Early language experience in a Papuan community

Marisa Casillas[1], Penelope Brown[1], & Stephen C. Levinson[1]

[1] Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Marisa Casillas, P.O. Box 310, 6500 AH Nijmegen, The Netherlands. E-mail: Marisa.Casillas@mpi.nl

Abstract

Daylong recordings capture many patterns within children's typical language experience, including how linguistic input rate varies depending on child age, time of day, and number of speakers present. We used daylong recordings to investigate how much speech is available to young children (0;0–3;0) on Rossel Island, Papua New Guinea; a community where prior ethnographic study demonstrated face-to-face contingency-seeking interactional styles with infants and young children. We found that the patterns of children's daylong language experience were somewhat different from that seen in prior ethnographic work. Children were infrequently directly addressed and their linguistic input rates were primarily affected by circumstantial aspects of everyday life (e.g., the presence of other speakers). We discuss the different insights afforded by these approaches in a comparative cross-cultural framework and how the daylong and ethnographic findings together shed light on the question of how little direct linguistic input can support first language development.

Keywords: Child-directed speech, linguistic input, non-WEIRD, vocal maturity, interaction, Papuan

Word count: XXXX (XXXX in the main text, excluding references)

Early language experience in a Papuan community

Introduction

In their first few years of life, children hear an extraordinary amount of language. The sum of this experience with language (their "input") is the basis for their lexical, grammatical, and sociolinguistic development. Much developmental language research focuses on the value of child-directed speech (CDS) **in particular** as a tailored source of linguistic input that can boost lexical and syntactic development (Bates & Goodman, 1997; Brinchmann, Braeken, & Lyster, 2019; Frank, Braginsky, Marchman, & Yurovsky, in preparation; Hart & Risley, 1995; Hoff, 2003; Huttenlocher, Waterfall, Vasilyeva, Vevea, & Hedges, 2010; Lieven, Pine, & Baldwin, 1997; Marchman, Martínez-Sussmann, & Dale, 2004; Shneidman & Goldin-Meadow, 2012; Weisleder & Fernald, 2013). However, we also know that **children's** language environments—e.g., who is around and talking about what to whom—vary dramatically within and across families, **and** that children in some communities **hear** very little directed talk **without any** apparent delays in their linguistic development (Brown, 2011, 2014; Brown & Gaskins, 2014; Casillas, Brown, & Levinson, 2019; Gaskins, 2006; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984).

A key puzzle for developmental language science is then **uncovering** how the human cognitive toolkit for language learning can flexibly adapt to the variable circumstances under which it successfully occurs**, including circumstances in which CDS is infrequent, produced in large part by other children, or is primarily restricted to a small number of activities (REFS; Shneidman, Ochs, Brown, TseltalCasillas, Wittebolle). Resolving this puzzle requires researchers to find ways to track the distribution and characteristics of linguistic input over multiple interactional contexts, across developmental time, between families, and across different cultural groups. In what follows we explore two major**

factors that may impact children's linguistic environments: ideological stance toward child-directed speech and situational features of everyday life. We build a case for testing both sources of variation using clips sampled from recordings of whole waking days at home. We then use this approach to report on the language environments of children under 3;0 in one child-centric subsistence farming society (Yélî, Rossel Island, Papua New Guinea), and compare the findings to a parallel set of results from another subsistence farming society that is, by contrast, *not* child-centric (Tseltal, Tenejapa, Mexico).

Ideological and situational variation in CDS

Caregivers' personal and cultural notions about how children should develop as members of the broader language community influence the prevalence and style of their child-directed talk [REFS]. For example, extensive ethnographic research among multiple, distinct Mayan communities of Southern Mexico and Guatemala has forged a consistent view of childrearing and child-directed speech: adult caregivers shape infants' and young children's worlds such that children learn to attend to what is going on around them rather than expecting to be the center of attention (e.g., Brown, 2011, 2014; de León, 2011; Gaskins, 2000; Pye, 1986; Rogoff, Paradise, Arauz, Correa-Chávez, & Angelillo, 2003). These ethnographic findings lay out a broader ideology of caregiving, including a number of component attitudes (e.g., infants as inadequate conversational partners), that lead to the prediction that, on average, typically developing Mayan children are only infrequently directly addressed during their days at home. Indeed, using data from daylong recordings of children under age 3;0, Casillas and colleagues (2019) found that the Tseltal Mayan children in their sample heard an average of 3.6 minutes per

hour of speech directed to them—around one third of the current estimate for North American English [REFS]—yet hit established benchmarks for the onset of single- and multi-word utterances [see also REFS-cychosz]. This finding appears to support the idea that attitudes about child-directed talk mediate how frequently children are addressed (see also REFS Shneidman). However, any direct comparison between these two childrearing contexts is critically confounded: the arrangement of everyday life is highly different between the subsistence farming, rural Tseltal Mayan community and the (sub)urban, middle-class North American populations samples to which they are being compared.

Children's pattern of linguistic input also varies depending on the social organization of everyday life, which shapes the circumstances for their interactions with others over the course of the day. Prior analyses of daylong recordings in both North American [REFS Wittebolle Greenwood] and Tseltal Mayan [REFS] contexts suggests that different activities impact the rate at which children hear child-directed speech from hour to hour [REFS; see also Bergelson, Tamis-LeMonda]. The limited evidence we have to date shows approximately similar patterns in input rate fluctuation across the waking day: children in both contexts hear their highest rates of linguistic input in the morning and afternoon, with a dip around midday [REFS Wittebolle Greenwood]. Intruigingly, the activities associated with dense adult talk in the North American context are highly rare in the Tseltal sample (e.g., sing-alongs) and the activities associated with the least dense periods in the North American data as associated with *peak* input periods in the Tseltal sample (e.g., mealtimes; Casillas et al. (2019)). In the Tseltal context specifically, the afternoon-dip pattern likely arises as a consequence of communal eating events with multiple adult and child speakers, separated by a longer, relatively quiet

midday period of work and/or rest. The fluctuations in linguistic input Tseltal children hear over the day thus appear to be driven by the presence of multiple adult and child speakers whose home presence is regulated by the schedule and workload of farming, food preparation, and other domestic activities (e.g., with respect to sun position, season, and domestic role; see also REFS).

The current study

Here we investigate the language environments of children growing up on Rossel Island, Papua New Guinea. While the Rossel Island lifestyle is broadly similar to that of the Tseltal Mayans, their orientation to verbal interaction with infants is more similar to that of middle-class North Americans: Rossel caregivers engage in intensive face-to-face verbal interactions with prelinguistic children, as described in more detail below [REFS Brown 2011; brownIPchildrearing]. Rossel Island therefore offers a critical new datapoint in our understanding of cross-cultural variation in linguistic input[1]: If patterns of **CDS on Rossel Island** are similar to those reported for North American English, **it would support that idea that caregiver ideology drives substantial differences in language input across variable contexts**. If, instead, **CDS** patterns are more similar to that of the Tseltal **Mayan** community, **it would support the idea that *lifestyle* drives substantial differences in language input across variable contexts**; specifically, subsistence farming vs. post-industrial **lifestyles**.

