New Sounds 2016 - Aarhus (Danmark)

Disentangling French tongues in a German classroom

Jane Wottawa & Martine Adda-Decker LPP, UMR 7018 CNRS - U. Paris 3 / Sorbonne Nouvelle







Introduction

- Pronunciation of a foreign language
 - not an intuitive task to accomplish
 - needs correct input (Flege, 2009)
 - training and feedback (Kartushina et al. 2015)
- Improvement of L2 pronunciation
 - aware of the differences that exist between a learners' L1 and L2 (Wrembel, 2007)
- Learners' production corpora
 - whether improvement was achieved over time
 - whether differences between two groups are noticeable

German consonantal system

- red highlights: which consonants are not phonemic in standard French
- this communication presents /h/ production in L2 speech

	Bilabial	Labiodental	Dental	Alveolar	Postalveolar	Retroflex	Palatal	Velar	Uvular	Pharyngeal	Glottal	
Plosive	рb			t d				kg			?	
Nasal	m			n				ŋ				
Trill									R			
Tap or Flap												
Fricative		f v		s z	∫ 3		ç	х	R		h	
Lateral fricative				4 33								
Approximant							j					3
Lateral approximant				1								

CONSONANTS (PULMONIC)

Where symbols appear in pairs, the one to the right represents a voiced consonant. Shaded areas denote articulations judged impossible.

German consonantal system

- red highlights: which consonants are not phonemic in standard French
- this communication presents /h/ production in L2 speech

	Bilabial	Labiodental	Dental	Alveolar	Postalveolar	Retroflex	Palatal	Velar	Uvular	Pharyngeal	Glottal	
Plosive	рb			t d				k g			?	
Nasal	m			n				ŋ				
Trill									R			
Tap or Flap												
Fricative		f v		s z	∫ 3		ç	х	R		h	
Lateral fricative				ŧβ	•							
Approximant							j					
Lateral approximant				1								L

CONSONANTS (PULMONIC)

Where symbols appear in pairs, the one to the right represents a voiced consonant. Shaded areas denote articulations judged impossible.

/h/ deletion / substitution

- Herz (heart) canonical pronunciation: /^Ihɛɐts/
- pronunciation of the learner: [^l?εεts]





/h/ insertion

- *Ahnung haben* (have [an] idea) canonical pronunciation: /¹?a:nʊŋ /
- pronunciation of the learner: [^lha:nvŋk]



Corpus

- FLACGS Corpus (French Learners Audio Corpus of German Speech)
- 20 German native speakers, 20 German non-native speakers
 - to identify difficulties French native speakers might have in producing German speech
- ProFee-FLACGS Corpus (Progression and Feedback - French Learners Audio Corpus of German Speech)
 - assess progression over one University semester
 - what does progression in L2 speech look like?
 - what features
 - ceiling effects?

ProFee-FLACGS Corpus

- 30 first year students, majoring in German and French
- between 17 and 21 years old
- all French dominant
- 5 German native speakers



Teaching Period (First semester 2015)



/h/ et /?/







Methods

- Audio files were sent-in by the students
- Manual transcription German orthography
- Automatic alignment with the Munich Automatic Speech Segmentation (MAUS) web-service

https://clarin.phonetik.uni-muenchen.de/ BASWebServices/#/services





Canonical [h] productions

• rate of correct [h] productions of the two learner groups

rate in %	Septe	ember		Nove	mber	
Group	AO	AV	Doodlag	AO	AV	Deedera
canonical /h/	93.6	81.1	Keading	96.5	87.8	Reading
TOKENS	171	190		198	230	

Canonical [h] productions

• rate of correct [h] productions of the two learner groups

rate in %		Octo	ober		December	
Group	Picture	AO	AV	Picture	AO	AV
canonical /h/	description	97	90.8	description	98.9	95.3
TOKENS		165	130		94	85

Canonical [h] productions

• rate of correct [h] productions of the two learner groups

rate in %	September		October		Nove	mber	December		
Group	AO	AV	AO	AV	AO	AV	AO	AV	
canonical /h/	93.6	81.1	97	90.8	96.5	87.8	98.9	95.3	
TOKENS	171	190	165	130	198	230	94	85	

Both learners' groups increase their canonical /h/ production over time

The differences between both groups decrease over time

Deleted [h]

• rate of deleted /h/ of the two learner groups

rate in %	Septe	ember		Nove	mber			
Group	AO	AV	ח 1'	AO	AV	D 1'		
deleted /h/	6.4	18.9	Keading	3.5	12.2	Reading		
TOKENS	171	190		198	230			

Deleted [h]

• rate of deleted /h/ of the two learner groups

rate in %		Octo	ober		December		
Group	Picture	AO	AV	Picture	AO	AV	
deleted /h/	description	3	8.2	description	1.1	4.7	
TOKENS		165	130		94	85	

Deleted [h]

• rate of deleted /h/ of the two learner groups

rate in %	September		October		Nove	mber	December		
Group	AO	AV	AO	AV	AO	AV	AO	AV	
deleted /h/	6.4	18.9	3	8.2	3.5	12.2	1.1	4.7	
TOKENS	171	190	165	130	198	230	94	85	

Both learners' groups delete less /h/ over time

The differences between both groups decrease over time

Inserted [h]

- number of inserted [h]
- number of [?]



Inserted [h]

- number of inserted [h]
- number of [?]

		Octo	ober		December		
Group	Picture	AO	AV	Picture	AO	AV	
inserted [h]	description	3	2	description	2	1	
regular [?]		416	405		508	426	



Inserted [h]

- number of inserted [h]
- number of [?]

	September		October		Nove	mber	December		
Group	AO	AV	AO	AV	AO	AV	AO	AV	
inserted [h]	15	8	3	2	1	10	2	1	
regular [?]	506	599	416	405	662	801	508	426	

The number of inserted [h] decreases over time

There seem to be more [h] insertions in reading

[h] insertion (in onset of #V syllables) triggered by /h/ in neighbourhood



Durations of canonical /h/



Conclusions & Perspectives

- after 11 weeks of training \rightarrow not native like (AO and AV)
- regarding the pronunciation of /h/ → both groups made progress regarding the canonical /h/ production
- AV group \rightarrow progress was more spectacular
- two possible reasons
 - the training was more effective
 - the AO group was closer to a ceiling effect?
- → more features have to be analysed
 - segmentals: /ŋ/, /ç/, vowel quantity and quality
 - supra-segmentals: syllable weight and lexical stress

New Sounds 2016 – Aarhus (Danmark)

Mange tak!

Thank you!





