An acoustic description of the vowels of Northern and Southern Standard Dutch
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A database is presented of measurements of the fundamental frequency, the frequencies of the first three formants, and the duration of the 15 vowels of Standard Dutch as spoken in the Netherlands (Northern Standard Dutch) and in Belgium (Southern Standard Dutch). The speech material consisted of read monosyllabic utterances in a neutral consonantal context (i.e., /sVs/). Recordings were made for 20 female talkers and 20 male talkers, who were stratified for the factors age, gender, and region. Of the 40 talkers, 20 spoke Northern Standard Dutch and 20 spoke Southern Standard Dutch. The results indicated that the nine monophthongal Dutch vowels /a e i ɛ ɪ u ɔ ɔ ʊ y/ can be separated fairly well given their steady-state characteristics, while the long mid vowels /e o ɔ/ and three diphthongal vowels /ɛɪ ɔu ɔɛy/ also require information about their dynamic characteristics. The analysis of the formant values indicated that Northern Standard Dutch and Southern Standard Dutch differ little in the formant frequencies at steady-state for the nine monophthongal vowels. Larger differences between these two language varieties were found for the dynamic specifications of the three long mid vowels, and, to a lesser extent, of the three diphthongal vowels.

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper presents a description of the acoustic characteristics of the 15 vowels of Standard Dutch as spoken in the Netherlands and in Belgium (Flanders). Previous descriptions of the vowels of Standard Dutch are given in Pols et al. (1973) and Van Nierop et al. (1973).\(^1\) These studies describe the Dutch vowels in terms of the average frequencies and standard deviations of the first three formants. Pols et al. recorded 1 token of the 12 monophthongal vowels in an /hVt/ context, produced by 50 male talkers, and Van Nierop et al. recorded one token of each of the 12 monophthongal vowels in an /hVt/ context, produced by 25 female talkers.

The acoustic measurements by Pols et al. (1973) and Van Nierop et al. (1973) have been recognized as representing the standard formant values for the vowels of Dutch and were used in studies on vowel perception and talker normalization (e.g., Disner, 1980; Syrdal and Gopal, 1986). However, in our view the description of the acoustic characteristics of the vowels of Dutch as presented by Pols et al. and Van Nierop et al. is limited in four respects:

(a) Pols et al. and Van Nierop et al. do not provide information about dynamic properties such as vowel duration and spectral change (formant measurements were presented for a single time slice); information that has been found to play a central role in vowel perception (Di Benedetto, 1989a, b; Hillenbrand and Gayvert, 1993; Nearey, 1989, Strange et al. 1983; Strange, 1989), and that reflects differences in language varieties (Hagiwara, 1997).

(b) Not all vowels of Dutch were included by Pols et al. and Van Nierop et al., as no description was given of the acoustic characteristics of the three diphthongs /ɛɪ ɔu ɔɛy/.

(c) No information is given in the two studies about the regional background of the talkers; the formant measurements described in Pols et al. and Van Nierop et al. may therefore display uncontrolled regional variation.\(^2\)

(d) No recordings were made of talkers from Flanders, the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium, thus excluding the southern variety of Standard Dutch from the description.

The purpose of the present study was twofold. First, we aim to give a description of the Dutch vowel sounds. In this description we want to improve on the four limitations mentioned above. Second, we aimed to give an overview of the similarities and dissimilarities of the vowel systems of Northern Standard Dutch and Southern Standard Dutch.

The present study was set up as follows. A total of 1200 vowel tokens were recorded, spoken by 40 talkers, 20 male talkers and 20 female talkers. These talkers were screened for their age, gender, regional background, and socioeconomic status. Each talker produced two tokens of all 15 vowel sounds of Dutch, /a e i ɛ ɪ u ɔ ɔ ʊ y/.

Each token was produced in a carrier sentence, in a /sVs/
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context. For each token, measurements were made of the duration, the fundamental frequency, and the first three formants at nine time slices in the vowel duration.

II. MATERIALS

A. Database design

Our materials were taken from a large database, comprising recordings of 160 talkers of standard Dutch who were stratified for the following sociological variables: speech community (country), regional background, gender, and age. All talkers were teachers of Dutch at secondary education institutes at the time the interview was recorded. They were required to be teachers of the Dutch language for three reasons. First, Dutch teachers are professional language users; they are expected to speak standard Dutch on a daily basis. Second, they are instructors of the standard language and can thus be regarded as having a normative role. Third, Dutch teachers’ speech was expected to show more regional variation than broadcasters’, whose speech is used in other pronunciation studies of the standard language (cf. Bell, 1983; Deterding, 1997).

