

**AGE-RELATED EFFECTS ON THE ACQUISITION
OF A FOREIGN LANGUAGE PHONOLOGY
IN A FORMAL SETTING**

Tesi doctoral presentada per

Natalia Fullana Rivera

com a requirement per a l'obtenció del títol de

Doctora en Filologia Anglesa

Programa de Doctorat: *Lingüística Anglesa i Lingüística Aplicada*
(Bienni 1998-2000)
Departament de Filologia Anglesa i Alemanya

Directors: **Dra. Carme Muñoz Lahoz** i **Dr. Ian R. A. MacKay**

Universitat de Barcelona

2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present dissertation is the result of a long study and research period that would not have been successfully completed but for the invaluable guidance, help, and support of many people. I would like to take this opportunity to express my heartfelt thanks to all of them.

First and foremost, I am very grateful to my supervisors, Dr Carme Muñoz Lahoz and Dr Ian R. A. MacKay.

Dr Muñoz's unconditional support since 1997, when she first hired me to work as an undergraduate assistant on the Barcelona Age Factor (BAF) project, has been paramount in the origin, development, and completion of this dissertation. Then, over my four-year period as a PhD student research assistant on the BAF project and until the present day I have been privileged to benefit from Dr Muñoz's expertise in L2 acquisition and the age factor. Moreover, her "permission" to mine the project's data for phonological aspects of L2 acquisition provided me with a golden opportunity to combine my two major research interests, namely phonetics and English learning as an FL. Dr Muñoz's methodological and research advice, and many comments on the contents and editing of the present study have been crucial. At a more personal level, I would also like to thank her for being so patient and skilful at handling the various crises of confidence I went through either in Barcelona or overseas. If I may, I think it is fair to say that this dissertation would not have come to light without Dr Muñoz's guidance and confidence in my work.

Dr MacKay first "came to the rescue" in the summer of 1999, when I was stuck with the first results obtained on the production task, by welcoming me as a visiting scholar at the Linguistics Department of the University of Ottawa. Without doubt, his suggestion that I carry out a foreign accent study with my data was vital in the development of this dissertation. I am thankful to Dr MacKay for providing the equipment, facilities, and English listeners, so that the first accent study not only became a reality but opened the doors for subsequent research under his supervision. My gratitude is further extended for his acceptance to co-direct this dissertation, whereby I have been very fortunate to benefit from his research guidance, valuable advice, and comments on content and editing, and continued support. Finally, I am very grateful to Dr MacKay for his help with everyday matters during all my short-term and long-term stays in Ottawa and for giving me the opportunity to experience the Canadian cottage life at Tenpenny Lake in the Gatineau Hills.

I would also like to thank Dr Eugenio Martínez Celdrán, Director of the *Laboratori de Fonètica* of the *Universitat de Barcelona*, who kindly allowed me to make use of the lab facilities any time I needed to. Special thanks are also due to Ana Ma. Fernández Planas, lab technician at the *Laboratori de Fonètica*, for immediately providing technical assistance and help, in addition to her generosity and support, whenever a problem arose during my work at the lab.

My thanks are extended to Enrique Astorga, former lab technician at the Linguistics Research Lab of the University of Ottawa. His assistance on technical and software-related matters was key to carrying out "some bits and pieces" of this dissertation, while his friendship made my long working hours at the Linguistics Research Lab more bearable and entertaining.

I am indebted to Dr Joaquín Romero of the *Universitat Rovira i Virgili* for taking an interest in this dissertation, hence providing valuable guidance and many useful comments on parts of the present study. Funding has played an important role in the completion of this dissertation and in my academic training. First, during the period 1997-2001 I benefited from a four-year doctoral research grant – *Beca de Formació en la Recerca i la Docència* – which further included three short summer stays at an overseas university – specifically, the University of Ottawa, Canada – in 1999, 2000, and 2001; all of which were awarded by the *Universitat de Barcelona*. Second, “la Caixa” scholarship in conjunction with the Canadian Studies Foundation – *Beca “la Caixa” per a cursar estudis de postgrau a l’estranger (convocatòria 2000)* – allowed me to further pursue my doctoral research for an academic year, 2001-2002, at the Linguistics Department of the University of Ottawa. This dissertation has also been partly supported by funding granted to the BAF project from the Ministry of Education of Spain (Refs. PB94-0944, PB97-0901, BFF2001-3384).

