

Research Article

The Role of Word Form in Lexical Selection of Late Talkers

Elizabeth Schoen Simmons^a  and Rhea Paul^a

^aDepartment of Communication Disorders, Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, CT

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received July 11, 2024

Revision received December 21, 2024

Accepted January 30, 2025

Editor-in-Chief: Julie A. Washington

Editor: Raúl Rojas

https://doi.org/10.1044/2025_JSLHR-24-00482

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The lexical selection hypothesis posits that first words added to a toddler's spoken vocabulary will be predominantly those beginning with early developing consonant phonemes. Using this framework, we evaluated the relationship between word form and lexical selection among late talkers and two typical comparison groups.

Method: An online database of MacArthur–Bates Communicative Developmental Inventories was used to extract the American English Words and Sentences Form (MB-CDI:WS). Inventories were divided into three groups: (a) a late talkers group (LTs; $n = 202$), (b) a typically developing age-matched group (TDA; $n = 1,238$), and (c) a younger, typically developing language-matched group (TDL; $n = 196$) matched on expressive language to the LTs. The first phoneme in each word produced by every toddler on the MB-CDI:WS was coded as early, middle, or late developing. The proportion of spoken words starting with phonemes in each developmental category was calculated. Mixed-effects models were used to evaluate group differences.

Results: All three groups' spoken vocabularies consisted mostly of words beginning with early developing phonemes. LTs and TDLs used more words beginning with early developing consonants than TDAs. TDAs had a higher proportion of words starting with middle- and late- developing phonemes than LTs and TDL groups. The LTs group produced a significantly smaller proportion of words beginning with middle-developing phonemes compared to the TDL group.

Conclusions: Initial phonemes produced in the lexicons of LTs are, in general, similar to both language-matched and age-matched typical toddlers and reflect lexical selection. Clinical implications of these findings will be discussed.

Unlike other primates, who are born with their full complement of vocalizations from birth (Oller et al., 2016), human infants have a unique capacity for acquiring vocal productions that are shaped through exposure to their linguistic environment (Curtis et al., 2023). Biological changes to the vocal tract (Vihman et al., 1986) along with the development of volitional motor control and imitation abilities (Ekström, 2022) work synergistically to support the acquisition of the phonological system during early development.

Phonological Development

The phonological system has two broad components, perception and production, where production provides feedback to strengthen perception (Choi et al., 2023). The perceptual element of the phonological system includes the storage and categorization of acoustic information that represents phonemes in memory. These mental representations of sound categories, or phonemes, are established and refined over the first year of life as a result of linguistic input (Werker & Tees, 1984) and predict later spoken language milestones including the onset of first words (Tsao et al., 2004). By about 9 months of age, most infants have undergone the process of perceptual narrowing and are no longer sensitive to nonnative phonetic contrasts suggesting their ambient language environment has shaped their perceptual system (Tsao et al., 2004).

Correspondence to Elizabeth Schoen Simmons: simmonse3@sacredheart.edu. **Disclosure:** The authors have declared that no competing financial or nonfinancial interests existed at the time of publication.

Protophones (e.g., vowel-like vocalizations) and spoken phonemes provide the foundation for an expressive lexicon (Oller et al., 2021). A spoken consonant inventory begins with the manifestation of canonical babbling and the earliest developing phonemes are generally those that require simple motor patterns and can be produced with relative ease by the infant (Aoyama & Davis, 2017). Cross-linguistic studies of infant vocal behavior highlight likenesses in the acquisition patterns of phonemes across languages (Edwards & Beckman, 2008), suggesting that the system is strongly influenced by the universal similarities in the vocal tract and motor development across human infants. For example, bilabials /m/, /p/, /b/ are some of the earliest produced phonemes in English, French, and K'iche' (Ingram & Babatsouli, 2024), requiring relatively simple motor movements (Aoyama & Davis, 2017). As the motor system develops, the perceptual system shapes spoken phonological inventories and a differentiation in phonemic production is observed specific to the language in which the young child is exposed. The sequence of phonological acquisition in typically developing (TD) English-exposed toddlers is well documented (Crowe & McLeod, 2020) with consonantal phonemes often described in order of mastery from early (stops, nasals, glides), to middle (some fricatives and affricates) to late (interdentals, liquids, and glides; Crowe & McLeod, 2020; Shriberg, 1993; see Table 1). Importantly, the production of phonemes stabilizes and strengthens phonological representations in memory; thus, infants and toddlers who produce low levels of babble may be at risk for weaker underlying phonological representations as they do not benefit from the practice effects afforded to TD infants and toddlers (Gershkoff-Stowe & Hahn, 2007).

Phonology and LTs

LTs are generally described as toddlers between 18 and 35 months of age with small expressive vocabularies in the absence of any frank neurological impairments, sensory deficits, or neurodevelopmental disabilities (Paul, 1991; Paul & Jennings, 1992; Rescorla, 1989). Approximately 15% of toddlers meet criteria for late talking (Collisson et al., 2016), which has the potential for long term sequelae

on social-emotional well-being, along with academic and vocational achievement (Singleton, 2018).

Much of the literature describing the symptom expression of LTs has focused on their limited spoken vocabulary size as it represents the primary symptom and is most noticeable by parents. A secondary symptom of this group is atypical expressive phonology where differences between LTs and TD peers emerge relative to the timing of phonological milestones, volubility of vocalizations, and complexity of phonological forms produced (Paul, 1993; Paul & Jennings, 1992; Rescorla & Ratner, 1996; Thal et al., 1995). Delayed onset of canonical babbling (i.e., no reduplicated sequences such as *bababa* by 10 months of age; Oller et al., 1999), babble limited to only vowels (Whitehurst et al., 1991), and less frequent vocalizing (i.e., lower volubility; Thal et al., 1995) have been reported in toddlers with small vocabularies. Once LTs begin to produce first words, their word forms contain both fewer consonant types (Rescorla & Ratner, 1996) and less complex syllable structures compared to same-age peers (Paul & Jennings, 1992). This literature points to limited expressive phonology as one possible contributing factor in late talking while also highlighting the relationship between phonological production and lexical development (Stoel-Gammon, 1998).

The Role of Phonology in Lexical Selection

The first words produced by toddlers often contain the same phonemes produced in babbled, prelinguistic vocalizations (Oller et al., 1976), supporting the transformation of vocal play into meaningful production. For example, the canonical babble production *mama* may move from vocal play to meaningful use around the toddler's first birthday as a label for their mother. The first 50 words expressed by toddlers generally contain the early phonemes and resemble syllable shapes produced prelinguistically in babble and these phonemes and syllable shapes form the building blocks for early words (Stoel-Gammon, 2011). Longitudinal studies that tracked infants from prelinguistic babble to first words found that those infants who had more diverse prelinguistic phonological production inventories had larger spoken lexicons as toddlers (Keren-Portnoy et al., 2009; Stoel-Gammon, 1989).

