

## L2 phonology

- We have seen proof of transfer
- Any phones present in the L1 is transfered and used in place of phones of L2


## Flege (1987)

- L2'ers do not produce phones of L2 authentically
- Do not perceive L2 phones accurately?
- Motor control issues?
- Adults L2'ers not able to modify previously established articulatory patterns (contra children)


## Equivalence classification

- Permits humans to perceive constant categories
- Adults and older children have well established phonemic inventories
- Does the EC prevents L2'ers from establishing a phonetic category for similar but not new L2 phones?


## Equivalence classification

- Some phones in L2 seems so dissimilar acoustically and articulatory from phones in L1 that EC is unlikely to occur


## Experiment in Flege (1987)

- Tested 'two, tous, tu'
- /u/ vs /y/
- /t/ vs /th/


## Assumption

- L2'ers will not be able to produce authentically L2 phones that differ acoustically from phones in L1 unless they established a phonetic category for the phones of L2


## Predictions

- If this is correct and adults have not passed a 'critical period' for speech learning , highly experienced native English speakers of French should produce the new French vowel /y/ authentically but not the similar French /u/


## Subjects

- 1 mononlingual English group
- 1 monolingual French group
- 3 groups native American English learners of French (B, C, D)
- 1 group of French native exposed to English


Figure 1. The mean voice onset time, in ms , in tokens of $/ \mathrm{t}$ in tous $(\mathbf{L})$ and
iwo (D) by the L2 learners in four groups (represented by bars) and by mono-
ingual native speakers of English and French (represented by horizontal lines) Most means are based on 70 observations ( 7 subjects $\times 2$ conditions $\times 5$ replicate tokens): the brackets enclose $\pm 1$ standard deviation

## Results on /t/

- Inexperienced English-speaking learners of French do not differentiate L1 and L2 /t/
- French /t/ is similar enough to English /t/ to be consider an instance of English /t/
= equivalence classification
- American instructors produce L2 French
/t/ with intermediate VOT


## Results on /t/

- More advanced learners produce L2 French /t/ with intermediate VOT duration
- Bilinguals shown to evidence of 'compromise' VOT values for L2 as well

French /u/ vs. English /u/



## Results

- Except for non-experienced learners (first columns), learners' /y/ productions have formant values closer to the one of French controls


## Results

- Neutralization of the contrast between French /u/ and English /u/
- New category for /y/

Results

- L2'ers created a new category for a new phone, absent from their L1
- L2'ers identify acoustically different phones in L 1 and L 2 as belonging to the same category, thus able to modify their previously established patterns of articulation when producing similar L2 phones

