Investigating narrative performance in children with developmental language disorder: A
systematic review and meta-analysis

Katherine L. Winters¹, Javier Jasso^{1,2}, James E. Pustejovsky³, Courtney T. Byrd¹

¹ The University of Texas at Austin

² Widener University

³ University of Wisconsin – Madison

January 11, 2022

Corresponding author:

Katherine L. Winters, MA, CCC-SLP

The University of Texas at Austin

Department of Speech, Language, and Hearing Sciences

2504A Whitis Ave. Stop A1100

Austin, TX 78712

(512) 471-4119

(512) 471-2957 (fax)

katiewinters@utexas.edu

Conflict of Interest: There are no relevant financial or nonfinancial relationships to report.

Funding Statement: The corresponding author received an ASHA Convention Student Research Travel Award to present preliminary findings at the ASHA 2019 Convention.

Key Words

narrative, assessment, children, developmental language disorder, meta-analysis

Abstract

Purpose: Speech-language pathologists (SLPs) typically examine narrative performance when completing a comprehensive language assessment. However, there is significant variability in the methodologies used to evaluate narration. The primary aims of this systematic review and meta-analysis were to a) investigate how narrative assessment type (e.g., macrostructure, microstructure, internal state language) differentiates typically developing (TD) children from children with developmental language disorder (DLD), or, TD–DLD group differences, b) identify specific narrative assessment measures (e.g., number of different words) that result in greater TD–DLD differences, and, c) evaluate participant and sample characteristics (e.g., DLD inclusionary criteria) that may uniquely influence performance differences.

Method: Three electronic databases (PsychInfo, ERIC, and PubMed) and ASHAWire were searched on July 30, 2019 to locate studies that reported oral narrative language measures for both DLD and TD groups between ages 4 and 12 years; studies focusing on written narration or other developmental disorders only were excluded. Thirty-seven primary studies were identified via a three-step study selection procedure. We extracted data related to the sample participants, the narrative task(s) and assessment measures, and research design. Standardized mean differences using a bias-corrected Hedges' g were the calculated effect sizes ($N = 382$). Research questions were analyzed using mixed-effects meta-regression with robust variance estimation to account for effect size dependencies.

Results: Searches identified eligible studies published between 1987 and 2019. An overall meta-analysis using 382 effect sizes obtained across 37 studies showed that children with DLD had decreased narrative performance relative to TD peers, with summary estimates ranging from -0.850 , 95% CI $[-1.016, -0.685]$ to -0.794 , 95% CI $[-0.963, -0.624]$, depending on the correlation assumed. Across all models, effect size estimates showed significant heterogeneity both between and within studies, even after accounting for effect size-, sample-,

and study-level predictors. Grammatical accuracy (microstructure) and story grammar (macrostructure) yielded the most consistent evidence of significant TD–DLD group differences across statistical models.

Conclusions: Present findings suggest some narrative assessment measures may yield significantly different performance between children with and without DLD. However, researchers need to be consistent in their inclusionary criteria, their description of sample characteristics, and in their reporting of the correlations of measures, in order to determine which assessment measures are more likely to yield group differences.

Supplemental Material: Additional supplementary material, complete raw data, and R code for replicating all reported analyses are available on the Open Science Framework at <https://osf.io/dgz7m/> (supplementary material) and <https://osf.io/ybdx7/> (replication materials).

Developmental language disorder (DLD) is a common neurodevelopmental communication disorder characterized by significant deficits in language learning, comprehension, and expression that impacts approximately 7.5% of children, or two school-age students per every classroom of thirty (Norbury et al., 2016; Tomblin et al., 1997). Children with DLD may demonstrate a variety of impairments across the domains of phonology, morphology/syntax, semantics, and pragmatics that persist into adulthood (Dollaghan, 2004, 2011; Goffman & Leonard, 2000; McGregor et al., 2020; Rudolph et al., 2019). Despite the prevalence and far-reaching effects of DLD, there is relatively low awareness of the disorder and children are often not identified for speech-language services (McGregor, 2020; Wittke & Spaulding, 2018). Additionally, there are at least two critical issues that limit generalization of research findings to present understanding of the disorder: 1) evolving disorder criteria and terminology (Bishop et al., 2016; Bishop et al., 2017) and 2) inconsistent and substandard inclusionary criteria for DLD in research studies (Nitido & Plante, 2020). The present study seeks to improve understanding of DLD by synthesizing previous research specific to one of the most employed measures of language assessment used to identify this clinical population: narration.

Narrative assessment, from a broad-based perspective, includes analysis of macrostructure (e.g., use of story grammar), microstructure (e.g., syntactic complexity), and internal state language (e.g., characters' thoughts or feelings). Narratives effectively elicit discourse-level language including syntactically complex utterances with causal and temporal details, often from a known context, and require the speaker to plan and share their story in real time (Channell et al., 2018; Southwood & Russell, 2004; Stein & Glenn, 1979; Westby, 1984; Westerveld & Moran, 2013). Thus, narrative performance has been recommended as a tool for diagnosis and as a method for determining intervention goals and classroom recommendations (Gallagher & Hoover, 2020; Newman & McGregor, 2006; Pico et al.,

2021). Furthermore, while language learning contexts differ globally, the use of narrative assessment likely extends beyond monolingual English-speaking children, as demonstrated with multilingual and non-English speaking data (Gagarina et al., 2012; Govindarajan & Paradis, 2019; Pesco & Bird, 2016).

Over the nearly 30 years of research completed to date, researchers have reported DLD performance in narrative tasks using various methodologies and outcome measures. This diversity makes it difficult to determine optimal narrative elicitation procedures and analyses for SLPs to use when assessing narrative performance of a child with suspected DLD. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to meta-analyze the available evidence from primary research studies investigating narrative performance in children with DLD, in order to elucidate narrative assessment methods and analyses that differentiate children with DLD from TD peers.

Narratives of Children with DLD

Previous research has reported narrative deficits in DLD across measures of macrostructure, microstructure, and internal state language. As a group, children with DLD produce narratives that are less syntactically complex (i.e., microstructure). Specifically, they produce narratives of reduced length (e.g., lower MLU), lexical diversity (e.g., fewer number of different words), grammatical accuracy (e.g., increased number of syntactic errors), and fluency (e.g., more mazes) compared to the narratives of TD peers (e.g., Govindarajan & Paradis, 2019). Children with DLD also produce narratives with less sophisticated story grammar and referencing (i.e., macrostructure; Fichman & Altman, 2019; Hao et al., 2018; Norbury & Bishop, 2003; Peña et al., 2006a; Reilly et al., 2004). Additionally, there is some evidence that narratives of children with DLD also contain less internal state language (Altman et al., 2016; Boerma et al., 2016).

The role of assessment type

Interestingly, although weaknesses in narrative macrostructure, microstructure, and internal state language have been reported in multiple studies, there are mixed findings regarding which aspects of narrative performance are impaired. For example, in a sample of 5-year-old English–Hebrew bilingual children, Altman (2016) reported distinct differences in narrative microstructure but similar performance in narrative macrostructure and internal state language between DLD and TD peers. In contrast, Duinmeijer et al. (2012) observed deficits in both microstructure and macrostructure in monolingual Dutch-speaking children ages six through nine years. Using a sample of monolingual English-speaking school-age children in the United States and Canada, Colozzo et al. (2011) provided evidence that children with language deficits may present with different patterns of deficit, such as relative strengths in narrative content (macrostructure) and relative weaknesses in narrative form (microstructure).

The role of participant characteristics

In addition to heterogeneity in presentation of DLD within and across previous studies, researchers also note individual participant characteristics (i.e., sample-level variation) such as age and language background may uniquely influence narrative performance. For example, Guo and Schneider (2016) reported percent grammatical C-units yielded greater diagnostic accuracy for 6-year-old children compared to 8-year-old children, indicating smaller TD–DLD group differences as children age. Similarly, both age and monolingual language experience appear to influence TD–DLD differences in lexical–semantic performance across narrative and standardized language tasks (Charest et al., 2020; Jasso et al., 2020). Given these relevant participant characteristics, the present meta-analysis assessed differences in narrative performance across narrative assessment types and within assessment type while accounting for participant characteristics such as age and bilingual status.

The role of study characteristics

There are also study-level characteristics that may influence differences in narrative performance between children with DLD and their TD peers, such as sample size, participant recruitment methods, and the narrative task implemented. For example, primary research studies with clinical populations often have smaller sample sizes and may be underpowered, which may influence the ability to draw accurate inferences about group differences (Gaeta & Brydges, 2020). Additionally, to our knowledge, no study on narrative performance has specifically investigated the effect of recruitment method (i.e., community sample or referral from a speech-language pathologist) or inclusionary criteria on DLD group narrative performance. However, previous work has shown many children who meet DLD or specific language impairment criteria for research studies are often not receiving speech-language intervention (Wittke & Spaulding, 2018). Furthermore, Dollaghan and Horner (2011) have reported spectrum bias, or diagnostic accuracy that does not reflect the full spectrum of clinical diagnosis, in research with DLD. Thus, it is possible that comparisons between children with DLD recruited via a community sample and TD peers may not yield the same difference in performance as comparisons between children with DLD who are referred by a speech-language pathologist and TD peers.

The specific narrative task implemented by researchers may also influence a child with DLD's performance. For example, narrative format (i.e., tell vs. retell) and level of support provided (e.g., use of visual aids) have been shown to influence the sophistication of a child's narration (Hayward, 2003; Peña et al., 2006b; Schneider & Dubé, 2005). Finally, there is variability between and within studies as to how to calculate commonly used language analyses such as mean length utterance (Duinmeijer et al., 2012; Thordardottir et al., 2011). Thus, this meta-analysis sought to evaluate if these distinct methodological characteristics influenced differences in performance between children with DLD and their TD peers.

