

# UC San Diego

## UC San Diego Previously Published Works

### Title

Impacts of acoustic-phonetic variability on perceptual development for spoken language: A review

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6z34g945>

### Journal

Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews Cognitive Science, 12(5)

### ISSN

1939-5078

### Authors

Quam, Carolyn  
Creel, Sarah C

### Publication Date

2021-09-01

### DOI

10.1002/wcs.1558

Peer reviewed

# Positive and Negative Effects Impacts of Acoustic-Phonetic Variability on Spoken-Language Development Perceptual Development for Spoken Language: A Review

*Carolyn Quam*<sup>1</sup>

Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences, Portland State University, USA

*Sarah C. Creel*

Department of Cognitive Science, University of California, San Diego, USA

## **Abstract**

This article reviews research on when acoustic-phonetic variability facilitates, inhibits, or does not impact spoken-language perceptual development for spoken language, to illuminate mechanisms by which variability aids (or does not aid) learning of language sound patterns. We first summarize structures and sources of variability. We next present proposed mechanisms that have been proposed to account for how and why variability impacts language learning. Finally, we review effects of variability in the domains of speech-sound and phonological category and - pattern learning; word-form recognition and word learning; and accent processing. Overall, random and patterned variability has either no effects or facilitative effects. Variability between accents may slow learning—but with the longer-term benefits of improved comprehension of multiple accents. This overview aims By highlighting accent as a form of acoustic-phonetic variability, and considering impacts of dialect prestige on children’s learning, we hope to contribute to a better understanding of how exposure to multiple dialects—accents impacts language development and easades to impact may have implications for literacy development.

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author. Portland State University Speech and Hearing Sciences, PO Box 751, Portland, OR 97207-0751, USA. 1-503-725-3558. cquam@pdx.edu.

## Introduction

Acoustic-phonetic variability is rampant in infants' early language experiences with sounds and words, yet infants somehow learn sound categories and patterns, and; words, and how sounds pattern and surface in context. The question of how we experience constancy despite fluctuation in sensory input goes back to stems from at least 500 BCE in remarks by Heraclitus. Heraclitus' ideas have been interpreted in two ways: Plutarch attributed to Heraclitus gleaned the idea that "it is not possible to step twice into the same river" (Graham, 2019), suggesting environmental variability is a challenge to learning and processing. More recent interpretations posit that constancy and change are fundamentally linked, and in fact, that variability is a precondition for constancy (Graham, 2019; Marcovich, 1966). Tension between variability-as-nuisance and variability-as-fundamental pervades research on spoken-language development. For modern scientists examining learning by humans and machines, lack of invariance is a perpetual challenge. Nonetheless, some recent work suggests acoustic-phonetic variability lends stability to children's and adults' representations of words and sounds.

In this article, we reviews research on when acoustic-phonetic variability facilitates, inhibits, or does not impact spoken-language perceptual development for spoken language, aiming to elucidating mechanisms by which variability does (or does not) contribute to the formation of helps form robust sound categories. In the course of the review, wWe summarize different sources and structures and sources of variability; present-proposed mechanisms proposed to account for how and why variability impacts language learning; and review effects of variability in the domains of speech-sound and phonological-pattern learning category and pattern learning-, word-form recognition and word learning-, and accent processing. We hope that highlighting accent as a form of acoustic-phonetic variability, and considering impacts of dialect prestige on accent processing, We hope this in turn will help engender a better understanding of illuminate how exposure to multiple dialects accents impacts language development and cascades to impact literacy development.

In the context of recent calls to diversify STEM disciplines (e.g., #ShutDownSTEM; Chen, 2020), we aim to critically evaluate our field, consciously reduce citation bias, and call for increased diversity in this research area, both in researchers, topics, and participants. Much of basic research on phonological-perceptual development for spoken language in the US has been conducted by and with predominantly White, middle-class White, educated people (Heinrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010) speaking White American English (WAE, also sometimes referred to as Mainstream or Standard American English; Wolfram, 2007; Y. Holt & Rangarathnam, 2018). Research on other dialects often compares them to WAE as though WAE is atreats WAE as a standard from which other forms are derived, rather than one of multiple variants itself. This bias limits generalizability and does a disservice to the diverse population who should benefit from research (DeGraffe, 2018; see also DeGraffe, 2005). Yet the limited research on other dialects that does exist has generated crucial insights into basic-science questions about effects of input variability on phonological-language learning, which are intimately connected to important applied topics, such as reducing racial disparities in literacy outcomes (Washington & Craig, 2000; Thompson, Craig, & Washington, 2004) and speech-language evaluation (e.g., Moland, 2011). Accordingly, we highlight work by and with those from minoritized groups, including work by scholars identifying as Black, Indigenous, or People of Color (BIPOC), focusing in particular on African American English (AAE). We aim to draw attention to high-quality,

relevant research, some of which has been underappreciated and under-cited in proportion to its value.

We also ~~want to~~ emphasize strongly that future work connecting basic research on phonological-perceptual learning for spoken language with topics such as racial disparities in literacy outcomes must center ~~the~~ perspectives of children and communities ~~being researched~~, working in careful partnership with ~~—~~ and ideally led by ~~—~~ communities of color, given their historic exploitation in research (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2019; Patel, 2015). The community-based participatory research framework provides a roadmap for such partnerships (Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker, 2001; Holkup, Tripp-Reiner, Salois, & Weinert, 2004). Future research should also consciously apply a strengths-based rather than deficits-based lens (Dudley-Marling & Lucas, 2009; Michaels, 2013; Avineri et al., 2015; Baugh, 2017; Cole, 2013; Sperry, Sperry, & Miller, 2019).

### Sources and Structures and Sources of Variability

#### **Sources of variability.**

Acoustic-phonetic variation comes from a variety of sources. One source is contrastive differences between words and sounds (i.e., those the language uses to differentiate meanings), and this type of variability is critical input to distributional learning (Maye, Werker, & Gerken, 2002; Vallabha et al., 2007). For example, sounds like *b* and *p* differ in voice-onset time (VOT) and pitch. Many other sources of variability are non-contrastive. Elman and McClelland (1984, 1986) distinguished two types of non-contrastive variability. The first, which they aimed to account for in the TRACE model of speech perception, was “lawful” sources of variability, from, e.g., phonological rules or segmental context, e.g., impacts of preceding consonants on acoustic-phonetic realizations of speech sounds.

Elman and McClelland (1986) distinguished lawful variability from other types of non-contrastive variability is unlawful variability, such as “cross-speaker and within-speaker token-to-token variability.” The TRACE model did not attempt to account for variability that was not lawful, as it is more difficult to adapt to systematically (as it varies more randomly). Nevertheless, its prevalence means it must still be accommodated by learners. Realizations of sounds differ *between talkers*, in part due to biological features including age (Schötz & Müller, 2007), vocal-tract size, health, and articulatory strategies (Johnson, Ladefoged, & Landau, 1993). Between-talker differences influence talker-voice characteristics (e.g., absolute formant frequencies) and can impact word learning and recognition.

*Within-talker* variability can also lead to different realizations of a sound from instance to instance. It can be due to myriad factors including changes in health status, fatigue (Greeley et al., 2007), circadian rhythm (Heald & Nusbaum, 2015), cognitive load (Segbroeck et al., 2014; Yap, Epps, Choi, & Ambikairajah, 2010), affective state (Cowie & Cornelius, 2003; Barrett & Paus, 2002), and recent linguistic experience (Evans & Iverson, 2007). Another source of “unlawful” variability is essentially random variability that pervades speech, such that the same speaker using the same accent, register, affect, and sentence context will not produce identical realizations of a sound twice.

Finally, individual speakers also differ systematically in socially conditioned features (e.g., accent, sociolect). Accent variability occurs due to regional and social variation in language


sound patterns (for example, AAE vs. WAE, or Chicano English vs. California Anglo English; Guerrero, 2014). Speakers can also employ distinct speech registers (such as formal vs. informal). It is not clear whether Elman and McClelland would consider differences across accents, sociolects, and registers as lawful or not.

Accent variability occurs due to regional (for example, southeastern WAE vs. northeastern WAE) and social variation in language sound patterns (for example, AAE vs. WAE in the same region, or Chicano English vs. California Anglo English; Guerrero, 2014). It also occurs in second-language (L2) speech, where productions in speakers' L2 are influenced by first-language (L1) sound patterns, creating variability between Spanish-accented English (as distinct from Chicano English, a dialect of English; Guerrero, 2014) and WAE or AAE:

we provide examples of variation from distinct *sources*, such as variation in segments (e.g., voice-onset time, VOT, and pitch cues to *p* vs. *b*) and variation related to talker-voice characteristics (e.g., absolute formant frequencies). We have already alluded to a few sources of variability. **Variability between speech sounds** is regarded as critical input to distributional learning (Maye, Werker, & Gerken, 2002; Vallabha et al., 2007), but there is also **noise variability within speech-sound categories** even from the same speaker and context (e.g., Lisker & Abramson, 1964). Contextual and allophonic variability also occur within a speech-sound category, such as differences between voiced and devoiced *r* in braid and prayed. **Variability between talkers** is widespread because different talkers produce the “same” sound differently, and as noted above, this can sometimes impact word learning and recognition.

An additional, complex source of variability we have yet to discuss is **accent variability**. Accent variability occurs due to regional (for example, southeastern WAE vs. northeastern WAE) and social variation in language sound patterns (for example, AAE vs. WAE in the same region, or Chicano English vs. California Anglo English; Guerrero, 2014). It also occurs in second-language (L2) speech, where productions in speakers' L2 are influenced by first-language (L1) sound patterns, creating variability between Spanish-accented English (as distinct from Chicano English, a dialect of English; Guerrero, 2014) and WAE or AAE:

How does variability pattern between accents? For some sounds, accent variability is inconsequential because two accents have very similar sound patterns (Figure 2, Panel 1). Examples include /i/ and /ɪ/ (peak and pick) in German-accented and US-accented English (Flege, Bohn, & Jang, 1997), or the many similar vowel contrasts in Los Angeles Chicano English and the local WAE (Santa Ana & Bayley, 2008). Other cases, however, create the possibility of confusion. One accent may merge a sound distinction another accent distinguishes (Figure 2, Panel 2). For example, Chicano English and Californian WAE merge the vowels in cot /ɑ/ and caught /ɔ/ (Santa Ana & Bayley, 2008), but many other US dialects do not. Or, two accents may distinguish sound categories in different ways, either due to shifted speech-sound boundaries (Figure 2, Panel 3), e.g., lax front vowels in the Californian Vowel Shift (Eckert, 2008), or different sets of cues or cue weightings (Figure 2, Panel 4), as for coda voicing in AAE vs. WAE (Y. Holt, Jacewicz, & Fox, 2016; see also Baran & Seymour, 1976; Farrington, 2019). Unless learners can track accent context, then the variability depicted in Figure 2 Panels 2-4 may introduce confusion. If learners can track accent context, they can often successfully interpret sounds using accent-specific sound categories (for a cross-linguistic example, see Quam & Creel, 2017).



**Figure 2.** Some of the possible forms of between-accent variability in two speech-sound categories. Rugs indicate frequency of each value on each axis.


**Table 2.** A small number of studies and real-world scenarios where each type of accent variability depicted in Figure 2 is observed.

Accents show identical patterning	One accent merges sounds	Accents have shifted cue boundaries	Accents separate patterns differently
German-accented and US-accented English /i/ vs. /ɪ/ (Flege et al., 1997)	The typical depiction of AAE coda devoicing as merger (of, e.g., <i>had</i> and <i>hat</i> )	White & Aslin, 2011; Weatherhead & White, 2016	AAE vs. WAE coda voicing (Y. Holt et al., 2016)
Many similar vowel contrasts in Los Angeles Chicano English and WAE (Santa Ana & Bayley, 2008)	caught/eot merger in California WAE but not northeastern WAE	Adults adapt to shifted fricative boundaries (e.g., Norris et al., 2003)	AAE > WAE listeners at AAE and cross-dialect comprehension (Baran & Seymour, 1976)
	salary-celery /æ/ /ɛ/ merger before /l/ in East LA Chicano	Lax front vowels in Californian Vowel Shift (Eckert, 2008)	

Note. Unshaded cells contain experimental or quasi-experimental tests of effects of variability on recognition or comprehension; shaded cells contain real-language cases where such variability has been described or measured. Because there is relatively little evidence of facilitation vs. inhibition based on particular accent sound-pattern relationships, we do not mark facilitation/inhibition, but discuss it in the text.

### Structures of variability.

Variability can be structured in a number of ways. In describing these structures, we provide examples of variation from distinct *sources*, such as variation in segments (e.g., voice-onset time, VOT, and pitch cues to *p* vs. *b*) and variation related to talker voice characteristics (e.g., absolute formant frequencies). Example Four particular structures of variability appear in Figure 1, which uses VOT and second-formant frequency as example dimensions, but one might imagine different axes. Table 1 summarizes experimental and real-world examples of each variability structure. Variability can be *patterned*, i.e., organized by modes or clusters. VOT, a cue which that differentiates sounds like English *b* and *p* at syllable onset, patterns bimodally (e.g., Lisker & Abramson, 1964). Alternatively, variability can be (seemingly) *random noise* (unimodally or uniformly distributed).



**Figure 1: Possible relationships between speech and nonspeech variability in laboratory studies and natural settings.** Colors refer to speech-sound category. Rugs indicate frequency of each value on each axis.

**Table 1: A small number of studies and real-world scenarios where each type of variability depicted in Figure 1 is observed.**

<b>Within-category noise variability on <u>relevant-contrastive</u> dimension</b>	<b><u>Irrelevant-Non-contrastive</u> variability is noise-like</b>	<b><u>Irrelevant-Non-contrastive</u> variability is patterned but not correlated</b>	<b><u>Irrelevant-Non-contrastive</u> variability is patterned + correlated</b>
√ Galle, Apfelbaum, & McMurray, 2015	√ Rost & McMurray, 2009, 2010; √ Quam et al., 2017, Exp. 1	√ Barcroft & Sommers 2005, Exp. 2, moderate variability condition (3 speakers)*	∅ Quam et al. 2017, Exp. 2 √ Creel 2014a
Language input predominantly from one caregiver	Learning from a large number of talkers with similar speech cues (e.g., VOTs)	Learning from small number of caregivers with distinct voices but similar speech cues (e.g., VOTs)	Certain talkers use certain speech forms (e.g., Foulkes, Docherty, & Watt, 1999)

Note. Top row: Experiments where: √ variability helps; ~~X~~ variability hurts; ∅ no effect of variability. Bottom row: possible situations where such variability might occur.

\* This study was conducted ~~on~~ with adults learning second-language vocabulary. Three speakers facilitated learning relative to one speaker.

Variability can be either on a contrastive dimension (relevant to distinguishing words) or on a non-contrastive dimension. Some researchers distinguish between relevant and irrelevant variability use the terms relevant vs. irrelevant somewhat synonymously with contrastive vs. non-contrastive, but this equivalence involves, where relevant variability typically means “relevant to distinguishing words from each other,” and irrelevant variability at least two presuppositions: (1) that learners’ goal is to distinguish words, not to (say) use coarticulatory cues to speed up word recognition, or to differentiate parents’ voices to identify the talker (e.g., the top vs. bottom two clusters in Figure 1, Panel 3); (2) that speech-sound variability is uncorrelated with non-segmental variability. Even accepting the first presupposition, that learners are learning words, the second is sometimes wrong, as experimental or natural situations may result in correlations between speech-sound and (e.g.) talker variability.

means everything else. Instead of conflating contrastive and relevant variability, we use ‘relevant’ and ‘irrelevant’ more synonymously with ‘lawful’ (Elman & McClelland, 1986) vs. ‘unlawful,’ though we note that relevance must be defined relative to the task. In our conceptualization, contrastive variability is lawful, and typically relevant. For example, assuming learners are trying to differentiate words, VOT variability is relevant (Figure 1, x-axes). Non-

contrastive variability can be either lawful (and typically relevant), as for variability due to coarticulation and allophonic variation, or unlawful (and typically irrelevant), as for token-by-token variability across and within talkers. For example, While we use these terms here, this distinction involves at least two presuppositions: (1) that learners' goal is to distinguish words from each other, not to (say) differentiate their parents' voices to identify who is talking (e.g., the top vs. bottom two clusters in Figure 1, Panel 3; (2) that speech sound variability is uncorrelated with non-segmental variability. Even accepting the first presupposition, that learners are learning words, the second presupposition is sometimes wrong, as experimental or natural situations may result in correlations between speech sound variability and (e.g.) talker variability.


Assuming that learners are trying to differentiate word forms, VOT variability is relevant (Figure 1, x-axes). In settings without talker variability—language-learning classes with one instructor, households with one caregiver, or experimental contexts—unlawful, irrelevant variation still occurs between instances of a speech sound (Figure 1, Panel 1). In settings with talker variability (e.g., speaker-related differences in absolute formant frequencies; Figure 1, Panels 2 and 3), it is often irrelevant (Figure 1, Panels 2 and 3) even when it happens to be patterned (Figure 1, Panel 3). Elman and McClelland's discussion of 'lawful' variability did not address patterned variability across speakers, so it is not clear whether or not they would consider it lawful.

Finally, it is possible for “irrelevant” variability, such as talker variability, to be correlated with “relevant” variability (Figure 1, Panel 4). When talker characteristics are correlated with speech sounds, either in experiments or natural settings, voice characteristics *are* relevant to word learning and recognition (again, however, it is not clear whether Elman and McClelland would consider this variability lawful). Still, it is important to distinguish two different learning cases. First, when cue correlations persist past initial learning (especially for strong correlations), there will be relatively fewer instances where learners must generalize to uncorrelated or anticorrelated cases (blank spaces in Figure 1, Panel 4). In these cases, Thus, correlated cues should largely facilitate learning and recognition by helping separate input distributions (as in Figure 1, Panel 4). This might happen in an experiment where a particular novel word, say *darg*, is always spoken by Talker 1, while the otherwise-similar *darge* is always spoken by Talker 2, and talker-word correlations persist throughout the experiment (Creel, 2014a; see also Creel et al., 2008, Creel & Tumlin, 2011, in adults, Creel, 2014a; but see Quam, Knight, & Gerken, 2017); or in a less-deterministic case where, e.g., men tend to preaspirate less than women (Foulkes, Docherty, & Watt, 1999).

