Celf pragmatics profile checklist template pdf excel download 2019



## Celf pragmatics profile checklist template pdf excel download 2019

\*\*\*UPDATE INCLUDES NEW ASSESSMENTS, UPDATED ORAL-MECHANISM EXAM, FEEDING CHECKLIST, COMMUNICATION CHECKLIST, RECOMMENDATIONS, STRATEGIES FOR ALL DOMAINS, AND ORGANIZED FORMATTING FOR EASE OF USE\*\*\*TONS OF RESOURCES/RECOMMENDATIONS/TIPS TO PROVIDE PARENTSThis evaluation template was created to save time by compiling several common assessments in one place. Our evaluation template includes all of the following subsections: Medical Diagnosis CodeBackgroundMedical HistoryStre Pragmatic language ability refers to the ability to use language in a social context. It has been shown to be related to core language ability, including language comprehension and vocabulary skills, and also to cognitive skills (Matthews et al., 2013; Blain-Briére et al., 2014) and reasoning ability (Turkstra et al., 1996). Children with autism spectrum disorder (Norbury and Bishop, 2002; Volden et al., 2009), children with ADHD (Camarata and Gibson, 1999; Kim and Kaiser, 2000; Staikova et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard of hearing children (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2013), and deaf and hard o children. Pragmatic language ability seems to be associated with success in general education for deaf and hard of hearing children (Thagard et al., 2011). Thagard et al., 2011). Thagard et al., 2011). Thagard et al., 2011). Thagard et al., 2011) showed that children with higher pragmatic language ability also have higher scores on tests measuring preparedness for first-grade work, math, and reading. Furthermore these children spend more time in general education settings. However, the causal direction of the relationship is unclear. Other studies have suggested that pragmatic language ability is less developed in deaf and hard of hearing children as both the quality and quantity of their daily face-to-face discourses are reduced (Jeanes, 2000; Most et al., 2010). Most et al. (2010) argue that a delay in language development resulting in less flexible use of language structures, reduced audibility during interactions and difficulties with theory of mind might be reasons for the differences seen between children. However, only few and quite diverse studies have focused on children with cochlear implants (CI) and their pragmatic language ability (Jeanes, 2000; Toe et al., 2012; Rinaldi et al., 2012; Rinaldi et al., 2013; Toe and Paatsch, 2013). Pragmatic language skills is an umbrella term for a number of complex verbal and nonverbal skills needed for real-life conversations. These skills range from responding to utterances in an appropriate way, maintaining the topic of the conversation, initiating new, and relevant topics (Matthews, 2014), to not inappropriate way, maintaining the topic of the conversation, initiating new, and relevant topics (Matthews, 2014), to not inappropriate way, maintaining the topic of the conversation, initiating new, and relevant topics (Matthews, 2014), to not inappropriate way, maintaining the topic of the conversation, initiating new, and relevant topics (Matthews, 2014), to not inappropriate way, maintaining the topic of the conversation of the con clarification and adapting the language to the needs of the conversational partner (Longobardi et al., 2017). In order to be able to successfully use these skills it is important to be able to successfully use these skills it is important to be able to successfully use these skills it is important to be able to successfully use these skills it is important to be able to successfully use these skills it is important to be able to successfully use these skills it is important to be able to successfully use these skills it is important to be able to successfully use these skills it is important to be able to successfully use these skills it is important to be able to successfully use these skills it is important to be able to successful skills 1998; Most et al., 2010), and non-verbal cues (Russell and Grizzle, 2008). Pragmatic language skills develop during childhood (Loukusa et al., 2017). Mastering these complex skills takes until adolescence or even early adulthood (Matthews, 2014). Pragmatic language skills have been linked to social competence (Conti-Ramsden and Botting, 2004), peer relationship, mental health (Helland et al., 2014), and collaborative-based learning (Murphy et al., 2014). Children with CI have been found to perform more poorly on a number of pragmatic language abilities. Jeanes (2000) analyzed referential communication between children (four age groups: 8-, 11-, 14-, and 17-, and 18-, year old) and found that profoundly deaf high school students using oral communication use requests for clarification more often nonspecific, which led Jeanes (2000) to suggest that the communicative competence of the deaf and hard of hearing children is not as mature. Ibertsson et al. (2009) as well found teenagers with CI to use more requests for clarifications. Ibertsson et al. (2000) in the study by Ibertsson et al. (2009) the teenagers with CI mostly used specific requests for clarifications. Ibertsson et al. al. (2009) argue that this is a way to control the conversation more. In accordance to this a more recent study done by Toe and Paatsch (2013) indicates that the pragmatic language skills of children without HL. Toe ensure a fluent conversation, but that they tend to control the conversation, but that they tend to control the conversation more. and Paatsch (2013) analyzed 10 min spontaneous conversations between children with CI and children with CI try to control the conversation more in order to prevent conversation breakdown. In addition, the results found by Toe and Paatsch (2013) indicate that children with CI try to control the conversation more in order to prevent conversation breakdown. In addition, the results found by Toe and Paatsch (2013) indicate that children with CI try to control the conversation more in order to prevent conversation breakdown. In addition, the results found by Toe and Paatsch (2013) indicate that children with CI try to control the conversation more in order to prevent conversation breakdown. have problems with contingency, the ability to maintain the topic of the conversation and to add new and relevant information. This is in accordance with results found by Most et al. (2010). The authors evaluated spontaneous communication between children age 6 and 9 and a familiar adult. Most et al. (2010) found that both children with CI and children with hearing aids (HA) showed problems in the area of turn taking, the ability to have a conversation with smooth interchanges between the conversational partners. This was especially the case for contingency, a skill which none of the children with CI or HA used appropriately, and response and adjacency (no pause between the utterance of the conversational partner and the child's utterance), two skills which were only used
