₁   Non-word repetition in Yélî Dnye

₂   Alejandrina Cristia[1] & Marisa Casillas[2]

₃   [1] Laboratoire de Sciences Cognitives et de Psycholinguistique, Département d'Etudes

₄   cognitives, ENS, EHESS, CNRS, PSL University

₅   [2] Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics

₆   Author Note

Abstract

In nonword repetition (NWR) studies, participants are presented auditorily with an item that is phonologically legal but lexically meaningless in the local language. Accuracy is thought to reflect long-term phonological knowledge as well as online phonological working memory and flexible production patterns.In this study, we report on NWR results among children learning Yêly Dnyé, an isolate spoken in Rossel Island, PNG, with an unusually dense phonological inventory. This study contributes to three lines of research. First, we document that non-word items containing typologically rare sounds are repeated accurately less often that non-words containing more common sounds. Second, we document rather weak effects of item length, contributing to other research suggesting that length effects may be language-specific. Third, we do not find strong individual variation effects in this population, contrary to previous results documenting strong age-related effects. Together, these data provide a unique view of online phonological processing in a seldom-studied language, and contribute to both typological and language acquisition research.

Keywords: phonology, non-word repetition, development

Word count: xxx words

Non-word repetition in Yélî Dnye

TODO Middy

- look through this manuscript for bits of text to be written by **mc**
- help with table 1 (formatting & making it appear, because it's broken by the phonological representations)
- do you think Figure 2 should be done with phonetic symbols? If yes, could you try to implement that?
- double check demo – probably start with the xlsx version that has the children's first names, date of birth, and date of test. I looked again at my local files (still haven't checked the labs' ones) and I'm surprised I have maternal education for more children than I have birth order for... If you correct this, to generate the csv I also round the age, assign age.rounded to reported age (in years) when DOB is missing, remove first names, DOB, DOTest and age.precise before pushing to github
- double check my frequency entries in segments.xlsx using the search function in https://phoible.org/parameters; take a look at http://phoible.github.io/conventions/ in case you see something about double articulation (I didn't find tp or lBj)
- double check phonological implementation of stimuli in stimuli.xlsx
- for both of the above, if you make any changes, they need to be re-saved as UTF16 txt file, and then converted (see remember above)
- double check also stim_seg_freq – why are some items still with NA freq?
- consent, "correct", "accuracy", "performance"
- draft discussion

TODO later

- probably turn summary of types of error into a table; use proportion of correctly produced rather than number; use first attempts rather than the whole data set DONE
- maybe add to the last ana the prevalence (ie out of all the gh which proportion get transformed) DONE I think... (this item looks the same as one of the three above)
- maybe add analyses of score as a function of frequency (phones, diphones) in MC's corpus? (mc suggested, but I don't think we need it...) - waiting until we talk about this

Introduction

Although infants begin to learn about their native language's phonology within the first year, many studies suggest that in perception and production, in phonetics and phonology, their knowledge continues to develop throughout childhood (e.g., Hazan & Barrett, 2000). One common task in this line of research is nonword repetition (NWR). In NWR studies, participants are presented auditorily with an item that is phonologically legal but lexically meaningless in the language children are learning. The child should immediately try to say it back without changing anything. Accuracy is thought to reflect long-term phonological knowledge (which allows the child to perceive the item accurately even though it is not a real word they have encountered before) as well as online phonological working memory (to encode the item in the interval between hearing it and saying it back) and flexible production patterns (to produce the item accurately even though it had never been pronounced before).

NWR has been used to seek answers to a variety of theoretical questions, including what the links between phonology, working memory, and the lexicon are (Bowey, 2001), and to assess the extent to which apparent phonological constraints found in the lexicon

affect online production (Gallagher, 2014). It is also frequently used as for applications, notably as a diagnostic for language delays and disorders (Estes, Evans, & Else-Quest, 2007). Since non-words can be generated in any language, it has attracted the attention of researchers working in multilingual and linguistically diverse environments, particularly in Europe (Action, 2009; Meir, Walters, & Armon-Lotem, 2016).

In this study, we report on NWR results among children learning Yêly Dnyé, an isolate spoken in Rossel Island, PNG, with an unusually dense phonological inventory. The present report uses these unique data to contribute to several lines of research. First, we made sure that some of the non-word items contained typologically rare and/or challenging sounds, so that we can contribute to the study of whether rare sounds are disadvantaged in perception and/or production, both in terms of overall accuracy of repetition and patterns of mispronunciation. Second, we look at the effects of item length, since previous NWR research has uncovered variable effects. Third, we contribute to the basic NWR literature by contributing an additional data point for children learning a rarely-studied language and culture, and further investigating whether there are structured sources that account for individual variation.

Intro to the language (mc) - please feel free to throw away anything that is not useful!.

- complexity in the vowel system
- complexity in the consonant system
- word shapes
- typical word length
- although not the focus of this paper, high use of suppletion in verbal paradigms, other features of language, see Levinson XXX for details

Intro to the people (mc) - please feel free to throw away anything that is not useful!. Little is known about language development in children growing up in

102 Rossel Island, a community of primarily subsistence farmers who tend to reside in

103 close-knitted villages where child care is distributed across many individuals, and who

104 typically speak Yélî Dnyé, a phonologically and lexically complex language.

