

# Newcastle University e-prints

---

**Date deposited:** 18th April 2011

**Version of file:** Preprint

**Peer Review Status:** Not Peer Reviewed

## Citation for published item:

Loucas T, Riches NG, Charman T, Pickles A, Simonoff E, Chandler S, Baird G. [Speech perception and phonological short-term memory capacity in language impairment: preliminary evidence from adolescents with specific language impairment \(SLI\) and autism spectrum disorders \(ASD\)](#). *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders* 2009, **45**(3), 275-286.

## Further information on publisher website:

[http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)1460-6984](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1460-6984)

## Publishers copyright statement:

This paper (c) Royal College of Speech & Language Therapists, and is available with access permissions, from the DOI below:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/13682820902936433>

Always use the definitive version when citing.

## Use Policy:

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not for profit purposes provided that:

- A full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- A link is made to the metadata record in Newcastle E-prints
- The full text is not changed in any way.

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

<p><b>Robinson Library, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, Newcastle upon Tyne. NE1 7RU. Tel. 0191 222 6000</b></p>
---

**Speech perceptual and phonological short-term memory deficits in language  
impairment: Evidence from adolescents with ASD and SLI**

Tom Loucas\*, Nick Riches, Tony Charman, Andrew Pickles, Emily Simonoff, Susie  
Chandler & Gillian Baird

Correspondence to:

\*Tom Loucas, School of Psychology and Clinical Language Sciences, University of Reading,  
Harry Pitt Building, Earley Gate, Reading, RG6 6AL, United Kingdom,  
[t.loucas@reading.ac.uk](mailto:t.loucas@reading.ac.uk)

Running Head: Loucas *et al.*  
Speech perceptual and phonological STM deficits

Word count: 6,805

## **Abstract**

**Purpose:** The cognitive bases of language impairment in autism spectrum disorders (ASD) and specific language impairment (SLI) were investigated in a novel nonword comparison task which manipulated phonological short term memory (PSTM) and speech perception, both implicated in poor nonword repetition.

**Method & Procedures:** Three groups of adolescents (aged 14 to 17), 14 with SLI, 16 with ASD and language impairment, and 17 age- and IQ-matched typically developing controls, made speeded discrimination between two or four syllable nonword pairs involving mismatches on an initial or medial segment.

**Outcomes & Results:** Reaction times showed effects of both word length and mismatch position and these factors interacted: Four syllable and word initial mismatch stimuli resulted in slower decisions and more errors. Individuals with language impairment showed the same pattern of performance as those with typical development in the reaction time data. The ALI participants made significantly more errors than the TD group on long items and the SLI group showed a trend in this direction, while making more errors overall than the TD group.

**Conclusions:** Reaction time data provide evidenced for unimpaired PSTM and speech perception in adolescents with language impairment. However, adolescents with language impairment were less accurate than TD individuals. Both of the ALI and SLI groups showed a clear effect of PSTM load, but the effect was stronger in the ALI group whereas the SLI group also made more errors overall. This may reflect different underlying causes of poor nonword processing in NWD and nonword repetition in SLI and ALI.

**KEY WORDS:** language disorders, specific language impairment, autism spectrum disorders, nonword repetition tasks, phonological working memory, speech perception

## **What This Paper Adds**

Children with language deficits are poor at repeating nonsense words. There is evidence that the underlying causes of poor nonword repetition may be different in different developmental disorders associated with language impairment, such as specific language impairment (SLI) and autism spectrum disorders (ASD). Understanding the different possible causes of poor nonword repetition is complicated because it relies on intact speech perception and speech output, and phonological short-term memory (PSTM) and it is not possible to tease these processes apart within the task. The present study uses a new nonword discrimination (NWD) task which simultaneously manipulates PSTM and speech perception load and does not require any speech output.

The results suggest that adolescents with SLI and ASD plus language impairment do not show disproportionate effects of PSTM or speech perception load compared to age-matched controls when their correct-decision reaction times are considered. Adolescents with language impairment are less accurate than TD individuals, with both the ALI and SLI groups showing a clear effect of PSTM load. However, the effect was stronger in the ALI group, whereas the SLI group also made more errors overall. This may reflect different underlying causes of poor nonword processing in NWD and nonword repetition in SLI and ALI.

## **Introduction**

The challenge of understanding the nature of language impairment requires both careful consideration of the range of developmental disorders that are associated with language impairment and the cognitive basis of impaired language behaviour.

Methodological approaches that address both of these issues can help us meet this challenge.

Direct comparisons between different disorders allow us to ask if language presentation is the same in different patterns of atypical development. Probing the underlying nature of the impairment requires methodological approaches that address the cognitive processes which may drive surface behaviours. Here we attempt to combine these approaches to investigate the possible cognitive bases of language impairment in autism spectrum disorders (ASD) and specific language impairment (SLI).

