Exploring variation in infants' preference for infant-directed speech: Evidence from a

multi-site study in Africa

Angeline Sin Mei Tsui[1], Alexandra Carstensen[1], George Kachergis[1], Amina Abubakar[2],

Mulat Asnake[3], Oumar Barry[4], Dana M. Basnight-Brown[5], Dangkat Bentu[6], Christina

Bergmann[7], Evans Binan Dami[6], Natalie Boll-Avetisyan[8], Marguerite de Jongh[9], Yatma

Diop[10], Reginald Akuoko Duah[11], Esther Herrmann[12], Chaning Jang[13], Simon Kizito[14],

Tilinao Lamba[15], Limbika Maliwichi-Senganimalunje[15], Joyce Marangu[2], Maya Mathur[1],

Catherine V. Mbagaya[16], Demeke Mekonnen Mengistie[17], Carmen Milton[9], Febronie

Mushimiyimana[18], Mikateko Ndhambi[9], Irene Ngina[13], Eunice Njoroge[2], Paul Odhiambo

Oburu[16], Asana Okocha[19], Paul Okyere Omane[8], Anisha Singh[13], Andrew S. Ssemata[14],

Juliette Unyuzumutima[18], Henriette Zeidler[20], Casey Lew-Williams[19], & Michael C. Frank[1]

[1] Stanford University

[2] Institute for Human Development, Aga Khan University, Kenya

[3] Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

[4] Cheikh Anta Diop University - Dakar, Senegal

[5] United States International University-Africa, Kenya

[6] University of Jos, Nigeria

[7] Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics, The Netherlands

[8] University of Potsdam, Germany

[9] Sefako Makgatho Health Sciences University, South Africa

[10] Michigan State University, USA

[11] Humboldt-Universität, Berlin and University of Ghana, Legon

[12] University of Portsmouth, UK

[13] Busara Center for Behavioral Economics, Kenya

[14] Makerere University, Uganda

[15] University of Malawi, Chancellor College, Zomba, Malawi

[16] Maseno University, Kenya

[17] St. Peter Specialized Hospital, Ethiopia

[18] University Teaching Hospital of Kigali, Rwanda

[19] Princeton University, USA

[20] Aston University, UK & University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Author Note

Abstract

Infants show a preference for infant-directed speech (IDS) over adult-directed speech (ADS). This preference has been linked to infants' language processing and word learning in experimental settings, and also correlates with later language outcomes. Recently, the cross-cultural consistency of infants' IDS preference has been confirmed by large-scale, multisite replication studies, but conclusions from these studies were primarily based on participants from North America and Europe. The current study addressed this sampling bias via a large-scale, multisite study of infants (3-15 months) across communities in Africa. We investigated whether participants showed a preference for IDS over ADS, and if so, whether the magnitude of their preference differs from effects documented in other populations of infants. Across six sites (total N = 200), we observed a preference for IDS over ADS, with no signficant difference between African infants in this study and a method-matched subsample of infants from prior studies of IDS preference. This study provides new evidence on the generalizability of IDS preference and looking-time methods more broadly, while also highlighting some of the challenges of global big team science.

Keywords: infant-directed speech; reproducibility; Africa; infants; generalizability

Word count: XYZ

Exploring variation in infants' preference for infant-directed speech: Evidence from a

multi-site study in Africa

Adults often speak to infants differently than to other adults, using a speech register known as infant-directed speech (IDS). Infant-directed speech tends to have exaggerated prosodic characteristics, including higher pitch, greater pitch variation, longer pauses, simplified grammatical structure, and shorter and slower utterances as compared to adult-directed speech (ADS; e.g. Fernald et al., 1989; Trainor & Desjardins, 2002). Even very young infants from a variety of language backgrounds have a preference for listening to IDS over ADS (Cooper, Abraham, Berman, & Staska, 1997; Cooper & Aslin, 1994; Fernald, 1985; Hayashi, Tamekawa, & Kiritani, 2001; Kitamura & Lam, 2009; Newman & Hussain, 2006; Pegg, Werker, & McLeod, 1992; Santesso, Schmidt, & Trainor, 2007; Singh, Morgan, & Best, 2002; Werker & McLeod, 1989). Infants' preference for IDS over ADS has also been demonstrated in a meta-analysis; across 34 studies, IDS preference had a fairly large average effect size with a value of Cohen's d 0.72 (Dunst, Gorman, & Hamby, 2012).

Why do infants prefer IDS? Perhaps IDS is intrinsically salient to infants because of its perceptual characteristics (e.g., higher pitch, greater pitch variability). Or perhaps, as infants are exposed to IDS, familiarity leads to preference. These explanations have different developmental predictions: while the intrinsic view would suggest an early preference (e.g., Cooper & Aslin, 1990), the exposure account would predict developmental increases in preference. Further, these explanations are not mutually exclusive: infants' early preference for IDS may motivate their parents to use more IDS, which in turn could lead infants to show a stronger IDS preference. Regardless of its origins, infants' preference for IDS may benefit their early language development. For example, in experimental studies, infants can segment words better in fluent speech produced in IDS than ADS (Thiessen, Hill, & Saffran, 2005), show better recognition of words introduced in IDS after a 24-hour delay (Singh, Nestor, Parikh, & Yull, 2009), and more successfully learn words

78 from IDS than ADS (Graf Estes & Hurley, 2013).

79   Further evidence comes from correlational studies, which have found that the amount

80 of IDS in the language environment is positively related to children's language outcomes,

81 such as vocabulary size (e.g., Ramírez-Esparza, García-Sierra, & Kuhl, 2014; L. A.

82 Shneidman & Goldin-Meadow, 2012; L. Shneidman, Arroyo, Levine, & Goldin-Meadow,

83 2013; but cf., Casillas, Brown, & Levinson, 2020; Casillas, Brown, & Levinson, 2021,who

84 found similar timing of language development milestones even in a population that hears

85 very limited IDS). Together, this work suggests that infants' preference for IDS over ADS

86 may support their language development, which explains why infants' IDS preference

87 continues to be an important topic in the literature on early childhood.

88   However, it is important to note that almost all prior studies, including the

89 meta-analysis by Dunst et al. (2012) have included mainly infants learning English in

90 Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic (WEIRD) societies (Henrich,

91 Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010), with only a few studies extended to non-Western infant

92 populations learning languages other than English (Hayashi et al., 2001; Werker, Pegg, &

93 McLeod, 1994). As such, there is a large sampling bias in the existing data about infants'

94 preference for IDS, as in many other research topics in developmental psychology (see

95 Nielsen, Haun, Kärtner, & Legare, 2017). This sampling bias is a problem for generalizing

96 findings about infants' IDS preference to infants growing up in different cultures and

97 learning different languages. In light of this generalizability issue – as well as the recent

98 replication crisis in psychology (e.g., Open Science Collaboration, 2015) – infant

99 researchers have begun to collaborate on large-scale, multi-site studies to replicate key

100 developmental findings (Frank et al., 2017).

101   One of these multi-site projects investigated infants' preference for IDS over ADS: the

102 ManyBabies1 study (MB1; ManyBabies Consortium, 2020). MB1 collected monolingual

103 data from 67 laboratories, with a total sample of 2329 monolingual infants 3 – 15 months

old. The protocol for this experiment was simple: infants listened to alternating audio clips of IDS and ADS while viewing an uninformative visual stimulus (a colored checkerboard). Their looking time was measured over the course of up to 16 trials, 18s each in length (8 IDS and 8 ADS). Notably, all participants in the study listened to stimuli that were constructed from naturalistic speech by North American mothers (speaking either to another adult or to their own infant). The mismatch between the stimuli and the native language of many infants in the study allowed inferences about native language effects and also minimized variability due to differences in the stimuli (a follow-up project now in progress seeks to measure native-language preferences in a subset of MB1 labs). Overall, older infants showed a stronger preference for IDS than younger infants. There was also an effect of infants' language backgrounds: North American infants exhibited a stronger IDS preference than infants who were not exposed to North American English (NAE). Although infants' ages and language backgrounds affected the magnitude of IDS preference, essentially all groups of infants preferred NAE IDS over ADS.