Table 1. Phonemic consonant categories by order of development.

Developmental level	Shriberg (1993)	Crowe and McLeod (2020)
Early	/m/, /b/, /j/, /n/, /w/, /d/, /p/, /h/	/m/, /b/, /j/, /n/, /w/, /d/, /p/, /h/, /t/, /ŋ/, /k/, /g/, /f/
Middle	/t/, /ŋ/, /k/, /g/, /f/, /v/, /tʃ/, /dʒ/	/s/, /l/, /ʃ/, /z/, /v/, /tʃ/, /dʒ/
Late	/s/, /l/, /ʃ/, /z/, /θ/, /ð/, /ʌ/, /ʒ/	/θ/, /ð/, /ʌ/, /ʒ/

Note. International phonetic alphabet notation used. Bolded items represent phonemes classified by Shriberg (1993) as Middle and classified by Crowe and McLeod (2020) as Early. Italicized items represent phonemes classified by Shriberg (1993) as Late and classified by Crowe and McLeod as Middle.

A relatively large body of research supports the notion, first proposed by Ferguson and Farwell (1975), that early words are selected for production, in part, on the basis of their phonological content. Many studies on a range of languages, using a variety of methods including experimental word-learning paradigms, language sampling, and parent report, converge on the finding that sound properties of words influence lexical production (Fletcher et al., 2004; Gayraud & Kern, 2007; Gendler-Shalev et al., 2021; Kehoe et al., 2020; Macken & Ferguson, 1983; Schwartz & Leonard, 1982; Stoel-Gammon, 1998; Stoel-Gammon & Cooper, 1984; Viterbori et al., 2018). This implicit bias, known as “lexical selection,” is evidenced by the preponderance of words containing primarily initial consonants that are in-repertoire within toddlers’ phonological inventories, while other consonants in the word may undergo substitution or deletion. Although not the only factor influencing early selection of words for production (Hodges et al., 2017; Kehoe et al., 2020), this kind of phonological preference is thought to arise from toddlers’ tendency to say, from all words in their receptive lexicon, those that have at least beginning phonemes they can already articulate. Parent report measures of vocabulary production are one of the means that have been used to support this finding, which is generally interpreted to reflect a process of implicit lexical selection based on phonological form. Davis et al. (2018) showed that the effect of this selection was strongest for phonemes in initial word position.

Present Study

Our study aims to determine whether LTs make use of lexical selection as their language-typical peers appear to do. To accomplish this, we coded the first phoneme of each word produced on a standardized parent checklist of spoken vocabulary in three groups of toddlers: those who scored at or below the 15th percentile (LTs), an age-matched group with productive lexicon scores within the typical range, and a younger group of toddlers matched to the LTs for expressive vocabulary size. The language-matched group will be used to determine if the lexical selection pattern of LTs is similar to that of younger, expressive language matched toddlers. We predict that the LTs will use lexical selection in a manner more similar to language-matched peers reflecting a delay and not an atypical pattern of adding words to their expressive vocabulary relative to phonology.

Method

Data Acquisition and Reduction

Wordbank (Frank et al., 2016) is an online, open-source database of MacArthur–Bates Communicative

Developmental Inventories (MB-CDI, Fenson et al., 2007), a group of norm-referenced parental reports of infant and toddler communication and language skills. Given the nature of the open-source anonymized database, this study was exempt from the institutional review board process. Using Wordbank, 1,636 Words and Sentences Forms (MB-CDI:WS) were obtained. The Words and Sentences form provides a robust, standardized measure of spoken vocabulary size for toddlers 16–30 months. This form provides the caregiver with a list of 680 possible items that are organized by semantic and syntactic categories (e.g., actions, toys, foods, prepositions) and the caregiver selects which words the toddler produces regularly. We constrained our inclusion to the American English Form as the focus of this article was American English phonology.

Any word beginning with a vowel was eliminated ($n = 66$), as we were interested in the consonant phonemes that form the basis for many early words (MacNeilage & Davis, 2000). Of the remaining 614 items, we subsequently removed an additional 48 items including nonword sound effects (e.g., “shh,” “moo”; $n = 10$), two-word phrases (e.g., “green beans,” “next to”; $n = 13$), proper nouns (e.g., pet’s name, babysitter’s name; $n = 8$), routines (e.g., “give me five,” “this little piggy”; $n = 9$), and catenatives (“gonna,” “lemme”; $n = 8$). The motivation for eliminating these were twofold: (a) Some items were idiosyncratic to the participant (e.g., pet’s name) or (b) might be simplified by the family and might affect the phonology of the word (e.g., the “green beans” item may be referred to as “beans”). Most items eliminated were multisyllabic words, which only represent a small proportion of the developing toddler lexicon while preserving monosyllabic forms that comprise the bulk of their early spoken words (Gendler-Shalev et al., 2021). A possible 566 words remained for analysis including noun, verb, adverb, adjective, preposition, social (e.g., “hi,” “bye”), and function (e.g., “yes,” “no”) word classes.

Inventory Groups

MB-CDI:WS participant forms were separated into three groups based on chronological age and expressive vocabulary percentile rank. The LTs group ($n = 202$) included toddlers aged 21–30 months who scored at or below the 15th percentile on the MB-CDI:WS, consistent with age ranges and cutoff scores used to describe LTs (Collisson et al., 2016; Curtis et al., 2023; Ellis et al., 2015; Ellis Weismer et al., 2011; Horvath et al., 2019; MacRoy-Higgins et al., 2013, 2016). The two comparison groups included a TD group ($n = 1,238$) who were matched on chronological age (TDA) to the LTs and a language-matched group (TDL; $n = 196$) who were

matched to the LTs on the number of spoken words produced on the MB-CDI:WS. The TDL participants were younger than both the LTs and TDA groups and ranged from 16 to 17 months of age. Matching procedures used for the TDL group aligned with the limited number of studies that include an expressive language-matched group (MacRoy-Higgins et al., 2013; Thal et al., 1995). Both TD groups had spoken vocabularies at or above the 30th percentile for their age (Sosa & Stoel-Gammon, 2012).

Groups were well matched on chronological age, expressive language levels, and biological sex. Pairwise comparisons revealed no significant differences between the LTs and the TDA groups on chronological age or between the LTs and the TDL groups on mean number of words produced on the MB-CDI:WS. Chi-square tests showed no differences in the proportion of males across the three groups. Although maternal education level across all three groups consisted mostly of some college or additional education, mothers from the LTs group had lower levels of education compared to the TD groups (see Table 2 for details).

