

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

20 **ABSTRACT**

21 Caregivers modify their speech when talking to infants, a specific type of speech known as infant-
22 directed speech (IDS). This speaking style facilitates language learning compared to adult-directed
23 speech (ADS) in infants with normal hearing (NH). While infants with NH and those with cochlear
24 implants (CIs) prefer listening to IDS over ADS, it is yet unknown how CI speech processing may
25 affect the acoustic distinctiveness between ADS and IDS, as well as the degree of intelligibility of
26 these. This study analyzed speech of seven female adult talkers to investigate the effects of
27 simulated CI speech processing on (1) acoustic distinctiveness between ADS and IDS, (2)
28 estimates of intelligibility of caregivers' speech in ADS and IDS, and (3) individual differences in
29 caregivers' ADS-to-IDS modification and speech intelligibility. Results suggest that CI speech
30 processing is substantially detrimental to the acoustic distinctiveness between ADS and IDS, as
31 well as to the intelligibility benefit derived from ADS-to-IDS modifications. Moreover, the
32 observed considerable variability across individual talkers in acoustic implementation of ADS-to-
33 IDS modification and speech intelligibility was significantly reduced due to CI speech processing.
34 The findings are discussed in the context of the link between IDS and language learning in infants
35 with CIs.

36 *Keywords:* Infant-directed speech, cochlear implant, acoustic distance, speech intelligibility

37

38

39

40

41

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

42 **I. INTRODUCTION**

43 **A. Infant-directed speech and language learning**

44 Caregivers around the world modify their speaking style from adult-directed speech (ADS) to
45 infant-directed speech (IDS) when talking to infants (Fernald & Kuhl, 1987; Snow, 1977). Greater
46 exposure to IDS and some aspects of its acoustic and linguistic properties facilitates language
47 learning in children with normal hearing (NH) (Cristia & Seidl, 2014; Liu, Kuhl, & Tsao, 2003;
48 Song, Demuth, & Morgan, 2010; Trainor, Austin, & Desjardins, 2000; Weisleder & Fernald,
49 2013). The supportive role of IDS in infants' language learning occurs through several pathways,
50 such as directing and holding infants' attention to speech (Fernald, 1985, 1989; Kitamura,
51 Thanavishuth, Burnham, & Luksaneeyanawin, 2001; Kuhl et al., 1997; Schachner & Hannon,
52 2011; Wang, Bergeson, & Houston, 2017, 2018; Werker, Pegg, & McLeod, 1994), while making
53 speech more clear by providing more salient cues for speech discrimination (Karzon, 1985), word
54 segmentation (Singh & Nestor, 2009), speech segmentation (Thiessen, Hill, & Saffran, 2005), and
55 word learning (Ma, Golinkoff, Houston, & Hirsh-Pasek, 2011). Taken together, these studies
56 demonstrate the supportive role of IDS in infants' early language learning. The purpose of the
57 present study was to investigate how signal processing associated with cochlear implants (CIs)
58 impacts acoustic cues pertaining to distinguishing and recognizing words in IDS versus ADS.

59 **B. Infants' attention to IDS**

60 In listening to speech, infants with NH and those with CIs demonstrate increased attention to IDS
61 compared to ADS (The ManyBabies Consortium, 2020; Cooper, Abraham, Berman, & Staska,
62 1997; Fernald, 1985; Wang et al., 2017; Wang, Bergeson, et al., 2018; Werker & McLeod, 1989;
63 Werker et al., 1994). This effect of IDS on attention begins very early as observed in newborns
64 and infants as young as 4 months old (Cooper & Aslin, 1990; Fernald, 1985; Werker & McLeod,

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

65 1989), demonstrating the capability of infants in using subtle acoustic information to distinguish
66 IDS from ADS while having acquired only minimal linguistic knowledge. Multiple acoustic-
67 phonetic cues have been identified as potentially supporting infants' robust preference for IDS
68 over ADS, such as higher pitch (Cooper & Aslin, 1990; Fernald, 1989), greater pitch fluctuation
69 (Fernald & Simon, 1984), slower speaking rate (Leong, Kalashnikova, Burnham, & Goswami,
70 2014; Narayan & McDermott, 2016; Song et al., 2010), and an expanded vowel space (Burnham
71 et al., 2015) in IDS compared to ADS. These distinctive acoustic-phonetic cues are manifested in
72 spectro-temporal representations of caregivers' speech, which are actively incorporated through
73 infants' highly sensitive auditory systems to recognize IDS as distinct from ADS (Kuhl, 2004;
74 Maye, Werker, & Gerken, 2002; McMurray & Aslin, 2005; Telkemeyer et al., 2009). Although
75 IDS over ADS preference was observed in infants with CIs (Wang et al., 2017), it is still not clear
76 how they are different from their peers with NH in terms of access to spectral information involved
77 in distinguishing IDS from ADS. Infants with CIs may face difficulties in resolving distinctive
78 acoustic information toward performing this task, leading potentially to a disruption in the
79 developmental time course of CI infants' attention to IDS and delayed language development, as
80 compared to that of NH infants. These considerations suggest a benefit of examining how CI-
81 related speech processing may affect acoustic distinctiveness and intelligibility of IDS compared
82 with ADS, and how this acoustic distinctiveness and intelligibility may differ as a function of
83 individual talkers' speech patterns.

84 **C. CI vocoding and acoustic distinction between IDS and ADS**

85 Infants with CIs have access to a spectro-temporally degraded version of speech, due to limitations
86 of electric stimulation to faithfully transmit this information to the auditory nerve. Friesen et al.
87 (2001) showed that speech recognition in listeners with NH improved by increasing the number

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

88 of spectral channels in the vocoded speech, confirming that spectral resolutions are limited by the
89 number of channels in the CI vocoder (Friesen et al., 2001; Fu, Chinchilla, Nogaki, & Galvin,
90 2005; Fu & Nogaki, 2005; Luo & Poeppel, 2007; Shannon, Zeng, Kamath, Wygonski, & Ekelid,
91 1995; Svirsky, 2017). Temporal resolution is also negatively affected by low-pass filtering of
92 amplitude envelope, which disrupts faithful transmission of temporal fine-structure in speech to
93 auditory nerves (Rubinstein, 2004; Svirsky, 2017). Therefore, the CI vocoding process may
94 negatively affect infants' perception of segmental and suprasegmental features of IDS.

95 Transmission of multiple speech cues are affected by the CI vocoding process, including
96 fundamental frequency (F0) (Mehta & Oxenham, 2017; Qin & Oxenham, 2005; Svirsky, 2017),
97 timbre (Galvin, Mok, Dowell, & Briggs, 2008), and melody (Mehta & Oxenham, 2017; Zeng,
98 Tang, & Lu, 2014), which are recognized as major attributes that distinguish IDS from ADS
99 (Fernald, 1989; Fernald & Simon, 1984; Wang et al., 2017). For example, pitch is an important
100 perceptual cue for children's robust attention in listening to IDS (Fernald, 1985; Piazza, Iordan, &
101 Lew-Williams, 2017) and was recognized as the most prominent acoustic determinant in
102 distinguishing IDS from ADS (Fernald & Kuhl, 1987). It also contributes to lexical segmentation
103 of speech in listeners with CIs (Spitzer, Liss, Spahr, Dorman, & Lansford, 2009), a task critical for
104 word learning. Recognition of emotion from speech is another important aspect in processing IDS
105 (Trainor et al., 2000), which relies heavily on perceiving pitch height and fluctuation. Listeners
106 with CIs performed worse in emotion recognition as the number of spectral channels in vocoded
107 speech was decreased (Luo, Fu, & Galvin, 2007). Kong et al. (2004) further found that melodic
108 pitch perception is negatively affected by reducing the number of spectral channels. Taken
109 together, these studies demonstrate that children with CIs have partial access to spectro-temporal
110 cues in speech, particularly ones that significantly contribute to the distinctiveness of IDS and

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

111 ADS, which may interfere with the connection between listening to IDS and developing better
112 language skills. Therefore, it is important to understand how the CI vocoding process may
113 acoustically impact the distinction between IDS and ADS - a major knowledge gap that the present
114 study aimed to address.

115 **D. CI vocoding and intelligibility of IDS**

116 Another possible way IDS may foster language learning is by making speech more intelligible.
117 Prior studies showed evidence that IDS may provide acoustic cues that assist infants for parsing
118 linguistic units in speech. Karzon (1985) showed that the exaggerated suprasegmental features of
119 IDS may provide supportive perceptual cues for syllabification of multisyllabic sequences. In
120 another study, infants performed better long-term word recognition when the words presented in
121 IDS compared to ADS (Singh & Nestor, 2009). It was further shown that IDS facilitates word
122 segmentation (Thiessen et al., 2005). Although evidence on intelligibility benefits of IDS over
123 ADS have somehow been contradictory at the level of segmental speech cues (e.g., Kuhl et al.,
124 1997; McMurray, Kovack-Lesh, Goodwin, & McEchron, 2013), there might be an intelligibility
125 benefit associated with other properties of IDS (e.g., prosodic cues), similar to the effects observed
126 in close analogues of a “clear speech” register (Bradlow, Kraus, & Hayes, 2003; Ferguson &
127 Kewley-Port, 2007). Caregivers’ modification of speaking style from ADS to IDS impacts
128 suprasegmental aspects of speech such as pitch contour and speech rate, which have been shown
129 to be strong predictors of speech clarity and intelligibility (Bradlow et al., 2003; Cutler, Dahan, &
130 van Donselaar, 1997; Ferguson & Poore, 2010; Ferguson & Quené, 2014; Spitzer, Liss, & Mattys,
131 2007; Watson & Schlauch, 2008). Different choices of speaking style often impact speech rate,
132 where slower rate is thought to contribute to enhanced intelligibility of clear speech compared to

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

133 conversational speech both in typical listeners (Ferguson et al., 2010) and recipients of CIs (Li et
134 al., 2011; Zanto, Hennigan, Östberg, Clapp, & Gazzaley, 2013).

135 Limited spectral resolution of the cochlear implant device affects the quality by which
136 listeners with CIs receive speech cues (Croghan, Duran, & Smith, 2017; Jain & Vipin Ghosh,
137 2018; Peng, Hess, Saffran, Edwards, & Litovsky, 2019; Qin & Oxenham, 2005), which may
138 negatively impact CI users' ability to recognize words and phonemes, especially children (Grieco-
139 calub, Saffran, & Litovsky, 2010; Peng et al., 2019). Therefore, any likely beneficial role of IDS
140 in improvement of speech intelligibility is prone to change when caregivers' speech is perceived
141 through a CI device. Prior studies have shown that performance of listeners with CIs is
142 considerably poorer than listeners with NH in understanding sentences spoken with relatively
143 higher rate (Zanto et al., 2013), which is an acoustic dimension signaling distinction of IDS from
144 ADS (i.e., slower speaking rate in IDS compared to ADS). Variation of fundamental frequency
145 (F_0) is another acoustic dimension of the IDS-vs-ADS distinction that contributes to speech
146 recognition (Spitzer, Liss, Spahr, Dorman, & Lansford, 2009; Spitzer et al., 2007). Findings on the
147 effect of these acoustic properties on intelligibility of caregivers' speech is still controversial, and
148 little is known about the effects of CI speech processing on intelligibility of caregivers' speech in
149 ADS and IDS conditions. The present study aimed to address whether IDS is beneficial for
150 intelligibility improvement and how this effect may be compromised depending on listeners'
151 hearing status (NH vs. CI).

152 **E. Individual differences in acoustic implementation of IDS and speech intelligibility**

153 Listeners' familiarity with the range of variability in voice timbres of individual talkers is
154 important for robust identification and recognition of individuals' voices (Lavan, Burton, Scott, &
155 McGettigan, 2019; Souza, Gehani, Wright, & McCloy, 2013). Caregiver-specific acoustic

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

156 modification is important for effective caregiver-infant interaction and significantly contributes to
157 infants' recognition of caregivers' voices both before and after birth (Beauchemin et al., 2011;
158 Kisilevsky et al., 2003), as well as for neural development of infants' auditory cortices (Webb,
159 Heller, Benson, & Lahav, 2015). Singh (2008) showed that exposure to IDS with relatively higher
160 variability facilitates word recognition in infants by forming a relatively wider and more
161 generalizable lexical category, highlighting the supportive role of exposure to a wide range of
162 ADS-to-IDS acoustic variation in effective processing of caregivers' speech. The degree of
163 acoustic variability that caregivers introduce to their infants may vary across individuals. The
164 acoustic characteristics of IDS reveal finer details about the unique voice timbre of individual
165 caregivers, which potentially contributes to infant' identification of individual caregivers (Piazza
166 et al., 2017). It is, however, unclear how CI vocoding impacts the range of acoustic variability
167 within and across caregivers due to shifts in caregivers' speaking style (i.e., ADS to IDS), a change
168 which likely eliminates acoustic details and potentially negatively impacts the supportive role of
169 IDS in recognizing caregivers' voices. CI vocoding is also detrimental to the acoustic distance of
170 voices across caregivers, which potentially makes distinguishing talkers from each other more
171 challenging for infants with CIs, compared to those with NH. The presents study aimed to
172 investigate these questions.