ASD and SLI are common developmental disorders associated with language impairment. Where structural language abilities (phonology, semantics, syntax and morphology) have been the focus of investigations into SLI (for a review see Leonard, 1998), pragmatic impairments have driven research into language and communication in ASD, as difficulties in this area are almost universal and found regardless of level of intellectual functioning (Tager-Flusberg, Lord & Paul, 2005). Structural language impairments are associated with ASD (for a review see, Tager-Flusberg, Lord & Paul, 2005), but understanding the nature of these language deficits is complicated by the great heterogeneity of language and cognitive abilities within this population. Epidemiological studies indicate about half of children have intellectual disabilities (Baird et al., 2006) and language impairment could be seen as the result of a general lowering of intellectual functioning. However, recently, Tager-Flusberg and colleagues (Kjelgaard & Tager-Flusberg, 2001; Roberts et al. 2004) have identified an ASD subgroup which presents with language impairment in the context of nonverbal skills within the average range (Autistic Language

Impairment: henceforth, ALI). This psychometric profile typical of SLI, invites the comparison between ALI and SLI.

Deficits can present at all structural levels of language in SLI, but production of grammatical morphology appears to be disproportionately impaired relative to other areas of language and these deficits are a reliable clinical marker for SLI (Rice et al., 2000). For example, English speaking children with SLI omit morphemes marking tense, such as third-person singular –s and past tense –ed, to a greater degree than their general delay in language acquisition. Children with ALI show similar high rates of omission of third-person singular and past tense morphemes (Roberts et al., 2004). A second clinical marker for SLI that has received a lot of attention is nonword repetition (Bishop, North, & Donlan, 1996). In nonword repetition individuals repeat nonsense words consisting of different numbers of syllables and it is argued to be a relatively pure measure of phonological short-term memory (PSTM) (Gathercole & Baddeley, 1989). By storing verbal input temporarily, PSTM allows other cognitive tasks such as verbal comprehension to take place and allows phonological information, such as word form representations, to be transferred to long-term memory (Montgomery, 2003). The importance of nonword repetition in understanding the aetiology of SLI has been underscored by recent evidence that poor nonword repetition is strongly associated with a quantitative trait locus on chromosome 16q (SLIC, 2004).

Nonword repetition also appears to be weak in children with ASD; although they may show less impairment than those with SLI. Kjelgaard and Tager-Flusberg (2001) reported that children with ALI had nonword repetition scores more than one standard deviation below the mean and although a group with ASD but no language impairment showed nonword repetition within the average range, the difference between the groups was not significant. Botting and Conti-Ramsden (2003) compared nonword repetition in children with SLI and those with ASD (not distinguishing between those with language impairment and those

without) and found that those with SLI performed more poorly than the children with ASD. However, nonword repetition could not distinguish between SLI and ASD children with an accuracy of 70% or greater. While problems with nonword repetition are common to SLI and ASD the underlying cause of this poor performance may differ in these disorders. Bishop et al. (2004) studied nonword repetition in probands with ASD and their first-degree relatives. They found the expected poor nonword repetition in the probands but not in their parents and siblings, indicating that the deficit was not heritable. This contrasts with the findings for SLI where first-degree relatives present with lower nonword repetition scores than controls (Bishop et al., 1996).

Understanding the different possible causes of poor nonword repetition requires an understanding of the cognitive bases of the task. Nonword repetition is taken to index PSTM, but is a complex task which engages a number of cognitive processes. As a minimum it relies on intact speech perception and speech output, as well as PSTM. In theory any of these processes may be impaired leading to poor nonword repetition. However, the task combines and conflates these different processing demands. If individuals with SLI and ASD present with poor nonword repetition it is not possible to say which of these processes or combination of processes are impaired. Therefore, the aim of this study is to evaluate PSTM and speech perceptual factors by directly manipulating them in a nonword processing task which does not involve an output component.

The nonword processing task presented here systematically varies the PSTM load on the listener by manipulating the length of stimuli (2- and 4-syllable nonwords are used) as in nonword repetition. Speech perception load is varied by manipulating the discriminability of nonwords. Evidence from mispronunciation detection tasks suggests that individuals ability to detect mispronunciations depends on where the deviation occurs in the word; for example, listeners are slower to detect word-initial deviations than word-medial or final ones

(Donselaar, 1996). Listeners are presented with pairs of nonwords, differing either word initially or medially, and required to make a speeded same/different judgment. Performance on this nonword discrimination task (NDW) is expected to depend on the locus on an individual's processing deficit. An individual with a PSTM deficit would be expected to show relatively slower responses and be less accurate to 4-syllable pairs than 2-syllable pairs than individuals with intact PSTM. An individual with a speech perception deficit may be less able to use acoustic-phonetic information early in a word to facilitate discrimination and so show a relatively smaller difference in their response to initial and medial mismatches. This experimental approach to the possible cognitive bases of language impairment is complemented by comparisons between different disorders associated with language deficits, SLI and ALI, which allows us to consider two related questions. What are the contributions of PSTM and speech perceptual factors in nonword processing? Do children with ALI and SLI show similar patterns of deficit in these cognitive processes?

