

Third language phonological acquisition: Understanding sound structure in a multilingual world

Abstract

The field of third language acquisition (3LA) has gathered increased attention over the last three decades. However, phonological acquisition in an L3 is still relatively understudied within the field, despite there likely being over a billion people regularly using an L3 worldwide. In this paper, we review experimental and theoretical studies of sequential L3 acquisition to date and aim to give implications for future L3 phonological acquisition research, laying the groundwork for advances in this area. According to the reviewed studies, it is necessary to adapt previous second language phonology models (i.e. SLM/SLM-r, PAM/PAM-L2, L2LP) into future L3 phonological research. Additionally, it is essential to expand the research scope and time scale to reflect linguistic diversity, age and education background of participants, and the processes of learning.

Keywords

third language acquisition, phonetics, phonology, multilingualism, speech perception, speech production, non-Indo-European languages

1 Introduction

It is estimated that over half of the worldwide population use two or more languages regularly in their daily life (Grosjean 2010). While it is difficult to put an exact number on the total speakers using three or more languages worldwide, a European Commission study (2013) reported that 25% of EU teenagers were competent users of three languages. Globally, we know that there are many regions where large numbers of people regularly use multiple languages, as in West Africa, Malaysia, India, for example. Multilingualism is, therefore, relatively common across the world, and is likely experienced by over a billion people. It is also likely that the number of multilinguals is increasing rapidly every year (Rocha-Hidalgo and Barr 2022). Despite the large numbers of multilingual language users globally, much of the previous phonological research has focused on monolingual and bilingual speakers, and work on L3 phonological acquisition is limited.

Previously, the field of L3 phonological acquisition was regarded as an extension of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research (Chen and Han 2019). However, L3 phonological acquisition differs from SLA due to much more complicated sources of language interactions, as either the L1, L2 or both can influence L3 phonology (Murphy 2003, Gut 2010, Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková 2019, Cenoz, Hufeisen, and Jessner 2001, Liu and Lin 2021). Comparisons to L1 and L2 phonological acquisition alone cannot, therefore,

enable us to have a comprehensive understanding of multilingual language capacity. Thus, it is necessary to investigate L3 phonological acquisition in its own right to gain a fuller understanding of this process (Flynn, Foley, and Vinnitskaya 2004).

The phenomenon of multilingualism has only been established as an area being researched systematically in linguistic studies over the last three decades (Klein 1995, Gut 2010, Garcia-Mayo 2012, Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková 2019). However, most experimental and theoretical L3 studies have focused on morphosyntax and lexicon, whereas the area of L3 phonetics and phonology has typically gained lesser attention (Gut 2010, Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková 2019). For example, theoretical models such as the Cumulative Enhancement Model and the Typological Primacy Model were proposed based on syntactic data (Flynn, Foley, and Vinnitskaya 2004, Rothman 2010). So far, only the Phonological Permeability Hypothesis proposed by Cabrelli Amaro and Rothman (2010) focuses exclusively on L3 phonological acquisition. Nevertheless, it does not precisely predict how multilinguals perceive and produce speech sounds (Luo, Li, and Mok 2020).

Additionally, L3 linguistic and psycholinguistic studies have, so far, largely focused on larger Indo-European languages (Liu and Lin 2021, Rocha-Hidalgo and Barr 2022). To give some specific examples of under-researched multilingual contexts, the majority of Nigeria's estimated 201 million inhabitants are multilingual, using e.g. Niger-Congo languages, English/Hausa and Nigerian Pidgin English, and most young people in China now learn English as a third language alongside their local language (usually referred to as a 'dialect') and Standard Mandarin. Where L3 phonological work focuses on larger Indo-European languages, it is likely to under-theorise the acquisition or influence of tone, non-pulmonic sounds, phonation distinctions, and other features that are uncommon in Indo-European languages, and is also likely to underestimate power dynamics between majority and minority languages.

We hope that the current work, alongside specific studies such as those contained in the recent special issue of *Languages* (edited by Gut and Kopečková), can lead the field in new and underexplored directions.

2 Our focus

In this paper, we aim to review progress to date in 3LA studies of phonology and lay the groundwork for future research. The earliest academic evidence of multilingual phonological acquisition research can be traced back to studies nearly fifty years ago (Cabrelli Amaro and Wrembel 2016), for example, work such as Chamot (1973), Rivers (1979), Singh and Carroll (1979). These early studies mostly relied on impressionistic analysis, but inspired more academic interest in this field and led to the area being more systematically researched currently (Cabrelli Amaro and Wrembel 2016). Well-known developments in the study of

SLA such as cross-linguistic influence (CLI) (Sharwood-Smith and Kellerman 1986) and diary studies e.g. Williams and Hammarberg (1998) laid the foundations for advances in 3LA (Cabrelli Amaro and Wrembel 2016, Cal and Sypiańska 2020).

To date, the vast majority of 3LA phonology work has considered adult sequential multilinguals. In this review, we focus particularly on this age group and specifically address quantitative, experimental approaches to the field whilst acknowledging the extremely important contributions to understanding made by qualitative studies of multilingual contexts. In Section 3, we discuss some previous dominant L2 and L3 acquisition models and explain how those models could be applied to L3 phonological acquisition. Section 4 reviews several of the most recent L3 phonological acquisition studies and discusses the factors contributing to cross-linguistic transfer onto L3 phonological behaviour. Section 5 focuses on the methodology used in recent L3 phonological studies. Section 6 concludes our review and provides implications for future research. Our work considers spoken language multilingual phonological acquisition. Multilingual research in sign languages has so far mainly considered lexical and grammatical aspects, or bilingualism, rather than multilingual phonology. See Zeshan and Webster (2020) and Brentari (2019, Chapter 7) for more information.

3 Theoretical models of L2 and L3 acquisition

This section considers theoretical approaches to L2 and L3 acquisition of phonology. Early models in this area built on the dominant linguistic theoretical approaches of the time, for example Archibald (1994), Brown (1998, 2000) both consider L2 learning through the lens of Universal Grammar. On the other hand, models such as the Speech Learning Model, Perceptual Assimilation Model, and the Second Language Linguistic Perception model provide various hypotheses for language phonological acquisition and have become more prominent in this field more recently due to their wide applicability.

Here, we first focus in detail on the current most dominant models proposed for L2 phonological acquisition: the Speech Learning Model (SLM) and its revised version (SLM-r) (Flege 1995, Flege and Bohn 2021), the Perceptual Assimilation Model (PAM), and its extension to advanced L2 learners, PAM-L2 (Best 1994, Best and Tyler 2007), and the Second Language Linguistic Perception Model (L2LP) (Escudero 2005, Van Leussen and Escudero 2015). Our reason behind discussing these L2 models is because it has been suggested that L3 acquisition could be an extension of L2 acquisition (Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková 2019). We discuss this possibility and how L2 models could potentially be expanded in scope. Finally, we explore several previous L3 acquisition models, and discuss how these models can shed light specifically on phonology.