105 • usually monolingual at home

106 • schooling in English but it starts at age XX, so not relevant here

107 • however, some use of English due to immigrants & children of immigrants

108 • children spend a lot of time with other children

109 • most parents are subsistence farmers

110 • parental education generally varies between XX and YY

111 **Brief review of NWR for our purposes.**   There is some variation in the

112 presentation procedure and structure of items found in previous NWR work. For example,

113 items are often presented orally by the experimenter (Torrington Eaton, Newman, Ratner,

114 & Rowe, 2015), although an increasing number of studies have turned to playing back the

115 stimuli in order to have greater control of the stability of the presentation (Brandeker &

116 Thordardottir, 2015). Additionally, while some studies have used 10-15 non-words, others

117 have employed up to 46 unique items (Piazzalunga, Previtali, Pozzoli, Scarponi, &

118 Schindler, 2019). Often, authors modulate structural complexity, typically measured in

119 terms of item length (measured in number of syllables) and/or syllable structure (open as

120 opposed to closed syllables, Gallon, Harris, & Van der Lely, 2007).

121 Previous work seems to avoid difficult sounds, but we felt this was important to

122 represent Yélî Dnye, so we also varied this factor. We designed a relatively large number of

123 items but, aware that this may render the task longer and more tiresome, we split some of

124 the items across children. This allowed us to get information about repetition accuracy of

125 more items.

126 Naturally, designing the task in this way may render the study of individual variaiton

127 within the population more difficult because different children are exposed to different

items. However, a review of previous work on individual variation suggested to us that many individual differences effects are relatively small, and would not be detectable with the sample size that we could collect in a given visit.

That said, we contribute to the literature by also reporting descriptive analyses of individual variation that could potentially be integrated in meta-analytic efforts. Based on previous work, we looked at potential improvements with age (Farmani et al., 2018; Kalnak, Peyrard-Janvid, Forssberg, & Sahlén, 2014; Vance, Stackhouse, & Wells, 2005), and potential negative effects of bilingual exposure (Brandeker & Thordardottir, 2015; Meir & Armon-Lotem, 2017; Meir et al., 2016). Previous work typically finds no significant differences as a function of maternal education (e.g., Farmani et al., 2018; Kalnak et al., 2014; Meir & Armon-Lotem, 2017) or child gender (Chiat & Roy, 2007). Although previous research has not often investigated potential effects of birth order on NWR, there is a sizable literature on these effects in other language tasks (Havron et al., 2019), and therefore we report on those too.

Research questions.   After some preliminary analyses to set the stage, we address the following questions:

- Does the frequency of sounds across languages predict NWR? Are rarer sounds more often substituted by commoner sounds?
- How does score change as a function of item length in number of syllables?
- Is individual variation attributable to child age, sex, birth order, monolingual status, and/or parental education?

In view of the hypothesis-driven nature of this work, we had considered boosting the interpretational value of this evidence by announcing our analysis plans prior to conducting them. However, we realized that even pre-registering an analysis would be equivocal because we do not have enough power to look at all relationships of interest, and often to detect any of the known effects given their variability across studies. To illustrate this, we

portray studies in which children's NWR scores were gathered between 4 and 12 years of age, and reported separately for items that are relatively short (1-2 syllables) versus longer items (3-4 syllables) in Figure 1. Notice that the effect of stimulus length is minuscule among Italian children (Piazzalunga et al., 2019), but considerable among Tsimane' children (Cristia, Farabolini, Scaff, Havron, & Stieglitz, 2020), where a drop of 40 percentage points is observed at all ages. A similar difference in NWR scores for short versus long items was observed among Arabic children (Jaber-Awida, 2018). Even the effect of age is unstable in this sample. Whereas it is quite clear that children's NWR scores increase in the Italian data, age effects are less stable among Tsimane' children. Therefore, all analyses here are descriptive and should be considered exploratory.

Methods

Stimuli. Many NWR studies are based on a fixed list of 12-16 items that vary in length between 1 and 4 syllables, often additionally varying syllable complexity and/or cluster presence and complexity, always meeting the condition that they do not mean anything in the target language (e.g., Balladares, Marshall, & Griffiths, 2016; Wilsenach, 2013). We kept the same variation in item length and the non-meaningfulness requirement, but we did not vary syllable complexity and clusters because these are vanishingly rare in Yély Dnye. We also increased the number of items an individual child would be tested on, so that a child would get up to 23 items to repeat (note that up to other work has also used 24-30 items: Jaber-Awida, 2018; Kalnak et al., 2014), and we created more items and distributed them across children, so as to increase the coverage, and be able to study more items.

A first list of candidate items was generated in 2018 by selecting simple consonants ("p", "t", "d", "k", "m", "n", "w", "y") and vowels ("i", "o","u", "a","e") that were combined into consonant-vowel syllables, further sampling the space of 1- to 4-syllable

Figure 1. NWR scores as a function of age (in years) and item length for comparable studies. Arabic data from Jaber et al. (2018); Italian data from Piazzalunga et al. (2019); Tsimane' from Cristia et al. (2020); Yélî data from the present study.

