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#### Abstract

This study used an analysis-by-synthesis approach to discover possible principles governing the coordination of oral and laryngeal articulators in the production of English stop-consonant sequences. Recorded utterances containing stop-consonant sequences were analyzed acoustically, with focus on formant movements, closure durations, release bursts, and spectrum shape at low frequencies. The results of the acoustic analysis were translated into general gestural timing estimates. From these estimates, a set of possible principles was derived. Both the general gestural estimates and the derived principles were verified and refined through quasiarticulatory synthesis using HLsyn. Perception tests composed of synthetic sequences with varying degrees of overlap were administered. From acoustic analysis, synthesis verification, and perception testing, two principles emerged. First, V1C1\#C2V2 stop-consonant sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation have more overlap of articulators than those with back-tofront order; this agrees with past research findings (Chitoran, Goldstein, and Byrd, 2002). The extent of the overlapping usually does not go beyond the obliteration of the Cl release burst. Second, gestural overlap involving laryngeal articulators exists but varies from individual to individual. The voicing of C 1 usually affects the voicing of C 2 in V1C1\#C2V2 sequences.
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## Chapter 1: Introduction

The coordination of articulatory movements is essential in speech production. However, the search for possible articulatory and acoustic invariance in the process has proven to be a significant challenge. Past research in the area has found articulatory timing to be highly variable and dependent on prosodic and contextual factors. The question of what the underlying principles that govern the coordination of articulatory movements are, if they exist, still remains.

This study employed the analysis-by-synthesis approach to discover possible principles governing the coordination of oral and laryngeal articulators in the production of English stop-consonant sequences. There were two phases to this study. Phase one consisted of analyzing acoustic data such as formant movements, closure durations, release bursts, and spectrum shape at low frequencies of naturally-spoken stop-consonant sequences. Based on the analysis, general gestural timing estimates were inferred. From those estimates, an initial set of possible principles was derived.

In the second phase of the study, both the general gestural estimates and the derived principles were verified and refined through quasiarticulatory synthesis using HLsyn. Consonant sequences were first generated using inferred gestural timing estimates from acoustic data. The synthetic utterances were acoustically and perceptually compared to the actual utterances in order to verify and refine the articulatory timing estimates; the resulting gestural timing estimates were used to cross-check and refine the general estimates inferred in phase one. Next, in order to verify the derived principles, synthetic
sequences with varying degrees of overlap were generated. Perception tests composed of these synthetic consonant sequences were administered. The results of the tests were used to verify the validity of each principle and the extent of its applicability.

Before diving into the specifics of the study, the next chapter will provide a review of past research conducted in the area of gestural overlap of stop-consonant sequences. In addition, Chapter 3 will provide a review of the mechanics and acoustical properties of stop consonants, the basics of gestural timing estimation, as well as an outline of the parameters and usage of HLsyn.

## Chapter 2: Review of Literature

In the framework of articulatory phonology proposed by Browman and Goldstein (1992), gestures are the "basic units of phonological contrast". Utterances are modeled as organized patterns of overlapping and non-overlapping gestures. There also exists an abstract, theoretical framework containing general principles of how the gestures are organized in speech production; gestural relations are expressed in terms of dynamics and phasing. Research is still being conducted to develop the framework.

A different model of acoustic speech, represented in terms of segments described by sets of binary distinctive features, was presented by Stevens (Stevens, 2002). These features may be articulator-bound or articulator-free; the articulator-free features fall into one of three classes: vowel, glide, or consonant. In addition to the primary articulatory and acoustic correlates of a feature, enhancing actions might also exist. For example, the somewhat fronting of the tongue-body in the production of an alveolar stop is an enhancing gesture. Such gestures are thought to heighten perceptual contrast and remain intact in consonant sequences; this raises a question investigated in this study: Are defining gestures more susceptible to obliteration when they are supported by enhancing actions?

Questions concerning the linguistic effects on gestural coordination have also been posed; they have been the focus of several studies. Byrd's research on the articulatory timing of consonant sequences using electropalatography (EPG) found that consonants in word-onset positions exhibit less gestural overlap than those in coda positions (Byrd,
1996). In addition, more overlap was found in coronal velar consonant sequences than velar-coronal sequences.

Chitoran, Goldstein, and Byrd's study on the gestural overlap of stop consonants in Georgian using the EMMA (Electromagnetic Midsagittal Articulometer) magnetometer system led to similar findings (Chitoran, Goldstein, and Byrd, 2002). Consonants in word-initial positions had less gestural overlapping than those in word-internal positions. Sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation were found to have more gestural overlap than those with back-to-front order. Examples having front-to-back order of place of articulation are labiatcoronal, coronaldorsal, and labialdorsal stopstop sequences. Examples having back-to-front order of place of articulation are coronat labial, dorsa-coronal, and dorsa-labial stop-stop sequences.

Zsiga's study on acoustical evidence for gestural overlap of VC\#CV stop-consonant sequences also found indications of more overlap for sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation than for those with back-to-front order (Zsiga, 1994). Formant transitions into the [d] closure for $[\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}]$ and $[\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{k}]$ sequences were compared to those of [d\#t]. The reasoning behind the comparison was that if the second consonant did not influence the formant transitions into the closure of the first consonant, then the transitions into the first consonant should be similar for all three stop-stop sequences. The alveolar-alveolar stop sequence [d\#t] was used as a control. The results of the study showed that formant movements into the [d] closure were more affected when followed by [k] than by [p] (Zsiga, 1994).

In addition to acoustic and articulatory data analysis, perception tests involving stop-stop sequences have been administered. Byrd's perception study involving synthesized [b\#d] and $[\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~b}]$ stop sequence stimuli found that as the overlap increased, correct identification of Cl , the first consonant in a VCCV sequence, was more reduced for [ $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~b}$ ] than for [b\#d] (Byrd, 1992). Similar findings were made from Surprenant and Goldstein's perception experiment involving natural speech $[\mathrm{p} \# \mathrm{t}]$ and $[\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{p}]$ sequences in English. With considerable but similar amounts overlap in the sequences, Cl in [p\#t] was correctly identified much more often than C1 in [ $\mathrm{H} \# \mathrm{p}$ ] (Surprenant and Goldstein, 1998). These studies suggest that perception recoverability may be a possible explanation for why there is less overlap in sequences with back-to-front order of place of articulation. However, in Repp's perception tests of carefully articulated stop-stop sequences, no strong suggestions of C 2 's co-articulatory influences on C 1 were found; C 2 is the second consonant in the VCCV sequence (Repp, 1983). He did find significant statistical evidence for a higher F 2 values just prior to the C 1 closure for $[\mathrm{b} \# \mathrm{~g}]$ sequences than for [b\#d] sequences.

These research efforts played crucial roles in fueling the motivation and guiding the direction of this study. First, stop consonants have been shown to be not discretely articulated. Many demands are placed on the lips, tongue, and glottis to articulate stopstop sequences in relatively short durations, making such utterances interesting subjects in the study of articulatory coordination. Second, previous findings of word position and order of place of articulation influencing gestural overlap of stop-stop sequences
indicated that linguistic effects must be considered and examined. Furthermore, previous studies' concentration solely on oral gestures prompted the inclusion of laryngeal gestures in this study. Finally, the possible link between the presence of enhancing gestures and defining gestures' susceptibility to obliteration was also examined.

## Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

This chapter provides a review of the mechanics and acoustical properties of stop consonants, the basics of gestural timing estimation, as well as an overview of the parameters and usage of HLsyn.

### 3.1 Mechanics and Acoustical Properties of Stop Consonants

The production of stop consonants consists of three general stages. First, the appropriate articulator makes a closure at some point along the vocal tract. For a labial stop consonant, the closure is formed at the lips; for an alveolar, the closure is formed with the tongue tip pressing against the inner ridge of the upper-front-teeth gums; for a velar stop, the closure is formed with the back of the tongue touching the soft palate (see Table 1). Pressure behind the closure is built up as the vocal tract remains closed in the second stage. The final stage involves the release of the closure (Stevens, 1998).

Table 1: Types of Stop Consonants

|  | Voiced | Voiceless |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Labial | b | p |
| Alveolar | d | t |
| Velar | g | k |

Voicing characteristics are an important differentiating factor among stop consonants. For a voiced stop consonant, vocal folds continue to vibrate for some time after the closure; whereas for a voiceless stop, the vibration stops upon closure (see Figure 1). The release of all stops is typically followed by a burst of transient noise and frication
noise from the constriction; aspiration noise from the glottis is usually produced for voiceless stops (see Figure 1). Voicing starts quickly following the release burst for voiced stop consonants; voicing onset is delayed for voiceless stops (Stevens, 1998).


Figure 1. Waveforms for [ad\#a] and [at\#a]. The top panel displays the waveform for [ad\#a]; the bottom panel displays the waveform for [at\#a]. Notice the vocal fold vibrations present even after the d-closure; vibrations stop upon the t -closure. Also, the d-burst is much smaller than the t -burst.

The place of articulation is another differentiating factor among stop consonants. Evidence from formant data can be used to reveal information about the place of articulation as well as the movements of oral articulators. In general, F1 of stop consonants decreases as the constriction size decreases and increases as the constriction size increases. Movements of F2 and F3 differ among labial, alveolar, and velar stops, as well as whether the consonant is followed by a front or back vowel. In this study, the
back vowel precedes and follows stop consonants. F2 of a back vowel going into a labial closure usually shows a small downward movement; the back body resonance is not affected by the front-body resonance change due to the lip constriction release. F3 also decreases, although not dramatically (see Figure 2). F2 of a back vowel going into an alveolar closure usually increases as the tongue tip forms a closure with the upper-frontteeth gums and the tongue body exhibits slight fronting (Stevens, 1998). F3 decreases, although not dramatically (see Figure 2). Finally, F2 increases during the transition into a velar closure from a back vowel, while F3 decreases. The two formants are close together just prior to the point of closurc (Stevens, 1998).

Formant transitions of a stop consonant moving into a back vowel approximately mirror those of the back vowel moving into the same consonant (Stevens, 1998).

### 3.2 Basics of Gestural Timing Estimation

Gestural timing estimates are made based on acoustic data. This section first discusses gestural timing estimation in cases where there is no overlap, and then discusses acoustic manifestations of gestural overlap and how they can be used to make articulatory timing estimates.

In cases where there is no gestural overlap, the acoustic properties of consonants in V1C1\#C2V2 sequences should not be different from the same C1 in VC\#V sequences and the same C2 in V\#CV sequences. The movements of the articulators for the production of C 1 should be the same whether it is in $\mathrm{V} 1 \mathrm{C} 1 \# \mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~V} 2$ or $\mathrm{VC} \mathrm{\# V}$ sequences;
similarly, the movements should be the same for C 2 whether it is in $\mathrm{V} 1 \mathrm{C} 1 \# \mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~V} 2$ or V\#CV sequences.


Figure 2. Formant Movements of Stop Consonants. a) F2 and F3 movements for [aba]. b) F2 and F3 movements for [ada]. c) F2 and F3 movements for [aga].

For V1C1\#C2V2 sequences with no gestural overlap, the formation of the Cl closure by the appropriate oral articulator begins toward the end of V1 and should be made by the time pitch periods end. If Cl is voiced, the area of the glottis remains relatively unchanged. On the other hand, if Cl is voiceless, the area of the glottis should start to increase starting around the end of V1; the spreading of the glottis should reach its maximum around the time just prior to the C 1 release. The C 1 closure remains until the
time of its release. The vocal folds remain lax for the voiced-stop burst and stiffen for the voiceless-stop burst. The release of the Cl closure generates a burst which should match the timing of the actual event as indicated by acoustic evidence. If both C 1 and C 2 are voiced, the area of the glottis and the stiffness of the vocal folds remain unchanged. If both consonants are voiceless, the area of the glottis remains large and the vocal folds remain stiff for C 2 . If C 1 is voiced and C 2 is voiceless, upon the release of C 1 , the glottis should begin to spread; the increase in the area of the glottis should reach a maximum around the time just prior to the C 2 release. In addition, the vocal folds would stiffen for the voiceless C 2 release. If C 1 is voiceless and C 2 is voiced, upon the release of C 1 , the stiffness of the vocal folds begins to decrease. The area of the glottis should also begin to decrease to a point where voicing is possible; the decrease should terminate around the time when the C 2 closure is made or some time soon afterwards, since the glottis usually does not close immediately.

Since no gestural overlapping is assumed here, the formation of the C 2 closure by the appropriate articulator(s) begins after the C 1 release. The C 2 closure remains until the time of its release. The release of the C 2 closure generates a burst which should match the timing of the actual event as indicated by acoustical evidence. If C 2 is voiced, the area of the glottis does not change and the onset of voicing begins fairly quickly. Also, the vocal folds remain lax for the voiced-stop release. If C2 is voiceless, the area of the glottis starts to decrease upon the release of the closure ending at a point where voicing is possible. The vocal folds stiffen for the voiceless-stop release. The glottis does not close immediately, since the onset of voicing is usually delayed for voiceless stops.

However, gestural overlap may very well exist for the production of stop-consonant sequences. In cases where there is overlap, the acoustic properties of the consonants in VC\#CV sequences should be different from those of the same consonants in VCV sequences. The differences in the movements of the articulators between the production of stop consonants in sequence and those in singleton VCV sequences should manifest themselves acoustically and possibly reflect the influence exerted by the neighboring consonant. The following discusses such acoustic manifestations and how they may be used to infer gestural timing estimates.

### 3.2.1 Formant Movements

Formant movements reveal information about the movements of the oral articulators and the tongue body in the production of stop consona nts. If the oralarticulator movements are the same for the production of stop consonants in sequence as for the production of the same consonants in singleton, the formant movements should also be the same. In addition, if the production of C 2 does not overlap with the production of C 1 , formant movements for a particular consonant should all be the same no matter what the neighboring consonant is. Therefore, attention is paid to the differences in formant movements of stop-consonant sequences where C 1 or C 2 is the only variable. For example, if differences in formant movements into the Cl closure exist and is C 2 dependent, then such evidence would suggest that the formation of the C 2 closure began before the release of C 1 . The extent of the overlap may be inferred from the magnitude of the C 1 - or C 2 -dependent deviations in the formant movements.

### 3.2.2 Closure Durations

The closure duration of the stop consonants in sequence is another focal point in the estimation of gestural overlap. Evidence supporting no overlap in the production of stopconsonant sequences would be if the closure durations of C 1 and C 2 in sequence are roughly equal to the sum of singleton C 1 and C 2 . However, if there is overlap, the closure durations would very likely be shortened. Therefore, the following measure will be taken of consonant sequences:
(closure duration $\mathrm{VCl} \# \mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~V}) /[($ clos. dur. $\mathrm{VCl} \# \mathrm{~V})+($ clos. dur. $\mathrm{V} \# \mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~V})] \quad \mathrm{Eq} .1$

This measure gives a ratio of how the closure duration for the consonant sequence compares with the combined closure durations of the consonants individually. Closure durations that are notably shorter than those of the combined C 1 and C 2 closure durations suggest overlap in the production of the consonants.

