

1 Comparing Language Input in Homes of Blind and Sighted Children: Insights from Daylong
2 Recordings

3 Erin Campbell¹, Lillianna Richter¹, Genia Lukin¹, & Erika Bergelson¹

4 ¹ Department of Psychology & Neuroscience, Duke University, Durham, NC

5 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors have no conflicts of interest to report. **Funding:** This
6 work was supported by the National Science Foundation CAREER grant (BCS-1844710) to
7 EB and Graduate Research Fellowship (2019274952) to EC.

Comparing Language Input in Homes of Blind and Sighted Children: Insights from Daylong Recordings

Abstract

Purpose: This study compared language input to young blind children and their sighted peers in naturalistic home settings.

Methods: Using the LENA audio recorder, naturalistic speech in the home was captured and analyzed for various dimensions of language input, including quantitative, interactive, linguistic, and conceptual features.

Results: Our data showed far more similarity than difference across groups, with all differences being small in magnitude. Both groups received similar speech quantity, interactiveness, and lexical diversity. Fine-grained analysis revealed that blind children's language environments contained longer utterances, more temporal displacement, and content words that are harder for children to interact with, suggesting a similarity to adult-directed speech.

Conclusions: The findings challenge the notion that blind children's language input places them at a disadvantage and suggest that blind children receive rich and complex language input that can support their language development.

Introduction

The early language skills of blind children are highly variable (E. E. Campbell, Casillas, & Bergelson, submitted), with some blind children demonstrating age-appropriate vocabulary from the earliest stages of language learning (Bigelow, 1987; E. E. Campbell et al., submitted; Landau & Gleitman, 1985), while others experience large and persistent language delays (E. E. Campbell et al., submitted). By adulthood, blind individuals are fluent speakers of their language and are even reported to have faster auditory and lexical

processing skills than sighted adults (Röder, Demuth, Streb, & Rösler, 2003; Röder, Rösler, & Neville, 2000). The causes of this variability and the later ability to “catch up” remain poorly understood. In particular, the incidence of severe language delays in blind children (E. Campbell et al., submitted) yields questions about the process of language development in the absence of visual perception: what makes the language learning problem different and initially more difficult for the blind child? There are multiple possible contributors, including characteristics of the child (e.g., visual acuity, comorbid conditions, gender) as well as characteristics of the environment (e.g., access to early intervention services; school setting; caretakers tailoring interactions to their child’s sensory access). Here, we explore the characteristics of the language environment of blind children as it compares to the language environment of their sighted peers. In doing so, we begin to narrow down the role that visual input plays in language development, among all other factors.

Why would input matter?

Among both typically-developing children and children with developmental differences, language input can predict variability in language outcomes (Anderson, Graham, Prime, Jenkins, & Madigan, 2021, 2021; Gilkerson et al., 2018; Huttenlocher, Haight, Bryk, Seltzer, & Lyons, 1991; Huttenlocher, Waterfall, Vasilyeva, Vevea, & Hedges, 2010; Rowe, 2008, 2012). There are many ways to operationalize language input, that tend to be grouped into **quantity of language input** and **input characteristics** (often discussed as **quality of language input**, c.f. MacLeod & Demers, 2023). Quantity of language input can be broadly construed as the number of words or utterances a child is exposed to. At a coarse level, children who are exposed to more speech (or sign, Watkins, Pittman, & Walden, 1998) tend to have better language outcomes (Anderson et al., 2021; Gilkerson et al., 2018; Huttenlocher et al., 1991; Rowe, 2008). However, if only the *amount* of language exposure mattered, then infants should be able to sit in front of the television all day and become fluent language users. Yet young children struggle to learn language from video alone (e.g.,

58 Roseberry, Hirsh-Pasek, & Golinkoff, 2014 May-Jun).

59 The specific characteristics of that language input are perhaps even more influential
60 (Hirsh-Pasek et al., 2015; Rowe, 2012), although it is somewhat trickier to turn the
61 qualitative characteristics of language input into operationalizable properties. In the present
62 study, we move away from describing these linguistic characteristics as “quality” measures¹.
63 Rowe and Snow (Rowe & Snow, 2020) divide this space into three dimensions of language
64 input: interactive features (e.g., parent responsiveness, speech directed *to* child vs. overheard;
65 conversational turn-taking), linguistic features (e.g., lexical diversity, grammatical
66 complexity), and conceptual features (e.g., topic diversity). These environmental features at
67 various stages interact with the child’s own cognitive, linguistic, and conceptual abilities.

68 An important social feature of the language environment is the amount of interactivity
69 in parent-child communication. Prior literature reports that back-and-forth communicative
70 exchanges (also known as conversational turns) between caregivers and children predict
71 better language learning across infancy (Donnellan, Bannard, McGillion, Slocombe, &
72 Matthews, 2020; Goldstein & Schwade, 2008) and toddlerhood (Hirsh-Pasek et al., 2015;
73 Romeo et al., 2018), indicating that parents’ active response to their children’s actions and
74 utterances supports their learning. Adults’ attunement to children’s non-linguistic cues of
75 attention and interest, like pointing or eye gaze, also contributes to interactivity. In infancy,
76 words heard in contexts where the adult and child share joint attention are more likely to be
77 learned (Lucca & Wilbourn, 2018; Tomasello & Farrar, 1986). Parents’ interaction with their
78 child and the world around them ties together the linguistic and conceptual characteristics of
79 the language input, to which we turn next.

¹ In the field thus far, the directionality of the term “quality” has favored the types of language used by white and abled groups as immutable universal standards, thereby framing racialized and disabled peoples’ language as deficit and “low quality” by nature. Describing a singular source of input variation as “high quality” ignores the sociocultural variation of talk styles, and the presence of many rich sources of information from which children can learn (MacLeod & Demers, 2023).

Two commonly-analyzed linguistic features are lexical diversity (often measured as type/token ratio) and syntactic complexity. In accounts of the development of sighted children, toddlers who are exposed to greater diversity of words in their language input tend to have larger vocabulary scores (Anderson et al., 2021; Hsu, Hadley, & Rispoli, 2017; Huttenlocher et al., 2010; Rowe, 2012; Weizman & Snow, 2001). Lexical diversity is intertwined with input quantity: parents who talk more provide more unique words (Hoff & Naigles, 2002 Mar-Apr). Likewise, the diversity of syntactic constructions in parental language input is associated both with children’s vocabulary growth and structure diversity in their own productions (De Villiers, 1985; Hadley et al., 2017; Hoff, 2003 Sep-Oct; Huttenlocher, Vasilyeva, Cymerman, & Levine, 2002; Huttenlocher et al., 2010; Naigles & Hoff-Ginsberg, 1998).

The conceptual dimension of language input aims to capture the extent to which the language signal maps onto objects and events in the world (Rowe & Snow, 2020). As with the other dimensions, the pieces of the conceptual content of language input that are most informative may shift across developmental time: as children develop, their ability to represent abstract, displaced, decontextualized referents improves [Luchkina, Xu, Sobel, and Morgan (2020); Kramer, Hill, and Cohen (1975); CITE] (though object permanence and related skills may be delayed in blind children, S. J. Rogers and Puchalski (1988)). For example, infants are more likely to learn a new word when the referent is perceptually salient, dominating their field of view [Yu and Smith (2012); cite; cite]. Parents responding to a child’s point and labeling the object of interest might boost learning in that instance (Lucca & Wilbourn, 2018). By contrast, *displaced* language use— that is, talking about past, future, or hypothetical events, or people and items that are not currently present in the environment— may be beneficial at later stages of development (Rowe, 2013). Indeed, greater decontextualized language use in speech to toddlers predicts kindergarten vocabulary (Rowe, 2012), children’s own decontextualized language use (Demir, Rowe, Heller, Goldin-Meadow, & Levine, 2015), and academic achievement in adolescence (Uccelli, Demir-Lira, Rowe,

Levine, & Goldin-Meadow, 2019). Decontextualized language may support language learning because it provides an opportunity to discuss a broader range of topics and reflects typical adult language usage, which is often abstract (**CITE?**). It also provides the opportunity for more lexical and syntactic diversity.