There is a long-standing discussion whether the speech communities of the Netherlands and Flanders have one or two Dutch standard languages. It is evident that there is a Netherlandic and a Flemish standard variety, with clear differences on all linguistic levels, certainly on the phonetic level (cf. Van de Velde et al., 1997). The historical background of the development of the Dutch standard language in relation to the speech communities of the Netherlands and Flanders is too complex to summarize here. Van de Velde et al., (1997) present a short overview, including the relevant literature. Research data available produce convincing evidence that many differences exist between the two speech communities on the level of pronunciation. The data set was therefore split into a Dutch and a Belgian component, referred to as Northern Standard Dutch (NSD) and Southern Standard Dutch (SSD), respectively.

In each community, four regions were selected: a central region, an intermediate region, and two peripheral regions. The central region is the economically and culturally dominant region in each of the speech communities. For the Netherlands, the central region is the west, consisting of the provinces of Northern-Holland, Southern-Holland, and Utrecht, also known as the ‘Randstad,” referred to as “N-R” (Netherlands-Randstad). The cities Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Utrecht, and The Hague are part of the Randstad. In Flanders, the central region is “Brabant,” or “F-B” (Flanders-Brabant). Brabant comprises the Belgian provinces “Antwerpen” and “Flemish-Brabant,” with the cities of Antwerpen and Leuven, respectively.

In this paper, we limit our description of the acoustic characteristics of the vowel tokens produced by the 40 Dutch teachers from the two “central” regions N-R and F-B, respectively. Therefore, whenever we refer to Northern Standard Dutch, the N-R region is meant, and whenever we refer to Southern Standard Dutch, the F-B region is meant. See Adank (2003) for a description of the remaining six regions.

Several towns were selected per region, following three criteria. First, the selected towns in each region had a comparable socioeconomic profile. Second, the towns within each region belonged to the same dialect group. Third, the Dutch spoken in that town was regarded as characteristic of that region. No major cities were selected, because it was expected that the Dutch spoken in major cities is influenced by dialects (or languages) other than the dialects spoken in the surrounding region, due to migration. For N-R, two towns were selected: Alphen aan de Rijn and Gouda; for F-B the two towns selected were Lier and Heist-op-den-berg.

The teachers who participated in the interview taught at schools for secondary education in the selected towns. They had to meet the following requirements. First, at the time of the interview, they all lived in one of the selected towns, or near that town in the dialectal region characteristic for that region. Second, they were born in the region or moved there before their eighth birthday. Third, they had lived in the region for at least eight years prior to their 18th birthday. This last requirement was formulated on the basis of studies by Payne (1980) and by Scovel (1988). Payne stated that children younger than 8 years old have no difficulty acquiring the phonological system of the place they moved to. Scovel reported that learners of a second language generally do not acquire near-native pronunciation of this language after puberty. This last requirement was therefore used to make sure that the talkers had lived in the town/region from an age at which they had no difficulties in learning the language variety spoken in that region/town. Finally, the talkers were divided into two age groups, a younger group and an older group. The talkers in the younger group were between 22 and 44 years old at the time of the interview and talkers in the older group were between 45 and 60 years old. NSD and SSD thus both consisted of 20 talkers: five young men, five older men, five younger women, and five older women.

B. Recordings

Dutch vowels are traditionally divided into phonologically short vowels, /a e i o u y/, phonologically long vowels /a e i o u y/, diphthongs, /ei eu ey/, and schwa, /a/ (Booij, 1995). Recordings were made for all vowels except for schwa, because it does not occur in stressed syllables in Dutch. All target vowels were produced in a carrier sentence. The sentences had the following generic structure for the short vowels (“V” indicates the target vowel):

\[
\text{In } sVs \text{ en in } sVsse \text{ zit de } V
\]

\[
/\text{in } sVs \text{ en in } sVsse \text{ zit de } V/
\]

\[\text{[In } sVs \text{ and in } sVsse \text{ is the } V]\]

The sentences had the following structure for the long vowels and the diphthongs:

\[
\text{In } sVs \text{ en in } sVze \text{ zit de } V
\]

\[
/\text{in } sVs \text{ en in } sVze \text{ zit de } V/
\]

\[\text{[In } sVs \text{ and in } sVze \text{ is the } V]\]

Of the three different consonantal contexts (CVC, CVCC, or V), the CVC contexts were selected for further processing. The CVC structure /sVs/ can be regarded as a neutral context for Dutch vowels. It was decided not to use the “traditional” /hVd/ structure (/hVd/ for English), because it could not be predicted how people from Flanders would
pronounce the word-initial /h/. Almost all people interviewed in Flanders are originally dialect talkers; they usually speak Southern Standard Dutch as well as their (native) dialect. Some Flanders dialects do not have /h/ in their phoneme inventory. When asked to produce a word-initial /h/, Flemish dialect talkers tend to replace /h/ by either a glottal stop, or by /ŋ/. The /sVs/ context was adopted to make sure that no additional sources of variation were added to the data.

