



**Inner speech's relationship with overt speech in post-stroke aphasia**

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Journal:                      | <i>Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research</i>   |
| Manuscript ID                 | JSLHR-S-16-0270.R2   |
| Manuscript Type:              | Research Article   |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | n/a  |
| Complete List of Authors:     | Stark, Brielle; University of Cambridge, Clinical Neurosciences<br>Geva, Sharon; University College London, UCL Institute of Child Health<br>Warburton, Elizabeth; University of Cambridge, Clinical Neurosciences |
| Keywords:                     | Aphasia, Stroke, Speech, Speech production, Communication, Cognition   |
|                               |  |

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Review

1  
2  
3 Inner speech's relationship with overt speech in post-stroke aphasia  
45 BC Stark<sup>1</sup>, S Geva<sup>2</sup>, EA Warburton<sup>1</sup>  
67  
8 <sup>1</sup>University of Cambridge, <sup>2</sup>University College London  
910 **Corresponding author:**

11 BC Stark

12 University of South Carolina

13 Office 211 915 Greene St

14 Columbia SC 29205

15 [stark2@mailbox.sc.edu](mailto:stark2@mailbox.sc.edu) or [brielle.stark@gmail.com](mailto:brielle.stark@gmail.com)  
16  
1718 (803) 777 9240  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
2829 **Author Note**  
30  
31  
32  
3334 B Stark's work at the University of Cambridge was made possible by the Gates Cambridge  
35 Trust. SG was supported by the Pinsent-Darwin Fellowship; Wingate scholarship; The  
36 Cambridge Overseas Trust and B'nai Brith Scholarship. EAW was supported by the Biomedical  
37 Centre Grant (BMC) to Cambridge from the UK National Institute of Health Research (NIHR).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

**Abstract****Purpose**

Preserved inner speech alongside relatively poor overt speech has been documented in some persons with aphasia (PWA) but the relationship of overt speech with inner speech is still largely unclear, as few studies have directly investigated these factors. The present study investigates the relationship of preserved inner speech in aphasia with selected measures of language and cognition.

**Method**

38 chronic PWA (11 F, average age  $64.53 \pm 13.29$  years, time since stroke 8-111 months), were classified as having preserved inner and overt speech (N=21), preserved inner speech with poor overt speech (N=8) or not classified due to insufficient measurements of inner and/or overt speech (N=9). Inner speech scores (by group) were correlated with selected measures of language and cognition from the Comprehensive Aphasia Test.

**Results**

The group with relatively poor overt speech showed a significant relationship of inner speech with overt naming ( $r=0.95$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) and with mean length of utterance produced during a written picture description ( $r=0.96$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). Correlations between inner speech and language and cognition factors were not significant for the group with relatively good overt speech.

**Conclusion**

Like previous research, we show that preserved inner speech is found alongside otherwise severe production deficits in PWA. PWA with relatively poor overt speech may rely more on preserved inner speech for overt picture naming (perhaps due to shared resources with verbal working memory) and for written picture description, perhaps owing to reliance on inner speech due to perceived task difficulty. Assessments of inner speech may be useful as a standard component of

INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

aphasia screening, and therapy focused on improving and utilizing inner speech may prove clinically worthwhile.

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

**Introduction**

At least one million people in the USA are currently living with aphasia, the loss of language most often resulting from stroke (National Aphasia Association, 2016). A phenomenon that has been observed in some persons with aphasia (PWA) is that their internal monologue, or inner speech, is preserved despite poor language production (Fama et al., 2017; Geva et al., 2011a; Hayward et al., 2016; Langland-Hassan et al., 2015).

The awareness of an internal monologue/inner speech found its roots early in psychological research (Vygotsky, 1962) and has been diversely defined. Inner speech has been described as abstract 'language of the mind' (reviewed in Sokolov, 1972), as dialogic or conversational (Alderson-Day et al., 2016) and as phonologically or phonetically concrete (Oppenheim & Dell, 2010a; Vigliocco & Hartsuiker, 2002). Inner speech has played a role in schizophrenia research regarding auditory hallucinations (Agnati et al., 2012; Girbau, 2007; Langdon et al., 2009) but less of a role in aphasia research. Geva et al., (2011a) define inner speech "as the ability to create an internal representation of the auditory word form, and to apply computations or manipulations to this representation" and we will employ this definition when referring to inner speech.

The cognitive mechanisms of inner speech are potentially diverse. Inner speech has been associated with pre-speech articulation (i.e., Geva et al., 2011b; Owen et al., 2004) and, especially in the case of rhyme judgment using inner speech, with phonological working memory (Baddeley & Hitch, 1974; Durisko, 2002; Geva et al., 2011a; Howard & Franklin, 1990; Martin & Saffran, 1997; Marvel & Desmond, 2012). Inner speech has also been described as an internal monitoring mechanism in the language system (i.e., Dell, 1986; Levelt, 1983) and has been proposed as a potential buffer for detection of pre-speech errors (Corley et al., 2011; Dell &

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

1  
2  
3 Repka, 1992; Hartsuiker & Kolk, 2001; Nootboom, 2005; Oppenheim & Dell, 2010b; Postma,  
4  
5  
6 2000; Slevc & Ferreira, 2006).

7  
8         Studies evaluating the relationship of inner speech to overt speech in PWA are relatively  
9  
10 rare, and they have shown conflicting results (i.e., Fama et al., 2017; Geva, Bennett, et al., 2011;  
11  
12 **Langland-Hassan et al., 2015**). A recent study, using self-report of inner speech ability, showed  
13  
14 that subjective judgment of good inner speech correlated with aphasia severity and lexicality  
15  
16 effect (Fama et al., 2017), suggesting that there was preserved inner speech alongside deficits in  
17  
18 phonological output processes. However, while this study suggests that there may be a strong  
19  
20 relationship between inner speech and overt speech in aphasia, a study by Langland-Hassan and  
21  
22 colleagues (2015) did not find a relationship between inner speech and aphasia severity, as  
23  
24 measured by components of language processing (both production and comprehension) **from** the  
25  
26 Western Aphasia Battery, or a relationship of inner speech with various aspects of cognition. It is  
27  
28 likewise unclear how many, **within** the population of PWA, show this pattern of preserved inner  
29  
30 speech alongside poor overt speech. In **the present** study, we will evaluate, in a relatively large  
31  
32 group of PWA (**chronic**), the relationship of preserved inner speech with **particular** measures of  
33  
34 language and cognition, specifically evaluating the relationship of these factors to preserved  
35  
36 inner speech when overt speech is relatively poor.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

**Methods****Participants**

Thirty-eight chronic PWA (11 females), following left hemisphere middle cerebral artery (MCA) territory stroke, age-at-testing 21-87 years ( $M=63.53$ ,  $SD=13.29$ ), 8-111 months' post-stroke ( $M=30.03$ ,  $SD=24.39$ ), and 6-20 years of education ( $M=13.76$ ,  $SD=3.23$ ) participated in the study. The study was approved by the Cambridge Research Ethics Committee (2007) and East of England Ethics Committee (2013). All participants gave informed consent following receipt of information sheet and task instructions.

Participants showed first language competence in British English. Participants did not have any known degenerative neurological conditions and no known history of other neurological or psychiatric disorders. The diagnosis of aphasia was based on the convergence of clinical consensus and the results of a standardized aphasia examination, the Comprehensive Aphasia Test (CAT) (Swinburn et al., 2004). All PWA had some level of language production impairment at initial presentation with relatively intact comprehension. Full participant demographics are found in Supplementary Table 1.