### 3.2.3 Absence of the C1 Burst

The absence of Cl bursts in stop-consonant sequences is another strong indicator of overlap. A likely cause of the absence of the C 1 burst is the formation of the C 2 closure before the C 1 release.

### 3.2.4 Voicing Characteristics

Voicing characteristics reveal information about the movements of laryngeal articulators in the production of stop-consonant sequences, because it is determined by vocat fold
stiffness adjustments and glottal opening adjustments. If the voicing of C 2 has no influence on the voicing of C 1 , voicing characteristics for a particular consonant in the C1 position should be the same no matter what consonant is in the C 2 position. Similarly, if the voicing of C 1 exerts no influence on that of C 2 , the voicing characteristics should reflect no difference among sequences where Cl is the only variable.

To measure the voicing characteristics of the stop consonants, focus is placed on the vowels preceding and following the consonants. The difference between the amplitude of the first harmonic (H1) and that of the second harmonic (H2) for vowels preceding and following the stop consonant(s) is positively correlated to the open quotient, the percent of the cycle in which the glottis is open (Hanson, 1997). The difference between H1 and the amplitude of the strongest harmonic in the first-formant range (A1) for vowels preceding and following the stop consonant(s), is positively correlated to the acoustic loss at the glottis. Such measurements may be made for pitch periods of V1 just prior to the C 1 closure as well as for those just after the onset of V 2 voicing to infer voicing characteristics of C 1 and C 2 , respectively.

### 3.3 HLsyn

HLsyn plays a crucial role as an analysis and applications tool in this study. It is a commercial product of Sensimetrics Corporation. There are two parts to the synthesizer. The lower-level part consists of a formant synthesizer that carries out the actual sound generation. It is controlled by 40 -some acoustically-oriented parameters. The higher-
level part consists of 13 articulatory-oriented parameters and a set of mapping equations which use these variables to calculate the lower-level parameters (Hanson and Stevens, 2002). When properly controlled, HLsyn has been shown to produce naturatsounding speech.

In this study, gestural estimates are directly transferred into manipulating HLsyn's articulatory-oriented parameters for the generation of the stop-consonant sequences. Table 2 lists the 13 articulatory parameters and how they are controlled.

Table 2: Manipulating HLsyn Parameters

| Parameter | Manipulation Technique |
| :---: | :---: |
| al (cross-sec. area formed by lips) | Use gestural estimations for the lips. |
| ab (cross-sec. area formed by tongue blade) | Use gestural estimations for the tongue blade. |
| ag (area of glottal opening) | Use gestural estimations for the glottis opening. |
| an (cross-sec. area of velopharyngeal port) | Velopharyngeal port is closed for stop consonant production. |
| f0 (pitch) | Use pitch estimations. |
| F1-f4 (formants) | Use formant estimations; these parameters control tongue body gestures. |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { ps (subglottal } \\ \text { pressure) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Assumed to be 8 cm H 2 O for males and 6.5 cm H 2 O for females. |
| dc (compliance of vocal folds) | Set to negative to increase the phonation threshold for voiceless stops and set to positive to decrease the phonation threshold for voiced stops. |
| ue (active expansion of the vocal tract volume) | Positive for active expansion; negative for contraction. |
| ap (area of posterior glottal opening | Presence of opening normal for female speakers; set to $1 \mathrm{~mm}^{\wedge} 2$ throughout |

### 3.4 Analysis of Variance

In this study, the analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used to test for significance in the differences between groups of data. The null hypothesis tested by ANOVA is always the statement that the groups in question have the same mean. The resulting p -value from the analysis indicates the strength of the evidence against the null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$. Table 3 contains an interpretation of p -values (Devore, 1995). Based on convention, alpha is set to 0.05 . The $p$-value must be equal to or less than alpha in order to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 3: Interpretation of P-Values

| $\mathrm{P}-$ Value | Interpretation |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{P}<0.01$ | very strong evidence against $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ |
| $0.01 \leqslant \mathrm{P}<0.05$ | moderate evidence against $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ |
| $0.05 \leqslant \mathrm{P}<0.10$ | suggestive evidence against $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ |
| $0.10 \leqslant \mathrm{P}$ | little or no real evidence against $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ |

## Chapter 4: Phase I

In phase one of this study, acoustic data such as formant movements, closure durations, release bursts, and spectrum shape at low frequencies, were collected and analyzed for a number of naturally-spoken stop-consonant sequences. Based on the analysis, gestural timing estimates were inferred. Finally, from the gestural timing estimates, an initial set of possible principles was derived.

### 4.1 Phase I Methodology

### 4.1.1 Natural Speech Recording

Four native speakers of American English, two male and two female, were asked to read the list of phrases (shown in Figure 3) at a normal pace. Two repetitions of each phrase were uttered. These utterances include individual English stop consonants in word-initial (V\#CV) and word-final (VC\#V) positions, as well as all possible combinations of VC\#CV English stop-consonant sequences. The utterances were recorded on DAT tape in a sound-proof recording room The recordings were digitized at a sampling rate of 11 kHz .

### 4.1.2 Acoustic Data Collection

Spectrograms, pitch estimations and formant estimations were generated for each consonant sequence using the software tools xkl and lspecto. The following sections detail how formant movements, closure durations, stop consonant burst presence, and
voicing characteristics were measured from the recorded speech data.

Say saw pot again. Say saw top again. Say saw copagain. Say saw bob again. Say saw dot again. Say saw got again.

Say top ox again.
Say dot ox again.
Say dock ox again.
Say bob ox again.
Say cod ox again.
Say dog ox again.

Say top pot again. Say got pot again. Say dock pot again.
Say top tot again. Say got top again. Say dock top again.
Say top cop again. Say got cop again. Say dock cop again.
Say top bob again. Say got bob again. Say dock bob again.
Say top dot again. Say got dot again. Say dock dot again.
Say top got again. Say dot got again. Say dock got again.
Say mob pot again. Say cod pot again. Say dog pot again.
Say mob top again. Say cod top again. Say dog top again.
Say mob cop again. Say cod cop again. Say dog cop again.
Say mob bob again. Say cod bob again. Say dog bob again.
Say mob dot again. Say cod dot again. Say dog dot again.
Say mob got again. Say cod got again. Say dog got again.
Figure 3. Phrases Containing Stop-Consonant Sequences. Subjects are asked to read the list of phrases as naturally as they can.

### 4.1.2.1 Recording Formant Movements

F2 and F3 formant movements were recorded by measuring the values in the middle of the vowel preceding Cl , as well as at $60 \mathrm{~ms}, 40 \mathrm{~ms}, 20 \mathrm{~ms}$, and immediately prior to the closure of C 1 . Measurements were also made at the onset of the vowel following C 2 , as well as at $20 \mathrm{~ms}, 40 \mathrm{~ms}$, and 60 ms after the vowel onset, and in the middle of the same vowel.

Each formant reading was taken as follows. Using xkl, a 6.4 Hamming window was
placed over a pitch period at an appropriate time prior to the closure of C 1 or after V2 onset. The first formant was measured at the frequency of the maximum low frequency peak. The second formant was recorded at the frequency of the highest peak in magnitude after the first formant. The third formant was recorded at the frequency of the highest peak in magnitude after the second formant (see Figure 4).

### 4.1.2.2 Measuring Closure Duration

The closure duration for singleton consonants was measured starting at the end of the last pitch period prior to the stop closure and ending just before the release of the stop consonant burst. Figure 5 details how closure durations were measured for singleton consonants.

As for the closure durations for stop-consonant sequences, if both C 1 and C 2 release bursts were present, the closure duration of C 1 was measured starting at the end of the last pitch period prior to the C 1 closure and ending just before the C 1 release burst; that of C 2 was measured starting at the termination of the C 1 burst and ending at the release of C 2 (see Figure 5). If the C 1 burst was absent, the closure duration was measured starting at the end of the last pitch period prior to the C 1 closure and ending just before the C 2 release burst.


Figure 4. Formant Measurements. A 6.4 Hamming window was placed over a pitch period. The first formant was measured at the frequency of the highest peak in magnitude. The second formant was recorded at the frequency of the highest peak in magnitude after the first formant. The third formant was recorded at the frequency of the highest peak in magnitude after the second formant (see Figure 1).


Figure 5. Closure Duration Measurements. The top panel shows how closure duration was measured for VCV sequences. The bottom panel shows how closure durations were measured for VCCV sequences, for cases where C1-bursts were present.

### 4.1.2.3 Presence and Length of Stop Burst

Acoustic evidence for the stop-consonant release in the form of bursts was examined for each individual consonant and consonant sequence; the time of the release burst was recorded (see Figure 5). The length of the release burst was measured starting at the onset of the release-burst and terminating at the end of the noise burst.

### 4.1.2.4 Measuring H1, H2 and A1

H1 (first harmonic), H2 (second harmonic), and A1 (strongest harmonic in the firstformant range) were measured by applying a Hamming window over the last four
complete pitch periods of V1 prior to the closure of C 1 (see Figure 6). The same process was repeated for the first four complete pitch periods of V 2 following the C 2 release. The length of the Hamming window varied from 30 ms to 45 ms depending on the pitch of the speaker. In addition, the frequency of each harmonic was recorded.

H1 and H2 were also adjusted to account for the F1 boost on the vocaltract transfer function (Hanson, 1997). F1 readings were taken from the same pitch periods where the harmonics were measured. The final F1 value was the average of the readings taken at each of the last four complete pitch periods of V1 or at each of the first four complete pitch periods of $\mathrm{V} 2 ;$ a 6.4 ms Hamming window was used to measure F1. The method for measuring F1 was the same as that used for measuring F2 and F3 detailed in 4.1.2.1. The quantity, $20 \log _{10}\left[\mathrm{~F}^{2} /\left(\mathrm{Fl}^{2}-f^{2}\right)\right]$, was subtracted from both H 1 and $\mathrm{H} 2 ; f$ is the frequency at which the harmonic is located (Hanson, 1997). From here on, H1* and H2* represent the adjusted values of H 1 and H 2 .


Figure 6: Spectrum Shape at Low Frequencies. H1 (first harmonic), H2 (second harmonic), and A1 (strongest harmonic in the first-formant range) were measured by applying a Hamming window over the last four complete pitch periods of V1 prior to the closure of C1.

### 4.2 Phase I Results

Figure 7 details the average F2 movement of V1 into the C 1 closure, measured from the middle of the vowel to just before the closure, with respect to the order of place of articulation. Averages were calculated from detailed data gathered on the formant movements from all four speakers (see Appendix C though F).


Figure 7. F2 Movement of V1 into C 1 vs. Order of Place of Articulation. A plot of the average F2 movement of V1 into the C1 closure, measured from the middle of the vowel to just prior to the closure, with respect to the order of place of articulation. Averages were taken from both voiced and voiceless sequences with respect to order of place of articulation.

The average F2 movements into the labial C 1 closure seem affected by C 2 . When the labial was followed by an alveolar rather than another labial, the average decrease of F2 into the closure was smaller by 16 Hz (see Figure 7). When the labial was followed by a velar, the average decrease of F2 was smaller than that of a labiallabial sequence by 39Hz.

As for sequences with an alveolar stop in the C 1 position, the average F 2 increase into an alveolar-labial sequence was smaller than that into an alveolar-alveolar sequence by 7 Hz . On the other hand, the average F2 increase into an alveolar-velar sequence was larger
than that into an alveolar-alveolar sequence by 27 Hz .

Finally, for sequences with a velar stop in the C 1 position, the average F 2 increase into a velar-labial sequence was smaller than that into a velar-velar sequence by 9 Hz . The average F2 increase into a velar-alveolar sequence was smaller than that into a velar-velar sequence by 2 Hz .

Figure 8 details the average F2 movement of V2 following the C 2 release, measured from the onset of V2 voicing to the middle of the vowel, with respect to the order of place of articulation. Averages were calculated from detailed data gathered on the formant movements from all four speakers (see Appendix C through F).

The average increase of F 2 from C 2 to V 2 in alveolar-labial sequences was larger than that for labial-labial sequences by 8 Hz (see Figure 8). The average F2 increase for velarlabial sequences was larger than that of labial labial sequences by 34 Hz .

The average F2 decrease into V2 for labial-alveolar sequences was larger than that of alveolar-alveolar sequences by 54 Hz . The average F2 decrease into V 2 for velar-alveolar sequences was larger than that of alveolar-alveolar sequences by 27 Hz .

As for sequences with a velar stop in the C 2 position, when a labial is in the C 1 position instead of a velar, the average F2 decrease was larger by 19 Hz . When an alveolar was in the C 1 position instead of a velar, the average F 2 decrease was larger by 72 Hz .


Figure 8. F2 Movement from C2 to V2 vs. Order of Place of Articulation. A plot of the average F2 movement of V2 following the C2 release, measured from the onset of V2 voicing to the middle of the vowel, with respect to the order of place of articulation.

Figure 9 is a plot of the average ratio of the consonant-sequence closure duration to the sum of the closure durations of singleton C 1 and C 2 with respect to the order of place of articulation. Averages were taken of all four speakers.

Sequences with a velar stop in the C 1 position had closure durations roughly equal to the sum of the closure durations of singleton C 1 and C 2 ; their ratios were around 1 (see Figure 9). Alveolar-alveolar sequences had a closure duration ratio of .93. As for the rest of the sequences, the closure durations ratios ranged from .85 to .88 .


Figure 9. Closure Duration Ratio vs. Order of Place of Articulation. A plot of the average ratio of the consonant-sequence closure duration to the sum of the closure durations of singleton C 1 and C 2 with respect to the order of place of articulation

Figure 10 is a plot of the average ratio of the consonant-sequence closure duration to the sum of the closure durations of singleton C 1 and C 2 with respect to the order of voicing. Averages were taken of all four speakers.

The closure duration of sequences with voiced stop consonants in the C 1 position were roughly equal to the sum of singleton C 1 and C 2 closure durations. On the other hand, voiceless-voiceless and voiceless- voiced sequences had lower closure duration ratios at .83 and .85 , respectively.


Figure 10. Closure Duration Ratio vs. Voicing Characteristics. A plot of the average ratio of the consonant-sequence closure duration to the sum of the closure durations of singleton C 1 and C 2 with respect to the order of voicing.

