

Running head: PITCH DISCRIMINATION AND AUTISTIC TRAITS

Discrimination of foreign speech pitch and autistic traits in non-clinical population

Lai-Sang Iao^{a,*}, Anna Wippich^a, and Yu Hin Lam^b

^aDepartment of Psychology, Nottingham Trent University, 50 Shakespeare Street,
Nottingham, United Kingdom, NG1 4FQ

^bDepartment of Educational and Psychological Studies, College of Education,
University of South Florida, USA

*Corresponding author

Address for correspondence: Department of Psychology, Nottingham Trent University,
50 Shakespeare Street, Nottingham, United Kingdom, NG1 4FQ

E-mail: lai-sang.iao@ntu.ac.uk

Phone: +44 (0)115 848 2387

Conflict of Interest: Lai-Sang Iao declares that she has no conflict of interest. Anna Wippich declares that she has no conflict of interest. Yu Hin Lam declares that he has no conflict of interest.

Abstract

Individuals with Autism Spectrum Conditions (ASC) are widely suggested to show enhanced perceptual discrimination but inconsistent findings have been reported for pitch discrimination. Given the high variability in ASC, this study investigated whether ASC traits were correlated with pitch discrimination in an undergraduate sample when musical and language experiences were taken into consideration.

Results indicated that the Social Skills subscale of the Autism Spectrum Quotient (AQ) was associated with foreign speech pitch discrimination, suggesting that individuals who were less sociable and socially skillful were less able to discriminate foreign speech pitch. Current findings have an implication in investigating individual differences in ASC and further investigation is needed for spelling out the relationship between the non-social and social aspects of ASC.

Keywords: Pitch discrimination, Autism Spectrum Quotient, Musical experience, Language experience, Individual differences

PITCH DISCRIMINATION AND AUTISTIC TRAITS

Discrimination of foreign speech pitch and autistic traits in non-clinical population

Abstract

Individuals with Autism Spectrum Conditions (ASC) are widely suggested to show enhanced perceptual discrimination but inconsistent findings have been reported for pitch discrimination. Given the high variability in ASC, this study investigated whether ASC traits were correlated with pitch discrimination in an undergraduate sample when musical and language experiences were taken into consideration. Results indicated that the Social Skills subscale of the Autism Spectrum Quotient (AQ) was associated with foreign speech pitch discrimination, suggesting that individuals who were less sociable and socially skillful were less able to discriminate foreign speech pitch. Current findings have an implication in investigating individual differences in ASC and further investigation is needed for spelling out the relationship between the non-social and social aspects of ASC.

1 Discrimination of foreign speech pitch and autistic traits in non-clinical population
2
3 Autism Spectrum Conditions (ASC) are characterized by impairments in social
4 communication and interaction as well as restricted, repetitive interests and/or
5 behaviors, in which hypersensitivity or hyposensitivity to sensory information are also
6 included in the most recent Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders
7 (DSM-5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Many research findings support
8 the Enhanced Perceptual Functioning (EPF) theory that individuals with ASC show
9 enhanced low-level perceptual processing (Mottron & Burack, 2001; Mottron,
10 Dawson, Soulières, Hubert, & Burack, 2006). Given that traits related to ASC are
11 prevalent in relatives of individuals with ASC and in typically developing individuals
12 (e.g., Baron-Cohen, Wheelwright, Skinner, Martin, & Clubley, 2001; Dawson et al.,
13 2007), individuals with higher ASC traits in the general population are also found to
14 exhibit enhanced perceptual processing (e.g., Almeida, Dickinson, Maybery, Badcock,
15 & Badcock, 2010; Grinter et al., 2009; Mayer, Hannent, & Heaton, 2016; Stewart,
16 Griffiths, & Grube, 2015). However, this is not always the case in the auditory
17 domain (for reviews, see Haesen, Boets, & Wagemans, 2011; O'Connor, 2012).