Data Coding

The first phoneme in each word produced on the MB-CDI:WS by each toddler, not inclusive of words with vowel initial phonemes, was coded as early, middle, or late developing, using Shriberg’s (1993) consonant categories (see Table 1). The decision to use Shriberg’s system, rather than the more recent taxonomy provided by Crowe and McLeod (2020) has two sources. First, the order of acquisition of phonemes in both systems is the same (see Table 1). The difference arises during the parsing of phonemes into developmental levels. Crowe and McLeod

considered any phonemes acquired before 4 years of age to be early developing. This is a very sensible approach for a classification system aimed to help determine which preschoolers are in greatest need of articulation intervention. Four-year-olds still missing any early phonemes would indeed be classified as delayed and would benefit from intervention. However, when studying toddlers with both typical and delayed language development, the Shriberg system provides a more granular classification. None of the participants in our sample was older than 30 months. Crowe and McLeod classified all consonants acquired by 47 months of age as “early developing,” over a year beyond the developmental level of our participants. Therefore, separating out what might be called the “later early” consonants (/t, ɲ, k, g, f/)—none of which is acquired according to Crowe and McLeod’s data (pp. 2161) until after 36 months—into “middle developing,” as Shriberg does, seems a more valid classification scheme for evaluating phonological performance in toddlers 30 months and younger. Similarly, none of the four consonants considered as “late developing” by Shriberg and in the middle developing (/s, l, ʃ, z/) by Crowe and McLeod is acquired before 50 months in Crowe and McLeod’s report, leading us to surmise that, like the four phonemes classified as late developing by Crowe and McLeod, they will be relatively rare in both late talking and TD toddlers. Thus, Shriberg’s system better aligned to the phonological repertoires of our toddler participants.

Our second rationale for using Shriberg’s (1993) system lay in the equal numbers of phonemes in his three groups. By limiting the phonemes considered early to the eight that appear before 36 months in typical development,

Table 2. Demographics and expressive vocabulary by group.

	Group			One-way ANOVA		<i>p</i> values from pairwise comparisons or χ^2		
	TDA (<i>n</i> = 1,238)	TDL (<i>n</i> = 196)	LTs (<i>n</i> = 202)	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	TDA vs. TDL	TDA vs. LTs	TDL vs. LTs
Mean chronological age in months (<i>SD</i>)	25.75 (2.50)	16.43 (0.49)	25.55 (2.33)	1,369.00	< .001	< .001	.50	< .001
Age range in months	22–30	16–17	22–30	-	-	-	-	-
Percent male	51%	49%	53%	-	-	.76	.54	.49
% with maternal education ≥ some college	81%	86%	69%	-	-	< .001	< .001	< .001
Mean MB-CDI:WS Percentile (<i>SD</i>)	66% (20%)	60% (20%)	8% (4%)	791.40	< .001	< .001	< .001	< .001
Mean # of words produced on MB-CDI:WS (<i>SD</i>)	453 (140)	103 (84)	92 (68)	1,176.00	< .001	< .001	< .001	.66

Note. Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations. MacArthur–Bates Communicative Developmental Inventories: Words and Sentences Form (MB-CDI:WS; Fenson et al., 2007). ANOVA = analysis of variance; TDA = typically developing age-matched; TDL = typically developing language-matched; LTs = late talkers.

and considering those typically mastered at 36–48 months to be in the middle-developing group, there was an improved chance of observing a difference between the very first and the somewhat later sounds, which would provide a more realistic picture of the phonological limitations of the late-talking toddlers. Supplemental Material S1 provides a table for each word included in analysis, its phoneme category (Shriberg, 1993), and age of acquisition (see Table 1).

The total number of words produced from each phonological category (Shriberg, 1993) was summed. The proportion of spoken words beginning with our early, middle-, and late-developing consonant phonemes was calculated for every toddler (number of words produced from each consonant category/total number of words produced with a consonant in word-initial position).

Analysis Plan

Analyses were conducted in R (R Core Team, 2020) using the *afex* package (Singmann et al., 2018) and the *aov_4* function for mixed-effects models. The *emmeans* package was used for planned post hoc comparisons (Lenth et al., 2020). Group (LTs, TDL, and TDA) and Consonant Category (early developing, middle developing, and late developing) were used as the fixed factors. The dependent variable was proportion of words with word-initial consonants from each consonant category. The Group \times Consonant Category interaction was also computed and was our variable of interest. Participant was included as the random effect (intercepts) as the model


failed to converge when random slopes were added (Barr et al., 2013).

Results

There was no main effect of Group ($F < .001$; $p > .99$), but there was a significant main effect of Consonant Category ($F = 1,275.19$; $p < .001$) on proportion of words produced. The absence of Group main effect indicates the proportion of words produced from each consonant category summed to 100% for each participant in each group which was predicted given the formula used to calculate proportions. Holm-adjusted post hoc comparisons revealed, collapsed across groups, participants were generally producing a greater proportion of words beginning with early developing ($t = 149.82$, $p < .001$) phonemes compared to middle-developing ($t = -39.16$, $p < .001$) or late-developing ($t = -110.66$, $p < .001$) phonemes (see Figure 1a).

The interaction of Group \times Consonant Category was our variable of interest and was also significant ($F = 623.30$; $p < .001$; see Figure 1b). Again, Holm-adjusted post hoc comparisons revealed that a greater proportion of words produced by both the LTs and TDL groups began with early developing consonants, compared to the TDA group. The inverse pattern was observed for the middle- and late-developing consonant categories. For these categories, the TDA group produced a greater proportion of words from the middle- and late-developing consonant categories compared to both the LTs and TDL groups. Significant differences were also observed between

Figure 1. Bar plots of mean proportion of spoken words by (a) developmental consonant category and (b) diagnostic group. (a) Mean proportion of spoken words from the MacArthur–Bates Communicative Developmental Inventories: Words and Sentences Form (MB-CDI:WS; Fenson et al., 2007) beginning with early, middle-, or late-developing consonants collapsed across diagnostic groups (Shriberg, 1993). (b) Mean proportion of spoken words from the MB-CDI:WS beginning with early, middle-, or late-developing consonants by diagnostic group. Error bars represent standard error for both plots. LTs = late talkers; TDL = typically developing language-matched; TDA = typically developing age-matched.



the LTs and TDL groups for words beginning with middle-developing phonemes. The TDL group produced a significantly greater proportion of words starting with middle-developing consonants compared to the LTs group (see Table 3 for post hoc comparisons).

Discussion

The aim of this study was to determine whether the early spoken lexicons of late-talking toddlers showed a bias toward words beginning with early developing consonants, as suggested by the lexical selection account. This account predicts that very young children are more likely to produce words in the early stages of lexical acquisition that contain phonemes already within their phonological repertoire particularly in initial position. We found that late-talking toddlers' first words generally do appear to follow a pattern like that of typical peers, at least as measured by a preference for early developing phonemes in initial word position, suggesting use of lexical selection. We found, further, that both the LTs and TDs' expressive vocabularies are, in accord with other research reported for typical toddlers (Davis et al., 2018; Gendler-Shalev et al., 2021), composed primarily of words beginning with early developing phonemes. Our data also show that words with middle-developing phonemes were produced next most often, and late-developing phonemes represented the smallest proportion words in early spoken vocabularies by all three groups. We have provided a scatter plot showing the relationship between phoneme category and spoken vocabulary size in Supplemental Material S2 as another way to visualize the results (Figure 1).