The Present Study

Due to the variability across studies with respect to participant characteristics (e.g., age), narrative characteristics (e.g., narrative task and measure type), and study characteristics (e.g., DLD inclusionary criteria), it is not surprising that there is no universally adopted narrative assessment and subsequent analysis that yields high true positive identification of DLD and TD status. Presently, consumers of primary research studies investigating narratives in children with DLD face several challenges in synthesizing the results of these studies to inform clinical practice. Fortunately, recent advances in statistical methods such as multi-level meta-analysis and robust variance estimation allow researchers to effectively summarize effect sizes across studies while accounting for both multiple narrative measures and multiple samples within primary research studies, both of which lead to dependence in effect size estimates. These methods have been adopted in a few previous meta-analyses in communication disorders research (Hopkins-Rossabi et al., 2019; Lancaster et al., 2020; Sandbank et al., 2020). The present study provides further insight into the statistical, clinical, and practical significance of this methodological approach, and a much-needed pathway for understanding differences in outcomes across the available studies that have analyzed narration in children with DLD.

To our knowledge, no meta-analysis has previously synthesized the available evidence regarding differences in narrative performance between TD children and children with DLD, nor has any study specifically investigated the influence of DLD recruitment and inclusionary criteria. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to conduct a systematic review and quantitative meta-analysis in order to effectively summarize the research findings of the past three decades. We asked the following research questions:

- 1) How large are TD–DLD differences across narrative assessment type (macrostructure, microstructure, and internal state language)?

- 2) Are TD–DLD differences in macrostructure moderated by narrative assessment subtype (e.g., story grammar)?
- 3) Are TD–DLD differences in microstructure moderated by narrative assessment subtype (e.g., lexical diversity)?
- 4) Across narrative assessment types, are TD–DLD differences moderated by DLD recruitment method and inclusionary criteria?
- 5) Across narrative assessment types, are TD–DLD differences moderated by task type (e.g., tell vs. retell) and level of support (e.g., verbal cues)?
- 6) Across narrative assessment types, which common narrative assessment measures (e.g., MLU) yield large TD–DLD differences?

Method

The procedures for this systematic review and meta-analysis were in accordance with relevant best practice guidelines as outlined in the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA; Moher et al., 2009; Page et al., 2020) Supplementary materials include a completed PRISMA checklist. The review was not pre-registered.

Study Selection

Inclusion Criteria

We included studies in this synthesis if they reported the following: 1) oral narrative language performance for a group of children with developmental language disorder, specific/primary language impairment, or language impairment (i.e., DLD group) and a group of age-matched peers with typical language (i.e., TD group); 2) group membership assignment (DLD or TD) determined through standardized assessment, non-standardized assessment, and/or clinical judgement by a certified SLP; 3) participant age range between 4 and 12 years (or, if age was not reported, grades preschool to sixth grade); and 4) sufficient quantitative results (e.g., sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and relevant test statistics)

to calculate an effect size estimate and its associated sampling variance. Because of the range of clinical terminology and diagnostic criteria used across studies (Bishop et al., 2016, 2017; Nitido & Plante, 2020), we made the decision to use broad inclusion criteria for group assignment (DLD or TD) and carefully document differences in terminology and DLD inclusionary criteria in our coding procedures, which are described later.

Selection Procedure

Identification of eligible studies comprised a three-step process: 1) an electronic database search, 2) an abstract screening, and 3) a full-text article review (Figure 1; Haddaway & McGuinness, 2020). A comprehensive electronic search was conducted on July 30, 2019, using three electronic databases: PsychInfo, ERIC, and PubMed. The following search terms were used across databases: (“narrative skill*” or “narrative abilit*” or narration) AND (assess* or evaluat* or perform*) AND (“language impair*” or “language delay*” or “language disorder*” or “specific language impairment” or “developmental language disorder”) NOT (“adult” or “motor” or “spell*” or “writ*” or “hear” or “read*”). To maximize search coverage, truncations, indicated by an asterisk, were used to search all word variations (i.e., word roots with different derivational or inflectional suffixes); for example, “evaluat*” searched “evaluate,” “evaluation,” “evaluating,” and so on. The PubMed search made use of relevant MeSH headings (“narration”, “child,” “disease”). In addition to these databases, ASHAWire was used to search all ASHA journals, using the following search terms: (“narrative skill*” or “narrative abilit*” or narration) AND (assess* or evaluat* or perform*). Across databases, studies were not restricted to recent publications or peer-reviewed articles; therefore, dissertations and poster abstracts were not excluded from consideration. This database search resulted in 1,172 studies, which were then screened for eligibility based on title and abstract.

The first author completed the next step of screening process by evaluating study abstracts from all 1,172 studies with respect to the four inclusionary criteria. Studies that met all four criteria advanced to the full article review stage. Studies where inclusion could not be determined solely by the abstract (e.g., articles that did not expand upon DLD or TD group assignment but met all other criteria) also advanced to the full article review stage. Interrater reliability between the first and second authors on a randomly selected 20% of abstracts ($n = 236$) showed 96.19% reliability. After duplicate studies were removed ($n = 8$), a total of 56 studies advanced to the full article review.

The second author reviewed the full text of these 56 studies to determine whether they met all inclusionary criteria and were eligible for inclusion in the present analysis. Studies with missing effect size data or missing demographic information were included at this stage. Of the 56 studies evaluated, 14 did not meet inclusionary criteria, and 42 studies were retained. Interrater reliability on 20% of the full articles ($n = 11$) showed 90.9% reliability between the second and first authors.

Of the 42 studies retained, six studies were determined to have insufficient information for calculating effect sizes or missing demographic information. The first author contacted the corresponding author of each study; all responded, and one provided sufficient data for effect size calculation. A total of $n = 40$ studies were retained and coded during this correspondence. Three of these studies reported values for effect size calculation that were insufficient (e.g., standard deviations of zero). Ultimately, 37 studies were included in the present meta-analysis.

Coding Procedures

Data from each study that passed the full article review (final $n = 37$) were entered into a Microsoft Excel workbook by the first and second authors and a trained research assistant, using a detailed codebook. The complete dataset is available in the replication

materials (<https://osf.io/ybdx7/>). We extracted information related to each study's sample(s), as well as both descriptive and quantitative results summarizing group performances. Specifically, we recorded descriptive data for each study related to sample characteristics, such as average age, average SES level, and determination of group assignment. For studies that reported data on multiple, non-overlapping samples, we extracted information for each sample meeting inclusion criteria. In a separate spreadsheet, we coded information regarding group performance on standardized language assessments, with one row per assessment per sample per study. In a third spreadsheet, we coded descriptive data related to the narrative task(s) administered and quantitative data related to group performances in order to calculate effect sizes. This resulted in multiple rows of data for studies reporting multiple narrative assessment tasks (i.e., multiple effect sizes were extracted for each sample). Detailed information regarding all coding procedures is outlined below.

The second author and a trained research assistant coded study data on demographic information or data relevant to the planned analyses. This included participant characteristics for each group (age, sex, language performance, nonverbal IQ, SES, bilingual/bidialectal status, language(s) spoken, and country tested), task-level data (task language, task material, elicitation type, and level of support), and information regarding the narrative measure (specific index used across macrostructure, microstructure or internal state language). The first author subsequently checked and confirmed these values.

Participant Sample-Level Data. For TD and DLD groups, summary data (including means and SDs) were extracted for age, sex, language performance, nonverbal IQ, SES, bilingual/bidialectal status, language(s) spoken, country tested, DLD/TD inclusionary criteria, DLD recruitment, and diagnostic term used (e.g., DLD or SLI). Age values were transformed to age in months. In cases where summary data was reported for a previous time point than

the measure reported on (e.g., Fey et al., 2004), the first author referred to the original study to obtain necessary sample-level data.

Language ability status determination (TD vs. DLD) differed across studies, consistent with previous reports in the literature (Bishop et al., 2016; Bishop et al., 2017; Nitido & Plante, 2020). For example, some studies used criteria that aligned with district or state eligibility requirements, while others relied on stricter SLI criteria. To capture these differences in recruitment and determination of ability status, studies were coded both for whether DLD children were recruited via a clinical or population-based sample and for how DLD status was determined. DLD inclusionary criteria was classified as 1) SLP identified, 2) two or more standardized subtests/tests used, or, 3) both.

For studies of bilingual/bidialectal populations (e.g., Spanish–English bilingual children), in addition to the task language/dialect and country variables that were coded in monolingual groups, the specific languages spoken by the child were also coded (e.g., Russian (L1) and Hebrew (L2)). Given the wide variability in descriptions of participants’ bilingual experience (e.g., input/output, age of acquisition), more fine-grained coding was not possible (see Surrain & Luk, 2019, for a synthesis on bilingual sample reporting). Language performance on each standardized assessment measure reported in primary studies (i.e., to describe the sample and/or determine group assignment) was coded for each language reported.