Figure 11 details the ratio of sequences with absent C 1 bursts to the total number of sequences with respect to the order of place of articulation. A stop burst was considered absent when there was no acoustical evidence to support its presence.

Labial-alveolar, labial-velar, alveolar-velar, and velar-labial sequences all had C1-burst absence ratios of .25 or less (see Figure). Alveolar-labial and velar-alveolar sequences had at least a .5 C1-burst absence ratio. For sequences where C 1 and C 2 had the same place of articulation, the absence ratio was at least .63 .


Figure 11. C1 Burst Absence vs. Order of Place of Articulation. A plot of the ratio of sequences with absent C 1 bursts to the total number of sequences with respect to the order of place of articulation.

Figure 12 is a plot of the ratio of sequences with absent C 1 bursts to the total number of sequences with respect to the stop consonant in the C 1 position. Data indicated that a ' g ' in the C 1 position had the highest absence ratio at .71 . A ' d ' in the C 1 position had the next highest absence ratio at .5 , followed closely by ' $t$ ' with an absence ratio of .46 . A ' $b$ ' in the C 1 position had a release-burst absence ratio of .33 , while the ratio for ' p ' was .38. A C1 ' k ' had the lowest absence ratio at .25 . On average, the C 1 burst absence ratios for voiced stops were larger than those for voiceless stops.


Figure 12. C1 Burst Absence vs. Stop Consonant in C1 Position. A plot of the ratio of sequences with absent C 1 bursts to the total number of sequences with respect to the stop consonant in the C 1 position.

Figure 13 is a plot of the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 values based on data taken from the last four complete pitch periods prior to the C 1 closure of $\mathrm{V} 1 \mathrm{C} 1 \# \mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~V} 2$ sequences, with respect to the order of voicing. The averages consisted of data from all four speakers.

On average, when a voiced C 1 was followed by a voiceless C 2 instead of a voiced C 2 , $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2 *$ was larger by .9 dB and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 was larger by .86 dB . When a voiceless C 1 was followed by a voiced C 2 instead of a voiceless C 2 , the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2$ * was smaller by .82 dB and the average $\mathrm{H}^{*}-\mathrm{Al}$ was smaller by .08 dB .


Figure 13. $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{Al}$ of C 1 vs. Voicing Characteristics. A plot of the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 values based on data taken from the last four complete pitch periods prior to the C 1 closure of $\mathrm{V} 1 \mathrm{C} 1 \# \mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~V} 2$ sequences, with respect to the order of voicing.

Figure 14 is a plot of the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 values based on data taken from the first four complete pitch periods at the onset of V 2 voicing in $\mathrm{V} 1 \mathrm{C} 1 \# \mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~V} 2$ sequences, with respect to the order of voicing. The averages consisted of data taken from all four speakers.

On average, when a voiced C 2 was preceded by a voiceless C 1 rather than a voiced C 1 , $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-H2* was larger by .35 dB and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 was larger by 2.37 dB . When a voiceless C 2 was preceded by a voiced C 1 instead of a voiceless C 1 , the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$ - $\mathrm{H} 2 *$ was smaller by .04 dB and the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 was smaller by 1.58 dB .


Figure 14. $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{A} 1$ of C 2 vs. Voicing Characteristics. A plot of the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{Al}$ values based on data taken from the first four complete pitch periods at the onset of V2 voicing in $\mathrm{V} 1 \mathrm{C} 1 \# \mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~V} 2$ sequences, with respect to the order of voicing.

### 4.3 Acoustic Data Analysis

### 4.3.1 Trends in F2 Movements into the C1 Closure in V1C1\#C2V2 Sequences

The average F2 movements into the C1 closure for V1C1\#C2V2 sequences seemed to deviate depending on the place of articulation for C 2 . For example, the average decreasing movements of F2 into the C 1 closures of labial-alveolar and labial-velar sequences were smaller than that of labial labial sequences. The differences seemed to indicate a possible C 2 influence on the F 2 movements into C 1 ; since F 2 generally
increases going into alveolar and velar closures. As for alveolar-labial and velar-labial sequences, the average increases in F2 movements were smaller than those for alveolaralveolar and velar-velar sequences, respectively. Again, the deviations seemed to indicate a possible influence exerted by the labial, since F2 movements usually decrease going into labial closures.

Compared to the average increasing F2 movement into alveolar-alveolar sequences, that of alveolar-velar sequences was higher. The average F2 movement into velar-alveolar sequences was slightly lower than that into velar-velar sequences. Such deviations agree with the observation that F2 values terminate at a higher frequency going into velar stops than going into alveolar stops. However, the observation was made based only on the data collected in this study.

Furthermore, deviations in F2 movements in sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation were greater in magnitude, ranging from 16 Hz to 39 Hz , than in sequences with back-to-front order where deviations ranged from 2 Hz to 9 Hz .

Overall, the data seemed to reflect C 2 -dependent deviations in the average F2 movements into the Cl closure, with sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation exhibiting deviations that were larger in magnitude than those of sequences with back-tofront order. These trends suggest the existence of C2-dependent movements of the tongue body and possibly other oral articulators prior to the Cl closure. However, such trends were found to be statistically insignificant using analysis of variance (ANOVA)
with alpha of 0.05 (see Table 4). The resulting p-value must be smaller than alpha in order to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 4. Results ANOVA Tests Examining Differences in F2 Movements into the C1 Closure Between Groups with Different Orders of Place of Articulation

| Group 1 <br> (12 sequences <br> per group) | Group 2 <br> (12 sequences <br> per group) | p -Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}:$ Means from Group 1 and Group 2 <br> are the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| labial-labial | labial-alveolar | 0.49 | Cannot Reject |
| labial-labial | labial velar | 0.22 | Cannot Reject |
| alveolar-alveolar | alveolar-labial | 0.88 | Cannot Reject |
| alveolar-alveolar | alveolar-velar | 0.50 | Cannot Reject |
| velar-velar | velar-labial | 0.81 | Cannot Reject |
| velar-velar | velar-alveolar | 0.92 | Cannot Reject |

### 4.3.2 Trends in F2 Movements of C2 Transitioning into V2

Special attention was paid to the possible influence of C 1 on C 2 in the analysis of F 2 movements of C 2 transitioning into V2. Although the average F2 movements differed for sequences with varying places of Cl articulation, no trends were observed. For example, the average F2 movement of labials transitioning into V2 was actually higher when alveolar and velar stops were in the C1 position instead of labials. The average decreases in F2 movements for labial-alveolar and labialvelar sequences transitioning into V2 were greater than for alveolar-alveolar and velar-velar sequences, respectively. Clearly, the deviations were not C1-dependent and no trends were discovered.

The F2-movement differences between groups of varying orders of place of articulation were further tested using analysis of variance (ANOVA) with alpha of 0.05 . These differences were found to be statistically insignificant (see Table 5).

Table 5: Results ANOVA Tests Examining Differences in F2 Movements into V2 Between Groups with Different Orders of Place of Articulation

| Group 1 <br> (12 sequences <br> per group) | Group 2 <br> (12 sequences <br> per group) | p-Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : Means from Group 1 and <br> Group 2 are the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| labial-labial | alveolar-labial | 0.72 | Cannot Reject |
| labial-labial | velar-labial | 0.11 | Cannot Reject |
| alveolar-alveolar | labialalveolar | 0.25 | Cannot Reject |
| alveolar-alveolar | velar-alveolar | 0.54 | Cannot Reject |
| velar-velar | labial velar | 0.68 | Cannot Reject |
| velar-velar | alveolar-velar | 0.09 | Cannot Reject |

Trends in F2 movements seemed to indicate a possible influence of C 2 on C 1 but not the other way around. Sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation were more affected by C 2 than sequences with back-to-front order, a finding which agrees with results of past studies (Byrd, 1996; Chitoran, Goldstein, and Byrd, 2002; Zsiga, 1994). However, these trends were found to be statistically insignificant.

### 4.3.3 Closure Duration and Order of Place of Articulation

On average, sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation had smaller closure duration ratios than those of sequences with back-to-front order. The average ratio for sequences with front-to-back order was .86 compared to .98 for sequences with back-to-front order. The difference between the two groups was tested using analysis of variance (ANOVA) with alpha of 0.05 . The resulting p-value of 0.028 indicated that the difference between the two groups was statistically significant (see Table 6). This finding seemed to indicate that there was more overlap for sequences with front-to-back
order of place of articulation. Perhaps articulators started to form the C 2 closure prior to the C 1 release, maybe even before the C 1 closure, therefore shortening the closure duration

Table 6: ANOVA Test Result Examining Differences in Closure Duration Ratios Between Sequences with Front-to-Back and Back-to-Front Orders of Place of Articulation

| Group 1 <br> (48 sequences) | Group 2 <br> (48 sequences) | p-Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}:$ Means from Group 1 and Group 2 <br> are the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Front-to-Back | Back-to-Front | 0.028 | Rejected |

### 4.3.4 Closure Duration and Voicing

On average, sequences beginning with a voiceless stop consonant had smaller closure duration ratios than those of sequences with a voiced C 1 . The average ratio for sequences with voiceless C 1 was .84 compared to 1.02 for sequences with voiced C 1 . In order to test the significance of the difference, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed with an alpha of 0.05 . The resulting p -value of $6.35 * 10^{-5}$ was much smaller than alpha; therefore, there was very strong evidence rejecting the null hypothesis (see Table 7). This finding seemed to indicate that there was more overlap in sequences with voiceless stops in the C 1 position

Table 7: ANOVA Test Result Examining Differences in Closure Duration Ratios Between Sequences with Voiced C1 and Sequences with Voiceless C1

| Group 1 <br> (72 sequences) | Group 2 <br> (72 sequences) | p -Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}:$ Means from Group 1 and Group 2 <br> are the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Voiced C1 | Voiceless C1 | $6.35^{*} 10^{-5}$ | Rejected |

### 4.3.5 Absence of C1 Burst

C1-burst absence rates were very high for sequences where C 1 and C 2 had the same place of articulation, with ratios ranging from .68 to .94 . Sequences with back-to-front order had absence ratios ranging from .19 to .56 . Surprisingly, sequences with front-toback order of place of articulation had the lowest C1-burst absence rates, ranging from 0 to .25 . This finding was unexpected because sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation were thought to have more gestural overlap than sequences with back-tofront order. The low absence ratios may suggest that the overlapping of gestures in such sequences did not extend so far as to obliterate the Cl burst.

One trend emerged from comparing C1-burst absence ratios among the different stop consonants. On average, the absence ratios were larger for voiced stops in the Cl position than for voiceless stops. The average absence ratio for sequences with voiced C1 was 0.51 , compared to 0.36 for sequences with voiceless C 1 . In the previous section, greater overlap for sequences with voiceless C1 was suggested because of their smaller closure duration ratios compared to sequences with voiced C 1 . This finding seemed to suggest that although such sequences may have greater overlap, the extent of the overlap did not go so far as to obliterate the C 1 burst.

Unfortunately, the differences in C1-burst absence ratios were not statistically analyzed because of the small sample size; there were only three voiced and three voiceless stop consonants.

Finally, no conclusive evidence was found indicating a definite link between the presence of enhancing gestures and defining gestures' susceptibility to obliteration. For example, the absence ratio of $t$-bursts is slightly larger, at .46 , than that of $p$-bursts, at 0.38 . The higher rate of absence for the tburst, a defining gesture, is perhaps explained by the presence of the fronting of the tongue body, an enhancing gesture. However, significance of the ratio differences is unclear; statistical analysis was not performed because of the small sample size.

### 4.3.6 Order of Voicing

The average values of both $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{A} 1$, measured from the last four complete pitch periods prior to the C 1 closure, were larger when a voiced Cl was followed by a voiceless C 2 instead of a voiced C 2 . Both measurements were larger by 0.9 dB and correlated to a larger open-quotient and bigger acoustic loss at the glottis. However, the differences between the voiced-voiced and voiced-voiceless groups proved to be statistically insignificant using analysis of variance (ANOVA) with alpha of 0.05 (see Table 8).

The average values of both $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{A} 1$, measured from the last four complete pitch periods prior to the C 1 closure, were smaller when a voiceless C 1 was followed by a voiced C 2 instead of a voiceless $\mathrm{C} 2 . \mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ was smaller by 0.8 dB and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{A} 1$ was smaller by 0.08 dB ; the differences correlated to a smaller open-quotient and slightly less acoustic loss at the glottis, respectively, for voiceless-voiced sequences compared to voiceless-voiceless sequences. However, the differences between the voiceless-voiced
and voiceless-voiceless groups proved to be statistically insignificant using analysis of variance (ANOVA) with alpha of 0.05 (see Table 9). The high p -values indicated that the voicing of C 1 did not seem to be affected by that of C 2 .

Table 8: ANOVA Test Results Examining Differences in Voicing Characteristics of C1 Between Voiced-Voiced and Voiced-Voiceless Sequences

| Group 1 <br> (36 sequences <br> per group) | Group 2 <br> (36 sequences <br> per group) | p-Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : Means from Group 1 and Group 2 are <br> the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ prior <br> to C1 for <br> voiced-voiced | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-H2* <br> prior to C1 for <br> voiced- <br> voiceless | 0.43 | Cannot Reject |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 prior <br> to Cl for <br> voiced-voiced | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 prior <br> to C1 for <br> voiced- <br> voiceless | 0.58 | Cannot Reject |

Table 9: ANOVA Test Results Examining Differences in Voicing Characteristics of C1 Between Voiceless-Voiced and Voiceless-Voiceless Sequences

| Group 1 <br> (36 sequences <br> per group) | Group 2 <br> (36 sequences <br> per group) | p-Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}:$ Means from Group 1 and Group 2 are <br> the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ prior <br> to Cl for <br> voiceless- <br> voiced | $\mathrm{H1*}$ - $\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ <br> prior to Cl for <br> voiceless- <br> voiceless | 0.66 | Cannot Reject |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 prior <br> to C1 for <br> voiceless- <br> voiced | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 prior <br> to Cl for <br> voiceless- <br> voiceless | 0.96 | Cannot Reject |

The average values of both $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{Al}$, measured from the first four complete pitch periods at the onset of V2 voicing, were larger when a voiced C 2 is preceded by a
voiceless C 1 instead of a voiced Cl ; the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2 *$ value was larger by .35 dB and $\mathrm{H} 1 *$-A1 was larger by 2.37 dB . Such differences indicated a larger open-quotient and bigger acoustic loss at the glottis, respectively, for C 2 in voiceless-voiced sequences than in voiced-voiced sequences. However, the differences between the voiceless-voiced and voiced-voiced groups proved to be statistically insignificant using analysis of variance (ANOVA) with alpha of 0.05 (see Table 10).

