

# Goldsmiths Research Online

*Goldsmiths Research Online (GRO)  
is the institutional research repository for  
Goldsmiths, University of London*

## Citation

Krishnan, Saloni; Alcock, Katherine J.; Mercure, Evelyne; Leech, Robert; Barker, Edward; Karmiloff-Smith, Annette and Dick, Frederic. 2013. Articulating Novel Words: Children's Oromotor Skills Predict Nonword Repetition Abilities. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 56(6), pp. 1800-1812. ISSN 1092-4388 [Article]

## Persistent URL

<https://research.gold.ac.uk/id/eprint/32837/>

## Versions

The version presented here may differ from the published, performed or presented work. Please go to the persistent GRO record above for more information.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Goldsmiths, University of London via the following email address: [gro@gold.ac.uk](mailto:gro@gold.ac.uk).

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated. For more information, please contact the GRO team: [gro@gold.ac.uk](mailto:gro@gold.ac.uk)

Running Head: Oromotor skill predicts non-word repetition ability

Articulating novel words: children's oromotor skills predict non-word repetition abilities

Saloni Krishnan<sup>1</sup>  
Katherine J. Alcock<sup>2</sup>  
Evelyne Mercure<sup>3</sup>  
Robert Leech<sup>4</sup>  
Edward Barker<sup>1</sup>  
Annette Karmiloff-Smith<sup>1</sup>  
Frederic Dick<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Centre for Brain and Cognitive Development, Department of Psychological Sciences, Birkbeck, University of London

<sup>2</sup> Department of Psychology, Lancaster University, UK

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Cognitive Neuroscience, UCL, London, UK

<sup>4</sup> Division of Neuroscience and Mental Health, Imperial College, London

Correspondence to:

Saloni Krishnan or Frederic Dick  
Centre for Brain and Cognitive Development  
Birkbeck, University of London  
Malet Street, London, WC1E 7HX, UK  
s.krishnan@bbk.ac.uk  
f.dick@bbk.ac.uk

### Abstract

#### Purpose:

Pronouncing a novel word for the first time requires the transformation of a newly encoded speech signal into a series of coordinated, exquisitely timed oromotor movements. Individual differences in children's ability to repeat novel nonwords are associated with vocabulary development and later literacy. Nonword repetition (NWR) is often used to test clinical populations. While phonological/auditory memory contributions to learning and pronouncing nonwords have been extensively studied, much less is known about the contribution of children's oromotor skills to this process.

#### Method:

Two independent cohorts of children (7-13 years, N = 40, and 6.9-7.7 years, N = 37) were tested on a battery of linguistic and non-linguistic tests, including NWR and oromotor tasks.

#### Results:

In both cohorts, individual differences in oromotor control were a significant contributor to NWR abilities; moreover, in an omnibus analysis including experimental and standardized tasks, oromotor control predicted the most unique variance in NWR.

#### Conclusions:

Results indicate that nonlinguistic oromotor skills contribute to children's NWR ability, and suggest that important aspects of language learning and consequent language deficits may be rooted in the ability to perform complex sensorimotor transformations.

## Articulating novel words: children's oromotor skills predict non-word repetition abilities

Speaking is a remarkably complex motor behavior. In order to produce a highly structured and constrained stream of acoustic energy, more than 50 muscles must rapidly change the shape and position of articulators within the vocal tract (Kent, 2000; Levelt et al., 1999; Ackermann & Riecker, 2004). The relationship of 'higher-level' speech and language abilities to lower-level aspects of motor control, planning, and imitation is not well understood, due in part to the fact that language development is often studied apart from neuromotor development (Iverson, 2010; Iverson & Braddock, 2011). A growing body of recent work shows that motor development has an impact on abilities beyond the purely motor domain – for instance, early emerging motor skills such as independent sitting or object mouthing are predictive of consonant production (Iverson, 2010). In typically developing infants, oromotor control at 21 months is associated with language production skills (vocabulary and sentence complexity on the MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventory (CDI) - Alcock & Krawczyk, 2010). Longitudinal links between measures of articulatory kinematics and the CDI have been demonstrated in 9-21 month olds, even when age was controlled for (Nip et al., 2011). However, earlier longitudinal studies (for instance, Bates et al., 1979) yielded few if any links between gross motor milestones (examples include the age at which a child started crawling, walking etc.) and language milestones. The relationship between motor ability and language skill may vary depending on the language skill under study, and the measure of motor control used. Gaining an understanding of which non-linguistic motor skills are relevant when learning language should contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between non-linguistic and linguistic development.

One basic language skill that might be linked to motor abilities is that of learning to say new words for the first time. While all language is inherently generative, the production of a novel word requires the assembly of a combination of oral gestures in a previously unencountered context. This process can be highly utterance-specific and likely involves considerable motor planning (Tremblay et al., 2008). Nonword repetition (NWR), a measure that assesses the ability to imitate novel words, is widely utilized in the clinical diagnosis of language impairment, and also as a marker of linguistic ability in genetic studies (Bishop et al., 2006). A NWR task involves listening to and repeating a phonotactically legal but non-existent word like /baɪli:dəʊdʒ/ (Bishop et al., 1996), and is thought to assess a child's ability to perceive, encode, remember and re-synthesize new sound combinations. These are abilities that are important not only when learning new oral vocabulary but also for later literacy (Gathercole et al., 1994). NWR is a known correlate of vocabulary, and a predictor of later vocabulary (Gathercole & Baddeley 1990; Stokes & Klee, 2009 but cf. Melby-Lervåg et al., 2012).

NWR tasks have been used with many clinical populations (Gathercole, 2006; Bishop et al., 2006; Conti-Ramsden et al., 2001; Grant et al., 1997; Laws & Gunn, 2004; Graf-Estes et al., 2007) and across languages (Sahlen et al., 1999; reviewed in Coady &

Evans, 2008). However, there is no current consensus about which underlying skills, including sensorimotor skills, contribute to NWR performance, and in what proportion (Coady & Evans, 2008; Snowling et al., 1981, 1986). NWR is most commonly thought of as a measure of phonological short-term memory (Perrachione, 2011; Montgomery, 2004; Laws & Gunn, 2004). This account (for more details, see Gathercole, 2006) posits a direct relationship between NWR and vocabulary, i.e., children who are better at remembering long strings of novel, phonologically-encoded speech sounds will be quicker to learn the novel phonological forms of new words (Gathercole, 2006). But the accurate repetition of nonwords cannot rely on phonological memory alone. Skills underlying NWR are likely to include speech perception (Coady & Evans, 2008), phonological encoding (Bowey, 2006), and lexical and phonological knowledge (Snowling et al., 1986). In current accounts, the only motor skill that is thought to influence NWR is maturity of an individual's articulation (Vance et al., 2005). Furthermore, misarticulation is not thought to contribute greatly to differences in NWR (Gathercole, 2006).

The motor component of NWR, or indeed of producing any novel real word, does not simply relate to the articulation of the sounds in the word, but involves converting an auditory representation to a motor sequence in real time, thereby requiring coordination of multiple articulators, such as the lips, tongue, jaw and palate. (This computational problem has been the focus of models such as DIVA (Guenther, 2006)). To our knowledge, the relationship of NWR to the ability to plan and sequence these kinds of oral articulatory movements has never been investigated. There is evidence for both individual and developmental differences at this level of oral articulatory control - for instance, the speed of articulator movements is known to increase with age, as speaking patterns become more complex (Nip et al., 2011; Goffman & Smith, 1999; Smith & Zelaznik, 2004). Variability in articulatory movement patterns of the jaw, lips and tongue also decreases with age, as well as when task complexity is reduced (Kleinow & Smith, 2006; Goffman & Smith, 1999; Smith & Zelaznik, 2004). There is a clear developmental change in the production of nonwords, with children - but not adults - showing motor learning effects on simple nonwords (Sasisekaran et al., 2010) during a period in which children continue to develop articulatory control (Smith, 2006). Such results suggest that individual variation in non-linguistic oromotor control may in fact be relevant to imitating novel words.

