Phonation in Nine* Languages

P. Keating[1], J. Kuang[1], C. Esposito[2], M. Garellek[1], S. Khan[1,3]

[1]UCLA; [2]Macalester College; [3]Brown University

In fact, only 7 reported here

Introduction

Across languages with phonation contrasts, the phonation categories are distinguished by a variety of measures (e.g. Gordon & Ladefoged 2001), but these are inter-related and far outnumber the contrasting categories.

Our questions:

• What is a **low-dimension space** (acoustic, physiological) for voice quality?

• How are the phonation categories of different languages **located** in this space?

Language Samples

We compare contrastive and other phonations of 10 languages from 4 groups

Here we report results from 7 languages with both audio and EGG recordings – about 13,000 tokens

• **Bo** (Tibeto-Burman)
  Tonal; **tense vs. lax** (largely independent of pitch)
  12 speakers in Yunnan, China (isolated words)

• **California English** (Indo-European)
  Non-tonal; intonational creak
  22 speakers in Los Angeles USA (isolated words)
  NO EGG AVAILABLE; **not reported here**

• **Gujarati** (Indo-European)
  Non-tonal; **modal vs. breathy**
  10 speakers in Los Angeles (sentence-initial words)

• **Luchun Hani** (Tibeto-Burman)
  Tonal; **tense vs. lax** (largely independent of pitch)
  10 speakers in Yunnan, China (isolated words)

• **White Hmong** (Hmong-Mien)
  Tonal; **modal vs. breathy** on one pitch; **creaky** low tone
  32 speakers in St. Paul USA (isolated words)

• **Beijing Mandarin** (Sino-Tibetan)
  Tonal; Tone 3 has **allophonic creak**
  20 speakers in Beijing, China (disyllables)

• **Jalapa Mazatec** (Oto-Manguean)
  Tonal; **modal vs. breathy vs. creaky** (crossed w/ tones)
  16 speakers in Mexico (isolated wds in online archive)
  NO EGG AVAILABLE; **Not reported here**

• **Black Miao** (Hmong-Mien)
  Tonal; **modal vs. breathy** at one pitch, **creaky** low tone
  pressed high tone)
  15 speakers in Guizhou, China (isolated words)
  Not reported here

• **Southern Yi** (Tibeto-Burman)
  Tonal; **tense vs. lax** (largely independent of pitch)
  12 speakers in Yunnan, China (isolated words)

• **Santiago Matatlán and San Juan Guelavia Valley Zapotec** (Oto-Manguean)
  (Two varieties grouped together here)
  Tonal; **creaky** large-falling tone and **breathy** small-falling tone
  6 speakers in Los Angeles, USA (isolated words)

Acoustic Measures

Acoustic measures over time were made semi-automatically from the audio by **VoiceSauce** (Shue et al. 2011), a free UCLA program.

Spectral measures analyzed:

• **F0** by the STRAIGHT algorithm (Kawahara et al. 1999) for finding harmonics

• Corrected (*: Hanson 1995, Iseli et al. 2007) **harmonic amplitudes and differences:**
  • **H1*, H2*, H4*, A1*, A2*, A3***
  • **H1*-H2*, H2*-H4***
  • **H1*-A1*, H1*-A2*, H1*-A3***

• Noise measures (NOT REPORTED HERE)
  • **Cepstral Peak Prominence**
  • **Harmonic-Noise ratios**
  • **Subharmonic-harmonic ratio**

EGG Measures

Electroglottographic signals were recorded with the audio for 8/10 languages. Automated EGG measures were made by **EggWorks**, a free UCLA program.