We use manually annotated daylong recordings of Rossel children's language environments to track how much speech they hear from different

[1]While a comparison between Rossel Island and the Tseltal Mayan community is still confounded by numerous other cultural and linguistic differences, their similarity in economic lifestyle makes for a more valid comparison than either community compared to a post-industrial one.

speakers over the course of a day at home. During these recordings, the target child freely navigates their environment for multiple hours at a time while wearing an audio recorder, a simple method that can be similarly deployed across diverse linguistic and cultural settings (Bergelson et al., in preparation; Casillas & Cristia, 2019; Cychosz et al., under review). We capture both situational variation and variation due to ideas about caregiver responsiveness by sampling the daylong recordings in two different ways. First, we randomly sample clips to get us a baseline estimate for how much speech children encounter, on average, over the course of the day. Because these clips are indiscriminately distributed over the whole recording, they include variation in input due to both specific activities (e.g., mealtime vs. work periods) and social-organizational effects (e.g., subsistence farming schedule, household composition). Second, we look specifically at patterns of interlocutor responsiveness by manually selecting the day's peak clips of sustained interaction between the target child and one or more co-interactants. By identifying clips in which children are hearably interacting with others, we aim to partly—albeit imperfectly—sample from home interactional contexts in which we know the target child is alert and socially engaged, similar to contexts in which cross-cultural differences in CDS have been shown in the past with these same Rossel Island and Tseltal Mayan communities [e.g., REFS Brown 2011; brownIPchildrearing].

On the basis of this past comparative work, we predicted that children on Rossel Island would hear frequent CDS from a wide variety of caregiver types throughout the day, which would support of the idea that ideologies about child-directed talk drive substantial cross-context variation in language input rate. Prior ethnographic findings also led us to predict that: the more distributed caregiving practices on Rossel Island would weaken the fluctuations in CDS

rate due to the subsistence farming schedule compared to the Tseltal Mayan data; children would hear an increasing proportion of CDS from other children as they got older; and that other-directed speech (ODS) would be abundant. We also predicted that any ideologically-based differences between the Tseltal Mayan and Rossel Island data would be most apparent during the clips targeting interactant responsiveness, which (imperfectly) approximate the contexts in which past differences between these communities have been found: at-home recordings in which the child is alert and available for interaction [e.g., REFS Brown 2011; brownIPchildrearing]. Consonant with prior daylong child language data across multiple cultural contexts, we also expected little-to-no increase in CDS rate with age, a decrease in ODS rate with age, and that CDS appears in non-uniform bursts throughout the recording (Abney, Smith, & Yu, 2017; Bergelson et al., 2019b; Casillas et al., 2019; Scaff, Stieglitz, Casillas, & Cristia, in preparation).

In what follows we review the ethnographic work done in this community previously, describe our methods for following up on that work with daylong recordings, present the current findings, and discuss the differences that arose. All methods for annotation and analysis in this study closely follow those reported elsewhere for Tseltal Mayan children's speech environments (Casillas et al., 2019).

Method

Corpus

The participants in this study live in a collection of small hamlets on north-eastern Rossel Island, approximately 250 nautical miles off the southern tip of mainland Papua New Guinea with only intermittent access to and contact with the outside world. The traditional

language of Rossel Island is Yélî Dnye, an isolate (Papuan), which features a phonological inventory and set of grammatical features unlike any other in the (predominantly Austronesian) languages of the region. The islanders are subsistence farmers, cultivating taro, sweet potato, manioc, yam, coconut, and more for their daily subsistence, with protein coming from fishing and (occasionally) slaughtering pigs or local animals. Children often forage independently for shellfish and wild nuts, extra sources of protein. Most children on Rossel Island grow up speaking Yélî Dnye monolingually at home, learning English as a second language once they begin school around age 7. Children grow up in patrilocal household clusters (i.e., their family and their father's brothers' families), usually arranged such that there is some shared open space between households.

During their waking hours, infants are typically carried in a caregiver's arms as they go about daily activities. Infants, even very young ones, are frequently passed between different family members (male and female, young and elderly) throughout the day, returning to the mother to suckle when hungry. The arc of a typical day for an infant might include waking, being dressed and fed, then a mix of (a) spending time with nearby adults or older children as they walk around socializing and completing tasks with others and (b) more feeding, perhaps followed by short bouts of sleep in the late morning and afternoon, usually with the mother. Sometimes children are also taken to the gardens after the morning meal. Afternoon meals are cooked from around 15:00 onward, with another eating and more socializing before resting for the night. Starting around age two or three, children spend much of their time in large, independent child playgroups (10+ cousins and neighbors) who freely travel near and around the village searching for nuts and fruits, bathing in nearby rivers, and engaging in group games (e.g., tag, pretend play, etc.).

Interaction with infants and young children on Rossel Island is initiated by women, men, girls, and boys alike in a face-to-face, contingency-seeking, and affect-laden style (Brown, 2011; Brown & Casillas, in press). Children are considered a shared responsibility,

but also a source of joy and entertainment for the wider network of caregivers in their community. In her prior ethnographic work, Brown details some ways in which interactants make bids for joint attention and act as if the infant can understand what is being said (Brown, 2011). Infants pick up on this pattern of caregiving, initiating interactions with others twice as frequently as Tseltal children, who are encouraged instead to be observers of the interactions going on around them (Brown, 2011). Brown and Casillas (in press) document how Rossel caregivers encourage early independence in their children, observing their autonomy in choosing what to do, wear, eat, and say while finding other ways to promote pro-social behavior (e.g., praise). Overall, Rossel Island could be characterized as a child-centered language environment (but see Brown & Casillas, in press; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984), in which children, even very young ones, are considered interactional and conversational partners whose interests are often allowed to shape the topic and direction of conversation.

The data presented here come from the Rossel Island subset of the OMITTED-FOR-REVIEW, a collection of raw daylong recordings and supplementary data from over 100 children under age four growing up on Rossel Island OMITTED-FOR-REVIEW. The Rossel Island subcorpus was collected in 2016 and includes daylong audio recordings and experimental data from 57 children born to 43 mothers. These children had 0–2 younger siblings (mean = 0.36; median = 0) and 0–5 older siblings (mean = 2; median = 2); most participating caregivers were on the younger end of those in the community, though two primary caregiver pairs were their child's biological grandparents (mean = 33.9 years; median = 32; range = 24–70 and fathers: mean = 35.6; median = 34; range = 24—57). Based on available demographic data for 40 of the biological mothers we estimate that mothers are typically 21.4 years old when they give birth to their first child (median = 21.5; range = 12–30). On the basis of demographic data for 34 of those mothers, we estimate an average inter-child interval of 2.8 years (median = 2.6; range = 1.75–5.2). Household size, defined here as the number of people sharing kitchen and sleeping areas on a