Table 10: ANOVA Test Results Examining Differences in Voicing Characteristics of C2 between Voiced-Voiced and Voiceless-Voiced Sequences

| Group 1 <br> (36 sequences <br> per group) | Group 2 <br> (36 sequences <br> per group) | p-Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : Means from Group 1 and Group 2 are <br> the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiced-voiced | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ at <br> V 2 onset for <br> voiceless- <br> voiced | 0.76 | Cannot Reject |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiced-voiced | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiceless- <br> voiced | 0.15 | Cannot Reject |

The average values of both $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{Al}$, measured from the first four complete pitch periods at the onset of V2 voicing, were smaller when a voiceless C2 is preceded by a voiced C 1 instead of a voiceless C ; the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$ - $\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ value was smaller by .04 dB and H1*-A1 was smaller by 1.58 dB . Such differences indicated a smaller open-quotient and smaller acoustic loss at the glottis, respectively, for C 2 in voiced-voiceless sequences than in voiceless-voiceless sequences. However, the differences between the two groups proved to be statistically insignificant using analysis of variance (ANOVA) with alpha of
0.05 (see Table 11).

Table 11: ANOVA Test Results Examining Differences in Voicing Characteristics of C2 between Voiced-Voiceless and Voiceless-Voiceless Sequences

| Group 1 <br> (36 sequences <br> per group) | Group 2 <br> (36 sequences <br> per group) | p-Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : Means from Group 1 and Group 2 are <br> the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiced- <br> voiceless | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-H2* at <br> V2 onset for <br> voiceless- <br> voiceless | 0.96 | Cannot Reject |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiced- <br> voiceless | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiceless- <br> voiceless | 0.23 | Cannot Reject |

Relatively small p-values of 0.15 and 0.23 resulted from ANOVA tests examining differences in $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 data between voiced-voiced sequences and voiceless-voiced sequences, as well as between voiced-voiceless and voiceless-voiceless sequences, respectively. This prompted a closer look at the voicing characteristics data.

One important detail to mention is that $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{Al}$ values differ significantly between male and female speakers. More specifically, female speakers usually have larger open quotient and bigger acoustical loss at the glottis than male speakers (Hanson, 1999). Data collected in this study also reflect such differences (see Appendix G). In order to take a closer look at the voicing characteristics data, the next two graphs reflect data separated by gender.

Figure 15 is a plot of the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$ - A 1 values based on data taken from
the first four complete pitch periods at the onset of V 2 voicing in $\mathrm{V} 1 \mathrm{C} 1 \# \mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~V} 2$ sequences, with respect to the order of voicing. Averages consisted of data taken from female speakers.


Figure 15. H1*-H2* and H1*-A1 of C2 vs. Voicing Characteristics of Sequences by Female Speakers. A plot of the average H1*-H2* and H1*-A1 values based on data taken from the first four complete pitch periods at the onset of V2 voicing in V1C1\#C2V2 sequences, with respect to the order of voicing. Averages consisted of data taken from female speakers.

On average, when a voiced C 2 was preceded by a voiceless C 1 rather than a voiced C 1 , H1*-H2* was larger by 4.42 dB and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 was larger by 3.8 dB for female speakers. When a voiceless C2 was preceded by a voiced C1 instead of a voiceless C1, the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2 *$ was actually larger by .54 dB and the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 was smaller by .96 dB for female speakers.

These differences between the groups of sequences were tested using analysis of variance with alpha of 0.05 (see Table 12).

Table 12: ANOVA Test Results Examining Differences in Voicing Characteristics of C2 between Voiced-Voiced and Voiceless-Voiced Sequences Uttered by Female Speakers

| Group 1 <br> (18 sequences <br> per group) | Group 2 <br> (18 sequences <br> per group) | p-Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : Means from Group 1 and Group 2 are <br> the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiced-voiced | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-H2* at <br> V 2 onset for <br> voiceless- <br> voiced | 0.0047 | Rejected |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{Al}$ at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiced-voiced | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiceless- <br> voiced | 0.018 | Rejected |

The analysis of variance indicated strong evidence for the rejection of the null hypothesis; differences between $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{A} 1$ values, measured at the first four complete pitch periods at V2 onset, between voiced-voiced and voiceless-voiced sequences were statistically significant. This finding indicated that for female speakers, the voicing characteristics of the voiced C 2 were affected by those of the voiceless Cl . More specifically, the voiced C2 was less "voiced" when it was preceded by a voiceless C 1 than by a voiced C 1 .

Table 13 details the ANOVA test results examining differences in wicing characteristics of C2 between voiced-voiceless and voiceless-voiceless sequences uttered by female speakers. No statistical significance to the differences was found.

Table 13: ANOVA Test Results Examining Differences in Voicing Characteristics of C2 between Voiced-Voiceless and Voiceless-Voiceless Sequences Uttered by Female Speakers

| Group 1 (18 sequences per group) | Group 2 ( 18 sequences per group) | p-Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : Means from Group 1 and Group 2 are the same |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H1*-H2* at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiced- <br> voiceless | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ at <br> V2 onset for voicelessvoiceless | 0.85 | Cannot Reject |
| H1*-A1 at V2 onset for voicedvoiceless | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 at V2 onset for voicelessvoiceless | 0.5 | Cannot Reject |

Figure 16 is a plot of the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{Al}$ values based on data taken from the first four complete pitch periods at the onset of V 2 voicing in $\mathrm{V} 1 \mathrm{C} 1 \# \mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~V} 2$ sequences, with respect to the order of voicing. Averages consisted of data taken from male speakers.

On average, when a voiced C 2 was preceded by a voiceless C 1 rather than a voiced C 1 , H1*-H2* was actually smaller by 1.97 dB and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 was larger by .95 dB for male speakers. When a voiceless C 2 was preceded by a voiced C 1 instead of a voiceless C 1 , the average $\mathrm{H1}^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ was smaller by .22 dB and the average $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$ - A 1 was smaller by 2.3 dB for male speakers.


Figure 16. H1*-H2* and H1*-A1 of C2 vs. Voicing Characteristics of Sequences by Male Speakers. A plot of the average H1*-H2* and H1*-A1 values based on data taken from the first four complete pitch periods at the onset of V2 voicing in V1C1\#C2V2 sequences, with respect to the order of voicing. Averages consisted of data taken from male speakers.

These differences between the groups of sequences were tested using analysis of variance with alpha of 0.05 (see Tables 14 and 15).

The large p-values indicated that the differences in $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{A} 1$ data, measured from the first four complete pitch periods of V2, between voiced-voiced and voicelessvoiced sequences were not statistically significant.

Table 14: ANOVA Test Results Examining Differences in Voicing Characteristics of C2 between Voiced-Voiced and Voiceless-Voiced Sequences Uttered by Male Speakers

| Group 1 <br> (18 sequences <br> per group) | Group 2 <br> $(18$ sequences <br> per group) | p-Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : Means from Group 1 and Group 2 are <br> the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiced-voiced | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ at <br> V 2 onset for <br> voiceless- <br> voiced | 0.22 | Cannot Reject |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{Al}$ at V 2 <br> onset for <br> voiced-voiced | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{Al}$ at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiceless- <br> voiced | 0.66 | Cannot Reject |

Table 15 details the ANOVA test results examining differences in voicing characteristics of C2 between voiced-voiceless and voiceless-voiceless sequences uttered by male speakers. No statistical significance to the differences was found.

Table 15: ANOVA Test Results Examining Differences in Voicing Characteristics of C2 between Voiced-Voiceless and Voiceless-Voiceless Sequences Uttered by Male Speakers

| Group 1 <br> (18 sequences <br> per group) | Group 2 <br> (18 sequences <br> per group) | p-Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : Means from Group 1 and Group 2 are <br> the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiced- <br> voiceless | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-H2* at <br> V2 onset for <br> voiceless- <br> voiceless | 0.89 | Cannot Reject |
| $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{A} 1$ at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiced- <br> voiceless | $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{A} 1$ at V2 <br> onset for <br> voiceless- <br> voiceless | 0.08 | Cannot Reject |

The analysis of voicing characteristics of stop-consonant sequences indicated no evidence for the influence of C 1 by C 2 . Although there was evidence indicating that the voicing of

C1 seems to affect the voicing of C2, such effects did not always occur (see Appendix G). For example, the only statistically significant data suggesting Cl 's influence on the voicing of C 2 were shown in voiced- C 2 sequences uttered by female speakers. A closer look at the $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}-\mathrm{H} 2^{*}$ and $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$-A1 sorted by speaker reveal that the extent of Cl 's influence varies greatly from individual to individual (see Appendix G).

### 4.4 General Gestural Timing Estimates

This section discusses what the results of acoustic data analysis mean in terms of gestural timing estimates.

The analysis of acoustic data disclosed several interesting findings. First, F2 data revealed C2-dependent deviations in the movements of F 2 into the C 1 closure. Such deviations were larger in magnitude for sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation than for sequences with back-to-front order. However, these trends were found to be statistically insignificant. Nevertheless, the trends agree with similar findings in past studies examining formant movements in stop-consonant sequences (Zsiga, 1994).

How do these trends translate to general gestural timing estimates? The existence of C2dependent deviations in F 2 movements into the C 1 closure suggests the presence of C 2 dependent movements of the tongue body and of possibly other ora-articulators into the C1-closure. Greater deviations in sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation suggest more overlapping than in sequences with back-to-front order.

Data also indicated smaller closure duration ratios for sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation than those with back-to-front order. This suggests more overlap in sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation than in sequences with back-to-front order. Very possibly, the formation of the C 2 closure by the appropriate articulators begins prior to the release of C 1 , perhaps even before the Cl closure. However, the absence rates of C1-bursts were lower for sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation than for those with back-to-front order. The low absence rates of such sequences suggest that the formation of the C 2 closure does not occur early enough to obliterate the Cl release.

In addition, data indicated smaller closure duration ratios for voiceless- C 1 sequences than for voiced- C 1 sequences. However, the C1-burst absence rate was lower for voicelessC 1 sequences than for voiced- C 1 sequences. It is unclear why closure duration ratios and C 1 -burst absence rates differ between voiceless- C 1 and voiced- C 1 sequences.

Finally, voicing data indicated possible influence of C 1 's voicing on the voicing of C 2 , although such effects varied from individual to individual. This finding suggests that the actions of the laryngeal articulators, such as glottal opening adjustments and vocal fold stiffness adjustments, for the production of C 1 may overlap with those for the production of C 2 . For example, if C 1 is voiceless, the area of the glottis may still be a bit spread and the vocal folds a bit stiff going into a voiced C2.

### 4.5 Derivation of Possible Principles

Based on the analysis of acoustic data and the inferred gestural timing estimates, two principles were derived.

Principle 1: There exist C2-dependent movements of the tongue body and of possibly other oral-articulators into the C 1 -closure. The formation of the C 2 closure by the appropriate articulators is likely to start to occur before the release of C 1 , perhaps even prior to the Cl closure, for stop-consonant sequences. The extent of such overlapping is greater in sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation than in back-to-front order, however, overlapping does not extend so far as to obliterate the C 1 release burst.

Principle 2: The actions of the laryngeal articulators for C 1 production such as glottal opening adjustments and vocal fold stiffness adjustments, may overlap with those for C2 production.

The derived principles, along with the inferred gestural estimates, were verified and refined in the next phase of this study.

## Chapter 5: Phase II

In phase two of this study, both the general gestural estimates and the derived principles were verified and refined through quasiarticulatory synthesis using HLsyn. Consonant sequences were first generated using sets of specific gestural timing estimates inferred from acoustic data. The synthetic utterances were acoustically and perceptually compared to the actual utterances in order to verify and refine the articulatory timing estimates; the resulting gestural timing estimates were used to cross-check and refine the general estimates inferred in phase one. Next, in order to verify the revised principles, synthetic sequences with varying degrees of overlap were generated. Perception tests composed of these synthetic consonant sequences were administered. The results of the tests were used to verify the validity of each principle and the extent of its applicability.

### 5.1 Phase II Methodology

### 5.1.1 Verification and Refinement of Gestural Timing Estimates

The first step in this phase of the study was to verify and refine the general gestural timing estimates made from acoustical analysis. The process involved making specific gestural timing estimates for naturally-spoken stop-consonant sequences and transferring these estimates to HLsyn to generate synthetic counterparts to the spoken utterances. The synthetic sequences were generated to be as acoustically identical to the actual sequences as possible. Through the process, the general gestural timing estimates were refined so that they were in agreement with the specific gestural estimates.

Gestural timing estimates were made for 12 singleton stop consonants (VCV) and 12 VC\#CV sequences spoken by a male speaker, using the concepts detailed in Section 3.2. Sequences with voiced and voiceless alveolar stops in the Cl position were chosen; such sequences include both back-to-front and front-to-back orders of articulation.

The gestural timing estimates, along with the corresponding formant data, were transferred directly to HLsyn to generate synthetic sequences (refer to Section 3.3 for HLsyn manipulation). Appropriate adjustments were made to make the synthetic sequences acoustically and perceptually similar to the spoken utterances (see disk attachment of HLsyn files).

The resulting gestural timing estimates were used to cross-check the general gestural timing estimates inferred from phase one. The process found no discrepancies significant enough to change the general gestural timing estimates made in phase one. Therefore, the derived principles were also not modified.

### 5.1.2 Verification and Refinement of Derived Principles

The validity of the derived principles and the extent of their applicability were verified through perception testing. The tests were composed of synthetic sequences with varying degrees of overlap. Four sets of such sequences were generated; each set was aimed at the verification and refinement of an aspect of a particular principle. The following describes those sets of synthesized sequences.

The first set of synthetic sequences consisted of $15 \mathrm{~d} \# \mathrm{~d}$ sequences with the F 2 value just prior to the Cl closure varying in 50 Hz steps from 1000 Hz to 1700 Hz . F2 at middle of V1 was kept constant at 1200 Hz for all sequences (see Appendix for articulatory parameters of the sequences). The control sequence in this group had a F2 value of 1400 Hz just prior to the C 1 closure.

This set of $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~d}$-sequences was aimed at modeling the potential deviations in the F2 movements into the C 1 closure. The delta of the F2 movement into a dclosure was gradually decreased to that of a b-closure in one extreme, and gradually increased to that of a g-closure in the other extreme. The perception accuracies of these sequences should reveal a possible window of allowable deviation that did not negatively affect the perception of the sequence. Since the F2 movements reflect the oral gestures, the results were used to verify and refine Principle 1. For example, if any slight deviation in the F2 movement, even for sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation, significantly decreased perception accuracy, then the validity of Principle 1 would be questioned. In addition, differences in perception accuracies of sequences with front-toback F2 movement deviations (toward that of ' g ') and sequences with back-to-front F2 movement deviations (toward that of 'b') would further substantiate or question Principle 1's statement of greater overlap for front-to-back sequences.