A striking example of a relationship between sensorimotor sequencing and NWR has been demonstrated in a British family (the 'KE family'), where several generations of individuals have a mutation of the FOXP2 gene. This mutation was initially thought to be predominantly associated with severe speech and language impairments, including syntactic processing (Lai et al., 2001). However, family members with and without the mutation showed no overlap in their NWR and oromotor control scores, indicating that they could be distinguished on the basis of these abilities alone (Vargha-Khadem et al., 1998). More generally, children with specific language impairment (SLI) often perform poorly on NWR tasks (Bishop et al., 1996; Conti-Ramsden et al., 2001) and can show subtle but pervasive difficulties with sensorimotor control (Hill, 2001) and motor imitation (Marton, 2009). In a pioneering study, Stark & Blackwell (1997) showed that NWR accuracy in children with SLI was correlated with their oral praxis abilities. In addition, the parents of

children with SLI have also been shown to present with poor performance on a task of oromotor skill (Barry et al., 2007). In distinguishing between parents of children with language impairments and a control group of parents, oromotor skill was as effective as NWR (Barry et al., 2007), suggesting that NWR deficits could be a genetic risk factor and directly related to speech motor output performance. In that study, however, oromotor skill was assessed by the smooth production of sequential speech sounds in a series of tongue twisters, rather than non-speech and non-linguistic oromotor movements.

The evidence reviewed above suggests that oromotor and novel NWR skills may be mechanistically linked in both typical and atypical development. As described above, NWR is a sensitive marker for language impairment. If indeed non-linguistic and non-speech oromotor skills make a unique contribution to NWR performance, then this would indicate the need for a detailed assessment of not only auditory perception or phonological ability but also oromotor skill in the differential diagnosis and remediation of language impairment. To explore this issue, the present study assesses the contribution of non-linguistic, non-speech oromotor control to NWR abilities in two cohorts of school-age children tested on a wide battery of language, cognitive, and auditory tasks.

### **The present study**

The oromotor control task we employ is a non-linguistic visual analogue to NWR, in that the child has to encode, retain, and re-synthesize a visually-presented sequence of movements, much in the same way that one must reproduce an oral sequence when hearing a nonword (see Figure 1 for example). Crucially, as the oromotor control task is non-linguistic and non-phonetic, phonological memory should not play a role in the oromotor control performance.

In addition to the oromotor control and NWR tasks, we assembled a battery of linguistic and non-linguistic tasks that are thought to tap into subsets of the cognitive and perceptual processes underlying NWR. The choice of tasks was largely driven by the literature on language impairments (LI), both congenital and acquired. Children with LI - who tend to fare poorly on tasks of non-word repetition (Graf-Estes et al., 2007) - are also apt to show impairments in a range of other skills (Bishop, 2006). For instance, children with LI show differences from typically developing children in their speed of processing and motor response latency (Miller et al., 2001; Schul et al., 2004), attentional resource capacity/allocation (Marton et al., 2007; Finneran et al., 2009; Montgomery et al., 2008) and auditory or phonemic discrimination and processing (Bishop, 2006; Fox et al., 2011, cf. Bishop et al., 2012), amongst other skills. Syntactic comprehension in children with LI (one of their basic weaknesses - Dick et al., 2004) has also been associated with non-word repetition (Montgomery & Evans, 2009, Marton & Schwartz, 2003, but cf. Montgomery, 2000). Thus, it is possible that individual differences in these more general skills might contribute to potential correlations between NWR and oromotor control and imitation (OM), not only in children with LI, but in healthy children. The inclusion of these tasks allows us to factor out individual differences in other abilities that might contribute to NWR-OM correlations (such as sustained attention or speed of processing).

The non-linguistic tasks we included were designed to measure lower-level auditory and motor processing. Tasks were explicitly chosen to be ‘game-like’ and to require very little instruction. First, we included a simple measure of auditory-motor response latency (from Leech et al., 2007). Second, to characterize individual differences in selective auditory attention and integration, we included a non-linguistic analogue of the “cocktail-party” scenario (Leech et al., 2009; Krishnan et al., submitted). The younger child cohort also completed a measure of sustained attention and response inhibition (Finneran et al., 2009; Montgomery et al., 2008; Marton et al., 2007; Marton et al., 2008).

The linguistic measures were a word reading efficiency task and a test of syntactic comprehension. To measure children’s reading, we used the Test of Word Reading Efficiency, (TOWRE; Torgesen, Wagner & Rashotte, 1999), which correlates strongly with children’s overall reading performance (Wise et al., 2007), vocabulary (Ricketts et al., 2007), and NWR ability (Nation & Hulme, 2010). Syntactic comprehension was assessed using a task that reveals considerable individual differences in typically developing children’s performance (Dick et al., 2004; Leech et al., 2007). The younger cohort also completed a test of phonemic discrimination (based on Bishop et al., 1990) to allow us to characterize variance related to fine-grained phonemic discrimination, as opposed to the production-reliant measure obtained using NWR.

Finally, in a subset of children from both experiments, we assessed verbal and non-verbal cognitive ability using online computer-based tasks (normed on over 5000 pairs of twins - Davis et al., 2009). These were administered via the internet and used adaptive branching to keep children engaged and limit the number of items to be answered (Haworth et al., 2007).

These tasks were used to investigate the relationship between NWR and oromotor control in two different cohorts. In Experiment 1, we tested a cohort of children aged between 7-13 years. The same relationship is further explored in Experiment 2 in 6.9-7.7 year olds with the additional measures described above. The two cohorts allow us to present an independent replication of the results in two different age groups, while factoring out variance related to an overlapping set of tasks. In order to maximize statistical power, we also report analyses combining children in both cohorts, and use this combined sample to assess the contribution of general cognitive ability.

## **Experiment 1: The relationship between nonword repetition and oromotor control in school age children (7-13 years)**

### Methods

#### *Participants*

Forty children participated in this study as part of a larger language battery, designed to give an overall picture of a child’s auditory, language and motor ability during the school years. The age of children completing behavioral testing ranged between 7-12.5 years (yr), with a mean age of 10.1 years (7 yr N= 2; 8 yr N= 7; 9 yr N=8, 10 yr N=12; 11 yr N= 6; 12 yr N=6). All the children were typically developing right-handed native British English speakers with normal hearing and no history of neurological or speech and language impairments. Hearing status was assessed using parental report,

none of the children had ear infections for at least one year prior to testing, nor did any child have a known history of hearing loss. On the TOWRE, every child achieved an age-normed standard score > 80 (mean = 110.7, S.D. = 13.1). The Birkbeck Research Ethics committee approved the study; children and parents gave informed and signed consent prior to participation.

### *Methods and Procedure*

The behavioral battery comprised six experimental tasks (counterbalanced for order). To assure data quality, an experimenter monitored children's attention and motivation, making notes on whether they repeatedly looked away from the screen, if they were talking during trials, or if they persevered in pressing the same button on the gamepad during the auditory tasks. On the basis of these notes, a subset of data from four children was excluded, with a subset of data from three more children excluded due to technical errors. Children were encouraged to take a break between tasks, and were given verbal motivation throughout, as well as stickers and a certificate.

#### Experimental Tasks:

1. Oromotor control task (adapted from Alcock et al. (2000)). This task assesses the accuracy of oromotor control by having children imitate simultaneous and sequential orofacial movements (see Figure 1). The choice of the simultaneous movement condition was based on research in acquired speech and language disorders showing that speech-timing problems can be associated with difficulties in simultaneously moving multiple articulators (Blumstein et al., 1980, 1998; Alcock et al., 2000). A sequential movement condition was included as patients with oral apraxia show deficits in temporo-spatial programming for sequences (Miller et al., 1989; Alcock et al., 2000).


