

Fathers' infant-directed speech and its effects on child language development

Naja Ferjan Ramírez 

Department of Linguistics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA

Correspondence

Naja Ferjan Ramírez, Department of Linguistics, University of Washington, Guggenheim Hall, 3940-2425 Benton Ln, Seattle, WA 98195, USA.

Email: naja@u.washington.edu

Funding information

University of Washington's Language Acquisition and Multilingualism Endowment

Abstract

Infant-directed speech (IDS), a speaking style distinguished by its higher pitch, slower tempo, and exaggerated intonation, has been documented in speech directed towards infants across many cultures and languages. Previous research shows that IDS in the context of parent-infant interactions is associated with advances in children's language learning. While we have long known that fathers, like mothers, produce IDS, most research on IDS to this day has focussed exclusively on female (maternal) speech. In light of the recent societal changes which have increased fathers' time spent in hands-on activities with children, I argue that the research on IDS needs to move away from using the maternal template. I first describe why IDS plays a central role in language development. I then outline known similarities and differences between paternal and maternal IDS, and point to potential biases and challenges within the research that has been conducted so far. Finally, I outline why investigators should strive to include fathers in research on IDS, and conclude with recommendations for follow-up work that can help advance our understanding of fathers' contributions to children's linguistic development.

1 | INTRODUCTION

Infant-directed speech (IDS) refers to a style of speech often used to address young children (Saint-Georges et al., 2013; The ManyBabies Consortium, 2020). Initially termed 'baby talk'

(Ferguson, 1964), later ‘motherese’, and then ‘parentese’ (Fernald, 1985; Fernald et al., 1989; Grieser & Kuhl, 1988), this speech register is distinguished from adult-directed speech (ADS) by a variety of segmental and prosodic features, including higher overall pitch and wider pitch range, slowed speech rate, exaggerated intonation contours, fewer and simpler lexical items, shorter utterances, and longer pauses between phrases (Cooper & Aslin, 1990; Fernald, 1985; Fernald et al., 1989; Fernald & Simon, 1984; Garnica, 1977; Grieser & Kuhl, 1988; Stern et al., 1983; Tang & Maidment, 1996). Infant-directed speech is used across cultures in spoken and signed languages by parents, grandparents, siblings, teachers, and adults who do not have their own children (Ferguson, 1964; Jacobson et al., 1983; Kuhl et al., 1997; Reilly & Bellugi, 1996). Across different languages, similarities and differences have been observed in specific linguistic aspects of IDS (Broesch & Bryant, 2015; Han et al., 2020; Narayan & McDermott, 2016). In addition to its unique linguistic signature, IDS is distinct from ADS in that it emphasises positive emotion through auditory and visual cues (Kim & Johnson, 2014; Singh et al., 2002; Trainor et al., 2000), uses distinct facial expressions (Kim & Johnson, 2014), and typically co-occurs with positive social interactions, including eye contact, joint attention, and interactive play (Golinkoff et al., 2015).

In terms of its effects on infants, IDS is reported to have four main functions: communicating affect, facilitating social interactions, engaging and maintaining infants’ attention, and facilitating language learning (Saint-Georges et al., 2013). These processes are hypothesised to be the foundation for infants’ preference for IDS over ADS, which has been demonstrated in study after study (e.g., see Cooper & Aslin, 1990; Fernald, 1985; Hayashi et al., 2001; Newman & Hussain, 2006; Santesso et al., 2007; Singh et al., 2002). The three most common methods for measuring infants’ preference for IDS include head-turn preference, central fixation, and eye tracking (The ManyBabies Consortium, 2020). Recently, three large studies examined the robustness of these effects across cultures, procedures, languages, and laboratories. The first, by Dunst et al. (2012), examined data across 34 experiments and reported a robust effect size (Cohen’s $d = 0.72$) for a preference of IDS over ADS. The second, published by The ManyBabies Consortium (2020), combined studies from 67 laboratories across North America, Europe, Australia, and Asia. The reported meta-analytic effect size across all studies was significant (Cohen’s $d = 0.35$). The third study, also by The ManyBabies Consortium, examined the IDS preference across 17 laboratories in seven countries, and demonstrated that the preference for IDS is equally strong in bilingual and monolingual babies (Byers-Heinlein et al., 2021).

Within the field of language acquisition, the widespread use of IDS, along with infants’ robust preference for it, has led researchers to postulate that IDS represents an ideal signal for language learning, due to its attentional-emotional, linguistic, and social cues (Golinkoff et al., 2015; Kuhl, 2007; Newport et al., 1977; Soderstrom et al., 2008). While the field generally agrees that IDS in the context of parent-infant interactions plays a central role in children’s language development, the vast majority of research on IDS to this day has focussed exclusively on mothers, likely due to a combination of historical, societal, and economic reasons (reviewed in Section 3). However, given recent global social, economic, and demographic changes, many studies on IDS may not accurately reflect the language experiences of modern-day infants, in which fathers play an increasingly important role (Cabrera et al., 2000). This is particularly true in light of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which has further reshaped parents’ work and family life, and in many cases, has substantially increased fathers’ time spent in hands on activities with their children (Craig & Churchill, 2021; Shafer et al., 2020). In this review, I argue that the traditional mother-centred view of IDS and its contributions to child language development may be incomplete. In contemporary society, most would agree that fathers matter to children’s cognitive development (for review, see Volling et al., 2019). Within the field of developmental cognitive science,

multiple initiatives have recently been launched to include the topic of fathers more heavily in research and theory (Cabrera et al., 2007, 2014; Volling et al., 2019). As language development researchers, we cannot claim to have a thorough understanding of parental language input if paternal IDS is largely ignored. Before reviewing what we currently know about paternal IDS, I describe the role that IDS plays in language learning.

2 | IDS AND LANGUAGE LEARNING

Research studies using a range of procedures have illuminated the specific language learning mechanisms that are boosted through caregivers' usage of IDS. For example, Liu et al. (2003) demonstrated that the degree to which mothers exaggerate vowels in IDS correlates with infants' sound discrimination. Further, IDS has been shown to facilitate infants' word segmentation (Thiessen et al., 2005), word recognition (Singh et al., 2009), and fast mapping (Ma et al., 2011). Studies using naturalistic daylong recordings in infants' homes have linked exposure to IDS with enhanced child language production: Infants who hear more IDS produce higher rates of babbling at around one year of age and have greater productive vocabularies at 24 and 33 months of age (Ramírez-Esparza et al., 2014, 2016, 2017).

With the above findings in mind, a critical question to consider is *how* and *why* IDS helps infants in the process of learning language. The seminal work by Hart and Risley (1995) demonstrated that the total amount of speech heard by an infant is highly correlated with their language outcomes. Children whose parents talk less tend to have smaller vocabularies by the time they are three years old. This difference, known as the '30-million word gap', predicts children's IQ scores and academic success in grade school (cf. Golinkoff, Hoff, Rowe, Tamis-LeMonda, & Hirsh-Pasek, 2019; Hart & Risley, 1995; Rowe, 2012). Yet, a large body of research following these discoveries has come to a more refined conclusion: The sheer number of words that infants hear is insufficient to account for the observed variation in children's language development; the *quality* of language input also needs to be considered (e.g., see Conboy et al., 2015; Hirsh-Pasek et al., 2015; Hoff, 2006; Kuhl et al., 2008; Kuhl et al., 2014; Rowe, 2012; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2014; Weisleder & Fernald, 2013). With its exaggerated acoustics and accompanying social behaviours, IDS is hypothesised to provide the ideal ('high quality') signal to facilitate language learning. The positive effects of IDS on language learning can be divided into three categories: attentional and emotional, linguistic, and social.

2.1 | Attentional and emotional effects of IDS

In order to learn language, infants must attend to it and discern it from other environmental sounds. As reviewed above, infants show a robust preference for IDS over ADS from very early on, and there are multiple potential reasons for this: First, as argued by Fernald (1992), IDS might have biological roots in the desire of a parent to comfort a child. Second, IDS draws infants' attention to the speaker, likely because of its highly salient acoustic qualities (Cusack & Carlyon, 2003). Research using neuroimaging supports these attentional findings, demonstrating that IDS results in more brain activation than ADS (Peter et al., 2016; Zangl & Mills, 2007). Furthermore, brain studies using continuous and natural IDS stimuli demonstrate that acoustic properties of IDS may facilitate infants' early speech processing and encoding (Kalashnikova et al., 2018; Naoi et al., 2012; Saito et al., 2007; Santesso et al., 2007). Third, while the prosody of

IDS changes with context (Fernald et al., 1989), IDS has been shown to convey positive emotions (Singh et al., 2002; Trainor et al., 2000) through higher mean fundamental frequency (F0) and exaggerated F0 modulations (Fernald & Simon, 1984). For example, expressing approval and eliciting attention in IDS are associated with large bell-shaped (up-down) pitch contours, while soothing is associated with lower-pitched, falling contours (Fernald et al., 1989; Katz et al., 1996). Of course, ADS can also express positive emotion in the auditory domain, and some studies suggest that the expression of emotion in IDS is not necessarily distinct from the expression of emotion in ADS. Rather, what is special about IDS is the widespread expression of emotion to infants, in comparison to the more inhibited expression of emotion in ADS (Trainor et al., 2000). Interestingly, mothers who have depression generally exhibit a ‘flatter’ vocal affect (indexed by reduced F0 modulations), and their infants show reduced learning from IDS (Kaplan et al., 2002). Finally, IDS is typically paired with exaggerated facial expressions (Kim & Johnson, 2014), which further engages infants in conversation with their caregivers and increases the frequency of positive social interactions that co-occur with IDS (Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2014).

