

Abstract

Pitch and duration of 4 sets of experimental material are measured and analyzed. The material was used to investigate the role of prosodic, syntactic and lexical focus in word processing and learning in second language acquisition. The well-known finding that accent boosts pitch is confirmed. The boosting of duration in one set could also be due to final lengthening. Syntactic and lexical means of marking focus, however, do not give the duration and the pitch of a word an extra boost.

Introduction

It is important for us to know what the duration and the pitch of the target words of the experimental material is. These measurements are the basis of this poster. The measurements were done with **Praat** (and its algorithms), and pitch measured in the range between 75 and 350 Hz (Boersma & Weenink, 2006). All pitch values were then transformed to ERB values (Traunmüller, 1990).

Both pitch and duration are boosted by accent, but being in a clefted constituent or in the scope of a lexical marker do not give an extra boost.

The graphics in panel 4 and 5 illustrate this very clearly.

This paper is not intended as an analysis of focus and its markers in German and English: There is only one speaker per experimental set, which makes a generalization to the German or English population impossible. Moreover, the material has been controlled for prosodically, but not segmentally.

Pitch in English Clefts

Accent, but not cleft, boosts pitch in the English material.



# PITCH AND DURATION OF TARGET WORDS IN OUR MATERIAL

# Ruben van de Vijver, Anke Sennema and Anne Zimmer–Stahl

## Universität Potsdam, SFB 632–C4 ruben@ling.uni-potsdam.de





### Pitch in English focus partie

### Accent, but not being in the scope of a focus particle, boos



	Prosodic m
Γ for the ruckus. t for the ruckus.	Stressed syllables are longer and have a more accented syllables are longer and have a mor <i>Mean Duration in msec.</i> <i>first and second syllable</i> <i>Accented</i>
eity development. ity development. nen Fuß steht. inen Fuß steht.	$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 &$
the sidewalk. onto the sidewalk. he sidewalk. nto the sidewalk.	l = 2.126 p = 0.040 df = 35.929 N = 19 Mean lowest pitch in ERB first and second syllable Accented $\int_{1}^{2} \int_{1}^{2} \int_$
	Mean highest pitch in ERB first and second syllable Accented
cles	Con
sts pitch in the English material.	In this poster, we reported on measurement sets of our experimental material. We want marking focus (syntactic and lexical) had a turned out that it did not. Even though w the material of our experiments, we have see lexical focus markers had an additional effec- duration in the cleft material can be explai- phrase finally. Phrase-final syllables are lenged
	<ul> <li>References</li> <li>Boersma, P. &amp; Weenink, D. (2006). Praat [computer program]. Retrieved Apr. 1 200</li> <li>Cambier-Langeveld, T. (2000). Temporal me Holland Institute of generative Linguistics</li> <li>Traunmüller, H. (1990). Analytical expression the Acoustical Society of America, 88, 9</li> </ul>
I = 0 $SEM = 0$ $SEM = 0.437$ $SEM = 0.5688$ $I = 0$ $Mean = 0.5859$ $Nean = 0.437$ $I.127$ $I = 0$ $Mean = 0.5859$ $Mean = 0.437$ $Mean = 0.5688$ $I = 22$ $7.177$ $Mean = 8.735$ $Mean = 8.734$	Tha
(B) Syll. 1 Highest Pitch (ERB) Syll. 2	Kirsten Brock, Paul Elbourne, Henrik Froes Smolibocki, Shravan Vasishth.