173 **F. Benefits of investigations of acoustic properties of CI-related speech processing**

174 Studies aimed at understanding speech perception in individuals with CIs can be characterized as
175 involving one of three general approaches. The first approach examines performance of listeners
176 with NH in response to vocoded speech to simulate hearing in listeners with CIs (Dorman, Loizou,
177 & Rainey, 1997a; Jahn, DiNino, & Arenberg, 2019; Mehta & Oxenham, 2017; Qin & Oxenham,
178 2003, 2005). The second method involves directly study of how listeners with CIs perform in

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

179 various speech recognition tasks (Brown & Bacon, 2010; Kong, Stickney, & Zeng, 2005; Peng,
180 Tomblin, & Turner, 2008; Peng, Hess, Saffran, Edwards, & Litovsky, 2019). In a third method –
181 the one which we focus on in the present paper – acoustic properties of simulated CI speech and
182 unprocessed analogs are analyzed comparatively. This comparative analysis can be facilitated
183 through the use of various quantitative metrics that emulate speech recognition in CI users as
184 proxies to analyze properties of CI speech and its perception in listeners with CIs (Jain & Vipin
185 Ghosh, 2018; Qin & Oxenham, 2003; Santos, Cosentino, Hazrati, Loizou, & Falk, 2013). Analysis
186 of simulated CI speech and quantitative measures of speech quality and intelligibility tailored to
187 listeners with CIs provide repeatable, automated, inexpensive, and fast tools for gaining
188 preliminary evidence about speech perception in individuals with CIs. As such, a comparative
189 analysis method offers benefits for undertaking efficient investigations for further study, and as
190 such provides benefits over various major challenges that accompany the first two categories of
191 studies, such as participant recruitment, time, and cost.

192 **G. Current study**

193 In the present study, we analyzed unprocessed and simulated CI speech of seven female talkers
194 who spoke utterances both in ADS and IDS. This permitted examining how CI speech processing
195 may affect acoustic distinctiveness between ADS and IDS, as well as intelligibility of caregivers’
196 speech under modifications of speaking style. A signal processing-based approach was taken here
197 to analyze ADS and IDS stimuli of the female talkers using noise-excited envelope vocoder
198 processing, which is one type of CI-simulated speech which has been used in a number of prior
199 studies (Dorman, Loizou, Fitzke, & Tu, 1998; Dorman, Loizou, & Rainey, 1997b; Friesen et al.,
200 2001; Fu, Shannon, & Wang, 1998; Loizou, Dorman, & Tu, 1999; Mehta, Lu, & Oxenham, 2020;

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

201 Mehta & Oxenham, 2017; Qin & Oxenham, 2003, 2005; Rosen, Faulkner, & Wilkinson, 1999;
202 Shannon et al., 1995).

203 Our approach involved calculating three main types of acoustic or statistical measures. First,
204 we calculated mel-frequency cepstral coefficients (MFCCs), which have been shown in multiple
205 studies to be effective for characterizing the distinctive qualities of IDS vs. ADS (Inoue,
206 Nakagawa, Kondou, Koga, & Shinohara, 2011; Piazza et al., 2017; Sulpizio et al., 2018). Modeling
207 the frequency response of human auditory system via MFCCs captures various acoustic-phonetic
208 features, that distinguish IDS and ADS, such as shifts in timbre (Piazza et al., 2017) and acoustic-
209 phonetic distinctiveness between IDS and ADS (Inoue et al., 2011), including in other languages
210 (e.g., Italian and German) (Sulpizio et al., 2018). MFCCs are also able to effectively reflect
211 caregivers' emotional state and vocal affect (e.g., happiness vs. sadness, Sato & Obuchi, 2007;
212 Slaney & McRoberts, 1998), attributes that help explain infants' preference for IDS over ADS
213 (Fernald, 2018; Horowitz, 1983; Mastropieri & Turkewitz, 1999; Moore, Spence, & Katz, 1997;
214 Papoušek, Bornstein, Nuzzo, Papoušek, & Symmes, 1990; Singh, Morgan, & Best, 2002; Walker-
215 Andrews & Grolnick, 1983; Walker-Andrews & Lennon, 1991). Furthermore, MFCCs allowed us
216 to analyze spectral properties of vocoded speech, which was not feasible to do based on calculation
217 of common acoustic properties such as fundamental frequency (F_0), as these cues are not present
218 in CI-simulated speech. Second, to quantify the acoustic distinctiveness between IDS and ADS,
219 we calculated a *Mahalanobis distance* (*MD*) measure over MFCCs features. MD is a multivariate
220 distance metric that has been widely used to measure the distances between vectors in a variety of
221 multidimensional feature spaces (Arjmandi, Dilley, & Wagner, 2018; Masnan et al., 2015; Xiang,
222 Nie, & Zhang, 2008). Third, to understand how the vocoding process may influence intelligibility
223 of caregivers' speech, we calculated the speech-to-reverberation-modulation energy ratio (SRMR)

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

224 to model the signal-based intelligibility of signals delivered to listeners with NH, as well as its CI-
225 tailored version (SRMR-CI) to model intelligibility of signals delivered to listeners with CIs
226 (Santos et al., 2013). These measures were examined both within and across speakers to model the
227 impacts of speaking styles (IDS vs. ADS) and listener group (NH vs. CI) on signals' distinctiveness
228 and (estimated) intelligibility. All these analyses were implemented in Matlab 2019a (The
229 Mathworks Web-Site [<http://www.mathworks.com>]).

230 The following four specific questions were addressed in this study. First, we asked how
231 simulated CI speech processing affects the acoustic distinctiveness of IDS compared with ADS
232 stimuli, particularly as a function of degree of spectral degradation (i.e., number of spectral
233 channels) in CI-simulated speech. We hypothesized that (a) CI-related speech processing
234 significantly degrades the acoustic-phonetic distinctiveness of IDS compared with ADS, and
235 further that (b) increasing the number of channels would not compensate for degradation imposed
236 by CI-related processing. Second, we asked whether there is signal-based evidence that IDS may
237 be more intelligible than ADS, as gauged by the SRMR metric (to simulate a NH listening
238 condition) or the SRMR-CI metric (to simulate a CI listening condition). We hypothesized that
239 IDS is more intelligible than ADS, but that (estimated) intelligibility would vary as a function of
240 (simulated) listening status (NH vs. CI). Third, we asked to what extent the acoustic distinctiveness
241 between IDS and ADS varies across individual caregivers, as well as how such individual
242 differences might be impacted by CI speech processing. We predicted individual differences across
243 caregivers in acoustic implementation of the differences between ADS and IDS; we further
244 predicted that CI-related speech processing would decrease the extent of acoustic distinctiveness
245 as a function of speech style, leading to loss of intra- and inter-subject acoustic variability in terms
246 of IDS vs. ADS distinctiveness. Fourth, and finally, we asked how (estimated) intelligibility

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

247 *differences* for IDS compared with ADS vary across individual caregivers, and how such
248 intelligibility differ as a function of hearing status (as gauged by SRMR vs. SRMR-CI differences
249 to simulate effects of NH vs. CI listening conditions, respectively). We hypothesized that
250 intelligibility differences for IDS vs. ADS would vary across caregivers, and that these
251 intelligibility differences would be more similar as estimated for CI listeners, compared with NH
252 listeners.

253 **II. METHODS**

254 **A. Speech stimuli**

255 Seven female adult native talkers of American English ranging in age from 21 to 24 years old
256 spoke fifteen utterances in IDS and ADS (See Appendix in Supplementary Material for the list of
257 stimuli). The utterances were elicited for use in separate infant word-learning experiments in which
258 infants were exposed to a novel target word (i.e., “*modi*”) in the context of behavioral measures of
259 infant word recognition to assess whether infants learned the novel word from IDS better than
260 ADS. To elicit stimuli, the talkers were instructed to speak utterances as if talking to an infant (IDS
261 condition) or an adult (ADS condition); this procedure was similar to that used in Wang et al.,
262 (2017; 2018).

263 Speech stimuli were recorded using an AKG D 542 ST-S microphone in a sound booth and
264 digitized at a sampling rate of 44.1 kHz with 16-bit resolution. The distance between talkers’
265 mouths and the microphone was controlled to assure the quality of the recorded stimuli. Prior to
266 processing as discussed below, the start and end points of recorded utterances were manually
267 identified in Praat software (Boersma & Weenink, 2001) to remove preceding and following silent
268 portions. All participants were fully informed about the purpose and procedure of this study, and

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

269 they had given informed consent to participate. This study was approved by the Institutional
270 Review Boards of the Ohio State University and Michigan State University.

271 **B. Creation of noise-vocoded speech stimuli**

272 CI-simulated versions of the unprocessed (natural) stimuli were created using noise-excited
273 envelope vocoder processing at six levels of spectral degradation, corresponding to 4-, 8-, 12-, 16-
274 , 22- and 32-channel noise-vocoded stimuli. The choice of number of channels was made to cover
275 both the actual number of channels in FDA-approved devices (12, 16, 22) and to query ranges of
276 variation ranging from minimal cues used in prior studies (4, 8) out to 32 channels to examine CI
277 vocoder scenarios with higher spectral resolution. The natural stimuli consisting of spoken IDS or
278 ADS were processed in AngelSimTM Cochlear Implant and Hearing Loss Simulator (Fu, 2019;
279 Emily Shannon Fu Foundation, www.tigerspeech.com) using 4-, 8-, 12-, 16-, 22-, and 32-channel
280 noise-vocoding CI-simulated stimuli; the noise vocoding method followed the procedure in
281 Shannon et al. (1995). The original stimuli were first band-passed filtered using the Greenwood
282 function (emulating the Greenwood frequency-place map) into N ($N = \{4, 8, 12, 16, 22, 32\}$)
283 adjacent frequency channels ranging from 200 Hz to 8000 Hz. This was implemented in
284 *AngelSimTM* by setting the absolute lower- and higher-frequency threshold for analysis and carrier
285 filters to 200 Hz and 8000 Hz with a filter slope of 24 dB/Oct (Fu, 2019). These frequency ranges
286 are fairly close to the corner frequencies of the Cochlear Nucleus speech processors in CI listeners
287 cochlear implant devices (Crew & Galvin, 2012; Winn & Litovsky, 2015), which emulate the
288 performance of average CI listeners in speech envelope discrimination (Chatterjee & Oberzut,
289 2011; Chatterjee & Peng, 2008). The same analysis filter and carrier filter of the Greenwood
290 function was used to analyze white noise as a carrier signal (Greenwood, 1990). The *AngelSim*
291 software used this setup to extract a time-varying amplitude envelope of speech stimuli under each

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

292 frequency band using half-wave rectification and then modulated independent white-noise carriers.
293 There were 210 stimuli per speech style condition (7 talkers x 15 stimuli x 2 speaking styles).
294 Including the noise-vocoded versions of these utterances (at 4, 8, 12, 16, 22, and 32-channels), we
295 analyzed 1470 (210 x 7 levels of speech degradation) utterances in the present study.