The simultaneous and sequential movement conditions were crossed with the presence or absence of a 'memory gap' between observation and execution. In the developmental spatial cognition literature, the imposition of a memory gap can be helpful in unveiling potential individual differences. For instance, it increases error frequency in typically developing children who have mastered a standard no-delay task (Diamond, 1985) and in children with peri-natal focal lesions has helped to reveal subtle but reliable differences in performance that were not evident using a standard immediate drawing reproduction task (reviewed in Stiles, 2011 and Stiles et al., 2012).

In this task, video-recorded stimuli showed a researcher making oral movements. Each set of oral movements involved three sets of articulators, for instance 'opening the mouth', 'sticking out the tongue' and 'rounding the lips'. Care was taken to ensure that these movements were primarily non-linguistic, and occurred in non-linguistic contexts (for instance, spreading lips as in smiling, sticking one's tongue out while making a funny face, or rounding lips as when blowing bubbles). Oromotor movements that are visible can typically be associated with a sound. To control for this, we included multiple movements that are typically associated with the same sound (for example, both opening the mouth wide, or sticking out one's tongue as if at the doctor's can be associated with saying /a/), thereby ensuring that an auditory strategy was not sufficient to succeed on the task.



As described above, half the trials were presented with a 'memory gap', where there was a 5 second silent period between stimulus presentation and the onset of a xylophone sound, which cued the child to imitate the stimulus. In the other half of trials, the stimulus presentation was immediately followed by the imitation cue (no-gap condition).

### An example of a sequential and a simultaneous oral movement



*Figure 1. An example of a sequential and a simultaneous oral movement*

Children were seated in front of a camera and computer screen and were instructed to imitate the observed movements after the sound cue. Three practice trials each were provided for the 'memory' gap and no-gap conditions. After every practice trial, children received verbal feedback on their oral movements (e.g., "good" or "try to do exactly what she does"). The order of presentation of movements was counterbalanced across subjects, and all participants performed 20 sets of movements that were video-recorded for subsequent analysis. Two researchers independently scored the videos using the rating system developed by Square-Storer et al. (1989). There were three sets of articulators involved in each sequential/ simultaneous trial, and each of these three movements was scored between 0-2, with 2 being awarded for a completely accurate repetition, 1 awarded for each partially correct or for a repetition that was not in the order of the sequence presented, and 0 awarded for no attempt or an incorrect one. Thus, for each trial, scores could range between 0 - 6. Inter-rater reliability was at least 0.85 over all subjects and all conditions.

2. Nonword repetition task. A standardized measure of NWR was used to establish a link with the existing literature on NWR, and to ensure that our results did not arise due to any task artifacts of a newly-developed NWR task. The NWR subtest we used was taken from the Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP; Torgesen, Wagner & Rashotte, 1999). The 18 nonwords from the test (ranging from one to six syllables) were recorded by a native British English speaker and presented to children over headphones (see also Nation & Hulme, 2010; Nation et al., 2010). Children were

asked to repeat the word they heard. Three practice trials were provided, followed by the 18 test items. Example stimuli from the CTOPP include /baɪlɪ:dəʊdʒ/ and /geki:zaɪzəkæd/. The nonwords in the CTOPP do not contain consonant clusters and obey English phonotactics, while varying considerably in terms of phonological complexity. Audio recordings of the children's responses were scored by two independent researchers. Fractional scores were awarded on the basis of accuracy. Inter-rater reliability was 0.85.

3. Test of Word Reading Efficiency (TOWRE; Torgesen, Wagner & Rashotte, 1999). The sight word reading efficiency subtest for familiar words from the TOWRE was administered. This is a simple test of fluency, which involves reading a list of progressively complex familiar words within 45 seconds. This child's score on this test is simply the number of words accurately read.

4. Complex sentence interpretation task (Leech et al., 2007). This syntactic comprehension task was a two-alternative forced choice picture-matching task where children identified the agent in a series of syntactically simple (actives, subject clefts) and complex (passives, object clefts) sentences. Participants heard sentences presented with competing speech mixed in with the target sentence, and saw pictures of the sentences' agent and patient. They indicated 'who did the action' by pressing the button under the agent's picture. The presentation of simple and complex sentences was interleaved. Percent correct was calculated separately for simple and complex sentences.

5. Auditory scene analysis task (Leech et al., 2009; Krishnan et al., submitted). Children matched pictures to environmental sound targets (such the sound of a car starting) that were presented in a single complex natural background (such as a noisy street scene), or in one of two backgrounds, each presented to a single ear. Target detection accuracy was calculated separately for targets presented in single or dual auditory backgrounds.

6. Auditory-motor reaction time (Leech et al., 2007). Children pressed the right or left button on a game pad indicating which ear an alert sound was presented to. Mean reaction times were used as a measure of auditory-motor processing speed.

### *Analyses*

Initial exploratory analyses were conducted by running pairwise correlations between the outcome variable (NWR) and each of the predictor variables: age, oromotor control (with and without 'memory' gap), reading efficiency, simple and complex syntax, auditory scene analysis in single and multiple background scenes, and auditory-motor processing speed - see Table 1 & 2 for descriptive statistics and pairwise correlations. In order to understand how well a given task uniquely predicted variance in NWR (given that the predictors themselves were correlated - see Table 2), we then constructed a set of regression models. In order to avoid model overfitting, we included only those predictors that singly could account for at least a moderate amount of variance in NWR (defined here as a pairwise correlation with NWR of  $r \geq 0.30$ ). The set of models was made of all possible combinations of predictors, e.g., for predictors A, B, & C, possible models were i) A&B, ii) A&C, iii) B&C, and iv) A, B, & C.

Table 1. *Descriptives for Tasks and Questionnaires used in Experiment 1*

<b>Experiment 1</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>Minimum Score</b>	<b>Maximum Score</b>	<b>Maximum possible score</b>
Age	40	10.1	1.5	7.1	12.5	12.5
Oromotor control (OMC)	36	109.9	4.7	98	119	120
--- OMC gap condition	36	53.9	2.9	47	59	60
--- OMC no gap condition	36	56.1	2.4	51	60	60
--- OMC simultaneous condition	36	57.1	2.1	52	60	60
--- OMC sequential condition	36	52.8	4.0	45	59	60
Nonword Repetition (NWR)	39	15.2	1.5	12	18	18
Reading efficiency	38	73	12.5	50	102	104
Easy syntax	33	.86	.19	.26	1	1
Complex syntax	33	.65	.19	.17	.92	1
Auditory object identification in single background	39	.85	.09	.56	.98	1
Auditory object identification in multiple backgrounds	39	.74	.12	.48	.91	1
Auditory motor reaction time (RT)	35	834.5	192.5	435.9	1258.8	n/a

Table 2. Correlations between NWR and Other Experimental Measures from Experiment 1

	Age	OMC	NWR	TOWRE	Complex Syntax	Easy syntax	AOI in single	AOI in multiple	Auditory motor RT
Age	1								
Oromotor Control (OMC)	.16	1							
Nonword Repetition (NWR)	.02	.48**	1						
Reading efficiency (TOWRE)	.50**	.24	.24	1					
Complex syntax	.50**	.39	.46**	.49**	1				
Easy syntax	.34	.04	.06	.33	.32	1			
Auditory Object Identification (AOI) in a single background	.43**	.28	.31*	.05	.44**	.13	1		
AOI in multiple backgrounds	.19	.31	.17	.16	.46**	.13	.47**	1	
Auditory motor RT	-.10	-.06	-.13	-.36*	-.29	-.39*	-.13	-.08	1

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

We report the results of these models ranked by proportion of variance accounted for; all analyses report adjusted- $R^2$  (henceforth adj- $R^2$ ) to allow for model comparison across different sample sizes and number of predictors (Leach & Henson, 2007); we also indicate which individual predictors contributed significant unique variance to each model. N per pairwise correlation or regression model is included since not all children completed all tasks, and therefore N differs slightly by experiment. All analyses were conducted in Stata/SE 11.1 using distribution-independent bootstrap techniques (robust for smaller and non-normally distributed samples) to estimate probability and variance measures (10,000 replication samples per model).