179 sequences. These candidates were automatically checked against Levinson's 2015 dictionary

180 and removed from consideration if they appeared in the dictionary. The second author

181 presented them orally to three local research assistants, who were asked to repeat them and

182 further say whether they were real words. Any item for which two or more of the assistants

183 reported them having a meaning or some form of association was excluded.

184   A second list of candidate items was generated in 2019 by selecting complex

185 consonants and systematically crossing them with all the vowels in the Yélî inventory to

186 produce consonant-vowel monosyllables. As before, items were automatically excluded if

187 they appeared in the dictionary. Additionally, since hearing vowel length in monosyllables

in isolation is challenging, any item that had a short/long real word neighbor was filtered

out. Since the phonology and phonetics of Yélî is still in the process of being described

[CITE **mc** please fill in], there could have been undocumented constraints that rendered

items illegal. Therefore, we made sure that the precise consonant-vowel sequence occurred

in some real word in the dictionary (i.e., that there was a longer word included the

monosyllable as a subsequence). These candidates were presented to one informant, for a

final check that they did not mean anything. Together with the 2018 selection, they were

recorded using a headset **XXX** mc** please fill in** and an Olympus **XXX** mc** please

fill in** from the written form presented together with the same item orally (by the second

author). The complete recorded list was finally presented to two more informants, who

could repeat all the items and who confirmed there were no real words. Even so, there was

one monosyllable that was often identified as a real word (intended "yî" /yXX/; identified

as "yi" /yi/, *tree*). This item is removed from analyses below.

The final list is composed of three practice items; 20 monoysllables containing sounds

that are less frequent in the world's languages than singleton plosives; 8 bisyllables; 12

trisyllables; and 4 quadrisyllables (see Table 2).

A Praat script was written to randomize this list 20 times, and split it into two

sublists, to generate 40 different elicitation sets. The 40 elicitation sets are available online

from https://osf.io/5qspb. The split had the following constraints:

- the same three items were selected as practice items and used in all 40 elicitation sets
- splits were done within each length group from the 2018 items (i.e., separately for 2,
  3, and 4-syllable items); and among onset groups for the difficult monosyllables
  generated in 2019 (i.e., all the monosyllables starting with tp were split into 2
  sublists). Since some of these groups had an odd number of items, one of the sublists
  was slightly longer than the other (20 versus 23).
- once the sublist split had been done, items were randomized such that all children

heard first the 3 practice items in a fixed order (1, 2, and 4 syllables), a randomized

version of their sublist selection of difficult onset items, and randomized versions of

their 2-syllables, then 3-syllables, and finally 4-syllable items.

Procedure. We tried to balance three desiderata: That children would not be

unduly exposed to the items before they themselves had to repeat them; that children

would feel comfortable doing this task with us; and that the community would feel safe

with us doing this task with their children. Moreover, there were also some logistic

constraints in terms of the space availability. As a result, the places where elicitation

happened varied across the hamlets.

We visited four different hamlets once, and attempted to test all eligible children

present at the time, to prevent the items "spreading" through hearsay. In the first hamlet,

we tested children in five different places, with some children being tested inside a house

and others tested on the veranda. The complete list of places and the ways in which they

met the desiderata mentioned above can be found in the raw data, available from online

supplementary materials.

The child was donned a headset (**xx** mc** please fill in** for most of the children,

SHURE WH20 XLR headset with a dynamic microphone for the rest), recorded into the

left channel into a Tascam DR40x digital recorder. For most children, the headset could

not stay comfortably on the child's head, and thus it was placed on the child's shoulders,

with the microphone carefully placed close to the child's mouth. A local informant sat next

to the child, to would provide the instructions and, if needed, coach the child to make sure,

using the three practice items as well as real words, that they understood that the task was

to repeat the items precisely without changing anything. An experimenter (the first author)

delivered the elicitation stimuli to the local informant and the child over headphones.

The first phase was making sure the child understood the task. This was explained

orally and the first training item was presented. Often, children froze and did not say

240 anything. If this happened, then we followed this procedure. First, the informant insisted.

241 If the child still did not say anything, the informant asked the child to repeat a real word,

242 and another, and another. If the child could repeat these correctly, then we provided the

243 recorded training item over headphones again. Most children successfully started repeating

244 the items presented over headphones at this point; a few further needed the local informant

245 to model the behavior (i.e., they would hear the item again, and she would say it; then we

246 would play it again, and ask the child to say it). A small minority still failed to repeat the

247 item after hearing it over headphones. If that occurred, we tried with the second training

248 item, at which point some children got it and could continue. A small minority, however,

249 failed to repeat this one, as well as the third training item, in which case we stopped the

250 test altogether.

251 NWR studies vary in whether children are provided with several opportunities to

252 hear and say the item. To have a fixed and clear procedure, we decided that items other

253 than the inital three training ones would not be repeated unless the child made an attempt

254 to produce them. If this attempt was judged correct by the local informant, then the

255 experimenter would move on to the next item (whispering this over a separate headset that

256 was recording onto the right track of the same Tascam). If the local informant heard a

257 deviation, she indicated to the experimenter that the item needed to be repeated, and up

258 to 5 attempts were allowed.