In this study, we were interested in **particular** measurements of language and cognition; these will be detailed in *'Outcome Measures.'*

**Procedure For Testing Inner Speech**

Two tests were employed for assessing inner speech. Patients were asked to perform a yes/no task on whether two words rhymed or were homophones without pronouncing the words aloud and without moving any part of the mouth, including lips or tongue. **The words were presented to the participant side-by-side on pieces of paper by the experimenter (author BS or author SG).** Participants pointed to 'yes' or to 'no' on a piece of a paper or said the word 'yes' or

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

1  
2  
3 'no' to indicate their answer. Participants were monitored during the task by the experimenter to  
4 make sure these instructions were followed. The visually-presented words which were used to  
5 test inner speech and overt speech were partially derived from the PALPA subtests 36 (non-word  
6 reading) and 15 (written rhyme judgment) (Kay et al., 1996) and ensured to match British  
7 pronunciation (Geva, Bennett, et al., 2011a). Variations of this test have been used to assess  
8 inner speech in aphasia previously (Geva et al., 2011a; Kay et al., 1996; Langland-Hassan et al.,  
9 2015; Stark, 2016) and further details of test administration and scoring can be found in Geva et  
10 al (2011a).

11  
12 To test inner speech using rhyme judgment, participants were tested with 60 pairs of  
13 potential rhyming words with varying orthography, the majority of which were single syllable  
14 words. Some words had similar orthography and rhymed ('tweak' and 'freak'); similar  
15 orthography but did not rhyme ('tint' and 'pint'); dissimilar orthography and rhymed ('quay' and  
16 'sea'); or dissimilar orthography but did not rhyme ('chew' and 'hoe'). In this way, participants  
17 could not determine whether or not a word rhymed based on orthography alone. The 60 pairs of  
18 words were split into two lists of 30 word pairs each, and each list presentation was  
19 counterbalanced across participants. Lists of words can be found in Supplementary Table 3.

20  
21 To test inner speech using homophone judgment, participants were shown 60 pairs of  
22 potential homophones, with 20 of them being non-words such as 'quib' and 'kwib.' Since the  
23 number of pairs of non-words from the PALPA was small, 40 additional pairs of non-words were  
24 developed by authors SG and BS. As in the rhyme judgment procedure, the 60 pairs of words  
25 were split into two lists of 30 word pairs each, and each list presentation was counterbalanced  
26 across participants. Lists of words can be found in Supplementary Table 3.



## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

To measure overt speech, PWA were asked to read the same visually-presented words aloud for both the rhymes and the homophones. The overt speech score had two scoring segments: correct pronunciation of the words and correct indication as to whether the words rhymed or were homophones. The pronunciation of the words was based on a British-English rhyming dictionary. To ensure the validity of the results from these two tasks, we correlated the overt speech measure from the PALPA with the reading aloud component from the CAT, finding that they showed significant agreement ( $r_s=0.76, p<0.001$ ).

For both inner and overt speech, we used the raw accuracy score. In this study, 'relatively preserved' inner and overt speech function is defined as scoring greater than 50% on the rhyme and homophone test. However, it should be noted that persons in this study are still considered to have aphasia based on their CAT scores. Therefore, 'preserved' overt speech means relatively good production for a person diagnosed with aphasia.

Some participants did not complete inner and overt speech assessments due to difficulty; they are noted in the results.

### Outcome Measurements

Conflicting results have arisen from previous studies attempting to associate inner speech with phonological working memory (Geva, Bennett, et al., 2011) as well as with measures of generative speech and confrontational naming (Fama et al., 2017; Langland-Hassan et al., 2015) and non-linguistic cognition (Langland-Hassan et al., 2015). In an attempt to resolve this conflict in a relatively large cohort of PWA, we chose measurements from the CAT that targeted aspects of non-linguistic cognition, phonological working memory, confrontational naming and

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

1  
2  
3 **generative speech.** These tests are described in more detail below. Refer to Figure 1 for a graphic  
4  
5 explanation of the proposed correlations.  
6  
7

**Measures of language and cognition from the CAT.**

8  
9  
10 Seven subtests from the CAT were used as outcome measures: non-word repetition and  
11 sentence repetition; overt picture naming; written and spoken picture description; semantic  
12 memory and **mental** arithmetic.  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 (1) Non-word repetition and sentence repetition subtests examined the ability to repeat  
18 non-words and sentences of varying lengths, targeting both speech repetition and phonological  
19 working memory.  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 (2) Overt picture naming subtest involved confrontational, overt naming of pictures. We  
25 used this measure to evaluate inner speech's relationship with components of confrontational  
26 naming.  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 (3) Written and spoken picture description subtests involved generative writing and  
32 speaking about a picture for an unspecified amount of time. In the spoken picture description  
33 (SPD) subtest, PWA were asked to describe a picture aloud, and in the written picture  
34 description (WPD) subtest, were asked to describe the same picture with writing. The tasks used  
35 the same picture (Cookie Theft). There was no time limit for completing either task and SPD was  
36 always administered first. We used these tests to provide a measure of spontaneous or generative  
37 language; that is, having the potential to incorporate grammatical and syntactic complexity into  
38 written and spoken language. For the purposes of this paper, we used mean length of utterance  
39 (MLU) as the score for SPD and WPD. MLUs are a standard measure of grammatical  
40 complexity in the literature (for example, in Expression, Reception and Recall of Narrative  
41 Instrument (ERRNI) (Bishop, 2004) and have been used in aphasia literature (Martinez-Ferreiro  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

et al., 2015; Thompson et al., 2010; Thompson & Shapiro, 2007). MLUs were scored according to the protocol used by ERRNI, where the MLU for each PWA was obtained by calculating the average number of words per utterance (Bishop, 2004).

(4) Two components from the cognitive screen of the CAT were used to probe general memory and cognition: semantic memory and **mental arithmetic**. In the test of semantic memory, PWA were shown a set of four pictures and a target picture. They were asked to point to the picture that was most related to the target picture. In the **mental arithmetic** test, PWA were given a set of ten mathematical problems of increasing difficulty. There were five multiple choice answers from which they could choose to solve the problem. They were asked to complete the task entirely in their head. We used these measures of cognition to investigate whether cognitive (less linguistic) factors might show a relationship with preserved inner speech.

**Preserved Inner Speech Groups**

We were interested in two groups of participants: those with preserved inner speech alongside relatively preserved overt speech (GOS) and those with preserved inner speech alongside relatively poor overt speech (POS).

First, we qualitatively separated participants into groups based on their average inner and overt speech scores. Participants who successfully completed both the rhyme and homophone section of both inner speech and overt speech were assessed. Seven participants were not classified into groups because they were missing data from a rhyme or homophone section for inner and/or overt speech. Of the included participants, those scoring >50% on both the inner and overt speech tasks were classified into the GOS group, while participants scoring >50% on inner speech and  $\leq$ 50% on overt speech tasks were classified into POS group. We were interested in

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

1  
2  
3 relatively preserved inner speech, and therefore two participants were not classified into the  
4  
5 groups because they showed overall poor inner and overt speech scores ( $\leq 50\%$  accuracy).  
6  
7

8 Then, we compared inner and overt speech scores of the GOS and POS groups to our  
9  
10 50% benchmark, to verify that the GOS group as a whole showed relatively preserved inner and  
11  
12 overt speech and that the POS group showed relatively preserved inner speech but relatively poor  
13  
14 overt speech. GOS group demonstrated average inner and overt speech scores significantly  
15  
16 greater than 50% as tested by the one-sample Wilcoxon Signed Rank test (inner speech:  $W=3.92$ ,  
17  
18  $p<0.001$ ; overt speech:  $W=3.93$ ,  $p<0.001$ ). POS group demonstrated inner speech scores  
19  
20 significantly greater than 50% ( $W=2.24$ ,  $p=0.03$ ) and overt speech scores significantly less than  
21  
22 50% ( $W=2.53$ ,  $p=0.01$ ). The GOS group comprised 21 participants and the POS group comprised  
23  
24 eight participants; descriptive statistics are shown in Table 2.  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 We were most interested in the ratio of inner speech to overt speech within these groups,  
30  
31 as we wanted to verify that the POS group showed relatively preserved inner speech as compared  
32  
33 to their overt speech. This was indeed the case. Within the POS group, average inner speech  
34  
35 score was significantly greater than average overt speech score ( $W=2.52$ ,  $p=0.01$ ). As expected,  
36  
37 the GOS group **did not show** significantly different inner speech and overt speech scores  
38  
39 ( $W=1.85$ ,  $p=0.06$ ).  
40  
41  
42