## Results

The initial pairwise correlation analysis showed a significant positive relationship between NWR and overall oromotor control score ( $r=0.48$ , adj- $R^2=0.203$ ,  $N=36$ ,  $p<0.0008$ ). When oromotor control was split by 'memory gap' condition, NWR was significantly correlated with oromotor control score in the gap condition ( $r=0.45$ , adj- $R^2=0.166$ ,  $N=36$ ,  $p<0.0058$ ) and the no-gap condition ( $r=0.42$ , adj- $R^2=0.140$ ,  $N=36$ ,  $p<0.0126$ ). There were

also significant positive correlations between NWR and complex syntactic comprehension ( $r=0.46$ ,  $\text{adj-R} = 0.183$ ,  $N=33$ ,  $p<0.003$ ), and NWR with auditory scene analysis accuracy in the single background condition (henceforth single ASA;  $r=0.31$ ,  $\text{adj-R}^2=0.076$ ,  $N=39$ ,  $p<0.026$ ). All other correlations with NWR were nonsignificant including age ( $p<0.90$  perhaps due in part to uneven sampling over the age range - see Table 2 for all pairwise correlations). We then generated robust regression models to test the unique contribution of each of these predictors; average oromotor control score was used in the model rather than including the individual subscores (with and without the 'memory' gap), given their intercorrelation ( $r=0.57$ ).

All four models accounted for significant variance in NWR, and are ordered in terms of descending adjusted  $R^2$ . The model including oromotor control and complex syntax accounted for the most variance ( $\text{adj-R}^2=0.237$ ,  $p<0.0004$ ,  $N=31$ ), with only oromotor control a significant unique predictor ( $z=2.27$ ,  $p<0.023$ ). The model with all three predictors accounted for slightly less overall variance ( $\text{adj-R}^2=0.211$ ,  $p<0.001$ ,  $N=31$ ), again with only oromotor control contributing unique variance ( $z=2.15$ ,  $p<0.032$ ). In the model composed of oromotor and single ASA scores ( $\text{adj-R}^2=0.181$ ,  $p<0.003$ ,  $N=36$ ), oromotor control again predicted unique NWR variance ( $z=2.93$ ,  $p<0.003$ ). Finally, when only complex syntax and single ASA were included ( $\text{adj-R}^2=0.167$ ,  $p<0.003$ ,  $N=33$ ), complex syntax alone predicted unique NWR variance ( $z=2.06$ ,  $p<0.039$ ).

## Discussion

These results revealed a relationship between non-linguistic oromotor control and NWR in a 7-13-year-old typically developing group. As noted above, this relationship could be driven by the shared demands of the two tasks (both of which require the child to use a dynamic percept to rapidly resynthesize a motor plan that in turn produces a perceptually matching output). Importantly, this cross-task correlation is strong despite the differences in perceptual input, in that the oromotor task involves nonlinguistic visual input, whereas the NWR involves linguistic auditory input. The cross-task correlation is unlikely to be driven by individual differences in short-term memory alone, as performance in the oromotor gap and no-gap conditions both significantly correlate with the NWR score. If this result were due to individual differences in working memory, one would not expect that the no-gap condition scores to predict NWR scores, as 'working memory load' is relatively minimal. The correlation between the two tasks regardless of memory gap suggests that the common non-linguistic skills of motor sequencing, planning and imitation play a significant role in NWR performance in school-age children.

A correlation also emerged between NWR and complex syntax. A relationship between complex syntactic constructions and NWR has been demonstrated in children with SLI (Montgomery & Evans, 2009), but to our knowledge never before in typically developing children. The demands of our syntactic task (in particular the perceptual and attentional masking components (Leech et al., 2007)) may have helped to unveil this relationship in typically developing children.

One limitation of the first experiment was the somewhat uneven sampling over age, with more than half the children ages 9 or older. The undersampling of younger children

may have contributed to the near-ceiling performance on simultaneous oromotor movements (see Table 1) as well as the lack of relationship between reading efficiency and NWR (see Nation & Hulme, 2010). In addition, the battery of tasks in the first experiment did not allow us to test whether the relationship between oromotor and NWR skills might be mediated by individual differences in cognitive control or speech sound perception. Therefore, in the second experiment, we tested an independent cohort of younger (~7 year old) children on a similar battery of linguistic and non-linguistic measures, but also a test of executive function (a no-go task) and phonemic discrimination (AX discrimination task).

## **Experiment 2: The relationship between nonword repetition and oromotor control in younger school age children (7 year cohort)**

### Methods

#### *Participants*

Children were recruited via invitation on the basis of their previous participation in a longitudinal infant study (Karmiloff-Smith et al., 2010) for the purposes of another experiment, but whom we also tested in the present one. Thirty-seven typically developing children with normal hearing (all British English speakers) between the ages of 6.9-7.7 years (22 males, 15 females) responded to the invitation and participated in Experiment 2. Every child achieved an age-normed standard score > 80 on the TOWRE (mean = 113.22, S.D. = 11.9). The Birkbeck Research ethics committee approved the study; children and parents gave informed and signed consent prior to participation.

Table 3. *Descriptives for Tasks and Questionnaires used in Experiment 2*

<b>Experiment 2</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>Minimum Score</b>	<b>Maximum Score</b>	<b>Maximum possible score</b>
Age	37	7.3	.2	6.9	7.7	n/a
Oromotor control (OMC)	36	101.2	7.3	82	113	120
--- OMC gap condition	36	48.4	5.2	33	57	60
--- OMC no gap condition	36	52.8	3.5	45	58	60
Nonword repetition (NWR)	35	12.6	1.8	8.8	15.8	18
Reading efficiency	36	51.9	14.9	16	69	104
Easy syntax	35	.76	.19	.34	1	1
Complex syntax	35	.38	.14	.21	.83	1
Auditory object identification in single background	30	.74	.12	.30	.90	1
Auditory object identification in multiple backgrounds	30	.65	.12	.34	.80	1
Auditory-motor RT	36	976.6	187.3	685.7	1383.5	n/a
Phonemic discrimination RT	32	1576.6	198.0	1258.8	2047.6	n/a

### *Methods and Procedure*

A slightly modified battery from Experiment 1 was constructed, and the order in which children completed the tasks was kept constant. Experimenter notes were made on children's attention as before, and on this basis a subset of data from two children were excluded from the analyses. Two other children were excluded due to technical reasons, while one child did not want to participate in the oromotor task. Overall, children were encouraged to take breaks between tasks, and were given general verbal motivation throughout. They were also awarded stickers as they finished tasks.

The oromotor task was modified to include only sequential movements (as most of the participants in the previous experiment performed close to ceiling on the simultaneous

movements). The children therefore completed 10 sequential movements with a 5-second gap and 10 sequential movements with no gap.

The NWR, the sight word reading test from the TOWRE, and the auditory-motor reaction time task were completed using the same procedure as in Experiment 1. The complex sentence identification task and the auditory scene analysis were modified to create the option for a break halfway through the task. A phonemic discrimination task (adapted from Bishop (1990)) measured children's accuracy and reaction time for detecting differences between pairs of nonwords. Sixty items were devised, half consisting of two identical nonwords (e.g., /bif/ - /bif/), and the remainder consisting of two acoustically similar nonwords that differed by one phoneme on the initial or final consonant (e.g., /raub/ => /raus/). Phonemes could differ by one feature (e.g., /b/-/d/), two features (e.g., /b/-/t/) or three features (e.g., /b/-/s/). Children heard the nonwords through headphones, and responded by pressing buttons on a game pad to indicate whether the pair of words were the same or different. Reaction times and accuracy were measured. Children also completed a test of executive functioning, the Sustained Attention to Response Task (Manly et al., 2000). Children saw a series of digits (inter-stimulus interval = 1.15 seconds) and responded by pressing a button on a game pad for every digit except 3. The percentage of trials accurately inhibited was scored for this task.

