



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: De Clerck, I., Pettinato, M., Gillis, S., Verhoeven, J. & Gillis, S. (2018). Prosodic modulation in the babble of cochlear implanted and normally hearing infants: a perceptual study using a visual analogue scale. *First Language*, 38(5), pp. 481-502. doi: 10.1177/0142723718773957

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/19373/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723718773957>

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

City Research Online:

<http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/>

publications@city.ac.uk



Prosodic modulation in the babble of cochlear implanted and normally hearing infants: a perceptual study using a visual analogue scale.

Journal:	<i>First Language</i>
Manuscript ID	FLA-17-0040.R3
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keywords:	Cochlear Implants, Infants, Babble, Prosody, Prosodic modulation, Prosodic development, Perceptual experiment
Abstract:	<p>This study investigates prosodic modulation in the spontaneous canonical babble of congenitally deaf infants with cochlear implants (CI) and normally hearing (NH) infants. Research has shown that the acoustic cues to prominence are less modulated in CI babble. However acoustic measurements of individual cues to prominence give incomplete information about prosodic modulation. In the present study, raters are asked to judge prominence since they simultaneously take into account all prosodic cues. Disyllabic utterances produced by CI and NH infants were presented to naive adult raters who had to indicate the degree and direction of prosodic modulation between syllables on a visual analogue scale. The results show that the babble of infants with CI is rated as having less prosodic modulation. Moreover, segmentally more variegated babble is rated as having more prosodic modulation. Raters do not perceive the babble to be predominantly trochaic, which indicates that the predominant stress pattern of Dutch is not yet apparent in the children's productions.</p>
<p>Note: The following files were submitted by the author for peer review, but cannot be converted to PDF. You must view these files (e.g. movies) online.</p>	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

experiment.mov

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

For Peer Review

Abstract

This study investigates prosodic modulation in the spontaneous canonical babble of congenitally deaf infants with cochlear implants (CI) and normally hearing (NH) infants. Research has shown that the acoustic cues to prominence are less modulated in CI babble. However acoustic measurements of individual cues to prominence give incomplete information about prosodic modulation. In the present study, raters are asked to judge prominence since they simultaneously take into account all prosodic cues. Disyllabic utterances produced by CI and NH infants were presented to naive adult raters who had to indicate the degree and direction of prosodic modulation between syllables on a visual analogue scale. The results show that the babble of infants with CI is rated as having less prosodic modulation. Moreover, segmentally more variegated babble is rated as having more prosodic modulation. Raters do not perceive the babble to be predominantly trochaic, which indicates that the predominant stress pattern of Dutch is not yet apparent in the children's productions.

Acknowledgements

Our special thanks go to the families and infants who participated in the study and to K. Schauwers, I. Molemans, R. van den Berg and L. Van Severen for collecting the Clips Child Language Corpus. We would also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers and Associate Editor for their constructive comments and suggestions.

Introduction

In congenitally deaf infants, Cochlear Implantation (CI henceforth) in the prelexical period has been shown to have a positive effect on their speech and language acquisition (Dettman et al., 2016; Levine, Strother-Garcia, Golinkoff, & Hirsh-Pasek, 2016; Tomblin, Barker, Spencer, Zhang, & Gantz, 2005). However, the prosodic modulation of speech remains difficult even long after implantation. In Dutch prosodic modulation is achieved by manipulating three acoustic cues, viz. fundamental frequency (F0), intensity and duration (Lieberman, 1960). In perceptual terms this means that a prosodically prominent syllable in a word or prelexical utterance has higher pitch and is louder and longer. Cochlear implants are limited in transmitting the spectral and temporal information that is crucial for adequate perception of pitch (Green, Faulkner, & Rosen, 2004; Moore, 2003; O'Halpin, 2010) and intensity (Drennan & Rubinstein, 2008; Meister, Landwehr, Pyschny, Wagner, & Walger, 2011; Moore, 2003), leading to difficulties with prominence production.

For typical development there are some acoustic studies of prominence production showing that infants already start to manipulate F0, intensity and duration in canonical babble (Davis, MacNeilage, Matyear, & Powell, 2000; De Clerck, Pettinato, Verhoeven, & Gillis, 2017). This early production ability originates from infants' perceptual sensitivity to the prosodic properties of the ambient language (Friederici, Friedrich, & Christophe, 2007; Jusczyk, Cutler, & Redanz, 1993; Ramus, 2002). CI infants' speech perception is not only degraded but they also gain access to auditory input at a later chronological age. Because of this initially delayed access to the prosodic properties of their ambient language, their ability to manipulate prosodic cues is likely to be delayed as well. However, hardly any studies have focused on prelexical prominence production by early implanted infants (i.e. infants who received their CI before the age of two). The present study therefore investigates prosodic

1
2
3 modulation in the prelexical utterances of congenitally deaf infants who received a CI before
4
5 the age of two, compared to their typically developing peers.
6
7

8 9 *Prosody production by CI users*

10
11 Prosody production, and more specifically word stress production, is problematic for severe-
12
13 to-profoundly deaf children. They modulate prominence inadequately, resulting in anomalous
14
15 intonation due to a slower speech rate (Clement, 2004; van den Dikkenberg-Pot, Koopmans-
16
17 van Beinum, & Clement, 1998) as well as excessive or monotone pitch production (Clement,
18
19 2004; Kent, Osberger, Netsell, & Hustedde, 1987). Although cochlear implantation
20
21 substantially improves speech perception, school-aged CI children still have problems with
22
23 particular aspects of speech modulation in production, such as prominence production.
24
25 Lenden and Flipsen (2007) investigated the prosodic characteristics of conversational speech
26
27 of 3- to 6-year-olds with CI (implanted before age 3) by means of the Prosody-Voice
28
29 Screening Profile (Shriberg et al. 1990). 83.1% of their utterances were classified as
30
31 inappropriately stressed and 96.7% of these inappropriately-stressed utterances were judged
32
33 to have ‘excessive, equal or misplaced’ stress. Carter, Dillon, and Pisoni (2002) conducted a
34
35 non-word repetition task in a group of 8- to 10-year-old English children with CI (mean age at
36
37 implantation 3.3 years). They found that the accuracy of imitating the stress pattern of non-
38
39 words was only 61%, but there was no normally hearing (NH henceforth) control group
40
41 included in the study to compare the results with. In a study with 6- to 9-year-old Dutch
42
43 children with CI (age at implantation before 2 years) a non-word repetition task was
44
45 performed in which the participants had to imitate the stress pattern of disyllabic non-words
46
47 (Hide, 2013). It was found that CI children had a lower percentage of correctly imitated stress
48
49 patterns (86% for trochaic and 81% for iambic non-words) than an age-matched NH control
50
51 group (95% for trochaic and 97% for iambic non-words). Moreover, the disyllabic imitations
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 were classified into trochaic or iambic utterances by three raters. For the non-words that were
4
5 unanimously judged as having stress on the first or the second syllable, the CI children
6
7 showed less acoustic modulation than the NH children regarding pitch rises and pitch rise
8
9 duration. All these studies show that school-aged CI users have difficulties with producing
10
11 prosodic prominence.
12

13 14 15 *Prosody production in prelexical speech*

16
17 Although the production of word stress by school-aged CI users has already been
18
19 investigated, studies of prosodic prominence production in prelexical speech are rare, even for
20
21 typically developing infants. Davis et al. (2000) showed that prelexical NH English infants
22
23 already have the necessary abilities to produce prominent syllables, but they do not yet use
24
25 these in a consistent way. Raters indicated a clearly prominent syllable in less than half of the
26
27 disyllabic babble. However, in those utterances with a prominent syllable F0, intensity and
28
29 duration values were modulated in a way similar to adult speech. For all three cues the ratios
30
31 between the more prominent and the less prominent syllables were comparable for infants and
32
33 adults. One of our previous longitudinal studies followed 9 NH infants acquiring Dutch from
34
35 the onset of babbling until they reached a cumulative vocabulary of 200 words (De Clerck et
36
37 al., 2017). The three cues to prosody were measured in disyllabic babble and early words. It
38
39 was found that from babbling onwards infants differentiate acoustically between prominent
40
41 and less prominent syllables. Intensity and F0 already tend to be slightly higher in the first
42
43 syllables of infant babble, but the predominant trochaic pattern was well established in early
44
45 word use. Words had more prosodic modulation than babble in terms of F0 and intensity.
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Research on early prominence production in CI infants is even rarer than in NH infants,
53
54 therefore an acoustic study was carried out in which the three cues to prosody in disyllabic
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 babble and words of infants with CI and a NH control group were measured (Pettinato, De
4 Clerck, Verhoeven, & Gillis, 2017). The results indicated that CI infants show poorer use of
5 acoustic cues, especially of F0 and intensity. This discrepancy between CI and NH infants
6 started from babbling onwards and the gap between the two groups became even wider when
7 looking at early word productions. In acoustical terms, infants with CI showed less prosodic
8 modulation from babbling onwards and the emergence of the first words did not boost
9 prosodic modulation as was the case for NH infants.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 *Perceptual judgments to assess prominence production*

