PROSODIC DEVELOPMENT IN NORMAL ARABIC SPEAKING CHILDREN

Thesis

Submitted for partial fulfillment of M.D. in Phoniatrics

By

Safinaz Nagib Azab

(M.B., B.Ch., M.Sc)

Supervised by

Prof. Dr. Maged Bahgat Amr Bahgat

Professor of ENT
Faculty of Medicine- Cairo University

Prof. Dr. Ashraf Mahmoud Khaled

Professor of ENT Faculty of Medicine- Beni Suef University

Prof. Dr. Azza Adel Aziz

Assistant Prof. of Phoniatrics Faculty of Medicine- Cairo University

Prof. Dr. Dalia Mostafa Ahmed

Assistant Prof. of Phoniatrics
Faculty of Medicine- Cairo University

Faculty of Medicine Cairo University 2010

Contents

| | | Page |
|---|---|------|
| • | Introduction | 1 |
| | Aim of the work | 7 |
| • | Review of Literature | 0 |
| | ✓ What is prosody? | 8 |
| | The Phonetic basis of supra-segmental features: | 12 |
| | 1. Pitch | 13 |
| | 2. Duration | 14 |
| | 3. Loudness | 16 |
| | 4. Pitch patterns | 17 |
| | ✓ The systemic organization of prosody | 29 |
| | ✓ Tone languages and Pitch accent languages | 24 |
| | 1. Tone languages | 24 |
| | 2. Pitch accent languages | 26 |
| | ✓ Prosody in Arabic language | 28 |
| | Historical study | 28 |
| | Prosodic parameters | 29 |
| | Sound length or duration | 29 |
| | 2. The syllables | 30 |
| | Kinds of Arabic syllables | 32 |
| | 3. Intonation | 32 |
| | a. Units of intonation | 33 |
| | b. Contour types | 34 |
| | 4. Tempo | 36 |
| | 5.a.Speaking Rate | 37 |
| | 5.b. Duration of sounds and syllables | 38 |
| | 6. Stress | 38 |
| | 6.a. Word stress | 39 |
| | 6.b. Arabic word stress | 40 |
| | 6.c. Sentences stress | 42 |
| | 6.d. Stress Transition | 42 |
| | 7. Rhythm | 43 |
| | ✓ Prosodic Development in children | 44 |
| | 1. Prosodic Development in English | 46 |
| | 2. Prosodic development in Hebrew | 47 |
| | 3. Prosodic development in other | 49 |
| | languages . | |

| | 4. Prosodic development in Arabic | 50 |
|---|------------------------------------|-----|
| | 4.a.Prosodic word acquisition | 50 |
| | 4.b.Functional prosody acquisition | 51 |
| | 4.b.1.Grammatical | 51 |
| | 4.b.2.Attitudal or Emotional | 51 |
| | 4.b.3.Semantic | 51 |
| | 4.b.4.Social | 51 |
| | 4.b.5.Psychological | 52 |
| | ✓ Assessment of prosody | 53 |
| • | Subjects and Methods | 57 |
| | ✓ Methodology | 57 |
| | ✓ Selection Criteria | 57 |
| | ✓ Tests used in this study | 58 |
| | ✓ Statistical analysis | 64 |
| • | Results | 68 |
| • | Discussion | 125 |
| • | Conclusion | 144 |
| • | Recommendations | 147 |
| • | Summary | 149 |
| • | References | 155 |
| • | Arabic references | 165 |
| - | Arabic summary | |
| _ | Alabio Salililai y | |

Acknowledgement

First and foremost thanks to Allah the most Beneficent and merciful.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to **Prof. Dr. Maged Bahgat Amr Bahgat**, Prof. of ENT, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, for his valuable guidance and supervision throughout this work in spite of his responsibilities. It is a pleasure to work under his supervision.

I would like also to express my deepest gratitude and great thanks to **Prof. Dr. Ashraf Khaled** Prof. ENT, Faculty of Medicine, Beni Suif University.

I am very much indebted to **Dr. Azza Adel Aziz** Assistant Prof. of phoniatrics, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University for her kind supervision, valuable advice, constructive criticism and indispensable help throughout this work.