Although the general order of proportions among word forms is similar across the three groups (words with early developing phonemes in initial position > words with middle-developing phonemes in initial position > words with late-developing phonemes in initial position), LTs appear to produce a marginally smaller proportion of words starting

with middle-developing consonants compared to their language-matched peers ($p < .04$). This finding could represent a statistical artifact, influenced by the large difference in standard deviation of values for proportion of words beginning with middle-developing phonemes for the two groups. Alternatively, it could be a valid reflection of an increased constraint on acquisition of more advanced, middle-developing phonemes for LTs. This interpretation seems less likely, given that, although a nonsignificant difference, the proportion of words beginning with late-developing phonemes produced by LTs is slightly larger than by the TDL group. A clear interpretation of this finding awaits replication of these results with other samples or use of more direct sampling methods rather than parent report.

These findings do generally align with previous work (Paul, 1993; Paul & Jennings, 1992; Rescorla & Ratner, 1996; Thal et al., 1995), which demonstrates that phonological development in LTs appears to have some relation to slow expressive vocabulary growth. This earlier work using direct sampling of vocal and verbal production of LTs revealed limited phonological repertoires. The present study, which examines early lexical production by means of parent report can be interpreted to validate the earlier findings, showing that LTs are more likely to say words with early developing initial consonants than are typical age mates. The older, language typical toddlers in this sample appear to have a broader range of spoken phonemes at their disposal, allowing, proportionally, more words beginning with middle- and late-developing phonemes that support the addition of more variable word forms.

A range of contributors to order of acquisition of early words have been suggested, including frequency of linguistic input, phonological neighborhood density, statistical learning, social cueing, and syntactic bootstrapping (Braginsky et al., 2019; Hodges et al., 2017; Jones & Brandt, 2019; Kehoe et al., 2020; Tomasello, 2000). It seems likely that phonological accessibility of the phonemes and the structure of early words is an additional contribution. Future longitudinal research that examines the relations between perceptual knowledge, measured perhaps by eye tracking, and

Table 3. Post hoc comparisons of Group \times Consonant Category Interaction.

Consonant category	Pairwise comparisons								
	LTs vs. TDL			LTs vs. TDA			TDL vs. TDA		
	EMM*	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> **	EMM	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> **	EMM	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i> **
Early developing	0.46	0.96	.33	13.75	37.52	< .001	13.29	35.79	< .001
Middle developing	-1.22	-2.51	.04	-4.61	-12.59	< .001	-3.40	-9.15	< .001
Late developing	0.75	1.55	.24	-9.14	-24.94	< .001	-9.89	-26.64	< .001

Note. LTs = late talkers; TDL = typically developing language-matched; TDA = typically developing age-matched.

*EMM = estimated marginal means using Holm-correction for multiple comparisons. ***p* value corrected for multiple comparisons.

expressive skills in these populations could serve to provide a deeper understanding of the course of word learning.

Limitations

A major limitation of data on speech production drawn from parent report checklist is, of course, that the parent does not report how the child pronounced the word, only that it was said by the toddler and recognized by listeners. Perhaps the toddler has a recognizable approximation for “shoe,” but actually say /du/. In our coding system, the toddler would receive credit for a late sound /ʃ/, even though an earlier sound was produced.

The MB-CDI:WS has been used to understand the relationship between spoken phonology and lexical development in previous work as the features of words included on this instrument match closely to direct observations of toddler spoken phonology (Stoel-Gammon, 1998). Moreover, recent research has employed WordBank data, just as we have, to examine the properties of toddlers’ early lexicons (Braginsky et al., 2019; Davis et al., 2018; Gendler-Shalev et al., 2021; Horvath et al., 2022). Although we acknowledge that using the MB-CDI:WS in a study of phonological issues would fail to capture pronunciation errors in situations such as the example above, when a target word is recognizable by adults, our contention is the lexical selection bias draws on the underlying phonological representation of the word. This mental representation would serve as the basis for selection and production. Even if the production itself is an approximation, we would argue that toddlers are more likely to attempt sounds for which they have an available motor plan, even if the plan is not a perfect one, derived from frequent practice in babbling and early speech than to attempt phonemes for which the underlying phonological representation and motor plan are less fully developed. The fact that findings from studies using artificial language learning, language sampling, and parent report converge strengthens the assertion that parent report is a relatively valid means of assessing lexical selection.

An additional potential limitation is the way in which we chose to create our proportions. Indeed, there are a greater number of words in the early developing category (~49% of words analyzed) compared to the middle-developing (23% of words analyzed) and late-developing (28% of words analyzed) categories. The bias on the MB-CDI:WS toward words that begin with early developing phonemes is seen because these words are based on developmental data from children’s typical early word productions and therefore reflect a natural artifact of the character of early vocabularies in toddlers. Another way to evaluate our data could be to create a proportion of words each toddler produces from each category out of the total possible words for the given category. This may control for

the fact there are more early developing category words compared to middle and late developing.

We calculated a revised set of proportions, utilizing the total number of possible words in each category as the denominator, and conducted our analyses again. A similar pattern emerged where no significant differences were observed between the LTs and their language-matched counterparts (TDL group) on proportion of words produced in each consonant category. Differences emerged between the LTs and TDL groups compared to the TDA group (see Supplemental Material S3). We believe these patterns are consistent with our initial analysis and interpretation of the data and reinforce the overarching interpretation—that LTs use a lexical selection process similar to that of their language-matched peers.

Finally, there are additional limitations to using data from a preexisting repository. It is possible that some of our late-talking participants may have other conditions like autism spectrum disorder or global developmental delay. We also do not know the status of their receptive language abilities. Additionally, the majority of the participants were derived from households with high maternal education and thus it may be difficult to generalize our findings to the population as a whole. This fact is especially salient in light of the finding that even in our relatively highly educated sample, a difference in maternal education across the groups is associated with language delay. As we showed, the mothers in our LT group, even though the majority attended at least some college, were, on average, less highly educated than those from the two language-typical groups, suggesting that even this small difference may have some consequences for language development. Whether this finding reflects some hidden bias in the data, or a true association is another potential area for future research. Despite the limitations, this study leverages a large open-source database to extend our understanding of potential mechanisms that contribute to slow expressive language development.

