




STRUCTURED VARIATION IN ENGLISH L-ALLOPHONY

OCP 12 Jan 2018

Bert Vaux, Cambridge University
Emily Prud'hommeaux, Boston College

Introduction: a textbook example...



Giegerich 1992:211

CAMBRIDGE TEXTBOOKS IN LINGUISTICS

English phonology

An introduction

Heinz J. Giegerich

8.2.1 Complementary distribution of allophones: clear and dark /l/

In many accents of English, for example RP, the lateral phoneme /l/ has two major realisational variants, or allophones: a 'clear' one, transcribed simply as [l], and a 'dark' one – [ɫ]. Both are laterals with alveolar contact; the articulatory difference between the two is that in the former the back of the tongue is lowered while in the latter it is raised towards the velum or retracted towards the uvula (without making contact in either case). Here are some examples for RP:

(1) a. 'clear' [l]: *full, lip, low, blind, splice, yellow, foolish*
b. 'dark' [ɫ]: *full, hill, pool, help, solve, elbow, little*

[...]

Recalling the principles of syllabification that were discussed in chapter 6, we note that all the cases of clear [l] in (1a) are sited in syllable onsets while the instances of dark [ɫ] occur in syllable rhymes.

Also Steriade 1988, Rubach 1996, Hoffmann 1997, Donegan 2002, Carter and Local 2007 (for some varieties), Johnson and Britain 2007...

English /L/ is traditionally considered to display a literally textbook case of allophony, with a single underlying lateral approximant surfacing in two categorically different ways for latero-typical speakers. One allophone is referred to as "light" or "clear" L, and the other as "dark" or "hollow" L. We can see here [POINT TO SLIDE] that Giegerich believes, like many others, that light L occurs in Onsets and dark L in Rimes. But this is not the only popular picture of L allophony: [NEXT]

Other popular generalizations

Onset vs Coda	Bladon and Al Barni 1976, Bladon and Nolan 1977, Wrench and Scobbie 2003, Tsukada et al. 2004, Oxley et al. 2006, Scobbie and Pouplier 2010, Yavaş 2011, Yuan and Liberman 2011
σ-initial vs σ-final	Browman and Goldstein 1995, Pegg and Werker 1997, Krakow 1999, Carter 2003, Nakamura 2009, Zhou 2009
light prevocalically	Trager and Smith 1951, Jones 1960, Giles and Moll 1975, Roach 1991, Cruttenden 1994, Gesuato 1996, Narayanan et al. 1997, Lunn et al. 1998, Wells 1998
dark postvocalically	Matthews 1938, Campbell and Gick 2003
light foot-initially	Jensen 1993, 2000; Olive et al. 1993, Hayes 2000 (some speakers)
word-initial vs word-final	Lee-Kim et al. 2013
light word-initially	Delattre 1971
dark word-finally	Stoddart et al. 1999, Plag et al. 2015

Many see the light and dark L divide in terms of Onset vs Coda, syllable-initial vs. syllable-final, or foot-initial vs. elsewhere, while others believe the variation is conditioned by segmental factors: prevocalic, preconsonantal, word-initial, or word-final. [NEXT]

A selection of non-starters

- “/l/ is realised as [l̥] after word-initial voiceless consonants, as [t̥] in word-final position, and as [l̥] elsewhere” (Plag et al. 2015:46)
 - he[t̥]p, e[t̥]bow, app[l̥]y, etc.
- RP has “clear /l/ before vowels and dark /t̥/ elsewhere” (Cruttenden 1994:84)
 - mi[l̥]ion, twink[t̥]ing (the verb, for some)
- “the lateral /l/ is velarised when after a vowel or before a consonant at the end of a word” (Ladefoged 2006:76)
 - a[l̥]ive, twink[t̥]e...

Many of these analyses can be quickly ruled out by relatively uncontroversial data, such as Plag et al.’s generalization that /l/ is realised as voiceless after word-initial voiceless consonants, dark in word-final position, and light elsewhere. This fails to account for the appearance of dark L in coda clusters, devoiced light L in non-initial clusters, and so on. Once we factor out analyses of this type... [NEXT]

Coda vs Rime

- /l/ → [t] in Coda?
 - problem: syllabic [t] (Steriade 1988)
 - “SSBE syllabic /l/ is always dark” (Gimson 1989, Roach 1991, Spencer 1995)



We are left with two viable competitors for the phonological component of L variation: darkening in Coda vs. darkening in Rime.

Steriade 1988 argues for the Rime analysis on the basis of the fact that syllabic Ls, which by hypothesis are in the Nucleus rather than the Coda as shown here for “apple”, are dark. If darkening applied only in Codas, we would incorrectly predict the syllabic L in “apple” to be light.

However...[NEXT]


Coda vs Rime

□ /l/ → [t] in Rime?


□ problem: syllabic [l] in SSBE (Barry 2000)

□ “When an affix beginning with a vowel is added or the next word begins with a vowel... the lateral may become clear, either syllabic or non-syllabic.” (Cruttenden 1994)

(a) light l



(b) dark t̪



Barry 2000 points out that not all syllabic Ls are dark for all speakers. In an electropalatographic study he finds empirical support for Cruttenden's 1994 statement that syllabic Ls may be light when immediately followed by a vowel-initial affix or word, as in “tackling” or “middle of”. Barry provides various arguments for these Ls still being syllabic, which rules out the possibility of attributing the lightness to these Ls having simply resyllabified as Onsets. As shown in (a), Barry proposes that they do in fact attach to the following Onset, which is responsible for their lightness. However, they remain attached to the Nucleus as well, accounting for their syllability. Syllabic Ls that remain dark have the representation in (b) for Barry. Armed with the representations in (a) and (b), Barry proposes that one can account for the range of L distributions in terms of Coda Darkening, but not Rime darkening.

