



Atypical preference for infant-directed speech as an early marker of autism spectrum disorders? A literature review and directions for further research

Marisa G. Filipe, Linda Watson, Selene G. Vicente & Sónia Frota

To cite this article: Marisa G. Filipe, Linda Watson, Selene G. Vicente & Sónia Frota (2018) Atypical preference for infant-directed speech as an early marker of autism spectrum disorders? A literature review and directions for further research, *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 32:3, 213-231, DOI: [10.1080/02699206.2017.1342694](https://doi.org/10.1080/02699206.2017.1342694)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699206.2017.1342694>



Published online: 20 Jul 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1188



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 6 View citing articles [↗](#)



Atypical preference for infant-directed speech as an early marker of autism spectrum disorders? A literature review and directions for further research

Marisa G. Filipe^{a,b}, Linda Watson^c, Selene G. Vicente^b and Sónia Frota^a

^aCentro de Linguística, Faculdade de Letras, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal; ^bUniversidade do Porto, Porto, Portugal; ^cUniversity of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA

ABSTRACT

Autism spectrum disorders (ASD) refer to a complex group of neuro-developmental disorders causing difficulties with communication and interpersonal relationships, as well as restricted and repetitive behaviours and interests. As early identification, diagnosis, and intervention provide better long-term outcomes, early markers of ASD have gained increased research attention. This review examines evidence that auditory processing enhanced by social interest, in particular auditory preference of speech directed towards infants and young children (i.e. infant-directed speech – IDS), may be an early marker of risk for ASD. Although this review provides evidence for IDS preference as, indeed, a potential early marker of ASD, the explanation for differences in IDS processing among children with ASD versus other children remains unclear, as are the implications of these impairments for later social-communicative development. Therefore, it is crucial to explore atypicalities in IDS processing early on development and to understand whether preferential listening to specific types of speech sounds in the first years of life may help to predict the impairments in social and language development.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 2 February 2017

Revised 9 June 2017

Accepted 12 June 2017

KEYWORDS

Autism spectrum disorders; early markers; infant-directed speech; review

Introduction

Autism spectrum disorders (ASD) refer to a heterogeneous and complex group of neurodevelopmental conditions causing difficulties with communication and interpersonal relationships, as well as restricted and repetitive behaviours and interests (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). As the prevalence of this condition is increasing (global median of prevalence estimates of ASD is 62/10 000; Elsabbagh et al., 2012a), understanding ASD characteristics is a social, economic, and health issue. To provide better long-term outcomes and decrease the cost of care of these individuals over their lifetime, researchers are working on the identification of atypical features early in development that are important to understand how ASD unfolds from birth (e.g. Chasson, Harris, & Neely, 2007; Dawson, 2008; Dawson et al., 2012).

Research has shown that very young children have biases that orient their attention to relevant signals present in the environment. Typically developing infants pay more attention to socially relevant stimuli than non-social stimuli (Butterfield & Siperstein, 1970;

Valenza, Simion, Cassia, & Umiltà, 1996; Vouloumanos & Werker, 2007), and crucially to the speech addressed to them, that is, ‘infant-directed speech’ (IDS; Cooper & Aslin, 1990; Dunst, Gorman, & Hamby, 2012; Fernald, 1985; McRoberts, McDonough, & Lakusta, 2009; Schachner & Hannon, 2011; Werker, Pegg, & Mcleod, 1994). Indeed, research suggests that IDS effectively orients and holds infants’ attention and promotes their social and language development (Cristia, 2013; Floccia et al., 2016; Kubicek et al., 2014; Kuhl, 2007; Weisleder & Fernald, 2013). In contrast, individuals with ASD have known deficits in the realm of social communication, and there is reason to hypothesise that this typical preference for socially relevant stimuli is altered in this population. Previous work found atypicalities in the orientation to relevant auditory stimuli (for review: O’Connor, 2012). For instance, comparing the percentage of head turns in the direction of the samples of IDS versus non-speech analogues between typically developing children and children with ASD, the ASD group demonstrated a strong listening preference for non-speech analogue signals, unlike the typically developing group (Kuhl, Coffey-Corina, Padden, & Dawson, 2005).

To explain these atypical biases that orient the attention of individuals with ASD to certain signals in the environment, several theoretical frameworks have been proposed. Some theories are mainly focused on differences in low-level processing (for review: Happé & Frith, 2006; Mottron, Dawson, Soulieres, Hubert, & Burack, 2006). In this context, the theory of weak central coherence (Frith, 1989) postulates that individuals with ASD have a tendency to focus on individual elements rather than the whole, combined with an inability to integrate information into context. As an alternative to the previous model, the enhanced perceptual functioning (Mottron et al., 2006) suggests that individuals with ASD have improved perception of low-level perceptual information in comparison with higher-order operations. This makes perceptual processes more difficult to control and more disruptive to the development of other behaviours and abilities. A related framework to the enhanced perceptual functioning theory, which has specifically been used to describe auditory processing in ASD, is the neural complexity hypothesis (Bertone, Mottron, Jelenic, & Faubert, 2005; Samson, Mottron, Jemel, Belin, & Ciocca, 2006). This framework suggests enhanced perception of simple, low-level auditory stimuli in individuals with ASD together with impaired perception of more complex auditory information. Specifically, the authors proposed that individuals with ASD, in comparison with typically developing individuals, show superior performance for simple tones processed in the primary auditory cortex, but reduced performance for complex tones processed in the associative auditory cortex. According to this point of view, this enhanced perception of low-level auditory features may be prejudicial to high-level processing, affecting the response to the categorical patterns that characterise IDS.

Other theories have focused on social-cognitive aspects of processing, such as the Theory of Mind (Baron-Cohen, Leslie, & Frith, 1985), the Theory of Executive Dysfunction (Hughes & Russell, 1993), and the Social Motivation Theory (Chevallier, Kohls, Troiani, Brodtkin, & Schultz, 2012), hypothesising that individuals with ASD have diminished attention to certain stimuli because of its social-cognitive aspects. In this approach, the Theory of Mind framework is useful to explain high-order abnormalities in the process that enable most of us to understand that others have beliefs, desires, thoughts, hopes, and emotions that may differ from our own (Baron-Cohen et al., 1985). The Theory of Executive Functioning suggests that symptoms of ASD are a result of a

primary problem in the executive control of action (Hughes & Russell, 1993; Ozonoff, Rogers, Farnham, & Pennington, 1994; Pennington et al., 1997). This theory identifies difficulties in planning, initiation, and inhibition skills as a core deficit that underlines this disorder (Rajendran & Mitchell, 2007). Indeed, the distinction made within this theory between two interrelated constructs, one emotional (hot) and one cognitive (cool) (Zimmerman, Ownsworth, O'Donovan, Roberts, & Gullo, 2016), could also help us understand these atypicalities. It is suggested that some social skills, namely the ability to recognise emotions and make social inferences, are supported by working memory as well as by response initiation and suppression processes. Finally, the Social Motivation Theory purports that mechanisms related to social motivation may represent the primary deficit in ASD, manifested by diminished social orientation, social reward, and social maintaining. This theory highlights the fact that individuals with ASD react to social scenes in an atypical manner, for instance, paying greater attention to objects compared to people than typically developing children. These atypical developmental processes ultimately deprive them of adequate social learning opportunities. According to this point of view, individuals with ASD have diminished attention to IDS because of its social-cognitive aspects.