Second, when cue correlations do not reliably persist past initial learning, learners must generalize past their learning data. This might happen, e.g., when children learn certain words only from one caregiver and others from another caregiver, but must eventually generalize to other speakers. In these cases, short-term facilitation via from correlated cues may come at the cost of reduced generalization beyond particular contexts or talkers (see Quam, Knight, & Gerken, 2017, for discussion), reflected in reduced recognition speed or accuracy. Even worse, correlated cues that are salient but eventually irrelevant might pull attention away from relevant dimensions, impairing learning (relative to random variability; see Quam, Knight, & Gerken, 2017).

A particularly complex case of variability patterning (which is again ambiguous in terms of lawfulness) arises from accent differences. How does variability pattern between accents? For some sound contrasts, accent variability is inconsequential because two accents have very similar

sound patterns (Figure 2, Panel 1; see Table 2 for experimental and real-world examples). Examples include /i/ and /ɪ/ (peak and pick) in German-accented and US-accented English (Flege, Bohn, & Jang, 1997), or many corresponding vowel contrasts in Los Angeles Chicano English and the local WAE (Santa Ana & Bayley, 2008). Other cases, however, create the possibility of confusion. One accent may merge a distinction another distinguishes (Figure 2, Panel 2). For example, Chicano English and Californian WAE merge the vowels in cot /ɑ/ and caught /ɔ/ (Santa Ana & Bayley, 2008), but many other US accents do not. Or, two accents may distinguish sound categories in different ways, either due to shifted speech-sound boundaries (Figure 2, Panel 3), e.g., lax front vowels in the Californian Vowel Shift (Eckert, 2008), or different sets of cues or cue weightings (Figure 2, Panel 4), as for coda voicing in AAE vs. WAE (Y. Holt, Jacewicz, & Fox, 2016; see also Baran & Seymour, 1976; Farrington, 2018). Unless learners can track accent context, the variability depicted in Figure 2 Panels 2-4 may introduce confusion. If learners can track accent context, they can successfully interpret sounds using accent-specific categories (for a cross-linguistic example, see Quam & Creel, 2017).



**Figure 2: Some of the possible forms of between-accent variability in two speech-sound categories.** Rugs indicate frequency of each value on each axis.

**Table 2: A small number of studies and real-world scenarios, experienced by child listeners, where each type of accent variability depicted in Figure 2 is observed.**

<u>Accents show identical patterning</u>	<u>One accent merges sounds</u>	<u>Accents have shifted cue boundaries</u>	<u>Accents separate patterns differently</u>
<u>German-accented and US-accented English /i/ vs. /ɪ/ (Flege et al., 1997)</u>	<u>The typical depiction of AAE coda devoicing as merger (of, e.g., <i>had</i> and <i>hat</i>)</u>	<u>White &amp; Aslin, 2011; Weatherhead &amp; White, 2016</u>	<u>AAE vs. WAE coda voicing (Y. Holt et al., 2016)</u>
<u>Many similar vowel contrasts in Los Angeles Chicano English and WAE (Santa Ana &amp; Bayley, 2008)</u>	<u>caught/cot merger in California WAE but not northeastern WAE; salary-celery /æ/-/ɛ/ merger before /l/ in East LA Chicano English (García, 1984)</u>	<u>Lax front vowels in Californian Vowel Shift (Eckert, 2008)</u>	<u>AAE &gt; WAE child listeners at AAE and cross-dialect comprehension (Baran &amp; Seymour, 1976)</u>

Note. Unshaded cells contain experimental or quasi-experimental tests of effects of variability on recognition or comprehension; shaded cells contain real-language cases where such variability has been described or measured. Because there is relatively little evidence of facilitation vs. inhibition based on particular accent sound-pattern relationships, we do not mark facilitation/inhibition, but discuss it in the text.

~~**Signal-extrinsic variability.** Up to this point, we have discussed signal-intrinsic variability. Additional sources of variability may be extrinsic to the speech signal, but predictive of or related to phonetic content. For example, formality of situations may covary with particular speech forms within a single talker, or the speech forms a speaker uses might covary with the age of their conversational partner (e.g., work supervisor vs. child). Young children are sensitive to changes in linguistic register (e.g., Wagner, Greene-Havas, & Gillespie, 2010) and context (Smith, Durham, & Fortune, 2007; Smith, Durham, & Richards, 2013).~~

~~Both talker and accent variability, mentioned above, are connected to speech-extrinsic variability, because speakers who talk differently also differ on (sometimes visually available) social dimensions due to sex, age, gender identity, group identification, and even individual differences within a group. For example, one group might tend to use one set of forms, such as those characteristic of AAE, while another group tends to use another set, such as those characteristic of WAE; and many speakers dialect-switch depending on context or their speech partner (Thompson et al., 2004). Young children are sensitive to relationships between language and social group (e.g., Kinzler, Dupoux, & Spelke, 2007), but it is not clear whether this sensitivity extends to fine-grained phonetic differences. Given that signal-extrinsic variation is ubiquitous in children's language input, future work should continue to determine the conditions under which it facilitates vs. hinders learning.~~

## Putative Mechanisms for Impacts of Variability on Learning

Models of the earliest stages of phonological-perceptual learning for spoken language tend to focus on how infants discover the constituent sounds of their language(s). Despite evidence of continued sound-category development well past infancy (Hazan & Barrett, 2000; McMurray, Danelz, Rigler, & Seedorff, 2018; Nittrouer, Lowenstein, & Packer, 2009; Ohde & Haley, 1997; see Creel & Quam, 2015, for discussion), language-specific tuning within the first year is a focus of substantial theoretical and modeling efforts. Exposure to the native language over the first year tunes infants' early, possibly species-general (Kluender, Diehl, & Killeen, 1987; Kuhl, 1981; Kuhl and Padden, 1982, 1983) sensitivities to sound patterns (Eimas et al., 1971; Jusczyk et al., 1980; Lasky et al., 1975; Sundara et al., 2018, Trehub, 1976). For vowels, this reorganization happens by 6 months (Polka & Werker, 1994); for consonants, by 12 months (Werker & Tees, 1984), though there are exceptions (e.g., Kuhl et al., 2006; Mazuka, Hasegawa, & Tsuji, 2014; Narayan, Werker, & Beddor, 2010; Polka, Colantonio, & Sundara, 2001).

We discuss models in order of their claims about the internal structure of representations, moving from models assuming more- to less-abstract representations of input variation ~~to those assuming less-abstract representations~~. Historically, While models of spoken-word processing traditionally assumed acoustic-phonetic variability was normalized to match word tokens to *abstract* representations, or models simplified their input to mostly “lawful” variability. Exemplar approaches, on the other hand exemplar models (Goldinger, 1996, 1998; Johnson, 1997), argue all variability is stored ~~store all variability~~ in individual, detailed experiences, out of which emerge clusters representing words and speech sounds (as well as and talkers and accent-specific patterns). Variability on irrelevant dimensions during learning helps relevant dimensions emerge as stable (Pierrehumbert, 2003), while also helping learners detect newly relevant information, such as like talker-word correlations (Goldinger, 1996, 1998). Thus, exemplar-based models of phonological development tend to address impacts of input variability on learning more directly than other models, even though all the models we highlight focus on learning from input distributions.

Several theoretical frameworks attempt to capture reduced discrimination of nonnative speech-sound contrasts across infancy. Kuhl et al.'s (2008) Native Language Magnet Theory Expanded (NLM-e) (NLM-e) argues decreased discrimination results from magnetic pull of category prototypes ~~(Kuhl et al., 2008)~~, which abstract away from input variability. Kuhl et al. ~~(2008)~~ predict this learning mechanism would apply to both monolingual and bilingual learners, but bilinguals may show slower and/or perhaps somewhat different learning trajectories in response to the demands of bilingual input. One might infer that children learning hearing multiple dialects accents might would also show slower learning trajectories within each accent due to greater input complexity. Best's (1994) Perceptual Assimilation Model (PAM; 1994) predicts relative discriminability of nonnative speech-sound contrasts based on their relationship to native sound categories. If each sound in a contrast falls into a different native category, infants are predicted to continue to discriminate them (akin to between-accent relationships in Figure 2, Panel 1). If the sounds both fall within one native category, discrimination is predicted to worsen (akin to Figure 2, Panel 2).

The PRIMIR framework (Werker & Curtin, 2005), accounts for different sensitivity to speech-sound distinctions across ages and tasks. Speech is accessible through general-perceptual,

word-form, or phonemic planes, but children's biases, ~~their~~ developmental level, and task requirements constrain access. PRIMIR was developed to address a complex pattern of findings about infants' word learning as assessed in the "Switch" habituation procedure (Werker, Cohen, Lloyd, Casasola, & Stager, 1998). In one version, infants habituate to two word-object associations, and then at test, word-object pairs are maintained or switched. Word learning is inferred from a novelty response: longer looking to switched word-object pairings. ~~Many Across many studies indicate,~~ 14-month-olds fail to distinguish similar-sounding words like /bɪ/ vs. /dɪ/—~~even~~ words differentiated by two features (/pɪn/ vs. /dɪn/; Pater, Stager, & Werker, 2004)—despite distinguishing the sounds (e.g., /b/ vs. /d/, Stager & Werker, 1997; Werker, Fennell, Corcoran, & Stager, 2002). According to PRIMIR, 14-month-olds fail because they are processing word-form information (and representing it with an exemplar-based structure), while 17-month-olds succeed (Werker et al., 2002) by processing phonemic information. This might predict ~~that~~ irrelevant variability would facilitate learning most strongly at 14 months (Rost & McMurray, 2009), prior to phonemic processing of words.

Juszyk's (1993) Word Recognition and Phonetic Structure Acquisition (WRAPSA) model is distinct from the approaches described above in assuming infants store specific instances of syllables (not phonemes), comparing them to traces of prior exemplars (variants), not prototypes. As experience accumulates, the auditory-analysis system adjusts weights of different features to highlight contrastive dimensions (~~i.e., those the language uses to differentiate meanings~~). In WRAPSA, young infants treat non-contrastive and contrastive variability as equally relevant, but non-contrastive variability receives reduced attention with age, suggesting (in line with PRIMIR) that younger infants would be more sensitive to facilitation from irrelevant variability than older learners. Apfelbaum and McMurray's (2011) associative-learning model aims to explain facilitative effects of variability on 14-month-olds' Switch word learning (Rost & McMurray, 2009). The model is somewhat consistent with exemplar models, but incorporates dimensional weighting very similar to WRAPSA (Juszyk, 1993). Variability facilitates learning in the model by affecting association strengths between acoustic dimensions and visual referents. Thus, it may predict variability would not facilitate learning in tasks that lack visual referents, such as typical laboratory ~~probes of discrimination of speech sounds~~ speech-sound discrimination tasks.

Sumner, Kim, King, and McGowan's (2014; Sumner, 2015)'s exemplar-based framework aims to account for better memory for less-frequent but socially prestigious<sup>2</sup> forms of a word. (Note that, while the framework was based on adult studies, it is potentially relevant to children.) Sumner and colleagues They posit that more-prestigious exemplars of a word are weighted more strongly (Sumner et al., 2014; Sumner, 2015). On this account, children learning multiple dialects may successfully learn prestigious forms from limited input, though this is not consistent with data indicating that AAE-speaking children's adjustment to WAE, as the dialect of school, is often challenging (Washington & Craig, 2000).

An alternative social-weighting approach, in line with traditional exemplar approaches, is that social context (talker, register, dialect/accent) is encoded within each exemplar. This would allow perceivers to up-regulate activation of contextually appropriate forms, yielding more efficient recognition. On this account, evidence for amplification of prestige forms could actually

<sup>2</sup> We note the term "prestigious"/"prestige" implies a value judgment we do not intend; however, we are not aware of an existing, less-loaded term.

reflect contextual expectations: college students might expect to hear “prestigious” speech in scientific experiments. For multiple-~~dialect~~-~~accent~~ learners, this account predicts that hearing fewer instances of words in each ~~dialect~~-~~accent~~ than single-~~dialect~~-~~accent~~ learners will lead to slower accrual of exemplars, resulting in slower cluster formation (see discussion of NLM-e above). Thus, children learning multiple ~~dialects~~-~~accents~~ might show both context sensitivity and more difficulty with prestige forms compared to children ~~mainly hearing prestige forms~~hearing primarily the prestige dialect.

### Evidence for Effects of Variability

We summarize evidence from three domains in which variability impacts children’s perceptual learning/development for spoken language: learning and processing of speech-sound categories and patterns~~speech-sound and phonological-pattern learning/processing~~; word-form recognition and word learning; and accent. For the first two domains, we first describe how children learn linguistic structure from distributional patterns in the input, and then address impacts of summarize cases where variability occurs on dimensions both relevant and variability on dimensions irrelevant to the task (e.g., sound discrimination or word learning). For accent, the distinction between relevant and irrelevant-~~variation~~-variability is less clear-cut.

We focus mainly on child learners. We sometimes include brief descriptions of learning in adults, in some cases because a research question has been more thoroughly investigated in adults, and more generally because adults represent a developmental target or endpoint. For example, we note that a complementary literature in adult word and speech-sound learning focuses on influences of word knowledge on speech-sound retuning (termed lexical feedback; Norris, McQueen, & Cutler, 2003), with some research on bottom-up perceptual learning (e.g., Goudbeek, Swingley, & Smits, 2009; Idemaru & L. Holt, 2011). Like child ~~learners~~ren, adults ~~also need to~~must balance stability of representations with perceptual flexibility (Baese-Berk, 2018; Earle & Quam, expected 2021). While we focus on development, we refer interested readers to Baese-Berk (2018) and Barriuso and Hayes-Harb (2018), among others, for more information.

#### Learning and processing Speech of speech-sound and phonological-pattern categories and patterns learning and processing.

In this section, we first review evidence from learning and processing of speech-sound categories, and then infants’ learning of patterns of speech sounds. In each domain of learning, we consider impacts of irrelevant variability that is clearly non-phonological, e.g., talker, pitch, and affect, on learning of speech-sound categories and patterns.~~sound-category learning/processing and phonological-pattern learning. For each, we first describe children’s sensitivity to variability between sounds themselves, and then consider irrelevant variability.~~

*Learning and processing of speech-sound categories. ~~Speech-sound learning and processing: Variability on relevant dimensions.~~ ~~Contrastive~~ variability between speech sounds is essential for infants' phonological learning. Infants appear to infer one sound category if the distribution of ~~VOT~~ a cue is unimodal and two if it is bimodal (Maye, Werker, & Gerken, 2002; see Vallabha, McClelland, Pons, Werker, & Amano, 2007 for a computational model). Infants can also use bimodal visual information to learn two phonemes from a unimodal phonetic distribution (Teinonen et al., 2008). Thus, variability between speech sounds can facilitate learning of sound categories by serving as input to distributional-learning mechanisms.*

*~~Speech-sound learning and processing: Variability on irrelevant dimensions.~~*  
—— Variability during phonetic learning can also occur on ~~dimensions not relevant to the learning task~~ non-contrastive dimensions. Such variability can be lawful (Elman & McClelland, 1986), as for variability across different within-word contexts, or unlawful, as for within-talker or between-talker variability across tokens. Here, we consider impacts of unlawful variability on infants' speech-sound processing. In the next section, we consider infants' learning of lawful variability, ~~such as multiple tokens of a sound from a single talker, multiple talkers, or multiple word forms (i.e., within word contexts).~~ Even in adult learners, ~~Research on adults~~ monitoring for phonemes suggests that unlawful talker variation interferes with speech-sound identification (e.g., Mullennix & Pisoni, 1990). ~~Infants~~ Compared with mature listeners, infants could be ~~particularly even more~~ susceptible to interference, given that some adult studies suggest variability can overwhelm learners with weaker perceptual skills (Antoniou & Wong, 2016; Perrachione, Lee, Ha, & Wong, 2011; Sadakata & McQueen, 2014).