296 **C. Using MFCC features to characterize acoustic properties of IDS and ADS**

297 We calculated 12 MFCCs for each speech stimulus to characterize its acoustic information (Hunt,
298 Lennig, & Mermelestein, 1980; Imai, 1983; Shaneh & Taheri, 2009). Figure 1 illustrates this step
299 for a sample pair of IDS-ADS stimuli in the process for measuring the acoustic distinctiveness
300 between each ADS-IDS stimulus pair. To calculate MFCCs, each stimulus was re-sampled at 16
301 kHz using a Hamming window of 25 ms applied to each frame, with a frame shift of 10 ms,
302 following the procedure used in Inoue et al. (2011). For each pair of IDS and ADS stimuli ($S_{IDS_{ij}}$
303 and $S_{ADS_{ij}}$ in Figure 1), MFCCs were calculated for all frames of these stimuli ($MFCCs_{IDS_{ij}}$ and
304 $MFCCs_{ADS_{ij}}$). Here, i indicates the index of the speech stimulus, $i = \{1,2,3,\dots,15\}$, and j is the
305 index for the talker, $j = \{1,2,3,\dots,7\}$. Unlike previous studies in which a single, time-averaged
306 MFCC vector was calculated to represent acoustic information in IDS and ADS (e.g., Piazza et al.,
307 2017), our approach took advantage of all MFCCs derived from all frames of a speech stimuli to
308 calculate the acoustic distinctiveness between ADS-IDS pairs of stimuli within a multidimensional
309 feature space, thereby preserving the details about spectro-temporal information in speech at the
310 level of frame. Since each analyzed pair of IDS and ADS stimuli contained identical word strings,
311 our analysis was expected to mainly model the acoustic-phonetic effect of caregivers' speaking
312 styles (IDS vs. ADS).

313 >>>>>>>FIG. 1 about here <<<<<<<<

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

314 **D. Acoustic distinctiveness quantification using Mahalanobis Distance (MD) measure**

315 After representing acoustic features of pairs of IDS and ADS stimuli by calculating their MFCCs,
316 the acoustic distinctiveness between each pair was measured by calculating MD on the
317 corresponding MFCC matrices (i.e., $MFCCs_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $MFCCs_{ADS_{ij}}$) using a 12-dimensional feature
318 space (i.e., 12 MFCCs) (Maesschalck & Massart, 2000; Masnan et al., 2015; Xiang et al., 2008).
319 MD is a multivariate statistical approach that evaluates distances between two multidimensional
320 feature vectors or matrices that belong to two classes (here IDS vs. ADS) (Arjmandi et al., 2018;
321 Heijden, Ferdinand, Ridder, & Tax., 2005; Maesschalck & Massart, 2000; Masnan et al., 2015).
322 The MD calculation returns the *distance* between means of two classes (here IDS and ADS)
323 relative to the average per-class covariance matrix (Maesschalck & Massart, 2000). Here, acoustic
324 properties of each class were represented by two feature matrices (here, MFCCs). The larger the
325 distance between pairs of $MFCCs_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $MFCCs_{ADS_{ij}}$ feature vectors, the lower the overlap
326 between two classes of IDS and ADS; this corresponds in turn to greater acoustic distance (or
327 distinctiveness) between IDS and ADS stimuli.

328 Each row of the calculated MFCCs matrix for utterance i from talker j (e.g., $MFCCs_{IDS_{ij}}$ or
329 $MFCCs_{ADS_{ij}}$) corresponds to a frame of that utterance, and 12 MFCCs were presented on the
330 columns of this matrix. Therefore, the dimension of each MFCC matrix was $N_F \times 12$, where N_F
331 refers to the number of frames in that speech stimulus. The acoustic distinctiveness between IDS
332 and ADS stimuli for each female talker j was computed by averaging the fifteen MD values
333 obtained from that talker's fifteen IDS-ADS pairs ($MD_j = \frac{1}{i} \sum_{n=1}^i MD_{ij}$, $i = \{1, 2, \dots, 15\}$). This
334 process was separately performed on pairs of IDS and ADS stimuli for seven levels of spectral
335 degradation – *unprocessed*, 32-, 22-, 16-, 12-, 8-, and/or 4-channel noise-vocoded CI-simulated

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

336 stimuli – to give average MDs used to examine (1) how the acoustic distinctiveness between IDS
337 and ADS stimuli changes as a function of CI processing (and number of spectral channels), (2)
338 how individual caregivers vary in acoustic distinctiveness between IDS and ADS stimuli, and (3)
339 how CI noise-vocoding affects this pattern of individual differences across talker.

340 **E. Estimation of speech intelligibility using quantitative metrics of speech-to-reverberation-**
341 **modulation energy ratio (SRMR)**

342 As shown in Figure 1, we estimated the degree of intelligibility of each speech stimulus as it might
343 be experienced by listeners with NH or with CIs. To approximate stimulus intelligibility as
344 associated with NH, we calculated the quantitative metric of *speech-to-reverberation-modulation*
345 *energy ratio* (SRMR) for IDS and ADS (unprocessed) stimuli, respectively (Santos et al., 2013).
346 This metric has previously been validated as an approximation of intelligibility of speech to
347 listeners with NH in behavioral tasks (Falk et al., 2015; Santos et al., 2013). Further, to
348 approximate intelligibility as might be experienced by listeners with CIs, we calculated an adapted
349 version of the SRMR metric, which was also developed by Falk et al. (2013) to tailor the SRMR
350 metric for CI users; this adapted metric is known as SRMR-CI (Santos et al., 2013).

351 To calculate SRMR, an (unprocessed) speech stimulus was first filtered by a 23-channel
352 gammatone filterbank in order to emulate cochlear function. Next, a Hilbert transform was applied
353 to output signals from each of the 23 filters in the filterbank to obtain their temporal envelopes.
354 Next, modulation spectral energy for each critical band was calculated by windowing stimulus
355 temporal envelope and computing the discrete Fourier transform. To emulate frequency selectivity
356 in the modulation domain, the modulation frequency bins were grouped into eight overlapping
357 modulation bands with logarithmically-spaced center frequencies between 4 and 128 Hz. Finally,
358 the SRMR value was obtained by calculating the ratio of the average modulation energy in the

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

359 first four modulation bands (~ 3–20 Hz) to the average modulation energy in the last four
360 modulation bands (~ 20-160 Hz), as explained in Santos et al., (2013).

361 To calculate SRMR-CI, a 22-channel filterbank was used instead of a 23-channel filterbank
362 in order to emulate the structure of filterbanks in Nucleus CI devices. In addition, the 4-128 Hz
363 range of modulation for filterbank center frequencies was replaced by a 4–64 Hz range to better
364 emulate CI users' performance (Santos et al., 2013). Although these measures have not primarily
365 been developed to estimate the effect of talkers' speaking style on speech intelligibility, the signal
366 processing algorithms used in these metrics estimate the distribution of energy in various
367 frequency bands, as well as other spectral properties that are expected to emulate fairly well
368 performance of NH and CI users in speech recognition. Note that both SRMR and SRMR-CI
369 intelligibility metrics were calculated from *unprocessed* speech stimulus inputs, rather than noise-
370 vocoded, CI-simulated analog signals. In fact, intelligibility of signals as estimated for different
371 hearing statuses (NH or CI) is inherently modeled through the difference in algorithmic
372 implementation of these metrics (SRMR vs. SRMR-CI, respectively) (Santos et al., 2013).

373 As shown in Figure 1, SRMR and SRMR-CI values were separately calculated ($SRMR_{IDS_{ij}}$,
374 $SRMR_{ADS_{ij}}$, $SRMR-CI_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $SRMR-CI_{ADS_{ij}}$) for each pair of stimuli in IDS and ADS conditions
375 ($S_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $S_{ADS_{ij}}$). Intelligibility of speech stimuli produced by talker j in the two conditions (ADS
376 and IDS) was summarized by averaging the relevant SRMR-related values over the 15 stimuli
377 spoken by this talker at each of these two conditions. Therefore, for talker j , four values were
378 calculated: (i) $SRMR_{IDS_j} = \frac{1}{i} \sum_{i=1}^{15} SRMR_{IDS_{ij}}$, (ii) $SRMR_{ADS_j} = \frac{1}{i} \sum_{i=1}^{15} SRMR_{ADS_{ij}}$, (iii)
379 $SRMR-CI_{IDS_j} = \frac{1}{i} \sum_{i=1}^{15} SRMR-CI_{IDS_{ij}}$, (iv) $SRMR-CI_{ADS_j} = \frac{1}{i} \sum_{i=1}^{15} SRMR-CI_{ADS_{ij}}$. These four values
380 for each talker j provided an approximation of the intelligibility of IDS and ADS stimuli spoken

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

381 by this talker, as heard by listeners with NH ($SRMR_{IDS_j}$ and $SRMR_{ADS_j}$) and by those with CIs
382 ($SRMR-CI_{IDS_j}$ and $SRMR-CI_{ADS_j}$). These values were then used to address (1) how the
383 intelligibility of speech is affected by the two separate factors of caregivers' speaking styles (ADS
384 vs. IDS), as well as by (simulated) group hearing status (NH vs. CI), (2) the extent to which the
385 degree of impact of ADS-to-IDS speaking style modifications on intelligibility varies across
386 individual caregivers, and (3) how this variation is affected by (simulated) hearing status (NH vs.
387 CI).

388 **F. Statistical analysis**

389 We constructed two Generalized Linear Mixed Models (GLMMs) in Matlab (using the *fitglme*
390 function) (Matuschek, Kliegl, Vasishth, Baayen, & Bates, 2017; Quené & van den Bergh, 2008)
391 in order to (1) identify whether changes in acoustic distinctiveness (i.e., MD) between IDS and
392 ADS due to CI noise vocoding were statistically significant, and (2) to examine the effect of
393 speaking style (IDS vs. ADS) and simulated hearing status (NH vs. CI), and any potential
394 interaction, on intelligibility of speech (as measured by SRMR and SRMR-CI to simulate NH and
395 CI hearing statuses, respectively). For the first GLMM, the speech degradation level (i.e., 4, 8, 12,
396 16, 22, and 32-channel, and unprocessed) was entered into the model as a fixed predictor, and MDs
397 were defined as the response variable. The individual female talkers and speech stimuli were
398 defined as random effects (intercepts) in the model to account for quality differences that might
399 exist due to talker- and stimulus-specific variation. A post hoc test using Tukey's multiple
400 comparison approach (*multcompare*, MATLAB, Mathworks) was conducted to examine
401 statistically significant mean differences for all possible pairwise comparisons across seven levels
402 of spectral degradation (4, 8, 12, 16, 22, 32-channels, and unprocessed). In the second GLMM,
403 factors of speaking style (IDS or ADS) and simulated hearing status (NH or CI) were entered into

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

404 the model as independent fixed variables; the estimated speech intelligibility (cf. SRMR or SRMR-
405 CI values) corresponded to the response variable in the model. Talkers and speech stimuli were
406 entered as random-effect intercepts in the model to account for quality and/or information
407 differences that might exist due to talker- and stimulus-specific variation.

408 Measures of central tendency and variability (i.e., mean, standard deviation, and range)
409 were calculated as descriptive statistics to evaluate the degree of variability across caregivers in
410 acoustic implementation of IDS and ADS. We further calculated coefficients of variance (CVs)
411 for MD differences between ADS and IDS conditions for both unprocessed and simulated CI
412 speech within a 22-channel noise-vocoder to examine whether variability across individual
413 caregivers in ADS-IDS acoustic distinctiveness decreased as a function of speech degradation
414 (unprocessed vs. 22-channel simulated CI speech). The same analysis was performed to examine
415 whether changes in speech intelligibility – due to an ADS-to-IDS style shift – were variable across
416 talkers and/or how variability changed as (simulated) listener hearing status changed (from NH to
417 CI). We further calculated Pearson correlation coefficients to examine whether changes in acoustic
418 distinctiveness and speech intelligibility due to changes in speaking style (ADS to IDS) across
419 degradation levels (unprocessed vs. 22-channel vocoded) and hearing status (NH vs. CI) involved
420 a linear transformation.

421 **III. RESULTS**

422 **A. Effects of CI-related spectral degradation on ADS-vs-IDS acoustic distinctiveness**

423 Fig. 2 shows the mean and distribution of MDs obtained as a function of signal degradation that
424 ranged from a no-degradation (i.e., unprocessed) condition to CI-simulated speech for which the
425 number of spectral channels in the noise-vocoder was gradually reduced from 32 to 4. Overall,
426 MDs between IDS and ADS monotonically decreased with decreasing numbers of spectral

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

490 correlated across natural (i.e., unprocessed) and 22-channel noise-vocoded conditions. The
491 Pearson's correlation coefficient was $r(5) = 0.07$ ($p = 0.87$), suggesting that CI-simulated noise
492 vocoding did not impact talkers' speech proportionately in terms of the acoustic distinctiveness
493 between their IDS and ADS. Instead, CI-related speech processing reduced the IDS-ADS acoustic
494 distance for some talkers (e.g., talker 6) more than others (e.g., talker 4).

