

©2023

Kyle Parrish

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE PHONOLOGY OF THE ABSOLUTE INITIAL STATE OF L3 ACQUISTION

By

KYLE PARRISH

A Dissertation submitted to the

School of Graduate Studies

Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in The Department of Spanish and Portuguese, Second Language

Acquisition and Bilingualism

Written under the direction of

Joseph Casillas

And approved by

New Brunswick, New Jersey

May 2023

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The phonology of the absolute initial state of L3 acquisition

by

KYLE PARRISH

Dissertation Director:

Joseph Casillas

This is where the body of your abstract goes. The abstract should summarize your work. The abstract for a dissertation or document may be longer than one page; word count is more important than page length in this section.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Couldn't find sections/acknowledgements.tex to include as your acknowledgements.

DEDICATION

*I dedicate this dissertation to my loving wife, Marinna, and to my 3 fur children,
Olive, Kevin, and Phyllis. I could not have done it without you.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
DEDICATION	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
 Chapter 1: Introduction	 2
1.1 Introduction	2
1.2 Cross-linguistic language features	3
1.2.1 Voice-Onset Time	3
1.2.2 Vocalic systems	4
 Chapter 2: Models of third language acquisition	 6
2.1 Models of third language acquisition	6
2.1.1 The Cumulative Enhancement Model	6
2.1.2 The L2 Status Factor Model	7
2.1.3 The Typological Primacy Model	9
2.1.4 The Linguistic Proximity Model	14
2.1.5 The Scalpel Model	17
 Chapter 3: Models of L2 phonological acquisition	 19
3.1 Models of L2 phonological acquisition	19
3.1.1 The Speech Learning Model	19
3.1.2 The Perceptual Assimilation Model	21
3.1.3 The Second Language Linguistic Perception Model	23
 Chapter 4: Previous literature in L3 phonology	 26
4.1 Previous literature in L3 phonology	26
4.1.1 L3 Production Studies	26
4.1.2 L3 Perception studies	28
 Chapter 5: Methods and anylsis in previous work	 31

5.1	Methods and anylsis in previous work	31
5.2	Bringing L2 speech models and L3 models together and evaluating predictions	33
Chapter 6: The Present Study		35
6.1	Research Questions	35
6.1.1	Chapter 2: Production	35
6.1.2	Chapter 3: Perception	37
6.1.3	Chapter 4: Production and Perception	38
6.2	Method	39
6.2.1	Participants	39
6.2.2	Materials	39
6.2.3	Procedure	43
6.3	Analysis	44
REFERENCES		45

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

```
library(ggplot2)
library(tidyverse)
```

```
## -- Attaching packages ----- tidyverse 1.3.1 --

## v tibble  3.1.1      v dplyr   1.0.5
## v tidyr   1.1.3      v stringr 1.4.0
## v readr   1.4.0      v forcats 0.5.1
## v purrr   0.3.4

## -- Conflicts ----- tidyverse_conflicts() --
## x dplyr::filter() masks stats::filter()
## x dplyr::lag()    masks stats::lag()
```

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

The difficulty of learning a new language in adulthood has a well documented history. This is especially true in the case of phonological acquisition.

For example, many studies over the course of the past five decades have demonstrated that adult second language (L2) learners often produce and perceive the sounds of the target language in a non-native manner (James Emil Flege, 1991; James Emil Flege & Eefting, 1988). This difficulty arises, in part, because bilinguals often navigate complex communicative situations in which they produce and perceive speech from both of their languages in real time. Much less is known about the acquisition of a third language (L3A), particularly with regard to L3 production, perception, and phonological learning. The present dissertation explores the production patterns and perceptual categorization routines of adult bilinguals during the initial stages of L3 acquisition.

Empirical studies in L3 phonological acquisition have found evidence of multi-directional influence in language production (Llama & Cardoso, 2018; Llama, Cardoso, & Collins, 2010), with the impact of previously learned languages on a third varying. In some cases, L2 influence on L3 production has been found, where in others, L1 influence or simultaneous influence of both languages on L3 production has been reported. It is unclear what factors could be at the root of these varied findings. On one hand, it might be sampling error. At large, empirical studies in L3 acquisition have used low samples to build models. One issue with this approach is related to sampling error. On the other, factors such as L2 and L3 proficiency, language dominance and choices of methods and analysis may play a role in the conclusions drawn by these studies.

The present dissertation aims to address the issue of low sample sizes and varied statistical analyses by, firstly, recruiting bilinguals who do not yet know a third language, and, secondly, by using more fitting statistical analyses made more appropriate

by a larger sample size. It is likely that the relatively homogeneous populations of bilinguals are in greater supply than trilingual populations, particularly when suggested methodological practices are to be used, such as the use of mirror-image groups. With the increase in sample size, more precise observations and conclusions may be drawn about the very starting point of L3 phonological acquisition which are far less likely to be explained by statistical limitations such as sampling error. To deal with the potential impact of proficiency and dominance on L3 production and perception, L2 proficiency was measured using the LexTALE in English (Izura, Cueto, & Brysbaert, 2016; Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2016) and Spanish (citation). The Bilingual Language Profile (BLP) was used to measure language dominance and background (Birdsong et al., 2012). Finally, participant groups will be exposed to either German or French, to examine how phonetic similarity across languages may play a role in the first exposure to an L3.

1.2 Cross-linguistic language features

In order to gain insights into the relative influence of a first and second language the present dissertation makes use of both (relative) voice-onset time (VOT) in stop production and perception and spectral qualities of vowels in vowel perception in production. In the following sections, the vocalic systems of Spanish, English, French, and German, as well as their respective uses of voice-onset time, are overviewed.

1.2.1 Voice-Onset Time

Voice-onset time (VOT) is a phonetic measure in milliseconds of the release of the closure and its relationship with the onset of the vibration of the vocal folds (Lisker & Abramson, 1964). In particular, when the vocal folds begin to vibrate prior to the release, this is described as pre-voicing and is characterized by a negative VOT value. On the other hand, when the release occurs prior to the onset of voicing, a positive VOT is measured. Stops with a positive VOT are considered phonetically voiceless. VOT has been found to be a primary acoustic cue in the distinction of stop consonants

in many of the world's languages. However, language specific use of VOT to make distinctions between sounds is language specific. For example, Spanish and French belong to a classification of languages referred to as true-voicing languages (Lisker & Abramson, 1964) . This label suggests that the difference between a stop consonant that is phonemically voiced, such as /b/ is also phonetically voiced (negative VOT) and its counterpart that is phonemically voiceless, such as /p/ is also phonetically voiceless. True voicing languages stand in contrast to aspirating languages, such as German and English, in which the phonemic categories /p/ and /b/ exist within these languages, but are distinct in the way that they make use of VOT. That is, in aspirating languages, /p/ typically has a long-lag VOT (a longer duration in milliseconds) than the true-voicing languages' /p/. In the latter case, /p/ also has positive VOT, but typically with a much shorter duration. The phoneme /b/, on the other hand, is often realized with a short-lag positive VOT in aspirating languages, in which it likely has acoustic/phonetic overlap with the true-voicing language /p/. Overall, these cross-linguistic differences in VOT provide a useful continuous measure that can provide insights into cross-linguistic influence.

1.2.2 Vocalic systems

Another useful object to examine cross-linguistic influence is the vowel inventory of each language. Studies examining the articulatory space of vowels typically involve spectral measurements such as formant frequencies. In these studies, the frequency in Hertz of the at least first and second formants are measured and plotted for each vowel. The first formant (F1) is an acoustic correlate for vowel height, with higher values corresponding to lower vowels. The second formant (F2) represents vowel frontness, with higher values corresponding to a more fronted vowel.

The chosen languages also vary in the size of their vowel inventory. The Spanish vowel space is the smallest of the present study and consists of 5 distinct vowel monophthongs categorizations (Bradlow, 1995). English, French and German have a larger relative vowel spaces, where has English 11 monophthongs, and German has

14 (Bradlow, 1995; Jongman, Fourakis, & Sereno, 1989). French has as many as 16 phonemic vowel sounds.

Cross-linguistic differences in vowel spaces are important in part due to evidence that language specific L1 categories seem to matter during L2 learning. That is, previous research has identified patterns in learning novel vowel contrasts in a new language, where some are easier than others. This ease is driven by cross-linguistic similarity, or lack thereof. A main question of the present dissertation is whether this cross-linguistic similarity affects the learning of L3 sounds, and whether the L1 and L2 vowel proportionally affect this process, or if the L1 or L2 has privileged status.

Chapter 2: Models of third language acquisition

2.1 Models of third language acquisition

Research in third language acquisition has attempted to model the interplay between L1 and L2 language systems and their cumulative influence in the process of the acquisition of a third. Among questions asked by third language models is whether the L1 or L2, or a combination of both languages, serves as the basis in L3 acquisition. This question is complicated in the context of multilingualism due to the widespread diversity in bilingual populations that include wide variation in ultimate attainment in adult L2 learners, and, in the case of phonological acquisition, wide variation in the production patterns of L2 segments. To date, the models of L3 acquisition of largely focused on morphosyntax. The predictions and theoretical underpinnings of models of L3 acquisition are covered in the following section, as well as the empirical evidence for each model.

2.1.1 The Cumulative Enhancement Model

The Cumulative Enhancement Model (CEM) (Flynn, Foley, & Vinnitskaya, 2004) was one of the first formal models of L3 acquisition in adulthood. The authors argued that L3 acquisition can provide unique insights about language learning that is not possible in L1 or L2 research alone. The key question in this article was whether the properties of the L1 maintain a privileged status in L3 acquisition, or if L3 acquisition is cumulative process, in which all grammatical properties of previously known languages impact subsequent language acquisition, and, importantly, are helpful.

Within this article, the authors conducted a study to provide evidence for the newly proposed CEM. The study examined the production of restrictive relative clauses in adults and children who spoke L3 English (L1 Kazakh-L2 Russian). The results revealed similar performance on the experimental task by adults and children, and that the production of relative clauses was influenced by the participants' L2 Russian. This influence was facilitative, since this syntactic structure is common in Russian and English, but not Kazakh. The authors note, however, that the results of this study

could also be explained by a special status for the L2, rather than the L1. Berkes & Flynn (2012) conducted a further study to empirically test the predictions of the CEM. German L1 and Hungarian L1-German L2 speakers were tested in English (their L2 and L3). The authors found evidence that the L3 group performed better than the L2 group, when the syntactic structure in question was L1-like, oppositely from Flynn, Foley, & Vinnitskaya (2004), which found facilitation when L2 and L3 elements were similar. The authors argue that the results of these two studies taken together suggest that both the L1 and the L2 may influence the L3 grammar, and that these languages' influence help to produce target-like L3 productions, when the L3 has a common feature with either the L1 or the L2. A proposed issue with this model is that it can not explain non-facilitative influence from previous languages in the L3. Non-facilitation refers to when L3 performance is not target like and resembles performance in the L1 or L2. Several empirical studies have found evidence for non-facilitation in L3 tasks and would underly the predictions of further L3 models.

2.1.2 The L2 Status Factor Model

In contrast to the CEM, the L2 Status Factor Model (L2SF) predicts that the L2 will influence the L3 by default. This prediction stems from the proposed cognitive similarity between the L2 and the L3. These proposed cognitive similarities stem from the Declarative-Procedural model, which posits that the grammar of late learned languages are largely subserved by the declarative memory system, whereas early learned languages are subserved by procedural memory. Procedural and declarative memory are long term memory systems which serve distinct general cognitive functions. The declarative memory is largely used to store explicitly known knowledge, such as factual information. The procedural memory, on the other hand, subserves implicit knowledge and procedures, such as riding a bike. During first language acquisition, learning is argued to be largely implicit and is seen as a procedure in this view.

