The relationship between information carrying words, memory and language skills in school age children with language impairment.

Authors

Dr Pauline Frizelle (corresponding author)
Department of Experimental Psychology, Oxford University
Tel.: +44 (0)1865 271334
Email: pauline.frizelle@psy.ox.ac.uk

Ms Jennifer Harte
Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences, Brookfield Complex, University College Cork, College Road, Cork, Ireland.
Tel.: +353 (0)21 4901609
Email: j.harte@ucc.ie

Dr Kathleen O'Sullivan
School of Mathematical Sciences, Room 1.58, Western Gateway Building
University College Cork
Tel: +353 (0)21 4205812
Email: Kathleen.osullivan@ucc.ie

Professor Emeritus Paul Fletcher
Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences, Brookfield Complex, University College Cork, College Road, Cork, Ireland.
Tel.: +353 (0)21 4901537
Email: p.fletcher@ucc.ie

Professor Fiona Gibbon
Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences, Brookfield Complex, University College Cork, College Road, Cork, Ireland.
Tel.: +353 (0)21 4901537
Email: F.Gibbon@ucc.ie

Abstract

The receptive language measure *information-carrying word (ICW) level* is used extensively by speech and language therapists (SLTs) in the UK and Ireland. Despite this it has never been validated via its relationship to any other relevant measures. This study aims to validate the ICW measure by investigating the relationship between the receptive ICW score of children with language impairment (LI) and their performance on standardized memory and language assessments.

Twenty-seven children with LI, aged between 5;07 and 8;11, completed a sentence comprehension task in which the instructions gradually increased in number of ICWs. The children also completed subtests from The Working Memory Test Battery for children and The Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals – 4.

Results showed that there was a significant positive relationship between both language and memory measures and children's ICW score but that language was the greater contributor in children's ability to do this task. ICW score is in fact a valid measure of the language ability of children with LI. However therapists should also be cognisant of its strong association with working memory when using this construct in assessment or intervention methods.

Keywords

Information-carrying words, language impairment, memory, children, assessment

I Introduction

The term *information carrying words* (ICWs) became commonly used by speech and language therapists (SLTs) and specialist teachers in the UK and Ireland with the

emergence of the Derbyshire Language Scheme, an intervention programme targeting early language skills (Knowles and Masidlover, 1982). The ICW construct continues to be used widely by SLTs in the UK and Ireland as a measure of children's understanding of language and as a therapeutic tool, in the management of young children with impaired language. In fact, a recent online survey conducted by Morgan et al. (2013) (which included 231 SLTs in England) revealed that 98% of therapists surveyed, reported using ICWs with preschool and school aged children with primary speech and language impairments. Despite this fact, a literature review has uncovered no research validating ICW as a measure of language or investigating its relationship with other related skills such as memory. This is somewhat surprising given our primary aim to work in the context of a robust evidence base. SLTs who use ICWs as a clinical measure may reasonably assume that it correlates with memory or other language measures but this assumption has never been investigated. It is difficult to interpret ICW as a level of language ability or implement this construct in therapeutic goals when there is no evidence of its validity, for example via its relationship to any other relevant measures.

1 ICWs – an overview

The term ICW refers specifically to the number of words which give the specific information in any given instruction or sentence, i.e. the amount of information in an instruction, which the child is required to remember and act upon. It is therefore reasonable that therapists would assume a relationship between children's receptive ICW performance, their receptive language abilities and their memory abilities. However, calculating the number of ICWs is not as straightforward as simply counting the words that provide information in the sentence. In order to assess the

number of ICWs in each instruction the SLT must ascertain how much of the instruction is made redundant by the contextual information available to the child, i.e. given the context, only the words that a child **must** understand in order to respond correctly are considered to be the ICWs. For example, if a child is offered a plate of biscuits, with the accompanying question 'Would you like a biscuit?' it is likely that the child will take one, but the extent to which the child fully understood the language in the question remains unknown. It could be that the child's response was to the speaker's tone of voice, their gesture, eye pointing and the overall physical context. In this situation the instruction would be categorized as having no ICWs. If however the child was offered a plate on which there were biscuits, cakes and sweets, with the instruction 'Take a biscuit' then we might at least assume that the child understood the name of the food item. The verb *take* might be considered somewhat redundant as it could be interpreted from the context. The number of words that the child **must** understand in this instruction is therefore categorized as one – the instruction is at a one or single ICW level. Previous instructions given will also effect how the contextual information is interpreted. For example, if a child had already carried out the instruction 'Give the biscuit to teddy' and was then told to 'Take a biscuit' the word *take* would no longer be considered contextually redundant and the sentence 'Take a biscuit' would be considered to have two ICWs. Therefore, depending on the context, the same instruction could be considered to have a different number of ICWs.