21
22 The study of Pettinato et al. (2017) focused on the acoustic phonetics of individual prosodic
23 cues in babble and words. Measuring F0, intensity and duration reveals subtle prosodic
24 differences between CI and NH infants in the realisation of the isolated prosodic cues to
25 prominence. However, a limitation of this method is that acoustically measured differences do
26 not necessarily have a perceptual effect, meaning that raters are not necessarily able to detect
27 these differences in prominence production. A body of research on covert contrasts in
28 phonological development shows that significant differences between two categories of
29 speech sounds can be measured acoustically but these differences are not perceived as such by
30 raters (Li, Edwards, & Beckman, 2009; Scobbie, Gibbon, Hardcastle, & Fletcher, 1996). Li et
31 al. (2009) for instance investigated the contrasts between voiceless sibilant fricatives in
32 English and Japanese 2-to-3-year olds. Both languages have a contrast between an alveolar
33 fricative /s/ and a postalveolar fricative (English: /ʃ/, Japanese: /ɕ/). For four out of 22 English
34 and two out of 21 Japanese children they found significant acoustic difference between the
35 two types of fricatives, although a trained native transcriber transcribed all productions as /s/
36 (for English) or as /ɕ/ (for Japanese). Therefore, a perceptual experiment is needed to
37 complement the acoustic findings of Pettinato et al. (2017).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 An additional motivation for a perceptual study is that the prosodic cues can be in trade-off
6 relations in speech (Lieberman, 1960), e.g. in an utterance with a prominent first syllable the
7 measurement of one cue (e.g. F0) could for instance be higher on the first syllable, whilst the
8 others are not (e.g. intensity and duration). Consequently the separate acoustic measurements
9 give an ambiguous image of the realised stress pattern. Raters have been shown to make stress
10 judgements by taking into account these trade-off relations between the different cues instead
11 of decoding the signal into the three separate cues to prominence (Flege & Bohn, 1989; Fry,
12 1958). Perceptual judgements thus complement acoustic measurements because raters
13 indicate which prosodic prominence pattern they hear by taking into account all cues at the
14 same time.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 The aim of the current study is to investigate prosodic modulation in the babble of CI and NH
29 infants in a perceptual experiment in which naive adult raters indicate the degree and direction
30 of prosodic differentiation in disyllabic babble on a Visual Analogue Scale (VAS). A VAS is
31 a psychometrical measurement tool consisting of a line with two opposite speech
32 characteristics of a stimulus at the extremes of the scale (Munson, Schellinger, & Carlson,
33 2012). In our study those opposites are “a very prominent first syllable” versus “a very
34 prominent second syllable”.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 *Canonical babble in CI infants*

47

48 The focus of this study is on prosodic modulation in canonical babble of CI and NH infants.
49 Canonical babbling is considered to be an important milestone in the construction of adult-
50 like syllables. Canonical babble consists of consonant-vowel sequences that can be
51 reduplicated or variegated (Oller & Eilers, 1988; Stoel-Gammon & Otomo, 1986). In
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reduplicated babble the sequences follow each other repetitively (e.g. ‘didi’, ‘mamama’). In
4
5 variegated babble infants produce different segments in the syllable sequences (e.g.
6
7 ‘badigogu’, ‘kamobido’). Koopmans-van Beinum, Clement, and van den Dikkenberg-Pot
8
9 (2001) propose a sensorimotor description of the prelexical speech of NH and deaf infants.
10
11 They consider speech as a combination of phonation and articulation. In very early speech
12
13 infants either phonate or articulate. Later on they combine phonation and articulation,
14
15 resulting in the production of sequences of syllables, i.e. canonical babble. In their study
16
17 Koopmans-van Beinum et al. (2001) show that deaf infants have difficulties combining
18
19 phonation and articulation and thus to produce canonical babble. They argue that auditory
20
21 perception and (auto-)feedback are requirements to coordinate articulatory movements and
22
23 phonation of the airstream, which is essential for the production of canonical syllables.
24
25
26
27
28

29 Cochlear implantation at an early age improves speech perception and production of severely
30
31 deaf infants, but studies on prelexical speech show that infants with CI continue to have
32
33 difficulties with modulating the speech stream. When it comes to canonical babble, CI infants
34
35 do produce more repetitive vocalisations after implantation and their reduplicated babble
36
37 resembles that of younger infants with normal hearing in that the utterances consist of similar
38
39 numbers of CV-repetitions (Fagan, 2015). However, Schauwers, Gillis, and Govaerts (2008)
40
41 show that the intersyllabic structure of prelexical utterances remains less variegated in infants
42
43 with CI: they produce more reduplicated and less variegated babble than their NH peers. NH
44
45 and CI infants prefer vowel variegation over consonantal variegation and this preference is
46
47 significantly stronger in the CI group. Moreover, consonant variegation in CI utterances was
48
49 found to be predominantly simple (manner OR place change) rather than complex (manner
50
51 AND place change) which characterised NH children’s’ consonant variegation. In sum, the
52
53 canonical babble of CI infants is less varied or modulated at the segmental level than the
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 babble of NH infants. Infants with CI are able to produce reduplicated babble, but they do not
4
5 modulate the speech stream to the same extent as their NH peers in order to produce a variety
6
7 of segments. This results in less variegated babbling.
8
9

10
11 In sum, it is observed that infants with CI have less modulated prosody in acoustical terms
12
13 (Pettinato et al., 2017), and they have less modulation at the segmental level (Schauwers et al.
14
15 2008). Consequently the question arises whether CI speech is characterised by a more general
16
17 modulation issue that manifests itself both on the segmental (cf. Schauwers et al. 2008) and
18
19 the suprasegmental level. This has not yet been investigated, but present study explores the
20
21 possible influence of two maturation effects on prosody production. First of all it might be the
22
23 case that the expansion of phonological capacities influences prosodic modulation, i.e. the
24
25 phonological complexity of the babble might influence modulation. More concretely,
26
27 reduplicated babble might be prosodically less modulated than segmentally more modulated
28
29 variegated babble. Beside the expansion of phonological capacities another maturation effect
30
31 might impact prominence production. It might be the case that infants' experience with
32
33 producing canonical babble (i.e. their chronological age, counted from the onset of babbling)
34
35 leads to more prosodic modulation and/or more frequent production of the predominant
36
37 trochaic pattern.
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 *Research questions*

45
46 Two research questions are the focus of the present study:

- 47
48 (1) *Is the spontaneous canonical babble of congenitally deaf infants with CI perceived to*
49
50 *be prosodically less modulated than the babble of their NH peers?*
51

52 Given the initially delayed access to auditory input and the deprived perception of the
53
54 prosodic cues to prominence it is hypothesised that raters will perceive less modulated
55
56
57
58
59

1
2 prosody production in the babble of infants with CI. Moreover, the acoustic study of Pettinato
3 et al. (2017) has shown less modulation in pitch and intensity in CI babble. It is tested
4 whether maturation effects (i.e. phonological abilities and/or babble experience) influence
5 prosodic modulation
6
7
8
9
10

11
12
13 (2) *Do listeners perceive the babble to be predominantly trochaic? Is there a difference*
14 *between CI and NH infants in this respect?*
15
16

17 The predominant stress pattern in Dutch disyllables is trochaic (Daelemans, Gillis, &
18 Durieux, 1994). It is hypothesised that listeners will perceive more trochaic babble if infants
19 produce the dominant prosodic characteristics of their ambient language from babbling
20 onwards. It is tested whether maturation effects (i.e. phonological abilities and/or babble
21 experience) influence prosodic modulation.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Method

Participants

This study was carried out in 9 infants with a CI and 9 NH infants from the CLiPS Child Language Corpus (CCLC), a collection of longitudinal audio-video data and transcriptions of 10 children with a CI and 40 NH Dutch children (Molemans, 2011; Van den Berg, 2012; Van Severen, 2012). One infant with CI was not selected for the present study because of too few recordings in the relevant age range. All children had been raised in monolingual homes acquiring Belgian Dutch.

The children with CI were recruited from an ENT-unit of the St-Augustinus hospital in Antwerp/Belgium in 2000-2001 (Schauwers, 2006). The participants had all been diagnosed with a profound congenital hearing loss through a neonatal hearing screening during the first weeks of life. No other health or developmental problems were apparent. The children received a multichannel Nucleus-24 CI (Cochlear Corp., Sydney, Australia). **This device consists of 22 intra-cochlear electrodes, like more recent CIs. The data and results in the present study are still representative since the present-day electrodes are not significantly improved in transmitting spectro-temporal information.**

All infants were implanted before 20 months, with age of implantation ranging from 5 to 19 months ($M = 12$ months; $SD = 5$ months). Before implantation the average hearing threshold, i.e. Pure Tone Average (PTA), was 113 dBHL and the range was 93-120 dBHL ($SD = 9$ dBHL). One year after implantation the PTA steadily decreased to 30-52 dBHL ($M = 40$ dBHL; $SD = 7$ dBHL). All recordings used in this study were made while the children were unilaterally implanted. The auditory characteristics are listed in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

As a control group for this study, 9 NH children were randomly selected from the corpus. The

1
2
3 infants had been recruited from day-care centres, families known by the researchers and by
4
5 advertisements. The typical development of these children had been established on the basis
6
7 of parent report and a checklist of the attainment of communicative and motor milestones,
8
9 largely based on the checklist developed by 'Kind en Gezin', the Flemish infant welfare
10
11 centre (Molemans, 2011). Normal language development had been verified by means of the
12
13 Dutch version of the CDI ("N-CDI", Zink & Lejaegere, 2001). The N-CDI was filled out by
14
15 the parents of the NH children to estimate productive and receptive vocabulary development.
16
17 The mean percentile for the infants included in this study was 37.9 ($SD = 28.4$; range = 5.5 -
18
19 94.5) at 1;0, 46.9 ($SD = 23$; range = 20-90) at 1;6 and 51.7 ($SD = 29.5$; range = 10-90) at 2;0.
20
21
22
23

24 For the present experiment babble data from both groups was selected from the onset of
25
26 babbling until the children reached a cumulative vocabulary level of 200 words (cf.
27
28 'experimental stimuli'). This cut-off point was arbitrary but motivated by the fact that infants
29
30 do not stop babbling after the onset of word use and because the selected time range provided
31
32 enough data for every child included in this study. This procedure implies that the
33
34 chronological age of each child at the beginning of data selection and at the end of data
35
36 selection was (potentially) different. The onset of babbling was determined by a True
37
38 Canonical Babbling Ratio (tCBR) of 0.15 (Molemans, Van den Berg, Van Severen, & Gillis,
39
40 2011; Oller & Eilers, 1988). The tCBR is the ratio of the syllables with 'true consonants' (i.e.
41
42 all consonants except glottals (/h/, glotal stop) and glides (/w/, /j/)) over all syllables
43
44 produced. The mean age of the CI children at the start of the recordings used in the present
45
46 study was 18 months ($SD = 5$ months). The mean age at the cut-off point was 27 months (SD
47
48 = 5 months). The mean age of the NH children at the onset of recordings was 8 months ($SD =$
49
50 2 months). The mean age at the cut-off point was 22 months ($SD = 2$ months). The ages of
51
52 the individual children at the time of recording is given in Table 2.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE*Perceptual experiment*

A perceptual experiment was set up in which naive adult raters indicated the degree and direction of prosodic differentiation in disyllabic babble on a VAS.

