



Topics in Cognitive Science 15 (2023) 303–314

© 2022 Cognitive Science Society LLC.

ISSN: 1756-8765 online

DOI: 10.1111/tops.12635

This article is part of the topic “Best of Papers from the 2022 Cognitive Science Society Conference,” Andrea Bender (Topic Editor).

Estimating Demographic Bias on Tests of Children’s Early Vocabulary

George Kachergis, Nathan Francis, Michael C. Frank

Department of Psychology, Stanford University

Received 14 September 2022; received in revised form 19 October 2022; accepted 25 October 2022

Abstract

Children’s early language skill has been linked to later educational outcomes, making it important to measure early language accurately. Parent-reported instruments, such as the Communicative Development Inventories (CDIs), have been shown to provide reliable and valid measures of children’s aggregate early language skill. However, CDIs contain hundreds of vocabulary items, some of which may not be heard (and thus learned) equally often by children of varying backgrounds. This study used a database of American English CDIs to identify words demonstrating strong bias for particular demographic groups of children, on dimensions of sex (male vs. female), race (white vs. non-white), and maternal education (high vs. low). For each dimension, many items showed bias; removing these items slightly reduced the magnitude of race- and education-based group differences, but did not eliminate them. Additionally, we investigated how well the relative frequency of words spoken to young girls versus boys predicted sex-based word learning bias, and discuss possible sources of demographic differences in early word learning.

Keywords: Language acquisition; Word learning; Measuring instrument bias; Demographic bias

Researchers, clinicians, and parents have long been fascinated with the surprising speed and variability in the growth of young children’s vocabulary. Children’s early vocabulary growth is assumed to reflect not only their exposure to child-directed speech, but also the varying difficulty of different types of words, and individual differences in the aptitude of the child

Correspondence should be sent to George Kachergis, Department of Psychology, Stanford University, 450 Jane Stanford Way, Stanford, CA 94305, USA. E-mail: gkacherg@stanford.edu

– including potential language deficits. Children show both consistency in some skills across development, as well as significant influence from external factors. For example, Bornstein, Hahn, and Putnick (2016) found stability in core language skills across 10 years of children’s development, despite changes in maternal income and education over the study period.

Yet, there are consistent demographic predictors of early vocabulary. Maternal education, often used as a proxy for socioeconomic status (SES), is associated with children’s language processing and vocabulary by 18 months (Fernald, Marchman, & Weisleder, 2013), and is predictive of later educational outcomes (Marchman & Fernald, 2008; see Schwab & Lew-Williams, 2016 for review). Other factors are also predictive of language skill: first-born children tend to outpace their siblings, and female children tend to have better language skills than their age-matched male counterparts (Eriksson et al., 2012; Frank, Braginsky, Yurovsky, & Marchman, 2021) – a sex-based verbal advantage that continues through high school (see Petersen 2018 for a review).

One challenge in comprehensive assessment of these differences is that it is difficult to get a complete measure of young children’s language skill. Long recordings are prohibitively difficult to collect and transcribe, yet any short recording (e.g., a 1-h play session) will elicit only a small proportion of the words and constructions that children know. Thus, researchers of early word learning have constructed tests with hundreds of words, intentionally oversampling words that are more likely to be known by young children.

We focus here on the MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventories (CDIs) (Fenson Larry et al., 1994; Fenson et al., 2007), a set of parent-reported measures of children’s productive and receptive language skills, which offer a low-cost and reliable way to estimate children’s early language skills (Fenson Larry et al., 1994). CDIs have shown good predictive validity (Bornstein & Putnick, 2012; Duff, Reen, Plunkett, & Nation, 2015; e.g., Fenson Larry et al., 1994). Our primary focus is the vocabulary checklist portion of the CDI Words & Sentences (CDI:WS) form, comprised of 680 early learned words across 22 categories (e.g., animals, vehicles, action words, and pronouns) selected to assess the productive vocabulary of children 16–30 months of age.¹ For each item on the CDI:WS, caregivers are asked to respond whether the target child has been heard to say (i.e., produce) the given item. Children’s total vocabulary score on the CDI:WS is tightly correlated with other facets of early language (e.g., grammatical competence and gesture), suggesting that the language system is “tightly woven” (Frank et al., 2021). Due to these desirable properties, CDIs have been adapted to dozens of languages, and a central repository of CDI data contributed from all over the world has been created (Wordbank; Frank, Braginsky, Yurovsky, and Marchman, 2017).