It is also important to acknowledge that number of ICWs is an approximate measure within any sentence framework, as the level of vocabulary, the overall length of the instruction, the position of the information within the sentence, the syntactic form and the nature of the context will all affect its level of difficulty. All of these factors can reasonably be assumed to relate to the child's general language ability and

accordingly we would expect a relationship between receptive language abilities and ICW score. It is often assumed in the literature that children's abilities on one receptive language measure are reflective of their abilities on another. Researchers that language-match two groups of children based on the results from one language assessment are operating on this premise. For example, Donlan et al. (1998) and Montgomery (1995) language-matched (receptively) using the test results from the Test for the Reception of Grammar (TROG) (Bishop, 1989), Norbury et al. (2002) using those from the British Picture Vocabulary Scales (BPVS) (Dunn et al., 1982) and Durkin and Conti-Ramsden (2007) using the word classes subtest from the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals (CELF –R) (Semel et al., 1987), stating that it is used widely in the literature and considered a good indicator of language skills. Other studies have language matched using the expressive measure, mean length of utterance (MLU) (see Eisenberg et al., 2001; Riches, 2012). Research identifying sentence recall as a discriminating marker of specific language impairment (SLI) (sensitive to individual differences in language ability) (Conti-Ramsden et al., 2001) is also suggesting that this single measure of language ability is reflective of a more general language competence. Therefore we might predict that ICW score, as an individual measure, will be strongly associated with global language ability. However, this has never been investigated.

It is also noteworthy that when using the ICW construct it is not intended to be a reflection of children's receptive vocabulary. In fact therapists often ensure that children understand the vocabulary items in the instruction in order that the measure relates to number of ICWs recalled. In this regard it is measuring something quite different from the range of language skills assessed in standardized language measures and we might expect that it would be more closely associated with measures

of memory. Many studies have focused on memory in relation to different aspects of receptive language; in standardized tests (Leonard et al., 2007; Montgomery and Windsor, 2007), at single word level (Gray, 2004), at sentence level (both simple and complex) (Montgomery 1995, 2000a, 2000b, 2004, Montgomery and Evans 2009; Frizelle and Fletcher 2014; Norbury *et al.* 2002) and in narrative (Montgomery et al., 2009). However there are no studies exploring memory in relation to the ICW construct, a measure of early language ability that is commonly used clinically. An understanding of this relationship would provide us with better knowledge to inform diagnostic accuracy, to interpret children's performance on tasks designed to assess ICW level and to assist in the selection of more meaningful interventions.

Memory research in children with language impairment (LI) has primarily been carried out with respect to two dominant models, that of Baddeley and Hitch (Baddeley, 2003; Baddeley and Hitch, 1974) and Daneman and Carpenter (1980). Assessment measures used in the current study are based on the Baddeley and Hitch model.

2 Baddeley Memory Model

In this model working memory is a multidimensional system, composed of three separate but interactive components (Bayliss et al., 2005) – the phonological loop, the visuo-spatial sketchpad and the central executive. The phonological loop is responsible for the short-term storage of verbal information. It has a limited capacity and comprises a phonological store and an articulatory rehearsal system. Incoming speech is stored temporarily in the phonological store and is assumed to fade within about 2 - 3 seconds unless rehearsed by the articulatory rehearsal process. The phonological loop will be referred to henceforth as phonological short-term memory

(pSTM). The visuo-spatial sketchpad is responsible for the short-term storage of visuo-spatial information but is not the focus of the current study. The central executive is a resource limited, domain general system and is responsible for the regulation and co-ordination of information in both the phonological loop and the visuo-spatial sketchpad. Together, the functions of the central executive and phonological loop support the temporary storage and processing of verbal information. This is referred to as working memory (WM). Therefore, while pSTM is responsible for the short-term storage of verbal material, WM always involves an additional element of processing.