## **Method**

### **Participants**

The study investigated two clinical populations – adolescents with SLI and high-functioning adolescents with ASD with a language impairment (ALI). Twenty-seven adolescents with SLI or ALI were selected from a cohort of children with Special Educational Needs who had been assessed during the Special Needs and Autism Project (SNAP; Baird et al., 2006). A diagnosis of autism was made on the basis of ICD-10 (WHO, 1993) criteria using the Autism Diagnostic Interview-Revised (Lord et al. 1994) Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule -Generic (Lord et al., 2000), and additional information from locally-based assessment and information from schools (full details of the diagnostic process are available in Baird et al. 2006). Participants were categorised as being language impaired if there was a discrepancy between their language abilities, as measured by the Clinical

Evaluation of Language Fundamentals-3rd Edition UK (CELF-3UK; Semel, Wiig, & Secord, 2000), and their non-verbal IQ scores, as measured by the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-III (WISC-III; Wechsler, 1992). The language impairment was defined as a CELF-3UK Receptive, Expressive or Total Language standard score of 77 or below, while the normal nonverbal IQ was defined as a WISC-III Performance IQ or the Perceptual Organisational Index standard score of 80 or above. Overall 16 adolescents with ALI and 11 with SLI were recruited from the SNAP cohort. The participants' language and non-verbal abilities assessed for SNAP, used to establish the groups for this study, were confirmed by retested using British Picture Vocabulary Scale – II (BPVS-II; Dunn et al., 1997), selected subtests from the CELF-3UK (Concepts and Directions (CD) and Recalling Sentences (RS)) and the WISC-III (Picture Arrangement (PA) and Block Design (BD)).

In order to increase numbers in the SLI group, three additional participants with SLI were recruited from outside the SNAP cohort, from special schools for children with language impairment known to clinical services at Guy's Hospital, London. It was not possible to complete the entire test battery of full WISC-III, CELF-3UK, ADOS-G and ADI-R for the additional participants. The ASD status of the adolescents with SLI was established using on the ADOS-G and Social Communication Questionnaire (Rutter et al., 2003).

Seventeen typically-developing (TD) adolescents matched on chronological age with the clinical groups were recruited from a single school in South-West London. The school distributed letters and consent forms with pre-paid envelopes to the parents of all 14 year olds and participants were randomly selected from those who completed a consent form. The language and non-verbal learning abilities of the participants were screened to ensure language and nonverbal skills were in the average range using the CD and RS subtests from the CELF-3UK and PA and BD subtests from the WISC-III. The SCQ was used as an autism screening measure, with no participant obtaining a score greater than 6. Each participant was

offered a small cash sum to recompense their time and effort. All families were added to the research mailing list to keep them informed of the findings of the study.

Table 1 shows the mean (SD) standardised scores the CELF-3UK and WISC-III subtests, together with ages and sex ratios. As expected, a series of univariate ANOVAs and post hoc Tukey HSD tests indicated that the language impairment participants had weaker language skills and similar nonverbal skills than the normal language group, confirming their language impairment status (all  $ps < .05$ ). The TD group were significantly younger than the SLI group, but the three groups were matched on PA and BD scores. Both of the SLI and ALI groups showed lower CD and RS standard scores than the TD group. The participants with SLI and ALI also had lower BPVS scores than the TD participants.

---- Table 1 about here ----

### **Design**

Participants' NWD performance was compared with traditional nonword repetition, using the Children's Test of Nonword Repetition (CNRep) (Gathercole & Baddeley, 1996). In the both the CNRep and NWD diagnostic status (SLI, ALI, TD) was treated as between-subjects independent variable. These groups allowed us to compare language impaired individuals with TD individuals and compare individuals with ALI with individuals with SLI. In NWD stimuli were created by manipulating two factors nonword length (short (2-syllables) or long (4-syllables)) and the position of the mismatching segment (word-initial or word-medial). These factors were crossed to create four conditions – Initial-Short, Initial-Long, Medial-Short, Medial-Long – providing the opportunity to investigate the independent contributions of PSTM and speech perceptual demands and their possible interaction in nonword processing. The Medial-Short condition was expected to be easy for participants regardless of language impairment. Following Donselaar (1996), they were expected to show similar RTs to the TD participants on this condition and so it provided a check on whether the

language impaired participants were able to manage the task demands. In CNRep the dependent variable was overall number correct (accuracy). In NWD both accuracy scores and reaction times to a speeded same/different judgement were recorded.

## **Materials**

### **Children's Test of Nonword Repetition**

The participants were administered the Children's Test of Nonword Repetition (CNRep) (Gathercole & Baddeley, 1996). The CNRep consists of 40 items ranging from two to five syllables in length, with ten items for each syllable length. The stress patterns of the words conform to the dominant stress patterns in English, and the nonwords are phonologically complex, with both branching onsets (e.g. consonant clusters) and branching nuclei (e.g. long vowels, diphthongs and codas). Some of the words contain syntactic morphemes (e.g. -ing), and derivational morphemes (e.g. -er, -ist) and many sound like English words.