[NEXT]

canonical articulations of /l/

articulation	light [l]	dark [ɫ]	references
tongue tip	midsagittal apical or laminal gesture towards an anterior target, usually the alveolar ridge (or upper teeth)		Wrench and Scobbie 2003
		reduced apical gesture	Strycharczuk and Scobbie 2015
	alveolar and lateral linguo-palatal contact	primarily alveolar contact	Lehman and Swartz 2000
tongue body	tighter constriction between tongue and palate		Giles and Moll 1975
	fronted and raised	predorsum lowered	Recaens 2011, Lee-Kim et al. 2013
		postdorsum retracted	Giles and Moll 1975, Recaens 2011, Kirkham 2017
		velar or pharyngeal constriction	Delattre 1971, S&F 1993, Lin and Demuth 2015
timing	TT&TB synchronous	TB before TT	S&F 1993, Browman and Goldstein 1995

The last piece we require before formulating our monolithic rule of L allophony is a more precise notion of what the allophones actually are. Though many articulatory components of light and dark L have been identified in the literature, as summarized here [POINT TO SLIDE], since the influential X-ray microbeam studies by Sproat and Fujimura's in 1993 and Browman and Goldstein in 1995, scholars have tended to view English laterals as a combination of two lingual gestures, a forward movement of the tongue tip and a lowering and retraction of the tongue body, with the two being synchronous in light L, and the dorsal gesture preceding that of the tongue tip in dark L. The phasing relations can be seen in the following figure from Browman and Goldstein: [NEXT]

Browman and Goldstein 1995




FIGURE 3. X-ray microbeam pellet data showing difference in relative timing of tongue tip raising and tongue dorsum (tongue rear) retraction for initial [l]. Tongue tip pellet is the frontmost pellet in the outlined image in Figure 1; tongue rear pellet is in the position indicated by the arrow in that image. (a) "leap" (b) "peel."

Here we can see that in the single speaker investigated, a midwestern American female, the apical and dorsal gestures roughly coincide in the light L of LEAP, whereas the apical lags significantly behind the dorsal in the dark L of PEEL. [NEXT]


canonical acoustics of /ɪ/

feature	light [ɪ]	dark [t̪]	references
F2 and F3	weak or absent	present	Lehman and Swartz 2000
formant transitions to/from V	discontinuous	continuous	Olive et al. 2013
F2	higher	lower	Carter and Local 2007:184; Potter, Kopp & Green 1947; Lehiste 1960, 1964; Bladon & Al-Bamerni 1976; Maddieson 1985; Espy-Wilson 1992, Olive, Greenwood & Coleman 1993; S&F 1993, Ladefoged & Maddieson 1996; Carter 1999, 2003; Tunley 1999; Local & Simpson 1999, Heid & Hawkins 2000; Lehman and Swartz 2000, Cruttenden 2001; Recasens & Espinosa 2005, Carter and Local 2007, Lee-Kim et al. 2013, etc.
F1	lower	higher	
normalized intensity	greater	lesser	Espy-Wilson 1992, Stevens 1998, Lee-Kim et al. 2013

Several acoustic consequences of these articulations have been identified in the literature, as shown here [POINT TO SLIDE], but in practice researchers tend to focus their attentions on the second formant.

[NEXT]

interdental 1



"aardman's mouth shapes" <https://www.pinterest.com/pin/43347215142283537/>

Despite the numerous phonetic differences between light and dark L reviewed here, since the time of Sproat and Fujimura 1993 many investigators have run with their idea that there is only one L in English, not two, and this single L category varies according to a range of morphosyntactic, prosodic, and other factors, with the variation taking the form of gradient changes in the phasing and magnitude of the apical and dorsal gestures that characterize L.

In this context it may be relevant that many humans actually have a different system of L opposition that may not submit as easily to a gradient phasing analysis. The most common, in my experience, involves a light L which is interdental rather than alveolar or dental, as we can see here with Wallace and Gromit, Rebel Wilson, and Miss Coco Peru in the film "Trick". [NEXT]

[pictures: Rebel Wilson on Tonight Show with Jimmy Fallon; from Coco: "So... There I was... lying in the middle of my bed with an eye full of cum" (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kJeAwTN2XEg>)]

apicolabial L



Another surprisingly common implementation of light L is apicolabial, as made famous by Britney Spears. Here she can be seen producing the L of “all I need” in the video for her song “Sometimes”—note that she appears to cliticize the pronoun “I” here and syllabify the L as its Onset.

For interdental and apicolabial L speakers, there appears to be a relatively clear-cut distinction between two types of L: a light allophone with obvious tongue protrusion beyond the teeth, and a more conventional dark allophone. The distinction can be seen clearly with my old student Corrine Occhino: [NEXT]
[other image is from A Place in the Sun Home or Away, Dorset vs Croatia]

Corrine's system



si[ɫ]k




[l]ight



Here we have images of Corrine producing “silk” with a fairly conventional dark L, and “light” with a visibly different interdental light L. We will return to Corrine’s L system later, but for now the key point is that we appear to be dealing in such cases with relatively clear-cut categorical allophony, rather than subtly gradient phonetic variation. [NEXT]

L allophony is categorical in RP

Figure 5: RP splines at /l/ midpoint across phonological context (see text for full description of spline patterns).




Turton, Danielle. 2017. Categorical or gradient? An ultrasound investigation of /l/-darkening and vocalization in varieties of English. *Laboratory Phonology* 8.1:1-31.

This is not to say that more conventional L systems cannot also be categorical. Turton has found using ultrasound, for example, that her RP speaker shows a clear-cut categorical opposition in the articulation of light Ls and dark Ls, as you can see here [POINT TO SLIDE]. [NEXT]


[l] : [t̪] difference is statistically significant

Toft 2002



Toft 2002 measured the mean formant values produced by six female speakers of British English for four different /l/ allophones: word-initial onset, word-final coda, syllabic L, and post-schwa-L. She found a statistically significant difference between the onset /l/ allophone and the other three variants, with the Onset L having a significantly lower F1 and higher F2. [NEXT]

a traditional RBP-LP analysis



On the basis of what we have seen so far, we can postulate a working analysis of what I call the Monolithic L system, which as we shall see later appears to exist in just over half of our sample of 303 speakers. In this system, there is a single underlying lateral phoneme /l/, which surfaces as such when attached to a syllable Onset. When syllabified as a Coda, on the other hand, it undergoes a Darkening process. In terms of traditional rule-based Lexical Phonology this process is post-lexical and therefore can be fed by earlier processes of cliticization and resyllabification which can have the effect of attaching to Onsets some Ls that were previously Codas or Nuclei.

