**Supplementary materials for “Learning speaker-specific linguistic ‘style’ is mediated by deviance from common language-use”**

**S1. An analysis of the number of correct responses by condition**

In this section, we report an additional analysis comparing the number of correct responses, instead of the binary classification to learners and non-learners as was done in Experiment 1. To be able to compare the results of the two experiments, this analysis was conducted for the data in Experiment 2 as well. In the analysis, we counted the number of correct responses in the test phase for each participant and compared it between conditions using unpaired two-sample t-tests. We note that this analysis may be susceptible to guessing strategy, and therefore may be less accurate.

**Experiment 1**

Pairwise comparisons revealed that the number of correct responses was larger in the HL condition than in the HH condition (t(29.22) = 2.15, *p* = 0.04; Figure 1), and marginally larger in the LL condition compared to the HH condition (t(34.38) = 1.87, *p* = 0.07). The number of correct responses in the HL and LL conditions did not differ significantly (t(35.39) = 0.57, *p* = 0.575).

****

**Figure 1.** Number of correct responses by condition in Ex.1. \* p < 0.05

**Experiment 2**

Pairwise comparisons revealed that the number of correct responses was larger in the HL condition than in the HH condition (t(100.25) = 4.667, *p* < 0.001; Figure 2), and in the LL condition compared to the HH condition (t(105.02) = 7.262, *p* < 0.001). The number of correct responses in the HL and LL conditions did not differ significantly (t(125.25), *p* = 0.066).



**Figure 2.** Number of correct responses by condition in Ex.2. \*\*\* p < 0.001

Overall, the pattern of results reported here is similar to the results attained with the analyses reported in the main manuscript (for both experiments), but with smaller effect sizes.