3 Memory in children with LI

Regarding studies investigating memory in children with LI in relation to sentence comprehension, results appear mixed. Results from studies carried out by Montgomery (1995), Montgomery and Evans (2009), and Norbury et al. (2002) suggest a correlation between phonological short-term memory (pSTM) and children's comprehension of simple (subject-verb-object) constructions. While other studies showed no such correlation (Montgomery 2000a, 2000b, 2004). In relation to more complex structures (such as passives, pronominals and reflexives) Montgomery and Evans (2009) reported a significant correlation between working memory and these sentence types. Frizelle and Fletcher (2014) reported on memory in relation to relative clause constructions of varying degrees of difficulty and found a significant association between WM and the more complex relative clause constructions and a significant association between pSTM and the least difficult construction. They suggested a synergistic relationship between components of memory and the degree of difficulty of the sentence that is being processed. However, the aforementioned

studies are difficult to interpret in relation to the current study as (1) their focus is on children's understanding of syntactic structures and (2) with the exception of Frizelle and Fletcher (2014) they assess both pSTM and working memory using a single measure (rather than a composite score). Considering the memory literature overall, the reported associations between memory and language in children with LI, and the fact that receptive ICW score is a numeric calculated on the basis of *number of lexical items* the child must act upon in the instruction in order to carry it out correctly, we could reasonably assume an association between children's ICW score and their memory skills.

However, despite the number of studies that have investigated the relationship between memory and both simple and complex sentences, the issue of how memory might relate to children's ability to understand sentences containing different numbers of ICWs has never been addressed.

The current paper aims to address the gap in our research and clinical knowledge by attempting to validate ICW as a clinical measure in relation to standardized measures of memory and language.

The following research questions are considered:

1. Is there a relationship between the receptive ICW score of children with LI and their performance on standardized memory and language assessments?
2. If a relationship does exist what are the relative contributions of language and memory to the ICW scores of children with LI?
3. Which of the two variables (language or memory) makes the greater contribution to the ICW scores of children with LI?

II Methodology

1 Participants

Forty children with LI, between the ages of 5;07 and 8;11 years, were recruited in to the study. Thirteen of the children were subsequently excluded as a result of not meeting the LI diagnostic criteria or failing the hearing screen. The participants included consisted of 17 boys and 10 girls, with a mean age of 7;01 years (SD = 12.57 months). In order to participate in the study children were required to score below -1.25 standard deviations (SD) on the composite scores derived from either the receptive or expressive language subtests of the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals (CELF-4) (Semel et al., 2006). See Table 1 for descriptive statistics.

Table 1. Summary of group characteristics and performance scores on standardised assessments.

Measure	Mean	SD	Min – Max
Age	7;1 years	1.05 years	5;7 – 8;11 years
IQ SS	98.89	10.95	85 – 125
ICW score (out of 240)	193.74	17.05	169 – 229
Receptive language RS	55.59	11.52	30 – 71
Receptive language SS	76.74	10.90	57 – 96
Expressive language RS	68.44	15.33	36 – 103
Expressive language SS	77.26	7.07	65 – 93
Phonological short-term memory RS	64.93	10.27	44 – 78
Phonological short-term memory SS	87.41	12.16	57 – 110
Working memory RS	25.04	6.36	14 – 43
Working memory SS	74.30	8.11	55 – 92

Notes: ICW = information carrying word, SS = standard score, RS = raw score

Of the twenty-seven children, five met the language inclusion criteria based on their receptive language scores, six on expressive language scores and sixteen based on their performance on both receptive and expressive measures. Children were also required to demonstrate cognitive ability within the normal range (achieve a score of 85 or greater on The Raven's test of Progressive Matrices (Raven, 2008)) and pass a hearing screen in both ears, administered at 25dB and at three frequencies (1000 Hz, 2000 Hz and 4000 Hz). These are the most common frequencies and hearing levels at which young children are consistently screened (as documented by Bamford et al. in the NHS – Current Practice, accuracy and effectiveness report, 2007). Based on speech and language therapy (SLT) reports, children were excluded on the basis of a previous diagnosis of Autistic Spectrum Disorder, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, major physical disabilities, an intellectual disability or a hearing impairment. Children were recruited from clinics in a city in Southern Ireland, and were either attending or waitlisted for SLT. Written ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Cork Teaching Hospitals Clinical Research Ethics Committee.