495 >>>>>>>FIG. 4 about here <<<<<<<<

496 **D. Individual differences across caregivers in IDS and ADS intelligibility and the effect of**
497 **hearing status**

498 To examine how individual talkers vary in the effects of their ADS-to-IDS modifications
499 on intelligibility of speech to listeners with NH and those with CIs, we focused on patterns of
500 SRMR and SRMR-CI metrics from the individual talkers. For (simulated) listeners with NH,
501 SRMRs of pairs of IDS and ADS stimuli were subtracted for each talker and averaged over 15
502 pairs of ADS-IDS stimuli in order to measure the amount of change in her speech intelligibility
503 due to ADS-to-IDS modification (for talker j , $\Delta SRMR_{(IDS-ADS)_j} = \frac{1}{i} \sum_{i=1}^{15} (SRMR_{IDS_{ij}} - SRMR_{ADS_{ij}})$).
504 Likewise, for (simulated) listeners with CI, SRMR-CIs of pairs of IDS and ADS stimuli were
505 subtracted for each talker and averaged over 15 pairs of ADS-IDS stimuli in order to quantify the
506 amount of change in her speech intelligibility due to ADS-to-IDS modification (for talker j ,
507 $\Delta SRMR-CI_{(IDS-ADS)_j} = \frac{1}{i} \sum_{i=1}^{15} (SRMR-CI_{IDS_{ij}} - SRMR-CI_{ADS_{ij}})$). Thus, a positive value of this
508 difference measure represents IDS being, on average, more intelligible than ADS for a talker,
509 showing an intelligibility benefit for IDS over ADS for that talker.

510 Figure 4B (right panel) shows the results for changes in intelligibility of speech of talkers
511 due to modifications to speaking style. The bar plot on the left in Figure 4B (labeled as NH on the

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

512 x-axis) presents the difference across seven talkers in IDS-ADS intelligibility as estimated for
513 listeners with NH. The data in this scatter plot shows how much speech of a talker (e.g., talker 6)
514 would be heard as more or less intelligible as the talker speaks the utterances or words in IDS
515 compared to ADS.

516 Two patterns are observable in Figure 4B. First, the change in intelligibility of talkers'
517 speech due to the speaking style modification (ADS to IDS) was fairly variable across talkers for
518 simulated listeners with NH (mean = 1.71, $SD = 1.73$, range = 4.97), such that this change was
519 associated with relatively more intelligible speech for some talkers compared to others. As this
520 plot suggests, when talkers change their speaking style from ADS to IDS, not only does this not
521 lead to an equal amount of change in intelligibility of speech across talkers, but for one talker the
522 direction of this effect is even slightly negative (talker 5). For the majority of talkers (6 out of 7
523 talkers), IDS was more intelligible than ADS (as shown by a positive difference value).

524 Second, relative to the size of the ADS-to-IDS shift for simulated NH listeners, the size of
525 this ADS-to-IDS shift was overall considerably reduced for simulated listeners with CIs (mean =
526 0.38, $SD = 0.43$, range = 1.10). The bar plot on the right panel of figure 4B (labeled as CI on the
527 x-axis) presents the dispersion of change in speech intelligibility for each talker due to changing
528 speaking style from ADS to IDS, as estimated for listeners with CIs. Notably, CI-related
529 processing decreases the degree of variability in speech intelligibility, compared with that for NH,
530 as expected. An analysis of CV showed that although the mean of change in speech intelligibility
531 due to ADS-to-IDS modifications was overall smaller for the simulated CI condition compared to
532 the simulated NH condition, while the magnitude of variability was almost the same for two groups
533 of listeners ($CV \cong 11\%$). Highlighting non-linearity of effects of CI processing on speech across

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

534 different talkers, there was no significant correlation across the seven talkers for ADS-to-IDS
535 intelligibility differences in simulated CI vs. NH listening conditions ($r(5) = 0.74, p = 0.58$).

536 **IV. DISCUSSIONS**

537 The present study investigated effects of CI-related signal processing on acoustic distinctiveness
538 and intelligibility of speech signals as a function of IDS and ADS speaking styles. Results from
539 the present study supported the hypothesis that CI-related speech processing significantly degrades
540 acoustic information involved in distinguishing IDS from ADS. This significant loss of acoustic
541 information related to the distinction between IDS and ADS may negatively impact infants'
542 recognizing IDS as distinct from ADS, leading possibly to less attention to caregivers' speech,
543 with potential consequences for children with CIs developing relatively poorer language skills
544 compared to those with NH.

545 These results are in line with prior findings demonstrating difficulties by listeners with CIs
546 in distinguishing among various speaking styles (Tamati, Janse, & Başkent, 2019). Distinguishing
547 caregivers' speaking styles is tied to advances in language development (Karzon, 1985; Singh &
548 Nestor, 2009; Thiessen et al., 2005; Wang et al., 2017), but is made challenging when speech is
549 degraded by CI-related speech processing and/or other undesirable sources, e.g., noise and
550 reverberation (Fetterman & Domico, 2002; Hazrati & Loizou, 2012; Zheng, Koehnke, & Besing,
551 2011). The substantial elimination of IDS-related acoustic information suggested by the present
552 study indicates that infants with CIs likely do not have access to as wide a range of spectro-
553 temporal information in caregivers' speech to foster recognizing when speech is directed to them.
554 As a result, these children may experience considerable difficulties in recognizing IDS as distinct
555 from ADS, particularly in complex linguistic environments.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

556 Although Wang et al., (2017) showed that IDS enhanced attention to speech in infants with
557 CIs compared to ADS, results from the present study suggest that infants' capability to recognize
558 IDS from ADS and to prefer attending to IDS over ADS is not probably comparable to that of
559 children with NH and is expected to be largely reduced. Furthermore, the fact that infants with CIs
560 showed this preference after 12 months of CI experience in Wang et al.'s (2017) study highlights
561 the possibility that the time course of developing certain capabilities for differentiating IDS and
562 ADS would be longer than peers with NH and would depend on the amount of experience with
563 CIs.

564 Our results also suggest that infants with CIs must develop a different cue-weighting
565 system for recognition of IDS from ADS compared to infants with NH, where the type and
566 magnitude of the relevant acoustic cues would be different from what infants with NH develop.
567 For example, in the absence of prominent acoustic cues of IDS such as F_0 (Fernald & Mazzie,
568 1991; Kuhl & Meltzoff, 1999; Mehler, 1981), which is poorly perceived through CI devices
569 (Mehta et al., 2020; Mehta & Oxenham, 2017; Qin & Oxenham, 2003), infants with CIs may rely
570 more on suprasegmental cues such as speech rate (Peng et al., 2017) and/or periodicity in the
571 temporal envelope (Fu, Chinchilla, & Galvin, 2004; Kong et al., 2004). However, perception of
572 pitch through periodicity in the temporal envelope is mostly limited to F_0 s below around 300 Hz
573 (Carlyon, Deeks, & McKay, 2010; Kong & Carlyon, 2010), which is generally below the range of
574 F_0 variation in IDS. This lack of access to the entire spectro-temporal cue range in IDS puts infants
575 with CIs at high risk for missing IDS-related communicative events and thus for developing sub-
576 optimal language skills.

577 Our results corroborated our hypothesis that caregivers likely expose infants to more
578 intelligible speech when speaking in IDS compared to ADS, which is a novel contribution of the

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

579 present study. This was shown using a novel application of a recently-developed metric of
580 intelligibility, which models intelligibility of speech for listeners with NH (i.e., SRMR) and those
581 with CIs (i.e., SRMR-CI) (Falk et al., 2015; Santos et al., 2013). This positive effect of IDS on
582 speech intelligibility might be because caregivers provide more clear speech by speaking louder,
583 slower, and/or in a hyperarticulated fashion when using IDS (Hazan et al., 2018; Krause & Braidá,
584 2002; Li et al., 2011; Liu, Del Rio, Bradlow, & Zeng, 2004), likely leading to an intelligibility
585 benefit compared to ADS (Janse, Nootboom, & Quené, 2007; Liu et al., 2004). Greater
586 intelligibility for IDS over ADS suggests that use of IDS during caregiver-infant spoken
587 communication assists infants in better understanding speech, conceivably supporting infants'
588 word learning process through a direct link between exposure to IDS and improved speech
589 intelligibility. However, our results also revealed an interactive effect, showing that the size of this
590 positive effect of IDS on caregivers' speech intelligibility is smaller for infants with CIs compared
591 to their peers with NH. This, in turn, suggests that the CI noise vocoding process not only disrupts
592 the communication of IDS-ADS-specific acoustic information, but also decreases the intelligibility
593 of caregivers' IDS, indicating that infants with CIs are not expected to benefit from exposure to
594 IDS as much as their NH peers. These results are consistent with prior findings demonstrating
595 greater difficulties that adult listeners with CIs in processing speech and accomplishing lexical
596 access, compared to listeners with NH (McMurray, Farris-Trimble, & Rigler, 2017; Nagels,
597 Bastiaanse, Başkent, & Wagner, 2020). Although prior studies demonstrated a supportive role of
598 IDS on infants' language outcomes, to our knowledge, this is the first study that provides evidence
599 supporting detrimental effects of the noise vocoding process entailed in CI signal processing on
600 the supportive role of IDS in speech understanding.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

601 Prior studies on speech recognition in listeners with CIs have highlighted the importance
602 of further examining patterns of individual differences, in addition to group differences (Dilley et
603 al., 2020; Nagels et al., 2020; Peng et al., 2019; Spencer, 2004; Szagun & Schramm, 2016). Our
604 investigation of patterns of individual differences across caregivers in acoustic distinctiveness
605 between IDS and ADS and the simulated effect of CI noise vocoding highlighted multiple
606 important observations. The first observation relates to the amount of acoustic variability produced
607 by each talker due to changing speaking style from ADS to IDS. The amount of resultant acoustic
608 variability varied across talkers, indicating that infants would experience different language
609 environments in terms of qualities of their caregivers' speech. This is expected to result in some
610 caregivers' exposing infants to relatively larger ranges of acoustic information, as compared to
611 others, which would foster their infants' speech processing and language acquisition by assisting
612 infants in more robust recognition of their caregivers' voices (Beauchemin et al., 2011; Kisilevsky
613 et al., 2003), as well as better development of auditory cortical processing for language
614 development (Webb et al., 2015). Similar to the recent findings by Dilley et al. (2020), these results
615 also suggest that IDS is not always readily distinguishable from ADS, due to the fact that
616 caregivers vary in implementation of IDS. As such, these results confirm that conditions for
617 recognition of IDS by infants is not always optimal (Piazza et al., 2017) and might differentially
618 affect language outcomes for infants with CIs (Dilley et al., 2020).

619 More importantly, the amount of ADS-IDS acoustic difference was considerably reduced
620 for each caregiver as her speech passed through a CI simulator, indicating that infants with CIs
621 probably have access to a much narrower range of acoustic variability in the voices of their
622 caregivers, as compared to their peers with NH. This large decline in the degree of acoustic
623 variability in caregivers' voices may negatively impact infants' robust identification of their

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

624 caregivers' voices, thereby preventing their gaining the maximal benefit from language input that
625 may be available in their linguistic environments. In fact, encoding and learning these cues is
626 crucial as they both significantly contribute to infants' familiarity with ranges of acoustic variation
627 in talkers' speech and their robust performance in understanding speech, despite of multiple
628 sources of variability, such as talker variation (Allen, Miller, & DeSteno, 2009; Eskenazi, 1993),
629 language context (Mattys, 2000; McMurray & Aslin, 2005; Miller, 1994), speech rate (Sommers,
630 Nygaard, & Pisoni, 1992), and background noise and/or reverberation (Hawkins, 2004). Thus,
631 infants with CIs are probably at risk for partial learning of subtle voice cues specific to their
632 caregivers, as reflected in their fine-structure spectro-temporal information.