Adult raters. 30 naive native Dutch-speaking adults (mean age 23 years, range 18-42 years) made the prominence judgements in the perceptual experiment. The raters were naive since they were not informed about the purpose of the study. Moreover, they were not familiar with CI and NH children's speech. None of the raters reported problems with hearing or health, nor developmental disorders.

Experimental stimuli. For the present study, all eligible disyllabic utterances were selected from the CCLC. Each recording lasted 60-90 minutes and the portions of the recordings in which the child was vocally most active were selected for further processing. These selections were restricted to approximately 20 minutes. From the selections only disyllabic babbled utterances were selected when they consisted of two vocalic phases minimally separated by a clear consonantal phase. Moreover, disyllabic babble was included if there was no concurrent speech or noise and if they were not produced with a creaky, breathy, excessively loud or whispery voice. A total of 524 disyllabic babble (165 CI babble, 359 NH babble) was included as stimuli for the perceptual experiment (see Table 2).

Since maturation effects might influence the production prosodic modulation, two variables were investigated in this study. The first maturation variable is the infants' babble experience. Since infants start babbling at different ages and since there is a large discrepancy between

1
2
3 the chronological age at onset of babbling of the CI and NH infants, it is more meaningful to
4
5 take into account the chronological age counted from the onset of babbling onwards. More
6
7 specifically, the month in which the child started babbling was labelled as 0, the first month
8
9 after the onset of babbling as 1, the second month as 2, etc. The second maturation variable is
10
11 the phonological complexity of the babble. The canonical babble utterances were categorised
12
13 into reduplicated and variegated babble. The prelexical utterances in the recordings of the
14
15 CCLC are transcribed in broad phonemic categories (detailed information on the transcription
16
17 is provided in Molemans, 2011; Van den Berg, 2012; Van Severen, 2012). These broad
18
19 phonemic transcriptions were used to automatically categorise babble into variegated or
20
21 reduplicated babble. When the same segmental content was repeated in the two syllables the
22
23 utterance was classified as reduplicated (e.g. 'baba'). Whereas in variegated babble the
24
25 syllables differ at the segmental level by consonantal and/or vocalic variation (e.g. 'baka').
26
27 This means that there were two intermediary steps: the sound files were first transcribed as
28
29 part of a previous research project (Molemans, 2011; Van den Berg, 2012; Van Severen,
30
31 2012), and then these transcriptions were automatically coded as reduplicated or variegated
32
33 babble. 44% of the disyllabic babble included in the present study was reduplicated babble
34
35 (reduplicated CI babble: 45%, reduplicated NH babble 43%) and 56% of the stimuli was
36
37 variegated babble (variegated CI babble: 55%, variegated NH babble 57%). Table 2 contains
38
39 an overview of the number of reduplicated and variegated babble per child.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 As a reliability check 20% of the automatically categorised stimuli (106 babble: 53 NH and
47
48 53 CI utterances) was manually re-categorised into reduplicated and variegated babble by the
49
50 first author. The raw sound files were used to judge whether the babble has repeated
51
52 segmental content or not. In 91 out of 106 utterances categorisation was identical, resulting in
53
54 an agreement of 86% and a Cohen's Kappa of 0.68.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 *Experimental design.* In the rating task, the raters indicated the more prominent syllable.
6
7 Moreover, by moving the slider on the VAS they indicated the relative degree of prominence
8
9 of the syllable. Studies have shown that perceptual ratings on a VAS are informative for
10
11 capturing the perceptual effects of fine phonetic detail in child speech (Julien & Munson,
12
13 2012; McAllister Byun, Harel, Halpin, & Szeredi, 2016; Munson, Schellinger et al., 2012).
14
15 Munson and Carlson (2016) showed that a VAS is a useful method for experimental and
16
17 observational studies of within-category speech sound perception as it allows gradual
18
19 responses.
20
21
22
23

24 The VAS used in the present study was a sliding bar of which a screencast can be found in
25
26 supplemental material 1 and a print screen of three different rating positions can be found in
27
28 Figure 1. Two circles above the sliding bar served as a visualisation of the two syllables of
29
30 each stimulus. The initial position of the slider was the midpoint of the VAS (Figure 1a).
31
32 When sliding to the left, the left circle became larger while the right one became smaller,
33
34 indicating a more prominent first syllable (Figure 1b). In order to indicate a more prominent
35
36 second syllable, the slider was moved to the right, creating a larger right circle and a smaller
37
38 left circle (Figure 1c). The position of the slider moved along a scale ranging from 0 (extreme
39
40 left) to 100 (extreme right). Thus, a range between 0 to 49 means a more prominent first
41
42 syllable (the lower the number, the more prominent the first syllable). Point 50 indicates
43
44 equally prominent syllables, and a position in the range from 51 to 100 indicates a more
45
46 prominent second syllable (the higher the number, the more prominent the second syllable).
47
48
49
50
51

52 **INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE**
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Experimental procedure.* Before the start of the experiment, the raters went through an
4 information phase and a familiarisation phase. During the information phase, the purpose of
5 the experiment was explained in a section with instructions (see supplemental material 2) and
6 raters were told that they could replay an utterance 2 times (i.e. each utterance could be
7 played maximally 3 times).
8
9
10
11
12

13
14
15 The familiarisation phase consisted of an example and trial phase. During the example phase
16 utterances with clear prominence relationships (i.e. clear equal prominence or a clearly
17 prominent first or second syllable) were presented. The raters saw an animation of 6 clear
18 examples of how the sliding bar was moved to the appropriate position. During the trial phase
19 the raters had to indicate the prominence on similarly clear utterances. The task in the trial
20 phase was the same as in the actual experiment, i.e. “indicate the prosodic modulation and
21 stress pattern on the VAS”. The description and design of the example and trial utterances can
22 be found in supplemental material 3. In the actual experiment 524 disyllabic babble utterances
23 produced by CI and NH infants were presented in random order to the raters. The total
24 duration of the experiment was approximately 60 minutes. For every stimulus we recorded the
25 rate and how many times raters listened to the stimulus.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 The experimental interface was created by means of Functional Reactive Programming
42 (Czaplicki, 2012), a tool developed for creating responsive graphical interfaces. The
43 programming language used to create the front end was Elm, and Haskell was used for the
44 back end. The experiment was designed as an online application and ran on an iMac (2,9 GHz
45 Intel Core i5, on a 21.5 inch screen) in a quiet room for all 30 participants. During the
46 experiment the selected disyllabic babble utterances were presented one by one to the raters
47 via SONY MDR-1R headphones. Every stimulus was preceded and followed by one second
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of surrounding silence.
4
5
6
7
8
9

10 11 *Statistical approach*

12
13 *Generalised mixed models.* To analyse the data generalised mixed models (GLMM) (Baayen,
14 2008) were run in R (R Core Team, 2013) with the lme4 package (Bates, Maechler, Bolker, &
15 2008) were run in R (R Core Team, 2013) with the lme4 package (Bates, Maechler, Bolker, &
16 Walker, 2014). GLMM is an appropriate tool to examine data that are hierarchically
17 structured: the stimuli in the present study ($n = 524$) are embedded in different infants ($n = 18$)
18 and all utterances are rated by different raters ($n = 30$). Moreover, GLMM is robust to missing
19 data and different numbers of data points per participant. These models consist of two parts: a
20 random and a fixed part. The random part takes into account the variation caused by the
21 random effects, e.g. the variation between individuals. The fixed part consists of the
22 independent variables that may have an effect on the dependent variables, i.e. participant
23 group (CI or NH babble), utterance type (variegated or reduplicated babble) and age at onset
24 of babbling.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 The statistical models are constructed iteratively: first the random effects are added one by
54 one and then the fixed effects are added one at a time. After adding a random or fixed effect
55 the new model is compared to the previous model by means of likelihood ratio tests. Only the
56 effects that improve the fit of the model are included. The best fitting model explains the
57 largest amount of variance with the smallest set of predictors.
58
59
60

61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1
2
3 dependent variable were conducted (see supplemental material 4). However, in neither of the
4
5 analyses were the residuals normally distributed, meaning that a GLMM analysis of the
6
7 continuous variable was not permitted. As an alternative the data were recoded into binomial
8
9 dummy variables that are informative of the rating zone on the VAS instead of using the raw
10
11 score (from 0 to 100) as dependent variable.
12

