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# Method

## Participants

The data include 42 participants from 3 populations: monolingual English speakers, monolingual Spanish speakers, and bilingual Spanish-English speakers. All participants were females between the ages of 18 and 23. The monolingual English speakers were recorded in English and the monolingual Spanish speakers were recorded in Spanish. The Spanish-English bilinguals were recorded in both of their languages.

### Monolingual English speakers

The study includes 8 monolingual English speakers. They were undergraduate students at the University of Arizona, born and raised in the US Southwest. The English speakers were functionally monolingual, though they reported having taken introductory Spanish courses. They were not able to maintain a basic conversation in Spanish. All of the participants in this group reported English as their native language and verified not having been exposed to any other languages while growing up.

### Monolingual Spanish speakers

The monolingual Spanish group comprised 8 speakers that were recruited from the *Universitat de les Illes Balears* campus community and were born and raised on the island of Majorca, Spain. They reported that, although they had studied some English in Spain, they were not able to maintain a basic conversation in this language. The participants of this group also speak Catalan. Importantly, there are no reported differences in the phonetic realization of voice timing between the Spanish and Catalan, nor are there place difference between the coronal stops.

### Bilingual speakers

The English-Spanish bilinguals (n = 26) came from Southern Arizona and Northern Mexico. There are two samples from this population. The coronal dataset includes 17 speakers and the bilabial dataset includes 9 speakers. The Spanish-English bilinguals were undergraduate students at the University of Arizona in Tucson, Arizona. The bilinguals were brought up by Spanish-speaking families and were schooled mostly in English. They reported using English and Spanish daily, both in the classroom as well as with their friends and relatives.

## Metrics

F1/F2, voice onset time, relative intensity, center of gravity, standard deviation, skewness, kurtosis

## Procedure

Decide if we will present 3 separate experiments with 3 different methods sections.

## Statistical analyses

All analyses were conducted in R (R Core Team, 2019, version 3.6.0). We use Bayesian multilevel models fitted in Stan using brms (Bürkner, 2017, 2018, version 2.10.0). Bayesian Data Analysis (BDA) has become a welcome alternative to frequentist statistical analysis. See Schoot and Depaoli (2014) and Vasishth, Nicenboim, Beckman, Li, and Kong (2018) for tutorials and in depth explanations related BDA in the psychological and speech sciences. For all models, the criterion was standardized, or converted to z-scores, in order to facilitate comparibility between metrics. Continuous predictors were also standardized and categorical predictors were sum-to-zero coded. Thus for all models the intercept represents the outcome variable at the grand mean in standardized units. We used regularizing, weakly informative priors in all models (specifics below) with 4,000 iterations (2,000 warmup) running on 16 processing cores. We quantify our uncertainty regarding a given effect by reporting point estimates derived from the posterior predictive distribution, including the 95% Highest Density Credible Intervals (HDI). Additionally, we assume a negligible effect size of ± 0.1 (Cohen, 1988, 2013; Kruschke, 2018) in order to establish a Region of Practical Equivalence (ROPE), for which we assess the proportion of the HDI that falls within this interval. Finally, we report the Maximum Probability of Effect (MPE), or the Probability of Direction, as the proportion of the posterior distribution that is of the median’s sign. We assume there to be compelling evidence for a given effect when the HDI of the posterior distribution does not contain 0 nor fall within the ROPE by a reasonable margin and the MPE is close to 1.

# Results

The results are divided into 4 subsections dealing with (1) F1/F2, (2) monolingual data, (3) bilingual data, and (4) POA data.

## Experiment 0: Vowels

The first analysis scrutinezed F1 and F2 of the vowel following the coronal stops. The purpose of this analysis was to determine if the low /a/ and /ae/ vowels of Spanish and English, respectively, differed from each other. This analysis was taken as a precautionary measure with the objective of determining whether or not coarticulation effects may be present in the stop metrics due to the possible different spectral envelopes of the next segment.

The F1 and F2 data were analayzed using separate Bayesian multilevel models. The criterion (F1 or F2) were standardized and modeled as a function of language (English, Spanish), segment (/d/, /t/), and item repetition. Language and segment were sum coded (-1, 1). The random effects structure included by-subject intercepts with random slopes for segment and item repetition, as well as by-item intercepts with a random slope for item repetition. The model included weakly informative priors with the mean centered at 0 and a standard deviation of 2.