3.1 L2 acquisition models

3.1.1 The Speech Learning Model

The Speech Learning Model (SLM) proposes equivalence classification, which suggests that bilinguals tend to initially identify tokens of different categories in the L2 as instances of L1 categories (Flege 2018). The more similar L2 segments are perceived to be to those of L1 segments, the harder it is for L2 learners to acquire L1-like L2 pronunciation. This is because L2 learners tend to assimilate L2 sounds as existing similar L1 sounds and to reduce learning the new segments in the L2. Namely, L2 learners are more likely to notice the differences between L2 sounds and L1 phones and establish new categories for L2 sounds if those L2 sounds are more dissimilar to L1 sounds (Flege 1995). The revised Speech Learning Model (SLM-r) further suggests that both mechanisms and processes that speakers use to acquire their L1 can still be used in L2 acquisition, without any change or exception in the lifetime (Flege and Bohn 2021). Indeed, it agrees with the view of PAM-L2 (Best and Tyler 2007) that L2 phonological acquisition is deeply influenced by perceptual biases caused by L1 (Flege and Bohn 2021).

However, the SLM-r has some different hypotheses from the SLM (Flege 1995). For example, the SLM-r argues that it is impossible for L2 users to resemble L1 speakers because of the essential interactions between the L1 and L2 phonetic systems, and the inequality of the L2 input in L2 acquisition compared to L1. Also, it argues that the age of first exposure to L2 does not prevent L2 phonetic category formation. Specifically, it suggests that the more precise the L1 phonetic categories that bilinguals have, the more likely they can distinguish phonetic differences between L2 sounds and L1 sounds (Flege and Bohn 2021). The SLM-r proposes that perception and production evolve together rather than perception preceding production. Namely, the L2 production accuracy is not limited by how accurate L2 sounds are perceived by L2 learners (Flege and Bohn 2021). Though the SLM-r is proposed based on substantial published research so far, it is acknowledged that this model still requires testing (Flege and Bohn 2021).

3.1.2 The Perceptual Assimilation Model

PAM proposes that bilinguals tend to perceive L2 contrasts based on the phonetic similarity between the phonological categories of L1 and L2 (Best 1994, Chan 2013, Chen and Han 2019). Namely, naïve listeners are likely to perceptually assimilate L2 phones to L1 phonemes according to the common ground in articulators, constriction locations and degrees. Theoretically, the PAM is explicitly couched in Articulatory Phonology (Browman and Goldstein 1992), and Direct Realist approaches to speech perception (Best 1995). These approaches state that listeners learn to directly perceive speech gestures as the minimal underlying units of phonology.

Generally, L2 sounds can be perceived as poor or good exemplars of the L1 sound (categorised), or different from any L1 sounds (uncategorised), or non-speech sounds (non-assimilable). PAM proposes four modes of assimilation which can be used to indicate how well bilinguals discriminate different foreign sounds at the beginning of L2 phonological acquisition (Best 1994): Two Category Assimilation (TC), Single Category Assimilation (SC), Category Goodness Assimilation (CG), and Non-assimilable Assimilation (NA). More specifically, TC refers to the case where two L2 phones are assimilated into two different L1 phonological categories. In such instances, the discrimination of such contrasts should be excellent. SC refers to the case where two L2 phones are assimilated into one L1 phonological category. Consequently, these two phones are regarded as equally good or bad exemplars of the L1 phonological category, and discrimination performance is predicted to be poor. CG refers to the case where two L2 contrasting phones are assimilated into one L1 phonological category while being different from each other in terms of the goodness of fit to that category (e.g. phoneme) and the discrimination of such contrasts should be intermediate.

The PAM-L2 expands the original PAM to contexts of more advanced L2 learning (Best and Tyler 2007). According to PAM-L2, advanced multilinguals may adapt to L2 perceptual cues as their L2 learning experience increases. They can perceive contrasts between L2 sounds that are not present in the L1 and will then develop two separate phonological categories, especially when the two sounds are very frequent in L2. While the SLM predicts that similar sounds in the L1 and L2 are likely to be very difficult to acquire, this final point about the PAM(-L2) suggests that similar sounds are not that difficult to acquire as the SLM predicts. Here, there is a contrast in focus between the models: the SLM is focusing on the specifics of phonetic production, but the PAM on whether two sounds can be perceptually discriminated.

3.1.3 The Second Language Linguistic Perception Model

The Second Language Linguistic Perception Model (L2LP) is an extension of the Linguistic Perception model proposed by Escudero (2005), which focuses on the entire development process of L2 perception, including the initial state, development state, and end state. This model is proposed based on the optimal perception hypothesis (Escudero 2005) which suggests beginner L2 learners tend to perceive L2 phones as instances of categories they acquire in the L1. L2 learners will then adjust their L1 perceptual boundaries in the direction of L2 perceptual boundaries and attain optimal L2 perception (Escudero 2009). Thus, the acoustic differences and similarities between L1 and L2 will shape the development process of L2 perception. Three scenarios have been proposed: the new scenario, the similar scenario, and the subset scenario. In the new scenario, speakers must learn a sound not present in their L1 (predicted to be difficult for learners). In the similar scenario, L2 sounds resemble existing L1 categories (predicted to be less difficult for learners). In the subset scenario, learners must learn to fit a larger L1 phonology into a smaller L2 phonology

(predicted to be of medium difficulty for learners) (Escudero 2005). L2LP suggests that the L2 perception development (i.e. from the initial state to the development state and to the end state) is driven by the L2 learning experience, and L2 learners will ultimately obtain monolingual-like perceptions of L1 and L2 since they are handled by two separate perception grammars (Escudero 2009).

The revised L2LP model suggests that the change in the number of L1 perceptual categories is a meaning-driven process influenced by lexical items, instead of L2 learners' perception of the number and type of phonemes that are relevant in their L2 (Van Leussen and Escudero 2015). It proposes two versions of the model on phonetic perception and lexical recognition. For instance, sequential L2 learners are suggested to maintain an L1 phonetic category for certain L2 stimuli while interactive L2 learners fully adapt their L1 vowel categories to the L2 at the end.

3.1.4 Extending the models to L3 contexts

Though L2 phonological acquisition models do not make predictions about the development of multilinguals, it is still possible that L3 learners can change the existing L1 and/or L2 boundaries to incorporate realisations of similar phonetic properties in L1, L2 and L3, as well as to develop new categories for their L3 (Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková 2019).

