

29th Conference of
The International Association for Forensic Phonetics and
Acoustics
22nd August – 25th August 2021, Marburg

**preliminary
abstract booklet
for posters**

IAFPA 2021
22nd August – 25th August 2021, Marburg
– Final Program –

Sunday , 22th August 2021

18:00 Registration + Welcome
 Crash course Gathertown and Webex
 19:00 The Tonight Show starring Gea de Jong-Lendle hosting two mystery guests
 Open End Gathertown remains open throughout the conference

Monday , 23rd August 2021

08:45 Crash course Webex

09:00 Welcome	Chair Director Research Centre Deutscher Sprachatlas , Philipps-University Marburg Senior Advisor for Serious Crime - Hessisches Landeskriminalamt	Gea de Jong-Lendle Prof Alfred Lameli Kriminalhauptkommissar Klaus Lochhas
09:30 Keynote 1	Michael Jessen	Two issues on the combination between automatic and auditory-acoustic methods in forensic voice comparison
10:30 Talk 1	Peter French, Jessica Wormald, Katherine Earnshaw, Philip	An Empirical Basis for System Validation and Proficiency Testing in the UK
10:55	BREAK	
11:30 Talk 2	Christin Kirchhübel and Georgina Brown	Competency Testing: Opportunities and Challenges
11:55 Talk 3	Richard Rhodes	Project proposal for IAFPA-led collaboration on method testing and validation
12:20 Talk 4	Sula Ross, Georgina Brown and Christin Kirchhübel	Voicing Concerns: Data protection principles and forensic speech science
12:45	LUNCH	
13:45	Poster session 1	
14:45	BREAK	
15:15 Talk 5	Anil Alexander, Finnian Kelly and Erica Gold	A WYRED connection: x-vectors and forensic speech data
15:40 Talk 6	Bruce Xiao Wang and Vincent Hughes	System performance as a function of score skewness, calibration and sample size in forensic voice comparison
16:05 Talk 7	Zhenyu Wang and John H.L. Hansen	Impact of Naturalistic Field Acoustic Environments on Forensic Text-independent Speaker Verification System
16:30	BREAK	
16:50 Talk 8	Tomáš Nechanský, Tomáš Bořil, Alžběta Růžičková, Radek Skarnitzl and Vojtěch Skořepa	The effect of language and temporal mismatch on LTF and ASR analyses
17:15 Talk 9	Linda Gerlach, Tom Coy, Finnian Kelly, Kirsty McDougall and Anil Alexander	How does the perceptual similarity of the relevant population to a questioned speaker affect the likelihood ratio?
17:45 Zumba (15Min)	Dr. Zumba	Something for your mental and physical wellbeing: Get those old bones moving!

Tuesday , 24th August 2021

09:30 Talk 10	Conor Clements, Deborah Loakes and Helen Fraser	Forensic audio in context: enhancement, suggestibility, and listener aptitude for identifying speakers in indistinct audio
09:55 Talk 11	Valeriia Perepelytsya, Thayabaran Kathiresan, Elisa Pellegrino	Does audio recording through video-conferencing tools hinder voice recognition
10:20 Talk 12	Camryn Terblanche, Philip Harrison and Amelia Gully	Performance of humans in detecting spoofed speech in degraded conditions
10:45	BREAK	
11:15 Talk 13	Luke Carroll	Bringing rhythm measures to spontaneous speech through frequently occurring speech units
11:40 Talk 14	Kirsty McDougall, Alice Paver, Francis Nolan, Nikolas Pautz, Harriet Smith and Philip Harrison	Phonetic correlates of listeners' judgements of voice similarity within and across accents.
12:05 Keynote 2	Phil Rose	Applications of the likelihood ratio framework in forensic speech science
12:55	LUNCH	
14:00	Poster session 2	
15:00	BREAK	
15:30 Talk 15	Linda Gerlach, Kirsty McDougall, Finnian Kelly and Anil Alexander	How do Automatic Speaker Recognition systems 'perceive' voice similarity? Further exploration of the relationship between human and machine voice similarity ratings
15:55 Talk 16	Willemijn Heeren and Lei He	Between-speaker variability in segmental F1 dynamics in spontaneous speech
16:20	Annual General Meeting	
18:00	CONFERENCE DINNER	
19:30 Keynote 3	Yulia Oganian	Encoding and decoding of speech sounds using direct neural recordings from human auditory