To describe language performance at the group level, a single proxy for language performance was used for each language reported. In order to select one representative assessment, we established four decision rules. First, all single-word vocabulary measures (e.g., *PPVT*) were excluded, given their poor identification of DLD in monolingual/bilingual populations (Anaya et al., 2018; Gray et al., 1999; Shahmahmood et al., 2016; Spaulding et al., 2006). Second, all parent-report measures of language performance were excluded in

order to avoid confounding parent-report and behavioral measures, as most studies reported behavioral assessments. Third, if only one non-vocabulary behavioral measure was reported, this was used. Finally, if multiple measures were included, we used the following hierarchy: a composite score of a standardized battery with specified cutoffs and adequate specificity/sensitivity (Nitido & Plante, 2020); a subtest of a battery (if only one was administered) or a composite score of a battery that did not have adequate psychometrics to be used alone; and an average of two or three subtest scores from a standardized battery. In order to compare language performance across a heterogeneous list of assessments ($n = 22$), we collected normative data for these selected assessments. These normative means and standard deviations were used to transform sample means and standard deviations into z-scores.

Task-Level Data. We also extracted information about the narrative tasks used. This included the task material (e.g., Frog story, *TNL*, and *MAIN*), the language of the task, and the task context (e.g., story retell with sequential pictures), as described in the primary studies. In order to represent similarities and differences across task contexts, we classified each task along two dimensions: task type (retell, tell, or both retell and tell) and level of support (visual, auditory only, or a combination). Inter-rater reliability on 20% of this data between first and second authors was greater than 90% (task type = 97%; task support = 91%).

Categorization of narrative assessment measures. Data related to written language or oral–written composites were excluded from the analysis. Although our focus was on narrative production, measures of narrative comprehension or comprehension–production composites were retained. For intervention studies that reported both pre- and post-test measures, only pretest measures were retained, given our interest in overall performance, not gains after a period of intervention. For studies reporting multiple TD control groups (e.g., age-matched, language-matched), only the performance of age-matched controls was entered. Finally, to ensure interpretability of effect size comparisons and pooling across studies,

measures with negative valence (i.e., ones where a higher score equals more of a negative construct like “ungrammaticality,” “errors,” and “maze production”) were reversed.

Each eligible outcome measure was first coded by 1) the narrative measure type (macrostructure, microstructure, or internal state language), in line with previous work (Baixauli et al., 2016), and 2) the specific narrative assessment measure reported by the study (e.g., MLU_m, % correct adverbs). Given the large number of unique measures extracted across studies (macrostructure: $n = 84$; microstructure: $n = 134$, ISL: $n = 13$; mixed: $n = 10$), we used thematic coding that was theoretically grounded to further classify those measures into a narrative assessment subtype (e.g., MLU was coded within the microstructure narrative assessment subtype of “length”). Table 1 provides examples of this categorization process. Reliability for these intermediate measure constructs between first and second authors was 92.13%.

Effect size calculations. Standardized mean differences, which quantified the difference in performance between TD and DLD groups, were the effect sizes (ES) metric. Effect sizes were coded so that a negative value indicated that DLD performed worse than TD peers, and a positive value indicated the opposite pattern. For measures where a higher score represented a less desirable performance (e.g., “ungrammaticality,” “errors,” or “maze production”), the direction of the effect size was reversed to ensure interpretability when pooling across studies. Standardized mean differences were calculated using the Hedges’ g estimator (Hedges, 1981).

Planned Analyses

Data were analyzed using R 4.0.2 (R Core Team, 2020) in RStudio (RStudio Team, 2015), using two packages appropriate for meta-analysis: *metafor* (version 2.4.0; Viechtbauer, 2010) and *clubSandwich* (version 0.5.2; Pustejovsky, 2020). R scripts used to conduct all reported analyses are available in the replication materials at <https://osf.io/ybdx7/>.

Outliers. Prior to conducting analysis, we examined the distribution of effect size estimates for outliers, defined as an effect size estimate falling more than three times the inter-quartile range below the first quartile or more than three times the inter-quartile range above the third quartile (Tukey, 1977). Based on this definition, there were no outlying effect sizes, so we conducted analysis using all eligible effect size estimates.

Effect size dependency. The set of effect size estimates included in our analyses had two features that necessitated use of advanced meta-analytic methods. First, many of the eligible samples included effect size data for multiple measures of narrative performance. Effect size estimates calculated from a common sample of participants will have correlated sampling errors, and so should not be treated as independent. However, the information needed to assess the degree of correlation was seldom provided in primary study reports. Second, some studies reported data for multiple participant samples. Effect sizes estimated from different samples within the same study may be similar if researchers use the same measurement procedures, recruitment strategies, or other study procedures across the samples. Thus, the effect size data exhibited a hierarchical dependence structure, with individual effect sizes nested within samples, and samples nested within studies.

To synthesize the effect size estimates while accounting for these two features, we used a meta-analytic method known as robust variance estimation (RVE; Hedges et al., 2010; Pustejovsky & Tipton, 2021). RVE involves use of a *working model* that describes tentative assumptions about the degree of correlation and other forms of dependence in the effect size estimates, and which is used to determine an appropriate weight assigned to each effect size and study. However, the standard errors, hypothesis tests, and confidence intervals based on RVE remain valid even if some of the assumptions of the working model are wrong. Additionally, we used RVE with the “CR2” small-sample correction method (Tipton, 2015;

Tipton & Pustejovsky, 2015) to ensure that tests and confidence intervals had good properties even for analyses involving a small number of studies.

Summary Meta-Analysis and Sensitivity Analysis

As a preliminary summary of the effect size distribution, we estimated an overall average effect size across all included samples. For the summary meta-analysis, we used RVE with a working model that assumed that effect size estimates calculated from a common sample would be correlated at $\rho = .4$, and that there would be heterogeneity at three distinct levels: across effect sizes nested within samples, across samples nested within studies, and across studies. With this working model, heterogeneity is characterized in terms of estimated standard deviations at each level (effect-level, sample-level, and study-level). Larger standard deviations indicate that there is a higher degree of variability in the effect sizes, after accounting for the variation expected due purely to sampling error. Because we used RVE, estimates of overall average effect size should be valid even if our assumption about the degree of correlation was inaccurate. Nonetheless, we conducted sensitivity analyses to assess the extent to which our estimates size was sensitive to this assumption, by repeatedly re-estimating the model using correlations ranging from $\rho = .0$ to $\rho = .9$. As a further sensitivity analysis, we also repeatedly re-estimated the summary meta-analysis while excluding each study in turn, in order to gauge whether results were influenced by inclusion of a single, specific study.

Publication Bias

Publication bias and other forms of selective reporting of study results are common in many scientific disciplines, including communication disorders. Selective reporting occurs if specific study results (or even full studies) are more likely to be reported—and thus available for inclusion in a meta-analysis—when they are statistically significant than when they are not statistically significant. This can lead to inflation of effect size estimates and distortion of

meta-analytic results. To assess this possibility in our data, we created a contour-enhanced funnel plot (Peters et al., 2008). Asymmetry in the distribution of effect sizes within the funnel plot is a warning sign of potential selective reporting (although other factors can also lead to asymmetry). We also formally tested for asymmetry using a modified form of Egger's regression test, which used RVE to account for effect size dependency (Rodgers & Pustejovsky, 2020).

Meta-Regression Analysis

To address each of the first three research questions, as well as the sixth research question, we estimated a series of three meta-regression models using RVE with the same working model as in the summary meta-analysis. For each research question, we used meta-regression models with indicator variables for each level of the focal moderator (e.g., each measure type for RQ1, each microstructure narrative construct for RQ2), along with one or more additional predictors to account for variation in effect size magnitude due to factors other than the focal moderator. Model A adjusted for average age of the DLD group. Model B adjusted for average age of the DLD group, an indicator for non-English tasks, an indicator for bilingual samples, and an indicator for outcomes assessed in a second language. Finally, Model C adjusted for all of the predictors included in Model B, along with indicators for each level of the focal moderator that were centered at the mean of each unique sample. These sample mean-centered indicator variables account for sample-level differences in composition of the focal moderator. As a result, differences between levels of the focal moderator are estimated based only on *within-sample* comparisons—all sample-level factors are held constant. Model C therefore provides the most stringent test of differences in effect size between levels of the focal moderator.

The fourth and fifth research questions involved more than one focal moderator. To address them, we specified meta-regression models that included indicator variables for each

of the four narrative measure types, along with indicators for the levels of the focal moderators. For RQ4, the recruitment strategy indicators were compared to the reference level of clinical recruitment; the inclusionary criteria indicators were compared to the reference level of SLP only. For RQ5, the task type indicators were compared to the reference level of retell tasks; the task support indicators were compared to the reference level of auditory support.

For ease of interpretation, we centered most of the additional predictor variables near their median values. We centered publication year at 2020. Average effect size estimates can therefore be interpreted as applying to a contemporary population where DLD samples have an average age of 7.0 years, average non-verbal IQ of 95, average language test performance z-score of -1.64, are monolingual, use English-language tasks, and use tasks in L1 (rather than L2 for bilingual speakers). For each research question, we tested for differences across categories of the focal moderator using robust Wald tests with small-sample corrections (Tipton & Pustejovsky, 2015), which are similar to F-tests but with denominator degrees of freedom that can take non-integer values.

Results

Participant and Study Characteristics

The final meta-analysis summarized a total of 57 samples from 37 studies. Studies were published between 1987 and 2019, and each study reported between 1 and 6 samples (mean = 1.5 samples per study). Table S1 in Supplementary Material includes all descriptive statistics related to sample size, participant characteristics (e.g., age, language status), and sample characteristics (e.g., method of DLD recruitment). Sample sizes ranged from 20 to 435 total participants. Only two studies had samples greater than 100 participants (Burns et al., 2012; Kapantzoglou et al., 2019). The average sample size was 55.63 participants.