259 Whenever siblings from the same family were tested, an attempt was made to test

260 first the older and then the younger child, and always on different elicitaiton sets.

261 **Coding.**   A script was written to randomize all tokens from all children, pairing

262 each with the auditory target the child had been provided with. A native research assistant

263 then listened through all productions of a given target (randomized across children and

264 repetition order), and made a judgment of whether the item was correctly or incorrectly

265 repeated. She additionally orthographically transcribed exactly what the child said,

providing some examples of the types of errors children in general make (without making specific reference to Yélî sounds or the items in the elicitation sets).

Analyses.   Some NWR studies employ phoneme-based scoring in addition to or instead of word-level accuracy (e.g., Cristia et al., 2020). We scored items in terms of the number of phonemes that could be aligned across the target and attempt, divided by the number of phonemes of whichever item was longer (the target or the attempt). Although previous work does not use distance metrics, we additionally report those.

Additionally, we looked up each phoneme in each target word in the Phoible database (Moran & McCloy, 2019). We entered the number of languages in which each phoneme was found, as well as what percentage of languages in the database that represented. We could not find a small number of phonemes in the database, and treat those as NA values that do not contribute to the target-level global average phone cross-linguistic frequency, although an alternative would be to attribute them a very small number.

Finally, for describing children's patterns of errors, all repetitions of a given target were taken into account. We describe the proportion of items where the change resulted in a real word (semantic errors); and classify the most common phonological errors.

Participants.   This study was approved as part of a larger research effort by Marisa Casillas, with the research protocol having been approved by the IRB committee entitled The Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Social Sciences (Ethiek Commissie van de faculteit der Sociale Wetenschappen; ECSW) of Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands. The approval for work outside of the Netherlands came as an amendment to the general research line on language development research (original request: ECSW2017-3001-474 Manko-Rowland; amendment: ECSW-2018-041). Participation was voluntary, with children being invited to come and participate. Regardless of how they performed, children were provided with a snack as compensation. Children who came up to participate but then refused were nonetheless provided with the snack.

A total 55 children were tested, from 34 of families, in five hamlets. Some children could not be included for the following reasons: refused participation or failed to repeat items presented over headphones even after coaching (N=0), spoke too softly to allow offline coding (N=5). In addition, 2 teenagers were tested to put younger children at ease; their data is not included in analyses below. The remaining 40 children (14 girls) were aged 6.96 years (range 3.90-11 years). There were 32 children exposed only to Yélî in the home, 6 children who were also exposed to another language in the home, and , 2 for whom this information was missing. Maternal years of education averaged 8.24 years (range 6-12 years; 2 children had this information missing).[1] In terms of birth order, 5 were first borns, 4 second, 2 third, 7 forth, 5 fifth, 1 sixth, and NA did not have this information.

Results

*Figure 2.* (#fig:Fig1-first_vs_others)NWR scores for individual participants averaging separately their first attempts and all other attempts.

---

[1]Education is often reported in even years because people typically complete two-year cycles.

303   **Preliminary analyses.**   We first checked whether accuracy varies between first and

304   subsequent presentations of an item by averaging word-level accuracy at the participant

305   level separately for first attempts and subsequent repetitions. We excluded 3 children who

306   did not have data for one of these two types. As shown in Figure 1, participants' mean

307   word-level accuracy became more heterogeneous in subsequent repetitions. Surprisingly,

308   subsequent repetitions (M = 39, SD = 26) were on average less accurate than first ones (M

309   = 65, SD = 15), t(38) = 6.62, p = 0. Given the uncertainty in whether previous work used

310   only the first or all repetitions, and since behavior degraded and became more

311   heterogeneous in subsequent repetitions, the rest of the analyses focus on only the first

312   repetitions.

313   Taking into account only the first attempts, we averaged attempts by each of the 24

314   children who had data for first attempts; their ages ranged from 3.90 to 10.20 (M = 6.50,

315   SD = 1.50).

316   The overall NWR score was M = 61% (SD = 15%). Scores based on phonemes are

317   even higher M = 77% (SD = 9%). The phoneme-based normalized Levenshtein distance

318   was M = 23% (SD = 9%), meaning that about a fifth of phonemes were were substituted,

319   inserted, or deleted. Notice that the normalized Levenshtein distance is the complement of

320   phoneme-based scores.

321   **NWR as a function of cross-linguistic phone frequency.**   In this analysis, we

322   were interested in variation in performance as a function of the average frequency with

323   which sounds composing individual target words are found in languages over the world. To

324   look at this, we fit a mixed logistic regression, in which the outcome variable was whether

325   the non-word was correctly repeated or not. The fixed effects of interest was the average

326   cross-linguistic phone frequency; we also included child age as a control fixed effect, and

327   child ID & target ID as random variables.