Wednesday , 25th August 2021

09:30 Talk 17	Helen Fraser	Updating the Likelihood Ratio debate: Behind the scenes in three Australian trials
10:00 Talk 18	Tina Cambier-Langeveld	Speaking of authorship—can text analysis techniques be applied in forensic speaker comparison casework?
10:25 Talk 19	Vincent van Heuven and Sandra Ferrari Disner	What's in a name? On the phonetics of trademark infringement
10:50 Talk 20	Honglin Cao and Xiaolin Zhang	A Survey on Forensic Voice Comparison in Mainland China
11:25	BREAK	
11:40 Talk 21	Alice Paver, David Wright and Natalie Braber	Accent judgements for social traits and criminal behaviours: ratings and implications
12:05 Talk 22	Kirsty McDougall, Nikolas Pautz, Harriet Smith, Katrin Müller-Johnson, Alice Paver and Francis Nolan	An investigation of the effects of voice sample duration and number of foils on voice parade performance.
12:30 Talk 23	Paula Rinke, Mathias Scharinger, Kjørtan Beier, Ramona Kaul, Tatjana Schmidt and Gea de Jong-Lendle	The effect of Angela Merkel on right temporal voice processing – an EEG study
13:00	CONFERENCE FAREWELL	

Effects of speech channel on acoustic measurements and speaker discrimination from /s/

Laura Smorenburg and Willemijn Heeren

Leiden University Centre for Linguistics, Leiden, The Netherlands

b.j.l.smorenburg@hum.leidenuniv.nl, w.f.l.heeren@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Sibilant fricative /s/ is reported to be affected by various social factors such as social class (Stuart-Smith, 2007), gender and sexual orientation (e.g. Munson et al., 2006), and region (Ditewig et al., 2019). In terms of its speaker-specificity and possible potential for forensic speaker comparisons, /s/ seems to carry a useful amount of speaker information, generally ranking with nasals amongst the consonants (Kavanagh, 2012; Van den Heuvel, 1996).

Forensic casework often has to deal with scarce, or low-quality speech material such as wire-tapped telephone conversations. Although the effect of the telephone band on speech acoustics has been studied for vowels (e.g. Byrne & Foulkes, 2004), the effect on various consonants is not well documented. The effect of the telephone bandwidth (300 – 3400 Hz for landlines) is expected to be larger for some consonants than for vowels, as many consonants can have their main spectral peaks around or below the lower cut-off (nasal consonants) or above (sibilant fricatives) the upper cut-off of the telephone band. In this study, we investigate how spectral measures from /s/ are affected by the telephone band and how this affects the strength-of-evidence in speaker comparisons.

Methodology

Material. Materials were taken from Task 2 in the WYRED corpus (Gold et al., 2018). In this task, speakers conversed over the telephone with an “accomplice” whilst being simultaneously recorded over a high-quality microphone (44.1 Hz sampling frequency). The landline telephone signal was wiretapped and – as is typical for these signals – only had spectral energy from 0 – 4 kHz with attenuated frequencies below 300 and above 3,400 Hz.

For 43 speakers from the Wakefield region, /s/ tokens were automatically queried from forced-aligned annotations that were generated from the orthographic transcriptions. Per speaker, the segmentations for the first one hundred /s/ tokens were then manually corrected. Tokens with overtalk, laughter, or background noise were excluded, resulting in 5,518 tokens.