Across samples, the average age of children with DLD participating ranged from 4.3 years to 11.4 years (mean = 7.1 years). The average age of typically developing children participating ranged from 4.2 years to 11.5 years (mean = 7.1 years). Participants represented several countries, including Australia, Canada, China, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Navajo Nation, The Netherlands, Sweden, Vietnam, and the United States. Forty-eight samples included monolingual speakers and nine samples included bilingual speakers; language experience included Dutch, English, French, Hebrew, Icelandic, Italian, Mandarin, Russian, Spanish, Swedish, and Vietnamese. Children with DLD were recruited by population sampling ($n = 6$ samples), clinically referred by a speech-language pathologist ($n = 48$ samples), or through unspecified means ($n = 3$ samples). Inclusionary criteria included either a referral from a speech-language pathologist ($n = 3$ samples), standardized testing performance ($n = 17$ samples), or both ($n = 37$ samples). Additional sample characteristics (i.e., language test performance, non-verbal IQ, socio-economic status) were available for some, but not all studies (See Table 2 for a summary of missing data and Table S1 for descriptive statistics for these variables). In general, DLD and TD groups performed similarly on measures of non-verbal IQ, TD groups earned higher scores on standardized language testing, and both groups reported similar socio-economic status across samples.

A total of 382 effect sizes were obtained across all 57 samples and 37 studies. Individual studies reported between 1 and 6 samples and between 1 and 42 effect sizes. The simple average effect size estimate was -0.75 ($SD = 0.73$), with TD children outperforming children with DLD by 0.75 standard deviations, on average. Fourteen studies included samples with one or more positive effect sizes, indicating tasks where children with DLD outperformed TD children, albeit marginally. See Figure 2 for a forest plot depicting the set of effect size estimates from each included sample.

Meta-Analysis

An overall summary meta-analysis found an average TD–DLD group difference of -0.822 standard deviations, $t(33.7) = -10.1$, $p < .0001$, 95% CI [-0.987, -0.657]. There was substantial heterogeneity across effect sizes, $Q(381) = 1865.1$, $p < .0001$, with variance component estimates (reported as SDs) of 0.38 at the study level, 0.11 at the sample level, and 0.49 at the effect size level. The overall average effect size was not sensitive to our assumption about correlation between effect size estimates, with estimates varying from -0.850, 95% CI [-1.016, -0.685] assuming $\rho = .0$ to -0.794, 95% CI [-0.963, -0.624] assuming $\rho = .9$. The estimated total variation in true effect sizes was similarly insensitive, with a total SD ranging from 0.626 to 0.659, although individual variance component estimates were more sensitive to the assumed ρ (see Supplementary Figure S3 and Table S5). The overall average effect size and total variation in true effect sizes were not strongly influenced by any single study (Supplementary Figure S4). A cluster-robust Egger's regression test provided no clear indication of publication bias (See Supplementary Material Section S4 for a contour-enhanced funnel plot and results of Eggers's regression).

Our overall multi-level meta-analysis model assessed TD–DLD differences across all $k = 382$ effect sizes while accounting for nesting within samples and studies; however, it did not account for pertinent characteristics such as the measure type (e.g., macrostructure vs. microstructure) or age of the participants. Therefore, in order to answer each of our research questions, we assessed three meta-regression models with different study-, sample-, and effect size-level characteristics.

RQ1: Are there TD–DLD differences across narrative assessment type (macrostructure, microstructure, and internal state language)?

We assessed differences across narrative assessment types using models A, B, and C; results are reported in Table 4. Based on model A, there were significant differences between microstructure, macrostructure, internal state language (ISL), and mixed narrative assessment

type, $F(3, 2.8) = 17.7, p = .024$. Average group differences were statistically distinct from zero for each narrative assessment type, with estimated effects of -1.042 SD, 95% CI [-1.915, -0.169], for mixed types, -0.853, 95% CI [-1.036, -0.670] for microstructure; -0.782, 95% CI [-1.014, -0.551] for macrostructure; and -0.608, 95% CI [-0.930, -.286] for ISL. However, differences in average effects between macrostructure, microstructure, and ISL were not as large, nor as statistically distinct, when controlling for additional participant characteristics (Model B). Differences between narrative assessment types were further reduced when controlling for the composition of narrative assessments used in each study (Model C). Macrostructure, microstructure, and ISL assessments held differences statistically distinct from zero across all models. Notably, substantial heterogeneity at the study- and effect size-level remained despite the addition of sample- and task-related predictors.

RQ2: Are TD–DLD group differences in macrostructure moderated by narrative assessment subtype (e.g., story grammar)?

Table 5 reports estimated TD–DLD group differences for each macrostructure subtype, based on models estimated for the subset of effect sizes from macrostructure assessments. There was not strong evidence of differences between macrostructure subtypes. Descriptively, the macrostructure subtype that emerged as having the largest effect sizes across models was story grammar (average effect size range -1.059 to -0.852), followed by events (-0.872 to -0.802), referencing (-0.780 to -0.603), and a combination of these constructs (-.734 to -0.406). Across all three models, variance component estimates indicated considerable heterogeneity both between and within studies.

RQ3: Are TD–DLD differences in microstructure moderated by narrative assessment subtype (e.g., lexical diversity)?

Table 6 reports estimated TD–DLD differences for each microstructure subtype, based on the subset of effect sizes from microstructure assessments. Across all three models, there

was clear and consistent evidence of differences between microstructure assessment subtypes. Accuracy measures emerged as having the largest average effect size, showing a TD–DLD difference of -1.135, 95% CI [-1.587, -0.683], in Model A and similar levels in Models B and C. Fluency had the lowest average effect size across models, showing a TD–DLD difference of -0.039, 95% CI [-0.627, 0.550], in Model A and similar levels in Models B and C. Similar to the analysis of macrostructure subtypes, there was substantial remaining heterogeneity between and within studies.

RQ4: Across narrative assessment type, are TD–DLD differences moderated by DLD recruitment method and inclusionary criteria?

There was not strong evidence that DLD recruitment method (clinical vs. population) or inclusionary criteria (SLP determination only, standardized assessment only, or a combination of SLP determination and standardized assessment) influenced TD–DLD differences. Supplementary Table S6 reports results from this analysis. Differences in recruitment method were not statistically significant in any model. Descriptively, studies that determined inclusion by standardized assessment (alone or in combination with SLP judgement) exhibited larger TD–DLD differences than studies that used SLP determination only; however, differences between inclusionary criteria were imprecisely estimated and not statistically distinguishable. Of note, there was an uneven number of studies across comparison groups, resulting in limited power to detect a true difference if one existed. For example, very few studies reported population-based samples as opposed to samples recruited from clinical practice (see Table 3).

RQ5: Across narrative assessment type, are TD–DLD group differences moderated by task type (e.g., tell vs. retell) and level of support (e.g., verbal cues)?

We examined task type and level of support within the same model specifications, which also controlled for narrative assessment type (See Supplementary Table S7). There was

insufficient evidence to rule out the possibility that task type was unassociated with TD–DLD group differences in narrative performance. Descriptively, retell-and-tell tasks had larger group differences compared to narrative retell-only tasks, but this difference was imprecisely estimated and not statistically distinct from zero. Task level of support explained little variation in TD–DLD group differences and was not statistically significant in any of the models.

RQ6: Across narrative assessment type, are TD–DLD group differences moderated by common narrative assessment measures (e.g., MLU)?

For this research question, we identified specific narrative assessment measures across macrostructure, microstructure, and internal state language assessment types that were reported most often in primary studies (i.e., reported by at least 3 primary studies). We condensed related but slightly different measures (e.g., MLUw and MLU5w) to capture as many measures as possible in this analysis. This resulted in 12 specific narrative analyses reported in three or more studies, within 3–24 samples, and 3–45 effect sizes. These analyses and their average effect size estimates are depicted in Figure 3. There was insufficient evidence to suggest TD–DLD group differences varied across the 12 narrative analyses (see Supplementary Table S8). Although differences across measures were not statistically distinguishable, descriptively, grammaticality and tests of narrative language measures were associated with the largest effect size estimates. Only for grammaticality measures were the average effect sizes statistically distinct from zero.

Discussion

Research over the past three decades has substantially increased our knowledge of narration and narrative assessment for children with DLD. This study meta-analyzed TD–DLD group differences in narration and revealed TD children demonstrate superior narrative performance compared to age-matched peers with DLD. In order to answer our research

questions, we employed three distinct meta-regression models to assess potential moderating effects across narrative assessment type (i.e., macrostructure, microstructure, internal state language; RQ1), assessment subtype (e.g., grammatical accuracy, microstructure; RQ2 and story grammar, macrostructure; RQ3), study characteristics (i.e., recruitment method and inclusionary criteria; RQ4), narrative task characteristics (i.e., task type and level of support; RQ5), and commonly employed assessment measures (e.g., MLU; RQ6). Considerable heterogeneity, an uneven number of effect sizes across comparison groups, and inconsistent reporting of pertinent demographic information (e.g., age) limited our ability to answer these questions. However, these limitations provide valuable insight for prospective similar investigations that aim to further delineate differences between TD and DLD children. We discuss our most compelling findings in relation to the existing literature and clinical practice, and then provide suggestions for future research and meta-analyses in speech, language, and hearing sciences.

Assessment type and subtype: Evidence for story grammar and grammatical accuracy

Although the results of our overall meta-analysis revealed significant TD–DLD group differences across effect sizes, no single assessment type (i.e., macrostructure, microstructure, internal state language) yielded greater TD–DLD differences, even when controlling for participant- and study-level characteristics. This may be due, in part, to the heterogeneity observed within and between primary studies. For example, some researchers have found relative weaknesses in specific narrative skills (e.g., microstructure; Altman, 2016) or different profiles of strengths and weaknesses across children (e.g., Colozzo et al., 2011). With respect to assessment subtypes, story grammar (RQ2 and RQ6) and grammatical accuracy (RQ3 and RQ6) represented the greatest differences between TD children and children with DLD.