328   We could include 885 observations (**why − shouldn't it be 1k??**), from 41 children

329 producing in any given trial one of 41 potential target words. The analysis revealed a

330 significant estimate for the average cross-linguistic frequency of phones in the target words

331 (ß = 0.03, SE ß = 0.01, p = 0): Target words with phones found more frequently across

332 languages had a higher proportion of words that were correctly repeated, as clear in Figure

333 2.

Figure 3. (#fig:Fig2-xling_freq)NWR scores for individual target words as a function of the average frequency with which each phone is found across languages.

334 **use proportion of correctly produced rather than number; DONE**

335 **a2m use first attempts rather than the whole data set: having second**

336 **thoughts. To be clear: the argument for using first attempts only is that all of**

337 **the other analyses are on kids' first attempts, rather than all of their attempts,**

338 **so we should use just first attempts here because it may confuse readers & it is**

339 **more consistent. BUT there are fewer mistakes this way, which is Options 1**

340 **and 2 below has lots of zeros... CF Option 3 further down**

a2m probably turn the paragraph on substitutions into a table: having second thoughts, the table would look just like a para, no?

Option 1: just numbers, first attempts only Next, we investigated patterns of deletion and substitution. Deletions were relatively rare, with only 19 vowels deleted, and 4 consonants.

As for substitutions, it was as common for a nasal vowel to be produced as an oral vowel as vice versa (0 oral target vowels produced as nasal vowels, 0 nasal target vowels produced as oral vowels). Substitutions in which the oral nature was preserved but the quality of the vowel was changed were a great deal more common than changes in quality among nasal vowels (42 oral vowels produced with a different quality; 0 nasal vowels produced with a different quality). As for consonants, asymmetries were very marked with more complex consonants (specifically dptpkpkmknmbghlv) mispronounced as simple ones (specifically mnlwyvdgptkfhch, 0) than vice versa (0). Simple consonants were mispronounced as other simple consonants quite frequently (62 simple consonants mispronounced as other simple ones, compared to 0 complex ones).

Option 2: numbers and proportions, first attempts only Next, we investigated patterns of deletion and substitution. Deletions were relatively rare, with only 19 vowels deleted (about 1.17% of all vowel targets), and 4 consonants deleted (about 0.24% of all consonant targets).

As for substitutions, it was as common for a nasal vowel to be produced as an oral vowel as vice versa (0 oral target vowels produced as nasal vowels or about 0% out of all oral vowel targets, 0 nasal target vowels produced as oral vowels or about NA% out of all nasal vowel targets). Substitutions in which the oral nature was preserved but the quality of the vowel was changed were a great deal more common than changes in quality among nasal vowels (42 oral vowels produced with a different quality or about 0.29% out of all oral vowel targets; 0 nasal vowels produced with a different quality or about NA% out of all

nasal vowel targets). As for consonants, asymmetries were very marked with more complex

consonants (specifically dptpkpkmknmbghlv) mispronounced as simple ones (specifically

mnlwyvdgptkfhch, 0 times or about NA% out of all complex consonant targets) than vice

versa (0 times or about NA% out of all simple consonant targets). Simple consonants were

mispronounced as other simple consonants quite frequently (62 simple consonants

mispronounced as other simple ones or about 0.30% out of all simple consonant targets,

compared to 0 complex ones or about NA% out of all complex consonant targets).

Option 3: numbers and proportions, ALL attempts Next, we investigated

patterns of deletion and substitution. Deletions were relatively rare, with only 29 vowels

deleted (about 0.55% of all vowel targets), and 9 consonants deleted (about 0.26% of all

consonant targets).

As for substitutions, it was as common for a nasal vowel to be produced as an oral

vowel as vice versa (52 oral target vowels produced as nasal vowels or about 2.01% out of

all oral vowel targets, 58 nasal target vowels produced as oral vowels or about 6.46% out of

all nasal vowel targets). Substitutions in which the oral nature was preserved but the

quality of the vowel was changed were a great deal more common than changes in quality

among nasal vowels (197 oral vowels produced with a different quality or about 3.20% out

of all oral vowel targets; 23 nasal vowels produced with a different quality or about 7.08%

out of all nasal vowel targets). As for consonants, asymmetries were very marked with

more complex consonants (specifically dptpkpkmknmbghlv) mispronounced as simple ones

(specifically mnlwyvdgptkfhch, 266 times or about 5.55% out of all complex consonant

targets) than vice versa (2 times about 5.55% out of all simple consonant targets). Simple

consonants were mispronounced as other simple consonants quite frequently (128 simple

consonants mispronounced as other simple ones or about 0.48% out of all simple consonant

targets, compared to 62 complex ones or about 2.79% out of all complex consonant targets).

Finally, we looked into the frequency with which mispronunciations resulted in real

words. Nearly all of them were: 97%.

TO DISCUSS TOGETHER this is higher than any previous report! can we be sure of it?

Accuracy a function of item length.   Next, we inspected whether accuracy varied as a function of word length. Results are shown on table XX. This table shows that monosyllables accuracy was much lower than other lengths. This is likely due to the fact that the majority of monosyllables included were chosen because they had sounds that are rare in the world's languages, which may indicate that they are hard to produce or to perceive.