In the present article, we provide a comprehensive review of evidence related to auditory processing enhanced by social interest, namely the processing of IDS, particularly focusing on the auditory preferences in younger siblings of children with ASD (infants at high-risk for ASD), as around 20% of these children have been found to meet the criteria for ASD by their third year of life (Ozonoff et al., 2011; Szatmari et al., 2016). Studies using this prospective research design are useful to better understand the nature of several atypicalities in ASD. They allow the comparison between the developmental trajectories of infants who later do or do not meet ASD diagnostic criteria, and provide a unique opportunity to characterise ASD development. Our goal is to better understand the atypical biases in IDS preference and processing that may underlie the atypical social-communicative development in ASD and explore potential implications for early identification and early intervention. This highlights previous suggestions in that auditory preference and processing of IDS may be a potentially early marker of ASD, providing important theoretical and clinical implications. This review was conducted using the PsycINFO database. Articles were selected through the combination of the keywords 'Autism' and 'Auditory Processing' together or in conjunction with the keywords 'Infant-Directed Speech', 'Child-Directed Speech', 'Motherese', and/or 'Maternal Speech'. Based upon title and abstract screening, a total of 41 references were identified through the search process and were selected for full text review. The final sample of articles was divided into three categories: general auditory processing in ASD, auditory processing of IDS in ASD, and auditory preference of IDS in infants at high-risk for ASD. The design characteristics and the main findings of the reviewed studies related to auditory processing of IDS in ASD and auditory preference of IDS in infants at high-risk for ASD are presented in Table 1.

General auditory processing in ASD

Research on general auditory processing in ASD investigated both basic stimuli (particularly, the dimensions of pitch and loudness), as well as more complex processing (e.g.

Table 1. Description of included studies related to auditory processing of infant-directed speech (IDS) in ASD and in infants at high-risk for ASD.

Source - author (year)	Sample	Design	Main findings
<i>Auditory Processing of IDS in ASD</i>			
Kuhl et al. (2005)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>N</i> = 73 (ASD <i>n</i> = 29; Typically Developing mental age match <i>n</i> = 29; Typically Developing chronological age match <i>n</i> = 15).• CA = participants age range between 32 and 70 months.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Auditory preference test to extract a social measure, using Head-Turn:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Children heard eight IDS samples against non-speech analogues of the same signals.• Speech samples were between 4.8 and 5.3 seconds in duration.• Phonetic discrimination assessed with mismatch negativity (MMN), an event-related potential (ERP), to extract a linguistic measure:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Children heard speech stimuli: consonant–vowel syllables /ba/and /wa/, computer synthesised to be identical except for the duration of the initial formant.• Stimuli were 80 ms long.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Children with ASD differed from controls and demonstrated a preference for the non-speech analogues, as well as failed to show a significant MMN in response to a syllable change.• When ASD children were divided into subgroups based on auditory preferences (speech vs. non-speech), ASD children who preferred non-speech still failed to show an MMN in response to a syllable change, whereas ASD children who preferred IDS did not differ from the controls.
Paul et al. (2007)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>N</i> = 158 (ASD <i>n</i> = 52; Developmentally Delayed = 32; Typical Developing age match <i>n</i> = 44; Typically Developing language match <i>n</i> = 30).• CA = participants age range between 14 and 36 months.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Auditory preference protocol.• Children heard IDS and ‘rotated’ samples of the same speech (i.e. manipulated original speech sounds that had some of the same acoustic properties, but did not sound like speech).• Two sessions each lasting 5–10 min.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Children with ASD in the second and third year of life demonstrated the least preference for IDS, whereas the typically developing chronological age-matched group presented the most marked preference for IDS.• Children with ASD demonstrated significantly less preference for IDS than their age-matched peers, but were not significantly different from either of the two other groups.

Watson et al. (2010)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $N = 22$ (with ASD). • CA = participants age at entry ranged between 28 and 42 months ($N = 19$ participated in the longitudinal follow-up at 40 to 55 months). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication skills (at entry and readministered 12 months later): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Receptive language. • Expressive language. • Social-communicative adaptive skills. • Looking measures – sustained looking at the target stimuli (at entry): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The non-social stimulus condition consisted of a music video comprised of digitised classical music accompanied by non-social visual images (moving toys, visual patterns). The length of the non-social stimulus condition was two minutes. • The IDS condition included three different vignettes: (a) a video story, (b) a live puppet show, and (c) a video toy. The length for each of these IDS vignettes was one minute. • Physiological measures (at entry): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respiratory sinus arrhythmia (i.e. vagal activity). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking during IDS was strongly correlated with all entry and follow-up communication skills. • Respiratory sinus arrhythmia (i.e. vagal activity) during IDS was moderately to strongly correlated with entry receptive language, follow-up expressive language, and social-communicative adaptive skills. • After controlling for entry communication skills, vagal activity during IDS accounted for significant variance in follow-up communication skills.
Watson et al. (2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • $N = 51$ (ASD $n = 22$; Typical Developing language age match $n = 15$; Typically Developing chronological age match $n = 14$). • CA = participants age range between 29 and 42 months. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking measures – sustained looking at the target stimuli: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The non-social stimulus condition consisted of a music video comprised of digitised classical music accompanied by non-social visual images (moving toys, visual patterns). The length of the non-social stimulus condition was two minutes. • The IDS condition included three different vignettes: (a) a video story, (b) a live puppet show, and (c) a video toy. The length for each of these IDS vignettes was one minute. • Physiological measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heart activity. • Respiratory sinus arrhythmia. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children with ASD demonstrated diminished attention to IDS compared to typically developing peers at the same chronological age. • Children with ASD showed no differences in looking at non-social stimuli. • Children with ASD and language age-matched peers differed in patterns of looking at live versus videotaped IDS stimuli. • Children with ASD demonstrated faster heart rates than chronological age-matched peers, but did not differ significantly on respiratory sinus arrhythmia.

(Continued)

Table 1. (Continued).

Source - author (year)	Sample	Design	Main findings
<i>Auditory Preference of IDS in Infants at High-Risk for ASD</i>			
Curtin and Vouloumanos (2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• N = 62 (High-risk n = 31; Low-risk n = 31).• CA = participants tested at ages 12 and 18 months.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sequential looking preference procedure.<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Infants heard two types of auditory stimuli: A speech set composed of non-sense words and a non-speech set composed of complex non-speech analogues (each one with a duration of 40s).• General functioning assessed at 12 months (using Mullen Scales of Early Learning).• Autistic-like behaviour assessed at 18 months (using Autism Observation Scales Infancy).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• At 12 months, the infants in both groups looked longer at a visual stimulus (checkerboard) presented concurrently with speech than when the visual stimulus was presented concurrently with non-speech; however, the difference in looking time was significant only for the low-risk infants, and the high-risk infants were significantly more variable than low-risk infants in their looking time.• The high-risk group did not listen reliably longer to speech and this group's atypical preference was associated with autistic behaviours at 18 months.
Droucker et al. (2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• N = 36 (High-risk n = 14; Low-risk n = 22).• CA = participants tested at ages 6, 8, 12, and 18 months.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sequential looking preference procedure<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Infants heard 2 IDS and 2 adult-directed speech passages (each one with a duration of 40s) paired with a checkerboard or a face.• Expressive language assessed at 12 and 18 months (using MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventories: Words and Gestures).• General functioning assessed at 12 months (using Mullen Scales of Early Learning).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The low-risk group showed a trend to look longer at IDS than adult-directed speech at 8 months that was not apparent at this age in the high-risk siblings.• The low-risk group also showed higher expressive language scores at 18 months than the high-risk group, and this result correlated with preferences for IDS at 12 months.