Some studies have therefore tried to investigate L3 phonological acquisition based on adapting previous L2 acquisition models. For example, Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková (2019) aim to adapt PAM and PAM-L2 to investigate L3 phonological acquisition. Results suggested that multilinguals, even at the beginning of L3 acquisition, tend to assimilate L3 sounds to both L1 and L2 phonological categories first, and then establish separate L3 phonological categories as their L3 learning experience increases. This pattern follows the pattern of Single Category assimilation proposed by the PAM-L2, i.e. multilinguals behave similarly to advanced L2 learners (Best and Tyler 2007, Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková 2019).

Several previous studies also suggest that the SLM could be used to predict L3 phonological perception patterns (Sypiańska 2016a, Liu, Zeng, and Lu 2019, Liu and Lin 2021). For example, Liu and Lin (2021) demonstrate that multilinguals perceptually acquire L3 voiceless and voiced stops in a way predicted by the SLM (Flege 1995). More specifically, L1 Chinese speakers were likely to equate voiceless stops in L3 Spanish or Russian (i.e. /p, t, k/) with the L1 Chinese voiceless unaspirated stops and L2 English voiced stops, causing difficulties in their perception of L3 voiceless stops. Instead, they were better able to perceive the differences in voiced stops between L3 and L1 or L2 since the pre-voicing feature of word-initial stops was basically absent in their L1 and L2 while being present in their L3. Thus, they performed better in perceiving voiced stops than voiceless stops in the L3.

3.2 L3 acquisition models

Although models such as the SLM(-r) and PAM could potentially be extended to the context of L3 phonological acquisition, L3 perception and production still differ from those of L2 due to complicated sources of language interactions (Gut 2010, Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková 2019). For example, Chen and Han (2019) find that participants' L3 Mandarin production is modulated by both L2 English and L1 Cantonese while Cal and Sypiańska (2020) find that participants' L3 Spanish production is only influenced by L2 English. It is therefore possible that 3LA is influenced by the L1, L2, or both. Also, there are many more possibilities for learning third languages than learning second languages in terms of the order of language acquisition (Lipińska 2015).

So far, there have been several explanatory models proposed for L3 acquisition of morphosyntax, such as the Cumulative-Enhancement Model (Flynn, Foley, and Vinnitskaya 2004), the L2 Status Factor Model (Williams and Hammarberg 1998, Hammarberg 2001), the Typological Primacy Model (Rothman 2010, Bardel and Falk 2012), the Scalpel Model (Slabakova 2017), and the Linguistic Proximity Model (Westergaard, Mitrofanova, Mykhaylyk, and Rodina 2016, Westergaard 2019). At present, only the Phonological Permeability Hypothesis (PPH) focuses specifically on L3 phonological acquisition (Cabrelli Amaro and Rothman 2010). The PPH suggests that the L3 is more likely to influence the L2 than the L1 when the L2 is acquired after the 'critical period' (pre-puberty) and the effects of L3 on L1 or L2 sound systems are different as L1 and L2 are not represented in the same manner cognitively (Cabrelli Amaro and Rothman 2010, Luo, Li, and Mok 2020). Namely, the PPH argues that there is significant difference in phonological acquisition in terms of the age of L3 acquisition (AOA). However, this hypothesis does not give concrete predictions on how speech sounds would be perceived and produced by multilingual speakers. It only generally focuses on the directions of cross-linguistic influence (Luo, Li, and Mok 2020).

4 Factors contributing to cross-linguistic transfer

All the models identified above suggest that some cross-linguistic transfer will happen, as is natural and expected when someone uses more than one language. In this section, we discuss the factors which have been shown to contribute to cross-linguistic transfer in contexts of L3 phonological acquisition focusing on the most recent research from 2010 until present¹. We especially aim to identify and include studies of L3 phonology in non-Indo-European contexts, as this setting has received lesser attention in the literature to date.

¹ We firstly searched in the following journals: *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *Language and Speech*, *Journal of Phonetics*, *Speech Communication*, *Second Language Research*, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* as well as a recent special issue in *Languages* (edited Gut and Kopečková). We then consulted as widely as possible beyond these journals in order to specifically include further studies involving non-Indo-European contexts.

There are two kinds of linguistic transfer: progressive and regressive. Here, we focus on progressive transfer from the L1/L2 or both to L3 phonological acquisition in terms of speech perception and production as they are relatively common (Chen and Han 2019). For a recent example of regressive transfer, see Nelson (2022). In early studies, the L1 was proposed as the primary influence source of transfer onto the L3 speech perception (Ringbom 1987). More recently, we now have a better understanding of the important role of the L2 in this process (Wrembel 2010). Table 1 and Table 2 present the source of transfer onto L3 speech perception and production suggested in the most recent literature. As shown in the tables, almost all studies recorded transfer from the L2 to the L3, and over half reported hybrid transfer from the L1 and L2. However, Grünke and Gabriel (2022) find that neither L1 nor L2 has transfer onto L3 production in terms of intonational patterns.

Previous studies have proposed factors contributing to cross-linguistic transfer in L3 phonological acquisition such as the L2 status (Llama, Cardoso, and Collins 2010, Wrembel 2010), the L3 experience (Luo, Li, and Mok 2020), typological proximity (Cabrelli Amaro and Rothman 2010, Liu, Zeng, and Lu 2019), and the level of proficiency (Cal and Sypiańska 2020). The following sub-sections discuss these factors separately.

4.1 L2 status

'L2 status' refers to the impact of previously learnt languages on L3 phonological acquisition, which has been demonstrated as a factor influencing the source of cross-linguistic effects on L3 perception and production (Hammarberg 2001, Wrembel 2010). According to Wrembel (2010), L2 transfer is greater than L1 transfer at the beginning of L3 phonological acquisition. However, the influence of L2 on L3 phonological acquisition diminishes as L3 experience increases (Hammarberg 2001, Wrembel 2010, Luo, Li, and Mok 2020).

4.2 L3 experience

L3 experience generally refers to exposure to the L3, such as the Length Of Residence (LOR) in the L3-speaking environment (Luo, Li, and Mok 2020). Increased L3 experience is suggested to facilitate sound discrimination, especially in the early stage of L3 acquisition. Luo, Li, and Mok (2020)'s study investigates the role of experience in depth comparing L1 Mandarin, L2 English and L3 Cantonese participants' perception of Cantonese vowels. Participants were divided into naïve listeners, listeners with less than 1 year of Cantonese experience, and listeners with over 5 years of Cantonese experience. Multilingual speakers' perceptual accuracy of L3 Cantonese contrastive vowel pairs increased rapidly at the early stage of L3 acquisition. However, the perceptual accuracy of L3 Cantonese contrastive vowel pairs did not benefit much from increased exposure to L3 Cantonese at later stages of L3 acquisition.

