Longitudinal Changes in English Accents at UCU



Research questions

- speech accommodation: partners in conversation converge (accommodate) to each other [1] to reduce social distance [2]
- with L2/L1 speakers?
- what resulting accent? [3]
- longitudinal recordings
- descriptive models of phonetic measurements
- plus listening experiments assessing intelligibility

Corpus



- n=282 UCU students from cohorts 2010 to 2013
- about 60% native Dutch,
 5% native English, 35% other
- 5 interviews of ~20' with same speaker, longitudinal, over 3 years
- English: read sentences, read texts, read UN Decl Human Rights, informal and formal monologues, dialogue.
- LI: read UN Decl Human Rights, informal monologue
- metadata: questionnaires, audiometry, administrative



Hugo Que	ené &	Rosem	nary Orr
UiL OTS &	UCU, U	ltrecht	University

Challenges

data collectio	- on-campus c - logistics (150 - ~900 hours,	office; evenings only!) interviews in 6 weeks) ~12 interviewers,	
		feguard consistency?	
validation	 did speaker indeed say X? 		
conformity with speakers' consent - is privacy and anonymity assured? - with (future!) speaker recognition? - what if anonymity would be violated?			
se	xual abuse story	"I was so mad at my flatmate Lisa for sleeping with Thomas"	
transcription	- what did speaker say? use speech technology		
metadata	link speech data with metadata (both static and dynamic) across 5 recordings		
integrity	adhering to backup schedule is difficult (~20 GB/interview, ~2.5 TB total)		

0.5

4.0

0.3

0.2

Some findings

reduction of unstressed syles Dutch L2ers: no change English L1ers: convergence towards Dutch values!

decreasing betw-speaker variance



than in Dutch? R1: contrast present R2: Dutch and Eng sharper R5: Dutch and Eng less sharp, contrast reduced, convergence towards Dutch values!

is /s/ sharper in English

is converged speech more **intelligible** (lower SRT) than unconverged speech? RI: unconverged, baseline R2: lower SRT; less variance in SRT between talkers and between listeners, more intelligible R3: as RI

no interlanguage benefit!



listeners pooled

Dissemination

- with metadata
- using ISOcat labels:
 "mother tongue" yes/no, vs
 "native language" + codes
- · linking recordings by speaker
- CLARIN compatible storage
- MPI: The Language Archive
- Meertens Institute
- access only after compliance with consented terms of usage

... for linguistic research and development ...

... ensuring anonymity ...

Future plans

- integration of production and perception
 use same individuals as
 - use same individuals as speakers and as listeners, correlate findings
- network analysis
 - how is convergence related to (prestige in) social network? who converges to whom?

References

 H. Giles, N. Coupland, J. Coupland, in Contexts of Accommodation: Developments in applied sociolinguistics (CUP, Cambridge, 1991), pp.1-68.

[2] J. Pardo, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. 119(4): 2382-2393 (2006).

[3] J. E. Flege, in Speech Perception and Linguistic Experience: Issues in Cross-language research (York Press, Timonium, MD, 1995), pp. 229-273.

Information

Thanks to Lisa Teunissen and all facilitators!

Hugo Quené h.quene@uu.nl www.hugoquene.nl

UU Digital Humanities Community Event, 7 Oct 2016 hat tip: http://colinpurrington.com/tips/poster-design