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Introduction

The Language Assessment, Remediation and Screening Procedure (LARSP) was one of the first linguistically principled assessment procedures and one of the first clinical procedures aimed at analyzing a child’s expressive language within a conversational context. LARSP is grounded in the descriptive framework of an adult reference grammar and each utterance in the language sample is analyzed at the clause, phrase and word levels of description.

Utterance he is washing the doggie.

Procedure

- 20-month mother-child language samples
- Free-play interaction with standard set of toys in lab or clinic
- Transcription done in SALT format; grammatical coding done with TASP based on standard LARSP procedure
- Transcription and coding done blindly with respect to children’s age, sex and language test outcome
- Inter-observer point-to-point agreement calculated

Method

Participants

- N = 152 (55% boys)
- Age range: 24 to 47 months
- 50% from UK, 50% from USA

Standardized language test (RDL3-3, RDL3-US or SICD-R) and audiological screen administered. Children not excluded on the basis of language ability.

Further information regarding the sample previously published.

Results

Children produced a mean of 164.1 C&I utterances (SD = 49.8) during the 20-minute language samples.

1. Mean frequency of constructions, with SD and 95% confidence interval, per 100 major utterances (subset of data shown).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase level</th>
<th>Age (Months)</th>
<th>24 - 26</th>
<th>27 - 29</th>
<th>30 - 32</th>
<th>33 - 35</th>
<th>36 - 38</th>
<th>39 - 41</th>
<th>42 - 43</th>
<th>44 - 45</th>
<th>46 - 47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ed</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ing</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ed</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ing</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ing</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Percentage of children producing two or more instances of each construction per 100 major utterances (subset of data shown).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word level</th>
<th>Age (Months)</th>
<th>24 - 26</th>
<th>27 - 29</th>
<th>30 - 32</th>
<th>33 - 35</th>
<th>36 - 38</th>
<th>39 - 41</th>
<th>42 - 43</th>
<th>44 - 45</th>
<th>46 - 47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ed</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ing</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advantages of the original LARSP procedure

- Gives snapshot of grammatical structures present in language sample
- Provides profile of grammatical strengths and weaknesses
- Informs diagnosis and intervention
- Complements formal testing

Disadvantages

- Normative data unavailable to aid interpretation
- Can’t readily distinguish lack of knowledge from non-occurrence

Motivation for the present study

- Need for empirical data based on standardized sampling context

Conclusions

The quantitative data resulting from this study of 152 British and American preschool children represent an initial attempt at establishing a reference database for the LARSP profile chart. Normative data should be of clinical use in interpreting the results of the LARSP analysis, but further research is needed to develop the clinical potential of the database, including the need to:

- Develop an ‘error’ profile for Stage VI of the chart;
- Extend the upper age range of the database;
- Determine the extent to which the profile can differentiate children with and without language impairment at the individual level (diagnostic accuracy).
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