Alternatively, L2 learning is associated with declarative memory and explicit learning of a grammar, at least to a larger extent than L1 learning (Paradis, 2009) As a result, the L2 Status Factor does not make predictions in L3 learning for simultaneous

bilinguals, since it is argued that both of their languages are procedural. In summary, the L2 Status Factor predicts that, due to the cognitive similarity between a late-learned L2 and L3, the L2 will influence the L3 by default. Likewise, unlike the CEM, this influence will not always be facilitative, and is predicted to block access to the L1.

Several studies have found L2 influence in L3 tasks. In a low-sample study Bardel & Falk (2007) examined two sets of participants learning Swedish as an L3 ($n = 5$), and either Dutch or Swedish as the L2 ($n = 4$). The participants varied in their L1 and L2, and sometimes spoke three languages (which the authors classified as 2 L2s). This design was chosen to vary the order of acquisition of V2 and non-V2 languages, which differ in their placement of negation. An inspection of individual language background by the participants in Bardel & Falk (2007) (p 471-472) reveals that 4 of the participants spoke a non-V2 L1 and a V2 L2, and the remaining 5 spoke a V2 L1 and non-V2 L2. The researchers were investigating whether cross-linguistic similarity (the presence or absence of V2 in the L1 or L2) affected the production of V2 in the L3. The results provided evidence that the group with the V2 L2 outperformed the non-V2 L2 group. The authors took this result as evidence for a privileged status of the L2 in L3 production, despite its lack of facilitation. These results contradict the predictions of the CEM, which suggested that L3 learning is a cumulative process that takes advantage both L1 and L2 grammars in L3 learning.

The L2 Status Factor model has seen further empirical support in studies examining L3 syntax. Bayona (2009) examined the acquisition of middle and impersonal passive constructions in L2 and L3 Spanish. The L2 group consisted on mostly English L1 speakers, and the L3 group consisted of English L1 and French L2 speakers. The author found that the L3 Spanish group was more accurate in rejection or acceptance of target-like use of middle and passive constructions in L3 Spanish than the L2 group. These results suggest that the L2 influenced that L3, and provided evidence for both the L2 Status Factor and the Cumulative Enhancement Model. In another early study, Leung (2005) investigated the acquisition of determiner phrases and adjective word order in French as an L2 (L1 Vietnamese) and L3 (L1 Cantonese-L2 English). Using a

battery of tests, the authors concluded that the L3 group experienced influence from their L2 in both determiner phrases, which was facilitative in this case, and adjective order, which resulted in non-target like pre-nominal French adjectives. In this case, the results could arguably be accounted for by the L2 Status Factor, while the CEM cannot explain non-facilitation. However, the author's narrative conclusion of these results did not claim that there was sole access to the L2, or that the L1 was blocked. Rather, they suggest that L3 learning is not simply another case of L2 learning, in which the L1 is the sole influence. This result was replicated in other studies. For instance, Bohnacker (2006) found that L1 Swedish-L2 English-L3 German speakers showed evidence of English like word order in L3 German V2 constructions, rather than facilitative L1 Swedish. Additionally, Falk & Bardel (2011) found that 44 L3 German learners with L1 English-L2 French or L1 French-L2 English behaved differently in tasks involving object pronoun placement. This distinct behavior was likened to L2 influence and suggested that order of acquisition was more deterministic in predicting CLI than typology. Interestingly, later studies found that L1 access was possible when learners had higher metalinguistic awareness of cross-linguistic similarity between the L1 and the L3. In a study of L3 learners of a V2 language who spoke a V2 L1 and non-V2 L2, Falk, Lindqvist, & Bardel (2015), participants were given a survey which measured their awareness of cross-linguistic features in their known languages. The results revealed that participants who scored higher on the metalinguistic survey also showed evidence of facilitative influence of their L1. This outcome led the authors to revise the predictions of the L2SF to include the potential for L1 influence when metalinguistic awareness is high.

2.1.3 The Typological Primacy Model

Later studies in L3 morphosyntax would first aim to demonstrate that influence of previously known languages in L3A is not always facilitative, and would then suggest an alternative explanation and methodology for the results found in previous studies supporting L2 influence in L3 acquisition. In one such study, Rothman & Cabrelli Amaro (2010) aimed to demonstrate that the influence of previously known languages

is not always helpful, as the CEM predicts, by examining null subjects in L3 learners. The study included two groups of Spanish-English bilinguals who were learning either L3 French or L3 Italian. Importantly, all participants spoke L2 Spanish, which allows for null subjects, and spoke either L3 French (obligatory overt subjects) or L3 Italian (optional null subjects). As a result, dropping a subject in L3 French would result in non-target like production, where the opposite would be true in L3 Italian. The authors found that the data from this study provided evidence that the L2 was the influence on L3 production in both L3 groups, and provided evidence against the CEM, since the French group experimented non-facilitative effects from a previously learned languages, and the L2 Status Factor, since neither group showed evidence of L1 influence. Despite these results, the authors posited that it was possible that the perception of cross-linguistic structural similarity (Kellerman, 1983) could also be a potential explanation for the results obtained in (Rothman & Cabrelli Amaro, 2010).

Eventually, this perspective was formalized as The Typological Primacy Model (Rothman, 2010, 2011, 2013, 2015) (TPM). TPM, like the L2SF, predicts that a single language will influence the L3, but differs in that this language may be either the L1 or the L2, and that which language transfers to the L3 is determined by psychotypology after exposure to input. Rothman (2015) explains that L3 input is parsed in a hierarchical manners in which the lexicon is the primary cue parsed to determine cross-linguistic similarity between the L3 and the languages known by the L3 learner, followed by phonological or phonotactic cues, functional morphology and finally by syntactic structure. Importantly, the transfer of one grammar holistically is predicted to occur during the initial stages of acquisition. This idea of initial stages is described by Rothman as “very early in the L3 process” Rothman (2015, p. 180). At what the TPM refers to the “absolute initial state,” which the present dissertation calls “first exposure,” it suggests that both languages are in principle available to the L3 learner, but does not elaborate or make predictions as to how features of the L1 and L2 will affect absolute initial state perception and production. As a result, the TPM does not make clear predictions in the context of the present dissertation, since

the learners examined here are intended to perceive and produce the L3 at their very first exposure. Nonetheless, the TPM would best be able to account for results in which L3 speakers produce and perceive the L3 in a practically equivalent manner to their L1 or L2 in a cross-sectional design, rather than solely the L2.

Several published studies include conclusions in which the TPM is supported. In the discussion of Rothman & Cabrelli Amaro (2010), the authors suggested that it could not be determined whether L3 performance was due to L2 effects or psychotypology. As a result, the authors suggested the use of language combinations in which the order of acquisition of L1 and L2 are reversed. These groups, sometimes referred to as mirror-image groups, would include groups such as L1 Spanish-L2 English and L1 English-L2 Spanish speakers who learned the same L3. In this view, between-group performance should be similar if transfer is driven by psychotypology, and groups should behave differently if L2 status is deterministic. For example, if mirror-image groups had been used in Rothman & Cabrelli Amaro (2010) with L1 Spanish-L2 English and L1 English-L2 Spanish groups, the acceptance or rejection of L3 null subjects would allow for the examination of the predictive power of L2 status and psychotypology relative to one another. In a future study using this methodology, Rothman (2011) aimed to investigate whether L3 Brazilian Portuguese would be influenced by Spanish both when it was and was not the L2. The study examined adjective placement and meaning in the L3. The first group consisted of L1 Italian-L2 English speakers learning L3 Spanish, while the second group spoke L1 English and L2 Spanish and was learning L3 Brazilian Portuguese (BP). Based on the absence of a main effect for group in a one-way ANOVA, Rothman (2011) concluded that there was similar performance between groups and used this as evidence for the basis of the TPM. These results suggested that both groups performed in a target-like manner on the experimental task and also supported the Cumulative Enhancement Model.

Following the formal introduction of the TPM, further studies included mirror-image groups in their design and aimed to test the predictions of the model relative to the L2 Status Factor. Several of these studies involve the acquisition of L3 Brazilian

Portuguese (BP) by Spanish-English bilinguals in both orders of acquisition. Montrul, Dias, & Santos (2011) examined the production of clitic and object expressions in L3 BP by mirror-image groups of Spanish-English bilinguals. Using an oral production task and a written Acceptability Judgment Task, (AJT), it was found that L3 BP was influenced by Spanish whether it was the L1 or the L2 of the participants. Examining the same language combination and using similar mirror-image groups, Giancaspro, Halloran, & Iverson (2015) also found investigated the use of differential object marking (DOM) in L3 BP. The results suggested that Spanish influenced L3 BP whether it was the L1 or the L2. Like Montrul, Dias, & Santos (2011), Parma (2017) also investigated L3 BP clitic development and expanded upon previous studies by including both a perception and production task. Another novelty of Parma (2017) was the inclusion of an online measure, a self-paced reading task, to measure comprehension, while the study also included a story-telling task to measure production. The results of the comprehension task were inconclusive, and it could not be concluded that the experimental conditions were being processed at meaningfully difference speeds by any group. The production task, on the other hand, found evidence of errors in clitic production in L3 BP by both L1 and L2 Spanish speakers that could be likened to Spanish influence. The results of these studies provided evidence contrary to the predictions of the L2 Status Factor and suggest that Spanish influences L3 BP. Following these initial results in the language combination of L3 BP with English and Spanish, other studies aimed to test whether either the L1 or the L2 could influence performance on L3 tasks. The evidence outside of the BP/Spanish/English triad has been more limited and controversial. Some accounts in favor of the TPM's predictive power have aimed to accumulate evidence in its favor. For instance, in a recent systematic review of 92 studies in L3 acquisition, Puig-Mayenco, González Alonso, & Rothman (2020) concluded that, in support of the TPM, that either the L1 or L2 influenced L3 performance in 59 out of 92 studies. On the other hand, 29 of the studies out of 92 found that the L2 influenced the L3. Importantly, the findings were not coded in a mutually exclusive manner, since the authors coded 25 total studies as being explained both by L2 status and typology, meaning that the results of these studies

reported that the L2 transferred to the L3, but could not rule out the possibility that psycho-typological transfer could also explain the results, since the studies did not use mirror image groups (i.e., L3 groups with the same languages, but the opposite order of acquisition). A closer examination of this systematic review reveals, however, that the coding procedure did not follow a clear objective criterion. That is, there are instances in which the coding provided by the authors in the appendix contradicts the narrative conclusions of the cited studies, and it is unclear how the authors of the systematic review determined when to depart from the conclusions of authors of studies and when they decided not to.