Despite the breadth of its sample relative to previous work, the MB1 study still constitutes a biased sample of infant populations in the world. Most of the data in MB1 were contributed by laboratories in economically-advantaged areas, accessing relatively high socio-economic status participant populations. Further, although this large-scale study had a diverse sample from 17 countries, 60 out of the 67 participating laboratories were from Europe and North America, only a handful of laboratories were from Australia and Asia, and none were from Africa or South America. Thus, the sample studied in MB1 came almost exclusively from Western, educated, affluent populations who heard Indo-European languages, limiting the generalizability of the findings to infants growing up in other cultural and linguistic contexts. This lack of evidence on generalizability of a key finding about infants' preference restricts our ability to build robust developmental theories of language learning across cultural contexts. Our current study takes a step towards addressing this gap.

131   We investigate whether infants growing up in a variety of African cultures show an

132 IDS preference, using the paradigm developed by the MB1 study. Our study has both a

133 theoretical goal and a practical goal. Theoretically, we are interested in whether IDS

134 preference is a culturally and linguistically invariant developmental pattern (Nielsen et al.,

135 2017). The inclusion of infants across many African cultures (who are acquiring many

136 different languages, see Table 1) provides an important test of generalizability of the IDS

137 preference. Practically, increasing sample diversity also promotes diversity among

138 researchers engaged in developmental science and hopefully increasing exchanges between

139 researchers across cultures. Thus, one goal of our study is building research networks to

140 facilitate further studies with the communities represented in the current study.

141   Our study builds on a foundation of prior descriptive work investigating the

142 generality of IDS across cultures. Although this work has investigated a variety of different

143 cultures and languages, it can be (and often is) crudely summarized via the distinction

144 between WEIRD and non-WEIRD cultures discussed above. We follow this convention

145 here without endorsing this distinction as necessarily being meaningful in the context of

146 our study, as IDS in WEIRD and non-WEIRD cultures shares similar prosodic properties.

147 For example, Broesch and Bryant (2015) reported that IDS produced by North-American

148 mothers, as well as by Kenyan and Fijian mothers, is produced with higher pitch, greater

149 pitch variation, and is spoken at a slower rate than ADS. This finding is consistent with

150 past work reporting that IDS shares some common exaggerated prosodic features (e.g.,

151 higher pitch, larger pitch variation) across diverse languages, which include French, Italian,

152 German, Japanese, British English, American English (Fernald et al., 1989), Mandarin

153 Chinese (Grieser & Kuhl, 1988), Thai, Australian English (Kitamura, Thanavishuth,

154 Burnham, & Luksaneeyanawin, 2001), Arabic (Farran, Lee, Yoo, & Oller, 2016).

155   IDS can also be recognized as being infant-directed by listeners from non-WEIRD

156 cultures. Bryant, Liénard, and Clark Barrett (2012) reported that Turkanan adults in

157 Kenya can discriminate between NAE IDS and ADS (see similar results in Bryant &

Barrett, 2007 for Shuar hunter horticulturists from Amazonian Ecuador). These studies are consistent with findings from the MB1 studies showing that children who are not learning NAE, including children from Singapore and Korea, nonetheless show a preference for NAE IDS over ADS. Taken together, the common acoustic properties of IDS across different languages, and how NAE IDS can be recognized by non-native participants, raise the possibility of infants' IDS preference over ADS being quite consistent across different cultures and languages. However, it is possible that the strength of this preference will nonetheless be influenced by similarity between the test language (English) and the language(s) that each infant is learning, which could bolster the measured preferences to the extent that test and native language are similar (as in the case of infants learning other Indo-European languages with similar phonetic and acoustic properties). If this is the case, we expect that phylogenetic similarity between Indo-European languages and our stimuli would lead to comparable or stronger observed IDS preferences in samples of infants learning Indo-European languages than those learning languages in other families (e.g., Bantu, the language family we expect to be most prevalent in our sample).

Despite evidence for general recognition of and preference for IDS across cultures, the strength of IDS preferences is likely modulated by exposure. Exposure to IDS in the home environment varies widely both within and between cultures (Casillas et al., 2020, 2021; Cristia, Dupoux, Gurven, & Stieglitz, 2019; LeVine, 1994; L. A. Shneidman & Goldin-Meadow, 2012; Vogt, Mastin, & Schots, 2015). Differences in IDS quantity have also been hypothesized to reflect differences in child-rearing practices across cultures. For example, direct verbal interaction between parents and infants can be rare in some societies (Heath, 1983; LeVine, 1994; LeVine & LeVine, 2016; Schneidman & Goldin-Meadow, 2012; Weber, Fernald, & Diop, 2017). Children in these societies – which are typically non-WEIRD, though certainly not all non-WEIRD societies can be characterized this way – are often expected to learn through observation and participation according to their skill levels (see Legare, 2019, for a review). Thus, infants and young children in such societies

185 may hear less IDS directly from their caregivers than those in WEIRD societies in which

186 the norm involves a greater degree of direct address to parents. Of course, variation is also

187 present within as well as across cultures. Within-culture variation has primarily been

188 studied in North American contexts, where children from higher socioeconomic status

189 (SES) families tend to hear more IDS than children from lower SES families (e.g., Hart &

190 Risley, 1995; Hoff, 2006a; Huttenlocher, Waterfall, Vasilyeva, Vevea, & Hedges, 2010;

191 Rowe, 2012; Schneidman & Goldin-Meadow, 2012; Weisleder & Fernald, 2013).

192   By virtue of our broad sample of African cultures, we expect that our study will

193 likely capture substantial cultural variation in the average amount of IDS in children's

194 environments. The African sites we sample vary widely in their degree of urbanization,

195 their culture, their parenting values, and the average resources available in children's home

196 environments – all of which have been argued to be meaningful dimensions governing

197 children's early linguistic environment. For example, Keller (2012) suggested three

198 prototypical cultural environments for children based on the degree of urbanization of the

199 families in Western and non-Western societies. In this framework, in Western middle-class

200 urban societies, highly educated parents generally aim to help children develop individual

201 psychological autonomy. In contrast, in non-Western rural subsistence-based societies,

202 parents generally aim to help children develop communal action autonomy, so that children

203 have a strong sense of social responsibility and can contribute to the economic functioning

204 of the family (e.g., farming). Importantly, non-Western middle-class urban societies are a

205 hybrid of non-Western, rural and Western, urban societies, where parents generally want

206 their children to develop more individual autonomy but also emphasize the importance of

207 social responsibility in a large family. Broadly speaking, we expect that the African

208 families in our study will be from the non-Western, urban and non-Western, rural groups

209 in this taxonomy (see Table 1).

210   The confirmatory analyses of our study are designed to test whether there are

211 differences in the magnitude of IDS preferences measured in this sample and in the prior

²¹² samples of MB1. Although the average IDS production in the African sites we examine is

²¹³ unknown, consistent differences along this dimension might plausibly lead to variation in

²¹⁴ the magnitude of IDS preferences between our current study and MB1. In addition, our

²¹⁵ exploratory analyses will attempt to understand whether variation in IDS preference

²¹⁶ among infants in our sample of African cultures is explained by demographic proxies

²¹⁷ related to this taxonomy (e.g., urbanization and/or socioeconomic status). Finally, we will

²¹⁸ use an exploratory measure of subjective IDS use as a proxy of IDS quantity within

²¹⁹ families to probe links between parent reported IDS use and infant preference.

²²⁰   Since multilingualism is common in Africa (e.g., Posel & Zeller, 2016; Rosenhouse &

²²¹ Goral, 2004), many African children begin learning two or more different languages during

²²² infancy. Will early multilingualism alter infants' preferences for IDS? The

²²³ ManyBabies1-Bilingual (MB1B) study provides some evidence that bilingual infants showed

²²⁴ a similar preference for NAE IDS when compared to monolingual infants (Byers-Heinlein et

²²⁵ al., 2021). MB1B examined bilingual infants' preference for NAE IDS at 6 to 9 months and

²²⁶ 12 to 15 months and found that bilingual and monolingual infants did not differ in terms of

²²⁷ the magnitude of their IDS preferences. MB1B also found similar results to MB1, that

²²⁸ older bilingual infants and those bilinguals with higher exposure to NAE show stronger

²²⁹ IDS preference. However, as in the MB1 study, data collected in MB1B mainly came from

²³⁰ laboratories in WEIRD areas, such as North America and Europe, with no laboratories

²³¹ from Africa, so the same caveats of generalizability apply to MB1B as to MB1. Thus, in

²³² the current study, we will include both monolingual and multilingual infants, allowing us to

²³³ assess the generalizability of MB1B's conclusions to our samples in Africa.