To our knowledge, no studies have found facilitative effects of irrelevant, unlawful acoustic-phonetic variability on infants' speech-sound processing, with a few cases of ~~inhibition of performance~~ ory effects. Two infant studies have found null effects. ~~Quam and colleagues (Quam, Clough, & Gerken, 2017; Quam et al., under review 2020)~~ found that talker variability did not impact 7.5-month-old infants' discrimination of either a native, salient onset contrast /b/ vs. /p/ ~~nor~~ a non-native, less-salient onset contrast /n/ vs. /ŋ/, regardless of whether they were spoken by 1 or 4 habituation talkers. Kuhl (1983) trained 6-month-old infants to discriminate a vowel pair produced by a single synthesized "talker." Infants generalized discrimination to simulated men's, women's, and children's voices, suggesting synthesized talker variability does not disrupt infants' discrimination. Two other early studies ~~that incorporated~~ eding variability into training stimuli found mixed null and inhibitory effects. In the high-amplitude-sucking procedure, 4- to 16-week-old infants' pitch discrimination was impaired by vowel variation, but not vice-versa (Kuhl & Miller, 1982; see also Lebedeva & Kuhl, 2010), with the asymmetry likely reflecting differences in acoustic salience (vowel > pitch) rather than phonological knowledge (we consider vowel variation to be "irrelevant" for pitch discrimination). When testing immediately followed familiarization, Jusczyk, Pisoni, and Mullennix (1992) found 2-month-olds detected changes to syllables (/bʌg/ vs. /dʌg/) whether they heard a single talker or multiple talkers. When a 2-minute delay was incorporated before the test phase, only infants in the single-talker condition detected changes. Thus, while infants track variability between speech sounds themselves to learn speech-sound categories, unlawful, irrelevant variability appears to

~~generally not impact with a few exceptions, infants' detection of changes in speech sounds, though it sometimes has inhibitory effects appears unaffected by irrelevant variability.~~

~~*Phonological Learning of lawful variability: patterns of speech sounds-pattern learning: Variability on relevant dimensions.*— Some variation in speech sounds is non-contrastive, but lawful. In addition to speech sound categories, children must learn phonological alternations by tracking distributions on relevant dimensions. One common type is allophonic variation, where a phoneme has different, but related, sound forms, lawfully conditioned by ~~in~~ different phonetic contexts. For example, *r* in “braid” is voiced, while *r* in “prayed” is voiceless, due to the preceding voiceless ~~stop~~ consonant. Infants can learn a novel phonological alternation and group allophones (surface realizations) into a single “functional category” by 12 months (White, Peperkamp, Kirk, & Morgan, 2008; see also Chong & Sundara, 2015). Infants' ability to learn this patterning depends on phonetic similarity between sounds, consistent with the tendency for allophones to be phonetically similar (White & Sundara, 2014). Whether sounds are allophonic or contrastive also impacts infants' learning of a novel phonotactic pattern (sound combination) at 11 months. Infants can only learn the patterns relying on if it relies on a sound distinctions that is-are contrastive in their language, but not if the distinction is—not allophonic (Seidl et al., 2009).~~

~~Multiple observational studies suggest children can produce variant forms. Children learning South Philadelphia English, with variable, but phonologically conditioned, deletion of /d/ and /t/ in coda consonant clusters, produce mostly adult-like deletion patterns by age 3 (Roberts, 1997). Evidence suggests acquisition is slower for more variable input. Miller and Schmitt (2012) compared children learning Chilean Spanish, which sometimes deletes or aspirates syllable final -s, to children learning Mexican Spanish, which uses -s consistently. Chilean Spanish learning children take longer to acquire the plural -s marker than children learning Mexican Spanish, presumably due to the inconsistency (Miller & Schmitt, 2012).~~

~~*Phonological pattern learning: Variability on irrelevant dimensions lawful variability* can sometimes facilitate infants' learning of lawful variability. — Infants seem to benefit from irrelevant acoustic-phonetic variability for phonotactic-pattern learning. Seidl, Onishi, and Cristia (2014) reported facilitative effects of talker variability, for infants at 4 and 11 months, on discrimination of nonce words that were phonotactically compatible vs. incompatible with familiarization. Infants use talker differences to track grammatical-like rules (Gonzales, Gerken, & Gómez, 2018), but apparently not to track phonological statistics (Benitez, Bulgarelli, Byers-Heinlein, Saffran, & Weiss, 2020). Richtsmeier, Gerken, & Ohala (2011) found facilitation from talker and word-type frequency on preschoolers' production of phonotactic sequences (see also Richtsmeier, Gerken, Goffman, & Hogan, 2009). In summary, infants and toddlers appear to correctly attribute variability in segments to allophony and other types of phonological alternations, differentiating allophonic variation from contrastive variation. Thus, wLearning of such lawful variation in speech sounds can sometimes ~~hile~~ phonological-pattern learning requires attending to relevant variation in sound realizations and distributions, it can also be facilitated by variability on *irrelevant* dimensions.~~

## **Word-form recognition and word learning.**

In this section, we first review evidence from impacts of unlawful variability on early word-form recognition, the component of word learning that involves forming a representation of the sound pattern of the word, as opposed to learning the meaning or referent of the word or the association between sound and meaning. We then review impacts of unlawful variability on—and then—word learning,—the mapping of word forms to *meanings*. For each, we first describe children’s sensitivity to variability on relevant dimensions, and on irrelevant dimensions, e.g., talker, pitch, and affect. As will become apparent here, and even more apparent in discussing accent variation, the boundaries of relevance between relevant and irrelevant variation are somewhat murky. Thus, the last topic we address in this section is the fact that learners must contend with ambiguity about whether segmental distinctions are relevant or irrelevant.

### ***Impacts of unlawful, irrelevant variability on***

***Word-form recognition and word learning.*** As with speech-sound learning, early word-form recognition and word learning require recognizing acoustic-phonetic forms by tracking variation on relevant dimensions, while ignoring irrelevant variation. A fundamental question is when developmentally children discover what-which variation is or is not contrastive. This question has been probed somewhat differently for word-form recognition vs. word learning. For word-form recognition, Accordingly, infant researchers have tested how readily children generalize a word form (typically presented in isolation during familiarization) across a change in irrelevant properties to recognize it in fluent speech. Note that this literature has typically not probed the level of detail of children’s word-form representations to the same degree as the literature on word learning (which we summarize in the next subsection). It has tended to focus more on impacts of irrelevant variability than on subtle, relevant changes in words’ sounds. By 9-10.5 months, infants recognize familiarized word forms despite unlawful variability in even if the talker gender (Houston & Jusczyk, 2000), affect (Singh, Morgan, & White, 2004), or pitch (Singh, White, & Morgan, 2008) changes from between familiarization to and test.

Earlier, at (7.5 months), however, infants’ word recognition is disrupted by these changes unlawful variability, unless familiarization words are embedded in fluent, natural speech during familiarization (van Heugten and Johnson, 2012). While 7.5-month-olds generalized familiarized word forms to a new same-gender talker (Houston & Jusczyk, 2000), recognition was disrupted by a 1-day delay between familiarization and test (though reminding infants of the original talker in the test session helped them to generalize; Houston & Jusczyk, 2003). Relatedly, in some cases, in the presence of a competing talker, 7.5-month-old infants only recognize words spoken in a familiar voice (their mother’s; Barker & Newman, 2005 2004). Thus, unlawful acoustic-phonetic variability challenges early recognition of word forms.

—While 7.5-month-old infants’ word-form recognition is easily disrupted by irrelevant, unlawful variability, strategic introduction of training variability (e.g., multiple talkers or multiple vocal affects) can aid generalization across acoustic differences. While 7.5-month-olds do not generalize familiarized word forms across changes in vocal affect (Singh et al., 2004), Singh (2008) found that providing incorporating affect variability during

into word-familiarization facilitated their-generalization. Thus, irrelevant, unlawful variability is simultaneously-challenging for infants' early word-form recognition. However, it is also critically-and important for the formation of robust, generalizable word-form representations-in infants.

For word learning, as for word-form recognition, unlawful, irrelevant variability during learning may introduce additional complexity, but several studies suggest it facilitates learning. Talker variability facilitates infants' associative word learning in the Switch procedure: when habituation words /buk/ and /puk/ were spoken by 18 male and female talkers, 14-month-olds successfully learned words (Rost & McMurray, 2009, 2010; see replication in Quam, Knight, & Gerken, 2017). Galle, Apfelbaum, and McMurray (2015) demonstrated that even single-talker variability (noise variability around voicing-category means) facilitates learning if it presents a wide enough scope of acoustic values. Facilitation at 14 months, specifically, is consistent with PRIMIR (which argues 14-month-olds are processing word forms holistically and storing exemplars; Werker & Curtin, 2005); as well as with WRAPSA (which argues irrelevant dimensions are weighted more heavily earlier in infancy; Jusczyk, 1993). Facilitation in word-learning tasks but not sound-discrimination tasks (summarized earlier) is also consistent with Apfelbaum & McMurray's putative mechanism, that variability operates on cue weights between acoustic dimensions and visual referents (the latter of which are not included in common laboratory discrimination tasks).

Yet not all irrelevant variability facilitates infants' word learning. While Höhle et al. (2020) replicated the talker-variability facilitation effect, variability in the visual appearance of objects did *not* facilitate word learning (see Sommers & Barcroft, 2013, for a related finding in adults). Variability could need to be in the speech signal to help infants rule out dimensions as potentially relevant for differentiating words. However, Quam and Swingley (in prep.) found a null effect of acoustic-phonetic variability: 18-month-olds learned words in the Switch habituation procedure irrespective of whether variability was introduced on an irrelevant dimension (pitch contour for vowel-contrasted words, or vowel for pitch-contour-contrasted words).


While in many cases learners use variability on irrelevant dimensions to downweight those dimensions, sometimes they can use non-contrastive variability as a correlated cue to help them track differences in words (or grammatical patterns). Three- to five-year-olds (Creel, 2014a; and adults, Creel, Aslin, & Tanenhaus, 2008; Creel & Tumlin, 2011) can use talker differences, such as a male voice always saying "marv" and a female voice always saying "mard," to recognize otherwise-similar-sounding words more quickly in real time. These results are consistent with an exemplar approach in which learners store both speech-sound and talker information. However, in one study, 14-month-olds did not learn words when voice gender covaried with word, even though they did learn words with random talker variation (Quam, Knight, & Gerken, 2017). This set of findings suggests an age trajectory for word learning in which irrelevant variability, rather than being tuned out over development, may increase in usefulness over development. What is not clear is whether early presence of covarying cues may be detrimental to post-learning generalization, though as discussed in the structures of variability section, there is less pressure to generalize if cue correlations are stable in learners' environments.

Coping with ambiguity in whether variation is contrastive. For early word learning, differentiating between contrastive and non-contrastive changes in words is complicated by the fact that

~~Word learning: Variability in segments.~~—Some variation in segments (e.g., consonants and vowels) is contrastive, but some is not. ~~Non-contrastive variation can be conditioned by phonetic context, as when *r* is voiced in ‘braid’ but devoiced in ‘prayed.’ Or, a single speaker might use multiple variants of a sound with probabilistic preferences according to level of formality (e.g., Miller & Schmitt, 2012). Finally, what might appear to be contrastive changes in segments (not attributable to allophony, dialect, accent, etc.) could actually be inadvertent misspeakings, which listeners should simply disregard.~~

~~For listeners, these different sources of apparent phonemic changes create a tension~~ Thus, there is a tension for listeners: how does one know if a variant is inadvertent or deliberate? If inadvertent, ~~it is ideal to~~ one should listen through the variation and activate the closest-matching real word. If intentional, ~~it is ideal to~~ one should treat the change as phonologically relevant (Swingley & Aslin, 2000, 2002) and infer a new word with a distinct referent (Quam & Swingley, 2010; though see Swingley, 2016).

One factor listeners ~~may use to determine whether to listen through a mispronunciation or treat it as a novel word~~ seem to consider is the degree or severity of the mispronunciation, e.g., how many phonetic features are changed. We illustrate with a series of word-learning studies by Quam and Swingley (2007, 2010, in prep.), which focused primarily on toddlers, but included adults for comparison. Each 2.5-year-old or adult ~~learner~~ was repeatedly exposed to a novel object labeled “deebo” (/diboʊ/). A distracter object was ~~also~~ visually familiarized, but not named. In test, they saw the two objects and heard either “deebo” or a mispronunciation. Visual fixations to objects assessed ~~what learners’~~ interpretations of words ~~thought they were hearing—~~ deebo, or a novel word.




**Figure 3: Response to mispronunciations of a newly learned word (“deebo”) is related to degree of mispronunciation.** Adults and 30-month-olds showed a larger target-fixation decrement to a two-feature change in vowel height and front/backness (/i/ to /a/ in “dahbo”) than to a single-feature change in consonant voicing (/d/ to /t/ in “teebo”).

Results (Figure 3) differed both by age (~~adult, child~~) and degree of mispronunciation. Toddlers were sensitive to the more substantial two-feature vowel mispronunciation “dahbo” /dɑboʊ/, exhibiting more looks to the target for “deebo” than for the mispronunciation (Figure 3). But only 46% of children fixated the distracter more than the target (Quam & Swingley, 2010), suggesting most children did not fully reject the target as the referent of the mispronounced word. For the milder mispronunciation, toddlers did not show a decrement in target looking, implying acceptance or even obliviousness to the mispronunciation (Quam & Swingley, in prep.; see White & Morgan, 2008, for similar findings with familiar words in 19-month-olds). Adult listeners were sensitive to both mispronunciations; there were more looks to the target object for “deebo” than for mispronunciations (Figure 3). But did adults think the mispronunciation referred to the target object or the as-yet-unnamed object?, but even adults seemed to interpret mispronunciations differently depending on their magnitude. When they heard a For the two-feature vowel mispronunciation “dahbo” /dɑboʊ/, 75% fixated the distracter more than the target, suggesting adults they interpreted “dahbo” as a novel word. By contrast, for a the single-feature consonant-voicing mispronunciation “teebo” /tiboʊ/, showed a different pattern: only 33% fixated the distracter more (Quam & Swingley, 2007). Toddlers were sensitive to the more substantial mispronunciation “dahbo” /dɑboʊ/, but only 46% fixated the distracter more than the target (Quam & Swingley, 2010). For the milder mispronunciation, toddlers did not even show a decrement in target looking, implying acceptance or even obliviousness to the

mispronunciation (Quam & Swingley, in prep.; see White & Morgan, 2008, for similar findings with familiar words in 19-month-olds).

One might ask how well looking measures match children’s final interpretations. That is, does a high proportion of looks to a novel object indicate the child thinks it was the object named, or could it instead indicate uncertainty or interest in the novel object? Studies using both manual responses and looks suggest strong agreement between the two measures. Swingley (2016) presented 27-month-olds with familiar-word mispronunciations (e.g., “guck” for duck) in the presence of one familiar (duck) and one novel object. Children’s manual (touchscreen) responses and looking patterns both suggested children chose the duck the majority of the time for “guck,” while they mostly looked at and touched the novel object when hearing an unrelated form (e.g., “meb”). In older children, aged 3-5 years, Creel (2012) found something similar: children looked and pointed less at a picture (e.g., fish) when its name was mispronounced (e.g. “fesh”, and even less for more-distant “fosh”), but the familiar object (fish) was still the predominant response.



**Figure 3: Response to mispronunciations of a newly learned word (“deebo”) is related to degree of mispronunciation.** Adults and 30-month-olds showed a larger target-fixation decrement to a two-feature change in vowel height and front/backness (/i/ to /a/ in “dahbo”) than to a single-feature change in consonant voicing (/d/ to /t/ in “teebo”).

One might ask how well looking measures match children’s final interpretations. That is, does a high proportion of looks to a novel object indicate the child thinks it was the object named, or could it instead indicate uncertainty or interest in the novel object? Studies using both manual responses and looks suggest good agreement between the two measures. Swingley

(2016) presented 27-month-olds with familiar word mispronunciations (e.g., “guck” for duck) in the presence of one familiar (duck) and one novel object. Children’s manual (touchscreen) responses and looking patterns both suggested that children chose the duck the majority of the time for “guck,” while they mostly looked at and touched the novel object when hearing an unrelated form (e.g., “meb”). In older children, aged 3–5 years, Creel (2012) found something similar: children looked and pointed less at a picture (e.g., fish) when its name was mispronounced (e.g., “fesh”, and even less for more distant “fosh”), but the familiar object (fish) was still the predominant response.

These studies taken together suggest children do not automatically assume a mildly mispronounced word is an unfamiliar one. Thus, interpretation of potentially relevant variation is actually fairly gradient: in many cases—particularly for toddlers—variant forms are treated as close enough, with familiar(ized)-word activation decreasing as mispronunciation severity increases. Sensitivity to partial similarity provides a mechanism for recognizing word forms not only when speakers make errors, but also when speakers systematically produce less-familiar forms, as in cases of unfamiliar accents. Thus studies of mispronunciation sensitivity provide an interesting counterpoint to the literature on accented-speech comprehension and adaptation (discussed in the final section below).

Still, this gradient sensitivity must be reconciled with children’s demonstrated ability to distinguish similar-sounding familiar-word pairs. For example, children in Swingley (2016) treated “puhk” (a non-word rhyming with book) like “book,” but same-age children in Barton (1976) readily distinguished “bear” and “pear.” Why are *b* and *p* distinguishable in familiar words indistinguishable in novel words but not in novel words distinguishable in familiar words? This pattern of results is consistent with an exemplar account. If children learn entire word forms rather than individual sounds, knowing “bear” and “pear” does not imply differentiation of “book” and “puhk.” Differential sensitivity across acoustic contexts might also allow learners to use variability in one accent (e.g., where a contrast is meaningful) but not another (e.g., where it is merged).

***Word learning: Variability on irrelevant dimensions.***—Irrelevant variability during learning may introduce additional complexity, but several studies suggest it facilitates word learning, including a sizable literature on adult L2 speech-sound learning (Bradlow, Akahane-Yamada, Pisoni, & Tokhura, 1997; Lively, Logan, & Pisoni, 1993; Sadakata & McQueen, 2013; Shinohara & Iverson, 2018; see Barriuso & Hayes-Harb, 2018, for a review of high-variability phonetic training, and Barcroft & Sommers, 2005, on vocabulary learning). Similarly, talker variability facilitates infants’ associative word learning in the Switch procedure: when habituation words /buk/ and /puk/ were spoken by 18 male and female talkers, 14-month-olds successfully learned words (Rost & McMurray, 2009, 2010; see replication in Quam, Knight, & Gerken, 2017). Galle, Apfelbaum, and McMurray (2015) demonstrated that even single talker variability (noise variability around voicing category means) facilitates learning if it presents a wide enough scope of acoustic values. Facilitation at 14 months, specifically, is consistent with PRIMIR (Werker & Curtin, 2005), which argues 14-month-olds are processing word forms holistically (vs. phonemes) and representing them with an exemplar-based structure; as well as with WRAPSA (Jusezyk, 1993), which argues irrelevant dimensions are weighted more heavily earlier in infancy. Facilitation in word-learning tasks but not sound-discrimination tasks

(summarized earlier) is also consistent with Apfelbaum & McMurray's putative mechanism, that variability operates on cue weights between acoustic dimensions and visual referents (the latter of which are not included in common laboratory discrimination tasks).

Yet not all irrelevant variability facilitates infants' word learning. While Höhle et al. (2020) replicated the facilitative effect of multiple talkers, they found that variability in the visual appearance of objects did *not* facilitate word learning (see Sommers & Barcroft, 2013, for a related finding in adults). Perhaps variability must be inherent in the speech signal in order to help infants rule out dimensions as potentially relevant for differentiating words.