43 Demographically, GOS and POS were not significantly different in age ( $U=1.41$ ,  
44  
45  $p=0.17$ ), years of education ( $U=0.54$ ,  $p=0.60$ ) or time since stroke ( $U=1.63$ ,  $p=0.10$ ). GOS group  
46  
47 showed significantly higher scores on the total production score (naming, reading, repetition,  
48  
49 writing) from the CAT ( $U=3.61$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and total comprehension score (auditory and reading)  
50  
51 from **the** CAT ( $U=3.23$ ,  $p=0.001$ ). GOS group showed significantly better scores on inner speech  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

rhyme ( $U=2.48, p=0.01$ ), inner speech homophone ( $U=2.74, p=0.01$ ), overt rhyme ( $U=4.16, p<0.001$ ) and overt homophone ( $U=4.01, p<0.001$ ) (Figure 2).

**Statistical analysis.**

The subtests of the CAT each contained a different amount of items/stimuli. To standardize these measures, we transformed each subtest score as a function of the subtest's aphasia-cut off, a score above which is considered non-aphasic for that subtest. The various CAT subtests have different aphasia cut-off scores. For example, see Table 1, which shows the repetition subtest of the CAT, which comprises five subcomponents all of which have different aphasia cut-off scores according to their total possible score. Two of these measures (non-word and sentence repetition) were used as outcome measures. Row four of Table 1 shows the transformed score, dividing the raw scores by the aphasia cut-off. Raw scores from the CAT were standardized in this way. We believe this standardization also provide an easily accessible interpretation of the participant's score on the subtest (for more detailed description, see: Stark & Warburton, 2016). For example, Table 1 shows that the example participant exhibited a 0.96 score for total repetition, indicating that they score as aphasic on this particular task. A score of 1.0 signifies that the person's score is equivalent to aphasia cut-off, and a score higher than 1.0 suggests they are not considered aphasic on the task.

To establish inter-rater reliability of MLU scoring on the picture description subtests, six randomly selected transcripts from the WPD subtest and 13 randomly selected transcripts from the SPD subtest were scored independently by two of the authors (BS and SG). Using Cronbach's alpha at 95% confidence to assess inter-rater reliability in SPSS 23, both WPD MLUs ( $\alpha=0.99$ ) and SPD MLUs ( $\alpha=0.94$ ) showed high inter-rater agreement. Due to high agreement, MLU scores by author BS were used in the analysis.

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

SPSS 23 was used for all statistical analyses. Nonparametric tests were used if data did not satisfy the normality assumptions of the Shapiro-Wilk normality test. For the purposes of using the Fisher r-to-z transformation, Pearson product moment correlations were used; however, if data was not normal, the Spearman rho correlation was also presented. The stringent Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons was used for correlation comparison.

For Peer Review

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

**Results**

The POS group showed a significant correlation (with multiple comparison correction) between inner speech rhyme and naming ( $r=0.95$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) and between inner speech homophone and written MLUs ( $r=0.96$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) (Table 3). Without multiple comparison correction, the GOS group showed relationships of non-word repetition ( $r=0.49$ ), sentence repetition ( $r=0.54$ ) and spoken MLUs ( $r=0.63$ ) with inner speech rhyme and the POS group showed an additional relationship of sentence repetition with inner speech rhyme ( $r=0.76$ ).

Fisher r-to-z transformation (using Pearson's  $r$ ) indicated that the POS group showed significantly greater correlation of inner speech rhyme with naming ( $p=0.006$ ) and inner speech homophone with written MLUs ( $p=0.004$ ) than the GOS group (Table 4). The relationship of inner speech rhyme to naming for both groups is shown in Figure 3.

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

**Discussion**

In this study we investigated the relationship between preserved inner speech and selected measures of language and cognition, specifically interested in whether there was a different relationship with these factors in people with preserved inner speech alongside poor overt speech as compared to those with relatively good overt speech. Further, while the relationship of inner speech and overt speech **has** been investigated in few studies (Fama et al., 2017; Geva, Bennett, et al., 2011; Hayward et al., 2014, 2016; Stark, 2016), there has not been agreement as to whether inner speech and overt speech are dissociable in aphasia.

This study was able to differentiate a cohort of 29 out of 38 PWA into two groups: a group of good overt and inner speech (GOS) and a group of poor overt and good inner speech (POS). While the POS group was much smaller than the GOS group, the groups were not significantly different in age, years of education **or** time since stroke. As members of the POS group were chosen because of their poor overt speech, it is not surprising that the GOS group presented with less severe scores on language production. However, the POS group was likewise more severe on measurements of language comprehension, inner speech and overt speech. This finding reveals two things. The first is that persons in the POS group presented with the most severe aphasia symptoms. Second, that despite presenting with severe production deficits, members of the POS group demonstrated relatively preserved inner speech in comparison to their overt speech, suggesting a dissociation between inner and overt speech. Nine participants from the original cohort were not assigned to groups, either due to overall poor scores in both inner and overt speech or missing scores on these measures. Therefore, there are also individuals in which both inner speech and overt speech are equally poor, but this study did not specifically investigate the relationship of inner and overt speech in these individuals.



## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

1  
2  
3  
4 The proportion of PWA who show relatively preserved inner speech alongside relatively  
5 poor overt speech in the population of PWA in general, is unclear. Geva et al., (2011a)  
6 investigated rhyme and homophone judgments using inner and overt speech (some participants  
7 which are included in the present study were included in this 2011 study). Of the 29 participants  
8 included in the 2011 study, six showed relatively preserved inner speech alongside poor overt  
9 speech for homophone judgment and four participants showed relatively preserved inner speech  
10 alongside poor overt speech for rhyme judgment. This finding suggests that, in a sample of  
11 nearly thirty participants, one-sixth showed relatively preserved inner speech alongside poor  
12 overt speech. Another fairly large study, examining subjective experiences of overt anomia (“*I*  
13 *can’t say it out loud, but I can say it in my head and it sounds right*”), found relatively intact  
14 inner speech in 78.4% of participants (N=29) from a cohort of 37 participants (34 with diagnosed  
15 aphasia from the Western Aphasia Battery) (Fama et al., 2017). It is unclear how many  
16 participants in the Fama et al. (2017) study showed poor overt speech in the same way that we  
17 have classified here, but Fama et al.’s study does suggest that, in more than half of their  
18 participants, an intact experience of inner speech was associated with overt anomia. In the  
19 current study, we found 21% of participants (N=8) with relatively preserved inner speech and  
20 relatively poor overt speech and 55% (N=21) showed relatively preserved inner alongside  
21 relatively preserved overt speech (5.2% (N=2) showed poor inner and overt speech and 18.42%  
22 (N=7) were not able to be classified). Altogether, these studies suggest that problems with overt  
23 speech alongside preserved inner speech are present in the aphasia population, albeit in a smaller  
24 proportion than those with preserved inner and overt speech, and give credence to a dissociation  
25 of the cognitive mechanisms generating inner and overt speech.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