²³⁴   In sum, there are three primary (confirmatory) goals for the current study. First, we

²³⁵ aim to measure infants' preference for North-American English IDS across a range of

²³⁶ cultural and linguistic contexts in Africa. Second, we seek to measure developmental

²³⁷ changes in this preference. As we found that older infants show stronger IDS preferences

²³⁸ than younger infants in both MB1 and MB1B, we will evaluate whether participants in our

Table 1

Test locations, participant ages, and languages by country

Country	Test location	Target age	Test language(s)
Ghana	University of Ghana, Accra	3–9 months	Akan, Ga, Ewe
Kenya	Nanyuki	9–15 months	Kikuyu, Kiswahili, English
Malawi	University of Malawi – Chancellor College, Zomba	6–15 months	Chichewa, English, or both
Nigeria	University of Jos, Plateau	3–15 months	Hausa, English, Birom, Ngas
Rwanda	Kigali	6–15 months	Kinyarwanda
Senegal	Dakar	3–15 months	French, Wolof
South Africa	Pretoria	3–15 months	Setswana, Xitsonga
Uganda	Makerere University, Kampala	3–15 months	Luganda, English

study show the same developmental increases in IDS preference. Finally, we will investigate whether there are differences in IDS preferences between infants in Africa in our study and those in Europe and Asia in MB1 and MB1B. As an exploratory aim, we also will examine relationships between parents' demographics, their responses to survey items regarding subjective use of IDS, and their child's IDS preference.

Methods

All deviations from the preregistration in the Stage 1 Registered Report are given in Appendix A.

Participation Details

²⁴⁷

Time-frame.   On July 23, 2018, we issued an open call for participation by African researchers via listservs and social/professional networks. Prior to submission, 11 labs committed to data collection, but some labs were unable to collect data, in part due to changing professional obligations and delays due to Covid-19 closures. Thus, we report data from 8 labs (See Table 1 for target sample characteristics of each site). Our participating laboratories will recruit infants living in eastern (e.g., Kenya), western (e.g., Senegal) and southern (e.g., South Africa) regions of Africa. We also note that many of our participating laboratories are located in East Africa, thus East African participants are disproportionately represented in our sample. Data collection began September 21, 2021. We initially anticipated finishing data collection a year later, but labs encountered a wide variety of unforeseen circumstances due to the COVID-19 pandemic, challenges with receiving IRB approval, and equipment and staffing issues. Thus, data collection was extended through 2023.

Age distribution.   Each participating laboratory was asked to recruit participants in two age bins: 3;0 – 9;0 and 9;1 – 15;0 months. Similar to MB1, each laboratory was asked to collect data spanning the age bin window, but aiming for the mean of the age bin.

Sample size determination.   We estimated the effect size of infants' IDS preference on the basis of the data from MB1. We used data from laboratories in MB1 that used the single-screen central visual-fixation preference procedure (which we also use here: see below) and that tested infants with no exposure to North American English (similar to our population of interest). In a mixed-effects model, we examined the effect of test trial type (IDS vs. ADS) on infants' looking time (log-transformed seconds), while controlling for normally-distributed random intercepts by infant and laboratory. The intercept, representing infants' average log-looking time across ADS trials, was 1.91; the variances of the random intercepts were 0.074 and 0.022 at the infant and laboratory levels respectively.

The fixed-effect coefficient representing infants' preference for IDS over ADS was 0.080 and the residual variance was 0.33.

In the first power analysis, we simulated datasets based on the above coefficient estimates and variances. Using the simr package in R (Green & MacLeod, 2016), we ran a power analysis for a mixed-effect analysis with the above-mentioned simulated datasets (number of simulations = 1000). We were uncertain exactly how many labs to assume but settled on 10, given the likelihood of some later signups as well as some lab attrition. Assuming that we had 240 infants across 10 laboratories in each simulated dataset and an alpha level of 0.05, we found that the average power was 99.40% [95% confidence interval: 98.70% – 99.78%] to detect the fixed ADS vs. IDS coefficient of 0.08. This first power analysis was based on very small random-effect variances estimated from MB1 and MB1B datasets. Given that most of the laboratories that participated in MB1 and MB1B had more resources and more extensive experience in running infancy studies in comparison to the participating laboratories in Africa, we planned for potentially higher variances in the data collected in the current project. Thus, we ran a conservative second power analysis by doubling the values of the random intercept and residual variances reported in the datasets from MB1 and MB1B, while holding constant the intercept and the fixed-effect coefficient representing infants' preference for IDS over ADS. With larger variances, the average power estimate dropped to 87.20% [95% confidence interval: 84.97% – 89.21%] for a total sample of 240 infants. The power analysis can be found at https://osf.io/jgr79.

Given that MB1 reported around 15% data excluded in the final analysis, we expect the exclusion rate for our project is around 15% to 20%. Thus, each laboratory agreed to contribute a minimum of 32 infants (16 infants in each age bin), including infants tested but excluded for reasons not related to the demographic and age inclusion criteria (e.g., fussiness). Further, we encouraged each laboratory to contribute additional data beyond that minimum. We propose that our projected sample size of 352 would have sufficient power, as 80% of this sample size exceeds our targeted final sample size (n = 240) based on

300 the power analysis described above.

301   **Ethics.**   All laboratories collected data under their own independent IRB protocol.
302 Videos of individual infant participants during the experiment were recorded and stored at
303 each laboratory. However, these videos were not shared with the central data analysis team.
304 Laboratories were instead asked to only submit de-identified data for central data analyses.

Exclusion Criteria

306   All data collected for the study (i.e., every infant for whom a data file was generated,
307 regardless of how many trials were completed) were uploaded to a central database for data
308 analysis. Every laboratory followed the protocol to report any infants who were tested in
309 this study, including those who were excluded from the analysis. Furthermore, each
310 laboratory followed the protocol to make note of the reasons that infants were excluded
311 from the study.

312   Typically, participants were only included in the analysis if they met all of the
313 criteria below. However, we allowed parents to choose not to answer some of the questions
314 (e.g., about full-term gestation and developmental disorders) because disclosures might
315 violate cultural norms in some areas of Africa. Thus, participating laboratories may have
316 included infants who did not fully meet the inclusion criteria defined here:

317   **Full-term.**   We defined full term as gestation times greater than or equal to 37
318 weeks. 11 (4.01%) of infants tested did not meet this criterion, and were excluded from
319 further analysis. To maximize parents' comfort in participating in the experiment, they
320 were given the option of not responding to questions about gestation.

321   **No developmental disorders or hearing loss.**   We excluded infants with
322 parent-reported developmental disorders (e.g., chromosomal abnormalities, etc.) or
323 diagnosed hearing impairments. Developmental disorders and delays are stigmatized in
324 some cultures in Africa (e.g., negative attitudes towards children with disorders or delays),

therefore some parents may decline to answer the question about children's developmental disorders. In this case, we still tested the infants and included the infants' data in the analysis. This inclusion criterion was chosen to allow us to retain as much data as possible while ensuring our questionnaire accommodates cultural norms. Further, we noted that only 2 participants (i.e. less than 0.1%) in MB1 were excluded based on parents' report of developmental disorders. Accordingly, we do not expect that including children whose parents decline to answer this question will lead to an inclusion of large numbers of children with developmental disorders that could potentially skew the results in the study. 4 (1.46%) of the infants tested did not meet this criterion. (We did not plan exclusions based on self-reported ear infections unless parents reported medically-confirmed hearing loss.)

Trial-level and session-level errors. Following MB1 and MB1B, we adopted a relatively liberal inclusion criterion for this study. To be included in the study, a child must have contributed non-zero looking time on at least one pair of test trials (i.e., one trial each of IDS and ADS from a particular stimulus pair). We asked laboratories to identify two different types of errors when uploading their data: trial-level errors and session-level errors. Trial-level exclusions were based on whether we could use infants' data from a particular test trial. For example, if an infant only completed the first six test trials of the experiment, we entered this infant's data from the first six trials and discarded data from all other trials. In this case, laboratories would identify this infant's data from the first to sixth trials as "no trial errors" and any trials from the seventh trial onwards would be identified as "trial errors". In contrast, session-level errors were errors that occurred when running a particular participant. This type of error is different from the trial-level error exclusions because it indicates that errors occurred which affected an entire session (e.g., failure to save data in the experiment). If a laboratory indicated a session-level error for a particular infant, all data from this infant was excluded from the analysis. In sum, infants who can contribute at least one pair of test trials (i.e., one IDS trial and one ADS trial) would have some data excluded at the trial level whereas infants who cannot contribute

Table 2

Final sample's demographics and language background by country. Mean age in months.

