(1) Increasing use of language contact data
   a. Loanword adaptation and the p-map (e.g. Fleischhacker 2005; Yun 2012)
   b. Creoles and stress/tone typology (Saramaccan: Good 2004; Papiamentu: Remijsen & van Heuven 2005)

(2) “Contact as simplification”
      › McWhorter’s (1998; 2011) creole prototype hypothesis: “the world’s simplest grammars”
      › Not for phoneme inventories and syllable templates (Uffmann 2009; Klein 2011)
   b. Larger population → Simpler morphosyntax, larger inventories
      (Hay & Bauer 2007; Atkinson 2011; Wichmann et al. 2011; Donohue & Nichols 2011)
   c. But how much simplification do we expect in the phoneme inventory?

(3) “Contact as perception”
   a. Emergent patterns: too-many-solutions, divergent repairs, unnecessary repairs (Kang 2011)
      › Japanese /kannu/ < Cannes, but /pen/ from pen (Peperkamp et al. 2008)
   b. Underlying phonology vs. phonetics/perception
      › Mexican Spanish /bitet/ < bitter [bira] (LaCharité & Paradis 2005)
   c. Who is borrowing, naïve non-native listeners, or competent bilinguals?

(4) Contact as sound change
   a. Phonological constraints, social interactions, phonetic precursors
   b. Phonetic effects unique to L2 → Sound changes unique to language contact?

(5) | Unrounnding | Creolisation | Other contact | L1 transmission |
    |------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
    a. Front rounded vowels (phoneme merger) | y > i | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
    Backing | y > u | rare | ✓ | rare |
    b. Vowel assimilation (stress-dependent) | Unstressed trigger | bűke > bӱke | unknown | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
    Stressed trigger | bűke > bӱku | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
    c. Word-final epenthesis (vs. other repairs) | Epenthesis | big > bigi | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | rare |
    Others | big > bik | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
(6) Overwhelming pattern: French /y/ > creole /i/ (e.g. Holm 1988: 120)
   a. Haitian [mi] ‘wall’ < mur
   b. Martinique [jme] ‘mood’ < humeur
   c. Guadeloupe [kĩme] ‘to foam, skim’ < ecumer
   d. St. Lucia [fĩmen] ‘to smoke’ < fumer
   e. Mauritius [diţe] ‘tea’ < du thé
   f. Réunion [ʃirtu] ‘mainly’ < surtout
   g. Seychelles [lɪniform] ‘uniform’ < l’uniforme
   h. New Caledonia [tribi] ‘tribe’ < tribu

(7) Minority patterns (e.g. Valdman 1973; Klingler 2003; Carrington 1984; Parkvall 2000: 29)
   a. /u/ in some Haitian words, e.g. bule ‘burn’ < bruler (cf. Louisiana, Mauritius burle)
   b. [y] in acrolect: Nearly all French creoles, e.g. hypercorrect Louisiana [klarynet] < clarinette
   c. /y/ in several words: rural St Lucian /kõsyt/ ‘council’ < consulter (cf. basilectal rural Haitian)

(8) /u ~ i/ in West African indigenised French varieties
   a. Asante Twi speakers in Ghana (Haggis 1975: 65)
   b. Ewe speakers in South Togo (Lafigure 1985: 165)
   c. Bassa speakers in coastal Cameroon (Wamba & Noumssi 2004: 46)

(9) Gradual creolisation (e.g. Arends 1989; Selbach et al. 2009)
   a. Homestead → Plantation (Singler 1995; Chaudenson 2001)
   b. Target shift during successive waves of adult L2 acquisition

(10) Early but reduced acquisition of L2 contrasts (Flege et al. 2003; Flege 1993; Flege 1980)
   a. Quality of /et/ vs. /el/, duration of beat-bead and /p t k/ vs. /b d g/
   b. /y/ could go in two directions: /u/-like (advanced [uʰ]), or /i/-like (less rounded [y])

   a. /i/ only: Kikongo, Kituba
   b. /u/ only: “Bantu speakers in Congo-Kinshasa”
   c. /i/ and /u/: Kinyarwanda, Fula, Lingala, Mandinka, Wolof, Moroccan Arabic
   d. Others: /wi/ in Fongbe, Vietnamese; /ju/ in Japanese

(12) Phonological bias hypothesis
   a. More bilingualism early in the transmission process will tend to favour outcomes with the closest phonological match rather than the closest acoustic match.
   b. All else being equal, major place of articulation is privileged in phonological matching.

(13) Findings from this case study
   a. A phonetic mechanism for ‘phonological’ adaptation
   b. Language contact is more than naïve perception
   c. Creole exceptionality within language contact

(14) Other phonetic effects peculiar to adult L2 acquisition
   a. Consonant cluster timing: CC → C’C (e.g. Zsiga 2000; Davidson 2006)
   b. Speech planning in shorter chunks (e.g. Pienemann 1998)
   c. Hypercorrection and self-monitoring (e.g. Jaeger 2005: 82; Eckman et al. 2013)
   d. Overcompensation for apparent phonetic reduction or weak perceptual salience?
      › Haitian /piţi/ < French petit
      › Bazaar Malay /ampat/ < Malay /ampat/
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