My deep gratitude, appreciation and thanks go to **Dr. Dalia Mostafa** Assistant Prof. of Phoniatrics, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, for her kind instructions and advice that were very valuable both in selecting and completing this work.

I also extend my great thanks to **Prof. Dr. Hossam El Dessoukiy** Prof. Of phoniatrics, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, for his generous help and continuous support throughout this work.

To

My Great Parents

My Dear Brothers

My Wonderful Husband

And

My Lovely Sweetly Daughters

List of Tables

| Number | Title of table | Page |
|--------|--|------|
| 1 | Comparison between the age and the gender | |
| | among the four groups under the study. | 70 |
| 2 | Comparison between subjective prosodic skills | |
| | and their acoustic parameters among groups I | 72 |
| | (2-3 years) and II (3-4 years) under the study. | |
| 3 | Comparison between subjective prosodic skills | |
| | and their acoustic parameters among groups II | 78 |
| | (3-4 years) and III (4-5 years) under the study. | |
| 4 | Comparison between subjective prosodic | |
| | skills and their acoustic parameters among | 82 |
| | groups III (4-5 years) and IV (5-6 years) under | |
| | the study. | |
| 5 | Comparison between subjective prosodic skills | |
| | and their acoustic parameters among the four | 86 |
| | groups under the study. | |
| 6 | Correlation between age and all subjective | |
| | prosodic skills and their acoustic parameters | 88 |
| | among group I (2-3 years) under the study. | |
| 7 | Correlation between age and all subjective | |
| | prosodic skills and their acoustic parameters | 91 |
| | among group II (3-4 years) under the study. | |
| | | |
| | | |

| 8 | Correlation between each subjective prosodic skill score and its acoustic assessment parameters among group II (3-4years) under the study. | 94 |
|----|--|-----|
| 9 | Correlation between age and all subjective prosodic skills and their acoustic parameters among group III (4-5 years) under the study. | 116 |
| 10 | Correlation between each subjective prosodic skill score and its acoustic assessment parameters in group III (4-5 years) under the study. | 120 |
| 11 | Correlation between age and all subjective prosodic skills and acoustic parameters among group IV (5-6 years) under the study. | 123 |
| 12 | The ages of normal prosodic skills development in Arabic speaking children. | 125 |

List of figures

| Number | Title of figure | Page |
|--------|--|------|
| 1 | Comparison between ages of the four groups under the | |
| | study. | 69 |
| 2 | Comparison between genders of the four groups under | |
| | the study. | 69 |
| 3 | Comparison between all subjective prosodic skills | |
| | among the four groups under the study. | 74 |
| 4 | Comparison between objective parameter- duration- of | |
| | all prosodic skills among the four groups under the | 74 |
| | study. | |
| 5 | Comparison between the objective parameter- pitch- of | |
| | all prosodic skills among the four groups under the | 75 |
| | study. | |
| 6 | Comparison between the objective parameter- energy- | |
| | of all prosodic skills among the four groups under the | 75 |
| | study. | |
| 7 | Correlation between age and total score of Subjective | |
| | prosodic skills in group I under the study. | 88 |
| 8 | Correlation between age and total score of Subjective | |
| | prosodic skills in group II under the study. | 91 |
| 9 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| | And mean-duration (objective ass.) of emotional status | 94 |
| | in group II under the study. | |
| 10 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) and | |
| | mean-pitch (objective ass.) of emotional status in | 94 |
| | group II under the study. | |

| 11 | Correlation between total score (Subjective ass.) And | |
|----|---|----|
| | mean-energy (objective ass.) of emotional status in | 95 |
| | group II under the study. | |
| 12 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| | And verbal disapproval mean - pitch (objective ass.) in | 95 |
| | group II under the study. | |
| 13 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| | And verbal disapproval means energy (objective ass.) | 96 |
| | in group II under the study. | |
| 14 | Correlation between verbal exclamation score | |
| | (Subjective ass.) And it's mean-duration (objective | 96 |
| | ass.) in group II under the study. | |
| 15 | Correlation between verbal exclamation score | |
| | (Subjective ass.) And it's mean pitch (objective ass.) in | 97 |
| | group II under the study. | |
| 16 | Correlation between verbal exclamation score | |
| | (Subjective ass.) And it's mean energy (objective ass.) | 97 |
| | in group II under the study. | |
| 17 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| | And verbal exclamation mean – duration (objective | |
| | ass.) in group II under the study. | 98 |
| 18 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| | And verbal exclamation mean - pitch (objective ass.) in | 98 |
| | group II under the study. | |
| 19 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| | And verbal exclamation means – energy (objective | 99 |
| | ass.) in group II under the study. | |
| | | |
| | | |