### **Speeded Nonword Discrimination**

NWD stimuli consisted of 40 nonword pairs which differed minimally and 40 nonword pairs which were the same. The latter acted as fillers items to ensure the probability of making a same or different response was the same. All nonwords, experimental stimuli and fillers, were generated using the same procedure. The CELEX database (Burnage, 1990) was used to determine the most common 2- and 4-syllable structures in English. These were [CV][CVC], [CVV][CVC], [CV][CV][CV][CV], and [CV][CV][CV][CVC] which accounted for 1.6%, 1.6%, .32% and .26% of the total word tokens for the spoken and written databases. A randomised procedure was used to generate nonwords. First, all of the words with a particular syllable structure were entered into a database. Then, within each syllable position, the syllables were randomly rearranged. From the list of randomly generated nonwords 20 of each syllable structure were selected for their word-likeness by two raters with a background

in theoretical and clinical linguistics. Half of the nonwords (40) were chosen at random, and a mismatch version was generated.

In constructing the mismatching stimuli the aim was to provide a challenge to the speech perceptual system, whilst avoiding highly confusable contrasts. Single feature deviations were used as they are harder to detect than two or more feature deviations (e.g., Goldinger, 1996; van Donsellaar, 1996). Deviations in place of articulation were used because they are more confusable than deviations in other phonetic dimensions and so should place more demands on the speech perception system, although the most confusable place contrasts, such as /f/ > /T/ were avoided (Miller & Nicely, 1955). Taking account of these considerations a range of consonants were altered for the mismatching items. The same set of minimal contrasts were used to create mismatching nonwords in the four experimental conditions. When the mismatching segment occurred within a nonword it was chosen from the same set of phonemes used to create the word-initial mismatch items. This ensured the word-medial mismatch items were similar to the word-initial mismatch items. In each condition, six mismatches involved oral stop consonants (p > k, b > d, t > p, t > k, d > g), two mismatches involved nasal stops (m > n), one mismatch involved fricatives (s > Σ), and one mismatch involved approximants (r > j). Eight dummy items were constructed in the same way to be used as warm-up items at the beginning of each half of the experiment.

The stimuli were all recorded in a soundproof booth by a female native speaker of Southern British English. Stimuli were recorded digitally to Minidisk at a sampling rate of 44.1 KHz. For the matched stimuli, two versions of the word were recorded to ensure that participants were not merely using echoic memory to match two identical wave forms. The recorded stimuli were imported onto a speech editing program (Audacity version 1.2.4) and split into individual sound files. The start and end point of each nonword was identified using the speech waveform. Spectrograms were used to set timing trigger points, which were

placed at the beginning of the deviant segment for both the word-initial and word-medial items.

#### Procedure

NWD was implemented using the DMASTR/DMDX software (Forster, 2004). All of the stimuli were presented using a DELL laptop computer, and headphones (Pro-Luxe OA 850). A training session was conducted before the test itself, which allowed the participants to practise the paradigm. Three pairs of pictures were presented and then three word-pairs, as sound files. Pictures were used in order to facilitate the participant's understanding of the paradigm. The participants pressed either the left Shift or the right Shift button to indicate if the pictures words were the same / different. The participants were asked which hand they used to write with, and the same button was allocated to the dominant hand. For example, left-handed participants pressed the left Shift button to indicate same, and the right Shift button to indicate different. These allocations were used in the test itself. During the training, the experimenter emphasised the need to respond as quickly as possibility, and continuously checked the participant's understanding of which key corresponded to same, and which key corresponded to different. If the experimenter had any doubts about the participant's understanding of the paradigm, the training was re-run.

Before commencing the test the participant was reminded to respond as quickly and carefully as possible. Testing commenced upon pressing the Space bar. The participants heard the first word in the pair, followed by a 500 millisecond (msec) pause, and then the second word in the pair. After the second sound file stopped playing there was a 200 millisecond pause before the next pair of sound files. However, the 200 msec pause was cut short whenever the participant made a response. In this way, the experiment was self-paced, with the time lag between the end of the second word, and the beginning of the next word

pair dependent on the participant's response rate, and ranged from 0 to 200 msec. However, the pause between words in a pair was always 500 msec.

The test was divided into two halves of equal length (44 items), and each half began with 4 warm-up items. A short break was inserted in the middle, and participants could move on to the second part of the test when they were ready by pressing the Space bar. In order to control for ordering effects, for example, loss of concentration towards the end of the testing session, the stimuli were presented in one of four orders. Each order was created by first randomising the stimuli, and then systematically swapping items to ensure that there were no runs of more than three same-pairs/different-pairs. Participants were assigned to these four orders as evenly as possible given that not all the groups were divisible by four.

## **Results**

### **CNRep and NWD total scores**

The mean (SD) totals of items correct for CNRep (maximum score = 40) for each diagnostic group are shown in Table 2. These data were compared using a univariate ANOVA with Group (TD, SLI, ALI) as a between-subjects factor. There was as a significant effect Group ( $F(2,44) = 8.91$ ,  $p = .001$ , partial eta-squared = .288). Post hoc Tukey HSD tests revealed that TD group were more accurate than the SLI and ALI groups ( $p < .05$ ) but the SLI and ALI groups did not differ ( $p > .05$ ).