Invaluable statistical advice to perform some of the analyses in this dissertation was provided by Maribel Però and Toni Sans at the *Facultat de Psicologia* at the *Universitat de Barcelona*, as well as by Josep Matas, former research assistant at the *Laboratori de Fonètica* at the *Universitat de Barcelona*.

I thank Imma Miralpeix, Gisela Grañena, M. Mar Suárez, and Josep M. Armengol (former or current research assistants on the BAF project) for providing me invaluable help and support, in addition to their friendship.

I thank all the members on the BAF project and, in particular, Teresa Naves and Dr M. Luz Celaya, who one way or another contributed to this dissertation by collecting some of the subject data examined herein.

I also thank Natalia Rivera and Meritxell Alambillaga for help collecting the English control group data. Thanks are extended to *La Escuela Inglesa* in Mahón (Menorca) and *Col·legi Públic de Sant Lluís* in Menorca.

Much moral support and encouragement was given by my friends in Barcelona: Marilisa Birello, who has especially shared my ups and downs on finalising this dissertation while she was going through the same process, Raquel Sintés, Soledat Camps, Natasha Stepney, David Corpas, Aya Matsubara, Chinatsu Mori, Juan Hidalgo and Anna Sibel, in addition to overseas friends, among them, Sharon McAleer, Claudia Hüsgen, Claudia Schmiedchen, and Hélène Roblot. I thank them all for being so patient and understanding with me and my dissertation.

Jo-Anne Doherty, Professor P.G. Patel, Ann Meltzer, and the Voigts contributed to making my time in Ottawa a memorable experience. Special thanks are due to Jo-Anne Doherty for her long-term friendship and hospitality.

Lucrecia Rallo, Raquel Fernández Fuertes, and Elisa Rosado were very helpful with preparations related to my first short-term summer stay in Ottawa.

My colleagues Marta Viladot and Joan-Tomàs Pujolà at the *Departament de Didàctica de la Llengua i la Literatura* of the *University of Barcelona* have been a great help not only in providing moral support along the writing of my dissertation, but also in giving me guidance on teaching and class preparation since I started my teaching career two years ago.