While in many cases learners use variability on irrelevant dimensions to downweight those dimensions, sometimes they can use non-contrastive variability as a correlated cue to help them track differences in words (or grammatical patterns). Adults (Creel, Aslin, & Tanenhaus, 2008; Creel & Tumlin, 2011) and 3- to 5-year-olds (Creel, 2014a) can use talker differences, such as a male voice always saying "marv" and a female voice always saying "mard," to recognize similar-sounding words more quickly in real time. These results are consistent with an exemplar approach in which learners store both speech-sound and talker information. However, 14-month-olds did not learn words when voice gender covaried with word, even though they did learn words with random talker variation (Quam, Knight, & Gerken, 2017). This set of findings suggests an age trajectory for word learning in which irrelevant variability, rather than being tuned-out over development, may increase in usefulness over development. What is not clear is whether early presence of covarying cues may be detrimental to post-learning generalization, though as discussed in the structures of variability section, there is less pressure to generalize if cue correlations are stable in learners' environments. In summary, while some studies have shown facilitation from noise-like or patterned, correlated talker variability for word-form recognition and word learning, other studies have found null effects of variability on word learning. The structure of variability may interact with age to determine whether variability will facilitate learning: random acoustic variability (but not visual variability) facilitates word learning at 14 but not 18 months. Correlated talker-gender cues seem similarly to facilitate certain types of learning, perhaps only at certain ages. They do not appear to facilitate 14-month-olds' word learning, though they facilitate word recognition in preschool and beyond. Finally, toddlers' detection of variation in segments in newly learned words is somewhat less robust than adults'. It is also gradient, with stronger detection for multiple-feature mispronunciations than for single-feature mispronunciations.

### **Accent variability.**

We now address accent variability, which is highly complex, for several reasons. First, it is not clear whether cross-accent differences would be treated as lawful or unlawful in Elman and McClelland's (1984, 1986) framework. Elman and McClelland (1984) focused mainly on effects of segmental context on acoustic-phonetic realizations of speech sounds, describing how segments pattern systematically *within* an accent (though they described how bilinguals interpret sounds with respect to the language context). Second,

We summarize accent variability last because it is especially complex, for several reasons. While differences across accents do not signal lexical contrast, as described above, there can be ambiguity between accent differences vs. contrastive changes. Third, a difference between accents typically encompasses multiple sound distinctions. While in many experimental studies,

young learners' detection of mispronunciations of words has been interpreted as a response to "accent" variability, naturalistic accent differences are rarely as clear-cut as experimental mispronunciations of words. Rather than always shifting from one speech-sound category familiar to a child (e.g., /d/) to another familiar category (/t/), an accent might (partially) merge a category or change cues, as illustrated in Figure 2.

Fourth, naturalistic accent covaries with non-phonological features of dialect. In the sections below, we mainly use the term 'accent,' but we will also sometimes refer to the concept of 'dialect,' which has a somewhat distinct meaning. Accent refers specifically to pronunciation: either to differences between first- and second-language (L2) speakers' pronunciations, which may be impacted by the speech sounds and prosody of their first language (L1); or to variation in pronunciation across different dialect groups. Dialect refers more broadly, not just to pronunciation, but also to variation in vocabulary and grammar. As one aspect of dialect, accent often activates stereotypes, that is, overgeneralized language-external notions about speakers based on their perceived identity. This means that, in some cases, it is unclear whether recognition difficulty results directly from accent properties in speech vs. or from stereotype activation. Listeners may experience subjective difficulty understanding speech because of negative associations with speakers' cultural or linguistic backgrounds (Kang & Rubin, 2009; Kang, Rubin, & Lindemann, 2015) and then blame speakers for their difficulty understanding (Lippi-Green, 2012). In our review, we assume that recognition difficulty results from unfamiliarity of sound forms, but alternative social-bias explanations should be kept in mind.

First, accent variability blurs distinctions between relevant and irrelevant variability. Second, accent often activates stereotypes, that is, overgeneralized language-external notions about speakers based on their perceived identity. This means that in some cases, it is unclear whether recognition difficulty results directly from accent properties in speech vs. from stereotype activation. Listeners may experience subjective difficulty understanding speech because of negative associations with speakers' cultural or linguistic backgrounds (Kang & Rubin, 2009; Kang, Rubin, & Lindemann, 2015) and then blame speakers for their difficulty understanding (Lippi-Green, 2012). In our review, we assume that recognition difficulty results from unfamiliarity of sound forms, but alternative social-bias explanations should be kept in mind.

Finally, given the high perceived social relevance of accent (e.g., as a cue to group membership), accent variability blurs distinctions between relevant (or lawful) and irrelevant (or unlawful) variability. Thus, instead of organizing the subsections below by relevant vs. irrelevant variability, we follow a different structure. We first discuss early recognition of accent differences. We next discuss recognition and learning of words in unfamiliar accents. Then, we discuss recognition and learning of words in unfamiliar accents. We then discuss learning in multiple accents, including those differing in social prestige addressing impacts of dialect prestige.

***Recognition and learning of words in unfamiliar accents.*** Infants', toddlers', and preschoolers' word learning in the face of accent variability is a research topic of increasing interest. As is typically the case in the experimental literature, there is a longer record of research on accent comprehension and adaptation in adults, which provides an endpoint measure of sorts for child accent processing. Briefly, adults are less adept at comprehending unfamiliar-accented than familiar-accented speech, but with exposure to an accent they rapidly improve (e.g., Bradlow & Bent, 2008; Clarke & Garrett, 2004; McQueen, Norris, & Cutler, 2003). Thus there is a cost to accent variation, but experience can reduce it.

In infants, a *Early recognition of accents*:

**A possible precursor to comprehension or adaptation to accented speech may be the ability to detect that two accents differ.** Some research suggests accent-difference detection by 12 months (Butler, Floccia, Goslin, & Panneton, 2011; Cristia et al., 2014; Kinzler, Dupoux, & Spelke, 2007; Mulak, Bonn, Chládková, Aslin, & Escudero, 2017; Nazzi, Jusczyk, & Johnson, 2000). However, other studies indicate children as old as 5 years or more have difficulty differentiating their accent from another (Creel, 2018; Floccia, Butler, Girard, & Goslin, 2009; Girard, Floccia, & Goslin, 2008; Jones, Yan, Wagner, & Clopper, 2017), with slow developmental improvement. The apparent discrepancy between these research areas likely reflects methodological differences (Creel & Quam, 2015), so it is not clear how findings at earlier vs. later ages relate to each other.

There is also a lengthy timeline for recognition of words in unfamiliar accents, but it is not clear whether this skill is strongly linked to accent-difference detection. However, other studies indicate children as old as 5 have difficulty differentiating their accent from another accent (Creel, 2018; Floccia, Butler, Girard, & Goslin, 2009; Girard, Floccia, & Goslin, 2008; Jones, Yan, Wagner, & Clopper, 2017), with slow developmental improvement. This may mean accent detection is not sufficient for accent adaptation or comprehension—and that perhaps it is not even necessary. In other words, infants may recognize a word in an accent even if they cannot yet detect that the word is accented.

Children must develop “phonological constancy,” that is, recognizing an accented form as a familiar word. If infants have had natural exposure to an accent, they can demonstrate phonological constancy as early as 6 months (Kitamura, Panneton, & Best, 2013). For unfamiliar accents, infants can recognize familiarized words despite changes to the talker and the accent around 13 months (Schmale & Seidl, 2009; see also Schmale, Cristià, Seidl, & Johnson, 2010). However, Best et al. (2009) reported a later time-course: 15-month-olds only recognized a word as familiar in their native accent (see also Mulak et al., 2013), while 19-month-olds did so in a different accent. Infants under two can only recognize familiar words in an unfamiliar accent if they are first familiarized with the accent in a highly familiar story, but by age 2 they do not need accent familiarization, suggesting good generalization to unfamiliar accents (van Heugten & Johnson, 2014; van Heugten, Krieger, & Johnson, 2015). For novel-word learning, by 24 months, toddlers can learn a word in an unfamiliar accent after under 2 minutes of exposure to the accent (Schmale, Cristià, & Seidl, 2012). However, when taught a word in their native accent, only 30-month-olds—not 24-month-olds—recognize it in another accent (Schmale, Hollich, & Seidl, 2011).

Studies in older children suggest that difficulty understanding accented words does not end in toddlerhood, but extends at least into mid-childhood. Studies using sentence-repetition measures have found that children have greater difficulty comprehending words (Bent, 2014) and sentences (Bent & Atagi, 2015, 2017) in unfamiliar-accented speech (including unfamiliar native

accents: Bent & R. Holt, 2018; see also Nathan, Wells, & Donlan, 1998). While performance improves with age and phonological skill (Bent & Atagi, 2015) and when semantic cues are provided (R. Holt & Bent, 2017), children as old as 8 still have more difficulty than adults (typically evaluated via transcription measures) in comprehending unfamiliar accents (Bent & Atagi, 2015).

Why do studies of older children show extended difficulty when studies with toddlers suggest good accent comprehension by 24-30 months? One reason may be the difficulty of the task. Toddlers are often tested with picture-fixation tasks that provide a small set of response alternatives (hearing “feesh” while seeing fish and banana pictures), while older children are tested with a repetition task, which provides less context (no pictures) and has a free response set. Creel, Rojo and Paullada (2016) found that this task difference is substantial: monolingual English-learning 3- to 5-year-olds showed good recognition of Spanish-accented words and sentences in a picture-recognition test—nearly comparable to their performance on WAE-accented words—but a much larger gap on the unfamiliar (Spanish) accent when children had to repeat heard words. In addition to emphasizing the importance of methodological factors, this collection of studies, taken together, suggests children may need more contextual support to recognize unfamiliar-accented variants at younger ages, with less support needed as development progresses.—

#### *Recognition and learning of words in unfamiliar accents.*

Multiple studies have examined accent comprehension and adaptation in adults, providing an endpoint measure of sorts for child accent processing. Briefly, adults are less adept at comprehending unfamiliar-accented than familiar-accented speech, but with exposure to an accent they rapidly adapt (e.g., Bradlow & Bent, 2008; Clarke & Garrett, 2004; McQueen, Norris, & Cutler, 2003). Thus there is a cost to accent variation, but experience can alleviate it.

While we noted above that infants may detect accent differences before 12 months, it appears to take longer for children to demonstrate “phonological constancy,” that is, to recognize an accented form as a familiar word. If infants have had natural exposure to a dialect, they can demonstrate phonological constancy as early as 6 months (Kitamura, Panneton, & Best, 2013). For unfamiliar accents, infants can recognize familiarized words despite changes to the talker and the accent around 13 months (Schmale & Seidl, 2009; see also Schmale, Cristià, Seidl, & Johnson, 2010). However, Best et al. (2009) reported a later time course: 15-month-olds only recognized a word as familiar in their native dialect (see also Mulak et al., 2013), while 19-month-olds did so in a different dialect. Infants under two can only recognize familiar words in an unfamiliar accent if they are first familiarized with the accent in a highly familiar story, but by age two they do not need accent familiarization, suggesting good generalization to unfamiliar accents (van Heugten & Johnson, 2014; van Heugten, Krieger, & Johnson, 2015). For novel word learning, by 24 months, toddlers can learn a word in an unfamiliar accent after under 2 minutes of exposure to the accent (Schmale, Cristià, & Seidl, 2012). However, when taught a word in their native accent, only 30-month-olds—not 24-month-olds—recognize it in another accent (Schmale, Hollich, & Seidl, 2011).

~~Studies in older children suggest that difficulty understanding accented words does not end in toddlerhood, but extends at least into mid-childhood. Studies using sentence-repetition (children) and transcription (adults) measures have found that children have greater difficulty comprehending words (Bent, 2014) and sentences (Bent & Atagi, 2015, 2017) in unfamiliar accented speech (including unfamiliar native accents: Bent & R. Holt, 2018; see also Nathan, Wells, & Donlan, 1998). While performance improves with age and phonological skill (Bent & Atagi, 2015) and when semantic cues are provided (R. Holt & Bent, 2017), children as old as 8 still have more difficulty than adults in comprehending unfamiliar accents (Bent & Atagi, 2015).~~

~~Why do studies of older children show extended difficulty when studies with toddlers suggest good accent comprehension by 24-30 months? One reason may be the difficulty of the comprehension task: toddlers are often tested with picture-fixation tasks that provide a small set of response alternatives (hearing “feesh” while seeing fish and banana pictures), while older children are tested with a repetition task, which provides less context (no pictures) and has a free response set. Creel, Rojo and Paullada (2016) found that this task difference is substantial: monolingual English-learning 3- to 5-year-olds showed good recognition of Spanish-accented words and sentences in a picture-recognition test—nearly comparable to their performance on WAE-accented words—but a much larger gap on the unfamiliar (Spanish) accent when children had to repeat heard words. In addition to emphasizing the importance of methodological factors, this collection of studies suggests children may need more contextual support to recognize unfamiliar accented variants at younger ages, with less support needed as development progresses.~~

## *Learning in multiple accents.*

The question we address here is whether dual-accent input slows learning in each accent. Multiple studies make clear that children *can* learn to recognize and produce at least some types of cross-accent variability. Infants and toddlers can learn to interpret word forms differently depending on the accent of the speaker, both via lab training (Weatherhead & White, 2016; see also White & Aslin, 2011) and real-world exposure (van der Feest & Johnson, 2016; and see Smith et al., 2007, 2013 for children as young as 3 producing multiple phonological variants depending on the formality of a situation). However, several lab and observational studies suggest that learning a language with accent variation or with multiple phonological variants may slow learning, relative to learning primarily in a single accent. To our knowledge, only one set of studies has simulated multi-accent input in the lab. Creel and colleagues have found that 3- to 5-year-old children (Creel, 2014b; Frye & Creel, ~~in prep.~~ under review) have more difficulty learning novel words when they are pronounced with segment variability (e.g., an object is called both “beesh” and “peesh”) vs. segment consistency (an object is always called “beesh”). This effect is gradient, with greater difficulty (lower pointing accuracy) when two labels for an object are phonologically dissimilar (an object is called “dedge” and “vush”); see Muench & Creel, 2013, for similar findings with adults). This mirrors a similar set of findings in adult novel word learning (Muench & Creel, 2013), where increases in the phonetic feature distance between two labels increases learning difficulty. It also mirrors Miller and Schmitt’s (2012) finding of slower learning of plural -s in Spanish dialects with variable -s realization.

Related evidence from infant studies suggests natural exposure to multiple accents may lead to slower comprehension in a given accent (Durrant, Delle Luche, Cattani, & Floccia, 2014; Floccia, Delle Luche, Durrant, Butler, & Goslin, 2012; Buckler, Oczak-Arsic, Siddiqui, & Johnson, 2017). ~~Specifically,~~ ~~Children with exposure~~ to multiple accents sometimes show more difficulty recognizing words ~~spoken~~ in one of the accents than do children exposed to a single accent. However, this slower learning ~~should be placed in context: slower learning~~ may occur because there is simply more for bi-accentual children to learn. A tradeoff often underemphasized in deficits-based accounts of language development in bilingual and bi-accentual children is that, while a monolingual or mono-accentual child may learn one ~~dialect accent~~ faster, a bilingual or bi-accentual child can communicate effectively with ~~far~~ more people and maintain stronger family and community connections (Yu, 2013). ~~The complexity-of-learning account predicts that learning difficulty will be proportional to the degree and nature of dissimilarity between a child’s two accents. This makes it critical to accurately characterize the nature of the variability between accents, as we illustrate in the section on AAE below.~~

To summarize, several laboratory studies show children can cope with accent variability, but it increases learning complexity and thus introduces challenges for learners, both in and out of the laboratory. At the same time, natural dialect exposure can be viewed as cultural and linguistic enrichment. The complexity-of-learning account predicts that learning difficulty will be proportional to the degree and nature of dissimilarity between a child’s two accents. This makes it critical to accurately characterize the nature of the variability between accents, as we illustrate in the next section.

*Impacts of dialect prestige on learning ~~from~~ in multiple accents.*

Another important consideration in learning and processing of multiple ~~dialects~~ accents is impacts of ~~differences in~~ dialect prestige (as imposed by society). Because of the ubiquity of prestige-dialect (WAE) speakers in media and society (their currently greater US population share, overrepresentation in political office and media), children who speak non-prestige dialects become familiar more quickly with prestige dialects (Perrachione, Chiao, & Wong, 2009) and have better comprehension of them (see Baran & Seymour, 1976; Noyer & Seymour, 1974, 1979) than prestige-dialect learners have for non-prestige dialects. And because a prestige or majority dialect is likely to be the dominant dialect of teachers and educational materials (Craig & Washington, 2004), children who speak a non-prestige dialect at home are much more likely to learn to dialect switch (i.e., code-switch between dialects) than speakers of mainstream dialects (Thompson et al., 2004). This ~~pressure to~~ Dialect switching includes ~~requires~~ adapting not only to phonological features (e.g., Thomas, 2007) but also to syntactic, morphological, and lexical patterns (Washington & Craig, 1994). Given that natural dialects vary on many dimensions simultaneously, learning a dialect other than WAE outside of school and then learning to ~~dialect~~ shift ~~switch~~ within an academic setting (Craig & Washington, 2004) might benefit children cognitively, akin to cognitive benefits attributed to bilingualism (Bialystok, 2007).

However, other work suggests AAE speakers experience substantial difficulty in WAE-dominated learning contexts (Washington & Craig, 2000), due to added complexity of adjusting to another dialect while simultaneously processing information needed for academic success (Craig & Washington, 2004; Thompson et al., 2004). This suggests that even if there is a boost to prestigious forms (Sumner, 2015; Sumner et al., 2014), it is insufficient for many learners. Recent researchers ~~have~~ has noted that these challenges are heightened by the fact that content in standardized assessments (Moland, 2011) and curricular materials is almost always in WAE (Thompson et al., 2004).