Limitations of the TPM in addition to the lack of robust and cross-linguistic support include overstated predictive power and over-interpretation of results. The potential problem when it comes to the predictive power of the TPM is the vagueness associated with the term “initial stages” of L3 acquisition. Puig-Mayenco, González Alonso, & Rothman (2020) describes this time as some 20-25 hours of instruction, before which time access to either language is possible. This vague criterion makes it quite difficult to derive the predictions of the TPM in the case of learners who first encounter an L3. The problem of over-interpretation can be seen in the use of single language properties and inappropriate statistical tests to justify narrative conclusions. For example, the TPM is rather explicit in its prediction that languages transfer holistically to the L3, rather than on a property-by-property basis that the CEM would suggest. While, some of the evidence gathered to date provides counterevidence to sole L2 influence on the L3, it is unclear how these studies support holistic transfer. In other words, it does not seem that the body of evidence can rule out the influence of both languages within the property examined, since small samples which provide inconclusive results (non-significant p-values) do not entail equivalence within or between subjects. Such small samples and choices of methods do not allow for potential gradient and small effects of co-activation to be observed, since, on one hand, it is not possible to determine whether group results have to do with sampling issues, and, on the other, clear criteria for co-activation of both languages known by a bilingual was not explicitly included in

predictions and design of these studies. As a result, it cannot be determined based on the results of studies to date that, in the case of the L3 BP studies, Spanish is solely activated and that English is not activated. Telling this would require much larger samples and clear criteria for interpreting how results support models prior to data collection, which could include potential for non-binary interpretation of data.

2.1.4 The Linguistic Proximity Model

The prediction that a sole language will influence L3 production and perception is not shared by all models. More recent models of L3 acquisition, like the CEM, predict that both the L1 and the L2 are available to influence an L3. For example, the Linguistic Proximity Model (LPM) predicts that there is full transfer potential (FTP) of either linguistic system, but that this occurs in a gradient fashion and on a property-by-property basis (Westergaard, 2021; Westergaard, Mitrofanova, Mykhaylyk, & Rodina, 2017). In the founding article of the LPM, Westergaard, Mitrofanova, Mykhaylyk, & Rodina (2017) posed several research questions. In addition to investigating whether a sole language influences an L3, they also examined whether CLI comes from the more typologically similar language, and whether this influence is facilitative. To provide evidence that could aid in answering these questions, the authors recruited 22 Norwegian-Russian simultaneous bilinguals who spoke English as an L3. The participants completed a binary Grammaticality Judgment Task related to verb movement. The results of the tasks indicated that, compared to L1 Norwegian speaking children, bilingual children were able to benefit from their knowledge of Russian when learning L3 English. At the same time, the bilingual participants did not perform as well as L1 Russian children learning English. The authors interpreted these results, taken together, as influence from both the L1 and the L2 in the L3 English of the Russian-Norwegian bilingual children. That is, the intermediate score of the Russian-Norwegian simultaneous bilingual children learning L3 English relative to the comparison groups was taken as evidence of the co-occurrence of facilitative influence from their Russian and non-facilitative influence from their Norwegian.

The LPM, like the TPM and CEM, predicts that similarities between languages plays a major role in L3 acquisition, rather than order of acquisition, as the L2 Status Factor predicts. The LPM departs from the TPM in that it predicts that abstract structural properties causes CLI, rather than the general perceived typological proximity. In other words, it suggests that cross-linguistic influence is decided on a feature-by-feature basis, rather than generalizing whole language predictions. Additionally, the LPM predicts that all languages are available to the L3 learner throughout the learning process, unlike the TPM.

A methodological consideration advocated for by the LPM is the use of subtractive groups. Unlike mirror image groups, which seek to compare two trilingual groups, subtractive groups compare L3 learners to L2 learners. In the case of the studies to date, L3 learners of English who speak Russian and Norwegian were compared to Russian L1/English L2 and Norwegian L1/English L2 groups. It has been argued that this design allows for gradient effects of both the L1 and L2 to be observed. That is, intermediate values in L3 performance on experimental tasks relative to the L2 performance of the comparison groups is taken as evidence of co-activation of both languages. On the other hand, if no difference could be found between L2 and L3 learners of the same language, the LPM would consider this evidence for the influence of a single language on the L3.

Following the introduction of the model, several studies have tested the predictions of the LPM. In order to test whether bilinguals have access to two languages during L3 learning, Mitrofanova & Westergaard (2018) conducted a study Norwegian-Russian bilinguals and Norwegian monolinguals in which they taught them some of an artificial language which was designed to contain Norwegian-like lexical items, but also Russian like case marking to distinguish subjects from objects. The results revealed that the bilingual group performed better than the monolingual group on a sentence/picture matching task, in which the monolinguals relied solely on word order when making decisions.

These results suggested that the bilingual group was able to make use of both of their

languages at first exposure. In a series of studies, Stadt, Hulk, & Sleeman (2016) examined L1 Dutch - L2 English - L3 French speakers in both English immersion and general Dutch-dominant educational settings. In the first study, the results of a Grammaticality Judgement Task indicated that third year the immersion group showed signs of heavy L2 influence in the L3, where the regular group showed evidence of CLI from both the L1 and the L2. In a follow up study, the authors recruited 4th year students from the same educational background to investigate whether L2 influence would differ between 3rd and 4th year students (Stadt, Hulk, & Sleeman, 2018b). The results revealed that both 3rd and 4th year immersion groups behaved similarly and showed evidence of primarily English influence on their L3 judgments, though evidence for L1 influence was also found.

In a second follow up study, the authors gave similar materials to the an L3 German group (Stadt, Hulk, & Sleeman, 2020). In this case, L3 German judgments were concluded to have been influenced by the more typologically similar L1 Dutch, rather than L2 English as found in the previous cases. Taken together, the results of these studies suggest that both typology and L2 Status may play a role in modeling the patterns of cross linguistic influence in an L3. Finally, these authors also conducted longitudinal study (Stadt, Hulk, & Sleeman, 2018a), again with L1 Dutch-L2 English-L3 French speakers. In this study, they found that the L1 was more influential in the beginning stages of L3 development, but that the L1 also maintained influence as L3 proficiency increased. In a more recent study, Jensen et al. (2021) investigated similar groups to Westergaard et al. (2017), in which simultaneous Russian-Norwegian bilinguals were compared to subtractive L1 Russian-L2 English and L1 Norwegian-L2 English groups, but included seven total linguistic properties. The results indicated that the L3 group experienced facilitative influence in some cases, but non-facilitative influence in others. Additionally, the sources of this influence could be likened to either Russian or Norwegian. The results of studies, taken together, suggest that both languages are active in L3 learning, and it also appears that they remain active throughout L3 development.

Like other L3 models, the LPM has received criticism. Scholars have argued that the LPM makes vague predictions creates a problem in modeling L3 transfer acquisition [Bardel & Falk (2021); wrembel_multilingual_2021], since it is unclear when transfer of a particular structure occurs and when it does not. Likewise researchers have argued that, unlike the TPM and the L2SF, the LPM is not easily falsifiable (Bardel & Falk, 2021). However, Westergaard (2021) argue that the LPM does make specific predictions, since it is predicted that accuracy should fall between L1 and L2 values on experimental tasks. The authors state that, when using subtractive groups, if the L3 group performance falls above or below the one of the two L2 groups, then the model would be falsified.

Additionally, it is notable that the empirical studies that serve as the basis of the LPM (Westergaard, 2021; Westergaard, Mitrofanova, Mykhaylyk, & Rodina, 2017) utilize groups of simultaneous bilinguals, which do not allow for the examination of potential L2 status effects. Following this idea, Westergaard, Mitrofanova, Mykhaylyk, & Rodina (2017) suggest that an optimal design to examine both the individual contributions of languages, as well as potential language status effects, would be the so-called fully combined design. This suggestion entails the use of both mirror-image groups, as seen in the TPM studies (e.g. L1 Spanish-L2 English-L3 BP and L1 English-L2 Spanish-L3 BP), and subtractive groups (e.g. L1 Spanish-L2 English-L3 BP, L1 Spanish-L2 BP and L1 English-L2 BP) used in the LPM studies. As a result, a fully combined design would result in the use of 6 total groups, in which a mirror image design contains L1 speakers of both background languages who learn the L3 as an L2.

2.1.5 The Scalpel Model

The Scalpel Model (Slabakova, 2017) is an additional model of L3A which overlaps in many of its predictions with the LPM. Like the LPM, the Scalpel Model rejects the idea of wholesale transfer of either L1 or L2 proposed by the TPM. Rather, it suggests that, given L3 input, the L1 and L2 combined grammar should successfully extract facilitative features from the input. In this view, non-facilitation is driven by

misleading, processing complexity, and frequency of a construction. That is, more complex constructions and less frequent constructions are predicted to be associated with non-facilitative CLI.

The major divergence of the Scalpel Model from other L3 models lies in its focus on the role of input in driving non-facilitation. Evidence for this claim comes from 2 empirical studies. Both studies examined three groups of participants L1 Basque-L2 Spanish-L3 English, L1 Spanish-L2 Basque-L3 English, and L1 Spanish-L2 English (García Mayo & Slabakova, 2015; Slabakova & García Mayo, 2015). García Mayo & Slabakova (2015) tested the use of null objects, which are not allowed in English, they are in Basque and sometimes in Spanish. Using speaker judgments, the results showed that null objects were often correctly rejected in L3 English. The second study, examining the same groups, focused on topicalization (Slabakova & García Mayo, 2015). In this case, L3 English speakers did not show evidence of target like behavior on grammaticality judgment tasks. The results of these studies suggest that one feature, topicalization, is difficult to acquire, where null objects was easier to acquire in L3 English. The author suggests that this difficulty could be explained the likely lower frequency of topicalization in L3 English input relative to the lack of null objects. Overall, the predictions of the Scalpel Model at first exposure might suggest that facilitation would occur in the event that the L3 stimulus has a clear bias to the L1 or the L2. That is, the Scalpel Model and the CEM should share similar predictions for the behavior of L3 learners at first exposure, but differ as the L3 develops. The Scalpel Model does not seem to predict or concur with the prediction of the LPM that L3 performance on experimental task should fall between L1 and L2 performance.

Chapter 3: Models of L2 phonological acquisition

3.1 Models of L2 phonological acquisition

Notably, much of the evidence for the L3 models to date come from studies which examine the acquisition (morpho)syntactic features. The models do not always spell out specific predictions when it comes to L3 phonology. In the case of the TPM, full transfer could be taken to mean the transfer of an entire language system to the L3, including phonology, but this stipulation is not explicitly spelled out in the recent articles articulating the predictions and motivations of the TPM (Rothman, 2010, 2011, 2013, 2015). In the LPM, phonology is also not directly addressed, but there does not seem to be any reason why the same predictions should not apply to phonology as syntax. Specifically, the LPM should predict that L3 performance should be intermediate and fall between L1 and L2 performance on experimental tasks. Though a model of L3 phonological acquisition has yet to be proposed, the expansion of L2 models of phonological acquisition has been proposed (Wrembel, Marecka, & Kopečková, 2019).

Many accounts for L2 phonological acquisition exist. In general, these models all have in common that language-specific L1 categories drive L2 speech development. It is still not well known how the predictions of the predictions of these models apply to L3 speech development when L2 categories are also theoretically available to the L3. In the section that follows, a brief overview of each model, along with its evidence, will be covered. Following the model introductions, its relationship and proposed expansion to L3 phonology will be discussed.

3.1.1 The Speech Learning Model

The original SLM J. Flege (1995) focuses on the acquisition of segments in the L2 and emphasizes the importance of cross-linguistic similarity in L2 speech learning. In this view, new segments are predicted to be easier to learn, where segments which have close matches in the L2 will be much harder to acquire at a native-like level.

