arabic language has a variety of regional and dialectal differences. Besides, it is commonly accepted the Arabic speaking world can be divided into two main dialectal areas: the Western area vs. the Eastern area. The part including the South East of Tunisia, the West of Egypt and Libya being considered as an intermediate dialectal area where one can find mixed-languages [8].

4. MATERIAL AND METHOD

In this paper two dialects are studied: Jordanian Arabic spoken in Amman and Irbid and Moroccan Arabic spoken in Casablanca. Vocalic systems of these two dialects are slightly different in terms of number of items: 5 vowels are attested in MA /i:uu:əa/, 8 vowels in JA /ii:uu:eo:aa/. In our corpus, vowels of JA and MA are preceded by /d/ and /d^ɕ/ in production and perception. In production, we presented 51 items for JA and 35 for MA. Each item was presented 5 times in random order to 10 male native speakers of JA and 10 male native speakers of MA. Subjects' realizations were recorded on PC at 22 KHz, 16 bits, mono. In perception, the experiment was based on a method of formant adjustment (i.e. MOA) of isolated synthetic vowels with F₀ = 120 Hz. Subjects' task was to determine the best prototypic vocalic representations for 16 items (for JA) and 10 (for MA). Each item being presented 10 times in random order.

4. DATA ANALYSIS

In production, we extracted values of F1 and F2 at the middle part of the vowels using *Winsnoori*® [9] within two consonantal contexts i.e., /d d^ɕ/. We converted our data into Barks applying Henton's formula¹ [10] before calculating the average and the standard deviation for all vowels' formant values. In perception, we converted vowel formant values from Hertz to Bark and calculated the average and the standard deviation of F1 and F2 values for all vowels.

5. RESULTS

Results will be presented below both for JA and MA in production as well as in perception: (i) distribution of long vs. short vowels and cross-dialectal comparison of vocalic dispersion, (ii) effect of pharyngealization on vocalic distribution, (iii) comparison of production vs. perception vocalic spaces. Several works deal with the opposition between long and short vowels in Arabic among them [11] [12] [13] [14] [15]. Authors regularly noticed short vowels are reduced as compared to long ones confirming Lindblom's finding [16] Our analysis reveals the same pattern of distribution both for production and perception in JA and MA, short vowels centralization being significant on the statistical level (p<0.0001) (figures 1 to 4).




Figure 1: long vs. short vowels distribution for JA in production.




Figure 2: long vs. short vowels distribution for MA in production.




Figure 3: long vs. short vowels distribution for JA in perception.




Figure 4: long vs. short vowels distribution for MA in perception

¹ $6 * ASINH * (Data / 600) - 1$ where *ASINH* corresponds to the reversed hyperbolic Sinus of a number; *Data* is the formant value of F1 and/or F2 in Hz.

In order to see if the size of vocalic inventory affects its organization in terms of distribution, we compared the organization of vocalic space in JA vs. MA. Our claim was that a great amount of variability for the realization of one segment could be observed for reduced vocalic charts

without leading to categorization mistakes. Graphical representation below show the fewer vowels are attested in a language the greater variation for the realization of each vowel is observed: largest ellipses corresponding to MA long vowels /i: u: a:/ as compared to their JA counterparts




Figure 5: Long vowels dispersion for MA (in red) vs. JA (in blue).

Besides, statistical analyses show us on the one hand there are differences in the dispersion of vowels in the Arabic dialects. MA vocalic space, for long and short vowels, is more centralized than JA's ($p < 0.0001$). The central open vowel /a:/ in JA is significantly more posterior than its Moroccan equivalent ($p < 0.001$). In dental context, /u/ and /ə/ merge in MA ($p < 0.001$) leading to a simplification on the phonological system (figure 6).




Figure 6: Short vowels dispersion for MA (in red) vs. JA (in blue).

The effect of pharyngealization on adjacent vowels is also fairly studied [11] [12] [13] [17]. Authors found that adjacent vowels are posteriorized in pharyngealized context (i.e. lowering of F2 values). Nevertheless there is no cross-dialectal comparative study of pharyngealization effect on adjacent segments. Statistical analysis on data obtained in production in JA and MA showed pharyngealized vowels are posteriorized (figures 8 & 9) confirming the literature. We observed as well an effect of pharyngealization both on F1 and F2 axis in MA ($p < 0.0001$)

(cf. figures 7 & 8). In perception, JA vowels in pharyngealized context attest a significant difference on F1 axis only ($p < 0.0001$). Indeed we did not find any effect of contextual pharyngealization on F2 as expected *a priori*. This result may be interpreted in the light of Barkat's perceptual experiments (2000) where Jordanian dialects were said to be easily discriminated from other Arabic dialects thanks to 'a higher degree of pharyngealization', an auditory impression which may be linked to a more important opening of the jaw. Further analysis based on articulatory measures should be taken so as to answer this question.