As in Experiment 1, initial analyses were conducted by running pairwise correlations between the outcome variable (NWR) and each predictor variable, with age not included as a predictor due to the narrow age range. In the second stage, a family of regression models were constructed using all combinations of variables that were pairwise correlated with NWR at  $r \geq 0.30$ , and are reported exactly as in Experiment 1.

Descriptive statistics for children's performance on all tasks are provided in Table 3.

## Results

As in Experiment 1, there was a pairwise correlation between NWR and overall oromotor control ( $r=0.40$ ,  $\text{adj-R}^2 = 0.136$ ,  $N=34$ ,  $p<0.0106$ ); split by memory load, NWR was significantly correlated with the oromotor no-gap condition ( $r=0.40$ ,  $\text{adj-R}^2=0.134$ ,  $N=34$ ,  $p<0.0110$ ), and with the gap condition ( $r=0.30$ ,  $\text{adj-R}^2=0.058$ ,  $N=34$ ,  $p<0.0487$ ). NWR was also significantly correlated with reading efficiency (e.g., TOWRE,  $r=0.32$ ,  $\text{adj-R}^2 = 0.077$ ,  $N=34$ ,  $p<0.0333$ ), and phonemic discrimination ( $r=0.38$ ,  $\text{adj-R}^2= 0.113$ ,  $N=30$ ,  $p<0.0103$ ).



Table 4. Correlations between NWR and Other Experimental Measures from Experiment 2

	Age	OMC	NWR	Reading efficiency	Complex Syntax	Easy syntax	AOI in single	AOI in multiple	Auditory motor RT	Phonemic discrim RT
Age	1									
Oromotor control (OMC)	-.30	1								
Nonword repetition (NWR)	-.03	.40**	1							
Reading efficiency	.20	.06	.32*	1						
Complex syntax	.14	-.12	.26	.04	1					
Easy syntax	.07	.01	.14	.08	.36*	1				
Auditory object identification (AOI) in a single background	.03	-.09	.07	-.19	.14	.14	1			
AOI in multiple backgrounds	.26	.08	.28	-.11	.01	.23	.68***	1		
Auditory motor RT	-.20	-.21	-.22	-.18	-.09	-.10	-.12	.01	1	
Phonemic discrimination RT	.27	.24	.38*	.15	.34	.22	.04	.17	.16	1

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

All other correlations with NWR were non-significant (see Table 4). As in the analyses from Experiment One, we created regression models using all four combinations of predictors with pairwise  $r \geq 0.30$  (oromotor control score, reading efficiency, and phonemic discrimination). All accounted for significant variance in NWR, and are ordered in terms of descending variance accounted for, with unique contributions noted. The regression model including oromotor control and reading efficiency accounted for the most variance ( $\text{adj-R}^2 = 0.217$ ,  $p < 0.0023$ ,  $N = 34$ ), with oromotor control ( $z = 2.69$ ,  $p < 0.007$ ) and reading efficiency ( $z = 2.26$ ,  $p < 0.024$ ) predicting unique variance. The model with all three predictors accounted for slightly less overall variance ( $\text{adj-R}^2 = 0.208$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ,  $N = 29$ ), with no predictor accounting for unique variance. In the model composed of oromotor and phonemic discrimination ( $\text{adj-R}^2 = 0.170$ ,  $p < 0.003$ ,  $N = 29$ ), again no single predictor accounted for unique variance. Finally, when only reading efficiency and phonemic discrimination were included ( $\text{adj-R}^2 = 0.151$ ,  $p < 0.003$ ,  $N = 30$ ), phonemic discrimination predicted unique NWR variance ( $z = 1.96$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

## Discussion

As in Experiment 1, a significant relationship was found between oromotor control and NWR performance, thus providing additional evidence for a link between non-linguistic

oromotor skills and NWR performance. Also as in Experiment 1, both oromotor no-gap and gap performance were significantly correlated with NWR, suggesting that working memory differences alone do not drive this relationship, as the gap condition places greater demand on working memory as compared to the no-gap condition.

In concordance with results from Nation and Hulme (2010), reading efficiency as measured by the TOWRE was also a significant predictor of NWR in this cohort. Also as would be expected given previous findings, children's phonemic sensitivity (as indexed by the phonemic discrimination task) was significantly correlated with NWR. However, unlike results from Experiment 1, complex syntax was only marginally correlated with NWR (see Table 4).

### **Combined data from Experiments 1&2**

In order to account for other factors that might drive the relationship between oromotor control and NWR, we combined the data from Experiments 1 and 2 that contain overlapping subsets of experimental test measures. All statistical models included cohort<sup>1</sup> as a binary predictor variable (7-12 year olds in Experiment 1; 7-year-olds in Experiment 2).

We first ran a regression model on all 70 children who had successfully completed oromotor and NWR tasks. Together, oromotor control and cohort accounted for considerable variance in NWR ( $\text{adj-R}^2 = 0.515$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ), with significant unique variance accounted for both by oromotor control ( $z = 3.75$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and cohort ( $z = 4.04$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), where the 7-yr-old cohort was significantly less accurate than the 7-12-yr-olds (see Figure 2a). A test for homogeneity of slopes for oromotor control over the two cohorts did not show significant differences ( $p > 0.4$ ).

Next, we built an omnibus regression model with data from the 55 children in Experiments 1 and 2 who completed an overlapping subset of experimental measures: oromotor control, reading efficiency, syntax (collapsed across simple and complex conditions), auditory scene analysis (collapsed across background conditions), and auditory-motor processing speed. (The syntax and auditory scene analysis submeasures were collapsed as they were moderately to strongly correlated across the larger sample: simple versus complex syntax,  $r = 0.43$ , single versus dual background auditory scene analysis,  $r = 0.74$ ). Cohort was also included in the model. The omnibus model predicted considerable variance in NWR scores ( $\text{adj-R}^2 = 0.550$ ,  $p < 0.0001$ ), with oromotor control significantly accounting for unique variance ( $z = 3.22$ ,  $p < 0.001$  - see leverage plot in Figure 2b), along with reading efficiency ( $z = 1.97$ ,  $p < 0.049$ ).

## Oromotor (OM) scores predict nonword repetition (NWR) proficiency




Figure 2a-c. 2a) Whole regression plot of raw oromotor (OM) versus nonword repetition (NWR) scores, combined across cohorts from Experiments 1 (7-12-year-olds) & 2 (7-year-olds). Regression lines show best fit for oromotor to nonword repetition scores with cohort in model; offset in lines shows effect of cohort. 2b) Plot of oromotor leverage by nonword repetition leverage residuals in regression model that includes all experimental measures and cohort. Distance between each point and horizontal line shows residual error without OM included in model; fit line shows parameter estimate for OM. 2c) Plot of oromotor leverage by nonword repetition leverage residuals in regression model that includes OM, cohort, and the first two principal components of the standardized measures of general cognitive ability.

### Contribution of general cognitive abilities

Finally, to determine whether general cognitive factors might underlie relationship between oromotor control and NWR, all participants were invited to complete the at-home online standardized tests described above. The measures included two non-verbal reasoning tests, the Raven's Standard Progressive Matrices (Raven et al., 1996) and the WISC-III-UK Picture Completion (Wechsler, 1992). Two verbal measures were also included, the WISC-III General Knowledge (Multiple Choice Information) and Vocabulary Multiple Choice subtests (Wechsler, 1992) - see Table 5 for descriptive statistics and Table 6 for cross-task correlations). A subset of each group from Experiments 1 (n=28) and 2 (n=17) completed these online tasks, and were combined into a single dataset. Because the subscale scores were moderately to strongly intercorrelated (see Table 6), we reduced the four scales to two principal components, accounting for 77% of score variance.