Essentially, the SLM proposes that L1 and L2 sounds are linked through a process referred to as “interlingual identification,” in that the L2 sound encountered as first exposure are seen as either good or bad phonetic variants of a native category (J. Flege, 1995). In this view, acquisition of L2 segments occurs after increased exposure to these segments, where segmental complexity modulates the rate of learning (James Emil Flege, Aoyama, & Bohn, 2021). Additionally, the SLM posits that allophonic variation and segment position matter, as opposed to the learning of a phoneme generalizing across positions.

For instance, Iverson, Hazan, & Bannister (2005) conducted a study in which they successfully trained Japanese speakers to better identify /r/ and /l/ in word initial position, but that this training was not effective for word-medial or word-initial clusters containing liquids.

The original SLM also suggested that the age of first exposure (the younger the better), and L2 experience were important predictors to L2 learning success. The SLM makes a distinction between identification as opposed to categorization. The importance of this distinction involves the learning of phonetic variants during the learning process, which lead to new L2 phonetic category formations. For example, using a two-alternative forced choice task, Bohn & Flege (1992) asked Spanish monolinguals to identify English stops and provided them with pre-voiced, short lag and long lag stops as tokens. Importantly, Spanish monolinguals identified English stops identified long lag /t/ as /t/, despite the lack of a long-lag category in their native inventory.

3.1.1.1 The revised SLM

The SLM was recently revised, and has updated some assumptions and predictions. The revised model maintained many of the same assumptions as the original, and importantly focuses on sequential bilinguals, where speech learning begins when the phonetic categories of the L1 have been established. According to James Emil Flege, Aoyama, & Bohn (2021), the updated tenets of the Revised Speech Learning Model

(SLM-r) are that, first, phonetic categories are formed based on their statistical regularities in the input, such that greater exposure to a particular phonetic cue should be correlated with the re-tuning of that cue towards the input. Second, all learners make use of the same learning mechanisms in L2 learning that they do in native language learning. That is, the SLM-r refutes the idea of a critical period for speech learning, and suggests that non-native production in perception is due to differences the quality and quantity of input between native speakers and L2 learners and L1 effects. Another important update to the SLM-r is the idea that perception and production co-evolve. In other words, the SLM-r does not predict that perception will precede production.

The revised model has not yet received empirical support, due to its recent revision. It is outside the scope of the present dissertation to evaluate the predictions of the SLM-r when it comes to statistically driven re-tuning of phonetic categories. However, the phonetic categories that are in place in a bilingual at the first exposure to L3 learning could be treated as an integrated inventory when it comes to L3 learning. Based on the idea that the same mechanisms are in place in L1 and L2 phonetic category formation, the same mechanisms should be in place for L3 phonetic category formation. In this view, the acoustic similarity of an L3 segment to an L1 or L2 segment should predict how difficult learning an L3 segment will be. In this view, there is not reason to predict a blocking of one language system (L1 or L2) provided that these systems have well-established phonetic categories.

3.1.2 The Perceptual Assimilation Model

Relative to the SLM, the Perceptual Assimilation Model (SLM) focuses on the perception of sound contrasts by L2 learners (Best & Tyler, 2007). The PAM involves various scenarios in which the cross-linguistic inventories of specific languages predict how easily L2 sounds will be to acquire. For instance, if a L2 learner's native language contains a contrast that also exist in the L2, then this contrast will be easily perceived in the L2 (two-category assimilation). In the event that two native language categories

correspond to a single L2 category (single category assimilation), discrimination is predicted to be intermediate. In the event that a native category must be split into two categories (X assimilation) discrimination is predicted to be poorer.

Evidence for the predictions of the PAM has been found in studies which involve the presentation of sounds to naive learners of an L2 (first exposure), or to more experienced L2 learners. Experiments typically present the subjects with native-language vowel categories in written form and auditory stimuli of L2 vowel sounds and participants are tasked with choosing the closest matching native-language vowel category given the options, and to rate the goodness of fit of this decision.

This methodological paradigm has found evidence that two category assimilation is difficult for L2 learners. For example, Escudero & Chládková (2010) found that Spanish L1 speakers assimilated SSBE /æ/ and /a/ to Spanish /a/ (that discrimination of this contrast was difficult). Additionally, Escudero, Sisinni, & Grimaldi (2014) provided evidence that Salento Italian L1 speakers assimilated SSBE /æ/, /a/ and /ʌ/ to Salento Italian /a/, while Escudero & Vasiliev (2011) Spanish speakers assimilated Canadian English /æ/ and /e/ to Spanish /a/. Finally, Escudero & Williams (2011) found that Spanish listeners assimilated the two categories in Dutch /a/ and /a:/ to their single Spanish category /a/.

The present dissertation tests whether assimilation acquired during second language acquisition apply to third language sound perception. In other words, it tests whether L3 perception mirrors L2 perception in similar ways that has been observed in L3 production. Specifically, it tests whether L3 speakers categorize L3 sounds similarly to L2 sounds, and whether phonetic discrimination of sounds that would be phonemic in the L1 is accessible in the perception of L3 words at first exposure, or whether there is an initial blocking or the L1 or L2 bias effect.

3.1.3 The Second Language Linguistic Perception Model

The Second Language Linguistic Perception Model (L2LP) is a computational model of L2 speech learning and is similar to the PAM in that it focuses on sound contrasts as the basis for L2 speech learning, rather than single segments (Leussen & Escudero, 2015). In this view, it is difficult for L2 learners to make contrasts which are not present in their L1. In their revision of the L2LP, van Leussen & Escudero support this claim with several empirical studies. Namely, that these studies have provided evidence that L2 learners experience difficulty with the contrasts of /r/ and /l/ in Japanese, (Aoyama, Flege, Guion, Akahane-Yamada, & Yamada, 2004) “beat” and “bit” in Spanish and Portuguese (J. E. Flege, Frieda, & Nozawa, 1997) “bet” and “bat” in Dutch (Broersma, 2005). The authors argue that these results suggest that linguistic experience is at the heart of L2 learning. Specifically, cross-linguistic comparisons of L1 categories and L2 categories are thought to predict the ease of L2 category learning. The L2LP, unlike the PAM and the SLM, also aims to model the entire learning process, rather than the beginning stages of L2 speech learning. This entire learning process is predicted computationally and is based on Stochastic Optimality Theory (Boersma, 1998).

An important tenet of the postulate of the L2LP is the optimal perception hypothesis. Essentially, this proposal suggests that the initial perception of L2 sounds is the result of L1 acquisition. The development of L2 learners is predicted similarly to PAM, where a single category assimilation from PAM, in which a native category must be split, is called a new category scenario in the L2LP. This scenario is predicted by both models to be difficult for the L2 learner. On the other hand, the PAM and the L2LP predict that the case when two L1 sounds correspond well to two L2 sounds that discrimination of these sounds will be relatively easier. This is referred to as a single category assimilation in PAM and a similar scenario in the L2LP. The final scenario of the L2LP is the subset scenario. In this case, a single L2 phoneme is perceived as two L1 categories. The same case is referred to as uncategorized or categorized-uncategorized in the PAM, and both models predict that discrimination

of these sounds will be better than the case of new scenarios, but not as good as discrimination of subset scenarios.

Empirical support has been found for these predictions. In two-category assimilation/similar scenario, Escudero & Boersma (2004), native Dutch speakers assimilated the Spanish /i/ to their native Dutch /i/, and the Spanish /e/ to their Dutch /I/. However, the L2LP predicts that the similar (two-category assimilation) scenario may lead to inappropriate lexical contrasts, and argues that pre-lexical and lexical contrasts should be taken into account when it comes to sound discrimination. Evidence for this claim stems from studies which found that L2 learners could not perceive a contrast in lexical items that they could discriminate outside of lexical items (Curtin, Goad, & Pater, 1998). Other studies show that some lexical items can also be reliably distinguished by L2 learners that could not be told apart pre-lexically (Cutler, Weber, & Otake, 2006; Weber & Cutler, 2004). As a result, an important tenet of the revised L2LP (Leussen & Escudero, 2015) is that meaning-driven learning predicts the developmental path of L2 phoneme perception. The L2LP simulates the entire trajectory of L2 learning based on the various learning scenarios. In the revised L2LP, Leussen & Escudero (2015) suggest that category reduction is possible when it is driven by meaning based learning.

The predictions of the L2LP which are important for the present dissertation are the Full Copying hypothesis. If L3 phonological learning is another instance of L2 learning, then the L2LP and the TPM should share the prediction that the initial state of L3 learning is the end state of either L1 or L2 learning, but not both. In this view, bilingual participants who are first exposed to an L3 should produce and categorize L3 sounds as similarly to a single language, rather than producing or perceiving some sounds as L1-like and others as L2-like. Additionally, these participants' behavior on the experimental tasks should a) resemble either their own L2 behavior or L1 behavior or b) in the case of L1 influence, resemble a monolingual comparison group who is first exposed to an L2 (e.g. Spanish L1, English L2, exposed to German, and Spanish L1 exposed to German should behave similarly if Spanish is language which is "fully

copied” at first exposure.)

Chapter 4: Previous literature in L3 phonology

4.1 Previous literature in L3 phonology

In the research to date, L3 models have focused largely on empirical results stemming from experiments in morpho-syntax to derive predictions about how the L1 and L2 affect L3 acquisition. Fewer studies have been conducted in L3 phonology, and it remains unclear whether L3 models make specific predictions for phonology and morphosyntax. Despite this lack of specificity in the models when it comes to phonology, some trends have emerged in the body of research. Specifically, it appears that the L1 and L2 likely both affect L3 perception and production, with the L2 often providing a greater level of influence in the beginning stages of acquisition, even when it is not facilitative. This trend cannot readily be accounted for by the TPM, the L2SF, the CEM nor the Scalpel Model, leaving only the LPM which can predict co-activation of all languages known by a bilingual in L3 acquisition. The following sections cover the empirical studies that have been done in L3 production studies across L3 proficiency levels, and the fewer studies done in L3 perception, as well as their relevance to L3 models.

4.1.1 L3 Production Studies

The findings in empirical studies of L3 phonological cross-linguistic influence have varied. One of the first studies to examine progressive influence of the L1 or L2 on L3 production was the seminal case study of Williams & Language 1998. This study elicited the production of an adult L1 British English, L2 German, and L3 Swedish speaker in the L2 and L3 upon her arrival to Sweden. The speech samples were rated for native-likeness by native speakers of German and Swedish respectively, with low ratings (i.e. non-nativeness) being elaborated upon. In the event of non-native speech, the raters guessed where the speaker in the recording might be from. The informant was rated as having near native productions in her L2 German, while her L3 Swedish was rated as being non-native like and to be German-accented. The experiment was repeated after 6 months in Sweden, however, and the Swedish raters then judged the

informant's Swedish to be British English accented.

This study constituted evidence of an L2 status effect in the initial stages of L3 phonological acquisition, in which the second learned language influence L3 production, but also provided evidence that this effect diminishes as L3 proficiency increases. This notion has been called the 'foreign language effect' (Meisel, 1983), which refers to the idea that speakers who learn a second non-native language are biased to sound unlike a native speaker of their native language.

The default L2 status effect has received some empirical support in the L3 phonology literature. In a study of global accent production, heavier L2 influence in L3 productions was found by L1 Polish, L2 German and L3 English speakers based on ratings of EFL instructors (Wrembel, 2010). Similar findings have also been reported in vowel production (Kamiyama, 2007) vowel reduction and speech rhythm (Gut, 2010). L2 influence has also been found in VOT productions. Llama, Cardoso, & Collins (2010) examined L3 Spanish VOT production by French-English mirror-image bilingual groups and found that both groups had L2-like productions of the L3.