Last but not least, my heartfelt thanks are due to all my family, especially my parents and brother, for their continued and invaluable support throughout all these years, and for giving me the freedom to do my own thing.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------------|
| Chapter 1. Introduction | 1 |
| Chapter 2. Literature review | 5 |
| 2.1. General overview | 5 |
| 2.2. Age and SLA | 8 |
| 2.3. Studies in L2 phonological acquisition | 30 |
| 2.3.1. Theoretical frameworks | 32 |
| 2.3.1.1. The Speech Learning Model | 32 |
| 2.3.1.2. The Perceptual Assimilation Model | 60 |
| 2.3.1.3. The Native Magnet Language Model | 72 |
| 2.3.1.4. Main similarities and differences between the SLM, the PAM, and the NLM | 76 |
| 2.3.2. Perception and production of TL sounds: Focus on NSs of Romance languages | 78 |
| 2.3.3. FA research | 88 |
| 2.3.4. Methodological issues in L2 phonological acquisition research: Main tasks and training effects | 94 |
| Chapter 3. The present study | 99 |
| 3.1. Research questions | 99 |
| 3.2. Overview of the present study | 103 |
| Chapter 4. Method | 105 |
| 4.1. Subjects | 105 |
| 4.2. Speech materials | 113 |
| 4.3. Procedure | 115 |
| 4.4. Analyses | 116 |
| 4.4.1. Auditory discrimination task | 116 |
| 4.4.2. Imitation task | 125 |
| Chapter 5. Results | 129 |
| 5.1. Auditory discrimination task | 129 |
| 5.1.1. Effect of onset age of FL learning | 130 |
| 5.1.2. Effect of exposure | 132 |
| 5.1.3. Effect of dominant L1(s) | 134 |
| 5.1.4. Effect of gender | 134 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| 5.1.5. Effects of research variables on specific sound contrasts | 135 |
| 5.1.5.1. Effects of onset age of FL learning, exposure, dominant L1(s), and gender on the discrimination of vowel contrasts | 139 |
| 5.1.5.2. Effects of onset age of FL learning, exposure, dominant L1(s), and gender on the discrimination of consonant contrasts | 145 |
| 5.1.5.3. Effects of onset age of FL learning, exposure, dominant L1(s), and gender on the discrimination of distractors | 151 |
| 5.2. Imitation task | 155 |
| 5.2.I. Imitation task – Study 1 | 156 |
| 5.2.1. Method | 156 |
| 5.2.1.1. Subjects | 156 |
| 5.2.1.2. Task | 158 |
| 5.2.1.3. Objective | 158 |
| 5.2.1.4. Stimulus preparation | 159 |
| 5.2.1.5. Listeners | 160 |
| 5.2.1.6. Procedure | 161 |
| 5.2.2. Results | 162 |
| 5.2.2.1. FA ratings on words | 162 |
| 5.2.2.1.1. Effect of onset age of FL learning | 166 |
| 5.2.2.1.2. Effect of exposure | 172 |
| 5.2.2.1.3. Effect of dominant L1(s) | 177 |
| 5.2.2.1.4. Effect of gender | 181 |
| 5.2.2.2. FA ratings on segments | 184 |
| 5.2.2.2.1. Effect of onset age of FL learning | 188 |
| 5.2.2.2.1.1. <i>Production of vowel segments /i ɪ æ/</i> | 188 |
| 5.2.2.2.1.2. <i>Production of consonant segments /d s v/</i> | 194 |
| 5.2.2.2.2. Effect of exposure | 198 |
| 5.2.2.2.2.1. <i>Production of vowel segments /i ɪ æ/</i> | 198 |
| 5.2.2.2.2.2. <i>Production of consonant segments /d s v/</i> | 203 |
| 5.2.2.2.3. Effect of dominant L1(s) | 207 |
| 5.2.2.2.3.1. <i>Production of vowel segments /i ɪ æ/</i> | 207 |
| 5.2.2.2.3.2. <i>Production of consonant segments /d s v/</i> | 211 |
| 5.2.2.2.4. Effect of gender | 214 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 5.2.2.2.4.1. Production of vowel segments /i ɪ æ/ | 214 |
| 5.2.2.2.4.2. Production of consonant segments /d s v/ | 216 |
| 5.3. Imitation task | 220 |
| 5.3.II. Imitation task – Study 2 | 220 |
| 5.3.1. Method | 220 |
| 5.3.1.1. Subjects | 220 |
| 5.3.1.2. Task | 222 |
| 5.3.1.3. Objective | 222 |
| 5.3.1.4. Stimulus preparation | 223 |
| 5.3.1.5. Listeners | 225 |
| 5.3.1.6. Procedure | 225 |
| 5.3.2. Results | 228 |
| 5.3.2.1. Intra-rater reliability | 228 |
| 5.3.2.2. FA ratings on vowels /i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/ | 232 |
| 5.3.2.2.1. Effect of onset age of FL learning | 236 |
| 5.3.2.2.2. Effect of exposure | 246 |
| 5.3.2.2.3. Effect of dominant L1(s) | 255 |
| 5.3.2.2.4. Effect of gender | 259 |
| 5.3.2.3. Vowel identification task /i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/ | 263 |
| 5.3.2.3.1. Effect of onset age of FL learning | 277 |
| 5.3.2.3.2. Effect of exposure | 290 |
| 5.3.2.3.3. Effect of dominant L1(s) | 297 |
| 5.3.2.3.4. Effect of gender | 302 |
| 5.3.2.3.5. Misidentification patterns | 307 |
| Chapter 6. Discussion | 313 |
| 6.1. Auditory discrimination task | 313 |
| 6.1.1. Effect of onset age of FL learning | 313 |
| 6.1.2. Effect of exposure | 320 |
| 6.1.3. Effect of dominant L1(s) | 322 |
| 6.1.4. Effect of gender | 323 |
| 6.2. Imitation task – Study 1 | 323 |
| 6.2.1. Effect of onset age of FL learning | 325 |
| 6.2.2. Effect of exposure | 328 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 6.2.3. Effect of dominant L1(s) | 329 |
| 6.2.4. Effect of gender | 330 |
| 6.3. Imitation task – Study 2 | 330 |
| 6.3.1. FA ratings on vowels /i ɪ ɛ æ ɒ u ʌ/ | 331 |
| 6.3.1.1. Effect of onset age of FL learning | 332 |
| 6.3.1.2. Effect of exposure | 334 |
| 6.3.1.3. Effect of dominant L1(s) | 335 |
| 6.3.1.4. Effect of gender | 336 |
| 6.3.2. Vowel identifications /i ɪ ɛ æ ɒ u ʌ/ | 337 |
| 6.3.2.1. Effect of onset age of FL learning | 337 |
| 6.3.2.2. Effect of exposure | 338 |
| 6.3.2.3. Effect of dominant L1(s) | 340 |
| 6.3.2.4. Effect of gender | 342 |
| 6.4. General discussion | 342 |
| Chapter 7. Conclusion | 347 |
| 7.1. Concluding remarks | 347 |
| 7.2. Implications for further research | 352 |
| References | 357 |
| Appendix A | 377 |
| Appendix B | 379 |
| Appendix C | 381 |
| Appendix D | 393 |
| Appendix E | 415 |