Within the macrostructure subtype, story grammar yielded the greatest average effect sizes (RQ2). Descriptively, story grammar also had one of the largest average effect sizes when compared to other commonly used analyses (e.g., MLU; RQ6). In our sample, story grammar was measured across studies using the Edmonton Narrative Norms Instrument (ENNI) story grammar, the dynamic assessment and intervention (DAI) total story score, and Test of Narrative Language (TNL) content score, among other measurements of story components. Based on these findings, this aspect of macrostructure should be included in SLPs' assessment of narration for children with DLD. And, not surprisingly, recent research demonstrates direct instruction in story grammar is an effective method for narrative intervention for school-age children (e.g., Story Grammar Marker; Pico et al., 2021).

Grammatical accuracy emerged as the largest average effect size across models when compared to other subtypes of microstructure (i.e., diversity, fluency, and length; RQ3) and descriptively when compared to commonly used analyses (e.g., MLU; RQ6). Across the studies analyzed, the most common measure of grammatical accuracy was percent grammatical utterances or accuracy of language-specific features (e.g., *ba* particle in Mandarin, Hao et al., 2018). Additional measurements of grammatical accuracy included percent morphological errors, verb accuracy, and TNL form score. Increasingly, research suggests grammatical accuracy likely interacts with other elements of microstructure. For example, Castilla-Earls and colleagues (2021) reported more errors of commission in longer utterances in both Spanish and English in addition to fewer errors of omission in shorter utterances. Thus, SLPs should include grammatical accuracy in their assessment of children with suspected DLD. Further, researchers should consider including this as an outcome measure for intervention studies in addition to the frequently used measures of length (e.g., MLU) or diversity (e.g., NDW; Pico et al., 2021).

Assessing narrative assessment type and subtype

Internal state language, which draws on both macro- and microstructure, did not arise as an area of difficulty for children with DLD compared to their TD peers (RQ1). One reason for this finding may be that few studies investigated this aspect of narration or provided a detailed analysis of this assessment. Unlike other neurodevelopmental communication disorders (e.g., autism) that may have a specific deficit in this area (Baixauli et al., 2016), relative impairment in internal state language may be influenced by a more global language impairment, or an interaction between macro- and microstructure, in children with DLD. Future research is needed to successfully meta-analyze this assessment type.

Additional aims of this study were to identify specific narrative assessment subtypes (e.g., story grammar, macrostructure, RQ2; length, microstructure, RQ3) and specific analyses (e.g., MLU, length, microstructure; RQ6) that yield the greatest TD–DLD differences to aid SLPs in assessing children with suspected DLD. Although our findings provided moderate support for evaluation of grammatical accuracy and story grammar, large variability and heterogeneity at the effect-, sample-, and study-levels made it difficult to assess TD–DLD differences. Future research should report correlations between measures of interest, as well as correlations with other commonly used narrative analyses. Routine reporting of correlations would allow for more nuanced analysis of variation in TD–DLD differences across assessment types and would improve the capacity to predict such differences on specific assessments (e.g., percent grammatical utterances) or for specific populations (e.g., children with DLD).

Assessing study characteristics

For all research questions, each of the three statistical models included an increasing number of participant-level characteristics (e.g., chronological age, model A). In RQ4, we specifically assessed two study-level characteristics as potential moderators of TD–DLD differences: DLD recruitment method (i.e., clinical vs. population) and inclusionary criteria

(i.e., SLP determination only, standardized assessment only, or a combination). Although these participant- and study-level characteristics were extracted from the primary studies included in this meta-analysis, limited power reduced our ability to detect differences across comparison groups with uneven numbers. For example, as noted in RQ4, very few studies reported population-based samples compared to clinical populations.

One limitation of the primary studies included in this meta-analysis was the insufficient description of participant characteristics, including age; DLD inclusionary criteria, including language assessment scores; nonverbal IQ, socioeconomic status, and treatment history. Many of these clinically relevant elements could not be investigated because this information was either not provided or was not described in sufficient detail to allow secondary analysis. For example, some researchers noted a general age or grade range without reporting descriptive statistics. Other researchers provided a general description of socioeconomic status by stating that participants were recruited from a middle-class community without reporting specific information for the participants in their sample. Future research should therefore provide more detailed descriptions of participants included in a sample, including descriptive statistics (e.g., means, standard deviations) for these variables of interest.

Assessing narrative task characteristics

An additional purpose of this study was to examine the role of task characteristics (i.e., narrative retell vs. tell) on TD–DLD differences. Our results did not provide compelling evidence regarding task-level characteristics. Although we included both narrative format (tell vs. retell) and support provided (e.g., visual, verbal) in our models, narrative retell was overrepresented, and there was not sufficient variation to assess whether this specific task characteristic moderated greater TD–DLD differences. Similarly, few tasks employed verbal- or auditory-only support compared to visual support or a combination of visual and verbal

support. One recommendation from these findings would be for clinicians to use both narrative formats and individually tailored support for each child, because it would allow speech-language pathologists to navigate variability in deficits that may be unique to each child.

Conducting meta-analyses

Results of this meta-analysis are robust to heterogeneity and variation across primary studies due to the use of analytic methods based on robust variance estimation, which account for such heterogeneity without relying on strong modeling assumptions. One benefit of the current methodology was our ability to assess a variety of narrative assessments across the areas of macrostructure, microstructure, and internal state language. This was particularly useful given that researchers provided extensive information related to a diverse set of theory-informed narrative analyses. However, our methods also have some limitations that are important to note. Although PRISMA recommends reporting assessments of risk of bias for included studies (Page et al., 2020), we did not include this because of lack of established tools for assessing risk of bias for the descriptive research studies included in the review. In addition, we used single author screening for 80% of the possible titles and abstracts. Although this may have introduced some degree of error, our high reliability (> 90%) across this and other single-author procedures increases our confidence that these decisions did not meaningfully influence the findings.

Future meta-analysis investigations should incorporate methodology that is suitable not only for transparency and reproducibility (Chow et al., 2021) but also for the small sample sizes and heterogeneous data reported by primary studies. Although previous meta-analyses in the field have included moderator analyses, only a few prior syntheses (e.g., Sandbank et al., 2020) have incorporated these advanced methods. Collaboration between SLPs, researchers,

and methodologists can yield mutually beneficial projects that allow for the advancement both of speech, language, and hearing sciences and of methodology for research synthesis.

Conclusion

This study implemented multi-level meta-analysis and robust variance estimation to assess differences in narration between TD and DLD peers across assessment type, assessment measure, and participant and sample characteristics. While all assessment types yielded TD–DLD differences significantly different from zero, there was significant heterogeneity within and between studies. Grammatical accuracy and story grammar analyses yielded the most compelling evidence for identifying significant TD–DLD differences. The available participant and sample characteristics did not appear to influence difference in narration; however, consistent reporting of inclusionary criteria, sample characteristics, and correlations of assessment measures may assist in future meta-analyses. Findings from this study provide valuable insight into future primary research studies and meta-analyses in speech, language, and hearing sciences that will further elucidate children with TD from children with DLD.

References

References marked with an asterisk (*) indicate studies included in the meta-analysis.

- *Altman, C., Armon-Lotem, S., Fichman, S., & Walters, J. (2016). Macrostructure, microstructure, and mental state terms in the narratives of English–Hebrew bilingual preschool children with and without specific language impairment. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 37(1), 165-193. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716415000466>
- Anaya, J. B., Peña, E. D., & Bedore, L. M. (2018). Conceptual Scoring and Classification Accuracy of Vocabulary Testing in Bilingual Children. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 49(1), 85-97. https://doi.org/10.1044/2017_LSHSS-16-0081
- Baixauli, I., Colomer, C., Roselló, B., & Miranda, A. (2016). Narratives of children with high-functioning autism spectrum disorder: A meta-analysis. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 59, 234-254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2016.09.007>
- Bishop, D. V., Snowling, M. J., Thompson, P. A., Greenhalgh, T., & Consortium, C. (2016). CATALISE: A multinational and multidisciplinary Delphi consensus study. Identifying language impairments in children. *PLOS ONE*, 11(7), e0158753. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0158753>
- Bishop, D. V., Snowling, M. J., Thompson, P. A., Greenhalgh, T., Consortium, C., Adams,