EGG measures analyzed:

• **CQ_H**: **Contact Quotient**, here using the "hybrid" method with 3/7 threshold

• **PIC: Peak Increase in Contact** (the peak positive value in the EGG derivative, like DECPA (Michaud 2004))

• **PDC: Peak Decrease in Contact** (the peak negative value in the EGG derivative)

• **OP_DUR: Opening duration** (not included)

• **CL_DUR: Closing duration**

• **SQ: Skew quotient** (ratio of CL_DUR/OP_DUR)

Contact quotient | Peak increase/decrease in contact | Skew quotient

peak velocities of contact Increase and Decrease from dEGG

closing duration / opening duration from EGG

Contact Quotient CQ 4 methods

Categories across languages

Boxplot of CQ_H of 16 phonation categories in 7 languages with EGG data.

• Categories mostly **cluster within a limited middle range** of values
• Within languages, **cross-category differences are often small**, although always statistically significant
• The **"same" category can be very different** across languages
• Languages with **more categories** do not necessarily have **less variable** categories


Low-dimensional phonetic spaces

Multi-Dimensional Scaling of spectral and EGG measures

■ All 16 language-specific phonation categories in these 7 languages
■ **Male speakers only**
■ Data for each measure are normalized from 0 to 1 for all languages together
■ 3-D solutions and 2-D planes of 3-D solutions are plotted

Spectral measures

• **Dimension1** distinguishes some languages (relates to H4*, A1*, A2*, A3*)
• **Dimensions 2+3** (right) together distinguish breathy vs. non-breathy along one diagonal, and group languages together by contrast types: Gujarati vs. 3-category languages vs. tense/lax languages (where Mandarin patterns)
• Differences on **Dimension2** relate most to H1*-H2*; differences on **Dimension3** to H1*-H2*, H1*-A1*/A2*/A3*

EGG measures

• **Dimension 1** distinguishes some languages, and most breathy/lax vs. creaky/tense (relates most to SQ, PIC, PDC)
• **Dimension 3** distinguishes **modal** from others (relates to CQ, as does dim2)
• **Dimensions 1+3** together (right) distinguish **languages**, and **creaky/tense**

References & Acknowledgments

• Esposito, C. (2012) An acoustic and electroglottographic study of White Hmong tone and phonation., *Journal of Phonetics 40*, 466-476.
• Garellek, M. & P. Keating (2011) The acoustic consequences of phonation and tone interactions in Jalapa Mazatec, *J. International Phonetic Association 41*, 185-205.
• Gordon, M. & P. Ladefoged (2001) Phonation types: a cross-linguistic overview, *Journal of Phonetics 29*, 383–406.
• Hanson, H. M. (1995) Glottal characteristics of female speakers, Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard.
• Iseli, M., Y.-L. Shue & A. Alwan (2007) Age, sex, and vowel dependencies of acoustic measures related to the voice source, *J. Acoustical Society of America 121*, 2283–2295.
• Kawahara, H., H. Katayose, A. de Cheveigné & R. D. Patterson (1999) Fixed point analysis of frequency to instantaneous frequency mapping for accurate estimation of F0 and periodicity, EUROSPEECH '99, 2781–2784.
• Kuang, J. (2011) Phonation contrast in two register contrast languages and its influence on vowel quality and tone, Proceedings of the ICPhS XVII, 146-1149
• Kuang, J. (2012) Registers in tonal contrasts, to be presented at TAL 2012 in Nanjing
• Michaud, A. (2004) A Measurement from Electroglottography: DECPA, and its Application in Prosody, Speech Prosody, Nara, 633–636.
• Shue, Y.-L., P. Keating, C. Vicenik, K. Yu (2011) VoiceSauce: A program for voice analysis, Proceedings of the ICPhS XVII, 1846-1849.

Thanks to NSF grant BCS-0720304; to Yen Shue for VoiceSauce and Henry Tehrani for EggWorks.

Conclusions

Low-dimensional phonetic spaces for phonation can be derived from acoustic and physiological measures of phonation. These spaces distinguish **languages** (speakers, recordings) as much as they do phonation **categories**.

• In the **spectral** space, **languages** seem to group together by **type of contrast**.

• In the **EGG** space, **phonation categories** in most of the languages seem to group together by **type of category**, with breathy the most variable category.