13
14 As shown in Figure 2, the collected ratings form a multimodal distribution: a distribution on
15
16 the left and right side of the VAS and a peak at the midpoint of the VAS. These variables
17
18 were ‘trochee’, ‘iamb’, ‘midpoint’. ‘Trochee’ (score: 0-49) represents the utterances that are
19
20 rated as having a prominent first syllable, which is the predominant Dutch pattern. ‘Iamb’
21
22 (score: 51-100) represents the utterances that are rated as having a prominent second syllable.
23
24 ‘Level’ (score: 50) represents the utterances that are rated at the midpoint of the axis. The
25
26 midpoint was also the default position of the sliding bar before being moved by the raters.
27
28 When an utterance is rated at the midpoint this is an indication that there is no clear prosodic
29
30 differentiation between syllables.
31
32

33
34 **INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE**
35

36 The binomial dependent variables were analysed by means of Logistic Regression Analyses
37
38 in the form of GLMM. The estimates (E), standard errors (S.E.), t- and p-values of the fixed
39
40 effects of the four best fitting models (i.e. one for every dependent variable) are reported in
41
42 the results section. These values are computed in logits, but to facilitate the interpretation they
43
44 are converted to the likelihood or probability (expressed in percentages) to be rated in this
45
46 area of the VAS.
47
48
49
50

51 The aim of the analyses was to investigate for every rating zone whether (1) CI utterances
52
53 were more likely to be rated in the respective zone as compared to NH utterances and vice
54
55 versa, (2) chronological age at onset of babbling has an impact and (3) whether reduplicated
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 babble is more likely to be rated in a particular zone as compared to variegated babble and
4
5 vice versa.
6
7

8
9 The first research question focuses on the prosodic modulation in the babble of CI and NH
10 infants. Three analyses were performed to answer this research question. The first analysis
11 looked at the probability of an utterance being rated at the midpoint of the VAS (score: 50).
12
13 Since the midpoint of the VAS is considered to be the zone that represents the least prosodic
14 modulation, this analysis aims to answer the question whether the babble of infants with CI is
15 more likely to be rated in this zone. The analysis controls for a possible effect of babble
16 experience (i.e. chronological age counted from the onset of babbling) and phonological
17 complexity (i.e. the babble type: reduplicated versus variegated babble) on prosodic
18 modulation.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 The second analysis that investigates raters' perception of prosodic modulation focussed on
32 those utterances that were indicated as having the most modulated prominence. This analysis
33 aims to answer the question whether the utterances of the NH group are more likely to be
34 rated as having a clearly prominent syllable than the utterances of infants with CI. Again age
35 at onset of babbling and the babble type are added as predicting variables.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 The utterances that are rated more towards the extremes of the VAS are considered to have
45 the most prosodic modulation. However, looking at the extremes of the raw VAS (e.g. the
46 stimuli rated in zone 0-20 and zone 80-100) would not be informative since individual raters
47 may well apply different strategies to indicate prominence on a VAS: some use the entire
48 scale (from 0 to 100), but most of them do not use the entire VAS and tend to centre their
49 ratings in a smaller range (e.g. from 19 to 82). Therefore it is more informative convert the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 ratings of every rater to z-scores. The z-scores are used to determine the extreme ratings per
3 individual rater. A stepwise approach was used to determine these extreme ratings. First of
4 all the range of the ratings of each rater was determined: e.g. for rater 1 the leftmost z-score
5 was -2.33, whereas the rightmost rating was a z-score of 3.01. In a next step this range was
6 divided into 5 equal parts in order to determine the 20% leftmost and 20% rightmost parts of
7 the VAS for each individual rater: e.g. for rater 1 the extremes range from -2.33 and -1.26
8 (left) and 1.94 and 3.01 (right). The utterances rated in the first and fifth part of the selected
9 range were coded as being rated at the extremes of the scale: e.g. for rater 1 the left extreme
10 included 45 utterances and the right extreme 24 utterances. The dependent variable in the
11 third analysis was the number of times an utterance was replayed by the raters. If the prosodic
12 modulation of a stimulus is hard to judge, raters are expected to replay it more often than
13 when prominence is clear.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 The second research question was whether listeners perceive the babble to be predominantly
32 trochaic and whether there is a difference between CI and NH infants in this respect. This was
33 investigated by two analyses. The first analysis looked at the probability that an utterance was
34 rated on the left, trochaic side (score: 0-49) of the VAS. The second analyses looked at the
35 probability that an utterance was rated on the right, iambic side (score: 51-100) of the VAS.
36 Both analyses control for possible maturation effects by adding age at onset of babbling and
37 utterance type to the models.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Results

Analyses of raters' perception of prosodic modulation in babble of CI and NH infants

The first set of analyses aims to answer the first research question: Are spontaneous canonical babble of congenitally deaf infants with CI perceived to be prosodically less modulated than the babble of their NH peers?

Midpoint. The first analysis looked at the probability of an utterance being rated at the midpoint of the VAS (score: 50). Since the midpoint of the VAS is considered to be the zone that represents the least prosodic modulation, this analysis aims to answer the question whether the babble of infants with CI is more likely to be rated in this zone. Moreover, it is investigated whether maturation variables (i.e. utterance type and babble experience) influence the likelihood of babble being rated with no modulation.

The best model with “midpoint” as dependent variable had participant group and utterance type as fixed effects (supplemental material 5). Adding age at onset of babbling did not improve the fit model. The random part controlled for the variance of the different infants, utterances and raters. The intercept of the model was estimated at -3.222 logits or 4% ($S.E. = 0.297$, $z = -10.833$, $p < 0.001$), meaning that babble is significantly less likely to be rated at the midpoint, than anywhere else on the VAS. This finding is not surprising since this variable focuses on only one point on the VAS, in comparison to all other points. This finding indicates that the cursor was very likely being moved when making a judgement on the prominence pattern of babble. Regarding the question whether there is a difference between CI and NH infants, the results show that CI utterances are significantly more likely to be rated at the midpoint: reduplicated CI babble utterance has a probability of 3.5% of being rated at

1
2
3 the midpoint, whereas the probability is only 2.6% for reduplicated NH utterance (-3.222 -
4 0.401 logits; $E = -0.401$, $S.E. = 0.188$, $z = -2.127$, $p = 0.033$). Reduplicated babble of CI
5 infants is judged as having less modulated prominence. The same holds for variegated babble.
6
7 Variegated CI babble utterance has a probability of 2.2% (-3.222 - 0.527 logits; $E = -0.527$,
8
9 $S.E. = 0.136$, $z = -3.878$, $p < 0.001$) to be rated at the midpoint and that of a NH infant has a
10
11 probability of 1.5% (-3.222 - 0.401 + 0.527 logits) to be rated at the midpoint. All these
12
13 differences are shown to be significant. These results indicate that babble of CI infants is
14
15 significantly more likely judged as having no clearly prominent syllable. A similar result is
16
17 found for the difference between variegated and reduplicated babble. In both infant groups
18
19 reduplicated babble had a higher probability (i.e. 3.5% for a CI- and 2.6% for a NH-
20
21 reduplicated babble) to be rated at the midpoint compared to segmentally variegated babble
22
23 (i.e. 2.2% for a CI- and 1.5% for a NH-reduplicated babble). The age at onset of babbling did
24
25 not improve the fit of the statistical model, meaning that it did not impact the probability of
26
27 being rated with no clearly stressed syllable.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 It can be concluded that babble of CI children is more likely to be rated as having no clearly
36
37 prominent syllable. Regarding the effect of the maturation variables it can be concluded that
38
39 phonetic complexity influences prosodic modulation: reduplicated babble is more likely to be
40
41 rated as having no clearly prominent syllable and thus as having less prosodic modulation,
42
43 irrespective of the infant group or the age at onset of babbling at which they are produced.
44
45
46
47

48 *Extremes.* The best model with “extreme” as dependent variable had participant group and
49
50 utterance type as fixed effects (Supplemental material 6). Again the random part controlled
51
52 for the variance of the different infants, utterances and raters and the fixed effects were
53
54 participant group and babble type. The intercept of the model was estimated at -0.826 logits
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 or 30% ($S.E. = 0.116, z = -7.133, p < 0.001$), indicating that babble is significantly less likely
4
5 to be rated at the extremes than anywhere else on the VAS. Regarding the question whether
6
7 there is a difference between CI and NH infants in prosodic modulation in babble, the results
8
9 indeed show that NH utterances are significantly more likely to be rated at the extremes: there
10
11 is a probability of 30% for reduplicated babble of a CI infant being rated at the extremes,
12
13 whereas the probability that reduplicated NH babble is rated at the extremes is 36% ($-0.826 +$
14
15 0.255 logits; $E = 0.255, S.E. = 0.129, z = 1.981, p = 0.048$). When looking at variegated
16
17 utterances it appears that variegated CI babble has a probability of 38% ($-0.826 + 0.308$
18
19 logits; $E = 0.308, S.E. = 0.084, z = 3.667, p < 0.001$) and that variegated NH babble has a
20
21 probability of 43% ($-0.826 + 0.255 + 0.308$ logits) to be rated at the extremes. All these
22
23 differences are shown to be significant. The age at onset of babbling has no significant effect
24
25 on the probability of being rated at the extremes ($E = 0.004, S.E. = 0.010, z = 0.426, p <$
26
27 0.670).

28
29
30
31
32
33 It can be concluded that the canonical utterances of the NH infants are more likely to be rated
34
35 at the extremes of the ratings compared to the CI infants' utterances. This is an indication that
36
37 the prosodic modulation within NH babble is more salient. This difference between groups is
38
39 apparent in both variegated and reduplicated babble. Regarding the effect of the maturation
40
41 variables it can be concluded that phonetic complexity influences prosodic modulation:
42
43 variegated babble is more likely to be rated at the extremes than reduplicated utterances
44
45 irrespective of the infant group or the age at onset of babbling at which they are produced.