4.3 Typological proximity

Typological proximity typically refers to the relationship between languages and language families that linguists can formally and objectively define and identify (De Angelis 2007). Previous studies agree that cross-linguistic influence is more likely to occur between languages that are closely related (Wrembel 2015). Specifically, L3 learners are likely to establish links between the L3 and prior languages they have acquired. They tend to establish links between languages that have more similarities rather than differences (Ringbom and Jarvis 2009), and the similarities between the L3 and L1/L2 can hinder multilinguals' ability to learn an L3. As well as the diachronic links between language families e.g. between Spanish and Portuguese, research has also noted effects on L3 learning stemming from structural similarities and differences between unrelated languages. For example, in Liu, Zeng, and Lu (2019), L3 learners of Japanese/Russian/Spanish had higher accuracy in perceiving voiced stops than voiceless stops, which was due to significant differences between L3 and L1 or L2 in terms of the differences between voiced stops rather than voiceless stops.

4.4 Level of proficiency

Previous studies have also demonstrated that level of proficiency (LoP) played an influential role in L3 vowel production (Hammarberg and Hammarberg 2009, Wrembel 2010, Cal and Sypiańska 2020). LoP refers to both L2 and L3 if multilinguals are assumed to have a uniform level of L1 (Cal and Sypiańska 2020). Previous research suggests that the lower the level of L3 proficiency, the greater the cross-linguistic influence from L2 to L3 (Hammarberg 2001, Gut 2010). This implies that learners at the initial stage of L3 acquisition are likely to transfer L2 phonology directly into their L3 production. However, the influence of the L2 decreases as L3 proficiency increases, and L3 phonological categories are more likely to be influenced by input from the L3 (Hammarberg 2001, Hammarberg and Hammarberg 2009, Wrembel 2010).

In other words, lower proficiency in either the L2 or L3 makes (input of) the other, more proficient language, become the source of transfer onto L3 phonological categories (Cal and Sypiańska 2020). Moreover, the interactions between L2LoP and L3LoP are also likely to influence part of L3 production. For example, the production of the L3 Spanish vowel /a/ was conditioned by both L2LoP and L3LoP in Cal and Sypiańska (2020). Additionally, L3 phonological categories are likely to be influenced by L2 and input from the L3 equally if L2LoP and L3LoP are at the same level. For instance, the first formant value of a Spanish vowel was at an intermediate value between L2 English and L3 Spanish vowel properties in Cal and Sypiańska (2020).

Having identified potential factors contributing to cross-linguistic transfer, we now turn to methodology in recent approaches to L3 phonological research and aim to indicate future directions the field could take.

5 Methodological challenges and future directions

This section reviews the methodological challenges in terms of research scope and design in recent L3 phonological research. In identifying challenges from previous work, we hope to indicate gaps for future directions in the field.

5.1 Research scope

The works surveyed in Table 1 and Table 2 indicate that recent experimental approaches in this area have focused on L3 speech production (e.g. Llama, Cardoso, and Collins 2010, Garcia 2013, Cabrelli Amaro and Wrembel 2016) and comparatively less on perception (e.g. Wrembel 2010, Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková 2019, Luo, Li, and Mok 2020, Liu and Lin 2021). Thus, the next logical stage for the field should be to investigate the perception-production interface for L3 phonological acquisition (Best 1994, Cabrelli Amaro and Wrembel 2016).

Table 3 shows the linguistic focus of recent L3 phonology studies. This table indicates that most of the research has focused on Indo-European languages as the target language (i.e. L3), especially Germanic and Romance languages such as German, English, French, Spanish and Portuguese, whereas Slavic languages were less studied e.g. Russian and Polish (Cabrelli Amaro and Wrembel 2016, Liu and Lin 2021). Non-Indo-European languages as the target language in L3 phonological research were much less frequent, such as Arabic (Benrabah 1991, reanalysed in Archibald 2022), Mandarin Chinese (Gabriel, Kupisch, and Seoudy 2016), and Japanese (Tremblay 2007). On the other hand, most of the previous research shown in Table 3 has focused on language trios where L1, L2 and L3 are all Indo-European languages, especially Germanic and Romance languages e.g. Llama et al. (2010), Wrembel (2015), whereas L3 phonological research focusing on language trios where L1 and L3 are non-Indo-European languages and L2 is Indo-European languages was less frequent e.g. Onishi (2016). Non-Indo-European languages as L1 (and L2), or as L2 and L3 in L3 phonological research were much less frequent e.g. Qin and Jongman (2016), Grünke and Gabriel (2022), Zhang and Levis (2021). It is clear that there is a vast gap in the literature with regard to multilingualism in west and southern Africa, and L3 acquisition of minority and indigenous languages.

In the L3 phonology and phonetics studies outlined below, segmental properties have received more attention than suprasegmental properties. Studies of segmental properties mainly focused either on acoustic measurements of voice onset time (VOT) or on vowel formants. This research focus is in line with trends in SLA studies (Cabrelli Amaro and Wrembel 2016). Previous L3 studies which have investigated suprasegmental features considered things such as word stress (Louriz 2007), speech rhythm (Gabriel, Stahnke, and Thulke 2015), vowel neutralisation (Gut 2010), and vowel reduction (Cabrelli Amaro 2013; 2016, Cabrelli Amaro and Wrembel 2016).

5.2 Time scales

According to Cabrelli Amaro and Wrembel (2016), most L3 phonology studies focus on a single time point, whereas longitudinal investigations are much rarer. A pioneering instance of longitudinal investigation studies is a case study conducted by Williams and Hammarberg (1998), and Hammarberg and Hammarberg (2009), about one informant's development over several years. A rare example of a longitudinal design is Kartushina and Martin (2019), who demonstrate longer term shifts in vowel production for Basque-Spanish bilinguals learning English while studying abroad. They demonstrate longer term changes associated with changing input and indicate cross-linguistic influence can shift over time depending on exposure. Nelson (2022) compares adult and adolescent L3 learners of Polish over the course of a year. She demonstrates that adolescents showed greater changes to their L1 and L2 than the adults, indicating that the specific outcome of acquisition can vary across age groups, and there is much yet to be understood about the plasticity of language development in different groups of multilinguals over time.