2 Performance measures

Measures relevant to the current study were collected to represent five sets of variables: (1) children's ability to understand sentences with an increasing number of ICWs, (2) children's phonological short-term memory skills, (3) children's working memory skills, (4) children's receptive language skills and (5) children's expressive language skills.

ICW Sentence Comprehension Task – The ICW sentence comprehension task was adapted from the Token Test (McGhee et al., 2007). Instructions, increasing in the number of ICWs (matched for syllable length), were spoken by two female SLTs of

similar age and the children were required to carry out each instruction by manipulating real objects (tokens) of different size, colour and shape. The Token Test was designed for use with children aged 3 to 12 years. The task in the current study consisted of 46 instructions presented in two blocks of 23. An example of the test instructions given is shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Examples of test instructions given for ICW task.

Section	Instruction
Section 1	Touch the large blue square
	Touch the small white circle
Section 2	Touch the blue square and the yellow square
	Touch the red square and the white circle
Section 3	Touch the small blue square and the large red square
	Touch the large yellow square and the small red circle
Section 4	Touch the square to the right of the yellow square after touching the blue circle
	Except for the square to the left of the red square, touch all the squares

Note: Information carrying words (ICWs) are underlined in this table.

The instructions were organised in four sections and increased in the number of ICWs as the child progressed through the task (from three ICWs in section 1 up to 11 ICWs in section 4).

3 Scoring of sentence comprehension task

A score of one was given for each ICW correctly identified within a given instruction. The summation of these scores resulted in a total ICW score for each child. For example given the instruction *Touch the large white square and the large red circle* a

child could score a total of 6, as there are six ICWs in this sentence (the words *Touch the* are not included as they are used repeatedly throughout the first three sections). However, if the child touched the *large* ***white*** ***square*** *and the* ***small*** *red* ***square*** they would score 4. The total score for each child across all sections gave a value on which children could be compared.

4 Memory tasks

Children's memory functioning was assessed using the Working Memory Test Battery for Children (WMTB-C; Pickering and Gathercole, 2001). This test consists of eight subtests, designed to assess the phonological loop, visuo-spatial sketchpad and central executive components of Baddeley's (2003) model of working memory (for validation study see Gathercole et al., 2004). For the purposes of this study the tests assessing the phonological loop (pSTM) and the central executive (working memory) components were administered.

Phonological short-term memory (pSTM) was measured using four subtests; *digit recall, word list matching, word list recall* and *non-word list recall*. Three of these measures (*digit recall, word list recall* and *non-word list recall*) use an immediate serial recall paradigm where children are asked to temporarily store and then recall digits, words or non-words. A span is then calculated based on the level at which the child can recall. The fourth measure requires that the child judges whether two spoken word sequences are identical or not. All four subtests provide a composite score of pSTM.

Children's WM skills were measured using the *listening recall, counting recall* and *backward digit recall* subtests. All of these measures require both storage and processing of information. The *listening recall* subtest is an adaptation of the

Competing Language Processing Task (Gaulin and Campell, 1994). The child is required to make a truth-value judgement about a sentence presented aurally (for example – *fish can swim*) while at the same time trying to recall the final word in the sentence. The sentences are arranged in groups reflecting six levels of difficulty. In level 1 the child must only understand one sentence and recall the last word of that sentence, while at level six the child must understand all six sentences in the group and then recall the final word of each previously presented sentence. The *counting recall* task (based on that by Case et al., 1982) requires the child to count the number of randomly presented target dots in a series of displays and to recall the tally of each presentation. The *backward digit recall* subtest requires the child to repeat a list of digits in reverse order. A span is calculated for each subtest based on the level at which the child can recall. Combined performance on the three subtests is represented in a composite WM score. As we were interested in investigating the memory abilities of children with different ICW scores we did not want to adapt for age, we therefore used raw scores rather than standard scores in the statistical analyses.

