Ling 251, Topics in phonetics & phonology
Round-up of Production Planning Hypothesis

10 Oct. 2017

1. Reminder: what the whole idea is

- **Maybe phonological rules can be made very simple**
  - {t,d} → Ø / V(ɹ) __ # V
  - no reference to prosodic domains, no reference to syntax
    - (we need the # here because unlike the within-word rule, the following V doesn't have to be unstressed; maybe we could get rid of it if we adopt an ambisyllabicity analysis (Kahn 1976), and syllabify words both before and after they're put into phrases)
  - apparent prosodic/syntactic effects are the extra-grammatical effect of processing
    - if we don't get know whether the following word starts with a V, then we don't (yet) have V(ɹ) __ # **V**, so the rule can't apply

2. See table starting on next page

3. Then come back here: plan

- Thursday (12 Oct.) reminder
  - Kie presents overview
  - **Goldrick 2014**: prepare a comment about how something in it relates to the paper you presented
  - **Buchwald 2014**: likewise

- next Tuesday (17 Oct.)
  - Let's all read two more overview-type articles [that might be enough, then we move on to OCP]
  - **Keating & Shattuck-Hufnagel 2002**—this one is long! Pp. 112-127 pages are crucial overview of "consensus" model; 127-137 discuss where it needs to be changed/expanded; 137-151 is their proposal.
  - **Wheeldon, Meyer & Smith 2006** <u>plus</u> **Wheeldon 2013** (the 2006 is a brief encyclopedia entry—use it as preparation for the 2010)
  - We can decide Thursday, after we see how it goes with Goldrick and Buchwald, whether we want to stick with the same task or try something different

source	phenom.	speech rate	W1 freq., prob.	W2 freq., prob.	planning proxy (MacKenzie's coinage?)
Wagner 2012	Eng. –*ing/in'*	*not tested*	*not tested*	*irrelevant (always* a *or* the*)*	Word2 **duration** & Word1 duration: longer → less effect of following *the*
Kilbourn-Ceron, Wagner & Clayards 2016, experiment	Eng. tapping	*not tested*	*irrelevant (Word1 is always made-up)*	*not tested*	**clause** boundary: boundary → less tapping Word1 final V **duration**: longer duration → less tapping, if no clause boundary
K-C & al. 2016, Buckeye corpus		*not tested*	no effect	hi **freq** → more tapping	**pause** duration longer pause → less tapping Word1 relative **duration** no effect
Kilbourn-Ceron & Sonderegger 2018	Jp. devoicing	faster (for speaker overall) → more devoicing	not significant	*not tested*	*treated as two different rules:* $\{i,u\} \rightarrow$ [-voice] / __ [-voice] $\{i,u\} \rightarrow$ [-voice] / __]$_{phrase}$ intonational **break** type: bigger break → less devoicing **pause** duration: longer pause → less devoicing within phrase (following [-voice] less accessible), more devoicing at end of phrase (is more phrase-final) end-of-Word1 relative **duration**: longer → less devoicing
Kilbourn-Ceron 2017b	Fr. liaison	not significant	hi **freq** → more liaison, A N only – but turns out to be only an interaction of W1 freq : W2 freq	hi **freq** → more liaison (both N$_{pl}$ A$_{pl}$ and A N)	*none*

Tanner, Sonderegger & Wagner 2015, 2017		faster → more deletion __V and __C (but not __{t,d})	hi **freq** → more deletion __V and __C (__{t,d} close to ceiling)	hi **prob** → possibly greater differentiation of following context	**pause** duration : longer pause → less deletion __C and __{t,d} (__V close to floor)
Tamminga 2015		faster → more deletion	hi **freq** → more deletion	*not tested*	**clause** boundary: clause boundary intervening → foll. V has weaker ability to suppress deletion
Gahl & Garnsey 2004	Eng. t/d deletion	not significant (but also didn't vary much: reading-aloud task)	hi **freq** → marginally more deletion (but small range of W1 frequencies)	*not tested, and would be hard to test (same noun in both members of sentence pair)*	*(they don't present it this way! they tentatively favor "speaker control," choosing to use clearer articulation when info is unpredictable)* whether verb is followed by type of complement it prefers (NP vs. clause) preferred ("bias-matching") complement for that verb → more deletion
MacKenzie 2012, ch. 5	Eng. is/'s, has/'s, will/'ll	ch. 4: faster → more contraction	*not tested, but:* ch. 4: for *pronouns*, frequency of **bigram** (*it is, you had*) has no significant effect	*not really testable (is always is, has, will)*	*not so much a planning proxy but rather a factor that could be explained by planning* **size** of subject NP (Word1's whole phrase) more orthographic words in subject → less *is, has* contraction more prosodic words in subect → less *will* contraction
MacKenzie 2016	Eng. is/'s	*not tested*	*not tested*	*irrelevant (always* is*)*	**duration** of Word2 (*is*): longer W2 duration → less contraction **but** no interaction with W2 syntactic category—i.e., effect of W2 syntactic category doesn't get weaker as W2 gets longer
Lamontagne & Torreira 2017	Sp. V deletion	not significant	hi **freq** → ? hi **prob** → more deletion __#, but not #__	hi **freq**, hi **prob** → more deletion __#	