Table 5. *Descriptives for Tasks of General Cognitive Functioning*

	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D.</b>	<b>Minimum Score</b>	<b>Maximum Score</b>
Raven's progressive matrices	46	10.5	4.6	0	18
General Knowledge WISC -III	46	20.4	6.9	9	40
Vocabulary WISC - III	46	35.6	8.7	18	52
Picture Completion	45	17.0	5.3	2	30

Table 6. *Correlations between Standardized Test Scores*

	<b>Raven's Matrices</b>	<b>General Knowledge</b>	<b>Vocabulary</b>	<b>Picture Completion</b>
Raven's progressive matrices	1			
General Knowledge WISC -III	0.55***	1		
Vocabulary WISC - III	0.43**	0.58***	1	
Picture Completion	0.38**	0.30*	0.44**	1

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

Oromotor control, cohort, and the two principal components from the standardized tests were entered in the regression model as predictors for NWR. This model was significant ( $\text{adj-R}^2=0.482$ ,  $p<0.0001$ ), revealing a significant effect of oromotor control ( $z=2.73$ ,  $p=0.006$  – leverage plot in Figure 2c), with no other factor contributing unique variance.

#### Discussion

Across all participants, nonlinguistic oromotor control was the experimental predictor accounting for most variance in NWR, with additional unique variance being predicted by reading efficiency. Inclusion of our standardized measures (including Raven's Matrices) into the regression model did not eliminate oromotor control as a significant predictor of NWR performance. This result might be considered as further indirect

evidence that individual differences in memory (and working memory) are not the primary contributor to the NWR/oromotor relationship. Performance on the Raven's Matrices tends to be associated with measures of memory ( $r = 0.18 - 0.30$ ) and working memory ( $r = 0.30 - 0.62$ ) (Unsworth & Engle, 2005; but cf. Engel de Abreau et al., 2010), and therefore might be expected to remove at least some of the variance associated with memory skills.

## General Discussion

Separate and combined results from both experiments showed that typically developing children's ability to imitate novel nonlinguistic oromotor sequences is predictive of their ability to imitate novel, phonotactically legal nonwords. This relationship is independent of age and broader language skills, and is seemingly not driven by skill in reading, attentional ability or complex auditory perception. Furthermore, our results indicate that this relationship is independent of more general cognitive abilities, as non-linguistic oromotor control remains a significant predictor of NWR performance when standardized cognitive test scores are included in the regression model.

In particular, our findings challenge a longstanding assumption in the literature, i.e., that NWR tasks index only phonological storage or phonological working memory. In contrast, we have demonstrated that these tasks also involve non-linguistic motor skills and planning. These results provide experimental confirmation of Snowling's suggestion (1986) that different types of deficits might result in NWR impairment, e.g. phonological encoding, storage or - importantly for the present study - motor execution. Our findings also fit with genetic studies suggesting that 'genes that put the child at risk for communicative problems also affect motor development, with the association being most evident when speech production is affected' (Bishop, 2002). Moreover, our results extend Stark and Blackwell's (1997) original findings of a correlation between NWR and oral praxis in children with SLI<sup>2</sup>.

On the basis of our findings, we suggest that a developmental assessment of oromotor control may be a helpful differentiator in studies of language impairment, allowing researchers to parse out differences related to oromotor control from phonological perception/sensitivity. Given the prevalence of motor coordination difficulties in children with LI (some estimates indicate up to ten times more likely, Hill, 1998; Iverson & Braddock, 2011), oromotor control may contribute even more to the NWR performance of children with language impairment than is the case in typically developing children (also see Archibald & Gathercole, 2007). In designing such assessments, a caveat to bear in mind is that previous studies have shown little to no relationship between language production skills and the ability to synthesize single oral movements, but rather a tighter relationship with the ability to combine and co-ordinate multiple oral movements (Alcock et al., 2000; Alcock & Krawczyk, 2010).

While our results show that individual differences in the control of oromotor skills predict variation in one measure of language production well into the school years, further research is needed to untangle the relative contribution to this relationship of individual differences in oromotor imitation and oromotor dexterity. Our study investigated children's accuracy in imitating a complex oral movement seen for the first time, and focused on

overall sensorimotor transformation ability. However, performance on our task involves both encoding of the stimulus and motor control and planning. In order to separate out the influence of dexterity and planning from that of memory and imitation, it would be helpful to include direct measures of motor control that assess articulatory variability (Sasisekaran et al., 2010; Heisler et al., 2010; Walsh et al., 2006). The effector specificity of the NWR-omomotor relationship could also be examined by comparing oromotor and gestural sequencing ability (Zelaznik & Goffman, 2010). Finally, while we suggest it is unlikely that shared demands on working memory drive the NWR-omomotor relationship (for the reasons discussed after each experiment), inclusion of measures such as digit span would be useful in clarifying its role.

More broadly, our results are also relevant to recent discussions of the possible links between motor skills and language, including models that posit a role for the motor system at multiple levels of language representation (Skipper et al., 2006). Until now, most research into the development of motor/language relations has focused on manual gesture or motor milestones in early childhood (see Iverson & Braddock, 2011). As Goffman (2010) suggests, articulatory and linguistic production units may interact in complex, dynamic ways throughout development. The links between articulatory and linguistic production may also be driven in part by shared reliance on more basic procedural and sequence learning skills (Ullman & Pierpont, 2005; also see Evans et al., 2009 for a discussion of these issues).

In conclusion, our findings are of importance with respect to language acquisition, both clinically and theoretically. Clinically, they indicate that NWR is not simply an indicator of phonological proficiency, but also an index of nonlinguistic oromotor skill and planning. We speculate that quantifying the contribution of oromotor skill to NWR may help identify a potential risk factor for language impairment. In this case, oromotor control would not be the only risk factor to influence performance, but might act in combination with other risk factors. Theoretically, our findings clearly illustrate the need to study language development in an embodied context in order to fully understand developmental relationships between non-linguistic and linguistic systems.

## **Acknowledgements**

We thank The Medical Research Council, U.K. (Grant No. G0400341), and The Waterloo Foundation, U.K. for their generous support in this study; we also thank Jason Zevin, Essi Viding, Daniel Richardson and Charles Hulme for comments and discussions.

## **Footnotes**

<sup>1</sup> Across our two experimental cohorts, age was non-normally distributed and highly positively skewed, and therefore non-ideal as a predictor variable. The binary variable of cohort was used in lieu of age as it accounted for the majority of variance in age (adj-R<sup>2</sup> = 0.64,  $p < 0.0001$ ); it also controlled for the slight differences in test battery composition and procedure across the two experimental cohorts. The pattern of results observed when

cohort was entered did not differ from the results obtained when continuous age was entered.

<sup>2</sup> Sahlen et al. (1999) did not find such a correlation in children with SLI, perhaps because most participants performed at ceiling on a screening tool with only five non-speech single movement items.