Setting monosyllables aside, we observe the typical pattern of decreased accuracy for longer items, although this is particularly salient for the whole word scoring. This is the most commonly reported type of score, but it is also the least forgiving. The pattern is less marked when other two scores are used, which are less sensitive to errors.

```
##
##
## \begin{table}[tbp]
## \begin{center}
## \begin{threeparttable}
## \caption{\label{tab:tablength}NWR scores measured in whole word accuracy, phoneme-based
## \begin{tabular}{lll}
## \toprule
## Word & \multicolumn{1}{c}{Phoneme} & \multicolumn{1}{c}{NLD}\\
## \midrule
## 47 (22) & 59 (17) & 41 (17)\\
## 79 (22) & 94 (7) & 6 (7)\\
## 78 (19) & 94 (6) & 6 (6)\\
```

419 ## 75 (32) & 93 (11) & 7 (11)\\

420 ## \bottomrule

421 ## \end{tabular}

422 ## \end{threeparttable}

423 ## \end{center}

424 ## \end{table}

Figure 4. (#fig:Fig2-scores by age)NWR whole-word scores for individual participants as a function of age and sex (blue = boys, pink = girls).

425   **Factor structuring individual variation.** Our final exploratory analysis assessed

426 whether variation in scores was structured by factors that vary across individuals. As

427 shown in Figure 2, there was a greater deal of variance in earlier than later ages, with

428 significantly higher NWR scores for older children (Spearman's rank correlation, given

429 inequality of variance, rho (1,548.04) = 0.33, p = 0.12). In contrast, there was no clear

430 association between NWR scores, on the one hand, and sex (t (0.18) = 21.34, p = 0.86),

birth order (data missing for 17 children, 2,678.47) = -0.16, p = 0.44) or maternal

education (data missing for 2 children, 2,091.92) = 0.09, p = 0.67)

Discussion

- What is the overall repetition accuracy (whole word, phoneme based, distance)?

- How does this change as a function of item complexity (number of syllables, sound complexity)?

1. Children are more accurate for mono-syllables than longer items

2. The length distribution in Yélî words is more balanced than that in English, and thus the performance decline for poly- versus mono-syllables may be less pronounced than that for English. **Check for work on European languages that may have looked into this**

3. Similarly, we do not know of NWR research that manipulates the difficulty of the sounds that are included in the items, but word naming and other research suggests that children are more accurate when producing easy and/or typologically common sounds than difficult and/or typologically rare sounds [CITE]. Therefore, we expect higher accuracy for items with common sounds than in those with rare sounds.

4. The Yélî sound inventory is very large and compressed, with many similar sounds that are acoustic and articulatory neighbors. Therefore, this may constitute a pressure for children to have finer auditory skills (and perhaps more precise articulations) than children speaking languages with a simpler inventory. As a result, differences between easier and harder items may be smaller in this work than in other research. **no work looking at consonants & vowels? no work looking at nasal vowels in particular?**

(MC: but we can try and do a cursory analysis based on the corpora we have from Steve and my transcription of naturalistic interactions!)

- How frequent are errors that result in real words? Is that a function of item complexity?

- Is individual variation explainable by child age, sex, birth order, monolingual status, and/or parental education?

3. Children's accuracy increases with child age.

4. Non-monolingual Yélî children are less accurate than monolingual ones when tested on the society-dominant language (we did not test any non-dominant language)

5. As revious NWR evidence on this is mixed, but general findings on language development suggest that children whose mothers are more educated are more accurate than children whose mothers are less educated.

6. To our knowledge, there is no previous NWR work on this, but other research suggests that first-born children should outperform later-born children

7. Anecdotally Yélî children grow up in close-knitted communities and thus may receive significant portions of their language input from people not in their nuclear family (or at least from people other than their mothers, who tend to be the non-native speakers). If so, the difference between monolinguals and not monolinguals may be smaller than that found in other work . That said, one recent study on the same population shows that most child-directed input in the first 2 years does come from the mother , so in so far as this input has a crucial formational role, then there may still be a performance gap between these two groups.

8. In the Rossel community, formal education plays an extremely minor role in ensuring individual's success, is not a good index of relative socio-economic status, and furthermore there is only a narrow range of variation in maternal educational

attainment. This may lead to no or only very small advantages for children whose mothers are more educated, provided that the causal chain between maternal education and child language is via SES more broadly. However, if education directly boosts maternal verbal skills and the incidence of verbal behavior (as suggested by CITE), then we should still see a difference along this factor.

9. One main causal path between birth order and language development is via parental input (CITE). Given our arguments above for how mothers may not be as important among Rossel people than in other places, then the performance gap between first borns and later borns may be smaller.

Acknowledgments

References

Action, C. (2009). Language impairment in a multilingual society: Linguistic patterns and the road to assessment. *Brussels: COST Office. Available Online at: Http://Www. Bi-Sli. Org.*

Balladares, J., Marshall, C., & Griffiths, Y. (2016). Socio-economic status affects sentence repetition, but not non-word repetition, in Chilean preschoolers. *First Language*, *36*(3), 338–351. doi:10.1177/0142723715626067

Bowey, J. A. (2001). Nonword repetition and young children's receptive vocabulary: A longitudinal study. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *22*(3), 441–469.