References

Buchwald, Adam. 2014. Phonetic processing. In Matthew Goldrick, Victor Ferreira & Michele Miozzo (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language production*, 245–258. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gahl, Susanne & Susan Marie Garnsey. 2004. Knowledge of Grammar, Knowledge of Usage: Syntactic Probabilities Affect Pronunciation Variation. *Language* 80(4). 748–775. doi:10.1353/lan.2004.0185.

Goldrick, Matthew. 2014. Phonological processing: The retrieval and encoding of word form information in speech production. In Matthew Goldrick, Victor Ferreira & Michele Miozzo (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language production*, 228–244. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kahn, Daniel. 1976. Syllable-based Generalizations in English Phonology. MIT.

Keating, Patricia & Stefanie Shattuck-Hufnagel. 2002. A prosodic view of word form encoding for speech production. *UCLA Working Papers in Phonetics* 101. 112–156.

Kilbourn-Ceron, Oriana. 2017. Speech production planning affects phonological variability: a case study in French liaison. In Karen Jesney, Charlie O'Hara, Caitlin Smith & Rachel Walker (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2016 Annual Meeting on Phonology*.

Kilbourn-Ceron, Oriana & Morgan Sonderegger. 2018. Boundary phenomena and variability in Japanese high vowel devoicing. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. doi:10.1007/s11049-017-9368-x.

Kilbourn-Ceron, Oriana, Michael Wagner & Meghan Clayards. 2016. The effect of production planning locality on external sandhi: a study in /t/. *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*.

Lamontagne, Jeffrey & Franciso Torreira. 2017. Production planning and directionality in external sandhi (poster). *Annual Meeting on Phonology*. New York University.

MacKenzie, Laurel. 2012. Locating variation above the phonology. University of Pennsylvania PhD dissertation.

MacKenzie, Laurel. 2016. Production planning effects on variable contraction in English. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 22(2). 121–130.

Tamminga, Meredith. 2015. Modulation of the following segment effect on coronal stop deletion [slides]. Toronto.

Tanner, James, Morgan Sonderegger & Michael Wagner. 2015. Production planning and coronal stop deletion in spontaneous speech. *Proceedings of the 18th International Congress of Phonetics Sciences (ICPHS) in Glasgow, 2015*. Glasgow.

Tanner, James, Morgan Sonderegger & Michael Wagner. 2017. Production planning and coronal stop deletion in spontaneous speech. *Laboratory Phonology: Journal of the Association for Laboratory Phonology* 8(1). doi:10.5334/labphon.96. http://journal-labphon.org/articles/10.5334/labphon.96/.

Wagner, Michael. 2012. Locality in phonology and production planning. In A McKillen & J Loughran (eds.), *Proceedings of the Montreal-Ottawa-Toronto (MOT) Phonology Workshop 2011. Phonology in the 21st Century: In honour of Glyne Piggott. McGill Working Papers in Linguistics 22(1)*.

Wheeldon, Linda. 2013. Producing spoken sentences: the scope of incremental planning. In S Fuchs, M Weirich, D Pape & P Perrier (eds.), *Speech production and perception volume 1: speech planning and dynamics*, 93–114. Peter Lang.

Wheeldon, Linda R, Antje S Meyer & Mark Smith. 2006. Language Production, Incremental. *Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. doi:10.1002/0470018860.s00252. http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/0470018860.s00252/abstract.