5.3 Participants

Most L3 phonology studies have relied on a limited number of participants due to the complexity of multilingual participants' profiles (e.g. Garcia 2013, Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková 2019), which can reduce the power of statistical analyses (Cabrelli Amaro and Wrembel 2016). As shown in Table 4, the majority of previous L3 phonological acquisition studies involve participants who were undergraduates and older than 18 (e.g. Llama, Cardoso, and Collins 2010, Luo, Li, and Mok 2020) while few of them involve participants who were children or adolescents. In terms of the age of L3 acquisition, few previous studies include participants who acquired their L3 before 18 (though see Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková 2019). Instead, participants in most studies acquired their L3 as adults (Llama, Cardoso, and Collins 2010, Garcia 2013, Liu and Lin 2021).

Most studies involved participants who had only begun learning an L3 quite recently. For instance, participants in Liu and Lin (2021) had studied their L3 for about two months. Also, participants in Onishi (2016) studied their L3 Japanese for less than two academic semesters. Fewer studies focus on learners who learned an L3 for a relatively long period (e.g. around ten years in Zhang and Levis 2021). While these studies indicate a range of learning times, the intensity of instruction also varies across studies. For example, Liu and Lin (2021) report participants had 80 hours of instruction in two months, whereas Onishi's (2016) participants likely received around 45 hours of teaching over two semesters.²

Additionally, the language proficiency of participants is very diverse. For instance, L3 Mandarin Chinese speakers in Chen and Han (2019) were divided into different groups according to their different English proficiency levels determined by exam results. However, their English phonological ability still varied within the groups even though individuals in each group were theoretically at the same proficiency level. In such instances, it is essential to have an objective proficiency measurement for determining which group participants should belong to, especially for studies in which proficiency is a variable (Cabrelli Amaro 2013).

5.4 Data collection paradigms

According to Cabrelli Amaro (2013), it is necessary to develop instruments in all three languages (i.e. L1, L2 and L3) when choosing a property to investigate the source of transfer to the L3 due to the complexity of L3 speakers' profiles. For example, these were included in Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková (2019). However, many studies only collected measurements of the L3 and L2 but did not include stimulus material in the L1, for example, Liu and Lin (2021). In terms of the types of tasks used, L3 phonology studies have used a

² Onishi (2016) does not specify the exact number of hours received. Thank you to an anonymous reviewer for making this estimate based on Japanese university teaching schedules.

variety of tasks typical of phonetics and psycholinguistics such as word lists (Llama, Cardoso, and Collins 2010) and more open-ended tasks such as story retelling (Gut 2010) and spontaneous speech (Wrembel 2010).

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we have reviewed the development of the field of L3 phonological acquisition, focusing most closely on recent experimental approaches to this area. In this section, we highlight the gaps identified in the literature and suggest potentially fruitful future areas for the field to explore.

Theoretically, most previous models of L3 acquisition focus on morphosyntax rather than phonology, and they do not yet provide accurate predictions about L3 phonological acquisition. However, they still provide potential factors contributing to cross-linguistic transfer in phonology, such as typological proximity and language status. In addition, some L2 phonological acquisition models, such as SLM (SLM-r), PAM (PAM-L2), and L2LP can be extended to the context of L3 phonological acquisition as demonstrated in several previous studies (Liu, Zeng, and Lu 2019, Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková 2019, Liu and Lin 2021).

In the last few years, the research design, and methods of L3 phonological acquisition studies have developed substantially. Many more studies have paid attention to the influence of L2 or both prior languages (i.e. L1 and L2) on L3 phonological acquisition (Liu and Lin 2021). According to their results, most recent studies suggested that both L1 and L2 were sources of transfer onto L3 speech perception and production (Wrembel 2010, Liu, Zeng, and Lu 2019, Liu and Lin 2021). Future work could further investigate the links between production and perception. In order to more fully investigate the processes behind L3 phonological learning, future work should consider more longitudinal designs as well as work with participants who are child or receive education outside of western education systems. Finally, further analyses could focus more on L3 combinations involving non-Indo-European languages, as well as minority and indigenous language multilingualism.

7 References

- Archibald, John. 1994. 'A Formal Model of Learning L2 Prosodic Phonology'. *Second Language Research* 10 (3): 215-40. [10.1177/026765839401000303](https://doi.org/10.1177/026765839401000303).
- Archibald, John. 2022. 'Segmental and Prosodic Evidence for Property-by-Property Transfer in L3 English in Northern Africa'. *Languages* 7 (1): 28. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7010028>.
- Bardel, Camilla, and Ylva Falk. 2012. 'The L2 Status Factor and the Declarative/Procedural Distinction'. In *Studies in Bilingualism*, Jennifer Cabrelli, Suzanne Flynn, and Jason

- Rothman (eds.), 61-78. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.46.06bar>.
- Benrabah, Mohamed. 1991. 'Learning English Segments with Two Languages'. In *Actes Du XIIème Congrès International Des Sciences Phonétiques*, 334-37. Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence.
- Best, Catherine T. 1994. 'The Emergence of Native-Language Phonological Influences in Infants: A Perceptual Assimilation Model'. In *The Development of Speech Perception: The Transition from Speech Sounds to Spoken Words*, Judith Claire Goodman and Howard C. Nusbaum (eds.), 167-224. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Best, Catherine T. 1995. 'A Direct Realist Perspective on Cross-Language Speech Perception'. In *Speech Perception and Linguistic Experience: Issues in Cross-language Research*, Winifred Strange (eds.), 171-204. Timonium, MD: York Press.
- Best, Catherine T., and Michael D. Tyler. 2007. 'Nonnative and Second-Language Speech Perception: Commonalities and Complementarities'. In *Second Language Speech Learning: The Role of Language Experience in Speech Perception and Production*, Murray Munro and Ocke-Schwen Bohn (eds.), 13-34. John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.17.07bes>.
- Brentari, Diane. 2019. *Sign Language Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Browman, Catherine P., and Louis Goldstein. 1992. 'Articulatory Phonology: An Overview'. *Phonetica* 49 (3-4): 155-80.
- Brown, Cynthia. 1998. 'The Role of L1 Grammar in the Acquisition of Segmental Structure'. *Second Language Research* 14: 139-93.
- – – . 2000. 'The Interrelation between Speech Perception and Phonological Acquisition from Infant to Adult'. In *Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theory*, John Archibald (eds.), 4-64. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cabrelli Amaro, Jennifer. 2013. 'Methodological Issues in L3 Phonology'. *Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics* 6 (1): 101-18. <https://doi.org/10.1515/shll-2013-1142>.
- – – . 2016. 'Testing the Phonological Permeability Hypothesis: L3 Phonological Effects on L1 versus L2 Systems'. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 21 (6): 698-717. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006916637287>.
- Cabrelli Amaro, Jennifer, and Jason Rothman. 2010. 'On L3 Acquisition and Phonological Permeability: A New Test Case for Debates on the Mental Representation of Non-Native Phonological Systems'. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 48 (2-3): 275-96. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.2010.012>.
- Cabrelli Amaro, Jennifer, and Magdalena Wrembel. 2016. 'Investigating the Acquisition of Phonology in a Third Language – a State of the Science and an Outlook for the Future'. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 13 (4): 395-409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2016.1217601>.
- Cal, Zuzanna, and Jolanta Sypiańska. 2020. 'The Interaction of L2 and L3 Levels of Proficiency in Third Language Acquisition'. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 56 (4): 577-603. <https://doi.org/10.1515/psicl-2020-0019>.
- Cenoz, Jasone, Britta Hufeisen, and Ulrike Jessner (eds.), 2001. *Cross-Linguistic Influence in*

- Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595509>.
- Chamot, Anna Uhl. 1973. 'Phonological Problems in Learning English as a Third Language'. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 11: 243-50.
- Chan, Alice Y. W. 2013. 'The Discrimination of English Vowels by Cantonese ESL Learners in Hong Kong: A Test of the Perceptual Assimilation Model'. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics* 03 (03): 182-89. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2013.33025>.
- Chen, Hsueh Chu, and Qian Wen Han. 2019. 'L3 Phonology: Contributions of L1 and L2 to L3 Pronunciation Learning by Hong Kong Speakers'. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 16 (4): 492-512. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1573901>.
- De Angelis, Gessica. 2007. *Third or Additional Language Acquisition*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690050>.
- European Commission. 2013. *Frequently Asked Questions on Languages in Europe*. Official Memo IP/13/875. Brussel: European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/MEMO_13_825
- Escudero, Paola. 2005. *Linguistic Perception and Second Language Acquisition: Explaining the Attainment of Optimal Phonological Categorization*. Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics.
- – – . 2009. *Linguistic Perception of "Similar" L2 Sounds*. Mouton de Gruyter Berlin.
- Flege, James Emil. 1995. 'Second Language Speech Learning: Theory, Findings, and Problems'. In *Speech Perception and Linguistic Experience: Issues in Cross-Language Research*, Winifred Strange (eds.), 233-77. Timonium: York Press.
- Flege, James Emil. 2018. 'The Speech Learning Model (SLM) account of how Japanese speakers learn English /r/ and /l/'. *Unpublished presentation at Sophia University, Tokyo, July*.
- Flege, James Emil, and Ocke-Schwen Bohn. 2021. 'The Revised Speech Learning Model (SLM-r)'. In *Second Language Speech Learning: Theoretical and Empirical Progress*, Ratreay Wayland (eds.), 3-83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108886901.002>.
- Flynn, Suzanne, Claire Foley, and Inna Vinnitskaya. 2004. 'The Cumulative-Enhancement Model for Language Acquisition: Comparing Adults' and Children's Patterns of Development in First, Second and Third Language Acquisition of Relative Clauses'. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 1 (1): 3-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710408668175>.
- Gabriel, Christoph, Tanja Kupisch, and Jeanette Seoudy. 2016. 'VOT in French as a Foreign Language: A Production and Perception Study with Mono- and Multilingual Learners (German/Mandarin-Chinese)'. F. Neveu, G. Bergounioux, M.-H. Côté, J.-M. Fournier, L. Hriba, and S. Prévost (eds.), *SHS Web of Conferences* 27:09002. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20162709002>.
- Gabriel, Christoph, Johanna Stahnke, and Jeanette Thulke. 2015. 'Acquiring English and French Speech Rhythm in a Multilingual Classroom: A Comparison with Asian Englishes'. In *Universal or Diverse Paths to English Phonology?*, Ulrike Gut, Robert

- Fuchs, and Eva-Maria Wunder (eds.), 135-63. Berlin: De Gruyter.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110346084-008>.
- Garcia, Alison. 2013. 'The Effects of L2 Proficiency on L3 Phonological Acquisition: A Preliminary Test of the L2 Proficiency Hypothesis'. In *Selected Proceedings of the 2011 Second Language Research Forum: Converging Theory and Practice*. Erik Voss, Shu-Ju Diana Tai, and Zhi Li (eds.), 173-86. Somerville, Masschuset: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Garcia-Mayo, Maria Del Pilar. 2012. 'Cognitive Approaches to L3 Acquisition'. *International Journal of English Studies* 12 (1): 129-46. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.12.1.140421>.
- Geiss, Miriam, Sonja Gumbsheimer, Anika Lloyd-Smith, Svenja Schmid, and Tanja Kupisch. 2022. 'Voice Onset Time in Multilingual Speakers: Italian Heritage Speakers in Germany with L3 English'. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 44 (2): 435-59. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263121000280>.
- Grosjean, François. 2010. *Bilingual: Life and Reality*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674056459>.
- Grünke, Jonas, and Christoph Gabriel. 2022. 'Acquiring French Intonation against the Backdrop of Heritage Bilingualism: The Case of German–Turkish Learners'. *Languages* 7 (1): 68. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7010068>.
- Gut, Ulrike. 2009. *Non-Native Speech: A Corpus-Based Analysis of Phonological and Phonetic Properties of L2 English and German*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783484431225.157>.
- – – . 2010. 'Cross-Linguistic Influence in L3 Phonological Acquisition'. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7 (1): 19-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710902972248>.
- Hammarberg, Björn. 2001. 'Roles of L1 and L2 in L3 Production and Acquisition'. In *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition*, Jasone Cenoz, Britta Hufeisen, and Ulrike Jessner (eds.), 21-41. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595509-003>.
- Hammarberg, Björn, and Britta Hammarberg. 2009. 'Re-Setting the Basis of Articulation in the Acquisition of New Languages: A Third Language Case Study'. In *Processes in Third Language Acquisition*, 74-85. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748635122-007>.
- Kartushina, Natalia, and Clara D. Martin. 2019. 'Third-Language Learning Affects Bilinguals' Production in Both Their Native Languages: A Longitudinal Study of Dynamic Changes in L1, L2 and L3 Vowel Production'. *Journal of Phonetics* 77 (November): 100920. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2019.100920>.
- Klein, Elaine C. 1995. 'Second versus Third Language Acquisition: Is There a Difference?'. *Language Learning* 45 (3): 419-66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1995.tb00448.x>.
- Kopečková, Romana. 2014. 'Crosslinguistic Influence in Instructed L3 Child Phonological Acquisition'. In *Essential Topics in Applied Linguistics and Multilingualism: Studies in Honour of David Singleton*, Miroslaw Pawlak and Larissa Aronin (eds.), 205-24. New York: Springer Verlag. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-01414-2_12.