Note. N = number of participants; CA = chronological age.

prosody). Regarding basic auditory processing in ASD, special attention has been given to the perception of pitch. Initial work comes from case studies in autistic savants, which found absolute pitch processing despite other deficits on language and cognitive skills (e.g. Kanner, 1943; Mottron, Peretz, Belleville, & Rouleau, 1999; Young & Nettelbeck, 1995). Further work examined this absolute pitch processing, and the results showed that participants with ASD were more accurate at identifying and recalling pure tones than IQ-matched typically developing peers (Heaton, Hermelin, & Pring, 1998). Similar results were found in later work: individuals with ASD exhibited superior pitch memory and identification of familiar tones from musical chords than IQ-matched typically developing children (Heaton, 2003). Several subsequent studies found that individuals with ASD were more proficient at the discrimination and categorisation of pitch differences between lexical tones, pure tones, words pairs, non-words, and non-speech stimuli relative to controls (Bonnell et al., 2003; Heaton, 2005; Heaton, Hudry, Ludlow, & Hill, 2008; Järvinen-Pasley & Heaton, 2007; Järvinen-Pasley, Pasley, & Heaton, 2008a; Järvinen-Pasley, Wallace, Ramus, Happé, & Heaton, 2008b; O’Riordan & Passetti, 2006). Less research has been conducted regarding the perception and processing of loudness, but studies of these variables reported hypersensitivity to loud sounds concurrent with typical performance on discrimination tasks (Bonnell et al., 2010; Jones et al., 2009).

Regarding complex auditory processing, children with ASD have shown a number of processing patterns similar to those of typically developing children, for example, recalling stressed words better than unstressed ones (Fine, Bartolucci, Ginsberg, & Szatmari, 1991), discriminating word pairs differing in first- versus last-syllable stress patterns (Grossman, Bemis, Plesa-Skwerer, & Tager-Flusberg, 2010), and distinguishing sentence types such as statements versus questions (Paul, Augustyn, Klin, & Volkmark, 2005; Peppé, Cleland, Gibbon, O’Hare, & Mastínez-Castilla, 2011; Peppé, McCann, Gibbon, O’Hare, & Rutherford, 2007). However, impairments in complex auditory processing have also been found. For instance, significant deficits in the perception of contrastive stress were reported (e.g. Paul et al., 2005), as well as delays or impairments such the tendency to perceive pairs of the same auditory stimuli as prosodically different (Peppé et al., 2007). Other studies also showed prosody as a deficit at the communicative level in children with ASD. For instance, ASD children tend to judge questions as statements and produce questioning intonation when a statement was required, and tend to show problems with affective tasks and with the interpretation and production of contrastive stress (Peppé et al., 2007). In sum, individuals with ASD often reveal impaired performance in tasks with more complex stimuli such as speech (Dawson, Meltzoff, Osterling, Rinaldi, & Brown, 1998; Dawson et al., 2004; Fujikawa-Brooks, Isenberg, Osann, Spence, & Gage, 2010; Gervais et al., 2004; Källstrand, Olsson, Nehlstedt, Skold, & Nielzen, 2010; Kuhl et al., 2005; Lepistö et al., 2009; Teder-Salejarvi, Pierce, Courchesne, & Hillyard, 2005; Whitehouse & Bishop, 2008).

In addition to more accurate pitch perception together with impairments in complex auditory processing, reduced preference for linguistic/social information was also found. In fact, more specific deficits have been found for social stimuli versus non-social stimuli (Dawson et al., 1998, 2004; Kuhl et al., 2005; O’Connor, 2012; for a review). Thus, researchers have investigated listening preferences of individuals with ASD. Klin (1991) analysed preferences of children with ASD compared to children with intellectual deficits and typically developing children. A preferential listening task was presented to the three

groups, with each child hearing his or her own mother's voice and a sound of superimposed voices. The results showed that the children with intellectual deficits and the typically developing children preferred to listen to their mothers' speech. However, children with ASD either preferred the superimposed voices or showed no preference. Several other studies found atypical processing of social stimuli (both for auditory and visual modalities; Dawson et al., 1998, 2004; Dawson, Webb, & McI'artland, 2005; Rutherford, Baron-Cohen, & Wheelwright, 2002). Moreover, brain-imaging studies confirmed that children with ASD show atypical neural activation as a reaction to speech but not to non-speech sounds (Gervais et al., 2004), as well as abnormal cortical auditory processing (Boddaert et al., 2004).

Auditory processing of infant-directed speech in ASD

As IDS is a socially relevant linguistic stimulus, attenuated preferences for this kind of speech in individuals with ASD have captured increasing research attention. Infant-directed speech is an important speech style used by adults when speaking to infants (e.g. Snow & Ferguson, 1977), and it is generally characterised as having a variety of linguistic modifications in the syntax, lexicon, and prosody. For example, compared to adult-directed speech, (a) sentences in IDS tend to be shorter and often grammatically more simplified (Newport, Gleitman, & Gleitman, 1977); (b) the set of prosodic contours is less variable (Fernald & Simon, 1984); (c) frequently, focused words are placed at the end of sentences and marked with exaggerated pitch peaks (Fernald & Mazzie, 1991); and (d) higher pitch, larger pitch range, slower tempo, and enhanced rhythmic features tend to be used (Fernald, 1992; for a recent review, see Cristia, 2013).

Infant-directed speech may serve to (a) obtain and/or maintain attention (Fernald, 1992), (b) to communicate affective and contextual information (Fernald, 1992), and (c) to enhance language learning (Kuhl, 2007; Morgan & Demuth, 1996; Song, Demuth, & Morgan, 2010) in a number of different domains such as word segmentation (e.g. Floccia et al., 2016; Thiessen, Hill, & Saffran, 2005), word learning (e.g. Saffran, Aslin, & Newport, 1996; Weisleder & Fernald, 2013), and audio-visual associative learning (Kaplan, Bachorowski, Smoski, & Hudenko, 2002; Kaplan, Jung, Ryther, & Zarlengo-Strouse, 1996; Kubicek et al., 2014).