INDEX OF TABLES

| | | |
|------------|--|---------|
| Table I | SLM, PAM, and NLM: similarities | 76 |
| Table II | SLM, PAM, and NLM: differences | 77 |
| Table 4.1 | Characteristics of longitudinal and cross-sectional subject groups | 109 |
| Table 4.2 | Characteristics of longitudinal Ss | 111 |
| Table 4.3 | Characteristics of cross-sectional Ss | 112 |
| Table 4.4 | Data screening | 117 |
| Table 4.5 | Test of normality | 118 |
| Table 4.6 | Effects of Ss' scores with missing vs. complete values | 120 |
| Table 4.7 | Raters' assessments | 126 |
| Table 4.8 | Differences in judges' ratings | 126 |
| Table 5.1 | AX task: summary of comparisons. Factor: AOL | 131 |
| Table 5.2 | AX task: summary of comparisons. Factor: exposure | 133 |
| Table 5.3 | Taxonomy of perceptual difficulty of English sounds | 138 |
| Table 5.4 | Vowel contrasts: summary of comparisons. Factor: AOL | 140 |
| Table 5.5 | Vowel contrasts: summary of comparisons. Factor: exposure | 143 |
| Table 5.6 | Vowel contrasts: summary of comparisons. Factor: L1 | 143 |
| Table 5.7 | Vowel contrasts: summary of comparisons. Factor: gender | 145 |
| Table 5.8 | Consonant contrasts: summary of comparisons. Factor: AOL | 146 |
| Table 5.9 | Consonant contrasts: summary of comparisons. Factor: exposure | 147 |
| Table 5.10 | Consonant contrasts: summary of comparisons. Factor: L1 | 149 |
| Table 5.11 | Consonant contrasts: summary of comparisons. Factor: gender | 151 |
| Table 5.12 | Distractors: summary of comparisons. Factor: AOL | 152 |
| Table 5.13 | Distractors: summary of comparisons. Factor: exposure | 154 |
| Table 5.14 | Study 1: characteristics of cross-sectional groups | 157 |
| Table 5.15 | Study 1: characteristics of longitudinal groups | 158 |
| Table 5.16 | FA: words. Summary of comparisons. Factor: AOL | 169-170 |
| Table 5.17 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: AOL | 170-171 |
| Table 5.18 | FA: words. Summary of comparisons. Factor: exposure | 175 |
| Table 5.19 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: exposure | 176 |
| Table 5.20 | FA: words. Summary of comparisons. Factor: L1 | 178 |
| Table 5.21 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: L1 | 179 |
| Table 5.22 | FA: words. Summary of comparisons. Factor: gender | 182 |