Brandeker, M., & Thordardottir, E. (2015). Language exposure in bilingual toddlers: Performance on nonword repetition and lexical tasks. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *24*(2), 126–138.

Chiat, S., & Roy, P. (2007). The preschool repetition test: An evaluation of performance in typically developing and clinically referred children. *Journal of Speech, Language,*

512   *and Hearing Research, 50*(2), 429–443.

513   Cristia, A., Farabolini, G., Scaff, C., Havron, N., & Stieglitz, J. (2020). Infant-directed
514   input and literacy effects on phonological processing: Non-word repetition scores
515   among the tsimane'. *Preprint.*

516   Estes, K. G., Evans, J. L., & Else-Quest, N. M. (2007). Differences in the nonword
517   repetition performance of children with and without specific language impairment:
518   A meta-analysis. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 50*(1),
519   177–195.

520   Farmani, H., Sayyahi, F., Soleymani, Z., Labbaf, F. Z., Talebi, E., & Shourvazi, Z. (2018).
521   Normalization of the non-word repetition test in farsi-speaking children. *Journal of*
522   *Modern Rehabilitation, 12*(4), 217–224.

523   Gallagher, G. (2014). An identity bias in phonotactics: Evidence from Cochabamba
524   Quechua. *Laboratory Phonology, 5*(3), 337–378. doi:10.1515/lp-2014-0012

525   Gallon, N., Harris, J., & Van der Lely, H. (2007). Non-word repetition: An investigation of
526   phonological complexity in children with grammatical sli. *Clinical Linguistics &*
527   *Phonetics, 21*(6), 435–455.

528   Havron, N., Ramus, F., Heude, B., Forhan, A., Cristia, A., Peyre, H., & Group, E. M.-C. C.
529   S. (2019). The effect of older siblings on language development as a function of age
530   difference and sex. *Psychological Science, 30*(9), 1333–1343.

531   Hazan, V., & Barrett, S. (2000). The development of phonemic categorization in children
532   aged 6–12. *Journal of Phonetics, 28*(4), 377–396.

533   Jaber-Awida, A. (2018). Experiment in non word repetition by monolingual Arabic
534   preschoolers. *Athens Journal of Philology, 5*(4), 317–334. doi:10.30958/ajp.5-4-4

535   Kalnak, N., Peyrard-Janvid, M., Forssberg, H., & Sahlén, B. (2014). Nonword repetition–a

clinical marker for specific language impairment in swedish associated with parents' language-related problems. *PloS One*, *9*(2), e89544.

Meir, N., & Armon-Lotem, S. (2017). Independent and combined effects of socioeconomic status (ses) and bilingualism on children's vocabulary and verbal short-term memory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 1442.

Meir, N., Walters, J., & Armon-Lotem, S. (2016). Disentangling sli and bilingualism using sentence repetition tasks: The impact of l1 and l2 properties. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *20*(4), 421–452.

Moran, S., & McCloy, D. (Eds.). (2019). *PHOIBLE 2.0*. Jena: Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History. Retrieved from https://phoible.org/

Piazzalunga, S., Previtali, L., Pozzoli, R., Scarponi, L., & Schindler, A. (2019). An articulatory-based disyllabic and trisyllabic non-word repetition test: Reliability and validity in italian 3-to 7-year-old children. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, *33*(5), 437–456.

Torrington Eaton, C., Newman, R. S., Ratner, N. B., & Rowe, M. L. (2015). Non-word repetition in 2-year-olds: Replication of an adapted paradigm and a useful methodological extension. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, *29*(7), 523–535.

Vance, M., Stackhouse, J., & Wells, B. (2005). Speech-production skills in children aged 3–7 years. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, *40*(1), 29–48.

Wilsenach, C. (2013). Phonological skills as predictor of reading success: An investigation of emergent bilingual Northern Sotho/English learners. *Per Linguam: a Journal of Language Learning= Per Linguam: Tydskrif vir Taalaanleer*, *29*(2), 17–32.

559   doi:10.5785/29-2-554

560   Action, C. (2009). Language impairment in a multilingual society: Linguistic patterns and

561   the road to assessment. *Brussels: COST Office. Available Online at: Http://Www.*

562   *Bi-Sli. Org.*

563   Balladares, J., Marshall, C., & Griffiths, Y. (2016). Socio-economic status affects sentence

564   repetition, but not non-word repetition, in Chilean preschoolers. *First Language*,

565   *36*(3), 338–351. doi:10.1177/0142723715626067

566   Bowey, J. A. (2001). Nonword repetition and young children's receptive vocabulary: A

567   longitudinal study. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, *22*(3), 441–469.

568   Brandeker, M., & Thordardottir, E. (2015). Language exposure in bilingual toddlers:

569   Performance on nonword repetition and lexical tasks. *American Journal of*

570   *Speech-Language Pathology*, *24*(2), 126–138.

571   Chiat, S., & Roy, P. (2007). The preschool repetition test: An evaluation of performance in

572   typically developing and clinically referred children. *Journal of Speech, Language,*

573   *and Hearing Research*, *50*(2), 429–443.