Children ~~who have had~~ with more prior exposure to WAE in more integrated communities, ~~and those who have~~ and/or stronger reading and vocabulary scores, are better able to ~~dialect~~ shift ~~switch~~ (Craig & Washington, 2004), indicating they are mastering the complexity of bi-dialectal input to successfully acquire two dialect systems. ~~Thus, the finding that prior experience predicts degree of bi-dialectal proficiency parallels findings from adult L2 learning that more experience with contrasts (Chang & Bowles, 2015) makes learners more likely to benefit from rather than be negatively impacted by input variability. Likewise, the link with stronger language skills (while direction of causality is not clear) parallels findings that stronger perceptual aptitude makes learners more likely to benefit from variability (Sadakata & McQueen, 2014; Perrachione, Lee, Ha, & Wong, 2011).~~

We now illustrate a case from AAE where mainstream characterizations of so-called “non-mainstream” dialects and neglect of relevant literature ~~may have~~ has impeded research progress. Among other features, AAE is described as having a merger of /I/ and /E/ before nasal consonants (as in pin and pen) and final-consonant devoicing (“had” sounds like “hat”; for an overview see, e.g., Thomas, 2007). Thus, for these sounds, the AAE/WAE relationship is that shown in Figure 2, Panel 2. However, it is possible that in some cases, accents like AAE with

apparent mergers actually preserve contrasts, but along different dimensions (that WAE-speaking listeners and researchers do not hear), as illustrated in Figure 2, Panel 4.

Y. Holt et al. (2016) acoustically document a pattern in AAE speakers suggesting possible maintenance of coda-voicing differences. Multiple cues have been linked to coda-voicing differences, including preceding vowel length (the vowel in “had” is longer than “hat”), consonant-closure duration, and closure voicing (see, e.g., Hayes-Harb, Smith, Bent, & Bradlow, 2008). Y. Holt and colleagues measured vowel durations in 28 word pairs ending in *d* vs. *t*, such as *had* and *hat*, in AAE and WAE speakers from the same region in western North Carolina. AAE speakers produced a *larger* vowel-duration difference in these pairs than WAE speakers did (Y. Holt et al., 2016). This suggests that AAE speakers in this region may maintain coda-voicing contrasts but in a different way than WAE speakers—via stronger weighting on preceding vowel duration. This is consequential in that some research programs start with the assumption that AAE-speaking children have difficulty learning to read because merged distinctions lead to decreased spelling-sound correspondence. If instead AAE speakers *do* distinguish these sounds but rely on vowel-length distinctions rather than other cues, these could be highlighted by teachers and mapped onto spelling differences; and f. Future research should focus both on developing best-practices for dialect-specific literacy instruction and on other sources of cross-dialect learning difficulty, such as reduced comprehension of instructions from differently accented instructors.

A study by Baran and Seymour (1976) suggests the acoustic distinctions AAE speakers produce are more intelligible to AAE than WAE listeners. AAE-speaking children surpassed WAE-speaking children in identifying AAE speech contrasts (predominantly coda-voicing pairs). In addition, AAE-speaking children were better at understanding WAE speech than WAE-speaking children were at understanding AAE speech vice-versa. Further, Nober and Seymour (1974, 1979) showed a similar pattern in pre-service teachers who spoke either AAE or WAE and tried to identify AAE and WAE child speech in AAE and WAE. AAE listeners were equally good at comprehending AAE and WAE, comparable to WAE speakers on WAE speech, and better than WAE speakers on AAE speech (Nober & Seymour, 1974, 1979). Neglect of Seymour’s prior research (e.g., Baran and Seymour, 1976, has been cited only 24 times) has obscured evidence for the presence of potentially contrastive patterning of coda-voicing distinctions in some AAE speakers, counter to the common narrative that AAE obscures such distinctions. Happily, some newer work (Y. Holt et al., 2015, 2016; Y. Holt, 2018) is beginning to fill this gap. Further research is needed, however, along with greater acknowledgment from reviewers, editors, and relevant funding agencies that dialect variation is a legitimate, important topic of inquiry and that non-“mainstream” dialects are not special, rare cases, but widespread in learners’ experiences. Better understanding of the phonological characteristics of AAE could inform more accurately targeted, phonologically based literacy instruction.

In summary, the question of how children learn in multiple accents is inextricably linked with sociological issues of dialect prestige. Dialect prestige introduces many asymmetries between the experiences of different groups of children as they cope with accent variability. Children dominant in a dialect of relatively low prestige (as imposed by society) show some advantages over children dominant in a prestige dialect, such as greater familiarity with their non-dominant dialect and greater ability to dialect switch. At the same time, the tendency for academic settings to teach in the prestige dialect can introduce barriers for learning. Efforts to reduce so-called ‘achievement gaps’ for BIPOC children should carefully consider impacts of

pressures to dialect switch on children’s academic access. More attention and resources must be paid to important research suggesting that speakers of AAE may maintain contrasts on different acoustic dimensions than speakers of WAE.

## Conclusion

In summary, our review indicates that children learn language sound patterns in the face of rampant variability in the acoustic-phonetic realizations of sounds and words. Variability ~~may~~ can be helpful, harmful, or neutral depending on the learner’s age and learning objective. Irrelevant, unlawful variability can facilitate children’s learning, particularly for early learning of words and phonotactic rules, but facilitation may depend on children’s age and the nature of the variability. ~~However,~~ In other domains, such as speech-sound change detection and word-form recognition, children seem either unaffected or impaired by ~~irrelevant-unlawful~~ variability. While in some ways a source of “irrelevant” variation (at least for sound-category or word learning), accent differences are lawful. ~~However,~~ they often interact with contrastive dimensions, so they ~~might~~ can slow word learning temporarily and introduce academic barriers. However, exposure to multiple accents has benefits, including dialect-switching flexibility and likely better maintenance of family and community ties~~may lead to long-term flexibility in comprehension.~~ More research is needed to better characterize how pressure to dialect switch contributes to so-called ‘achievement gaps’ for BIPOC children. Better characterizing the phonological properties of dialects like AAE could also contribute to more targeted and effective literacy instruction.

## Acknowledgments

We thank students from the X lab at X University, particularly X and Y, for assistance with literature reviews. We also thank X for permission to describe unpublished data collected with the first author.

## Funding Information

During the time period in which they were writing this article, the authors were supported by funding provided by NIH/NIDCD grant X to the first author and NIH/NICHHD grant X to the second author.

## References

- #ShutDownAcademia #ShutDownSTEM. (2020, June 10). [www.shutdownstem.com](http://www.shutdownstem.com)
- Antoniou, M., & Wong, P. C. M. (2016). Varying irrelevant phonetic features hinders learning of the feature being trained. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 139, 271-278.
- Apfelbaum, K. S., & McMurray, B. (2011). Using variability to guide dimensional weighting: Associative mechanisms in early word learning. *Cognitive Science*, 35, 1105-1138. doi: 10.1111/j.1551-6709.2011.01181.x

- Avineri, N., Johnson, E., Brice-Heath, S., McCarty, T., Ochs, E., Kremer-Sadlik, T., Blum, S., Zentella, A. C., Rosa, J., Flores, N., Alim, H. S., & Paris, D. (2015). Invited forum: Bridging the “language gap.” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 25, 66-86.
- Baese-Berk, M. (2018). Perceptual learning for native and non-native speech. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 68, 1-29.
- Baran, J., & Seymour, H. N. (1976). The influence of three phonological rules of Black English on the discrimination of minimal word pairs. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 19, 467-474.
- Barcroft, J., and Sommers, M. S. (2005). Effects of acoustic variability on second language vocabulary learning, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 387-414.
- Barker, B. A., & Newman, R. S. (2004). Listen to your mother! The role of talker familiarity in infant streaming. *Cognition*, 94(2), 45-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2004.06.001>
- Barrett, J., & Paus, T. (2002). Affect-induced changes in speech production. *Experimental Brain Research*, 146(4), 531-537.
- Barriuso, T. A., & Hayes-Harb, R. (2018). High Variability Phonetic Training as a Bridge From Research to Practice. *The CATESOL Journal*, 30, 177.
- Barton, D. (1976). Phonemic discrimination and the knowledge of words in children under 3 years. *Papers and Reports on Child Language Development*, 11, 1-9.
- Baugh, J. (2017). Meaning-less differences: Exposing fallacies and flaws in “the word gap” hypothesis that conceal a dangerous “language trap” for low-income American families and their children. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 11, 39-51.
- Benitez, V. L., Bulgarelli, F., Byers-Heinlein, K., Saffran, J. R., & Weiss, D. J. (2020). Statistical learning of multiple speech streams: A challenge for monolingual infants. *Developmental Science*, 23(2), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12896>
- Bent, T. (2014). Children’s perception of foreign-accented words. *Journal of Child Language*, 41(6), 1334-1355. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000913000457>
- Bent, T., & Atagi, E. (2015). Children’s perception of nonnative-accented sentences in noise and quiet. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 138(6), 3985-3993. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4938228>
- Bent, T., & Atagi, E. (2017). Perception of nonnative-accented sentences by 5-to 8-year-olds and adults: The role of phonological processing skills. *Language and Speech*, 60(1), 110-122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0023830916645374>
- Bent, T., & Holt, R. F. (2018). Shhh... I Need Quiet! Children’s Understanding of American, British, and Japanese-accented English Speakers. *Language and Speech*, 61(4), 657-673. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0023830918754598>
- Best, C. T. (1994). The emergence of native-language phonological influences in infants: A perceptual assimilation model. In J. C. Goodman and H. C. Nusbaum (Eds.), *The Development of Speech Perception*, 167-224, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Best, C. T., Tyler, M. D., Gooding, T. N., Orlando, C. B., & Quann, C. A. (2009). Development of phonological constancy: Toddlers’ perception of native- and Jamaican-accented words. *Psychological Science*, 20(5), 539-42. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02327.x>
- Bialystok, E. (2007). Cognitive effects of bilingualism: How linguistic experience leads to cognitive change. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 10, 210-223.

- Bradlow, A. R., & Bent, T. (2008). Perceptual adaptation to non-native speech. *Cognition*, *106*(2), 707–729. doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2007.04.005
- Buckler, H., Oczak-Arsic, S., Siddiqui, N., & Johnson, E. K. (2017). Input matters: Speed of word recognition in 2-year-olds exposed to multiple accents. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *164*, 87–100. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2017.06.017>
- Butler, J., Floccia, C., Goslin, J., & Panneton, R. (2011). Infants' discrimination of familiar and unfamiliar accents in speech. *Infancy*, *16*(4), 392–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7078.2010.00050.x>
- Chen, S. (2020, June 9). *Researchers around the world prepare to #ShutDownSTEM and 'Strike For Black Lives.'* Science. [www.sciencemag.org/news/2020/06/researchers-around-world-prepare-shutdownstem-and-strike-black-lives#](http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2020/06/researchers-around-world-prepare-shutdownstem-and-strike-black-lives#)
- Chong, A.J., & Sundara, M. (2015). 18-month-olds compensate for a phonological alternation. In Grillo, E., & Jepsen, K. (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 39<sup>th</sup> Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 113-126.
- Clarke, C. M., & Garrett, M. F. (2004). Rapid adaptation to foreign-accented English. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *116*(6), 3647–3658. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1815131>
- Cole, M. (2013). Differences and deficits in psychological research in historical perspective: A commentary on the special section. *Developmental Psychology*, *49*, 84-91.
- Cowie, R., & Cornelius, R. (2003). Describing the emotional states that are expressed in speech. *Speech Communication*, *40*(1-2), 5-32.
- Craig, H. K., & Washington, J. A. (2004). Grade-related changes in the production of African American English. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *47*, 450-463.
- Creel, S. C. (2012). Phonological similarity and mutual exclusivity: on-line recognition of atypical pronunciations in 3-5-year-olds. *Developmental Science*, *15*(5), 697–713. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2012.01173.x>
- Creel, S. C. (2014a). Preschoolers' flexible use of talker information during word learning. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *73*, 81-98.
- Creel, S. C. (2014b). Impossible to ignore: Word-form inconsistency slows preschool children's word-learning. *Language Learning and Development*, *10*(1), 68–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2013.803871>
- Creel, S. C. (2018). Accent detection and social cognition: Evidence of protracted learning. *Developmental Science*, *21*(2), e12524. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12524>
- Creel, S. C., & Quam, C. (2015). Apples and oranges: Developmental discontinuities in spoken-language processing? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *19*, 713-716.
- Creel, S. C., & Tumlin, M. A. (2011). On-line acoustic and semantic interpretation of talker information. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *65*(3), 264-285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2011.06.005>
- Creel, S. C., Aslin, R. N., & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2008). Heeding the voice of experience: The role of talker variation in lexical access. *Cognition*, *106*, 633-664.
- Cristià, A., Minagawa-Kawai, Y., Egorova, N., Gervain, J., Filippin, L., Cabrol, D., & Dupoux, E. (2014). Neural correlates of infant accent discrimination: An fNIRS study. *Developmental Science*, *17*(4), 628–635. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12160>
- DeGraff, M. (2005). Linguists' most dangerous myth: The fallacy of Creole Exceptionalism. *Language in Society*, *34*, 533-591.
- DeGraff, M. (2018). Linguistics' role in the right to education. *Science*, *360*(6388), 502.

- Dudley-Marling, C., & Lucas, K. (2009). Pathologizing the language and culture of poor children. *Language Arts*, 86, 362-370.
- Durrant, S., Delle Luche, C., Cattani, A., & Floccia, C. (2014). Monodialectal and multidialectal infants' representation of familiar words. *Journal of Child Language*, 42, 447-465. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000914000063>
- Earle, F. S., & Quam, C. (Eds.) (expected 2021). Perceptual flexibility for speech: What are the pros and cons? *Brain and Language*.
- Eckert, P. (2008). Where do ethnolects stop? *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 12(1-2), 25-42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069080120010301>
- Eimas, P. D., Siqueland, E. R., Jusczyk, P., and Vigorito, J. (1971). Speech perception in infants. *Science*, 171, 303-306.
- Elman, J. L., & McClelland, J. L. (1986). Exploiting lawful variability in the speech wave. In J. S. Perkell & D. H. Klatt (Eds.), *Invariance and variability in speech processes* (pp. 360-385). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Farrington, C. (2018). Incomplete Neutralization in African American English: The case of final consonant voicing. *Language Variation and Change*, 30, 361-383.
- Flege, J. E., Bohn, O.-S., & Jang, S. (1997). Effects of experience on non-native speakers' production and perception of English vowels. *Journal of Phonetics*, 25(4), 437-470. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jpho.1997.0052>
- Floccia, C., Butler, J., Girard, F., & Goslin, J. (2009). Categorization of regional and foreign accent in 5- to 7-year-old British children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 33(4), 366-375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025409103871>
- Floccia, C., Delle Luche, C., Durrant, S., Butler, J., & Goslin, J. (2012). Parent or community: Where do 20-month-olds exposed to two accents acquire their representation of words? *Cognition*, 124(1), 95-100. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2012.03.011>
- Foulkes, P., Docherty, G. J., & Watt, D. (1999). Tracking the emergence of sociophonetic variation. *Proceedings of the XIVth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, 1625-1628.
- Frye, C. I., & Creel, S. C. (under review). Preschoolers learn words with speech sound variability, but do not show a consonant bias.
- Galle, M. E., Apfelbaum, K. S., & McMurray, B. (2015). The role of single talker acoustic variation in early word learning. *Language Learning and Development*, 11(1), 66-79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2014.895249>
- García, M. (1984). Parameters of the East Los Angeles speech community. In J. Ornstein-Galicia (Ed.), *Form and Function in Chicano/a English*, 85-98, Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Girard, F., Floccia, C., & Goslin, J. (2008). Perception and awareness of accents in young children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 26(3), 409-433. <https://doi.org/10.1348/026151007X251712>
- Goldinger, S. D. (1996). Words and voices: Episodic traces in spoken word identification and recognition memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, & Cognition*, 22(5), 1166-1183.
- Goldinger, S. D. (1998). Echoes of echoes? An episodic theory of lexical access. *Psychological Review*, 105, 251-279.
- Gonzales, K., Gerken, L.A., & Gómez, R. (2018). How who is talking matters as much as what they say to infant language learners. *Cognitive Psychology*, 106, 1-20.