The vowel tokens were recorded as a task in a so-called “sociolinguistic interview” in which vowels and consonants were elicited in a wide variety of tasks. The carrier sentences were presented to the talker on a computer screen, with a three-second interval between sentences. When the talker made a mistake, the interviewer interrupted the computer program and went back at least two sentences and asked the talker to read these sentences again, to make sure that all sentences were recorded correctly. The carrier sentences task was performed twice during the interview; each vowel token was therefore available twice in each syllabic structure. A total of 1200 vowel tokens were recorded: two tokens of each of the 15 vowel categories of Dutch, produced by 40 talkers.

The recordings were made on DAT with a TASCAM DA-P1 portable DAT-recorder, with an AKG C420 Headset condenser microphone. The recordings were digitized through a Lucid Technology PC124 digital audio card, and stored at 48 kHz on a PowerMac 7500/100. The neutral context sentences were down-sampled to 16 kHz, using an non-causal FFT anti-aliasing filter set to 8 kHz.

Recording conditions were different for each of the talkers. Some were interviewed in an empty classroom and others were interviewed at their own home. Due to these differences in recording conditions, in rare cases, background noises were audible. Whenever this was the case, the speech segment was excluded from further analysis.

C. Acoustic measurements

1. Duration

The start and end times for the duration of each token were labeled manually in the digitized speech wave, using the program Praat, version 4.02 (Boersma, 2001). We define the duration as the interval between the onset and offset of the glottal vibrations of the vocalic portion of the /sVs/ syllable. When labeling, it was ensured that the surrounding speech sounds were not audible in the remaining signal. Segment labels were placed at zero crossings. The duration of each vowel segment was defined as the interval between the segment labels at the start and end of the vocalic portion.

2. Fundamental frequency

For each vowel token, F0 was extracted automatically with Praat using an autocorrelation-based procedure that was evaluated as the best option available in Praat (Boersma, 1993). The upper and lower limits for the autocorrelation peaks were set at 50 and 300 Hz for male talkers and at 100 and 500 Hz for female talkers, respectively. The size of the Hanning window was chosen such that it included at least three glottal pulses and was set to 60 ms for the male talkers and to 33.3 ms for the female talkers. F0 was extracted at the temporal mid-point of the vowel token’s duration.

The resulting measurements were checked for outliers (cases 1.5–3 times the interquartile range, or IQR), and extreme values (cases >3 IQR) for each talker. Every outlier and extreme value was manually verified. Eleven cases were replaced by the mean F0 for the talker, usually because of hoarseness) of the talker prevented reliable F0-estimation.

3. Formant contours

The formant contours for F1, F2, and F3 were estimated using a program for automatic formant tracking (Nearey et al., 2002).4 Nearey et al.’s program consists of two parts: a formant tracking algorithm and a user interface that allows the user to verify and, where necessary, adjust the formant tracks generated by the tracking algorithm. Its preprocessing consists of applying a 25-ms cosine4 window with a time-step of 2 ms. Subsequently, three formant candidates are estimated by means of root extraction, using a version of Markel and Gray’s (1976) “FORMNT” algorithm, followed by a five-point running median smoothing. The number of LPC coefficients is fixed at nine. For each vowel token, these settings were identical.

Some settings for Nearey et al.’s tracking algorithm are to be chosen by the user. The tracking program cycles through several cutoff frequencies for each individual vowel token. The frequency range consists of two parts, a lower range and an upper range. The lower range is fixed between 0 and 3000 Hz, while the upper range is to be set by the user between 3000 Hz and the highest cutoff frequency (hc) to be evaluated. Within this upper range (3000-hc) the user must also provide the total number of cutoff frequencies (nc) to be evaluated. Finally, the user has to decide whether the distance (d) between the cutoff frequencies is spaced logarithmically (Log) or linearly (Hz) across the upper range.

We evaluated several combinations of settings for hc, nc and d and found that the best results were obtained with hc set to 4200 Hz, nc set to 5, and d set to Log (Adank, 2003). Formant tracks for all vowel tokens were measured with these settings.