[NEXT]

Halle and Mohanan 1985

configuration	light L	dark L
morpheme-internal	Mr Beelik	
level 1 boundary	the beel-ic men	
level 2 boundary	the beel-ing men	
compound, level 3 boundary	the beel equator's amazing	
word boundary		Beel equates the actors

(examples taken from S&F 1993)

In the mid-80s, when Halle and Mohanan begin to formalize the workings of L Darkening in extensive and explicit detail within a Lexical Phonology framework, problems with the monolithic analysis began to appear. Likely because neither Halle nor Mohanan was a native speaker of an L-Darkening variety of English, they based their analysis on the information in Kenyon and Knott's 1944 pronouncing dictionary of American English, and to a lesser extent Jones's Outline of English Phonetics, originally published in 1918. On the basis of these sources, they identified L Darkening as a post-lexical rule that could be bled by a rule of L Resyllabification which they assigned to lexical Level 4 because it followed Level 1 and Level 2 affixation as well as compounding, but preceded the phrasal phonology.

After this point some linguists began to realize that not all speakers of English had the same distribution of light and dark L in these contexts. For example, Nolan et al. 1991 found that 67% (4/6?) of young Cambridge speakers and 90% of old Cambridge speakers produced light L in "call Andy", contrary to Halle and Mohanan's system. Turton 2014 found the same light L treatment, at least with vowel-initial clitics, with her RP speaker. [NEXT]

Problem: variation

- “variation in English /l/ realization has been underestimated in the existing literature, and [...] we can observe phonetic, phonological, and morphosyntactic conditioning when accounting for a representative range of phonological environments across varieties.” (Turton 2017)

Sproat and Fujimura 1993 explored the production of L by four Americans and one americanized Brit, namely Sproat, in these and additional morphosyntactic contexts, and found that the picture had changed and was also more complex than what Halle and Mohanan worked with. More recently our understanding of the dimensions along which L can vary phonologically has been enhanced significantly by Hayes in 2000 and by Bermúdez-Otero and his associates in a series of studies beginning in 2007. On the basis of these Turton 2017 concludes that “variation in English /l/ realization has been underestimated in the existing literature, and we can observe phonetic, phonological, and morphosyntactic conditioning when accounting for a representative range of phonological environments across varieties.” Where do we go from here? [NEXT]

Systematizing variation

- Hayes 2000: average over ratings by 10 listeners, create gradient metagrammar
- Bermúdez-Otero, Trousdale, Turton, Yuan, and Liberman: factor out phonetic variation, identify structured phonological systems in what remains
 - B-O, Trousdale, and Turton: 4 systems, connected to frequency values generated by Hayes
 - Yuan and Liberman 2011: one system extracted from automated acoustic analysis of 50 years' worth of Supreme Court recordings

Hayes 2000 expanded Sproat and Fujimura's rich set of conditioning environments into a total of 17 that he tested on a larger set of 10 individuals, over which he averaged to create a single gradient-yet-phonological metagrammar. Bermúdez-Otero and his associates took Sproat and Fujimura's data in a different direction, separating out phonetic from phonological effects and then identifying four distinct phonological systems which they interpret as four stages in Bermudez-Otero's Life Cycle of Phonological Processes. Yuan and Liberman started with a different database, generated from automated acoustic analysis of 50 years' worth of audio recordings of Supreme Court transactions, but converged on a rule scattering analysis similar to Bermudez-Otero's, in which a single phonological system of L Darkening in Rimes co-exists with various phonetic processes.

Though each of these studies represents a significant advance in our understanding of L allophony, we feel that each can be improved on in various ways.

Hayes, for example, arguably creates a non-existent straw grammar by averaging over the judgements of 10 individuals rather than identifying the internal workings of each individual system. The same can be said for Yuan and Liberman, who average over 50 years' worth of unidentified outputs of an unidentified set of speakers covering two or three generations. Bermudez-Otero and his associates are in our opinion on the right track in identifying the structure of individual grammars with great precision, but their classification of the range of L systems into four types misses out on a large number of attested and attestable systems, such as the one possessed by Corrine:...

[NEXT]

Corrine's system

- a. forms consistent with classic Onset/Coda distinction:
 - [l]: light, Louanne, please, antler, balloon, Greeley, freely
 - [t]: twinkle, silk
- b. no compound- or phrase-level resyllabification except with clitics
 - [t]: fallout, whale office, the whale offered
 - [l]: mail it
 - cf. B-O 2007:10, Selkirk 1996 on cliticization of weak object pronouns to verbal PrWds
- c. coda clusters
 - light before labials, dark before dorsals, determined by backness of preceding V before coronals

As I mentioned earlier, Corrine's system is relatively easy to investigate as its two allophones are quite distinct from one another articulatorily and visually. At first blush her system seems to be a straightforward one with light L in Onsets and dark L in Codas, as in (a) and (b). Closer inspection turns up complications that do not sit well with Sproat and Fujimura's or Bermudez-Otero's taxonomies, though, such as the behavior of Coda clusters containing L, as in (c). We hypothesized that careful inspection of a large number of individual L systems should reveal a wide range of subtle and unexpected nanovariations of this sort, resulting from essentially free combination of the phonological variables that have been proposed in the literature to date: morphosyntactic and prosodic differences, vowel backness, and so on. In 2004 we implemented an online survey designed to address these concerns.

[NEXT]

light vs. dark /L/ survey

overview

- 20 words displaying a wide variety of phonological environments: partial Hayes word list with additional forms to test effects of adjacent segmental features.
- 303 linguistically sophisticated speakers of English answered all of the questions.
- Subjects asked to state whether they use light, dark, or both in each word.
- 24 prosodic and segmental parameters investigated for each word.
- Survey ran from 28 April 2004 until 6 March 2008, when the host site became defunct.

light vs. dark /L/ survey

word list

light	pal
grayling	silk
Greeley	glass
bell	sprinkler
help	slipped
mailer	fallout
mail it	please
antler	black
balloon	allow
freely	Louanne

Here are the 20 words we used...[NEXT]

light vs. dark /L/ survey

features

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. after V | 15. in stressed syllable |
| 2. before V | 16. immediately after stressed |
| 3. after C | syllable |
| 4. before C | 17. after dorsal consonant |
| 5. onset | 18. before dorsal consonant |
| 6. coda | 19. after coronal consonant |
| 7. complex onset | 20. before level 2 V-initial |
| 8. complex coda | suffix |
| 9. after front V | 21. before V-initial clitic |
| 10. after back V | 22. before V-initial second |
| 11. before front V | member of compound |
| 12. before back V | 23. potential syllabic L |
| 13. after high V | before V-initial suffix |
| 14. before high V | 24. morpheme-initial |


and here are the 24 phonological environments that we examined via our set of 20 words. [NEXT]

Part 2

survey results and analysis

Survey: Summary results

% of responses
(n = 303)



Although coda L tends to be dark and onset L tends to be light, but there are speakers who do not follow this pattern, including roughly 20% of speakers who use or can use light L in word final codas. Also seems to be evidence of features at play beyond just where the L is located in a word or syllable (e.g., antler, allow, fallout).