---- Table 2 about here ----

The mean (SD) totals of items correct for NDW (maximum score = 40) for each diagnostic group are also shown in Table 2. NWD scores were also analysed using a univariate ANOVA with Group (TD, SLI, ALI) as a between-subjects factor. Again there was a significant effect of Group ( $F(2,44) = 5.89$ ,  $p = .005$ , partial eta-squared = .211). Post hoc Tukey HSD tests revealed that TD group were more accurate than the SLI group ( $p <$

.05) but the TD and ALI groups did not differ and the SLI and ALI did not differ ( $p > .05$ ) (see Table 2).

### **NWD Reaction times**

Responses for the mismatching items (i.e., the experimental conditions) were used in the analyses. Reaction times (RT) less than 200 msec (4 responses) were treated as pre-emptive responses and excluded from the data. The RTs over the 2000 msec time-out (26 responses) were automatically coded as errors along with the “Same” responses to the mismatching items. All other correct responses to mismatching items were included untransformed in the analyses of RT data (see Table 3).

---- Table 3 about here ----

A mixed ANOVA with Group (TD, SLI, ALI) as a between-subjects factor and Position (Initial, Medial) and Length (Short, Long) as within-subjects factors was used to model the RT data. There was a significant main effect of Position ( $F(1,44) = 46.02$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial eta-squared = .511), RTs were slower to word-initial mismatches ( $M = 862.7$  msec,  $SE = 20.3$ ) than word-medial ones (788.0 msec,  $SE = 16.9$ ), and Length ( $F(1,44) = 102.20$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial eta-squared = .699), RTs were slower to long nonwords (872.8 msec,  $SE = 17.9$ ) than short ones (777.8 msec,  $SE = 18.9$ ). There was also a significant interaction between Position and Length ( $F(1,44) = 20.23$ ,  $p < .001$ , partial eta-squared = .315). But there were no two-way and three-way interactions between Group and the stimulus variables Position and Length (all  $ps > .1$ ). Hence, the groups responded in a similar way to manipulations of mismatch position and stimulus length, suggesting no evidence for a disproportionate effect of increasing either speech perception or PSTM load on the participants with language impairment.

The interaction between Position and Length (shown in Figure 1) was further investigated by analysing simple effects. Initial mismatches generated significantly longer

RTs than medial mismatches for both short items (estimated marginal mean for Initial = 797.2 (SE = 22.2), Medial = 762.0 (17.2);  $F(1,46) = 1701.95$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and long items (Initial = 932.9 (19.0), Medial = 815.6 (17.0);  $F(1,46) = 2379.19$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

---- Figure 1 about here ----

A significant main effect of Group was found ( $F(2, 44) = 3.69$ ,  $p = .033$ , partial eta-squared = .144). Post hoc Tukey HSD tests indicated that the ALI group had slower overall reaction times ( $M = 877.0$ ;  $SD = 106.1$ ) than the TD group ( $M = 768.8$ ;  $SD = 108.3$ ), other comparisons were not significant (SLI:  $M = 835.0$ ;  $SD = 133.1$ ). A univariate ANOVA with group (TD, SLI, ALI) as a between-subjects factor carried out on the RTs for the Short-Medial condition, which was predicted to be the easiest for all participants, showed no effect of Group ( $F(2, 44) = 2.95$ ,  $p = .063$ , partial eta-squared = .118). This suggests that all participants were equally able to meet the task demands.

#### **NWD accuracy scores**

NWD scores are shown in Table 4. NWD scores were also analysed using a mixed ANOVA with Group (TD, SLI, ALI) as a between-subjects factor and Position (Initial, Medial) and Length (Short, Long) as within-subjects factors was used.

---- Table 4 about here ----

The main effect of Length was significant ( $F(1,44) = 13.74$ ,  $p = .001$ , partial eta-squared = .238), participants were less accurate discriminating between long items ( $M = 8.4$ ,  $SD = .2$ ) than short ones ( $M = 9.0$ ,  $SE = .2$ ). But the position of the mismatch did not affect accuracy ( $F(1,44) = 3.02$ ,  $p = .089$ , partial eta-squared = .064) (Initial:  $M = 8.6$ ,  $SE = .2$ ; Medial:  $M = 8.9$ ,  $SE = .2$ ). The interaction between Position and Length in the decision latencies was not found in the accuracy scores ( $p > .1$ ). The interaction between Length and Group approached significance ( $F(2,44) = 2.92$ ,  $p = .064$ , partial eta-squared = .117). The

other two-way and three-way interactions between Group and Position and Length were not significant ( $p > .1$ ).

The marginal interaction between Group and Length was further investigated by analysing simple effects. Both of language impaired groups were less accurate to long items than short ones. This effect was stronger for individuals with ALI (estimated marginal mean for Short = 9.0 (SE = .3), Long = 8.1 (.4);  $F(1,44) = 13.37$ ,  $p = .001$ ) than those with SLI (Short = 8.4 (.3), Long = 7.7 (.4);  $F(1,44) = 5.50$ ,  $p = .024$ ). The TD group did not show this effect (Short = 9.5 (.3), Long = 9.4 (.4);  $p > .1$ ).