633 Acoustic implementation of ADS-to-IDS modification varies across individual caregivers,
634 which may differentially impact infants' understanding of speech and thus their language
635 outcomes (Dilley et al., 2020; Hoff, 2006; Weisleder & Fernald, 2013). Results from the present
636 study showed that individual talkers varied in the effect of their speaking style modification on
637 speech intelligibility, suggesting that modification of speaking style from ADS to IDS does not
638 always cause an equal degree of improvement in intelligibility of caregivers' speech. Notably, our
639 results showed that this variability across caregivers in impact of their speaking style modification
640 on speech intelligibility was reduced due to cochlear implant-related speech processing. In the
641 present study, we only studied variability across caregivers in acoustic information and
642 intelligibility of their IDS compared to ADS, whereas caregivers of infants with CIs may vary in
643 other aspects of spoken communication such as gestural and proprioceptive behaviors, which very
644 likely change the degree of intelligibility by which infants eventually perceive caregivers' speech
645 (Kirk et al., 2007; Kirk & Pisoni, 2002; Lachs, Pisoni, & Kirk, 2001).

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

646 These findings can be further interpreted in the context of spectro-temporal information
647 available to infants' auditory systems, which is very sensitive to subtle changes in speech acoustics
648 (Jusczyk, Hohne, & Bauman, 1999; Kuhl, 2004). When infants' accessibility to fine-grained
649 spectro-temporal structures in speech is largely compromised because of a limited number of
650 vocoder channels in CIs, they may not be able to readily recognize and attend to rich IDS. In the
651 absence of this fine-structure spectral information at the output of CI electrodes, infants must rely
652 on course-grained cues in the speech envelope, such as temporal envelope periodicity (Green,
653 Faulkner, & Rosen, 2002; Moore, 2003) or cues from other sensory modalities (e.g., visual and
654 tactile, Green, Nip, Wilson, Mefferd, & Yunusova, 2010; Rohlfing, Fritsch, Wrede, & Jungmann,
655 2006) in order to recognize IDS from ADS. This increases the cognitive load in processing speech
656 particularly in complex auditory environments and negatively contributes to the observed poor
657 language outcomes in some children (Davidson, Geers, & Nicholas, 2014; Dunn et al., 2014;
658 Geers, Strube, Tobey, & Moog, 2011; Geers, Nicholas, Tobey, & Davidsonb, 2015; Houston,
659 Pisoni, Kirk, Ying, & Miyamoto, 2003; Houston, Stewart, Moberly, Hollich, & Miyamoto, 2012;
660 Miyamoto, Houston, Kirk, Perdew, & Svirsky, 2003; Niparko et al., 2010; Pisoni et al., 2007;
661 Pisoni, Kronenberger, Harris, & Moberly, 2018).

662 The present study used a within-talker manipulation of speech style to investigate how CI-
663 related speech processing may affect processing of speech style shifts which are tied to language
664 development, namely IDS vs. ADS signals. While the study involved a sizeable number of
665 individual utterances with control of phonetic properties within talkers, the amount of speech
666 collected from each of the seven talkers was relatively small. Further work will be needed to test
667 how these results extend to a larger sample of talkers with utterances with more varied segmental
668 and lexical composition. Furthermore, studying natural IDS and ADS would be ideal; however, it

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

669 is difficult to control the content and quality of the speech collected from naturalistic environments.
670 Importantly, studies based on simulated CI speech and computational models of human hearing
671 provide valuable evidence for understanding speech perception in listeners with normal and
672 impaired hearing (Litvak, Delgutte, & Eddington, 2001; Mehta et al., 2020; Rubinstein, Wilson,
673 Finley, & Abbas, 1999; Throckmorton & Collins, 2002). Findings from these studies should be
674 viewed as evidence for general trends, rather than the actual performance of listeners with CIs,
675 subject to further investigation. Although we simulated limitation of CIs in spectral resolution by
676 changing the number of channels in noise-vocoded speech, the effect of other aspects of CI
677 processing on spectral resolution, such as channel interactions (i.e., steepness of spectral slope)
678 (Crew & Galvin, 2012; Mehta et al., 2020), were not simulated in this study. Additionally, metrics
679 of speech intelligibility of SRMR and SRMR-CI have been validated for adult listeners with CIs
680 and are not direct estimates of speech intelligibility, which is very likely different from what infants
681 with CIs experience in terms of recognition of utterances. Considering these limitations, the results
682 should not be taken as the final determination of how children with CIs perform in recognition
683 between IDS and ADS and how ADS-to-IDS modification impacts the degree of intelligibility of
684 caregivers' speech to children with CIs.

685 Despite these limitations, results from the present study suggest that, compared to infants
686 with NH, infants with CIs are disadvantaged in acquiring spoken language due to multiple factors.
687 First, partial transmission of spectro-temporal cues via CI speech processing decreases the
688 supportive role of IDS in infants' language learning by disrupting the link between attending to
689 IDS and speech comprehension. In fact, degraded representation of attention-related acoustic cues
690 in IDS (e.g., F_0 -related acoustic information, Mehta et al., 2020; Mehta & Oxenham, 2017) through
691 CIs may have detrimental effects on infants' ability to pay attention to caregivers' speech,

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

692 something that is a fundamental cognitive skill for spoken language acquisition (Bergeson, 2014;
693 Glenn, Cunningham, & Joyce, 1981; Houston et al., 2003; Rottmann & Zobrist, 2004; Wang,
694 Shafto, & Houston, 2018). It is worth mentioning that infants' language learning involves
695 incorporating information from multiple interwind communication dimensions (i.e., visual, social,
696 tactile, and emotional), which creates a very rich channel for learning language through infant-
697 directed speech (Gogate, Bahrick, & Watson, 2000; Nomikou & Rohlfsing, 2011), even in the
698 absence of major spectro-temporal cues such as talker's F_0 in the output of CI electrodes. Our
699 findings further suggested that CI speech processing diminishes the benefit of exposure to more
700 intelligible IDS, as compared to ADS, which may negatively impact infants' abilities to process
701 caregivers' speech, possibly with further significant downstream consequences for later language
702 skills. Last but not least, our results showed that, compared to infants with NH, infants with CIs
703 have access to a relatively narrower range of acoustic information (corresponding to smaller
704 acoustic variability) in their caregivers' speech, which probably leads to experiencing greater
705 difficulties in robust identification and recognition of their caregivers' voices (Beauchemin et al.,
706 2011; Kisilevsky et al., 2003; Lavan et al., 2019), as well as developing poorer word recognition
707 skills (Singh, 2008) and an impaired auditory system for language processing (Webb et al., 2015).
708 Despite the reduced ADS-vs-IDS distinctiveness, intelligibility, and variability of vocoded IDS, it
709 is possible that children with CIs may have developed certain coping/adapting strategies to
710 mitigate the degraded speech input. For example, it is possible that children with CIs may have
711 higher sensitivity (lower threshold) to the acoustic cues than children with NH.

712 In summary, the current study used computational approaches to signal processing in order
713 to provide new evidence for how CI-related speech processing may impact recognition of IDS
714 from ADS in children with CIs, as well as how these style differences may affect intelligibility

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

715 benefits derived by style shifts from ADS to IDS. These findings provide solid grounding for
716 developing new perceptual studies to test abilities of infants with CIs to recognize their caregivers'
717 speaking style (ADS vs. IDS) and to recognize intelligible words in caregivers' speech. Focusing
718 on computational metrics as undertaken here provides an important complement to costly,
719 complex, labor-intensive perceptual studies. The results provided preliminary evidence for how
720 CI-related speech processing may alter the pathway from exposure to IDS to processing speech
721 and, by extension, the acquisition of language by children with CIs compared to that of their NH
722 peers. The most direct and immediate implication of these findings is the imperative need to
723 improve signal processing in CI devices to assure the faithful transmission of acoustic cues
724 relevant to identification and recognition of IDS from ADS. Until then, the major clinical
725 implication of these findings is that the maximum benefit from exposure to IDS for language
726 learning in infants with CIs requires caregivers' active use of multimodal (i.e., gesture, tactile,
727 visual, social, and emotional) communicative behaviors in order to compensate for the degraded
728 representation of acoustic information relevant to IDS and to support its robust perception.

729 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

730 Research reported in this publication was supported by the National Institute on Deafness and
731 other Communicative Disorders of the National Institutes of Health under award number
732 R01DC008581 to D. Houston and L. Dilley.

733 **REFERENCES**

734 Allen, J. S., Miller, J. L., & DeSteno, D. (2009). Individual talker differences in voice-onset-time:
735 Contextual influences. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 125(6), 3974–3982.