The model found weak evidence for a language effect on F1 (β = 0.18; SE = 0.09; CI = [0.01, 0.36]) and F2 (β = 0.20; SE = 0.11; CI = [−0.03, 0.42]). Fifteen and eighteen percent of the HDI’s fell within the specified ROPE for F1 and F2, respectively. The probability that β was greater than 0 was .979 for F1 and .958 for F2. Together, the point estimates suggest the spectral centroid of the Spanish vowel was slightly higher and more posterior with respect to the English vowel. There was no evidence for a segment effect on F1 (β = −0.02; SE = 0.04; CI = [−0.10, 0.05]), nor on F2 (β = −0.01; SE = 0.04; CI = [−0.09, 0.08]). In both cases 100% of the HDI fell within the ROPE and the probability that β was less than 0 was .717 for F1 and .555 for F2. Given the possibility of a small effect of language on the spectal envelope, standardized F1 and F2 were used in subsequent analyses of the coronal stops. Figure 1 plots the F1 × F2 data and Figure 2 plots the model summary. A complete table of the F1 and F2 models is available in Appendix A.

![Figure 1: F1 × F2 of /a/ from monolingual speakers as a function of language (English, Spanish). Transparent points represent raw data. Solid points indicate posterior means ± 95% and 80% credible intervals.](data:application/pdf;base64,)

Figure 1: F1 × F2 of /a/ from monolingual speakers as a function of language (English, Spanish). Transparent points represent raw data. Solid points indicate posterior means ± 95% and 80% credible intervals.



Figure 2: Posterior medians ± 95% and 66% credible intervals for F1 and F2 data.

## Experiment 1: Monolinguals

![Figure 3: VOT and burst metrics of coronal stops (/d/, /t/) from monolingual speakers as a function of language (English, Spanish). Transparent points represent raw data. Solid points indicate posterior means ± 99% and 80% credible intervals.](data:application/pdf;base64,)

Figure 3: VOT and burst metrics of coronal stops (/d/, /t/) from monolingual speakers as a function of language (English, Spanish). Transparent points represent raw data. Solid points indicate posterior means ± 99% and 80% credible intervals.



Figure 4: Model plot.

## Experiment 2: Bilinguals

![Figure 5: VOT and burst metrics of coronal stops (/d/, /t/) from bilingual speakers as a function of language (English, Spanish). Transparent points represent raw data. Solid points indicate posterior means ± 99% and 80% credible intervals.](data:application/pdf;base64,)

Figure 5: VOT and burst metrics of coronal stops (/d/, /t/) from bilingual speakers as a function of language (English, Spanish). Transparent points represent raw data. Solid points indicate posterior means ± 99% and 80% credible intervals.



Figure 6: Model plot.

## Experiment 3: Bilingual POA data

![Figure 7: VOT and burst metrics of voiceless stops from bilingual speakers as a function of language (English, Spanish), place of articulation (Coronal, Bilabial). Transparent points represent raw data. Solid points indicate posterior means ± 99% and 80% credible intervals.](data:application/pdf;base64,)

Figure 7: VOT and burst metrics of voiceless stops from bilingual speakers as a function of language (English, Spanish), place of articulation (Coronal, Bilabial). Transparent points represent raw data. Solid points indicate posterior means ± 99% and 80% credible intervals.



Figure 8: Model plot.

# Results

# Discussion

effectSize <- (mu1 - mu2) / sqrt((sigma1^2 + sigma2^2) / 2)
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Appendix A

Model summary for F1 and F2 as a function of language (English, Spanish), segment (/d/, /t/), and item repetition. The percentage of the HDI contained within the ROPE is based on an effect size of ± 0.1.

| Metric | Parameter | Estimate | HDI | ROPE | MPE |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| F1 | Intercept | -0.014 | [-0.245, 0.219] | 0.650 | 0.550 |
|  | Language | 0.184 | [-0.001, 0.353] | 0.154 | 0.979 |
|  | Phoneme | -0.021 | [-0.096, 0.053] | 1.000 | 0.717 |
|  | Item rep. | 0.008 | [-0.074, 0.091] | 1.000 | 0.573 |
| F2 | Intercept | -0.094 | [-0.368, 0.176] | 0.467 | 0.759 |
|  | Language | 0.196 | [-0.037, 0.409] | 0.181 | 0.958 |
|  | Phoneme | -0.006 | [-0.09, 0.082] | 1.000 | 0.555 |
|  | Item rep. | 0.045 | [-0.033, 0.123] | 0.938 | 0.874 |