The second set consisted of $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{~d} \# \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{~d} \# \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{k}$ sequences with C 1 bursts and their counterparts without C 1 bursts. Sequences with absent Cl bursts were
synthesized by forming the C 2 closure before the release of C 1 closure. The perception accuracies of these sequences should provide information on the importance of the C1burst in the perception of the sequences. The results were used to verify and refine Principle 1's statement about the non-obliteration of the C1-burst in the gestural overlap of stop consonant sequences.

The third set consisted of a series of $11 \mathrm{~d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequences with changing voicing characteristics of ' p ' to eventually sound like ' $b$ ' (see Table 16). The first sequence in the series was a normal $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequence. With each successive sequence, he voicing characteristics of ' $p$ ' were modified to be acoustically closer and closer to that of a ' $b$ '. The last sequence of the series had the voicing characteristics of a normal $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~b}$ sequence. The voice bar following the voiced-Cl closure was not a changing factor. This set modeled the potential effects of a voiced Cl on the voicing characteristics of a voiceless C2. More specifically, perception accuracies of these sequences should answer the question: When preceded by a ' $d$ ', how "voiced" can the 'p' be and still be accurately perceived?

The last set consisted of a series of $11 \mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}$ sequences with changing voicing characteristics of ' $b$ ' to eventually sound like ' $p$ ' (see Table 17). The first sequence in the series was a normal $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}$ sequence. With each successive sequence, the voicing characteristics of ' $b$ ' were modified to be acoustically closer and closer to that of a ' $p$ '. The last sequence of the series had the voicing characteristics of a normal $t \# p$ sequence. This set modeled the potential effects of a voiceless C 1 on the voicing characteristics of a
voiced C2. More specifically, perception accuracies of these sequences should answer the question: When preceded by a ' $t$ ', how "voiceless" can the ' $b$ ' be and still be accurately perceived?

Table 16: D\#P Sequences with Changing HLsyn Voicing Parameters Around the PRelease

|  | HLsyn Voicing Parameters Around the ' p 'Release |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequence 1 (normal d\#p sequence) | $\mathrm{ag}=50, \mathrm{ue}=-100, \mathrm{dc}=-70$ |
| $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequence 2 | $\mathrm{ag}=45.4, \mathrm{ue}=-90, \mathrm{dc}=-56$ |
| $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequence 3 | $\mathrm{ag}=40.8, \mathrm{ue}=-80, \mathrm{dc}=-42$ |
| $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequence 4 | $\mathrm{ag}=36.2, \mathrm{ue}=-70, \mathrm{dc}=-28$ |
| $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequence 5 | $\mathrm{ag}=31.6, \mathrm{ue}=-60, \mathrm{dc}=-14$ |
| $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequence 6 | $\mathrm{ag}=27, \mathrm{ue}=-50, \mathrm{dc}=0$ |
| $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequence 7 | $\mathrm{ag}=22.4, \mathrm{ue}=-40, \mathrm{dc}=14$ |
| $\mathrm{d} \#$ p sequence 8 | $\mathrm{ag}=17.8, \mathrm{ue}=-30, \mathrm{dc}=28$ |
| $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequence 9 | $\mathrm{ag}=13.2$, ue $=-20, \mathrm{dc}=42$ |
| $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequence 10 | $\mathrm{ag}=8.6, \mathrm{ue}=-10, \mathrm{dc}=56$ |
| $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequence 11 (acoustically similar to $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~b})$ | $\mathrm{ag}=4, \mathrm{ue}=0, \mathrm{dc}=70$ |

The perception accuracies of the last two sets of sequences should provide a possible window of allowable laryngeal gestural overlap, which would be used to refine Principle 2. In addition, the validity of Principle 2 would also be verified. For example, a nonexistent window of allowable overlap would cast doubt on whether overlap of laryngeal gestures exists.

### 5.1.3 Perception Tests

Two perception tests were administered. The first test was composed of the four sets of synthesized sequences with varying degrees of overlap; listeners were asked to indicate
the consonant-sequence they heard. The second test was composed of spoken sequences and their synthetic counterparts; listeners were asked to rate how natural the synthetic sequences were when compared to the spoken ones. Ten subjects participated in the series of two perception tests. The next two paragraphs detail the composition and administration of each perception test.

Table 17: T\#B Sequences with Changing HLsyn Voicing Parameters Around the BRelease

|  | HLsyn Voicing Parameters Around the ' $b$ '- Release |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}$ (normal t\#b sequence) | $\mathrm{ag}=4, \mathrm{ue}=0, \mathrm{dc}=70$ |
| $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}$ | $\mathrm{ag}=7, \mathrm{ue}=-10, \mathrm{dc}=56$ |
| t\#b | $\mathrm{ag}=10, \mathrm{ue}=-20, \mathrm{dc}=42$ |
| t\#b | $\mathrm{ag}=13, \mathrm{ue}=-30, \mathrm{dc}=28$ |
| t\#b | $\mathrm{ag}=16$, ue $=-40, \mathrm{dc}=14$ |
| t\#b | $\mathrm{ag}=19, \mathrm{ue}=-50, \mathrm{dc}=0$ |
| t\#b | $\mathrm{ag}=22, \mathrm{ue}=-60, \mathrm{dc}=-14$ |
| t\#b | $\mathrm{ag}=25, \mathrm{ue}=-70, \mathrm{dc}=-28$ |
| t\#b | $\mathrm{ag}=28, \mathrm{ue}=-80, \mathrm{dc}=-42$ |
| t\#b | $\mathrm{ag}=30, \mathrm{ue}=-90, \mathrm{dc}=-56$ |
| $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}$ (acoustically similar to $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}$ ) | $\mathrm{ag}=33, \mathrm{ue}=-100, \mathrm{dc}=-70$ |

The first perception test was composed of the four sets of synthesized sequences with varying degrees of overlap detailed in section 5.1.2. The 52 uniquely synthesized sequences were each repeated 5 times for a total of 260 sequences. Each sequence was composed of two repeats of a single synthesized VC\#CV utterance. There was a 500 ms pause in between repeats. Each synthesized sequence was separated by a 2 s pause.

The sequences were given non-descriptive names and randomly mixed in the perception test play-list. Subjects were asked to follow the instructions detailed in Appendix A.

After taking the first perception test, a second test was administered. The second perception test was composed of spoken $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{~d} \# \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~g}, \mathrm{~d} \# \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~g}$, and $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{k}$ sequences and their synthetic counterparts. Each sequence was repeated twice, with a 500 ms in between. Each spoken sequence was presented first, followed by a 2 -second pause; next, its synthetic counterpart was presented. The listener was asked to rate how natural each synthetic sequence sounded compared to its natural counterpart (see Appendix B). The naturally produced VC\#CV sequences were extracted from the spoken utterances. The goal of this test was to have an idea of the quality of the synthesized sequences.

### 5.2 Perception Test Results

Figure 17 contains the accuracy ratios of the $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~d}$ sequences as the F 2 value just prior to the C 1 closure changes from 1000 Hz to 1700 Hz . The F 2 value at mid-V1 was constant at 1200 Hz for all sequences. The control sequence had a F2 of 1400 Hz just prior to the C1 closure.

Data indicated that when F2 was at 1400 Hz or higher, the sequences were accurately perceived about $90 \%$ of the time. However, as the F 2 value prior to the C 1 closure got smaller than 1400 Hz , perception became less accurate. Subjects began to hear $\mathrm{b} \# \mathrm{~d}$ and $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~b}$ sequences. When F2 fell below 1200 Hz , perception accuracy was about $40 \%$, with about equal numbers $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~b}$ and $\mathrm{b} \# \mathrm{~d}$ sequences perceived.


Figure 17. Perception Accuracy vs. Final F2 Prior to C1 Closure. A plot of the accuracy ratios of the $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~d}$ sequences as the F 2 value just prior to the C 1 closure changes from 1000 Hz to 1700 Hz .

Figure 18 details the effects of the absent C 1 release bursts on the perception of V1C1\#C2V2 sequences. Each V1C1\#C2V2 sequence had a synthesized version where the C 1 burst was present and a version where the C 1 burst was absent. The perception accuracies of the sequences were plotted on the graph.

Data indicated that perception accuracy was lowered when C1 bursts were absent. Perception accuracy ratios for d -sequences with C 1 bursts ranged from 0.82 to 0.92 , while those for d-sequences without C 1 bursts ranged from 0.62 to 0.84 . Perception accuracy ratios for t -sequences with C 1 bursts ranged from 0.8 to 0.86 , whereas those for


Figure 18. Perception Accuracy vs. Presence of C1-Burst. A Plot of the perception accuracy ratios of $\mathrm{V} 1 \mathrm{C} 1 \# \mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~V} 2$ sequences with and without C 1 bursts.

Figure 19 is a plot of the perception accuracy ratios of the series of $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequences, as the ' p ' in each successive sequence gets acoustically closer and closer to a 'b'. Perception accuracy ratios for the first several sequences were not significantly affected by the changes in voicing parameters, with ratios centered at 0.75 . However, starting with the eighth sequence $(a g=17.8$, ue $=-30, \mathrm{dc}=28)$ in the series, the perception accuracy ratio dropped below 0.6 ; the number of $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~b}$ sequences perceived increased significantly. The perception accuracy ratios continued to drop and the ratio of perceived $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~b}$ sequences continued to increase as the last few sequences in the series got acoustically closer and
closer to a d\#b sequence. The last $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequence in the series only had a perception accuracy ratio of 0.02 and a $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~b}$ perception ratio of 0.86 .


Figure 19. Perception Accuracy vs. Changing HLsyn Voicing Parameters of D\#P. A plot of the perception accuracy ratios of the series of $d \# p$ sequences, as the ' $p$ ' in each successive sequence gets acoustically closer and closer to a 'b'.

Figure 20 is a plot of the perception accuracy ratios of the series of $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}$ sequences, as the ' b ' in each successive sequence gets acoustically closer and closer to a ' p '. The first $\mathrm{t} \mathrm{\#} \mathrm{~b}$ sequence in the series had a perception accuracy ratio of 0.8 . As the glottis spread and the vocal folds became less slack, the perception accuracy ratio fell to 0.66 for the second $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}$ ratio. As the voicing parameters got closer to those for the voiceless labial, perception accuracy ratios continued to decrease as the ratio of perceived $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequences
increased. The last $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}$ sequence in the series had a perception accuracy ratio of 0.1 and a $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{p}$ perception ratio of 0.65 .


Figure 20. Perception Accuracy vs. Changing HLsyn Voicing Parameters of T\#B. A plot of the perception accuracy ratios of the series of $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}$ sequences, as the ' $b$ ' in each successive sequence gets acoustically closer and closer to a 'p'

The results of the second perception test are contained in Table 18. Subjects rated the naturalness of the synthesized sequences compared to their spoken counterparts. The scale ranged from -5 to 5 , with -5 being "extremely less natural", 0 being "just as natural", and 5 being "extremely more natural".

The overall average rating for the synthesized sequences was around 0 , meaning that the listeners thought that the sequences were just as naturalsounding as the spoken
sequences. The standard deviation of the ratings was around 2. Listeners seemed to think either that all the synthesized sequences were more naturatsounding than the ones extracted from natural speech or that they were all less natural-sounding than those extracted from natural speech.

Table 18: Naturalness Ratings on the Synthesized Sequences When Compared to Their Spoken Counterparts (Scale of -5 to 5)

|  | db | dk | dd | dg | dp | tb | tk | tg | tp |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Listener 1 | -1 | -1 | -3 | -3 | -2 | -2 | -1 | -1 | -3 |
| Listener 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | -1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Listener 3 | -3 | -4 | -1 | -2 | -3 | -3 | -2 | -2 | -4 |
| Listener 4 | 3 | -2 | -3 | 0 | -2 | -3 | 0 | 2 | -2 |
| Listener 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Listener 6 | -2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Listener 7 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | -1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | -1 |
| Listener 8 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Listener 9 | -3 | -1 | 0 | -1 | -3 | -3 | -1 | -1 | -3 |
| Listener 10 | 0 | -1 | -1 | 0 | -1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | -1 |
| Average | 0.6 | -0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | -0.4 | -0.9 | 0.5 | 0.6 | -1.1 |
| Overall Avg. Rating | -0.02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Standard Dev. | 2.077 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 5.3 Discussion of Perception Test Results

The perception accuracies of the set of $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~d}$ seque nces with varying F2 values indicated that the F2 movements into the d-closure were sensitive to deviations toward that into a labial-closure. As the final F2 value started to get smaller than 1400 Hz , the perception accuracy also started to fall. However, when the final F2 value was increased from 1400 Hz all the way up to 1700 Hz , the perception accuracies remained relatively
unchanged. When the final F2 values were less than 1400 Hz , significant numbers of $\mathrm{b} \# \mathrm{~d}$ and $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{~b}$ sequences were perceived. However, no sequences containing a velar stop(s) were perceived. Perhaps the manipulation of F3 transitions may increase the number of velars perceived, since F2 and F3 usually converge prior to velar closures. It cannot be explained why d\#b sequences were perceived, since the only variable was the final F2 value prior to the C 1 closure.

In addition, the results seemed to indicate an allowable range of values for the final F2 to take, even if its movements resembled that into a velar closure. However, this allowable range of values did not extend to F2 movements resembling those going into a labiar closure; such movements have very small or negative deltas. Therefore, results seemed to indicate a higher sensitivity to C2-dependent deviations in the F2 movements reflecting overlap in back-to-front sequences than that for front-to-back sequences.

These findings agree with Principle 1 derived in the previous phase. The results indicate a much bigger window of allowable C2-dependent deviation in F2 movements into the Cl closure for sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation than for those with back-to-front order. Furthermore, the existence of such windows supports the validity of Principle 1's assertion of the presence of C2-dependent movements of the tongue body and possibly of other oral articulators while going into the C 1 closure. In addition, the results agree with Principle 1's suggestions that the formation of the C 2 closure may begin prior to the C 1 release, perhaps even before the C 1 -closure, and not negatively affect perception accuracy.

Compared to VC\#CV sequences with Cl bursts present, sequences without C 1 bursts had lower perception accuracies. The differences between the two groups were found to be statistically significant using an analysis of variance (ANOVA) with alpha of 0.05 (see Table 19). This suggests the important role Cl bursts play in the perception of V1C1\#C2V2 sequences.