- Goudbeek, M., Swingley, D., & Smits, R. (2009). Supervised and Unsupervised Learning of Multidimensional Acoustic Categories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 35(6), 1913–1933. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015781>
- Graham, Daniel W. (2019). Heraclitus. In Edward N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2019 Edition), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2019/entries/heraclitus/>.
- Guerrero, Jr., A. (2014). ‘You Speak Good English for Being Mexican’: East Los Angeles Chicano/a English: Language & Identity. *Voices*, 2(1), 53-62. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/94v4c08k>
- Hazan, V., & Barrett, S. (2000). The development of phonemic categorization in children aged 6–12. *Journal of Phonetics*, 28(4), 377–396. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jpho.2000.0121>
- Heald, S. L. M., & Nusbaum, H. C. (2015). Variability in vowel production within and between days. *PLoS ONE*, 10(9): e0136791.
- Heinrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, 1-75.
- Höhle, B., Fritzsche, T., Meß, K., Phillip, M., & Gafos, A. (2020). Only the right noise? Effects of phonetic and visual input variability on 14-month-olds’ minimal pair word learning. *Developmental Science*, e12950. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12950>
- Holkup, P. A., Tripp-Reimer, T., Salois, E. M., & Weinert, C. (2004). Community-based participatory research: An approach to intervention research with a Native American community. *ANS Adv. Nurs. Sci.*, 27, 162-175.
- Holt, R. F., & Bent, T. (2017). Children’s Use of Semantic Context in Perception of Foreign-Accented Speech. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research*, 60(January), 223–231. DOI: 10.1044/2016\_jslhr-h-16-0014
- Holt, Y. F. (2018). Mechanisms of Vowel Variation in African American English. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 61, 197-209.
- Holt, Y. F., & Ranganathan, B. (2018). F<sub>0</sub> declination and reset in read speech of African American and White American women. *Speech Communication*, 97, 43-50.
- Holt, Y. F., Jacewicz, E., & Fox, R. A. (2016). Temporal variation in African American English: The distinctive use of vowel duration. *Journal of Phonetics & Audiology*, 2(2), 1000121. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2471-9455.1000121>
- Holt, Y. F., Jacewicz, E., and Fox, R. A. (2015). Variation in vowel duration among Southern African American English speakers. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 24, 460-469.
- Houston, D. M., & Jusczyk, P. W. (2000). The role of talker-specific information in word segmentation by infants. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 26, 1570–1582.
- Houston, D. M., & Jusczyk, P. W. (2003). Infants’ long-term memory for the sound patterns of words and voices. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 29, 1143–1154.
- Idemaru, K., & Holt, L. L. (2011). Word recognition reflects dimension-based statistical learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 37(6), 1939–1956. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025641>

- Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (2001). Community-based participatory research: Policy recommendations for promoting a partnership approach in health research. *Education for Health, 14*, 182-197.
- Johnson K., Ladefoged P., & Lindau M. (1993). Individual differences in vowel production. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 94*(2), 701-714.
- Johnson, K. (1997). Speech perception without speaker normalization: An exemplar model. In K. Johnson & J. W. Mullennix (Eds.), *Talker Variability in Speech Processing* (pp. 145–165). Academic Press.
- Jones, Z., Yan, Q., Wagner, L., & Clopper, C. G. (2017). The development of dialect classification across the lifespan. *Journal of Phonetics, 60*, 20–37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2016.11.001>
- Jusczyk, P. W. (1993). From general to language-specific capacities: The WRAPSA model of how speech perception develops. *Journal of Phonetics, 21*, 3–28.
- Jusczyk, P. W., Pisoni, D. B., Walley, A. C., and Murray, J. (1980). Discrimination of relative onset time of two-component tones by infants. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 67*, 262–270.
- Jusczyk, P.W., Pisoni, D.B., & Mullennix, J. (1992). Some consequences of stimulus variability on speech processing by 2-month-old infants. *Cognition, 43*(3), 253-291. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(92\)90014-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(92)90014-9)
- Kang, O., & Rubin, D. L. (2009). Reverse linguistic stereotyping: Measuring the effect of listener expectations on speech evaluation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 28*(4), 441-456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X09341950>
- Kang, O., Rubin, D. L., & Lindemann, S. (2015). Mitigating U.S. undergraduates' attitudes toward international teaching assistants. *TESOL Quarterly, 49*(4), 681–706. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.192>
- Kinzler, K. D., Dupoux, E., & Spelke, E. S. (2007). The native language of social cognition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 104*(30), 12577–12580. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0705345104>
- Kitamura, C., Panneton, R., & Best, C. T. (2013). The development of language constancy: Attention to native versus nonnative accents. *Child Development, 84*(5), 1686–1700.
- Kluender, K. R., Diehl, R. L., & Killeen, P. R. (1987). Japanese quail can learn phonetic categories. *Science, 237*(4819), 1195–1197.
- Kuhl, P. K. (1981). Discrimination of speech by nonhuman animals: Basic auditory sensitivities conducive to the perception of speech-sound categories. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 70*, 340-349.
- Kuhl, P. K., & Padden, D. M. (1982). Enhanced discriminability at the phonetic boundaries for the voicing feature in macaques. *Perception and Psychophysics, 32*, 542–550.
- Kuhl, P. K., & Padden, D. M. (1983). Enhanced discriminability at the phonetic boundaries for the place feature in macaques. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 73*, 1003–1010.
- Kuhl, P. K., Conboy, B. T., Coffey-Corina, S., Padden, D., Rivera-Gaxiola, M., & Nelson, T. (2008). Phonetic learning as a pathway to language: New data and Native Language Magnet Theory, expanded (NLM-e). *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, 363*, 979-1000.

- Kuhl, P. K. (1983). Perception of auditory equivalence classes for speech in early infancy. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 6(2-3), 263-285. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383\(83\)80036-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(83)80036-8)
- Kuhl, P. K., & Miller, J.D. (1982). Discrimination of auditory target dimensions in the presence or absence of variation in a second dimension by infants. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 31(3), 279-292.
- Kuhl, P. K., Stevens, E., Hayashi, A., Deguchi, T., Kiritani, S., & Iverson, P. (2006). Infants show a facilitation effect for native language phonetic perception between 6 and 12 months. *Developmental Science*, 9(2), F13-F21.
- Lasky, R. E., Syrdal-Lasky, A., & Klein, R. E. (1975). VOT discrimination by four-to-six-and-a-half-month-old infants from Spanish environments. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 10, 215-225.
- Lebedeva, G.C., & Kuhl, P.K. (2010). Sing that tune: Infants' perception of melody and lyrics and the facilitation of phonetic recognition in songs. *Infant Behavior and Development*, (33)4, 419-430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2010.04.006>
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*: 2nd Edition. Routledge: London and New York.
- Lisker, L., & Abramson, A. S. (1964). A cross-language study of voicing in initial stops: acoustical measurements. *Word*, 20(3), 384-422.
- Marcovich, M. (1966). On Heraclitus. *Phronesis*, 11(1), 19-30.
- Maye, J., Werker, J. F., and Gerken, L. (2002). Infant sensitivity to distributional information can affect phonetic discrimination. *Cognition*, 82, B101-B111.
- McMurray, B., Danelz, A., Rigler, H., & Seedorff, M. (2018). Speech categorization develops slowly through adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 54(8), 1472-1491.
- Michaels, S. (2013). Déjà vu all over again: What's wrong with Hart & Risley and a "linguistic deficit" framework in early childhood education? *LEARNing Landscapes*, 7, 23-41.
- Moland, C. W. (2011). *Comparison of the Diagnostic Evaluation of Language Variation-Screening Test (DELV-ST) to two other screeners for low-income, African American children*. [Ph.D. Dissertation]. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Mulak, K. E., Best, C. T., Tyler, M. D., Kitamura, C., & Irwin, J. R. (2013). Development of phonological constancy: 19-month-olds, but not 15-month-olds, identify words in a non-native regional accent. *Child Development*, 84, 2064-2078. <http://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12087>
- Mulak, K.E., Bonn, C.D., K. Chládková, Aslin, R.N., Escudero, P. (2017). Indexical and linguistic processing by 12-month-olds: Discrimination of speaker, accent and vowel differences. *PLoS ONE*, 12(5), e0176762. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0176762>
- Mullennix, J. W., & Pisoni, D. B. (1990). Stimulus variability and processing dependencies in speech perception. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 47(4), 379-390. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2345691>
- Narayan, C. R., Werker, J. F., & Beddor, P. S. (2010). The interaction between acoustic salience and language experience in developmental speech perception: Evidence from nasal place discrimination. *Developmental Science*, 13, 407-420.
- Nathan, L., Wells, B., & Donlan, C. (1998). Children's comprehension of unfamiliar regional accents: a preliminary investigation. *Journal of Child Language*, 25(2), 343-365. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000998003444>

- Nazzi, T., Jusczyk, P. W., & Johnson, E. K. (2000). Language discrimination by English-learning 5-month-olds: Effects of rhythm and familiarity. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 43(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.2000.2698>
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2019). Provisional notes on decolonizing research methodology and undoing its dirty history. *Journal of Developing Societies*, 35, 481-492.
- Nittrouer, S., Lowenstein, J. H., & Packer, R. R. (2009). Children discover the spectral skeletons in their native language before the amplitude envelopes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 35(4), 1245–1253. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015020>
- Nober, E. H., & Seymour, H. N. (1974). Speech recognition scores of white and Black student-teacher listeners for Black and white first grade speakers. In *Technical report for National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.* (Issue 4).
- Nober, E. H., & Seymour, H. N. (1979). Speaker intelligibility of black and white school children for black and white adult listeners under varying listening conditions. *Language and Speech*, 22(3), 237–242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002383097902200304>
- Norris, D., McQueen, J. M., & Cutler, A. (2003). Perceptual learning in speech. *Cognitive Psychology*, 47(2), 204–238. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0285\(03\)00006-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0285(03)00006-9)
- Ohde, R. N., & Haley, K. L. (1997). Stop-consonant and vowel perception in 3- and 4-year-old children. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 102(6), 3711–3722. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9407663>
- Patel, L. (2015). *Decolonizing educational research*. New York: Routledge.
- Pater, J., Stager, C., & Werker, J. (2004). The perceptual acquisition of phonological contrasts. *Language*, 80(3), 384–402.
- Perrachione, T. K., Chiao, J. Y., & Wong, P. C. M. (2009). Asymmetric cultural effects on perceptual expertise underlie an own-race effect for voices. *Cognition*, 114, 42-55.
- Perrachione, T. K., Lee, J., Ha, L. Y., & Wong, P. C. (2011). Learning a novel phonological contrast depends on interactions between individual differences and training paradigm design. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 130, 461-472.
- Pierrehumbert, J. B. (2003). Phonetic diversity, statistical learning, and acquisition of phonology. *Language and Speech*, 46(2-3), 115–154. doi: 10.1177/00238309030460020501
- Polka, L., & Werker, J. F. (1994). Developmental changes in perception of nonnative vowel contrasts. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 20, 421–435.
- Polka, L., Colantonio, C., & Sundara, M. (2001). A cross-language comparison of /d/-/ð/ perception: Evidence for a new developmental pattern. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 109(5), 2190–2201. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1362689>
- Quam, C., & Creel, S. C. (2017). Mandarin-English bilinguals process lexical tones in newly learned words in accordance with the language context. *PLOS-One*, 12, e0169001. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0169001.
- Quam, C., & Swingle, D. (2007, November). Phonological knowledge trumps salient local regularity in 2-year-olds' word learning. *Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 32 (poster).
- Quam, C., & Swingle, D. (2010). Phonological knowledge guides 2-year-olds' and adults' interpretation of salient pitch contours in word learning. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 62, 135-150.

- Quam, C., & Swingley, D. (in preparation). A protracted developmental trajectory for detection of consonant mispronunciations in newly learned words.
- Quam, C., & Swingley, D. (in preparation). English-learning children's processing of salient phonetic distinctions varying in phonological relevance for word identity.
- Quam, C., Clough, L., Knight, S., & Gerken, L.A. (2020). Does variability impact infants' sound discrimination? *Infancy*. 2020;00:1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/infa.12371>
- Quam, C., Knight, S., and Gerken, L.A. (2017). The distribution of talker variability impacts infants' word learning. *Laboratory Phonology: Journal of the Association for Laboratory Phonology*, 8, 1–27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/labphon.25>
- Richtsmeier, P., Gerken, L.A., & Ohala, D. (2011). Contributions of phonetic token variability and word-type frequency to phonological representations. *Journal of Child Language*, 38, 951-978.
- Richtsmeier, P., Gerken, L.A., Goffman, L., & Hogan, T. (2009). Statistical frequency in perception affects children's lexical production. *Cognition*, 111, 372-377.
- Rost, G. C., & McMurray, B. (2009). Speaker variability augments phonological processing in early word learning. *Developmental Science*, 12(2), 339–349. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7687.2008.00786.x
- Sadakata, M., & McQueen, J. M. (2014). Individual aptitude in Mandarin lexical tone perception predicts effectiveness of high-variability training. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 1318.
- Santa Ana, O., and Bayley, R. (2008). Chicano English: Phonology. In E. Schneider (Ed.), *Varieties of English, Vol. 2: The Americas and the Caribbean*, 219–238. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Schmale, R., & Seidl, A. (2009). Accommodating variability in voice and foreign accent: Flexibility of early word representations. *Developmental Science*, 12(4), 583–601. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00809.x>
- Schmale, R., Cristià, A., & Seidl, A. (2012). Toddlers recognize words in an unfamiliar accent after brief exposure. *Developmental Science*, 15(6), 732–738. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2012.01175.x>
- Schmale, R., Cristià, A., Seidl, A., & Johnson, E. K. (2010). Developmental changes in infants' ability to cope with dialect variation in word recognition. *Infancy*, 15(6), 650–662. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7078.2010.00032.x>
- Schmale, R., Hollich, G., & Seidl, A. (2011). Contending with foreign accent in early word learning. *Journal of Child Language*, 38(5), 1096–108. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000910000619>
- Schötz S., & Müller C. (2007). A study of acoustic correlates of speaker age. In Müller C. (Ed), *Speaker Classification II. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 4441. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74122-0\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74122-0_1)
- Segbroeck, M. V., Travadi, R., Vaz, C., Kim, J., Black, M. P., Potamianos, A. & Narayanan, S. S. (2014). Classification of cognitive load from speech using an i-vector framework. In H. Li, H. M. Meng, B. Ma, E. Chng & L. Xie (Eds.), In the 15<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the International Speech Communication Association (pp. 751-755).
- Seidl, A., Cristià, A., Bernard, A., & Onishi, K. H. (2009). Allophones and phonemes in infants' learning of sound patterns. *Language Learning and Development*, 5, 191–202.
- Seidl, A., Onishi, K. H., & Cristia, A. (2014). Talker variation aids young infants' phonotactic learning. *Language Learning and Development*, 10, 297–307.

- Singh, L. (2008). Influences of high and low variability on infant word recognition. *Cognition*, *106*, 833–870.
- Singh, L., Morgan, J. L., & White, K. S. (2004). Preference and processing: The role of speech affect in early spoken word recognition. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *51*, 173–189.
- Singh, L., White, K. S., & Morgan, J. L. (2008). Building a word-form lexicon in the face of variable input: Influences of pitch and amplitude on early spoken word recognition. *Language Learning and Development*, *4*, 157-178.
- Smith, C. L. (1997). The devoicing of /z/ in American English: Effects of local and prosodic context. *Journal of Phonetics*, *25*(4), 471–500. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jpho.1997.0053>
- Sommers, M. S., & Barcroft, J. (2013). Effects of Referent Token Variability on L2 Vocabulary Learning. *Language Learning*, *63*(2), 186–210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12007>
- Sperry, D. E., Sperry, L. L., & Miller, P. J. (2019). Reexamining the verbal environments of children from different socioeconomic backgrounds. *Child Development*, *90*, 1303-1318.
- Stager, C. L., and Werker, J. F. (1997). Infants listen for more phonetic detail in speech perception than in word-learning tasks. *Nature*, *388*(6640), 381–382.
- Sumner, M. (2015). The social weight of spoken words. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *19*(5), 238–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.03.007>
- Sumner, M., and Samuel, A. G. (2005). Perception and representation of regular variation: The case of final /t/. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *52*, 322–338. [doi:10.1016/j.jml.2004.11.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2004.11.004)
- Sumner, M., Kyung Kim, S., King, E., and McGowan, K. B. (2014). The socially weighted encoding of spoken words: a dual-route approach to speech perception. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *4*, 1015.
- Sundara, M., Ngon, C., Skoruppa, K., Feldman, N. H., Onario, G. M., Morgan, J. L., & Peperkamp, S. (2018). Young infants’ discrimination of subtle phonetic contrasts. *Cognition*, *178*, 57-66.
- Swingle, D. (2016). Two-year-olds interpret novel phonological neighbors as familiar words. *Developmental Psychology*, *52*(7), 1011–1023.
- Swingle, D. and Aslin, R. N. (2000). Lexical neighborhoods and the word-form representations of 14-month-olds. *Psychological Science*, *13*(5), 480–484.
- Swingle, D. and Aslin, R. N. (2002). Spoken word recognition and lexical representation in very young children. *Cognition*, *76*, 147–166.
- Teinonen, T., Aslin, R.N., Alku, P., & Csibra, G. (2008). Visual speech contributes to phonetic learning in 6-month-old infants. *Cognition*, *108*(3), 850-855. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2008.05.009>
- Thomas, E. R. (2007). Phonological and phonetic characteristics of African American Vernacular English. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *1*(5), 450–475. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818x.2007.00029.x>
- Thompson, C. A., Craig, H. K., & Washington, J. A. (2004). Variable production of African American English across oracy and literacy contexts. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, *35*, 269-282.
- Trehub, S. E. (1976). The discrimination of foreign speech contrasts by infants and adults. *Child Development*, *47*, 466–472.

- Vallabha, G. K., McClelland, J. L., Pons, F., Werker, J. F., & Amano, S. (2007). Unsupervised learning of vowel categories from infant-directed speech. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *104*(33), 13273–13278. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0705369104>
- van der Feest, S. V. H., & Johnson, E. K. (2016). Input-driven differences in toddlers' perception of a disappearing phonological contrast. *Language Acquisition*, *23*, 89–111.
- van Heugten, M., & Johnson, E. K. (2012). Infants exposed to fluent natural speech succeed at cross-gender word recognition. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *55*(2), 554–560. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2011/10-0347\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2011/10-0347))
- van Heugten, M., & Johnson, E. K. (2014). Learning to contend with accents in infancy: Benefits of brief speaker exposure. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *143*(1), 340–350. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032192>
- van Heugten, M., Krieger, D. R., & Johnson, E. K. (2015). The developmental trajectory of toddlers' comprehension of unfamiliar regional accents. *Language Learning and Development*, *11*, 41–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2013.879636>
- Washington, J. A. and Craig, H. K. (1994). Dialectal forms during discourse of poor urban African American preschoolers. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, *37*, 816-823.
- Washington, J. A., & Craig, H. K. (2000). Reading performance and dialectal variation. In J. L. Harris et al. (Eds.), *Literacy in African American Communities*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Weatherhead, D., & White, K. S. (2016). He says potato, she says potahto: Young infants track talker-specific accents. *Language Learning and Development*, *12*, 92-103.
- Werker, J. F. and Curtin, S. (2005). PRIMIR: A developmental framework of infant speech processing. *Language Learning and Development*, *1*(2), 197–234.
- Werker, J. F., & Tees, R. C. (1984). Cross-language speech perception: Evidence for perceptual reorganization during the first year of life. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *7*, 49–63.
- Werker, J. F., Cohen, L. B., Lloyd, V. L., Casasola, M., & Stager, C. L. (1998). Acquisition of word-object associations by 14-month-old infants. *Developmental Psychology*, *34*(6), 1289–1309.
- Werker, J. F., Fennell, C. T., Corcoran, K. M., & Stager, C. L. (2002). Infants' ability to learn phonetically similar words: Effects of age and vocabulary size. *Infancy*, *3*, 1–30.
- White, J., & Sundara, M. (2014). Biased generalization of newly learned phonological alternations by 12-month-old infants. *Cognition*, *133*(1), 85–90. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2014.05.020>
- White, K. S., & Aslin, R. N. (2011). Adaptation to novel accents by toddlers. *Developmental Science*, *14*(2), 372-384.
- White, K. S., & Morgan, J. L. (2008). Sub-segmental detail in early lexical representations. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *59*(1), 114–132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2008.03.001>
- White, K. S., Peperkamp, S., Kirk, C., & Morgan, J. L. (2008). Rapid acquisition of phonological alternations by infants. *Cognition*, *107*(1), 238–65. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.11.012>
- Wolfram, W. (2007). Sociolinguistic folklore in the study of African American English. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *1*(4), 292–313.
- Yap, T. F., Epps, J., Choi, E. H., & Ambikairajah, E. (2010). Glottal features for speech-based cognitive load classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Acoustic, Speech and Signal Processing*, 5234-5237.