46
47
48
49
50 *Analysis of number of replays.* A third analysis investigates how many times an utterance was
51
52 replayed by the raters. The random effects again account for the variance caused by the
53
54 different infants, raters and stimuli. The fixed effects in this analysis were infant group,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 babble type and extreme (i.e. part of the extreme ratings or not). The fixed effects in the best
4 fitting model were participant group and the variable 'extreme' (i.e. the utterance is rated at
5 one of the extremes or not). Adding babble type did not improve the fit of the model, meaning
6 that there was no significant difference in the number of replays of reduplicated versus
7 variegated babble. The results of this analysis are displayed in supplemental material 7.
8
9
10
11
12

13
14
15 The intercept of this statistical model was estimated at 0.423 ($S.E. = 0.046$, $t = 9.156$, $p <$
16 0.001), meaning that an average CI utterance that is rated anywhere at the VAS except at the
17 extremes is replayed on average 0.423 times. Utterances of the NH infants are repeated
18 significantly less than those of the infants with CI ($E = -0.058$, $S.E. = 0.017$, $t = -3.349$, $p =$
19 0.004), indicating that it was easier to judge the prominence of NH babble than CI babble.
20 The stimuli rated at the extremes were repeated significantly less than those at the rest of the
21 VAS ($E = -0.126$, $S.E. = 0.009$, $t = -14.613$, $p < 0.001$). The age at onset of babbling did not
22 improve the fit of the statistical model, meaning that it did not impact the number of replays.
23 These results are supporting evidence for the findings of the VAS analysis that showed that
24 NH stimuli are rated as having clearer prominence and as those utterances that were rated at
25 the ends of the continuum are repeated less often and are thus easier to judge.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 *Analyses of raters' perception of the trochaic pattern in babble of CI and NH infants*

42
43 The following two analyses aim to answer the second research question: Do listeners perceive
44 the predominant trochaic stress pattern in babble? Is there a difference between CI and NH
45 infants in this respect?
46
47
48
49

50 *Trochee.* The first analysis looked at the probability that an utterance was rated on the left,
51 trochaic side (score: 0-49) of the VAS. The random part of the best fitting model controlled
52 for the variance explained by participant identity (i.e. the 18 infants), utterance identity (i.e. a
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 unique number for each of the 524 babble utterances) and rater identity (i.e. the 30 adult
4 raters). The only fixed effect required in the best fitting model was infant group (CI versus
5 NH). Adding babble type (reduplicated versus variegated babble) and age at onset of babbling
6 as fixed effects did not improve the fit of the model. An overview of the best fitting model
7 with ‘trochee’ as dependent variable can be found in supplemental material 8.
8
9
10
11
12

13
14
15 The intercept of the model was estimated at 0.157 logits or a likelihood of 54% ($S.E. =$
16 0.268 , $z = 0.586$, $p = 0.558$). This positive intercept indicates a higher probability for
17 utterances to be rated as a trochee than at any other zone on the VAS. However this effect is
18 not significant. There is no significant difference between the ratings of the CI and NH babble
19 ($E = -0.041$, $S.E. = 0.345$, $z = -0.120$, $p = 0.904$). These results show that babble is not
20 significantly more likely to be rated at the trochaic side of VAS, nor that the NH infants are
21 more likely to produce trochees than CI infants or vice versa. The babble type did not
22 improve the fit of the statistical model, indicating that the segmental variation of the utterance
23 does not lead to more ratings on the trochaic side of the VAS. Age at onset of babbling did
24 not improve the fit of the model either, meaning that there is no age effect on the probability
25 to be rated as a trochee. Regarding the second research question it can be concluded that the
26 predominant trochaic pattern is not significantly more often perceived by raters and this is the
27 case for both infant groups.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 *Iamb*. The aim of the second analysis was to see whether there is a difference between groups
47 and babble types regarding the probability to be rated on the right side of the VAS (score: 51-
48 100). The same fixed and random effects as in the analysis with trochee as dependent variable
49 were added. The statistical model with the best fit (supplemental material 9) had participant
50 identity, utterance identity and rater identity as random effects and participant group and
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 utterance type as fixed effects. The intercept was estimated at -0.929 or a likelihood of 28%
4
5 ($S.E. = 0.320, z = -2.905, p = 0.004$). This significant negative intercept indicates that
6
7 utterances are less likely to be rated at the right side of the VAS than at all the other rating
8
9 zones together. As for the analysis of trochees there was no significant difference between the
10
11 ratings of the CI and NH babble ($E = 0.094, S.E. = 0.389, z = 0.243, p = 0.808$) suggesting
12
13 that there is no difference between groups in the probability that an utterance is rated as
14
15 having a more prominent second syllable. The analysis showed that variegated babble is
16
17 significantly more likely to occur at the iambic side of the VAS ($E = 0.401, S.E. = 0.192, z =$
18
19 $2.088, p = 0.037$). For the CI infants the likelihood of reduplicated babble occurring at the
20
21 iambic side of the VAS is 28% (-0.929 logits) whereas it is 37% for variegated babble (-0.929
22
23 + 0.401 logits). For the NH infants the likelihood of reduplicated babble occurring at the
24
25 iambic side of the VAS is 30% (-0.929+0.094+0.401 logits) and 39% for variegated babble (-
26
27 0.929 + 0.401 logits). It can be concluded that variegated babble is more likely to be rated as
28
29 having a more prominent second syllable than babble with a repetitive segmental content,
30
31 irrespective of the children's hearing status.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion

This paper examines the prosodic modulation in the babble of congenitally deaf infants with CI and their NH peers. Two previous studies of the infants included in the present study suggested that early implanted infants with CI may have difficulties with modulating speech from babbling onwards: one study showed that CI infants' babble is segmentally less modulated (Schauwers et al., 2008) and the other study showed that CI babble is prosodically less modulated (Pettinato et al., 2017). Schauwers et al. (2008) showed that infants with CI produce less variegated and more reduplicated utterances than their NH peers. Moreover, there is less segmental variation in variegated babble of CI infants. Regarding the modulation of the acoustic cues to prosodic prominence, Pettinato et al. (2017) showed that infants with CI made smaller differentiation between the two syllables of their babble utterances in terms of pitch and intensity, whereas there was no significant difference in duration differentiation in babble. However, since the acoustic cues were measured separately in this study and since trade-off relations between the three prosodic cues are expected to occur (Lieberman, 1960), the current study aimed to take into account the relations between separate cues by presenting babble to raters in a perceptual rating task. This was done by means of a VAS on which naive adults had to indicate the degree and direction of differentiation between the two syllables of babble. The click location on the VAS was analysed in order to find an answer to the following research questions:

- (1) Are spontaneous canonical babble of congenitally deaf infants with CI perceived to be prosodically less modulated than the babble of their NH peers?
- (2) Do listeners perceive babble to be predominantly trochaic? Is there a difference between CI and NH infants in this respect?

Regarding the first research question, results of this study showed that babble of the CI infants

1
2
3 was indeed perceived as less prosodically modulated. This was shown in the analyses of the
4 rating position on the VAS and confirmed by the analysis of the number of replays. First of all,
5 the analyses of the VAS ratings revealed that the babble of CI infants was more likely to be
6 scored at the midpoint of the VAS: this is the default position of the slider which represents
7 equally prominent syllables. Therefore, this result indicates that raters found it more difficult
8 to decide which syllable was more prominent in CI babble than in NH babble. Secondly, the
9 VAS ratings showed that CI babble was less likely to be scored towards the extremes of the
10 rating scale. Utterances that are rated at the extremes are considered to have the most prosodic
11 modulation: one of the two syllables is clearly prominent. The higher likelihood of CI babble
12 being rated towards the centre of the VAS rather than towards the extremes of the scale is
13 consistent with a perception of smaller prosodic modulation in the canonical babble of CI
14 infants. Interestingly, the analysis of the number of replays as dependent variable has also
15 shown that raters listened significantly more often to CI babble than to NH babble. This is
16 also suggestive of the greater difficulty in judging which syllable is more prominent in CI
17 utterances.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The result that adult raters perceived CI babble as being less modulated is consistent with the
39 literature, which shows anomalous prominence production in school-aged children with
40 cochlear implants (Carter et al., 2002; Hide, 2013; Lenden & Flipsen, 2007). Moreover, the
41 results from the present perceptual experiment support the previous acoustic findings that
42 pitch and intensity are less modulated in CI babble (Pettinato et al., 2017). The present study
43 shows that gradient ratings on a VAS reveal subtle differences in prosodic modulation in
44 infant babble and therefore reveal modulation differences between a typical group and a
45 clinical group (CI group in this case). This finding confirms the studies that show the
46 importance and validity of perceptual judgements (on a VAS) to track subtle phonetic
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2 differences (McAllister Byun et al., 2016; Munson & Payesteh, 2013; Munson et al., 2012).
3
4
5
6
7

