



The role of native language experience in the perception of  
L2 speech sounds :  
The case of the perception of English nasal  
coda contrasts by Xiang Chinese and  
Cantonese Chinese learners

吴明会  
上海外国语大学


- ▶ Introduction
  - ▶ Research question
  - ▶ Method
  - ▶ Results
  - ▶ Discussion
- 

# Introduction

- ▶ Human beings are born with the ability to perceive any sound that occurs in human languages across the world
  - ▶ During the first year of life, however, humans undergo a perceptual reorganization
  - ▶ The L1 sound system “filters out” non-native speech sounds, resulting in non-native (including L2) speech learning difficulties.
- 

- ▶ The Speech Learning Model (Flege, 1995), the Perceptual Assimilation Model [e.g. Best, 1995], the Second Language Linguistic Perception model [Escudero, 2005], and the Native Language Magnet Model [e.g. Iverson & Kuhl, 1995].
- ▶ In contrast to the vowel perception by Chinese Learners of English (CLE), few studies on consonant perception by CLE
- ▶ The role of native language experience ignored

# Research questions

- ▶ How native language experience (Xiang and Cantonese) affects the perception of English nasal coda contrasts?
  - ▶ Are there any differences in performance between the two groups?
  - ▶ Does vowel quality affect nasal perception?
- 

# Method

## ▶ Participants

- 15 Beijing vs. 15 Changsha & 15 Guangzhou Cantonese
- With roughly the same proficiency in English

## ► The phonology of nasal codas in four languages

(-n/-ŋ)	Beijing	Changsha	Cantonese	English
/i/	鬢 - 病 (51)	冰 (41)	/pin/边 (55)	
/ɪ/			/pɪŋ/兵 (55)	sin-sing
/u/			/pun/本 (35)	
/ʊ/			/pʊŋ/甬 (35)	
/y/		君 (33)		
/ɔ/			赶 - 港 (35)	gone-gong
/ʌ/				sun-sung
/ə/	笨 - 蹦 (51)	根 (33)		
/a/	办 - 棒 (51)	板 (33)	山 - 生 (55)	
/ɐ/			新 - 生 (55)	
/æ/				pan-pang

## ▶ Stimuli

- Targeted VC syllables were clipped from the actual English words *sin*, *sing*, *sun*, *sung*, *pan* and *pang*
- /ɪn/-/ɪŋ/, /ʌn/-/ʌŋ/ and /æn/-/æŋ/
- 4 tokens for each syllables, 24 tokens altogether



Syllable Contrasts <sub>ϕ</sub>	Syllable Duration <sub>ϕ</sub> (ms) <sub>ϕ</sub>	Vowel <sub>ϕ</sub>	
		f0(Hz) <sub>ϕ</sub>	Intensity(dB) <sub>ϕ</sub>
/ɪn/ <sub>ϕ</sub>	284.8 <sub>ϕ</sub>	130.8 <sub>ϕ</sub>	72.3 <sub>ϕ</sub>
/ɪŋ/ <sub>ϕ</sub>	273.3 <sub>ϕ</sub>	128.7 <sub>ϕ</sub>	72.4 <sub>ϕ</sub>
/ʌn/ <sub>ϕ</sub>	274.3 <sub>ϕ</sub>	124.8 <sub>ϕ</sub>	72.7 <sub>ϕ</sub>
/ʌŋ/ <sub>ϕ</sub>	278.6 <sub>ϕ</sub>	126.8 <sub>ϕ</sub>	72.9 <sub>ϕ</sub>
/æn/ <sub>ϕ</sub>	314.3 <sub>ϕ</sub>	126.1 <sub>ϕ</sub>	72.3 <sub>ϕ</sub>
/æŋ/ <sub>ϕ</sub>	345.1 <sub>ϕ</sub>	127.0 <sub>ϕ</sub>	72.5 <sub>ϕ</sub>

## ▶ Procedure

- AXB discrimination test
- Each type of contrast (/ɪn/-/ɪŋ/, /ʌn/-/ʌŋ/ and /æn/-/æŋ/) was tested by 16 AXB trials.
- 48 trials altogether in a single randomized block
- The experiment was automatically controlled by the speech software Praat

# Results


Nasal Contrasts				
Language group	<u>/m/</u> -/ <u>m/</u>	<u>/ɲn/</u> -/ <u>ɲŋ/</u>	<u>/æn/</u> -/ <u>æŋ/</u>	Overall
Beijing	84.8 (17.4)	78.1 (16.3)	95.4 (6.5)	86.1
Changsha	62.6 (12.8)	59.3 (13.9)	85.6 (12.6)	69.2
Cantonese	62.4 (18.2)	58.4 (18.9)	87.6 (13.2)	69.5

# Discussion

- ▶ Best & Tyler's perceptual assimilation model-L2 (2007) confirmed
- ▶ No significant differences between two groups: two possibilities
  - 1) NO nasal contrasts with high vowels leads to similar perceptual pattern to Changsha speakers
  - 2) Phonological system possessed by Young Cantonese speakers differs from that by old generation
- ▶ /ʌŋ/-/ʌŋ/ & /ɪŋ/-/ɪŋ/ < /æŋ/-/æŋ/: vowel quality affect nasal perception confirmed (Zee 1981; Kluge et al 2007; Cheng & Guion-Anderson)

- Its of interest to investigate the perception of /ʌn/-/ʌŋ/ in noise condition as well as by L2 learners with different native language backgrounds
- Overall, /ʌn/-/ʌŋ/ & /ɪn/-/ɪŋ/ < /æn/-/æŋ/; no differences in performances on /ʌn/-/ʌŋ/ & /ɪn/-/ɪŋ/
- Separately, for Changsha & Cantonese, /ʌn/-/ʌŋ/ & /ɪn/-/ɪŋ/ < /æn/-/æŋ/; no differences in performances on /ʌn/-/ʌŋ/ & /ɪn/-/ɪŋ/.
- By contrasts, for Beijing, no differences in performance on /æn/-/æŋ/ & /ɪn/-/ɪŋ/; /ʌn/-/ʌŋ/ & /ɪn/-/ɪŋ/
  - English nasal coda perception was constrained by both native language experience and phonetic-universal property

# Conclusion

- ▶ The perception of English nasal coda contrasts is affected significantly by native language experience (Xiang & Cantonese)
  - ▶ No differences in performance between the two groups
  - ▶ Both linguistic experience and phonetic-universal property play a role in the perception of English nasal coda contrasts
- 

- ▶ Further study should control subjects' proficiency in both Mandarin & English
- ▶ Linguistic experience constantly shapes listeners' perceptual ability (plasticity of speech perception) (Best & Tyler 2007: 24), so how “Chinese” L1 and L2 shape English (L3) perception? (cf. in a 18<sup>th</sup> oriental-cocoda paper)

Thanks