CDIs are a useful tool for measuring demographic effects because of their ease of use and wide distribution to different groups. But their use in this context poses a chicken and egg problem. While it is possible that there is an underlying difference in mean language ability (or vocabulary size) between demographic groups, CDIs could also have bias for or against particular groups based on the particular words they include, which different groups may have a varying amount of exposure to.

¹ The CDI: Words and Gestures form includes a subset of the CDI:WS items and targets children 12–18 months of age, measuring both comprehension and production.

The idea that some items on a test may show bias, favoring one group over another, is known in psychometrics as Differential Item Function (DIF; Holland & Wainer, 1993). DIF can decrease the validity of a test, as the test may be overestimating the ability of test-takers in one group and underestimating the ability of another group – not because of any underlying mean difference in ability between the groups, but simply because the test is unfair (Camilli, 2013). For example, if a vocabulary test is composed almost entirely of the names of farm equipment, the test will underestimate the knowledge of urban children, who have experience of other contexts, despite being less familiar with farm equipment than their rural peers. Of course, there may be a true ability difference between demographic groups, as is likely the case for the female language advantage, which has been documented in many languages (Eriksson et al., 2012; Frank et al., 2021). And both observations could be true – a test could be biased to inflate *or* deflate a true demographic difference.

Our goal in the current study is to use DIF analyses to assess these possibilities. We focus on the American English data from Wordbank due to its large size and due to the presence of demographic data for our variables of interest. Specifically, we test the 680 vocabulary items on the American English CDI:WS for DIF along three dichotomized demographic dimensions: sex (male vs. female), maternal education (no more than secondary vs. at least some college), and race (white vs. non-white).

The outline of this paper is as follows. First, we introduce the Wordbank data and the IRT model, and examine the overall size of demographic differences in early word learning based on the full CDI:WS. We then fit the IRT model to both groups for each demographic factor and examine the item parameters for evidence of DIF. Next, we use these item parameters to systematically prune biased items from the CDI:WS, and examine how the estimated size of demographic differences change as we prune more items. Finally, using a corpus of child-directed speech, we examine the extent to which variation in word frequencies heard by boys versus girls predicts sex-based DIF. Based on these analyses, we provide recommendations for next steps to be taken to identify and potentially replace items on the CDI that show demographic bias.

1. Methods

1.1. Vocabulary data

1.1.1. Participants

We analyzed parent-reported Wordbank data from 5520 American English CDI: Words & Sentences administrations for children 16–30 months of age (Frank et al., 2017, 2021). Full demographic data are not reported in some datasets contributed to Wordbank: sex was available for 4094 children, race/ethnicity was available for 2715 children, and maternal education (a proxy for socioeconomic status; SES) was available for 5520 children.

The analysis of sex-based differences included CDI administrations from 1989 female and 2105 male children. The analysis of race-based differences included data from 2202 white, 67 Asian, 222 Black, 131 Hispanic, and 93 “Other” children. Due to sparse data for many

categories, we binarized participants' race and ethnicity as White (2202) or Non-white (513), recognizing that there is important variation between groups that this will fail to capture. Data for the maternal education analysis included CDI data from children whose mothers had the following levels of education: 8 with no more than primary school education, 123 with some secondary school, 416 with no more than secondary school, 613 with some college, 870 with no more than a college degree, 162 with no more than some graduate school, and 584 with a graduate degree. Again due to data sparsity, we binarized the 4973 children whose mothers had at least some college or more as high maternal education (high-ME), and those whose mothers had at most high school (547 children) as low maternal education (low-ME).