## **Discussion**

This study aimed to investigate possible cognitive bases of impaired nonword repetition in ASD and SLI. A novel task, NWD, which manipulated PSTM and speech perception load in a way not possible in nonword repetition, allowed us to investigate the contribution of these factors to nonword processing. We found evidence for both factors influencing decision latencies in individuals with and without language impairment. RTs suggested that adolescents with SLI and ALI were affected by increasing PSTM and speech perception loads in a similar way to TD adolescents. Participant's judgements were slower to 4-syllable compared to 2-syllable nonword pairs and slower to nonword pairs that mismatched on word-initial phonemes as compared to word-medial phonemes. These factors interacted, with 4-syllable, word-initial mismatch pairs leading to slowest decision latencies. In contrast, individuals with language impairment were less accurate for long nonword pairs than TD individuals, suggesting they were disproportionately affected by the PSTM load.

### *Unravelling the roles of PSTM and speech perception in nonword processing*

NWD required the listener to hold stimuli in PSTM in order to compare them. This was more difficult when the items were long, suggesting nonword discrimination is sensitive to PSTM load. This finding replicates a wealth of evidence that PSTM plays an important

role in typical and disordered language processing (for a review see Baddeley, 2003). The position of the deviant segment in mismatching nonword pairs was varied in order to manipulate the speech perception load. All the stimuli were nonwords and so listeners could not rely on lexical knowledge to identify mismatches. However, the ability to use bottom-up information in the form of acoustic-phonetic cues to identify upcoming segments may explain the mismatch position effect. Marslen-Wilson and Warren (1994) found that listeners' real-time lexical access was disrupted by a mismatch between vowel transition and release-burst information in a following consonant, demonstrating listeners' use of fine-grained acoustic-phonetic information in spoken word recognition. Listeners may apply this processing capacity in NWD. When a mismatching segment is word-medial, listeners can compare the current acoustic-phonetic input against their representation of the first nonword, using the information in the vowel preceding the deviant segment to start making a decision, before the segment is encountered. This is not possible for word-initial mismatches, where there is no preceding acoustic-phonetic material. Furthermore, as processing cannot draw on stored lexical representations the discrimination will rely on the representation of the first nonword stored temporarily in PSTM and so both PSTM and speech perception should influence performance, as found. This integration of PSTM and speech perception in language processing is consistent with the model proposed by Jacquemot and Scott (2006) which sees PSTM as a property that emerges from the cycling of information between phonological input and output buffers, the former serving speech perception and the later speech production.

***PLEASE NOTE IMPORTANT COMMENT HERE***

*PSTM and speech perception in SLI and ALI*

NWD was able to provide evidence for PSTM and speech perception interacting during speech processing and we found no evidence in NWD RTs of a disproportionate affect of increasing speech perception or PSTM loads on the ALI and SLI groups. It is possible to argue that in the case of speech perception this is not surprising as the evidence for speech perceptual problems being associated with language impairment is equivocal. Much evidence suggests language impairment is not associated with speech perception deficits. Children with SLI are able to recognise spoken words with the same amount of speech input as children without SLI (Montgomery 1999), and show unimpaired discrimination for synthetic CV strings (Burlingame et al., 2005) and brief nonspeech stimuli (Bishop et al., 2005).

The lack of a PSTM effect in the RTs is more unexpected because of the well-established association between language impairment and deficits in tasks measuring PSTM. However, evidence of length effects were found in the NWD scores which differentiated between individuals with language impairment and those without. This difference between the pattern of results found in RTs and accuracy scores may be explained in the following way. RTs reflect processing when participants make correct responses. In this case, the decision latencies of adolescents with language impairment are influenced by PSTM and speech perception loads in a similar way to TD adolescents. However, individuals with language impairment are less accurate. When they make errors, they are influenced by item length (i.e., by PSTM load) not by mismatch position (i.e., by speech perception load). This suggests speech perception is not impaired in individuals with language impairment, by the time they reach adolescence, whereas PSTM may be.

However this conclusion requires qualification as the ALI and SLI groups do not perform in quite the same way. Both of the showed a clear effect of PSTM load. However, the effect was stronger in the ALI group and the SLI group also made more errors overall.