2.2 | Linguistic effects of IDS

Infant-directed speech also impacts language learning because of its unique linguistic structure. Although notable variation from language to language has been observed (see e.g. Han et al., 2020; Narayan & McDermott, 2016), IDS generally has a higher pitch, greater pitch excursions, a slower tempo, elongated vowels, and an expanded vowel space in comparison to ADS (Fernald & Simon, 1984; Grieser & Kuhl, 1988; Kuhl et al., 1997; Stern et al., 1983). In addition, the vocabulary of IDS tends to be simple, with frequent repetitions and redundancies (McRoberts et al., 2009). Likewise, IDS utterances tend to be short and simple compared to ADS utterances, with many isolated words and phrases, frequent use of proper names, and a high number of questions (Durkin et al., 1982; Soderstrom et al., 2008).

A large and growing body of research demonstrates that the structural properties of IDS promote specific aspects of language learning. For example, IDS features an expanded ‘vowel triangle’. When plotted in acoustic space, the vowels form a triangle whose points are determined by vowels /i/, /a/ and /u/. These three vowels (called ‘corner vowels’ or ‘point vowels’) are farther apart in IDS than the same vowels in ADS, and the area of the triangle indexes the degree of vowel hyperarticulation. Expansions of the vowel triangle have been proposed to result in clearer, more intelligible speech (Bradlow et al., 1996). The larger acoustic difference between the corner vowels has been argued to simplify and improve the learnability of vowel categories (Kuhl et al., 1997), and the degree to which mothers hyperarticulate vowels has been related to infants’ expressive and receptive vocabulary sizes (Hartman et al., 2017; Kalashnikova & Burnham, 2018). Other linguistic properties of IDS, such as the preponderance of questions, have been proposed to highlight the syntactic regularities in the given language (Soderstrom et al., 2008).

2.3 | Social effects of IDS

Language uptake during parent-child exchanges is also enhanced as a result of positive social interactions, such as joint attention, gaze following, and interactive play, which are known to frequently co-occur with IDS and have been related to children’s vocabulary size (Brooks & Meltzoff, 2005; Hirsh-Pasek et al., 2015). According to social gating theory (Kuhl, 2007), language

learning relies on social interactions between caregivers and children, and IDS is proposed to be a crossroad facilitating these interactions (see also Hoff, 2006; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2014). Through turn-taking in IDS, parents provide contingent feedback that is continuously adjusted to their infants' linguistic needs. Infants, in turn, adjust their vocalizations in response to parental vocalizations, increasing their complexity (Bornstein et al., 1999; Braarud & Stormark, 2008; Goldstein & Schwade, 2008; Smith & Trainor, 2008), thereby creating a positive feedback loop that further promotes language growth (Warlaumont et al., 2014). Parental use of IDS has recently been shown to enhance caregiver-infant turn-taking (Ferjan Ramírez et al., 2020), which is known to positively impact neural language processing (Merz et al., 2019; Romeo et al., 2018a, 2018b). That is, children who are engaged in more turn-taking exhibit greater brain activity in the left inferior frontal brain areas (Broca's area), which explains the relation between their language exposure and their verbal skills (Romeo, Leonard, et al., 2018).

3 | PATERNAL IDS

While there is a wide consensus that IDS plays an important role in language development and that early language experience has long-lasting consequences on language and cognitive development in general, most of the above reviewed research has focussed exclusively on female IDS. This is puzzling given that the acquisition of language skills occurs within social contexts with many caregivers (Bruner, 1981; Kuhl, 2007; Tomasello, 1992; Vygotsky, 1962)—including fathers.

There are multiple reasons why fathers remain mostly absent from research on IDS. Historically, fathers have been considered 'secondary caregivers' who are assumed to be less involved in childrearing. Accordingly, fathers are often excluded from laboratory research appointments, which are frequently attended only by the 'primary caregiver' (Cabrera et al., 2018).

A related reason stems from the social norms about appropriate roles of men and women in parenting in Western societies (Eagly & Wood, 2017). Fathers have traditionally been characterised as being the 'breadwinners' of the family, and also as being less involved in hands-on parenting, leading some to conclude that fathers do not spend enough time with their children to affect their lives emotionally (Amato & Gilbreth, 1999). Infant-directed speech conveys a positive affect and emotion that comforts the infant (Singh et al., 2002; Tartter, 1980), which some may view as conflicting with traditional male gender roles, such as being strong, masculine, and dominant (Kuo et al., 2018). However, recent studies have shown that fathers, like mothers, are warm and nurturing, and demonstrate sensitivity in their interactions with children (Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2013). As family values in Western societies are becoming increasingly egalitarian, and ideas of equal partnership in caretaking and working are now being endorsed by many (Cotter et al., 2011), the notion of the father who is not engaged in hands-on parenting is quite far from reality in many modern families (Cabrera et al., 2018).

Finally, investigators may continue to shy away from including fathers in research on IDS because it is too difficult, too expensive, or some might even think unnecessary, especially if mothers seem more available (Volling et al., 2019). For example, in many societies, paternity leave remains an outlier, and most fathers return to full-time work shortly after their child is born (Petts et al., 2020). Under such circumstances, adjusting data collection times to be convenient for fathers requires more effort, and often more resources from the investigators (e.g., paying personnel to work on weekends or after regular hours; see also Mitchell et al., 2007, for a discussion around challenges and increased costs related to father identification, recruitment, and retention in research studies). As a result, our view of IDS and its impact on child language development

continues to be centred around mothers and, as such, may be incomplete. For example, in a widely cited meta-analysis, Saint-Georges et al., 2013 found that only seven of out of 114 IDS studies included paternal speech. In the next section, I review the current literature on paternal IDS, focussing on similarities and differences between mothers and fathers in their IDS quantity (Section 3.1) and quality (Section 3.2).

3.1 | Quantity of paternal IDS

A number of studies report substantial quantitative differences between maternal and paternal speech in interactions with children, with fathers producing less input than mothers. Early work in this research line was summarised in a meta-analysis, which reported that fathers not only use less language overall compared to mothers, but also less supportive and more directive language than mothers (Leaper et al., 1998). Several more recent observational studies have confirmed the existence of a quantitative gap in IDS specifically between mothers and fathers (e.g., Kwon et al., 2013; Pancsofar & Vernon-Feagans, 2006). These studies have used multiple types of assessment (including video-recorded interactions between fathers and children); however, it should be noted that most father-child assessment measures were originally developed to assess mother-child interactions. While using such assessments is a reasonable first step, it is also likely that such assessments place lesser emphasis on parenting behaviours that are preferred by fathers, such as physical activity (Parke, 2002; Yeung et al., 2001) or rough-and-tumble play, which has been demonstrated to be important in the development of children's social and regulatory skills (Fletcher et al., 2013).

One way for studies to include more behaviours that may be preferred by fathers is to employ daylong recordings in children's naturalistic environments. Technologies such as LENA provide unobtrusive recordings of language input from *all* caregivers, via a lightweight recorder that can be snapped into a chest pocket of children's clothing to record everything that they hear (Gilkerson & Richards, 2020). LENA's acoustic modelling software supplies various estimates of exposure to adult speech, including Adult Word Count, which is further subdivided into words spoken by women and those spoken by men, defined as 'female adult nearby' (FAN) words and 'male adult nearby' (MAN) words. In a large scale semi-longitudinal study using LENA's FAN and MAN estimates, Gilkerson and Richards (2009) reported that mothers accounted for 75% of the total adult words spoken around children between two and 48 months of age. However, follow-up independent research assessing the reliability of LENA estimates demonstrated that classifications of adult word counts are significantly affected by both speaker gender and usage of IDS versus ADS (Lehet et al., 2021). For example, when male speakers use a higher pitch to address their infants, they are more likely to be erroneously tagged as FAN. Since multiple studies have confirmed systematic errors in LENA's automatic annotation (see also Bulgarelli & Bergelson, 2020; Cristia, Bulgarelli, & Bergelson, 2020; Cristia et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020), researchers who are looking to distinguish maternal and paternal contributions are now encouraged to supplement their LENA analyses with manual annotations, which is extremely labour intensive, slow, and costly.