From this review, it appears that sighted children learn about the world and language simultaneously from many sources, including sensory perception, linguistic input, and conceptual and social knowledge. For blind children, however, language input may constitute a greater proportion of the available clues for learning than for sighted children; in the absence of visual input, language is an important source of information about the world (E. E. Campbell & Bergelson, 2022). Syntactic structure in particular provides cues to word meaning that may be lost without visual cues, such as the relationship between two entities that aren't within reach (Gleitman, 1990). In our review so far, we have presented a pattern wherein the features of the input that are most helpful for language learning change over the course of children's development: early on, many of these cues require visual access, such as parental gaze, shared visual attention, pointing to remote object and the presence of salient objects in the visual field. Only later in development do the handholds to language learning become more abstract. This may be part of the reason why language delays are common in blind toddlers, but often resolved in older childhood [CITE]. If direct sensory access to referents provides an initial "brute force" mechanism for mapping words onto meanings, it may take longer for blind children to acquire the first few words. . By hypothesis, once this initial seed of lexical knowledge is acquired, blind children and sighted children alike are able to use more abstract and linguistic features as cues, and learning can proceed more rapidly thereafter (Babineau, de Carvalho, Trueswell, & Christophe, 2021; Babineau, Havron, Dautriche, de Carvalho, & Christophe, 2022; E. E. Campbell & Bergelson, 2022)]. Nevertheless, we cannot assume that access to visual experience is the *only* difference in the language learning experiences for blind and sighted children. The language input itself may very well differ for blind children relative to sighted children, for a variety of reasons.

Why would the input differ?

First, speakers regularly tailor input to communicate efficiently with the listener (Grice, 1975). Parents are sensitive to their child's developmental level and tune language input accordingly (Snow, 1972; Vygotsky & Cole, 1978). Child-directed speech is one example—whereby parents speak to young children with exaggerated prosody, slower speech rate, and increased vowel clarity (Bernstein Ratner, 1984; Fernald, 1989), which is in some cases helpful to the young language learner (Thiessen, Hill, & Saffran, 2005). Parents show increased alignment (a tendency to re-use the conversation partner's expressions) for younger children, which decreases as children get older (Yurovsky, Doyle, & Frank, 2016). When interacting with infants and toddlers, parents repeat words more often than when interacting with older children or adults (Snow, 1972). Communicative tailoring is also common in language input to children with disabilities, who tend to receive simplified, more directive language input, and less interactive input compared to typically-developing children (Dirks, Stevens, Kok, Frijns, & Rieffe, 2020; Yoshinaga-Itano, Sedey, Mason, Wiggin, & Chung, 2020).

In addition to tailoring communication to children's developmental level, speakers also adjust their conversation in accordance with the conversation partner's sensory access (Gergle, Kraut, & Fussell, 2004; Grigoroglou, Edu, & Papafragou, 2016). In a noisy environment, speakers will adapt the acoustic-phonetic features of their speech with the intent to make it easier for their interlocutor to understand them (Hazan & Baker, 2011), which demonstrates sensitivity to even temporary sensory conditions of their conversation partner. When describing scenes, speakers aim to provide the information their listeners lack but avoid redundant visual description (Grice, 1975; Ostarek, Paridon, & Montero-Melis, 2019). During in-lab tasks with sighted participants, participants tailor their descriptions and requests by verbally providing visually-absent cues when an object is occluded to their partner (Hawkins, Gweon, & Goodman, 2021; Jara-Ettinger & Rubio-Fernandez, 2021;

Rubio-Fernandez, 2019). These results suggest that adults and even infants (Chiesa, Galati, & Schmidt, 2015; Ganea et al., 2018; Senju et al., 2013) can flexibly adapt communication to the visual and auditory abilities of their partner.

Curiously though, these patterns are not borne out in the existing literature on interactions between blind infants and their sighted parents. We might expect parents to verbally compensate for missing visual input, resulting in parents providing more description of the child's environment. Instead, caregivers of blind children seem to restrict conversation to things that the blind child is currently engaged with, rather than attempt to redirect their attention to other stimuli (Andersen, Dunlea, & Kekelis, 1993; J. Campbell, 2003; Kekelis & Andersen, 1984). In naturalistic settings, parents of blind children use *fewer* declaratives and *more* imperatives than parents of sighted children, suggesting that children might be receiving less description than sighted children (Kekelis & Andersen, 1984; Landau & Gleitman, 1985). On the other hand, some parents may adapt to their children's visual abilities in specific contexts. Tadić, Pring, and Dale (2013 Nov-Dec) and colleagues find that in a structured book reading task, parents of blind children provide more descriptive utterances than parents of sighted children. Further, parents of blind children provide more tactile cues to initiate interactions or establish joint attention (Preisler, 1991; Urwin, 1983), which may serve the same social role as shared gaze in sighted children. These mixed results suggest that parents of blind children might alter language input in some domains but not others.

The Present Study

Reaching a better understanding of how sensory perception and linguistic input interact to influence blind children's language outcomes is of great scientific, clinical, and education importance. If properties of language input influence the likelihood of language delays among blind infants and toddlers (E. E. Campbell et al., submitted), capturing this variation may reveal a more nuanced picture of how infants use the input to learn language.

By contrast, if there is no relationship between language input properties and children’s language outcomes, then trying to modify language input can be one less worry for caregivers. In the present study, we examine daylong recordings of the naturalistic language environments of blind and sighted children in order to characterize the input to each group. Using both automated measures and manual transcription of these recordings, we measure input quantity (adult word count) and analyze several characteristics that may be information-rich learning cues, including interactivity (conversational turn counts, proportion of child-directed speech), conceptual features (temporal displacement, sensory modality), and linguistic complexity (type/token ratio and mean length of utterance).

Methods

Participants

29 blind infants and their families participated in this study. Blind participants were recruited through ophthalmologist referral, preschools, early intervention programs, social media, and word of mouth. To be eligible for this study, participants had to be 6–30 months old, have no additional disabilities (developmental delays; intellectual disabilities, or hearing loss), and be exposed to $\geq 75\%$ English at home. Caregivers were asked to complete a demographics survey and the MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventory (CDI, Fenson et al., 1994) within one week of the home language recording. Given the wide age range of the study, to control for age, each blind participant was matched to a sighted participant, based on age (± 6 weeks), gender, maternal education (\pm one education level: less than high school diploma, high school diploma, some college / Associate’s, Bachelor’s, graduate school), and number of siblings (± 1 sibling). When more than one match was available, we prioritized matching the blind participants as closely as possible on each characteristic in the preceding order. Caregivers were asked to complete a demographics survey and the MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventory (CDI, Fenson et al., 1994) within one week of the home language recording. See Table @ref(tab:

212 participant-characteristics) for sample characteristics.

213 **Recording Procedure**

214 Eligible families were asked to complete two surveys and complete a daylong home
215 language recording. For the recording portion of the study, caregivers of participating infants
216 received a LENA wearable audio recorder and vest (Ganek & Eriks-Brophy, 2016; Gilkerson
217 & Richards, 2008). They were instructed to place the recorder in the vest on the day of their
218 scheduled recording and put the vest on their child from the time they woke up until the
219 recorder automatically shut off after 16 hours (setting vest nearby during bath, nap, and car
220 times). They were also instructed how to pause the recording at any time, but asked to keep
221 these pauses to a minimum. Actual recording length ranged from 8 hours 17 minutes to 15
222 hours 59 minutes (Mean: 15 hours 16 minutes).

223 **Processing**

224 Audio recordings were first processed by LENA proprietary software, creating
225 algorithmic measures such as conversational turn counts. Each recording was then run
226 through an in-house automated sampler that selected 15- non-overlapping 5-minute
227 segments, randomly distributed across the duration of the recording. The process outputs a
228 codeable ELAN file (.eaf, Brugman & Russel, 2009). Each segment consists of 2 core minutes
229 of annotated time, with 2 minutes of listenable context marked out preceding the annotation
230 clip and 1 minute of additional context following the annotation clip. Each file therefore
231 contains 30 minutes of coded recording time and 75 minutes of total time listened. Because
232 these segments were sampled randomly, and not on a high-volubility measure such as
233 conversational turns or adult speech density, the amount of time with codeable speech input
234 varied for each recording. Indeed, across participants roughly 27% of the random 2-minute
235 coding segments contained no speech at all. For questions of *how much does a phenomenon*
236 *occur*, random sampling schemes can help avoid overestimating speech in the input, but for

questions of input *content*, randomly selected samples may be too sparse (Pisani, Gautheron, & Cristia, 2021).