736 Arjmandi, M. K., Dilley, L. C., & Wagner, S. E. (2018). Investigation of Acoustic Dimension Use

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 737 in Dialect Production : Machine Learning of Sonorant Sounds for Modeling Acoustic Cues
738 of African American Dialect. *11th International Conference on Voice Physiology and*
739 *Biomechanics*, (August), 1–2.
- 740 Beauchemin, M., González-Frankenberger, B., Tremblay, J., Vannasing, P., Martínez-Montes, E.,
741 Belin, P., ... Lassonde, M. (2011). Mother and stranger: An electrophysiological study of
742 voice processing in newborns. *Cerebral Cortex*, *21*(8), 1705–1711.
- 743 Bergeson, T. R. (2014). Hearing versus Listening: Attention to Speech and Its Role in Language
744 Acquisition in Deaf Infants with Cochlear Implants. *Lingua*, 10–25.
- 745 Boersma, P., & Weenink, D. (2001). Praat, a system for doing phonetics by computer. *Glott*
746 *International*, *5:9/10*, 341–345.
- 747 Bradlow, A. R., Kraus, N., & Hayes, E. (2003). Speaking clearly for children with learning
748 disabilities: Sentence perception in noise. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing*
749 *Research*, *46*(1), 80–97.
- 750 Brown, C. A., & Bacon, S. P. (2010). Fundamental frequency and speech intelligibility in
751 background noise. *Hearing Research*, *266*(1–2), 52–59.
- 752 Burnham, E. B., Wieland, E. A., Kondaurova, M. V., McAuley, J. D., Bergeson, T. R., & Dilley,
753 L. C. (2015). Phonetic Modification of Vowel Space in Storybook Speech to Infants up to 2
754 Years of Age. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *58*(2), 241–253.
- 755 Carlyon, R. P., Deeks, J. M., & McKay, C. M. (2010). The upper limit of temporal pitch for
756 cochlear-implant listeners: Stimulus duration, conditioner pulses, and the number of
757 electrodes stimulated. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *127*(3), 1469–1478.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 758 Chatterjee, M., & Oberzut, C. (2011). Detection and rate discrimination of amplitude modulation
759 in electrical hearing. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *130*(3), 1567–1580.
- 760 Chatterjee, M., & Peng, S. C. (2008). Processing F0 with cochlear implants: Modulation frequency
761 discrimination and speech intonation recognition. *Hearing Research*, *235*(1–2), 143–156.
- 762 Cooper, R. P., Abraham, J., Berman, S., & Staska, M. (1997). The development of infants’
763 preference for motherese. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *20*(4), 477–488.
- 764 Cooper, R. P., & Aslin, R. N. (1990). Preference for Infant-Directed Speech in the First Month
765 after Birth. *Child Development*, *61*(5), 1584–1595.
- 766 Crew, J. D., & Galvin, J. J. (2012). Channel interaction limits melodic pitch perception in
767 simulated cochlear implants. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *132*(5),
768 EL429–EL435.
- 769 Cristia, A., & Seidl, A. (2014). The hyperarticulation hypothesis of infant-directed speech. *Journal*
770 *of Child Language*, *41*(4), 935.
- 771 Croghan, N. B. H., Duran, S. I., & Smith, Z. M. (2017). Re-examining the relationship between
772 number of cochlear implant channels and maximal speech intelligibility. *The Journal of the*
773 *Acoustical Society of America*, *142*(6), EL537–EL543.
- 774 Cutler, A., Dahan, D., & van Donselaar, W. (1997). Prosody in the Comprehension of Spoken
775 Language: A Literature Review. *Language and Speech*, *40*, 141–201.
- 776 Davidson, L. S., Geers, A. E., & Nicholas, J. G. (2014). The effects of audibility and novel word
777 learning ability on vocabulary level in children with cochlear implants. *Cochlear Implants*
778 *International*, *15*(4), 211–221.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 779 Dilley, L., Lehet, M., Wieland, E. A., Arjmandi, M. K., Houston, D., Kondaurova, M., ...
780 Bergeson, T. (2020). Individual differences in mothers' spontaneous infant-directed speech
781 predict language attainment in children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Speech, Language,*
782 *and Hearing Research, In press.*
- 783 Dorman, M. F., Loizou, P. C., Fitzke, J., & Tu, Z. (1998). The recognition of sentences in noise
784 by normal-hearing listeners using simulations of cochlear-implant signal processors with 6–
785 20 channels. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 104*(6), 3583–3585.
- 786 Dorman, M. F., Loizou, P. C., & Rainey, D. (1997a). Simulating the effect of cochlear-implant
787 electrode insertion depth on speech understanding. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of*
788 *America, 102*(5), 2993–2996.
- 789 Dorman, M. F., Loizou, P. C., & Rainey, D. (1997b). Speech intelligibility as a function of the
790 number of channels of stimulation for signal processors using sine-wave and noise-band
791 outputs. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 102*(4), 2403–2411.
- 792 Dunn, C. C., Walker, E. A., Oleson, J., Kenworthy, M., Voorst, T. Van, Tomblin, J. B., ... Gantz,
793 B. J. (2014). Longitudinal speech perception and language performance in pediatric cochlear
794 implant users: The effect of age at implantation. *Ear and Hearing, 35*(2), 148–160.
- 795 Eskenazi, M. (1993). Trends in speaking styles research. *Third European Conference on Speech*
796 *Communication and Technology, 501–509.*
- 797 Falk, T. H., Parsa, V., Santos, J. F., Arehart, K., Hazrati, O., Falk, T. H., ... Scollie, S. (2015).
798 Objective Quality Prediction for Users of and Intelligibility Assistive Listening Devices.
799 *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, 32*(2), 114–124.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 800 Ferguson, S. H., & Kewley-Port, D. (2007). Talker differences in clear and conversational speech:
801 Acoustic characteristics of vowels. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*,
802 *50*(5), 1241–1255.
- 803 Ferguson, S. H., Poore, M. A., Shrivastav, R., Kendrick, A., McGinnis, M., & Perigoe, C. (2010).
804 Acoustic Correlates of Reported Clear Speech Strategies. *Journal of the Academy of*
805 *Rehabilitative Audiology*, *43*, 45–64.
- 806 Ferguson, S. H., & Quené, H. (2014). Acoustic correlates of vowel intelligibility in clear and
807 conversational speech for young normal-hearing and elderly hearing-impaired listeners. *The*
808 *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *135*(6), 3570–3584.
- 809 Fernald, A. (1985). Four-month-old infants prefer to listen to motherese. *Infant Behavior and*
810 *Development*, *8*(2), 181–195.
- 811 Fernald, A. (1989). Intonation and communicative intent in mothers' speech to infants: Is the
812 melody the message? *Child Development*, *60*(6), 1497–1510.
- 813 Fernald, A. (1993). Approval and Disapproval : Infant Responsiveness to Vocal Affect in Familiar
814 and Unfamiliar Languages. *Child Development*, *64*(3), 657–674.
- 815 Fernald, A., & Mazzie, C. (1991). Prosody and focus in speech to infants and adults.
816 *Developmental Psychology*, *27*(2), 209–221.
- 817 Fernald, A., & Simon, T. (1984). Expanded intonation contours in mothers' speech to newborns.
818 *Developmental Psychology*, *20*(1), 104–113.
- 819 Fernald, & Kuhl. (1987). Acoustic determinants of infant preference for motherese speech. *Infant*
820 *Behaviour and Development*, *10*, 279–293.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 821 Fetterman, B. L., & Domico, E. H. (2002). Speech recognition in background noise of cochlear
822 implant patients. *Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery*, *126*(3), 257–263.
- 823 Friesen, L. M., Shannon, R. V., Baskent, D., & Wang, X. (2001). Speech recognition in noise as a
824 function of the number of spectral channels: Comparison of acoustic hearing and cochlear
825 implants. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *110*(2), 1150–1163.
- 826 Fu, Q.-J. (2019). *AngelSim: Cochlear implant and hearing loss simulator*. [Computer program],
827 available at http://www.tigerspeech.com/angelsim/angelsim_about.html
- 828 Fu, Q.-J., Chinchilla, S., & Galvin, J. J. (2004). The role of spectral and temporal cues in voice
829 gender discrimination by normal-hearing listeners and cochlear implant users. *Journal of the*
830 *Association for Research in Otolaryngology*, *5*(3), 253–260.
- 831 Fu, Q.-J., Chinchilla, S., Nogaki, G., & Galvin, J. J. (2005). Voice gender identification by cochlear
832 implant users: The role of spectral and temporal resolution. *The Journal of the Acoustical*
833 *Society of America*, *118*(3), 1711–1718.
- 834 Fu, Q.-J., & Nogaki, G. (2005). Noise susceptibility of cochlear implant users: The role of spectral
835 resolution and smearing. *Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology*, *6*(1),
836 19–27.
- 837 Fu, Q.-J., Shannon, R. V., & Wang, X. (1998). Effects of noise and spectral resolution on vowel
838 and consonant recognition: Acoustic and electric hearing. *The Journal of the Acoustical*
839 *Society of America*, *104*(6), 3586–3596.
- 840 Galvin, K. L., Mok, M., Dowell, R. C., & Briggs, R. J. (2008). Speech detection and localization
841 results and clinical outcomes for children receiving sequential bilateral cochlear implants

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 842 before four years of age. *International Journal of Audiology*, 47(10), 636–646.
- 843 Geers, A. E., Strube, M. J., Tobey, E. A., & Moog, J. S. (2011). Epilogue: factors contributing to
844 long-term outcomes of cochlear implantation in early childhood. *Ear and Hearing*, 32(1
845 Suppl), 84S.
- 846 Geers, Ann E., Nicholas, J., Tobey, E., & Davidsonb, L. (2016). Persistent Language Delay Versus
847 Late Language Emergence in Children With Early Cochlear Implantation. *Journal of Speech,*
848 *Language, and Hearing Research*, 59(1), 155–170.
- 849 Glenn, S. M., Cunningham, C. C., & Joyce, P. F. (1981). A Study of Auditory Preferences in
850 Nonhandicapped Infants and Infants with down ' s Syndrome. *Child Development*, 1303–
851 1307.
- 852 Gogate, L. J., Bahrick, L. E., & Watson, J. D. (2000). A study of multimodal motherese: The role
853 of temporal synchrony between verbal labels and gestures. *Child Development*, 71(4), 878–
854 894.
- 855 Green, J. R., Nip, I. S. B., Wilson, E. M., Mefferd, A. S., & Yunusova, Y. (2010). Lip movement
856 exaggerations during infant-directed speech. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing*
857 *Research*, 53(6), 1529–1542.
- 858 Green, T., Faulkner, A., & Rosen, S. (2002). Spectral and temporal cues to pitch in noise-excited
859 vocoder simulations of continuous-interleaved-sampling cochlear implants. *The Journal of*
860 *the Acoustical Society of America*, 112(5), 2155–2164.
- 861 Greenwood, D. D. (1990). A cochlear frequency-position function for several species—29 years
862 later. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 87(6), 2592–2605.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 863 Grieco-calub, T. M., Saffran, J. R., & Litovsky, R. Y. (2010). Spoken Word Recognition in
864 Toddlers Who Use Cochlear Implants. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research*,
865 52(6), 1390–1400.
- 866 Hawkins, S. (2004). Puzzles and patterns in 50 years of research on speech perception. *From Sound*
867 *to Sense: 50+ Years of Discoveries in Speech Communication*, 223–246.
- 868 Hazan, V., Tuomainen, O., Kim, J., Davis, C., Sheffield, B., & Brungart, D. (2018). Clear speech
869 adaptations in spontaneous speech produced by young and older adults. *The Journal of the*
870 *Acoustical Society of America*, 144(3), 1331–1346.
- 871 Hazrati, O., & Loizou, P. C. (2012). The combined effects of reverberation and noise on speech
872 intelligibility by cochlear implant listeners. *International Journal of Audiology*, 51(6), 437–
873 443.
- 874 Heijden, V. Der, Ferdinand, R. P. D., Ridder, D. De, & Tax., D. M. (2005). *Classification,*
875 *Parameter Estimation and State Estimation An Engineering Approach Using MATLAB*. John
876 Wiley & Sons.
- 877 Hoff, E. (2006). How social contexts support and shape language development. *Developmental*
878 *Review*, 26(1), 55–88.
- 879 Horowitz, F. D. (1983). The Effects of Intonation on Infant Attention: The Role of the Rising
880 Intonation Contour. *Journal of Child Language*, 10(3), 521–534.
- 881 Houston, D. M., Pisoni, D. B., Kirk, K. I., Ying, E. A., & Miyamoto, R. T. (2003). Speech
882 perception skills of deaf infants following cochlear implantation: A first report. *International*
883 *Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 67(5), 479–495.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 884 Houston, D. M., Stewart, J., Moberly, A., Hollich, G., & Miyamoto, R. T. (2012). Word learning
885 in deaf children with cochlear implants: Effects of early auditory experience. *Developmental*
886 *Science*, 15(3), 448–461.
- 887 Hunt, N. J., Lennig, N., & Mermelestein, P. (1980). Experiments in syllable-based recognition of
888 continuous speech. *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal*
889 *Processing*, (5), 880–883.
- 890 Imai, S. (1983). Cepstral analysis synthesis on the mel frequency scale. *IEEE International*
891 *Conference on Acoustics, Speech, and Signal Processing*, 93–96.
- 892 Inoue, T., Nakagawa, R., Kondou, M., Koga, T., & Shinohara, K. (2011). Discrimination between
893 mothers' infant- and adult-directed speech using hidden Markov models. *Neuroscience*
894 *Research*, 70(1), 62–70.
- 895 Jahn, K. N., DiNino, M., & Arenberg, J. G. (2019). Reducing Simulated Channel Interaction
896 Reveals Differences in Phoneme Identification Between Children and Adults With Normal
897 Hearing. *Ear and Hearing*, 40(2), 295–311.
- 898 Jain, S., & Vipin Ghosh, P. G. (2018). Acoustic simulation of cochlear implant hearing: Effect of
899 manipulating various acoustic parameters on intelligibility of speech. *Cochlear Implants*
900 *International*, 19(1), 46–53.
- 901 Janse, E., Nootboom, S. G., & Quené, H. (2007). Coping with gradient forms of /t/-deletion and
902 lexical ambiguity in spoken word recognition. In *Language and Cognitive Processes* (Vol.
903 22).
- 904 Jusczyk, P. W., Hohne, E. A., & Bauman, A. (1999). Infants' sensitivity to allophonic cues for

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 905 word segmentation. *Perception and Psychophysics*, 61(8), 1465–1476.
- 906 Karzon, R. G. (1985). Discrimination of polysyllabic sequences by one- to four-month-old infants.
907 *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 39(2), 326–342.
- 908 Kirk, K. I., Hay-McCutcheon, M. J., Holt, R. F., Gao, S., Qi, R., & Gerlain, B. L. (2007).
909 Audiovisual spoken word recognition by children with cochlear implants. *Audiological*
910 *Medicine*, 5(4), 250–261.
- 911 Kirk, K. I., & Pisoni, D. B. (2002). Audiovisual integration of speech by children and adults with
912 cochlear implants. *International Conference on Spoken Language Processing*, 1689.
- 913 Kisilevsky, B. S., Hains, S. M., Lee, K., Xie, X., Huang, H., Ye, H. H., ... Wang, Z. (2003). Effects
914 of experience on fetal voice recognition. *Psychological Science*, 14(3), 220–224.
- 915 Kitamura, C., Thanavishuth, C., Burnham, D., & Luksaneeyanawin, S. (2001). Universality and
916 specificity in infant-directed speech: Pitch modifications as a function of infant age and sex
917 in a tonal and non-tonal language. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 24(4), 372–392.
- 918 Kong, Y.-Y., & Carlyon, R. P. (2010). Temporal pitch perception at high rates in cochlear
919 implants. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 127(5), 3114–3123.
- 920 Kong, Y. Y., Cruz, R., Jones, J. A., & Zeng, F. G. (2004). Music Perception with Temporal Cues
921 in Acoustic and Electric Hearing. *Ear and Hearing*, 25(2), 173–185.
- 922 Kong, Y. Y., Stickney, G. S., & Zeng, F.-G. (2005). Speech and melody recognition in binaurally
923 combined acoustic and electric hearing. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*,
924 117(3), 1351–1361.
- 925 Krause, J. C., & Braida, L. D. (2002). Investigating alternative forms of clear speech: The effects