| | | |
|------------|---|---------|
| Table 5.23 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: gender | 183 |
| Table 5.24 | FA: vowels. Summary of comparisons. Factor: AOL | 189-190 |
| Table 5.25 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: AOL | 191-192 |
| Table 5.26 | FA: consonants. Summary of comparisons. Factor: AOL | 196 |
| Table 5.27 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: AOL | 197-198 |
| Table 5.28 | FA: vowels. Summary of comparisons. Factor: exposure | 201 |
| Table 5.29 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: exposure | 202 |
| Table 5.30 | FA: consonants. Summary of comparisons. Factor: exposure | 206 |
| Table 5.31 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: exposure | 206-207 |
| Table 5.32 | FA: vowels. Summary of comparisons. Factor: L1 | 209 |
| Table 5.33 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: L1 | 210 |
| Table 5.34 | FA: consonants. Summary of comparisons. Factor: L1 | 212 |
| Table 5.35 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: L1 | 213 |
| Table 5.36 | FA: vowels. Summary of comparisons. Factor: gender | 215 |
| Table 5.37 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: gender | 216 |
| Table 5.38 | FA: consonants. Summary of comparisons. Factor: gender | 218 |
| Table 5.39 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: gender | 219 |
| Table 5.40 | Study 2: characteristics of cross-sectional groups | 221 |
| Table 5.41 | Study 2: characteristics of longitudinal groups | 222 |
| Table 5.42 | Intra-class correlations coefficients: FA ratings | 229 |
| Table 5.43 | Percent agreement and +/-1 scores: FA ratings | 230 |
| Table 5.44 | Intra-class correlations coefficients: identification scores | 230 |
| Table 5.45 | Percent agreement scores: identification scores | 232 |
| Table 5.46 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: AOL | 238-239 |
| Table 5.47 | FA: vowels. Summary of comparisons. Factor: AOL | 244-245 |
| Table 5.48 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: exposure | 248 |
| Table 5.49 | FA: vowels. Summary of comparisons. Factor: exposure | 254 |
| Table 5.50 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: L1 | 257 |
| Table 5.51 | FA: vowels. Summary of comparisons. Factor: L1 | 258 |
| Table 5.52 | FA: judges. Summary of comparisons. Factor: gender | 261 |
| Table 5.53 | FA: vowels. Summary of comparisons. Factor: gender | 262 |
| Table 5.54 | Identification scores: summary of comparisons. Factor: AOL | 288-289 |
| Table 5.55 | Identification scores: summary of comparisons. Factor: exposure | 296 |

| | | |
|------------|---|-----|
| Table 5.56 | Identification scores: summary of comparisons. Factor: L1 | 301 |
| Table 5.57 | Identification scores: summary of comparisons. Factor: gender | 306 |