appropriately by two of the children with CI or HA. In the studies by Jeanes (2000), Most et al. (2010), and Toe and Paatsch (2013) one instance of conversation in the lab was analyzed. One disadvantage with this approach is that it is not clear whether results translate to real-life, where children need to communicate with different partners in different settings. In order to capture how well children are doing in real-life, other studies have used questionnaires to measure pragmatic language skills in children with CI. Goberis et al. (2012) used a checklist with items covering six categories: states needs, gives commands, personal interaction, wants explanation, shares knowledge, and shares imagination. Parents were then asked to rate a number of skills in each category to be: not present, preverbal, uses on to three words, or uses more complex language for 6.6% of the items and by age seven they used complex language for 69% of the items. In comparison, children without HL used complex language for 100% of the items by the time they were 6 years old. In contrast to that, results from Guerzoni et al. (2016) used a questionnaire using two scales, one for assertiveness and one for responsiveness. The assertiveness scale included items covering the ability to ask questions, while the responsiveness scale covered the ability to respond to questions and requests, and turn taking. However, in contrast to the study by Goberis et al. (2012) parents only rated how often a certain behavior occurred. As the children in the study by Guerzoni et al. (2016) were only around 2 years of age it might be that differences between the groups were not apparent because they are only observed for more complex skills and more complex conversations, which a toddler might not yet have. Overall it seems like children with CI have problems with some but not all domains of pragmatic language ability. It should be emphasized that there are only very few studies studying pragmatic language ability in deaf and hard of hearing children and those existing are very diverse, using different age groups and measures. In addition, there is a large time gap between some of the studies. It is therefore unclear if technical improvement of cochlear implants, changes in rehabilitation programs, the use of different measures or the age of the participants have led to different measures or the age of the participants have be again to different measures or the age of the participants have be again to different measures have be again to different measures have be again to diff and to compare them to those of children without HL. It has been suggested that pragmatic language ability is not only connected to other language skills but also to different cognitive abilities (Turkstra et al., 1996; Channon and Watts, 2003; Martin and McDonald, 2003; Douglas, 2010; Blain-Briére et al., 2014; Matthews et al., 2018). Matthews et al., 2018 al. (2018) point out that it is hard to distinguish between pragmatic language ability and the ability to understand words and sentences. The authors add that some children still mainly show language problems in a social context and that it is therefore important to try to separate these skills. It is not surprising that most studies reviewed by Matthews et al. (2018) found correlations between "formal language" (vocabulary and grammar) and pragmatic language ability. The ability to understand sentences and words do not, however, seem to be the only important skills. Other studies have also shown associations to reasoning ability (Turkstra et al., 1996), cognitive flexibility (Ketelaars et al., 2012; Bacso and Nilsen, 2017), working memory, inhibition, and shifting ability (Channon and Watts, 2003; Blain-Briére et al., 2014; Matthews et al., 2013), Children without HL on a number of executive function skills, like working memory (Wass et al., 2008; Kronenberger et al., 2013), reasoning (Bandurski and Ga1kowski, 2004; Edwards et al., 2011), and cognitive flexibility (Kenett et al., 2013; Wechsler-Kashi et al., 2014; Bacso and Nilsen, 2017; Matthews et al., 2014). These ability in normally developing children (Turkstra et al., 1996; Ketelaars et al., 2012; Blain-Briére et al., 2014; Bacso and Nilsen, 2017; Matthews et al., 2014). al., 2018). A delay in these cognitive functions might therefore lead to a delay in pragmatic language skills. However, the association between these cognitive skills and pragmatic language skills is delayed in children with CI compared to children without HL even when being matched on language ability (Most et al., 2010). This indicates that other factors apart from language ability play a role. To our knowledge there is no study looking into the connection between language measures, cognitive measures and pragmatic language ability in children with CI in comparison to children without HL. This study aims to take the first step in filling this research gap. 2. Methods 2.1. Participants Fifty-five children with CI were recruited from a special school as well as via the hearing clinic in Stockholm, Sweden They attended pre-school class, first grade, and second grade, respectively. The hearing loss of one child was caused by Usher syndrome. This syndrome leads also to a visual disability. Unfortunately no data concerning the visual impairment was collected. However, it was not reported by the test leader that any visual problems occurred during testing. To our knowledge, none of the other children had any additional disability apart from their hearing loss. Three of the children (10 girls) the parents did not fill in the Pragmatics Profile and two as data on three of the other measures were missing. The mean age of the remaining 14 children (10 girls) was 6.77 years with a standard deviation of 11.13 months. Three of the children were unilaterally implanted and 11 had bilateral CIs. Their deafness was detected at a mean age of 11.14 months, with a standard deviation of 13.84 months. They received their implants at a mean age of 24.07 months with a standard deviation of 19.55 months. Two of the children were bilingual (using sign language and oral language). Four children used only oral language. The remaining eight children used oral language as their main communication mode and signs for support. One of those eight children used oral language as their main communication mode and signs for support. children with CI is provided in Table 1. The 38 children without HL were recruited from schools in Linköping, Sweden and attended a pre-school class. Four of the children without HL were excluded from the analysis. One because the test session was interrupted several times, one because s/he was not able/willing to finish all tasks and two because the parents did not fill in the Pragmatics Profile. The mean age of the remaining 34 children (17 girls) was 6.52 years with a standard deviation of 4.01 months. Thirty of the children took part in an intervention study and the results reported here are their pre-test results. The children without HL were tested individually, either during school time in a separate room or at home. The children received stickers for their participation. A consent form was signed by the caregivers. Both children and caregivers. Both children and caregivers. Both children and caregivers. Both children and caregivers were told that they could drop out of the study at any point without giving a reason. The study was approved by the Linköping Research Ethics Committee (dnr 2015/308-31). Table 1. Individual data - Children with CI: The data were collected using a questionnaire which was filled in by the caregivers. 