daily basis, ranged between 3 and 12 (mean = 7; median = 7). Households are clustered into small patrilocal hamlets which form a wider group of communal caregivers and playmates. The hamlets themselves are clustered together into patches of more distantly related patrilocal residents. The average hamlet in our corpus comprises 5.8 households (median = 5; range = 3–11); the typical household in our dataset has 2 children under age seven (i.e., not yet attending school) and 2 adults, leading us to estimate that there are around 10 young children and 10 adults present within a hamlet throughout the day. This estimate does not include visitors to the target child's hamlet or relatives the target child encounters while visiting others. Therefore, while 24.6% of the target children in our corpus are first born to their mothers, these children are incorporated into a larger pool of young children whose care is divided among numerous caregivers. Among our participating families, most mothers had finished their education at one of the island's schools (6 years of education = 32.6%; 8 years of education = 37.2%)[2], with about a quarter having attended secondary school off the island (10 years of education = 25.6%; 12 years of education = 2%). Only one mother had less than six years of education. Similarly, most fathers had finished their education at one of the island's schools (6 years of education = 44.2%; 8 years of education = 20.9%) or at an off-island secondary school (10 years of education = 27.9%), with only 7% having less than six years of education. Note that in Table 1 we use a different set of educational levels than is used on the island so that we can more easily compare the present sample to that used in Casillas et al. (2019). To our knowledge at the time of recording, all but two children were typically developing; one showed signs of significant language delay and one showed signs of multiple developmental delay (motor, language, intellectual). Both children's delays were consistently observed in follow-up trips in 2018 and 2019. Their recordings are not included in the analyses reported below.

[2]Local schools include elementary (~3 years; ages ~7–10) and primary (~6 years; ages ~10–16) education. Subsequent education is not locally available and students pursuing this route must find accommodations on the nearby island Misima or on mainland PNG.

Dates of birth for children were initially collected via parent report. We were able to verify the majority of birth dates using the records at the island health clinic. Because not all mothers give birth at the clinic and because dates are written by hand, some births are not recorded, are inaccurately recorded, or otherwise significantly diverge from what the parents report. In these cases we gathered information from as many sources as possible and followed up with the families, often using the dates of neighboring children born around the same time to determine the correct date.

The data we present come from 7–9-hour recordings of a waking day at home. Children wore the recording device: an elastic vest containing a small stereo audio recorder (Olympus WS-832 or WS-853) and a miniature camera that captured photos of the child's frontal view at a fixed interval (every 15 seconds; Narrative Clip 1). The camera was outfitted with a fisheye lens that allowed us to capture 180 degrees of the child's frontal view. This photo technique increases the ease and reliability of transcription and annotation. However, because the camera and recorder are separate devices, we had to synchronize them manually. We used an external wristwatch to record the current time at start of recording on each device individually, with accuracy down to the second (photographed by the camera and spoken into the recorder). The camera's software timestamps each image file such that we can calculate the number of seconds that have elapsed between photos. These timestamps were used with the cross-device time synchronization cue to create photo-linked audio files of each recording, which we then formatted as video files (see URL_MASKED_FOR_REVIEW for scripts). The informed consent process used with participants, as well as data collection and storage, were conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines approved by the Radboud University Social Sciences Ethics Committee.

Table 1

Demographic overview of the 10 children whose recordings are sampled in the current study, including from left to right: child's age (years;months.days); child's sex (M/F); mother's age (years); highest level of maternal education achieved (none (grades 0–5)/primary (grades 6–7)/secondary (grades 8–11)/preparatory (grade 12)); and the number of people living in the child's household.

Age	Sex	Mother's age	Level of maternal education	People in household
00;01.09	F	31	secondary	8
00;03.19	M	37	primary	9
00;04.13	M	24	preparatory	5
00;07.18	M	24	secondary	5
00;09.03	F	29	secondary	5
01;00.29	F	30	primary	9
01;05.02	M	25	secondary	6
01;08.03	F	33	primary	9
02;01.22	F	21	secondary	4
02;11.29	M	41	primary	8

Data selection and annotation

From the daylong recordings of 57 Rossel children, we selected 10 representative children between ages 0;0 and 3;0 for transcription and analysis. The 10 children were selected to be spread between the target age range (0;0–3;0) while also representing a range of typical maternal education levels found in the community and being evenly split between male and female children (Table 1). We selected a series of non-overlapping sub-clips from each recording for transcription (Figure 1) in the following order: nine randomly-selected 2.5-minute clips, five manually-selected "peak" turn-taking activity 1-minute clips, five



Figure 1. Recording duration (black line) and sampled clips (colored boxes) for each of the 10 recordings analyzed, sorted by child age in months.

manually-selected "peak" **target child** vocal activity 1-minute clips, and one manually-selected 5-minute expansion of the best one-minute clip, for a total of 37.5 minutes of transcribed audio for each child (6.25 audio hours in total).

Manual clip selection proceeded as follows: one person (the first author or a non-Rossel research assistant) listened through the entirety of each recording, documenting the approximate onset time, duration, and notable features of any short period that they perceived to be a *burst* of turn taking and/or target-child vocalization; judgments were made subjectively, and with reference to the lack of such activity in other parts of the recording. After compiling a list candidate bursts for each recording, the first author listened again to each candidate, adding further notes about the diversity of target-child vocalizations and the density of turn taking. Clips that overlapped with previously transcribed segments or that featured significant background noise were

eliminated. From the remainder, the five 1-minute clips that best demonstrated sequences of temporally contingent vocalization between the target child and at least one other person were selected as the "turn-taking" clips. From the remaining candidate clips, the five that best demonstrated high density, high maturity, and high diversity vocalizations by the target child were selected as the "vocal activity" clips. After these ten 1-minute clips had been transcribed for each recording (i.e., during the field visit), the first author assessed each for its density of vocal and turn-taking activity and searched for continuation of that activity before and after the one-minute clip. The clip that best balanced dense, minimally repetititious verbal activity with continuation in neighboring minutes was selected to have a 5-minute extension window for further annotation. All else being equal, we give preference to clips featuring speech from underrepresented foreground speakers (e.g., adult males; see more details at OMITTED-FOR-REVIEW).

We were limited to annotating these sub-clips from only 10 children because of the time-intensive nature of transcribing these naturalistic data; 1 minute of audio typically took approximately 60–70 minutes to be segmented into utterances, transcribed, annotated, and loosely translated into English (~400 hours total). Yélî Dnye is almost exclusively spoken on Rossel Island, where there is no electricity (we use solar panels) and unreliable access to mobile data, so transcription was completed over the course of three 4–6 week visits to the island in 2016, 2018, and 2019.