18
19 Superior pitch perception may be limited to children with ASC (Heaton, Hudry,
20 Ludlow, & Hill, 2008b; Mayer et al., 2016; O'Riordan & Passeti, 2006), subgroups
21 of children and adolescents with ASC (Eigsti & Fein, 2013; Heaton, Williams,
22 Cummins, & Happé, 2008c) and subgroups of adults with ASC (Bonnell et al., 2010;
23 Jones et al., 2009). Two recent studies even reported deficits in pitch discrimination in
24 adolescents and adults with ASC (Boets, Verhoeven, Wouters, & Steyaert, 2015;
25 Kargas, López, Reddy, & Morris, 2015). Neural sensitivity for speech pitch in
26 Mandarin-speaking children with ASC was also found to be diminished (Yu et al.,
27 2015). This discrepancy in findings may be due to the variability in ASC. For example,
28 pitch discrimination is associated with general symptom severity in children with

1 ASC (Eigsti & Fein, 2013) and specific symptom severity on reciprocal social
2 interaction and restricted and repetitive behaviours in adults with ASC (Kargas et al.,
3 2015; Mayer et al., 2016). Thus, it might not be ASC in general but specific ASC
4 symptoms/traits that were related to pitch discrimination. Given that it is still not clear
5 whether ASC can be viewed as a single unitary spectrum or a multidimensional
6 spectrum (Happé & Ronald, 2008; Happé, Ronald, & Plomin, 2006), investigating
7 specific ASC symptoms/traits in relation to pitch discrimination and taking
8 variabilities into account would provide further insight into the processing styles
9 across the autism spectrum.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21
22 ASC traits have frequently been measured by the Autism Spectrum Quotient
23 (AQ; Baron-Cohen et al., 2001), which is a self-administered questionnaire. It
24 provides a score, which is found to be high in individuals with ASC but lower in
25 typically developing individuals on a continuum. It also provides five subscale scores
26 corresponding to specific ASC traits: Social Skills, Attention Switching, Attention to
27 Detail, Communication, and Imagination. So far, to our knowledge, only two studies
28 examined the correlation between ASC traits and pitch discrimination. Stewart et al.
29 (2015) found a correlation between AQ and pitch discrimination in a sample of 24
30 undergraduates while Mayer et al. (2016) reported a correlation between Attention to
31 Detail and speech pitch discrimination in a sample of 38 individuals with and without
32 ASC. Both were based on small samples and were not controlled for related variables,
33 e.g., musical and language experiences, given that pitch is shared by both domains of
34 music and language (Plack, Oxenham, & Fay, 2005).
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Previous research has shown that musical experience is associated with pitch
54 discrimination in both domains of music and language (Magne, Schön, & Besson,
55 2006; Marques, Moreno, Castro, & Besson, 2007; Schön, Magne, & Besson, 2004).
56 For example, musicians are able to discriminate both musical pitch and speech pitch
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 better than non-musicians. More importantly, musical experience could be referred to
2
3 the amount of time spent on musical-related training (Besson, Schön, Moreno, Santos,
4
5 & Magne, 2007; Micheyl, Delhommeau, Perrot, & Oxenham, 2006; Moreno et al.,
6
7 2009), suggesting that one does not necessarily have to be classified as musicians with
8
9 extended years of training and expertise in order to show better pitch discrimination.
10

11
12 There is also evidence showing that language experience affects pitch
13
14 discrimination in music and in language (Bent, Bradlow, & Wright, 2006; Bidelman,
15
16 Hutka, & Moreno, 2013; Giuliano, Pfordresher, Stanley, Narayana, & Wicha, 2011).
17
18 For example, native English speakers are less capable in discriminating pitch in music
19
20 and in tone languages (e.g., Mandarin and Cantonese) than native tone-language
21
22 speakers. It was also found that native Mandarin speakers have stronger subcortical
23
24 pitch representation of Mandarin tones, even when a simulation of Mandarin tones
25
26 without any speech context was used as stimuli, compared to native English speakers
27
28 (Krishnan, Gandour, Bidelman, & Swaminathan, 2009; Krishnan, Xu, Gandour, &
29
30 Cariani, 2005). Although, unlike tone languages, pitch variations in non-tonal
31
32 languages (e.g., English) are not lexically relevant to word discrimination, they
33
34 provide supra-lexical information such as stress and intonation (Krishnan & Gandour,
35
36 2014) so non-tonal language experience might also affect pitch discrimination. For
37
38 example, pitch discrimination was superior in Finnish children with advanced English
39
40 pronunciation skills than those with less-advanced English pronunciation skills
41
42 (Milovanov, Huotilainen, Välimäki, Esquef, & Tervaniemi, 2008).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Therefore, there is a need to control for musical and language experience when
52
53 investigating pitch discrimination. This study sought to do so by recruiting only native
54
55 English speakers who did not know a second language and by testing pitch
56
57 discrimination in an unknown foreign tone language rather than in English, English
58
59 simulation or music to further control for native language and musical experience.
60
61