Other findings in L3 production, however, have yielded mixed results. Several studies have found that acoustic properties of the participants' productions fall between L1 and L3 values, suggesting that both the L1 and the L2 have some influence on L3 productions, rather than solely one language. For instance, (Wrembel, 2014) measured VOT and aspiration in all languages of participants with two different language combinations: L1 Polish, L2 English, and L3 French; (2) L1 Polish, L2 English, and L3 German. The results showed that each language had a specific stop-value, and that the L3 VOT productions were intermediate, falling between the L1 and L2 values. Similarly, (Wrembel, 2011) examined thirty-two learners of L3 French with L1 Polish and L2 English who were recorded reading lists of words in carrier phrases. As in previous studies (Wrembel, 2014), combined transfer from the L1 and the L2 in VOT productions was found. Findings of combined L1 and L2 influence in VOT productions were also reported by Wunder (2010) in L3 Spanish speakers, and by Blank & Zimmer

(2009) in L3 English speakers who spoke L1 Brazilian Portuguese and L2 French. Other studies have found an L1 influence on production despite L3 proficiency (Wrembel, 2012), or in advanced L3 learners (Llama & Cardoso, 2018). Importantly, these studies report L3 VOT values which fall between L1 and L2 values. Following the suspicion that intermediate values might have to do with either sampling issues or proficiency effects, Parrish (2021) examined Mexican Spanish-English bilinguals who produced voiceless stop-initial French words in isolation at first exposure to the language. The results found that the relative VOT of the L3 fell between their own L1 and L2 values, in line with previous research, and that suggested that intermediate values were less likely to have been seen in previous studies as a result of small samples or proficiency effects. However, a subsequent analysis of the data suggested that wide individual variation existed in the data, in which some participants produced L3 French as L1 Spanish like, and other produced intermediate, L2-like values. This result suggests that higher samples could reveal group trends and provide better insights into individual variation in crosslinguistic influence, as opposed to assuming that a single group trend exists.

4.1.2 L3 Perception studies

Overall, studies in L3 perception have been much more scarce relative to studies in production. These few studies have often used methods found in L2 speech acquisition research, such as studies testing the predictions of the Perceptual Assimilation Model. For instance, Wrembel, Marecka, & Kopečková (2019) examined the categorization and discrimination of L3 vowels by 10 young trilinguals who spoke L1 German-L2 English-L3 Polish. To test categorization, a cross-linguistic similarity task was used in which participants heard minimal pairs of sounds and had to rate how similar sounds were on a 1-7 Likert scale. The results showed evidence that participants assimilated L3 sounds to both L1 and L2 categories, but preferred the L2. In a second experiment, and AX discrimination task was given to participants to evaluate whether retroflex and palato-alveolar sibilant discrimination, a feature of Polish, could be accessed in L3 words. The results revealed that discrimination of the L1 Polish contrast was very

good (84% accuracy), suggesting that L3 learners retain access to L1 sound contrasts in L3 words.

Additionally, this language specific phonetic discrimination was attended to by even L3 beginners. Balas (2018) also used the PAM as a perceptual framework to work in and adapted it to L3 learners. The study recruited three groups of Polish L1 speakers, including two L3 groups (L1 Polish-L2 English-L3 Dutch and L1 Polish-L2 English-L3 Dutch). The third group spoke only English as an L2. All three groups were listened to Dutch vowels and were asked to categorize them given Polish vowel categories. Unfortunately, the L3 groups were not given L2 English categories as options during this task, so the results of this study cannot directly provide evidence that L3 learners categorize L3 sounds using both the L1 and L2. The same study also conducted an AXB discrimination task of 8 Dutch vowels and found that discrimination was at ceiling for all vowels involved.

An additional line of research in L3 perception studies has pondered whether L3 learners have a general perceptual advantage over their L2 learning counterparts. In an early study, Werker (1986) investigated mono, bi and multilingual participants' discrimination of non-native perceptual contrasts and did not find any evidence that the bi or multilingual group had any perceptual advantage. Patihis, Oh, & Mogilner (2015) examined Korean stops by naive mono and multilingual listeners and found that phoneme discrimination was feature dependent, rather than bilingualism providing a general advantage. Antoniou, Best, & Tyler (2013) investigated the contrast of Ma'di stops by early English-Greek bilinguals, English monolinguals and Greek monolinguals. The researchers wanted to know whether language mode affected categorization and discrimination. They found that categorization is modulated by language mode, but discrimination of novel sounds was not. In particular, the Greek monolingual group was most successful in the discrimination of the novel contrast, where the English monolingual group was the least accurate. The bilingual group, regardless of language mode, displayed intermediate ability to discriminate the novel sounds. In a further study, Antoniou, Liang, Ettlinger, & Wong (2015) taught mono and

bilingual participants an artificial language based on either English or Mandarin. The results revealed that bilingual participants outlearned the monolingual groups overall, but universally more difficult unfamiliar L3 segments do not seem to be learned more easily by bilinguals. Wrembel, Gut, Kopečková, & Balas (2020) also found that cross-linguistic influence is structure dependent and varies among individuals. Onishi (2016) reported a bilingual advantage, but, rather than feature dependent, suggested that this advantage was global. The study involved speakers of Korean who spoke L2 English and L3 Japanese. The author found a correlation between successful discrimination of L3 contrasts and L2 experience, and argued that this correlation is evidence for a bilingual advantage. These findings suggest that crosslinguistic similarity of both a bilingual's languages play a role in the ease of acquiring a novel, L3 sound. Additionally, research focused on a bilingual advantage in phonetic learning can inform L3 models, since it implies that bilinguals have access to the phonetic categories in both languages that they speak, even at first exposure, whether or not the advantages of bilingualism on phonetic learning are global or feature dependent. Few studies have investigated the role of VOT in L3 perception. One such study is Z. Liu, Gorba, & Cebrian (2019), which examined the perceptual boundary of a VOT continuum in L1 Mandarin, L2 English and L3 Spanish. Using a /pi-bi/ continuum, the authors found that the perceptual boundaries of each language were 28ms for Chinese, 24.6ms for English and 23ms for Spanish. Despite the goal of the study being to examine regressive transfer and to compare the L3 speakers to monolinguals, descriptive evidence of L2 effects can be inferred from the reported means. Additionally, J. Liu & Lin (2021) examined perception and production of word-initial voiced and voiceless stops in speakers of L1 Mandarin, L2 English and L3 Russian or Japanese. The authors found that voiced stops were effectively perceived, but not reliably produced, where voiceless stops were both successfully perceived and produced.

Chapter 5: Methods and anylsis in previous work

5.1 Methods and anylsis in previous work

The widely varied findings in previous work do not have a clear plausible correlate, but may be related to issues related to sampling issues combined with methodological choices. In this subsection, an overview of sample sizes in previous work will be given, followed by potential issues related to small samples. Subsequently, common methods in the body of research used to analyze L3 data will be discussed, followed by their potential shortcomings. Finally, the manner in which the present dissertation addresses these issues will be covered.

Overall, it is unclear whether sufficient sample sizes have been used in the body of research to date. Of the empirical studies reported in the present dissertation, none used a power analysis or otherwise justified their sample size per group. Unfortunately, the tradition in L3 research has involved model building with small samples. The use of small samples are associated with higher sampling error, and, as a result, a higher risk of type 1 error. In other words, a single study with a small sample cannot rule out the possibility that their results are due to sampling error, or a non-representative pool of participants from an assumed population distribution. As Brysbaert (2020) argues, low samples lead to low statistical power, and in turn provide a metaphorical blurred picture of our desired outcome.

In addition to issues associated with low sample size, L3 research to date has used statistical methods which provide dubious evidence for their claims. Among these issues is the use of an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as a basis for determining whether groups or individuals perform experiment tasks in a practically equivalent manner rather than a statistical Test of Equivalence (Lakens, 2017). At the heart of this issue is a criticism which may apply to frequentist methods of statistical analysis in general; testing against the null hypothesis. If the null hypothesis is rejected, evidence is provided that the difference between or within groups is non-zero. On the other hand, if a non-zero difference is not found, there is not evidence for practical

equivalence. Such an assumption has been made in the L3 literature, and in particular in L3 model building.

For example, in his seminal article introducing the Typological Primacy Model, Rothman (2011) concluded that two groups of L3 learners did not perform differently on the L3 Brazilian Portuguese acceptability judgment task and took this as evidence for similar performance between the groups, and evidence of typological similarity effects in L3 judgments. There are two possible issues with this conclusion. Firstly, the lack of a power analysis does not rule out sampling error. It cannot be argued that the sample used in this study was high enough to reliably detect an effect (or lack thereof). Secondly, a wide confidence interval from the low sample size would make providing evidence for statistical equivalence in a test of equivalence likely impossible. Unfortunately, the reporting of results in many L3 studies to date do not allow for post-hoc power analyses to be run, since means and standard deviations are not reported. It remains unclear whether sample sizes in L3 research are sufficiently powered to be able to generalize, and, by extension, to build models.

Despite the lack of empirical data available to evaluate the statistical power of L3 studies to date, it is probable that the sample sizes used are not statistically powered. Brysbaert (2020) argues that, for between group comparisons, samples of at least 80 per group are often necessary, but a power analysis should be carried out to justify sample size. To the author's knowledge, no L3 study has been able to recruit this many participants per group. For instance, Rothman (2011) recruited just 11 and 15 in two groups. Plonsky (2015) suggests that combating issues associated with low sample size is possible in ways other than simply increasing sample size. For instance, he suggests that the use of descriptive statistics, including effect sizes and confidence intervals, would be an improvement in L2 research in general. This advice is in line with the idea that frequentist analysis, and linguistic research, has relied on p-values to determine the presence of a so-called significant statistical difference. Plonsky (2015), along with others, have argued that the use of p-value alone to make real-world inferences is problematic due to issues associated with sampling error and

the presence of the magnitude of an effect.

In order to address these potential issues, the present dissertation recruited bilinguals, rather than trilinguals, at first exposure to a third language in order to pull from a likely higher and more homogeneous population of participants. This higher sample, coupled with the use of frequentist tests of equivalence and Bayesian inference allow for both a categorical and gradient interpretation of the data. In doing so, less reliance is put on a narrative interpretation of the results, and the results lend themselves to a more objective outcome.

5.2 Bringing L2 speech models and L3 models together and evaluating predictions

By using the methods used to test the prediction of models of L2 phonological acquisition (The SLM, the PAM, and the L2LP), more nuanced evidence may be obtained to evaluate the predictive power of L3 models. With the revision of the SLM, at least three L2 speech models advocate for the study of naive or beginning learners in L2 speech learning research. The present dissertation adopts this point of view and applies it in a third-language context in perception and production. By measuring the perception and production patterns of the first (or, at least, very early) exposure to a third language, coupled with measurements in each language, and the variation of cross-linguistic influence can be observed/studied in L3 perception and production. If, as the SLM-r predicts, category formation is driven by input and retuning of L1 categories in L2 acquisition, and the same mechanisms that are used in L1 phonetic category formation in L2 phonetic category formation, then it is likely that the SLM would predict that those same mechanisms are at play in L3 phonetic category formation, and that this process is guided by L3 input.