Acoustic analysis. Following Koenig et al. (2013), a low-frequency cut-off of 550 Hz was applied across recording types to exclude ambient noise and potential lower harmonics from intruding voicing during the fricative. A high-frequency cut-off of 8 kHz was applied to the studio recordings to ensure that the highest-amplitude peak is likely to be the main front-cavity resonance (cf. Koenig et al. 2013). For the telephone recordings, an upper cut-off of 3.4 kHz was used, thus excluding attenuated frequency regions. Spectral moments (M1: mean, M2: standard deviation, M3: skewness, and M4: kurtosis) were measured automatically over the mid 50% of each /s/ token in Praat (Boersma, 2001). M1 was also measured dynamically in 20% non-overlapping windows over the full duration of the fricative. A cubic polynomial fit resulted in four coefficients: an intercept and three dynamic coefficients. The cubic fit was a better fit to the data than the quadratic fit: $\chi^2(1) = 27.79$, $p < .001$.

Statistical analysis. The statistical analysis had two parts. First, linear mixed-effects

modelling was used to examine the fixed effect of Channel (sum-coded). Second, LR analysis was used to calculate the strength-of-evidence in speaker comparisons. Highly correlating features ($r > .50$) were excluded (M3 and the dynamic intercept of M1 were excluded for their high correlation with M1). Given that only 43 speakers had been annotated so far, a leave-one-out MVKD implementation with calibration was used (Morrison, 2007).

Results

As expected, large differences in acoustic measurements were found by speech channel, with much lower values in the telephone band (see e.g. M1 and M2 in Table 1). Only the linear and cubic terms from the M1 dynamics did not show significant channel effects, indicating only minimal effects of channel on the dynamics.

Table 1. Best-fitting mixed-models for M1 and M2

		M1			M2				
Random effects		Var	SD	Cor	Var	SD	Cor		
Speaker	(intercept)	99,246	315		8,833	94			
	Channel	110,887	333	-0.46	8,975	95	-0.71		
Residual		250,756	501		39,192	198			
Fixed effects		Est.	SE	t	p	Est.	SE	t	p
(intercept)		3,363	48	69.6	<.001	981	14	67.8	<.001
Channel: telephone		-1,622	51	-31.8	<.001	-298	15	-20.4	<.001

Although there were effects of channel on the acoustics, when suspect and offender data match on speech channel, its effect on the strength-of-evidence in speaker comparisons seems to be minimal. This suggests that the lower frequencies might capture similar speaker information as the higher frequencies.

Table 1. Same-speaker and different-speaker LLRs and system performance measures

	LLR SS	LLR DS	Cllr	Cllr-min	EER%
Studio	3.08	-11.40	0.27	0.22	6.2
Telephone	3.23	-16.88	0.24	0.20	6.3

References

- Boersma, P. (2001). Praat, a system for doing phonetics by computer. *Glott Int.*, 5(9/10), 341–347.
- Byrne, C., & Foulkes, P. (2004). The “Mobile Phone Effect” on Vowel Formants. *Speech Lang. and the Law*, 11(1), 83–102.
- Ditewig, S., Pinget, A. C. H., & Heeren, W. F. L. (2019). Regional variation in the pronunciation of /s/ in the Dutch language area. *Nederlandse Taalkunde*, 24(2), 195–212.
- Gold, E., Ross, S., & Earnshaw, K. (2018). The “West Yorkshire Regional English Database”. *Proc. Interspeech, 2018-September*, 2748–2752.
- Kavanagh, C. M. (2012). *New consonantal acoustic parameters for forensic speaker comparison* University of York.
- Morrison, G.S. (2007). Matlab implementation of Aitken & Lucy’s (2004) forensic likelihood-ratio software using multivariate-kernel-density estimation.
- Munson, B., McDonald, E. C., DeBoe, N. L., & White, A. R. (2006). The acoustic and perceptual bases of judgments of women and men’s sexual orientation from read speech. *J.Phon.*, 34, 202–240.
- Stuart-Smith, J. (2007). Empirical evidence for gendered speech production: /s/ in Glaswegian. *Change in Phon.: Papers in Lab. Phon.* 9, 65–86.
- Van den Heuvel, H. (1996). *Speaker variability in acoustic properties of Dutch phoneme realisations* Radboud Universiteit.