The resulting formant tracks for each vowel token were verified by hand in the user interface of the program. Here, the tracks were plotted on the smoothed spectrogram. The course of each track could be altered, which was done in 20%–25% of the cases.

Once the experimenter was satisfied with the position of the formant tracks, the frequencies of the first three formant tracks were stored at nine points (t1–t9) of the vowel’s duration, with the first point, t1, at the start of the vocalic portion of the token, and the ninth point, t9, at the end of the vocalic portion, and the remaining points spaced at equal-sized intervals, relative to the absolute duration of the token. Whenever we refer to the vowel’s temporal midpoint, the fifth point of the total of nine points, or t5, is meant. We only present results for points t3 (25%) through t7 (75%), because we suspected that, the measurements at that point were influenced less by the consonantal context than at t1 and t9, or even at t2 and t8.
TABLE I. Average durations (ms), fundamental frequencies (Hz), and formant frequencies (Hz) for the first three formants for the vowels tokens produced by the 20 NSD talkers and the 20 SSD talkers. F, female talkers; M, male talkers. Dur, duration. N per cell is 20. F0, F1, F2, and F3 were sampled at 50% (15) of the steady-state portion of each vowel token.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>F0</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>M0</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/æ/</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ı/</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. RESULTS

Table I gives the average measurement results for the true monophthongal vowels, for the five acoustic variables (duration, F0, F1, F2, and F3), taken at the temporal midpoint $t_5$ (50%), for the NSD and the SSD talkers. The average values at $t_3$ (25%) and $t_7$ (75%) for /o/ and /u/ are displayed in Table II.

1. Duration

Figure 1 shows the average durations for all 15 vowels for the male talkers and Fig. 2 for the female talkers. A first observation is that the vowels in Figs. 1 and 2 can roughly be divided into two groups based on their duration: long ones, i.e., the three diphthongal vowels /ei/ and /u/, the three long mid vowels /e/ and /o/ plus /æ/, and short ones, i.e., all full monophthongal vowels /æ/ and /i/ except /æ/. A series of $t$-tests was carried out to establish which vowel pairs differed significantly in duration. A total of 105 pairwise comparisons were carried out for the 15 vowels. These analyses were done separately for the NSD men, the NSD women, and the SSD men, and the SSD women. Because of the large number of analyses, a Bonferroni correction was carried out, setting the significance level to $\alpha=0.001$. The results showed that /æ/ and /e/ and /i/ all have significantly longer durations than /æ/ and /u/ for $t_7$.

Figures 1 and 2 further show longer durations for female SSD talkers, for a larger subset of the vowels. To test the significance of possible effects of regional background and gender, we carried out a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) on the duration measurements. In the ANOVA, the within-subject factor VOWEL consisted of the duration measurements for the 15 vowels, while the regional...

TABLE II. Average formant frequencies (Hz) for the first three formants for the vowels tokens produced by the 20 SSD talkers and the 20 SSD talkers. F, female talkers; M, male talkers. N per cell is 20. F1, F2, and F3 were sampled at 25%: “$t_3$” and 75%: “$t_7$” of the steady-state portion of each vowel token.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel</th>
<th>/æ/</th>
<th>/ı/</th>
<th>/u/</th>
<th>/æ/</th>
<th>/ı/</th>
<th>/u/</th>
<th>/æ/</th>
<th>/ı/</th>
<th>/u/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/æ/</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ı/</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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background of the talker (region) and the talker's gender (gender) served as between-subject factors. The analysis showed that the longer durations for the female talkers in Figs. 1 and 2 are significant: gender had a significant effect on duration ($F[1,36] = 5.77, p < 0.05$). Region, the interaction of gender$x$region, and the three-way interaction of vowel$x$region$x$gender were just not significant. Restricting the ANOVAs to pairs out of the four groups clearly indicated that one group was different from the other three: SSD women, who on average produce longer durations. Post-hoc analyses on the four groups for all 15 vowels reveal a clear pattern (Tukey, $\alpha=0.05$): SSD women have significantly longer durations compared to the other three groups for the diphthong "ei" and for the three high vowels /y $\ddot{o}$ u/.