The SLI and ALI groups were more similar in nonword repetition; their scores were lower than the TD group and did not differ from each other. This could be taken as evidence for the expected impairment in PSTM associated with language impairment. But the NWD accuracy scores suggest that specific effects of PSTM load on nonword processing are found in individuals with ALI, whereas in SLI there is also poorer performance overall. This may indicate in NWD demands other than PSTM load are affecting the performance of individuals with SLI. The differences found in the ASD and SLI groups may reflect different underlying causes of poor nonword processing in these two disorders as Bishop et al. (2004) suggested for nonword repetition. Archibald and Gathercole (2007), comparing serial recall and nonword repetition in ten-year olds with SLI, found nonword repetition deficits persisted even when PSTM load was factored out. They argue that poor nonword repetition performance in SLI is not solely the result of a PSTM deficit and suggest that one or a combination of phonological processing, auditory perception and speech-motor output demands may play a role. NWD may allow the speech-motor demands to be discounted as an explanation. It was designed to probe the effects of speech perception load, but did so in a narrow way and individuals with SLI may have problems with some aspects of phonological and/or auditory processing not tapped by the manipulation of speech perceptual load implemented. Alternatively other factors such as auditory attention may play a role in the pattern of performance shown by the SLI group. Thus, Montgomery (2008) reported that real-time comprehension of simple sentences was associated with indices of auditory attention in 8-year olds with SLI but not age matched controls. However, many children with ASD also showed significant deficits in auditory attention (Corbett & Constantine, 2006). These remain issues for further investigation which may be facilitated by developing the NWD approach introduced here.

### **Conclusions**

This study investigated the cognitive bases of impaired nonword repetition in ASD and SLI using a novel task, NWD, which manipulated PSTM and speech perception load. The reaction time data provide evidence for PSTM and speech perception interacting during speech processing and indicated that adolescents with language impairment were affected by increasing PSTM and speech perception loads in a similar way to typically developing adolescents, without evidence of deficits in either process. Adolescents with language impairment were less accurate than TD individuals, with both the ALI and SLI groups showing a clear effect of PSTM load. However, the effect was stronger in the ALI group whereas the SLI group also made more errors overall. This may reflect different underlying causes of poor nonword processing in NWD and nonword repetition in SLI and ALI. **SEE**

**IMPORTANT COMMENT**

## References

- Archibald, L. M. D., & Gathercole, S. E. (2007). Nonword repetition in specific language impairment: more than a phonological short-term memory deficit. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 14(5), 919-24.
- Baddeley A. (2003). Working memory and language: an overview. *J Commun Disord*. May-Jun; 36(3): 189-208.
- Baird, G., Simonoff, E., Pickles, A., Chandler, S., Loucas, T., Meldrum, D. & Charman, T. (2006). Prevalence of disorders of the autism spectrum in a population cohort of children in South Thames – the special needs and autism project (SNAP). *Lancet*, 368, 210-5.
- Bishop, D. V. M., Adams, C. V., Nation, K., & Rosen, S. (2005). Perception of Transient Nonspeech Stimuli Is Normal in Specific Language Impairment: Evidence from Glide Discrimination. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 26(02), 175-194.
- Bishop, D. V. M., Maybery, M., Wong, D., Maley, A., Hill, W., & Hallmayer, J. (2004). Are phonological processing deficits part of the broad autism phenotype? *American Journal of Medical Genetics. Part B, Neuropsychiatric Genetics*, 128B(1), 54-60.
- Bishop DV, North T, & Donlan C. (1996). Nonword repetition as a behavioural marker for inherited language impairment: evidence from a twin study. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. May; 37(4): 391-403.
- Botting N, & Conti-Ramsden G. (2003). Autism, primary pragmatic difficulties, and specific language impairment: can we distinguish them using psycholinguistic markers? *Dev Med Child Neurol*. Aug; 45(8): 515-24.
- Burlingame, E., Sussman, H. M., Gillam, R. B., & Hay, J. F. (2005). An Investigation of Speech Perception in Children With Specific Language Impairment on a Continuum of Formant Transition Duration. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*, 48(4), 805-816.

- Burnage, G. (1990). CELEX: A Guide for Users. Nijmegen, The Netherlands: CELEX.
- Donselaar, W. van (1996). Mispronunciation detection. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 11(6), 621-628.
- Dunn, L.M., Dunn, L.M., Whetton, C., & Burley, J. (1997). *British Picture Vocabulary Scale: Second Edition*. NFER Nelson.
- Gathercole, S. E., & Baddeley, A. D. (1989). Development of vocabulary in children phonological memory. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 28, 200–213.
- Gathercole, S. & Baddeley, A. (1996) *Children's Test of Nonword Repetition*. Psychological Corporation.
- Goldinger, SD (1996). Auditory lexical decescion. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 11(6), 559-567.
- Jacquemot, C., & Scott, S. K. (2006). What is the relationship between phonological short-term memory and speech processing? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 10(11), 480-486.
- Kjelgaard, M., M. & Tager-Flusberg, H. (2001). An investigation of language impairment Implications for genetic subgroups. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 16, 287-308.
- Leonard, LB (1998). *Children with Specific Language Impairment*. Cambridge: MA.: MIT Press.
- Lord, C., Rutter, M., & Le Couteur, A. (1994). Autism Diagnostic Interview-Revised - A revised version of a diagnostic interview for caregivers of individuals with possible pervasive developmental disorders. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 24, 659-685.
- Lord, C., Risi, S., Lambrecht, L., Cook, E.H., Leventhal, B.L., DiLavore, P.C. et al. (2000). The Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule-Generic: A standard measure of social and communication deficits associated with the spectrum of autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 30, 205-223.