Numerous possible grammars

- 303 speakers: 255 distinct grammars.
- Significant inter-speaker variation for most environments tested, even “canonical” onset and coda.
- Can these many individual grammars be grouped into larger clusters of similar grammars?

Clustering grammars via EM


expectation maximisation (EM)

- EM process (Dempster et al. 1977):
 1. Initialize: randomly assign subjects to groups.
 2. Determine likelihood of that clustering given responses, and set parameters for group assignment based on that.
 3. Reassign subjects to groups using those parameters.
 4. Repeat steps 2 and 3 until no further improvement.
- Advantages:
 - Doesn't need number of clusters specified in advance.
 - Works with categorical/discrete data.
 - Relatively easy to understand.
- EM groups the speakers subjects into 8 clusters.

FYI or if someone asks, EM does not know about the phonological features. It only knows what each speaker chose for each word.

I used the free software called Weka to do all the clustering and feature selection work.

Eight grammar clusters



Features associated with clusters

correlation-based feature subset (CFS)

- Do different clusters of speakers use different features for deciding between light and dark L?
- Feature selection with machine learning: **CFS** (Halle, 1998).
 - Finds features that individually best predict outcomes.
 - Considers correlations between features.
 - High correlation = redundancy, so it picks informative features that make independent contributions.
 - Important for our features (e.g., before high vowel will always co-occur with before vowel).

This is how I worked the data. I looked at one cluster at a time. I took each word/speaker pair in that cluster and its 24 binary feature values and what kind of L that speaker picked. This set of data vectors (i.e., 20 per speaker) is what gets fed to CFS, and then CFS finds the features that best predict which type of L should be used for speakers in that cluster. CFS doesn't bother with redundant features, which is great in our case because many of our features are highly correlated, e.g., before V and before high V.

Clusters 1&2: All or nothing

- **Cluster 1**

- Observations: almost **always dark L**. Occasional instances of light L in *grayling*, *Greeley*, and *freely*.
 - Key Features: after front vowel, after high vowel.

- **Cluster 2**

- Observations: **light L almost exclusively**. Dark L appears only in *antler* and *sprinkler*, and then only rarely.
 - Feature: speaker ID. No apparent phonological basis for always choosing light L, just idiosyncratic.

There are people who always choose one or the other.

Clusters 3&4: Traditional

- **Cluster 3**

- Observations: canonical onset-coda rule **with resyllabification** of word-final /l/ before V-initial words, though free variation in *mail it*, *fallout*.
 - Feature: before vowel

- **Cluster 4**

- Canonical onset-coda rule **without resyllabification** of word-final /l/ before V-initial words.
 - Features: after vowel, before vowel, before consonant, onset, coda, morpheme-initial.

What I mean is that all /L/ are light except for those in word-final coda position.

Clusters 5&6: Adjacent segments

- **Cluster 5**

- Observations: dark L in coda and **when adjacent to back vowel** (*mailer, antler, balloon, sprinkler, fallout, allow, Louanne*).
 - Features: before vowel, onset, complex onset, after back vowel, before front vowel, after high vowel, before high vowel.

- **Cluster 6**

- Dark L in coda, in **clusters**, and in the words *fallout* and *allow*.
 - Features: before vowel, before high vowel, in stressed syllable, morpheme-initial. (Morpheme initial and before vowel correlate highly with complex onset.)

For features for cluster 6: Recall that CFS looks for non-correlated sets of features. A negative value of morpheme-initial will be highly correlated with a positive value for complex onset; complex onset is also highly correlated with before vowel, since an /l/ will always be the last member of a complex onset. Hence, the notion of complex onset is likely being captured by these other features.

Clusters 7&8: Not too picky

- **Cluster 7**

- Observations: light L before high vowels; dark L in coda position; both elsewhere.
 - Features: after high vowel, before high vowel, morpheme-initial.

- **Cluster 8**

- Observations: light L pretonically; dark L in codas; both elsewhere.
 - Features: before vowel, onset.

Classification of L quality

- Can we determine a particular speaker's L preference for a particular word given the described set of features for that word?
- Baseline evaluation: always guess light L because it is more common in our data.
- Compare this to a classifier built using:
 - only the phonological features
 - above plus the speaker's ID number and the cluster number that speaker was assigned to

Random forest classifier accuracy

- Baseline F1: 0.48
- Phonological features alone: 0.59
- With speaker ID and cluster info: 0.71

- Cluster membership and speaker ID combine with phonological features to produce a reasonably accurate prediction of an individual's L preferences.

- Most helpful features: coda, onset, before_V, clusterID, before_C, complex_coda, before_high_V, morpheme_initial


Nice to note that the most helpful features include (1) syllable/word position, (2) cluster membership, and (3) segment features like high V

Feature selection

correlation-based feature subset (CFS)

- Do different clusters of speakers use different features for deciding between light and dark L?
- If so, which of our 24 features are important? Two ways to figure this out
 1. Human observation of patterns.
 2. Feature selection with machine learning: **CFS** (Halle, 1998).
 - Finds features that individually best predict outcomes.
 - Considers correlations between features.
 - High correlation = redundancy, so it picks informative features that make independent contributions.
 - Important for our features (e.g., before high vowel will always co-occur with before vowel).

This is how I worked the data. I looked at one cluster at a time. I took each word/speaker pair in that cluster and its 24 binary feature values and what kind of L that speaker picked. This set of data vectors (i.e., 20 per speaker) is what gets fed to CFS, and then CFS finds the features that best predict which type of L should be used for speakers in that cluster. CFS doesn't bother with redundant features, which is great in our case because many of our features are highly correlated, e.g., before V and before high V.



Comparison with previous studies

“Free variation” in Hayes (2000)

- Hayes: ambisyllabic environment of /l/ in Greeley “evokes free variation between light and dark”; supported by the close listener scores (1.8 for light /l/, 2.7 for dark /l/).
- If it’s free variation, we expect “both light and dark” choice to be quite frequent in our survey.
- In fact, frequency of “both” for Greeley (7.3%) is essentially average (7.6%). Very few acknowledge using both forms.