The above results for the duration measurements can be summarized as follows. First, the 15 vowels fall into two groups based on their duration: longer ones /a $e$ $i$ u $\ddot{u}$ ey e o $\ddot{a}$/ and shorter ones /a $e$ $i$ u $\ddot{u}$ ey e o $. Second, female SSD talkers produced longer durations than male talkers for several vowels, indicating a more general effect for the whole set of long vowels and the high vowels. Longer vowel durations for female talkers were reported earlier in Hillenbrand et al. (1995). We, like Hillenbrand et al., cannot account for these gender-specific differences and we cannot predict whether a similar difference between male and female talkers in SSD would also be found in spontaneous speech.

Finally, it is not feasible to compare our results with those reported in Pols et al. (1973) and Van Nierop et al. (1973), because they did not include duration measurements in their description of the Dutch vowels.

### 2. Fundamental frequency

The average $F_0$ values for the male talkers are displayed in Fig. 3, whereas Fig. 4 gives the values for the female talkers. First, a regional difference can be observed in Fig. 3: average $F_0$ values for all vowels are lower for SSD, with differences ranging between 8 Hz (for $i$) and 25 Hz (for $e$). No such pattern can be observed for the female talkers in Fig. 4. A repeated measures ANOVA was carried out for the male and female talkers separately to evaluate whether there was an effect of region on $F_0$. In this ANOVA, vowel was composed of the 15 vowels and the regional background of the talker (region) served as a between-subject factor. The results show no significant effects for region. Further analysis showed that $F_0$ and duration correlate: vowels with a low average $F_0$ in Figs. 3 and 4 generally show longer durations in ms in Figs. 1 and 2. Pearson’s $r$ was computed for $F_0$ and
duration for the NSD women ($-0.468$), NSD men ($-0.480$), SSD women ($-0.284$), and SSD men ($-0.331$), across all vowel tokens. All correlations were significant at $p<0.05$. This phenomenon is also known as vowel-intrinsic $F_0$, and it was reported to occur in many languages [cf. Whalen and Levitt (1995) for an overview]. Finally, it was again not possible to compare our results with those in Pols et al. (1973) and Van Nierop et al. (1973), because they did not include fundamental frequency measurements in their description.

3. Formant frequencies

a) Steady-state. Figures 5 (male talkers) and 6 (female talkers) show acoustic vowel diagrams for the nine monophthongal vowels at 50% ($t_5$); the long mid vowels /e ø ø/ and the three diphthongal vowels /ei ø ø ø/ were excluded, because we suspected that these six vowels show considerable diphthongization.

It is not easy to provide a concise description of the variation patterns in Figs. 5 and 6. Still, some general tendencies can be observed. Overall, Fig. 5 shows that the shape and size of the vowel systems for both language varieties for the male talkers are roughly similar, although /u/ for NSD shows a higher average $F_2$. Large differences can also be seen for /i/ and /u/, and /i/ and /u/ for /1/ as well as for /F/. For the female talkers in Fig. 6, the overall shape and size of the vowel systems for NSD and SSD appear to differ little; the locations of the point vowels /i a u/ are roughly equal for both varieties. Larger differences can be observed for /i/ and /u/; average $F_2$ is higher and average $F_1$ is lower for /h/ for NSD, and average $F_1$ and $F_2$ for more for SSD for /y/. Finally, Fig. 6 shows that /h/ and /t/ differ mainly in their average $F_1$ and less in their average $F_2$.

b) Spectral change. Figure 7 gives the average frequencies for /1/ and /F/ at 25% and 75% in the vowel duration ($t_3$ and $t_7$, respectively). Figure 7 presents spectral change for the three full diphthongs, for the male and female talkers, respectively. Figure 8 shows the spectral change for the three long mid vowels, for the male and female talkers.

To evaluate whether there are systematic differences in the spectral change patterns of the two regions and the two genders depicted in Figs. 7 and 8, five ANOVAS (repeated measures) were carried out, three for the diphthongal vowels /ei ø ø ø/ and two for the long mid vowels /e ø ø/. The within-subject factor consisted of a measure for the spectral change in each vowel token, which was defined as the absolute difference of the formant frequency between 25% and 75% of the vowel duration in Hz. Thus $\Delta F_1$ is the absolute difference in Hz between the values of $F_1$ at $t_3$ and at $t_7$, and $\Delta F_2$ is the absolute difference in Hz between the values of $F_2$ at $t_3$ and at $t_7$. The first ANOVA for the diphthongal vowels tested possible effects of the between-subject factors region and gender and the within-subject factor vowel, on the change in the first formant frequency $\Delta F_1$. The results showed an effect for region ($F[1, 36] = 7.15$, $p<0.05$) and an interaction effect for gender×region ($F[1, 36] = 4.42$, $p<0.05$). The significance of the interaction between gender and region indicates that the effect of region on $\Delta F_1$ is
also found for the ANOVA with D5 (results showed an effect of region for the female talkers). Note, with region as the sole between-subject factor. The ANOVA was repeated for the male and female talkers separately, with region as the sole between-subject factor. The ANOVA showed no significant effects for ΔF2. The final two analyses were set up as the first two, only this time the analyses were carried out on the vowels /e o y/ for ΔF1 and ΔF2, respectively. The results for the ANOVA with ΔF1 for /e o y/ showed an effect for region (F[1,36] = 33.53). An effect for region was also found for the ANOVA with ΔF1 for /e o y/ (F[1,36] = 18.51, p<0.05).