Using supplemental manual analyses with LENA, Bergelson et al. (2018) studied 61 North American families with infants between three and 20 months of age and reported that infants heard 2–3× more IDS from women than from men. While their use of manual annotation is a great step forward in avoiding the systematic biases of LENA's acoustic modelling, it is still possible that, at least in some of their participating families, fathers may not have been present

in the homes when the daylong recordings were collected. To avoid this potential bias, which would invariably lead to lower male word counts, Shapiro et al. (2021) conducted a longitudinal study of mother-father families with infants at 6, 10, 14, 18, and 24 months in which naturalistic daylong recordings were collected exclusively on weekends when both parents were home. This study used a combination of automatic LENA estimates and manual annotation, and found that infants were exposed to 46.8% fewer words from males than females, and to 51.9% less IDS from fathers than from mothers. Critically, in this study, paternal, but not maternal, IDS predicted children's concurrent linguistic vocalizations, possibly as a result of heightened salience to paternal IDS. The proposed hypothesis is that, under conditions where maternal IDS quantity is high, and/or significantly above its paternal counterpart, paternal IDS may become attentionally more salient within the input, allowing it to differentially relate to child vocalizations (Shapiro et al., 2021; see also; Pancsofar & Vernon-Feagans, 2006). Interestingly, Shapiro and colleagues report that both, paternal and maternal IDS increased from six to 24 months. However, the rate of increase was 2.8× faster in fathers compared to mothers, suggesting that the quantitative gap between maternal and paternal IDS may be particularly pronounced in early infancy, perhaps as a consequence of fathers spending a greater proportion of time interacting with their children in physical play activities, which younger infants may not yet engage in (Parke, 2002; Yeung et al., 2001). A previous study by Leaper et al. (1998) found that in general, the effect sizes associated with quantitative differences in maternal and paternal language input tended to be larger for younger children; however, due to a shortage of longitudinal data, this particular issue requires further investigation.

It is important to emphasize that several studies on quantitative differences between maternal and paternal IDS have also identified contextual factors that contribute to the observed variability in quantity of maternal versus paternal IDS. For example, studies report that, in dyadic interactions, mothers and fathers produce a similar amount of IDS (Bingham et al., 2013; Golinkoff & Ames, 1979; Rowe et al., 2004), but fathers use less IDS than mothers in triadic interactions (Golinkoff & Ames, 1979; Pancsofar & Vernon-Feagans, 2006), leading some researchers to propose that mothers may act as 'gatekeepers' (Altenburger et al., 2020; Beitel & Parke, 1998), and that fathers may feel less responsible for interacting with their children when the mother is present (Bingham et al., 2013). These findings further emphasize the point that children develop in a socially complex context in which mothers and fathers exert influence on their growth both individually and collectively through interactions with each other, amidst other contextual factors (Cabrera et al., 2014). Theories and models explaining the role of parental language input need to acknowledge these complexities.

3.2 | Quality of paternal IDS

While studies consistently report quantitative differences between paternal and maternal IDS, studies that focus on *qualitative* aspects of IDS report mostly similarities. As the field currently stands, paternal and maternal IDS are more similar than different in their prosodic, lexical-semantic, and syntactic characteristics, each of which are briefly reviewed below.

3.2.1 | Prosodic characteristics of paternal IDS

Research has identified two key prosodic and acoustic modifications of the speech signal within IDS: a higher perceived pitch, which corresponds to the fundamental frequency (F0) of the acoustic waveform, and an increased pitch range and variability compared to ADS (Estes & Hurley, 2013; Soderstrom, 2007). Notably, some research (predominantly with mothers) indicates that acoustic properties of IDS can change with infants' age (Narayan & McDermott, 2016). Pitch height, for example, has been shown to increase up until around 1 year of age, and then decreases around after ~16 months of age (Kitamura et al., 2002; Stern et al., 1983). However, stability has also been noted in specific acoustic components of IDS over time. For example, Kalashnikova and Burnham (2018) demonstrate that three components of maternal IDS (pitch, affect, and vowel hyperarticulation) did not vary between 7 and 19 months of age, although they may serve different functions depending on the child's age. Finally, some acoustic characteristics of IDS are known to vary from language to language (Han et al., 2020; Narayan & McDermott, 2016).

Studies using a variety of languages, such as English, Dutch, German, Japanese, and Hungarian, have consistently shown that fathers, like mothers, use a higher pitch in IDS compared to ADS (Amano et al., 2006; Fernald et al., 1989; Gergely et al., 2017; Jacobson et al., 1983; McRoberts & Best, 1997; Warren-Leubecker & Bohannon, 1984; Weirich & Simpson, 2019). Additionally, multiple studies have not detected meaningful differences when comparing maternal and paternal pitch raising in these languages (Fernald et al., 1989; Gergely et al., 2017; Jacobson et al., 1983; Weirich & Simpson, 2019). Regarding pitch variability, it is important to recognise that it can be characterised both within a single utterance and across utterances (Benders et al., 2021), and that differences between male and female speech have been identified with regards to how their pitch is varied at these two distinct levels. At the within-utterance level, which most studies focus on, Japanese- and English-speaking fathers have been shown to vary their pitch less than mothers; furthermore, at the within-utterance level, paternal IDS pitch variability has been shown to be similar to paternal ADS pitch variability (Amano et al., 2006; Fernald et al., 1989). However, at the cross-utterance level, Japanese-, English-, and Dutch-speaking fathers tend to speak with more variability in IDS than in ADS (Amano et al., 2006; Benders et al., 2021; Fernald et al., 1989), varying the pitch between their utterances to a similar or even greater extent than mothers (Benders et al., 2021). This is interesting and consistent with the idea that father-child interactions are characterised by 'bursts of energy' (Feldman, 2003) and a dynamic, playful, and energetic interaction style (Cabrera & Roggman, 2017), whereas mother-child interactions tend to be 'smooth' and 'flowing' (Feldman, 2003; Kokkinaki & Vasdekis, 2015). These findings are also important because they demonstrate the importance of employing a range of acoustic measures in order to fully capture the differences between paternal and maternal IDS.

3.2.2 | Lexical and semantic characteristics of paternal IDS

The literature with female caregivers has found strong and consistent links between lexical and semantic characteristics of maternal IDS and children's early language development (e.g., Hoff & Naigles, 2002; Huttenlocher et al., 2010; Pan et al., 2005; Rowe, 2012). The most commonly used measure is the diversity of parent vocabulary, calculated as the number of word types produced or the type-token ratio (i.e., the total number of unique words divided by the total number of all words). In general, studies report that maternal word types within IDS predict child

vocabulary growth to a greater degree than the sheer amount of maternal talk (e.g., see Huttenlocher et al., 2010; Pan et al., 2005).

Surprisingly few studies have considered lexical and semantic characteristics of paternal IDS. Earlier work includes a study by O'Brien and Nagle (1987), who studied 10 English-speaking families with children between 1.5 and 2 years of age during free play and reported no significant differences between mothers and fathers in their vocabulary diversity within IDS. In a similar context, Ratner (1988) found only minor differences between mothers' and fathers' type-token ratios but observed that fathers used a higher number of rare words and fewer common words than mothers. More recent work also reports few differences between mothers and fathers. For example, Pancsofar and Vernon-Feagans (2006) and Kwon et al. (2013) reported that, when controlling for the amount of talk, fathers' lexical diversity is just as high, if not higher, than that of mothers. Some studies also conjecture that fathers may be more challenging linguistic partners than mothers, as they may request more clarifications or repetitions and use lower frequency words (Majorano et al., 2013; Rowe et al., 2004; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2012).

3.2.3 | Syntactic complexity of paternal IDS

In general, studies that relate maternal IDS speech complexity to child language growth report positive associations, both with respect to children's vocabulary growth, as well as their syntactic development (e.g., Hoff & Naigles, 2002; Hoff-Ginsberg, 1986; Huttenlocher et al., 1991). In contrast, studies considering the syntactic complexity of paternal IDS have yielded somewhat inconsistent results.

