



# Introduction

- Aphasia is an acquired language disorder typically caused by stroke
- The Western Aphasia Battery-Revised (WAB-R; Kertesz, 2007) is a common tool used to assess language function in individuals with aphasia
  - The cut-off for not-aphasic on the WAB-R is an aphasia quotient (AQ) at or above 93.8
  - However, oftentimes these individuals complain of mild language difficulties
- A multi-level discourse analysis procedure can detect discourse deficits at both the micro- and macrolinguistic level (Marini et al., 2011)
  - These procedures have been shown to be more sensitive to language deficits than standardized measures (Marini et al., 2011; Sherratt, 2007; Wright & Capilouto, 2012)

# Purpose

The purpose of this study was examine micro- and macrolinguistic measures individuals determined nonaphasic by WAB-R AQs (NABW) and control individuals across three discourse tasks

# **Research Questions**

- Do NABW score differ from control individuals with no history of neurogenic disorders damaged group (NBD) on microlinguistic measures?
- Do NABW differ from NBD on macrolinguistic measures?

## **Participants** - retrieved from AphasiaBank

### database

- NABW Group included N = 27
- NBD Group included N = 27
- Groups were matched for:
  - Age
  - Education
  - Gender

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the personnel in the Adult and Aging Language Disorders Lab for their assistance in completing this research.



## Deculto

Results				
		NABW	NBD	P-value
Lexical errors	Cat in tree	.745(.312)	.643 (.471)	.356
	Cinderella	.623(.210)	.741(.173)	.031
	Sandwich	.697(.369)	.484(.482)	.073
Grammatical errors	Cat in tree	.364(.451)	.00(.00)	<.001
	Cinderella	.435(.395)	.00(.00)	<.001
	Sandwich	.419(.397)	.00(.00)	<.001
Global Coherence errors	Cat in tree	.567(.394)	.352(.456)	.06
	Cinderella	.410(.345)	.241(.424)	.122
	Sandwich	.462(.328)	.451(.481)	.919

## Discussion

- Participants with AQs at or at WAB-R can present with sub discourse production
- No significant differences we between groups for global co across the three discourse ta
- Significant differences for gra errors for all discourse tasks
  - NABW group had more e NBD group

### **Clinical Implications**:

Need to be cautious in battery results as "norm performance; subtle lan may be present at the d

### **Contact**:

Heather Harris Wright - wrighth@ecu.edu

<section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header><section-header></section-header></section-header></section-header></section-header></section-header></section-header>	
e <kəıdʒ@u< td=""><td></td></kəıdʒ@u<>	
m]. And [/]	
nce]> [* s:r] hna find her	
nd	
asia ution of bound	
tic paraphasia	
ion	
bove 93.8 on tle deficits in	
ere found oherence asks	
ammatical	
errors than the	
interpreting test	
nguage deficits discourse level	