We used the ACLEW Annotation Scheme (Casillas et al., 2017) in ELAN (Wittenburg, Brugman, Russel, Klassmann, & Sloetjes, 2006) to transcribe and annotate all hearable speech in the clips. Using both the audio and photo context, we segmented out the utterances and ascribed them to individual speakers (e.g., older brother, mother, aunt, etc.). We then annotated the vocal maturity of each utterance produced by the target child

(non-canonical babble/canonical babble/single word/multi-word/unsure) and annotated the addressee of all speech from other speakers (addressed to the target child/one or more other children/one or more adults/a mix of adults and children/any animal/other/unsure). **Regarding vocal maturity annotations, an vocalization was considered "single word" if it contained a single recognizable (transcribed) lexical type (e.g., "mine", "mine mine") and "multi-word" if it contained more than one lexical type (e.g., "my mango"), with non-lexical lingusitic vocalizations annotated as "canonical babble" (containing at least one consonant with an adult-like transition with its neighboring vocalic sound(s)) or "non-canonical babble", and non-linguistic vocalizations classified as "crying" or "laughing". Vocalizations that were too ambiguous to make a decision were marked as "unsure". Vegetative sounds (e.g., sneezes) were ignored. Regarding addressee annotations, the audio and photo context were used to review who each speaker was talking to for each utterance; utterances were only considered directed to the target child when the native Rossel-speaking research assistant and first author felt certain of this judgment given the context. Utterances were otherwise classified as directed to a "child" (1+ children; a group of children including the target child), "adult" (1+ adults), "both" (1+ children and 1+ adults; a group that may include the target child), "animal" (1+ animals), "other" (a clear addressee that doesn't fit into the other categories), or "unsure" (not enough evidence to make a judgment). Note that all transcription** and annotation was done together by the first author and one of three community members (all native Yélî Dnye speakers). The community-based research assistants personally knew all the families in the recordings, and were able to use their own experience, the discourse context, and information from the accompanying photos in reporting what was said and to whom speech was addressed for each utterance. **These annotations relied on mutual agreement between the first author and the**

Rossel research assistant, so there is no direct way to estimate interrater reliability for the NN target-child vocalizations and NN other-speaker vocalizations discovered in the clips. That said, independent vocal maturity annotations of these same target child vocalizations in a different studied revealed a highly similar pattern of results (OMITTED-FOR-REVIEW). Detailed manuals and self-guided training materials, including a "gold standard test" for this annotation scheme can be found at OMITTED-FOR-REVIEW.

In what follows we first analyze the nine randomly selected 2.5-minute clips from each child to establish a baseline view of their speech environment, focusing on the effects of child age, time of day, household size, and number of speakers on the rate of target child-directed (TCDS) and other-directed speech (ODS). Next, we repeat these analyses, focusing instead only on the turn-taking clips to gain a view of the speech environment as it appears during the peak interactions for the day. Then as a first approximation of children's linguistic development, we map a coarse trajectory of children's use of babble, first words, and multi-word utterances. Finally, we wrap up by integrating our Panoramic-approach results with those from prior Close Study work, relating these findings to the larger literature on child-directed speech and its role in language development.

Statistical models

We conducted all analyses in R, using the glmmTMB package to run generalized linear mixed-effects regressions (M. E. Brooks et al., 2017; R Core Team, 2019) and ggplot2 to generate figures (Wickham, 2016). This dataset and analysis are available at URL_MASKED_FOR_REVIEW. TCDS and ODS minutes per hour are naturally restricted to non-negative (0–infinity) values, causing the distributional variance of those measures to become positively skewed. To address this issue we use negative binomial regressions, which can better fit non-negative, overdispersed data (M. E. Brooks et al., 2017;

Smithson & Merkle, 2013). There were also many cases of zero minutes of TCDS across the clips—for example, this often occurred in the randomly sampled clips when the child was sleeping in a quiet area. To handle this additional distributional characteristic of the data, we added a zero-inflation model to TCDS analysis which, in addition to the count model of TCDS (e.g., testing effects of age on the input rate), creates a binary model to evaluate the likelihood of TCDS being used at all. More conventional, gaussian linear mixed-effects regressions with log-transformed dependent variables are provided in the Supplementary Materials, but are qualitatively similar to what we report here.

Results

The models included the following predictors: child age (months; centered and standardized), household size (number of people; centered and standardized), number of non-target-child speakers present in that clip (centered and standardized), and time of day at the start of the clip (factor: "morning" = before 11:00; "midday" = 11:00–13:00; "afternoon" = after 13:00). We also included two-way interactions of (a) child age and the number of speakers present and (b) child age and time of day, with a random effect of child. For the zero-inflation model of TCDS, we included the number of speakers present. We limit our discussion to significant effects; full model results are provided in the Supplementary Materials.

Target-child-directed speech (TCDS)

In the random sample, these 10 children heard an average of 3.13 minutes of speech directly addressed to them per hour (median = 2.95; range = 1.58–6.26; Figure 2 left panel, purple/solid summaries). For comparison, this is slightly less than reported values using a near-identical method of data collection, annotation, and analysis in a Tseltal Mayan



Figure 2. Estimates of TCDS min/hr (left) and ODS min/hr (right) across the sampled age range. Each box plot summarizes the data for one child from the randomly sampled clips (purple; solid) or the turn taking clips (green; dashed). Bands on the linear trends show 95% confidence intervals.

community (3.6 minutes per hour for children under 3;0; Casillas et al. (2019)) and comparable to what has been reported using a similar method in a Tsimane community (1.6–4.8 minutes per hour for children under 3;0 depending on what speech is counted; Scaff et al., in preparation).

The zero-inflated negative binomial regression of TCDS minutes per hour (N = 90, log-likelihood = -195.26, overdispersion estimate = 3.37) suggested significant effects of child age, time of day, and their interaction on the rate at which children are directly addressed. First, the older children heard a small but significantly greater amount of TCDS per hour (Figure 2 left panel purple/solid summaries; B = 0.73, SD = 0.23, z = 3.20, $p < 0.01$). Overall, these children were also more likely to hear TCDS in the mornings (Figure 3 top left panel), with significantly higher TCDS rates in the morning compared to both midday (midday-vs-morning: B = 0.80, SD = 0.36, z = 2.23, p = 0.03) and the afternoon (afternoon-vs-morning: B = 0.54, SD = 0.26, z = 2.10, p = 0.04), and no significant difference in TCDS rate between midday and the afternoon. However, the time-of-day

pattern changed with child age. Older children were more likely than younger children to show a peak in TCDS during midday, with a decrease in TCDS between midday and the afternoon (midday-vs-afternoon: B = -0.60, SD = 0.29, z = -2.04, p = 0.04) and marginally less TCDS in the morning than at midday (midday-vs-morning: B = -0.59, SD = 0.30, z = -1.94, p = 0.05). There were no significant effects in either the count or the zero-inflation models.

Children heard TCDS from a variety of different speakers. Most TCDS came from adults (mean = 72.65%, median = 75.51%, range = 41.41–100%). On average, 82.35% of the total TCDS minutes from adults came from women. However, an increasing quantity of TCDS with age came from child speakers (child-TCDS, e.g., from siblings, cousins, or neighbors; C-TCDS); a Spearman's correlation showed a significant positive relationship between the average proportion of C-TCDS in a clip and target child age (Spearman's *rho* = 0.78; $p = 0.01$).