1 With a larger sample size than Stewart et al. (2015) and Mayer et al. (2016), it was
2
3 predicted that foreign speech pitch discrimination would be correlated with ASC traits,
4
5 even after controlling for self-reported musical experience, if ASC traits play a
6
7 significant role in pitch discrimination.
8
9

10 **Method**

11 **Participants**

12
13 One hundred and two students (53 females; mean age = 21.65 years, $SD = 3.51$,
14
15 range = 18–35) were recruited from a university in United Kingdom. All were native
16
17 English speakers and were reported to have normal hearing and no history of learning
18
19 a foreign language. They were not screened for any psychiatric or other characteristics.
20
21 Ethical approval was obtained from university ethics committee before recruitment.
22
23
24
25

26 **Materials and Procedure**

27
28 Participants were tested individually in a laboratory setting. They were first
29
30 asked to rate their musical experience on a 4-point scale: no training at all, 1- to
31
32 2-year training, 3- to 5-year training, or more than 5- year training. This was because
33
34 participants found it hard to recall and report the exact amount of time spent on
35
36 musical training. Participants then filled in the AQ (Baron-Cohen et al., 2001). It
37
38 consists of 50 items, to which participants indicate how much they agree or disagree
39
40 on a 4-point scale: Definitely Agree – Slightly Agree – Slightly Disagree – Definitely
41
42 Disagree. The items are grouped into five subscales, each involving ten items. Each
43
44 item was coded as either 0 or 1. Thus, the total score ranges from 0 to 50, and each
45
46 subscales score ranges from 0 to 10. The higher the score the higher level of ASC
47
48 traits the individual possesses. Baron-Cohen et al. (2001) reported good test-retest
49
50 reliability ($r = .70$) and adequate internal consistency ($\alpha = .69$).
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 Participants then took part in a foreign speech pitch discrimination task, in
58
59 which they determined whether there were pitch differences between pairs of
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 monosyllabic Cantonese words. These words were *bui, dyun, jau, ngoi, ziu, and zoeng*.
2
3 All were produced by an adult male, who is a native Cantonese speaker, with a
4
5 high-level tone in Cantonese. Each recording was 150-msec long. Using PRAAT
6
7 (Boersma & Weenink, 2001), the pitch contour of each word was then shifted to
8
9 lower levels, equivalent to 1, 2 and 3 semitone(s) away from the original.¹
10
11

12 Each original word was paired with the same word at a different pitch level,
13
14 comprising 18 word pairs that differed by 1, 2 or 3 semitone(s). The order of the two
15
16 pitch levels in these 18 “different” trials were counterbalanced, making 36 “different”
17
18 trials. Words at each pitch level were also paired with themselves, comprising 24
19
20 word pairs that were at same pitch. Six of these 24 “same” trials consisted of the
21
22 original words, which were equally distributed in all 3 “different” conditions. Thus,
23
24 repeating these 6 trials should not affect the findings but would make up a total of 30
25
26 “same” trials, reducing the difference between the numbers of the “same” and
27
28 “different” trials so that participants were not biased toward the “different” response.²
29
30
31
32

33 All trials had an inter-word pause of 250 ms so that the words were temporally
34
35 distinguishable. They were played with the E-prime software on a standard computer
36
37 through the speakers to each participant in a randomised order. Participants were told
38
39 that different sound pairs would be presented and they were asked to indicate whether
40
41 the two sounds in each pair were same or different by pressing “1” for same or “2” for
42
43 different.³ The entire task lasted about 10 minutes.
44
45
46
47

48
49 ¹ One semitone lower is a decrease in frequency of 6%. We used “1, 2 and 3 semitones” instead of “2,
50
51 3 and 6 semitones” that were used in Heaton et al. (2008b) and Mayer et al. (2016) because we
52
53 reasoned that a harder task was needed to avoid an overall ceiling effect given that we tested university
54
55 students rather than children, and had no restriction on musical experience.