## References

- Ackermann, H., & Riecker, A. (2004). The contribution of the insula to motor aspects of speech production: A review and a hypothesis. *Brain and Language*, 89(2), 320–328. doi:10.1016/S0093-934X(03)00347-X
- Alcock, K. J., Passingham, R. E., Watkins, K. E., & Vargha-Khadem, F. (2000). Oral dyspraxia in inherited speech and language impairment and acquired dysphasia *Brain and Language*, 75(1), 17–33.
- Alcock, K. J., & Krawczyk, K. (2010). Individual differences in language development: relationship with motor skill at 21 months. *Developmental Science*, 13(5), 677–691.
- 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), 919–924.
- Barry, J. G., Yasin, I., & Bishop, D. V. M. (2007). Heritable risk factors associated with language impairments. *Genes, Brain and Behavior*, 6(1), 66–76. doi:10.1111/j.1601-183X.2006.00232.x
- Bates, E., Benigni, L., Bretherton, I., Camaioni, L., & Volterra, V. (1979). *The emergence of symbols: Cognition and communication in infancy*. New York: Academic Press.
- Bishop, D. V. M., Adams, C. V., & Norbury, C. F. (2006). Distinct genetic influences on grammar and phonological short-term memory deficits: evidence from 6-year-old twins. *Genes, Brain and Behavior*, 5(2), 158–169. doi:10.1111/j.1601-183X.2005.00148.x
- Bishop, D. V., Brown, B. B., & Robson, J. (1990). The relationship between phoneme discrimination, speech production, and language comprehension in cerebral-palsied individuals. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 33(2), 210–219.
- Bishop, D. V. M., North, T. & Donlan, C. (1996). Nonword repetition as a behavioural marker for inherited language impairment: evidence from a twin study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 37, 391–403.
- Bishop, D. V. M., Hardiman, M. J., & Barry, J. G. (2012). Auditory deficit as a consequence rather than endophenotype of specific language impairment: electrophysiological evidence. *PLoS ONE*, 7(5), e35851. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0035851



- Bishop, D. (2006). Developmental cognitive genetics: How psychology can inform genetics and vice versa. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 59(7), 1153–1168. doi:10.1080/17470210500489372
- Bishop, D. V. M. (2002). Motor immaturity and specific speech and language impairment: Evidence for a common genetic basis. *American Journal of Medical Genetics Part A*, 114(1), 56–63.
- Bowey, J.A. (2006). Clarifying the phonological processing account of nonword repetition. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 27(4), 548-552.
- Blumstein, S. E. (1998). Phonological aspects of aphasia. *Acquired Aphasia*, 157–185.
- Blumstein, S. E., Cooper, W. E., Goodglass, H., Statlender, S., & Gottlieb, J. (1980). Production deficits in aphasia: A voice-onset time analysis. *Brain and Language*, 9, 153–170.
- Coady, J. A., & Evans, J. L. (2008). Uses and interpretations of non-word repetition tasks in children with and without specific language impairments (SLI). *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 43(1), 1-40.
- Conti-Ramsden, G., Botting, N., & Faragher, B. (2001). Psycholinguistic markers for specific language impairment (SLI). *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 42(6), 741–748.
- Davis, O. S. P., Haworth, C. M. A., & Plomin, R. (2009). Learning abilities and disabilities: Generalist genes in early adolescence. *Cognitive Neuropsychiatry*, 14(4-5), 312–331.
- Diamond, A. (1985). Development of the ability to use recall to guide action, as indicated by infants' performance on AB. *Child Development*, 56(4), 868–883.
- Dick, F., Wulfeck, B., Krupa Kwiatkowski, M., & Bates, E. (2004). The development of complex sentence interpretation in typically developing children compared with children with specific language impairments or early unilateral focal lesions. *Developmental Science*, 7(3), 360–377.
- Engel de Abreu, P. M. J., Conway, A. R. A., & Gathercole, S. E. (2010). Working memory and fluid intelligence in young children. *Intelligence*, 38(6), 552–561.
- Evans, J., Saffran, J., & Robe-Torres, K. (2009). Statistical learning in children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 52(2), 321–335. doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2009/07-0189)

- Fox, A. M., Reid, C. L., Anderson, M., Richardson, C., & Bishop, D. V. M. (2012). Maturation of rapid auditory temporal processing and subsequent nonword repetition performance in children. *Developmental Science*, 15(2), 204–211. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7687.2011.01117.x
- Finneran, D. A., Francis, A. L., & Leonard, L. B. (2009). Sustained attention in children with specific language impairment (SLI). *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 52(4), 915. doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2009/07-0053)
- Gathercole, S. (2006). Nonword repetition and word learning: The nature of the relationship. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 27(4), 513–543.
- Gathercole, S. E., Willis, C. S., Baddeley, A. D., & Emslie, H. (1994). The children's test of nonword repetition: A test of phonological working memory. *Memory*, 2(2), 103–127. doi:10.1080/09658219408258940
- Gathercole, S. E. & Baddeley, A. D. (1990). Phonological memory deficits in language-disordered children: is there a causal connection? *Journal of Memory and Language*, 29, 336–360.
- Goffman, L. (2010). Dynamic interaction of motor and language factors in normal and disordered development. In B. Maassen & P. H. Van Lieshout, (Eds.), *Speech motor control: new developments in basic and applied research*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Goffman, L., & Smith, A. (1999). Development and phonetic differentiation of speech movement patterns. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 25, 649–660.
- Graf-Estes, K., Evans, J., & Else-Quest, N. (2007). Differences in the nonword repetition performance of children with and without specific language impairment: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 50, 177–195.
- Grant, J., Karmiloff-Smith, A., Gathercole, S.E., Paterson, S., Howlin, P., Davies, M. & Udwin, O. (1997). Phonological short-term memory and its relationship to language in Williams Syndrome. *Journal of Cognitive Neuropsychiatry*, 2(2) 81-99.
- Guenther, F. (2006). Cortical interactions underlying the production of speech sounds. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 39(5), 350–365. doi:10.1016/j.jcomdis.2006.06.013
- Haworth, C. M. A., Harlaar, N., Kovas, Y., Davis, O. S. P., Oliver, B. R., Hayiou-Thomas, M. E., et al. (2007). Internet cognitive testing of large samples needed in genetic

research. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, 10(4), 554–563. doi:10.1375/twin.10.4.554

Heisler, L., Goffman, L., & Younger, B. (2010). Lexical and articulatory interactions in children's language production. *Developmental Science*, 13(5), 722–730.

Hill, E.L. (2001). Non-specific nature of specific language impairment: a review of the literature with regard to concomitant motor impairments. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 36, 149–171.

Hill, E. L. (1998). A dyspraxic deficit in specific language impairment and developmental coordination disorder? Evidence from hand and arm movements. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, 40(6), 388–395.

Iverson, J. (2010). Developing language in a developing body: the relationship between motor development and language development. *Journal of Child Language*, 37(2), 229.

Iverson, J., & Braddock, B. (2011). Gesture and motor skill in relation to language in children with language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 54(1), 72 - 86.

Karmiloff-Smith, A., Aschersleben, G., de Schonen, T., Elsabbagh, M., Hohenberger, A. & Serres, J. (2010) Constraints on the timing of infant cognitive change: Domain-specific or domain-general? *European Journal of Developmental Science*, 4(1), 31-45.

Kent, R. D. (2000). Research on speech motor control and its disorders: a review and prospective. *Journal of communication disorders*, 33(5), 391–427.

Kleinow, J., & Smith, A. (2006). Potential interactions among linguistic, autonomic, and motor factors in speech. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 48, 275–287.

Krishnan, S., Leech, R., Aydelott, J., & Dick, F., (submitted). School-age children's and adults' identification of environmental sound objects in natural auditory scenes: effects of masking and contextual congruency.

Lai, C. S., Fisher, S. E., Hurst, J. A., Vargha-Khadem, F., & Monaco, A. P. (2001). A forkhead-domain gene is mutated in a severe speech and language disorder. *Nature*, 413, 519–523.

Laws, G., & Gunn, D. (2004). Phonological memory as a predictor of language comprehension in Down syndrome: a five-year follow-up study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45(2), 326-337.

Leach, L. F., & Henson, R. K. (2007). The use and impact of adjusted R<sup>2</sup> effects in published regression research. *Multiple Linear Regression Viewpoints*, 33, 1–11.