In order to capture denser regions, once the randomly selected segments were annotated, we also chose to annotate 15 additional segments specifically for their high levels of speech. To select these segments of dense talk, we first conducted an automated analysis of the audio file using the voice type classifier for child-centered daylong recordings (Lavechin, Bousbib, Bredin, Dupoux, & Cristia, 2021) which identified all human speech in the recording. The entire recording was then broken into 2-minute chunks marked out at zero-second timestamps (e.g. 00:02:00.000 to 00:04:00.000). Each of these chunks was then ranked highest to lowest by the total duration of speech contained within the boundaries. For our high volubility sample, we chose the highest-ranked 15 segments of each recording, excluding those that overlapped with already-coded random segments.

Annotation

Trained annotators listened through each 2-minute segment plus its surrounding context and coded it using the Analyzing Child Language Experiences around the World (ACLEW) Daylong Audio Recording of Children’s Linguistic Environments (DARCLE) annotation scheme (Soderstrom et al., 2021). Prior to annotating lab data, annotators are trained on previously coded samples of child recordings and are required to reach 95% overall agreement with the gold standard version of the file for three different age ranges: 0-7 months, 8-18 months, and 19-36 months. For more information about this annotation scheme and the larger project, please see the ACLEW homepage (<https://sites.google.com/view/aclewdid/home>). Following the first pass, all files were reviewed by a highly-trained “superchecker” to ensure the consistency of annotations.

This annotation scheme is designed to capture both utterances by the target child and speech in the child’s environment, including adults, other children, and pre-recorded

electronic speech (e.g. toys, television, the radio). Annotators segment the duration of each utterance on a separate coding tier for each unique speaker. Speech by people other than the target child is transcribed using an adapted version of CHAT transcription style (MacWhinney, 2019), dubbed minCHAT for the ACLEW project (Soderstrom et al., 2021). Because the majority of target children in the project are pre-lexical, utterances produced by the target child are not yet transcribed. Environmental speech is then coded for the addressee of each utterance: speech directed to a child; adult-directed speech; speech directed to both an adult and a child; speech directed to pets or other animals; speech with an unclear addressee; or speech directed towards a recipient that doesn't fit into another category (e.g., voice control of Siri or Alexa, prayer to a metaphysical entity).

Extracting Measures of Language Input

These measures are summarized in Table 1. Proprietary LENA algorithm (Xu, Yapanel, & Gray, 2009) Manual annotations, which could be analyzed for the random segments, the high-volume segments, or both. This decision was made according to the goal of the analysis: quantity and interactiveness analyses were conducted on the random samples only, to try to capture a more representative estimate. Linguistic and conceptual analyses were conducted on all available annotations.

Quantity.

Adult Word Count.

To derive this count, first, the LENA algorithm segments the recording into clips of varying length. These segments are then classified as female adult speech, male adult speech, target child, other child, overlapping vocalization/noise, electronic noise, noise, silence, or uncertain, each of which is further categorized into “near” or “far”. Only segments that are classified as nearby male or female adult speech are included in the Adult Word Count estimation; Segments that the LENA algorithm identifies as “far”, “child”, or “overlapping”, do not contribute to this count (Xu et al., 2009; **xu2008?**). Validation work suggests that

this automated count correlates strongly with word counts derived from manual annotations [r = .71 – .92; Lehet, Arjmandi, Houston, and Dilley (2021)], but Lehet et al. (2021) and colleagues find that the amount of error may vary substantially across families. Compared to 30 minute – 1 hour samples that they had manually transcribed and counted, LENA’s AWC estimate ranged from undercounting words by 17% to overcounting words by 208% (Lehet et al., 2021).

Manual Word Count.

We also compare a manual count of speech in children’s environment. Manual word count is simply the number of intelligible words in our transcriptions of each child’s recording. Speech that was too far or muffled to be intelligible, as well as speech from the target child and electronic speech (TV, radio, toys) are excluded from this count. In order to try to get a representative estimate of the amount of talk in a children’s environment, we use the random samples only for this measure.

By using Adult Word Count and Manual Word Count, we hope to capture complementary estimates of the amount of speech children are exposed to. AWC is less accurate, but commonly used, and provides an estimate of the speech across the whole day. MWC, because it comes from manual annotations, is the accuracy gold-standard for speech estimates, but is only derived from 30 minutes of the recording.

Interactivity.

Conversational Turn Count.

One commonly used and easily-extracted metric of communicative interaction (e.g., Ganek & Eriks-Brophy, 2018; Magimairaj, Nagaraj, Caballero, Munoz, & White, 2022) is conversational turn count (or CTC), an automated measure generated by LENA (Xu et al., 2009). After tagging vocalizations for speaker identity, LENA algorithm looks for alternations between adult and target child speech in close temporal proximity. The algorithm counts any temporally close (within 5 seconds) switch between adult and target

child vocalizations, which can erroneously include non-contingent interactions (e.g., mom talking to dad while the infant babbles to herself nearby), and therefore inflate the count especially for younger ages and in houses with multiple children (Ferjan Ramírez, Hippe, & Kuhl, 2021). Still, this measure correlates moderately well with manually-coded conversational turns (Ganek & Eriks-Brophy, 2018; **busch2018?**), and because participants in our sample are matched on both age and number of siblings, CTC overestimation should not be biased towards either groups. Conversational turn count is calculated over the entire recording, but to normalize for recording length, we divided this by recording length.

Proportion of Child-Directed Speech.

Our other measure of interactivity is the proportion of utterances that are child-directed, derived from the manual annotations. Each proportion was calculated as the number of utterances (produced by someone *other* than the target child) tagged with a child addressee out of the total number of utterances. To try to get a representative measure of child-directed speech, we use the random samples only for this calculation.

Linguistic Features.

Type-Token Ratio.

As in previous work [(**templin1957?**); cite cite cite], we calculated type-token ratio by dividing the number of unique words in by the total number of words. Because the type-token ratio changes as a function of the size of the language sample (Richards, 1987), we first standardize the sample length by cutting children’s input (from the manual annotations) in each recording into 100-word bins. We then calculate type-token ratio within each of these bins by dividing the number of unique words by the number of total words (100). For each child, type-token ratio is the average of the type-token ratios for each of the bins in their input.

MLU.

We also analyzed the syntactic complexity of children’s language input, approximated

as mean utterance length in morphemes. Each utterance was tokenized into morphemes using the ‘morphemepiece’ R package (Bratt, Harmon, & Learning, 2022). We then calculated the mean length of utterance (number of morphemes) per speaker in each audio recording. We manually checked utterance length in a random subset of 10% of the utterances, and reached XXX agreement with the udpipe approach, indicating high reliability.

Conceptual Features. Our analysis of the conceptual features aims to measure whether the extent to which language input centers around the “*here and now*”: objects/events/people that are currently present/occurring vs. displaced objects/events. Prior work has quantified such *here-and-nowness* by counting object presence co-occurring with a related noun label (osina2013?; ganea2013?). The audio format of our data make it difficult to ascertain object presence, so instead of object displacement, in this analysis, we approximate *here-and-nowness* using lexical and syntactic properties of the input. We do this by comparing 1) What proportion of words are temporally displaced?; 2) To what extent can children physically engage in / interact with words’ referents?; and 3) What proportion of words have referents that can only be experienced through vision?

Proportion temporally displaced verbs.

We examined the displacement of events discussed in children’s linguistic environment, via properties of the verbs in their input. Notably, we are attempting to highlight semantic features of the language environment; however, given the constraints of large-scale textual analysis, we are categorizing utterances based on a combination of closely related syntactic and morphological features of verbs, since these contain time-relevant information. We assigned each utterance a **temporality** value: utterances tagged *displaced* describe events that take place in the past, future, or irrealis space, while utterances tagged *present* describe current, ongoing events. This coding scheme roughly aligns with both the temporal displacement and future hypothetical categories in Grimminger, Rohlfing, Lüke, Liszkowski, and Ritterfeld (2020; Hudson, 2002; see also: Lucariello and Nelson, 1987). To do this, we used the udpipe package (Wijffels, 2023) to tag the transcriptions with parts of speech and

other lexical features, such as tense, number agreement, or case inflection. To be marked as present, a verb either had to be marked with both present tense and indicative mood, or appear in the gerund form with no marked tense (e.g. *you talking to Papa?*). Features that could mark an utterance as displaced included past tense, presence of a modal, presence of *if*, or presence of *gonna/going to*, *have to*, *wanna/want to*, or *gotta/got to*, since these typically indicate belief states and desires, rather than real-time events. In the case of utterances with multiple verbs, we selected the features from the first verb or auxiliary, as a proxy for hierarchical dominance. A small number of utterances in our corpus were left *uncategorized* ($n = 1306/7867$) because they were fragments or because the automated parser failed to tag any of the relevant features. We manually checked verb temporality in a random subset of 10% of the utterances, and reached XXX agreement with the NLP approach, indicating moderate reliability.