The most commonly used measure of syntactic complexity has been the mean length of utterance (MLU; calculated in words or morphemes, typically on a sample of 100 consecutive utterances collected in a recording session; Brown, 1973), although some studies also consider the diversity of sentence types, the number of *wh*-questions, yes-no questions, and/or the occurrence of specific syntactic structures. Two older studies reported a shorter MLU for fathers compared to mothers (McLaughlin et al., 1983; Rondal, 1980), though other studies, including some relatively recent ones, have not replicated this (Golinkoff & Ames, 1979; O'Brien & Nagle, 1987; Pancsofar & Vernon-Feagans, 2006; Rowe et al., 2004; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2012). Rowe et al. (2004) report that, while mothers and fathers were similar in their MLU, fathers used significantly more *wh*-questions and more requests for clarifications than mothers; yet, earlier studies reported the opposite findings (Malone & Guy, 1982) or no significant differences between maternal and paternal question use (Golinkoff & Ames, 1979; Hladik & Edwards, 1984).

4 | WHY SHOULD WE STUDY PATERNAL IDS?

Given that paternal and maternal IDS are linguistically quite similar, and that children are typically exposed to less paternal IDS, one might wonder whether including fathers in research on IDS is really necessary. Will adding paternal data really make the needle budge? A growing body of research suggests that it might. As we have seen in Section 3.2, some differences between certain linguistic aspects of paternal and maternal IDS have already been noted. Given the paucity of research on paternal IDS in comparison to maternal IDS, it may very well be the case that other linguistic differences do exist that have not been uncovered yet. Perhaps even more importantly, a number of recent studies indicate that paternal IDS is directly related to

child language outcomes, and that maternal and paternal IDS can differentially relate to child language. For example, in a recent study by Shapiro and colleagues, it was paternal, not maternal, IDS that predicted infants' concurrent linguistic vocalizations between 6 and 24 months of age (Shapiro et al., 2021). Similar associations have been reported by other researchers, often after controlling for maternal language input and demographic factors (Leech et al., 2013; Pancsofar & Vernon-Feagans, 2006; Reynolds et al., 2019; Rowe et al., 2017; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2012).

For example, a recent study with 50 Irish-English speaking father-child dyads found that fathers' pitch variability is associated with children's receptive vocabulary, independent of child age, gender, and expressive language ability (Quigley et al., 2019). In the domain of lexical semantics, Majorano et al. (2013) reported that Italian fathers' IDS noun frequency during free play at age two was significantly associated with their children's language production and comprehension at age three. Pancsofar and colleagues also reported a link between paternal use of different English verb roots within IDS at 24 months and children's expressive language skills at 36 months (Pancsofar & Vernon-Feagans, 2006), as well as a link between paternal vocabulary diversity during shared book reading in IDS at 6 months and language measures at 15 and 36 months (Pancsofar et al., 2010). In both studies, these associations were found after controlling for maternal language input, parental education levels, and quality of childcare. In the domain of syntactic complexity, Tamis-LeMonda et al. (2012) found that fathers' use of diverse IDS utterance types when children were 24 months of age was a unique predictor of their children's overall language at that age. Along similar lines, Rowe et al. (2017) and Leech et al. (2013) reported that fathers' use of English *wh*-questions within IDS at 24 months was positively associated with children's concurrent vocabulary and verbal reasoning skills. Finally, Reynolds and colleagues found that, in an economically and culturally diverse sample of families with children between six and 36 months of age, fathers' MLU and *wh*-questions during shared book reading in IDS were significantly associated with children's vocabulary upon Kindergarten entry (Reynolds et al., 2019).

While the described contributions of paternal IDS to child language development are meaningful and important, there are other reasons to move away from the maternal template. Infant-directed speech is not used in isolation, but within a social context that typically involves *multiple* caregivers. During the first two years of life, infants are known to benefit from exposure to live speech that is directed to them, as opposed to overheard speech or speech from an electronic source (Golinkoff et al., 2019; Kuhl et al., 2003; Shneidman et al., 2013; Weisleder & Fernald, 2013). This is also the period in development when infants are known to benefit from exposure to speech from multiple speakers (Rost & McMurray, 2009; Seidl et al., 2014). It is also possible that infants in this age range benefit from exposure to distinct behavioural styles that fathers are known to adopt (Cabrera & Roggman, 2017; Cabrera et al., 2000; Popenoe, 1996). Compared to mothers, fathers are often described as more energetic, playful, fun, stimulating, and physically active in their interactions with children (Cabrera & Roggman, 2017; John et al., 2013). Fathers demonstrate positive expressions in shorter and more frequent temporal cycles (Feldman, 2003; Kokkinaki & Vasdekis, 2015), are known to challenge their children to take calculated risks, and engage them in physical and rough-and-tumble play (Fletcher et al., 2013). As such, paternal and maternal language scaffolding through IDS is likely quite distinct. As we have reviewed in Section 3.1, much of the research on IDS within social interactions has ignored the study of parenting behaviours that may be preferred by fathers. In some recent studies that do include fathers and are conducted in naturalistic settings (e.g., the study by Shapiro and colleagues, which used LENA recordings collected in infants' homes *when the fathers were present*), paternal IDS has

been shown to uniquely predict child vocalizations within the first two years of life, despite being significantly less abundant than maternal IDS (Shapiro et al., 2021).

Another reason to study paternal IDS is its potential as a target for co-parenting and father-centred language interventions. A recent parent coaching intervention delivered to English-speaking families in 4 month intervals when the infants were six to 18 months old increased parental IDS and turn-taking, and enhanced infants' vocabulary (Ferjan Ramírez et al., 2020; Ferjan Ramírez et al., 2018). However, most parent coaching appointments in this study were attended exclusively by mothers, leaving us left to wonder whether and how interventions might specifically enhance *paternal* IDS. While fathers have been historically underrepresented in psychosocial intervention research (Tiano & McNeil, 2005), increases in positive outcomes have been reported when both parents are involved (Bagner, 2013; Lundahl et al., 2008). Furthermore, new father-centred interventions have enhanced the quality of father-child interactions (Barr et al., 2014; Chacko et al., 2017), and co-parenting interventions have been shown to enhance parenting quality (Feinberg et al., 2014; Schoppe-Sullivan et al., 2009). However, in preparation for designing father-centred or co-parenting IDS interventions, it will be important to first learn more about fathers' beliefs and attitudes surrounding IDS, the contexts in which paternal IDS is more or less likely to be used throughout infancy, in addition to the cultural, educational, and demographic variables that may contribute to variation in paternal IDS use. Father-centred or co-parenting interventions could be particularly powerful in communities where most infants grow up in two-parent households and where fathers may be more present and involved in infants' day-to-day activities, such as US families of Latinx descent (Lopez & Velasco, 2010), or certain European communities that offer extended paternal leave in infancy (Van Belle, 2016). Such interventions could also be of critical importance in families where members suffer from emotional disorders, such as maternal depression. Infants from two-parent households where mothers are depressed show reduced associative learning from maternal IDS, but enhanced learning from male IDS (Kaplan et al., 2010), suggesting that paternal IDS can hold a privileged status under certain circumstances.

5 | CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Although the body of literature on fathers' language input to young children has grown significantly over the last few years, research on paternal IDS still pales in comparison to research on maternal IDS. Given the broad societal changes over the last few decades, including the increased participation of mothers in the workforce and the recent family changes related to the COVID-19 pandemic, the role that many fathers play in childrearing has changed, and the research on IDS needs to be adjusted to reflect these changes. While paternal and maternal IDS are similar in terms of their linguistic features, the social contexts and interactions that co-occur with paternal and maternal IDS can be quite distinct. Furthermore, recent research has demonstrated that specific features of paternal IDS can be uniquely predictive of child language outcomes, even after controlling for maternal contributions and demographic variables. What this means is that future studies on IDS should move away from using the maternal template. This will require using multiple methods, including daylong recordings that are collected when fathers are present (and that are analysed manually to avoid potential biases of automatic tagging), qualitative methods (e.g., focus groups and interviews with fathers), and laboratory research using male voices. Further, models of IDS and child language acquisition should be developed on the bases of a broad array of mothering and fathering behaviours, including behaviours that are similar for both parents,

more/less prevalent for one or the other parent, and more/less prevalent in dyadic versus triadic interactions. Such models should include variables that predict father involvement, variables that interact with father involvement, and variables that might influence paternal characteristics and thereby impact father involvement (see Cabrera et al., 2007). Together, these studies will enable researchers to uncover how fathers interact with and relate to their children, and how they engage in different activities through IDS.

Future research should also address paternal IDS within more diverse populations, such as non-White families, multilingual households, single-parent families, and families with same-sex parents. While fathers in mother-father households have been largely sidelined and deserve greater attention, this is even more true of LGBTQ + parents where research on IDS is virtually non-existent. Future research might also consider modelling parent gender as a variable that is multifaceted, rather than binary (Cameron & Stinson, 2019).