Other-directed speech (ODS)

In the random sample, these children heard an average of 35.90 minutes of other-directed speech per hour (Figure 2 right panel, purple/solid summaries; median = 32.37; range = 20.20–53.78): that is more than eleven times the average quantity of speech directed to them, with many clips displaying near-continuous background speech. For comparison, the prior estimate for Tseltal children using near-parallel methods found an average of 21 minutes of overhearable speech per hour (Casillas et al., 2019), and a recent study of North American children's daylong recordings found that adult-directed speech (a subset of ODS) occurred at a rate of 7.3 minutes per hour (Bergelson, Amatuni, Dailey, Koorathota, & Tor, 2019a).

The negative binomial regression of other-directed speech rate (N = 90, log-likelihood



Figure 3. Estimates of TCDS min/hr (left panels) and ODS min/hr (right panels) across the recorded day in the random clips (top panels) and turn-taking (bottom panels) clips. Each box plot summarizes the data for children age 1;0 and younger (light) or age 1;0 and older (dark) at the given time of day.

= -370.87, overdispersion estimate = 9.14) revealed effects of child age, number of speakers present, and time of day on the rate of ODS encountered. The rate of ODS significantly decreased with child age (Figure 2 right panel, purple/solid summaries; B = -0.57, SD = 0.17, z = -3.28, $p < 0.01$) and significantly increased in the presence of more speakers (B = 0.50, SD = 0.05, z = 10.07, $p < 0.001$). Across the randomly selected clips, there were an average of 6.19 speakers present other than the target child (median = 6; range = 1–19), an average of 59.99% of whom were adults. Comparing again to Tseltal and North American English, in which the average number of speakers present, not including the target child, was 3.44 and 3.9 respectively (Bergelson et al., 2019a; Casillas et al., 2019), we can infer that the increased rate of ODS on Rossel Island is due in part to there simply being more speakers

present. Time-of-day effects on ODS only came through in an interaction with child age (Figure 3 top right panel). In particular, older children heard a pattern of ODS mirroring the general pattern of TCDS; significantly more ODS in the mornings compared to midday (midday-vs-morning: B = 0.65, SD = 0.20, z = 3.23, $p < 0.01$) and the afternoon (afternoon-vs-morning: B = 0.37, SD = 0.15, z = 2.50, p = 0.01). There were no other significant effects on ODS rate.

In sum, the random baseline rates of TCDS and ODS in children's speech environments are influenced by child age (TCDS increases, ODS decreases), time of day (both generally peak in the morning), and their interaction (older children hear more TCDS and less ODS than younger children at midday). The rate of ODS is also impacted by the number of speakers present. Correlational results suggest that TCDS comes increasingly from other children over the first three years. That said, the baseline rate of TCDS is low, on par with estimates in other small-scale rural communities (Casillas et al., 2019; Scaff et al., in preparation), while the ODS rate is quite high relative to estimates in prior work.

TCDS and ODS during interactional peaks

If we instead investigate the rates of TCDS and ODS encountered by these children during interactional peaks, a different picture emerges (Figures 2 and 3 green/dashed summaries). The children heard much more TCDS in the turn-taking clips—14.45 min/hr; more than four times the rate of TCDS in the random baseline (Figure 2, left panel, green/dashed summaries; median = 15.07; range = 9.61–18.73). Children also heard a reduced rate of ODS: 25.27 min/hr (70.39% of the random-sample ODS rate, Figure 2, right panel, green/dashed summaries; median = 19.59; range = 6.68–60.18).

The negative binomial mixed-effects regression of TCDS (N = 55, log-likelihood = -183.25, overdispersion estimate = 2.91) revealed a significant decrease with child age (B =

-0.63, SD = 0.27, z = -2.33, p = 0.02) and a significant interaction between child age and time of day; TCDS rate during interactional peaks was marginally higher for older children at morning compared to midday (midday-vs-morning: B = 0.53, SD = 0.28, z = 1.89, p = 0.06) and significantly higher in the afternoon than at midday (midday-vs-afternoon: B = 0.61, SD = 0.28, z = 2.17, p = 0.03; see Figure 3, bottom left panel).

As in the random sample, an increasing portion of TCDS during interactional peaks came from other children with age. While, overall, more of the TCDS in interactional peaks came from adults than in the random clips (mean = 82.68%, median = 88.04%, range = 50–100%), a Spearman's correlation showed an even stronger positive relationship between the average proportion of child TCDS in a clip and target child age (Spearman's $rho = 0.92$; $p = < 0.001$). Notably, women contributed proportionally less TCDS during interactional peaks than they did during the random clips: on average, women contributed 61.55% of the children's TCDS minutes from adults in the turn-taking clips (compared to 82.35% in the random clips). In brief, compared to the random sample, interactional peaks included more directed speech from men and, for older target children, more directed speech from other children.

The negative binomial mixed-effects regression of ODS (N = 55, log-likelihood = -202.60, overdispersion estimate = 4.66) only revealed a significant effect of number of speakers. As before, ODS rates were higher when more speakers were present (B = 0.56, SD = 0.08, z = 6.76, p < 0.001). There were no other significant effects on ODS rate (Figure 3, bottom right panel).

Overall, the results suggest that these children typically hear very little directly addressed speech, but that interactional peaks provide opportunities for dense input. While the majority of directed speech comes from women, an increasing portion of it comes from other children with age, and directed speech from men is more likely during interactional peaks. Directed and overhearable speech are most likely to occur during the morning, before

most of the household has dispersed for their work activities, similar to other findings from subsistence farming households (Casillas et al., 2019). However, older children are more likely than younger children to show higher input rates at midday, perhaps due to their increased interactions with other children while adults attend to gardening and domestic tasks. Possibly because of the large number of speakers present, these children were also in the vicinity of voluminous overhearable speech, underscoring the availability of other-addressed speech as a resource for linguistic input in this context.

Vocal maturity

Given the low baseline rate of directed speech, one might expect that Rossel children's early linguistic development, particularly the onset and use of single- and multi-word utterances, shows delays in comparison to children growing up in more CDS-rich environments. We plotted the proportion of all linguistic vocalizations for each child (i.e., discarding laughter, crying, or unknown-types; leaving a total of 4308 vocalizations) that fell into the following categories: non-canonical babble, canonical babble, single-word utterance, or multi-word utterance. Children are expected to traverse all four types of vocalization during development such that they primarily produce single- and multi-word utterances by age three.

In the onset of use for canonical babble, first words, and multi-word utterances, these Rossel children's vocalization data closely resemble expectations based on populations of children who hear more CDS (Figure 4). Canonical babble appears in the second half of the first year, first words appear around the first birthday, and multi-word utterances appear a few months after that (Frank et al., in preparation; Kuhl, 2004; Pine & Lieven, 1993; Slobin, 1970; Tomasello & Brooks, 1999; Warlaumont, Richards, Gilkerson, & Oller, 2014). Rossel children also far exceeded the canonical babbling ratio (CBR) associated with major developmental delay (proportional use of speech-like vocalizations > 0.15 by 0;10; Cychosz et

al., under review; Oller, Eilers, Basinger, Steffens, & Urbano, 1995); the minimum CBR among Rossel children 0;9 and older was 0.22 (mean = 0.63; median = 0.68; range = 0.22–0.86).