1  
2  
3  
4           The relationship of preserved inner speech with selected measures of language and  
5  
6 cognition was evaluated. We believe that this evaluation has important implications for  
7  
8 understanding the cognitive processes associated with inner speech, such as pre-articulation and  
9  
10 phonological working memory, and whether there is a difference in the relationship of inner  
11  
12 speech with these measures of language and cognition when overt speech is particularly poor or  
13  
14 aphasia symptoms are severe.  
15

16  
17           We found that persons with preserved inner speech alongside poor overt speech showed a  
18  
19 significant positive correlation of inner speech rhyming with overt naming, and this correlation  
20  
21 was significantly greater than the same comparison for persons with relatively good overt  
22  
23 speech. Inner speech rhyme has been shown to associate with phonological working memory  
24  
25 (Howard & Franklin, 1990; Geva et al., 2011a). Within Baddeley and Hitch's 1974 model of  
26  
27 working memory is the phonological loop, made up of two parts: a phonological store and an  
28  
29 articulatory control process (Baddeley & Hitch, 1974). The phonological store holds verbal  
30  
31 information for short periods of time, whilst the articulatory control process allows the  
32  
33 manipulation of this information, such as rehearsal (Baddeley & Hitch, 1974). This original  
34  
35 working memory model did not implicate the language system, but evidence has shown that  
36  
37 parts of the language system and parts of the working memory system share a common  
38  
39 mechanism (Fedorenko, Duncan, & Kanwisher, 2012; Hulme & Roodenrys, 1997; Martin &  
40  
41 Saffran, 1996; Marvel & Desmond, 2012; Saffran, 1997).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48           The empirical evidence of phonological working memory playing a part in inner speech  
49  
50 has been varied. Baddeley and Wilson (1985) demonstrated that the processes of sub-vocal  
51  
52 rehearsal were not dependent on the capacity for overt articulation: dysarthric patients (who lost  
53  
54 the capacity to articulate) showed evidence of sub-vocal rehearsal as reflected in the word length  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

1  
2  
3 effect or an effect of acoustic similarity with visually presented items (Baddeley & Wilson,  
4  
5 1985). Dyspraxic patients (whose problems stem from a loss of capacity to assemble speech-  
6  
7 motor control programs) did not show a sign of rehearsal (Caplan & Waters, 1995). However, it  
8  
9 is difficult to fully disentangle repetition from working memory, as clinical tests often employ  
10  
11 only repetition to test working memory. While our study did not explicitly evaluate phonological  
12  
13 working memory as a factor, a more exhaustive study utilizing specific phonological working  
14  
15 memory assessments (i.e. varying difficulties of word span) alongside inner speech rhyme would  
16  
17 more clearly demonstrate the relationship between these two closely related internal  
18  
19 mechanisms.  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 While the significant association of phonological working memory with inner speech  
26  
27 rhyme may explain some of the relationship with overt naming in persons with relatively poor  
28  
29 overt speech, the strength of this relationship may also be due to the role of inner speech in pre-  
30  
31 articulation processes (De Bleser & Marshall, 2005; Goldstein, 1948; Marvel & Desmond, 2012;  
32  
33 Sokolov, 1972). Inner speech in PWA has been shown to associate with neural components  
34  
35 linked with articulatory features pre-speech, such as the premotor cortex (Calvert et al., 2000;  
36  
37 Geva et al., 2011b; Owen et al., 2004). Therefore, in persons with relatively poor overt speech  
38  
39 alongside preserved inner speech, the contribution of inner speech to pre-articulation may be  
40  
41 emphasized.  
42  
43  
44

45  
46 Subjective inner speech has been shown to significantly correlate with objective  
47  
48 measurements of overt anomia and post-lexical output processes (Fama et al., 2017). While  
49  
50 Fama and colleagues (2017) did not detail the participants who showed particularly impaired  
51  
52 overt speech, they did indicate that a large proportion of participants (78.4%) reported intact  
53  
54 inner speech alongside overt anomia, so a portion of their cohort appear to resemble members of  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

1  
2  
3 the POS group in our study. Together with Fama et al. (2017), our findings suggest that, when  
4  
5 overt speech is relatively poor, inner speech may play a significant role in successful overt  
6  
7 naming.  
8  
9

10         Alongside a relationship of inner speech rhyme with overt naming, persons with  
11  
12 relatively poor overt speech also showed a significant correlation of inner speech homophone  
13  
14 with greater MLU produced on the writing picture description task. There are few studies  
15  
16 evaluating inner speech's role in writing, or indeed generative writing. Since writing is produced  
17  
18 letter-by-letter, it is believed that the ability to sound out words or produce a phonological  
19  
20 representation plays an important and perhaps essential role in the ability of people to write.  
21  
22 Agraphia, or problems with writing, can accompany aphasia, and this has been considered by  
23  
24 some to be a manifestation of the dependence of writing on inner speech (Friederici et al., 1981),  
25  
26 especially for more difficult writing tasks (Levine et al., 1982).  
27  
28  
29  
30

31         Unlike inner speech rhyme, inner speech homophone is not thought to associate strongly  
32  
33 with phonological working memory (Howard & Franklin, 1990). We propose that one role of  
34  
35 inner speech homophone during a generative writing task in persons with relatively poor overt  
36  
37 speech may be as an error buffer. Inner speech as an error monitoring system has been  
38  
39 hypothesized as part of the language system (Bredart, 1991; G. S. Dell & Repka, 1992;  
40  
41 Hartsuiker & Kolk, 2001; MacKay, 1992; Motley, Camden, & Baars, 1982; Runnqvist et al.,  
42  
43 2016; van Wijk & Kempen, 1987; Vigliocco & Hartsuiker, 2002). Inner speech, in these models,  
44  
45 serves as an internal 'buffer' for possible language errors. Therefore, greater MLUs during a  
46  
47 generative writing task associating with inner speech homophone in persons with relatively poor  
48  
49 overt speech might reflect the fact that these participants have an opportunity for revising and  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

correcting their errors during completion of the written picture description task. Indeed, in some examples from this study, participants scratched out incorrect words or restarted sentences.

However, persons with relatively preserved overt speech also edited their writing samples. Why, then, do we see a significant correlation of written MLUs with inner speech only for the POS group? This relationship is not fully explained by inner speech as an error buffer. Another reason for inner speech's involvement in writing for the POS group may be due to perceived task difficulty. Non-aphasic people have been shown to invoke an internal monologue when reading, with more difficult texts showing a heavier reliance on inner speech (Alexander & Nygaard, 2008). It might be the case that persons with relatively poor overt speech, who also show more severe language deficits than those with relatively preserved overt speech, perceived the writing task to be more difficult and therefore relied more heavily on inner speech for aid in processing.

Notably, inner speech (rhyme or homophone) did not show a significant relationship with the selected measures of language and cognition in persons with relatively preserved overt speech. Langland-Hassan and colleagues (2015), whose participants' competency on an overt rhyme task largely resembled those persons included in the GOS group in our study, likewise did not show a significant relationship between inner speech and a battery of language production, nor with measures of linguistic cognition.