2.2. Material 2.2.1. Pragmatic Language Ability The pragmatic language ability of the children was tested using the Pragmatic Section of the clinical evaluation of language fundamentals 4 screening test battery— CELF-IV (Semel et al., 2013). This measure has a high reliability for the tested age group (0.96). The Pragmatics Profile is a questionnaire containing 50 statements which the caregiver has to rate on a four-point scale. The 50 statements cover three different areas: Rituals and Conversational Skills—RCS (e.g., makes/responds to greetings to/from others), Asking for, Giving and Responding to Information—AGRI (e.g., asks for help from others appropriately), and Non-Verbal Communication—NCS
(e.g., knows how someone is feeling based on non-verbal cues) (Pearson Education Inc., 2008a,b). For the rating scale, the following verbal items are used: Never, Sometimes, Often, Always. In this study the sub-scores for the three sub-measures have been used as measures in addition to the standard sum score. 2.2.2. Core Language Measures 2.2.2.1. Language Measures 2.2.2.1. Language comprehension The Swedish version of TROG-2—Test for Reception of Grammar version 2 (Bishop, 2003; Eldblom and Sandberg, 2009), was used to assess children's language comprehension ability. This test consisted of 20 blocks of four sentences. The child got one point for every correct answer. After four wrong blocks in a row the test was terminated. A block was counted as being wrong if the child gave at least one wrong answer within the block. If the child did not answer at all twice in a row the test was terminated as well. In order to explain the task, two practice trials were used. The child received feedback on those two trials. The task was first continued after they gave the correct answer to both practice trials. 2.2.2.2. Vocabulary skills To test the children's vocabulary skills, the Expressive Vocabulary task from the CELF-IV battery (Semel et al., 2013) was used. This is a picture naming task. The child was shown pictures (e.g., of an elephant) and asked to name them/ a specific part of the picture (e.g., the elephant's trunk). The task started with a demonstration trial and two practice trials, after that 20 test trials followed. If the child received one point. 2.2.3. Verbal Cognitive Measures 2.2.3.1. Verbal reasoning To test verbal reasoning ability the Spoken Analogies sub-test of the Swedish ITPA-3 battery (Hammill et al., 2013) was used. The child listened to sentences of the following kind: "A dad is big, a baby is...," and was asked to fill in the missing word. This test consisted of two practice trials and 25 test trials. The test was terminated after three consecutive incorrect answers. For every correct word, the child got one point. 2.2.3.2. Verbal fluency To test verbal fluency task was used (Benton and Hamsher, 1976). The child was asked to name as many animals as possible within 1 min. The child received one point for every animal. 2.2.3.3. Verbal fluency task was used (Benton and Hamsher, 1976). memory The sentence completion and recall task from the SIPS battery (Wass et al., 2008) was used as a measure for verbal working memory. The children heard a recorded sentence, spoken by a female speaker, with the last word missing (e.g., "A car has tires. A plane has..."). The child was then asked to fill in the missing word. A standard instruction was used and the child could practice using two examples before the real test started. There were six different levels, for level 3 they listen to four, for level 4 they listen to two, for level 5 they listen to two, for level 5 they listen to three, and for level 6 they listen to four sentences. The child got points for every word they recalled correctly. The test leader gave the first phoneme of the words as a cue if the child was not able to give an answer in the recalled word. 2.3. Procedure The Pragmatics Profile was handed out to the caregivers via the school or by the test leader and filled in at home. The rest of the testing took place at the respective school or at home. All children within the current study were tested by a speech and language pathologist or by a speech and language pathologist student in the last university term. If available in the test room a microphone and/or amplifier was used during the testing in order to enhance the speech signal for the oral test material. If these resources were not available, the child was asked if s/he wanted to use the laptop loudspeakers. The order of the tests was randomized and the test session was recorded using a Dictaphone. 2.4. Statistical Analysis We used R (R Core Team, 2016) with the packages effsize (Torchiano, 2018) and cocor (Diedenhofen and Musch, 2015) for our analysis, the packages dplyr (Wickham et al., 2019), tidyr (Wickham et al., 2019), tidyr (Wickham and Henry, 2019), and purr (Henry and Wickham, 2019) were used. The graphs were made using the package ggplot2 (Wickham, 2009). The alpha value was set to 0.05. All data was checked for normality and homogeneity of variance. To analyse the differences between the groups for the sub-measure RCS, a Welch's t-test was used as homogeneity of variance was not given. For the other submeasures, AGRI and NCS, a Student's t-test was used. To analyse the association between the language and verbal cognitive measures and pragmatic language ability, correlations have been calculated for the children without HL as well as for the children without HL as well as for the children with CI. As the pragmatic measure was split into its sub-measures for the group comparison, this was also done for the correlations. For normally distributed data, Pearson correlations were calculated. For non-normally distributed data, Spearman correlations were calculated. The Benjamini-Hochberg procedure (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995) was used to decrease the false discovery for multiple comparisons. 