

3. RESULTS

The results of the Finnish-speaking subjects are presented in Table 2 (upper part). The overall error rate was 2,5 % and false alarm rate 0,96 %. The miss rate for the deviants was 4,0 %. RTs longer or shorter than three standard deviations from the individual means (comprising a total of 0,5 % of the responses) were excluded from further analysis. The individual miss rates were subjected to repeated measures Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The factors were Continuum type (/æ – e/, /æ – ø/) and Acoustic distance of the deviant stimuli (33, 66, 100 mels). Acoustic distance had a significant effect on the miss rate ($F(2,18) = 19,277$ $p < 0.01$), the longer the acoustic distance, the lower the miss rate.

The individual mean RTs for each condition were subjected to ANOVA using the same model as for the miss rates. The RTs reflected significantly the acoustic distance between stimuli ($F(2,26) = 55,292$ $p < 0,001$). The shortest acoustic difference (33 mel) was perceived significantly slower (505 ms) than the 66 mel (432 ms, $p < 0,001$) and the 100 mel difference (428 ms, $p < 0,001$). More importantly, the Continuum type had a significant effect on the RTs ($F(1,13) = 21,441$ $p < 0,001$), which was due to the fact that the /æ – ø/ continuum was perceived faster (474 ms) than the corresponding /æ – e/ continuum (436 ms).

The results of the Spanish-speaking subjects are presented in Table 2 (lower part). The overall error rate was 7,5 % and false alarm rate 1,03 %. The miss rate for deviants was 16,5 %. One subject was excluded from the analysis because of the lack of sufficient data in one condition. The RTs longer or shorter than three standard deviations from the individual means (comprising a total of 2,0 % of the responses) were discarded from further analysis. The repeated measures ANOVA on miss rates showed a significant effect of Acoustic distance ($F(2, 12) = 32,450$ $p < 0.01$); the longer the acoustic distance the lower the miss rate. Also, the main effect of Continuum type was significant ($F(1, 6) = 6,503$ $p = 0.43$) indicating that the parallel formant movements were perceived more accurately (20,0%) than the movements in opposite directions (13,0%).

The individual mean RTs of the Spanish-speaking subjects for each condition were subjected to ANOVA, which showed a main effect of Acoustic distance ($F(2,12) = 37,437$ $p < 0.001$). The shortest acoustic distance (33 mel) was perceived significantly slower (604 ms) than the longer acoustic distances (66 mel, 513 ms; 100 mel, 497 ms, both p 's < 0.001). The main effect of Continuum type was also significant ($F(1,6) = 8,617$, $p = 0.026$). The /æ – e/ continuum was perceived slower (558 ms) than the /æ – ø/ continuum (518 ms).

Finally, to directly compare the discrimination performance of Finnish and Spanish-speaking subjects an additional ANOVA was run using Subject group as a

between-subject factor. The results showed a significant difference in the miss rates between the subject groups ($F(1,18) = 22,153$, $p < 0,001$). The overall miss rate of the Spanish subjects was 16,5% compared to 4 % of the Finnish subjects. The interaction between Subject group and Acoustic distance was also significant ($F(2,36) = 23,036$, $p < 0,001$). The Spanish subjects made more misses in the shorter acoustic distances compared to the Finnish subjects. Finally, the Spanish subjects made more errors on the /æ – e/ continuum compared to the /æ – ø/ continuum resulting in a significant interaction between Subject group and Continuum type ($F(1,19) = 5,421$, $p = 0.031$).

Comparison of the RTs showed that the Spanish subjects were slower (538 ms) than the Finnish subjects (455 ms) in overall response speed ($F(1,19) = 9,688$, $p = 0,006$). However, the factor Group did not interact with Continuum type nor Acoustic distance.

Table 2. RTs and miss rates for the Finnish and Spanish-speaking subjects in the discrimination task on the two vowel continua.

Finnish subjects						
	/æ – e/ continuum			/æ – ø/ continuum		
Deviant	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mean RT	528	456	439	483	408	417
(s.d.)	(63)	(63)	(65)	(65)	(53)	(54)
Miss rate	13,2	1,1	0	9,3	0,7	0
Spanish subjects						
	/æ – e/ continuum			/æ – ø/ continuum		
Deviant	1	2	3	1	2	3
Mean RT	625	534	517	582	493	478
(s.d.)	(102)	(70)	(60)	(80)	(57)	(59)
Miss rate	48,5	10	1,5	36,0	2,1	0,7

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We studied whether discrimination speed and accuracy was affected either by the phonemic structure of the language or the acoustic pattern reflected in the direction of formant frequency movements. Two vowel continua (/æ – ø/ and /æ – e/) had the same Euclidean acoustic distance in F1 and F2, but different, parallel or opposite, formant pattern change. Furthermore, in Finnish, the continua also differed phonemically so that the /æ – ø/ endpoint vowels differed more in terms of distinctive features compared to /æ – e/. In Spanish, there is no such distinction.

The results showed that the /æ – ø/ continuum with the parallel formant movements was perceived significantly faster than the /æ – e/ continuum with the opposite formant movements. This finding resembles earlier results obtained by Hawks [3], and Nord and Svantelius [2], who also suggested that language specific factors might affect formant discrimination. Our results do not support this claim, because both Finnish and Spanish-speaking subjects demonstrated a similar performance pattern regardless of the different phonemic status of the two continua in Finnish and Spanish.

The only language dependent result was the slower overall response speed and less accurate discrimination performance of the Spanish subjects as compared to the Finnish subjects. This can be attributed to the fact the stimuli were synthesized using typical values for Finnish vowels, and were thus less familiar for the Spanish subjects.

The perception of auditory features relevant to the discrimination of vowel seems not to be based on the labeling of stimuli. Our results suggest that the movements in the formant pattern (possibly reflecting differences between some invariant *auditory* attributes such as the center of gravity of the spectrum [5]) may be perceived independently from the phonemic structure of the vowel inventory.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.L. Flanagan, “Difference limen for vowel formant frequency”, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol 27, pp. 613 – 617, 1955
- [2] L. Nord & E. Svantelius, “Analysis and prediction of difference limen data for formant frequencies”, *Speech Transmission Laboratory Quarterly Progress and Status Report*, vol. 3-4, pp. 60 – 72, 1979
- [3] J. W. Hawks, “Difference limen for formant patterns of sounds”, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, vol. 95, pp. 1074 – 1084, 1994
- [4] S.Blumstein, V. Tartter, D. Michel, B. Hirsch. & E. Leiter, “The role of distinctive features in the dichotic perception of vowels”, *Brain and Language*, vol 4, pp.508-520, 1977.
- [5] J.R. Sawusch, “Invariant acoustic attributes and model of speech perception”, in *Actes du XIIème congres international des sciences phonetiques, 19 –24 Août, Aix-en-Provence, France*, vol 1, pp. 63 – 67, 1991.