5 Language tasks

The language measures administered were the receptive and expressive subtests of the CELF- 4 (Semel et al., 2006). The receptive subtests administered were *Concepts and Following Directions, Word Classes – Receptive* and *Sentence Structure*. The *Concepts and Following Directions* subtest assesses a child's ability to understand spoken instructions of increasing length and complexity, which contain concepts of inclusion / exclusion, location, sequence and time e.g. *Point to the apple in the top row and the fish in the bottom row*. The child is also required to remember the order in which the objects and concepts are given. The *Word Classes – Receptive* subtest

examines a child's ability to understand relationships between words that are semantically related. The child is presented with either three or four named pictures and must identify the two words that go together best e.g. *butterfly, caterpillar, kitten*. The *Sentence Structure* subtest evaluates a child's ability to understand spoken sentences increasing in length and syntactic complexity and to select pictures from a choice of four, which represent the meaning of each sentence e.g. *The woman who is holding the baby dropped her handbag*.

The expressive subtests completed were *Word Structure, Recalling Sentences* and *Formulated Sentences.* The *Word Structure* subtest assesses a child's ability to apply morphological rules, marking inflections, derivations and comparisons e.g. *This man sings, he is called a* _____. It also assesses the child's ability to use appropriate pronouns to refer to people, objects and possessive relationships, e.g. *She is waving at* ____ *and he is waving at* ____. The *Recalling Sentences* subtest evaluates the child's ability to listen to spoken sentences of increasing length and complexity and to repeat those sentences verbatim, i.e. without changing the word meanings, morphology or syntax. An example sentence is *The rabbit was not put in the cage by the girl.* The *Formulated Sentences* subtest examines the child's ability to orally generate complete semantically and grammatically correct sentences of increasing complexity, using specific words (e.g. *forgot, always, when*) and contextually constrained by illustrations given. Again raw scores were used in the statistical analyses.

III Results

1 Descriptive statistics

Table 1 provides a summary of the mean, SD and range for each of the measures. Both standard scores and raw scores are given for each of the language and memory measures.

2 Relationships between ICW scores, age, language skills and memory

Table 3 provides a summary of the correlations between the measures.

Table 3. Correlations among independent and dependent variables.

Measure	1. ICW	2. Age	3. IQ	4. Rec	5. Exp	6. pSTM	7. WM
1. ICW score	–						
2. Age	.58**	–					
3. IQ	.29	-.08	–				
4. Rec	.73***	.67***	.03	–			
5. Exp	.68***	.71***	.17	.52**	–		
6. pSTM	.52**	.603**	.18	.64***	.66***	–	
7. WM	.72***	.79***	.16	.45*	.602**	.57**	–

Notes: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

ICW = information carrying word, Rec = receptive language, Exp = expressive language, pSTM = phonological short-term memory, WM = working memory

Correlations between the ICW scores and both the receptive language ($r = .73$, $p < .001$) and working memory measures ($r = .72$, $p < .001$) were highly significant. Using Davis (1971) criteria for interpreting the magnitude of correlation co-efficients these are classified as *very strong associations*. The correlations between ICW and expressive language scores ($r = .68$, $p < .001$) and between ICW and pSTM (pSTM $r = .52$, $p < .01$) were also significant and are classified as *substantial associations* (Davis, 1971). ICW score was also highly correlated with age (again a substantial

association). There was no correlation between ICW score and IQ. There was no evidence of collinearity amongst the independent variables. Initial examination of gender indicated that it was not significantly associated with ICW score. Furthermore interactions between gender and each memory and language variable were not significant.

To investigate the independent contributions of age, language skills and memory to ICW scores, a series of hierarchical regression analyses were conducted (regression analyses in which all variables were entered in blocks of related measures) using ICW scores as the dependent variable. In the first two models age was entered in the first block in order to control for its effect on the children's performance on the task. In the first model the second block consisted of receptive and expressive language scores in order to evaluate the role of language skills in ICW score above and beyond the developmental influences of age. The third block consisted of the two memory measures (pSTM and WM) with a view to assessing the relations between ICW score and memory having accounted for age and global language ability.

