Investigating the forensic applications of global and local temporal representations of speech for dialect discrimination

Leah Bradshaw, Vincent Hughes, and Eleanor Chodroff

Department of Language and Linguistic Science University of York



Forensic phonetics



Voice comparison

Speaker classification

Process of determining speaker-specific features (e.g., gender, age, dialect, idiosyncratic speech markers, etc.) using:

- Auditory analysis
- Acoustic-phonetic analysis
- Automatic speaker recognition approaches

Acoustic-phonetic analysis frequently involves court-presentable measurements that are strongly focused on segmental information:

- Formants
- FO
- Voice onset time

But what about suprasegmental information, and specifically information about a speaker's rhythmic pattern?

Rhythm in speaker classification

Previous studies demonstrate some utility of rhythm for dialect discrimination and forensic purposes

Limited in its application in research and casework

Ferragne and Pellegrino 2004, Biadsy and Hirschberg 2009, Torgersen and Szakay 2012, Leemann et al. 2012, 2015, Dellwo et al. 2015

Rhythm depends on some temporal representation of speech

Rhythm: Temporal characteristics of a spoken utterance

How can temporal characteristics of a spoken utterance be represented in an acoustic-phonetic analysis? In an ASR analysis?

Global temporal representations

Long-term alternations in vocalic and consonantal intervals which may approximate the rhythmic pattern of speech

Rhythm Metrics: measures examining the degree of variability in the duration of pre-specified intervals (e.g., vowels, consonants, CV sequences, adjacent intervals, etc.)

Rasmus et al., 1990, Grabe and Low 2002, Dellwo 2006

Rhythm in speaker classification

Syllable vs stress-timed distinctions

Syllable-timed: equal syllable durations

Stress-timed: equal stressed syllable durations (more variability between stressed and unstressed syllables)

Problematic: too coarse – but, possibly a place to start

Pike 1945, Abercrombie 1967, Dauer 1983, Arvaniti 2009

Local temporal representations

Delta (Δ) and delta-delta ($\Delta\Delta$) features: Reflect the change in spectral properties between adjacent temporal frames and the acceleration of that change

Common in ASR systems

e.g., Lee et al. 1990, Matsui and Furui 1990, Gish and Schmidt 1994

GOALS

1) Analyze rhythmic profile of four varieties of British English: Cambridge, Multicultural London English, Leicester, and Punjabi-Leicester

2) Investigate the utility of global RMs for discriminating among the dialects

3) Compare global and local temporal representations for dialect discrimination

OUTLINE

Introduction

Corpus Description

Global: Rhythm Metrics

Local: Deltas and Delta-deltas

Discussion



Four British English Dialects

	"South"	Leicester ("Midlands")
Non-contact (Anglo)	Cambridge English (CE)	Leicester English (LE)
Contact (Ethnic)	Multicultural London English (MLE) <i>Caribbean descent</i>	Punjabi-Leicester English (PLE) <i>At least one parent as</i> <i>native Punjabi speaker</i>

International Varieties of English (IViE) corpus: 12 CE, 12 MLE, age 16

Wormald (2016): 8 LE, 22 PLE, ages 20–53

METHODS

OUTLINE

Introduction

Corpus Description

Global: Rhythm Metrics

Local: Deltas and Delta-deltas

Discussion



GLOBAL MEASURES:

Rhythm Metrics

stdevV Standard deviation of vocalic interval duration

stdevC Standard deviation of consonantal interval duration

VarcoV Coefficient of variation for the vocalic interval duration





GLOBAL MEASURES:

Rhythm Metrics

- **nPVI-V** Pairwise Variability Index for vocalic interval durations
- **nPVI-C** Pairwise Variability Index for consonant interval durations
- **nPVI-CV** Normalised pairwise variability index for summed consonantal and vocalic interval durations





METHODS



Cambridge, MLE: Praat EasyAlign for British English

Leicester varieties: Alignments accompanied the recordings

All phone alignments were manually adjusted

Consonantal and vowel intervals determined based on the phone alignments

RMs measured with the Duration Analyzer Praat script

Dellwo 2019

RESULTS:

Rhythm Metrics



Dialect significantly improved model fit No gender differences

RESULTS:

Rhythm Metrics



Cambridge English: higher stdev-V, VarcoV, nPVI-CV

MLE: average

Leicester English: higher VarcoV

Punjabi Leicester: lower stdev-V, VarcoV

All relative to the average production across all four dialects

RESULTS:

Rhythm Metrics



Cambridge English: lower stdev-C

MLE: lower stdev-C, nPVI-V, nPVI-C

Leicester English: higher stdev-C, nPVI-V, nPVI-CV

Punjabi-Leicester: higher stdev-C lower nPVI-V

All relative to the average production across all four dialects

Rhythm Metrics

RESULTS:



OUTLINE

Introduction

Corpus Description

Global: Rhythm Metrics

Local: Deltas and Delta-deltas

Discussion



METHODS:

Δ and $\Delta\Delta$ s



MFCCs

Voice activity automatically detected + manually corrected

20 ms frames, shifted by 10 ms

0–4000 Hz

CMVN applied for room/equipment normalization

METHODS:

 Δ and $\Delta\Delta s$



Δs and $\Delta \Delta s$

Deltas: change between MFCCs in adjacent frames

Delta-deltas: change between deltas in adjacent vectors

Averaged for each recording

MFCCs not included in the analysis

Deltas and

delta-deltas

RESULTS:



DISCUSSION

Significant differences in RMs among four British English dialects

CE and LE more stress-timed—but in different ways

MLE and PLE more syllable-timed—but in different ways

Combination of RMs can be used as a Rhythmic Profile

DISCUSSION

Rhythmic profile is a useful feature in dialect discrimination

Issue: RMs somewhat correlated

Future directions: Which RMs and combinations of RMs are indeed best and least redundant?

Examine whether these results hold for dialects collected in a single corpus

DISCUSSION

Proof of concept: Global temporal representations > local temporal representations for dialect discrimination

Demonstrates need for global temporal representation in automatic speaker and language recognition systems (some work done already)

Forensic application of RMs: directly interpretable, court presentable

Adami et al. 2003, Shriberg et al. 2005, Dehak et al. 2007

Thank you!

Thanks to:

Jess Wormald Paul Foulkes Peter French Sam Hellmuth