Appendix B

test

| Metric | Parameter | Estimate | HDI | ROPE | MPE |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VOT | Intercept | 0.011 | [-0.124, 0.129] | 0.926 | 0.575 |
|  | Language | 0.666 | [0.567, 0.767] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Phoneme | -0.616 | [-0.691, -0.548] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | 0.010 | [-0.03, 0.052] | 1.000 | 0.704 |
|  | F2 | -0.006 | [-0.048, 0.035] | 1.000 | 0.626 |
|  | Item rep. | -0.013 | [-0.044, 0.019] | 1.000 | 0.790 |
|  | Language x Phoneme | 0.111 | [0.042, 0.178] | 0.364 | 0.998 |
| RI | Intercept | -0.120 | [-0.392, 0.146] | 0.409 | 0.821 |
|  | Language | 0.077 | [-0.142, 0.29] | 0.564 | 0.768 |
|  | Phoneme | -0.097 | [-0.227, 0.038] | 0.518 | 0.925 |
|  | F1 | -0.113 | [-0.222, -0.001] | 0.393 | 0.977 |
|  | F2 | -0.221 | [-0.334, -0.105] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Item rep. | 0.058 | [-0.025, 0.147] | 0.855 | 0.914 |
|  | Language x Phoneme | 0.022 | [-0.108, 0.148] | 0.904 | 0.635 |
| COG | Intercept | 0.048 | [-0.195, 0.296] | 0.593 | 0.658 |
|  | Language | 0.638 | [0.41, 0.88] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Phoneme | -0.209 | [-0.276, -0.141] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | -0.015 | [-0.065, 0.035] | 1.000 | 0.728 |
|  | F2 | 0.035 | [-0.025, 0.095] | 1.000 | 0.881 |
|  | Item rep. | -0.028 | [-0.074, 0.019] | 1.000 | 0.878 |
|  | Language x Phoneme | 0.058 | [-0.007, 0.127] | 0.916 | 0.957 |
| Kurtosis | Intercept | -0.117 | [-0.297, 0.072] | 0.430 | 0.901 |
|  | Language | -0.615 | [-0.781, -0.469] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Phoneme | 0.216 | [0.113, 0.327] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | -0.028 | [-0.089, 0.034] | 1.000 | 0.823 |
|  | F2 | -0.008 | [-0.063, 0.051] | 1.000 | 0.608 |
|  | Item rep. | 0.013 | [-0.05, 0.073] | 1.000 | 0.668 |
|  | Language x Phoneme | -0.240 | [-0.348, -0.136] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| SD | Intercept | 0.036 | [-0.213, 0.278] | 0.603 | 0.627 |
|  | Language | 0.497 | [0.281, 0.71] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Phoneme | -0.282 | [-0.397, -0.162] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | -0.005 | [-0.063, 0.054] | 1.000 | 0.560 |
|  | F2 | 0.018 | [-0.041, 0.086] | 1.000 | 0.719 |
|  | Item rep. | -0.027 | [-0.093, 0.04] | 1.000 | 0.798 |
|  | Language x Phoneme | 0.205 | [0.087, 0.315] | 0.016 | 0.999 |
| Skewness | Intercept | -0.025 | [-0.197, 0.155] | 0.768 | 0.608 |
|  | Language | -0.502 | [-0.642, -0.37] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Phoneme | 0.296 | [0.167, 0.431] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | -0.044 | [-0.108, 0.024] | 0.979 | 0.911 |
|  | F2 | 0.005 | [-0.05, 0.061] | 1.000 | 0.569 |
|  | Item rep. | 0.017 | [-0.036, 0.069] | 1.000 | 0.731 |
|  | Language x Phoneme | -0.251 | [-0.377, -0.123] | 0.000 | 1.000 |