→ Perception ratings ≠ choices in production.

B-O's 4 stages vs our results

Table 3: /l/-darkening in different morphosyntactic environments. Adapted from Bermúdez-Otero (2007).

		leap	helix	peel-ing	heal it	peel	
24%	RP	[l]	[l]	[l]	[l]	[t]	Cruttenden (2008)
9%	Am. Eng. 1	[l]	[l]	[l]	[t]	[t]	Sproat and Fujimura (1993)
4%	Am. Eng. 2	[l]	[l]	[t]	[t]	[t]	Olive et al. (1993)
2%	Am. Eng. 3	[l]	[t]	[t]	[t]	[t]	Hayes (2000)
	Emily	[l]	[l]	[l]	either	[t]	
	Corrine	[l]	[l]	[t]	[l]	[t]	

light, Greeley, mailer, mail_it, bell

everyone else 187

Other popular choices:

22243 15 (mail_it is either or)

22222 15 (they are all light L)

22323 13 (mailer=dark, mail_it=light, bell=dark)

23323 9 (light and mail_it=light)

22443 7 (mailer, mail_it=either-or

23233 7 (light, mailer light, others dark)

33333 6 (all dark L)

23333 6 (all dark L except light) >

B-O's 4 stages vs our results


Table 3: /l/-darkening in different morphosyntactic environments. Adapted from Bermúdez-Otero (2007).

	leap	helix	peel-ing	heal it	peel	
RP	[l]	[l]	[l]	[l]	[t]	Cruttenden (2008)
Am. Eng. 1	[l]	[l]	[l]	[t]	[t]	Sproat and Fujimura (1993)
Am. Eng. 2	[l]	[l]	[t]	[t]	[t]	Olive et al. (1993)
Am. Eng. 3	[l]	[t]	[t]	[t]	[t]	Hayes (2000)

□ These systems below were more common in our data than Am. Eng. 2 or Am. Eng. 3

[l]	[l]	[l]	either	[t]
[l]	[l]	[l]	[l]	[l]
[l]	[l]	[t]	[l]	[t]

comparison with Yuan&Liberman 2011



#LV1	light, Louanne, glass, slipped, please, black
VOLV1	balloon, allow
V1L#C	pal, silk, bell, help
V1L#V0	mail_it, fallout
V1LV0	mailer, Greeley, grayling, freely

D score = $\log(\text{prob of light L}) - \log(\text{prob of dark L})$. To make something equivalent to what Yuan and Liberman had, I took $\log(\text{percent light}) - \log(\text{percent dark})$. The big difference between our results and theirs is that the V1LV0 examples, where you have an intervocalic L that can be syllabified in different ways, tend to be LIGHT in our survey, but DARK in the Y&L acoustic analysis. I suspect that at one reason is that in our data, three of the four examples of this cross morpheme boundaries. Y&L don't mention how often this happens in their data, but I suspect it's not as often as 75% of the time (e.g., more things like yellow, willing, etc.) They argue, I think, that morphosyntactic stuff doesn't matter – it's just syllables. (I think.) But I don't see anything in the paper where they actually look at the morphology stuff.

Conclusions

- first large-scale survey and review of L nanosystems
- refined picture of phonological variables that can factor into L systems
- speakers assemble more complex and varied L systems in a more nuanced yet systematic way than previously thought
- corrective to hypo- and hyper-variationist perspectives on L allophony

To conclude, we have suggested that it is important to study the phonological systems of individuals both in detail, as is done for example by Oxley et al. 2006 and Turton 2017), and on a large scale, as is done by Yuan and Liberman 2011. Consequently we conducted the first large-scale investigation of L nanosystems, which we believe leads to a more refined picture of the range of phonological variables that can factor into L systems, and the ways in which they can combine. Our findings suggest that English L allophony is not monolithic, but rather shows extensive phonetic and phonological nano- and micro-variation. In our online survey of 303 speakers, for example, we found both order and diversity, with 8 main clusters of L system but hundreds of other variants.

Our findings also suggest that the nature of L allophony in English is not so simple as a single phonological process, a combination of a phonological process and a phonetic one (Yuan and Liberman 2011), or a single prosodically-organized hierarchy of four processes (B-O). Instead, while there does appear to be a rich array of phonological variables available, as Sproat and Fujimura 1993 and Hayes 2000, etc. suggest, but speakers assemble systems from these variables in a more nuanced yet systematic way than previously thought, as we saw for example with Corrine's system and its unexpected subdivision of Coda clusters.

We hope that large-scale investigation of nanovariation can serve as a corrective to hyper and hypovariationist perspectives on L allophony.

The term **Hypovariationist** refers to the fact that most studies of L allophones focus on extremely small numbers of speakers, e.g. 1 for Browman and Goldstein 1995 and Gick 2003, 2 for Loevenbruck et al. 1999 and Nakamura 2009, 3 for Giles and Moll 1975 and Barry 2000, and 5 in Sproat and Fujimura 1993. The small numbers are understandable given the imaging techniques employed in these studies. **HOWEVER**, given the abundant evidence we have seen for extensive micro- and nano-variation in the realization of L, we should be careful in assigning too much weight to publications that seek to generalize to English from studies of

