INTRODUCTION

Communicative Development Inventories (Fenson et al, 2007) are ideal tools for:
- Clinical assessment especially where clinicians are not qualified SALTs
- Research where lab assessment of vocabulary size/composition is impractical
- Large scale research
- Parent report accesses communication skills otherwise hard to assess directly (e.g. some types of vocabulary, where children are reluctant to interact with a stranger, Fenson et al (2007)

CDIs in English so far:
- US English standardised
- UK English non-standardised
- Infant (Hamilton et al., 2000), toddler and 3/4y versions
- Also many, many versions for specific labs
- No standardised UK versions

UK health professionals using US norms:

Why is this a problem?

- UK parents report lower vocabulary sizes than US parents
- Inappropriate use of US norms for UK children

New UK-CDI

(Alcock, Rowland, Meints, Christopher, Just & Brelsford, in prep.)
- Long and Short CDI – Words and Gestures – 8-18 months
- Score sheets
- Manual with norms
- Stratified sample by region and SES as well as other factors
- Online database accessible for all

PILOTING

1. Authorisation from CDI board
2. Pilot construction
   a. Used data from other UK Babylabs
   b. Wide variety of CDIs in circulation
   c. Words where comprehension correlated significantly with age were included
3. Two rounds of piloting
   a. Included items if correlated with age and rest of scale
   b. Also if known better by low SES group (round 2) and some v high frequency or specialist words
4. Also created demographic/medical questionnaire, the Family Questionnaire
   a. Piloted and focus groups with specific groups e.g. young mums
   b. Wording adjusted several times and some groupings e.g. groups of age more acceptable to parents than raw age.

NORMING

• Participants
  - Recruitment
    - successful methods: via other babylabs (81% participation);
    - through targeted ads on social media (56% participation, using commercial algorithms)
    - less successful methods included via Health Visitors/NHS (10%);
    - in person: baby groups/Children’s Centres (34%)
  - Exclusion: more than 10 hours a week of another language
  - No exclusion for disability: instead sample balanced to represent UK

• Procedure
  - Sign up via flyer/web
  - Receive paper or online questionnaire
  - If we have postal address:
    - Memento (laminated) ->
    - And/or £5 supermarket voucher for low income families
  - Online methods
    - Survey Monkey, now Qualtrics
    - Invite by email or set up participation link
    - Babytalk app (in preparation)

• Validation
  - Inter-form, paper vs online
  - Test- re-test
  - CDI vs lab testing – PLS-5, object selection, gesture task

• Short form
  - 91 words and 29 gestures that range in age of acquisition and correlate well with age

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

- Stratification
  - Stratified N = 1218
  - Regions, gender, age balanced as far as possible
  - Reliability (internal/inter-scale)
  - Validity (inter-form)
    - > 0.9 correlation between online and paper

We have a new tool! New UK-CDI:

- Highly internally valid
- Good correlation with age
- Length (moderately) acceptable to parents
- Online completion helps
- Recruitment via Social Media company ads very productive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>UK sample</th>
<th>Our sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (home language English only)</td>
<td>12.7% non-white</td>
<td>8.6% non-white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>42.6% degree or higher</td>
<td>52.2% degree or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>50% median</td>
<td>42.5% better median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, Comprehension</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gesture</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have a new tool! New UK-CDI:

Highly internally valid
Good correlation with age
Length (moderately) acceptable to parents
Online completion helps
Recruitment via Social Media company ads very productive
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