1.2. Rasch model

The Rasch model, also known as the 1-parameter logistic (1PL) model, is the simplest Item Response Theory model. Although we have elsewhere shown that the 2-parameter logistic model often fits CDI data better (Kachergis, Marchman, Dale, Mankewitz, & Frank, 2022), the simpler Rasch model is easier to use to evaluate potential differences in item function across different groups of participants. The Rasch model jointly estimates for each child j a latent ability θ_j , and for each item i a difficulty parameter b_i . In the model, the probability of child j knowing (i.e., producing or understanding) a given item i is

$$P_i(x_i = 1 | b_i, \theta_j) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-D(\theta_j - b_i)}}$$

where D is a constant scaling parameter ($D = 1.702$) which makes the logistic closely match the ogive function in traditional factor analysis (Chalmers, 2012; Reckase, 2009). Child ability (θ) and item difficulty (b) distributions are standardized (i.e., mean of 0), and expected to be normally distributed. Children with high latent ability (θ) will be more likely to produce any given item than children with lower latent ability, and more difficult items will be produced by fewer children (at any given θ) than easier items.

In the multigroup Rasch model, an item's difficulty is allowed to vary by group. For example, in the sex-based multigroup model, item i 's difficulty is b_i^{female} for females, and b_i^{male} for males. To identify DIF, a multigroup Rasch model will be fitted for each demographic dimension of interest (sex, maternal education, and ethnicity), and we will examine the between-group difficulty difference for each item (e.g., $d_i = b_i^{female} - b_i^{male}$). If there is no DIF for a given item, then $d_i \approx 0$ as the two groups find the item equally difficult.

2. Results

First, we examine the size of demographic effects on language ability in a baseline Rasch model fitted without regard to demographic group. Then, we fit a multigroup Rasch model for each demographic factor, and characterize the between-group differences in item difficulties. Next, we re-examine the size of demographic effects after pruning biased items from the CDI:WS using different criteria, and recommend a threshold. Finally, we measure the strength




Fig. 1. Language ability versus age by demographic group, from the baseline Rasch model.

of association between sex-related differences in language input and the degree of sex-related DIF. The scripts and models needed to reproduce our analyses are available on <https://osf.io/57rsw/OSF>.

2.1. Demographic effects in the baseline Rasch model

We fit a baseline Rasch model to the entire dataset, without demographic information. Fig. 1 shows children's language ability versus age by demographic group from the baseline Rasch model, which assumes no DIF (i.e., equal item parameters for all groups). A linear regression for each demographic group, with age (centered) and its interaction, showed significant effects. Female children had higher language ability than male children ($\beta = 0.56$, $p < .001$), with no significant interaction with age ($\beta = 0.02$, $p = .10$). High-SES children had higher language ability than low-SES children ($\beta = 0.23$, $p = .02$), an advantage that grew with age ($\beta = 0.11$, $p < .001$). White children had higher language ability than non-white children ($\beta = 0.50$, $p < .001$), an advantage that grew with age ($\beta = 0.08$, $p < .001$). We will re-examine these demographic regressions after trimming items showing extreme DIF.

2.2. Identifying biased CDI items

To aid in identifying CDI items with DIF, we created GLIMMERS (Graphs of Logits Imputed Multiply with Means Equal; Stenhaus, Frank, and Domingue, 2021), which visualize between-item variation in group performance differences. These parameters are drawn from a fitted multigroup Rasch model for each demographic variable (sex, SES, and race), with the assumption that the mean language ability in each group is the same (e.g., for sex, $\mu_{male} = \mu_{female} = 0$), thus pushing all between-group variation into the item difficulty




Fig. 2. GLIMMER plots of a sample of CDI:WS words from the sex bias model (left), the maternal education model (center), and the race model (right). Words at the top are more well-known by one group (e.g., females, for sex), while those at the bottom are more known by the other group (e.g., males), and the selection in the middle show roughly the median difficulty difference for those groups.

parameters. For the case of sex, where we believe $\mu_{female} > \mu_{male}$, this means we may expect to find many items with difficulty $b_i^{female} < b_i^{male}$, but we can still examine the distribution of differences in item difficulty ($d_j = b_i^{male} - b_i^{female}$) for outliers. GLIMMER plots show distributions of parameter differences rather than point estimates to convey the uncertainty about the existence of DIF. These distributions are generated by drawing 10,000 imputations from the item parameter covariance matrix.