Clinical Implications

Although intervention for late talkers generally focuses on increasing lexical diversity, it may be equally important to support the expansion of phonological repertoires within the context of early lexical intervention. Output interventions—such as back-and-forth babbling activities in which adults imitate children’s preverbal babbling, then add changes on their turn to encourage variety in babbled phonemes (Goldstein & Schwade, 2008); drill play (Paul et al., 2018) in which the child is shown objects in a play context and is rewarded for producing a specific verbal response; or milieu teaching (Finestack & Fey, 2013) in which the adult provides models of verbal output and the environment is engineered to

“tempt” the child to reproduce the model—all have some evidence of efficacy in expanding both lexical and phonological repertoires. Other interventions for early language development focus on enriched input and implicit learning. These include indirect language stimulation (Fey, 1986) and, more recently, Vocabulary Acquisition and Usage for Late Talkers (Alt et al., 2014; Munro et al., 2021), which reports on its use with three toddlers that resulted in improvement both in expressive vocabulary and an increase in the toddlers’ phonological inventories of both consonants and vowels. Thus, there is emerging evidence that both lexical and phonological development can be affected by early interventions. One implication of our findings may be that providing exposure, through intensified input and structured temptations to communicate, to more complex phonological structures in otherwise age-appropriate target words may be a fruitful strategy. Just as, in understanding the relations between language and cognition, researchers have invoked a “local homologies” model of mutually supportive relations between certain language behaviors and certain cognitive achievements (e.g., Thal & Bates, 1988), providing a carefully calibrated level of phonological complexity in input and targeted words may afford opportunities for phonological growth that can also support lexical development. Research is needed to explore this speculation, as well as the relative effects of various emerging interventions to provide guidance for clinicians working with this population.

Conclusions

This study finds that the phonological pattern of words added to the early lexicons of late talkers is generally similar to that of both language-matched and age-matched typical toddlers; that, the greatest proportion of words begin with early developing phonemes. This finding supports lexical selection as a mechanism, among others, that helps determine which words, of the many a child may understand, are produced first. Although marginal differences between our late-talking sample and younger language-matched toddlers were observed and merit further investigation; broadly, our findings support lexical selection as a bias observed in all of our toddler groups, both typical and language delayed. Moreover, the typical order of acquisition of consonant phonemes is seen to be reflected in the proportion of words beginning with consonants from each of the three broadly defined groups of early, middle-, and late-developing phonemes for both typical groups and the late talkers group. We interpret these findings to suggest that late talkers are following a delayed but otherwise typical path in the building of a lexicon based, in part, on a phonological foundation. We suggest that this finding provides some guidance to clinicians in developing programs for late talkers that aim to strengthen both phonological and lexical skills.

Data Availability Statement

The data used for analyses in this article are publicly available from the WordBank repository (<https://wordbank.stanford.edu/data>).

Acknowledgments

This article was written using support from the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders under Award R15DC020290 (principal investigator: Elizabeth Schoen Simmons).

References

- Alt, M., Meyers, C., Oglivie, T., Nicholas, K., & Arizmendi, G. (2014). Cross-situational statistically based word learning intervention for late-talking toddlers. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 52, 207–220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2014.07.002>
- Aoyama, K., & Davis, B. L. (2017). Non-adjacent consonant sequence patterns in English target words during the first-word period. *Journal of Child Language*, 44(5), 1065–1087. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000916000404>
- Barr, D., Levy, R., Scheepers, C., & Tily, H. (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>
- Braginsky, M., Yurovsky, D., Marchman, V. A., & Frank, M. C. (2019). Consistency and variability in children’s word learning across languages. *Open Mind*, 3, 52–67. https://doi.org/10.1162/opmi_a_00026
- Choi, D., Yeung, H. H., & Werker, J. F. (2023). Sensorimotor foundations of speech perception in infancy. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 27(8), 773–784. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2023.05.007>
- Collisson, B. A., Graham, S. A., Preston, J. L., Rose, M. S., McDonald, S., & Tough, S. (2016). Risk and protective factors for late talking: An epidemiologic investigation. *Journal of Pediatrics*, 172, 168–174.e1. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpeds.2016.02.020>
- Crowe, K., & McLeod, S. (2020). Children’s English consonant acquisition in the United States: A review. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 29(4), 2155–2169. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_AJSLP-19-00168
- Curtis, P. R., Estabrook, R., Roberts, M. Y., & Weisleder, A. (2023). Specificity of phonological representations in U.S. English-speaking late talkers and typical talkers. *Infancy*, 28(4), 771–792. <https://doi.org/10.1111/inf.12536>
- Davis, B., Feest, S. V. D., & Yi, H. (2018). Speech sound characteristics of early words: Influence of phonological factors across vocabulary development. *Journal of Child Language*, 45(3), 673–702. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000917000484>
- Edwards, J., & Beckman, M. E. (2008). Some cross-linguistic evidence for modulation of implicational universals by language-specific frequency effects in phonological development. *Language Learning and Development*, 4(2), 122–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475440801922115>
- Eklström, A. G. (2022). Motor constellation theory: A model of infants’ phonological development. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 996894. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.996894>