56 ² In Heaton et al. (2008b) and Mayer et al. (2016), this bias was not controlled and there were 20 more
57
58 “different” trials than the “same” trials.

59 ³ Participants were never asked to compare pairs that differed in pitch contour. The contrast was
60
61 always of different pitch levels (i.e., frequencies).
62
63
64
65

Results

Descriptive statistics for foreign speech pitch discrimination, AQ scores and musical experience rating are presented in Table 1. In order to compare with previous research, participants' task performance was analyzed before investigating the relationship between task performance and ASC traits. Participants' task performance was significantly above chance for 0, 1, 2 and 3 semitone differences, $t_s(101) > 9.27$, $p_s < .001$, $d_s > 1.84$. A repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed a significant main effect of semitone difference, $F(2.05, 207.27) = 45.54$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .31$. Post hoc tests suggested that correct discrimination significantly improved with increases in semitone differences (all comparisons $p_s < .001$ except the comparison between 1 and 2 semitone differences, $p = .41$).

[Table 1]

Correlations were not found between task performance and the AQ total, $r_s(102) = -.19$ – $.05$, $p_s > .06$, nor the subscale scores of Attention Switching, Attention to Detail, Communication and Imagination, $r_s(102) = -.18$ – $.10$, $p_s > .07$. However, the Social Skills subscale score was marginally correlated with performance on 1 semitone difference, $r(102) = -.19$, $p = .05$, and was significantly correlated with performance on 3 semitone difference, $r(102) = -.28$, $p < .01$. After controlling for musical experience, the correlation coefficients improved, $r_s(99) = -.26$ and $-.32$ for 1 and 3 semitone difference respectively, and both were significant, $p_s < .01$. These findings suggested that participants who scored high on the Social Skills subscale (i.e., less sociable and less socially skillful) were less capable in pitch discrimination.

Discussion

With a larger sample size and better controls, the current study investigated the relationship between pitch discrimination and ASC traits when musical and language experiences were taken into account. It replicated previous findings (Heaton et al.,

1 2008b; Mayer et al., 2016) that correct discrimination was near ceiling for 0 semitone
2
3 difference, dropped significantly for small semitone differences and improved
4
5 gradually with increases in semitone differences although the pitch discrimination
6
7 task we used was more difficult and has controlled for response bias. This replication
8
9 provided a basis for the main finding that pitch discrimination was negatively
10
11 correlated with the Social Skills subscale score only even when self-reported musical
12
13 experience was further controlled, indicating that participants who were less sociable
14
15 and less socially skillful were less capable in pitch discrimination. Although this
16
17 finding was inconsistent with those in Mayer et al. (2016) and Stewart et al. (2015), it
18
19 could be explained by several possibilities.
20
21
22

23
24 The first possibility is that the stimuli used to test pitch discrimination in each
25
26 study were different. This study used foreign speech whereas Stewart et al. (2015)
27
28 used pure tones and Mayer et al. (2016) used native speech and its analogue. While
29
30 different stimuli might sufficiently lead to different findings, there is also a possibility
31
32 that Stewart et al. and Mayer et al.'s findings were contaminated by participants'
33
34 musical and language experience. By using foreign speech as stimuli, this study
35
36 controlled for both musical and native language experiences. Musical experience was
37
38 controlled for both musical and native language experiences. Musical experience was
39
40 further controlled using statistical methods and foreign language experience was
41
42 controlled by including only participants who did not know a second language.
43
44 Although language delay, which was suggested to be related to pitch discrimination in
45
46 ASC (Bonnell et al., 2010; Eigsti & Fein, 2013; Heaton et al., 2008a, b, c; Jones et al.,
47
48 2009), was not considered and may be suggested as a limitation of the current study, it
49
50 was assumed that language delay was not prevalent in a non-clinical undergraduate
51
52 sample. Together with a larger sample size, the current findings may thus be more
53
54 convincing than those in Stewart et al. and Mayer et al.
55
56
57
58
59