- Leech, R., Aydelott, J., Symons, G., Carnevale, J., & Dick, F. (2007). The development of sentence interpretation: effects of perceptual, attentional and semantic interference. *Developmental Science*, 10(6), 794–813.
- Leech, R., Gygi, B., Aydelott, J., & Dick, F. (2009). Informational factors in identifying environmental sounds in natural auditory scenes. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 126(6), 3147–3155.
- Levelt, W. J., Roelofs, A., & Meyer, A. S. (1999). A theory of lexical access in speech production. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22(1), 1–75.
- Manly, T., Davison, B., Heutink, J., Galloway, M., & Robertson, I. (2000). Not enough time or not enough attention? Speed, error and self-maintained control in the Sustained Attention to Response Test (SART). *Clinical Neuropsychological Assessment*, 3, 167-177.
- Marton, K. (2009). Imitation of body postures and hand movements in children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 102(1), 1–13.
- Marton, K. (2008). Visuo-spatial processing and executive functions in children with specific language impairment. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 43(2), 181–200. doi:10.1080/16066350701340719
- Marton, K., Kelmenson, L., & Pinkhasova, M. (2007). Inhibition control and working memory capacity in children with SLI. *Psychologia*, 50(2), 110–121. doi:10.2117/psysoc.2007.110
- Marton, K. & Schwartz, R.G. (2003). Working memory capacity and language processes in children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 46(5), 1138–1153. doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2003/089)
- Melby-Lervåg, M., Lervåg, A., Lyster, S.-A. H., Klem, M., Hagtvet, B., & Hulme, C. (2012). Nonword-repetition ability does not appear to be a causal influence on children's vocabulary development. *Psychological Science*, 23(10), 1092–1098. doi: 10.1177/0956797612443833
- Miller, C.A., Kail, R., Leonard, L.B., & Tomblin, J.B. (2001). Speed of processing in children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 44, 416–433.
- Miller, N. (1989). Apraxia of speech. In C. Code (Ed.), *The characteristics of aphasia*. London: Taylor & Francis.

- Montgomery, J. W. (2000). Relation of working memory to off-line and real-time sentence processing in children with specific language impairment. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 21(01), 117–148.
- Montgomery, J. W., & Evans, J. L. (2009). Complex sentence comprehension and working memory in children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 52(2), 269-287.
- Montgomery, J. W., Evans, J. L., & Gillam, R. B. (2008). Relation of auditory attention and complex sentence comprehension in children with specific language impairment: A preliminary study. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 30(01), 123–151. doi:10.1017/S0142716408090061
- Montgomery, J. W. (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, 115–133.
- Nation, K., & Hulme, C. (2010). Learning to read changes children's phonological skills: evidence from a latent variable longitudinal study of reading and nonword repetition. *Developmental Science*, 14(4), 649–659. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7687.2010.01008.x
- Nation, K., Cocksey, J., Taylor, J. S., & Bishop, D. V. (2010). A longitudinal investigation of early reading and language skills in children with poor reading comprehension. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 51(9), 1031–1039. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2010.02254.x
- Nip, I. S. B., Green, J. R., & Marx, D. B. (2011). The co-emergence of cognition, language, and speech motor control in early development: A longitudinal correlation study. *Journal of communication disorders*, 44(2), 149–160. doi:10.1016/j.jcomdis.2010.08.002
- Perrachione, T. K., Del Tufo, S. N., & Gabrieli, J. D. E. (2011). Human voice recognition depends on language ability. *Science*, 333(6042), 595–595.
- Raven, J. C., Court, J. H., & Raven, J. (1996). *Manual for Raven's Progressive Matrices and Vocabulary Scales*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ricketts, J., Nation, K., & Bishop, D. (2007). Vocabulary is important for some, but not all reading skills. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 11(3), 235–257.
- Sahlen, B., Reuterskiold-Wagner, C., Nettelbladt, U. & Radeborg, K. (1999). Non-word repetition in children with language impairment — pitfalls and possibilities. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 34, 337–352.
- Sasisekaran, J., Smith, A., Sadagopan, N., & Weber-Fox, C. (2010). Nonword repetition in children and adults: effects on movement coordination. *Developmental Science*, 13(3), 521–532. doi:10.1111/j.1467-7687.2009.00911.x

- Schul, R., Stiles, J., Wulfeck, B., & Townsend, J. (2004). How 'generalized' is the 'slowed processing' in SLI? The case of visuospatial attentional orienting. *Neuropsychologia*, 42(5), 661–671.
- Skipper, J. I., Nusbaum, H. C., & Small, S. L. (2006). Lending a helping hand to hearing: Another motor theory of speech perception. In M. A. Arbib (Ed.), *Action to Language Via the Mirror Neuron System*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, A. (2006). Speech motor development: Integrating muscles, movements, and linguistic units. *Journal of communication disorders*, 39(5), 331–349.
- Smith, A., & Zelaznik, H. N. (2004). Development of functional synergies for speech motor coordination in childhood and adolescence. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 45, 22–33.
- Snowling, M. J. (1981). Phonemic deficits in developmental dyslexia. *Psychological Research*, 43, 219–234.
- Snowling, M., Goulandris, N., Bowlby, M. & Howell, P. (1986). Segmentation and speech perception in relation to reading skill: a developmental analysis. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 41, 489–507.
- Square-Storer, P., Qualizza, L., & Roy, E. A. (1989). Isolated and sequenced oral-motor posture production under different input modalities by left-hemisphere damaged adults. *Cortex*, 25(3), 371-86.
- Stark, R.E., & Blackwell, P.B.. (1997). Oral volitional movements in children with language impairments. *Child Neuropsychology*, 3, 81–97.
- Stokes, S. F., & Klee, T. (2009). Factors that influence vocabulary development in two-year-old children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 50(4), 498–505.
- Stiles, J. (2011). Brain development and the nature versus nurture debate. In O. Braddick, J. Atkinson and G. Innocenti (Eds.) *Gene Expression to Neurobiology and Behaviour: Human Brain Development and Developmental Disorders*, 189, 3 -22.
- Stiles, J. (2012). The effects of injury to dynamic neural networks in the mature and developing brain. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 54(3), 343–349. doi:10.1002/dev.20628
- Torgesen, J.K., Wagner, R.K., & Rashotte, C.A. (1999). *TOWRE, Test of Word Reading Efficiency*. PRO-ED, Austin, Texas.
- Torgesen, J.K., Wagner, R.K., & Rashotte, C.A. (1999). *CTOPP, Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing*. PRO-ED, Austin, Texas.

- Tremblay, S., Houle, G., & Ostry, D. J. (2008). Specificity of Speech Motor Learning. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 28(10), 2426–2434. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4196-07.2008
- Ullman, M. T., & Pierpont, E. I. (2005). Specific Language Impairment is not specific to language: The Procedural Deficit Hypothesis. *Cortex*, 41, 399–433.
- Unsworth, N., & Engle, R. W. (2005). Working memory capacity and fluid abilities: Examining the correlation between operation span and Raven. *Intelligence*, 33(1), 67–81.
- Vance, M., Stackhouse, J., & Wells, B. (2005). Speech–production skills in children aged 3–7 years. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 40(1), 29–48.
- Vargha-Khadem, F., Watkins, K. E., Price, C. J., Ashburner, J., Alcock, K. J., Connelly, A., Frackowiak, R. S., et al. (1998). Neural basis of an inherited speech and language disorder. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 95(21), 12695–12700.
- Walsh, B., Smith, A., & Weber-Fox, C. (2006). Short-term plasticity in children's speech motor systems. *Developmental Psychobiology*, 48(8), 660–674.
- Wechsler, D. (1992). *Wechsler intelligence scale for children — Third Edition UK (WISC-III-UK) Manual*. London: The Psychological Corporation.
- Wise, J. C., Sevcik, R. A., Morris, R. D., Lovett, M. W., & Wolf, M. (2007). The relationship among receptive and expressive vocabulary, listening comprehension, pre-reading skills, word identification skills, and reading comprehension by children with reading disabilities. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 50(4), 1093–1109.
- Zelaznik, H. N., & Goffman, L. (2010). Generalized Motor Abilities and Timing Behavior in Children With Specific Language Impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 53(2), 383-393.