Over all annotated clips, children produced an average of 7.18 linguistic vocalizations per minute (median = 7.79; range = 4.57–8.95), less frequently than children in short recordings of American infant-caregiver interaction (Oller et al., 1995) but similar to estimates for Tseltal children (Brown, 2011; Casillas et al., 2019).



Figure 4. Proportion of vocalization types used by children across age (NCB = Non-canonical babble, CB = Canonical babble, SW = single word utterance, MW = multi-word utterance).

Discussion

We analyzed the speech environments of 10 Rossel children under age 3;0 to investigate: (a) how often children were spoken to directly, (b) how much other overhearable speech is available to them, and (c) how these sources of linguistic input are shaped by child age and interactional context. **We then additionally conducted a preliminary**

investigation into (d) whether this (relatively) low rate of directed input appears to impact their early production milestones.

By investigating the language environments of children in this child-centric subsistence farming context, we aimed to provide a new and critical comparative datapoint to a research area that has previously confounded differences in child-directed speech ideology with differences in broad lifestyle features (post-industrial/nuclear vs. subsistence-farming/multi-generational; REFS casillas2019, shneidman). Our idea was that, if Rossel children's language environments pattern like North American ones, it would support that idea that caregiver ideology drives substantial differences in language input, whereas if they patterned like Tseltal environments, it would support the idea that lifestyle drives substantial differences instead. Overall, our findings point toward broad effects of lifestyle on the quantity of directed and overheard speech children hear. Evidence for the influence of CDS ideologies is more visible in *who* speaks to the target child rather than in the overall rate of linguistic input.

Input rate similarities across subsistence farming communities

Based on prior ethnographic work, we **hypothesized** that **Rossel** children would hear frequent child-directed speech (Brown & Casillas, in press). In fact, children were rarely directly addressed **over the course of the day. We found a baseline rate of TCDS** comparable to that found in a Tseltal community where **infrequent use of** TCDS is one means to socializing children into attending to their surroundings **(Rossel: 3.13 TCDS min/hr vs. Tseltal: 3.63). As in the case of Tseltal children, this relatively small rate of TCDS was not associated with any delay in the appearance of vocal maturity milestones, including the use of single and multi-word utterances. Since we know from prior, in-depth ethnographic work that**

caregivers' ideas about talking to young children do, in fact, differ enormously in these two communities (REFS Brown & Casillas, in press, p. 2011), we attribute the similarity in baseline rates of TCDS to the fact that all these children are growing up in multi-generational, subsistence farming households. This inference is bolstered by our finding that children in both communities show similar fluctuations in TCDS rate over the day: peak rates in the morning, with older children managing to elicit more TCDS during midday hours than younger children [REFS casillas2019], counter to our predictions. High caregiver workload has been linked to less child-directed speech in multiple previous studies of children in non-industrialized contexts (e.g., Kaluli, Samoan, Gusii, and Yucatec; Schieffelin 1990, Ochs 1988, Le Vine et al., 1994; see Gaskins REFS for a review); the data here suggest that the schedule of agricultural work may also play an important role in shaping the daily influx of both TCDS and ODS, which follow a similar pattern from morning to evening in both the Rossel and Tseltal communities. We had also hypothesized that cultural differences in caregiver talk to children would be most visible in the turn-taking clips, which are selected in particular for their insight into caregiver responsiveness patterns. But even under these circumstances, we found a similar overall rate of TCDS in the Rossel Island data compared to that of the Tseltal children (Rossel: 14.45 TCDS min/hr vs. Tseltal: 13.28). In both cultural contexts, peak TCDS clips displayed around four times the directed speech rate as the baseline, though this relative increase was greater in the case of the Rossel data than the Tseltal data (Rossel: 4.62x the random rate vs. Tseltal: 3.66x).

Our findings *did* support previous descriptions of shared caregiving practices on Rossel Island, in which women, men, and other children take turns attending to the care of young children (Brown & Casillas, in press). First,

Rossel children hear more CDS from other children than Tseltal children do (Rossel: 27% of TCDS vs. Tseltal 20%), and the proportion of TCDS from other children increases with age, unlike in the Tseltal case [REFS casillas2019]. Second, while TCDS from men is highly infrequent in the Tseltal data (absent in 4 out of 10 children's samples and outpaced >12 to 1 by women's TCDS otherwise), TCDS from men in the Rossel Island data is much more frequent, making up nearly 20% of adult TCDS in the random baseline and nearly 40% of TCDS in the turn-taking clips. We take this substantial proportion of TCDS from children and men as evidence that caregiving is indeed divided among many types of speakers in Rossel communities (Brown & Casillas, in press), and also note that, together, child and adult male speakers contribute more than half of the TCDS during interactional peaks. Therefore, rather than how much TCDS is present, we get an initial glimpse into the different caregiving arrangements between these two cultural contexts in who is talking to the target child.

This increase in TCDS from other children recalls findings from Shneidman and Goldin-Meadow (Shneidman and Goldin-Meadow (2012); see also (Brown, 2011; Brown & Casillas, in press)) in which Yucatec Mayan children's directed speech rate increased enormously between ages one and three, primarily due to increased input from other children. We saw a significant, but much smaller overall increase in TCDS in these 10 Rossel children's recordings, with an increasing proportion of that input coming from children. Interestingly, prior work with a Tseltal community—culturally more proximal to the Yucatec families studied in Shneidman and Goldin-Meadow (2012)—found no evidence for increased input from other children in this same age range (0;0–3;0; Casillas et al., 2019). The lack of child TCDS in the study of Tseltal Mayan children was attributed to the observation that they only begin to engage in independent, extended play with other children *after* age three. In comparison, prior ethnographic work on Rossel Island highlights independence as a primary

concern for parents of young children; from early toddlerhood Rossel children are encouraged to choose how they dress, when and what to eat, and who to visit (Brown & Casillas, in press). The formation of hamlets in a cluster around a shared open area, often close to a shallow swimming area, further nurtures a sense of safe, free space in which children can wander. These features of childhood on Rossel Island support extended independent play with other children from an early age and may help explain the strongly increasing presence of child TCDS in the present data. Further work combining the time of day and interlocutor effects found here with ethnographic interview data are needed to explore these ideas in full**.**

