

Utilization of suprasegmental information in English spoken word recognition among  
Chinese EFL learners: pitch drives the prosodic transfer

by

MENG, Yaxuan

SUPERVISOR: Prof. ZHANG, Juan

CO-SUPERVISOR: Prof. FAN, Xitao

UNIVERSIDADE DE MACAU  
Doctor of Philosophy in Education  
UNIVERSITY OF MACAU

2018

Faculty of Education

University of Macau

Author's right 2018 by

MENG, Yaxuan



澳門大學

UNIVERSIDADE DE MACAU

UNIVERSITY OF MACAU

## Abstract

Spoken word recognition is the foundation of successful communication and involves the processing of information from low-level acoustic cues to high-level cognitive representations. A wide variety of previous studies have explored the underlying mechanism of how lexical stress is utilized during spoken word recognition in stress languages and found that the utilization of lexical stress is influenced by the interdependency of segmental and suprasegmental cues. More specifically, when segmental variation is involved in lexical stress shift, people tend to utilize segmental cues rather than suprasegmental ones to recognize the spoken word. Additionally, the utilization of suprasegmental information in native spoken word recognition (L1) was found to influence how such information was utilized in non-native spoken word recognition (L2) across stress languages, and such influence could be attributed to prosodic transfer from L1 lexical stress to L2 lexical stress.

However, for speakers of Chinese (i.e., a tone language) who learn English (i.e., a stress language) as a foreign language (EFL), it remains unclear whether they could utilize lexical stress in English spoken word recognition through prosodic transfer from L1 lexical tone to L2 lexical stress. Moreover, if Chinese EFL learners could utilize lexical stress through prosodic transfer, the factors that might influence the utilization of lexical stress also remain unclear. Therefore, the current study was conducted to answer two research questions. First, can Chinese EFL learners utilize lexical stress in English spoken word recognition? Second, what factor might influence the utilization of lexical stress in English spoken word recognition among Chinese EFL learners.

To answer these two research questions, six experiments were conducted by adopting Event-Related Potential (ERP) measurements. The first three were conducted to answer the first research question among Mandarin EFL learners (adults). The last three experiments were conducted to answer the second research question by comparing Mandarin and Cantonese EFL learners (adults). The results of the current study demonstrate that Chinese EFL learners utilize lexical stress in English spoken word recognition through prosodic transfer from L1 lexical tone to L2 lexical stress at the phonetic level rather than at the suprasegmental level. Specifically, pitch plays an important role in the prosodic transfer.



澳門大學  
UNIVERSIDADE DE MACAU  
UNIVERSITY OF MACAU

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgement.....	i
Abstract .....	ii
Declaration .....	iv
List of Tables and Figures.....	ix
Chapter 1 Introduction .....	1
1.1 Background of the study .....	1
1.2 Purpose of the study .....	3
1.3 Research questions .....	3
1.4 Definitions of key terms.....	4
1.5 Methodological considerations .....	6
1.6 Significance of the study.....	6
1.7 Overview of the study.....	7
1.8 Statement of originality.....	8
Chapter 2 Literature review .....	9
2.1 Spoken word recognition.....	9
2.2 The underlying mechanism of spoken word recognition.....	10
2.2.1 The Cohort Model.....	11
2.2.2 The Trace Model.....	12
2.2.3 Criticisms of previous models.....	13
2.3 Segmental/suprasegmental information in spoken word recognition .....	13
2.3.1 Definition of segmental and suprasegmental information .....	14
2.3.2 The utilization of suprasegmental information in english spoken word recognition.....	15
2.3.3 The utilization of suprasegmental information in stress languages with moderate or no vowel reduction.....	18
2.4 The utilization of suprasegmental information by efl learners .....	21
2.4.1 EFL learners from stress language backgrounds .....	21
2.4.2 EFL learners from tone language backgrounds .....	23
2.5 Acoustic-phonetic correlates underlying prosodic transfer from tone languages to stress languages.....	27
2.5.1 Prosodic transfer from tone language to stress language in speech perception.....	28

2.5.2 Prosodic transfer from tone language to stress language in spoken word recognition.....	30
2.6 The present study .....	32
2.6.1 Research purpose.....	32
2.6.2 Research questions and predictions.....	33
Chapter 3 Methodology.....	35
3.1 Reasons for adopting erp measurements.....	35
3.2 ERP components of interest in the current study .....	36
3.2.1 P200.....	36
3.2.2 N325 .....	37
3.2.3 P350.....	37
3.2.4 N400 .....	38
3.2.5 Mismatch negativity (MMN).....	38
Chapter 4 Experiments for RQ1 .....	40
4.1 Experiment 1 .....	40
4.1.1 Research aim.....	40
4.1.2 Methods.....	42
4.1.2.1 Participants.....	42
4.1.2.2 Materials.....	42
4.1.2.3 Procedures.....	42
4.1.2.4 EEG recordings and analysis.....	44
4.1.3 Results.....	45
4.1.3.1 Behavioral results.....	45
4.1.3.2 ERP results.....	45
4.1.4 Discussion .....	47
4.1.5 Summary .....	48
4.2 Experiment 2 .....	48
4.2.1 Research aim .....	48
4.2.2 Methods.....	49
4.2.2.1 Participants.....	49
4.2.2.2 Materials.....	49
4.2.2.3 Procedure.....	50
4.2.2.4 EEG recordings .....	51
4.2.3 Results .....	51