- Yu, B. (2013). Issues in bilingualism and heritage language maintenance: Perspectives of minority-language mothers of children with autism spectrum disorders. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 22(1), 10-24.
- #ShutDownAcademia #ShutDownSTEM. (2020, June 10). www.shutdownstem.com
- Allen, J. S., & Miller, J. L. (2004). Listener sensitivity to individual talker differences in voice-onset time. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 115(6), 3171-3183. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1701898>
- Antoniou, M., & Wong, P. C. M. (2016). Varying irrelevant phonetic features hinders learning of the feature being trained. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 139, 271-278.
- Apfelbaum, K. S., & McMurray, B. (2011). Using variability to guide dimensional weighting: Associative mechanisms in early word learning. *Cognitive Science*, 35, 1105-1138. doi: 10.1111/j.1551-6709.2011.01181.x
- Apfelbaum, K. S., Hazeltine, E., & McMurray, B. (2013). Statistical learning in reading: Variability in irrelevant letters helps children learn phonics skills. *Developmental Psychology*, 49(7), 1348-1365. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029839>
- Avineri, N., Johnson, E., Brice-Heath, S., McCarty, T., Ochs, E., Kremer-Sadlik, T., Blum, S., Zentella, A. C., Rosa, J., Flores, N., Alim, H. S., & Paris, D. (2015). Invited forum: Bridging the “language gap.” *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 25, 66-86.
- Baese-Berk, M. (2018). Perceptual learning for native and non-native speech. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 68, 1-29.
- Baran, J., & Seymour, H. N. (1976). The influence of three phonological rules of Black English on the discrimination of minimal word pairs. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 19, 467-474.
- Barcroft, J., and Sommers, M. S. (2005). Effects of acoustic variability on second language vocabulary learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 387-414.
- Barker, B. A., & Newman, R. S. (2004). Listen to your mother! The role of talker familiarity in infant streaming. *Cognition*, 94(2), 45-53. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2004.06.001>
- Barriuso, T. A., & Hayes-Harb, R. (2018). High-Variability Phonetic Training as a Bridge From Research to Practice. *The CATESOL Journal*, 30, 177.
- Barton, D. (1976). Phonemic discrimination and the knowledge of words in children under 3 years. *Papers and Reports on Child Language Development*, 11, 1-9.
- Baugh, J. (2017). Meaning-less differences: Exposing fallacies and flaws in “the word gap” hypothesis that conceal a dangerous “language trap” for low-income American families and their children. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 11, 39-51.
- Benitez, V. L., Bulgarelli, F., Byers-Heinlein, K., Saffran, J. R., & Weiss, D. J. (2020). Statistical learning of multiple speech streams: A challenge for monolingual infants. *Developmental Science*, 23(2), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12896>
- Bent, T. (2014). Children’s perception of foreign-accented words. *Journal of Child Language*, 41(6), 1334-1355. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000913000457>
- Bent, T., & Atagi, E. (2015). Children’s perception of nonnative-accented sentences in noise and quiet. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 138(6), 3985-3993. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4938228>

- Bent, T., & Atagi, E. (2017). Perception of nonnative-accented sentences by 5- to 8-year-olds and adults: The role of phonological processing skills. *Language and Speech, 60*(1), 110–122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0023830916645374>
- Bent, T., & Holt, R. F. (2018). Shhh... I Need Quiet! Children's Understanding of American, British, and Japanese-accented English Speakers. *Language and Speech, 61*(4), 657–673. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0023830918754598>
- Bernier, D. E., & White, K. S. (2019). Toddlers process common and infrequent childhood mispronunciations differently for child and adult speakers. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 62*, 4137–4149.
- Best, C. T. (1994). The emergence of native-language phonological influences in infants: A perceptual assimilation model. In J. C. Goodman and H. C. Nusbaum (Eds.), *The Development of Speech Perception*, 167–224, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Best, C. T., Tyler, M. D., Gooding, T. N., Orlando, C. B., & Quann, C. A. (2009). Development of phonological constancy: Toddlers' perception of native- and Jamaican-accented words. *Psychological Science, 20*(5), 539–42. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02327.x>
- Bialystok, E. (2007). Cognitive effects of bilingualism: How linguistic experience leads to cognitive change. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 10*, 210–223.
- Bradlow, A. R., & Bent, T. (2008). Perceptual adaptation to non-native speech. *Cognition, 106*(2), 707–729. doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2007.04.005
- Buckler, H., Oezak-Arsic, S., Siddiqui, N., & Johnson, E. K. (2017). Input matters: Speed of word recognition in 2-year-olds exposed to multiple accents. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 164*, 87–100. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2017.06.017>
- Butler, J., Floecia, C., Goslin, J., & Panneton, R. (2011). Infants' discrimination of familiar and unfamiliar accents in speech. *Infancy, 16*(4), 392–417. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7078.2010.00050.x>
- Chang, C. B., & Bowles, A. R. (2015). Context effects on second-language learning of tonal contrasts. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 136*(6), 3703–3716.
- Chen, S. (2020, June 9). Researchers around the world prepare to #ShutDownSTEM and 'Strike For Black Lives.' Science. [www.sciencemag.org/news/2020/06/researchers-around-world-prepare-shutdownstem-and-strike-black-lives#](http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2020/06/researchers-around-world-prepare-shutdownstem-and-strike-black-lives#)
- Chong, A. J., & Sundara, M. (2015). 18-month-olds compensate for a phonological alternation. In Grillo, E., & Jepson, K. (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 39<sup>th</sup> Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 113–126.
- Clarke, C. M., & Garrett, M. F. (2004). Rapid adaptation to foreign-accented English. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 116*(6), 3647–3658. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1815131>
- Cole, M. (2013). Differences and deficits in psychological research in historical perspective: A commentary on the special section. *Developmental Psychology, 49*, 84–91.
- Craig, H. K., & Washington, J. A. (2004). Grade-related changes in the production of African American English. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 47*, 450–463.
- Craig, H. K., Thompson, C. A., Washington, J. A., & Potter, S. L. (2003). Phonological features of child African American English. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 46*, 623–635.

- Creel, S. C. (2012). Phonological similarity and mutual exclusivity: on-line recognition of atypical pronunciations in 3-5-year-olds. *Developmental Science, 15*(5), 697–713. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2012.01173.x>
- Creel, S. C. (2014a). Preschoolers' flexible use of talker information during word learning. *Journal of Memory and Language, 73*, 81–98.
- Creel, S. C. (2014b). Impossible to ignore: Word form inconsistency slows preschool children's word learning. *Language Learning and Development, 10*(1), 68–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2013.803871>
- Creel, S. C. (2018). Accent detection and social cognition: Evidence of protracted learning. *Developmental Science, 21*(2), e12524. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12524>
- Creel, S. C., & Quam, C. (2015). Apples and oranges: Developmental discontinuities in spoken language processing? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 19*, 713–716.
- Creel, S. C., & Tumlin, M. A. (2011). On-line acoustic and semantic interpretation of talker information. *Journal of Memory and Language, 65*(3), 264–285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2011.06.005>
- Creel, S. C., Aslin, R. N., & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2008). Heeding the voice of experience: The role of talker variation in lexical access. *Cognition, 106*, 633–664.
- Cristià, A., Minagawa-Kawai, Y., Egorova, N., Gervain, J., Filippin, L., Cabrol, D., & Dupoux, E. (2014). Neural correlates of infant accent discrimination: An fNIRS study. *Developmental Science, 17*(4), 628–635. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12160>
- DeGraff, M. (2005). Linguists' most dangerous myth: The fallacy of Creole Exceptionalism. *Language in Society, 34*, 533–591.
- DeGraff, M. (2018). Linguistics' role in the right to education. *Science, 360*(6388), 502.
- Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (1997). Accent, Intelligibility, and Comprehensibility: Evidence from Four L1s. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20*, 1–16.
- Dudley-Marling, C., & Lucas, K. (2009). Pathologizing the language and culture of poor children. *Language Arts, 86*, 362–370.
- Durrant, S., Delle Luche, C., Cattani, A., & Floccia, C. (2014). Monodialectal and multidialectal infants' representation of familiar words. *Journal of Child Language, 42*, 447–465. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000914000063>
- Earle, F. S., & Quam, C. (Eds.) (expected 2021). Perceptual flexibility for speech: What are the pros and cons? *Brain and Language*.
- Eckert, P. (2008). Where do ethnolects stop? *International Journal of Bilingualism, 12*(1–2), 25–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069080120010301>
- Eimas, P. D., Siqueland, E. R., Jusczyk, P., and Vigorito, J. (1971). Speech perception in infants. *Science, 171*, 303–306.
- Farrington, C. (2018). Incomplete Neutralization in African American English: The case of final consonant voicing. *Language Variation and Change, 30*, 361–383.
- Feldman, N. H., Myers, E. B., White, K. S., Griffiths, T. L., & Morgan, J. L. (2013). Word-level information influences phonetic learning in adults and infants. *Cognition, 127*(3), 427–438. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2013.02.007>
- Flege, J. E., Bohn, O. S., & Jang, S. (1997). Effects of experience on non-native speakers' production and perception of English vowels. *Journal of Phonetics, 25*(4), 437–470. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jpho.1997.0052>

- Floccia, C., Butler, J., Girard, F., & Goslin, J. (2009). Categorization of regional and foreign accent in 5- to 7-year-old British children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 33*(4), 366–375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025409103871>
- Floccia, C., Delle Luche, C., Durrant, S., Butler, J., & Goslin, J. (2012). Parent or community: Where do 20-month-olds exposed to two accents acquire their representation of words? *Cognition, 124*(1), 95–100. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2012.03.011>
- Foulkes, P., Docherty, G. J., & Watt, D. (1999). Tracking the emergence of sociophonetic variation. *Proceedings of the XIVth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, 1625–1628*.
- Frye, C. I., & Creel, S. C. (Manuscript in preparation). Preschoolers learn words with speech sound variability, but do not show a consonant bias.
- Galle, M. E., Apfelbaum, K. S., & McMurray, B. (2015). The role of single talker acoustic variation in early word learning. *Language Learning and Development, 11*(1), 66–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2014.895249>
- García, M. (1984). Parameters of the East Los Angeles speech community. In J. Ornstein-Galicia (Ed.), *Form and Function in Chicano/a English*, 85–98, Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Girard, F., Floccia, C., & Goslin, J. (2008). Perception and awareness of accents in young children. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 26*(3), 409–433. <https://doi.org/10.1348/026151007X251712>
- Goldinger, S. D. (1996). Words and voices: Episodic traces in spoken word identification and recognition memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, & Cognition, 22*(5), 1166–1183.
- Goldinger, S. D. (1998). Echoes of echoes? An episodic theory of lexical access. *Psychological Review, 105*, 251–279.
- Gómez, R. L. (2002). Variability and detection of invariant structure. *Psychological Science, 13*, 431–436. doi: 10.1111/1467-9280.00476
- Gonzales, K., Gerken, L.A., & Gómez, R. (2018). How who is talking matters as much as what they say to infant language learners. *Cognitive Psychology, 106*, 1–20.
- Goudbeek, M., Swingle, D., & Smits, R. (2009). Supervised and Unsupervised Learning of Multidimensional Acoustic Categories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 35*(6), 1913–1933. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015781>
- Graham, Daniel W. (2019). Heraclitus. In Edward N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2019 Edition), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2019/entries/heraclitus/>.
- Grunow, H., Spaulding, T. J., Gómez, R. L., & Plante, E. (2006). The effects of variation on learning word order rules by adults with and without language-based learning disabilities. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 39*, 158–170.
- Guerrero, Jr., A. (2014). ‘You Speak Good English for Being Mexican’: East Los Angeles Chicano/a English: Language & Identity. *Voices, 2*(1), 53–62. Retrieved from <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/94v4e08k>
- Hazan, V., & Barrett, S. (2000). The development of phonemic categorization in children aged 6–12. *Journal of Phonetics, 28*(4), 377–396. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jpho.2000.0121>
- Höhle, B., Fritzsche, T., Meß, K., Phillip, M., & Gafos, A. (2020). Only the right noise? Effects of phonetic and visual input variability on 14-month-olds’ minimal pair word learning. *Developmental Science, e12950*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12950>

- Holkup, P. A., Tripp-Reimer, T., Salois, E. M., & Weinert, C. (2004). Community-based participatory research: An approach to intervention research with a Native American community. *ANS Adv. Nurs. Sci.*, *27*, 162-175.
- Holt, R. F., & Bent, T. (2017). Children's Use of Semantic Context in Perception of Foreign-Accented Speech. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research*, *60*(January), 223-231. DOI: 10.1044/2016\_jslhr-h-16-0014
- Holt, Y. F. (2018). Mechanisms of Vowel Variation in African American English. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *61*, 197-209.
- Holt, Y. F., & Ranganathan, B. (2018). F<sub>0</sub> declination and reset in read speech of African American and White American women. *Speech Communication*, *97*, 43-50.
- Holt, Y. F., Jacewicz, E., & Fox, R. A. (2016). Temporal variation in African American English: The distinctive use of vowel duration. *Journal of Phonetics & Audiology*, *2*(2), 1000121. <https://doi.org/10.4172/2471-9455.1000121>
- Holt, Y. F., Jacewicz, E., and Fox, R. A. (2015). Variation in vowel duration among Southern African American English speakers. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *24*, 460-469.
- Houston, D. M., & Jusczyk, P. W. (2000). The role of talker-specific information in word segmentation by infants. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *26*, 1570-1582.
- Houston, D. M., & Jusczyk, P. W. (2003). Infants' long-term memory for the sound patterns of words and voices. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, *29*, 1143-1154.
- Hudson Kam, C. L., & Newport, E. L. (2005). Regularizing unpredictable variation: The roles of adult and child learners in language formation and change. *Language Learning and Development*, *1*, 151-195.
- Hudson Kam, C. L., & Newport, E. L. (2009). Getting it right by getting it wrong: When learners change languages. *Cognitive Psychology*, *59*, 30-66.
- Idemaru, K., & Holt, L. L. (2011). Word recognition reflects dimension-based statistical learning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, *37*(6), 1939-1956. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025641>
- Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (2001). Community-based participatory research: Policy recommendations for promoting a partnership approach in health research. *Education for Health*, *14*, 182-197.
- Johnson, E. K., & White, K. S. (2019). Developmental sociolinguistics: Children's acquisition of language variation. *WIREs Cognitive Science*, *11*, e1515.
- Johnson, K. (1997). Speech perception without speaker normalization: An exemplar model. In K. Johnson & J. W. Mullennix (Eds.), *Talker Variability in Speech Processing* (pp. 145-165). Academic Press.
- Jones, Z., Yan, Q., Wagner, L., & Clopper, C. G. (2017). The development of dialect classification across the lifespan. *Journal of Phonetics*, *60*, 20-37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.woen.2016.11.001>
- Jusczyk, P. W. (1993). From general to language-specific capacities: The WRAPSA model of how speech perception develops. *Journal of Phonetics*, *21*, 3-28.

- Jusczyk, P. W., Pisoni, D. B., Walley, A. C., and Murray, J. (1980). Discrimination of relative onset time of two component tones by infants. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *67*, 262–270.
- Jusczyk, P.W., Pisoni, D.B., & Mullennix, J. (1992). Some consequences of stimulus variability on speech processing by 2-month-old infants. *Cognition*, *43*(3), 253–291. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(92\)90014-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(92)90014-9)
- Kamide, Y. (2012). Learning individual talkers' structural preferences. *Cognition*, *124*(1), 66–71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2012.03.001>
- Kang, O., & Rubin, D. L. (2009). Reverse linguistic stereotyping: Measuring the effect of listener expectations on speech evaluation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *28*(4), 441–456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X09341950>
- Kang, O., Rubin, D. L., & Lindemann, S. (2015). Mitigating U.S. undergraduates' attitudes toward international teaching assistants. *TESOL Quarterly*, *49*(4), 681–706. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.192>
- Kinzler, K. D., Dupoux, E., & Spelke, E. S. (2007). The native language of social cognition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *104*(30), 12577–12580. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0705345104>
- Kitamura, C., Panneton, R., & Best, C. T. (2013). The development of language constancy: Attention to native versus nonnative accents. *Child Development*, *84*(5), 1686–1700.
- Kluender, K. R., Diehl, R. L., & Killeen, P. R. (1987). Japanese quail can learn phonetic categories. *Science*, *237*(4819), 1195–1197.
- Krueger, B. I., Storkel, H. L., & Minai, U. (2018). The Influence of Misarticulations on Children's Word Identification and Processing. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research*, *61*, 820–836. [https://doi.org/10.1044/2017\\_JSLHR-S16-0379](https://doi.org/10.1044/2017_JSLHR-S16-0379)
- Kuhl, P. K. (1981). Discrimination of speech by nonhuman animals: Basic auditory sensitivities conducive to the perception of speech sound categories. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *70*, 340–349.
- Kuhl, P. K. and Padden, D. M. (1982). Enhanced discriminability at the phonetic boundaries for the voicing feature in macaques. *Perception and Psychophysics*, *32*, 542–550.
- Kuhl, P. K. and Padden, D. M. (1983). Enhanced discriminability at the phonetic boundaries for the place feature in macaques. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *73*, 1003–1010.
- Kuhl, P. K., Conboy, B. T., Coffey-Corina, S., Padden, D., Rivera-Gaxiola, M., & Nelson, T. (2008). Phonetic learning as a pathway to language: New data and Native Language Magnet Theory, expanded (NLM-e). *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, *363*, 979–1000.
- Kuhl, P.K. (1983). Perception of auditory equivalence classes for speech in early infancy. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *6*(2-3), 263–285. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383\(83\)80036-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(83)80036-8)
- Kuhl, P.K., & Miller, J.D. (1982). Discrimination of auditory target dimensions in the presence or absence of variation in a second dimension by infants. *Perception & Psychophysics*, *31*(3), 279–292. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03202536>
- Lasky, R. E., Syrdal-Lasky, A., & Klein, R. E. (1975). VOT discrimination by four-to-six-and-a-half-month-old infants from Spanish environments. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *10*, 215–225.