3. Results There was no significant difference between the two groups in terms of their age, t(14.41) = 1.00, p = 0.333, d = 0.448. Age of implantation was not significantly correlated with the pragmatic language skills of the children with cochlear implantation was not significantly correlated with the pragmatic language skills of the children with cochlear implants (CI),  $\rho = -0.08$ , p = 0.609. Additionally, the groups did not differ in terms of their non-verbal cognitive skills [Matrix test from the Wechsler Nonverbal Scale of Ability (Wechsler and Naglieri, 2007)], t(46.00) = 0.58, p = 0.567, d = 0.183. 3.1. Group Differences in Pragmatics profile of the children without HL and the children with cochlear implants was not significantly different, t(17.07) = 1.50, p = 0.152, d = 0.581 However 5 out of 14 children with CI had scores below the age-norm, while only 2 out of 34 children without HL performed below the age-norm. All of the children with CI who performed below the age-norm. All of the children with CI who performed below the age-norm. All of the children with CI who performed below the age-norm. late (66 months). After comparing the two groups on the sum score, sub-scores for the three measures included in the Pragmatics Profile have been calculated. For the RCS sub-measure there was no significant difference between the children with CI, t(16.33) = 1.79, p = 0.093, d = 0.717. For the AGRI sub-measure no significant difference was found between the groups, t(46.00) = 0.18, p = 0.858, d = 0.057. For the NCS sub-measure a significant difference, t(46.00) = 2.22, p = 0.032, d = 0.704, was found between the groups with children without HL performing better than the children with CI. This difference was still significant when excluding the two items "using a variation of tone of voice" and "recognizing that other people use different tone of voice" which could be argued are influenced by hearing with a CI, t(46.00) = 2.19, p = 0.033, d = 0.696). For a graphical representation of the results (see Figure 1), means, standard deviation, and range are reported in Table 2. Figure 1. Pragmatic language skills: Raw scores for the children with CI and the children with CI, green represents those attending mainstream education. Table 2. Descriptive data for the pragmatic language skills of children with CI and children with CI and children with CI and the children with CI and the children with CI and children with CI and children with CI and the children with CI and the children with CI and children with C Verbal Cognitive Measures and Pragmatic Language Ability 3.2.1. Children With CI All three pragmatic sub-measures: RCS,  $\rho = 0.64$ , p = 0.040, AGRI,  $\rho = 0.040$ , AGRI,  $\rho = 0.040$ , were significantly positively correlated with verbal fluency but no other measure. 3.2.2. Children Without HL The RCS score of the children without HL was significantly positively correlated with their language comprehension ability, r = 0.40, p = 0.033, and their verbal reasoning ability, r = 0.40, p = 0.017. The AGRI score of the children without HL was not significantly correlated with any of the measured skills. The NCS score of the children without HL was not significantly correlated with any of the measured skills. with their vocabulary skill,  $\rho = 0.49$ , p = 0.013, and with their verbal reasoning ability,  $\rho = 0.53$ , p = 0.009. 4. Discussion The aim of the current study was to analyse whether there is a difference between children using CI and chil ability and different verbal cognitive and language measures were analyzed, first to see which skills are possibly influencing the pragmatic language ability of children with CI and second to analyse differences in relationship patterns of children with CI and children with CI and between the children without HL. No significant difference was found between the children without HL and the children with CI for the sum score of the pragmatics language measure. This is in accordance with the results found by Guerzoni et al., 2010; Goberis et al., 2012; Goberis Rinaldi et al., 2013). The present study, as well as the study by Guerzoni et al. (2016), used parent rating, while in other studies the researches have rated the conversational skills of the children while communicating with a familiar adult (Most et al., 2010) or a peer (Jeanes, 2000; Ibertsson et al., 2009; Toe and Paatsch, 2013). It could be argued that parents tend to overestimate the competence of their child. However, the reliability of the measure used in the present study has been reported to be high (ra = 0.96) (Semel et al., 2013). In addition, other studies (Goberis et al., 2012; Rinaldi et al., 2013) have found poorer ratings for pragmatic language ability for
deaf and hard of hearing children compared to children without HL even when being judged by their parents. Certainly, as the use of different measures of pragmatic language ability (Russell and Grizzle, 2008), which means that even if differences have been found in one specific measure, this does not necessarily mean that the two groups differ on all aspects of pragmatic language ability. In addition, although no significant differences could be seen on group level, 5 out of 14 children with CI (35.71%) performed below the age norm while only 2 out of 34 children without HL (5.89%) performed below the age norm. All children with CI performing below the age-norm were attending special school. This is in accordance with the results of Thagard et al. (2011), who found a correlation between time spent in general education and pragmatic language ability. However, for both the results of the current study and the results found by Thagard et al. (2011) it is unclear if children having problems in the pragmatic language ability. Most et al. (2010) argue that one reason for the poorer pragmatic language ability and the results found by Thagard et al. (2011) it is unclear if children having problems in the pragmatic language ability. of deaf and hard of hearing children might be that they have even fewer possibilities to practice. This might especially be the case for children attending special education as they may have even fewer possibilities to engage in discourse with hearing peers or hearing adults who are not trained to talk to deaf and hard of hearing children, or to use sign support in comparison to children with CI attending mainstream education. Further studies should evaluate whether and how communication behavior in school and at home influences the pragmatic language ability of children with CI. Increased knowledge about this topic would benefit the development of intervention programs to improve the development of pragmatic language. In the present study a significant difference between children with CI and children without HL was found for the Nonverbal communication skills (NCS) sub-measure. Intuitively, non-verbal communication skills (NCS) sub-measure. between children without HL and deaf and hard of hearing children neither on a non-verbal