Structured variation in English l-allophony¹

Bert Vaux, University of Cambridge

Emily Prud'hommeaux, Boston College

OCP, 12 January 2018

References

- Armstrong, S., Leila Gleitman, and H. Gleitman. 1983. What some concepts might not be. *Cognition* 13:163–308.
- Bangayan, Philbert, Abeer Alwan, and Shrikanth Narayanan. 1996. From MRI and acoustic data to articulatory synthesis: A case study of the lateral approximants in American English. In *Proceedings of InterSpeech*, pp. 793–796, 2, Philadelphia.
- Barry, Martin. 2000. A phonetic and phonological investigation of English clear and dark syllabic /l/. *Cahiers de l'ICP Bulletin de la Communication Parlée* 5:77-88.
- Bauer, Laurie and Paul Warren. 2004. New Zealand English: phonology. In Schneider, Edgar W.; Burridge, Kate; Kortmann, Bernd; Mesthrie, Rajend; Upton, Clive, *A handbook of varieties of English*, 1: Phonology, Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 580–602.
- Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo. 2007. Diachronic phonology. In Paul de Lacy (ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of phonology*, 497-517. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo. 2011. Cyclicity. In Marc van Oostendorp, Colin Ewen, Elizabeth Hume, and Keren Rice (eds), *The Blackwell companion to phonology* (vol. 4: Phonological interfaces). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2019-48.
- Bermúdez-Otero, Ricardo and Graeme Trousdale. 2012. Cycles and continua: on unidirectionality and gradualness in language change. In T. Nevalainen & E. Traugott (eds), *The Oxford handbook of the history of English*, 691-720. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bladon R. and A. Al-Bamerni. 1976. Coarticulation resistance in English /l/. *Journal of Phonetics* 4:137–150.
- Bladon, R. and Francis Nolan. 1977. A video-fluorographic investigation of tip and blade alveolars in English. *Journal of Phonetics* 5:185–193.
- Boersma, Paul and Bruce Hayes. 2001. Empirical tests of the Gradual Learning Algorithm. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:45-86.
- Borowsky, Toni. 1984. On resyllabification in English. *WCCFL* 3:1-15.
- Borowsky, Toni. 1986 Topics in the lexical phonology of English. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts-Amherst.
- Borowsky, Toni. 2001. The vocalisation of dark l in Australian English. In Blair, D. and P. Collins, eds., *English in Australia*, pp. 69-87. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Borowsky, Toni and Barbara Horvath. 1997. L Vocalization in Australian English: the Adelaide study. In Hinskens, F, R. van Hout, and L. Wetzel, eds., *Variation, Change and Phonological Theory*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Browman, Catherine and Louis Goldstein. 1995. Gestural Syllable Position Effects in American English. In *Producing Speech: Contemporary Issues*, Katherine Safford Harris, F. Bell-Berti and L. J. Raphael (Eds.), 19-34. New York, NY: AIP Press.
- Campbell, Fiona and Bryan Gick. 2003. A labial gesture for /l/. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 113:2257.
- Canepari, Luciano. 2005. *A Handbook of Pronunciation: English, Italian, French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, Arabic, Hindi, Chinese, Japanese, Esperanto*. München: Lincom Europa.

¹ Thanks to Joe Fruehwald, Dan Johnson, Andrew Nevins, Corrine Occhino, and Patrick Taylor for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

- Carr, Philip. 1999. English phonetics and phonology: An introduction. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Carter, Paul. 1999. Abstractness in phonology and extrinsic phonetic interpretation: the case of liquids in English. ICPPhS99: 105-108.
- Carter, Paul. 2003. Extrinsic phonetic interpretation: spectral variation in English liquids. In Local, J., Ogden, R. & Temple, R. (eds.), *Papers in Laboratory Phonology VI: Phonetic Interpretation*, 237–252. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carter, Paul and John Local. 2007. F2 variation in Newcastle and Leeds English liquid systems. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 37/2:183-199.
- Collins, Beverley and Inger Mees. 2003. Practical phonetics and phonology: a resource book for students. London: Routledge.
- Cruttenden, A. 1994. Gimson's pronunciation of English. Fifth edition of Gimson, A.C. 1962. An introduction to the pronunciation of English. London: Edward Arnold.
- Crystal, David. 2003. The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Delattre, P. 1971. Consonant gemination in four languages: An acoustic, perceptual, and radiographic study, part I. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 9(1):31–52.
- Dempster, A., N. Laird, and D. Rubin. 1977. Maximum Likelihood from Incomplete Data via the EM Algorithm. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B* 39:1-38.
- Donegan, Patricia. 2002. Phonological processes and phonetic rules. In *Future Challenges for Natural Linguistics*, ed. Katarzyna Dziubalska-Kołacyk and Jarosław Weckworth, pp. 57-81. Muenchen: Lincom Europa.
- Durian, David. 2008. The vocalization of /l/ in urban blue collar Columbus, OH African American Vernacular English: A quantitative sociophonetic analysis. OSUWPL 58:30-51.
- Foulkes, Paul and Docherty, G. (eds.) 1999. *Urban Voices: Accent Studies in the British Isles*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Foulkes, Paul and Gerry Docherty. 2007. Phonological variation in England. In David Britain (ed.) *Language in the British Isles* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 52-74.
- Francis, Winthrop Nelson. 1954. The structure of American English. New York: Ronald Press Company.
- Gafos, Adamantios and Louis Goldstein. 2011. Articulatory representation and organization. In *The Handbook of Laboratory Phonology*. Eds. Abigail C. Cohn, Cécile Fougeron, Marie K. Huffman. Oxford University Press.
- Gallistel, Charles R., P. Balsam, & S. Fairhurst. 2004. The learning curve: Implications of a quantitative analysis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 101:13124-13131.
- Gesuato, Sara. 1996. Perception of alveolar and velar allophones of English /l/ in word-initial and word-final positions. *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on The Role of Learnability in Grammatical Theory* (1996), pp. 116-131.
- Gick, Bryan. 2003. Articulatory correlates of ambisyllabicity in English glides and liquids. In: Local, J.; Ogden, R.; Temple, R., editors. *Papers in Laboratory Phonology VI: Constraints on phonetic interpretation*, pp. 222-236. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gick B., Wilson I., & Derrick D. 2013. Articulatory phonetics. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Giegerich, Heinz. 1992. English phonology: An introduction. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giles, S. and K. Moll. 1975. Cinefluorographic study of selected allophones of English /l/. *Phonetica* 31:206-227.
- Gimson, A. 1989. An introduction to the pronunciation of English, 4th edition. London: Edward Arnold.