8 The analyses also controlled for the influence of possible maturation effects on prosodic
9 modulation in canonical babbling. The analyses showed that an infant's experience with
10 babbling did not boost prosodic modulation, i.e. babble produced shortly after the onset of
11 babbling was not less modulated than babble produced later and vice versa. On the other hand,
12 the infants' phonological capacities did influence prosodic modulation. The analysis showed
13 that phonologically more complex, variegated, babble is significantly more likely to be rated
14 towards the extremes of the VAS than towards the midpoint of the scale: this means that
15 variegated babble has more prosodic modulation. No interaction effect between the infant
16 groups and utterance types was found, which indicates that variegated babble is rated as being
17 more modulated in both groups. Since infants with CI produce less variegated babble in
18 comparison to NH infants (Schauwers et al., 2008) it is possible that prosodic modulation in
19 the babble of CI infants is linked to reduced segmental variegation in their utterances. It
20 should be noted that this study is the first to explore this link between segmental and
21 suprasegmental modulation. Therefore the present result is interpreted as an exploratory
22 finding that needs replication in a study that is designed to investigate this link.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 A plausible explanation for the indirect link between the lack of modulation at the
45 segmental and at the suprasegmental level is that (prelexical) infants with CI have difficulties
46 modulating the speech stream, due to their reduced perception of the speech signal. Infants
47 with CI perceive less variation in the speech signal due to the limited transmission of spectro-
48 temporal information. The results of the present study suggest that this reduced perception of
49 variation is also reflected in reduced production of variation, both at the segmental and the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 suprasegmental level. Moreover, the degraded perception of the speech stream leads to
4 storage deficits in working memory (Nittrouer, Caldwell-Tarr, & Lowenstein, 2013). Children
5 with more limited working memory in turn are less efficient in processing stress (Torppa et al.,
6 2014). The results of the present study suggest that perception and processing problems in CI
7 infants not only impact word stress discrimination but also word stress production. More
8 specifically, a reasonable hypothesis is that the workload involved in producing two
9 segmentally and/or prosodically equal syllables (i.e. reduplicated babble and equally
10 prominent syllables) is lower than the workload required for producing modulated syllables
11 (i.e. variegated babble and babble utterances with a prominent syllable). This hypothesis
12 suggested by the results of the present study requires further experimental testing in order to
13 figure out whether children with poorer working memory indeed have more modulation issues
14 at the segmental as well as the suprasegmental level.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 The second research question was whether listeners perceive the predominant trochaic pattern
33 in the babble of infants and whether there is a difference between CI and NH infants in this
34 respect. Studies on early prominence production often focus on the occurrence of
35 characteristics of the ambient stress pattern (Davis et al., 2000; Hallé, De Boysson-Bardies, &
36 Vihman, 1991). In the present paper raters indicated whether the utterances were trochaic (i.e.
37 the ambient Dutch pattern), iambic or equally stressed. The results indicate that naive adult
38 raters did not show a trochaic or an iambic bias in their judgements. Moreover, the results did
39 not show a difference between CI and NH babble in this analysis. Previous acoustic studies
40 (De Clerck et al., 2017; Pettinato et al., 2017) showed that intensity and F0 tend to be higher
41 in the first syllables of infant babble, thus suggesting a trochaic pattern. The predominant
42 trochaic pattern became more dominant than the iambic pattern in early word use. However
43 this tendency is not found in the present perceptual study. It might well be the case that raters
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 find it substantially more difficult to judge the stress pattern of meaningless babble compared
4
5 to meaningful first words. Although several studies have found ambient language effects in
6
7 the babbling stage (Boysson-Bardies, Hallé, Sagart & Durant, 1989; Boysson-Bardies &
8
9 Vihman, 1991; Whalen, Levitt and Wang, 1991), Engstrand, Williams, and Lacerda (2003)
10
11 for instance have shown that the detection of ambient-language effects in the babble
12
13 utterances of 18 month-olds becomes substantially easier for trained raters when the dataset
14
15 includes possible words and imitations. Similarly, the previous study on NH infants has
16
17 shown enhanced prosodic differentiation in words as compared to babble (De Clerck et al.,
18
19 2017). The ambient trochaic pattern thus may only be detectable from word-use onwards.
20
21 Therefore it would be interesting to compare the present results to the results of a rating task
22
23 in which early lexical utterances are judged.
24
25
26
27
28