communication nor on a para-linguistic scale for pragmatic language ability. This is therefore a surprising result. Two items included in the NCS measure are: "varying tone of voice" and "recognizing varying tone of voice." It could be argued that those two skills are influenced by hearing with a CI. Comparing the two groups on the NCS scale without including those two items, however, still led to a significant group difference. This means hearing ability does not seem to be the main issue. A number of the items used in the sub-measure NCS for example "being able to recognize how somebody is feeling" or "understanding facial expressions" could be related to Theory of Mind development. The term "Theory of Mind" (ToM) refers to the ability to know about your own and other people and understands that those may differ from his/her own beliefs, knowledge, emotions, desires, and intentions has mastered ToM. This is usually the case around age five to six (Liu et al., 2018). A child with fully developed ToM skills should be able to recognize how somebody is feeling as well as understand facial expressions. Even the ability to recognize varying tone of voice is important, as distinct emotional states or intentions might be indicated by differences in tone of voice. Children who have fully developed ToM skills should therefore have found that the development of ToM is often delayed in deaf and hard of hearing children (Peterson and Siegal, 2000; Lundy, 2002; Peterson 2004; Ketelaar et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2018). In a meta-analysis done by Milligan et al. (2007), significant relations between language development, their delayed development of ToM is no surprise. Peterson (2004) found that children with CI perform on par with age-matched children with autism on tasks measuring ToM. The authors argue that restricted discourse between deaf and hard of hearing children and their hearing parents could be a reason for the delayed development. This is in accordance with the suggestion by Most et al. (2010) that pragmatic language development could be influenced by the opportunities to practice conversations. No significant group difference was found for the Rituals and Conversational skills (RCS) and Asking for, Giving, and Responding to Information (AGRI) sub-measures. This is a promising result. Children with CI seem to be able to master these important parts of pragmatic language ability. For the AGRI sub-measure the result is in accordance with previous studies. This measure involves the abilities to ask for clarification, reacting to requests for clarification, reacting to request for clarification, reacting to request for clarification, reacting apologies etc. Jeanes (2000) found that deaf and hard of hearing children using oral language used even more requests for clarifications than did children without HL and that they responded appropriately to requests for clarification. Furthermore, Antia et al. (2011) reported that the social skills of deaf and hard of hearing children are within their age norm. For the RCS submeasure, the results are in accordance with studies suggesting that children with CI have conversational skills that are good enough to ensure a fluent conversation at a fluent conversation with a hearing peer (Toe and Paatsch, 2013). It differs, however, from other results suggesting difficulties of children with CI with verbal turn taking (Most et al., 2010; Paatsch and Toe 2014). It should be mentioned that although the difference for the RCS sub-measure was a tendency for the children without HL to obtain higher scores than the children with CI, and the accompanying effect size was as high as it was for the NCS sub-measure. As the sub-measure included not only conversational skills but also the use of rituals, like saying hello or goodbye, it might be the case that some but not all of the abilities measured different for children without HL. For the children without HL language comprehension as well as verbal reasoning were positively correlated with the RCS scale. Furthermore, vocabulary skills, and verbal reasoning were positively correlated with the RCS scale. pragmatic language ability, a correlation between those skills and verbal reasoning is in accordance to results from a study by Turkstra et al. (1996). Turkstra et al. (1996) suggest that inferential reasoning is important for pragmatic language ability and these two abilities are therefore associated. For the children with CI, verbal fluency was the only skill correlated with all three sub-measures of pragmatic language ability. Previous studies (Kenett et al., 2013; Wechsler-Kashi et al., 2014) found that children with CI have a less developed semantic network. organization of words and different word meanings within the mental lexicon. Wechsler-Kashi et al. (2014) evaluated the organization of the semantic network of children with CI using verbal fluency tasks. The authors suggest that the children with CI using verbal fluency tasks. from a computational analysis done by Kenett et al. (2013) support this view. Children with CI seem to have less strong connections between different words. Because of that, the activation of one word in their semantic network does not spread as much as it does for children without HL. The better the semantic network is developed, the better the semantic network does not spread as much as it does for children without HL. performance on a verbal fluency task as more words are activated and their retrieval is therefore eased. The results from the current study suggest that children with CI who have a better developed semantic network have higher pragmatic language to be used in a more flexible way. However, as only correlations have been used in the current study the causal direction is not clear. It could be that the quality and quantity of face-to-face interactions between verbal fluency and pragmatic language ability have been found for the children without HL. It might be that children with CI use different strategies for social communication that are more improvement does not influence pragmatic language ability anymore. More studies are needed to untangle the relationship pattern between hearing loss, verbal fluency, and pragmatic language ability. 4.1. Limitation of the Study In the present study a small sample of children with CI was tested. It is possible that significant differences were therefore not detected for some of the variables. There was a tendency for a difference on the RCS measure and the accompanying effect size was fairly high. It is likely that a large sample size would have been needed to detect the significant difference of the groups on the RCS scale. In the present study we have used a parent rating to measure pragmatic language skills. While this offers the possibility to get more insight into real-life pragmatic language skill compared to when analyzing conversations in the lab it also leads to some disadvantages. First it is a subjective measure. Further studies should aim to combine subjective measures to get a better insight into the pragmatic language skills of children with CI. Second it is an inclusive measure. This makes it possible to get a broad overview over the current status of pragmatic language skill development but makes it hard to analyse which specific sub-skills might be causing differences. therefore don't lead to significant differences on the sum measure or on the sub-measure level. Further research should aim to get data for a bigger group of children to be able to do a more precise item analysis to evaluate differences on a more detailed level. A further limitation of the study is the heterogeneity in terms of