In the second model the order of entry of the language and memory variables was reversed. The second block consisted of the two memory measures and the third block included the two language measures. This allowed us assess the role of memory in ICW score (having accounted for age) and evaluate the relationship between ICW score and language over and above the contribution of age and memory. By carrying out the analyses in this manner it allowed us investigate whether memory or language was the greater contributor to children's ICW score. Results of the regression analyses are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Multiple Regression Analysis – Models 1 and 2.

Model	Variable	R^2	R^2 increase	*p*
1	*Block 1*			
	Age	.34	.34	.001
	Block 2			
	Receptive language Expressive language	.65	.32	.001
	Block 3			
	Phonological Short-term memory Working memory	.74	.08	.061
2	*Block 1*			
	Age	.34	.34	.001
	Block 2			
	Phonological Short-term memory Working memory	.53	.20	.017
	Block 3			
	Receptive language Expressive language	.74	.20	.003

The total model accounted for a large amount of the variance (74%) in the ICW scores and age explained 34% of that variance ($p < .001$). In the first model an additional 32% of the variance was explained by the inclusion of language ($p < .001$) demonstrating the significant contribution of global language abilities on ICW score. The addition of memory accounted for a further 8% of the variance ($p = .06$), which was not significant. In contrast, in the second model where memory was included in block two in the equation (following age) it accounted for a significant 20% of the variance in ICW score ($p = .017$), while the addition of language accounted for a further 20% ($p < .003$), also significant. In conclusion both analyses showed that language made a significant contribution to children's ICW scores (having accounted

for age). However when language was already in the model, the contribution from the memory variables did not reach significance.

Examining the regression co-efficients for the five independent variables (see Table 5), receptive (p = .014) and expressive language (p = .011) and working memory (p = .02) were significant and all three measures were positively associated with ICW. Age and pSTM were not significant.

Table 5. Regression coefficients for Models 1 and 2.

Variable	β	95% CI	*p*
Age	-0.57	-1.18 – 0.05	.069
Receptive language	0.67	0.15 – 1.19	.014
Expressive language	0.50	0.13 – 0.87	.011
Phonological short-term memory	-0.002	-0.53 – 0.53	.995
Working memory	1.29	0.23 – 2.36	.02

IV Discussion

The motivation for conducting this study came from the lack of research into the relationship between ICWs, language and memory skills and therefore an absence of validation in relation to the ICW construct. Addressing this knowledge gap is particularly important due to the recent survey (Morgan et al., 2013) indicating that almost all SLTs in the UK use the ICW construct in the treatment of children's receptive language.

1 Relationship between total ICW score, memory and language tests

Our first research question asked whether there is a relationship between the ICW scores of children with LI and their performance on language and memory tests. A

very clear picture emerged. There was a significant relationship between both language and memory measures and children's ICW score, i.e. the higher the ICW score, the higher the children's performance on tests of language and memory. The strongest associations were between ICW score and receptive language and ICW score and working memory – both being classified as *very strong associations* (Davis, 1971).

Our second and third research questions asked about the relative contributions of language and memory to the ICW scores of children with LI. Our results consistently showed the significant contribution of global language skills to ICW score. The contribution of memory was also significant but only when language was not already accounted for. Therefore we can conclude that ICW score as a measure is more closely related to children's language abilities than to their memory skills, i.e. language is the greater contributor in children's ability to do this task.

2 The role of language in ICW score

So how do we interpret these findings? Our results suggest that receptive ICW score is in fact a valid measure of the language ability of children with LI. While therapists may ostensibly assume that this would be the case, it has never been investigated. Previous studies investigating the associations between different language measures report mixed results and it is not always the case that performance on one language measure is a predictor of another. However researchers that language-match on one language test or subtest are assuming that the measure is reflective of a wider set of language skills (Donlan et al., 1998; Montgomery, 1995). Equally, the assertion that performance on sentence recall is sensitive to individual differences in language ability (Archibald and Joanisse, 2009), and a strong psycholinguistic marker of SLI

(Conti-Ramsden et al., 2001) is based on the premise that this measure is reflective of more general language competence. We might therefore consider the very strong association between ICW score and global language skills somewhat unsurprising.