Finally, it is important to acknowledge that conducting research with fathers still presents challenges for investigators as it requires more effort, more resources, and often times a different approach to studying parenting behaviours (Mitchell et al., 2007; see also; Volling et al., 2019). For example, investigators will need to think of ways to recruit fathers and invite them to the laboratories in a way that makes fathers feel welcomed and important. Data will have to be collected in ways that accommodate fathers' schedules, and interventions will have to consider behaviours that fathers are comfortable engaging in. Research tools, beyond those that have been used with mothers, will have to be developed to assess, evaluate, and code father-child interactions. While these challenges remain, we cannot claim to have a thorough understanding of the role of parental language if we continue to exclude fathers just because it is too complicated or too expensive to include them.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks Lili Correa, Naomi Tachikawa Shapiro, and Katie Lindekugel for her valuable help with manuscript preparation. This work was supported by the University of Washington's Language Acquisition and Multilingualism Endowment.

ORCID

Naja Ferjan Ramírez  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6900-9298>

REFERENCES

- Altenburger, L. E., Gugiu, P. C., & Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J. (2020). Measuring maternal gatekeeping: A Rasch analysis of the parental regulation inventory. *Journal of Family Studies*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13229400.2020.1825229>
- Amano, S., Nakatani, T., & Kondo, T. (2006). Fundamental frequency of infants' and parents' utterances in longitudinal recordings. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 119(3), 1636–1647. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.2161443>
- Amato, P. R., & Gilbreth, J. G. (1999). Nonresident fathers and children's well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61, 557–573. <https://doi.org/10.2307/353560>
- Bagner, D. M. (2013). Father's role in parent training for children with developmental delay. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 27(4), 650–657. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033465>
- Barr, R., Morin, M., Brito, N., Richeda, B., Rodriguez, J., & Shauf-fer, C. (2014). Delivering services to incarcerated teen fathers: A pilot intervention to increase the quality of father-infant interactions during visitation. *Psychological Services*, 11, 10–21. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034877>
- Beitel, A. H., & Parke, R. D. (1998). Paternal involvement in infancy: The role of maternal and paternal attitudes. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 12(2), 268–288. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.12.2.268>

- Benders, T., St George, J., & Fletcher, R. (2021). Infant-directed speech by Dutch fathers: Increased pitch variability within and across utterances. *Language Learning and Development*, 17, 292–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2021.1876698>
- Bergelson, E., Casillas, M., Soderstrom, M., Seidl, A., Warlaumont, A. S., & Amatuni, A. (2018). What do North American babies hear? A large-scale cross-corpus analysis. *Developmental Science*, 22(e12724), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12724>
- Bingham, G. E., Kwon, K., & Jeon, H. (2013). Examining relations among mothers', fathers', and children's language use in a dyadic and triadic context. *Early Child Development and Care*, 183, 394–414. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2012.711590>
- Bornstein, M. H., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., & Haynes, O. M. (1999). First words in the second year: Continuity, stability, and models of concurrent and predictive correspondence in vocabulary and verbal responsiveness across age and context. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 22(1), 65–85. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383\(99\)80006-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(99)80006-X)
- Braarud, H. C., & Stormark, K. M. (2008). Prosodic modification and vocal adjustments in mothers' speech during face-to-face interaction with their two to four-month-old infants: A double video study. *Social Development*, 17, 1074–1084. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2007.00455>
- Bradlow, A. R., Torretta, G. M., & Pisoni, D. B. (1996). Intelligibility of normal speech I: Global and fine-grained acoustic-phonetic talker characteristics. *Speech Communication*, 20(3), 255–272. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6393\(96\)00063-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-6393(96)00063-5)
- Broesch, T. L., & Bryant, G. A. (2015). Prosody in infant-directed speech is similar across Western and traditional cultures. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, 16(1), 31–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15248372.2013.833923>
- Brooks, R., & Meltzoff, A. N. (2005). The development of gaze following and its relation to language. *Developmental Science*, 8, 535–543. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2005.00445>
- Brown, R. (1973). *A first language: The early stages*. George Allen & Unwin.
- Bruner, J. (1981). The social context of language acquisition. *Language & Communication*, 1, 155–178. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309\(81\)90010-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(81)90010-0)
- Bulgarelli, F., & Bergelson, E. (2020). Look who's talking: A comparison of automated and human-generated speaker tags in naturalistic day-long recordings. *Behavior Research Methods*, 52(2), 641–653. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-019-01265-7>
- Byers-Heinlein, K., Tsui, A. S. M., Bergmann, C., Black, A. K., Brown, A., Carbajal, M. J., Wermelinger, S., Fennell, C. T., Fiévet, A.-C., Frank, M. C., Gampe, A., Gervain, J., Gonzalez-Gomez, N., Hamlin, J. K., Havron, N., Hernik, M., Kerr, S., Killam, H., Klassen, K., ... Wermelinger, S. (2021). A multilab study of bilingual infants: Exploring the preference for infant-directed speech. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245920974622>
- Cabrera, N., Fitzgerald, H. E., Bradley, R. H., & Roggman, L. (2007). Modeling the dynamics of paternal influences on children over the life course. *Applied Developmental Science*, 11(4), 185–189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888690701762027>
- Cabrera, N. J., Fitzgerald, H. E., Bradley, R. H., & Roggman, L. (2014). The ecology of father-child relationships: An expanded model. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 6(4), 336–354. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12054>
- Cabrera, N. J., & Roggman, L. (2017). Father play: Is it special? *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 38(6), 706–708. <https://doi.org/10.1002/imhj.21680>
- Cabrera, N. J., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Bradley, R. H., Hofferth, S., & Lamb, M. E. (2000). Fatherhood in the twenty-first century. *Child Development*, 71, 127–136. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00126>
- Cabrera, N. J., Volling, B. L., & Barr, R. (2018). Fathers are parents too! Widening the lens on parenting for children's development. *Child Development Perspectives*, 12, 152–157. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12275>
- Cameron, J. J., & Stinson, D. A. (2019). Gender (mis)measurement: Guidelines for respecting gender diversity in psychological re-search. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 13(11), e12506. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc.12506>
- Chacko, A., Fabiano, G. A., Doctoroff, G. L., & Fortson, B. (2017). Engaging fathers in effective parenting for preschool children using shared book reading: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 47(1), 1–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2016.1266648>

- Conboy, B. T., Brooks, R., Meltzoff, A. N., & Kuhl, P. K. (2015). Social interaction infants' learning of second-language phonetics: An exploration of brain-behavior relations. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 40, 216–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87565641.2015.1014487>
- Cooper, R. P., & Aslin, R. N. (1990). Preference for infant-directed speech in the first month after birth. *Child Development*, 61(5), 1584–1595. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1130766>
- Cotter, D. A., Hermsen, J. M., & Vanneman, R. D. (2011). The end of the gender revolution? Gender role attitudes from 1977 to 2008. *American Journal of Sociology*, 117, 259–289. <https://doi.org/10.1086/658853>
- Craig, L., & Churchill, B. (2021). Dual-earner parent couples' work and care during COVID-19. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 28(S1), 514–527. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12497>
- Cristia, A., Bulgarelli, F., & Bergelson, E. (2020a). Accuracy of the Language environment analysis system segmentation and metrics: A systematic review. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 63(4), 1093–1105. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_JSLHR-19-00017
- Cristia, A., Lavechin, M., Scaff, C., Soderstrom, M., Rowland, C., Räsänen, O., Bunce, J., & Bergelson, E. (2020b). A thorough evaluation of the Language Environment Analysis (LENA) system. *Behavior Research Methods*, 53, 467–486. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-020-01393-5>
- Cusack, R., & Carlyon, R. P. (2003). Perceptual asymmetries in audition. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 29, 713–725. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.29.3.713>
- Dunst, C., Gorman, E., & Hamby, D. (2012). *Preference for infant-directed speech in preverbal young children* (Vol. 5, pp. 1–10). Center for Early Literacy Learning.
- Durkin, K., Rutter, D. R., & Tucker, H. (1982). Social interaction and language acquisition: Motherese help you. *First Language*, 3(8), 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014272378200300803>
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (2017). Gender identity: Nature and nurture working together. *Evolutionary Studies in Imaginative Culture*, 1, 59–62. <https://doi.org/10.26613/esic/1.1>
- Estes, K. G., & Hurley, K. (2013). Infant-directed prosody helps infants map sounds to meanings. *Infancy: The Official Journal of the International Society on Infant Studies*, 18(5). <https://doi.org/10.1111/infa.12006>
- Feinberg, M. E., Jones, D. E., Roettger, M. E., Solmeyer, A., & Hostetler, M. (2014). Long-term follow-up of a randomized trial of family foundations: Effects on children's emotional, behavioral, and school adjustment. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 28, 821–831. <https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000037>
- Feldman, R. (2003). Infant-mother and infant-father synchrony: The coregulation of positive arousal. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 24(1), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1002/imhj.10041>
- Ferguson, C. (1964). Baby talk in six languages. *American Anthropology*, 66, 103–114. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1964.66.suppl_3.02a00060
- Ferjan Ramírez, N., Lytle, S., Fish, M., & Kuhl, P. K. (2018). Parent coaching at 6 and 10 months improves language outcomes at 14 months: A randomized controlled trial. *Developmental Science*, 22(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12762>
- Ferjan Ramírez, N., Lytle, S., & Kuhl, P. K. (2020). Parent coaching increases conversational turns and advances infant language development. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 117(7), 3484–3491. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1921653117>
- Fernald, A. (1985). Four-month-old infants prefer to listen to motherese. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 8, 181–195. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383\(85\)80005-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(85)80005-9)
- Fernald, A. (1992). Human vocalizations to infants as biologically relevant signals: An evolutionary perspective. In J. Barkow, & L. Cosmides (Eds.), *The Adapted Mind: Evolutionary Psychology and the Generation of Culture* (pp. 391–428). Oxford University Press.
- Fernald, A., & Simon, T. (1984). Expanded intonation contours in mothers' speech to newborns. *Developmental Psychology*, 20(1), 104–113. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.20.1.104>
- Fernald, A., Taeschner, T., Dunn, J., Papousek, M., de Boysson-Bardies, B., & Fukui, I. (1989). A cross-language study of prosodic modifications in mothers' and fathers' speech to preverbal infants. *Journal of Child Language*, 16, 477–501. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900010679>
- Fletcher, R., St George, J., & Freeman, E. (2013). Rough and tumble play quality: Theoretical foundations for a new measure of father-child interaction. *Early Child Development and Care*, 183, 746–759. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2012.723439>