| 20 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
|----|--|-------|
| 20 | , , , | 00 |
| | And wishful thinking mean – duration (objective ass.) in | 99 |
| | group II under the study. | |
| 21 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| | And wishful thinking mean - pitch (objective ass.) in | 100 |
| | group II under the study. | |
| 22 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| | And wishful thinking mean - energy (objective ass.) in | 100 |
| | group II under the study. | |
| 23 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| | And question form mean – duration (objective ass.) in | 101 |
| | group II under the study. | |
| 24 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| 24 | , , , | 404 |
| | And question form mean - pitch (objective ass.) in | 101 |
| | group II under the study. | |
| 25 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| | And question form mean - energy (objective ass.) in | 102 |
| | group II under the study. | 102 |
| 26 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| | And exceptional indicator mean - duration (objective | 102 |
| | ass.) in group II under the study. | |
| 27 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| | And exceptional indicator means - Pitch (objective ass.) | 103 |
| | in group II under the study. | |
| 28 | Correlation between total score of (Subjective ass.) | |
| | And exceptional indicator means - energy (objective | 103 |
| | ass.) in group II under the study. | - • • |
| | door, in group it direct the study. | |
| | | |

| 29 | Correlation between demonstrative pronounces score | |
|----|---|-----|
| | (Subjective ass.) And mean-duration (objective ass.) in | 104 |
| | group II under the study. | |
| 30 | Correlation between demonstrative pronounces score | |
| | (Subjective ass.) And mean pitch (objective ass.) in | 104 |
| | group II under the study. | |
| 31 | Correlation between demonstrative pronounces score | |
| | (Subjective ass.) And mean energy (objective ass.) in | 105 |
| | group II under the study. | |
| 32 | Correlation between total score (Subjective ass.) And | |
| | demonstrative pronounce mean - duration (objective | 105 |
| | ass.) in group II under the study. | |
| 33 | Correlation between total score (Subjective ass.) And | |
| | demonstrative pronounce mean - pitch (objective ass.) | |
| | in group II under the study. | 106 |
| 34 | Correlation between total score (Subjective ass.) And | |
| | demonstrative pronounce mean - energy (objective | 106 |
| | ass.) in group II under the study. | |
| 35 | Correlation between total score (Subjective ass.) And | 40= |
| | embedded phrases mean - duration (objective ass.) in | 107 |
| 36 | group II under the study. | |
| | Correlation between total score (Subjective ass.) And | 107 |
| | embedded phrases mean - pitch (objective ass.) in group II under the study. | 101 |
| 37 | Correlation between total score (Subjective ass.) And | |
| | embedded phrases mean - energy (objective ass.) in | 108 |
| | group II under the study. | |
| 38 | Correlation between total score (Subjective ass.) and | |
| | warning speech mean - duration (objective ass.) in | 108 |
| | group II under the study. | |

| 39 | Correlation between total score (Subjective ass.) And warning speech mean - pitch (objective ass.) in group II | 109 |
|----|--|-----|
| | under the study. | |
| 40 | Correlation between total score (Subjective ass.) And | |
| | warning speech mean - energy (objective ass.) in group | 109 |
| | Il under the study. | |
| 41 | Correlation between total score (Subjective ass.) And | |
| | negation mean - duration (objective ass.) in group II | 440 |
| | under the study. | 110 |
| 42 | Correlation between total score (Subjective ass.) And | |
| | negation mean - pitch (objective ass.) in group II under | 110 |
| | the study. | |
| 43 | Correlation between total score (Subjective ass.) And | |
| | negation means - energy (objective ass.) in group II | 111 |
| | under the study. | |
| 44 | Correlation between age and total score of Subjective | |
| | prosodic skills in group III under the study. | 117 |
| 45 | Correlation between embedded phrases score | |
| | (Subjective ass.) And embedded phrases mean pith | 120 |
| | (objective ass.) in group III under the study. | |
| 46 | Correlation between age and total score of Subjective | |
| | prosodic skills in group IV under the study. | 124 |
| 47 | The ages of normal prosodic skills | 125 |
| | development in Arabic speaking children. | |
| | | |