29 In conclusion, the present study shows that perceptual judgements by naïve raters reveal
30
31 subtle prosodic differences between the canonical babble of congenitally deaf infants with CI
32
33 and NH infants. The raters indicated less prosodic modulation in CI babble. Interestingly,
34
35 segmentally more variegated utterances are rated as having more prosodic modulation.
36
37 Listeners did not perceive a bias towards the predominant trochaic pattern.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3
4
5 Baayen, H. (2008). *Analyzing linguistic data: a practical introduction to statistics*.
6 Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 7 Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B.M. , & Walker, S. (2014). lme4: linear mixed-effects
8 models using Eigen and S4. R package version 1.1-7. Retrieved from [http://CRAN.R-](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4)
9 [project.org/package=lme4](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4)
- 10 De Boysson-Bardies, B., Halle, P., Sagart, L., & Durand, C. (1989). A crosslinguistic
11 investigation of vowel formants in babbling. *Journal of Child Language*, 6, 1-17.
- 12 De Boysson-Bardies, B., & Vihman, M. (1991). Adaptation to language: Evidence from
13 babbling and first words in four languages. *Language*, 67, 297-319.
- 14 Carter, A., Dillon, C., & Pisoni, D. (2002). Imitation of nonwords by hearing impaired
15 children with cochlear implants: suprasegmental analyses. *Clinical Linguistics &*
16 *Phonetics*, 16, 619-638.
- 17
18 Clement, C. J. (2004). *Development of vocalizations in deaf and normally hearing children*.
19 (Doctoral dissertation), Universiteit van Amsterdam, Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- 20 Czaplicki, E. (2012). *Elm: concurrent FRP for functional GUIs*. Harvard University,
21 Cambridge, UK.
- 22 Daelemans, W., Gillis, S., & Durieux, G. (1994). The acquisition of stress: a data-oriented
23 approach. *Computational Linguistics*, 20 (3), 421-451.
- 24 Davis, B., MacNeilage, P., Matyear, C., & Powell, J. (2000). Prosodic correlates of stress in
25 babbling: an acoustical study. *Child Development*, 71, 1258-1270.
- 26 De Clerck, I., Pettinato, M., Verhoeven, J. , & Gillis, S. (2017). Is prosodic production driven
27 by lexical development? Longitudinal evidence from babble and words. *Journal of*
28 *Child Language*, 44(5), 1248-1273.
- 29
30 Dettman, S., Dowell, R., Choo, D., Arnott, W., Abrahams, Y., Davis, A., . . . Briggs, R.
31 (2016). Long-term communication outcomes for children receiving cochlear implants
32 younger than 12 months: a multicenter study. *Otology & Neurotology*, 37(2), e82-e95.
- 33 Drennan, W. R., & Rubinstein, J. T. (2008). Music perception in cochlear implant users and
34 its relationship with psychophysical capabilities. *Journal of Rehabilitation Research*
35 *and Development*, 45(5), 779-789.
- 36 Engstrand, O., Williams, K., & Lacerda, F. (2003). Does babbling sound native? Listener
37 responses to vocalizations produced by Swedish and American 12- and 18-month-
38 olds. *Phonetica*, 60(1), 17-44.
- 39 Fagan, M. K. (2015). Why repetition? Repetitive babbling, auditory feedback, and cochlear
40 implantation. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 137, 125-136.
- 41 Flege, J. E., & Bohn, O. S. (1989). An instrumental study of vowel reduction and stress
42 placement in Spanish-accented English. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11,
43 35-62.
- 44
45 Friederici, A., Friedrich, M., & Christophe, A. (2007). Brain responses in 4-month-old infants
46 are already language specific. *Current Biology*, 17, 1208-1211.
- 47 Fry, D. B. (1958). Experiments in the perception of stress. *Language & Speech*, 1, 126-152.
- 48 Green, T., Faulkner, A., & Rosen, S. (2004). Enhancing temporal cues to voice pitch in
49 continuous interleaved sampling cochlear implants. *Journal of the Acoustical Society*
50 *of America*, 116(4), 2298-2310.
- 51 Hallé, P., De Boysson-Bardies, B., & Vihman, M. (1991). Beginnings of prosodic
52 organization: intonation and duration patterns of disyllables produced by Japanese and
53 French infants. *Language & Speech*, 34(4), 299-318.
- 54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hide, O. (2013). *Acoustic features of speech by young cochlear implant users. A comparison*
4 *with normal-hearing and hearing-aided age mates.* (Doctoral dissertation), University
5 of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium.
- 6 Julien, H., & Munson, B. (2012). Modifying speech to children based on their perceived
7 phonetic accuracy. *Journal of Speech, Language, & Hearing Research, 55*, 1836-
8 1849.
- 9 Jusczyk, P., Cutler, A., & Redanz, N. (1993). Infants' preference for the predominant stress
10 patterns of English words. *Child Development, 64*, 675-687.
- 11 Kent, R. D., Osberger, M. J., Netsell, R., & Hustedde, C. G. (1987). Phonetic development in
12 identical twins differing in auditory function. *Journal of Speech & Hearing Disorders,*
13 *52*(1), 64-75.
- 14 Koopmans-van Beinum, F., Clement, C., & van den Dikkenberg-Pot, I. (2001). Babbling and
15 the lack of auditory speech perception: a matter of coordination? *Developmental*
16 *Science, 4:1*, 61-70.
- 17 Lenden, J., & Flipsen, P. (2007). Prosody and voice characteristic of children with cochlear
18 implants. *Journal of Communication Disorders, 40*, 66-81.
- 19 Levine, D., Strother-Garcia, K., Golinkoff, R. M., & Hirsh-Pasek, K. (2016). Language
20 development in the first year of life: what deaf children might be missing before
21 cochlear implantation. *Otology & Neurotology, 37*(2), e56-e62.
- 22 Li, F., Edwards, J., & Beckman, M. (2009). Contrast and covert contrast: The phonetic
23 development of voiceless sibilant fricatives in English and Japanese toddlers. *Journal*
24 *of Phonetics, 37*, 111-124.
- 25 Lieberman, P. (1960). Some acoustic correlates of word stress in American English. *Journal*
26 *of the Acoustical Society of America, 32*(4), 451-454.
- 27 McAllister Byun, T., Harel, D., Halpin, P. F., & Szeredi, D. (2016). Deriving gradient
28 measures of child speech from crowdsourced ratings. *Journal of Communication*
29 *Disorders, 64*, 91-102.
- 30 Meister, H., Landwehr, M., Pyschny, V., Wagner, P., & Walger, M. (2011). The perception of
31 sentence stress in cochlear implant recipients. *Ear & Hearing, 32*(4), 459-467.
- 32 Molemans, I. (2011). *Sounds like babbling: A longitudinal investigation of aspects of*
33 *the prelexical speech repertoire in young children acquiring Dutch.* (Doctoral
34 dissertation), University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium.
- 35 Molemans, I., Van den Berg, R., Van Severen, L., & Gillis, S. (2011). How to measure the
36 onset of babbling reliably? *Journal of Child Language, 1-30.*
- 37 Moore, B. C. J. (2003). Coding of sounds in the auditory system and its relevance to signal
38 processing and coding in cochlear implants. *Otology & Neurotology, 24*(2), 243-254.
- 39 Munson, B., Bjorum, E., & Windsor, J. (2003). Acoustic and perceptual correlates of stress in
40 nonwords produced by children with suspected developmental apraxia of speech and
41 children with phonological disorder. *Journal of Speech, Language, & Hearing*
42 *Research, 46*, 189-202.
- 43 Munson, B., & Carlson, K. U. (2016). An exploration of methods for rating children's
44 productions of sibilant fricatives. *Journal of Speech, Language & Hearing Research,*
45 *19*(1), 36-45.
- 46 Munson, B., & Payesteh, B. (2013). *Clinical feasibility of visual analog scaling.* Paper
47 presented at the 2013 Convention of the American Speech-Language Hearing
48 Association.
- 49 Munson, B., Schellinger, S. K., & Carlson, K. U. (2012). Measuring speech-sound learning
50 using visual analog scaling. *SIG 1 Perspectives on Language Learning & Education,*
51 *19*, 19-30.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Nittrouer, S., Caldwell-Tarr, A., & Lowenstein, J. H. (2013). Working memory in children
4 with cochlear implants: problems are in storage, not processing. *International Journal*
5 *of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 77(11), 1886-1898.
- 6 O'Halpin, R. (2010). *The perception and production of stress and intonation by children with*
7 *cochlear implants*. (Doctoral dissertation), University College London, London, UK.
- 8 Oller, D., & Eilers, R. (1988). The role of audition in infant babbling. *Child Development*,
9 59(22), 441-449.
- 10 Pettinato, M., De Clerck, I., Verhoeven, J., & Gillis, S. (2017). Expansion of prosodic abilities
11 at the transition from babble to words: a comparison between children with cochlear
12 implants and normally hearing children. *Ear & Hearing*, 38(4), 475-486.
- 13 R Core Team. (2013). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,
14 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computin. Retrieved from [http://www.R-](http://www.R-project.org)
15 [project.org](http://www.R-project.org)
- 16 Ramus, F. (2002). Language discrimination by newborns: teasing apart phonotactic, rhythmic,
17 and intonational cues. *Annual Review of Language Acquisition*, 2, 85-115.
- 18 Schauwers, K. (2006). *Early speech and language development in deaf children with a*
19 *cochlear implant: A longitudinal investigation*. (Doctoral dissertation), University of
20 Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium.
- 21 Schauwers, K., Gillis, S., & Govaerts, P. J. (2008). The characteristics of prelexical babbling
22 after cochlear implantation between 5 and 20 months of age. *Ear & Hearing*, 29(4),
23 627-637.
- 24 Scobbie, J. M., Gibbon, F., Hardcastle, W. J., & Fletcher, P. (1996). Covert contrast as a stage
25 in the acquisition of phonetics and phonology. *QMC Working Papers in Speech and*
26 *Language Sciences*, 1, 13-62.
- 27 Stoel-Gammon, C., & Otomo, K. (1986). Babbling development of hearing impaired and
28 normally hearing subjects. *Journal of Speech & Hearing Disorders*, 51, 33-41.
- 29 Tomblin, J., Barker, B., Spencer, L., Zhang, X., & Gantz, B. (2005). The effect of age at
30 cochlear implant initial stimulation on expressive language growth in infants and
31 toddlers. *Journal of Speech, Language, & Hearing Research*, 48, 853-867.
- 32 Torppa, R., Faulkner, A., Huotilainen, M., Jarvikivi, J., Lipsanen, J., Laasonen, M., & Vainio,
33 M. (2014). The perception of prosody and associated auditory cues in early-implanted
34 children: the role of auditory working memory and musical activities. *International*
35 *Journal of Audiology*, 53(3), 182-191.
- 36 Van den Berg, R. (2012). *Syllables inside out. A longitudinal study of the*
37 *development of syllable types in toddlers acquiring Dutch: a comparison between*
38 *hearing impaired children with a cochlear implant and normally hearing children*.
39 (Doctoral dissertation), University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium.
- 40 van den Dikkenberg-Pot, I., Koopmans-van Beinum, F., & Clement, C. (1998). *Influence of*
41 *lack of auditory speech perception on sound productions of deaf infants*. Paper
42 presented at the Institute of Phonetic Sciences Amsterdam.
- 43 Van Severen, L. (2012). *A large-scale longitudinal survey of consonant development in*
44 *toddlers' spontaneous speech*. (Doctoral dissertation), University of Antwerp,
45 Antwerp, Belgium.
- 46 Whalen, D., Levitt, A., & Wang, Q. (1991). Intonational differences between the
47 reduplicative babbling of French- and English-learning infants. *Journal of Child*
48 *Language*, 18, 501-516.
- 49 Zink, I., & Lejaegere, M. (2001). *N-CDIs: lijsten voor communicatieve ontwikkeling.*
50 *aanpassing en hernormering van de MacArthur CDI's van Fenson et al.* Leuven,
51 Belgium: ACCO.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ID	Gender	PTA unaided (dBHL)	Age 1 st CI (y;mm.dd)	PTA with CI (dBHL)	Age fitting CI (y;mm.dd)
CI-7	F	117	0;05.05	43	0;06.04
CI-2	F	120	0;06.21	30	0;07.20
CI-9	F	103	0;08.21	32	0;09.21
CI-6	M	120	0;08.23	43	0;09.20
CI-3	F	115	0;10.00	33	0;11.20
CI-10	F	91↓117	1;01.07	43	1;02.04
CI-1	F	120	1;01.15	47	1;02.27
CI-5	M	93	1;04.27	35	1;05.27
CI-4	M	113	1;06.05	42	1;07.09
CI-8	F	112	1;07.14	52	1;09.04

Table 1: Auditory characteristics of the CI children. Legend: PTA = Pure Tone Average at the age of 2; dBHL = decibel hearing level; HA = Hearing Aid; CI = Cochlear Implant; ↓ = progressive hearing loss

ID	Gender	Age start (y;mm.dd)	Age end (y;mm.dd)	# utterances	# reduplicated babble	# variegated babble
CI-7	F	0;08.01	2;04.16	23	12	11
CI-9	F	1;01.24	1;05.21	13	5	8
CI-2	F	1;03.27	2;03.20	21	16	5
CI-1	F	1;04.25	2;09.27	25	18	7
CI-6	M	1;04.29	1;09.23	16	4	12
CI-5	M	1;07.24	2;01.18	20	6	14
CI-3	F	1;07.25	2;06.09	36	9	27
CI-4	M	1;11.23	2;04.12	3	2	1
CI-8	F	2;00.27	2;05.07	8	3	5
CI Total				165	75	90
(mean; SD)	/	/	/	(18.33; 9.77)	(8.33; 5.80)	(10; 7.53)
NH-4	M	0;05.27	1;09.28	49	22	27
NH-1	M	0;06.03	2;00.01	94	48	46
NH-6	F	0;06.05	1;10.02	53	28	25
NH-7	M	0;07.02	1;10.02	25	8	17
NH-9	F	0;08.02	1;09.28	26	7	19
NH-5	F	0;08.30	1;11.02	29	11	18
NH-3	M	0;09.00	1;09.01	27	13	14
NH-8	F	0;11.01	1;10.26	30	7	23
NH-2	M	1;00.03	2;00.02	26	11	15
NH Total				359	155	204
(mean; SD)	/	/	/	(39.88; 22.8)	(17.22; 13.58)	(22.66; 9.81)
OVERAL TOTAL	/	/	/	524 (29.11; 20.33)	230 (12.21; 11.08)	295 (15.53; 10.98)

Table 2: Recording information on the individual children. Legend: CI = Cochlear Implanted infants; NH = Normally hearing infants; Age start: age at a the onset of babbling; Age end: age at a cumulative vocabulary of 200 words; SD = Standard Deviation

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 1a: Equally prominent syllables



Figure 1b: Prominent first syllable




Figure 1c: Prominent second syllable

Figure 1: Print screen of three different rating positions on the sliding bar. Legend: “Deel 1/2 heel sterk benadrukt” = “Part 1/2 very strongly emphasised”




Figure 2: Distribution of all ratings per participant group.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Supplemental material 1

Screencast of the rating experiment (cf. mov file)


For Peer Review

Supplemental material 2

Instructions

In this experiment you will get to hear meaningless babbles produced by infants. These babbles consist of two parts (for instance “TI TI”). These two parts can be emphasized in different gradations. For instance, the first part can be a bit, slightly or very emphasized. The same can be the case for the second part. The emphasis on part one and part two can differ or be the same.

