

# Phoneme categorization depends on production abilities during the first year of life

M Dole, H el ene Loevenbruck, O Pascalis, Jean-Luc Schwartz, Anne Vilain

► **To cite this version:**

M Dole, H el ene Loevenbruck, O Pascalis, Jean-Luc Schwartz, Anne Vilain. Phoneme categorization depends on production abilities during the first year of life. International Conference on Infant Studies (ICIS 2016), May 2016, La Nouvelle Orl ans, LA, United States. <hal-01489951>

**HAL Id: hal-01489951**

**<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01489951>**

Submitted on 14 Mar 2017

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destin ee au d ep ot et  a la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publi es ou non,  emanant des  tablissements d'enseignement et de recherche fran ais ou  trangers, des laboratoires publics ou priv es.

# Phoneme categorization depends on production abilities during the first year of life

Dole, M.<sup>1</sup>, Loevenbruck, H.<sup>2</sup>, Pascalis, O.<sup>2</sup>, Schwartz, J.L<sup>1</sup>, Vilain, A.<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> GIPSA-Lab, Département Parole & Cognition, CNRS & Université Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France

<sup>2</sup> Laboratoire de Psychologie et NeuroCognition, CNRS & Université Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France

## Introduction

### Phoneme categorization

- Infants show discrimination of syllables as soon as 1 month of age (Eimas et al., 1971; Eimas, 1974).
- **Problem of invariance:** ability to detect a consonant in ≠ syllable contexts despite acoustic variations: argument for the Motor Theory (Liberman et al., 1967).
- A recent study claimed that 6-month olds solve the invariance problem (Hochmann et al., 2014) and argue against a motor interpretation since babbling occurs later.

• Standard: (baseline) *bead-bad-boat* (target) *boo*

• Deviant: (baseline) *bead-bad-boat* (target) *due*

### However

- Are infants detecting invariance or just acoustic differences between stimuli?
- Does babbling only start at 6 months?

### Goals of the present study

- Assess the ability to detect invariants and the role of motor knowledge in 6-to 12-month old infants.

## Methods

### Exp1

31 6 month and 31 9 month-old infants  
Intersensory matching procedure: /b/ - /d/  
Parental questionnaire : infants' production abilities (46 infants)

### Exp 2: control study

35 6month-old and 47 9month-old infants  
Same procedure with contrast /v/-/z/

### Analysis: Intersensory matching.

- % Looking Time (LT) for Baseline (1&2) and for Test (4&6)
- **Difference score** = %LT Test – %LT Baseline.


**Analysis: production.** Infants were classified on the tested contrast as:

- **Non Babbling:** no production
- **Canonical Babbling:** reduplicated CVCVCV with /a/ for one or both consonants
- **Variegated Babbling:** CVCVCV with ≠ vowels for one or both consonants

### Hypotheses

- If infants have plosive categories they should associate the sound in one vocalic context with the visual gesture in another vocalic context: preference for **familiar** stimulus
- If motor knowledge plays a role this should vary according to babbling abilities
- **AV association for /b/ - /d/ contrast in babbling infants**



### Intersensory matching procedure (Pons et al., 2009)



## Results


### Exp.1

- Effect of Age ( $p < 0.001$ ): preference for familiar stimulus in 9mo olds, not in 6mo olds.
- Production: 18 NonBabbling, 16 Canonical, 12 Variegated
- Effect of Production Stage ( $p = 0.06$ ): better scores in infants who are in the Canonical and Variegated phase than NonBabbling infants.



### Exp.2

- No significant preference, for 6-mo olds or for 9-mo olds.
- 52 infants did not produce the /v/-/z/ contrast
- Infants who did not produce the /v/-/z/ contrast did not show any preference (t-test vs 0:  $p = 0.42$ )
- Infants who produced the contrast showed a non significant preference for the familiar stimulus



## Conclusion

- For a contrast that they produce, infants showed a preference for videos pronouncing the consonant with which they had been familiarized.  
**They performed intersensory matching in spite of the varying vowel context** (invariance for plosive place of articulation?)

- For an unknown contrast (/v/ - /z/) visually identical, there is no matching in infants

### Role of the perceptuo-motor link in categorization?

### References

- Eimas, P.D., Siqueland, E.R., Jusczyk, P., Vigorito, J. (1971). Speech perception in infants. *Science*, 171 (3968), 303-306.  
Eimas, P.D. (1974). Auditory and linguistic processing of cues for place of articulation by infants. *Perception & Psychophysics*, 16 (3), 516-521.  
Hochmann, J.R. & Papeo, L. (2014). The invariance problem in infancy: A pupillometry study. *Psychological Science*, 25 (11), 2038-2041.  
Liberman, A.M., Cooper, F., Shankweiler, D., & Studdert-Kennedy, M. (1967). Perception of the speech code. *Psychological Review*, 74, 431-461.  
Pons, F., Lewkowicz, D.J., Soto-Faraco, S., & Sebastian-Galles, N. (2009). Narrowing of intersensory speech perception in infancy. *PNAS*, 106 (26), 10598-10602.