In summary, the following spectral change patterns were found. First, for the diphthongal vowels /ei œy œu/, greater diphthongization of F1 was found for the female NSD talkers as opposed to the female SSD talkers, whereas no such region effect was found for the male talkers. Second, the long mid vowels /e o y/ showed more diphthongization of F1 and F2 for NSD than for SSD, for both genders.

C. Comparison with Pols et al. (1973) and Van Nierop et al. (1973). Figure 9 gives the acoustic vowel diagram for the nine monophthongal vowels at 50% (i5) for our male talkers plus the Pols et al.’s male talkers. Figure 10 gives the acoustic vowel diagram for the nine monophthongal vowels at 50% (i5) for our female talkers plus Van Nierop et al.’s female talkers. A first general observation from Fig. 9 is that all average formant values for Pols et al.’s data are higher for F1. The vowels /a ae œ/ show lower average values for F2 for Pols et al.’s data. Figure 10 shows a different variation pattern in the vowel systems for the women than the one observed for the men in Fig. 9. Higher average values for F1 for /a ae œ/ and lower values for F2 for the vowels /a ae œ/ can be observed in Fig. 10. Overall, the vowel diagrams for our data appear smaller than Pols et al.’s and Van Nierop et al.’s, possibly indicating a more “casual” speaking style in our data. It is unclear what caused the other differences between the two data sets. One possible cause may be that the pronunciation of the Dutch vowels has changed in the three decades since Pols et al. and Van Nierop et al. made their recordings. In our opinion, however, it seems more likely that the observed differences are due to differences in the consonantal context of the vowels (hVt/ vs. /sVs/), or to uncontrolled regional variation in Pols et al.’s and Van Nierop et al.’s data, or to differences in the techniques used to estimate the formant frequencies. Given these variation sources, we decided not to further analyze differences between our data and data described in Pols et al. and Van Nierop et al.

IV. DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

We carried out a series of quadratic discriminant analyses (QDAs) to establish how well the vowels could be separated based on various combinations of acoustic characteristics. We evaluated steady-state characteristics, i.e., F0 and F1.

![FIG. 7. Spectral change patterns for the three diphthongal vowels /ei œy œu/ for NSD and SSD for the men (left panel) and the women (right panel). The phonetic symbol at the end of each line is plotted at the average formant frequency at 75% of the vowel duration and each line originates from the average formant frequencies at 25% of the vowel duration. The larger symbols refer to NSD and the smaller symbols refer to SSD. ei refers to /lei/.