- Marslen-Wilson W, & Warren P (1994). Levels of perceptual representation and process in lexical access: words, phonemes, and features. *Psychol Rev*, 101(4), 653-75.
- Miller GA, & Nicely, PE (1955). An Analysis of Perceptual Confusions Among Some English Consonants. *J Acoustical Society America*, 27(2), 338-352.
- Montgomery JW (1999). Recognition of gated words by children with specific language impairment: an examination of lexical mapping. *J Speech Lang Hear Res*, 42(3):735-43.
- Montgomery JW. (2003). Working memory and comprehension in children with specific language impairment: what we know so far. *J Commun Disord*. May-Jun; 36(3): 221-31.
- Montgomery, J. W. (2008). Role of auditory attention in the real-time processing of simple grammar by children with specific language impairment: a preliminary investigation. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 43(5), 499-527
- Rice ML, Wexler K, Marquis J, & Hershberger S (2000). Acquisition of irregular past tense by children with specific language impairment. *J Speech Lang Hear Res.*, 43(5), 1126-45.
- Roberts JA, Rice, ML, & Tager-Flusberg, H (2004). Tense marking in children with autism. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 25, 429-448.
- Rutter M, Bailey A, & Lord C. (2003). *Social communication question*. Los Angeles, USA: Western Psychological Services.
- Rutter M, Bailey A, & Lord C. (2003). *Social communication question*. Los Angeles, USA: Western Psychological Services.
- Semel, E, Wiig EH, & Secord, W (2000). *Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals® - Third Edition UK (CELF-3 UK)*. The Psychological Corporation.

SLI Consortium (2004). Highly significant linkage to the SLI1 locus in an expanded sample of individuals affected by specific language impairment. *Am J Hum Genet*, 74(6), 1225-38.

Tager-Flusberg, H., Paul, R. & Lord, C. (2005). Language and Communication in autism. In FV, RP, AK and DC (Eds) *Handbook of autism and PDD*. Pp. 335-364. New Jersey: Wiley.

Wechsler, D. (1992). *Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Third Edition - Revised*, UK. The Psychological Corporation.

World Health Organization. (1993). *Mental disorders: a glossary and guide to their classification in accordance with the 10th revision of the international classification of diseases—research diagnostic criteria (ICD-10)*. Geneva: WHO.

Table 1. Age, language and nonverbal abilities of participants (Mean (SD))

	TD (N= 17, 7 females)	SLI (N= 14, 1 female)	ALI (N= 16, 0 females)	ANOVA	Group differences ( $p < .05$ )
Age	172.7 ( 4.2)	180.5 (4.9)	176.3 (5.8)	$F(2, 44) = 13.28, p < .001$	SLI > TD; SLI = ALI; TD = ALI
CD	10.1 (2.6)	4.2 (0.8)	4.5 (1.4)	$F(2, 44) = 44.32, p < .001$	TD > SLI = ALI
RS	9.1 (1.9)	3.8 (1.3)	4.9 (1.6)	$F(2, 44) = 52.30, p < .001$	TD > SLI = ALI
BPVS	106.4 (20.0)	84.5 (7.5)	80.4 (9.0)	$F(2, 44) = 15.82, p < .001$	TD > SLI = ALI
PA	12.7 (3.9)	13.6 (3.0)	12.6 (4.0)	$F(2, 44) = .32, p > .1$	TD = SLI = ALI
BD	9.6 (2.9)	10.1 (3.4)	10.6 (3.3)	$F(2, 44) = .38, p > .1$	TD = SLI = ALI

Table 2. Mean (SD) total scores for CNRep (max = 40) and NWD (max = 40).

	TD	SLI	ALI	Group differences (p < .05)
CNRep	33.4 (3.4)	25.9 (7.0)	28.9 (4.3)	TD>SLI=ALI
NWD	37.8 (1.7)	32.1 (6.3)	34.1 (5.2)	TD>SLI; TD=ALI; SLI=ALI

Table 3: Mean (SD) reaction times for nonword discrimination.

	TD	SLI	ALI
Initial-Short	734.4 (117.0)	815.1 (211.1)	842.0 (120.3)
Initial-Long	857.1 (117.1)	954.1 (136.1)	987.5 (136.2)
Medial-Short	710.2 (126.4)	766.6 (121.0)	809.3 (103.7)
Medial-Long	773.3 (115.8)	804.4 (130.5)	869.1 (103.4)

Table 4. Mean (SD) correct responses by condition for nonword discrimination

	TD	SLI	ALI	Group differences ( $p < .05$ )
Initial-Short	9.2 (1.3)	8.6 (1.6)	9.1 (.9)	TD=SLI=ALI
Initial-Long	9.2 (1.0)	7.6 (1.8)	7.7 (2.2)	TD>SLI=ALI
Medial-Short	9.8 (.4)	8.1 (1.9)	8.9 (1.6)	TD>SLI; TD=ALI; SLI=ALI
Medial-Long	9.6 (.6)	7.8 (2.2)	8.4 (1.4)	TD>SLI; TD=ALI; SLI=ALI

Figure 1. Nonword discrimination mean reaction times (with standard error bars) for data combined across all groups.