- Garnica, O. (1977). On some prosodic and paralinguistic features of speech to young children. In C. E. Snow, & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition* (pp. 271–285). Cambridge University Press.
- Gergely, A., Faragó, T., Galambos, Á., & Topál, J. (2017). Differential effects of speech situations on mothers' and fathers' infant-directed and dog-directed speech: An acoustic analysis. *Scientific Reports*, 7, 13739. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-13883-2>
- Gilkerson, J., & Richards, J. A. (2009). The power of talk: Impact of adult talk, conversational turns, and TV during the critical 0-4 years of child development. In *The Power of Talk* (2nd ed.)
- Gilkerson, J., & Richards, J. A. (2020). *LENA: A guide to understanding the design and purpose of the LENA system*. LENA Foundation. https://www.lenafoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/LTR-12_How_LENA_Works.pdf
- Goldstein, M. H., & Schwade, J. A. (2008). Social feedback to infants' babbling facilitates rapid phonological learning. *Psychological Science*, 19, 515–523. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02117>
- Golinkoff, R. M., & Ames, G. J. (1979). A comparison of fathers' and mothers' speech with their young children. *Child Development*, 50(1), 28–32. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129037>
- Golinkoff, R. M., Can, D. D., Soderstrom, M., & Hirsh-Pasek, K. (2015). (Baby)Talk to me: The social context of infant-directed speech and its effects on early language acquisition. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(5), 339–344. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721415595345>
- Golinkoff, R. M., Hoff, E., Rowe, M. L., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., & Hirsh-Pasek, K. (2019). Language matters: Denying the existence of the 30-million-word gap has serious consequences. *Child Development*, 90, 985–992. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13128>
- Grieser, D. L., & Kuhl, P. K. (1988). Maternal speech to infants in a tonal language: Support for universal prosodic features in motherese. *Developmental Psychology*, 24(1), 14–20. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.24.1.14>
- Han, M., De Jong, N., & Kager, R. (2020). Pitch properties of infant-directed speech specific to word-learning contexts: A cross-linguistic investigation of Mandarin Chinese and Dutch. *Journal of Child Language*, 47(1), 85–111. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0305000919000813>
- Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Brookes.
- Hartman, K. M., Ratner, N. B., & Newman, R. S. (2017). Infant-directed speech (IDS) vowel clarity and child language outcomes. *Journal of Child Language*, 44(5), 1140–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000916000520>
- Hayashi, A., Tamekawa, Y., & Kiritani, S. (2001). Developmental change in auditory preferences for speech stimuli in Japanese infants. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 44(6), 1189–1200. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2001/092\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2001/092))
- Hirsh-Pasek, K., Adamson, L., Bakeman, R., Golinkoff, R. M., Pace, A., Yust, P., Suma, K., & Suma, K. (2015). The contribution of early communication to low-income children's language success. *Psychological Science*, 26, 1071–1083. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797615581493>
- Hladik, E. G., & Edwards, H. T. (1984). A comparative analysis of mother–father speech in the naturalistic home environment. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 13(5), 321–332. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01068149>
- Hoff, E. (2006). How social contexts support and shape language development. *Developmental Review*, 26(1), 55–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2005.11.002>
- Hoff, E., & Naigles, L. (2002). How children use input to acquire a lexicon. *Child Development*, 73(2), 418–433. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00415>
- Hoff-Ginsberg, E. (1986). Function and structure in maternal speech: Their relation to the child's development of syntax. *Developmental Psychology*, 22(2), 155–163. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.22.2.155>
- Huttenlocher, J., Haight, W., Bryk, A., Seltzer, M., & Lyons, T. (1991). Early vocabulary growth: Relation to language input and gender. *Developmental Psychology*, 27(2), 236–248. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.27.2.236>
- 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>
- Jacobson, J. L., Boersma, D. C., Fields, R. B., Olson, K. L., & David, C. (1983). Paralinguistic features of adult speech to infants and small children. *Child Development*, 54(2), 436–442. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1129704>
- John, A., Halliburton, A., & Humphrey, J. (2013). Child–mother and child–father play interaction patterns with preschoolers. *Early Child Development and Care*, 183(3–4), 483–497. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2012.711595>

- Kalashnikova, M., & Burnham, D. (2018). Infant-directed speech from seven to nineteen months has similar acoustic properties but different functions. *Journal of Child Language*, 45(5), 1035–1053. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000917000629>
- Kalashnikova, M., Peter, V., Di Liberto, G. M., Lalor, E. C., & Burnham, D. (2018). Infant-directed speech facilitates seven-month-old infants' cortical tracking of speech. *Scientific Reports*, 8, 13745. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-32150-6>
- Kaplan, P. S., Bachorowski, J. A., Smoski, M. J., & Hudenko, W. J. (2002). Infants of depressed mothers, although competent learners, fail to learn in response to their own mothers' infant-directed speech. *Psychological Science*, 13(3), 268–271. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00449>
- Kaplan, P. S., Danko, C. M., & Diaz, A. (2010). A privileged status for male infant-directed speech in infants of depressed mothers? Role of father involvement. *Infancy*, 15(2), 151–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7078.2009.00010>
- Katz, G. S., Cohn, J. F., & Moore, C. A. (1996). A combination of vocal fold dynamic and summary features discriminates between three pragmatic categories of infant-directed speech. *Child Development*, 67(1), 205–217. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1996.tb01729.x>
- Kim, H. I., & Johnson, S. P. (2014). Detecting 'infant-directedness' in face and voice. *Developmental Science*, 17(4), 621–627. <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12146>
- Kitamura, C., Thanavishuth, C., Burnham, D., & Luksaneeyanawin, S. (2002). Universality and specificity in infant-directed speech: Pitch modifications as a function of infant age and sex in a tonal and non-tonal language. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 24(4), 372–392. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383\(02\)00086-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(02)00086-3)
- Kokkinaki, T., & Vasdekis, V. G. S. (2015). Comparing emotional coordination in early spontaneous mother–infant and father–infant interactions. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 12(1), 69–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2014.950220>
- Kuhl, P., Tsao, F., & Liu, H. (2003). Foreign-language experience in infancy: Effects of short-term exposure and social interaction on phonetic learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 100, 9096–9101.
- Kuhl, P. K. (2007). Is speech learning 'gated' by the social brain? *Developmental Science*, 10, 110–120. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2007.00572>
- Kuhl, P. K., Andruski, J. E., Chistovich, I. A., Chistovich, L. A., Kozhevnikova, E. V., Ryskina, V. L., Lacerda, F., Sundberg, U., & Lacerda, F. (1997). Cross-language analysis of phonetic units in language addressed to infants. *Science*, 277, 684–686. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.277.5326.684>
- Kuhl, P. K., Conboy, B. T., Coffey-Corina, S., Padden, D., Rivera-Gaxiola, M., & Nelson, T. (2008). Phonetic learning as a pathway to language: New data and native language magnet theory expanded (NLM-e). *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 363, 979–1000.
- Kuhl, P. K., Ramírez, R. R., Bosseler, A., Lin, J.-F., & Imada, T. (2014). Infants' brain responses to speech suggest analysis by synthesis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111, 11238–11245. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1410963111>
- Kuo, P. X., Volling, B. L., & Gonzalez, R. (2018). Gender role beliefs, work-family conflict, and father involvement after the birth of a second child. *Psychology of men & masculinity*, 19(2), 243–256. <https://doi.org/10.1037/men0000101>
- Kwon, K., Bingham, G., Lewisader, J., Jeon, H., & Elicker, J. (2013). Structure task versus free play: The influence of social context on parenting quality, toddlers' engagement with parents and play behaviors, and parent-toddler language use. *Child and Youth Care Forum*, 42, 207–224. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-013-9198-x>
- Leaper, C., Anderson, K. J., & Sanders, P. (1998). Moderators of gender effects on parents' talk to their children: A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 34(1), 3–27. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.34.1.3>
- Leech, K. A., Salo, V. C., Rowe, M. L., & Cabrera, N. J. (2013). Father input and child vocabulary development: The importance of wh questions and clarification requests. *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 34(4), 249–259. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0033-1353445>
- 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>
- Liu, H. M., Kuhl, P. K., & Tsao, F. M. (2003). An association between mothers' speech clarity and infants' speech discrimination skills. *Developmental Science*, 6, F1–F10. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7687.00275>