Fig. 2 shows GLIMMERS for a selection of CDI items for sex (left), maternal education (middle), and race (right). The full GLIMMERS, with all 680 CDI:WS items, are too large to include here but can be found at OSF.² Inspecting GLIMMER plots can reveal clusters of items, indicating candidates for DIF on that dimension. For example, there is some clustering at the top and bottom of the sex GLIMMER (Fig. 2, left): at the top, “vagina,”³ “tights,” “dress (object),” and “doll” form a cluster of items that are much more well-known for females, while at the bottom, “penis” stands out as much more well-known by males. For the maternal education and race GLIMMERS – and in the rest of the full sex GLIMMER, there are not clusters, but rather a continuum of smoothly varying differences with overlap. This pattern makes identifying items with DIF quite difficult, as different methods are likely to yield inconsistent results (Stenhaus et al., 2021). Hence, we next characterized the distributions of the item-level group difficulty differences, and measured the influence of pruning a varying number of items on the demographic effect sizes.

² <https://osf.io/57rsw/>

³ Parents using the CDI are instructed to check genital items if the child produces whatever word the family uses.

2.2.1. Sex

For sex, the median difficulty difference (male-female) was 0.28 ($M = 0.27$, $sd = 0.40$), with 593/680 items being easier for females than males. The fact that the bulk of this distribution favors females shows that the female language advantage is pervasive across the CDI:WS, and suggests that it is likely to reflect more than the effect of a small number of biased words (cf. Frank et al. 2021).

2.2.2. Maternal education

For maternal education (ME), the median difficulty difference (low-high) was -0.01 ($M = 0.03$, $sd = 0.55$), with 337/680 items being easier for high-ME than low-ME children. With the mean and median difficulty differences close to 0, and roughly half of the words favoring each ME group, it seems that the CDI:WS items are somewhat balanced with respect to ME (and thus SES, by proxy).

2.2.3. Race

For race, the median difficulty difference (nonwhite-white) was 0.40 ($M = 0.46$, $sd = 0.55$), with 549/680 items being easier for white than non-white children, revealing a fairly pervasive advantage for white children on CDI items.

2.3. Demographic effects after pruning

If only a small number of items show DIF, pruning decisions are simple; this situation was not the case for any of the three characteristics we examined. Instead, distributions of DIF varied smoothly by each demographic factor. Thus, we chose to evaluate multiple thresholds for pruning the extreme-valued items from each distribution. For each demographic factor, we pruned items with a between-group difficulty difference from the mean difference at varying thresholds, from $>.25$ SD to >3 SD, in increments of $.25$ SD. At each SD threshold, a potentially different subset of items are excluded for each model, but with the goal of creating a single CDI that is less biased on all dimensions, we pruned the union of the subsets excluded from each model. For example, pruning >2 SD from the mean of each model excluded 25 sex-biased items, 39 ME-biased items, and 31 race-biased items, with their union being 76 unique items. Fig. 3 shows the demographic effects (β s) at different exclusion thresholds.

Ideally, we would find a single threshold that minimized the magnitude of coefficients (and thus bias) for all three demographics simultaneously. Unfortunately, the effect size for each demographic variable was smallest (closest to 0) at different exclusion thresholds. The effect size of sex was smallest when almost all items were trimmed ($>.25$ SD; $\beta_{sex} = -.47$; 661/680 total items trimmed; 433 due to sex extremity). The effect size of maternal education (SES) was smallest when items >1.25 SD in difficulty difference were trimmed ($\beta_{ME} = -.17$; 234 total items trimmed; 126 due to ME extremity). The effect size of race was minimized when items more extreme than 0.5 SD were trimmed ($\beta_{race} = .42$; 577 total items trimmed; 425 due to race extremity).




Fig. 3. Size of demographic effects (regression coefficients) with different pruning thresholds.

