

The status of vowels in Jordanian and Moroccan Arabic: Insights from production and perception.

Jalaleddin Al-Tamimi¹, René Carré² & Egidio Marsico¹

¹: Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage (DDL) – UMR 5596 CNRS & Université Lyon 2 – France. ²: ENST, TSI, UMR 5141 CNRS

Jalal-Eddin.Al-Tamimi@etu.univ-lyon2.fr, rene.carre@enst.fr, Egidio.Marsico@ish-lyon.cnrs.fr

Introduction

- Vowels in isolation are often considered as the canonical form of a vowel. (Joss 1948, Ladefoged 1967 & Daniloff & Hammerberg 1973),
- But some researchers considered them as 'laboratory artefacts' (Liberman & al. 1967 & Liberman 1970): a) generally, they exist when coarticulated with consonants in a specific syllabic structure, b) acoustical vowel information merge with those of consonants, c) formants of vowels are not invariant, due to 2 different sources of variation: inter- and intra-individual variability, and consonant environment,
- So, in different perceptual experiments, isolated vowels were discarded, and dynamic information was considered useful to have more natural stimuli and to help auditors in identification ~ discrimination tests.
- Different authors described isolated vowels as completely different from those produced in context, so they concluded that indices used by auditors to identify vowels (in isolation and in context) are different. (Fairbanks & Grubb 1961, Fujimura & Ochiai 1963, Lehiste & Meltzer 1973, Strange & al. 1976, 1983, 1989, etc.).

What about vowels in Arabic?

- Arabic grammarians described vowels as: a) sounds included in consonants and/or b) a facilitator of consonant production, so...
- Vowels never occur in isolation, they must be associated to consonantal environment to be produced, this can be explained by the morphological structure of Arabic, (A nonconcatenative language with a triconsonantal root, that exhibits direct consonant~consonant relation),
- Some verb categories are marked by a systematic alteration of vowel qualities, without any modification in the consonantal root. Ex. 'K T B' → [ka:tib] 'writer', [kitab] 'book', [maktab] 'library'. (Sibawayh VIIIth century, Ibn Jinni Xth century, Cantineau 1960, Mehri 1973, BenKiran 1982, McCarthy 1982, Ibrahim 1997, among others).

Goals of this research

- The characterization of the variation, in both production and perception of speech in (and within) 2 Arabic dialects: Jordanian Arabic (JA) and Moroccan Arabic (MA),
- The characterization of static and dynamic cues in production and perception of Arabic vowels,
- To study the status of vowels in Arabic dialects.

Discussion & conclusion

In this work, we studied the variability in both production and perception of speech in JA and MA dialects. Results show that:

- Both in JA and MA, there is no significant difference between the production of vowels in Word and in Syllable, but a very significant one when compared with Isolated vowels,
- Both in JA and MA there is more variability in the production of vowels in Isolation, than when produced in Word or Syllable,
- In production, JA long vowels are more peripheral than those of MA (figures from 1 to 4), but no difference in perception (figures 5 & 6)
- In both production and perception, MA /a u/ merge (figures 2, 4 & 6),
- JA and MA auditors found the perceptual experiment (figures 5 & 6) very difficult and caused a high degree of variability in the acoustic plan (that can be explained by the fact that isolated vowels may not exist in Arabic).


To characterize the importance of dynamic cues (in comparison with static ones), a new perceptual task was elaborated. The results displayed in figures 7 to 10 show less variability in the dynamic task than in static one, and auditors found the new task easier.

In production, a Delta Average calculation served to characterize the formant trajectories. Graphics (from 11 to 14) show that even in isolated vowels, formant trajectories do change over time.

These results indicates that dynamic cues (in both production and perception) may be taken into consideration to describe Arabic vowels, but experimentations with more consonantal context and more speakers are needed to characterize the vowel status in Arabic.