60 Nevertheless, the current study was not the first to demonstrate a relationship
61

1 between pitch discrimination and sociability. Using analogue tones derived from
2 native speech, Mayer et al. (2016) reported a similar finding that pitch discrimination
3 was negatively correlated with and independently predicted by the reciprocal social
4 interaction subscale of the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule (ADOS) in adult
5 participants with ASC. Previous research on children with ASC also showed that
6 some children with ASC did not preferentially attend to social speech and failed to
7 show typical neural changes to vowel pitch changes (Kuhl, Coffey-Corina, Padden, &
8 Dawson, 2005). Moreover, social interest and social interaction play a role in learning
9 and discriminating speech (Kuhl, 2003; Kuhl, Tsao & Liu, 2003). Infants readily
10 learned and discriminated characteristics in speech, no matter of whether they were
11 native or foreign, during natural social interaction but not via audio or video tape.
12 Although pitch discrimination is a non-social capacity, its relation to social capacities
13 is therefore not unexpected and this relationship extends across typically developing
14 individuals and individuals with ASC.

15 While there has not been a single account that entirely explains all the features
16 of ASC, the current finding that pitch discrimination was negatively correlated with
17 autistic social traits failed to support the EPF theory (Mottron & Burack, 2001;
18 Mottron et al., 2006). This was in line with previous studies which used group
19 measures and reported diminished pitch discrimination in individuals with ASC across
20 lifespan (Boets et al., 2015; Kargas et al., 2015; Yu et al., 2015). Although this study
21 did not test individuals with ASC, its findings have an implication in investigating
22 individual differences in pitch discrimination and specific ASC traits rather than ASC
23 in general, reflecting the high variability and complexity across the autism spectrum.
24 Further investigation is still warranted to spell out the relationship between non-social
25 and social aspects of ASC (for reviews, see Leekam, 2016; Valla & Belmonte, 2013)
26 given its importance in our understanding of ASC.

References

- 1
2
3 Almeida, R. A., Dickinson, J. E., Maybery, M. T., Badcock, J. C., & Badcock, D. R.
4 (2010). A new step towards understanding embedded figures test performance
5 in the autism spectrum: The radial frequency search task. *Neuropsychologia*, *48*,
6 374-381.
7
8
9 American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of*
10 *mental disorders* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
11
12 Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Skinner, R., Martin, J., & Clubley, E. (2001). The
13 autism-spectrum quotient (AQ): Evidence from Asperger
14 syndrome/high-functioning autism, males and females, scientists and
15 mathematicians. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *31*, 5-17.
16
17 Bent, T., Bradlow, A. R., & Wright, B. A. (2006). The influence of linguistic
18 experience on the cognitive processing of pitch in speech and nonspeech
19 sounds. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and*
20 *Performance*, *32*, 97-103.
21
22 Besson, M., Schön, D., Moreno, S., Santos, A., & Magne, C. (2007). Influence of
23 musical expertise and musical training on pitch processing in music and
24 language. *Restorative Neurology and Neuroscience*, *25*, 399-410.
25
26 Bidelman, G. M., Hutka, S., & Moreno, S. (2013). Tone language speakers and
27 musicians share enhanced perceptual and cognitive abilities for musical pitch:
28 Evidence for bidirectionality between the domains of language and music. *PLoS*
29 *One*, *8*, e60676.
30
31 Boersma, P., & Weenink, D. (2001). PRAAT, a system for doing phonetics by
32 computer. *Glott International*, *5*, 341-345.
33
34 Boets, B., Verhoeven, J., Wouters, J., & Steyaert, J. (2015). Fragile spectral and
35 temporal auditory processing in adolescents with autism spectrum disorder and
36 early language delay. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *45*,
37 1845-1857.
38
39 Bonnel, A., McAdams, S., Smith, B., Berthiaume, C., Bertone, A., Ciocca, V., ...
40 Mottron, L. (2010). Enhanced pure-tone pitch discrimination among persons
41 with autism but not Asperger syndrome. *Neuropsychologia*, *48*, 2465-2475.
42
43 Dawson, G., Estes, A., Munson, J., Schellenberg, G., Bernier, R., & Abbott, R. (2007).
44 Quantitative assessment of autism symptom related traits in probands and
45 parents: Broader phenotype autism symptom scale. *Journal of Autism and*
46 *Developmental Disorders*, *37*, 523-536.
47
48 Eigsti, I. M., & Fein, D. A. (2013). More is less: pitch discrimination and language

1 delays in children with optimal outcomes from autism. *Autism Research*, 6,
2 605-613.

