# Does short-term phonetic accommodation lead to long-term sound change? Not directly

*Cesko C. Voeten*
*Leiden University Centre for Linguistics*
*Leiden Institute for Brain and Cognition*

The change-by-accommodation model ('CAM'; [1,2]) suggests that sound change is caused by phonetic accommodation ([3,4]). This is tested empirically via longitudinal experiments using three on-going sound changes in Dutch: the diphthongization of /e:,ø:,o:/ ([5,6]), the blocking of diphthongs before coda /l/ ([6,7]), and the gliding of coda /r/ to [ɹ] ([8]). These have effectively completed in the Netherlands, but have not affected Flanders. This makes it possible to perform empirical studies of the CAM via *sociolinguistic migrants* ('SMs'): Flemish speakers of Dutch who migrated to the Netherlands to start their university studies.

Over the course of nine months, ten SMs and ten controls participated in three sessions of experiments focused on their production and perception of the three sound changes. The low number of participants is compensated by a high number of experimental items combined with the repeated-measures design, resulting in sufficient power. Results show robust differences between the groups, that do not convincingly diminish over time.

This is problematic for the CAM, especially because a follow-up cross-sectional experiment over multiple years' time *did* find changes. Since phonetic accommodation is known to be extremely rapid ([3,4]), the result that nine months were not enough, but decades are, casts doubt on the change-by-accommodation model.

**References**

[1] Auer, Peter, & Hinskens, Frans. 2005. The role of interpersonal accommodation in a theory of language change. *Dialect change: Convergence and divergence in European languages*, 335.
[2] Sonderegger, Morgan. 2012. *Phonetic and phonological dynamics on reality television*. Doctoral dissertation, Chicago.
[3] Pardo, Jennifer S. 2006. On phonetic convergence during conversational interaction. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 1194, 2382–2393. doi:10.1121/1.2178720
[4] Maye, Jessica, Aslin, Richard N, & Tanenhaus, Michael K. 2008. The weckud wetch of the wast: Lexical adaptation to a novel accent. *Cognitive Science*, 323, 543–562. doi:10.1080/03640210802035357
[5] Van de Velde, Hans. 1996. *Variatie en verandering in het gesproken Standaard-Nederlands*. Doctoral dissertation, Nijmegen. doi:2066/146159
[6] Voeten, Cesko Cis. 2015. *The interaction between the segmental and the prosodic phonology in the midst of an on-going sound change. resolving a contradiction in the synchronic phonology of Dutch*. Master's thesis, Nijmegen. Retrieved from https://theses.ubn.ru.nl/handle/123456789/628
[7] Berns, Janine, & Jacobs, Haike M G M. 2012. A first glance at the role of length in production and perception of diphthongs before Dutch coda l. *Linguistics in the Netherlands*, 291, 15–26. doi:10.1075/avt.29.02ber
[8] Sebregts, Koen. 2015. The sociophonetics and phonology of Dutch /r/. Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht. doi:1874/306415