CBOI distribution.

Next, we measure whether the distribution of Child-Body-Object Interaction (CBOI) rating differed across groups (Muraki, Siddiqui, & Pexman, 2022). These norms were generated by asking parents of six-year-olds to rate the extent to which children physically interact with words' referents, from 1 (*things that a typical child does not easily physically interact with*) to 7 (*things a typical child would easily physically interact with*). We first use the udpipe part-of-speech tags to filter to content words (adjectives, adverbs, nouns, and verbs). Words without a CBOI rating ($N = 5188/28821$) were removed.

Proportion highly visual words.

In addition to these two more traditional measures of decontextualized language, we include one measure that is uniquely decontextualized for the blind children relative to their sighted matches: the proportion of words in the input with referents that are highly and exclusively visual. We categorize the perceptual modalities of words' referents using the Lancaster Sensorimotor Norms, ratings from typically-sighted adults about the extent to

which a word evokes a visual/tactile/auditory/etc. experience (Lynott, Connell, Brysbaert, Brand, & Carney, 2020). Words with higher ratings in a given modality are more strongly associated with perceptual experience in that modality. A word’s dominant perceptual modality is the modality which received the highest mean rating. We tweak this categorization in two ways: words which received low ratings (< 3.5) across all modalities were re-categorized as *amodal*, and words whose ratings were distributed across modalities were re-categorized as *multimodal*. Using this system, each of the content words in children’s input (adjectives, adverbs, nouns, and verbs) were categorized into their primary perceptual modality. For each child, we extracted the proportion of “visual” words in their language environment

Results

Measuring Properties of Language Input

We first seek to assess whether language input to blind children is categorically different from the language input to sighted children, along the dimensions of quantity, interactivity, linguistic properties, and conceptual properties. We test for group differences using Bonferroni-corrected t-tests or the non-parametric Wilcoxon signed rank tests, when a Shapiro-Wilks test indicates that the variable is not normally distributed. Because this analysis involves multiple tests against the null hypothesis (*that there is no difference in the language input to blind vs. sighted kids*), we use the conservative Bonferroni correction to set our threshold for significance ($p = 0.05 / 8 \text{ tests} = 0.01$).

Language Input Quantity. We first compare the quantity of language input to blind and sighted children using two measures of the number of words in their environment: LENA’s automated Adult Word Count and word token count from our manual annotations. Shapiro-Wilks tests indicated that both of these variables were normally distributed ($ps > .05$).

Turning first to LENA’s automated measure, a two-sample t-test shows that despite

419 wide variability in the number of words children hear (Range: 195–992 words_{blind}, 238–804
 420 words_{sighted}), blind and sighted children do not differ in language input quantity ($t(44.85) =$
 421 -1.17 , $p = .248$). If we instead measure this using word counts from the transcriptions of the
 422 audio recordings, we find parallel results: blind and sighted children do not differ in language
 423 input quantity ($t(27.00) = 0.08$, $p = .939$); see Figure 1.




Figure 1. Comparing LENA-generated adult word counts (left) and transcription-based word counts in the input of blind and sighted children. Each dot represents the estimated number of words in one child’s recording.

424 **Interactivity.** We compared the proportions of child-directed speech (CDS) between
 425 the blind children and their sighted matches. A two-sample test for equality of proportions
 426 revealed no significant difference in the overall proportions of child-directed speech to blind
 427 children versus to sighted children ($W = 0.86$, $p = .399$).

428 We next compare the number of conversational turn counts for blind and sighted
 429 children, using LENA’s automated Conversational Turn Count measure. This measure is
 430 normally distributed ($W = 0.88$, $p = .924$). Despite wide variability in conversational turns
 431 (7–45_{blind}, 4–42_{sighted}), we find no evidence for group-level differences between blind and
 432 sighted children ($t = 515$, $p = .143$).





Figure 2. Comparing LENA-generated conversational turn counts (left) and proportion of utterances in child-directed speech (center). Each dot represents one child's recording. The full breakdown by addressee is shown in the rightmost panel.



For linguistic features, we first measure, or type-token ratio, from the manual annotations. Because this variable met the normality assumption, we performed a two-sample t-test. Results indicated that there was no significant difference in the type-token ratio between the two groups ($t(18.46) = -2.36, p = .030$). This suggests that, on average, the type-token ratio is similar for blind (M: 0.70) and sighted (M: 0.67) children (see Figure ??). These results provide evidence that the variety of words in the input is not affected by children's vision.


We then compared the MLU of environmental speech to blind children (M(SD) = 5.08 (1.29)) to that of sighted children (M(SD) = 4.47 (1.39)); this variable was normally distributed ($W = 0.92, p = .924$). A two-sample t-test revealed that the MLU was slightly but significantly higher in speech to blind children than to their sighted peers ($t(147.71) = -2.80, p = .006$); see Figure ??).

Conceptual Features. We compare the proportion of temporally displaced verbs using a Wilcoxon rank-sum test, given that a Shapiro-Wilks test indicates that the proportion of displaced verbs does not follow a normal distribution ($W = 0.98, p = .977$). We find that blind children hear proportionally more displaced verbs than sighted children ($W = 36.50, p = .003$).

We then compared the distribution of CBOI ratings in word tokens in blind children's input to that in sighted children's input using a two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. We find that these distributions significantly differ ($D = 0.98, p < .001$); this difference survives Bonferroni correction. Descriptively, low CBOI words were more common in language input to blind children, and high CBOI words were more common in language input to sighted children.


Lastly, we measure whether the language input to blind children contains a different proportion of words referring to visual objects/actions/properties; this variable was normally distributed ($W = 0.96, p = .962$). We found no differences across groups in the proportion of

461 highly visual words ($t(25.11) = 0.32, p = .755$).




463

Patterns in Language Input.
Blind (N=15)



464

Sighted (N=13)



Lastly, we also ran an exploratory analysis testing for patterns among these measures of language input. First, we re-aggregated the language input variables such that each child had a single value for each variable; this required calculating MLU over child rather than over speaker and giving each child’s input a mean child-body-object interaction rating. Next, we generated correlation matrices separately for the blind sample and the sighted sample, using Kendall’s Tau correlations; see Figure ???. We then compared correlations among variables across groups. To reiterate, this analysis is purely exploratory and descriptive in nature.

Looking across matrices, we found similarities in how properties of children’s language input patterned across groups. To highlight one of the strongest common relationships, in both samples, children who heard more adult words were involved in more conversational turns ($r_{\text{blind}} = 0.58$, $p_{\text{blind}} = .002$; $r_{\text{sighted}} = 0.47$, $p_{\text{sighted}} = .011$) and had lower type-token ratios ($r_{\text{blind}} = 0.10$, $p_{\text{blind}} = .667$; $r_{\text{sighted}} = 0.58$, $p_{\text{sighted}} = .003$). However, we also found some differences, where associations ran in the *opposite* direction: For blind kids but not sighted kids, higher BOI ratings was associated with a greater proportion of temporally displaced verbs; for sighted kids, higher BOI was associated with *less* temporal displacement ($r_{\text{blind}} = 0.41$, $p_{\text{blind}} = .047$; $r_{\text{sighted}} = -0.41$, $p_{\text{sighted}} = .047$). For blind kids only, proportion of child-directed speech was associated with a *lower* proportion of highly visual words ($r_{\text{blind}} = -0.30$, $p_{\text{blind}} = .157$; $r_{\text{sighted}} = 0.16$, $p_{\text{sighted}} = .451$).

Discussion

This study measured language input to young blind children and their sighted peers, using the LENA audio recorder to capture naturalistic speech in the home. We found that across many dimensions of language input, parents largely talk similarly to blind and sighted children, with a few nuanced differences, that we discuss further below.