3
4 Giuliano, R. J., Pfordresher, P. Q., Stanley, E. M., Narayana, S., Wicha, N. Y. (2011).
5 Native experience with a tone language enhances pitch discrimination and the
6 timing of neural responses to pitch change. *Frontiers in psychology*, 2, 146.

7
8
9 Grinter, E. J., Maybery, M. T., Van Beek, P. L., Pellicano, E., Badcock, J. C., &
10 Badcock, D. R. (2009). Global visual processing and self-rated autistic-like
11 traits. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 39, 1278-1290.

12
13
14 Haesen, B., Boets, B., & Wagemans, J. (2011). A review of behavioural and
15 electrophysiological studies on auditory processing and speech perception in
16 autism spectrum disorders. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*, 5,
17 701-714.

18
19
20 Happé, F., & Ronald, A. (2008). The 'fractionable autism triad': A review of evidence
21 from behavioural, genetic, cognitive and neural research. *Neuropsychology*
22 *Review*, 18, 287-304.

23
24
25
26 Happé, F., Ronald, A., & Plomin, R. (2006). Time to give up on a single explanation
27 for autism. *Nature Neuroscience*, 9, 1218-1220.

28
29 Heaton, P., Davis, R. E., & Happé, F. (2008a). Research note: Exceptional absolute
30 pitch perception for spoken words in an able adult with autism.
31 *Neuropsychologia*, 46, 2095-2098.

32
33
34 Heaton, P., Hudry, K., Ludlow, A., & Hill, E. (2008b). Superior discrimination of
35 speech pitch and its relationship to verbal ability in autism spectrum disorders.
36 *Cognitive Neuropsychology*, 25, 771-782.

37
38
39 Heaton, P., Williams, K., Cummins, O., & Happé, F. (2008c). Autism and pitch
40 processing splinter skills: A group and subgroup analysis. *Autism*, 12, 203-219.

41
42
43 Jones, C. R. G., Happé, F., Baird, G., Simonoff, E., Marsden, A. J. S., Tregay, J., ...
44 Charman, T. (2009). Auditory discrimination and auditory sensory behaviours
45 in autism spectrum disorders. *Neuropsychologia*, 47, 2850-2858.

46
47
48 Kargas, N., López, B., Reddy, V., & Morris, P. (2015). The relationship between
49 auditory processing and restricted repetitive behaviors in adults with autism
50 spectrum disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 45,
51 658-668.

52
53
54
55 Krishnan, A., & Gandour, J. T. (2014). Language experience shapes processing of
56 pitch relevant information in the human brainstem and auditory cortex:
57 Electrophysiological evidence. *Acoustics Australia/Australian Acoustical*
58 *Society*, 42, 166-178.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Krishnan, A., Gandour, J. T., Bidelman, G. M., & Swaminathan, J. (2009). Experience-dependent neural representation of dynamic pitch in the brainstem. *Neuroreport*, *20*, 408-413.
- Krishnan, A., Xu, Y., Gandour, J., & Cariani, P. (2005). Encoding of pitch in the human brainstem is sensitive to language experience. *Cognitive Brain Research*, *25*, 161-168.
- Kuhl, P. K. (2003). Human speech and birdsong: communication and the social brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *100*, 9645-9646.
- Kuhl, P. K., Coffey-Corina, S., Padden, D., & Dawson, G. (2005). Links between social and linguistic processing of speech in preschool children with autism: Behavioral and electrophysiological measures. *Developmental Science*, *8*, F1-F12.
- Kuhl, P. K., Tsao, F.-M., & Liu, H.-M. (2003). Foreign language experience in infancy: effects of short-term exposure and social interaction on phonetic learning. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *100*, 9096-9101.
- Leekam, S. (2016). Social cognitive impairment and autism: What are we trying to explain? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, Series B: Biological Sciences*, *371*, 20150082.
- Magne, C., Schon, D., & Besson, M. (2006). Musician children detect pitch violations in both music and language better than nonmusician children: Behavioral and electrophysiological approaches. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *18*, 199-211.
- Marques, C., Moreno, S., Castro, S. L., & Besson, M. (2007). Musicians detect pitch violation in a foreign language better than nonmusicians: behavioral and electrophysiological evidence. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, *19*, 1453-1463.
- Mayer, J. L., Hannent, I., & Heaton, P. F. (2016). Mapping the developmental trajectory and correlates of enhanced pitch perception on speech processing in adults with ASD. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, *46*, 1562-1573.
- Micheyl, C., Delhommeau, K., Perrot, X., & Oxenham, A. J. (2006). Influence of musical and psychoacoustical training on pitch discrimination. *Hearing Research*, *212*, 36-47.
- Milovanov, R., Huotilainen, M., Välimäki, V., Esquef, P. A. A., & Tervaniemi, M. (2008). Musical aptitude and second language pronunciation skills in