Table 19: ANOVA Test Result Examining the Differences in Perception Accuracies between Sequences with C1 Bursts and without C1 Bursts

| Group 1 | Group 2 | p-Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}:$ Means from Group 1 and Group 2 <br> are the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sequences with <br> C1 bursts (8) | Sequences <br> without C1 <br> bursts (8) | 0.004 | Rejected |

In addition, absent $t$-bursts were found to decrease perception accuracies more than absent d-bursts. The differences between the perception accuracies of sequences with absent t -bursts and those with absent d-bursts were found to be statistically significant using an analysis of variance with alpha of 0.05 (see Table 20). This finding suggests that $t$-bursts may play a bigger role in the perception of $t$-sequences than $d$-bursts in the perception of $d$-sequences.

The importance of the C1-burst in perception suggests a reason for the non-obliteration of the C 1 bursts in sequences that may have greater gestural overlap. The findings do not conflict with Principle 1's statement that the extent of overlap usually does not go so far as to obliterate Cl bursts.

Table 20: ANOVA Test Result Examining the Differences in Perception Accuracies between Sequences with Absent D-Bursts and Sequences with Absent T-Bursts

| Group 1 | Group 2 | p-Value | $\mathrm{H}_{0}:$ Means from Group 1 and Group 2 <br> are the same |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| D-sequences <br> without d- <br> bursts (4) | T-sequences <br> without t- <br> bursts (4) | 0.026 | Rejected |

Perception test results from $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ and $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}$ sequences with varying voicing parameters suggest that a window of allowable C 1 -dependent deviations for the voicing of C 2 exist. For instance, the perception accuracies of $\mathbf{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequences were not significantly affected until voicing parameters ag decreased from 50 to 13.8 , ue increased from -100 to -30 , and dc increased from -70 to 28 . The perception accuracies of $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{~b}$ sequences were not significantly affected until voicing parameters ag increased from 4 to 10 , ue decreased from 0 to -20 , and de decreased from 70 to 42 . The existence of such windows supports the validity of the existence of laryngeal gestural overlap, as stated in Principle 2.

In addition, application of the principle in HLsyn revealed a gray area which seemed to separate voiced and voiceless consonants. In this gray area, ag ranged from 10 to 13 , ue ranged from -20 to -30 , and dc ranged from 20 to 40 . However, it is important to note that these parameters were modified dependently as a set of variables in the generation of $\mathrm{d} \# \mathrm{p}$ and $\mathrm{t} \# \mathrm{p}$ sequences for the perception test.

Finally, participants of the perception tests generally found the synthesized sequences to be just as natural as those extracted from actual speech. This finding lessens the
possibility that the results of the first perception test were skewed because of the unnaturalness of synthesized sequences.

## Chapter 6: Conclusion and Recommendation

Through acoustic data analysis, quasiarticulatory synthesis verification, and perception testing, two possible principles governing the coordination of oral and laryngeal articulators in the production of English stop-consonant sequences emerge from this study.

First, V1C1\#C2V2 stop-consonant sequences with front-to-back order of place of articulation have more overlap of articulators than those with back-to-front order. More specifically, there exist C2-dependent movements of the tongue body and possibly other oral articulators while going into the C 1 closure. In addition, the formation of the C 2 closure by the appropriate articulators is likely to begin prior to the release of C 1 , perhaps even before the Cl closure, for such sequences. The extent of the overlapping usually does not go beyond the obliteration of the C 1 release burst. This finding agrees with results from previous studies demonstrating more gestural overlap in sequences with front-to-back order or place of articulation (Byrd, 1996; Chitoran, Goldstein, and Byrd, 2002; Zsiga, 1994).

Second, gestural overlap of laryngeal articulators, such as glottal opening adjustments and vocal fold stiffness adjustments, usually affects the voicing of C 2 in $\mathrm{V} 1 \mathrm{C} 1 \# \mathrm{C} 2 \mathrm{~V} 2$ sequences. The existence of the overlap varies from individual to individual. There may be a window of allowable overlap of laryngeal gestures that does not significantly sacrifice speech perception accuracy.

Future extensions from this study may involve closer examinations of possibly greater overlap in sequences with voiceless C1s than in those with voiced Cls. Acoustic analysis in this study has found such sequences to have shorter closure duration ratios than sequences with voiced Cls ; such differences are statistically significant.

In addition, fundamental frequency, voice-bar duration, and voicing onset readings may be measured and analyzed for the spoken stop-consonant sequences to further substantiate voicing characteristics data for the inference of laryngeal gestural timing estimates and the derivation of possible principles.

Singleton VCV sequences need also be acoustically analyzed. Acoustic data of VCV sequences may be compared to those of VCCV sequences to reveal and investigate possible evidence suggesting gestural overlap in the production of stop-consonant sequences.

Finally, perception tests involving sequences with varying degrees of overlap not limited to alveolar stops in the C1 position may be administered. This would give more data demonstrating the effects of overlap in sequences with various orders of place of articulation and various voicing orders on perception accuracies.
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## Appendix A: Perception Test 1 Instruction Sheet

You will hear a series of vowelconsonant-consonant-vowel sequences (e.g. "adba"). Each sequence is repeated twice. Please indicate the 2 consonants you hear in each sequence to the best of your ability.

Possible answers are: $\mathrm{db}, \mathrm{dd}, \mathrm{dg}, \mathrm{dp}, \mathrm{dt}, \mathrm{dk}, \mathrm{tp}, \mathrm{tt}, \mathrm{tk}, \mathrm{td}, \mathrm{tg}, \mathrm{tb}$. Sequences may be repeated. Please type one response per line.

To begin, load the playlist named "test1.m3u" in winamp and play it. Please use headphones to listen to the sound sequences. You may pause the test if needed. Please note that sequences with the same number indicator do not necessary mean that they are identical.

After you finish taking the test, please save this file and email it to szhao@mit.edu and I will email you a short summary of what the tests are for. Thanks.

## Appendix B: Perception Test 2 Instruction Sheet

You will hear a series of vowetconsonant-consonant-vowel sequences (i.e. "adba"). Each sequence is repeated twice. Sequences with names ending in "synthesized" are synthesized. Each synthesized sequence follows one that is spoken by a speaker. Please use headphones to listen to the sound sequences. Please indicate on a scale of -5 to 5 how natural the synthesized version is compared to the actual.

5 = extremely more natural
$4=$ much more natural
$3=$ definitely more natural
$2=$ fairly more natural
$1=$ a bit more natural
$0=$ just as natural
$-1=$ a bit less natural
$-2=$ fairly less natural
$-3=$ definitely less natural
$-4=$ much less natural
$-5=$ extremely less natural
To begin, load the playlist named "test2.m3u" in Winamp and play it. You may pause the test if needed. Please type only one response per line.

After you finish taking the test, please save this file and email it to szhao@mit.edu and I will email you a summary of what the tests are for. Thanks.

## Appendix C: Speaker 1's Acoustic Data

| Speaker 1 | codtop | codpot | codgot | coddot | codcop | codbob |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f2_midVCl | 1174,1586(427) | 1152,1586(445) | 1152(444) | 1174,1565(446) | 1174(402) | 1174(431) |
| f2_60 $\mathrm{msPCl}^{\text {a }}$ | 1195,1565(447) | 1152,1586(464) | 1174(463) | 1174,1565(465) | 1195(422) | 1195,1565(450) |
| $\mathrm{f} 2.40 \mathrm{msPC1}$ | 1174,1521(467) | 1174,1565(482) | 1174,1500(482) | 1152,1543(485) | 1195(442) | 1174,1565(470) |
| f2_20 msPCl | 1108,1521(487) | 1130,1500(500) | 1521(502) | 1521(505) | 1500(462) | 1152,1543(490) |
| f2_PCl | 1108,1521(509) | 1152,1586(518) | 1521(521) | 1521(525) | 1521(482) | 1543(509) |
| f3_midVCl | 2412,2782 | 2412,2847 | 2021,2412 | 2456 | 2391 | 2021,2434 |
| f 3 60 msPCl | 2412,2803 | 2412,2782 | 1999,2391 | 2434 | 2456 | 2021,2434 |
| f 3.40 msPCl | 2391,2803 | 2412,2803,3260 | 1999,2391 | 2391 | 2391 | 2021,2434 |
| f 3 20 msPC1 | 2391,2760 | 2391,2738,3260 | 1999,2391 | 2412 | 2391 | 1999,2412 |
| f3_PCl | 2391,3064 | 2391,3151 | 1978,2391 | 2391 | 2369 | 1999,2391 |
| f2_OnC2V2 | 1304(672) | 1152(694) | 1543(671) | 1521(663) | 1217,1543(663) | 1130(645) |
| f2_20msOV2 | 1174(691) | 1152(713) | 1478(693) | 1478(684) | $1195(684)$ | $1130(666)$ |
| f2_ 40 msOV 2 | 1174(712) | $1152(733)$ | 1217(714) | $1195(705)$ | 1174(704) | 1087(687) |
| f 2 _60 msOV 2 | 1174(733) | 1152(754) | 1174(735) | 1174(728) | 1174(725) | 1043 |
| $f 3 \mathrm{OnC2V} 2$ | 2391,2803 | 2325,2869 | 1999,2412 | 2412 | 2021,2434,2803 | 2021,2456 |
| f3 20msOV2 | 2391,2760 | 2369,2869 | 2021,2412 | 2412 | 2021,2391,2847 | 2021,2412 |
| f3_40msOV2 | 2369,2803 | 2369,2825 | 2043,2434 | 2391 | 2021,2412,2782 | 1999,2391 |
| f3 60msOV2 | 2391,2803 | 2369,2825 | 2043,2434 | 2412 | 2021,2369,2803 | 1999,2369 |
| dur_closure | 81.2 ms | 109.2 ms | $36.4 \mathrm{~ms}, 59.9 \mathrm{~ms}$ | 98.2 | $48.0 \mathrm{~ms}, 38.3 \mathrm{~ms}$ | 105.3 ms . |
| closure_2_V | 153.1(517,669) | 164.4(527,690) | $136.0(532,668)$ | $124.8(534,659)$ | 168.1(492,660) | 121.8(519,633) |
| release_2_V | 71.5 | 54.9 | 35.6 | 27.1 | 74.6 | 17.3 |
| burst | $\mathrm{d}(0) \mathrm{t}(598)$ | $\mathrm{d}(0) \mathrm{p}(636)$ | $\mathrm{d}(568), \mathrm{g}(633)$ | $\mathrm{d}(0), \mathrm{d}(632)$ | $\mathrm{d}(541), \mathrm{c}(586)$ | $\mathrm{d}(0), \mathrm{b}(624.3)$ |
| H1-H2,V1 | 43.1-45.3(451) | $52.949 .3(475)$ | 49.8-47.5(449) | 46.446.6(458) | 45.448.4(428) | 46.4-49.3(464) |
| V2 | 40.8-38.8(727) | 40.3-42.2(738) | 38.3-39.2(751) | 37.9-44.4(721) | 36.6-41.5(717) | 37.1-44.2(724) |
| H1-Al,V1 | 43.1-52.8 | 52.9-58.2 | 49.8-54.9 | 46.4-53.7 | 45.456.4 | 46.4-57.6 |
| V2 | 40.8-50.9 | 40.3-52.3 | 38.3-49.1 | 37.9-54.0 | 36.6-50.7 | 37.1-54.1 |


| Speaker 1 | docktop | dockpot | dockgot | dockdot | dockcop | dockbob |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f2_midVC1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f2_ 60 msPCl | 1195(405) | 1152(382) | 1195(364) | 1195(370) | 1195(420) | 1174(424) |
| $\mathrm{f}_{2}$ - 40 msPCl | 1174(427) | 1130(403) | 1174(385) | 1174(391) | 1174(441) | 1174(446) |
| f2_20 $\mathrm{msPC1}$ | 1174(448) | 1130(422) | 1174(407) | 1152(412) | 1174(461) | 1174(466) |
| f2_PCl | 1195(468) | 1152(441) | 1195(429) | 1174(433) | 1195(481) | 1174(488) |
| f3_midVC1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f3_60msPCl | 1956,2304 | 1934,2260,2695 | 2347 | 1956,2347 | 1934,2347 | 1978,2369 |
| f 3 - 40 msPCl | 1978,2369 | 1978,2304,2695 | 1978,2369 | 1956,2369 | 1999,2391 | 1978,2347 |
| f3_20msPCl | 1978,2412 | 1934,2369,2695 | 1978,2412 | 1956,2347 | 1999,2391 | 1999,2347 |
| f3_PCl | 1956,2238 | 1999,2673 | 1978,2456 | 1978,2325 | 2021,2412 | 1999,2369 |
| f2 OnC2V2 | 1369(689) | 1152(648) | 1500(599) | 1456(619) | 1326(702) | 956(712) |
| f2 20msOV2 | $1195(709)$ | 1152(667) | 1413(619) | 1239(641) | 1217(722) | 978(733) |
| f2_40msOV2 | 1195(729) | 1152(687) | 1217(641) | 1195(662) | $1195(742)$ | 1087(754) |
| f2_60msOV2 | 1174(750) | 1174(708) | 1195(663) | 1174(684) | 1174(764) | 1021(776) |
| f 3 - $\mathrm{OnC2V} 2$ | 1934,2347 | 2260 | 1956,2347 | 2347 | 1978,2347,2782 | 2304 |
| $\mathrm{f} \mathrm{B}_{2} 2 \mathrm{mmsOV} 2$ | 1956,2347 | 2304 | 1999,2369 | 2391 | 1978,2347,2760 | 2325 |
| f -40msOV2 | 1956,2325 | 2282 | 1978,2391 | 2347 | 2021,2760 | 2369 |
| f3_60msOV2 | 2304 | 1978,2412 | 2347 | 2021,2412 | 2347 |  |
| dur_closure | 129.4 ms | 63,64.6 | 137.1 | 76.5,65.6 | 143.7 | 67,97.3 |
| closure_2_V | 205.2(478,680) | 193(450,644) | $161(436,596)$ | $169.6(440,608)$ | 208.5(490,699) | 211.3(498,708) |
| release_2_V | top(76.9) | pot(43.2) | $\operatorname{got}(23.9)$ | $\operatorname{dot}(21.1)$ | cop(77.9) | bob(23.1) |
| burst | $\mathrm{k}(0) \mathrm{t}(602.6)$ | $\mathrm{k}(500) \mathrm{p}(595.4)$ | $\mathrm{k}(0) \mathrm{g}(571.9)$ | $\mathrm{k}(515.4) \mathrm{d}(587.8)$ | (620.56) | $\mathrm{k}(560) \mathrm{b}$ (681) |
| H1-H2,V1 | 37.3-41.6(408) | 40.8-43.9(405) | 36.1-43.5(379) | 39.1-43.0(384) | 42.7-41.0(435) | 42.7-41.6(430) |
| V2 | 39.4-42.3(726) | 34.0-40.7(701) | 39.3-42.8(669) | 37.7-42.4(699) | 35.3-38.7(759) | 34.3-40.2(793) |
| H1-Al, V1 | 37.3-50.6 | 40.8-55.9 | 36.1-52.2 | 39.1-50.8 | 42.7-51.6 | 42.7-52.7 |
| V2 | 39.4-47.5 | 34.0-48.2 | 39.3-50.6 | 37.7-49.3 | 35.3-46.5 | 34.3-47.5 |