INDEX OF FIGURES

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Figure 4.1 | Boxplot discrimination scores: vowel contrasts | 121 |
| Figure 4.2 | Boxplot discrimination scores: consonant contrasts | 122 |
| Figure 4.3 | Boxplot discrimination scores: distractors | 122 |
| Figure 4.4 | Boxplot discrimination scores: overall task | 123 |
| Figure 5.1 | Overall correct discrimination scores | 129 |
| Figure 5.2 | Discrimination scores. Factor: AOL | 130 |
| Figure 5.3 | Discrimination scores. Factor: exposure | 132 |
| Figure 5.4 | Discrimination scores. Factor: L1 | 134 |
| Figure 5.5 | Discrimination scores. Factor: gender | 135 |
| Figure 5.6 | Median discrimination scores: vowels, consonants, distractors | 136 |
| Figure 5.7 | Discrimination scores: vowels. Factor: AOL | 141 |
| Figure 5.8 | Discrimination scores: vowels. Factor: exposure | 142 |
| Figure 5.9 | Discrimination scores: vowels. Factor: L1 | 144 |
| Figure 5.10 | Discrimination scores: vowels. Factor: gender | 144 |
| Figure 5.11 | Discrimination scores: consonants. Factor: AOL | 146 |
| Figure 5.12 | Discrimination scores: consonants. Factor: exposure | 148 |
| Figure 5.13 | Discrimination scores: consonants. Factor: L1 | 149 |
| Figure 5.14 | Discrimination scores: consonants. Factor: gender | 150 |
| Figure 5.15 | Discrimination scores: distractors. Factor: AOL | 152 |
| Figure 5.16 | Discrimination scores: distractors. Factor: exposure | 153 |
| Figure 5.17 | FA ratings: judges | 163 |
| Figure 5.18 | FA ratings: words | 164 |
| Figure 5.19 | FA ratings: judges and words. Factor: L1 | 164 |
| Figure 5.20 | FA ratings: judges and words. Factor: gender | 165 |
| Figure 5.21 | FA: words. Factor: AOL | 167 |
| Figure 5.22 | FA: judges. Factor: AOL | 168 |
| Figure 5.23 | FA: words. Factor: exposure | 173 |
| Figure 5.24 | FA: judges. Factor: exposure | 174 |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| Figure 5.25 | FA: words. Factor: L1 | 177 |
| Figure 5.26 | FA: judges. Factor: L1 | 177 |
| Figure 5.27 | FA: judge 4. Factor: L1 | 180 |
| Figure 5.28 | FA: words. Factor: gender | 181 |
| Figure 5.29 | FA: judges. Factor: gender | 181 |
| Figure 5.30 | FA: words. Gender similarities | 184 |
| Figure 5.31 | FA: words. Gender differences | 184 |
| Figure 5.32 | FA ratings: vowels | 186 |
| Figure 5.33 | FA ratings: consonants | 186 |
| Figure 5.34 | FA ratings: judges (vowels) | 187 |
| Figure 5.35 | FA ratings: judges (consonants) | 187 |
| Figure 5.36 | FA: /i ɪ æ/. Factor: AOL | 189 |
| Figure 5.37 | FA: judges (/i ɪ æ/). Factor: AOL | 193 |
| Figure 5.38 | FA: /d s v/. Factor: AOL | 194 |
| Figure 5.39 | FA: judges (/d s v/). Factor: AOL | 195 |
| Figure 5.40 | FA: /i ɪ æ/. Factor: exposure | 199 |
| Figure 5.41 | FA: judges (/i ɪ æ/). Factor: exposure | 200 |
| Figure 5.42 | FA: /d s v/. Factor: exposure | 204 |
| Figure 5.43 | FA: judges (/d s v/). Factor: exposure | 205 |
| Figure 5.44 | FA: /i ɪ æ/. Factor: L1 | 208 |
| Figure 5.45 | FA: judges (/i ɪ æ/). Factor: L1 | 209 |
| Figure 5.46 | FA: /d s v/. Factor: L1 | 211 |
| Figure 5.47 | FA: judges (/d s v/). Factor: L1 | 212 |
| Figure 5.48 | FA: /i ɪ æ/. Factor: gender | 214 |
| Figure 5.49 | FA: judges (/i ɪ æ/). Factor: gender | 215 |
| Figure 5.50 | FA: /d s v/. Factor: gender | 217 |
| Figure 5.51 | FA: judges (/d s v/). Factor: gender | 218 |
| Figure 5.52 | FA ratings: /i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/ | 233 |
| Figure 5.53 | FA ratings: judges (/i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/) | 234 |