Following this logic, the question becomes whether L1 or L2 categories are retuned to L3 categories, and what conditions determine which language category is initially chosen and its rate of retuning. The present dissertation focuses on which category is

chosen as the initial L3 category, while the rate of change in these categories is left for future research. One possibility which may influence whether an L1 or L2 category influences an L3 is the acoustic similarity of the L3 segment relative to an individuals' L1 and L2 phonetic categories. The TPM predicts that phonetic cues do play a role in L3 input parsing, in that they are parsed and used in order to make a decision of which language system to holistically transfer. However, the TPM would (likely) not predict that two segments would be assimilated to two distinct language categories. Additionally, if one language holistically impacts the acquisition of a third at first exposure, then the behavior of L3 learners should resemble L2 learners, provided the L1 is the source of influence in L3 acquisition, or should be practically equivalent in a within-subject comparison. In the case of the predicted behavior of L2 influence on L3 productions, L2 production and perception should be practically equivalent in a within-subject comparison. The predictions of the Linguistic Proximity Model would be able to account for the same L3 sound being categorized differently by the same subject, and by different subjects, and for two different L3 sounds being categorized as an L1 and L2 category respectively.

Chapter 6: The Present Study

The present study investigates the production and perception of words in a language by bilinguals that they do not yet know. In so doing, the present dissertation aims to investigate the very initial stage of acquisition by providing an overview of the initial relative influence of both L1 and L2. In this study, sequential, late, Spanish-English bilinguals of both order of acquisition will be given an aspirating L3 (German) or a true-voicing L3 (French) to shadow. In perception, the participants will match L3 vowel sounds to L1 and L2 categories, and complete an AX discrimination task. Following these tasks, the link between perception and production will be discussed.

6.1 Research Questions

The present dissertation is guided by the following research questions. Broadly, this project focuses on progressive influence of L1 and L2 system of L3 perception and production, as well as the cross-linguistic similarity of the languages involved. By taking these factors into account, more precise evidence can be provided to evaluate the predictions of L3 models.

6.1.1 Chapter 2: Production

RQ1: Will Spanish-English bilinguals produce L3 words with Spanish or English like VOT?

Based on the results of (Parrish, 2021), it is predicted that L3 VOT will fall between L1 and L2 values, in both L3 German and L3 French. This result would support the Linguistic Proximity Model, which suggests that all languages are always active. However, there are several other possible scenarios that would support other L3 models. If L3 VOT values are practically equivalent to L1 or L2 values, the Typological Primacy Model would be supported, since single language influence would be a plausible explanation of this result. If L3 VOT is also target like, and comes from L1 or L2, then the Cumulative Enhancement Model and Scalpel Model could

also explain the results. On the other hand, if L3 VOT is practically equivalent to L2 VOT, this result is not (always) facilitative, and mirror image groups with distinct L2s both show L2-like L3 VOT, the L2 Status Factor would be the only model capable of explaining the data.

Additionally, there are no specific predictions about whether each L3 segment will be influenced to a similar degree, or whether some segments will be more influenced by the L1 or L2 than others. The results of (Parrish, 2021) suggest that each segment was similarly influenced by the L1 and L2, but there was some variation. In terms of L3 models, again the LPM would be the only model that could account for variation in the activation of both languages across segments in which both L1 and L2 influence can be seen. If some segments were L1 like and others were L2 like, then the CEM, Scalpel Model, and LPM could account for this, where TPM the L2SF could not.

RQ2: Will Spanish-English bilinguals produce vowels with F1 and F2 values more like English or Spanish?

The predictions in vowel production are analogous to those in stop production. It is predicted that L3 vowel production will be intermediate between L1 and L2 values. The evidence in support of L3 models and their predictions is also identical in the case of vowels.

RQ3: Will the same CLI trends be observed in L3 German as L3 French?

It is predicted that the phonetic differences in the input will affect the performance of the shadowing task, at least at the group level. In Parrish (2021), L1 Spanish L2 English bilinguals shadowed French, which is phonetically similar to Spanish in its use of voiceless As a result, the French stimuli were unaspirated short lag stops. The group results, however, revealed that many participants aspirated word initial stops, presumably due to the influence of English. This result suggested that L2 influence is frequent and pronounced. However, other participants produced target-like L3 French tokens. In this latter case, it was unclear whether L3 productions were target-like due

to effective mimicry or language influence. By including a German L3 group, both explanations can be tested. If, between groups with the same order of acquisition, relative VOT of shadowed German tokens are practically equivalent to the relative VOT of shadowed French and they are not target-like, then the phonetics of the stimuli will not seem to be a contributing factor to L3 pronunciation. That is, for example, if L1 Spanish-L2 English speakers aspirate German and French at the same rates, despite the German tokens being aspirated and French tokens being unsaturated, then the aspiration of the input would not reliably predict L3 production patterns. If, on the other hand, L3 German VOT is aspirated more often than L3 French, it could be interpreted as evidence that the phonetic qualities of the input at first exposure to an L3 interact with language status effects. A third possibility is that typological similarity of segments is the most influential factor predicting L3 pronunciation at first exposure. In order for this view to be supported, close to target-like L3 production should be seen from both orders of acquisition. For example, if the L3 were French and if typological (acoustic) similarity was the most influential predictor, it would be expected for L1 Spanish-L2 English and L1 English-L2 Spanish speakers to produce L3 French as close to their own Spanish, whether or not it is the L2.

RQ4: Will primary influence of the L1 or L2 remain consistent in vowels and stops?

Generalization across segments is an important piece of evidence to evaluate the predictions of full transfer models in L3A, since it provides evidence for or against holistic influence. In particular, if stop categories are influenced by a specific language, then full transfer models, such as the TPM and L2SF would predict that vowel categories should be influenced by the same language. Alternatively, if stops and vowels are influenced by different languages known by the L3 learner, then this would falsify the predictions of full transfer models.

6.1.2 Chapter 3: Perception

RQ5: Will bilinguals categorize L3 vowel sounds using L1 and L2 categories?

A closely related question to generalization across L3 segments is whether the same sounds will be perceived and categorized using a single language's categories, or whether the same sound may be assigned to an L1 category in one instance, but an L2 category in another. If the same sound is categorized differently by the same speaker, and if those categorizations are both L1 and L2 categories, then this will be taken as evidence of uncertainty, and access to both languages in the event of this uncertainty. The predictions of L3 models would likely be the same in this case as the categorization of different sounds in L1 and L2 categories.

RQ6: Is language specific discrimination fully accessible in L3 words?

In addition to categorization, the present dissertation will test whether language specific perceptual discrimination is accessible during the first encounter to a third language. Such information is useful in examining whether potential issues in L3 perception is due to difficulty in auditory discrimination or whether language mode effects may be a more appropriate explanation for potential non-target like categorization of L3 sounds. That is, if the participants categorize L3 sounds to L2 sounds when an L1 sound is more acoustically similar, but they still are able to discriminate fine phonetic distinctions, then it could be plausible that L2 mode effects, rather than lack of discrimination, contribute to L3 categorization.

6.1.3 Chapter 4: Production and Perception

RQ7: Will the relative influence of a particular language perception match production?

It is unclear whether L3 models would predict that L3 perception and production develop in tandem, or whether perception should develop prior to production. Similarly to generalization, the link between perception and production can give information about how third language phonological acquisition may begin in terms of previous language influence. That is, the present dissertation will gather data that will shed light on not only whether single language influence affects all segments, but also whether this influence is distinct in perception and production. Currently, the predictions of

L3 models are not well equipped to handle potential differences in perception and production. As a result, the outcome of the relationship between L3 perception and production will can only be evaluated by these models post-hoc.

6.2 Method

6.2.1 Participants

8 total groups of participants will take part in each experiment, in what Westergaard, Mitrofanova, Mykhaylyk, & Rodina (2017) refers to as a fully combined design. There will be 4 bilingual groups with opposite orders of acquisition, Spanish L1-English L2, and English L1-Spanish L2, with each of these groups hearing either L3 German or L3 French, and 4 monolingual English and monolingual Spanish groups, assigned to either French or German. German and French were chosen as the third languages primarily due to the phonetic differences in voice-onset time, where French is a true-voicing language (like Spanish) and German is an aspirating language (like English). Additionally, German and English and French and Spanish are typologically related in a global sense. As a result, the present design will allow for the examination of language status effects, global typology effects, and structure by structure similarity effects. By doing so, the relative influence of each of these factors can be determined in these populations, and the evaluation of L3 model predictions can be carried out. Based on a power analysis carried out in (Parrish, 2021), the bilingual groups will contain 75 participants per group, where the monolingual groups will contain 50 participants per group, for a total of 500 participants.

6.2.2 Materials

Each participant will produce stop-initial tokens in each language that they speak, and shadow tokens in their assigned language group (French or German). In the case of the bilingual group, this involves both a Spanish and English word reading task, where the monolingual groups will only complete the word reading task in their L1. Additionally, bilinguals participants will complete the LexTale proficiency test in their

L2 (Izura, Cuetos, & Brysbaert, 2016; Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2012), and the Bilingual Language Profile to gather biographical information.

6.2.2.1 Bilingual Language Profile

To measure language use and language dominance, the Bilingual Language Profile (BLP) (Birdsong, Gertken, & Amengual, 2012) will be used. The BLP is a self-report questionnaire which was designed to measure language dominance. The questionnaire asks several questions related to language use, attitudes, and age of acquisition in bilinguals. The answers are scales that include Likert scale, discrete numbers of years, and percentages of language use. The BLP can be administered online and was chosen for its comprehensiveness while also taking around 10 minutes to complete.

6.2.2.2 LexTALE

The LexTALE (Izura, Cuetos, & Brysbaert, 2016; Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2016) will be used to measure English and Spanish proficiency. The LexTALE is a lexical decision task, in which participants see either words or pseudowords on a screen one at a time. Participants are supposed to then decide whether the word presented is a real word in the language or a pseudoword. The task is intended to be a measure of vocabulary size, which has been argued to correlate to language proficiency. Either the English and Spanish versions of the task will be used in the study, depending upon the L2 of participant.

6.2.2.3 Chapter 2: Shadowing Task

The shadowing task is designed to elicit productions of L3 words at first exposure. This task is the same as the shadowing task in Parrish (2021), but the word list has been updated and an L3 German group will be recruited. During the task, the participants will see an orthographic representation of a word that they will shadow and they will play a recording of that word produced by a native speaker. Then, on the same screen, the participant will record themselves repeating the word they just

listened to by clicking a button to record, and the same button to stop recording. The participants will be able to listen to their recording, and then will click a separate button to submit their recording.

The stimuli will be one or two syllable words which are stop or fricative initial words. The stop consonants will be paired with high, low and mid vowels in order to examine the production of the vowels themselves, and to vary the context in which the stops are uttered. The fricative initial words will be included to provide a closed syllable for shadowing the L3 vowel sounds. The shadowing task will be programmed in Labvanced (Finger, Goeke, Diekamp, Kai, & Peter, 2016).

stimuli

6.2.2.4 Chapter 2: Word Reading Tasks

Together with the shadowing task, the word reading tasks will be used to elicit L1 and L2 productions in order to make within-speaker comparisons between L1, L2 and L3. The word reading task be similar to the shadowing task, and is also replication of the method in Parrish (2021). In these tasks, words will be presented on the screen in isolation and orthographically. Participants will record themselves reading the word aloud and will be able to listen to their recording prior to submission.

The stimuli in the word reading tasks will be similar cross-linguistic matches to the words used in the shadowing task. Specifically, voiceless stop-initial words will be used in all three places of articulation in one and two syllable words. All three places of articulation, as well as fricative initial stimuli, will be paired with high low and mid vowels. The word reading tasks will be programmed in Labvanced (Finger, Goeke, Diekamp, Kai, & Peter, 2016).