**Clinical Implications**

The present study suggested that, in those people presenting with preserved inner speech alongside poor overt speech, there was a positive relationship between inner speech ability and overt naming and written MLUs. Therefore, we found that deficits in overt speech are not necessarily accompanied by deficits in inner speech, and, in the case of overt naming and written

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

1  
2  
3 picture description, inner speech in some PWA with particularly poor overt speech may show an  
4  
5 augmented relationship with overt speech.  
6  
7

8           On one hand, assessments of inner speech may be useful as a standard component of  
9  
10 aphasia screening, illustrating whether an internal monologue is indeed preserved in persons who  
11  
12 show particularly severe overt speech deficits. Further, it was shown that members of the POS  
13  
14 group demonstrated relatively intact inner speech compared to their overt speech but it was also  
15  
16 demonstrated that their inner speech was significantly worse than the inner speech shown by the  
17  
18 GOS group. If indeed persons with severe overt speech deficits must rely on their internal  
19  
20 monologue to complete some overt tasks, specializing therapy to improve and more often utilize  
21  
22 their internal monologue may prove clinically worthwhile.  
23  
24  
25  
26

27           Training phonological working memory may be particularly useful for improving overt  
28  
29 naming, as phonological working memory associates with inner speech. A large meta-analysis  
30  
31 (Park & Ingles, 2001) showed that cognitive rehabilitation is used more often in traumatic brain  
32  
33 injury and has been shown to have a large effect on working memory (though not necessarily  
34  
35 phonological working memory), so it may be the case that training phonological working  
36  
37 memory, or other aspects of higher cognition, will feed forward into improved inner speech and  
38  
39 perhaps improved overt speech.  
40  
41  
42

43           Training inner speech may have other ramifications not investigated in the present study.  
44  
45 For example, it has been hypothesized that inner speech may have a role in self-cueing in  
46  
47 aphasia, where an internal mechanism such as inner speech, involved in choosing correct  
48  
49 phonological and lexical word forms, is necessary for successful self-cueing (Fama et al., 2017;  
50  
51 Tompkins et al., 2006).  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

**Conclusion**

In a cohort of 38 persons with aphasia, we investigated the relationship of preserved inner speech to selected measures of language and cognition. We were chiefly interested in the relationship of inner speech to these measures when overt speech was particularly poor. In our cohort, 21 participants showed relatively preserved inner and overt speech, eight showed relatively preserved inner speech alongside poor overt speech and nine did not fit either classification. Those with preserved inner speech alongside relatively poor overt speech also demonstrated significantly more severe aphasia, but were similar in biographical factors to those with relatively good overt speech. Therefore, some persons with aphasia may indeed demonstrate preserved inner speech alongside severe deficits of overt speech. Overt naming and a generative writing task were found to significantly, positively correlate with inner speech but only in persons with relatively poor overt speech and not in persons with relatively preserved overt speech, suggesting an exceptional role for inner speech when there is a severe impairment in overt speech. Assessing and treating inner speech in PWA may improve their inner speech, which in turn may feed into overt speech improvement.

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

References

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 Agnati, L. F., Barlow, P., Ghidoni, R., Borroto-Escuela, D. O., Guidolin, D., & Fuxe, K. (2012).  
8  
9 Possible genetic and epigenetic links between human inner speech, schizophrenia and  
10  
11 altruism. *Brain Research*, 1476, 38–57. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2012.02.074>  
12  
13  
14 Alderson-Day, B., Weis, S., Mccarthy-Jones, S., Moseley, P., Smailes, D., & Fernyhough, C.  
15  
16 (2016). The brain's conversation with itself: neural substrates of dialogic inner speech.  
17  
18 *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 11(1), 110–120.  
19  
20 <http://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsv094>  
21  
22  
23 Alexander, J., & Nygaard, L. (2008). Reading voices and hearing text: Talker-specific auditory  
24  
25 imagery in reading. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and*  
26  
27 *Performance*, 34(2), 446–459.  
28  
29  
30 Baddeley, A., & Hitch, G. (1974). Working memory. In H. Bower (Ed.), *The psychology of*  
31  
32 *learning and motivation: Advances in research and theory* (pp. 47–89). New York, NY:  
33  
34 Academic Press.  
35  
36  
37 Baddeley, A., & Wilson, B. A. (1985). Phonological coding and short-term memory in patients  
38  
39 without speech. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 24, 490–502.  
40  
41  
42 Bishop, D. (2004). *Expression, Reception and Recall of Narrative Instrument (ERRNI)*.  
43  
44  
45 Bredart, S. (1991). Word interruption in self-repairing. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 20,  
46  
47 123–138.  
48  
49  
50 Calvert, G. a, Brammer, M. J., Morris, R. G., Williams, S. C., King, N., & Matthews, P. M.  
51  
52 (2000). Using fMRI to study recovery from acquired dysphasia. *Brain and Language*, 71(3),  
53  
54 391–9. <http://doi.org/10.1006/brln.1999.2272>  
55  
56  
57 Corley, M., Brocklehurst, P. H., & Moat, H. S. (2011). Error biases in inner and overt speech:  
58  
59  
60



## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

Evidence from tongue twisters. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition*, 37(1), 162–75.

De Bleser, R., & Marshall, J. (2005). Egon Weigl and the concept of inner speech. *Cortex*, 41(2), 249–257.

Dell, G. S. (1986). A spreading-activation theory of retrieval in sentence production. *Psychological Review*, 93(3), 283–321.

Dell, G. S., & Repka, R. J. (1992). Errors in inner speech. In *Experimental slips and human error: Exploring the architecture of volition* (pp. 237–262).

Durisko, C. (2002). Exploring the inner speech process in verbal working memory, 1–45. Retrieved from <http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/10139/>

Fama, M. E., Hayward, W., Snider, S. F., Friedman, R. B., & Turkeltaub, P. E. (2017). Subjective experience of inner speech in aphasia: Preliminary behavioral relationships and neural correlates. *Brain and Language*, 164, 32–42. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2016.09.009>

Fedorenko, E., Duncan, J., & Kanwisher, N. (2012). Language-selective and domain-general regions lie side by side within Broca's area. *Current Biology*, qq, 2059–62.

Friederici, A. D., Schoenle, P., & Goodglass, H. (1981). Mechanisms underlying writing and speech in aphasia. *Brain and Language*, 13(2), 212–222.

Geva, S. (2010). *Inner Speech in Post-Stroke Aphasia : A Behavioural and Imaging Study*. University of Cambridge.

Geva, S., Bennett, S., Warburton, E. a., & Patterson, K. (2011). Discrepancy between inner and overt speech: Implications for post-stroke aphasia and normal language processing. *Aphasiology*, 25(3), 323–343. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2010.511236>

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

- 1  
2  
3 Geva, S., Jones, P. S., Crinion, J. T., Price, C. J., Baron, J.-C., & Warburton, E. a. (2011). The  
4  
5 neural correlates of inner speech defined by voxel-based lesion-symptom mapping. *Brain* :  
6  
7  
8 *A Journal of Neurology*, 134(Pt 10), 3071–82. <http://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awr232>  
9
- 10 Girbau, D. (2007). A neurocognitive approach to the study of private speech. *Span J Psychol*,  
11  
12 *10*(1), 41–51. Retrieved from  
13  
14  
15 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation>  
16  
17 &list\_uids=17549877  
18
- 19 Goldstein, K. (1948). *Language and language disturbances*. New York, NY: Grune and Stratton.  
20  
21
- 22 Hartsuiker, R. J., & Kolk, H. H. (2001). Error monitoring in speech production: a computational  
23  
24 test of the perceptual loop theory. *Cognitive Psychology*, 42, 113–157.  
25  
26  
27 <http://doi.org/10.1006/cogp.2000.0744>  
28
- 29 Hayward, W., Fama, M., Sullivan, K., Snider, S., Lacey, E., Friedman, R., & Turkeltaub, P. E.  
30  
31 (2014). Inner Speech in People with Aphasia. *Frontiers in Psychology*, (52nd Annual  
32  
33 Meeting of the Academy of Aphasia).  
34  
35
- 36 Hayward, W., Snider, S., Luta, G., Friedman, R., & Turkeltaub, P. (2016). Objective support for  
37  
38 subjective reports of successful inner speech in two people with aphasia. *Cognitive*  
39  
40 *Neuropsychology*, 33(5–6), 1–16. <http://doi.org/10.1080/02643294.2016.1192998>  
41  
42
- 43 Howard, D., & Franklin, S. (1990). Memory without rehearsal. In G. Vallar & T. Shallice (Eds.),  
44  
45 *Neuropsychological impairments of short-term memory* (pp. 287–318). Cambridge, UK:  
46  
47 Cambridge University Press.  
48  
49
- 50 Hulme, C., & Roodenrys, S. (1997). Word-frequency effects on short-term memory tasks:  
51  
52 Evidence for a reintegration process in immediate serial recall. *Journal of Experimental*  
53  
54 *Psychology-Learning Memory and Cognition*, 23(5), 1217–1232.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