- 1 school-aged children: neural and behavioral evidence. *Brain Research*, 1194,
2 81-89.
- 3
4 Moreno, S., Marques, C., Santos, A., Santos, M., Castro, S. L., & Besson, M. (2009).
5 Musical training influences linguistic abilities in 8-year-old children: more
6 evidence for brain plasticity. *Cerebral Cortex*, 19, 712-713.
- 7
8
9 Mottron, L., & Burack, J. (2001). Enhanced perceptual functioning in the
10 development of autism. In J. A. Burack, T. Charman, N. Yirmiya, & P. R.
11 Zelazo (Eds.), *The development of autism: Perspectives from theory and*
12 *research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 13
14
15 Mottron, L., Dawson, M., Soulières, I., Hubert, B., & Burack, J. (2006). Enhanced
16 perceptual functioning in autism: An update, and eight principles of autistic
17 perception. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 36, 27-43.
- 18
19
20 O'Connor, K. (2012). Auditory processing in autism spectrum disorder: A
21 review. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 36, 836-854.
- 22
23
24 O'Riordan, M., & Passetti, F. (2006). Discrimination in autism within different
25 sensory modalities. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 36,
26 665-675.
- 27
28
29 Plack, C. J., Oxenham, A. J., & Fay, R. R. (Eds.). (2005). *Pitch: Neural coding and*
30 *perception* (Vol. 24). New York: Springer.
- 31
32
33 Schön, D., Magne, C., & Besson, M. (2004). The music of speech: Music training
34 facilitates pitch processing in both music and language. *Psychophysiology*, 41,
35 341-349.
- 36
37
38 Stewart, M. E., Griffiths, T. D., & Grube, M. (2015). Autistic traits and enhanced
39 perceptual representation of pitch and time. *Journal of Autism and*
40 *Developmental Disorders*, 1-9.
- 41
42
43 Valla, J. M., & Belmonte, M. K. (2013). Detail-oriented cognitive style and social
44 communicative deficits, within and beyond the autism spectrum: Independent
45 traits that grow into developmental interdependence. *Developmental Review*, 33,
46 371-398.
- 47
48
49 Yu, L., Fan, Y., Deng, Z., Huang, D., Wang, S., & Zhang, Y. (2015). Pitch processing
50 in tonal-language-speaking children with autism: An event-related potential
51 study. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 45, 3656-3667.
- 52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for the Foreign Speech Pitch Discrimination Task Performance, the AQ Scores and Musical Experience Rating

Variable	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Foreign speech pitch discrimination				
0 semitone difference	.96	.07	.70	1
1 semitone difference	.75	.28	0	1
2 semitone difference	.76	.27	0	1
3 semitone difference	.85	.22	.08	1
AQ				
Total	15.07	6.25	2	34
Social Skills	1.84	1.87	0	9
Attention Switching	4.27	2.18	0	9
Attention to Detail	4.54	2.15	0	10
Communication	2.03	1.91	0	10
Imagination	2.40	1.71	0	9
Musical experience ^a	1.92	.85	1	4

^aRated on a 4-point scale: No training at all (1), 1- to 2-year training (2), 3- to 5-year training (3), or more than 5- year training (4).