- Lebedeva, G.C., & Kuhl, P.K. (2010). Sing that tune: Infants' perception of melody and lyrics and the facilitation of phonetic recognition in songs. *Infant Behavior and Development*, (33)4, 419–430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2010.04.006>
- Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*: 2nd Edition. Routledge: London and New York.
- Lisker, L., & Abramson, A. S. (1964). A cross-language study of voicing in initial stops: acoustical measurements. *Word*, 20(3), 384–422.
- Lively, S. E., Logan, J. S., & Pisoni, D. B. (1993). Training Japanese listeners to identify English /t/ and /t̬/. II: The role of phonetic environment and talker variability in learning new perceptual categories. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 94, 1242–1255.
- Magnuson, J. S., & Nusbaum, H. C. (2007). Acoustic differences, listener expectations, and the perceptual accommodation of talker variability. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 33(2), 391–409. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.33.2.391>.
- Mareovich, M. (1966). On Heraclitus. *Phronesis*, 11(1), 19–30.
- Maye, J., Werker, J. F., and Gerken, L. (2002). Infant sensitivity to distributional information can affect phonetic discrimination. *Cognition*, 82, B101–B111.
- McMurray, B., Danelz, A., Rigler, H., & Seedorff, M. (2018). Speech categorization develops slowly through adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, 54(8), 1472–1491.
- Michaels, S. (2013). Déjà vu all over again: What's wrong with Hart & Risley and a “linguistic deficit” framework in early childhood education? *LEARNing Landscapes*, 7, 23–41.
- Miller, K. (2013). Acquisition of variable rules: /s/ lenition in the speech of Chilean Spanish-speaking children and their caregivers. *Language Variation and Change*, 25(3), 311–340. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S095439451300015X>
- Miller, K. L., & Schmitt, C. (2012). Variable input and the acquisition of plural morphology. *Language Acquisition*, 19(3), 223–261. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10489223.2012.685026>
- Moland, C. W. (2011). *Comparison of the Diagnostic Evaluation of Language Variation-Screening Test (DELV-ST) to two other screeners for low-income, African American children*. [Ph.D. Dissertation]. Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Mulak, K. E., Best, C. T., Tyler, M. D., Kitamura, C., & Irwin, J. R. (2013). Development of phonological constancy: 19-month-olds, but not 15-month-olds, identify words in a non-native regional accent. *Child Development*, 84, 2064–2078. <http://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12087>
- Mulak, K.E., Bonn, C.D., K. Chládková, Aslin, R.N., Escudero, P. (2017). Indexical and linguistic processing by 12-month-olds: Discrimination of speaker, accent and vowel differences. *PLoS ONE*, 12(5), e0176762. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0176762>
- Mullennix, J. W., & Pisoni, D. B. (1990). Stimulus variability and processing dependencies in speech perception. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 47(4), 379–390. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2345694>
- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1995). Foreign accent, comprehensibility, and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners. *Language Learning*, 45(1), 73–97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1995.tb00963.x>
- Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (1995). Processing time, accent, and comprehensibility in the perception of native and foreign-accented speech. *Language and Speech*, 38(3), 289–306.

- Narayan, C. R., Werker, J. F., & Beddor, P. S. (2010). The interaction between acoustic salience and language experience in developmental speech perception: Evidence from nasal place discrimination. *Developmental Science, 13*, 407–420.
- Nathan, L., Wells, B., & Donlan, C. (1998). Children's comprehension of unfamiliar regional accents: a preliminary investigation. *Journal of Child Language, 25*(2), 343–365. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000998003444>
- Nazzi, T., Jusczyk, P. W., & Johnson, E. K. (2000). Language discrimination by English-learning 5-month-olds: Effects of rhythm and familiarity. *Journal of Memory and Language, 43*(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.2000.2698>
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2019). Provisional notes on decolonizing research methodology and undoing its dirty history. *Journal of Developing Societies, 35*, 481–492.
- Nittrouer, S., Lowenstein, J. H., & Packer, R. R. (2009). Children discover the spectral skeletons in their native language before the amplitude envelopes. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 35*(4), 1245–1253. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015020>
- Nober, E. H., & Seymour, H. N. (1974). Speech recognition scores of white and Black student-teacher listeners for Black and white first grade speakers. In *Technical report for National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.* (Issue 4).
- Nober, E. H., & Seymour, H. N. (1979). Speaker intelligibility of black and white school children for black and white adult listeners under varying listening conditions. *Language and Speech, 22*(3), 237–242. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002383097902200304>
- Norris, D., McQueen, J. M., & Cutler, A. (2003). Perceptual learning in speech. *Cognitive Psychology, 47*(2), 204–238. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0285\(03\)00006-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0285(03)00006-9)
- Ohde, R. N., & Haley, K. L. (1997). Stop-consonant and vowel perception in 3- and 4-year-old children. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 102*(6), 3711–3722. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9407663>
- Patel, L. (2015). *Decolonizing educational research*. New York: Routledge.
- Pater, J., Stager, C., & Werker, J. (2004). The perceptual acquisition of phonological contrasts. *Language, 80*(3), 384–402.
- Perrachione, T. K., Chiao, J. Y., & Wong, P. C. M. (2009). Asymmetric cultural effects on perceptual expertise underlie an own-race effect for voices. *Cognition, 114*, 42–55.
- Perrachione, T. K., Lee, J., Ha, L. Y., & Wong, P. C. (2011). Learning a novel phonological contrast depends on interactions between individual differences and training paradigm design. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 130*, 461–472.
- Pierrehumbert, J. B. (2003). Phonetic diversity, statistical learning, and acquisition of phonology. *Language and Speech, 46*(2–3), 115–154. doi: 10.1177/00238309030460020501
- Plante, E., Ogilvie, T., Vance, R., Aguilar, J. M., Dailey, N. S., Meyers, C., Lieser, A. M., & Burton, R. (2014). Variability in the language input to children enhances learning in a treatment context. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 23*, 530–545.
- Polka, L., & Werker, J. F. (1994). Developmental changes in perception of nonnative vowel contrasts. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 20*, 421–435.
- Polka, L., Colantonio, C., & Sundara, M. (2001). A cross-language comparison of /d/ /ð/ perception: Evidence for a new developmental pattern. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 109*(5), 2190–2201. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.1362689>

- Potter, C. E., & Lew-Williams, C. (2019). Infants' selective use of reliable cues in multidimensional language input. *Developmental Psychology*, *55*(1), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000610>
- Quam, C., & Creel, S. C. (2017). Mandarin-English bilinguals process lexical tones in newly learned words in accordance with the language context. *PLOS One*, *12*, e0169001. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0169001.
- Quam, C. & Swingley, D. (2007, November). Phonological knowledge trumps salient local regularity in 2-year-olds' word learning. *Boston University Conference on Language Development*, *32* (poster).
- Quam, C. & Swingley, D. (2010). Phonological knowledge guides 2-year-olds' and adults' interpretation of salient pitch contours in word learning. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *62*, 135-150.
- Quam, C., & Swingley, D. (in preparation). A protracted developmental trajectory for detection of consonant mispronunciations in newly learned words.
- Quam, C., Clough, L., & Gerken, L.A. (2017, October). Does talker variability impact infants' discrimination of easy versus difficult sound contrasts? *2017 Cognitive Development Society meeting, Portland, OR* (poster).
- Quam, C., Clough, L., Knight, S., & Gerken, L.A. (under review). Does variability impact infants' sound discrimination?
- Quam, C., Knight, S., and Gerken, L.A. (2017). The distribution of talker variability impacts infants' word learning. *Laboratory Phonology: Journal of the Association for Laboratory Phonology*, *8*, 1–27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/labphon.25>
- Riechtsmeier, P., Gerken, L.A., & Ohala, D. (2011). Contributions of phonetic token variability and word-type frequency to phonological representations. *Journal of Child Language*, *38*, 951-978.
- Riechtsmeier, P., Gerken, L.A., Goffman, L., & Hogan, T. (2009). Statistical frequency in perception affects children's lexical production. *Cognition*, *111*, 372-377.
- Rost, G. C., & Memurray, B. (2009). Speaker variability augments phonological processing in early word learning. *Developmental Science*, *12*(2), 339-349. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7687.2008.00786.x
- Sadakata, M., & McQueen, J. M. (2013). High stimulus variability in nonnative speech learning supports formation of abstract categories: Evidence from Japanese geminates. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *134*, 1324-1335.
- Sadakata, M., & McQueen, J. M. (2014). Individual aptitude in Mandarin lexical tone perception predicts effectiveness of high-variability training. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *5*, 1318.
- Santa Ana, O., and Bayley, R. (2008). Chicano English: Phonology. In E. Schneider (Ed.), *Varieties of English, Vol. 2: The Americas and the Caribbean*, 219-238. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Schmale, R., & Seidl, A. (2009). Accommodating variability in voice and foreign accent: Flexibility of early word representations. *Developmental Science*, *12*(4), 583-601. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00809.x>
- Schmale, R., Cristià, A., & Seidl, A. (2012). Toddlers recognize words in an unfamiliar accent after brief exposure. *Developmental Science*, *15*(6), 732-738. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2012.01175.x>

- Schmale, R., Cristià, A., Seidl, A., & Johnson, E. K. (2010). Developmental changes in infants' ability to cope with dialect variation in word recognition. *Infancy, 15*(6), 650–662. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7078.2010.00032.x>
- Schmale, R., Hollich, G., & Seidl, A. (2011). Contending with foreign accent in early word learning. *Journal of Child Language, 38*(5), 1096–108. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000910000619>
- Seidl, A., Cristià, A., Bernard, A., & Onishi, K. H. (2009). Allophones and phonemes in infants' learning of sound patterns. *Language Learning and Development, 5*, 191–202.
- Seidl, A., Onishi, K. H., & Cristia, A. (2014). Talker variation aids young infants' phonotactic learning. *Language Learning and Development, 10*, 297–307.
- Sernielaes, W. (2005). On the invariance of speech percepts. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics, 40*, 177–194.
- Shinohara, Y., & Iverson, P. (2018). High-variability identification and discrimination training for Japanese speakers learning English /t/ /t/. *Journal of Phonetics, 66*, 242–251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.woen.2017.11.002>
- Singh, L. (2008). Influences of high and low variability on infant word recognition. *Cognition, 106*, 833–870.
- Singh, L., Morgan, J. L., & White, K. S. (2004). Preference and processing: The role of speech affect in early spoken word recognition. *Journal of Memory and Language, 51*, 173–189.
- Singh, L., White, K. S., & Morgan, J. L. (2008). Building a word-form lexicon in the face of variable input: Influences of pitch and amplitude on early spoken word recognition. *Language Learning and Development, 4*, 157–178.
- Smith, C. L. (1997). The devoicing of /z/ in American English: Effects of local and prosodic context. *Journal of Phonetics, 25*(4), 471–500. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jpho.1997.0053>
- Sommers, M. S., & Barcroft, J. (2013). Effects of Referent Token Variability on L2 Vocabulary Learning. *Language Learning, 63*(2), 186–210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12007>
- Sperry, D. E., Sperry, L. L., & Miller, P. J. (2019). Reexamining the verbal environments of children from different socioeconomic backgrounds. *Child Development, 90*, 1303–1318.
- Stager, C. L., and Werker, J. F. (1997). Infants listen for more phonetic detail in speech perception than in word-learning tasks. *Nature, 388*(6640), 381–382.
- Sumner, M. (2015). The social weight of spoken words. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 19*(5), 238–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2015.03.007>
- Sumner, M., and Samuel, A. G. (2005). Perception and representation of regular variation: The case of final /t/. *Journal of Memory and Language, 52*, 322–338. [doi:10.1016/j.jml.2004.11.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2004.11.004)
- Sumner, M., Kyung Kim, S., King, E., and McGowan, K. B. (2014). The socially weighted encoding of spoken words: a dual-route approach to speech perception. *Frontiers in Psychology, 4*, 1015.
- Sundara, M., Ngon, C., Skoruppa, K., Feldman, N. H., Onario, G. M., Morgan, J. L., & Peperkamp, S. (2018). Young infants' discrimination of subtle phonetic contrasts. *Cognition, 178*, 57–66.
- Swingle, D. (2016). Two-year-olds interpret novel phonological neighbors as familiar words. *Developmental Psychology, 52*(7), 1011–1023.
- Swingle, D. and Aslin, R. N. (2000). Lexical neighborhoods and the word-form representations of 14-month-olds. *Psychological Science, 13*(5), 480–484.

- Swingle, D. and Aslin, R. N. (2002). Spoken word recognition and lexical representation in very young children. *Cognition*, 76, 147–166.
- Teinonen, T., Aslin, R.N., Alku, P., & Csibra, G. (2008). Visual speech contributes to phonetic learning in 6-month-old infants. *Cognition*, 108(3), 850–855. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2008.05.009>
- Theodore, R. M., & Miller, J. L. (2010). Characteristics of listener sensitivity to talker-specific phonetic detail. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 128(4), 2090–2099. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3467771>
- Thiessen, E. D. (2007). The effect of distributional information on children's use of phonemic contrasts. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 56, 16–34.
- Thiessen, E. D. (2011). When variability matters more than meaning: The effect of lexical forms on use of phonemic contrasts. *Developmental Psychology*, 47(5), 1448–1458. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024439>
- Thiessen, E. D., & Yee, M. N. (2010). Dogs, bogs, labs, and lads: What phonemic generalizations indicate about the nature of children's early word-form representations. *Child Development*, 81, 1287–1303.
- Thomas, E. R. (2007). Phonological and phonetic characteristics of African American Vernacular English. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 1(5), 450–475. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-818x.2007.00029.x>
- Thompson, C. A., Craig, H. K., & Washington, J. A. (2004). Variable production of African American English across oracy and literacy contexts. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 35, 269–282.
- Thompson, C. A., Craig, H. K., & Washington, J. A. (2004). Variable production of African American English across oracy and literacy contexts. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 35, 269–282.
- Trehub, S. E. (1976). The discrimination of foreign speech contrasts by infants and adults. *Child Development*, 47, 466–472.
- Vallabha, G. K., McClelland, J. L., Pons, F., Werker, J. F., & Amano, S. (2007). Unsupervised learning of vowel categories from infant-directed speech. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(33), 13273–13278. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0705369104>
- van der Feest, S. V. H., & Johnson, E. K. (2016). Input-driven differences in toddlers' perception of a disappearing phonological contrast. *Language Acquisition*, 23, 89–111.
- van Heugten, M., & Johnson, E. K. (2012). Infants exposed to fluent natural speech succeed at cross-gender word recognition. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 55(2), 554–560. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2011/10-0347\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2011/10-0347))
- van Heugten, M., & Johnson, E. K. (2014). Learning to contend with accents in infancy: Benefits of brief speaker exposure. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(1), 340–350. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032192>
- van Heugten, M., & Johnson, E. K. (2015). Toddlers' word recognition in an unfamiliar regional accent: The role of local sentence context and prior accent exposure. *Language and Speech*, 59, 353–363. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0023830915600471>
- van Heugten, M., Krieger, D. R., & Johnson, E. K. (2015). The developmental trajectory of toddlers' comprehension of unfamiliar regional accents. *Language Learning and Development*, 11, 41–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2013.879636>

- Vaughn, C., Baese-Berk, M. M., & Idemaru, K. (2018). Re-examining phonetic variability in native and non-native speech. *Phonetica*, 76, 327-258. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1159/000487269>
- Wagner, L., Greene-Havas, M., & Gillespie, R. (2010). Development in children's comprehension of linguistic register. *Child Development*, 81(6), 1678-1686. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01502.x>
- Washington, J. A. and Craig, H. K. (1994). Dialectal forms during discourse of poor urban African American preschoolers. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 37, 816-823.
- Washington, J. A., & Craig, H. K. (2000). Reading performance and dialectal variation. In J. L. Harris et al. (Eds.), *Literacy in African American Communities*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Weatherhead, D., & White, K. S. (2016). He says potato, she says potahto: Young infants track talker-specific accents. *Language Learning and Development*, 12, 92-103.
- Werker, J. F. and Curtin, S. (2005). PRIMIR: A developmental framework of infant speech processing. *Language Learning and Development*, 1(2), 197-234.
- Werker, J. F., & Tees, R. C. (1984). Cross-language speech perception: Evidence for perceptual reorganization during the first year of life. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 7, 49-63.
- Werker, J. F., Cohen, L. B., Lloyd, V. L., Casasola, M., & Stager, C. L. (1998). Acquisition of word-object associations by 14-month-old infants. *Developmental Psychology*, 34(6), 1289-1309.
- Werker, J. F., Fennell, C. T., Coreoran, K. M., & Stager, C. L. (2002). Infants' ability to learn phonetically similar words: Effects of age and vocabulary size. *Infancy*, 3, 1-30.
- White, K. S., & Aslin, R. N. (2011). Adaptation to novel accents by toddlers. *Developmental Science*, 14(2), 372-384.
- White, J., & Sundara, M. (2014). Biased generalization of newly learned phonological alternations by 12-month-old infants. *Cognition*, 133(1), 85-90. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2014.05.020>
- White, K. S., & Morgan, J. L. (2008). Sub-segmental detail in early lexical representations. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 59(1), 114-132. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2008.03.001>
- White, K. S., Peperkamp, S., Kirk, C., & Morgan, J. L. (2008). Rapid acquisition of phonological alternations by infants. *Cognition*, 107(1), 238-65. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2007.11.012>
- Wolfram, W. (2007). Sociolinguistic folklore in the study of African American English. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 1(4), 292-313.
- Yu, B. (2013). Issues in bilingualism and heritage language maintenance: Perspectives of minority language mothers of children with autism spectrum disorders. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 22(1), 10-24.