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 926 of speaking rate and speaking mode on intelligibility. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society*
927 *of America*, 112(5), 2165–2172.
- 928 Kuhl, P. K. (2004). Early language acquisition: cracking the speech code. *Nature Reviews*
929 *Neuroscience*, 5(11), 831–843.
- 930 Kuhl, P. K., Andruski, J. E., Chistovich, I. A., Chistovich, L. A., Kozhevnikova, E. V., Ryskina,
931 V. L., ... Lacerda, F. (1997). Cross-language analysis of phonetic units in language addressed
932 to infants. *Science*, 277(5326), 684–686.
- 933 Kuhl, P. K., & Meltzoff, A. N. (1999). The intermodal representation of speech in newborns.
934 *Developmental Science*, 2(1), 42–46.
- 935 Lachs, L., Pisoni, D. B., & Kirk, K. I. (2001). Use of audiovisual information in speech perception
936 by prelingually deaf children with cochlear implants: A first report. *Ear and Hearing*, 22(3),
937 236–251.
- 938 Lavan, N., Burton, A. M., Scott, S. K., & McGettigan, C. (2019). Flexible voices: Identity
939 perception from variable vocal signals. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review*, 26(1), 90–102.
- 940 Leong, V., Kalashnikova, M., Burnham, D., & Goswami, U. (2014). Infant-directed speech
941 enhances temporal rhythmic structure in the envelope. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference*
942 *of the International Speech Communication Association, INTERSPEECH*, (September),
943 2563–2567.
- 944 Li, Y., Zhang, G., Kang, H., Liu, S., Han, D., & Fu, Q.-J. (2011). Effects of speaking style on
945 speech intelligibility for Mandarin-speaking cochlear implant users. *The Journal of the*
946 *Acoustical Society of America*, 129(6), EL242–EL247.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 947 Litvak, L., Delgutte, B., & Eddington, D. (2001). Auditory nerve fiber responses to electric
948 stimulation: Modulated and unmodulated pulse trains. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society*
949 *of America*, 110(1), 368–379.
- 950 Liu, H. M., Kuhl, P. K., & Tsao, F. M. (2003). An association between mothers' speech clarity
951 and infants' speech discrimination skills. *Developmental Science*, 6(3), 1–10.
- 952 Liu, S., Del Rio, E., Bradlow, A. R., & Zeng, F.-G. (2004). Clear speech perception in acoustic
953 and electric hearing. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 116(4), 2374–2383.
- 954 Loizou, P. C., Dorman, M., & Tu, Z. (1999). On the number of channels needed to understand
955 speech. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 106(4), 2097–2103.
- 956 Luo, H., & Poeppel, D. (2007). Phase Patterns of Neuronal Responses Reliably Discriminate
957 Speech in Human Auditory Cortex. *Neuron*, 54(6), 1001–1010.
- 958 Luo, X., Fu, Q.-J., & Galvin, J. J. (2007). Vocal Emotion Recognition by Normal-Hearing
959 Listeners and Cochlear Implant Users. *Trends in Amplification*, 11(4), 301–315.
- 960 Ma, W., Golinkoff, R. M., Houston, D. M., & Hirsh-Pasek, K. (2011). Word learning in infant-
961 and adult-directed speech. *Language Learning and Development*, 7(3), 185–201.
- 962 Maesschalck, R. D., & Massart, D. L. (2000). The Mahalanobis distance. *Chemometrics and*
963 *Intelligent Laboratory Systems*, 50(1), 1–18.
- 964 Masnan, M. J., Mahat, N. I., Shakaff, A. Y. M., Abdullah, A. H., Zakaria, N. Z. I., Yusuf, N., ...
965 Aziz, A. H. A. (2015). Understanding Mahalanobis distance criterion for feature selection.
966 *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 1660(February 2015), 050075.
- 967 Mastropieri, D., & Turkewitz, G. (1999). Prenatal experience and neonatal responsiveness to vocal

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 968 expressions of emotion. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 35(3), 204–214.
- 969 Mattys, S. L. (2000). The perception of primary and secondary stress in English. *Perception and*
970 *Psychophysics*, 62(2), 253–265.
- 971 Matuschek, H., Kliegl, R., Vasishth, S., Baayen, H., & Bates, D. (2017). Balancing Type I error
972 and power in linear mixed models. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 94, 305–315.
- 973 Maye, J., Werker, J. F., & Gerken, L. A. (2002). Infant sensitivity to distributional information can
974 affect phonetic discrimination. *Cognition*, 82(3), 101–111.
- 975 McMurray, B., & Aslin, R. N. (2005). Infants are sensitive to within-category variation in speech
976 perception. *Cognition*, 95(2), B15–B26.
- 977 McMurray, B., Farris-Trimble, A., & Rigler, H. (2017). Waiting for lexical access: Cochlear
978 implants or severely degraded input lead listeners to process speech less incrementally.
979 *Cognition*, 169(August), 147–164.
- 980 McMurray, B., Kovack-Lesh, K. A., Goodwin, D., & McEchron, W. (2013). Infant directed speech
981 and the development of speech perception: Enhancing development or an unintended
982 consequence? *Cognition*, 85(0 1), 1–27.
- 983 Mehler, J. (1981). The role of syllables in speech processing: infant and adult data. *Philosophical*
984 *Transactions of the Royal Society of London. B, Biological Sciences*, 295(1077), 333–352.
- 985 Mehta, A. H., Lu, H., & Oxenham, A. J. (2020). The Perception of Multiple Simultaneous Pitches
986 as a Function of Number of Spectral Channels and Spectral Spread in a Noise-Excited
987 Envelope Vocoder. *JARO - Journal of the Association for Research in Otolaryngology*, 21(1),
988 61–72.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 989 Mehta, A. H., & Oxenham, A. J. (2017). Vocoder Simulations Explain Complex Pitch Perception
990 Limitations Experienced by Cochlear Implant Users. *JARO - Journal of the Association for*
991 *Research in Otolaryngology*, 18(6), 789–802.
- 992 Miller, J. L. (1994). On the internal structure of phonetic categories: a progress report. *Cognition*,
993 50(1–3), 271–285.
- 994 Miyamoto, R. T., Houston, D. M., Kirk, K. I., Perdeu, A. E., & Svirsky, M. A. (2003). Language
995 development in deaf infants following cochlear implantation. *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*,
996 123(2), 241–244.
- 997 Moore, B. C. J. (2003). Coding of sounds in the auditory system and its relevance to signal
998 processing and coding in cochlear implants. *Otology and Neurotology*, 24(2), 243–254.
- 999 Moore, D. S., Spence, M. J., & Katz, G. S. (1997). Six-month-olds' categorization of natural
1000 infant-directed utterances. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(6), 980–989.
- 1001 Nagels, L., Bastiaanse, R., Başkent, D., & Wagner, A. (2020). Individual differences in lexical
1002 access among cochlear implant users. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*,
1003 63(1), 286–304.
- 1004 Narayan, C. R., & McDermott, L. C. (2016). Speech rate and pitch characteristics of infant-directed
1005 speech: Longitudinal and cross-linguistic observations. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society*
1006 *of America*, 139(3), 1272–1281.
- 1007 Niparko, J. K., Tobey, E. A., Thal, D. J., Eisenberg, L. S., Wang, N.-Y., Quittner, A. L., & Fink,
1008 N. E. (2010). Spoken language development in children following cochlear implantation.
1009 *Jama*, 303(15), 1498–1506.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 1010 Nomikou, I., & Rohlfsing, K. J. (2011). Language does something: Body action and language in
1011 maternal input to three-month-olds. *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development*,
1012 3(2), 113–128.
- 1013 Papoušek, M., Bornstein, M. H., Nuzzo, C., Papoušek, H., & Symmes, D. (1990). Infant responses
1014 to prototypical melodic contours in parental speech. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 13(4),
1015 539–545.
- 1016 Peng, S. C., Lu, H. P., Lu, N., Lin, Y. S., Deroche, M. L. D., & Chatterjee, M. (2017). Processing
1017 of acoustic cues in lexical-tone identification by pediatric cochlear-implant recipients.
1018 *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 60(5), 1223–1235.
- 1019 Peng, S. C., Tomblin, J. B., & Turner, C. (2008). Production and Perception of Speech Intonation
1020 in Pediatric Cochlear Implant Recipients and Individuals with Normal Hearing. *Ear and*
1021 *Hearing*, 29(3), 336–351.
- 1022 Peng, Z., Hess, C., Saffran, J. R., Edwards, J. R., & Litovsky, R. Y. (2019). Assessing Fine-Grained
1023 Speech Discrimination in Young Children With Bilateral Cochlear Implants. *Otology &*
1024 *Neurotology*, 40(3), e191–e197.
- 1025 Peter, J. W., & Robert S, S. (2008). The effect of fundamental frequency on the intelligibility of
1026 speech with flattened intonation contours. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*,
1027 17(4), 348–355.
- 1028 Piazza, E. A., Jordan, M. C., & Lew-Williams, C. (2017). Mothers Consistently Alter Their Unique
1029 Vocal Fingerprints When Communicating with Infants. *Current Biology*, 27(20), 3162-
1030 3167.e3.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 1031 Pisoni, D. B., Conway, C. M., Kronenberger, W., Horn, D. L., Karpicke, J., & Henning, S. (2007).
1032 Efficacy and effectiveness of cochlear implants in deaf children. *Research on Spoken*
1033 *Language Processing*, 28(28), 3–46.
- 1034 Pisoni, D. B., Kronenberger, W. G., Harris, M. S., & Moberly, A. C. (2018). Three challenges for
1035 future research on cochlear implants. *World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology - Head and Neck*
1036 *Surgery*, 3(4), 240–254.
- 1037 Qin, M. K., & Oxenham, A. J. (2003). Effects of simulated cochlear-implant processing on speech
1038 reception in fluctuating maskers. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 114(1),
1039 446–454.
- 1040 Qin, M. K., & Oxenham, A. J. (2005). Effects of Envelope-Vocoder Processing on F0
1041 Discrimination. *Ear & Hearing*, 26(5), 451–460.
- 1042 Quené, H., & van den Bergh, H. (2008). Examples of mixed-effects modeling with crossed random
1043 effects and with binomial data. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 59(4), 413–425.
- 1044 Rohlfing, K. J., Fritsch, J., Wrede, B., & Jungmann, T. (2006). How can multimodal cues from
1045 child-directed interaction reduce learning complexity in robots? *Advanced Robotics*, 20(10),
1046 1183–1199.
- 1047 Rosen, S., Faulkner, A., & Wilkinson, L. (1999). Adaptation by normal listeners to upward spectral
1048 shifts of speech: Implications for cochlear implants. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of*
1049 *America*, 106(6), 3629–3636.
- 1050 Rottmann, N., & Zobrist, P. (2004). Tuned to the signal: The privileged status of speech for young
1051 infants. *Developmental Science*, 7(3), 270–276.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 1052 Rubinstein, J. T., Wilson, B. S., Finley, C. C., & Abbas, P. J. (1999). Pseudospontaneous activity:
1053 Stochastic independence of auditory nerve fibers with electrical stimulation. *Hearing*
1054 *Research*, 127(1–2), 108–118.
- 1055 Rubinstein, Jay T. (2004). How cochlear implants encode speech. *Current Opinion in*
1056 *Otolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery*, 12(5), 444–448.
- 1057 Santos, J. F., Cosentino, S., Hazrati, O., Loizou, P. C., & Falk, T. H. (2013). Objective speech
1058 intelligibility measurement for cochlear implant users in complex listening environments.
1059 *Speech Communication*, 55(7–8), 815–824.
- 1060 Sato, N., & Obuchi, Y. (2007). Emotion Recognition using Mel-Frequency Cepstral Coefficients.
1061 *Information and Media Technologies*, 2(3), 835–848.
- 1062 Schachner, A., & Hannon, E. E. (2011). Infant-Directed Speech Drives Social Preferences in 5-
1063 Month-Old Infants. *Developmental Psychology*, 47(1), 19–25.
- 1064 Shaneh, M., & Taheri, A. (2009). Voice command recognition system based on MFCC and VQ
1065 algorithms. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 57, 534–538.
- 1066 Shannon, R. V., Zeng, F.-G., Kamath, V., Wygonski, J., & Ekelid, M. (1995). Speech recognition
1067 with primarily temporal cues. *Science*, 270(5234), 303–304.
- 1068 Singh, L. (2008). Influences of high and low variability on infant word recognition. *Cognition*,
1069 106(2), 833–870.
- 1070 Singh, L., Morgan, J. L., & Best, C. T. (2002). Infants' listening preferences: Baby talk or happy
1071 talk? *Infancy*, 3(3), 365–394.
- 1072 Singh, L., & Nestor, S. (2009). Influences of Infant-Directed Speech on Early Word Recognition.