Country	N	Mean Age (SD)	Sex	Language background
Ghana	32	8.66 (3.72)	F: 17; M: 15	Monolingual: 3; Bilingual: 8; Other: 21
Kenya	27	11.14 (2.88)	F: 15; M: 12	Monolingual: 17; Bilingual: 5; Other: 5
Malawi	38	8.82 (4.10)	Unknown	Monolingual: 36; Other: 2
Rwanda	31	9.83 (4.23)	F: 16; M: 15	Monolingual: 31
South Africa	31	9.00 (3.71)	Unknown	Unknown
Uganda	41	12.27 (2.17)	F: 21; M: 20	Unknown

one pair of test trials would be excluded at the session level. In general, errors included the following: equipment error (e.g., no sound or visuals on the first pair of trials), experimenter error (e.g., an experimenter was unblinded in setups where infant looking was measured by live button press), or evidence of parent interference or other types of interference (e.g., talking or pointing by parents, construction noise, sibling pounding on door), and infants being uncooperative or fussy (e.g., crying, not willing to do the experiment).

Overall, at the trial level, 18 trials (0.39% of all trials) were excluded; relatively few trials were marked by labs as having errors. Due to experimental setup errors, data from two sites were unusable, leading to the exclusion of 60 infants (21.58% of all tested participants). No additional test sessions were excluded.

Participants

Final sample.   Our final sample included 200 infants (see Table 2 for more specific sample demographic information) from 6 laboratories (mean sample size per laboratory: 33.33, SD: 5.16, range: 27 – 41). The mean age of infants included in the study was 296.49 days (range: 71 – 606). Similar to MB1, each laboratory was asked to collect data spanning the two target age ranges (3;0 – 9;0 and 9;1 – 15;0 months); however, in practice, many laboratories recruited participants outside the intended windows (younger than 3-month-old: $N = 4$; older than 15-month-old: $N = 16$). We did not exclude these infants from our analyses. An additional 60 infants were tested but excluded (see the full details on exclusions above).

As mentioned in the Introduction, multilingualism is common in Africa. Thus, many infants in the final sample are likely to have been exposed to more than one language. To assess infants' language backgrounds, each laboratory completed a family questionnaire with the participating parents (see materials in linked repository: https://osf.io/jgr79/?view_only=5ee43f58762742daaa2caa21b85e3780). Our family language background questionnaire was created based on the family language background questionnaire in the MB1 and MB1B studies, and included questions asking parents to estimate the number of hours that their infants heard different languages. We calculated the percentage of time that infants were exposed to a given language as the number of hours they hear that language (per day) divided by the total number of hours the infant hears any language each day. This method is simpler than the traditional interview method used in assessing bilingual infants' language exposure (Byers-Heinlein et al., 2019), but in order to minimize the burden on participating laboratories and families, we decided to use a short questionnaire method to assess infants' language backgrounds.

In this paper, we define bilingualism following the criteria established in MB1B (Byers-Heinlein et al., 2021). Monolingual infants are defined as those who have a minimum

389 of 90% exposure to one language. Simultaneous bilingual infants are defined using the

390 following criteria: (i) infants are regularly exposed to two or more languages beginning

391 within the first month of life; (ii) they have a minimum of 25% exposure to each of their

392 languages. In other words, bilingual infants are exposed to two languages between 25% to

393 75% of their time. Based on these criteria, it is possible that bilingual infants in our paper

394 were exposed to multiple languages. For example, an infant with 45% English, 45% French,

395 and 10% Spanish exposure would be regarded as a bilingual infant. Infants who did not

396 meet the bilingual or monolingual criteria were designated as "other language background."

397 All infants were included in the main, confirmatory analyses regardless of language

398 background. Language background groupings were treated as a covariate in the analyses.

399   Based on the above-mentioned criteria, 87 infants were classified as monolingual

400 infants, 13 infants were classified as bilingual infants, and 28 infants were classified as

401 other. The remaining 72 infants' language background was unknown.

402 **Materials**

403   Visual stimuli. All visual stimuli were the same as those used in the MB1 study. We

404 used a brightly colored static checkerboard as the fixation stimulus, and an animation with

405 shrinking concentric multi-colored circles to ensure infants were attending to the screen at

406 the start of each trial. All of the stimuli can be found at https://osf.io/wh7md/.

407   Auditory stimuli. All auditory stimuli were identical to those used in the MB1 study.

408 The stimuli were recordings of North-American English mothers either speaking with

409 experimenters (ADS) or with their infants whose ages ranged from 122 to 250 days in a

410 laboratory setting. Mothers were provided with a set of objects and were asked to talk

411 about the objects with the experimenters and their infants in separate recording sessions.

412 In total, two sets of auditory stimuli were created: one set consisted of 8 IDS stimuli and

413 the other set consisted of 8 ADS stimuli. Each stimulus lasted for 18 seconds. The details

414 of stimulus creation can be found in the report of MB1 (ManyBabies Consortium, 2020).

415 Volume. Each laboratory measured stimulus volume level using a smartphone app
416 (e.g., the Android app "Sound Meter"). Labs kept the stimulus volume close to 63 – 65 dB
417 SPL. According to the protocol, labs would measure and report the background noise level
418 and the stimulus level. However, this information was not collected.

Procedure

420 Apparatus. Each laboratory used a laptop computer that had the experiment
421 programmed in Habit 2.26 (Oakes, Sperka, DeBolt & Cantrell, 2019). Moreover, each
422 laboratory used a computer monitor to present the visual stimuli, a speaker for audio
423 stimuli, a webcam for the experimenter to observe and record infants' performance,
424 curtains/room dividers that separated the experimenter from the infant and parent during
425 the experiment, and two sets of headphones: one for the experimenter and one for the
426 parent.

427 Experimental procedure. The procedure was identical to the single-screen central
428 visual fixation preference procedure reported in the MB1 study (ManyBabies Consortium,
429 2020). Using the single-screen central fixation method, researchers measured in real time
430 the duration of infants' looking time to the computer monitor while they listened to the
431 audio recordings. Infants' looking time to the computer monitor indicated their preference
432 for the audio recordings (i.e., IDS/ADS). Each laboratory followed procedural instructions
433 closely (based on pre-recorded videos illustrating the procedures, which were shared with
434 all participating laboratories) to maintain the consistency of the experimental procedure
435 across laboratories.

436 The experimenter explained the study to the parent and obtained consent from the
437 parent before running the experiment. After completing the consent form, the
438 experimenter led the participant to the testing room. To minimize distraction, the

experimenter was separated from the infant and parent by curtains or a room divider. During the experiment, the infant sat on the parent's lap. To minimize any bias introduced by the experimenter or parent hearing the stimuli, each of them wore headphones and heard masking music during the experiment.

Parents were instructed not to speak to the infant during the experiment and not to point to the screen. Infants' performance was recorded by a webcam that was placed in front of and below the computer monitor. Infants' looking time to each trial was measured online by the experimenter, who observed the infant's behavior via the webcam. At the beginning of each trial, a short video of a colorful circle was presented to orient the infant's attention to the screen. Once the infant fixated on the screen, the experimenter started the trial. The first two trials of the session were warm-up trials that accustomed infants with the procedure of the experiment, so the infant's looking time during warm-up trials was not analyzed. The auditory stimuli for the warm-up trials was piano music that lasted 18 seconds on each trial and the visual stimulus was the same as in the test trials (i.e., a colorful checkerboard). After the first two warm-up trials, the infant was tested with 16 trials presenting the IDS and ADS stimuli. Each infant was randomly assigned to one of four pseudo-random orders to counterbalance the order of presentation of IDS and ADS stimuli. Within each order, there were four blocks and each block presented 2 IDS and 2 ADS trials in alternating order. The presentation of the trials within each block were counterbalanced such that two blocks started with an IDS trial, and the other two blocks started with an ADS trial. On each trial, the auditory stimulus would continue to play until the infant looked away for 2 consecutive seconds or reached the maximum length of the auditory stimulus (18 seconds). Experimenters used the Habit program to record all looking time for every trial. There was no minimum looking time per trial that was required for continuation of the experiment. However, as in the MB1 study, any looking time that was less than 2 seconds was not analyzed. We excluded 335 (11.46%) trials that had less than 2 seconds looking time in total.