Where is the exclusion threshold that jointly minimizes the effect sizes of these demographic variables? The strict exclusion of all items with $>.25$ SD difficulty difference – 661/680 (97%) of the CDI:WS – best optimized this, but seems far too extreme of a culling. The next best thresholds are $>.5$ SD – again, too extreme – or 3 SD, a remarkably lax criterion that only excludes 19 items in total, the majority of which are sex-biased (11 of 19), retaining a large number of race- and SES-biased items. Only slightly worse than these is >2.25 SD, which excludes 59 items (9%), and shows a modest effect of both race ($\beta = 0.48$) and maternal education ($\beta = .19$), and a near-median effect size for sex ($\beta = -.59$). We characterize these 59 potentially biased items below, and consider whether we might recommend pruning them from the CDI:WS.

2.4. Characterizing biased items

Fig. 4 shows the 59 items showing extreme bias (i.e., whose difficulty was >2.25 SD from the mean difficulty difference on one or more demographic dimension). There were 22 items with extreme sex-based difficulty differences, only seven of which were more known by females, with the other 15 items favoring males. All but one of the sex-biased items are nouns, many of which are stereotypically associated with one gender more than the other, including stereotypically male professions (e.g., “fireman”). For maternal education, 27 extrema were identified, only 10 of which were biased for low-SES children. As for sex, most of the ME-biased items are nouns (15/27). Notably, many of the items more known by high-ME children were animals (“zebra,” “owl”) and animal sounds (“baa baa,” “moo”). Items more known by low-ME children include a few sweet treats: “candy,” “soda/pop,” and “gum.” For race, 21 extrema were identified, only eight of which were easier for non-white children. The lexical class of the race-biased items was more varied: 10 were nouns, but many others were early




Fig. 4. The 59 items showing extreme bias (difficulty difference >2.25 SD) for one or more demographic. The 19 items in bold are those showing a difference >3 SD.

learned words and phrases (e.g., “up,” “all gone,” “uh-oh,” “bye,” “mommy”). Only 10 of the 59 items were extreme in more than one model, with most of the overlap being between race and ME (eight items). Only one item (“vroom”) was extreme for all three demographics.

2.5. Relating child-directed speech to demographic bias

Demographic differences in language ability are likely to be at least partially explained by differences in linguistic input received by children in different groups. Indeed, input quantity (total daily tokens) and some measures of quality (e.g., lexical diversity: ratio of word types vs. tokens) have often been predictive of language learning outcomes in demographic studies (Huttenlocher, Haight, Bryk, Seltzer, & Lyons, 1991; Rowe & Goldin-Meadow, 2009). In an attempt to investigate this, we analyzed the extent to which word frequency in a corpus of child-directed speech to male versus female children was predictive of the amount of sex-based bias shown by CDI items. Similar to the approach taken by Braginsky, Meylan, and Frank (2016), we used the CHILDES corpus of transcripts from dyadic play sessions (MacWhinney, 2000), which are labeled with the sex of the target child, but not other demographic variables. We found a total of 5,213,750 female-directed tokens and 6,091,950 male-directed tokens that matched 662 of the 680 CDI:WS items, normalized the word frequencies

to tokens per million for each target sex, and calculated the log-odds of each word being spoken to a female (i.e., $\log(p_f/p_m)$), meaning unbiased words will have log-odds of 0, while those spoken more often to females will have log-odds >0 , and those spoken more often males will have log-odds <0 . For example “doll” was spoken 156 times to females, and 138 times to males, thus $p_f = 156/(156 + 138) = .53$, $p_m = 1 - p_f = 0.47$, and $\log(p_f/p_m) = 0.12$, while “police” was spoken 138 times to females, and 225 times to males, and thus has log-odds $= -0.49$). Overall, the correlation between the log-odds of a word being spoken to a female versus a male child and the size of the female (vs. male) advantage for that CDI word was weak, but significant ($r = .18$, $p < .001$). Some of the sex bias seen in CDI items is related to differences in language input received by girls versus boys – though of course this differential input could be elicited due to different interests.