- Lopez, M. H., & Velasco, G. (2010). *Childhood poverty among Hispanics sets record, leads nation*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2011/09/28/childhood-poverty-among-hispanics-sets-record-leads-nation/>
- Lundahl, B. W., Tollefson, D., Risser, H., & Lovejoy, M. C. (2008). A meta-analysis of father involvement in parent training. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 18, 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731507309828>
- Ma, W., Golinkoff, R. M., Houston, D., & Hirsh-Pasek, K. (2011). Word learning in infant- and adult-directed speech. *Language Learning and Development. The Official Journal of the Society for Language Development*, 7(3), 185–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2011.579839>
- Majorano, M., Rainieri, C., & Corsano, P. (2013). Parents' child-directed communication and child language development: A longitudinal study with Italian toddlers. *Journal of Child Language*, 40(4), 836–859. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000912000323>
- Malone, M. J., & Guy, R. F. (1982). A comparison of mothers' and fathers' speech to their 3-year-old sons. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 11, 599–608. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01067614>
- McLaughlin, B., White, D., McDevitt, T., & Raskin, R. (1983). Mothers' and fathers' speech to their young children: Similar or different? *Journal of Child Language*, 10, 245–252.
- McRoberts, G. W., & Best, C. T. (1997). Accommodation in mean f0 during mother-infant and father-infant vocal interactions: A longitudinal case study. *Journal of Child Language*, 24, 719–736. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S030500099700322X>
- McRoberts, G. W., McDonough, C., & Lakusta, L. (2009). The role of verbal repetition in the development of infant speech preferences from 4 to 14 months of age. *Infancy*, 14(2), 162–194. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15250000802707062>
- Merz, E. C., Maskus, E. A., Melvin, S., He, X., & Noble, K. G. (2019). Socioeconomic disparities in language input are associated with children's language-related brain structure and reading skills. *Child Development*, 91(3), 846–860. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13239>
- Mitchell, S. J., See, H. M., Tarkow, A. K. H., Cabrera, N., McFadden, K. E., & Shannon, J. D. (2007). Conducting studies with fathers: Challenges and opportunities. *Applied Developmental Science*, 11(4), 239–244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888690701762159>
- Naoi, N., Minagawa-Kawai, Y., Kobayashi, A., Takeuchi, K., Nakamura, K., Yamamoto, J., & Kojima, S. (2012). Cerebral responses to infant-directed speech and the effect of talker familiarity. *NeuroImage*, 59(2), 1735–1744. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2011.07.093>
- Narayan, C. R., & McDermott, L. C. (2016). Speech rate and pitch characteristics of infant-directed speech: Longitudinal and cross-linguistic observations. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 139(3), 1272–1281. <https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4944634>
- Newman, R. S., & Hussain, I. (2006). Changes in preference for infant-directed speech in low and moderate noise by 4.5- to 13-month-olds. *Infancy*, 10(1), 61–76. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327078in1001_4
- Newport, E. L., Gleitman, H., & Gleitman, L. R. (1977). Mother, I'd rather do it myself: Some effects and non-effects of maternal speech style. In C. E. Snow & C. A. Ferguson (Eds.), *Talking to Children: Language Input and Acquisition* (pp. 109–149). Cambridge University Press.
- O'Brien, M., & Nagle, K. J. (1987). Parents' speech to toddlers: The effect of play context. *Journal of Child Language*, 14, 269–279. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900012927>
- Pan, B. A., Rowe, M. L., Singer, J. D., & Snow, C. E. (2005). Maternal correlates of growth in toddler vocabulary production in low-income families. *Child Development*, 76(4), 763–782. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00876>
- Pancsofar, N., & Vernon-Feagans, L. (2006). Mother and father language input to young children: Contributions to later language development. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 27, 571–587. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2006.08.003>
- Pancsofar, N., Vernon-Feagans, L., & The Family Life Project Investigators (2010). Fathers' early contributions to children's language development in families from low-income rural communities. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 25, 450–463. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2010.02.001>
- Parke, R. D. (2002). Fathers and families. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Being and becoming a parent* (pp. 27–73). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

- Peter, V., Kalashnikova, M., Santos, A., & Burnham, D. (2016). Mature neural responses to infant-directed speech but not adult-directed speech in pre-verbal infants. *Scientific Reports*, 6, 34273. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep34273>
- Petts, R. J., Knoester, C., & Li, Q. (2020). Paid paternity leave-taking in the United States. *Community, Work & Family*, 23(2), 162–183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2018.1471589>
- Popenoe, D. (1996). *Life without father: Compelling new evidence that fatherhood and marriage are indispensable for the good of children and society*. Martin Kessler Books.
- Quigley, J., Nixon, E., & Lawson, S. (2019). Exploring the association of infant receptive language and pitch variability in fathers' infant-directed speech. *Journal of Child Language*, 46(4), 800–811. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000919000175>
- Ramírez-Esparza, N., García-Sierra, A., & Kuhl, P. K. (2014). Look who's talking: Speech style and social context in Language input to infants are linked to concurrent and future speech development. *Developmental Science*, 17, 880–891. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2005.00445>
- Ramírez-Esparza, N., García-Sierra, A., & Kuhl, P. K. (2016). The impact of early social interactions on later language development in Spanish–English bilingual infants. *Child Development*, 88, 1216–1234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12648>
- Ramírez-Esparza, N., García-Sierra, A., & Kuhl, P. K. (2017). Look who's talking now! Parentese speech, social context, and language development across time. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1173. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01008>
- Ratner, N. B. (1988). Patterns of parental vocabulary selection in speech to very young children. *Journal of Child Language*, 15, 481–492. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900012514>
- Reilly, J. S., & Bellugi, U. (1996). Competition on the face: Affect and language in ASL motherese. *Journal of Child Language*, 23(1), 219–239. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900010163>
- Reynolds, E., Vernon-Feagans, L., Bratsch-Hines, M., Baker, C. E., & The Family Life Project Key Investigators (2019). Mothers' and fathers' language input from 6 to 36 months in rural two-parent-families: Relations to children's kindergarten achievement. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 47, 385–395. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecresq.2018.09.002>
- Romeo, R. R., Leonard, J. A., Robinson, S. T., West, M. R., Mackey, A. P., Rowe, M. L., & Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2018a). Beyond the 30-million-word gap: Children's conversational exposure is associated with language-related brain function. *Psychological Science*, 29(5), 700–710. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617742725>
- Romeo, R. R., Segaran, J., Leonard, J. A., Robinson, S. T., West, M. R., Mackey, A. P., Gabrieli, J. D. E., Rowe, M. L., & Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2018b). Language exposure relates to structural neural connectivity in childhood. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 38(36), 7870–7877. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0484-18.2018>
- Rondal, J. A. (1980). Fathers' and mothers' speech in early language development. *Journal of Child Language*, 7, 353–369. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900002671>
- Rost, G. C., & McMurray, B. (2009). Speaker variability augments phonological processing in early word learning. *Developmental Science*, 12(2), 339–349. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2008.00786>
- Rowe, M. L. (2012). A longitudinal investigation of the role of quantity and quality of child-directed speech in vocabulary development. *Child Development*, 83, 1762–1774. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01805>
- Rowe, M. L., Coker, D., & Pan, B. A. (2004). A comparison of fathers' and mothers' talk to toddlers in low-income families. *Social Development*, 13(2), 278–291. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2004.000267>
- Rowe, M. L., Leech, K. A., & Cabrera, N. (2017). Going beyond input quantity: Wh-Questions matter for toddlers' language and cognitive development. *Cognitive Science*, 41(Suppl 1), 162–179. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12349>
- Saint-Georges, C., Chetouani, M., Cassel, R., Apicella, F., Mahdhaoui, A., Muratori, F., Laznik, M. C., & Cohen, D. (2013). Motherese in interaction: At the cross-road of emotion and cognition? (A systematic review). *PLoS One*, 8(10), e78103. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0078103>
- Saito, Y., Aoyama, S., Kondo, T., Fukumoto, R., Konishi, N., Nakamura, K., Toshima, T., & Toshima, T. (2007). Frontal cerebral blood flow change associated with infant-directed speech. *Archives of Disease in Childhood. Fetal and Neonatal Edition*, 92(2), F113–F116. <https://doi.org/10.1136/adc.2006.097949>
- Santesso, D. L., Schmidt, L. A., & Trainor, L. J. (2007). Frontal brain electrical activity (EEG) and heart rate in response to affective infant-directed (ID) speech in 9-month-old infants. *Brain and Cognition*, 65(1), 14–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandc.2007.02.008>

- Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J., Weldon, A. H., Cook, J. C., Davis, E. F., & Buckley, C. K. (2009). Coparenting behavior moderates longitudinal relations between effortful control and preschool children's externalizing behavior. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 50, 698–706. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2008.02009>
- Seidl, A., Onishi, K. H., & Cristia, A. (2014). Talker variation aids young infants' phonotactic learning. *Language Learning and Development*, 10, 297–307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2013.858575>
- Shafer, K., Scheibling, C., & Milkie, M. A. (2020). The division of domestic labor before and during the COVID-19 pandemic in Canada: Stagnation versus shifts in fathers' contributions. *Canadian Review of Sociology = Revue Canadienne de Sociologie*, 57(4), 523–549. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cars.12315>
- Shapiro, N. T., Hippe, D., & Ferjan Ramírez, N. (2021). How chatty are daddies? An exploratory study of infants' language environments. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 64(8), 3242–3252. https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_JSLHR-20-00727
- Shneidman, L. A., Arroyo, M. E., Levine, S. C., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2013). What counts as effective input for word learning? *Journal of Child Language*, 40(3), 672–686. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000912000141>
- Singh, L., Morgan, J. L., & Best, C. T. (2002). Infants' listening preferences: Baby talk or happy talk? *Infancy*, 3(3), 365–394. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327078IN0303_5
- Singh, L., Nestor, S., Parikh, C., & Yull, A. (2009). Influences of infant-directed speech on early word recognition. *Infancy*, 14(6), 654–666. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15250000903263973>
- Smith, N. A., & Trainor, L. J. (2008). Infant-directed speech is modulated by infant feedback. *Infancy*, 13, 410–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15250000802188719>
- Soderstrom, M. (2007). Beyond babble: Re-evaluating the nature and content of speech input to preverbal infants. *Developmental Review*, 27(4), 501–532. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2007.06.002>
- Soderstrom, M., Blossom, M., Foygel, R., & Morgan, J. L. (2008). Acoustical cues and grammatical units in speech to two preverbal infants. *Journal of Child Language*, 35(4), 869–902. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000908008763>
- Stern, D. N., Spieker, S., Barnett, R. K., & MacKain, K. (1983). The prosody of maternal speech: Infant age and context related changes. *Journal of Child Language*, 10, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900005092>
- Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Baumwell, L., & Cabrera, N. J. (2013). Fathers' role in children's language development. In N. J. Cabrera & C. S. Tamis-LeMonda (Eds.), *Handbook of Father Involvement: Multidisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 135–150). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Baumwell, L., & Cristofaro, T. (2012). Parent-child conversations during play. *First Language*, 32(4), 413–438. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723711419321>
- Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Kuchirko, Y., & Song, L. (2014). Why is infant language learning facilitated by parental responsiveness? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(2), 121–126. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414522813>
- Tang, J. S., & Maidment, J. A. (1996). Prosodic aspects of child-directed speech in Cantonese. *Speech, Hearing, and Language*, 9, 257–276.
- Tartter, V. C. (1980). Happy talk: Perceptual and acoustic effects of smiling on speech. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 27, 24–27. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03199901>
- The ManyBabies Consortium. (2020). Quantifying sources of variability in infancy research using the infant-directed-speech preference. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, 3(1), 24–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2515245919900809>
- Thiessen, E. D., Hill, E. A., & Saffran, J. R. (2005). Infant-directed speech facilitates word segmentation. *Infancy*, 7, 53–71. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327078in0701_5
- Tiano, J. D., & McNeil, C. B. (2005). The inclusion of fathers in behavioral parent training: A critical evaluation. *Child & Family Behavior Therapy*, 27, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1300/J019v27n04_01
- Tomasello, M. (1992). The social bases of language acquisition. *Social Development*, 1, 67–87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.1992.tb00135>
- Trainor, L. J., Austin, C. M., & Desjardins, R. N. (2000). Is infant-directed speech prosody a result of the vocal expression of emotion? *Psychological Science*, 11(3), 188–195. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00240>
- Van Belle, J. (2016). *Paternity and parental leave policies across the European Union*. RAND Europe.
- Volling, B. L., Cabrera, N. J., Feinberg, M. E., Jones, D. E., McDaniel, B. T., Liu, S., Cookston, J. T., Lee, J. k., Schoppe-Sullivan, S. J., Feng, X., Gerhardt, M. L., Dush, C. M. K., Stevenson, M. M., Safyer, P., Gonzalez, R., Lee, J. Y., Piskernik, B., Ahnert, L., Karberg, E., ... Cookston, J. T. (2019). Advancing research and measurement

- on fathering and children's development. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 84(1), 7–160. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mono.12404>
- Vygotsky, L. (1962). Thought and language. In E. Hanfmann, & G. Vakar (Eds.), *Thought and language*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.1037/11193-000>
- Wang, Y., Williams, R., Dilley, L., & Houston, D. M. (2020). A meta-analysis of the predictability of LENA automated measures for child language development. *Developmental Review*, 57, 100921. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2020.100921>
- Warlaumont, A. S., Richards, J. A., Gilkerson, J., & Oller, D. K. (2014). A social feedback loop for speech development and its reduction in autism. *Psychological Science*, 25(7), 1314–1324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797914531023>
- Warren-Leubecker, A., & Bohannon, J. N., III. (1984). Intonation patterns in child-directed speech: Mother-father differences. *Child Development*, 55(4), 1379–1385. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1130007>
- Weirich, M., & Simpson, A. (2019). Effects of gender, parental role, and time on infant-and adult-directed read and spontaneous speech. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 62(11), 4001–4014. https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_JSLHR-S-19-0047
- Weisleder, A., & Fernald, A. (2013). Talking to children matters: Early language experience strengthens processing and builds vocabulary. *Psychological Science*, 24, 2143–2152. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613488145>
- Yeung, W. J., Sandberg, J. F., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Hofferth, S. L. (2001). Children's time with fathers in intact families. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 63(1), 136–154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2001.00136>
- Zangl, R., & Mills, D. L. (2007). Increased brain activity to infant-directed speech in 6-and 13-month-old infants. *Infancy*, 11(1), 31–62. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327078in1101_2

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Dr. Naja Ferjan Ramírez is an Assistant Professor and the Director of the Language Development and Processing Laboratory in the Department of Linguistics at the University of Washington, and holds the Distinguished Professorship in Language Acquisition and Multilingualism Endowment. She earned her Bachelor's degree in Neuroscience from Brown University and her Ph.D. in Linguistics and Cognitive Science from the University of California, San Diego. She completed her post-doctoral training at the Institute for Learning & Brain Sciences at the University of Washington. Her research focuses on understanding the extent and origins of variability in brain growth and linguistic development among young children of diverse backgrounds. She uses multiple methodologies, including naturalistic audio recordings in children's homes and early education centres, magnetoencephalography (MEG), and behavioural language measures in the laboratory.

How to cite this article: Ferjan Ramírez, N. (2022). Fathers' infant-directed speech and its effects on child language development. *Language & Linguistics Compass*, e12448. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12448>