| | | |
|-------------|--|-----|
| Figure 5.54 | FA: judges (/i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/). Factor: AOL | 237 |
| Figure 5.55 | FA: /i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/. Factor: AOL (1) | 240 |
| Figure 5.56 | FA: /i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/. Factor: AOL (2) | 242 |
| Figure 5.57 | FA: /i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/. Factor: AOL (3) | 243 |
| Figure 5.58 | FA: judges (/i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/). Factor: exposure | 247 |
| Figure 5.59 | FA: /i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/. Factor: exposure (group A) | 250 |
| Figure 5.60 | FA: /i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/. Factor: exposure (group B) | 251 |
| Figure 5.61 | FA: /i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/. Factor: exposure (group C) | 252 |
| Figure 5.62 | FA: /i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/. Factor: exposure (group D) | 253 |
| Figure 5.63 | FA: judges (/i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/). Factor: L1 | 256 |
| Figure 5.64 | FA: /i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/. Factor: L1 | 256 |
| Figure 5.65 | FA: judges (/i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/). Factor: gender | 260 |
| Figure 5.66 | FA: /i ɪ ε æ ɒ u ʌ/. Factor: gender | 260 |
| Figure 5.67 | Identification and misidentification scores /i/ (<i>speak</i>) | 265 |
| Figure 5.68 | Identification and misidentification scores /i/ (<i>tea</i>) | 266 |
| Figure 5.69 | Identification and misidentification scores /ɪ/ (<i>it</i>) | 267 |
| Figure 5.70 | Identification and misidentification scores /ɪ/ (<i>this</i>) | 268 |
| Figure 5.71 | Identification and misidentification scores /e/ (<i>red</i>) | 269 |
| Figure 5.72 | Identification and misidentification scores /e/ (<i>tests</i>) | 270 |
| Figure 5.73 | Identification and misidentification scores /æ/ (<i>back</i>) | 271 |
| Figure 5.74 | Identification and misidentification scores /æ/ (<i>pad</i>) | 272 |
| Figure 5.75 | Identification and misidentification scores /ɒ/ (<i>box</i>) | 273 |
| Figure 5.76 | Identification and misidentification scores /u/ (<i>zoo</i>) | 274 |
| Figure 5.77 | Identification and misidentification scores /ʌ/ (<i>but</i>) | 275 |
| Figure 5.78 | Identification scores /i/ (<i>speak</i>). Factor: AOL | 279 |
| Figure 5.79 | Identification scores /i/ (<i>tea</i>). Factor: AOL | 280 |

| | | |
|-------------|---|---------|
| Figure 5.80 | Identification scores /ɪ/ (<i>it</i>). Factor: AOL | 281 |
| Figure 5.81 | Identification scores /ɪ/ (<i>this</i>). Factor: AOL | 282 |
| Figure 5.82 | Identification scores /ɛ/ (<i>red, tests</i>). Factor: AOL | 283 |
| Figure 5.83 | Identification scores /æ/ (<i>back, pad</i>). Factor: AOL | 284 |
| Figure 5.84 | Identification scores /ɒ/ (<i>box</i>). Factor: AOL | 285 |
| Figure 5.85 | Identification scores /u/ (<i>zoo</i>). Factor: AOL | 286 |
| Figure 5.86 | Identification scores /ʌ/ (<i>but</i>). Factor: AOL | 287 |
| Figure 5.87 | Identification scores /i i ɛ æ ɒ u ʌ/. Factor: exposure (group A) | 291-292 |
| Figure 5.88 | Identification scores /i i ɛ æ ɒ u ʌ/. Factor: exposure (group B) | 293-295 |
| Figure 5.89 | Identification scores /i i ɛ æ ɒ u ʌ/. Factor: L1 | 298-300 |
| Figure 5.90 | Identification scores /i i ɛ æ ɒ u ʌ/. Factor: gender | 303-305 |
| Figure 5.91 | Misidentification patterns: /i/ | 308 |
| Figure 5.92 | Misidentification patterns: /ɪ/ | 309 |
| Figure 5.93 | Misidentification patterns: /ɛ/ | 309 |
| Figure 5.94 | Misidentification patterns: /æ/ | 310 |
| Figure 5.95 | Misidentification patterns: /ɒ/ | 311 |
| Figure 5.96 | Misidentification patterns: /u/ | 311 |
| Figure 5.97 | Misidentification patterns: /ʌ/ | 312 |