From birth, typically developing infants prefer to listen to IDS versus other speech or auditory stimuli (Cooper & Aslin, 1990; Fernald, 1985; McRoberts et al., 2009; Werker et al., 1994), and this preference continues through preschool (Klin, 1991; Kuhl et al., 2005; Paul, Chawarska, Fowler, Cicchetti, & Volkmar, 2007). This has been shown both by studies using behavioural methods and studies using electrophysiological (e.g. Zangl & Mills, 2007) and neuroimaging techniques (e.g. Vouloumanos, Kiehl, Werker, & Liddle, 2001). Furthermore, research found that 5-month-old infants had a preference for individuals who previously used IDS (Schachner & Hannon, 2011). Indeed, the social and communicative aspects of IDS are highly attractive among typically developing infants.

It seems that although typically developing children prefer listening to IDS, children with ASD as a group do not demonstrate a similar preference. For instance, researchers examined whether children with ASD demonstrated a preference for IDS, compared to three other groups: children with other developmental disabilities matched for language age, typically developing children matched for chronological age, and typically developing

children matched for language age. In the experiment, the children heard IDS and 'rotated' samples of the same speech (i.e. manipulated original speech sounds that had some of the same acoustic properties, but did not sound like speech). Results showed that the children with ASD in the second and third year of life demonstrated the least preference for IDS, whereas the typically developing chronological age-matched group presented the most marked preference for IDS. Children with ASD demonstrated significantly less preference for IDS than their age-matched peers, but were not significantly different from either of the two other groups (Paul et al., 2007). However, it has been suggested that the way that IDS stimuli are presented may influence preference patterns (Watson, Roberts, Baranek, Mandulak, & Dalton, 2012). That is, children with ASD and their language age-matched peers with typical development spent similar amount of time looking at videotaped IDS, but when IDS was presented live, the language age-matched typically developing children showed increased looking time to the IDS speaker and significantly exceeded the amount of looking time for children with ASD in the live condition. This is not surprising given the findings that social interaction plays a significant role in early language learning, as demonstrated by studies with typically developing infants that compared live exposure to language to video or audio-only presentation (Kuhl, 2007; Kuhl & Rivera-Gaxiola, 2008; Kuhl, Tsao, & Liu, 2003).

Research also examined auditory preferences in preschool children with ASD compared to typically developing children matched for mental age using a head-turn paradigm that paired IDS samples and non-speech analogue signals of the IDS samples (Kuhl et al., 2005). On average, the children with ASD showed a preference for the non-speech analogue signals over IDS, whereas their typically developing peers did not demonstrate a preference. This study then analysed the discrimination of an English phonemic contrast (/wa/ as the standard and /ba/ as the deviant) through mismatch negativity (MMN), using a control group of typically developing children matched to the ASD sample based on chronological age. The children with ASD were separated into subgroups based on their listening preference (i.e. for the non-speech analogue, $n = 20$, or for IDS, $n = 7$), and the researchers found different neural patterns for the two ASD subgroups. The children with ASD who preferred IDS had a similar amplitude of MMN response to that of the typically developing children, whereas the children with ASD who preferred non-speech analogues with similar acoustic features did not show a clear MMN response to the deviant speech syllable (Kuhl et al., 2005).

Moreover, an interesting relationship has been found between IDS processing and typical language development, with specific features of IDS (e.g. higher pitch and exaggerated prosody) apparently assisting socio-communicative learning (e.g. Kuhl et al., 2005; Paul et al., 2007; Thiessen et al., 2005; Tsao, Liu, & Kuhl, 2004). For example, results showed that 7-month olds use transitional probabilities between syllables to distinguish non-sense words (versus 'partial words') within non-sense sentences when the sentences were presented using the prosody typical of IDS, but did not show evidence of discriminating between words and partial words when sentences were presented with the prosody of adult-directed speech (Thiessen et al., 2005). This study intentionally limited the IDS properties of their stimuli to pitch-based cues (higher pitch and exaggerated pitch contours). However, other properties might also be involved in the link between IDS processing and socio-communicative learning. For example, research found that the recognition

of words by 19-month olds might be affected by other properties of natural IDS, specifically slow speaking rate and vowel hyper-articulation (Song et al., 2010).

Different processing patterns among infants known to be at risk for ASD or young children diagnosed with ASD may also predict later language outcomes and aid in identifying early intervention targets or strategies. For example, children with ASD who prefer listening to non-speech over IDS are more likely to exhibit deficits in expressive language abilities (Kuhl et al., 2005). Research also found that behavioural measures and physiological responses to IDS are significantly correlated with later communication skills of children with this diagnosis (Watson, Baranek, Roberts, David, & Perryman, 2010). Furthermore, the child's responsiveness to IDS may have a crucial impact on the quantity of IDS used by caregivers, and this may restrict optimal language learning conditions for the children (e.g. Wan et al., 2013). These findings suggest that IDS might play a crucial role in language learning among children with ASD. The knowledge about the importance of IDS preference as a potential early marker of risk for ASD, as well as a predictor of language outcomes, has developed and become more promising in recent years because research groups have addressed these questions from different points of view. Studies with infants at high-risk for ASD have been especially valuable.

Auditory preference of infant-directed speech in infants at high-risk for ASD

An important issue regarding the potential value of atypical IDS preference as a marker of risk for ASD or predictor of language outcomes is to identify when individuals with ASD begin to orient less to IDS. That is, a key diagnostic assumption is that ASD involves an early disruption of neurodevelopment (for review: Jones, Gliga, Bedford, Charman, & Johnson, 2014). Therefore, many studies in the past decades have focused on early signs and indicators. Retrospective research using parent reports as well as home videos has shown impairments in a range of abilities in the first years of life of children later diagnosed with ASD (for review: Barbaro & Dissanayake, 2009; Costanzo et al., 2015; Szatmari et al., 2016; Yirmiya & Charman, 2010). More recently, as around 20% of siblings of children with ASD meet criteria for this disorder by their third year of age (Ozonoff et al., 2011), prospective studies of infant siblings have frequently been used as a methodological approach to studying early markers of ASD. These studies follow younger siblings of children with ASD from early infancy until 2–3 years of age (when the diagnosis can be achieved). They allow the comparison between different developmental trajectories of infants who later do or do not meet ASD diagnostic criteria. Because of the opportunity to directly observe behaviours under controlled conditions (difficult to achieve in retrospective video analysis studies), and to avoid recall biases (which are a concern when using retrospective parent report methods), these prospective studies of infant siblings are more reliable than retrospective studies (Costanzo et al., 2015). In addition to permitting the observation of behaviour in a standardised way, prospective studies of infant siblings offer opportunities to collect behavioural, neurophysiological, and/or electrophysiological data.