Finally, prior work using daylong audio recordings also led us to expect that the quantity of TCDS would be **relatively stable** across the age range studied**, that ODS rate would decrease with age, and that would be non-uniformly distributed over the recording day (Abney et al., 2017; Bergelson et al., 2019b; Casillas et al., 2019; Scaff et al., in preparation).** Counter to expectations, we found a small but significant increase in TCDS rate with child age in the random clips and a small and significant *decrease* in TCDS rate with age in the turn-taking clips. The age-related baseline increase in TCDS may derive from more frequent participation in independent play with other children; in prior work, increased proportional input from other children was also associated with an increase in overall input rate (Shneidman & Goldin-Meadow, 2012). The age-related decrease in TCDS rate during peak interactional moments was not expected, but may be attributable to this change in interactional partners with age; if adults are more likely to be the source of TCDS during interactional peaks for younger children, they may also provide more voluminous speech during those peaks than other children do during interactional peaks later in development. Sleep during the day may also help explain these patterns; if older children sleep less than younger children, they may be more likely hear more TCDS during random but not peak-based clips. All of these explanations require follow-up work from a larger sample of children and, ideally, from a larger sample of their interactions throughout the day. As predicted ODS decreased with age, consistent with prior

daylong audio studies with both Western and non-Western samples (Bergelson et al., 2019b; Casillas et al., 2019; Scaff et al., in preparation)**, though we note that the Rossel child speech environment contains ample overhearable speech; much more than has been reported elswhere, at time of writing. And, similar to the Tseltal data, the random and turn-taking clips across the day reveal substantial fluctuations in TCDS rate supporting the idea that children encounter a non-uniform stream of linguistic input during their days at home.**

Future directions One implication of our findings is that TCDS rate **estimates from daylong data are** not effective at distinguishing distinct caregiver attitudes toward talking to young children. While Rossel caregivers view their children, even their young infants, as potential co-interactants in conversational play (Brown & Casillas, in press), the circumstances of everyday life shape the children's broader linguistic landscape such that most of what children hear is talk between others. We suggest that, in the daylong context, caregivers from these two subsistence farming communities are preoccupied for most of the day with social and domestic commitments in which they are motivated to converse with the other adults and (older) children present; not just to get their daily tasks done but also because these more mature speakers enable more complex verbal interactions and social routines**.**

Whle TCDS is rare overall, we suspect that it is **precisely** during interactional peaks **when** caregiver attitudes about how to engage children in interaction are most clearly expressed. Indeed, during Rossel interactional peaks we see not only more TCDS but also TCDS from more diverse speaker types**. We suggest then, that** the forces shaping the rate of Rossel children's linguistic input are somewhat different from the forces shaping the content and sources of their linguistic input. This insight is critical in trying to join cognitive and social models of children's early language development. After all, children—particularly children in contexts with **relatively little** TCDS—may do most of their language learning

during these short bursts in the day when they are jointly attending to language during interactions with others. If so, it would be more efficient to aim models of learning and annotation time at these interactional peaks. Indeed, such a hybrid approach may be optimal for accessing varied, ecologically valid, culturally distinct codes of verbal interaction while also sketching a stable picture of early language exposure specific to those same communities (Shneidman, 2010; Shneidman & Goldin-Meadow, 2012). Further cross-cultural work on children's ability to learn from massed vs. distributed and directed vs. overhearable language use (e.g., Akhtar, Jipson, & Callanan, 2001; Schwab & Lew-Williams, 2016) is a critical route for further investigation into how these sources of linguistic input may be leveraged for language development.

Conclusion

We estimate that, on average, children on Rossel Island under age 3;0 hear 3.13 minutes of directed speech per hour, with an average of 14.45 minutes per hour during peak interactive moments during the day. Most of directed speech comes from adults, but older children hear more directed speech from other children. There is also an average 35.90 minutes per hour of overhearable speech present. Older children heard more directed speech and less overhearable speech than younger children. Bursts of speech featuring mostly TCDS appear to be present from infancy onward. Despite this relatively low rate of directed speech, these children's vocal maturity appears on-track with norms for typically developing children in multiple diverse populations (Cychosz et al., under review; Lee, Jhang, Relyea, Chen, & Oller, 2018; Warlaumont et al., 2014).

Our findings diverged in several ways from expectations developed on the basis of prior ethnographic work in this community, including the frequency of child-directed talk, the diversity of talkers, and the distribution of talk over the course of the day. When considered together with data from a Mayan community, the findings suggest that the Panoramic

approach, while well suited to gathering inclusive, ecologically valid estimates of how much linguistic input children hear, is also far more sensitive to circumstantial variation (e.g., the number of speakers present) than it is to established ideological variation in how caregivers talk to children. For the latter, a Close Study or other hybrid approach is needed (e.g., analyzing content in interactional peaks). Whether child language development is better predicted by meaningful individual differences in average circumstantial variation (e.g., Panoramic input quantity), ideologically-based variation (e.g., attitudes toward language pedagogy), or something inbetween is a question for future work. Cross-cultural and cross-linguistic data will have a major role to play in teasing out the causal factors at play in this larger issue relating children's early linguistic experience to their later language development.

Importantly, the data presented here come from an evolving corpus of Yélî Dnye developmental data; any reader interested in citing descriptive features of the Rossel child language environment is strongly encouraged to visit the following address for up-to-date estimates: URL_MASKED_FOR_REVIEW. The information on that linked page will include any new data, annotations, and analyses added after the publication of this study.

Acknowledgements

References

Abney, D. H., Smith, L. B., & Yu, C. (2017). It's time: Quantifying the relevant time scales for joint attention. In G. Gunzelmann, A. Howes, T. Tenbrink, & E. Davelaar (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society* (pp. 1489–1494). London, UK.

Akhtar, N., Jipson, J., & Callanan, M. A. (2001). Learning words through overhearing. *Child Development*, *72*(2), 416–430.

Bates, E., & Goodman, J. C. (1997). On the inseparability of grammar and the lexicon: Evidence from acquisition, aphasia, and real-time processing. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, *12*(5–6), 507–584. doi:10.1080/016909697386628

Bergelson, E., Alphen, P. van, Benneti, L., Bunce, J., Casillas, M., Guez, A., ... Cristia, A. (in preparation). Child language environments in >2500 daylong recordings across 5 continents.

Bergelson, E., Amatuni, A., Dailey, S., Koorathota, S., & Tor, S. (2019a). Day by day, hour by hour: Naturalistic language input to infants. *Developmental Science*, *22*(1), e12715. doi:10.1111/desc.12715

Bergelson, E., Casillas, M., Soderstrom, M., Seidl, A., Warlaumont, A. S., & Amatuni, A. (2019b). What do North American babies hear? A large-scale cross-corpus analysis. *Developmental Science*, *22*(1), e12724. doi:10.1111/desc.12724

Brinchmann, E. I., Braeken, J., & Lyster, S.-A. H. (2019). Is there a direct relation between the development of vocabulary and grammar? *Developmental Science*, *22*(1), e12709. doi:10.1111/desc.12709

Brooks, M. E., Kristensen, K., van Benthem, K. J., Magnusson, A., Berg, C. W., Nielsen, A.,

... Bolker, B. M. (2017). Modeling zero-inflated count data with glmmTMB. *bioRxiv*. doi:10.1101/132753

Brown, P. (2011). The cultural organization of attention. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & and B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Handbook of Language Socialization* (pp. 29–55). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Brown, P. (2014). The interactional context of language learning in Tzeltal. In I. Arnon, M. Casillas, C. Kurumada, & B. Estigarribia (Eds.), *Language in interaction: Studies in honor of Eve V. Clark* (pp. 51–82). Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins.