| Speaker 1 | dogtop | dogpot | doggot | dogdot | dogcop | dogbob |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f2_midVCl | 1130(381) | 1108(375) | 1174(372) | 1152(394) | 1152(363) | 1130(365) |
| f 2 _ 60 msPCl | 1021(402) | 1087(396) | 1174(392) | 1152(414) | 1130(383) | $1108(386)$ |
| f 2.40 mPPCl | 1043(423) | 1065(416) | 1174(414) | 1152(435) | 1108(403) | $1108(406)$ |
| f2_ 20 mPPCl | 1130(444) | $1130(437)$ | 1174(436) | 1174(456) | 1174(425) | 1152(427) |
| f2_PCl | 1152(467) | 1195(457) | 1326(456) | 1260(476) | 1239(445) | 1195(447) |
| f3_midVCl | 2325 | 2304 | 2369 | 2412 | 2347 | 1978,2369,2803 |
| f3_60msPCl | 2325 | 2304 | 2412 | 2391 | 2347 | 1978,2369,2847 |
| f3-40msPl | 2325 | 2325 | 2391 | 2391 | 2347 | 1978,2369,2847 |
| $\mathrm{f}_{3} 2^{2} \mathrm{OmsPCl}$ | 2325 | 2325 | 2412 | 2412 | 2369 | 1978,2347,2847 |
| ${ }_{63} \mathbf{P C l}$ | 2238 | 1978,2391 | 2477 | 2499 | 2412 | 1999,2456,2869 |
| 2869 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ¢2_OnC2V2 | 1195(663) | 1087(673) | 1478(611) | 1456(626) | 1195(664) | 956,1217(609) |
| f2_20msOV2 | 1174(682) | 10006693) | 1260(633) | 1217(648) | 1174(683) | 1000(629) |
| +2_40msOV2 | 1152(703) | 1065(714) | 1195(656) | 1195(669) | 1152(703) | 1000(650) |
| f2_60msOV2 | 1152(724) | 1174(736) | 1174(679) | 1152(691) | 1152(724) | 1087(672) |
| $\mathrm{f}_{3} \mathrm{OnC2V} 2$ | 2391 | 2325 | 1978,2391 | 2369 | 2021,2412,2803 | 2217,2499 |
| $\mathrm{f}_{3} 20 \mathrm{msOV} 2$ | 2347 | 2325 | 1999,2412 | 2412 | 2021,2803 | 2304 |
| f3-40msOV2 | 2391 | 2325 | 2021,2434 | 2369 | 1999,2391,2825 | 2347 |
| f3_60msOV2 | 2391 | 2325 | 2021,2456 | 2369 | 2021,2434,2847 | 2391 |
| dur_closure | 117.6 | 138 | 109.5 | 109.6 | 122.4 ms | 139.6 ms |
| closure_2_V | 183.7(476,659) | 195.1(467,662) | $144.9(466,608)$ | 139.8(467,605) | $199.2(454,652)$ | 148(457,604) |
| release_2_V | 69.4 | 57.2 | 35.9 | 30.3 | 76.3 | 11.3 |
| burst | $\mathrm{g}(0) \mathrm{t}(589.6)$ | $\mathrm{g}(0) \mathrm{t}(604)$ | $g(0) g(573)$ | $\mathrm{g}(0) \mathrm{d}(592.9)$ | $\mathrm{g}(0) \mathrm{c}(584)$ | $\mathrm{d}(0) \mathrm{b}(594)$ |
| H1-H2, V1 | 39.9-43.3(397) | 40.5-46.3(379) | 38.7-40.9(387) | 40.5-44.0(407) | 42.445.8(378) | 42.0-43.7(380) |
| V2 | 31.9-40.1(717) | 34.1-42.04719) | 33.7-39.7(673) | 37.7-40.5(707) | 38.8-42.8(707) | 34.4-40.5(688) |
| H1-A1, V1 | 39.9-54.4 | 40.5-57.8 | 38.7-52.6 | 40.5-53.6 | 42.454.6 | 42.0-55.6 |
| V2 | 31.9-48.4 | 34.1-50.5 | 33.7-47.8 | 37.7-47.9 | 38.8-51.1 | 34.4-49.3 |


| Speaker 1 | gottop | gotpot | gotdot | gotcop | gotbob | dotgot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f2_midVCl |  |  |  |  | 1217 b (388) | $1195(491)$ |
| 12.60 msPCl | 1217(377) | 1239(391) | 1195(353) | 1195(404) | 1195(408) | 1174(522) |
| 2_ 40 msPCl | 1217(396) | 1195(413) | 1217(373) | $1195(425)$ | 1174(429) | 1152(542) |
| R_20msPCl | 1217(407) | 1195(434) | 1217(393) | 1217(446) | $1195(449)$ | $1174(562)$ |
| R2PCl | 1217(429) | 1174(454) | 1521(415) | 1369(468) | 1217(470) | 1239(583) |
| f3_midVC. |  |  |  |  | 2021,2412 | 2456 |
| [3-60msPCl | 1978,2434 | 2021,2456 | 2456 | 2021,2434 | 2021,2456 | 2456 |
| f3_ $40 \mathrm{msPC1}$ | 1978,2456 | 1999,2477 | 2456 | 2021,2456 | 1999,2477 | 2456 |
| $\mathrm{f} 3-20 \mathrm{msPCl}$ | 1978,2434 | 1999,2477 | 2434 | 2021,2456 | 1999,2477 | 2456 |
| $\mathrm{f3}_{\mathbf{-} \mathrm{PCl}}$ | 1978 | 1999,2456 | 2456 | 2043,2477 | 1978,2521 | 2456 |
| $12 \mathrm{OnC2V} 2$ | 1239(620) | 1174(664) | 1478(549) | 1260(651) | 1174(623) | 1434(769) |
| f2 20 msOV 2 | 1195(639) | 1152(682) | 1391(569) | 1195(671) | 1174(643) | 1239(790) |
| f2 40 msOV 2 | 1174(659) | 1174(701) | 1217(590) | 1195(691) | 1174(665) | 1217(812) |
| f2_60msOV2 | 1174(680) | 1195(722) | 1195(612) | 1174(713) | 1174(687) | $1195(834)$ |
| f3_OnC2V2 | 2434 | 2043,2499 | 2456 | 2043,2477 | 1999,2477 | 2043,2456 |
| f3_20msOV2 | 2456 | 2043,2477 | 2434 | 2021,2499 | 2021,2456 | 2043,2477 |
| f3_40msOV2 | 2499 | 2021,2456 | 2434 | 2043,2521 | 2043,2456 | 2043,2477 |
| f3_60msOV2 | 2456 | 1956,2456 | 2456 | 2043, | 2043,2477 | 2065,2477 |
| dur_closure | 17.5,69.4 | 114.6 | 108.5 | 115.7 | 127.0 | 25.9,93.6 |
| closure_2_V | 170.3(446,617) | 168.2(491,660) | 125.2(420,545) | $172.4(475,647)$ | 127.0(492,627) | 167.6(598,766) |
| release_2. V | 72.8 | 53.5 | 16.7 | 56.3 | 0 | 33.7 |
| burst | $\mathrm{t}(463.9) \mathrm{t}(543.4)$ | ) $p(606.9)$ | $\mathrm{t}(0) \mathrm{d}(528.6)$ | $\mathrm{t}(0) \mathrm{k}(591.5)$ | $\mathrm{t}(0) \mathrm{d}(619.1)$ | $\mathrm{t}(624.6) \mathrm{g}(732.9)$ |
| H1-H2,V1 | 35.5-41.3(381) | 38.6-41.6(408) | 33.438.3(346) | 37.5-40.1(388) | 38.7-41.5(413) | 37.5-42.7(505) |
| V2 | $34.440 .4(673)$ | 41.2-43.4(717) | 37.5-39.3(607) | 36. 1-38.8(695) | 34.1-41.4(703) | 36.5-40.0(839) |
| H1-Al,V1 | 35.5-47.1 | 38.6-51.5 | 33.4-48.4 | 37.5-48.2 | 38.7-50.6 | 37.5-51.6 |
| V2 | 34.449.9 | 41.2-49.5 | 37.5-50.0 | 36.1-51.1 | 34.1-48.8 | 36.5-47.5 |


| Speaker 1 | mobtop | mobpot | mobgot | mobdot | mobcop | mobbob |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f2_midVCl | 934,1108(381) | 1152(390) |  | 1130(429) | 1152(327) |  |
| $\mathrm{f}_{2} \mathbf{6} 60 \mathrm{msPCl}$ | 1108(401) | 1152(413) | 1130(411) | $1130(450)$ | 1152(347) | 1065(384) |
| f2_ 40 msPCl | 956,1087(421) | 1130(432) | 1130(432) | 1152(470) | 1152(367) | 1021(403) |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2} 20 \mathrm{msPCl}$ | 913,1152(442) | 956(451) | 1130(453) | 1152(491) | 1152(387) | 978(424) |
| f2_PCl | 978(461) | 913(470) | 1174(475) | 1152(511) | 1152(407) | 934(444) |
| f3_midVCl | 1934,2391,2760 | 2434 |  | 2434,2847 | 2412,2869 |  |
| f3 600 msPCl | 1956,2391,2869 | 2412 | 2434 | 2434,2825 | 2412,2869 | 2391,2803 |
| $\mathrm{f}_{3} \mathbf{4 0 \mathrm { msPCl }}$ | 1956,2391,2869 | 2391 | 2434 | 2412,2803 | 2412,2803 | 2369,2847 |
| f 320 msPCl | 1956,2412,2890 | 2347 | 2434, | 2369,2803 | 2412,2825 | 2369,2825 |
| f3_PCl | 1956,2825 | 2217 | 2260,2890 | 1978,2499,2847 | 2304,2869 | 2217,2803 |
| f2_OnC2V2 | 1174(654) | 1152(662) | 1521(648) | 1521(695) | 1239(605) | 978(608) |
| f2_20msOV2 | 1217(673) | 913,1174(680) | $1239(670)$ | 1217(716) | 1217(624) | 1021(628) |
| f2_40msOV2 | 1195(693) | 934,1130(701) | $1195(693)$ | 1195(737) | 1195(643) | 1087(650) |
| $\mathrm{f} 2 \_60 \mathrm{msOV} 2$ | 1174(713) | 1152(721) | $1195(715)$ | 1174(760) | 1174(664) | $1108(673)$ |
| $f 3 \mathrm{OnC2V} 2$ | 2434,2912 | 2369 | 2369,2825 | 2434 | 2021,2391,2847 | 2325 |
| f3-20msOV2 | 2456,2869 | 2369 | 2391,2869 | 2391,2847 | 2021,2434,2847 | 2391,2869 |
| f3_40msOV2 | 2412,2803 | 2369 | 2412,2869 | 2434,2847 | 2021,2391,2825 | 2412,2847 |
| f3_60msOV2 | 2391,2825 | 2347 | 2456,2803 | 2412 | 2021,2391,2760 | 2412,2847 |
| dur_closure | 58.2,46.5 | 113.1 | 59.9,57.8 | 86.2,36.7 | 48.7,46.7 | 135.1 |
| closure_2_V | 179.6(472,651) | 179.8(479,659) | 158.9(486,644) | 169.6(522,691) | 174.7(427,602) | 152.0(454,606) |
| release 2 V | 64.0 | 67.0 | 35.3 | 35.3 | 63.7 | 17.2 |
| burst | $b(529), t(587)$ | $\mathrm{b}(0), \mathrm{p}(590)$ | $\mathrm{b}(545), \mathrm{g}(608)$ | $b(608), \mathrm{d}(656)$ | $b(476), \mathrm{c}(538)$ | $\mathrm{b}(0), \mathrm{b}(589)$ |
| H1-H2, VI | 43.3-45.8(406) | 44.4-47.2(418) | 39.3-43.4(406) | 40.6-44.1(435) | 43.7-46.7(362) | 44.5-45.4(390) |
| V2 | 40.9-39.1(718) | 38.3-42.5(706) | 39.9-37.2(720) | 34.4-41.1(764) | 39.5-38.7(659) | 35.4-41.5(711) |
| H1-Al, V! | 43.3-51.1 | 44.453 .9 | 39.3-50.5 | 40.6-48.9 | 43.7-53.1 | 44.5-50.9 |
| V2 | 40.9-50.4 | 38.3-51.7 | 39.9-46.1 | 34.4-48.1 | 39.5-49.1 | 35.4-47.9 |


| Speaker 1 | toptot | toppot | topgot | topdot | topcop | topbob |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | last/first |  |  |  |
| f2_midVC1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f2_60msPCl | 1217(404) | 1152(447) | 1217(398) | 1174(364) | 1326(339) | 1174(411) |
| $\mathrm{f} 2{ }_{2} 40 \mathrm{msPCl}$ | 1174(424) | 1152(467) | 1217(419) | 1195(384) | 1195(358) | 1174(430) |
| f 2 _ $20 \mathrm{msPC1}$ | 1130(442) | $1108(485)$ | 1195,1586(439) | 1174(404) | $1174(378)$ | 1130(449) |
| f2_PCl | 1174(462) | 1174(505) | 978,1239,1565(4) | ) $1174(425)$ | 1195(398) | 1065(469) |
| f3_midVCl |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f3_60msPC1 | 2434 | 2021,2412 | 2043,2477 | 2434 | 2043,2456 | 2434 |
| 13.40 msPCl | 2456 | 2043,2412 | 2043,2456 | 2434 | 2021,2456 | 2434 |
| f3_20 msPC1 | 2434 | 2021,2412 | 2043,2434 | 2434 | 2043,2456 | 2456 |
| f3_PCl | 2434 | 2043,2434 | 2065,2456 | 2456 | 2043,2477 | 2434 |
| f2_OnC2V2 | $1195(626)$ | 1152(680) | 1565(638) | 1304(557) | 1326(590) | 1174(625) |
| f 2 _20msOV2 | 1174(646) | 1152(699) | 1456(657) | $1195(577)$ | 1260(610) | 1174(644) |
| f2_40msOV2 | 1174(665) | 1195(718) | 1282(678) | 1217(597) | $1195(630)$ | 1174(665) |
| f2_60msOV2 | 1043(686) | 1043(739) | 1239(700) | 1217(618) | $1195(650)$ | 1174(686) |
| f3_OnC2V2 | 2412 | 2021,2412 | 2065,2434 | 2021,2434 | 2021,2434 | 2065,2477 |
| f 3 20msOV2 | 2412 | 2021,2434 | 2021,2434 | 2434 | 1999,2456 | 2043,2477 |
| $\mathrm{f} 3-40 \mathrm{msOV} 2$ | 2412 | 1999,2434 | 1978,2434 | 2456 | 2043,2412 | 2021,2434 |
| f 3 -60msOV2 | 2369 | 2391 | 1978,2434 | 2434 | 2043,2456 | 2021,2412 |
| dur_closure | 74.4 | 95.4 | 71.4 | 73.4,24.2 | 59.6,45.3 | 109.2 |
| closure_2_V | 144.2(480,623) | 151.9(523,677) | 152.5(471,624) | 124.5(431,553) | $182.8(406,588)$ | 122.9(499,621) |
| release_2_V | 69.7 | 58.1 | 74.1 | 21.3 | 68.3 | 14 |
| burst | $\mathrm{p}(0) \mathrm{t}(553.3)$ | $\mathrm{p}(0) \mathrm{p}(619)$ | $\mathrm{p}(0) \mathrm{g}(537)$ | $\mathrm{p}(503) \mathrm{d}(532.3)$ | $\mathrm{p}(464.6) \mathrm{c}(519.3)$ | (0)b(607) |
| H1-H2,V1 | 45.6-48.1(437) | 49.1-48.7(472) | 43.3-45.8(414) | 43.5-45.2(389) | 44.3-46.9(374) | 45.2-48.1(445) |
| V2 | 44.8-46.8(670) | 46.9-47.3(723) | 37.7-43.2(682) | 37.1-44.4(622) | 44.4-45.1(627) | 39.7-43.1(700) |
| H1-Al,V1 | 45.6-55.3 | 49.1-54.7 | 43.3-50.4 | 43.5-49.4 | 44.3-51.5 | 45.2-52.2 |
| V2 | 44.8-48.9 | 46.9-50.9 | 37.7-50.7 | 37.1-50.4 | 44.445.2 | 39.7-48.6 |