Using these methods, researchers have found patterns in behavioural development by around the end of the first year of life that may be seen as early risk markers for ASD, such as less responsiveness when the infant's name is called, reduced joint attention, repetitive behaviours involving body movements and/or atypical use of objects, and atypical

emotional regulation (e.g. Elsabbagh et al., 2012b; Lazenby et al., 2016; Osterling, Dawson, & Munson, 2002; Ozonoff et al., 2010; Szatmari et al., 2016). Although the use of prospective design with infants at high-risk for ASD to study ASD characteristics is a relatively new methodology, results suggest that differences in brain function that later cause the behavioural characteristics of ASD may be detectable early in the first year of life, such as less selective neural responses to social stimuli (auditory and visual) than low-risk controls (Elsabbagh et al., 2012b; Lloyd-Fox et al., 2013). Given that a preference for IDS is observed among typically developing infants in the early months of life, and that evidence was found that this preference is not seen among many children with ASD, examining speech preference among infants at risk for ASD at a very young age is important. In one study comparing high-risk infant siblings to low-risk infant siblings at 6, 8, 12, and 18 months, it was found that neither group looked reliably longer at stimuli during IDS than adult-directed speech samples until the age of 18 months, at which timepoint each group looked longer at IDS stimuli, with no significant difference between the two groups (Droucker, Curtin, & Vouloumanos, 2013). However, the low-risk siblings showed a trend to look longer at IDS than adult-directed speech at 8 months that was not apparent at this age in the high-risk siblings. The low-risk group also showed higher expressive language scores at 18 months than the high-risk group, and this result correlated with preferences for IDS at 12 months. Because this study compared high-risk infants to low-risk infants without consideration of ASD symptoms or clinical outcomes in the high-risk infants, the question of whether early atypical preference patterns for IDS versus other auditory stimuli predicts later ASD was not answered. More directly relevant to this specific issue, is a study that addressed the question of whether atypical preferences for speech at 12 months are associated with ASD symptoms at 18 months (Curtin & Vouloumanos, 2013). At 12 months, high-risk infants were compared to low-risk infants on their preference for speech stimuli versus complex non-speech analogues of the speech stimuli. The infants in both groups looked longer at a visual stimulus (checkerboard) presented concurrently with speech than when the visual stimulus was presented concurrently with non-speech; however, the difference in looking time was significant only for the low-risk infants, and the high-risk infants were significantly more variable than low-risk infants in their looking time. A difference score was computed by subtracting looking during non-speech versus looking during speech as a speech preference index. Addressing the primary question of the study, the researchers found that the speech preference index at 12 months had a moderately strong correlation with ASD markers (measured with the Autism Observation Scale for Infants; Bryson, Zwaigenbaum, McDermott, Rombough, & Brian, 2008) at 18 months for the high-risk infants, but a near zero correlation for the low-risk infants. The high-risk group did not listen reliably longer to speech, and this group's atypical preference for speech was associated with autistic behaviours at 18 months. Findings from these two studies of infant siblings of children with ASD suggest that the atypical preferences related to IDS stimuli seen among children with ASD may arise in early development; however, because neither study considered definitive diagnostic outcomes for the children, the findings fall short of providing conclusive evidence regarding early atypical preferences related to IDS as a marker for later ASD diagnosis. Nevertheless, the two studies provide strong evidence that atypical preferences for other stimuli versus IDS predict deficits in later language development and social communication.

Discussion

Research shows that individuals with ASD are often more skilled than typically developing peers at low-level processing of auditory stimuli (i.e. pitch; Bonnel et al., 2010, 2003; Heaton, Hudry, et al., 2008; Heaton, Williams, Cummins, & Happé, 2008; Jones et al., 2009; O’Riordan & Passetti, 2006). By contrast, they often reveal impaired performance in tasks with more complex auditory stimuli such as speech, and/or in more difficult tasks involving processing of auditory stimuli (Dawson et al., 1998, 2004; Fujikawa-Brooks et al., 2010; Gervais et al., 2004; Källstrand et al., 2010; Kuhl et al., 2003; Lepistö et al., 2009; Teder-Salejarvi et al., 2005; Whitehouse & Bishop, 2008). Some studies also have found that individuals with ASD have an atypical preference for sounds; in particular, they do not show the expected preferences for IDS stimuli over other auditory stimuli (e.g. Kuhl et al., 2003; Paul et al., 2007). Furthermore, abnormalities in IDS processing were also characteristic of preschool children with ASD. Research related to the implications of these atypical IDS-related preferences for social-communicative development and ASD symptomatology has been growing in recent years, but it is still scarce.

Research about predictors of ASD has become promising. Retrospective studies that focused on parental reports and home videos were an important early method to gain insights into the early development of individuals with ASD, and to identify possible pre-clinical signs, indicators, or markers. More recently, these kinds of studies have been complemented with prospective studies. Prospective studies represent an approach of great potential because they allow the study of different variables and the control of experimental design. This information can improve the detection of early signs and the distinction of ASD from other developmental disorders early on development. Thus, prospective studies of infants at high-risk for ASD offer the opportunity to examine whether atypical preferences related to IDS aid in the prediction of clinical outcomes and underlie the challenges in the development of language and communication experienced by many high-risk infants.

This review provided some evidence of preference patterns involving IDS as a potential early marker of ASD and of language outcomes in preschool children and in infants at high-risk for this disorder. However, although group-level associations between IDS processing and later development are observed over time, outcomes for individual children vary widely. Existing research is inconsistent in findings related to the nature or extent of differences between low- and high-risk infants and has not clarified whether high-risk infants who go on to be diagnosed with ASD are different from other infants in their preferences for speech stimuli from early infancy, or whether these differences emerge gradually over the first years of life. Indeed, our overall understanding of the role of IDS as a predictive marker of risk for ASD is limited. Although the prospective studies with high-risk infant sibling samples have several advantages, recent research has also highlighted implications for the comparability of children with ASD ascertained from prospective high-risk samples versus other children with ASD. The high-risk group may display less severe ASD symptoms and better adaptive skills than children identified from the community, including those with no family history (Sacrey et al., 2017). Therefore, caution should be taken in generalising findings from high-risk samples versus other methods. In further research, these potential differences should be explored.

As it has been mentioned in the introduction, several theories have been proposed to explain differences between individuals with ASD when compared to typically developing peers. The implications of these theories for the understanding of why individuals with ASD orient less to speech compared to individuals without ASD could be explored in future research. According to the theories of perceptual functioning, the enhanced perception of low-level auditory features may be prejudicial to high-level processing, affecting the response to the categorical patterns that characterise IDS. However, the preference for IDS is independent of low level acoustics, because, for instance, Kuhl and colleagues (2005) tested auditory preference to IDS and non-speech analogues with the same pitch and amplitudes and found that children with ASD exhibit a listening preference for non-speech analogue signals. Thus, it would be reasonable to suggest that the social-cognitive aspects of IDS account for atypical speech preferences in children with ASD, and children at-risk for ASD. Future research should evaluate alternative predictions that different general theories would make related to patterns of preference for speech or IDS among infants at high-risk for ASD. In other words, understanding the relationship between IDS preference patterns and ASD could provide insights into the nature and aetiology of this disorder, as well as contribute to the early diagnosis of ASD.

Beyond understanding whether theories of ASD can explain group differences in speech preferences between children with ASD and those with other disabilities or typical development, there is increasing interest in the theoretical and clinical importance of understanding the factors behind the heterogeneity in outcomes among children with ASD.