However, in this study (with the exception of the final section) the set of vocabulary items were primarily limited to colour shape and size and the items were repeated in different combinations throughout the task. They were also chosen on the basis that they would be familiar to young children and therefore by design were not stretching children to their receptive language limits. In this respect we may not have anticipated an association between children's ICW scores and their global language skills, (receptive language skills in particular) but even within this context a strong association emerged.

3 The role of memory in ICW score

Our results suggest that memory overall plays a smaller role than language in children's ICW scores. Despite strong memory associations shown in the initial correlations, if we examine the five variables fitted in the regression model we can see that the role of memory overall is diminished due to the non-significant contribution of pSTM. While other studies have shown correlations between pSTM, WM and sentence comprehension in children with LI (Montgomery, 1995; Montgomery and Evans, 2009; Norbury et al., 2002), as previously outlined they are difficult to interpret in the context of the current study. Studies researching the relationship between memory and sentence comprehension in children with LI have tended to focus on syntactic structures, with many assessing each memory component using a single subtest. More importantly, other studies have looked directly at the association between memory and a previously validated measure of language. In contrast, in the

current study we were trying to validate ICW score as a measure of language and were therefore interested in the contribution of memory to this construct both when language had and had not been accounted for. Although the contribution of memory was not significant having accounted for language, the working memory component was significant in the final model and the pSTM component was not. We could also argue that in the current study the contribution of pSTM to ICW scores may have been diminished due to the restrictive and repetitive nature of the vocabulary utilised in three out of the four sections and as a result of the visual supports provided by the tokens, therefore requiring each child to recall the vocabulary from a small lexical set.

Given the overlapping skills required in how both working memory and ICW score are assessed our results are not surprising – each measure requiring the child to store an amount of linguistic material in their pSTM and then process that material for meaning by acting on it in some way. It could also be argued that the smaller vocabulary set of semantically related items (used repeatedly in our assessment) could lead to a considerable amount of interference for children with LI. This would require the children to engage in the process of inhibition and increase their dependence on working memory. The strong association between WM and ICW score suggests that even when given instructions specifically controlled for number of ICWs, where other aspects of the sentence are contextually redundant, children with LI try to process the sentence as a complete unit, and it is only when they have processed the entire instruction that they can decide which elements of the sentence are contextually accounted for. SLTs should therefore be cognisant of all elements of the sentence when using this construct and not assume the child is immediately aware of contextual redundancy.

V Conclusions and Implications

Our findings indicate that ICW score is in fact a valid measure of the language ability of children with LI. When using this construct SLTs can now be confident that it is associated with other relevant standardized measures of language. However ICW score is also strongly associated with children's working memory ability and therapists need to be cognisant of this association when using the ICW construct in either assessment or intervention. It is possible that the association with working memory could be reduced by utilizing a more semantically diverse vocabulary set but this would need further investigation.

Declaration of conflicting interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Funding

This work was supported by a Health Research Award, research grant HRA_POR /2012/68 from the Irish Health Research Board.

References

Archibald LMD and Joanisse MF (2009) On the sensitivity and specificity of nonword repetition and sentence recall to language and memory impairments in children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 52: 899–914

Baddeley A (2003) Working memory and language: An overview. *Journal of Communication Disorders* 36: 189–208.

Baddeley and Hitch (1974) Working memory. In: Bower GA (eds) *Psychology of learning and motivation,* volume 8. New York: Academic Press, pp. 47–89.

Bamford J, Fortnum H, Bristow K, Smith J, Vamvakas G, Davies L, Taylor R, Watkin P, Fonseca S, Davis A and Hind S (2007) Current practice, accuracy, effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the school entry hearing screen. *Health Technology Assessment* 11(32): 5–16.

Bayliss DM, Jarrold C, Baddeley AD and Gunn DM (2005) The relationship between short-term memory and working memory: complex span made simple? *Memory* 13(3-4): 414–421.