⁴⁶⁶ After the main looking-time task, the parents answered questions from the

⁴⁶⁷ experimenter about participant and family demographic information, such as infant sex,

⁴⁶⁸ date of birth, language exposure, and preterm/full term status. The questionnaire was

⁴⁶⁹ translated into the appropriate language(s) for participants from each data collection site.

⁴⁷⁰ See supplementary materials for the English template and adaptations.

General Lab Practices

Training of the experimenters. Three of the authors conducted a 2-day training
workshop in Nairobi, Kenya on January 28 – 29, 2020, which was attended by lead
researchers from 8 of the participating laboratories. The training session provided an
overview of the experimental procedure, advice on setting up the apparatus at the
researcher's institution, and training, instructions and guidelines for running the
experiment. Further, the first author sent instructions for experiment set-up and the
workshop materials to all participating laboratories, and kept close contact with all lead
researchers in the participating laboratories to provide technical support for the
experiment.

Training of research assistants. Each laboratory was responsible for maintaining
good experimenter training practices. We extended an invitation for the training workshop
to one research assistant in each laboratory, so that the researcher primarily responsible for
data collection could receive training directly as well. Following the MB1 study, each
laboratory reported on which research assistant ran each infant using pseudonyms or
numerical codes. After data collection, each laboratory completed a questionnaire
regarding their training practices, the experience and academic status of each
experimenter, and their basic participant greeting practices.

⁴⁸⁹ **Results**

Confirmatory Analyses

⁴⁹¹   Data processing and analytic framework. Our primary dependent variable of interest

⁴⁹² was infants' looking time (LT). Infants' looking time was defined as time spent fixating on

⁴⁹³ the computer screen during test trials. We did not count LT when infants looked away

⁴⁹⁴ from the screen, though the trial was discontinued if an infant looked away and did not

⁴⁹⁵ look back to the screen within 2 seconds. Following MB1 and MB1B, we log-transformed

⁴⁹⁶ looking times prior to statistical analysis (Csibra, Hernik, Mascaro, Tatone, & Lengyel,

⁴⁹⁷ 2016). We made this decision because we wanted to compare the data of the current study

⁴⁹⁸ with those in MB1 and MB1B.

⁴⁹⁹   We tested our research questions via general linear mixed effects models. We fit all

⁵⁰⁰ models using a maximal random effects structure (Barr, Levy, Scheepers, & Tily, 2013).

⁵⁰¹ Under this approach, we first specified all random effects that are appropriate for the

⁵⁰² experimental design (e.g., IDS/ADS trial type varied within subjects in our experimental

⁵⁰³ design, thus it can be specified as a random effect by subject; see below for the full list of

⁵⁰⁴ effects considered). If any of these mixed-effects models failed to converge, we used an

⁵⁰⁵ iterative pruning strategy: first removing random slopes nested within subjects, next

⁵⁰⁶ removing random slopes nested within labs, and finally removing random intercepts from

⁵⁰⁷ groupings in the same order, retaining effects of trial type as these were of greatest

⁵⁰⁸ theoretical interest. Following MB1 and MB1B, we fit all models using the lme4 package

⁵⁰⁹ with the bobyqa optimizer, version 1.1-35.3 (Bates, Mächler, Bolker, & Walker, 2015) and

⁵¹⁰ computed confidence intervals and p values using the lmerTest package (Kuznetsova,

⁵¹¹ Brockhoff, & Christensen, 2017).

⁵¹²   In addition to the mixed-effect models, we assessed the reliability of measurement in

⁵¹³ our study by reporting the reliability of the infants' looking time difference to the IDS vs

⁵¹⁴ ADS stimuli across different trials.We reported the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC)

as our reliability measure. The ICC was computed using the psych package in R (Revelle, 2017). We reported an ICC3k measure, on the basis of a two-way random effects model, a mean-rating of 8 (i.e., we had 8 pairs of IDS and ADS trials) and consistency agreement (Koo & Li, 2016; Parsons, Kruijt, & Fox, 2019). The estimated ICC was 0.18, 95% CI [0.00, 0.34]. This relativley low value is consistent with previous work showing limited test-retest reliability in IDS studies (Schreiner et al., 2024).

Below is a description of variables in our mixed-effect models:

- Log_lt: Dependent variable. Log-transformed looking time in seconds.
- Trial_type: a dummy coded variable with two levels: ADS (reference) and IDS. A positive coefficient means that infants look longer to IDS trials compared to ADS trials.
- Age_months: a continuous variable measuring the infant's age in months (centered).
- Trial_num: An index for the current trial (1-16 for infants who completed the experiment). Excluded trials were reflected as missing trial numbers.
- Language_background: this consisted of two dummy coded variables that represented infants from three different language backgrounds: monolinguals (>= 90% exposure to one's native language); bilinguals (>=25 % to each of their languages); other (any infants who were not categorized as monolinguals or bilinguals). Using monolinguals as the reference level, the two dummy-coded variables are: (i) bilingual – infants who were categorized as bilinguals would be coded as 1 and all other infants would be coded as 0; (ii) Other (any infants who are not monolinguals or bilinguals) – infants who were categorized as other would be coded as 1 and all other infants would be coded as 0. In this case, monolingual infants would be coded as 0 in the above-mentioned dummy-coded variables.
- Infant_ID: a dummy coded variable with two levels, representing infants living in Africa in our current study (coded as 1) and infants living in Europe, Australia and

541 Asia who were not hearing North American English, with data from MB1(B) (coded

542 as 0).

543 As a reminder, we examined the following research questions in our paper: (1) IDS

544 preference: whether infants in our multi-site African sample showed a preference for IDS

545 and what is the corresponding effect size of this preference; (2) Age effect: whether there

546 were changes in the infants' IDS preference across different ages; (3) Population

547 comparison: examine whether the magnitude of infants' IDS preference in our study

548 differed from infants in MB1 and in MB1B (comparing only infants in these three samples

549 who were not exposed to North American English).

550 Research questions 1 and 2: Infants' IDS preference and age effect. We addressed our

551 first two research questions using only the data collected in the current paper from

552 laboratories in Africa. We specified the following model: `log_lt ~ trial_type +`

553 `trial_num + age_months + trial_type * trial_num + age_months * trial_num +`

554 `age_months * trial_type + (trial_type * trial_num | subid) + (trial_type |`

555 `lab)`.

556 The fixed-effects structure of this model included main effects of trial type (IDS vs

557 ADS), age, and trial number. This structure controls for the effects of each independent

558 variable on infants' looking time (e.g., longer looking times for IDS, shorter looking times

559 on later trials). In addition, we included several two-way interaction terms: trial type

560 interacting with trial number to model the possibility of infants' faster habituation to ADS,

561 age interacting with the trial type to model the developmental trajectory of infants' IDS

562 preference, and age interacting with trial number to model faster habituation for older

563 children. The random effects structure of the model controlled for subject-level and

564 lab-level grouping. For subject-level grouping, we added random intercepts and random

565 effects of trial type, trial number, and their interaction to model the possibility that each

566 infant may have different rates of habituation for IDS and ADS trials. For lab-level

567 grouping, we added a random effect trial type to model differences in IDS preferences

568 across labs.

569   After pruning for non-convergence, our final model specification was: `log_lt ~`

570 `trial_type + trial_num + age_months + trial_type * trial_num +  age_months *`

571 `trial_num + age_months * trial_type + (1 | subid) + (1 | lab)`.

572   As in MB1 and MB1B, the fixed effect estimate for trial type corresponds to the

573 predicted infant-directed speech preference effect in units of log looking time (research

574 question 1). The fixed effect estimate for the interaction of trial type and age indicates the

575 estimated age-related change in infant-directed speech preference in log seconds per month

576 (research question 2).

577   The model revealed a significant main effect of trial type, such that infants looked

578 longer at IDS trials than ADS trials (Figure 1; $\beta = 0.06$; $SE = 0.02$; $t = 2.76$; $p = 0.01$).