Although findings to date suggest that IDS might play a crucial role in social-communicative learning, it is crucial to understand whether preferential listening to specific speech sounds in the first years of life may help to explain the impairments in social and language development. As highlighted by Costanzo and colleagues (2015), the longitudinal structure of prospective studies of high-risk infants not only contributes to our understanding of the onset of the disorder, but also of its developmental trajectory over time. Such evidence may inform the development of intervention programs for at-risk infants, designed to change atypical IDS preference patterns as a potential mediator of later (and better) language and social-communication outcomes.

Furthermore, as IDS could play a vital role in the way listeners react to speech, thus affecting language and communication development, knowing more about differences between clinical populations could help early and differential diagnosis with welcome clinical implications. This review suggests that, potentially, preference for IDS should be included in behavioural assessment and in screening questionnaires that assess behaviours in early development that suggest risk for ASD or other neurodevelopmental disorders (e.g. First Year Inventory, Baranek, Watson, Crais, & Reznick, 2003; Symbolic Behaviour Scales-Infant Toddler Checklist, Wetherby & Prizant, 2002).

Still, the explanation for differences in IDS processing among children with ASD versus other children remains unclear, as are the implications of these impairments for later social-communicative development. Future research can inform the field about the extent to which early preference patterns related to IDS stimuli account for variability in social-communication outcomes among those infants who go on to be diagnosed with ASD, extending the work of Kuhl and colleagues, (2005) by addressing within-group variability. More research is needed to address several limitations identified in the literature that constrain the generalisation power of the findings reported so far: (1) lack of accurate description of sample characteristics (e.g. age, sex, neurodevelopmental characteristics,

and adaptive behaviour); (2) small sample sizes; (3) no standard diagnostic instruments for diagnostic confirmation; and (4) lack of longitudinal and follow-up analyses. The impact of future research can be enhanced by considering alternative theories related to key questions that remain unanswered: What is the explanation for reduced orientation/attention to IDS in children with ASD compared to other children? What are the implications of these impairments for social and language development?

Declaration of interest

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Funding

This research was supported by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (SFRH/BPD/100696/2014; EXCL/MHC-LIN/0688/2012; PEst-OE/LIN/UI0214/2013).

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (Fifth ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Baranek, G. T., Watson, L. R., Crais, E., & Reznick, S. (2003). *First-Year Inventory (FYI) 2.0*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.
- Barbaro, J., & Dissanayake, C. (2009). Autism spectrum disorders in infancy and toddlerhood: a review of the evidence on early signs, early identification tools, and early diagnosis. *Journal of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics*, 5, 447–459.
- Baron-Cohen, S., Leslie, A., & Frith, U. (1985). Does the autistic child have a ‘theory of mind’? *Cognition*, 21, 37–46.
- Bertone, A., Mottron, L., Jelenic, P. P., & Faubert, J. (2005). Enhanced and diminished visuo-spatial information processing in autism depends on stimulus complexity. *Brain*, 128, 2430–2441.
- Boddaert, N., Chabane, N., Belin, P., Bourgeois, M., Royer, V., Barthelemy, C., ... Zilbovicius, M. (2004). Perception of complex sounds in autism: abnormal auditory cortical processing in children. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 161, 2117–2120.
- Bonnell, A., McAdams, S., Smith, B., Berthiaume, C., Bertone, A., Ciocca, V., ... Mottron, L. (2010). Enhanced pure-tone pitch discrimination among persons with autism but not Asperger syndrome. *Neuropsychologia*, 48(9), 2465–2475.
- Bonnell, A., Mottron, L., Peretz, I., Trudel, M., Gallun, E., & Bonnell, A. M. (2003). Enhanced pitch sensitivity in individuals with autism: a signal detection analysis. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 15(2), 226–235.
- Bryson, S. E., Zwaigenbaum, L., McDermott, C., Rombough, V., & Brian, J. (2008). The autism observation scale for infants: scale development and reliability data. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 38, 731–738.
- Butterfield, E. C., & Siperstein, G. N. (1970). Influence of contingent auditory stimulation upon non-nutritional suckle. In J. F. Bosma (Eds.), *Third symposium on oral sensation and perception: The mouth of the infant* (pp. 313–334). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Chasson, G. S., Harris, G. E., & Neely, W. J. (2007). Cost comparison of early intensive behavioral intervention and special education for children with autism. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 16, 401–413.
- Chevallier, C., Kohls, G., Troiani, V., Brodtkin, E. S., & Schultz, R. T. (2012). The social motivation theory of autism. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 16(4), 231–239.
- Cooper, R. P., & Aslin, R. N. (1990). Preference for infant-directed speech in the 1st month after birth. *Child Development*, 61(5), 1584–1595.

- Costanzo, V., Chericoni, N., Amendola, F. A., Casula, L., Muratori, F., Scattoni, M. L., & Apicella, F. (2015). Early detection of autism spectrum disorders: from retrospective home video studies to prospective 'high risk' sibling studies. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 55, 627–635.
- Cristia, A. (2013). Input to language: The phonetics of infant-directed speech. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 7(3), 157–170.
- Curtin, S., & Vouloumanos, A. (2013). Speech preference is associated with autistic-like behavior in 18-month-olds at risk for autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 43(9), 2114–2120.
- Dawson, G. (2008). Early behavioral intervention, brain plasticity, and the prevention of autism spectrum disorder. *Development and Psychopathology*, 20(3), 775–803.
- Dawson, G., Jones, E., Merkle, K., Venema, K., Lowy, R., Faja, S., ... Webb, S. J. (2012). Early behavioral intervention is associated with normalized brain activity in young children with autism. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent*, 51(11), 1150–1159.
- Dawson, G., Meltzoff, A. N., Osterling, J., Rinaldi, J., & Brown, E. (1998). Children with autism fail to orient to naturally occurring social stimuli. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 28(6), 479–485.
- Dawson, G., Toth, K., Abbott, R., Osterling, J., Munson, J., Estes, A., & Liaw, J. (2004). Early social attention impairments in autism: social orienting, joint attention, and attention to distress. *Developmental Psychology*, 40(2), 271–283.
- Dawson, G., Webb, S., & McIartland, J. (2005). Understanding the nature of face processing impairment in autism! Insights from behavioral and electrophysiological studies. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 27(3), 403–424.
- Droucker, D., Curtin, S., & Vouloumanos, A. (2013). Linking infant-directed speech and face preferences to language outcomes in infants at risk for autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 56(2), 567–576.
- Dunst, C. J., Gorman, E., & Hamby, D. W. (2012). Preference for infant-directed speech in preverbal young children. *Center for Early Literacy Learning*, 5(1), 1–13.
- Elsabbagh, M., Divan, G., Koh, Y. J., Kim, Y. S., Kauchali, S., Marcin, C., ... Fombonne, E. (2012a). Global prevalence of autism and other pervasive developmental disorders. *Autism Research*, 5, 160–179.
- Elsabbagh, M., Mercure, E., Hudry, K., Chandler, S., Pasco, G., Charman, T., ... Johnson, M. H. (2012b). Infant neural sensitivity to dynamic eye gaze is associated with later emerging autism. *Current Biology*, 22(4), 338–342.
- Fernald, A. (1985). Four-month-old infants prefer to listen to motherese. *Infant Behavior & Development*, 8(2), 181–195.
- Fernald, A. (1992). Human maternal vocalisations to infants as biologically relevant signals: An evolutionary perspective. In J. H. Barkow, L. Gosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.), *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture* (pp. 391–428). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fernald, A., & Mazzie, C. (1991). Prosody and focus in speech to infants and adults. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 209–221.
- Fernald, A., & Simon, T. (1984). Expanded intonation contours in mothers' speech to newborns. *Developmental Psychology*, 20, 104–113.
- Fine, J., Bartolucci, G., Ginsberg, G., & Szatmari, P. (1991). The use of intonation to communicate in pervasive developmental disorders. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 32(5), 771–782.
- Floccia, C., Keren-Portnoy, T., DePaolis, R., Duffy, H., Delle Luche, C., Durrant, S., ... Vihman, M. (2016). British English infants segment words only with exaggerated infant-directed speech stimuli. *Cognition*, 148, 1–9.
- Frith, U. (1989). *Autism: Explaining the enigma*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fujikawa-Brooks, S., Isenberg, A. L., Osann, K., Spence, M. A., & Gage, N. M. (2010). The effect of rate stress on the auditory brainstem response in autism: a preliminary report. *International Journal of Audiology*, 49(2), 129–140.
- Gervais, H., Belin, P., Boddaert, N., Leboyer, M., Coez, A., Sfaello, I., ... Zilbovicius, M. (2004). Abnormal cortical voice processing in autism. *Nature Neuroscience*, 7(8), 801–802.