- Ellis, E., Borovsky, A., Elman, J., & Evans, J. (2015). Novel word learning: An eye-tracking study. Are 18-month-old late talkers really different from their typical peers? *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 58, 143–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2015.06.011>
- Ellis Weismer, S., Venker, C., Evans, J., & Moyle, M. (2011). Fast mapping in late-talking toddlers. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 34(1), 69–89. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716411000610>
- Fenson, L., Bates, E., Dale, P. S., Marchman, V. A., Reznick, J. S., & Thal, D. J. (2007). *MacArthur–Bates Communicative Development Inventories*. Brookes.
- Ferguson, C. A., & Farwell, C. B. (1975). Words and sounds in early language acquisition. *Language*, 51(2), 419–439. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412864>
- Fey, M. E. (1986). *Language intervention with young children*. Taylor & Francis.
- Finestack, L. H., & Fey, M. E. (2013). Evidence-based language intervention approaches for young late talkers. In L. A. Rescorla & P. S. Dale (Eds.), *Late talkers: Language development, interventions, and outcomes* (pp. 282–303). Brookes.
- Fletcher, P., Chan, C. W. Y., Wong, P. T. T., Stokes, S., Tardif, T., & Leung, S. C. S. (2004). The interface between phonetic and lexical abilities in early Cantonese language development. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 18(6–8), 535–545. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699200410001703655>
- Frank, M. C., Braginsky, M., Yurovsky, D., & Marchman, V. A. (2016). Wordbank: An open repository for developmental vocabulary data. *Journal of Child Language*, 44(3), 677–694. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000916000209>
- Gayraud, F., & Kern, S. (2007). Caractéristiques phonologiques des noms en fonction de l'âge d'acquisition [Phonological characteristics of words based on the age of acquisition]. *Enfance; Psychologie, Pédagogie, Neuropsychiatrie, Sociologie*, 59(4), 324–338. <https://doi.org/10.3917/enf.594.0324>
- Gendler-Shalev, H., Avivir, B. D., & Novogrodsky, R. (2021). The effect of phonological complexity on the order in which words are acquired in early childhood. *First Language*, 41(6), 779–793. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01427237211042997>
- Gershkoff-Stowe, L., & Hahn, E. R. (2007). Fast mapping skills in the developing lexicon. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 50(3), 682–697. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2007/048\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2007/048))
- Goldstein, M. H., & Schwade, J. A. (2008). Social feedback to infants' babbling facilitates rapid phonological learning. *Psychological Science*, 19(5), 515–523. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02117.x>
- Hodges, R., Munro, N., Baker, E., McGregor, K., & Heard, R. (2017). The monosyllable imitation test for toddlers: Influence of stimulus characteristics on imitation, compliance and diagnostic accuracy. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 52(1), 30–45. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12249>
- Horvath, S., Kueser, J. B., Kelly, J., & Borovsky, A. (2022). Difference or delay? Syntax, semantics, and verb vocabulary development in typically developing and late-talking toddlers. *Language Learning and Development*, 18(3), 352–376. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15475441.2021.1977645>
- Horvath, S., Rescorla, L., & Arunachalam, S. (2019). The syntactic and semantic features of two-year-olds' verb vocabularies: A comparison of typically developing children and late talkers. *Journal of Child Language*, 46(3), 409–432. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000918000508>
- Ingram, D., & Babatsouli, E. (2024). Cross-linguistic phonological acquisition. In M. Ball, N. Müller, & E. Spencer (Eds.). *The handbook of clinical linguistics* (2nd ed., pp. 407–419). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119875949.ch29>
- Jones, S. D., & Brandt, S. (2019). Neighborhood density and word production in delayed and advanced learners. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 62(8), 2847–2854. https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_JSLHR-L-18-046
- Kehoe, M. M., Patrucco-Nanchen, T., Friend, M., & Zesiger, P. (2020). The relationship between lexical and phonological development in French-speaking children: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 63(6), 1807–1821. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_JSLHR-19-00011
- Keren-Portnoy, T., Majorano, M., & Vihman, M. M. (2009). From phonetics to phonology: The emergence of first words in Italian. *Journal of Child Language*, 36(2), 235–267. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000908008933>
- Lenth, R., Singmann, H., Love, J., Buerkner, P., & Herve, M. (2020). *Package "Emmeans."* R Package (Version 1.4.8). <http://cran.r-project.org/package=emmeans>
- Macken, M. A., & Ferguson, C. A., (1983). Cognitive aspects of phonological development: Model, evidence and issues. In K. Nelson (Ed.), *Children's language* (4th ed., pp. 255–282).
- MacNeilage, P. F., & Davis, B. L. (2000). On the origin of internal structure of word forms. *Science*, 288(5465), 527–531. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.288.5465.527>
- MacRoy-Higgins, M., Schwartz, R. G., Shafer, V. L., & Marton, K. (2013). Influence of phonotactic probability/neighbourhood density on lexical learning in late talkers. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 48(2), 188–199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-6984.2012.00198.x>
- MacRoy-Higgins, M., Shafer, V. L., Fahey, K. J., & Kaden, A. M. (2016). Vocabulary of toddlers who are late talkers. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 38(2), 118–129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053815116637620>
- Munro, N., Baker, E., Masso, S., Carson, L., Lee, T., Wong, A. M.-Y., & Stokes, S. F. (2021). Vocabulary acquisition and usage for late talkers treatment: Effect on expressive vocabulary and phonology. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 64(7), 2682–2697. https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_JSLHR-20-00680
- Oller, D. K., Eilers, R. E., Neal, A. R., & Schwartz, H. K. (1999). Precursors to speech in infancy: The prediction of speech and language disorders. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 32(4), 223–245. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0021-9924\(99\)00013-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0021-9924(99)00013-1)
- Oller, D. K., Griebel, U., & Warlaumont, A. S. (2016). Vocal development as a guide to modeling the evolution of language. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 8(2), 382–392. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tops.12198>
- Oller, D. K., Ramsay, G., Bene, E., Long, H. L., & Griebel, U. (2021). Protophones, the precursors to speech, dominate the human infant vocal landscape. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 376(1836), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0255>
- Oller, D. K., Wieman, L. A., Doyle, W. J., & Ross, C. (1976). Infant babbling and speech. *Journal of Child Language*, 3(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900001276>
- Paul, R. (1991). Profiles of toddlers with slow expressive language development. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 11(4), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00011363-199111040-00003>
- Paul, R. (1993). Patterns of development in late talkers: Pre-school years. *Journal of Childhood Communication Disorders*, 15(1), 7–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/152574019301500103>
- Paul, R., & Jennings, P. (1992). Phonological behavior in toddlers with slow expressive language development. *Journal of*

- Speech and Hearing Research*, 35(1), 99–107. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3501.99>
- Paul, R., Norbury, C. F., & Gosse, C. (2018). *Language disorders from infancy through adolescence* (4th ed.). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2015-0-04093-X>
- R Core Team. (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. *R Foundation for statistical computing*. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Rescorla, L. (1989). The language development survey: A screening tool for delayed language in toddlers. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 54(4), 587–599. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshd.5404.587>
- Rescorla, L., & Ratner, N. B. (1996). Phonetic profiles of toddlers with specific expressive language impairment (SLI-E). *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 39(1), 153–165. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3901.153>
- Schwartz, R. G., & Leonard, L. B. (1982). Do children pick and choose? An examination of phonological selection and avoidance in early lexical acquisition. *Journal of Child Language*, 9(2), 319–336. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900004748>
- Shriberg L. D. (1993). Four new speech and prosody-voice measures for genetics research and other studies in developmental phonological disorders. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 36(1), 105–140. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3601.105>
- Singleton, N. C. (2018). Late talkers: Why the wait-and-see approach is outdated. *Pediatric Clinics of North America*, 65(1), 13–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcl.2017.08.018>
- Singmann, H., Bolker, B., Westfall, J., & Aust, F. (2018). *afex: Analysis of other factorial experiments*. R package version 0.27–2. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=afex>
- Sosa, A. V., & Stoel-Gammon, C. (2012). Lexical and phonological effects in early word production. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 55(2), 596–608. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2011/10-0113\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2011/10-0113))
- Stoel-Gammon, C. (1989). Prespeech and early speech development of two late talkers. *First Language*, 9(6), 207–223. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014272378900900607>
- Stoel-Gammon, C. (1998). Sound and words in early language acquisition: The relationship between lexical and phonological development. In R. Paul (Ed.), *Exploring the speech language connection* (pp. 25–52). Brookes.
- Stoel-Gammon, C. (2011). Relationships between lexical and phonological development in young children. *Journal of Child Language*, 38(1), 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000910000425>
- Stoel-Gammon, C., & Cooper, J. A. (1984). Patterns of early lexical and phonological development. *Journal of Child Language*, 11(2), 247–271. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0305000900005766>
- Thal, D., & Bates, E. (1988). Language and gesture in late talkers. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 31(1), 115–123. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3101.115>
- Thal, D., Oroz, M., & McCaw, V. (1995). Phonological and lexical development in normal and late-talking toddlers. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 16(4), 407–424. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716400066017>
- Tomasello, M. (2000). The social-pragmatic theory of word learning. *Pragmatics*, 10(4), 401–413. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.10.4.01tom>
- Tsao, F. M., Liu, H. M., & Kuhl, P. K. (2004). Speech perception in infancy predicts language development in the second year of life: A longitudinal study. *Child Development*, 75(4), 1067–1084. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00726.x>
- Vihman, M. M., Ferguson, C. A., & Elbert, M. (1986). Phonological development from babbling to speech: Common tendencies and individual differences. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 7(1), 3–40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716400007165>
- Viterbori, P., Zanobini, M., & Cozzani, F. (2018). Phonological development in children with different lexical skills. *First Language*, 38(5), 538–559. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723718784369>
- Werker, J. F., & Tees, R. C. (1984). Cross-language speech perception: Evidence for perceptual reorganization during the first year of life. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 7(1), 49–63. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383\(02\)00113-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0163-6383(02)00113-3)
- Whitehurst, G. J., Smith, M., Fischel, J. E., Arnold, D. S., & Lonigan, C. J. (1991). The continuity of babble and speech in children with specific expressive language delay. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 34(5), 1121–1129. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3405.1121>

