**Methods**

**Narrative Language Sample**
- Lost in Space (War-Kepper, 1998)
- Participants recalled the story after being told to them

**Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Impairment</th>
<th>Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>WMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9 males)</td>
<td>(5 males)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (yrs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLS (7.78)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM (8.19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIQ (102.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quantitative Scoring**

- **Productivity**
  - C-units: Total no. C-units
  - Events: No. recalled events

- **Fluency**
  - Pauses: No. pauses 2 s per 100 NUN
  - %Maze: Ratio of mazed words* to NUN

- **Grammatical Complexity**
  - MLUw: Unmazed words per C-unit
  - SubC-unit: Finite subordinate clauses per C-unit

- **Grammatical Accuracy**
  - %GCU: Percent grammatically correct C-units
  - Errors: Morphosyntactic errors per C-unit

**Model Testing**

- Logistic regression in R to predict LI status from MLUw, %GCU, Pauses, % Maze and WMI status from Events, SubC-units, Pauses, % Mazes.
- Used backward elimination to select predictors. Age added last.
- FB of iterative models compared using AIC, McFadden’s pseudo-R² and ANOVA.

**Qualitative Procedure**

- Descriptors were generated from linguistic features of narratives.
- Descriptors were developed through repetitive readings of narratives and comparison across participants.
- Samples from impairment groups were compared those from controls, examining for patterns of descriptors.

**Qualitative Descriptors**

- Fluency: Disfluencies, Hesitations, Effortful Recall, False Starts, Revisions, Blundering, Filler Phrases, Trailling Off
- Content: Elaborate, Short, Missing Content, Repeated Content, Mixed Up Content, Added Content
- Semantics: Expressive Vocabulary, Pauses, Odd Wording
- Morphosyntax: Long Sentence, Short Sentences, Morphological Errors, Clumsy Links
- Phonology: Low Attention to Phonological Detail
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**Conclusions**

- LI was predicted by linguistic factors whereas WMI was predicted by recall factors.
- Grammatical complexity: LI was related to MLUw (and errors) whereas WMI was related to subordination.
- Conceptual connections between events may support recall.
- Qualitative descriptors of narratives differentiated children with and without impairment.
- The relationship between mazing and impairment may be mediated by other factors such as monitoring ability or willingness to take risks while speaking.