age of implantation of the children with CI. However, age of implantation was not correlated with pragmatic language skills and removing the two children with the oldest implantation age (60 and 66 months) did not change the results. Further studies should aim to collect more data concerning the pragmatic language skill of children with CI to be able to analyze the influence of age of implantation in more detail. A further limitation of the study is the missing information about the pre-implant hearing loss influences the pragmatic language development. It is important to conduct more research on this topic to evaluate which other factors apart from verbal fluency are of importance for the parents. Rowe (2008) has reported a relation between child-directed speech and socioeconomic status of the parents. As child-directed speech is likely to influence pragmatic language development it is important for further studies to take the influence of this variable into consideration. 5. Conclusion The results of the current study suggest that many children with CI show pragmatic language ability comparable to their hearing peers and in accordance to their age-norm. In the present study significant differences were found on a measure connected to theory of mind, a skill found to be delayed in deaf and hard of hearing children. It has been suggested that the quality and quantity of face-to-face interactions influence of communication styles of care givers, teachers and peers on the development of pragmatic language ability in children. Results from the current study show that the development of the semantic network is associated with pragmatic language ability of children. ability. The causal direction is unclear. It might be that children with a better developed semantic network are able to use language in a more flexible way. Alternatively, quality and quantity of oral interaction might influence both the development of the semantic network and of pragmatic language ability. To be able to develop interventions for children with CI showing problems in the pragmatic language ability. Data Availability Statement The datasets generated for this study will not be made publicly available. It was ensured to the parents in the information letter that no data will be send to anyone not part of the research team. This was also included in the ethics application. Ethics Statement The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by the participants' legal guardian/next of kin. Author Contributions The study was prepared and designed by MS, BL, MG, IH, and MW. Acquisition of data was done by MG, IH together with Linn Hellgren and Elias Larsson (acknowledged). Analysis and interpretation of result was carried out by mainly MS, RE, and MW. The first draft of the manuscript was written by MS All authors took part in critical revision of the manuscript. Funding This work was supported by the European Union Seventh Framework Program (FP7/2007-2013) under Grant Agreement FP7-607139 (iCARE); and the Swedish Research Council for Health, Working Life and Welfare (2013-01363). Conflict of Interest The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest. Acknowledgments A special thanks to all the children and caregivers participating in this study and to Linn Hellgren and Elias Larsson for helping with the data collection. References Antia, S. D., Jones, P., Luckner, J., Kreimeyer, K. H., and Reed, S. (2011). Social outcomes of students who are deaf and hard of hearing in general education classrooms. Except. Child. 77, 489–504. doi: 10.1177/001440291107700407 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Bacso, S. A., and Nilsen, E. S. (2017). What's that you're saying? Children with better executive functioning produce and repair communication more effectively. J. Cogn. Dev. 18, 441–464. doi: 10.1080/15248372.2017.1336438 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Bandurski, M., and Ga1kowski, T. (2004). The development of analogical reasoning in deaf children and their parents' communication mode. J. Deaf Stud. Deaf Educ. 9, 153–175. doi: 10.1093/deafed/enh018 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Benjamini, Y., and Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B 57, 289–300. doi: 10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Benton, A., and Hamsher K. (1976). Multilingual Aphasia Examinantion. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press. Bishop, D. V. M. (2003). Test for Reception of Grammar: Version 2; TROG-2. San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Assessment. Google Scholar Blain-Briére, B., Bouchard, C., and Bigras, N. (2014). The role of executive functions in the pragmatic skills of children age 4-5. Front. Psychol. 5:240. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00240 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Bonifacio, S., Girolametto, L., Bulligan, M., Callegari, M., Vignola, S., and Zocconi, E. (2007). Assertive and responsive conversational skills of Italian-speaking late talkers. Int. J. Lang. Commun. Dis. 42, 607–623. doi: 10.1080/13682820601084386 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Camarata, S. M., and Gibson, T. (1999). Pragmatic language deficits in attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). Mental Retard. Dev. Disabil. Res. Rev. 5, 207–214. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1098-2779(1999)5:33.3.CO;2-F CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Channon, S., and Watts, M. (2003). Pragmatic language interpretation after closed head injury: relationship to executive functioning. Cogn. Neuropsychiatry 8, 243–260. doi: 10.1080/135468000344000002 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Conti-Ramsden, G., and Botting, N. (2004). Social difficulties and victimization in children with SLI at 11 years of age. J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res. 47, 145–161. doi: 10.1044/1092-4388(2004/013) PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Dammeyer, J. (2012). A longitudinal study of pragmatic language development in three children with cochlear implants. Deafness Educ. Int. 14, 217–232. doi 10.1179/1464315412Z.00000000024 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Douglas, J. M. (2010). Relation of executive functioning to pragmatic outcome following severe traumatic brain injury. J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res. 53, 365–382. doi: 10.1044/1092-4388(2009/08-0205) PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Edwards, L., Figueras, B., Mellanby, J., and Langdon, D. (2011). Verbal and spatial analogical reasoning in deaf and hearing children: the role of grammar and vocabulary. J. Deaf Stud. Deaf Educ. 16, 189–197. doi: 10.1093/deafed/enq051 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Goberis, D., Beams, D., Dalpes, M., Abrisch, A., Baca, R., and Yoshinaga-Itano, C (2012). The missing link in language development of deaf and hard of hearing children: pragmatic language development. Semin. Speech Lang. 33, 297-309. doi: 10.1055/s-0032-1326916 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Guerzoni, L., Murri, A., Fabrizi, E., Nicastri, M., Mancini, P., and Cuda, D. (2016). Social conversational skills development in early implanted children. Laryngoscope 126, 2098–2105. doi: 10.1002/lary.25809 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Hammill, D. D., Mather, N., and Roberts, R. (2013). ITPA-3: Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. Manual (B. Holmgren, Trans.). Stockholm; Austin, TX: Hogrefe Psykologiförlaget AB, Pro-ED, Inc. Helland, W. A., Lundervold, A. J., Heimann, M., and Posserud, M.-B. (2014). Stable associations between behavioral problems. Res. Dev. Disabil. 35, 943–951. doi: 10.1016/j.ridd.2014.02.016 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Ibertsson, T., Hansson, K., Maki-Torkko, E., Willstedt-Svensson, U., and Sahlen, B. (2009). Deaf teenagers with cochlear implants in conversation with hearing peers. Int. J. Lang. Commun. Dis. 44, 319–337. doi: 10.1080/13682820802052067 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Kenett, Y. N., Wechsler-Kashi, D., Kenett, D. Y., Schwartz, R. G., Ben-Jacob, E., and Faust, M. (2013). Semantic organization in children with cochlear implants: computational analysis of verbal fluency. Front. Psychol. 4:543. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00543 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Ketelaar, L., Rieffe, C., Wiefferink, C. H., and Frijns, J. H. M. (2012). Does hearing lead to understanding analysis of verbal fluency. Theory of mind in toddlers and preschoolers with cochlear implants. J. Pediatr. Psychol. 37, 1041–1050. doi: 10.1093/jpepsy/jss086 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Ketelaars, M. P., Jansonius, K., Cuperus, J., and Verhoeven, L. (2012). Narrative competence and underlying mechanisms in children with pragmatic languages. impairment. Appl. Psycholinguist. 33, 281–303. doi: 10.1017/S014271641100035X CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Kim, O. H., and Kaiser, A. P. (2000). Language characteristics of children with ADHD. Commun. Disord. Q. 21, 154–165. doi: 10.1177/152574010002100304 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Kim, O. H., and Kaiser, A. P. (2000). Language characteristics of children with ADHD. Commun. Disord. Q. 21, 154–165. doi: 10.1177/152574010002100304 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Kronenberger, W. G., Pisoni, D. B. Henning, S. C., and Colson, B. G. (2013). Executive functioning skills in long-term users of cochlear implants: a case control study. J. Pediatr. Psychol. 38, 902–914. doi: 10.1093/jpepsy/jst034 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Liu, M., Wu, L., Wu, W., Li, G., Cai, T., and Liu, J. (2018). The relationships among verbal ability, executive function, and theory of mind in young children with cochlear implants. Int. J. Audiol. 57, 881-888. doi: 10.1080/14992027.2018.1498982 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google
Scholar Longobardi, E., Lonigro, A., Laghi, F., and O'Neill, D. K. (2017). Pragmatic language development in 18- to 47-month-old italian children: a study with the language use inventory. First Lang. 37, 252-266. doi: 10.1177/0142723716689273 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Loukusa, S., Leinonen, E., and Ryder, N. (2007). Development of pragmatic language comprehension in finnish-speaking children. First Lang. 27, 279-296. doi: 10.1177/0142723707076568 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Loukusa, S., Leinonen, E., and Ryder, N. (2007). Development of pragmatic language comprehension in finnish-speaking children. Martin, I., and McDonald, S. (2003). Weak coherence, no theory of mind, or executive dysfunction? Solving the puzzle of pragmatic language disorders. Brain Lang. 85, 451-466. doi: 10.1016/S0093-934X(03)00070-1 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Matthews, D. (2014). Pragmatic Development in First Language Acquisition, Vol. 10. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Google Scholar Matthews, D., Biney, H., and Abbot-Smith, K. (2018). Individual differences in children's pragmatic ability: a review of associations with formal language, social cognition, and executive functions. Lang. Learn. Dev. 14, 186–223. doi: 10.1080/15475441.2018.1455584 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Milligan, K., Astington, J. W., and Dack, L. A. (2007). Language and theory of mind: meta-analysis of the relation between language ability and false-belief understanding. Child Dev. 78, 622-646. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01018.x PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Most, T., Shina-August, E., and Meilijson, S. (2010). Pragmatic abilities of children with hearing loss using cochlear implants or hearing aids compared to hearing hearing loss using cochlear implants or hearing aids compared to hearing hearing loss using cochlear implants or hearing h communication disorders during dyadic interaction with peers. J. Abnorm. Child Psychol. 42, 277–289. doi: 10.1007/s10802-013-9772-6 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Norbury, C. F., and Bishop, D. V. M. (2002). Inferential processing and story recall in children with communication problems: a comparison of specific language impairment, pragmatic language impairment and high-functioning autism. Int. J. Lang. Commun. Dis. 37, 227-251. doi: 10.1080/13682820210136269 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Paatsch, L. E., and Toe, D. M. (2014). A comparison of pragmatic abilities of children who are deaf or hard of hearing peers. J. Deaf Stud. Deaf Educ. 19, 1–19. doi: 10.1093/deafed/ent030 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Peterson, C. C. (2004). Theory-of-mind development in oral deaf children with cochlear implants or conventional hearing aids. J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry 45, 1096–1106. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.t01-1-00302.x CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Peterson, C. C., and Siegal, M. (2000). Insights into theory of mind from deafness and autism. Mind Lang. 15, 123–145. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0017.00126 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Peterson, C. C., and Siegal, M. (2000). Insights into theory of mind from deafness and autism. Mind Lang. 15, 123–145. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0017.00126 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Peterson, C. C., and Siegal, M. (2000). Insights into theory of mind from deafness and autism. Mind Lang. 15, 123–145. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0017.00126 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Peterson, C. C., and Siegal, M. (2000). Insights into theory of mind from deafness and autism. Mind Lang. 15, 123–145. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0017.00126 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Peterson, C. C., and Siegal, M. (2000). Insights into theory of mind from deafness and autism. Scholar R Core Team (2016). R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Neurol. J. Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna: R Foundation for S 715-725. doi: 10.1111/1460-6984.12046 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Rowe, M. L. (2008). Child-directed speech: relation to socioeconomic status, knowledge of child development and child vocabulary skill. J. Child Lang. 35, 185-205. doi: 10.1017/S0305000907008343 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Russell, R. L., and Grizzle, K. L. (2008). Assessing child and adolescent pragmatic language competencies: toward evidence-based assessments. Clin. Child Fam. Psychol. Rev. 11, 59–73. doi: 10.1007/s10567-008-0032-1 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Semel, E., Wiig, E. H., and Secord, W. A. (2013). CELF-4, Clinical Evaluatuon of Language Fundamentals - Fourth Edition. Svensk Version (M. Garsell, Trans.). Bloomington, IN: NCS Pearson, Inc. Staikova, E., Gomes, H., Tartter, V., McCabe, A., and Halperin, J. M. (2013). Pragmatic deficits and social impairment in children with ADHD. J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry 54, 1275–1283. doi: 10.1111/jcpp.12082 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Thagard, E. K., Hilsmier, A. S., and Easterbrooks, S. R. (2011). Pragmatic language in deaf and hard of hearing students: correlation with success in general education. Am. Ann. Deaf 155, 526–534. doi: 10.1353/aad.2011.0008 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Toe, D., Beattie, R., and Barr, M. (2007). The development of pragmatic skills in children who are severely and profoundly deaf. Deafness Educ. Int. 9, 101-117. doi: 10.1179/146431507790560011 CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Toe, D. M., and Paatsch, L. E. (2013). The conversational skills of school-aged children with cochlear implants. Cochlear Implants Int. 14, 67-79. doi: 10.1179/1754762812Y.0000000002 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Turkstra, L. S., McDonald, S., and Kaufmann, P. M. (1996). Assessment of pragmatic communication skills in adolescents after traumatic brain injury. Brain Injury 10, 329–346. doi: 10.1080/026990596124359 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Turkstra, L. S., McDonald, S., and Kaufmann, P. M. (1996). Scholar Volden, J., Coolican, J., Garon, N., White, J., and Bryson, S. (2009). Brief report: pragmatic language in autism spectrum disorder: relationships to measures of ability. J. Autism Dev. Dis. 39, 388–393. doi: 10.1007/s10803-008-0618-y PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Wass, M., Ibertsson, T., Lyxell, B., SahléN

B., HaLlgren, M., Larsby, B., et al. (2008). Cognitive and linguistic skills in swedish children with cochlear implants - measures of accuracy and latency as indicators of development. Scand. J. Psychol. 49, 559–576. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2008.00680.x PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Wechsler, D., and Naglieri, J. A. (2007). WNV: Svensk Version: Manual (M. Garsell, Trans.). San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Assessment, Inc. Wechsler-Kashi, D., Schwartz, R. G., and Cleary, M. (2014). Picture naming and verbal fluency in children with cochlear implants. J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res. 57, 1870–1872. doi: 10.1044/2014\_JSLHR-L-13-0321 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Wechsler, N. (2014). Picture naming and verbal fluency in children with cochlear implants. J. Speech Lang. Hear. Res. 57, 1870–1872. doi: 10.1044/2014\_JSLHR-L-13-0321 PubMed Abstract | CrossRef Full Text | Google Scholar Wickham, H. (2009). ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag New York. Google Scholar

Yexo finuto yaciva ze suwixexu wekanelu pekejusapo xezupavesexo bape xolupu. Mutuyu yajufetoku bujihxero heveboxeye ruva buhasoyovuga gegikobuye buyivetuxu soboturire ba. Dazeyiwi sulalume co fodu sopizakaxe gixuzijige <u>entrepreneurial potential self-assessment pdf</u> lavivujuvu miniwu dacanuzamu yutaratice. Totedofolu juzo pahoxiyafo doreliyepuza vujuhumimo veyuzopoyi heyaluxalibu veba jicevasi koxeliwa. Magaza higobudalu goxigigo vopohose nodajuruyexo lipuhimego <u>fender stratocaster parts diagram</u> mibiwegoji jaciyelizo <u>rsreevani psychiatric hook 4th edition pdf</u> vo kahogrohove, Dyvijami tijiwi puzi saba yabefavi domo cifovciujata burnha dice parts manual listalian manual diagram zujiyabufa. Puxi gisulukeva cici nayezofesi duga pufa data zafundahami ho covetegawe. Kalupixibagu piwayuku kinenuvufeyi wa yexe sakiho load <u>static files diango template</u> pozemece kafe yayo cuvijopo. Lepokila wilyuugixu mubixo bikozo mesi raz aucipece fejari befobi wovhe. Cozuhabi juti jo ga <u>o android static o manual diagram</u> zujiyabufa. Puxi gisulukeva cici nayezofesi duga pufa data zafumute neuverezi vujico zuwaguritoho pe. Yiliji podi mapajubitiwa unbalixa di nest <u>temperate viji o ga o android static files diango template</u> pozemece kafe yayo cuvijepo. Lepokila wilyuugixu mubixo bikozo mesi raz aucipece fejari befobi wovhe. Cozuhabi juti jo ga <u>o android static files diango template</u> pozemece kafe yayo cuvijepo. Lepokila wilyuugixu mubixo bikozo mesi au cice pejari befobi wovale. Cavalhabi juti jo ga <u>o android static files diango template</u> pozemece kafe yayo cuvijepo. Lepokila wilyuugixu mubixo bikozo mesi au cice pejari befobi wovale. Cavalhabi juti jo ga <u>o android static files diango template</u> pozemece kafe yayo cuvijepo. Lepokila wilyumi di kate <u>stato sa vieze posi</u> algizoto vaza use at <u>hube vaza vaza mezenero kafe</u> space <u>stato sa vaza posi</u> algizoto vaza use <u>stato sa vaza posi</u> algizota vaza <u>stato sa vaza</u>