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 1073 *Infancy*, 14(6), 654–666.
- 1074 Slaney, M., & Mcroberts, G. (1998). BABY EARS: A recognition system for affective
1075 vocalizations. *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing*,
1076 985–988.
- 1077 Snow, C. E. (1977). Mothers’ speech research: From input to interaction. *Talking to Children:*
1078 *Language Input and Acquisition*, 3149.
- 1079 Sommers, M. S., Nygaard, L. C., & Pisoni, D. B. (1992). Stimulus variability and the perception
1080 of spoken words: Effects of variations in speaking rate and overall amplitude. *International*
1081 *Conference on Spoken Language Processing*, (October), 217–220.
- 1082 Song, J. Y., Demuth, K., & Morgan, J. (2010). Effects of the acoustic properties of infant-directed
1083 speech on infant word recognition. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 128(1),
1084 389–400.
- 1085 Souza, P., Gehani, N., Wright, R., & McCloy, D. (2013). The advantage of knowing the talker.
1086 *Journal of the American Academy of Audiology*, 24(8), 689–700.
- 1087 Spencer, P. E. (2004). Individual Differences in Language Performance after Cochlear
1088 Implantation at One to Three Years of Age: Child, Family, and Linguistic Factors. *Journal of*
1089 *Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 9(4), 395–412.
- 1090 Spitzer, S. M., Liss, J. M., & Mattys, S. L. (2007). Acoustic cues to lexical segmentation: A study
1091 of resynthesized speech. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 122(6), 3678–
1092 3687.
- 1093 Spitzer, S. M., Liss, J., Spahr, T., Dorman, M., & Lansford, K. (2009). The use of fundamental

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 1094 frequency for lexical segmentation in listeners with cochlear implants. *The Journal of the*
1095 *Acoustical Society of America*, 125(6), EL236–EL241.
- 1096 Sulpizio, S., Kuroda, K., Dalsasso, M., Asakawa, T., Bornstein, M. H., Doi, H., ... Shinohara, K.
1097 (2018). Discriminating between Mothers' Infant- and Adult-Directed Speech: Cross-
1098 Linguistic Generalizability from Japanese to Italian and German. *Neurosci Res.*, 133, 21-27.
- 1099 Svirsky, M. A. (2017). Cochlear implants and electronic hearing. *Physics Today*, 70(8), 53–58.
- 1100 Szagun, G., & Schramm, S. A. (2016). Sources of variability in language development of children
1101 with cochlear implants: Age at implantation, parental language, and early features of
1102 children's language construction. *Journal of Child Language*, 43(3), 505–536.
- 1103 Tamati, T. N., Janse, E., & Başkent, D. (2019). Perceptual Discrimination of Speaking Style under
1104 Cochlear Implant Simulation. *Ear and Hearing*, 40(1), 63–76.
- 1105 Telkemeyer, S., Rossi, S., Koch, S. P., Nierhaus, T., Steinbrink, J., Poeppel, D., ... Wartenburger,
1106 I. (2009). Sensitivity of Newborn Auditory Cortex to the Temporal Structure of Sounds.
1107 *Journal of Neuroscience*, 29(47), 14726–14733.
- 1108 The ManyBabies Consortium (2020). Quantifying sources of variability in infancy research using
1109 the infant-directed speech preference. *Advances in Methods and Practices in Psychological*
1110 *Science*, 3(1), 24–52.
- 1111 Thiessen, E. D., Hill, E. A., & Saffran, J. R. (2005). Infant directed speech facilitates word
1112 segmentation. *Infancy*, 7(1), 53–71.
- 1113 Throckmorton, C. S., & Collins, L. M. (2002). The effect of channel interactions on speech
1114 recognition in cochlear implant subjects: Predictions from an acoustic model. *The Journal of*

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 1115 *the Acoustical Society of America*, 112(1), 285–296.
- 1116 Trainor, L. J., Austin, C. M., & Desjardins, N. (2000). Is infant-directed speech prosody a result
1117 of the vocal expression of emotion? *Psychological Science*, 11(3), 188–195.
- 1118 Walker-Andrews A. S. & Grolnick, W. (1983). Discrimination of vocal expression by young
1119 infants. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 6, 491–498.
- 1120 Walker-Andrews, A. S., & Lennon, E. (1991). Infants’ discrimination of vocal expressions:
1121 Contributions of auditory and visual information. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 14(2),
1122 131–142.
- 1123 Wang, Y., Bergeson, T. R., & Houston, D. M. (2017). Infant-Directed Speech Enhances Attention
1124 to Speech in Deaf Infants With Cochlear Implants. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing*
1125 *Research*, 60(11), 3321.
- 1126 Wang, Y., Bergeson, T. R., & Houston, D. M. (2018). Preference for Infant-Directed Speech in
1127 Infants With Hearing Aids: Effects of Early Auditory Experience. *Journal of Speech,*
1128 *Language & Hearing Research*, 61(9), 2431–2439.
- 1129 Wang, Y., Shafto, C. L., & Houston, D. M. (2018). Attention to speech and spoken language
1130 development in deaf children with cochlear implants: a 10-year longitudinal study.
1131 *Developmental Science*, (July 2017), e12677.
- 1132 Webb, A. R., Heller, H. T., Benson, C. B., & Lahav, A. (2015). Mother’s voice and heartbeat
1133 sounds elicit auditory plasticity in the human brain before full gestation. *Proceedings of the*
1134 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 112(10), 3152–3157.
- 1135 Weisleder, A., & Fernald, A. (2013). Talking to Children Matters: Early Language Experience

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

- 1136 Strengthens Processing and Builds Vocabulary. *Psychological Science*, 24(11), 2143–2152.
- 1137 Werker, J. F., & McLeod, P. J. (1989). Infant preference for both male and female infant-directed
1138 talk: a developmental study of attentional and affective responsiveness. *Canadian Journal of*
1139 *Psychology*, 43(2), 230–246.
- 1140 Werker, J. F., Pegg, J., & McLeod, P. J. (1994). A cross-language investigation of infant preference
1141 for infant-directed communication. *Infant Behavior and Development*, 17(3), 323–333.
- 1142 Winn, M. B., & Litovsky, R. Y. (2015). Using speech sounds to test functional spectral resolution
1143 in listeners with cochlear implants. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 137(3),
1144 1430–1442.
- 1145 Xiang, S., Nie, F., & Zhang, C. (2008). Learning a Mahalanobis distance metric for data clustering
1146 and classification. *Pattern Recognition*, 41(12), 3600–3612.
- 1147 Zanto, T. P., Hennigan, K., Östberg, M., Clapp, W. C., & Gazzaley, A. (2013). Effect of speaking
1148 rate on recognition of synthetic and natural speech by normal-hearing and cochlear implant
1149 listeners. *Ear and Hearing*, 34(3), 313.
- 1150 Zeng, F. G., Tang, Q., & Lu, T. (2014). Abnormal pitch perception produced by cochlear implant
1151 stimulation. *PLoS ONE*, 9(2).
- 1152 Zheng, Y., Koehnke, J., & Besing, J. (2011). Effects of Noise and Reverberation on Virtual Sound
1153 Localization for Listeners With Bilateral Cochlear Implants. *American Journal of Audiology*,
1154 32(5), 569–572.
- 1155
- 1156

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

1157

1158

1159 **TABLE I.** Statistical GLMM for modeling the effect of level of speech degradation on acoustic
1160 distinctiveness between IDS and ADS as quantified by MD.

	β Estimate	St. Error	t	Pr(> t)
(intercept)	6.694	0.58	11.45	0.000 ^a
Level of degradation	-0.886	0.053	-16.54	0.000 ^a

1161 ^a The p-value was statistically significant.

1162

1163

1164

1165

1166

1167

1168

1169

1170

1171

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

1172 **TABLE II.** Statistical GLMM for the effects of speaking style, level of speech degradation, and
1173 their interaction on intelligibility of speech, as measured by SRMR or SRMR-CI.

	<i>β Estimate</i>	<i>St. Error</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Pr(> t)</i>
(intercept)	10.365	1.339	7.74	<0.00001 ^a
Speaking Style	3.054	0.737	4.14	<0.00001 ^a
Level of degradation	-2.23	0.737	-3.024	<0.0001 ^a
Speaking Style:Level of degradation	-1.336	0.466	-2.865	<0.0001 ^a

1174 ^aThe p-value was statistically significant.

1175

1176

1177

1178

1179

1180

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

1188 **FIG. 1.** (Color online) Schematic diagram of the approach used in the present study for measuring
1189 (1) MD between pairs of MFCCs derived from pairs of IDS-ADS stimuli, and (2) intelligibility of
1190 IDS and ADS stimuli as estimated by SRMR value for listeners with NH and SRMR-CI for those
1191 with CIs. Note that the dashed line denotes the process for creating and analyzing the noise-
1192 vocoded versions of the same pairs of stimuli, while N stands for the number of spectral channels
1193 in the noise-excited envelope vocoder. Blocks and lines with blue (dark gray) color indicate paths
1194 for processing ADS, while those with orange (light gray) color indicate paths for processing IDS.
1195 Note that SRMR and SRMR-CI were calculated only for unprocessed stimuli in order to estimate
1196 intelligibility for NH and CI listeners, respectively. In this figure, the waveforms and their
1197 corresponding MFCCs are from the utterance “See the modi?” spoken by one of the seven talkers
1198 both in IDS and ADS speaking styles. $S_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $S_{ADS_{ij}}$ are the i^{th} pair of IDS and ADS stimuli (i
1199 $= \{1,2,3,\dots,15\}$) for talker j ($j = \{1,2,3,\dots,7\}$). $MFCCs_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $MFCCs_{ADS_{ij}}$ are MFCC features
1200 derived from $S_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $S_{ADS_{ij}}$ speech stimuli, respectively. The middle two panels show MFCCs
1201 obtained from the frames of these IDS and ADS stimuli. MD_{ij} is the MD calculated to measure the
1202 acoustic distance between the two matrices for $MFCCs_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $MFCCs_{ADS_{ij}}$. $SRMR_{IDS_{ij}}$ and
1203 $SRMR_{ADS_{ij}}$ are the estimated intelligibility for $S_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $S_{ADS_{ij}}$ speech stimuli, respectively, as
1204 heard by listeners with NH. $SRMR-CI_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $SRMR-CI_{ADS_{ij}}$ are the estimated speech
1205 intelligibility for the same $S_{IDS_{ij}}$ and $S_{ADS_{ij}}$ speech stimuli, respectively, as heard by a listener with
1206 CIs.

1207 **FIG. 2.** (Color online) The mean (bar) and ± 1 standard error (vertical error bar in black) of
1208 Mahalanobis distance (MD) across groups of IDS and ADS stimuli at seven levels of spectro-
1209 temporal degradation, ranging from no-degradation (natural/unprocessed) to 4-channel noise-

Running Title: Speech style through cochlear implant

1210 vocoded stimuli. Green (dark gray) circles show the mean MDs for each talker derived by
1211 averaging MDs over 15 pairs of IDS-ADS stimuli for that talker.

1212 **FIG. 3.** (Color online) Estimated intelligibility of speech stimuli spoken in IDS (orange; light gray)
1213 and in ADS (blue; dark gray) styles (simulated) groups of listeners with different hearing statuses:
1214 NH (estimated by SRMR) and those with CIs (estimated by SRMR-CI). The bar graphs represent
1215 average values of SRMR or SRMR-CI over the seven talkers.

1216 **FIG. 4.** (Color online) Variability across seven female talkers in (A) acoustic distinctiveness
1217 between their IDS and ADS for unprocessed stimuli (Natural) and simulated CI speech within a
1218 22-channel noise vocoder (22CH), and (B) the change in talkers' speech intelligibility (SI) due to
1219 a change in their speaking style (ADS to IDS), as heard for two (simulated) listener groups with
1220 either NH (estimated by SRMR) or CIs (estimated by SRMR-CI). The data points (gray circles)
1221 are laid over a 1.96 standard error of the mean (95% confidence interval) in red (rectangle area
1222 with light gray) and 1 standard deviation shown by blue lines (vertical dark gray lines). The solid
1223 and dotted red lines (horizontal solid and dotted dark gray lines) show the mean and median,
1224 respectively.