- Grossman, R. B., Bemis, R. H., Plesa-Skwerer, D., & Tager-Flusberg, H. (2010). Lexical and affective prosody in children with high-functioning autism. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 53(3), 778–793.
- Happé, F., & Frith, U. (2006). The weak coherence account: Detail-focused cognitive style in autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 36(1), 5–25.
- Heaton, P. (2003). Pitch memory, labelling and disembedding in autism. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 44(4), 543–551.
- Heaton, P. (2005). Interval and contour processing in autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 35(6), 787–793.
- Heaton, P., Hermelin, B., & Pring, L. (1998). Autism and pitch processing: a precursor for savant musical ability? *Music Perception*, 15(3), 291–305.
- Heaton, P., Hudry, K., Ludlow, A., & Hill, E. (2008). Superior discrimination of speech pitch and its relationship to verbal ability in autism spectrum disorders. *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 25(6), 771–782.
- Heaton, P., Williams, K., Cummins, O., & Happé, F. (2008). Autism and pitch processing splinter skills. *Autism*, 12(2), 203–219.
- Hughes, C., & Russell, J. (1993). Autistic children's difficulty with mental disengagement from an object: its implications for theories of autism. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 498–510.
- Järvinen-Pasley, A., & Heaton, P. (2007). Evidence for reduced domain-specificity in auditory processing in autism. *Developmental Science*, 10(6), 786–793.
- Järvinen-Pasley, A., Pasley, J., & Heaton, P. (2008a). Is the linguistic content of speech less salient than its perceptual features in autism? *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 38(2), 239–248.
- Järvinen-Pasley, A., Wallace, G. L., Ramus, F., Happé, F., & Heaton, P. (2008b). Enhanced perceptual processing of speech in autism. *Developmental Science*, 11(1), 109–121.
- Jones, C. R., Happé, F., Baird, G., Simonoff, E., Marsden, A. J., Tregay, J., ... Charman, T. (2009). Auditory discrimination and auditory sensory behaviours in autism spectrum disorders. *Neuropsychologia*, 47(13), 2850–2858.
- Jones, E. J., Gliga, T., Bedford, R., Charman, T., & Johnson, M. H. (2014). Developmental pathways to autism: a review of prospective studies of infants at risk. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 39, 1–33.
- Källstrand, J., Olsson, O., Nehlstedt, S. F., Skold, M. L., & Nielzen, S. (2010). Abnormal auditory forward masking pattern in the brainstem response of individuals with Asperger syndrome. *Neuropsychiatry Disorders and Treatment*, 6, 289–296.
- Kanner, L. (1943). Autistic disturbances of affective contact. *Nervous Child*, 2, 217–250.
- 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.
- Kaplan, P. S., Jung, P. C., Ryther, J. S., & Zarlengo-Strouse, P. (1996). Infant-directed versus adult-directed speech as signals for faces. *Developmental Psychology*, 32(5), 880–891.
- Klin, A. (1991). Young autistic children's listening preferences in regard to speech: A possible characterization of the symptom of social withdrawal. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 21(1), 29–42.
- Kubicek, C., Gervain, J., Hillairet De Boisferon, A., Pascalis, O., Lœvenbruck, H., & Schwarzer, G. (2014). The influence of infant-directed speech on 12-month-olds' intersensory perception of fluent speech. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 37(4), 644–651.
- Kuhl, P. K. (2007). Is speech learning 'gated' by the social brain? *Developmental Science*, 10(1), 110–120.
- Kuhl, P. K., Coffey-Corina, S., Padden, D., & Dawson, G. (2005). Links between social and linguistic processing of speech in preschool children with autism: behavioral and electrophysiological measures. *Developmental Science*, 8(1), F1–F12.
- Kuhl, P. K., & Rivera-Gaxiola, M. (2008). Neural substrates of language acquisition. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 31, 511–534.