- Lipińska, Dorota. 2015. 'The Influence of L2 Status on L3 Pronunciation'. *English Insights* 1: 69-85.
- Liu, Jiaqi, and Jiayan Lin. 2021. 'A Cross-Linguistic Study of L3 Phonological Acquisition of Stop Contrasts'. *SAGE Open* 11 (1): 215824402098551. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020985510>.
- Liu, Jiaqi, Ting Zeng, and Xiuchuan Lu. 2019. 'Challenges in Multi-Language Pronunciation Teaching: A Cross-Linguistic Study of Chinese Students' Perception of Voiced and Voiceless Stops'. In *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación: Multilingual Research in the Chinese Context*, Yongyan Zheng and Xuesong Gao (eds.) 79: 99-118.
- Llama, Raquel, Walcir Cardoso, and Laura Collins. 2010. 'The Influence of Language Distance and Language Status on the Acquisition of L3 Phonology'. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 7 (1): 39-57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710902972255>.
- Lloyd-Smith, Anika. 2021. 'Perceived Foreign Accent in L3 English: the Effects of Heritage Language Use'. *International Journal of Multilingualism*: 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2021.1957899>.
- Louriz, Nabila. 2007. 'Alignment in L3 Phonology'. *Langues et Linguistique* 18/19: 129-60.
- Luo, Jingxin, Vivian Guo Li, and Peggy Pik Ki Mok. 2020. 'The Perception of Cantonese Vowel Length Contrast by Mandarin Speakers'. *Language and Speech* 63 (3): 635-59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0023830919879471>.
- Murphy, Shirin. 2003. 'Second Language Transfer During Third Language Acquisition'. *Studies in Applied Linguistics and TESOL* 3 (2) (December 22): 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.7916/SALT.V3I2.1625>.
- Nelson, Christina. 2022. 'Do a Learner's Background Languages Change with Increasing Exposure to L3? Comparing the Multilingual Phonological Development of Adolescents and Adults'. *Languages* 7 (2): 78. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7020078>.
- Onishi, Hiromi. 2016. 'The Effects of L2 Experience on L3 Perception'. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 13 (4): 459-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2016.1217604>.
- Patience, Matthew, and Wenqing Qian. 2022. 'The Role of Task Complexity and Dominant Articulatory Routines in the Acquisition of L3 Spanish'. *Languages* 7 (2): 90. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7020090>.
- Qin, Zhen, and Allard Jongman. 2016. 'Does Second Language Experience Modulate Perception of Tones in a Third Language?'. *Language and Speech* 59 (3): 318-38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0023830915590191>.
- Ringbom, Håkan. 1987. *The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Limited.
- Ringbom, Håkan, and Scott Jarvis. 2009. 'The Importance of Cross-Linguistic Similarity in Foreign Language Learning'. In *The Handbook of Language Teaching*, Michael Long and Catherine Doughty (eds.), 106-18. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444315783.ch7>.
- Rivers, Wilga M. 1979. 'Learning a Sixth Language: An Adult Learner's Daily Diary'. *Canadian Modern Language Review* 36: 67-82.

- Rocha-Hidalgo, Joscelin, and Rachel Barr. 2022. 'Defining Bilingualism in Infancy and Toddlerhood: A Scoping Review'. *International Journal of Bilingualism* (Online first) (April) <https://doi.org/10.1177/13670069211069067>.
- Rothman, Jason. 2010. 'L3 Syntactic Transfer Selectivity and Typological Determinacy: The Typological Primacy Model'. *Second Language Research* 27 (1): 107-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658310386439>.
- Rothman, Jason, Jorge González Alonso, and Eloi Puig-Mayenco. 2019. *Third Language Acquisition and Linguistic Transfer*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316014660>.
- Sharwood-Smith, Michael, and Eric Kellerman. 1986. 'Crosslinguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition'. In *Crosslinguistic Influence in Second Language Acquisition*, Michael Sharwood-Smith, Eric Kellerman (eds.), 1-9. New York: Perhamon Press.
- Singh, Rajendra, and Susanne Carroll. 1979. 'L1, L2 and L3'. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 5: 51-63.
- Slabakova, Roumyana. 2017. 'The Scalpel Model of Third Language Acquisition'. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 21 (6): 651-65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006916655413>.
- Sypiańska, Jolanta. 2016a. 'L1 Vowels of Multilinguals: The Applicability of SLM in Multilingualism'. *Research in Language* 14 (1): 79-94. <https://doi.org/10.1515/rela-2016-0003>.
- – – . 2016b. 'Multilingual Acquisition of Vowels in L1 Polish, L2 Danish and L3 English'. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 13 (4): 476-95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2016.1217606>.
- – – . 2022. 'The L3 Polish Lateral in Unbalanced Bilinguals: The Roles of L3 Proficiency and Background Languages'. *Languages* 7 (2): 102. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7020102>.
- Tremblay, Marie-Claude. 2007. 'Cross-Linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: The Role of L2 Proficiency and L2 Exposure'. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Congress of the Phonetic Sciences*. Saarbrücken: University of Saarbrücken.
- Van Leussen, Jan-Willem, and Paola Escudero. 2015. 'Learning to perceive and recognize a second language: the L2LP model revised'. *Frontiers in psychology* 6: 1000.
- Westergaard, Marit. 2019. 'Microvariation in Multilingual Situations: The Importance of Property-by-Property Acquisition'. *Second Language Research* 37 (3): 379-407. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267658319884116>.
- Westergaard, Marit, Natalia Mitrofanova, Roksolana Mykhaylyk, and Yulia Rodina. 2016. 'Crosslinguistic Influence in the Acquisition of a Third Language: The Linguistic Proximity Model'. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 21 (6): 666-82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367006916648859>.
- Williams, Sarah, and Bjorn Hammarberg. 1998. 'Language Switches in L3 Production: Implications for a Polyglot Speaking Model'. *Applied Linguistics* 19 (3): 295-333. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.3.295>.
- Wrembel, Magdalena. 2010. 'L2-Accented Speech in L3 Production'. *International Journal of*

- Multilingualism* 7 (1): 75-90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790710902972263>.
- – – . 2015. 'Cross-Linguistic Influence in Second vs. Third Language Acquisition of Phonology'. In *Universal or Diverse Paths to English Phonology*, Ulrike Gut, Robert Fuchs, and Eva-Maria Wunder (eds.), 41-70. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110346084-004>.
- Wrembel, Magdalena, Marta Marecka, and Romana Kopečková. 2019. 'Extending Perceptual Assimilation Model to L3 Phonological Acquisition'. *International Journal of Multilingualism* 16 (4): 513-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1583233>.
- Zeshan, Ulrike and Webster, Jenny. 2020. *Sign Multilingualism*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501503528>
- Zhang, Wei, and John M Levis. 2021. 'The Southwestern Mandarin /n/-/l/ Merger: Effects on Production in Standard Mandarin and English'. *Frontiers in Communication* 6 (August): 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2021.639390>.

