

Phonological Analysis example exam INDICATIVE ANSWERS

(1)

Additional data

	Orthographic Gloss	Adult Target	Child Realisation
41	UMBRELLA	ʌmbɹɛlə	ambɛlə
42	TEAPOT	tɪpɒt	gɪpɒd
43	COFFEE	kɒfi	kɒfi
44	JAM	dʒam	gam
45	ORANGE	ɔːndʒ	ɔwɪn
46	TRAIN	tɹeɪn	gɛɪn
47	BRIDGE	bɹɪdʒ	bɪg

	Orthographic Gloss	Adult Target	Child Realisation
48	LETTER	letə	legə
49	STAMP	stamp	gamp
50	ZIP	zɪp	fɪb
51	VAN	van	ban
52	TEACHER	tɪtʃə	kɪgə
53	SCISSORS	sɪzəz	gɪgə
54	SWEETIES	swɪtɪz	fɪgɪ

(2) See separate file: George PPSA

(3) See separate file: George PPSA

(4) (a) **Progressive variability** (summary) NB. marks are awarded up to a maximum of 12, i.e., you are not expected to make all the following observations.

Alveolar backing

- 1 correct token of /t/ WI [tɪvi]
1 2
- /t/ → [d] / WI and / WF
5 4

Pre-vocalic voicing

- 1 correct token of /t/ WI [tɪvi]
1
- /t/ → [k] / WI
5
- /k/ correct / WI
3

Voicing

- /k/ correct / WF
2
- /kɪ/ → [k] ½
- /f/ also produced correctly WF (1 tkn)
- /fɪ, fɪ/ → [f]
1
- /pɪ/ correct /
1

Stopping

- /f/ 100% correct (singletons and clusters)
- 1 correct token of /v/ WM [tɪvi]
- 1 correct token of /s/ WI [sʌn]
- 1 token of /z/ → [f] WI [fɪb]
- /h/ also produced correctly

Final C deletion

- Only two phonemes: /s, z/ affected
- /s/ → [g] 3 WF (achieves CVC closure)
- see also /ʃ, tʃ, dʒ/ → [g] WF, /v/ → [b] WF

Cluster Reduction

- /pɫ, bɫ, kɫ, gɫ/ 100% correct
- /-ŋg-/ correct, /-mbɪ-/ → [-mb-]
- /-mp/, /-nd/ correct

(b) Stimulability assessment: [θ, ð, z, ʃ, ʒ, tʃ, dʒ, ɹ, j] (not tested / no correct tokens)

(5) Post-vocalic voicing. The typical pattern is pre-vocalic voicing (syllable-initially)/ post-vocalic devoicing (word-finally)

(6) (a) /sɒk/ → [gɒk]

- stopping + alveolar backing + pre-vocalic voicing
- consonant harmony

(b) /vest/ → [bɛg]

- /s/ cluster reduction
- /t/ is backed and voiced

Why reduction to [t] and not [s]? /s/ typically elided in /s/ clusters, evidence of this elsewhere in the data

(c) /zɪp/ → [fɪb]

- Velar fronting and palatal fronting related to lack of front-back tongue differentiation
- No other evidence of pre-vocalic devoicing
- Assimilatory effect?
 - No examples of voiced fricatives WI

(7) Systematic sound preference: widespread loss of contrast/failure to develop place, manner and voicing contrasts

- All manner categories represented apart from affricates (ie use of [g] does not cross obstruent-sonorant major class distinction)
- 3-way place contrast among plosives and nasals
 - bilabial, alveolar and velar
 - 3-way place contrast among fricatives
 - Voicing contrast emerging

(8) Differential diagnosis

- Phonological Disorder
- Atypical error patterns: alveolar backing (and post-vocalic voicing)
- Extent of process application given age (6;5 yrs)
- NB. It is not possible to comment on consistency of production – there are no repetitions of the same word to compare.

(9) Further Data Collection (summary) NB. Again, you do not need to make all these observations. ½ mark is awarded per point to a maximum of 6.

- How representative is the sample?
- Are all phonemes represented?
 - No data for /θ, ð, ʒ, j/
 - Are there sufficient tokens to highlight any variability in production?
 - Need 5 tokens WI & WF, 3 tokens WM
 - Limited data sample, particularly fricatives & affricates
 - Additional data required to explore variability & confirm error patterns
 - extent of process resolution (proportion of correct (or more correct) vs incorrect tokens, eg /t/ → [d, g])
 - influence of word position?
 - context-conditioning?
 - consonant harmony?
 - transcription errors?
- Dynamic Assessment: ongoing targeted sampling/transcription necessary to ensure a richer data sample and greater confidence in analysis
- How appropriate is the sample given George's age?
 - Word length and articulatory complexity
 - Word frequency / familiarity

(10) Any reasonable