Supplemental Material S1. Phoneme category and age of acquisition for each word included in analyses.

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
baby	early	17
babysitter	early	-
back	early	27
backyard	early	28
bad	early	26
ball	early	16
balloon	early	19
banana	early	17
basement	early	-
basket	early	26
bat	early	27
bath	early	19
bathroom	early	24
bathtub	early	23
be	early	-
beach	early	27
beads	early	-
beans	early	26
bear	early	20
because	early	-
bed	early	21
bedroom	early	26
bee	early	22
before	early	-
behind	early	29
belly button	early	21
belt	early	27
bench	early	-
beside	early	-
better	early	28
bib	early	25
bicycle	early	23
big	early	23

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
bird	early	18
bite	early	23
black	early	26
blanket	early	22
block	early	23
blow	early	25
blue	early	24
boat	early	22
book	early	17
boots	early	23
bottle	early	20
bowl	early	23
box	early	23
boy	early	24
bread	early	23
break	early	26
breakfast	early	25
bring	early	27
broken	early	24
broom	early	25
brother	early	27
brown	early	27
brush	early	23
bubbles	early	19
bucket	early	27
bug	early	23
build	early	28
bump	early	27
bunny	early	22
bus	early	22
but	early	-
butter	early	26
butterfly	early	24
button	early	24
buy	early	28
by	early	29

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
bye	early	16
cake	middle	23
call (on phone)	middle	24
camera	middle	27
camping	middle	-
can (auxiliary)	middle	28
can (object)	middle	28
candy	middle	24
car	middle	18
careful	middle	27
carrots	middle	24
carry	middle	26
cat	middle	18
catch	middle	26
cereal	late	23
chair	middle	22
chalk	middle	27
chase	middle	28
cheek	middle	24
cheerios	middle	25
cheese	middle	19
chicken (animal)	middle	23
chicken (food)	middle	23
child	middle	-
chin	middle	25
chocolate	middle	25
circus	late	-
clap	middle	24
clean (action)	middle	25
clean (description)	middle	25
climb	middle	26
clock	middle	25
close	middle	25
closet	middle	27
cloud	middle	26
clown	middle	28

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
coat	middle	24
coffee	middle	26
coke	middle	30
cold	middle	22
comb	middle	26
cook	middle	26
cookie	middle	19
corn	middle	25
couch	middle	25
could	middle	-
country	middle	-
cover	middle	28
cow	middle	21
cowboy	middle	-
cracker	middle	21
crayon	middle	24
crib	middle	26
cry	middle	24
cup	middle	21
cut	middle	27
cute	middle	27
daddy	early	16
dance	early	24
dark	early	26
day	early	29
deer	early	27
diaper	early	20
dinner	early	25
dirty	early	23
dish	early	28
do	early	26
doctor	early	26
does	early	-
dog	early	16
doll	early	23
don't	early	27

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
donkey	early	29
donut	early	27
door	early	21
down	early	21
downtown	early	-
draw	early	26
drawer	early	28
dress (object)	early	26
drink (action)	early	23
drink (beverage)	early	23
drive	early	26
drop	early	27
dry (action)	early	27
dry (description)	early	27
dryer	early	28
duck	early	18
dump	early	30
face	middle	24
fall	middle	24
farm	middle	28
fast	middle	26
feed	middle	27
find	middle	26
fine	middle	-
finger	middle	23
finish	middle	28
fireman	middle	28
firetruck	middle	25
first	middle	29
fish (animal)	middle	20
fish (food)	middle	24
fit	middle	29
fix	middle	26
flag	middle	27
flower	middle	22
food	middle	24

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
foot	middle	22
for	middle	29
fork	middle	23
friend	middle	27
frog	middle	23
full	middle	28
game	middle	27
garage	middle	27
garbage	middle	26
garden	middle	29
gentle	middle	28
get	middle	25
giraffe	middle	25
girl	middle	25
give	middle	26
glass	middle	27
glasses	middle	25
gloves	middle	27
glue	middle	29
go	middle	20
good	middle	25
goose	middle	28
grapes	middle	23
grass	middle	24
green	middle	25
gum	middle	29
hair	early	21
hamburger	early	26
hammer	early	27
hand	early	22
happy	early	25
hard	early	28
hat	early	19
hate	early	-
have	early	26
he	early	28

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
head	early	22
hear	early	27
heavy	early	26
helicopter	early	26
hello	early	19
help	early	23
hen	early	-
her	early	30
here	early	25
hers	early	-
hi	early	16
hide	early	26
high	early	27
him	early	30
his	early	30
hit	early	25
hold	early	26
home	early	23
horse	early	22
hose	early	28
hot	early	19
house	early	24
how	early	30
hug	early	23
hungry	early	25
hurry	early	28
hurt	early	25
jacket	middle	24
jar	middle	30
jeans	middle	28
jello	middle	29
jelly	middle	28
juice	middle	20
jump	middle	24
keys	middle	22
kick	middle	25

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
kiss	middle	22
kitchen	middle	25
kitty	middle	19
knee	early	24
knife	early	26
knock	early	26
ladder	late	28
lady	late	29
lamb	late	28
lamp	late	29
last	late	-
later	late	28
leg	late	24
lick	late	28
light	late	22
like	late	26
lion	late	24
lips	late	26
listen	late	28
little (description)	late	26
lollipop	late	28
long	late	30
look	late	25
loud	late	27
love	late	24
lunch	late	25
mad	early	28
mailman	early	29
make	early	27
man	early	26
me	early	23
meat	early	27
medicine	early	26
melon	early	29
milk	early	19
mine	early	21