![FIG. 8. Spectral change patterns for the three long mid vowels, /e o y/ for NSD and SSD for the men (left panel) and the women (right panel). The phonetic symbol at the end of each line is plotted at the average formant frequency at 75% of the vowel duration and each line originates from the average formant frequencies at 25% of the vowel duration. The larger symbols refer to NSD and the smaller symbols refer to SSD.]}
TABLE III. Percent correctly classified vowel tokens for the quadratic discriminant analyses for the NSD vowel tokens (N = 600) and the SSD vowel tokens (N = 600). The data were classified into 1 of the 15 vowel categories, or into 1 of 9 monophthongal vowel categories /a e i o u y/ ("9 vowels"). The parameters were sampled at one point in the vowel duration: "i5" (50% of the vowel duration), or at two points "t3 + t7" (25% and 75%). For NSD, all percentages higher than 62.9% are significantly higher than the baseline (59.0%); for SSD all percentages higher than 58.2% are significantly higher than the baseline (54.2%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>NSD</th>
<th>SSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1, F2</td>
<td>15 vowels</td>
<td>t5</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F0, F1, F2</td>
<td>15 vowels</td>
<td>t5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1, F2, F3</td>
<td>15 vowels</td>
<td>t5</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F0, F1, F2, F3</td>
<td>15 vowels</td>
<td>t5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1, F2, F3, dur</td>
<td>15 vowels</td>
<td>t3 + t7</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1, F2</td>
<td>9 vowels</td>
<td>t5</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1, F2, F3</td>
<td>9 vowels</td>
<td>t5</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1, F2, F3, dur</td>
<td>15 vowels</td>
<td>t5</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F0, F1, F2, F3, dur</td>
<td>15 vowels</td>
<td>t5</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F1 – F3 sampled at 50% of the vowel duration (t5), as well as dynamic specifications, i.e., the duration and F1 – F3 sampled at 25% and 75% of the duration (t3 and t7). Table III shows that including only F1 and F2 at t5 yields 59.0% for NSD and 54.2% for SSD. Including F0 in the set led to a small improvement for NSD and a considerable improvement for SSD. Entering the parameter set consisting of F1, F2, and F3 led to improvements for both language varieties as compared to entering only F1 and F2. Entering F0, F1, F2, and F3 led to another improvement in the scores. To find out whether the results would improve when the three mid vowels and the three full diphthongal vowels are excluded, the QDA for the parameters F1 and F2 was repeated using only the nine monophthongal vowels. The results show a remarkable improvement over those carried out using all 15 vowels, for both language varieties. However, the improvement is considerably higher for NSD. Adding F3 led to a further improvement, especially for SSD. The next QDA was carried out using F1, F2, and F3 and duration as predictor variables, using all 15 vowels at t5, to evaluate the role of duration. For this parameter set, a considerable improvement was found as compared to including only F1, F2, and F3 as parameters. Furthermore, when F0 is added as well as F1, F2, F3, and duration, some improvement is again found, but this time only for SSD (85.3% to 88.8%); for NSD the percentage is lower (90.0% to 89.3%). It is unclear why the percentage for NSD is lower, but since it only is a small difference (0.7%) not much weight should be attributed to it. The improvement for SSD is attributable to including F0. It appears that F0 plays a greater role in distinguishing vowels in SSD than in NSD, whenever F0 is added to a parameter set, the improvement is largest for SSD. Duration, on the other hand, seems to play a greater role in distinguishing vowels for NSD; improvements for NSD are largest for NSD whenever duration is added to a parameter set. Finally, when the last analysis is repeated with all parameters at t3 and t7, the highest percents correctly classified are obtained for both language varieties. Note that the relative improvements are highest for SSD, which is remarkable given the finding that SSD shows less diphthongization of F1 and F2 for the long mid vowels and the diphthongal vowels.

The results in Table III can be interpreted as follows: first, it appears that the nine monophthongal vowels could be separated reasonably well using only steady-state F1 and F2, although a higher percent correctly classified vowel tokens was obtained for NSD. Second, the three long mid vowels and the three full diphthongal vowels could be separated fairly well when dynamic properties such as duration and dynamic spectral information were included in the analysis, although again the percent correctly classified vowel tokens was highest for NSD. It could thus be the case that the vowel system for NSD requires more information about dynamic properties (especially for the three long mid vowels and the three diphthongs) in order to be separated acoustically.

V. DISCUSSION

The purpose of this paper was twofold: to give a description of the acoustic characteristics of all 15 Dutch vowel
sounds and to provide an overview of similarities and dissimilarities of the vowel systems of Northern Standard Dutch and Southern Standard Dutch. The results for the first aim were as follows.

First, the 15 vowels of Dutch could be divided into two groups depending on their duration. The group of shorter vowels consists of all full monophthongal vowels /y i u e ɔ ɔ y u/ except for /a/, while the group of long vowels consists of the three diphthongal vowels /o ο e u/, the three long mid vowels /o o e/ and /a/i y u. This phonetic pattern in the relative duration is only partially compatible with the phonological characteristics of Dutch vowels as described in Booij (1995), where the set of long vowels includes, besides /o o e/, also /i y u/. Our results also deviate slightly from the description provided by Koopmans-van Beinum (1980) and Rietveld et al. (in press). Koopmans-van Beinum and Rietveld et al. suggest that Dutch vowels can be divided into three groups: short, /a e ɛ y i u/, half-long, /i y u/, and long, /a e ɔ y u/ plus /ɛ ɔ ο e u/. If we pool the short and half-long vowels, the system by Koopmans-van Beinum and Rietveld et al. is compatible with our findings. This applies to three of the four groups of talkers. The results for the female SSD talkers conform the pattern found by Koopmans-Van Beinum and Rietveld et al. Nevertheless, it remains uncertain whether the pattern we reported for the relative average durations would also occur for data in other consonantal contexts and in spontaneous speech. Further research is required to investigate which patterns would occur in other speech samples.