574   Cristia, A., Farabolini, G., Scaff, C., Havron, N., & Stieglitz, J. (2020). Infant-directed

575   input and literacy effects on phonological processing: Non-word repetition scores

576   among the tsimane'. *Preprint.*

577   Estes, K. G., Evans, J. L., & Else-Quest, N. M. (2007). Differences in the nonword

578   repetition performance of children with and without specific language impairment:

579   A meta-analysis. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *50*(1),

580   177–195.

581   Farmani, H., Sayyahi, F., Soleymani, Z., Labbaf, F. Z., Talebi, E., & Shourvazi, Z. (2018).

582   Normalization of the non-word repetition test in farsi-speaking children. *Journal of*

Modern Rehabilitation, *12*(4), 217–224.

Gallagher, G. (2014). An identity bias in phonotactics: Evidence from Cochabamba
    Quechua. *Laboratory Phonology*, *5*(3), 337–378. doi:10.1515/lp-2014-0012

Gallon, N., Harris, J., & Van der Lely, H. (2007). Non-word repetition: An investigation of
    phonological complexity in children with grammatical sli. *Clinical Linguistics &*
    Phonetics, *21*(6), 435–455.

Havron, N., Ramus, F., Heude, B., Forhan, A., Cristia, A., Peyre, H., & Group, E. M.-C. C.
    S. (2019). The effect of older siblings on language development as a function of age
    difference and sex. *Psychological Science*, *30*(9), 1333–1343.

Hazan, V., & Barrett, S. (2000). The development of phonemic categorization in children
    aged 6–12. *Journal of Phonetics*, *28*(4), 377–396.

Jaber-Awida, A. (2018). Experiment in non word repetition by monolingual Arabic
    preschoolers. *Athens Journal of Philology*, *5*(4), 317–334. doi:10.30958/ajp.5-4-4

Kalnak, N., Peyrard-Janvid, M., Forssberg, H., & Sahlén, B. (2014). Nonword repetition–a
    clinical marker for specific language impairment in swedish associated with parents'
    language-related problems. *PloS One*, *9*(2), e89544.

Meir, N., & Armon-Lotem, S. (2017). Independent and combined effects of socioeconomic
    status (ses) and bilingualism on children's vocabulary and verbal short-term
    memory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, 1442.

Meir, N., Walters, J., & Armon-Lotem, S. (2016). Disentangling sli and bilingualism using
    sentence repetition tasks: The impact of l1 and l2 properties. *International Journal*
    of Bilingualism, *20*(4), 421–452.

Moran, S., & McCloy, D. (Eds.). (2019). *PHOIBLE 2.0*. Jena: Max Planck Institute for

the Science of Human History. Retrieved from https://phoible.org/

Piazzalunga, S., Previtali, L., Pozzoli, R., Scarponi, L., & Schindler, A. (2019). An articulatory-based disyllabic and trisyllabic non-word repetition test: Reliability and validity in italian 3-to 7-year-old children. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, *33*(5), 437–456.

Torrington Eaton, C., Newman, R. S., Ratner, N. B., & Rowe, M. L. (2015). Non-word repetition in 2-year-olds: Replication of an adapted paradigm and a useful methodological extension. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, *29*(7), 523–535.

Vance, M., Stackhouse, J., & Wells, B. (2005). Speech-production skills in children aged 3–7 years. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, *40*(1), 29–48.

Wilsenach, C. (2013). Phonological skills as predictor of reading success: An investigation of emergent bilingual Northern Sotho/English learners. *Per Linguam: a Journal of Language Learning= Per Linguam: Tydskrif vir Taalaanleer*, *29*(2), 17–32. doi:10.5785/29-2-554

Table 1

NWR stimuli in orthographic and phonological representations.

Practice		Monosyll		Bisyll		Trisyll		Tetrasyll	
Orth.	Phon.	Orth.	Phon.	Orth.	Phon.	Orth.	Phon.	Orth.	Phon.
nopimade	ṇ pimæd	dp:a	ṭpæ	kamo	kæm	dimope	ṭim p	diponate	ṭip ṇæt
poni	p ṇi	dpa	ṭpæ	kani	kæṇi	diyeto	ṭij t	nomiwake	ṇ miwæk
wî	w	dpâ	ṭp	kipo	kip	meyadi	m jæṭi	todiwuma	t ṭiwumæ
		dpê	ṭpə	noki	ṇ ki	mituye	mituj	wadikeno	wæṭik ṇ
		dpéé	ṭpe:	nomi	ṇ mi	nademo	ṇæd m		
		dpi	ṭpi	piwa	piwæ	nayeki	ṇæj ki		
		dpu	ṭpu	towi	t wi	nuyedi	ṇuj di		
		gh:ââ	:	tupa	tupæ	pedumi	p dumi		
		ghuu	u:			tiwune	tiwuṇ		
		kp:ââ	kp :			tumowe	tum w		
		kpu	kpu			widone	wiṭ ṇ		
		lv:ê	l ə			wumipo	wumip		
		lva	l æ						
		lvi	l i						
		t:êê	tə						
		tp:a	tpæ						
		tpâ	tp						
		tpê	tpə						