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Purpose

Use an extant dataset (Romski et al., 2010; Romski in prep) to address two purposes.

1. explore potential predictors of the total number of vocabulary combinations at the end of a parent-coached language intervention.
2. To raise awareness of potential methodological issues behind collecting frequency data (count data outcomes) and to compare popular models that address these issues.
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Word Combinations of Typically Developing Children

- TD children begin to combine words around 2 years of age.
- Vocabulary is important!
  - Begin to combine with an expressive vocabulary of 50 words
  - Conceptual development plays a role in early grammar (Brown, 1973)
  - Familiarity with verbs helps young children produce abstract grammatical structures (Tomasello, 2000)

Children with Intellectual Disabilities Who Use AAC

- Youth with ID use symbol vocabularies to build complex structures to communicate (Wilkinson, Romski & Sevcik, 1994)
- Many studies have successfully used trial-based (Binger & Light, 2007; Nigam et al., 2006) and partner training interventions (Binger et al., 2008, 2010) to teach vocabulary combinations.
- We know little about what contributes to the emerging combinations of children who participate in language interventions when they are being not formally taught.
Research Questions

- RQ1: Do toddler characteristics (baseline language measures, access to an AAC device) and Language outcomes (MLU, target vocabulary size, TTR), predict emerging number of vocabulary combinations when controlling for age?
- RQ2: Does target vocabulary size mediate the relationship between toddler characteristics (baseline language measures, access to an AAC device) and total number of target vocabulary combinations?
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Participants

- Extant data were used from 113 parent-toddler dyads who participated in two parent-coached language intervention studies (Romski et al., 2010; Romski, in prep).
- Toddlers ranged in age between 24-38 months.
- Toddlers had an expressive vocabulary of less than 10 words and scored less than 12 months on the expressive language scale of the Mullen.

Language Intervention

- All parent-child dyads participated in 24 30-minute parent-child language interventions over 12 weeks.
- All children were assigned an individualized set of vocabulary words they did not know.
- All parents were encouraged to elicit the vocabulary words using different strategies (e.g., modeling, expansion, sabotage).
- Children either did or did not have a speech-generating device (SGD) throughout the intervention.

Baseline Receptive and Expressive Language Scales:
Mullen Scales of Early Learning, Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales (VABS), The MacArthur-Bates Communicative Development Inventory (MCDI), and Sequenced Inventory of Communication Development (SICD).

Language Outcomes (final intervention session):
- Mean Length of Utterance (MLU)
- Type Token Ration (TTR)
- Target vocabulary size (e.g., ball, myturn, read, turnpage)

Use of AAC:
- SGD was a light-weight low-tech device using Picture Communication Symbols (PCS; Mayer-Johnson, 1981).
- Children who had access to a speech-generating device (SGD) vs. those who did not.
Measures and Variables

Word Combinations:

- Combination included more than one target vocabulary word
- Included both spoken and aided symbol vocabulary words

Table 1: Examples of combination types made by toddlers at session 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agent - action</th>
<th>Action - object</th>
<th>Entity locative</th>
<th>Possessor - possession</th>
<th>Entity - attribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bear ride</td>
<td>bear (book)</td>
<td>bear (cracker)</td>
<td>bear (tire)</td>
<td>bear (bike)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go cow</td>
<td>drink juice</td>
<td>train (in)</td>
<td>your (cracker)</td>
<td>drink (full)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go train</td>
<td>drink/train</td>
<td>bear (tire)</td>
<td>your (cracker)</td>
<td>drink (full)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Examples are categorized according to Brown’s (1973) definition of early grammatical categories (semantic relations).

Measurement Issues with Count Data

- Measuring linguistic behaviors (frequency data) in children with language and ID may result in counts with a preponderance of zeros and overdispersion.

- This creates complex issues when trying to analyze the data.

Types of Count Data Distributions

May want to consider modeling using count models rather than regular OLS regression. Why?

- Poisson regression: conditional mean is modeled as a function of the covariates. Assumes that the unconditional mean and unconditional variances are equal.