8 Tables

Table 1: Source of transfer onto L3 speech perception

Publication	L1 transfer?	L2 transfer?	Hybrid transfer (L1 and L2)?
Liu, Zeng, and Lu (2019)	✓	✓	✓
Liu and Lin (2021)	✓	✓	✓
Luo, Li, and Mok (2020)		✓	
Onishi (2016)	✓	✓	✓
Qin and Jongman (2016)	✓	✓	✓
Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková (2019)	✓	✓	✓

Table 2: Source of transfer onto L3 speech production

Publication	L1 transfer?	L2 transfer?	Hybrid transfer (L1 and L2)?
Cal and Sypiańska (2020)		✓	
Chen and Han (2019)	✓	✓	✓
Garcia (2013)	✓	✓	✓
Geiss, Gumbsheimer, Lloyd-Smith, Schmid, and Kupisch (2022)		✓	
Grünke and Gabriel (2022)			
Gut (2010)		✓	
Kopečková (2014)	✓	✓	✓
Liu and Lin (2021)	✓	✓	✓
Lloyd-Smith (2021)	✓	✓	✓
Llama, Cardoso, and Collins (2010)	✓	✓	✓
Patience and Qian (2022)	✓	✓	✓
Sypiańska (2016b)	✓	✓	✓
Sypiańska (2022)	✓		
Wrembel (2010)	✓	✓	✓
Wrembel (2015)	✓	✓	✓
Zhang and Levis (2021)	✓		

Table 3: Language involved in previous studies.

Publication	L3 language	L2 language	L1 language/heritage language ³
Cal and Sypiańska (2020)	Spanish	English	Polish
Chen and Han (2019)	Mandarin	English	Cantonese
Garcia (2013)	Portuguese	Spanish	English
Gut (2010)	German/English	German/English	Polish/Russian/ Hungarian/Spanish
Geiss, Gumbsheimer, Lloyd-Smith, Schmid, and Kupisch (2022)	English	German ⁴	Italian
Grünke and Gabriel (2022)	French	German	Turkish
Liu, Zeng, and Lu (2019)	Japanese/Russian/ Spanish	English	Mandarin
Kopečková (2014)	Spanish	English	German
Llama, Cardoso, and Collins (2010)	Spanish	English/French	English/French
Liu and Lin (2021)	Japanese/Russian	English	Mandarin
Lloyd-Smith (2021)	English	German ⁵	Italian
Luo, Li, and Mok (2020)	Cantonese	English	Mandarin
Onishi (2016)	Japanese	English	Korean
Patience and Qian (2022)	Spanish	English	Mandarin
Qin and Jongman (2016)	Cantonese	Mandarin	English
Sypiańska (2016b)	English	Danish	Polish
Sypiańska (2022)	Polish	Russian	Ukrainian
Wrembel (2010)	English	German	Polish
Wrembel (2015)	French	English	German
Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková (2019)	Polish	English	German
Zhang and Levis (2021)	English	Standard Mandarin	Southwestern Mandarin

³ L3 participants in Lloyd-Smith (2021), Geiss, Gumbsheimer, Lloyd-Smith, Schmid, and Kupisch (2022), Grünke and Gabriel (2022) acquired L1 as their heritage language, and L2 as their majority language.

⁴ 7 participants were exposed to German since birth, while other 13 participants were exposed to German between 2 to 6 years old (mean age = 2.7).

⁵ 14 participants were exposed to Italian since birth, and to German between ages 3 to 6 (mean age = 3.8), while 5 participants were exposed to German since birth.

Table 4: L3 group participants' profiles in recent L3 phonology studies.

Publication	Age of onset of Acquisition (years)	Age of Test (years)	Number of participants	Length acquiring L3
Cal and Sypiańska (2020)	15 (mean); range 3-20	22 (mean); range 19-25	25	7 years (mean)
Chen and Han (2019)	~10	~18	4 ⁶	8 years
Garcia (2013)	>18	22 (mean); range 19-31	10	~1 year
Geiss, Gumbsheimer, Lloyd-Smith, Schmid, and Kupisch (2022)	6-11	23 (mean); range 17-29	20	NA
Grünke and Gabriel (2022)	12-14	Range 15-17	6	3 years
Gut (2010)	Speaker 1: 13; Speaker 2: 18; Speaker 3: NA; Speaker 4: 29	39.25 (mean); range 30-50	4	Speaker 1: 17 years; Speaker 2: 32 years; Speaker 3: NA; Speaker 4: 2 years
Kopečková (2014)	NA	range 11-12	20	3 months (36 hours)
Llama, Cardoso, and Collins (2010)	NA	>18	22	NA
Lloyd-Smith (2021)	NA	23.3 (mean); range 17-31	19	NA
Liu and Lin (2021)	>18	range 18-20	39	2 months (80 hours)
Liu, Zeng, and Lu (2019)	>18	range 18-20	58	2 months
Luo, Li, and Mok (2020)	Experienced: ~18; Inexperienced: ~20	Experienced: 23.15 (mean); Inexperienced: 20.85 (mean)	40	Experienced: 5.46 years (mean); Inexperienced: 0.79 years (mean)
Onishi (2016)	>18	21.4 (mean)	22	<2 semesters
Qin and Jongman (2016)	23.67 (mean)	23.67 (mean)	15	NA
Sypiańska (2016b)	NA	57 (mean); range 32-69	20	NA
Sypiańska (2022)	~19	19.7 (mean); range 17-22	21	~5-8 months
Wrembel (2010)	Intermediate: 10; Elementary: 17	>18	24	Intermediate: 12 years;

⁶ There were 89 participants involved in this study, but only 4 participants finished all stages of the experiments, and the CLI source of transfer was analysed based on those 4 participants' data.

Publication	Age of onset of Acquisition (years)	Age of Test (years)	Number of participants	Length acquiring L3
Wrembel (2015)	13 (mean)	29 (mean); range 22-43	18	Elementary: 3.5 years) 7 years (mean)
Wrembel, Marecka, and Kopečková (2019)	Chronological L3: 12 (n=3); Dominance L3 (heritage): 0 (n=5)	13.8 (mean), range 13-14	8 ⁷	10 months
Zhang and Levis (2021)	~9	19.5 (mean); range 18-21	25	10 years (mean); range 7-12 years

⁷ Task 2 included 8 L3 Polish participants but Task 1 only included 7 L3 Polish participants due to one participant's withdrawal during data collection.