Bibliography

- Alwanji, <http://arabic.org/olwanji/>
- BenKiran, T. (1982). *Étude Phonétique et Fonction de la Syllabe en Arabe Marocain*. Thèse de 3ème Cycle de Phonétique Expérimentale, Faculté des Sciences et Appliquées, Université de Provence. Aix-Marseille I: 242.
- Cantineau, J. (1960). *Étude de l'arabique ancien - Cours de phonétique arabe - Leuven - Centre de Recherches de Phonétique et de Phonologie*. Ed. Librairie C. Klincksieck, Paris: 294.
- Daniloff, R. G. and Hammerberg, R. E. (1973). *On defining coarticulation*. Journal of Phonetics, 1: 239-248.
- Fairbanks, G. and Grubb, P. (1961). *A psychophysical investigation of vowel formants*. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 6: 203-219.
- Fujimura, O. and Ochiai, K. (1963). *Vowel identification and phonetic contexts*. JASA, 35: 1889 (A).
- Joss, (1948) *CVN context*. See Sauer *Acta Phon*, Vol. 1, p. 705.
- Jrakah, A-F. (1997). *Al-tamiz al-ṣaḥīḥ fi al-ʿarabiyyat al-ṣaḥīḥat li-ḥaṣṣat al-ʿarabiyyat* (The vowel identification in the standard Arabic dialects). *Laṭāʾif*: Tome 1: 399.
- Johnson, K., Flemming, E. and Wright, R. (1993). *The hyperspace effect: Phonetic targets are hyperarticulated*. Language 69: 305-328.
- Joss, M.A. (1948). *Acoustic phonetics*. Language 24 (Suppl): 1-136.
- Ladefoged, P. (1967). *Three areas of experimental phonetics*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Lehiste, I. and Meltzer, D. (1973). *Vowel and speaker identification in natural and synthetic speech*. Language Speech, 16: 356-364.
- Liberman, A. M. (1970). *The grammar of speech and language*. Cognitive Psychology, 1: 301-323.
- Liberman, A. M., Cooper, F. S., Shankweiler, D. P. and Studdert-Kennedy, M. (1967). *Perception of the speech code*. Psychology Review, 74: 431-451.
- McCarthy, J. J. (1982). *Formal problems in Semitic phonology and morphology*. Austin, University of Texas: 246.
- Mehri, A. (1973). *Les dialectes grammaticaux d'Égypte (Sûr-Sûd) et d'Arabie*. Nabe-Jeddah: Tamsi - Publications de l'Université de Tamsi: 289.
- Prati, <http://www.lettres.enscm.fr/ressources/>
- Sibawayh (VIIème siècle). *Al-Kitaab*. In: *Ḥadīṣ wa sharḥ*. Abi-Salīm Muhammad Hāḍim, Ed. Al-hay' al-masriyya al-Jadida: 1975: 493.
- Strange, W., Votrog, R. S., Shankweiler, D. P. and Edman, T. R. (1976). *Consonant environment specific vowel identity*. JASA, 60(1): 213-224.
- Strange, W. J., Jones, J., Johnson, Thomas L. (1983). *Dynamic Specification of Coarticulated Vowels*. JASA, 74(3): 695-705.
- Strange, W. B., Ode, Schew (1989). *Dynamic Specification of Coarticulated German Vowels: Perceptual and Acoustical Studies*. JASA, 104(1): 488-504.



Methodology

In paradigm A:

- 10 speakers in both JA and MA were recorded in 2 experimental protocols, in production and perception of speech,
- In production, speakers recorded vowels (/i i: e: a: o: u: u:/ in JA and /i: a: o: u: u:/ in MA), as produced in word, syllable and in isolation, in alveolar context (non pharyngealised),

In perception, the same speakers categorized vowels in a F1/F2 synthetic plane, based on a MOA Model (Method of Adjustment, Johnson & al. 1993)

In paradigm B:

- 5 auditors from JA and 1 from MA, categorized vowels in a static (static formant values + F0) and dynamic (static values + F0 + Duration + Dynamic information = onset of alveolar consonant) F1/F2 synthetic plane.

Recording & Acoustical Analysis

Speakers were recorded in an attenuated room, and vowels were digitized at 22 KHz, 16 Bits, Mono.

Recording of 8 JA and 10 MA (2 JA speakers were discarded because of saturation in the signal), were analyzed using Praat and Akustyk.

LPC acoustical analysis were conducted on vowels produced in word, syllable and in isolation, with a 25 ms Hamming window, 10 coefficients. Formant values were taken at the mid of the static portion of vowel. Onset and offset were taken at respectively the first and final pulses,