3. Discussion

We investigated the CDI:WS, a popular parent-report measure of children’s early vocabulary, for potential demographic bias, examining the distribution of word difficulties for children of mothers with high versus low education (a proxy for family SES), for female versus male children, and for white versus non-white children. Our IRT-based analysis revealed DIF for many items along each demographic dimension, but only in the case of sex were clear clusters of items that were more well-known to females (including feminine clothing and genitalia), and a clear item that was more well-known to males (male genitalia). For the rest of the items, and for SES- and race-based analysis, there was a smooth continuum of DIF, making the boundary of true DIF subjective. To move forward, we identified candidate DIF items by systematically pruning the extremes of each distribution, excluding outliers for each demographic across a range of thresholds, and seeking to minimize the size of demographic effects. Although many exclusion thresholds decreased the size of maternal education and race effects, the female advantage actually grew under most prunings, with the majority of excluded extrema being stereotypically male nouns (e.g., “truck,” “fireman”).

This analysis highlights a fundamental difficulty of identifying DIF: an analyst must either know the expected magnitude of an ability difference between the two demographic groups, or know a set of “anchor” items that are equally difficult (i.e., unbiased) for both groups (for an overview, see Stenhaug et al., 2021). But in the universe of children’s early language, there is only a finite set of early learned words to choose from – and we may expect many of them to be biased for various environmental reasons (e.g., boys and girls know the names for their respective anatomy; children in Florida may not use mittens or skis). Hence, the presence of DIF on a set of items could indicate varying linguistic and environmental input, rather than an actual advantage for one demographic over another.

Choosing an exclusion threshold that struck a balance of reducing race- and ME-based bias and not eliminating too many items, we identified 59 items – the majority of which favored white/high-ME groups. These extrema were predominantly nouns, including many animals (esp. for maternal education), vehicles and professions (esp. for sex). Notably, no verbs and few syntactically complex items were identified as outliers, which may suggest that these

lexical classes are less prone to bias via the internal or external mechanisms leading to the effects we observed. Pruning these 59 outliers would slightly decrease the demographic effects of maternal education (unpruned $\beta = .23$; pruned $\beta = .19$) and race (unpruned $\beta = .50$; pruned $\beta = .48$). In contrast, the majority of the sex-biased outliers were easier for the disadvantaged group (males), meaning that the removal of these extrema would increase the female language advantage on the CDI:WS (unpruned $\beta = 0.56$; pruned $\beta = .59$). In aggregate, these analyses seem to suggest that the CDI:WS may very slightly overestimate the magnitude of differences in language ability along the dimensions of maternal education and race, and perhaps underestimate the female advantage.


This investigation is only a first step in measuring demographic bias in the items on the CDI:WS. More research is needed to determine whether CDI items that show DIF are more related to environmental frequencies, as we found a weak though reliable association between the relative frequency of words in child-directed speech to boys versus girls and the amount of sex-based DIF. Examining the relative frequency of CDI words across households with varying maternal education and race may reveal similarly weak associations, or there may be strong associations only among particular categories of words. It may be that particular activity contexts—popular with some demographic groups, and not others—may be predictive. For example, many of the extrema favoring high-ME children are animals and animal sounds (e.g., “quack quack,” “woof woof,” “baa baa,” “duck,” “sheep,” “giraffe,” “zebra”): do high-SES households visit the zoo more often, or perhaps engage in other activities related to naming animals and noises they make (e.g., animal noise toys)? If certain activities are driving early word learning for high-ME children, what are the activities (and associated vocabulary) that low-SES households are instead engaging in? Critically, this enterprise will require a greater diversity of publicly available corpora of child language; we view the lack of such data as a substantial issue.

SES, race, and sex are only three of many possible demographic dimensions of interest. For example, geographic region is likely predictive of children’s early experience with (and thus knowledge of) CDI items related to winter weather (e.g., “snow,” “mittens”) or outdoor activities (e.g., “camping”). A truly fair test of children’s early vocabulary would contain a representative and balanced sample of words from all activities that children engage in, across demographic groups.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the Stanford Maternal and Child Health Research Institute. We thank members of the Language and Cognition lab and three anonymous reviewers for their feedback.

