# Voice Onset Time and onset f0 as correlates of voicing in American learners of French

# BACKGROUND Initial voicing in French and English French voiced/voiceless "bêche/pêche" English voiced (prevoiced or short lag)/voiceless "bet/pet"

Onset f0- fundamental frequency (f0) at the onset of the vowel following a stop consonant

positive

Short la



	[+voice]
English	Short lag/prevoiced
	Lower f0
French	Prevoiced
	Lower f0

Prevoicing

negative

- VOT and onset f0 both contribute to the production and perception of voicing (House & Fairbanks, 1953; Abramson & Lisker, 1965)
- Languages use acoustic cues differently to express phonological voicing, so an L2 learner must acquire a novel use of these cues
- Chang (2013) suggests that beginner learners might experience back transfer (L2->L1) in a complete immersion environment

# METHODS

#### **Participants:**

#### Learners

- 23 native speakers of Mid-Western English learning French at Purdue University
- 201 Level French (3<sup>rd</sup>) semester) or above

Control (Shultz, 2011)

 33 monolingual native speakers of Mid-Western English

#### Task:

- Words on screen
- Three randomized blocks
- Presentation: 2 seconds
- ISI 0.5 seconds

### **Measurements:**

- VOT (initial stops) Onset f0 (measured at the beginning of the vowel)

### Stimuli:

- Four French, voiced/voiceless, bilabial stop minimal pairs with vowels /i/,  $/\epsilon/$  and /a/(bêche/pêche)
- Four English, voiced/voiceless, bilabial stop minimal pairs with vowels i/i/i/,  $\epsilon/and a/(bet/pet)$ Eight distractor minimal pairs were also displayed

175<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Acoustical Society of America

# MOTIVATIONS

- Although the primary cue, VOT, has been studied quite extensively in L2 speech (Flege & Eefting, 1988; Flege 1991; Birdsong et al. 2007), there is a gap in the literature regarding secondary cues like onset f0
- Since onset f0 has been shown to aid in distinction between [+voice] and [-voice], an understanding of these cues in L2 acquisition is important









- Phonological division was significant

Long lag/aspirated VOT [-voice] Long lag Higher f0 Short lag Higher f0





# ASA-Minneapolis, MN, May 7-11, 2018

# INDIVIDUAL TRENDS



**4pSC16** 

I6 learners (69.57%) produced more prevoicing in French, four (17.39%) produced less prevoicing, and three (13.04%) produced approximately the same

• Five learners completely prevoiced in their [+voice] French productions





• 14 learners (60.87%) produce more short lag in French, two (8.70%) produce

fewer short lag, and seven (30.43%) produce approximately the same number of

• No learner manages to produce only the target, short lag, in their French stops • There is no correlation between success in [+voice] with success in [-voice]

## DISCUSSION

• Despite French VOT duration being heavily influenced by English, onset f0 production in French was distributed as expected: lower onset f0 in [+voice] and higher onset f0 in [-voice]

• Learners were able to maintain the correct distribution of f0 values independently of VOT realization

Individual results suggest the [-voice] VOT category in French was produced in a less target-like manner than the [+voice] VOT category • No evidence of phonetic drift was found in these data, but there was evidence of a divergence effect in [-voice] long lag stops

## hutchi25/odmitrie@purdue.edu

f0 in long lag 'pat'