- C., Archibald, L., Baird, G., Bauer, A., & Bellair, J. (2017). Phase 2 of CATALISE: A multinational and multidisciplinary Delphi consensus study of problems with language development: Terminology. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 58(10), 1068-1080. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12721>
- *Boerma, T., Leseman, P., Timmermeister, M., Wijnen, F., & Blom, E. (2016). Narrative Abilities of Monolingual and Bilingual Children with and without Language Impairment: Implications for Clinical Practice. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 51(6), 626-638. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12234>
- *Boudreau, D. (2005). Use of a Parent Questionnaire in Emergent and Early Literacy Assessment of Preschool Children. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 36(1), 33-47. [https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2005/004\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2005/004))
- *Burns, F. A., de Villiers, P. A., Pearson, B. Z., & Champion, T. B. (2012). Dialect-Neutral Indices of Narrative Cohesion and Evaluation. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 43(2), 132-152. [https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2011/10-0101\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2011/10-0101))
- Castilla-Earls, A., Francis, D. J., & Iglesias, A. (2021). The Complex Role of Utterance Length on Grammaticality: Multivariate Multilevel Analysis of English and Spanish Utterances of First-Grade English Learners. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. https://doi:10.1044/2021_JSLHR-20-00464
- Channell, M. M., Loveall, S. J., Conners, F. A., Harvey, D. J., & Abbeduto, L. (2018). Narrative Language Sampling in Typical Development: Implications for Clinical Trials. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 27(1), 123-135. https://doi:10.1044/2017_AJSLP-17-0046
- *Chapman, S. B., Watkins, R., Gustafson, C., Moore, S., Levin, H. S., & Kufera, J. A. (1997). Narrative Discourse in Children With Closed Head Injury, Children With Language Impairment, and Typically Developing Children. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 6(2), 66-76. <https://doi:10.1044/1058-0360.0602.66>
- Charest, M., Skoczylas, M. J., & Schneider, P. (2020). Properties of Lexical Diversity in the Narratives of Children With Typical Language Development and Developmental Language Disorder. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_AJSLP-19-00176
- Chow, J.C., Sjogren, A.L., & Zhao, H. (2021). Reporting and Reproducibility of Meta-Analysis in Speech, Language, and Hearing Research. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 64(7), 2786-2793. https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_JSLHR-21-00047
- *Colozzo, P., Gillam, R. B., Wood, M., Schnell, R. D., & Johnston, J. R. (2011). Content and form in the narratives of children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. [https://dx.doi.org/10.1044%2F1092-4388\(2011%2F10-0247\)](https://dx.doi.org/10.1044%2F1092-4388(2011%2F10-0247))
- *Dodwell, K., & Bavin, E. L. (2008). Children with Specific Language Impairment: An Investigation of Their Narratives and Memory. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 43(2), 201-218. <https://doi:10.1080/13682820701366147>
- Dollaghan, C. A. (2004). Taxometric analyses of specific language impairment in 3-and 4-year-old children. *Journal of Speech, Language & Hearing Research*, 47(2). [10.1044/1092-4388\(2004/037\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2004/037))
- Dollaghan, C. A., & Horner, E. A. (2011). Bilingual language assessment: A meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2010/10-0093\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2010/10-0093))
- *Duinmeijer, I., de Jong, J., & Scheper, A. (2012). Narrative Abilities, Memory and Attention

- in Children with a Specific Language Impairment. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 47(5), 542-555. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-6984.2012.00164.x>
- *Fichman, S., & Altman, C. (2019). Referential Cohesion in the Narratives of Bilingual and Monolingual Children With Typically Developing Language and With Specific Language Impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 62(1), 123-142. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_JSLHR-L-18-0054
- Gaeta, L., & Brydges, C. R. (2020). An Examination of Effect Sizes and Statistical Power in Speech, Language, and Hearing Research. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 63(5), 1572-1580. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_JSLHR-19-00299
- Gagarina, N., Klop, D., Kunnari, S., Tantele, K., Välimaa, T., Balčiūnienė, I., Bohnacker, U., & Walters, J. (2012). MAIN: Multilingual assessment instrument for narratives. *ZAS papers in linguistics*, 56, 155-155. <https://doi.org/10.21248/zaspil.56.2019.414>
- Gallagher, J. F., & Hoover, J. R. (2020). Measure What You Treat: Using Language Sample Analysis for Grammatical Outcome Measures in Children With Developmental Language Disorder. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*, 5(2), 350-363. https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_PERSP-19-00100
- *Gibson, T. A., Peña, E. D., & Bedore, L. M. (2018). The Receptive-Expressive Gap in English Narratives of Spanish-English Bilingual Children With and Without Language Impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 61(6), 1381-1392. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_JSLHR-L-16-0432
- Goffman, L., & Leonard, J. (2000). Growth of Language Skills in Preschool Children With Specific Language Impairment: Implications for Assessment and Intervention. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 9(2), 151-161. <https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360.0902.151>
- Govindarajan, K., & Paradis, J. (2019). Narrative abilities of bilingual children with and without Developmental Language Disorder (SLI): Differentiation and the role of age and input factors. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 77, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2018.10.001>
- Gray, S., Plante, E., Vance, R., & Henrichsen, M. (1999). The Diagnostic Accuracy of Four Vocabulary Tests Administered to Preschool-Age Children. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 30(2), 196-206. <https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461.3002.196>
- *Gummersall, D. M., & Strong, C. J. (1999). Assessment of Complex Sentence Production in a Narrative Context. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 30(2), 152-164. <https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461.3002.152>
- *Guo, L.-Y., Eisenberg, S., Schneider, P., & Spencer, L. (2019). Percent Grammatical Utterances Between 4 and 9 Years of Age for the Edmonton Narrative Norms Instrument: Reference Data and Psychometric Properties. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 28(4), 1448-1462. https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_AJSLP-18-0228
- *Guo, L.-Y., & Schneider, P. (2016). Differentiating School-Aged Children With and Without Language Impairment Using Tense and Grammaticality Measures From a Narrative Task. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 59(2), 317-329. https://doi.org/10.1044/2015_JSLHR-L-15-0066
- Haddaway, N. R., & McGuinness, L. A. (2020). *PRISMA2020: R Package and ShinyApp for producing PRISMA 2020 compliant flow diagrams (0.0.1)*. In Zenodo.
- *Hao, Y., Sheng, L., Zhang, Y., Jiang, F., de Villiers, J., Lee, W., & Liu, X. L. (2018). A Narrative Evaluation of Mandarin-Speaking Children with Language Impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 61(2), 345-359. https://doi.org/10.1044/2017_jslhr-l-16-0367

- Hayward, M. (2003). Critiques of narrative therapy: A personal response. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*, 24(4), 183-189. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1467-8438.2003.tb00558.x>
- Hedges, L. V. (1981). Distribution Theory for Glass's Estimator of Effect size and Related Estimators. *Journal of educational statistics*, 6(2), 107-128. <https://doi.org/10.3102/10769986006002107>
- Hedges, L. V., Tipton, E., & Johnson, M. C. (2010). Robust variance estimation in meta-regression with dependent effect size estimates. *Res Synth Methods*, 1(1), 39-65. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.5>
- *Henderson, D. E., Restrepo, M. A., & Aiken, L. S. (2018). Dynamic Assessment of Narratives Among Navajo Preschoolers. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 61(10), 2547-2560. https://doi:10.1044/2018_JSLHR-L-17-0313
- *Hoffman, L. M. (2009). The Utility of School-Age Narrative Microstructure Indices: INMIS and the Proportion of Restricted Utterances. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 40(4), 365-375. [https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2009/08-0017\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2009/08-0017))
- Hopkins-Rossabi, T., Curtis, P., Temenak, M., Miller, C., & Martin-Harris, B. (2019). Respiratory Phase and Lung Volume Patterns During Swallowing in Healthy Adults: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 62(4), 868-882. https://doi:10.1044/2018_JSLHR-S-18-0323
- Jasso, J., McMillen, S., Anaya, J. B., Bedore, L. M., & Peña, E. D. (2020). The Utility of an English Semantics Measure for Identifying Developmental Language Disorder in Spanish-English Bilinguals. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 29(2), 776-788. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_AJSLP-19-00202
- *Kapantzoglou, M., Fergadiotis, G., & Auza Buenavides, A. (2019). Psychometric Evaluation of Lexical Diversity Indices in Spanish Narrative Samples From Children With and Without Developmental Language Disorder. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 62(1), 70-83. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_JSLHR-L-18-0110
- Lancaster, H. S., Lien, K. M., Chow, J. C., Frey, J. R., Scherer, N. J., & Kaiser, A. P. (2020). Early Speech and Language Development in Children With Nonsyndromic Cleft Lip and/or Palate: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 63(1), 14-31. https://doi:10.1044/2019_JSLHR-19-00162
- *Lavelli, M., & Majorano, M. (2016). Spontaneous Gesture Production and Lexical Abilities in Children With Specific Language Impairment in a Naming Task. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 59(4), 784-796. https://doi.org/doi:10.1044/2016_JSLHR-L-14-0356
- *Liles, B. Z. (1987). Episode Organization and Cohesive Conjunctions in Narratives of Children with and without Language Disorder. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 30(2), 185-196. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1044/jshr.3002.185>
- McGregor, K. K. (2020). How We Fail Children With Developmental Language Disorder. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 51(4), 981-992. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_LSHSS-20-00003
- McGregor, K. K., Arbisi-Kelm, T., Eden, N., & Oleson, J. (2020). The word learning profile of adults with developmental language disorder. *Autism & Developmental Language Impairments*, 5, 2396941519899311. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2396941519899311>
- *Merritt, D. D., & Liles, B. Z. (1989). Narrative Analysis. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, 54(3), 438-447. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1044/jshd.5403.438>
- *Miranda, E. A., McCabe, A., & Bliss, L. S. (1998). Jumping Around and Leaving Things Out: A Profile of the Narrative Abilities of Children with Specific Language Impairment. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 19(4), 647-667.

- Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & The, P. G. (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLOS Medicine*, 6(7), e1000097. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>
- *Newman, R.M., & McGregor, K.K. (2006). Teachers and Laypersons Discern Quality Differences Between Narratives Produced by Children With or Without SLI. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 49(5), 1022-1036. <https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388>
- Nitido, H., & Plante, E. (2020). Diagnosis of Developmental Language Disorder in Research Studies. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 63(8), 2777-2788. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_jslhr-20-00091
- *Norbury, C. F., & Bishop, D. V. M. (2003). Narrative Skills of Children with Communication Impairments. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 38(3), 287-313. <https://doi.org/10.1080/136820310000108133>
- Norbury, C. F., Gooch, D., Wray, C., Baird, G., Charman, T., Simonoff, E., Vamvakas, G., & Pickles, A. (2016). The impact of nonverbal ability on prevalence and clinical presentation of language disorder: evidence from a population study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 57(11), 1247-1257. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12573>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., McGuinness, L. A., Stewart, L. A., Thomas, J., Tricco, A. C., Welch, V. A., Whiting, P., & Moher, D. (2020). The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. <https://doi.org/10.31222/osf.io/v7gm2>
- *Pankratz, M. E., Plante, E., Vance, R., & Insalaco, D. M. (2007). The diagnostic and predictive validity of the Renfrew Bus Story. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*. [https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2007/040\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2007/040))
- *Paul, R. & Smith, R. (1993). Narrative Skills in 4-Year-Olds With Normal, Impaired, and Late-Developing Language. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 36, 592-598. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3603.592>
- Paul, R., Hernandez, R., Taylor, L., & Johnson, K. (1996). Narrative Development in Late Talkers. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 39(6), 1295-1303. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3906.1295>
- *Peña, E. D., Gillam, R. B., & Bedore, L. M. (2014). Dynamic Assessment of Narrative Ability in English Accurately Identifies Language Impairment in English Language Learners. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 57(6), 2208-2220. https://doi.org/10.1044/2014_JSLHR-L-13-0151
- *Peña, E. D., Gillam, R. B., Malek, M., Ruiz-Felter, R., Resendiz, M., Fiestas, C., & Sabel, T. (2006). Dynamic Assessment of School-Age Children's Narrative Ability: An Experimental Investigation of Classification Accuracy. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 49(5), 1037-1057. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2006/074\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2006/074))
- Pesco, D., & Bird, E. K.-R. (2016). Perspectives on bilingual children's narratives elicited with the Multilingual Assessment Instrument for Narratives. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 37(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716415000387>[Opens in a new window]
- Peters, J. L., Sutton, A. J., Jones, D. R., Abrams, K. R., & Rushton, L. (2008). Contour-enhanced meta-analysis funnel plots help distinguish publication bias from other causes of asymmetry. *J Clin Epidemiol*, 61(10), 991-996. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.010>

- *Petersen, D. B., Chanthongthip, H., Ukrainetz, T. A., Spencer, T. D., & Steeve, R. W. (2017). Dynamic Assessment of Narratives: Efficient, Accurate Identification of Language Impairment in Bilingual Students. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 60(4), 983-998. https://doi:10.1044/2016_JSLHR-L-15-0426
- *Pham, G. T., Pruitt-Lord, S., Snow, C. E., Nguyen, Y. H. T., Pham, B., Dao, T. B. T., Tran, N. B. T., Pham, L. T., Hoang, H. T., & Dam, Q. D. (2019). Identifying Developmental Language Disorder in Vietnamese Children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 62(5), 1452-1467. https://doi:10.1044/2019_JSLHR-L-18-0305
- Pico, D. L., Prah, A. H., Biel, C. H., Peterson, A. K., Biel, E. J., Woods, C., & Contesse, V. A. (2021). Interventions Designed to Improve Narrative Language in School-Age Children: A Systematic Review With Meta-Analyses. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 52(4), 1109-1126. https://doi:10.1044/2021_LSHSS-20-00160
- *Purcell, S. L., & Liles, B. Z. (1992). Cohesion Repairs in the Narratives of Normal-Language and Language-Disordered School-Age Children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 35(2), 354-362. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1044/jshr.3502.354>
- Pustejovsky, J. E. (2020). clubSandwich: Cluster-Robust (Sandwich) Variance Estimators with Small-Sample Corrections. R package version 0.5.2. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=clubSandwich>
- Pustejovsky, J. E., & Tipton, E. (2021). Meta-Analysis with Robust Variance Estimation: Expanding the Range of Working Models. *Prevention Science*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-021-01246-3>
- *Redmond, S. M., Thompson, H. L., & Goldstein, S. (2011). Psycholinguistic Profiling Differentiates Specific Language Impairment From Typical Development and From Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 54(1), 99-117. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2010/10-0010\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2010/10-0010))
- *Reilly, J., Losh, M., Bellugi, U., & Wulfeck, B. (2004). "Frog, Where Are You?" Narratives in Children with Specific Language Impairment, Early Focal Brain Injury, and Williams Syndrome. *Brain and Language*, 88(2), 229-247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0093-934x\(03\)00101-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0093-934x(03)00101-9)
- *Reuterskiold, C., Hansson, K., & Sahlen, B. (2011). Narrative skills in Swedish children with language impairment. *J Commun Disord*, 44(6), 733-744. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2011.04.010>
- *Rezzonico, S., Chen, X., Cleave, P. L., Greenberg, J., Hipfner-Boucher, K., Johnson, C. J., Milburn, T., Pelletier, J., Weitzman, E., & Girolametto, L. (2015). Oral narratives in monolingual and bilingual preschoolers with SLI. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 50(6), 830-841. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1460-6984.12179>
- Rodgers, M. A., & Pustejovsky, J. E. (2020). Evaluating meta-analytic methods to detect selective reporting in the presence of dependent effect sizes. *Psychological Methods*, Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000300>
- RStudio Team. (2015). RStudio: integrated development for R. *RStudio, Inc., Boston, MA* URL <http://www.rstudio.com>, 42, 14.
- Rudolph, J. M., Dollaghan, C. A., & Crotteau, S. (2019). The finite verb morphology composite: Values from a community sample. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 62(6), 1813-1822. https://doi.org/10.1044/2019_JSLHR-L-18-0437
- Sandbank, M., Bottema-Beutel, K., Crowley, S., Cassidy, M., Feldman, J. I., Canihuate, M., & Woynaroski, T. (2020). Intervention Effects on Language in Children With Autism:

- A Project AIM Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 63(5), 1537-1560. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_JSLHR-19-00167
- Schneider, P., & Dubé, R. V. (2005). Story presentation effects on children's retell content. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360\(2005/007\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360(2005/007))
- *Scott, C. M., & Windsor, J. (2000). General Language Performance Measures in Spoken and Written Narrative and Expository Discourse of School-Age Children With Language Learning Disabilities. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 43(2), 324-339. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jslhr.4302.324>
- Shahmahmood, T. M., Jalaie, S., Soleymani, Z., Haresabadi, F., & Nemati, P. (2016). A systematic review on diagnostic procedures for specific language impairment: The sensitivity and specificity issues. *Journal of research in medical sciences : the official journal of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences*, 21, 67-67. <https://doi.org/10.4103/1735-1995.189648>
- Southwood, F., & Russell, A. F. (2004). Comparison of conversation, freeplay, and story generation as methods of language sample elicitation. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2004/030\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2004/030))
- Spaulding, T. J., Plante, E., & Farinella, K. A. (2006). Eligibility Criteria for Language Impairment. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 37(1), 61-72. [https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461\(2006/007\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/0161-1461(2006/007))
- Stein, N., & Glenn, C. (1979). An analysis of story comprehension in elementary children, vol. 2. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- *Strong, C. J., & Shaver, J. P. (1991). Stability of Cohesion in the Spoken Narratives of Language-Impaired and Normally Developing School-Aged Children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 34(1), 95-111. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3401.95>
- Surrain, S., & Luk, G. (2019). Describing bilinguals: A systematic review of labels and descriptions used in the literature between 2005–2015. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 22(2), 401-415. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728917000682>
- Team, R. C. (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. . *R Foundation for Statistical Computing*, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- *Thordardottir, E. (2008). Language-Specific Effects of Task Demands on the Manifestation of Specific Language Impairment: A Comparison of English and Icelandic. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 51(4), 922-937. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2008/068\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2008/068))
- *Thordardottir, E., Kehayia, E., Mazer, B., Lessard, N., Majnemer, A., Sutton, A., Trudeau, N., & Chilingaryan, G. (2011). Sensitivity and Specificity of French Language and Processing Measures for the Identification of Primary Language Impairment at Age 5. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 54(2), 580-597. [https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388\(2010/09-0196\)](https://doi.org/10.1044/1092-4388(2010/09-0196))
- Tipton, E. (2015). Small sample adjustments for robust variance estimation with meta-regression. *Psychol Methods*, 20(3), 375-393. <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000011>
- Tipton, E., & Pustejovsky, J. E. (2015). Small-Sample Adjustments for Tests of Moderators and Model Fit Using Robust Variance Estimation in Meta-Regression. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 40(6), 604-634. <https://doi.org/10.3102/1076998615606099>
- Tomblin, J. B., Records, N. L., Buckwalter, P., Zhang, X., Smith, E., & O'Brien, M. (1997). Prevalence of specific language impairment in kindergarten children. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 40(6), 1245-1260. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jslhr.4006.1245>

- Tukey, J. W. (1977). *Exploratory data analysis* (Vol. 2). Reading, Mass.
- Viechtbauer, W. (2010). Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 36(3), 1-48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v036.i03>
- Westby, C. (1984). Development of narrative language abilities. *Language learning disabilities in school-age children*, 103-127.
- Westerveld, M. F., & Moran, C. A. (2013). Spoken expository discourse of children and adolescents: Retelling versus generation. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 27(9), 720-734. <https://doi.org/10.3109/02699206.2013.802016>
- Wittke, K., & Spaulding, T. J. (2018). Which Preschool Children With Specific Language Impairment Receive Language Intervention? *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*, 49(1), 59-71. [doi:10.1044/2017_LSHSS-17-0024](https://doi.org/10.1044/2017_LSHSS-17-0024)