- 1  
2  
3 Kay, J., Lesser, R., & Coltheart, M. (1996). Psycholinguistic Assessments of Language  
4 Processing in Aphasia (PALPA): An Introduction. *Aphasiology*, *10*(2), 159–180.  
5  
6 <http://doi.org/10.1080/02687039608248403>  
7  
8  
9  
10 Langdon, R., Jones, S. R., Connaughton, E., & Fernyhough, C. (2009). The phenomenology of  
11 inner speech: comparison of schizophrenia patients with auditory verbal hallucinations and  
12 healthy controls. *Psychological Medicine*, *39*(4), 655–63.  
13  
14 <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291708003978>  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 Langland-Hassan, P., Faries, F. R., Richardson, M. J., & Dietz, A. (2015). Inner speech deficits  
20 in people with aphasia. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *6*(528), 1–10.  
21  
22 <http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00528>  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 Levelt, W. J. M. (1983). Monitoring and self-repair in speech. *Cognition*, *14*(1), 41–104.  
28  
29  
30 Levine, D. N., Calvanio, R., & Popovics, a. (1982). Language in the absence of inner speech.  
31  
32 *Neuropsychologia*, *20*(4), 391–409. Retrieved from  
33  
34 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7133379>  
35  
36  
37 MacKay, D. G. (1992). Constraints on theories of inner speech. In L. E. Associates (Ed.),  
38  
39 *Auditory Imagery* (pp. 121–149).  
40  
41  
42 Martin, N., & Saffran, E. (1996). Recovery in deep dysphasia: Evidence for a relation between  
43 auditory-verbal STM capacity and lexical errors in repetition. *Brain and Language*, *52*(1),  
44  
45 83–113.  
46  
47  
48  
49 Martin, N., & Saffran, E. (1997). *Language and Auditory-verbal Short-term Memory*  
50  
51 *Impairments: Evidence for Common Underlying Processes. Cognitive Neuropsychology*  
52  
53 (Vol. 14). <http://doi.org/10.1080/026432997381402>  
54  
55  
56 Martinez-Ferreiro, S., Gonzalez, E. V., & Bastiaanse, R. (2015). Spontaneous speech:  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

- 1  
2  
3 Quantifying daily communication in Spanish-speaking individuals with aphasia. In  
4  
5 *Academy of Aphasia 53rd Annual Meeting*.  
6  
7
- 8 Marvel, C. L., & Desmond, J. E. (2012). From Storage to Manipulation: How the Neural  
9  
10 Correlates of Verbal Working Memory Reflect Varying Demands on Inner Speech. *Brain*  
11  
12 *and Language*, 120(1), 42–51. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2011.08.005>  
13  
14
- 15 Motley, M. T., Camden, C. T., & Baars, B. J. (1982). Covert formulation and editing of  
16  
17 anomalies in speech production: Evidence from experimentally elicited slips of the tongue.  
18  
19 *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 21(5), 578–594.  
20  
21  
22 [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371\(82\)90791-5](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5371(82)90791-5)  
23  
24
- 25 National Aphasia Association. (2016). Aphasia FAQs. Retrieved from  
26  
27 <http://www.aphasia.org/aphasia-faqs/>  
28  
29
- 30 Nooteboom, S. (2010). Monitoring for speech errors has different functions in inner and overt  
31  
32 speech. In A. Everaert, MBH; Lentz, T; de Mulder, H; Nilsen, O; Zondervan (Ed.), *The*  
33  
34 *Linguistics Experience: From knowledge of language to knowledge in linguistics* (pp. 213–  
35  
36 234).  
37  
38
- 39 Oppenheim, G. M., & Dell, G. S. (2010a). Motor movement matters: the flexible abstractness of  
40  
41 inner speech. *Memory & Cognition*, 38(8), 1147–1160.  
42  
43
- 44 Oppenheim, G. M., & Dell, G. S. (2010b). Motor movement matters: the flexible abstractness of  
45  
46 inner speech. *Memory & Cognition*, 38(8), 1147–60. <http://doi.org/10.3758/MC.38.8.1147>  
47  
48
- 49 Owen, W. J., Borowsky, R., & Sarty, G. E. (2004). fMRI of two measures of phonological  
50  
51 processing in visual word recognition: Ecological validity matters. *Brain and Language*, 90,  
52  
53 40–46. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X\(03\)00418-8](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X(03)00418-8)  
54  
55
- 56 Park, N. W., & Ingles, J. L. (2001). Effectiveness of attention rehabilitation after an acquired  
57  
58  
59  
60

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

1  
2  
3 brain injury: a meta-analysis. *Neuropsychology*, 15(2), 199–210.

4  
5  
6 <http://doi.org/10.1037/0894-4105.15.2.199>

7  
8 Postma, A. (2000). Detection of errors during speech production: A review of speech monitoring  
9  
10 models. *Cognition*, 77(2), 97–131. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277\(00\)00090-1](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(00)00090-1)

11  
12 Runnqvist, E., Bonnard, M., Gauvin, H. S., Attarian, S., Trebuchon, A., Hartsuiker, R. J., &

13  
14 Alario, F.-X. (2016). Internal modeling of upcoming speech: A causal role of the right  
15  
16 posterior cerebellum in non-motor aspects of language production. *Cortex*, (May).

17  
18  
19 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cortex.2016.05.008>

20  
21 Slevc, L. R., & Ferreira, V. S. (2006). Halting in single word production: A test of the perceptual  
22  
23 loop theory of speech monitoring. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 54(4), 515–540.

24  
25  
26 <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2005.11.002>

27  
28 Sokolov, A. (1972). *Inner Speech and Thought*. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

29  
30 Stark, B. C. (2016). *CATChES: Computerized Aphasia Therapy in Chronic Aphasia;*

31  
32  
33 *Neuropsychological and Neuroimaging Study Exploring Self-delivered iPad-based Speech*  
34  
35 *Therapy*. University of Cambridge.

36  
37 Stark, B. C., & Warburton, E. (2016). Improved Language in Chronic Aphasia After Self-  
38  
39 delivered iPad Speech Therapy. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*.

40  
41  
42 <http://doi.org/10.1080/09602011.2016.1146150>

43  
44 Swinburn, K., Porter, G., & Al, E. (2004). *Comprehensive Aphasia Test*. East Sussex:

45  
46  
47  
48 Psychology Press.

49  
50 Thompson, C. K., Choy, J. J., Holland, A., & Cole, R. (2010). Sentactics(R): Computer-  
51  
52 Automated Treatment of Underlying Forms. *Aphasiology*, 24(10), 1242–1266.

53  
54  
55 <http://doi.org/10.1080/02687030903474255.Sentactics>

## INNER SPEECH'S RELATIONSHIP WITH OVERT SPEECH

1  
2  
3 Thompson, C. K., & Shapiro, L. P. (2007). Treatment of Underlying Forms. *Sciences-New York*,  
4  
5  
6 19, 1021–1036.