Appendix C

test

| Metric | Parameter | Estimate | HDI | ROPE | MPE |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VOT | Intercept | -0.075 | [-0.216, 0.072] | 0.638 | 0.850 |
|  | Language | 0.476 | [0.391, 0.565] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Phoneme | -0.622 | [-0.737, -0.497] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | 0.001 | [-0.028, 0.031] | 1.000 | 0.536 |
|  | F2 | -0.009 | [-0.041, 0.021] | 1.000 | 0.705 |
|  | Item rep. | -0.003 | [-0.034, 0.026] | 1.000 | 0.575 |
|  | Language x Phoneme | -0.007 | [-0.085, 0.07] | 1.000 | 0.565 |
| RI | Intercept | -0.025 | [-0.226, 0.184] | 0.706 | 0.598 |
|  | Language | 0.135 | [0.026, 0.237] | 0.240 | 0.994 |
|  | Phoneme | -0.084 | [-0.158, -0.014] | 0.677 | 0.988 |
|  | F1 | -0.271 | [-0.377, -0.166] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F2 | -0.193 | [-0.248, -0.138] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Item rep. | 0.004 | [-0.043, 0.052] | 1.000 | 0.566 |
|  | Language x Phoneme | 0.005 | [-0.062, 0.071] | 1.000 | 0.555 |
| COG | Intercept | -0.107 | [-0.286, 0.073] | 0.464 | 0.885 |
|  | Language | 0.581 | [0.441, 0.721] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Phoneme | -0.218 | [-0.272, -0.164] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | 0.020 | [-0.023, 0.063] | 1.000 | 0.821 |
|  | F2 | -0.021 | [-0.064, 0.018] | 1.000 | 0.842 |
|  | Item rep. | 0.020 | [-0.019, 0.055] | 1.000 | 0.852 |
|  | Language x Phoneme | -0.047 | [-0.11, 0.016] | 0.977 | 0.929 |
| Kurtosis | Intercept | 0.066 | [-0.095, 0.226] | 0.675 | 0.797 |
|  | Language | -0.596 | [-0.693, -0.498] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Phoneme | 0.254 | [0.182, 0.322] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | -0.000 | [-0.051, 0.052] | 1.000 | 0.503 |
|  | F2 | 0.005 | [-0.044, 0.055] | 1.000 | 0.584 |
|  | Item rep. | -0.044 | [-0.089, 0.003] | 1.000 | 0.969 |
|  | Language x Phoneme | -0.110 | [-0.209, -0.012] | 0.408 | 0.984 |
| SD | Intercept | -0.127 | [-0.285, 0.025] | 0.363 | 0.948 |
|  | Language | 0.556 | [0.436, 0.68] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Phoneme | -0.220 | [-0.296, -0.147] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | 0.003 | [-0.045, 0.051] | 1.000 | 0.548 |
|  | F2 | -0.013 | [-0.061, 0.031] | 1.000 | 0.706 |
|  | Item rep. | 0.028 | [-0.015, 0.07] | 1.000 | 0.909 |
|  | Language x Phoneme | 0.074 | [-0.011, 0.165] | 0.740 | 0.953 |
| Skewness | Intercept | 0.122 | [-0.041, 0.276] | 0.377 | 0.935 |
|  | Language | -0.514 | [-0.597, -0.427] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Phoneme | 0.306 | [0.225, 0.394] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | -0.010 | [-0.056, 0.035] | 1.000 | 0.663 |
|  | F2 | -0.003 | [-0.047, 0.044] | 1.000 | 0.543 |
|  | Item rep. | -0.009 | [-0.057, 0.039] | 1.000 | 0.651 |
|  | Language x Phoneme | -0.202 | [-0.297, -0.113] | 0.000 | 1.000 |