Second, the nine monophthongal vowels of Dutch, /a a e ɛ i y u y y/, could be separated fairly well based on their steady-state characteristics for their first two formants frequencies alone, while the three long mid vowels and three diphthongal vowels required information about their dynamic characteristics as well. The long mid vowels cannot be described adequately acoustically by their steady-state characteristics alone. We suggest that the three long mid vowels for Dutch should therefore not be treated as monophthongal vowels, but instead as semi-diphthongal vowels, when describing Dutch vowels acoustically. This is especially the case for NSD. The diphthongization of /e o o/ is most likely the result of a vowel shift. It is not clear whether the long mid vowels showed (early) signs of the process of diphthongization in Pols et al.’s and Van Nierop et al.’s descriptions three decades earlier. Pols et al. excluded the full diphthongs /e ɔ ο e y y/; but included the three long mid vowels. However, in their Fig. 3, considerable overlap can be observed in the vowel plot between /e/ and /ɪ/, and between /o/ and /ɔ/ (denoted in Pols et al. by “œ”), and /ɔ/ and /o/ (denoted in Pols et al. by “œ”). Furthermore, Pols et al. remark, “...the vowels in these three pairs have very similar formant frequencies and levels. The main difference between them is duration.” Nevertheless, it is not possible to establish whether /e o o/ can be distinguished from /ɪ ο o/, respectively, through their dynamic characteristics as well as by their duration, because Pols et al. and Van Nierop et al. do not present the formant frequencies at different time slices.

Regarding the second aim of this study, the difference between the two language varieties, the results were as follows. A first difference between the NSD and SSD was found for the duration of the three full diphthongs /e ɔ ο e y y/; the durations for the SSD talkers were longer for all three diphthongs, especially for the female talkers. The comparisons indicated further that NSD and SSD differ little in the steady-state characteristics of the nine monophthongal vowels; the main difference between both varieties was found for the three long mid vowels and the three full diphthongs. For the three diphthongs, more diphthongization (i.e., larger excursions) of the first formant was found for the female NSD talkers than for the female SSD talkers. No such effect was found for the male talkers. Overall, vowels produced by all NSD talkers show more diphthongization than vowels produced by SSD talkers. The differences between NSD and SSD were largest for the three long mid vowels. The results for the duration and dynamic spectral characteristic may be related: the longer durations for the diphthongal vowels for SSD may be used to compensate for the smaller amount of diphthongization for the SSD diphthongal vowels. Further research on other speech samples is necessary to evaluate the hypothesis that NSD and SSD use different quantity distinctions.

A comparison of our data with the data described in Pols et al. and Van Nierop et al. showed differences in the average frequencies of the nine monophthongal vowels. Most vowels show higher values for F1 for Pols et al.’s and Van Nierop et al.’s. In addition, Pols et al. and Van Nierop et al. show lower values for F2 for some vowels (especially for /a a ɔ/). We suggested three possible causes for the observed differences: a change in the pronunciation of the vowels, differences between the two data sets, such as the surrounding consonants (/sVt/ vs. /hVt/), or uncontrolled regional variation in Pols et al.’s and Van Nierop et al.’s data.

The present study is limited in that it describes the acoustic characteristics of the vowels of Dutch in read speech and in a fixed consonantal context only. It would be interesting to compare the acoustic characteristics of the vowels of the present study with other vowel tokens produced by the same talkers in different consonantal context and speaking styles. During the sociolinguistic interview in which our vowel data was obtained, recordings were also made of (guided) spontaneous conversations. We plan to extend our study in the near future and analyze the acoustic characteristics of vowel in these spontaneous speech samples as well. Finally, it was not feasible to provide a complete overview of all the variation patterns in all eight regional varieties in our data set in the present study. However, the individual measurements for all 160 speakers can be obtained by contacting the first or second author.
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1Pols, Trom and Plomp (1973) used the vowel set of the 50 male talkers described in Klein, Plomp, and Pols (1970).

2Klein, Plomp, and Pols (1970) talkers are described as “The 50 speakers were young male adults with a pronunciation representative of correct Dutch.”

3No recordings were made for the so-called “marginal” vowels of Dutch, i.e., the vowels /eː, ɨː, ðː/ and the nasalized versions of the vowels /eː, ɨː, ðː/ which all occur only in loan words in Dutch (Gussenhoven, 1999).

4It was not feasible to include measurements of F4, because these could not be obtained in the program used for the formant estimation.