6.2.2.5 Chapter 3: Phoneme Categorization Task

In order to determine how bilinguals categorize L3 sounds, a phoneme categorization task will be used. In the task, the participants will hear sounds one at a time and

choose which L1 or L2 sound best matches the sound they heard. The participants will see these L1 and L2 sounds orthographically in a carrier word, while the L3 sounds will only be presented auditorily. The auditory stimuli were presented in closed sVs syllables in 4 total conditions and for 5 repetitions each. As a result, 20 categorizations will be gathered from each participant. Each condition represents a vowel sound belonging to one language (conditions 1 and 2), neither language (condition 3) or both languages (condition 4). In particular, condition 1 was a mid back rounded vowel /o/, and was intended to bias the selection of the Spanish same Spanish category (in the carrier word *son*). Condition 2 is a near-open central vowel, as in the English word *such*. Condition 3 varies per groups. In the French group it is a close front rounded vowel as in the French word *su* or the German word *über*, and is not present in either English or Spanish. Finally, condition 4 is a close front unrounded vowel /i/, as in the English word *free* and the Spanish word *sin*. Following their categorization, participants will rate their choice for goodness of fit. They will see a continuous slider scale on the screen and click a point in the scale to submit their rating. Ratings will range from 1-7, but allow for non-discrete ratings (points between integers). The experiment will be programmed in Psychopy (Peirce et al., 2019) and a pilot version of the experiment can be accessed here: https://pavlovia.org/run/kparrish92/phoneme_categorization.

6.2.2.6 Chapter 3: AX Discrimination Task

In addition to categorization, the present dissertation is concerned with the discrimination of fine phonetic detail, or detail that does not contribute to categorization, in all three languages of the L3 learner. In particular, an AX discrimination task will be given to learners in all 3 languages, in which English language vowel continua will be embedded in L3 words to see whether phonetic discrimination is possible in L1 words, L2 words, and L3 words. In particular, the present dissertation will draw on vowel continua in previous research in L2 phonology, including continua similar to the pat-pot continuum (J. V. Casillas & Simonet, 2016), and the sheep-ship continuum (J. Casillas, 2015).

The stimuli will be created from naturally produced tokens of each vowel sound in a language specific carrier word produced by the same speakers. The continua will be created using a PRAAT script in which 7 steps will be created and the first three formats will be manipulated (Boersma & Weenink, 2021). The vowels will be embedded in language-specific carrier words, but the acoustics of the vowels themselves will remain the same. In particular, the English carrier words will be *fat* and *fit*, the Spanish carrier words will be *facha* and *fin*, the German words *faß* and *ficht*, and finally the French words will be *fille* and *fam*.

In the AX discrimination task, the participants will hear a sequence of two words drawn from the pat-pot or sheep-ship continuum in 3 language-specific blocks and decide whether those words sound the same or different. In the 7 step continuum, all 49 possible combinations of sound will be presented a total of three times each, resulting in 147 repetitions per continuum per participant. The task will be programmed in Psychopy (Peirce et al., 2019).

6.2.3 Procedure

Participants will complete the experimental tasks in a semi-longitudinal fashion, in which each participant will complete 1 of 3 language specific blocks on different dates. Data collection will take place online and participants will be recruited using the online platform Prolific.co. Every potential participant will first complete a screening block, in which they will take the LexTALE (Izura, Cuetos, & Brysbaert, 2016; Lemhöfer & Broersma, 2016) in their L2 and the Bilingual Language Profile (Birdsong, Gertken, & Amengual, 2012). Exclusion criteria will include a LexTALE score under 50% correct or knowledge of a third language.

Once participants are eligible for the experimental tasks, they will begin with either the L3, followed by the L1 or L2 in a counterbalanced manner. The blocks will begin with the production task, either a shadowing task (L3) or a word reading task (L1 and L2). Then, in the same experiment, the participant will complete the phoneme categorization task followed by the AX discrimination task. In order to control for

potential language mode effects brought on by the experiment, the language specific blocks will be given of separate days. Instructions will be given in each block in the participant’s native language, either English or Spanish.

6.3 Analysis

In the production tasks, both vowel and stop production will be analyzed using Bayesian Multilevel regression models. In the case of stops, Voice Onset Time will be modeled as a function of language, LexTALE score, and a continuous dominance measure obtained from the BLP. Random intercepts will include words and participants. In vowel production, F1 and F2 will be modeled separately using the same predictors as the stop model. A region of practical equivalence (ROPE) will also be established to determine whether any differences in productions between two languages can be attributed to noise in the data, and provide evidence that two specific languages are being produced in a near-equivalent manner. Such evidence would entail the entire posterior distribution falling within the equivalence bounds. Phoneme categorization will be analyzed in a descriptive manner. Specifically, it will show the preferred category per condition per language, and its ratings. This data will be visualized and used in comparison to both production and discrimination data. The AX discrimination task will again use Bayesian linear regression to model correctness as a function of language, LexTALE score, and dominance, with random intercepts per participant and item.

REFERENCES

- Antoniou, M., Best, C. T., & Tyler, M. D. (2013). Focusing the lens of language experience: Perception of Ma'di stops by Greek and English bilinguals and monolinguals. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 133(4), 2397–2411. <http://doi.org/10.1121/1.4792358>
- Antoniou, M., Liang, E., Ettlinger, M., & Wong, P. C. M. (2015). The bilingual advantage in phonetic learning. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 18(4), 683–695. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728914000777>
- Aoyama, K., Flege, J. E., Guion, S. G., Akahane-Yamada, R., & Yamada, T. (2004). Perceived phonetic dissimilarity and L2 speech learning: The case of Japanese /r/ and English /l/ and /r/. *Journal of Phonetics*, 32(2), 233–250. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0095-4470\(03\)00036-6](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0095-4470(03)00036-6)
- Balas, A. (2018). *Non-native vowel perception: The interplay of categories and features = Percepcja samogłosek w języku nienatywnym: Oddziaływanie kategorii i cech* (Wydanie I). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Bardel, C., & Falk, Y. (2007). The role of the second language in third language acquisition: The case of Germanic syntax. *Second Language Research*, 23(4), 459–484. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0267658307080557>
- Bardel, C., & Falk, Y. (2021). L1, L2 and L3: Same or different? *Second Language Research*, 37(3), 459–464. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0267658320941033>
- Bayona, P. (2009). The Acquisition of Spanish Middle and Impersonal Passive Constructions from SLA and TLA Perspectives. In *Third language acquisition and universal grammar*. Bristol, UK; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.
- Berkes, É., & Flynn, S. (2012). Further Evidence in Support of the Cumulative-Enhancement Model: CP Structure Development. In *Third Language Acquisi-*

- tion in Adulthood*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Best, C. T., & Tyler, M. D. (2007). Nonnative and second-language speech perception: Commonalities and complementarities. In O.-S. Bohn & M. J. Munro (Eds.), *Language Learning & Language Teaching* (Vol. 17, pp. 13–34). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <http://doi.org/10.1075/llt.17.07bes>
- Birdsong, D., Gertken, L. M., & Amengual, M. (2012). Bilingual Language Profile: An Easy-to-Use Instrument to Assess Bilingualism. University of Texas at Austin: COERLL. Retrieved from <https://sites.la.utexas.edu/bilingual/%3E>
- Blank, C. A., & Zimmer, M. C. (2009). A transferência fonético-fonológica L2 (francês) – L3 (inglês): Um estudo de caso. *Revista de Estudos Da Linguagem*, 17(1), 207–233. <http://doi.org/10.17851/2237-2083.17.1.207-233>
- Boersma, P., & Weenink, D. (2021). Praat: Doing phonetics by computer [Computer program]. Retrieved from <http://www.praat.org/>
- Bohn, O.-S., & Flege, J. E. (1992). The Production of New and Similar Vowels by Adult German Learners of English. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14(2), 131–158. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100010792>
- Bohnacker, U. (2006). When Swedes begin to learn German: From V2 to V2. *Second Language Research*, 22(4), 443–486. <http://doi.org/10.1191/0267658306sr275oa>
- Bradlow, A. R. (1995). A comparative acoustic study of English and Spanish vowels. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 97(3), 1916–1924. <http://doi.org/10.1121/1.412064>
- Broersma, M. (2005). Perception of familiar contrasts in unfamiliar positions. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 117(6), 3890–3901. <http://doi.org/10.1121/1.1906060>

- Brysbaert, M. (2020). Power considerations in bilingualism research: Time to step up our game. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 1–6. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728920000437>
- Casillas, J. (2015). Production and Perception of the /i/-/I/ Vowel Contrast: The Case of L2-Dominant Early Learners of English. *Phonetica*, 72(2-3), 182–205. <http://doi.org/10.1159/000431101>
- Casillas, J. V., & Simonet, M. (2016). Production and perception of the English /æ/-/a/ contrast in switched-dominance speakers. *Second Language Research*, 32(2), 171–195. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0267658315608912>
- Curtin, S., Goad, H., & Pater, J. V. (1998). Phonological transfer and levels of representation: The perceptual acquisition of Thai voice and aspiration by English and French speakers. *Second Language Research*, 14(4), 389–405. <http://doi.org/10.1191/026765898674095369>
- Cutler, A., Weber, A., & Otake, T. (2006). Asymmetric mapping from phonetic to lexical representations in second-language listening. *Journal of Phonetics*, 34(2), 269–284. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2005.06.002>
- Escudero, P., & Boersma, P. (2004). BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN L2 SPEECH PERCEPTION RESEARCH AND PHONOLOGICAL THEORY. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(04). <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263104040021>
- Escudero, P., & Chládková, K. (2010). Spanish listeners' perception of American and Southern British English vowels. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 128(5), EL254–EL260. <http://doi.org/10.1121/1.3488794>
- Escudero, P., Sisinni, B., & Grimaldi, M. (2014). The effect of vowel inventory and acoustic properties in Salento Italian learners of Southern British English vowels. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 135(3), 1577–1584. <http://doi.org/10.1121/1.4864477>

- Escudero, P., & Vasiliev, P. (2011). Cross-language acoustic similarity predicts perceptual assimilation of Canadian English and Canadian French vowels. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 130(5), EL277–EL283. <http://doi.org/10.1121/1.3632043>
- Escudero, P., & Williams, D. (2011). Perceptual assimilation of Dutch vowels by Peruvian Spanish listeners. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 129(1), EL1–EL7. <http://doi.org/10.1121/1.3525042>
- Falk, Y., & Bardel, C. (2011). Object pronouns in German L3 syntax: Evidence for the L2 status factor. *Second Language Research*, 27(1), 59–82. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0267658310386647>
- Falk, Y., Lindqvist, C., & Bardel, C. (2015). The role of L1 explicit metalinguistic knowledge in L3 oral production at the initial state. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 18(2), 227–235. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728913000552>
- Finger, H., Goeke, C., Diekamp, D., Kai, S., & Peter, K. (2016). LabVanced: A Unified JavaScript Framework for Online Studies. Cologne, Germany: University of Osnabrück.
- Flege, J. (1995). Second language speech learning: Theory, findings, and problems. In *Speech perception and linguistic experience: Issues in cross-language research* (pp. 233–277). Timonium, MD: York Press.
- Flege, James Emil. (1991). Age of learning affects the authenticity of voice-onset time (VOT) in stop consonants produced in a second language. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 89(1), 395–411. <http://doi.org/10.1121/1.400473>
- Flege, James Emil, Aoyama, K., & Bohn, O.-S. (2021). The Revised Speech Learning Model (SLM-r) Applied. In R. Wayland (Ed.), *Second Language Speech Learning* (1st ed., pp. 84–118). Cambridge University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1017/9781108886901.003>