579 There was also a significant negative effect of trial number, indicating that looking times

580 decreased over the course of the session ($\beta = $ -0.03; $SE = 0$; $t = $ -9.72; $p < 0.01$). Age in

581 months was also a significant predictor, with older infants showing shorter looking times

582 overall ($\beta = $ -0.09; $SE = 0.03$; $t = $ -3.40; $p < 0.01$). None of the interaction terms reached

583 statistical significance, including the interaction between trial type and age, suggesting that

584 the magnitude of IDS preference did not change reliably with age.

585   Research question 3: Population comparison. In this analysis, we compare the data

586 collected from the laboratories in Africa to data collected in MB1 and MB1B in Germany,

587 Italy, New Zealand, Turkey, United Kingdom. We selected the subset of data from MB1

588 and MB1B that was collected using central fixation procedures (to match methods across

589 studies) and from infants who were not exposed to North American English (non NAE) (to

590 match stimulus un-familiarity due to language background). While we could have

591 controlled the methodological and demographic variables statistically (and hence included

592 all data from MB1 and MB1B in the full model), we believed that the increase in model

Figure 1. By lab results. Each dot represents one trial of looking time. X-axis represents the trial number. Y-axis represents the log looking time in seconds. Red represents IDS trials. Blue represents ADS trials.

complexity – and comparable decrease in interpretability – outweighed the benefits of this strategy.

We examine whether our sample of infants' IDS preference is different from those in MB1 and MB1B with the following model: `log_lt ~ trial_type + trial_num + age_months + infant_ID + language_background + trial_type * trial_num + age_months * trial_num + age_months * trial_type + trial_type * infant_ID + trial_num * infant_ID + trial_type * language_background + (trial_type * trial_num | subid) + (trial_type | lab)`

In this mixed-effects model, the fixed-effects included main effects of trial type,

602 language background, age, trial number, infants in our study/non NAE infants in MB1(B)

603 and language background. In addition, we included several two-way interaction terms in

604 the fixed effects structure: (i) trial type interacted with trial number, modeling the

605 possibility of infants' faster habituation to ADS, (ii) age interacted with trial number,

606 modeling faster habituation for older children, (iii) age interacted with trial type, modeling

607 the developmental trajectory of infants' IDS preference, (iv) trial type interacted with

608 infants in our sample, modeling the possible difference in IDS preference between infants in

609 Africa and infants tested in MB1 and MB1B, (v) trial num interacted with infants in our

610 sample, modeling the possible difference in habituation between our sample of infants and

611 infants tested in MB1 and MB1B, and (vi) trial type interacted with language background,

612 modeling the possible difference in IDS preference from infants with different language

613 backgrounds. We adopted the same baseline random effects as in the previous model.

614   After pruning for non-convergence, our final model specification was: `log_lt ~`

615 `trial_type + trial_num + age_months + infant_ID + language_background +`

616 `trial_type * trial_num + age_months * trial_num + age_months * trial_type +`

617 `trial_type * infant_ID + trial_num * infant_ID + trial_type *`

618 `language_background + (1 | subid) + (1 | lab)`. The fixed effect estimate

619 corresponding to our research question is the `trial_type * infant_ID`, which captures

620 differences in measured IDS preference between the current data and data from

621 MB1/MB1B in units of log seconds of looking time.

622   The model revealed no significant difference in IDS preference between infants tested

623 in our sample and those tested in MB1/MB1B, as indicated by the non-significant

624 interaction between trial type and infant group (β = -0.01; SE = 0.03; t = -0.26; p = 0.80).

625 However, there was a significant main effect of trial type (β = 0.02; SE = 0.03; t = 0.66; p

626 = 0.51), suggesting that infants showed a reliable preference to IDS over ADS.

627   Consistent with expectations, looking times decreased over the course of the session

(β = -0.05; SE = 0; t = -30.82; $p < 0.01$), and older infants looked for less time overall (β = -0.13; SE = 0.02; t = -8.38; p < .001). We also found that older infants habituated more quickly, as indicated by a significant negative interaction between age and trial number (β = -0.01; SE = 0; t = -4.39; p < .001). The interaction between trial number and infant group was also significant (β = 0.02; SE = 0; t = 4.96; p < .001), indicating that looking times declined more slowly across trials for infants in our sample compared to those in MB1/MB1B. No other interactions reached significance.

Exploratory Analyses

SES. Previous research in North America (e.g., Hart & Risley, 1995; Hoff, 2006b; Weisleder & Fernald, 2013) has shown that the quantity and quality of child-directed speech vary across families with different SES backgrounds. These differences in language input may drive differences in infants' preference for IDS. Thus, we explored how SES affects infants' preference for IDS. SES was measured by primary caregiver's formal education (number of years). we entered primary caregiver's formal education (in years) as a predictor in the regression model specified for RQ1 and RQ2, along with its interaction with trial type.

The interaction between trial type and primary caregiver education was not significant (β = -0.01; SE = 0.02; t = -0.46; p = 0.65), not allowing rejection of the null hypothesis that SES does not moderate infants' preference for IDS. In other words, the magnitude of IDS preference was similar regardless of caregivers' years of formal education. At the same time, we did observe a significant main effect of trial type, with infants looking longer at IDS than ADS trials overall (β = 0.06; SE = 0.02; t = 2.55; p = 0.01). Looking times decreased significantly across trials (β = -0.04; SE = 0; t = -9.92; $p < 0.01$), and older infants looked for less time overall (β = -0.04; SE = 0; t = -9.92; $p < 0.01$). No other interactions were significant. As a robustness check, we re-ran the model on the subset of infants with female primary caregivers (80.52% infants). The pattern of results was

654 qualitatively unchanged.

655   Meta-analysis. For comparison with ManyBabies 1 and 1B, we computed

656 standardized effect sizes for each lab following the method used in ManyBabies Consortium

657 (2020). The resulting meta-analytic plot is shown in Appendix B: Figure B1. The

658 meta-analytic effect size is 0.17[-0.03, 0.37], which is numerically smaller than the .35 [0.29,

659 0.42] reported in MB1 (Manybabies Consortium, 2020) but these estimates are not directly

660 comparable due to the different method and age distribution in the current project (cf.,

661 Zettersten et al., 2024).

662   **General Discussion**

663   Infants' preference for IDS is both an important phenomenon for understanding

664 language learning and a case study for infant methods more broadly. The MB1 study

665 investigated variation in IDS preference across laboratories and across countries and found

666 a small but reliable effect such that infants preferred IDS over ADS; though there was

667 substantial variation across labs, much of this variation was in fact due to sampling

668 variation. Nevertheless, the effect was moderated by infant age, language background, and

669 experimental method. Though MB1 and its sister project MB1B investigated children from

670 a wide variety of language backgrounds, no sites from Africa were included in this initial

671 group of participating laboratories. The current study was designed to fill this gap.

672   We summarize our findings with respect to three research questions in the paper.

673 First, consistent with MB1 and MB1B, we found evidence for a significant IDS preference

674 in a sample of 200 African infants. Second, and unlike MB1, we did not find significant

675 age-related variation in IDS preference, but given the relatively small magnitude of the

676 overall effect, we may not have had sufficient power to detect an interaction with age in our

677 primary analytic model.

678   Finally, we were interested in comparing the magnitude of the IDS preference in the

current study to the estimates obtained in MB1 and MB1B (with multilingual data providing an important comparison because of the diverse language backgrounds in our current sample). We did not find significant study effects in a model comparing data from the current study to a method- and language-background matched sample of infants from MB1 and MB1B. The magnitude of the IDS preference in African infants in the current study ($d = 0.17$) was numerically smaller than the overall estimate reported by MB1 ($d = 0.35$), but the two estimates are not directly comparable; among other things, the current study was conducted with infants who were not growing up learning North American English and it used the central fixation method, both of which were associated with overall lower effect sizes in MB1 compared with other groups (Zettersten et al., 2024).

The current study provides important evidence on the generalizability of the IDS preference and of looking-time methods in infancy more broadly. Despite the diversity of MB1, as noted above, the vast majority of labs were from Western countries where Indo-European languages are spoken. Thus, the findings of the current study provide evidence that the IDS preference observed in MB1 is present in infants growing up in a diverse array of non-WEIRD environments. More broadly, there is limited work using looking time methods for infancy research in the African context (cf. Pyykkö et al., 2019), so our findings also serve as an important datapoint demonstrating the generality of these techniques for children worldwide.