Appendix D

test

| Metric | Parameter | Estimate | HDI | ROPE | MPE |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VOT | Intercept | -0.094 | [-0.212, 0.023] | 0.550 | 0.944 |
|  | Language | 0.773 | [0.663, 0.878] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Place | 0.140 | [0.032, 0.242] | 0.211 | 0.996 |
|  | F1 | 0.017 | [-0.014, 0.048] | 1.000 | 0.853 |
|  | F2 | -0.006 | [-0.04, 0.029] | 1.000 | 0.628 |
|  | Item rep. | 0.002 | [-0.037, 0.039] | 1.000 | 0.538 |
|  | Language x Place | 0.025 | [-0.079, 0.133] | 0.934 | 0.686 |
| RI | Intercept | 0.211 | [-0.009, 0.428] | 0.139 | 0.970 |
|  | Language | 0.115 | [0.033, 0.192] | 0.341 | 0.997 |
|  | Place | -0.410 | [-0.622, -0.179] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | -0.220 | [-0.309, -0.126] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F2 | -0.176 | [-0.252, -0.103] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Item rep. | 0.010 | [-0.062, 0.081] | 1.000 | 0.622 |
|  | Language x Place | 0.028 | [-0.055, 0.108] | 0.984 | 0.752 |
| COG | Intercept | -0.386 | [-0.52, -0.25] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Language | 0.303 | [0.196, 0.411] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Place | 0.647 | [0.522, 0.771] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | 0.042 | [-0.005, 0.092] | 1.000 | 0.953 |
|  | F2 | -0.037 | [-0.083, 0.011] | 1.000 | 0.942 |
|  | Item rep. | 0.001 | [-0.049, 0.049] | 1.000 | 0.520 |
|  | Language x Place | 0.291 | [0.178, 0.396] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Kurtosis | Intercept | 0.433 | [0.275, 0.589] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Language | -0.233 | [-0.301, -0.163] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Place | -0.829 | [-0.969, -0.677] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | 0.003 | [-0.04, 0.048] | 1.000 | 0.552 |
|  | F2 | 0.009 | [-0.042, 0.056] | 1.000 | 0.656 |
|  | Item rep. | -0.044 | [-0.092, 0.004] | 1.000 | 0.963 |
|  | Language x Place | -0.191 | [-0.259, -0.123] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| SD | Intercept | -0.501 | [-0.633, -0.37] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Language | 0.234 | [0.145, 0.321] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Place | 0.782 | [0.661, 0.9] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | 0.011 | [-0.034, 0.058] | 1.000 | 0.687 |
|  | F2 | -0.017 | [-0.066, 0.029] | 1.000 | 0.765 |
|  | Item rep. | 0.024 | [-0.026, 0.071] | 1.000 | 0.843 |
|  | Language x Place | 0.204 | [0.118, 0.291] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
| Skewness | Intercept | 0.546 | [0.35, 0.745] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | Language | -0.126 | [-0.228, -0.027] | 0.286 | 0.992 |
|  | Place | -0.865 | [-1.042, -0.68] | 0.000 | 1.000 |
|  | F1 | 0.006 | [-0.059, 0.076] | 1.000 | 0.555 |
|  | F2 | 0.014 | [-0.03, 0.059] | 1.000 | 0.732 |
|  | Item rep. | -0.013 | [-0.066, 0.046] | 1.000 | 0.684 |
|  | Language x Place | -0.092 | [-0.192, 0.007] | 0.561 | 0.967 |

Appendix E

# Overview

## Bayesian data analysis

This study employs Bayesian Data Analysis for quantitative inferential statistics. Specifically, this implies that we use Bayesian *credible intervals* to draw statistical inferences. A Bayesian model calculates a posterior distribution, i.e., a distribution of plausible parameter values, given the data, a data-generating model, and any prior information we have about those parameter values. Posterior distributions are computationally costly. For this reason, we use the Hamiltonian Markov Chain Monte Carlo algorithm to obtain a sample that incldues thousands of values from the posterior distribution. In practical terms, what this means is that we do not calculate a single point estimate for an effect β, but rather we draw a sample of 4,000 plausible values for β. This allows us to quantify our uncertainty regarding β by summaryzing the distribution of those values. We will use 4 statistics to describe the posterior distribution: (1) the mean, (2) the highest density credible interval (HDI), (3) a Region of Practical Equivalence (ROPE), and (4) the Maximum Probability of Effect (MPE). The mean provides a point estimate for the distribution. The 95% highest density credible interval provides bounds for the effect. The ROPE designates a region of practical equivalence for a negligible effect and calculates the proportion of the HDI that falls within this interval. The MPE calculates the proportion of the posterior distribution that is of the median’s sign (or the probability that the effect is positive or negative). For example, if a hypothesis states that β > 0, we judge there to be *compelling evidence* for this hypothesis if the mean point estimate is a positive number, if the 95% credible interval of β does not contain 0 and is outside the ROPE by a reasonably clear margin, and the posterior *P*(β > 0) is close to one.

Together these four statistics allow us to quantify our uncertainty and provide an intuitive interpretation of any given effect. For instance, consider a case in which the posterior mean of β is 100 and the 95% credible interval is [40, 160]. The interval tells us that we can be 95% certain the *true* value of β is between 40 and 160, given the data, our model, and our prior information. Furthermore, the interval allows us to specify areas of uncertainty. In this example, we can conclude that the effect is almost certain to be positive. The lower interval value of 40 tells us that 95% of the plausible values are greater than 40. We also note that the interval covers a wide range of values, thus we also conclude that we are not very certain about the size of the effect. This type of interepretation is not possible under a frequentist paradigm.

## About this document
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