- Kuhl, P. K., Tsao, F.-M., & Liu, H.-M. (2003). Foreign-language experience in infancy: effects of short-term exposure and social interaction on phonetic learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100, 9096–9101.
- Lazenby, D., Sideridis, G., Huntington, N., Prante, M., Dale, P., Curtin, S., ... Tager-Flusberg, H. (2016). Language differences at 12 months in infants who develop autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 46(3), 899–909.
- Lepistö, T., Kuitunen, A., Sussman, E., Saalasti, S., Jansson-Verkasalo, E., Nieminen, W., & Kujala, T. (2009). Auditory stream segregation in children with Asperger syndrome. *Biological Psychology*, 82(3), 301–307.
- Lloyd-Fox, S., Blasi, A., Elwell, C. E., Charman, T., Murphy, D., & Johnson, M. H. (2013). Reduced neural sensitivity to social stimuli in infants at risk for autism. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 280(1758), 20123026.
- McRoberts, G. W., McDonough, C., & Lakusta, L. (2009). The role of verbal repetition in the development of infant speech preferences between 4 and 14 months. *Infancy*, 14(2), 162–194.
- Morgan, J. L., & Demuth, K. (1996). Signal to Syntax: An overview. In J. L. Morgan & K. Demuth (Eds.), *Signal to syntax: Bootstrapping from speech to grammar in early acquisition* (pp. 1–22). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Mottron, L., Dawson, M., Soulières, I., Hubert, B., & Burack, J. (2006). Enhanced perceptual functioning in autism: an update, and eight principles of autistic perception. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 36(1), 27–43.
- Mottron, L., Peretz, I., Belleville, S., & Rouleau, N. (1999). Absolute pitch in autism: a case-study. *Neurocase*, 5, 485–501.
- Newport, E., Gleitman, H., & Gleitman, L. (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, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Connor, K. (2012). Auditory processing in autism spectrum disorder: a review. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 36(2), 836–854.
- O'Riordan, M., & Passetti, F. (2006). Discrimination in autism within different sensory modalities. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 36(5), 665–675.
- Osterling, J. A., Dawson, G., & Munson, J. A. (2002). Early recognition of 1-year-old infants with autism spectrum disorder versus mental retardation. *Development and Psychopathology*, 14(2), 239–251.
- Ozonoff, S., Iosif, A. M., Baguio, F., Cook, I. C., Hill, M. M., Hutman, T., ... Young, G. S. (2010). A prospective study of the emergence of early behavioral signs of autism. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 49(3), 256–266.
- Ozonoff, S., Rogers, S., Farnham, J., & Pennington, B. (1994). Can standard measures identify subclinical markers of autism? *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 23, 429–441.
- Ozonoff, S., Young, G. S., Carter, A., Messinger, D., Yirmiya, N., Zwaigenbaum, L., ... Stone, W. L. (2011). Recurrence risk for autism spectrum disorders: a baby siblings research consortium study. *Pediatrics*, 128(3), e488–495.
- Paul, R., Augustyn, A., Klin, A., & Volkmar, F. R. (2005). Perception and production of prosody by speakers with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 35(2), 205–220.
- Paul, R., Chawarska, K., Fowler, C., Cicchetti, D., & Volkmar, F. (2007). Listen my children and you shall hear: Auditory preferences in toddlers with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 50, 1350–1364.
- Pennington, B. F., Rogers, S., Bennetto, L., Griffith, E., Reed, D., & Shyu, V. (1997). Validity test of the executive dysfunction hypothesis of autism. In J. Russell (Ed.), *Executive functioning in autism* (pp. 143–178). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Peppé, S., Cleland, J., Gibbon, F., O'Hare, A., & Martínez-Castilla, P. (2011). Expressive prosody in children with autism spectrum conditions. *Journal of Neurolinguistics*, 24, 41–53.
- Peppé, S., McCann, J., Gibbon, F., O'Hare, A., & Rutherford, M. (2007). Receptive and expressive prosodic ability in children with high-functioning autism. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 50, 1015–1028.

- Rajendran, G., & Mitchell, P. (2007). Cognitive theories of autism. *Developmental Review*, 27, 224–260.
- Rutherford, M. D., Baron-Cohen, S., & Wheelwright, S. (2002). Reading the mind in the voice: a study with normal adults and adults with Asperger syndrome and high functioning autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 32(3), 189–194.
- Sacre, L. R., Zwaigenbaum, L., Szatmari, P., Bryson, S., Georgiades, S., Brian, J., Smith, I. M., Vaillancourt, T., Garon, N., Roncadin, C., & Elsabbagh, M. (2017). Brief Report: characteristics of preschool children with ASD vary by ascertainment. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 47(5), 1542–1550.
- Saffran, J. R., Aslin, R. N., & Newport, E. L. (1996). Statistical learning by 8-month-olds. *Science*, 274, 1926–1928.
- Samson, F., Mottron, L., Jemel, B., Belin, P., & Ciocca, V. (2006). Can spectro-temporal complexity explain the autistic pattern of performance on auditory tasks? *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 36(1), 65–76.
- Schachner, A., & Hannon, E. E. (2011). Infant-directed speech drives social preferences in 5-month-old infants. *Developmental Psychology*, 47(1), 19–25.
- Snow, C. E., & Ferguson, C. A. (1977). *Talking to children: Language input and acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Song, J. Y., Demuth, K., & Morgan, J. L. (2010). Effects of the acoustic properties of infant-directed speech on infant word recognition. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 128(1), 389–400.
- Szatmari, P., Chawarska, K., Dawson, G., Georgiades, S., Landa, R., Lord, C., ... Halladay, A. (2016). Prospective longitudinal studies of infant siblings of children with autism: lessons learned and future directions. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 55(3), 179–187.
- Teder-Salejari, W. A., Pierce, K. L., Courchesne, E., & Hillyard, S. A. (2005). Auditory spatial localization and attention deficits in autistic adults. *Brain Research: Cognitive Brain Research*, 23 (2–3), 221–234.
- Thiessen, E. D., Hill, E. A., & Saffran, J. R. (2005). Infant-directed speech facilitates word segmentation. *Infancy*, 7, 53–71.
- Tsao, F., Liu, H., & Kuhl, P. (2004). Speech perception in infancy predicts language development in the second year of life: a longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 75(4), 1067–1084.
- Valenza, E., Simion, F., Cassia, V. M., & Umiltà, C. (1996). Face preference at birth. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 22(4), 892–903.
- Vouloumanos, A., Kiehl, K. A., Werker, J. F., & Liddle, P. F. (2001). Detection of sounds in the auditory stream: event-related fMRI evidence for differential activation to speech and nonspeech. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 13(7), 994–1005.
- Vouloumanos, A., & Werker, J. F. (2007). Listening to language at birth: evidence for a bias for speech in neonates. *Developmental Science*, 10(2), 159–164.
- Wan, M. W., Green, J., Elsabbagh, M., Johnson, M., Charman, T., & Plummer, F. (2013). Quality of interaction between at-risk infants and caregiver at 12–15 months is associated with 3-year autism outcomes. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 54(7), 763–771.
- Watson, L. R., Baranek, G. T., Roberts, J. E., David, F. J., & Perryman, T. Y. (2010). Behavioral and physiological responses to child-directed speech as predictors of communication outcomes in children with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 53, 1052–1064.
- Watson, L. R., Roberts, J. E., Baranek, G. T., Mandulak, K. C., & Dalton, J. C. (2012). Behavioral and physiological responses to child-directed speech of children with autism spectrum disorders or typical development. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 42(8), 1616–1629.
- Weisleder, A., & Fernald, A. (2013). Talking to children matters: early language experience strengthens processing and builds vocabulary. *Psychological Science*, 24, 2143–2152.
- Werker, J. F., Pegg, J. E., & McLeod, P. J. (1994). A cross-language investigation of infant preference for infant-directed communication. *Infant Behavior & Development*, 17(3), 323–333.
- Wetherby, A. M., & Prizant, B. (2002). *Communication and symbolic behavior scales developmental profile—first normed edition*. Baltimore: Brookes.

- Whitehouse, A. J., & Bishop, D. V. (2008). Do children with autism 'switch off' to speech sounds? An investigation using event-related potentials. *Developmental Science*, 11(4), 516–524.
- Yirmiya, N., & Charman, T. (2010). The prodrome of autism: early behavioral and biological signs, regression, peri- and post-natal development and genetics. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 51(4), 432–458.
- Young, R. L., & Nettelbeck, T. (1995). The abilities of a musical savant and his family. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 25(3), 231–248.
- Zangl, R., & Mills, D. L. (2007). Increased brain activity to infant versus adult directed speech in 6- and 13-month olds. *Infancy*, 11(1), 31–62.
- Zimmerman, D. L., Ownsworth, T., O'Donovan, A., Roberts, J., & Gullo, M. J. (2016). Independence of hot and cold executive function deficits in high-functioning adults with Autism Spectrum Disorder. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, 10, 24.