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
mittens	early	28
mommy	early	16
money	early	25
monkey	early	22
moon	early	22
moose	early	29
mop	early	30
more	early	21
morning	early	27
motorcycle	early	26
mouse	early	24
mouth	early	21
movie	early	28
much	early	-
muffin	early	27
my	early	25
myself	early	30
nail	early	29
nap	early	23
napkin	early	26
naughty	early	-
necklace	early	27
new	early	28
nice	early	26
night	early	25
night night	early	19
no	early	16
noisy	early	28
none	early	-
noodles	early	25
nose	early	18
not	early	28
now	early	26
nurse	early	-
nuts	early	28
paint	early	27

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
pajamas	early	24
pancake	early	25
pants	early	23
paper	early	24
park	early	24
party	early	27
peas	early	26
peekaboo	early	20
pen	early	25
pencil	early	26
penguin	early	27
penny	early	28
people	early	28
person	early	-
pick	early	28
pickle	early	27
picnic	early	29
picture	early	25
pig	early	22
pillow	early	23
pizza	early	22
plant	early	27
plate	early	25
play	early	23
playground	early	28
please	early	20
police	early	29
pony	early	28
pool	early	25
poor	early	-
popcorn	early	25
popsicle	early	26
porch	early	-
potato	early	26
potty	early	22
pour	early	28

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
present	early	26
pretend	early	30
pretty	early	26
pretzel	early	27
pudding	early	30
pull	early	27
pumpkin	early	26
puppy	early	22
purse	early	26
push	early	25
put	early	27
puzzle	early	25
quiet	middle	27
radio	late	28
rain	late	23
raisin	late	26
read	late	24
red	late	25
refrigerator	late	26
ride	late	25
rip	late	30
rock	late	23
roof	late	29
room	late	25
rooster	late	28
run	late	24
sad	late	27
salt	late	29
same	late	30
sandbox	late	28
sandwich	late	25
sauce	late	28
say	late	27
scared	late	27
scarf	late	-
school	late	25

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
scissors	late	26
see	late	24
shake	late	28
share	late	27
she	late	29
sheep	late	24
shirt	late	23
shoe	late	17
shopping	late	27
shorts	late	26
shoulder	late	28
shovel	late	27
show	late	28
shower	late	25
sick	late	27
sidewalk	late	28
sing	late	25
sink	late	26
sister	late	28
sit	late	23
skate	late	-
sky	late	25
sled	late	-
sleep	late	24
sleepy	late	26
slide (action)	late	26
slide (object)	late	24
slipper	late	27
slow	late	29
smile	late	27
snack	late	24
sneaker	late	30
snow	late	25
snowman	late	28
snowsuit	late	-
so	late	-

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
soap	late	24
sock	late	21
sofa	late	30
soft	late	27
some	late	27
soup	late	26
spaghetti	late	25
spill	late	27
splash	late	26
spoon	late	21
sprinkler	late	29
squirrel	late	26
stairs	late	25
stand	late	27
star	late	23
stay	late	27
stick	late	25
sticky	late	27
stone	late	30
stop	late	23
store	late	25
story	late	25
stove	late	28
strawberry	late	24
street	late	26
stroller	late	25
stuck	late	26
sun	late	23
sweater	late	26
sweep	late	27
swim	late	26
swing (action)	late	25
swing (object)	late	23
table	middle	24
take	middle	27
talk	middle	27


Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
tape	middle	27
taste	middle	28
teacher	middle	28
tear	middle	30
teddybear	middle	24
telephone	middle	22
that	late	25
the	late	28
their	late	-
them	late	-
then	late	-
there	late	26
these	late	29
they	late	-
think	late	30
thirsty	late	27
this	late	26
those	late	30
throw	late	25
tickle	middle	24
tiger	middle	24
tights	middle	-
time	middle	-
tiny	middle	30
tired	middle	26
tissue	middle	26
to	middle	28
toast	middle	25
today	middle	29
toe	middle	22
tomorrow	middle	29
tongue	middle	24
tonight	middle	-
too	middle	27
tooth	middle	23
toothbrush	middle	23

Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
touch	middle	26
towel	middle	24
toy (object)	middle	22
tractor	middle	26
train	middle	22
trash	middle	25
tray	middle	-
tree	middle	21
tricycle	middle	30
truck	middle	20
tummy	middle	22
tuna	middle	-
turkey	middle	28
turtle	middle	23
TV	middle	23
vacuum	middle	25
vanilla	middle	-
vitamins	middle	28
wait	early	26
wake	early	27
walk	early	24
walker	early	-
was	early	-
wash	early	25
watch (action)	early	26
watch (object)	early	26
water (beverage)	early	20
water (not beverage)	early	21
we	early	30
were	early	-
wet	early	24
what	early	24
when	early	-
where	early	26
which	early	-
white	early	27


Word	Phoneme Category (Shriberg, 1993)	Age of Acquisition (AoA) in Months (Frank et al., 2016)
who	early	29
why	early	28
will	early	-
wind	early	27
window	early	25
windy	early	28
wipe	early	26
wish	early	-
with	early	28
wolf	early	29
woods	early	-
work (action)	early	26
work (place)	early	25
would	early	-
write	late	28
yard	early	28
yellow	early	25
yes	early	19
yesterday	early	-
yogurt	early	24
you	early	24
your	early	29
yourself	early	-
yucky	early	23
zebra	late	26
zipper	late	26
zoo	late	27

Note. Each word was coded as early-, middle-, or late-developing using Shriberg's (1993) classification. Age of acquisition (AoA; in months) was obtained via Wordbank (Frank et al., 2016) and is the age in which $\geq 50\%$ of the sample was reported to produce a given word. The dash (-) denotes no available AoA on Wordbank.

Supplemental Material S2. Mean proportion of spoken words from the MacArthur–Bates Communicative Developmental Inventories Words and Sentences Forms (Fenson et al., 2007) beginning with early-, middle- or late-developing consonants (Shriberg, 1993) as a function of total spoken vocabulary size collapsed across diagnostic groups.



Supplemental Material S3. (a) Mean proportion of spoken words from the MacArthur–Bates Communicative Developmental Inventories Words and Sentences Forms (MB-CDI:WS; Fenson et al., 2007) from total number of possible words in each consonant category (early-, middle- or late-developing consonants) collapsed across diagnostic groups (Shriberg, 1993). (b) Mean proportion of spoken words from the MB-CDI:WS from total number of possible words in each consonant category (early-, middle- or late-developing consonants) by diagnostic group.



Note. Error bars represent standard error for both plots. LTs = late talkers; TDL = typically developing, Language-matched; TDA = typically developing, age-matched.