A second goal of the current study was to build a team of laboratories in Africa collecting data with infants. We were successful in accomplishing this goal and we believe that the current study represents the largest experimental study of African infants to date. Despite this success, we encountered a number of substantial challenges. Some of these were unique to the African context and to the specific time-period of our study (e.g., spanning the Covid-19 pandemic) while others were more general to the project of conducting "big team science" investigations across institutions with a wide range of resources.

Although we received commitments for data collection from 11 teams, three of these teams were unable to collect data due to a variety of challenges relating to personnel and resources. One source of these challenges was the initiation of Covid-19 lockdowns soon after our initial project training in the winter of 2020. In some cases, personnel left the project or priorities changed, leading teams to lose the ability to participate. These lockdowns were also difficult even for teams who stayed involved in the project. Due to turnover and the long delay between initial training and setup for data collection after restrictions were eased, a number of procedural deviations were introduced. In two cases, these deviations were so severe that we could not analyze data from the site. In an ideal world, our group would have been able to conduct additional site visits and training after sites began collecting data; unfortunately this was not possible due to budget and personnel limitations.

The current study has a number of further scientific limitations, including some shared with prior studies including MB1 and MB1B. First, although we attempted to estimate IDS preference, we did so using a specific set of speech stimuli and a specific paradigm. It is likely that the stimuli used here are less extreme than many used in prior studies, and further, they are produced in North American English, making them linguistically unfamiliar to one degree or another to all of the infants in our study. Second, although we invited broad participation, our samples are convenience samples in at least two ways: both of the sites who participated and the infants who participated at each site. Thus our effect size estimates cannot be treated as population effects but rather "proof of concept" that an IDS preference can be observed in African infants across a diverse set of sites. Finally, although we did not observe major demographic variation, we caution against over-interpretation of any demographic differences in IDS preference given that IDS preference has not been shown to be individually predictive of any later outcomes (Soderstrom et al., 2024).

In sum, our study offers a case study of "big team science" (Coles, Hamlin, Sullivan,

732 Parker, & Altschul, 2022) carried out via a collaboration between African researchers and

733 the ManyBabies Consortium. Although it faced a variety of logistical challenges (many

734 shared with other grass roots efforts; Baumgartner et al., 2023), it nevertheless yields

735 important evidence on generalizability, of a key phenomenon in early language learning, of

736 looking time methods, and finally of a broad-based collaborative model for studying infant

737 development.

References

Barr, D. J., Levy, R., Scheepers, C., & Tily, H. J. (2013). Random effects structure for confirmatory hypothesis testing: Keep it maximal. *Journal of Memory and Language*, *68*(3), 255–278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2012.11.001

Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., & Walker, S. (2015). Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *67*(1). https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01

Baumgartner, H. A., Alessandroni, N., Byers-Heinlein, K., Frank, M. C., Hamlin, J. K., Soderstrom, M., … Coles, N. A. (2023). How to build up big team science: A practical guide for large-scale collaborations. *Royal Society Open Science*, *10*(6), 230235.

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

Bryant, G. A., & Barrett, H. C. (2007). Recognizing intentions in infant-directed speech: Evidence for universals. *Psychological Science*, *18*(8), 746–751.

Bryant, G. A., Liénard, P., & Clark Barrett, H. (2012). Recognizing infant-directed speech across distant cultures: Evidence from africa. *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology*, *10*(2), 47–59.

Byers-Heinlein, K., Tsui, A. S. M., Bergmann, C., Black, A. K., Brown, A., Carbajal, M. J., et al.others. (2021). A multilab study of bilingual infants: Exploring the preference for infant-directed speech. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science*, *4*(1), 2515245920974622.

Casillas, M., Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (2020). Early language experience in a tseltal mayan village. *Child Development*, *91*(5), 1819–1835. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13349

Casillas, M., Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (2021). Early language experience in a

papuan community. *Journal of Child Language*, *48*(4), 792–814.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000920000549

Coles, N. A., Hamlin, J. K., Sullivan, L. L., Parker, T. H., & Altschul, D. (2022).

Build up big-team science. *Nature*, *601*(7894), 505–507.

Consortium, M. (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.

Cooper, R. P., Abraham, J., Berman, S., & Staska, M. (1997). The development of

infants' preference for motherese. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *20*(4),

477–488. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(97)90037-0

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

Cooper, R. P., & Aslin, R. N. (1994). Developmental differences in infant attention

to the spectral properties of infant-directed speech. *Child Development*, *65*(6),

1663–1677. https://doi.org/10.2307/1131286

Cristia, A., Dupoux, E., Gurven, M., & Stieglitz, J. (2019). Child-directed speech is

infrequent in a forager-farmer population: A time allocation study. *Child*

Development, *90*(3), 759–773.

Csibra, G., Hernik, M., Mascaro, O., Tatone, D., & Lengyel, M. (2016). Statistical

treatment of looking-time data. *Developmental Psychology*, *52*(4), 521–536.

https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000083

Dunst, C., Gorman, E., & Hamby, D. (2012). Preference for infant-directed speech

in preverbal young children. *Center for Early Literacy Learning*, *5*(1), 1–13.

Farran, L. K., Lee, C.-C., Yoo, H., & Oller, D. K. (2016). Cross-cultural register

differences in infant-directed speech: An initial study. *PloS One*, *11*(3),

e0151518.

Fernald, A. (1985). Four-month-old infants prefer to listen to motherese. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *8*(2), 181–195. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(85)80005-9

Fernald, A., Taeschner, T., Dunn, J., Papousek, M., Boysson-Bardies, B. de, & Fukui, I. (1989). A cross-language study of prosodic modifications in mothers' and fathers' speech to preverbal infants. *Journal of Child Language*, *16*(3), 477–501. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900010679

Frank, M. C., Bergelson, E., Bergmann, C., Cristia, A., Floccia, C., Gervain, J., … Yurovsky, D. (2017). A collaborative approach to infant research: Promoting reproducibility, best practices, and theory-building. *Infancy*, *22*(4), 421–435. https://doi.org/10.1111/infa.12182

Graf Estes, K., & Hurley, K. (2013). Infant-directed prosody helps infants map sounds to meanings. *Infancy*, *18*(5), 797–824. https://doi.org/10.1111/infa.12006

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.

Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young american children*. P.H. Brookes.

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)

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *33*(2-3), 61–83.

819   Hoff, E. (2006b). How social contexts support and shape language development.

820   *Developmental Review*, *26*(1), 55–88.

821   Hoff, E. (2006a). How social contexts support and shape language development.

822   *Developmental Review*, *26*(1), 55–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2005.11.002

823   Huttenlocher, J., Waterfall, H., Vasilyeva, M., Vevea, J., & Hedges, L. V. (2010).

824   Sources of variability in children's language growth. *Cognitive Psychology*, *61*(4),

825   343–365.

826   Keller, H. (2012). Autonomy and relatedness revisited: Cultural manifestations of

827   universal human needs. *Child Development Perspectives*, *6*(1), 12–18.

828   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2011.00208.x

829   Kitamura, C., & Lam, C. (2009). Age-specific preferences for infant-directed

830   affective intent. *Infancy*, *14*(1), 77–100.

831   https://doi.org/10.1080/15250000802569777

832   Kitamura, C., Thanavishuth, C., Burnham, D., & Luksaneeyanawin, S. (2001).

833   Universality and specificity in infant-directed speech: Pitch modifications as a

834   function of infant age and sex in a tonal and non-tonal language. *Infant*

835   *Behavior and Development*, *24*(4), 372–392.

836   Koo, T. K., & Li, M. Y. (2016). A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass

837   correlation coefficients for reliability research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine*,

838   *15*(2), 155–163.

839   Kuznetsova, A., Brockhoff, P. B., & Christensen, R. H. B. (2017). lmerTest

840   package: Tests in linear mixed effects models. *Journal of Statistical Software*,

841   *82*(13). https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v082.i13

842   Legare, C. H. (2019). The development of cumulative cultural learning. *Annual*

843   *Review of Developmental Psychology*, *1*(1), 119–147.

844   LeVine, R. A. (Ed.). (1994). *Child care and culture: Lessons from africa*

845   (Reprinted). Cambridge University Press.