Open Research Badges

 This article has earned Open Data and Open Materials badges. Data and materials are available at <https://osf.io/57rsw/>.

References

- Bornstein, M. H., Hahn, C. S., & Putnick, D. L. (2016). Stability of core language skill across the first decade of life in children at biological and social risk. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 57(12), 1434–1443.
- Bornstein, M. H., & Putnick, D. L. (2012). Stability of language in childhood: A multiage, multidomain, multi-measure, and multisource study. *Developmental Psychology*, 48(2), 477.
- Braginsky, M., Meylan, S. C., & Frank, M. C. (2016). *Gender differences in lexical input and acquisition*. 41st Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development.
- Camilli, G. (2013). Ongoing issues in test fairness. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 19(2–3), 104–120.
- Chalmers, R. P. (2012). mirt: A multidimensional item response theory package for the R environment. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 48(6), 1–29.
- Duff, F. J., Reen, G., Plunkett, K., & Nation, K. (2015). Do infant vocabulary skills predict school-age language and literacy outcomes? *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 56(8), 848–856.
- Eriksson, M., Marschik, P. B., Tulviste, T., Almgren, M., Pérez Pereira, M., Wehberg, S., & Gallego, C. (2012). Differences between girls and boys in emerging language skills: Evidence from 10 language communities. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 30(2), 326–343.
- Fenson, Larry, Dale, P. S., Reznick, J. S., Bates, E., Thal, D. J., Pethick, S. J., & Stiles, J. (1994). Variability in early communicative development. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, i–185.
- Fenson, L., Marchman, V. A., Thal, D. J., Dale, P. S., Reznick, J. S., & Bates, E. (2007). *MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventories: User's guide and technical manual (2nd ed.)*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Fernald, A., Marchman, V. A., & Weisleder, A. (2013). SES differences in language processing skill and vocabulary are evident at 18 months. *Developmental Science*, 16(2), 234–248.
- Frank, M. C., Braginsky, M., Yurovsky, D., & Marchman, V. A. (2017). Wordbank: An open repository for developmental vocabulary data. *Journal of Child Language*, 44(3), 677.
- Frank, M. C., Braginsky, M., Yurovsky, D., & Marchman, V. A. (2021). *Variability and consistency in early language learning: The WordBank Project*. MIT Press.
- Holland, P. W., & Wainer, H. (1993). *Differential item functioning*. Routledge.
- Huttenlocher, J., Haight, W., Bryk, A., Seltzer, M., & Lyons, T. (1991). Early vocabulary growth: Relation to language input and gender. *Developmental Psychology*, 27(2), 236.
- Kachergis, G., Marchman, V. A., Dale, P., Mankewitz, J., & Frank, M. C. (2022). Online computerized adaptive tests (CAT) of children's vocabulary development in English and Mexican Spanish. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 65(6), 2288–2308. https://doi.org/10.1044/2022_JSLHR-21-00372
- MacWhinney, B. (2000). *The CHILDES project: Tools for analyzing talk. Transcription format and programs (Vol. 1)*. Psychology Press.
- Marchman, V. A., & Fernald, A. (2008). Speed of word recognition and vocabulary knowledge in infancy predict cognitive and language outcomes in later childhood. *Developmental Science*, 11(3), F9–F16.
- Petersen, J. (2018). *Gender difference in verbal performance: A meta-analysis of United States state performance assessments*. Springer.
- Reckase, M. D. (2009). *Multidimensional item response theory*. Springer.
- Rowe, M. L., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2009). Differences in early gesture explain SES disparities in child vocabulary size at school entry. *Science*, 323(5916), 951–953.
- Schwab, J. F., & Lew-Williams, C. (2016). Language learning, socioeconomic status, and child-directed speech. *WIREs Cognitive Science*, 7, 264–275.
- Stenhaus, B., Frank, M. C., & Domingue, B. (2021). *Treading carefully: Agnostic identification as the first step of detecting differential item functioning*.