- Negative binomial: Same mean structure as Poisson. Makes a provision for overdispersion in the data (variance is greater than the mean).

- Zero inflated Poisson (zip): Uses a logit model to model the probability of a constant (Structural) zero and count data is modeled by the Poisson regression.

- Zero inflated negative binomial (zinb): Model the probability of structural zero. Models count data and overdispersion in the distribution of the NB component.

Outcome: Number of Vocabulary Combinations

Let’s take a look at descriptives for the outcome of the present study:

- Only 22 out of 113 combined target vocabulary words.

- The unconditional Mean=.85 and the Variance=7.3.
Data Analysis Plan

- Model fit was compared across four count-data models (e.g., poisson, negative binomial, zero inflated negative binomial, zero-inflate poisson) by comparing Loglikelihood Ratios for nested models and comparing BIC values and Vuong tests (1989) for non-nested models.

- For RQ1 and RQ2, We utilized expressive and receptive language factor scores in our analyses as independent variables. Factor scores were calculated in Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2012) by fitting a two-factor model, ($p = .017, CFI = .976, RMSEA = .084$). Factors were correlated at $.541, p<.001.

- For RQ1, we conducted a multiple regression analysis. For RQ2 we conducted a mediation model. Analyses were conducted using STATA (RQ1; Statacorp, 2013) and Mplus (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2012).

Research Question 1: count data coefficients

Table 2. Comparison of count data models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Poisson</th>
<th>Negative Binomial</th>
<th>Zero Inflated Poisson</th>
<th>Poisson Logit</th>
<th>Negative Binomial Logit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.54**</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to AAC (yes or no)</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline language skills</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC Use</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLU (session 24)</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-3.14</td>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>-2.82</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTR (session 24)</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vocabulary Size (session 24)</td>
<td>0.12***</td>
<td>0.14***</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>-0.08*</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.81***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values are unstandardized coefficient estimates for Poisson, Negative Binomial, Zero-inflated Poisson and Zero-inflated binomial. MLU=Mean length of utterance. TTR=type-token ratio. Dispersion=dispersion parameter, $\alpha$. *Statistically significant ($p<.05$), **statistically significant ($p<.01$) ***statistically significant ($p<.000$).
Research Question 1: visualizing model fit

Figure 2: Comparison of model fit between count data models

Note: LR=Likelihood ratio test (nested models). BIC=Difference in BIC values (non-nested models). Vuong=significance test between non-nested models *Statistically significant (p<.05), **statistically significant (p<.01) ***statistically significant (p<.000)
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Research Question 1: NB results

- The negative binomial model provided the best model fit.
- Functional vocabulary words was a significant predictor the number of vocabulary combinations produced at session 24, p<.01
- For every one word increase in functional vocabulary, the number of total vocabulary combinations increased by 14.6% (1−exp (0.1363) = 0.146),
- Pseudo R2=.13

Research Question 2

Does target vocabulary size mediate the relationship between toddler characteristics (baseline language measures, access to AAC) and outcome of target vocabulary combinations?
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Research Question 2: Analyses

- Tested mediation using MPLUS.
- Applied the same steps to compare model fit as in RQ1.
- As in RQ 1, Negative binomial regression was the best fit to the data.
Discussion and Implications

- Vocabulary combinations can emerge in toddlers without teaching targeted vocabulary combinations.

- Receptive language skills and use of a SGD do not directly explain emerging vocabulary combinations. However, SGDs and receptive language skills promote acquisition of target vocabulary (Romski et al, 2010; Barker et al., in prep).

- Teaching parents to use language eliciting techniques (with a focus on targeting vocabulary growth) in a natural communication context is helpful to eliciting emerging vocabulary combinations.

Limitations

- Vocabulary repertoires are idiosyncratic!
- Other toddler characteristics?
- Comparison group?

Future Directions

- Combine intervention and follow-up data to look at individual growth curve patterns (has been done with count data!).
- Qualitative look at grammatical structures over time (follow-up data).
Thank you!