Quantity

Across both of these measures of language input quantity, one estimated from the full sixteen hour recording (Adult Word Count) and one precisely measured from a 40-minute window of that day (Manual Word Count), blind and sighted children were exposed to similar amounts of speech in the home. Quantity was highly variable *within* groups, but we found no evidence for *between* group differences in input quantity.

Interactivity

We quantified interactivity in two ways: through the LENA-estimated conversational turn count, and through the proportion of child-directed speech in our manual annotations.

Again, we found no differences across groups in the amount of parent-child interaction. This finding runs counter to previous research; other studies report *less* interaction in dyads where the child is blind (Pérez-Pereira & Conti-Ramsden, 2001; Rowland, 1984; Andersen et al., 1993; Grumi et al., 2021; Kekelis & Andersen, 1984; Moore & McConachie, 1994; Preisler, 1991). Using a non-visual sampling method (i.e., our audio recordings) might provide a different, more naturalistic perspective on parent-child interactions, particularly in this population. For one thing, many of these studies (e.g., Kekelis & Andersen, 1984; Moore & McConachie, 1994; Pérez-Pereira & Conti-Ramsden, 2001; Preisler, 1991) involve video recordings in the child’s home, with the researcher present. Like other young children, blind children distinguish between familiar individuals and strangers, and react with trepidation to the presence of a stranger (Fraiberg, 1975; McRae, 2002); for blind children, this reaction may involve “quieting”, wherein children cease speaking or vocalizing when they hear a new voice in the home (Fraiberg, 1975; McRae, 2002). By having a researcher present during the recordings², prior research may have artificially suppressed blind children’s initiation of interactions. Even naturalistic observer-free video-recordings appear to inflate aspects of parental input, relative to daylong recordings (Bergelson, Amatuni, Dailey, Koorathota, & Tor, 2019). In these cases, the video camera acts as an observer itself, making participants aware of its presence, limiting participants’ mobility, and therefore shrinking the pragmatic scope of possible interactions. Together, these factors could explain why past parent-child interaction research finds that blind children initiate less (Andersen et al., 1993; Dote-Kwan, 1995; Kekelis & Andersen, 1984; Moore & McConachie, 1994; Tröster & Brambring, 1992), that parents do most of the talking (Andersen et al., 1993; Kekelis & Andersen, 1984), and that there is overall less interaction (Nagayoshi et al., 2017; Sally J. Rogers & Puchalski, 1984; Rowland, 1984; Tröster & Brambring, 1992).

² Fraiberg (1975) writes “these fear and avoidance behaviors appear even though the observer, a twice-monthly visitor, is not, strictly speaking, a stranger.” (pg. 323).

Additionally, a common focus in earlier interaction literature is to measure visual cues of interaction, such as shared gaze or attentiveness to facial expressions (Baird, Mayfield, & Baker, 1997; Preisler, 1991; Sally J. Rogers & Puchalski, 1984). We can't help but wonder: are visual markers of social interaction the right yardstick to measure blind children against? In line with MacLeod and Demers (2023), perhaps the field should move away from sighted indicators of interaction "quality", and instead try to situate blind children's interactions within their own developmental niche, one that may be better captured with auditory- or tactile-focused coding schemes.

Linguistic Features

Along the linguistic dimension, we measured type-token ratio and mean length of utterance. Type-token ratio was similar across groups, and in line with type-token ratio in other child-centered corpora (e.g., Newman, Rowe, & Bernstein Ratner, 2016). However, we found slightly but significantly higher MLU in blind children's language environment. The MLU finding runs counter to common advice: Parents of children with disabilities (including parents of blind children! e.g., FamilyConnect (n.d.); Chernyak (n.d.)) are often advised to use shorter, simpler sentences with their children, in order to promote children's understanding. We find instead that the language environments of blind children contain *longer* utterances, which could suggest that consciously modifying your linguistic behavior is difficult for parents. In any case, this advice is not supported by the literature: evidence suggests that longer, more complex utterances are associated with better child language outcomes in both typically-developing children (Hoff & Naigles, 2002 Mar-Apr) and children with cognitive differences (Sandbank & Yoder, 2016).

Conceptual Features

The conceptual features of language input feel slipperiest to operationalize. For this analysis, we chose to capture *here-and-now*-ness by measuring the proportion of temporally displaced verbs, the distribution of high vs. low child-body-object interaction ratings for

content words, and the proportion of highly visual words. Relative to other aspects of language input, the conceptual dimension seemed to vary most across groups: though blind and sighted participants were exposed to a similar proportion of highly visual words, blind children heard more displaced verbs and their content words were distributed slightly more to the not-interactable side of the child-body-object interaction ratings.

The extent to which blind children’s language input is centered on the *here-and-now* has been contested in the literature. [cite cite cite] Our sample, which contains more blind participants than prior research alongside a carefully peer-matched sighted sample, finds that blind children’s input is *less* focused on the here-and-now. One possible explanation is that because children have less access to immediate visual cues, caregivers might instead refer to past or future events. To illustrate, while riding on a train, instead of describing the scenery passing outside the window, parents may choose to talk about what happened earlier in the day or their plans upon home. Without further information about the social and perceptual context, it is difficult to determine the communicative function of these results.

To that end, our exploratory analysis points to potential group differences in the *context* of conceptual information. Blind children’s proportion of temporally displaced verbs was inversely correlated with their mean child-body-object interaction rating, whereas sighted children showed the reverse relationship. Could this suggest that when sighted children hear about words that are perceivable or manipulable, it tends to be in the context of co-present objects / events, but when blind children hear about things that can be interacted with, it tends to be related to past/future events? Additionally, while we found that overall, blind and sighted children hear a similar proportion of highly visual words (blue, mirror, rainbow, see), blind children (but not sighted children) who receive *more* child-directed speech seem to receive *less* of this highly visual language. Our present analyses can only hint at potential relationships between these variables at the child level, but as more dense annotation becomes available, we can explore the social and

environmental context of conceptual information as it unfolds across discourse.

Patterns in Language Input

Before synthesizing any of these differences, we wish to highlight again how much variability there is *within* groups and how much consistency there is *between* groups. One could imagine a world in which the language environments of blind and sighted children are radically different from each other. Our data do not support that hypothesis. Rather, we find far more similarity across groups than difference, and all differences were small in magnitude. This is worth emphasizing and re-emphasizing: across developmental contexts, including, as we show here, visual experience, children’s language input is resoundingly similar (Bergelson et al., 2022).

When we zoom into more fine-grained aspects of the input, we found that blind children’s language environments contained longer utterances, more temporal displacement, and content words that are harder for children to interact with. Together, these features seem to suggest that blind children’s input is more similar to adult-directed speech [cite cite] than sighted children’s. This does not seem attributable to differences in addressee: our annotators indicate that there is a similar proportion of child-.vs.adult-directed speech across the two groups.

One explanation for the minimal differences between blind and sighted children’s language environments is parents’ ability to assess their children’s engagement and cognitive level, and thereby tailor their speech accordingly. Sighted parents may be unfamiliar with blind children’s signals of interest (Perez-Pereira & Conti-Ramsden, 1999), and as a result, may respond less often to infants’ vocalizations and bids for communication (Rowland, 1984), instead defaulting to more adultlike language. On the other hand, we found between-group differences in how these measures relate to each other. In speech to sighted children, there is a small positive relationship between the amount of child-directed speech and the quantity of

highly visual words, but in speech to blind children the opposite is true: parents who use more child-directed speech use *less* highly visual language, which suggests that at least some caregivers are tailoring their language to their child’s sensory access when speaking to their child specifically.

However, the evidence that each of these input measures differs in its relationship to other measures when examined across these two groups underscores the idea that no feature or its proportion relative to other features can be an indicator of input “quality” in and of itself. Speech to children is highly variable; even the dimensions of language input that we attempt to measure are not static in their orientation nor the ways we can operationalize them. Yet, despite all this variation both within and between groups, both blind and sighted children grow up to be competent speakers (Röder et al., 2003; Röder et al., 2000). Future work should explore the relationship between these input measures and the children’s own language outcomes; however, given the high variability of all of these variables and their relationship to one another, we do not expect parental input to be rigidly deterministic of successful language acquisition.

Connecting to Language Outcomes

Returning to the larger equation of language development, blind and sighted infants differ in their access to perceptual input, and we have shown that language input is different along only a few axes: conceptual features, where language and the perceptual world interact, and complexity, with blind children hearing slightly longer and more adult-like utterances, on average. Initial vocabulary delays in blind children may then primarily be a result of the conflict between their lack of visual access and the majority-visual cues to early world learning (e.g., shared gaze, pointing, visual perception of referents).