7  
8 Tompkins, C. A., Scharp, V. L., & Marshall, R. C. (2006). Communicative value of self cues in  
9  
10 aphasia: A re-evaluation. *Aphasiology*, 20(7), 684–704.  
11  
12 <http://doi.org/10.1080/02687030500334076>

13  
14  
15 van Wijk, C., & Kempen, G. (1987). A dual system for producing self-repairs in spontaneous  
16  
17 speech: Evidence from experimentally elicited corrections. *Cognitive Psychology*, 19(4),  
18  
19 403–440. [http://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285\(87\)90014-4](http://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(87)90014-4)

20  
21  
22 Vigliocco, G., & Hartsuiker, R. J. (2002). The interplay of meaning, sound, and syntax in  
23  
24 sentence production. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(3), 442–472. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033->  
25  
26 2909.128.3.442

27  
28  
29 Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1: Example of scoring transformation for Repetition subtest

|                                  | Words          | Complex<br>Words | <b>Non-<br/>Words</b> | Digits | Sentences | Total       |
|----------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------|-----------|-------------|
| <i>Total possible score</i>      | 32             | 6                | 10                    | 14     | 12        | <b>60</b>   |
| <i>Aphasia cut-off</i>           | 29             | 5                | 5                     | 8      | 10        | <b>49</b>   |
| <i>Example Raw Score</i>         | 20             | 3                | 5                     | 9      | 10        | <b>47</b>   |
| <i>Example Transformed Score</i> | $(20/29)=0.69$ | $(3/5)=0.60$     | $(5/5)=1$             | 1.13   | 1         | <b>0.96</b> |

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for the POS and GOS groups

|                         | POS Group   |           | GOS Group   |           |
|-------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
|                         | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| N                       | 8           |           | 21          |           |
| Age                     | 70.13       | 10.83     | 62.92       | 14.48     |
| Years of Education      | 13.50       | 2.73      | 14.08       | 3.49      |
| Time Since Stroke (mos) | 46.00       | 32.59     | 22.56       | 16.89     |
| Inner Speech (Average)  | 0.64        | 0.13      | 0.84        | 0.11      |
| Overt Speech (Average)  | 0.07        | 0.17      | 0.89        | 0.12      |

For Peer Review



Table 3: Table of Pearson's  $r$ -values (Spearman's  $\rho$  in parentheses for non-parametric correlations) for both groups showing relationship of inner speech with overt language and working memory; \* indicates significant with multiple comparison correction using Bonferroni correction of  $p < 0.01$  and ^ indicates significant without multiple comparison correction at  $p < 0.05$

|                     | GOS Group                              |                 | POS Group         |                     |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|
|                     | Inner Rhyme                            | Inner Homophone | Inner Rhyme       | Inner Homophone     |
| Non-word Repetition | 0.49 <sup>^</sup> (0.53 <sup>^</sup> ) | -0.04 (0.09)    | 0.24              | -0.1                |
| Sentence Repetition | 0.54 <sup>^</sup> (0.56 <sup>^</sup> ) | 0.28 (0.17)     | 0.76 <sup>^</sup> | 0.47                |
| Semantic Memory     | -0.25 (-0.24)                          | -0.15 (-0.08)   | 0.54 (0.49)       | -0.03 (0.28)        |
| Arithmetic          | 0.38 (0.45 <sup>^</sup> )              | 0.29 (0.41)     | 0.51 (0.56)       | -0.21 (-0.14)       |
| Naming              | 0.41 (0.43)                            | 0.20 (0.23)     | <b>0.95*</b>      | 0.5                 |
| Spoken MLUs         | 0.63 <sup>^</sup> (0.51 <sup>^</sup> ) | 0.10 (-0.02)    | -0.09             | -0.49               |
| Written MLUs        | 0.14 (0.11)                            | 0.03 (0.13)     | 0.70 (0.59)       | <b>0.96*</b> (0.65) |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 4: Fisher *r*-to-*z* transformation table of two-tailed *p*-values comparing POS and GOS groups, Bonferroni multiple comparison correction  $p < 0.007$  used (signified by \*)

|                     | Inner Rhyme   | Inner Homophone |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Non-word Repetition | 0.56          | 0.91            |
| Sentence Repetition | 0.44          | 0.66            |
| Semantic Memory     | 0.09          | 0.81            |
| Arithmetic          | 0.75          | 0.31            |
| Naming              | <b>0.006*</b> | 0.49            |
| Spoken MLUs         | 0.14          | 0.25            |
| Written MLUs        | 0.19          | <b>0.004*</b>   |

For Peer Review




Figure 1: Outcome measures; GOS=good overt speech and preserved inner speech, POS=poor overt speech and preserved inner speech




Figure 2: Descriptive statistics of POS and GOS groups on PALPA inner and overt speech subtests; error bars are standard deviation; \* = significant  $p < 0.05$

Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 3: Relationship of inner speech (rhyme) and naming in the GOS and POS groups; graph only includes values of inner speech (rhyme) over 0.50, as all participants showed values higher than chance

Supplementary Table 1: Participant biographic demographics

| Participant | Age (yrs) | Sex | Hand <sup>1</sup> | Education <sup>2</sup> | Time Since Stroke (mos) | Stroke Type |
|-------------|-----------|-----|-------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| 1           | 73        | M   | L                 | Age 11                 | 18                      | Ischemic    |
| 2           | 61        | M   | R (0.83)          | MA                     | 38                      | Ischemic    |
| 3           | 66        | M   | R                 | HS                     | 11                      | Ischemic    |
| 4           | 78        | M   | L                 | Age 14                 | 20                      | Ischemic    |
| 5           | 48        | F   | R                 | MA                     | 10                      | Hemorrhagic |
| 6           | 62        | M   | R                 | MA                     | 10                      | Ischemic    |
| 7           | 78        | M   | A                 | Age 17                 | 64                      | Ischemic    |
| 8           | 63        | F   | R                 | PhD                    | 72                      | Ischemic    |
| 9           | 69        | M   | R                 | HS                     | 25                      | Ischemic    |
| 10          | 60        | M   | R                 | Age 16                 | 14                      | Ischemic    |
| 11          | 78        | F   | R                 | Age 14                 | 9                       | Ischemic    |
| 12          | 75        | M   | R                 | BA                     | 19                      | Ischemic    |
| 13          | 69        | M   | R                 | BA                     | 22                      | Ischemic    |
| 14          | 78        | M   | R                 | BA                     | 12                      | Ischemic    |
| 15          | 73        | M   | R                 | Age 16                 | 10                      | Ischemic    |
| 16          | 21        | F   | R                 | HS                     | 15                      | Ischemic    |
| 17          | 47        | M   | R                 | HS                     | 12                      | Ischemic    |
| 18          | 42        | F   | R                 | HS                     | 13                      | Ischemic    |
| 19          | 81        | M   | R                 | Age 16                 | 19                      | Ischemic    |
| 20          | 62        | M   | R                 | PhD                    | 16                      | Ischemic    |
| 21          | 61        | M   | R                 | Age 16                 | 22                      | Hemorrhagic |
| 22          | 78        | M   | R                 | MA                     | 19                      | Ischemic    |
| 23          | 65        | F   | R                 | Age 15                 | 24                      | Ischemic    |
| 24          | 71        | M   | R                 | Age 15                 | 59                      | Ischemic    |
| 25          | 71        | M   | R                 | Age 15                 | 111                     | Ischemic    |
| 26          | 79        | M   | L                 | HS                     | 8                       | Ischemic    |
| 27          | 49        | F   | R                 | BA                     | 20                      | Ischemic    |
| 28          | 70        | M   | R (0.4)           | HS                     | 29                      | Ischemic    |
| 29          | 70        | M   | R                 | Age 16                 | 87                      | Ischemic    |
| 30          | 55        | M   | A (0.16)          | MA                     | 49                      | Ischemic    |
| 31          | 45        | F   | R                 | MA                     | 20                      | Ischemic    |
| 32          | 54        | M   | R                 | MA                     | 48                      | Ischemic    |
| 33          | 65        | M   | R                 | HS                     | 23                      | Ischemic    |
| 34          | 53        | F   | R                 | BA                     | 36                      | Ischemic    |
| 35          | 55        | M   | R                 | HS                     | 48                      | Ischemic    |
| 36          | 87        | F   | R (0.85)          | BA                     | 13                      | Ischemic    |
| 37          | 75        | F   | L                 | BA                     | 66                      | Hemorrhagic |
| 38          | 65        | F   | R                 | Age 12                 | Not recorded            | Ischemic    |

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

<sup>1</sup>L=Left, R=Right, A=Ambidextrous. In brackets: the score achieved on the Edinburgh Handedness Inventory for ambidextrous participants, where (-1) = strongly left-handed, (1) = strongly right-handed, and (0) = completely ambidextrous.