- Flege, James Emil, & Eefting, W. (1988). Imitation of a VOT continuum by native speakers of English and Spanish: Evidence for phonetic category formation. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 83(2), 729–740. <http://doi.org/10.1121/1.396115>
- Flege, J. E., Frieda, E. M., & Nozawa, T. (1997). Amount of native-language (L1) use affects the pronunciation of an L2. *Journal of Phonetics*, 25(2), 169–186. <http://doi.org/10.1006/jpho.1996.0040>
- Flynn, S., Foley, C., & Vinnitskaya, I. (2004). The Cumulative-Enhancement Model for Language Acquisition: Comparing Adults' and Children's Patterns of Development in First, Second and Third Language Acquisition of Relative Clauses. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1(1), 3–16. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14790710408668175>
- García Mayo, M. del P., & Slabakova, R. (2015). Object drop in L3 acquisition. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 19(5), 483–498. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1367006914524643>
- Giancaspro, D., Halloran, B., & Iverson, M. (2015). Transfer at the initial stages of L3 Brazilian Portuguese: A look at three groups of English/Spanish bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 18(2), 191–207. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728914000339>
- Gut, U. (2010). Cross-linguistic influence in L3 phonological acquisition. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7(1), 19–38. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14790710902972248>
- Iverson, P., Hazan, V., & Bannister, K. (2005). Phonetic training with acoustic cue manipulations: A comparison of methods for teaching English /r/-/l/ to Japanese adults. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 118(5), 3267–3278. <http://doi.org/10.1121/1.2062307>
- Izura, C., Cuertos, F., & Brysbaert, M. (2016). *Lexical Test for Advanced Learners*

- of Spanish*. American Psychological Association. Retrieved from <http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/t47086-000>
- Jensen, I. N., Mitrofanova, N., Anderssen, M., Rodina, Y., Slabakova, R., & Westergaard, M. (2021). Crosslinguistic influence in L3 acquisition across linguistic modules. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 1–18. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2021.1985127>
- Jongman, A., Fourakis, M., & Sereno, J. A. (1989). The Acoustic Vowel Space of Modern Greek and German. *Language and Speech*, 32(3), 221–248. <http://doi.org/10.1177/002383098903200303>
- Kamiyama, T. (2007). Acquisition of French vowels by Japanese-speaking learners: Close and close-mid rounded vowels. Freiburg, Germany.
- Kellerman, E. (1983). Now you see it, now you don't. In *Language Transfer in Language Learning. Issues in Second Language Research*. (pp. 112–134). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Lakens, D. (2017). Equivalence Tests: A Practical Primer for *t* Tests, Correlations, and Meta-Analyses. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8(4), 355–362. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617697177>
- Lemhöfer, K., & Broersma, M. (2012). Introducing LexTALE: A quick and valid Lexical Test for Advanced Learners of English. *Behavior Research Methods*, 44(2), 325–343. <http://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-011-0146-0>
- Lemhöfer, K., & Broersma, M. (2016). *Lexical Test for Advanced Learners of English*. American Psychological Association. Retrieved from <http://doi.apa.org/getdoi.cfm?doi=10.1037/t47085-000>
- Leung, Y.-K. I. (2005). L2 vs. L3 initial state: A comparative study of the acquisition of French DPs by Vietnamese monolinguals and Cantonese–English bilinguals. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 8(1), 39–61. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728904002044>

- Leussen, J.-W. van, & Escudero, P. (2015). Learning to perceive and recognize a second language: The L2LP model revised. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6. <http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01000>
- Lisker, L., & Abramson, A. S. (1964). A Cross-Language Study of Voicing in Initial Stops: Acoustical Measurements. *WORD*, 20(3), 384–422. <http://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1964.11659830>
- Liu, J., & Lin, J. (2021). A Cross-Linguistic Study of L3 Phonological Acquisition of Stop Contrasts. *SAGE Open*, 11(1), 215824402098551. <http://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020985510>
- Liu, Z., Gorba, C., & Cebrian, J. (2019). EFFECTS OF LEARNING AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE ON VOT PERCEPTION. In *19th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*. Melbourne, Australia: Australasian Speech Science; Technology Association Inc.
- Llama, R., & Cardoso, W. (2018). Revisiting (Non-)Native Influence in VOT Production: Insights from Advanced L3 Spanish. *Languages*, 3(3), 30. <http://doi.org/10.3390/languages3030030>
- Llama, R., Cardoso, W., & Collins, L. (2010). The influence of language distance and language status on the acquisition of L3 phonology. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7(1), 39–57. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14790710902972255>
- Meisel, J. M. (1983). Transfer as a second-language strategy. *Language & Communication*, 3(1), 11–46. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309\(83\)90018-6](http://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(83)90018-6)
- Mitrofanova, N., & Westergaard, M. (2018). Wholesale vs. Property-by-property transfer: Acquisition of morphological case in an artificial L3. Braunschweig.
- Montrul, S., Dias, R., & Santos, H. (2011). Clitics and object expression in the L3 acquisition of Brazilian Portuguese: Structural similarity matters for transfer. *Second Language Research*, 27(1), 21–58. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0267658310386649>

- Onishi, H. (2016). The effects of L2 experience on L3 perception. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 13(4), 459–475. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2016.1217604>
- Paradis, M. (2009). *Declarative and Procedural Determinants of Second Languages* (Vol. 40). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <http://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.40>
- Parma, A. (2017). Cross-Linguistic Transfer of Object Clitic Structure: A Case of L3 Brazilian Portuguese. *Languages*, 2(3), 14. <http://doi.org/10.3390/languages2030014>
- Parrish, K. (2021). The relative VOT productions of L3 French by Spanish-English bilinguals at first exposure. In *Multiple language acquisition, processing, and development*. Poznań, Poland: Adam Mickiewicz University.
- Patihis, L., Oh, J. S., & Mogilner, T. (2015). Phoneme discrimination of an unrelated language: Evidence for a narrow transfer but not a broad-based bilingual advantage. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 19(1), 3–16. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1367006913476768>
- Peirce, J., Gray, J. R., Simpson, S., MacAskill, M., Höchenberger, R., Sogo, H., ... Lindeløv, J. K. (2019). PsychoPy2: Experiments in behavior made easy. *Behavior Research Methods*, 51(1), 195–203. <http://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-018-01193-y>
- Plonsky, L. (Ed.). (2015). *Advancing quantitative methods in second language research*. New York: Routledge.
- Puig-Mayenco, E., González Alonso, J., & Rothman, J. (2020). A systematic review of transfer studies in third language acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 36(1), 31–64. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0267658318809147>
- Rothman, J. (2010). On the typological economy of syntactic transfer: Word order and relative clause high/low attachment preference in L3 Brazilian Portuguese.

- IRAL - International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 48(2-3). <http://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2010.011>
- Rothman, J. (2011). L3 syntactic transfer selectivity and typological determinacy: The typological primacy model. *Second Language Research*, 27(1), 107–127. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0267658310386439>
- Rothman, J. (2013). Cognitive economy, non-redundancy and typological primacy in L3 acquisition: Initial stages of L3 Romance and beyond. In S. Baauw, F. Drijkoningen, L. Meroni, & M. Pinto (Eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory* (Vol. 5, pp. 217–248). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <http://doi.org/10.1075/rllt.5.11rot>
- Rothman, J. (2015). Linguistic and cognitive motivations for the Typological Primacy Model (TPM) of third language (L3) transfer: Timing of acquisition and proficiency considered. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 18(2), 179–190. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S136672891300059X>
- Rothman, J., & Cabrelli Amaro, J. (2010). What variables condition syntactic transfer? A look at the L3 initial state. *Second Language Research*, 26(2), 189–218. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0267658309349410>
- Slabakova, R. (2017). The scalpel model of third language acquisition. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 21(6), 651–665. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1367006916655413>
- Slabakova, R., & García Mayo, M. D. P. (2015). The L3 syntax–discourse interface. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 18(2), 208–226. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728913000369>
- Stadt, R., Hulk, A., & Sleeman, P. (2016). The influence of L2 English and immersion education on L3 French in the Netherlands. *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 33, 152–165. <http://doi.org/10.1075/avt.33.11sta>
- Stadt, R., Hulk, A., & Sleeman, P. (2018a). The influence of L1 Dutch and L2

- English on L3 French: A longitudinal study. *Journal of the European Second Language Association*, 2(1), 63. <http://doi.org/10.22599/jesla.42>
- Stadt, R., Hulk, A., & Sleeman, P. (2018b). The role of L2 exposure in L3A: A comparative study between third and fourth year secondary school students in the Netherlands. In J. Berns, H. Jacobs, & D. Nouveau (Eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory* (Vol. 13, pp. 279–296). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <http://doi.org/10.1075/rllt.13.17sta>
- Stadt, R., Hulk, A., & Sleeman, P. (2020). L2 Influence in L3 Acquisition: The Role of the L3. In A. Trotzke & T. Kupisch (Eds.), *Formal Linguistics and Language Education* (Vol. 43, pp. 203–221). Cham: Springer International Publishing. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-39257-4_11
- Weber, A., & Cutler, A. (2004). Lexical competition in non-native spoken-word recognition. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 50(1), 1–25. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-596X\(03\)00105-0](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-596X(03)00105-0)
- Werker, J. F. (1986). The effect of multilingualism on phonetic perceptual flexibility. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 7(2), 141–155. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716400007360>
- Westergaard, M. (2021). Microvariation in multilingual situations: The importance of property-by-property acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 37(3), 379–407. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0267658319884116>
- Westergaard, M., Mitrofanova, N., Mykhaylyk, R., & Rodina, Y. (2017). Crosslinguistic influence in the acquisition of a third language: The Linguistic Proximity Model. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 21(6), 666–682. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1367006916648859>
- Wrembel, M. (2010). L2-accented speech in L3 production. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 7(1), 75–90. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14790710902972263>
- Wrembel, M. (2011). Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition

- of Voice Onset Time. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences* (pp. 2157–2160). Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong.
- Wrembel, M. (2012). Foreign accentedness in third language acquisition: The case of L3 English. In J. Cabrelli Amaro, S. Flynn, & J. Rothman (Eds.), *Studies in Bilingualism* (Vol. 46, pp. 281–310). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <http://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.46.16wre>
- Wrembel, M. (2014). VOT Patterns in the Acquisition of Third Language Phonology. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on the Acquisition of Second Language Speech* (Vol. 5). Concordia Working Papers in Applied Linguistics,.
- Wrembel, M., Gut, U., Kopečková, R., & Balas, A. (2020). Cross-Linguistic Interactions in Third Language Acquisition: Evidence from Multi-Feature Analysis of Speech Perception. *Languages*, 5(4), 52. <http://doi.org/10.3390/languages5040052>
- Wrembel, M., Marecka, M., & Kopečková, R. (2019). Extending perceptual assimilation model to L3 phonological acquisition. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 16(4), 513–533. <http://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1583233>
- Wunder, E.-M. (2010). Phonological cross-linguistic influence in third or additional language acquisition. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Symposium on the Acquisition of Second Language Speech* (pp. 566–571). Poznań, Poland: Adam Mickiewicz University.