Brown, P., & Casillas, M. (in press). Childrearing through social interaction on Rossel Island, PNG. In A. J. Fentiman & M. Goody (Eds.), *Esther Goody revisited: Exploring the legacy of an original inter-disciplinarian* (pp. XX–XX). New York, NY: Berghahn.

Brown, P., & Gaskins, S. (2014). Language acquisition and language socialization. In N. J. Enfield, P. Kockelman, & J. Sidnell (Eds.), *Handbook of Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 187–226). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139342872.010

Casillas, M., & Cristia, A. (2019). A step-by-step guide to collecting and analyzing long-format speech environment (lfse) recordings. *Collabra: Psychology*, *5*(1), 24. doi:10.1525/collabra.209

Casillas, M., Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (2019). Early language experience in a [tseltal mayan] village. *Child Development*, *OnlineOpen*(X), XX–XX.

Casillas, M., Bunce, J., Soderstrom, M., Rosemberg, C., Migdalek, M., Alam, F., ... Garrison, H. (2017). Introduction: The ACLEW DAS template [training materials].

Retrieved from https://osf.io/aknjv/

Cychosz, M., Cristia, A., Bergelson, E., Casillas, M., Baudet, G., Warlaumont, A. S., ... Seidl, A. (under review). Canonical babble development in a large-scale crosslinguistic corpus. Retrieved from https://osf.io/ca6qu/

de León, L. (2011). Language socialization and multiparty participation frameworks. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & and B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Handbook of Language Socialization* (pp. 81–111). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. doi:10.1002/9781444342901.ch4

Frank, M. C., Braginsky, M., Marchman, V. A., & Yurovsky, D. (in preparation). *Variability and consistency in early language learning: The Wordbank project*. Retrieved from https://langcog.github.io/wordbank-book/

Gaskins, S. (2000). Children's daily activities in a Mayan village: A culturally grounded description. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *34*(4), 375–389. doi:10.1177/106939710003400405

Gaskins, S. (2006). Cultural perspectives on infant–caregiver interaction. In N. J. Enfield & S. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition and Interaction* (pp. 279–298). Oxford: Berg.

Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful Differences in the Everyday Experience of Young American Children*. Paul H. Brookes Publishing.

Hoff, E. (2003). The specificity of environmental influence: Socioeconomic status affects early vocabulary development via maternal speech. *Child Development*, *74*(5), 1368–1378. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01492

Huttenlocher, J., Waterfall, H., Vasilyeva, M., Vevea, J., & Hedges, L. V. (2010). Sources of variability in children's language growth. *Cognitive Psychology*, *61*(4), 343–365.

773 doi:10.1016/j.cogpsych.2010.08.002

774 Kuhl, P. K. (2004). Early language acquisition: Cracking the speech code. *Nature Reviews*
775 *Neuroscience*, *5*(11), 831. doi:10.1038/nrn1533

776 Lee, C.-C., Jhang, Y., Relyea, G., Chen, L.-m., & Oller, D. K. (2018). Babbling development
777 as seen in canonical babbling ratios: A naturalistic evaluation of all-day recordings.
778 *Infant Behavior and Development*, *50*, 140–153.

779 Lieven, E. V. M., Pine, J. M., & Baldwin, G. (1997). Lexically-based learning and early
780 grammatical development. *Journal of Child Language*, *24*(1), 187–219.
781 doi:10.1017/S0305000996002930

782 Marchman, V. A., Martínez-Sussmann, C., & Dale, P. S. (2004). The language-specific
783 nature of grammatical development: Evidence from bilingual language learners.
784 *Developmental Science*, *7*(2), 212–224. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7687.2004.00340.x

785 Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three
786 developmental stories and their implications. In R. A. Schweder & R. A. LeVine
787 (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 276–322). Cambridge
788 University Press.

789 Oller, D. K., Eilers, R. E., Basinger, D., Steffens, M. L., & Urbano, R. (1995). Extreme
790 poverty and the development of precursors to the speech capacity. *First Language*,
791 *15*(44), 167–187.

792 Pine, J. M., & Lieven, E. V. M. (1993). Reanalysing rote-learned phrases: Individual
793 differences in the transition to multi-word speech. *Journal of Child Language*, *20*(3),
794 551–571. doi:10.1017/S0305000900008473

795 Pye, C. (1986). Quiché Mayan speech to children. *Journal of Child Language*, *13*(1), 85–100.

doi:10.1017/S0305000900000313

R Core Team. (2019). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from https://www.R-project.org/

Rogoff, B., Paradise, R., Arauz, R. M., Correa-Chávez, M., & Angelillo, C. (2003). Firsthand learning through intent participation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *54*(1), 175–203. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145118

Scaff, C., Stieglitz, J., Casillas, M., & Cristia, A. (in preparation). Language input in a hunter-forager population: Estimations from daylong recordings.

Schwab, J. F., & Lew-Williams, C. (2016). Repetition across successive sentences facilitates young children's word learning. *Developmental Psychology*, *52*(6), 879–886. doi:10.1037/dev0000125

Shneidman, L. A. (2010). *Language Input and Acquisition in a Mayan Village* (PhD thesis). The University of Chicago.

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. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7687.2012.01168.x

Slobin, D. I. (1970). Universals of grammatical development in children. In G. B. Flores d'Arcais & W. J. M. Levelt (Eds.), *Advances in Psycholinguistics* (pp. 174–186). Amsterdam, NL: North Holland Publishing.

Smithson, M., & Merkle, E. (2013). *Generalized linear models for categorical and continuous limited dependent variables*. New York: Chapman; Hall/CRC. doi:10.1201/b15694

Tomasello, M., & Brooks, P. J. (1999). Early syntactic development: A Construction

819 Grammar approach. In M. Barrett (Ed.), *The Development of Language* (pp.
820 161–190). New York: Psychology Press.

821 Warlaumont, A. S., Richards, J. A., Gilkerson, J., & Oller, D. K. (2014). A social feedback
822 loop for speech development and its reduction in Autism. *Psychological Science*,
823 *25*(7), 1314–1324. doi:10.1177/0956797614531023

824 Weisleder, A., & Fernald, A. (2013). Talking to children matters: Early language experience
825 strengthens processing and builds vocabulary. *Psychological Science*, *24*(11),
826 2143–2152. doi:10.1177/0956797613488145

827 Wickham, H. (2016). *Ggplot2: Elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York.
828 Retrieved from https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org

829 Wittenburg, P., Brugman, H., Russel, A., Klassmann, A., & Sloetjes, H. (2006). ELAN: A
830 professional framework for multimodality research. In *Proceedings of the Fifth*
831 *International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation* (pp. 1556–1559).