Sensory cues, primarily visual, may be the platform on which children first build a semantic seed, the earliest mappings between words and their meaning (Babineau et al.,

2021). Once the semantic seed is built, children can use their linguistic knowledge to bootstrap *further* linguistic knowledge, regardless of their sensory input. Because blind children lack access to the direct visual cues that bolster these mappings, developing this semantic seed may take longer. Once blind children build the semantic seed, perhaps through haptic or auditory information, they can then use the language signal as the primary source of information for subsequent language learning (E. E. Campbell & Bergelson, 2022). If, as literature from sighted children suggests, the relationship between language input and language outcomes changes across developmental time [cite cite cite], then we might expect this trajectory to be later for blind children. Specifically, we would expect blind children to find more complex language input beneficial later than sighted children (i.e., once children have acquired sufficient linguistic knowledge to benefit from that complexity). On the other hand, it could be precisely this input complexity which aids blind children in forming the semantic seed in the absence of visual input. These predictions are not mutually exclusive, but testing them awaits further research.

References

- Andersen, E. S., Dunlea, A., & Kekelis, L. (1993). The impact of input: Language acquisition in the visually impaired. *First Language*, 13(37), 23–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014272379301303703>
- Anderson, N. J., Graham, S. A., Prime, H., Jenkins, J. M., & Madigan, S. (2021). Linking Quality and Quantity of Parental Linguistic Input to Child Language Skills: A Meta-Analysis. *Child Development*, 92(2), 484–501. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13508>
- Babineau, M., de Carvalho, A., Trueswell, J., & Christophe, A. (2021). Familiar words can serve as a semantic seed for syntactic bootstrapping. *Developmental Science*, 24(1), e13010. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.13010>
- Babineau, M., Havron, N., Dautriche, I., de Carvalho, A., & Christophe, A. (2022). Learning to predict and predicting to learn: Before and beyond the syntactic bootstrapper. *Language Acquisition*, 0(0), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10489223.2022.2078211>
- Baird, S. M., Mayfield, P., & Baker, P. (1997). Mothers' Interpretations of the Behavior of Their Infants with Visual and Other Impairments during Interactions. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 91(5), 467–483. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X9709100507>
- Bergelson, E., Amatuni, A., Dailey, S., Koorathota, S., & Tor, S. (2019). Day by day, hour by hour: Naturalistic language input to infants. *Developmental Science*, 22(1), e12715. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12715>
- Bergelson, E., Soderstrom, M., Schwarz, I.-C., Rowland, C., Ramirez-Esparza, N., Hamrick, L., ... Casillas, M. (2022). Everyday language input and production in 1001 children from 6 continents.
- Bernstein Ratner, N. (1984). Patterns of vowel modification in mother–child speech. *Journal of Child Language*, 11, 557–578.
- Bigelow, A. (1987). Early words of blind children. *Journal of Child Language*, 14(1), 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900012721>
- Bratt, J., Harmon, J., & Learning, B. F. & W. P. G. L. D. M. (2022). Morphemepiece:

Morpheme Tokenization.

Brugman, H., & Russel, A. (2009). Annotating Multimedia / Multi-modal resources with ELAN. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation*.

Campbell, E. E., & Bergelson, E. (2022). Making sense of sensory language: Acquisition of sensory knowledge by individuals with congenital sensory impairments. *Neuropsychologia*, 174, 108320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2022.108320>

Campbell, E. E., Casillas, R., & Bergelson, E. (submitted). The Role of Vision in the Acquisition of Words: Vocabulary Development in Blind Toddlers. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/UW6ZM>

Campbell, J. (2003). Maternal Directives to Young Children who are Blind. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 97(6), 355–365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X0309700604>

Chernyak, P. (n.d.). 3 Ways to Teach Your Blind or Visually Impaired Child to Talk. *WikiHow*. <https://www.wikihow.life/Teach-Your-Blind-or-Visually-Impaired-Child-to-Talk>.

Chiesa, S., Galati, D., & Schmidt, S. (2015). Communicative interactions between visually impaired mothers and their sighted children: Analysis of gaze, facial expressions, voice and physical contacts. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 41(6), 1040–1046. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cch.12274>

De Villiers, J. (1985). Learning how to use verbs: Lexical coding and the influence of the input*. *Journal of Child Language*, 12(3), 587–595. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900006668>

Demir, Ö. E., Rowe, M. L., Heller, G., Goldin-Meadow, S., & Levine, S. C. (2015). Vocabulary, syntax, and narrative development in typically developing children and children with early unilateral brain injury: Early parental talk about the "there-and-then" matters. *Developmental Psychology*, 51(2), 161–175. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038476>

- Dirks, E., Stevens, A., Kok, S., Frijns, J., & Rieffe, C. (2020). Talk with me! Parental linguistic input to toddlers with moderate hearing loss. *Journal of Child Language*, 47(1), 186–204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000919000667>
- Donnellan, E., Bannard, C., McGillion, M. L., Slocombe, K. E., & Matthews, D. (2020). Infants' intentionally communicative vocalizations elicit responses from caregivers and are the best predictors of the transition to language: A longitudinal investigation of infants' vocalizations, gestures and word production. *Developmental Science*, 23(1), e12843. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12843>
- Dote-Kwan, J. (1995). Impact of Mothers' Interactions on the Development of Their Young Visually Impaired Children. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 89(1), 46–58. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X9508900109>
- FamilyConnect. (n.d.). Understanding the Stages of Language Development for Babies Who Are Blind. *FamilyConnect*.
- Fenson, L., Dale, P. S., Reznick, J. S., Bates, E., Thal, D. J., Pethick, S. J., ... Stiles, J. (1994). Variability in Early Communicative Development. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59(5), i. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1166093>
- Ferjan Ramírez, N., Hippe, D. S., & Kuhl, P. K. (2021). Comparing Automatic and Manual Measures of Parent–Infant Conversational Turns: A Word of Caution. *Child Development*, 92(2), 672–681. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13495>
- Fernald, A. (1989). Intonation and communicative intent in mothers' speech to infants: Is the melody the message? *Child Development*, 60(6), 1497–1510.
- Fraiberg, S. (1975). The development of human attachments in infants blind from birth. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 21, 315–334.
- Ganea, N., Hudry, K., Verneti, A., Tucker, L., Charman, T., Johnson, M. H., & Senju, A. (2018). Development of adaptive communication skills in infants of blind parents. *Developmental Psychology*, 54(12), 2265–2273. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000564>
- Ganek, H., & Eriks-Brophy, A. (2016). The Language ENvironment Analysis (LENA)

system: A literature review. In *Proceedings of the joint workshop on NLP for Computer Assisted Language Learning and NLP for Language Acquisition* (pp. 24–32). Umeå, Sweden: LiU Electronic Press.

Ganek, H., & Eriks-Brophy, A. (2018). Language ENvironment analysis (LENA) system investigation of day long recordings in children: A literature review. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 72, 77–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2017.12.005>

Gergle, D., Kraut, R. E., & Fussell, S. R. (2004). Language Efficiency and Visual Technology: Minimizing Collaborative Effort with Visual Information. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 23(4), 491–517. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X04269589>

Gilkerson, J., & Richards, J. A. (2008). *The LENA Natural Language Study*. Boulder, CO: LENA Foundation.

Gilkerson, J., Richards, J. A., Warren, S. F., Oller, D. K., Russo, R., & Vohr, B. (2018). Language Experience in the Second Year of Life and Language Outcomes in Late Childhood. *Pediatrics*, 142(4), e20174276. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2017-4276>

Gleitman, L. (1990). The Structural Sources of Verb Meanings. *Language Acquisition*, 1(1), 3–55. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20011341>

Goldstein, M. H., & Schwade, J. A. (2008). Social feedback to infants' babbling facilitates rapid phonological learning. *Psychological Science*, 19(5), 515–523. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02117.x>

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In *Syntax and semantics*. New York San Francisco London: Academic press, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Grigoroglou, M., Edu, U., & Papafragou, A. (2016). Are children flexible speakers? Effects of typicality and listener needs in children's event descriptions. *Cognitive Science*, 6.

Grimminger, A., Rohlfing, K. J., Lüke, C., Liszkowski, U., & Ritterfeld, U. (2020).

