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1. Replication of LMM21 with interleaved exposure and test

* Was the ‘cost’ observed in LMM21 an artifact of having to hold one representation over the course of the other’s test?

1. [MAYBE] Pre-test stims with identical /sʃ?/ between talkers of same and different gender

* How strong are pre-existing priors based on things like vowel F0? (e.g. lower F0 and/or perceived maleness leads to expectation of lower spectral center for /s/ and /ʃ/, which in turn leads to more /s/ responses for ambiguous stims).
* Using identical acoustics between talkers means that for at least one, the acoustics won’t quite ‘fit’... this might be worth norming beforehand.

1. Within-gender manipulation

* Crucially, /sʃ?/ tokens will be acoustically identical between talkers.
* If II is omitted, then null result potentially ambiguous betweenː
  + Learning isn’t talker specific (but rather only gender, or based on larger acoustic differences?)
  + Subjects are sensitive to the fact that the acoustics are identical between talkers, and therefore generalize in this specific case (but not ‘in the wild’)

1. Interleave test with exposure

* Do talker differences emerge over time?

Onset: F1, sh, or pe

Fricative: F1\_Clear, F1\_Amb, Altered\_Clear, Altered\_Amb

Offset: F1, sh, pe

What we need:

Experiments 1a, 1b:
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