- Gouskova, Maria, & Nancy Hall. 2009. Acoustics of epenthetic vowels in Lebanese Arabic. In Steve Parker (ed.), *Phonological Argumentation: Essays on Evidence and Motivation*, 203–225. London: Equinox Publishing.
- Gussmann, Edmund. 2002. *Phonology: analysis and theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hall, Mark. 1999. Correlation-based feature selection for machine learning. Doctoral dissertation, University of Waikato.
- Halle, Morris and K. P. Mohanan. 1985. Segmental phonology of modern English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16:57–116.
- Hardcastle, W. and W. Barry 1985. Articulatory and Voicing Characteristics of Adult Dysarthric and Verbal Dyspraxic Speakers: An Instrumental Study. *British Journal of Disorders of Communication*, 20:3:249–70.
- Hardcastle W. and W. Barry 1989. Articulatory and perceptual factors in /l/ vocalisations in English. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 15(2):3-17.
- Hayes, Bruce. 2000. Gradient Well-Formedness in Optimality Theory. In J. Dekkers et al., eds., *Optimality Theory: Phonology, Syntax, and Acquisition*, 88-120. Oxford: OUP. 1998 preprint version available at <http://linguistics.ucla.edu/people/hayes/Gradient.pdf>.
- Heselwood, Barry & Louise McChrystal. 1999. The effect of age-group and place of L1 acquisition on the realisation of Panjabi stop consonants in Bradford: An acoustic sociophonetic study. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics* 7:49–68.
- Honorof, Douglas, Jeffrey Weihing, and Carol Fowler. 2011. Articulatory events are imitated under rapid shadowing. *Journal of Phonetics* 39(1):18–38.
- Howe, Darin. 2004. Vocalic dorsality in Revised Articulator Theory. Manuscript, University of Calgary.
- Huffman, Marie. 1997. Phonetic variation in intervocalic onset /l's in English. *Journal of Phonetics* 25:115–141.
- Inkelas, Sharon and Yvan Rose. 2008. Positional Neutralization: A Case Study from Child Language. *Language* 83.4:707-736.
- Jensen, John. 1993. *English Phonology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Jensen, John. 2000. Against ambisyllabicity. *Phonology* 17:187-235.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1954. *A Modern English grammar on historical principles. Part I: Sounds and spellings*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Johnson, Wyn and David Britain. 2007. L-vocalisation as a natural phenomenon: explorations in sociophonology. *Language Sciences* 29:294–315.
- Jones, Daniel. 1960. *An Outline of English Phonetics*, 9th edition. Cambridge: Heffer.
- Kahn, Daniel. 1976. Syllable-based generalizations in English phonology. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Katalin, Balogné Bérces and Szentgyörgyi Szilárd, eds. 2006. *Az angol nyelv kiejtése – The Pronunciation of English*. Budapest: Bölcsész Konzorcium.
- Kelly, J. and John Local. 1986. Long-domain resonance patterns in English. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Speech Input/Output*, Institute of Electrical Engineers, 304–308.
- Kelly, J. and John Local. 1989. *Doing Phonology*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kenyon, J. and T. Knott. 1944. *A pronouncing dictionary of American English*. Springfield, MA: G. G. Merriam.
- Kerswill, Paul. 1995. Surface and underlying phonological differences in the study of dialect contact: evidence from citation forms. In L. Shockey (ed.) *Work in Progress 8*. Speech Research Laboratory, Department of Linguistic Science, University of Reading, 78–88.
- Kirkham, Sam. 2017. Ethnicity and phonetic variation in Sheffield English liquids. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 47.1:17-35.

- Krakow, Rena. 1999. Physiological organization of syllables: a review. *Journal of Phonetics* 27:23-54.
- Ladefoged, Peter. 2001. *A course in phonetics*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt.
- Ladefoged, Peter and Ian Maddieson. 1996. *The sounds of the world's languages*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lee-Kim, Sang-Im, Lisa Davidson, and Sangjin Hwang. 2013. Morphological effects on the darkness of English intervocalic /l/. *Laboratory Phonology* 4(2): 475 – 511.
- Lehiste, Ilse and G. Peterson. 1960. Some Allophones of /l/ in American English. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 32:914.
- Lehiste, Ilse. 1964. *Acoustical characteristics of selected English consonants*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Lehman, Mark and Bradford Swartz. 2000. Electropalatographic and spectrographic descriptions of allophonic variants of /l/. *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 90:47-61.
- Lin, Susan and Katherine Demuth. 2015. Children's acquisition of English Onset and Coda /l/: Articulatory evidence. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 58.1:13-27.
- Löwenbrück, H., M. Collins, Mary Beckman, A. Krishnamurthy, and S. Ahalt. 1999. Temporal coordination of articulatory gestures in consonant clusters and sequences of consonants. In *Proceedings of Linguistics Phonetics 1998, Item Order in Language and Speech*, Osamu Fujimura, Brian Joseph & Bohumil Palek (Eds.), pp. 547-573.
- Lunn, Julie, Alan Wrench, and Janet Mackenzie Beck. 1998. Acoustic analysis of /l/ in Glossectomees. In *ICSLP-1998 (Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Spoken Language Processing)*, paper 1118.
- Maddieson Ian. 1985. Phonetic cues to syllabification. In V. Fromkin (Ed.), *Phonetic linguistics: Essays in honor of Peter Ladefoged* (pp. 85–101). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Matthews, William. 1938. *Cockney: Past and present: A short history of the dialect of London*. London: George Routledge.
- Meuter, Anne. 2002. L-vocalisation and labiodental variants of /r/ in the speech of Colchester primary school children – The acquisition of a sound change? Masters dissertation, University of Essex.
- Mohanan, Karuvannur. 1985. Syllable structure and lexical strata in English. *Phonology Yearbook* 2:139-155.
- Mohanan, Karuvannur. 1986. *The theory of Lexical Phonology*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Nakamura, Mitsuhiro. 2009. Exploring Vocalization of /l/ in English: an EPG and EMA study. *Proceedings of Interspeech 2009*, pp. 2311-2314.
- Narayanan, Shrikanth, Abeer Alwan, and Katherine Haker. 1997. Toward articulatory-acoustic models for liquid approximants based on MRI and EPG data. Part I. The laterals. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 101 (2), 1064-1077.
- Nevins, Andrew and Bert Vaux. 2003. Metalinguistic, shmetalinguistic: The phonology of shmreduplication. *Proceedings from the Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 39(1): 702-721.
- Nolan, Francis, ed. 1995. Preview of the IPA handbook. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 25:1-47.
- Nolan, Francis, Paul Kerswill, and S. Wright. 1991. The interaction of sociophonetic features and connected speech processes. Final report submitted to the Economic and Social Research Council. Ref. R000231056.
- Occhino, Corrine. 2005. A Study on Grammaticality Judgments of Allophonic Variation of /l/ in American English. Manuscript, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.
- Oh, S. and Bryan Gick. 2005. Articulatory and acoustic characteristics of English /l/ in children's speech production. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 117(4), Pt.2: 2575.
- Olive, Joseph, Alice Greenwood, and John Coleman. 1993. *Acoustics of American English speech: a*