Figure 8: Effect of pharyngealization on vowels in production (JA)




Figure 8: Effect of pharyngealization on vowels in production (MA)




Figure 9: Effect of pharyngealization on vowels in perception (JA)




Figure 10: Effect of pharyngealization on vowels in perception (MA)

Eventually, as done in Johnson (1993), we compared production and perception vocalic spaces. If the perceptual vocalic space is larger than the one observed in production then, we could confirm that the perceptual vocalic space corresponds as a matter of fact to a hyper-articulated space. We applied different statistical analysis (ANOVAs and T-tests) in order to compare: the global vocalic distribution in production vs. perception then for each vowel separately. Both in Jordanian and Moroccan Arabic, the perceptual vocalic space is larger than it is in production ($p < 0.0001$). Back vowels are backed in perception whereas front vowels are As for F1 axis it appeared that closed vowels are significantly more closed in perception whereas open vowels are more open and more posterior ($p < 0.0001$) (figures 12 & 13).




Figure 12: production vs perception for MA speakers




Figure 13: production vs perception for JA speakers

5. CONCLUSION

Results revealed that for some of the issues mentioned one can observe the same pattern of realization both in speech

production and perception modality (i.e., reduction of short vowels as compared to their long counterparts both in JA and MA leading to a centralized vocalic distribution in Moroccan Arabic as opposed to a peripheral dispersion in Jordanian Arabic; backing co-articulation both in JA and MA in pharyngealized context due to the inertia of articulators and the lowering of velum for the articulation of pharyngealized consonants; a greater variability for the realization of vocalic segments when the system attest few vowels and last but not least, our study confirms Johnson's work since we were able to observe perceptual vocalic space corresponds to a hyper-articulated vocalic triangle so as to integrate speech variability without any risks for speech comprehension.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] Liberman, A. & Mattingly, I. (1985). "The motor theory of speech perception revised" *Cognition* 21: 1-36.
- [2] Twadell, W.F. (1952). "Phonemes and allophones in speech analysis" *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 24 : 607-611.
- [3] Hockett, C.F. (1955). "A manual of phonology," *International Journal of American Linguistics* 21.
- [4] Delattre, P. (1958). "Les indices acoustiques de la parole. Premier rapport" *Phonetica* 2 : 108-118, 210-251.
- [5] Kluender, K.R., Giehl, R. and Killen, O. (1987). "Japanese quail can learn phonetic categories", *Science* 237 : 1195-1197.
- [6] Fry, D.B. (1966). "Mode de perception des sons du langage" dans Moles, A. et Vallancien, B. *Phonétique et phonation*, 191-206.
- [7] Johnson, K., Flemming, G. E. & Wright, R. (1993). "The hyperspace effect: Phonetic targets are hyperarticulated" *Language* 69 : 505-528.
- [8] Henton, C. (1995). "Cross-language variation in the vowels of female and male speakers", *ICPhS, Stockholm* 4 : 421-423.
- [9] Laprie, Y. (1999). "Snorri, a software for speech sciences", in Esca workshop, Method and tool innovations for speech science education, Matisse, Londres.
- [10] Ghazali, S., Hamdi, R., Barkat-Defradas, M. (2002) "*Speech Rhythm Variation in Arabic Dialects.*" Paper presented at the Speech Prosody 2002, Aix-en-Provence (11-13 Avril 2002), pages 331-334.
- [11] Ghazali, S., (1977), "*Back consonants and backing co-articulation in Arabic*", PhD dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.
- [12] Ghazali, S., (1979), "*Du statut des voyelles en arabe*", *Analyses & Théorie*, 2/3, pp. 199-219.
- [13] Barkat, M., (2000), "*Détermination d'indices acoustiques robustes pour l'identification automatique des parlers arabes*" Thèse de doctorat nouveau régime, Université Lumière Lyon 2, publiée aux Editions du Septentrion, 300 pages (2002) .
- [14] Barkat-Defradas, M., (2001) Vers l'identification automatique des parlers arabes, *revue Langue & Linguistique*, n° 7, pp. 47-95
- [15] Al-tamimi, J.E. & M. Barkat-Defradas, (2002), Inter-dialectal and inter-individual variability in production and perception: a preliminary study in Jordanian and Moroccan Arabic, in Actes des 5eme rencontres AIDA, Cadiz, Spain, Septembre 2002 [under press].
- [16] Lindblom, B. (1963). "Spechographic study of vowel reduction", *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 35 : 1773-1781.
- [17] Elgendy, A.M. (2001). "*Aspects of pharyngeal coarticulation*", University of Amesterdam, LOT 44 : 312 pp.