Decontextualized talk in caregivers' input to 12-month-old children during structured interaction. *Journal of Child Language*, 47(2), 418–434.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000919000710>

- Grumi, S., Cappagli, G., Aprile, G., Mascherpa, E., Gori, M., Provenzi, L., & Signorini, S. (2021). Togetherness, beyond the eyes: A systematic review on the interaction between visually impaired children and their parents. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 64, 101590. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2021.101590>
- Hadley, P. A., Rispoli, M., Holt, J. K., Papastratakos, T., Hsu, N., Kubalanza, M., & McKenna, M. M. (2017). Input Subject Diversity Enhances Early Grammatical Growth: Evidence from a Parent-Implemented Intervention. *Language Learning and Development: The Official Journal of the Society for Language Development*, 13(1), 54–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2016.1193020>
- Hawkins, R. D., Gweon, H., & Goodman, N. D. (2021). The Division of Labor in Communication: Speakers Help Listeners Account for Asymmetries in Visual Perspective. *Cognitive Science*, 45(3), e12926. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12926>
- Hazan, V., & Baker, R. (2011). Acoustic-phonetic characteristics of speech produced with communicative intent to counter adverse listening conditions. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 130(4), 2139–2152. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.3623753>
- Hirsh-Pasek, K., Adamson, L. B., Bakeman, R., Owen, M. T., Golinkoff, R. M., Pace, A., . . . Suma, K. (2015). The Contribution of Early Communication Quality to Low-Income Children’s Language Success. *Psychological Science*, 26(7), 1071–1083. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615581493>
- Hoff, E. (2003 Sep-Oct). The specificity of environmental influence: Socioeconomic status affects early vocabulary development via maternal speech. *Child Development*, 74(5), 1368–1378. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00612>
- Hoff, E., & Naigles, L. (2002 Mar-Apr). How children use input to acquire a lexicon. *Child Development*, 73(2), 418–433. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00415>
- Hsu, N., Hadley, P. A., & Rispoli, M. (2017). Diversity matters: Parent input predicts toddler verb production. *Journal of Child Language*, 44(1), 63–86. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000915000690>

- Hudson, J. A. (2002). "Do You Know What We're Going to Do This Summer?": Mothers' Talk to Preschool Children About Future Events. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, 3(1), 49–71. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327647JCD0301_4
- Huttenlocher, J., Haight, W., Bryk, A., Seltzer, M., & Lyons, T. (1991). Early vocabulary growth: Relation to language input and gender. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 236–248. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.27.2.236>
- Huttenlocher, J., Vasilyeva, M., Cymerman, E., & Levine, S. (2002). Language input and child syntax. *Cognitive Psychology*, 45(3), 337–374. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0010-0285\(02\)00500-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0010-0285(02)00500-5)
- Huttenlocher, J., Waterfall, H., Vasilyeva, M., Vevea, J., & Hedges, L. V. (2010). Sources of variability in children's language growth. *Cognitive Psychology*, 61(4), 343–365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2010.08.002>
- Jara-Ettinger, J., & Rubio-Fernandez, P. (2021). The social basis of referential communication: Speakers construct physical reference based on listeners' expected visual search. *Psychological Review*, No Pagination Specified–No Pagination Specified. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000345>
- Kekelis, L. S., & Andersen, E. S. (1984). Family Communication Styles and Language Development. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 78(2), 54–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X8407800202>
- Kramer, J. A., Hill, K. T., & Cohen, L. B. (1975). Infants' Development of Object Permanence: A Refined Methodology and New Evidence for Piaget's Hypothesized Ordinality. *Child Development*, 46(1), 149–155. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1128843>
- Landau, B., & Gleitman, L. R. (1985). *Language and experience: Evidence from the blind child* (pp. xi, 250). Cambridge, MA, US: Harvard University Press.
- Lavechin, M., Bousbib, R., Bredin, H., Dupoux, E., & Cristia, A. (2021). An open-source voice type classifier for child-centered daylong recordings. arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2005.12656>

- Lehet, M., Arjmandi, M. K., Houston, D., & Dilley, L. (2021). Circumspection in using automated measures: Talker gender and addressee affect error rates for adult speech detection in the Language ENvironment Analysis (LENA) system. *Behavior Research Methods*, 53(1), 113–138. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-020-01419-y>
- Lucariello, J., & Nelson, K. (1987). Remembering and planning talk between mothers and children. *Discourse Processes*, 10(3), 219–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01638538709544673>
- Lucca, K., & Wilbourn, M. P. (2018). Communicating to Learn: Infants’ Pointing Gestures Result in Optimal Learning. *Child Development*, 89(3), 941–960. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12707>
- Luchkina, E., Xu, F., Sobel, D., & Morgan, J. (2020). *Sixteen-month-olds comprehend unanchored absent reference* (Preprint). Open Science Framework. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/5tc6d>
- Lynott, D., Connell, L., Brysbaert, M., Brand, J., & Carney, J. (2020). The Lancaster Sensorimotor Norms: Multidimensional measures of perceptual and action strength for 40,000 English words. *Behavior Research Methods*, 52(3), 1271–1291. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-019-01316-z>
- MacLeod, A. A. N., & Demers, C. (2023). Transmitting white monolingual Anglo-American norms: A concept analysis of “quality of language” in parent-child interactions. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S014271642300005X>
- MacWhinney, B. (2019). CHAT Manual. <https://doi.org/10.21415/3MHN-0Z89>
- Magimairaj, B., Nagaraj, N., Caballero, A., Munoz, K., & White, K. (2022). A Systematic Review of the Effects of LENA-based Feedback on Parent-Child Language Interactions in Families with Young Children. *Journal of Early Hearing Detection and Intervention*, 7(3), 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.26077/6c72-973b>
- McRae, K. A. (2002). *Attachment in blind infants : A systematic investigation using Ainsworth’s Strange Situation*. (PhD thesis). University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

- Moore, V., & McConachie, H. (1994). Communication between blind and severely visually impaired children and their parents. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 12(4), 491–502. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-835X.1994.tb00650.x>
- Muraki, E. J., Siddiqui, I. A., & Pexman, P. M. (2022). Quantifying children’s sensorimotor experience: Child body-object interaction ratings for 3359 English words. *Behavior Research Methods*, 54(6), 2864–2877. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-022-01798-4>
- Nagayoshi, M., Hirose, T., Toju, K., Suzuki, S., Okamitsu, M., Teramoto, T., . . . Takeo, N. (2017). Related visual impairment to mother-infant interaction and development in infants with bilateral retinoblastoma. *European Journal of Oncology Nursing: The Official Journal of European Oncology Nursing Society*, 28, 28–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejon.2017.02.002>
- Naigles, L. R., & Hoff-Ginsberg, E. (1998). Why are some verbs learned before other verbs? Effects of input frequency and structure on children’s early verb use. *Journal of Child Language*, 25(1), 95–120. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000997003358>
- Newman, R. S., Rowe, M. L., & Bernstein Ratner, N. (2016). Input and uptake at 7 months predicts toddler vocabulary: The role of child-directed speech and infant processing skills in language development. *Journal of Child Language*, 43(5), 1158–1173. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000915000446>
- Ostarek, M., Paridon, J. van, & Montero-Melis, G. (2019). Sighted people’s language is not helpful for blind individuals’ acquisition of typical animal colors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(44), 21972–21973. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1912302116>
- Perez-Pereira, M., & Conti-Ramsden, G. (1999). *Language Development and Social Interaction in Blind Children*. London: Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203776087>
- Pérez-Pereira, M., & Conti-Ramsden, G. (2001). The use of Directives in Verbal Interactions between Blind Children and their Mothers. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*,