LeVine, R. A., & LeVine, S. (2016). *Do parents matter? Why japanese babies sleep well, mexican siblings don't fight, and american parents should just relax* (First). PublicAffairs.

Mathur, M. B., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2020). Robust metrics and sensitivity analyses for meta-analyses of heterogeneous effects. *Epidemiology, 31*(3), 356–358.

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

Nielsen, M., Haun, D., Kärtner, J., & Legare, C. H. (2017). The persistent sampling bias in developmental psychology: A call to action. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 162*, 31–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2017.04.017

Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science, 349*(6251), aac4716. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac4716

Parsons, S., Kruijt, A.-W., & Fox, E. (2019). Psychological science needs a standard practice of reporting the reliability of cognitive-behavioral measurements. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological Science, 2*(4), 378–395.

Pegg, J. E., Werker, J. F., & McLeod, P. J. (1992). Preference for infant-directed over adult-directed speech: Evidence from 7-week-old infants. *Infant Behavior and Development, 15*(3), 325–345. https://doi.org/10.1016/0163-6383(92)80003-D

Posel, D., & Zeller, J. (2016). Language shift or increased bilingualism in south africa: Evidence from census data. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 37*(4), 357–370. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1072206

Pyykkö, J., Forssman, L., Maleta, K., Ashorn, P., Ashorn, U., & Leppänen, J. M. (2019). Early development of visual attention in infants in rural malawi. *Developmental Science, 22*(5), e12761.

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*(6), 880–891. https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12172

Revelle, W. R. (2017). *Psych: Procedures for personality and psychological research.*

Rosenhouse, J., & Goral, M. (2004). 31 bilingualism in the middle east and north africa: A focus on the arabic-speaking world. *The Handbook of Bilingualism*, 835.

Rowe, M. L. (2012). A longitudinal investigation of the role of quantity and quality of child-directed speech in vocabulary development. *Child Development*, *83*(5), 1762–1774.

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.

Schneidman, L. A., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2012). Language input and acquisition in a mayan village: How important is directed speech? *Developmental Science*, *15*(5), 659–673. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2012.01168.x

Schreiner, M. S., Zettersten, M., Bergmann, C., Frank, M. C., Fritzsche, T., Gonzalez-Gomez, N., et al.others. (2024). Limited evidence of test-retest reliability in infant-directed speech preference in a large preregistered infant experiment. *Developmental Science*, *27*(6), e13551.

Shneidman, L. A., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2012). Language input and acquisition in a mayan village: How important is directed speech? *Developmental Science*, *15*(5), 659–673.

Shneidman, L., Arroyo, M., Levine, S. C., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2013). What counts as effective input for word learning? *Developmental Science*, *16*(6), 993–1009. https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12055

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.

Soderstrom, M., Rocha-Hidalgo, J., Muñoz, L. E., Bochynska, A., Werker, J. F., Skarabela, B., et al.others. (2024). Testing the relationship between preferences for infant-directed speech and vocabulary development: A multi-lab study. *Journal of Child Language*, 1–26.

Thiessen, E. D., Hill, E. A., & Saffran, J. R. (2005). Infant-directed speech facilitates word segmentation. *Infancy, 7*(1), 53–71.

Trainor, L. J., & Desjardins, R. N. (2002). Pitch characteristics of infant-directed speech affect infants' ability to discriminate vowels. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 9*(2), 335–340.

Vogt, P., Mastin, J. D., & Schots, D. M. (2015). Communicative intentions of child-directed speech in three different learning environments: Observations from the netherlands, and rural and urban mozambique. *First Language, 35*(4-5), 341–358.

Weber, A., Fernald, A., & Diop, Y. (2017). When cultural norms discourage talking to babies: Effectiveness of a parenting program in rural senegal. *Child Development, 88*(5), 1513–1526.

Weisleder, A., & Fernald, A. (2013). Talking to children matters: Early language experience strengthens processing and builds vocabulary. *Psychological Science, 24*(11), 2143–2152.

Werker, J. F., & McLeod, P. J. (1989). Infant preference for both male and female infant-directed talk: A developmental study of attentional and affective responsiveness. *Canadian Journal of Psychology/Revue Canadienne de Psychologie, 43*(2), 230.

927   Werker, J. F., Pegg, J. E., & McLeod, P. J. (1994). A cross-language investigation

928   of infant preference for infant-directed communication. *Infant Behavior and*

929   *Development, 17*(3), 323–333.

930   Zettersten, M., Cox, C., Bergmann, C., Tsui, A. S. M., Soderstrom, M., Mayor, J.,

931   et al.others. (2024). Evidence for infant-directed speech preference is consistent

932   across large-scale, multi-site replication and meta-analysis. *Open Mind, 8*,

933   439–461.

Appendix A

Discrepancies between pre-registration and final analyses

1. **ICC comparison**

Pre-registration: We planned to compare the estimated ICC in our study with the ICC reported in MB1(B).

Final: This comparison was not conducted because MB1(B) did not report ICC values.

2. **Metrics of effect heterogeneity**

Pre-registration: We planned to report distributional metrics describing heterogeneity across labs (Mathur & VanderWeele, 2020) using the *MetaUtility* package. Specifically, we proposed to estimate: (1) the percentage of effects greater than 0, (2) the percentage greater than Cohen's d = 0.2, and (3) the percentage less than d = –0.2. These metrics were to be reported only if random slopes of trial type by lab were included in the final model, their variance was estimated as greater than 0, and at least 10 labs contributed data.

Final: Random slopes of trial type by lab were not included in the final model, and only six labs contributed data. As a result, we did not estimate these metrics.

3. **Subset of MB1 and MB1(B) data**

Pre-registration: We planned to subset MB1 and MB1(B) data to include only infants tested with central fixation procedures and infants not exposed to North American English (NAE), to maximize comparability with the present study.

Final: In MB1 and MB1(B) data, information about English exposure often did not distinguish between American and British English. Therefore, we excluded infants based on country of residence (United States/Canada) rather than reported language exposure.

4. **Urban–rural exploratory analysis**

Pre-registration: We planned an exploratory analysis testing whether infants' IDS preference differed between urban and rural areas, motivated by prior findings of differences in parental speech input across these contexts (e.g., Keller, 2012; Vogt et al., 2015). *Final:* We did not collect information on urban versus rural residence, so this analysis was not conducted.

5. **Socioeconomic status (SES) analyses**

Pre-registration: We planned to measure SES using both mothers' years of formal education and the MacArthur Scale of Subjective Social Status (MacSSS), including both variables in regression models.

Final: We did not have MacSSS data for most participants, and information on mothers' education was incomplete. We therefore used primary caregiver education as the main SES variable and conducted a robustness check using the subset of infant whose primary caregiver's sex is female.

Appendix B

By-lab Meta-analysis

We computed a single effect size per lab and fit an intercept-only mixed-effect meta-regression to estimate the overall IDS preference across sites.This approach provides a comparable summary of results across sites. Even with a standardized protocol, sites differ in their cultures, recruitment pools, equipment, and experimenter behavior. A random-effects meta-analysis treats those differences as legitimate heterogeneity rather than noise, yielding a conservative estimate of the cross-lab mean and its uncertainty.

To do so, we calculated each infant's mean IDS–ADS difference score [1], standardized these within lab to obtain, and estimated their sampling variances. These lab-level estimates were then entered into a REML random-effects model to produce the pooled effect size and 95% confidence interval (Figure 1). The meta-analytic effect size is 0.17[-0.03, 0.37], which is numerically smaller than the .35 [0.29, 0.42] reported in MB1 (Manybabies Consortium, 2020) but these estimates are not directly comparable due to the different method and age distribution in the current project (cf. Mathur et al., 2024).

---

[1] Due to an experimental procedure error, infants at the South Africa site were not always presented with complete IDS–ADS stimulus pairs; in some cases, the same stimulus was played multiple times. While this issue did not affect the random-effects model in the main analysis, it does impact the present meta-analysis. We therefore trimmed the data by (1) retaining only the first presentation of each trial and (2) including only trials in which both the IDS and ADS versions were presented. The trimmed data includes 176 trials from 28 infants.

Figure B1. Forest plot of lab-level standardized effect sizes (for the IDS–ADS preference. Points represent individual country estimates, with size proportional to the inverse of their sampling variance; horizontal bars show 95% confidence intervals. The meta-analytic aggregate (top, red) is from an intercept-only random-effects model.