INTRODUCTION

Arabic is now the old Semitic language with a history spread over one and half millennium. The first and foremost distinguishing character of Arabic is its historic continuation. Since its emergence as a dynamic language before advent of Islam, it remained unaffected by different changes on both political and cultural fronts. It proved its utility by defying the low of nature and stood the challenge of ever-spinning cycle of change. In the context of language, from linguistic point of view it is very strange and unique phenomenon that a language maintains its whole structural entity, its phonology, meanings and syntax for such along period (*Quiz, 2001*).

Despite of being the language of over 300 million people, Arabic phonology and phonetics have always been underinvestigated, in the phoniatrics field, in comparison to other languages derived from different origins especially from Latin origin. Semantics, syntactic, pragmatic, phonological and prosodic rules that apply to those languages are quite different from Arabic. Phonology and prosody in particular, have their extensive differences, as Arabic contains unique phonemes that are not used in many other languages. Different vowel system, appearance of many clusters and glottal stops at the middle and end of words, different tone types, different places of tonic accent, all have contributed to it being a completely different case in which regular rules do not apply (*El-Ani*, 1983).

Arabic and its relation to the other Semitic languages:

The Semitic languages are usually classified into East Semitic (consisting of Assyrian with its two dialects, Assyrian and Babylonian) and West Semitic (Consisting of North West Semitic and Southwest Semitic). Arabic is one of the Southwest Semitic languages, which are, sometimes, referred to as North Arabic to differentiate it from South Arabian (which is very different and unintelligible to North Arabic speakers, even though it contains many Arabic lexemes due to the influence of Islam). The Semitic family of languages operate on root + vocalic pattern principle, with Arabic being the most systematic representative of the famous triconsonantal system and the one usually used by linguists as typically illustrative of Semitic.

Arabic is the Semitic or indeed the Afro-Asiatic language with by far the greatest number of speakers, probably in excess of 300 million. It is the major language throughout the Arab world. It is even the major language of a non Arab country such as the republic of Chad in central Africa. As a minority language, Arabic is spoken and widely studied in other nations in Africa and Asia. Furthermore, it is in wide use throughout the Muslim world as a second language and as a learned, liturgical language (e.g. in Pakistan, India, Tanzania, or Indonesia) (*Kaye*, 1997).

There are from purely descriptive point of view, many recognizably distinct, major Arabic dialects. The peripheral Arabic dialects are, in fact, so radically different from those of the main Middle Eastern core that they are better referred to as separate

languages, by any satisfactory definition of what a language is (Kaye, 1994).

Arabic as Central Semitic:

According to **Robert Hetzron's** innovative classification of *Semitic Languages* (2002), Arabic shares traits of both South Semitic and North Semitic. It shares features with Hebrew, Ugaritic, and Aramaic, such as the masculine plural suffix and the internal passive. The morphology of the definitive article in Hebrew and Arabic also points to a common origin. The consonantal segments of a fairly educated pronunciation of Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), identical in most respects to Classical Arabic (CA). Modern Standard Arabic differs from Classical Arabic mainly in vocabulary and in stylistic devices, its phonology is essentially the same and its prosody is more or less also, the same.

Domains of Language Development:

Language is an arbitrary symbolic system which pairs sound to meaning and it is used as an expressive and verbal code to impress the receiver's mental state (*Kotby*, 1987). These codes, when familiar and understood by both the speaker and listener, make communication successful. In other definition, language refers to the system of spoken symbols organized within the brain. It is a system of communication where by speakers and hearers, using a set of internalized operations can relate sounds and meanings (*Bulter et al.*, 2002). Language categories are: language content (semantics), language form (syntax), language use in social contexts