Bishop DVM (1989) *Test of Reception of Grammar (TROG)*. Manchester, England: University of Manchester

Case R, Kurland MD and Goldberg J (1982) Operational efficiency and the growth of short-term memory span. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* 33: 386–404.

Conti-Ramsden G, Botting N and Faragher B (2001) Psycholinguistic markers for Specific Language Impairment (SLI). *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 42(6): 741–748.

Daneman M and Carpenter P (1980) Individual differences in working memory and reading. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 19: 450–466.

Davis JA (1971) *Elementary survey analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice–Hall.

Donlan C, Bishop DVM and Hitch GJ (1998) Magnitude comparisons by children with specific language impairments: Evidence of unimpaired symbolic processing. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders* 33(2): 149–160.

Dunn LM, Dunn DM, Whetton CW and Pintillie D (1982) *The British Picture Vocabulary Scales (BPVS)*. Windsor, UK: NFER Nelson.

Durkin K and Conti-Ramsden G (2007) Language, social behavior, and the quality of friendships in adolescents with and without a history of specific language impairment. *Child Development* 78(5): Pages 1441–1457.

Eisenberg SL, McGovern Fersko T and Lundgren C (2001) The use of MLU for identifying language impairment in preschool children: A review. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology* 10: 323–342

Frizelle P and Fletcher P (2014, in press) The role of memory in processing relative clauses in children with specific language impairment. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology.*

Gathercole SE, Pickering SJ, Ambridge B and Wearing H (2004) The structure of working memory from 4 to 15 years of age. *Developmental Psychology* 40: 177-190.

Gaulin C and Campbell T (1994) Procedure for assessing verbal working memory in normal school-age children: some preliminary data. *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 79: 55–64.

Gray S (2004) The relationship between phonological memory, receptive vocabulary, and fast mapping in young children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 49: 955–969.

Knowles W and Masidlover M (1982) *The Derbyshire Language Scheme*. Derby: Derbyshire County Council.

Leonard L, Ellis Weismer S, Miller C, Francis D, Tomblin J and Kail R (2007) Speed of processing, working memory, and language impairment in children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 50: 408–428.

Mcghee RL, Ehrler DJ and Disimoni F (2007) *Token Test for Children (TTFC – 2)*. 2nd edition. Texas: PRO-ED Inc.

Montgomery J (1995) Sentence comprehension in children with specific language impairment: The role of phonological working memory. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research* 38: 187–199.

Montgomery J (2000a) Relation of working memory to off-line and real-time sentence processing in children with specific language impairment. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 21: 117–148.

Montgomery J (2000b) Verbal working memory and sentence comprehension in children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 43: 293–308.

Montgomery J (2004) Sentence comprehension in children with specific language impairment: Effects of input rate and phonological working memory. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders* 39: 115–134.

Montgomery J and Evans J (2009) Complex sentence comprehension and working memory in children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research* 52(2): 269–288.

Montgomery JW, Polunenko A and Marinellie SA (2009) Role of working memory in children's understanding spoken narrative: A preliminary investigation. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 30(3): 485–509.

Montgomery JW and Windsor J (2007) Examining the language performances of children with and without specific language impairment: Contributions of phonological short term memory and speed of processing. *Journal of Speech Language and Hearing Research* 50: 778–797.

Morgan L, Marshall J, Harding S and Roulstone S (2013) Why do SLTs adapt the therapy they provide? *Bulletin* 738(10): 16–18.

Norbury C, Bishop D and Briscoe J (2002) Does impaired grammatical comprehension provide evidence of an innate grammar module? *Applied Psycholinguistics* 23: 247–268.

Pickering SJ and Gathercole SE (2001) *Working Memory Test Battery for Children (WMTB-C)*. London: Pearson Assessment.

Raven JC (2008*) Raven's – Educational: CPM/CVS*. London: Pearson Assessment.

Riches NG (2012) Sentence repetition in children with specific language impairment: an investigation of underlying mechanisms. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders* 47(5): 499–510.

Semel E, Wiig E and Secord W (1987) *Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals – Revised (CELF-R)*. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation

Semel E, Wiig EH and Secord WA (2006) *Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals – 4, UK Standardisation (CELF–4 UK.)*. London: Pearson Assessment.