Your task will be to indicate how the two parts relate. This will be done by means of a sliding bar that you can move to the left and the right. When you move this bar to the left, the left ball gets bigger and the right ball gets smaller. The opposite happens when you slide to the right. The size of the balls is a visual representation of the relation between the two parts of the babble: the bigger one of the two balls, the bigger the difference between the two parts. You can try out the slider below:



If you want to listen again to the babble you push the button below:

Herbeluister

In total you can listen to the babble three times.

Before we take of with the experiment we will show and let you hear six clear example babbles. You will hear a babble and see how the slider is moved to the right position. After these six examples you can have a try yourself on 20 babbles in which the emphasis is clear. For the first 10 trial babbles you will get a warning message if the slider is placed on the wrong side of the axis. This means that you were not able to locate the emphasis correctly. You can try again when this message occurs. If the bar is placed on the right side of the axis you can continue to the next babble.

For the last 10 trial babbles you will not get a second chance. You will have to localize the emphasis all by yourself. If you succeed in doing so, you can start with the actual experiment.

The actual experiment will look exactly the same like the trial phase.

IMPORTANT!

During the trial phase the emphasis will be clearly located on either the first or the second part of the

1
2
3 babble. This training is designed to familiarize you with the fact that two parts of the babble might be
4 emphasized differently. In the babbles presented in the actual experiment the emphasis will be less
5 clearly perceivable. Unlike the trial phase there is no right or wrong answer in the actual experiment.
6 We expect you to follow your intuition during the experiment. What you hear is important to us.
7
8
9

10 To sum up:

- 11 • First we show you six example babbles to give you an impression of the task.
- 12 • Then the trial phase will take off. This phase consists of the judgement of 20 clear trial
13 babbles.
 - 14 ◦ With the first 10 babbles you can only continue to the next stimulus if the bar is
15 correctly positioned.
 - 16 ◦ With the last 10 babbles you do not get any feedback.
- 17 • If you completed the trial phase correctly you can start with the actual experiment. During the
18 experiment there is no right or wrong answer and you just respond to what you hear. The bar
19 on top of the experiment indicates how much progression you already made. There is no time
20 limit so if you would like to pause during the experiment you can.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Do you have any questions left, ask the experimenter. If you are ready to take a look at the example
29 babbles press START.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Supplemental material 3

Description of the example and trial phase

The stimuli in the example and trial phase were disyllabic reduplicative nonsense utterances, recorded by 3 female adult voices in PRAAT (Boersma & Weenink, 2014). We recorded utterances with 6 different segmental contexts, 2 consonantal contexts per vowel context (i.e. /titi/, /didi/, /koko/, /gogo/, /baba/, /wawa/). The vowels and consonants were distributed following the Frame Content Hypothesis (Davis & MacNeilage, 1990). Moreover the two consonants per vowels context were counterparts, i.e. voiced versus unvoiced (i.e. ‘d-t’, ‘g-k’), except for ‘baba’ we did not use ‘papa’ since this is a meaningful Dutch word (‘daddy’). Therefore ‘wawa’ was used as an alternative.

In the interactive example phase the judges got to hear and see 6 clear examples, 2 trochees, 2 iambs and 2 level utterances (see Table I below). For each example the judges saw how the sliding bar was moved in the correct position. An accompanying illustrative sentence was displayed for each example (e.g. “As you can hear the first part of the babble is more prominent than the second one”). After running through the 6 examples they could continue to the trial phase.

The purpose of the trial phase was to familiarise the judges with the rating task and see if they were competent to start with the actual experiment. In total 20 stimuli were presented to the judges. The programme automatically randomised these stimuli per judge. The task in the trial phase was the same as in the actual experiment: the adults had to indicate which part of the **stimulus** is more emphasised and how much. For the first 10 trial stimuli the raters could only continue to the next utterance if they had put the slider on the correct side of the axis and thus were capable to localise the stress in the utterance. If they had put the slider on the wrong side they got the message “This is not correct, please listen again”. With the last 10 utterances the judges did no longer get any feedback. If less than 5 out of the 10 last utterances were judged correctly they were not allowed to start the actual experiment. In the latter case an automatic message would pop up to inform them that they could not start the experimental phase. However, none of the 30 adults had problems during the trial phase and all judges were allowed to start with the experiment.

VOICE	TROCHEE	LEVEL	IAMB
1	<u>ti ti</u>	ti ti	<u>ti ti</u>
1	<u>ko ko</u>	ko ko	<u>ko ko</u>
2	<u>ba ba</u>	ba ba	<u>ba ba</u>
2	<u>ti ti</u>	ti ti	<u>ti ti</u>
3	<u>ko ko</u>	<u>ko ko</u>	ko ko
3	<u>ba ba</u>	<u>ba ba</u>	ba ba
3	<u>di di</u>	di di	<u>di di</u>
3	<u>go go</u>	go go	<u>go go</u>
1	<u>wa wa</u>	wa wa	<u>wa wa</u>
1	<u>di di</u>	di di	<u>di di</u>
2	<u>go go</u>	go go	<u>go go</u>
2	<u>wa wa</u>	wa wa	<u>wa wa</u>

Table I: Design of the example and trial stimuli. Legend: VOICE = id of the recorded voice; = presented in the example phase; = presented in the trial phase

Supplemental material 4

Three analyses were performed in order to preserve the continuous nature of the VAS.

In the first analysis the perceived degree of prosodic modulation is the dependent variable, i.e. the more the sliding bar was moved from the midpoint of the VAS towards the extremes, the modulated the prosody. As shown in Figure 2 in the manuscript, the ratings form a multimodal distribution: a distribution on the left and the right side of the VAS and a peak at the midpoint of the VAS. The degree of prosodic modulation is represented by the ratings that move from the midpoint of the VAS towards the extremes. In order to determine the degree of modulation the scale was collapsed with midpoint = 0 and the extreme point = 50, irrespective of whether an utterance was rated at the left side or right side of the VAS. The more a rating differs from zero, the higher the degree of lexical stress. However, the residuals of the statistical model with degree of prosodic modulation as dependent variable were not normally distributed (cf. figure 1a and 1b below).




Figure 1a and 1b: distribution of the residuals of the analyses of the degree of prosodic modulation (entire dataset)

The second and the third analyses were conducted on a subset of the trochaic at the left side and iambic side. Again the dependent variable represented the degree of modulation in terms of how far the slider was removed from the midpoint. In both analyses the residuals of the statistical model were not normally distributed (cf. figure 1Ia, 1Ib, 1IIa and 1IIb below).




Figure IIa and IIb: distribution of the residuals of the analyses of the degree of prosodic modulation (subset of the ratings at the left/trochaic side of the VAS)




Figure IIIa and IIIb: distribution of the residuals of the analyses of the degree of prosodic modulation (subset of the ratings at the right/iambic side of the VAS)

Supplemental material 5

Analysis of the effect of participant group and utterance type on the likelihood that an utterance is rated at the midpoint of the axis (rate 50). Legend: Participant group = NH or CI; Utterance type: reduplicated or variegated babble. Significance codes: ***: $p \leq 0.001$, ** ≤ 0.01 , * ≤ 0.05 , . ≤ 0.1

<i>Fixed Effects</i>	Estimate	Standard Error	z	p
Intercept	-3.222	0.297	-10.833	<0.001 ***
Participant group (NH)	-0.401	0.188	-2.127	0.033 *
Utterance type (variegated)	-0.527	0.136	-3.878	<0.001 ***

Supplemental material 6

Analysis of the utterances in the extreme ratings (20% most left, 20% most right, [expressed in z-scores](#)): fixed effect results expressed in logits. Legend: Participant group = NH or CI; Utterance type: reduplicated or variegated babble. Significance codes: ***: $p \leq '0.001'$, **: $p \leq '0.01'$, *: $p \leq '0.05'$, . : $p \leq '0.1'$

<i>Fixed Effects</i>	Estimate	Standard Error	z	p
Intercept	-0.826	0.116	-7.133	< 0.001***
Participant group (NH)	0.255	0.129	1.981	0.048 *
Utterance type (Variegated)	0.308	0.084	3.667	< 0.001 ***
Age at onset of babbling	0.004	0.010	0.426	0.670

1
2
3 **Supplemental material 7**

4 Analysis of the effect of participant group (NH or CI) on the repetitions of the stimuli. Legend:

5 Participant group = NH or CI. Significance codes: ***: $p \leq '0.001'$, ** $\leq '0.01'$, * $\leq '0.05'$, . $\leq '0.1'$

6
7

<i>Fixed Effects</i>	Estimate	Standard Error	t	p
Intercept	0.423	0.046	9.156	< 0.001***
Participant group (NH)	-0.058	0.017	-3.349	0.004 **
20% Extreme	-0.126	0.009	-14.613	< 0.001***

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Supplemental material 8**

4 Analysis of the effect of participant group on the likelihood that an utterance is rated as a trochee.

5 Legend: Participant group = NH or CI. Significance codes: ***: $p \leq '0.001'$, ** $\leq '0.01'$, * $\leq '0.05'$, .
6 $\leq '0.1'$
7
8
9

<i>Fixed Effects</i>	Estimate	Standard Error	z	p
Intercept	0.157	0.268	0.586	0.558
Participant group (NH)	-0.041	0.345	-0.120	0.904

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Supplemental material 9

Analysis of the effect of participant group and utterance type on the likelihood that an utterance is rated as an iamb. Legend: Participant group = NH or CI; Utterance type: reduplicated or variegated babble. Significance codes: ***: $p \leq '0.001'$, ** $\leq '0.01'$, * $\leq '0.05'$, . $\leq '0.1'$

<i>Fixed Effects</i>	Estimate	Standard Error	Z	p
Intercept	-0.929	0.320	-2.905	0.004 **
Participant group (NH)	0.094	0.389	0.243	0.808
Utterance type (variegated)	0.401	0.192	2.088	0.037 *