Table 1. Categorization of Narrative Measures

Narrative Assessment Type	Narrative Assessment Subtype	Example Narrative Measure	Study
Macrostructure	Events	Total events recalled	Dodwell et al. (2008)
	Events	Complete episodes	Liles (1987)
	Story Grammar	Story components	Reilly et al. (2004)
	Story Grammar	Internal response	Hao et al. (2018)
	Referencing/Cohesion	Number of first mentions	Rezzonico et al. (2015)
	Referencing/Cohesion	Pronoun maintenance	Fichman & Altman (2019)
	Combination	Narrative Language Measure	Petersen et al. (2017)
Microstructure	Accuracy	Errors per C-unit	Colozzo et al. (2011)
	Accuracy	Grammaticality (%)	Duinmeijer et al. (2012)
	Diversity	Number of different words	Guo & Schneider (2015)
	Diversity	Different verbs per C-unit	Reuterskiold (2011)
	Fluency	Mazes per C-unit	Newman & McGregor (2006)
	Fluency	C-units with mazes	Newman & McGregor (2006)
	Length	MLU in morphemes	Thordardottir (2008)
	Length	Subordination index	Pham & Pruitt-Lord (2019)
Internal State Language	–	Motivational verbs	Altman et al. (2016)
	–	Perceptual verbs	Altman et al. (2016)
Mixed	–	DLST short narrative subtest	Burns (2012)
	–	TNL composite	Colozzo et al. (2011)

'Internal state language' and 'mixed' categories were not coded further. MLU = mean length of utterance; DSLT = Dialect Sensitive Language Test; TNL = Test of Narrative Language.

Table 2. Distribution of Participant Characteristics for k = 57 Samples.

Sample characteristic	Group	% Missing	Mean	SD	Min	Max
Sample size	DLD	0.0	20.7	15.2	9.0	100.0
	TD	0.0	35.0	45.0	9.0	335.0
Age (months)	DLD	0.0	85.6	23.8	51.7	137.0
	TD	0.0	85.5	23.4	50.6	138.0
Non-verbal IQ	DLD	61.4	95.3	5.6	87.0	107.1
	TD	66.7	103.9	5.8	93.6	116.0
SES	DLD	56.1	18.5	18.2	2.3	48.7
	TD	56.1	20.0	19.4	1.9	48.8
Language test performance	DLD	56.1	-1.9	0.9	-3.9	-0.6
	TD	68.4	0.0	0.5	-1.2	0.7
TD-DLD difference in language test		68.4	-2.0	0.8	-4.0	-0.6

Notes: Standardized test performance statistics reported in original studies were transformed to z-scores. DLD = developmental language disorder; TD = typically developing; SES = socio-economic status.

Table 3. Number of Studies, Samples, and Effect Sizes by Task Characteristics

Category	Studies (m)	Samples (n)	Effect sizes (k)
<i>Assessment type</i>			
Macrostructure	26	39	111
Referencing/cohesion	8	12	45
Story grammar	14	24	43
Events	10	11	21
Combination	1	1	2
Microstructure	31	49	235
Length	27	38	119
Accuracy	21	33	68
Diversity	15	25	35
Fluency	4	4	13
ISL	3	4	20
Mixed	6	13	16
<i>DLD recruitment</i>			
Clinical	29	48	288
Population	6	6	36
Not specified	2	3	58
<i>DLD inclusionary criteria</i>			
Standardized assessment	13	17	189
SLP clinical judgement	3	3	18
Standardized assessment and SLP clinical	21	37	175
<i>Task type</i>			
Tell	16	31	191
Retell	20	23	174
Retell and tell	3	5	17
<i>Task support</i>			
Visual	22	38	240
Auditory	3	3	27
Visual and auditory	14	18	115
<i>Task language</i>			
English	28	44	264
Other language	12	15	118
<i>Language status</i>			
Monolingual	31	48	289
Bilingual	9	9	93

Notes: ISL = internal state language; DLD = developmental language disorder.

Table 4. Average TD-DLD Group Differences by Narrative Assessment Type

Term	Model A			Model B			Model C		
	Est. (SE)	95% CI	p-value	Est. (SE)	95% CI	p-value	Est. (SE)	95% CI	p-value
Average effect size									
Macrostructure	-0.782 (0.113)	[-1.014, -0.551]	<.001	-0.855 (0.124)	[-1.112, -0.599]	<.001	-0.832 (0.118)	[-1.077, -0.586]	<.001
Microstructure	-0.853 (0.090)	[-1.036, -0.670]	<.001	-0.924 (0.093)	[-1.114, -0.733]	<.001	-0.897 (0.086)	[-1.076, -0.718]	<.001
ISL	-0.608 (0.080)	[-0.930, -0.286]	.014	-0.690 (0.093)	[-1.022, -0.358]	.009	-0.677 (0.077)	[-0.964, -0.390]	.007
Mixed	-1.042 (0.284)	[-1.915, -0.169]	.031	-1.132 (0.286)	[-1.991, -0.274]	.023	-0.789 (0.423)	[-2.249, 0.672]	.172
Wald tests									
Assessment type	F(3,2.8) = 17.7		.024	F(3,2.9) = 8.5		.061	F(3,2.2) = 15.3		.052
Variance components									
Study-level SD	0.356			0.321			0.269		
Sample-level SD	0.000			0.000			0.000		
Effect-level SD	0.486			0.489			0.482		
Total SD	0.602			0.585			0.553		

Notes: Model A controls for average age of the DLD participants. Model B controls for average age of the DLD participants, task language, bilingual samples, and outcomes assessed in a second language. Model C controls for all predictors included in Model B, along with sample mean-centered indicators for each level of the focal moderator. Est. = Estimate; CI = confidence interval; ISL = internal state language.

Table 5. Average TD-DLD Group Differences by Macrostructure Narrative Assessment Subtype

	Model A			Model B			Model C		
Term	Est. (SE)	95% CI	p-value	Est. (SE)	95% CI	p-value	Est. (SE)	95% CI	p-value
<i>Average effect size</i>									
Combination	-0.406 (0.024)	[-0.465, -0.347]	<.001	-0.734 (0.163)	[-1.124, -0.345]	.003	-0.428 (0.140)	[-0.754, -0.102]	.017
Events	-0.802 (0.116)	[-1.064, -0.540]	<.001	-0.874 (0.119)	[-1.138, -0.609]	<.001	-0.831 (0.170)	[-1.316, -0.346]	.010
Referencing/cohesion	-0.603 (0.168)	[-1.004, -0.203]	.010	-0.679 (0.134)	[-0.988, -0.371]	<.001	-0.780 (0.126)	[-1.104, -0.455]	.002
Story grammar	-0.959 (0.139)	[-1.267, -0.650]	<.001	-1.059 (0.172)	[-1.445, -0.672]	<.001	-0.852 (0.122)	[-1.221, -0.483]	.004
<i>Wald tests</i>									
Subtype	F(2,7.6) = 1.4		.299	F(2,7.8) = 1.6		.257	F(2,1.5) = 1.6		.424
<i>Variance components</i>									
Study-level SD	0.343			0.319			0.286		
Sample-level SD	0.000			0.000			0.000		
Effect-level SD	0.432			0.439			0.441		
Total SD	0.552			0.543			0.526		

Notes: Model A controls for average age of the DLD participants. Model B controls for average age of the DLD participants, task language, bilingual samples, and outcomes assessed in a second language. Model C controls for all predictors included in Model B, along with sample mean-centered indicators for each level of the focal moderator. Est. = Estimate; CI = confidence interval.

Table 6. Average TD-DLD Group Differences by Microstructure Narrative Assessment Subtype

Term	Model A			Model B			Model C		
	Est. (SE)	95% CI	p-value	Est. (SE)	95% CI	p-value	Est. (SE)	95% CI	p-value
Average effect size									
Accuracy	-1.135 (0.216)	[-1.587, -0.683]	<.001	-1.223 (0.206)	[-1.656, -0.791]	<.001	-1.254 (0.234)	[-1.741, -0.767]	<.001
Diversity	-0.755 (0.136)	[-1.047, -0.464]	<.001	-0.861 (0.151)	[-1.187, -0.535]	<.001	-0.862 (0.146)	[-1.173, -0.552]	<.001
Fluency	-0.039 (0.207)	[-0.627, 0.550]	.861	-0.123 (0.213)	[-0.718, 0.472]	.595	-0.075 (0.201)	[-0.613, 0.463]	.728
Length	-0.794 (0.086)	[-0.970, -0.618]	<.001	-0.885 (0.086)	[-1.065, -0.706]	<.001	-0.877 (0.099)	[-1.084, -0.670]	<.001
Wald tests									
Subtype	F(3,7.6) = 6.7		.015	F(3,7.7) = 6.5		.016	F(3,7.0) = 10.8		.005
Variance components									
Study-level SD	0.337			0.270			0.292		
Sample-level SD	0.001			0.000			0.000		
Effect-level SD	0.448			0.451			0.452		
Total SD	0.561			0.525			0.538		

Notes: Model A controls for average age of the DLD participants. Model B controls for average age of the DLD participants, task language, bilingual samples, and outcomes assessed in a second language. Model C controls for all predictors included in Model B, along with sample mean-centered indicators for each level of the focal moderator. Est. = Estimate; CI = confidence interval.

Figure 1. PRISMA Flow Chart

Figure 2. Forest Plot of TD-DLD Group Differences in Narrative Performance (Standardized Mean Difference, 95% CI)

NARRATIVES IN CHILDREN WITH DLD

Figure 3. Average TD-DLD Group Differences on Commonly Used Narrative Assessment Measures. k = number of effect size estimates; m = number of studies.