<sup>2</sup>Education: HS = finished high school, BA = Bachelor's degree, MA = Masters degree, PhD = Doctorate degree

For Peer Review

Supplementary Table 2: Percentage correct from PALPA tests for all participants and their group of classification

| Participant | Inner Rhyme | Inner Homophone | Overt Rhyme | Overt Homophone | Group          |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 1           | 70%         | No Score        | No Score    | 50%             | Not classified |
| 2           | No Score    | 60%             | No Score    | 63%             | Not classified |
| 3           | No Score    | 63%             | No Score    | 73%             | Not classified |
| 4           | 63%         | No Score        | No Score    | 50%             | Not classified |
| 5           | 93%         | 80%             | 83%         | 93%             | GOS            |
| 6           | 97%         | 100%            | 100%        | 100%            | GOS            |
| 7           | 63%         | 63%             | 0%          | 0%              | POS            |
| 8           | 83%         | 90%             | 100%        | 67%             | GOS            |
| 9           | 87%         | 95%             | 97%         | 90%             | GOS            |
| 10          | 90%         | 98%             | 97%         | 85%             | GOS            |
| 11          | 97%         | 98%             | 93%         | 100%            | GOS            |
| 12          | 83%         | 63%             | 47%         | 53%             | POS            |
| 13          | 47%         | 26%             | 0%          | 0%              | Not classified |
| 14          | 63%         | 67%             | 17%         | 0%              | POS            |
| 15          | 93%         | 90%             | 97%         | 98%             | GOS            |
| 16          | 82%         | 43%             | 93%         | 40%             | GOS            |
| 17          | 67%         | 97%             | 100%        | 97%             | GOS            |
| 18          | 63%         | 60%             | 53%         | 53%             | GOS            |
| 19          | 63%         | 27%             | 0%          | 0%              | POS            |
| 20          | 90%         | 100%            | 90%         | 93%             | GOS            |
| 21          | 43%         | 24%             | 0%          | 0%              | Not classified |
| 22          | No Score    | No Score        | No Score    | No Score        | Not classified |
| 23          | 73%         | 100%            | 93%         | 93%             | GOS            |
| 24          | 51%         | 65%             | 0%          | 0%              | POS            |
| 25          | 93%         | 78%             | 0%          | 0%              | POS            |
| 26          | 93%         | 98%             | 97%         | 100%            | GOS            |
| 27          | 93%         | 48%             | 97%         | 100%            | GOS            |
| 28          | 90%         | 85%             | 100%        | 98%             | GOS            |
| 29          | No Score    | 32%             | No Score    | No Score        | Not classified |
| 30          | 73%         | 87%             | 100%        | 95%             | GOS            |
| 31          | 70%         | 87%             | 100%        | 97%             | GOS            |
| 32          | 73%         | 73%             | 0%          | 0%              | POS            |
| 33          | 83%         | 71%             | 100%        | 57%             | GOS            |
| 34          | 55%         | 47%             | 0%          | 0%              | POS            |
| 35          | No Score    | No Score        | No Score    | No Score        | Not classified |
| 36          | 70%         | 77%             | 73%         | 55%             | GOS            |
| 37          | 90%         | 93%             | 90%         | 85%             | GOS            |



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

|    |     |     |     |     |     |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 38 | 67% | 60% | 72% | 52% | GOS |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

---

For Peer Review

Supplementary Table 3: Rhyming and Homophone Stimuli for Inner Speech

| Rhyme             |                   | Homophone         |                   |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| List 1            | List 2            | List 1            | List 2            |
| 1. Town / Gown    | 1. Pleat / Treat  | 1. Wime / Waime   | 1. Byme / Bime    |
| 2. Rush / Gush    | 2. Ghost / Roast  | 2. Fick / Phic    | 2. Quib / Kwib    |
| 3. Boot / Flute   | 3. Creak / Break  | 3. Bick / Blic    | 3. Zoar / Zure    |
| 4. Pea / Play     | 4. Paw / Hour     | 4. Coim / Koym    | 4. Peam / Pame    |
| 5. Sort / Part    | 5. Match / Hatch  | 5. Voar / Vore    | 5. Scad / Skad    |
| 6. Wart / Fort    | 6. Hive / Dive    | 6. Zoal / Zole    | 6. Thib / Shib    |
| 7. Hush / Bush    | 7. Bowl / Mole    | 7. Hain / Hine    | 7. Grex / Geks    |
| 8. Sauce / Worse  | 8. Flair / Year   | 8. Phex / Ffeks   | 8. Heem / Heam    |
| 9. Bone / Cone    | 9. Tone / Gone    | 9. Shad / Chad    | 9. Tain / Tane    |
| 10. Bond / Hand   | 10. Zoo / Thou    | 10. Noal / Nool   | 10. Foym / Fyme   |
| 11. Tint / Pint   | 11. Low / Toe     | 11. Bury / Berry  | 11. Prey / Pray   |
| 12. Tweak / Freak | 12. Down / Flown  | 12. Sea / See     | 12. Pail / Pale   |
| 13. Dull / Hull   | 13. Comb / Gnome  | 13. Frey / Fey    | 13. Pout / Port   |
| 14. Call / Ball   | 14. Rose / Lose   | 14. Route / Root  | 14. Peach / Poach |
| 15. Pool / Wool   | 15. Mint / Hint   | 15. Earn / Urn    | 15. Some / Sum    |
| 16. Four / Saw    | 16. Bait / Skate  | 16. Kill / Sill   | 16. Maid / Made   |
| 17. Wand / Pond   | 17. Horse / Force | 17. Fury / Ferry  | 17. Pear / Pair   |
| 18. Jute / Foot   | 18. Glove / Wove  | 18. Beach / Beech | 18. New / No      |
| 19. Food / Blood  | 19. Card / Ward   | 19. Pour / Pore   | 19. Sew / So      |
| 20. Bear / Chair  | 20. Gull / Full   | 20. Ear / Oar     | 20. Dough / Doe   |
| 21. Boast / Cost  | 21. Fall / Shall  | 21. Might / Mite  | 21. Dual / Jewel  |
| 22. Batch / Watch | 22. Doe / Cow     | 22. Sail / Soil   | 22. Shoot / Soot  |
| 23. Shoe / Screw  | 23. Love / Dove   | 23. Row / Rough   | 23. Neigh / Nigh  |
| 24. Cheat / Sweat | 24. Date / Plait  | 24. Raid / Ride   | 24. Pea / Pie     |
| 25. Head / Bed    | 25. Sea / Quay    | 25. Weigh / Way   | 25. Break / Brake |
| 26. Chew / Hoe    | 26. Wed / Bead    | 26. Flay / Flee   | 26. Dear / Dare   |
| 27. Five / Give   | 27. Dome / Bomb   | 27. Weak / Wake   | 27. Duet / Cruet  |
| 28. Fool / Tool   | 28. Yard / Hard   | 28. Cell / Sell   | 28. Sore / Saw    |
| 29. Pose / Prose  | 29. You / Two     | 29. Bore / Bow    | 29. Sight / Sigh  |
| 30. Hole / Owl    | 30. Mood / Brood  | 30. Quay / Key    | 30. Home / Hum    |