- dynamic approach. New York: Springer Verlag.
- Oxley, Judith, Hugh Buckingham, Nancy Roussel, and Raymond Daniloff. 2006. Metrical/syllabic factors in English allophony: Dark /l/. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics* 20.2/3:109-117.
- Oxley, Judith, Nancye Rouseel, and Hugh Buckingham. 2007. Contextual variability in American English dark-l. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 21.7:523-542.
- Pegg, Judith and Janet Werker 1997. Adult and infant perception of two English phones. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 102.6:3742-3753.
- Plag, Ingo, Sabine Arndt-Lappe, Maria Braun, and Mareile Schramm. 2015. Introduction to English linguistics, 3rd edition. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Raimy, Eric. 2007. Precedence theory, root and template morphology, priming effects and the structure of the lexicon. <https://goo.gl/GsRsVB>
- Recasens Daniel. 2004. Darkness in [l] as a scalar phonetic property: implications for phonology and articulatory control. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics* 18:593-603.
- Recasens, Daniel. 2011. Linguistic Phonetics: A look into the future. *Proceedings of ICPHS XVII*.
- Reiss, Charles. 2003. Quantification in structural descriptions: Attested and unattested patterns. *Linguistic Review* 20: 305-338.
- Roach, Peter. 1991. English Phonetics and Phonology: A practical course. Cambridge: CUP.
- Roussel, Nancye and Judith Oxley. 2010. Perception of American English dark /l/ by normally hearing young adult women. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*.
- Rubach, Jerzy. 1996. Shortening and ambisyllabicity in English. *Phonology* 13:197-237.
- Scobbie, James and Marianne Pouplier. 2010. The role of syllable structure in external sandhi: An EPG study of vocalisation and retraction in word-final English /l/. *Journal of Phonetics* 38 (2): 240-59.
- Scobbie, James and A. Wrench. 2003. An articulatory investigation of word final /l/ and /l/-sandhi in three dialects of English. *Proceedings of the 15th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, pp. 1871-1874.
- Simpson, Jane. 1980. Cyclic syllabification and a first cycle rule of vowel-rounding in some dialects of Australian English. Generals paper, MIT; now a manuscript at the University of Sydney. Downloaded 7-1-18 from <https://ses.library.usyd.edu.au/bitstream/2123/1725/1/simpson-cyclic-syll.pdf>.
- Smit, Ann. 1993. Phonologic error distributions in the Iowa-Nebraska Articulation Norms Project: consonant singletons. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research* 36(3):533-547.
- Spencer, Andrew. 1996. Phonology: theory and description. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sproat, Richard and O. Fujimura. 1993. Allophonic variation in English /l/ and its implications for phonetic implementation. *Journal of Phonetics* 21:291–311.
- Sproat, Richard. 1993. Looking into Words. In Ellen Kaisse and Sharon Hargus, eds., *Studies in Lexical Phonology*. New York: Academic Press, pp. 173-195.
- Steriade, Donca. 1988. Review of Clements and Keyser 1986. *Language* 64.1:118-129.
- Stoddart, Jana, Clive Upton, and J. Widdowson. 1999. Sheffield dialect in the 1990s: Revisiting the concept of NORMs. In Paul Foulkes & Gerard J. Docherty (eds.), *Urban voices: Accent studies in the British Isles*, 72–89. London: Longman.
- Strycharczuk, Patrycja and James Scobbie. 2015. Velocity measures in ultrasound data: Gestural timing of post-vocalic /l/ in English. *Proceedings of the 18th ICPHS* (0309).
- Toft, Zoë. 2002. The Phonetics and Phonology of some Syllabic Consonants in Southern British English. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 28:111-144.
- Trager, George and Henry Smith. 1951. An outline of English structure. *Studies in Linguistics Occasional Papers* 3. Washington: American Council of Learned Societies.
- Trudgill, Peter and Jean Hannah. 2002. International English: A Guide to the Varieties of Standard English (4th ed.), London: Arnold.

- Tsukada, Kimiko, David Birdsong, Molly Mack, Hyekyung Sung, Ellen Bialystok, and James Flege. 2004. Release Bursts in English Word-Final Voiceless Stops Produced by Native English and Korean Adults and Children. *Phonetica* 61:67-83.
- Turton, Danielle. 2012. The Darkening of English /l/: A Stochastic Stratal OT Analysis. Doctoral dissertation, University of Manchester.
- Turton, Danielle. 2014. Some /l/s are darker than others: Accounting for variation in English /l/ with ultrasound tongue imaging. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 20.2:x-x.
- Turton, Danielle. 2015. Determining categoricity in English /l/-darkening: A principal component analysis of ultrasound spline data. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*.
- Turton, Danielle. 2016. Synchronic stratum-specific rates of application reflect diachronic change: Morphosyntactic conditioning of variation in English /l/-darkening. *Papers in Historical Phonology* 1:130–165.
- Turton, Danielle. 2017. Categorical or gradient? An ultrasound investigation of /l/-darkening and vocalization in varieties of English. *Laboratory Phonology* 8.1:1-31.
- Van Hofwegen, Janneke. 2009. Cross-generational change in /l/ in Chicano English. *English World-Wide* 30.3:302–325.
- Wells, John. 1982. *Accents of English*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Wells, John. 1998. Our changing pronunciation. *Transactions of the Yorkshire Dialect Society* xix:42-48.
- Whitley, Melvin. 2002. *Spanish/English contrasts: A course in Spanish linguistics*, second edition. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Wrench, A. and James Scobbie. 2003. Categorising vocalisation of English /l/ using EPG, EMA and ultrasound. *Proceedings of the 6th International Seminar on Speech Production*, pp. 314-319.
- Yavaş, Mehmet. 2016. *Applied English phonology*, second edition. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ying, Jia, Christopher Carignan, Jason Shaw, Michael Proctor, Donald Derrick, and Catherine Best. 2017. Temporal Dynamics of Lateral Channel Formation in /l/: 3D EMA Data from Australian English. *Proceedings of Interspeech 2017*, pp. 2978-2982.
- Yuan, Jiahong and Mark Liberman. 2009. Investigating /l/ variation in English through forced alignment. *Interspeech 2009*:2215-2218.
- Yuan, Jiahong and Mark Liberman. 2011. /l/ variation in American English: A corpus approach. *Journal of Speech Sciences* 1(2): 35-46.
- Zhang, Zhaoyan and Carol Espy-Wilson. 2004. A vocal-tract model of American English /l/. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 115 (3):1274-1280.
- Zhou, Xinhui. 2009. An MRI-based articulatory and acoustic study of American English liquid sounds /r/ and /l/. Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.