- 854 95(3), 133–149. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482x0109500302>
- 855 Pisani, S., Gautheron, L., & Cristia, A. (2021). *Long-form recordings: From A to Z*.
- 856 Preisler, G. M. (1991). Early patterns of interaction between blind infants and their sighted
857 mothers. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 17(2), 65–90.
858 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2214.1991.tb00680.x>
- 859 Richards, B. (1987). Type/Token Ratios: What do they really tell us? *Journal of Child*
860 *Language*, 14(2), 201. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1017/s0305000900012885>
- 861 Röder, B., Demuth, L., Streb, J., & Rösler, F. (2003). Semantic and morpho-syntactic
862 priming in auditory word recognition in congenitally blind adults. *Language and*
863 *Cognitive Processes*, 18(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01690960143000407>
- 864 Röder, B., Rösler, F., & Neville, H. J. (2000). Event-related potentials during auditory
865 language processing in congenitally blind and sighted people. *Neuropsychologia*, 38(11),
866 1482–1502. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932\(00\)00057-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0028-3932(00)00057-9)
- 867 Rogers, Sally J., & Puchalski, C. B. (1984). Social Characteristics of Visually Impaired
868 Infants' Play. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 3(4), 52–56.
869 <https://doi.org/10.1177/027112148400300409>
- 870 Rogers, S. J., & Puchalski, C. B. (1988). Development of Object Permanence in Visually
871 Impaired Infants. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 82(4), 137–142.
872 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X8808200407>
- 873 Romeo, R. R., Leonard, J. A., Robinson, S. T., West, M. R., Mackey, A. P., Rowe, M. L., &
874 Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2018). Beyond the 30-Million-Word Gap: Children's Conversational
875 Exposure Is Associated With Language-Related Brain Function. *Psychological Science*,
876 29(5), 700–710. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617742725>
- 877 Roseberry, S., Hirsh-Pasek, K., & Golinkoff, R. M. (2014 May-Jun). Skype me! Socially
878 contingent interactions help toddlers learn language. *Child Development*, 85(3), 956–970.
879 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12166>
- 880 Rowe, M. L. (2008). Child-directed speech: Relation to socioeconomic status, knowledge of

child development and child vocabulary skill*. *Journal of Child Language*, 35(1), 185–205. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000907008343>

Rowe, M. L. (2012). A Longitudinal Investigation of the Role of Quantity and Quality of Child-Directed Speech in Vocabulary Development. *Child Development*, 83(5), 1762–1774. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01805.x>

Rowe, M. L. (2013). Decontextualized Language Input and Preschoolers' Vocabulary Development. *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 34(4), 260–266. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0033-1353444>

Rowe, M. L., & Snow, C. E. (2020). Analyzing input quality along three dimensions: Interactive, linguistic, and conceptual. *Journal of Child Language*, 47(1), 5–21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000919000655>

Rowland, C. (1984). Preverbal Communication of Blind Infants and Their Mothers. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 78(7), 297–302. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0145482X8407800701>

Rubio-Fernandez, P. (2019). Overinformative Speakers Are Cooperative: Revisiting the Gricean Maxim of Quantity. *Cognitive Science*, 43(11), e12797. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12797>

Sandbank, M., & Yoder, P. (2016). The Association Between Parental Mean Length of Utterance and Language Outcomes in Children With Disabilities: A Correlational Meta-Analysis. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 25(2), 240–251. https://doi.org/10.1044/2015_AJSLP-15-0003

Senju, A., Tucker, L., Pasco, G., Hudry, K., Elsabbagh, M., Charman, T., & Johnson, M. H. (2013). The importance of the eyes: Communication skills in infants of blind parents. *Proceedings. Biological Sciences*, 280(1760), 20130436. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.0436>

Snow, C. E. (1972). Mothers' Speech to Children Learning Language on JSTOR. *Child Development*, 43, 549–565.

- Soderstrom, M., Casillas, M., Bergelson, E., Rosemberg, C., Alam, F., Warlaumont, A. S., & Bunce, J. (2021). Developing a Cross-Cultural Annotation System and MetaCorpus for Studying Infants' Real World Language Experience. *Collabra: Psychology*, 7(1), 23445. <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.23445>
- Tadić, V., Pring, L., & Dale, N. (2013 Nov-Dec). Story discourse and use of mental state language between mothers and school-aged children with and without visual impairment. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 48(6), 679–688. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12040>
- Thiessen, E. D., Hill, E. A., & Saffran, J. R. (2005). Infant-Directed Speech Facilitates Word Segmentation. *Infancy: The Official Journal of the International Society on Infant Studies*, 7(1), 53–71. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327078in0701_5
- Tomasello, M., & Farrar, M. J. (1986). Joint Attention and Early Language. *Child Development*, 57(6), 1454. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1130423>
- Tröster, H., & Brambring, M. (1992). Early social-emotional development in blind infants. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 18(4), 207–227. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2214.1992.tb00355.x>
- Uccelli, P., Demir-Lira, Ö. E., Rowe, M. L., Levine, S., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2019). Children's Early Decontextualized Talk Predicts Academic Language Proficiency in Midadolescence. *Child Development*, 90(5), 1650–1663. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13034>
- Urwin, C. (1983). Dialogue and cognitive functioning in the early language development of three blind children: Normal and deficient, 142–161.
- Vygotsky, L. S., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in Society: Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Watkins, S., Pittman, P., & Walden, B. (1998). The Deaf Mentor Experimental Project for young children who are deaf and their families. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 143(1), 29–34. <https://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2012.0098>

- Weizman, Z. O., & Snow, C. E. (2001). Lexical input as related to children's vocabulary acquisition: Effects of sophisticated exposure and support for meaning. *Developmental Psychology*, 37(2), 265–279. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.37.2.265>
- Wijffels, J. (2023). UDPipe.
- Xu, D., Yapanel, U., & Gray, S. (2009). *Reliability of the LENA Language Environment Analysis System in Young Children's Natural Home Environment* (pp. 1–16). Boulder, CO: The LENA Foundation.
- Yoshinaga-Itano, C., Sedey, A. L., Mason, C. A., Wiggin, M., & Chung, W. (2020). Early Intervention, Parent Talk, and Pragmatic Language in Children With Hearing Loss. *Pediatrics*, 146(Supplement_3), S270–S277. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2020-0242F>
- Yu, C., & Smith, L. B. (2012). Embodied attention and word learning by toddlers. *Cognition*, 125(2), 244–262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2012.06.016>
- Yurovsky, D., Doyle, G., & Frank, M. C. (2016). Linguistic input is tuned to children's developmental level. *Cognitive Science*, 6.

Variable	Blind	Sighted	Overall
Age in months			
Mean (SD)	15.77 (8.20)	16.15 (8.15)	15.96 (8.04)
Min, Max	6.41, 30.38	6.18, 31.76	6.18, 31.76
Gender			
(Col %)			
F	7 (43.75%)	7 (43.75%)	14 (43.75%)
M	9 (56.25%)	9 (56.25%)	18 (56.25%)
Maternal education level			
(Col %)			
Some college	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Associate's degree	3 (23.08%)	1 (7.69%)	4 (15.38%)
Bachelor's degree	1 (7.69%)	2 (15.38%)	3 (11.54%)
Master's degree	5 (38.46%)	9 (69.23%)	14 (53.85%)
Missing	4 (30.77%)	1 (7.69%)	5 (19.23%)
Maternal education level	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)
Number of older siblings			
Mean (SD)	0.50 (0.82)	1.09 (1.04)	0.74 (0.94)
Min, Max	0.00, 2.00	0.00, 3.00	0.00, 3.00

Table 1

Language input variables extracted from recordings.

Variable	Coding	Portion of Recording	Description
Adult Word Count / half hour (AWC)	Automated	Whole day	Estimated number of words in recording categorized as nearby adult speech by LENA algorithm
Manual Word Count (WC)	Manual	Random	Number of word tokens from speakers other than target child
Conversational Turn Count / half hour (CTC)	Automated	Whole day	Count of temporally close switches between adult and target-child vocalizations, divided by recording length
Proportion of Child-Directed Speech (Prop. CDS)	Manual	Random	Number of utterances tagged with child addressee out of total number of utterances, from speakers other than target child
Type-Token Ratio	Manual	Random + High Volume	Average of the type-token ratios (number of unique words divided by number of total words) for each of the 100-word bins in their sample
Mean Length of Utterance	Manual + NLP parsing	Random + High Volume	Average number of morphemes per utterance (by speaker)
Proportion of Temporally Displaced Verbs (Prop. Displaced)	Manual + NLP tagging	Random + High Volume	Proportion of verbs that refer to past, future, or hypothetical events
Child-Body-Object Interaction Ratings (CBOI)	Manual + NLP tagging	Random + High Volume	Distribution of ratings of “how much a child can interact with” each word (adjectives, adverbs, nouns, verbs)
Proportion of Highly Visual Words	Manual	Random + High Volume	Proportion of words in the input with high visual association ratings and low ratings for other perceptual modalities