4.2.3.1 Behavioral results.....	51
4.2.3.2 ERP results.....	52
4.2.4 Discussion.....	54
4.2.5 Summary.....	55
4.3 Experiment 3.....	56
4.3.1 Research aim.....	56
4.3.2 Methods.....	57
4.3.2.1 Participants.....	57
4.3.2.2 Materials.....	58
4.3.2.3 Procedure.....	59
4.3.2.4 EEG recordings.....	60
4.3.3 Results.....	60
4.3.3.1 Behavioral results.....	60
4.3.3.2 ERP results.....	62
4.3.4 Discussion.....	65
4.3.5 Summary.....	67
Chapter 5 Experiments for RQ2.....	69
5.1 Experiment 4.....	69
5.1.1 Research aim.....	69
5.1.2 Method.....	69
5.1.2.1 Participants.....	69
5.1.2.2 Materials.....	70
5.1.2.3 Procedure.....	71
5.1.2.4 EEG recordings.....	71
5.1.3 Results.....	71
5.1.3.1 ERP results.....	71
5.1.3.2 Cross-correlational analysis.....	73
5.1.4 Discussion.....	75
5.1.5 Summary.....	76
5.2 Experiment 5.....	76
5.2.1 Research aim.....	76
5.2.2 Method.....	76
5.2.2.1 Participants.....	76
5.2.2.2 Materials.....	77

5.2.2.3 Procedure.....	78
5.2.2.4 EEG recordings .....	78
5.2.3 Results .....	78
5.2.3.1 Behavioral results.....	78
5.2.3.2 ERP results .....	80
5.2.4 Discussion .....	81
5.2.5 Summary .....	82
5.3 Experiment 6 .....	82
5.3.1 Research aim .....	82
5.3.2 Method .....	83
5.3.2.1 Participants.....	83
5.3.2.2 Materials.....	83
5.3.2.3 Procedure.....	83
5.3.2.4 EEG recordings .....	84
5.3.3 Results .....	84
5.3.3.1 Behavioral results.....	84
5.3.3.2 ERP results .....	86
5.3.4 Discussion .....	89
5.3.5 Summary .....	90
Chapter 6 General discussion.....	92
6.1 Main research findings .....	92
6.2 Significance of this study .....	99
6.3 Conclusion and limitations.....	101
6.4 Implications .....	101
Reference.....	103
Appendix A: The experimental materials in Experiment 1 .....	113
Appendix B: The experimental materials in Experiment 2 and 5 .....	120
Appendix C: The experimental materials in Experiment 3 and 6 .....	122



## List of Tables and Figures

<b>Table 4. 1</b> Examples of stimuli in each condition in Experiment 1 .....	41
<b>Table 4. 2</b> Mean familiarities and standard deviations across conditions in Experiment 1 .....	43
<b>Table 4. 3</b> Mean familiarities, word frequency, length and standard deviations across conditions in Experiment 2 .....	50
<b>Table 4. 4</b> Mean accuracy rates (response times) and standard deviations for the conditions in Experiment 2 .....	52
<b>Table 4. 5</b> Examples of prime-target word pairs in Experiment 3 .....	57
<b>Table 4. 6</b> Mean familiarities, word frequency, length and standard deviations across conditions in Experiment 3 .....	59
<b>Table 4. 7</b> Mean accuracy rates (response times) and standard deviations for the conditions in Experiment 3 .....	62
<b>Table 5. 1</b> Mean accuracy rates (response times) and standard deviations for the conditions in Experiment 5 .....	79
<b>Table 5. 2</b> Mean accuracy rates (response times) and standard deviations for the conditions in Experiment 6 .....	86
<b>Figure 4. 1</b> Procedure for Experiment 1 .....	44
<b>Figure 4. 2</b> Grand average ERP topographies of the P200 and N325 components across conditions in Experiment 1 .....	46
<b>Figure 4. 3</b> Grand mean ERPs for different conditions in Experiment 1 .....	46
<b>Figure 4. 4</b> Procedure for Experiment 2 .....	51
<b>Figure 4. 5</b> Grand average ERP topographies of the P200 and N325 components across conditions in Experiment 2 .....	53
<b>Figure 4. 6</b> Grand mean ERPs for different conditions in Experiment 2 .....	54

<b>Figure 4. 7</b> Procedure for Experiment 3 .....	60
<b>Figure 4. 8</b> Grand average ERP topographies of the P200, P350, and N400 components across conditions in Experiment 3 .....	63
<b>Figure 4. 9</b> Grand mean ERPs for different conditions in Experiment 3 .....	64
<b>Figure 5. 1</b> Grand average ERP topographies of the MMN component across conditions in Experiment 4 .....	72
<b>Figure 5. 2</b> Grand mean ERPs for different conditions in Experiment 4 .....	73
<b>Figure 5. 3</b> The example for the cross-correlational analysis in Experiment 4.....	75
<b>Figure 5. 4</b> Grand average ERP topographies of the P200 component across conditions in Experiment 5 .....	79
<b>Figure 5. 5</b> Grand mean ERPs for different conditions in Experiment 5 .....	80
<b>Figure 5. 6</b> Grand average ERP topographies of the P200, P350, and N400 components across conditions in Experiment 6 .....	87
<b>Figure 5. 7</b> Grand mean ERPs for different conditions in Experiment 6 .....	88