## Appendix D: Speaker 2's Acoustic Data

| Speaker 2 | codtop | codpot | codgot | coddot | codcop | codbob |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| v1f1 | 717 | 717 |  |  |  | 717 | 739 |



| Speaker 2 | dogtop |  | dogpot |  | doggot |  | dogdot | dogcop |  | dogbob |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vlfl | 695 |  | 717 |  | 695 |  | 695 | 695 |  | 674 |
| $\mathrm{f} 2 \ldots 60 \mathrm{msPCl}$ | 1239(514.3) |  | 1391 (458.8) |  | 1217(428.4) |  | 1347(492.6)1239(504.9)1347(458.5) |  |  |  |
| f 2.40 msPCl | 1195(537.9) |  | 1304(481.8) |  | 1217(453.9) |  | $1217(514.0) 1217(528.9) 1326(470.5)$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{f} 2 \_20 \mathrm{msPC1}$ | 1195(555.6) |  | 1282(504.8) |  | 1239(473.0) |  | $1195(535.9) 1217(546.8) 1326(488.5)$ |  |  |  |
| f2_PCl | 1195(578.8) |  | 1282(523.2) |  | 1195(491.1) |  | $1195(557.1) 1217(564.1) 1217(506.2)$ |  |  |  |
| f3 60 msPCl | 2282 |  | 2304 |  | 2021 |  | 2282 | 2304 |  | 2238 |
| f 3.40 msPCl | 2347 |  | 2347 |  | 2260 |  | 2391 | 2391 |  | 2282 |
| f3 20 msPCl | 2391 |  | 2369 |  | 2412 |  | 2456 | 2434 |  | 2456 |
| f3_PCl | 2477 |  | 2434 |  | 2543 |  | 2586 | 2499 |  | 2499 |
| v2f2 | 717 |  | 717 |  | 717 |  | 739 | 695 |  | 739 |
| f2_OnC2V2 | 1434(828 |  | 1326 (756. |  | $1717(67$ |  | 1673(746.1) | 1) 1500 | (770.8) 1260 ( | 3.4) |
| f2_20msOV2 | 1282 (84 |  | $1260(773$. |  | $1695(68$ |  | $1586(762.8$ | 8) 1456 | (787.6) $1369($ | 2.1) |
| f2_40msOV2 | 1326 (86 |  | 1326 (790. |  | 1565 (70 |  | 1565(780.1) | 1) 1478 | (805.3)1434( | 1.2) |
| f2_60msOV2 | 1239 (880 |  | 1391(808. |  | $1565(72$ |  | $1500(797.5$ | 5) 1456 | (823.1)1347( | 9.3) |
| f3_OnC2V2 | 2282 |  | 2325 |  | 2630 |  | 2543 | 2304 |  | 2304 |
| f3_20msOV2 | 2195 |  | 2304 |  | 2630 |  | 2586 | 2304 |  | 2282 |
| f3_40msOV2 | 2282 |  | 2325 |  | 2347 |  | 2304 | 2260 |  | 2108 |
| f3_60msOV2 | 2282 |  | 2347 |  | 2456 |  | 2260 | 2304 |  | 2282 |
| dur_closure | 143.3 |  | 103.1,31 |  | 138.8 |  | 146.3 | 127.0 | 104.7,6 |  |
| closure_2_V | 232.2 |  | 210.9 |  | 155.7 |  | 168.0 | 189.9 |  | 194.8 |
| release_2_V | 88.8 |  | 49.2 |  | 16.9 |  | 21.6 | 62.8 |  | 16.0 |
| burst | g) |  | $\mathrm{g}(639.3-666.7)$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & g(\text { check }) \\ & g(651.5-668.4) \end{aligned}$ |  | g) $\quad \mathrm{g}(629.8-634.1)$ |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{t}(734.7-823.5)$ |  | $\mathrm{p}(697.7-746.9)$ |  |  |  | $\mathrm{d}(716.3-737.9) \mathrm{c}(698.8-731.7) \mathrm{b}(704.0-720.0)$ |  |  |  |
| VI: hl | 174 Hz | 54.7 | 174 Hz | 53.0 | 152 Hz | 53.2 | 174 Hz56.9 |  | $174 \mathrm{HzS4}_{2} 2$ | $174 \mathrm{Hz55.3}$ |
| h2 | 348 Hz | 49.4 | 348 Hz | 49.3 | 326 Hz | 50.1 | 369 Hz | 51.1 | 326 Hz49.7 | 326 Hz 50.6 |
| a 1 | 674 Hz | 56.9 | 674 Hz | 57.3 | 630 Hz | 55.7 | 717 Hz | 57.7 | 674 Hz56.6 | $674 \mathrm{Hz56.5}$ |
| V2: hl | 174 Hz | 55.6 | 174 Hz | 56.9 | 152 Hz | 55.6 | 174 Hz | 57.4 | $174 \mathrm{Hz58.4}$ | $152 \mathrm{Hz55.2}$ |
| h2 | 326 Hz | 50.4 | 326 Hz | 52.0 | 326 Hz | 52.5 | 348 Hz | 52.8 | $326 \mathrm{Hz51.7}$ | $326 \mathrm{Hz5} 2.1$ |
| al | 674 Hz | 56.5 | 674 Hz | 58.1 | 652 Hz | 56.6 | 674 Hz | 55.1 | $674 \mathrm{Hz57.1}$ | $804 \mathrm{Hz5} 8.3$ |



| Speaker 2 | mobtop |  | mobpot |  | mobgot |  | mobdot | mobcop |  | mobbob |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| vlfl | 695 |  | 695 |  | 717 |  | 717 | 717 |  | 695 |
| f2_60 msPCl | 1217(452.2) |  | 1304(502.3) |  | 1347(438.2) |  | 1326(434.9)1369(471.3)1326(490.9) |  |  |  |
| f 2 _ 40 msPCl | 1282(475.4) |  | 1304(526.2) |  | 1347(457.2) |  | 1304(453.7)1413(494.8)1304(514.9) |  |  |  |
| f2_20 msPCl | 1239(497.9) |  | 1217(548.8) |  | 1260(475.7) |  | $1239(477.2) 1434(513.0) 1260(537.9)$ |  |  |  |
| f2_PCl | 1152(520.7) |  | 1130(570.8) |  | 1130(494.5) |  | 1152(500.2)1152(535.5)1174(561.6) |  |  |  |
| f3_ 60 msPCl | 2608 |  | 2760 |  | 2499 |  | $2521 \quad 2499$ |  |  | 2651 |
| f3_40msPCl |  |  | 2738 |  | 2521 |  | 2456 | 2543 |  | 2651 |
| f3_20msPC1 | $2608$ |  | 2738 |  | 2543 |  | 2499 | 2543 |  | 2673 |
| f3_PC1 | 2630 |  | 2717 |  | 2564 |  | 2564 | 2564 |  | 2586 |
| v2f2 |  |  | 717 |  | 739 |  | 761 | 717 |  | 739 |
| f2_OnC2V2 | 1478(737.7) |  | 1391(763.9) |  | 1673(723.8) |  | 1717(695.2)1434(778.6)1347(766.9) |  |  |  |
| f2_20msOV2 | 1456(756.4) |  | 1456(785.2) |  | 1586(742.9) |  | $1630(714.3) 1326(795.5) 1391(784.0)$ |  |  |  |
| f2_40msOV2 | 1413(773.2) |  | 1478(802.4) |  | 1543(761.7) |  | 1521(731.9)1217(812.9)1369(801.9) |  |  |  |
| f2_60msOV2 | 1391(791.2) |  | 1500(820.4) |  | 1500(781.1) |  | 1521(751.2)1195(824.9)1347(821.0) |  |  |  |
| f3_OnC2V2 | 2304 |  | 2347 |  |  |  | $2695 \quad 2195$ |  |  | 2304 |
| f3_20msOV2 | 2347 |  | 2412 |  | 2369 |  | 2673 | 2347 |  | 2304 |
| f3_40msOV2 | 2325 |  | 2412 |  | 2325 |  | 2217 | 2391 |  | 2304 |
| f3_60msOV2 | 2347 |  | 2434 |  | 2347 |  | 2238 | 2347 |  | 2325 |
| dur_closure | 76.8,37.4 121.9 |  |  | 73.6, | 80.2,58.5 | 64.6,62.6 | 172.6 |  |  |  |
| closure_2_V | 195.5 |  | 171.2 |  | 206.1 |  | 173.4 | 226.0 |  | 188.0 |
| release_2_V | 68.0 |  | 49.6 |  | 27.7 |  | 15.9 | 93.3 |  | 15.5 |
| burst | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{b}(610.6-623.8) \\ & \mathrm{t}(661.2-729.2) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{b} 0 \\ & \mathrm{p}(705.3-754.7) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{b}(582.1-586.7) \\ & \mathrm{g}(687.0-714.7) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{b}(593.7-612.6) \mathrm{b}(613.6-619.1) \quad \mathrm{b}) \\ & \mathrm{d}(671.0-686.9) \mathrm{c}(681.7-775.0) \mathrm{b}(747.3-762.7) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| V1: hl | 174 Hz | 57.0 | 174 Hz | 57.2 | 152 Hz | 51.8 | 174 Hz | 55.01 | $174 \mathrm{Hz55.4}$ | 17412z56.3 |
| h2 | 348 Hz | 50.3 | 348 Hz | 50.8 | 326 Hz | 47.9 | 326 Hz | 48.33 | 348 Hz 49.1 | 3481z47.9 |
| al | 695 Hz | 54.6 | 695 Hz | 54.5 | 804 Hz | 51.8 | 674 Hz | 50.76 | 674 Hz53.4 | $674 \mathrm{Hz53.8}$ |
| V2: hl | 174 Hz | 54.7 | 174 Hz | 56.3 | 152 Hz | 53.0 | 152 Hz | 51.01 | 174 Hz 57.0 | 174Hz56.9 |
| h2 | 326 Hz | 50.3 | 326 Hz | 51.2 | 326 Hz | 52.1 | 326 Hz | 48.73 | $348 \mathrm{Hz5} 2.5$ | 326 L 251.7 |
| al | 674 Hz | 58.3 | 674 Hz | 56.8 | 804 Hz | 58.3 | 804 Hz | 56.66 | $674 \mathrm{Hz58.4}$ | 652 Hz 56.9 |



## Appendix E: Speaker 3's Acoustic Data








## Appendix F: Speaker 4's Acoustic Data








## Appendix G: Average Voicing Characteristics Across Individuals

Table 1: Order of Voicing vs. $\mathrm{H} 1^{*}$ - $\mathrm{H} 2 *$ for V 1 in $\mathrm{V} 1 \mathrm{C} \# \mathrm{CV} 2$ Sequences

|  | voiceless- |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | voiced-voiced | voiced-voiceless | voiceless-voiced |  |
| avg. | -0.17 | 1.07 | 0.027 | 0.845 |
| male avg. | -6.37 | -4.35 | -7.04 | -5.77 |
| female avg. | 6.03 | 6.5 | 7.09 | 7.45 |
| m1 | -9.24 | -4.97 | -8.86 | -8.42 |
| m2 | -3.5 | -3.72 | -5.22 | -3.11 |
| f1 | 5.33 | 6.79 | 7.51 | 8.99 |
| f2 | 6.73 | 6.2 | 6.67 | 5.9 |

Table 2: Order of Voicing vs. H1*- A1 for V1 in V1C\#CV2 Sequences

|  |  | voiceless- |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
|  | voiced-voiced | voiced-voiceless | voiceless-voiced |  |
| voiceless |  |  |  |  |

Table 3: Order of Voicing vs. H1*-H2* for V2 in V1C\#CV2 Sequences

|  |  |  | voiceless- |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | voiced-voiced | voiceless-voiced | voiced-voiceless | voiceless |

Table 4: Order of Voicing vs. H1*-A1 for V1 in V1C\#CV2 Sequences

|  |  |  | voiceless- <br> voiceless |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| avg. | voiced-voiced | voiceless-voiced | voiced-voiceless | voin |
| male avg. | -6.03 | -3.66 | -1.96 | -0.38 |
| female avg. | -9.3 | -8.35 | -6.2 | -3.9 |
| m1 | -2.77 | 1.03 | 2.26 | 3.2 |
| m2 | -4.09 | -5.88 | -4.8 | -2.59 |
| f1 | -14.5 | -10.82 | -7.55 | -5.25 |
| f2 | -1.79 | 5.74 | 4.23 | 6.4 |
|  | -3.75 | -3.69 | 0.28 | -0.07 |

