

1
2
3
4
5

Macrolinguistic function in temporal lobe epilepsy: a reinterpretation of circumstantiality

6 Fiore D'Aprano^{a,b,c*}, Charles B. Malpas^{a,b,c,d}, Stefanie E. Roberts^{b,d}, & Michael M. Saling^{a,e}

7 *a. Melbourne School of Psychological Sciences, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia*

8 *b. Department of Neurology, The Royal Melbourne Hospital, Melbourne, Australia*

9 *c. Department of Neurology, Alfred Health, Melbourne, Australia*

10 *d. CORE, Department of Medicine, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia*

11 *e. Department of Clinical Neuropsychology, The Austin Hospital, Melbourne, Australia*

12

13

Abstract

14 Individuals with temporal lobe epilepsy (TLE) often have an impairment of conversational language
15 manifesting as verbosity and attributable to disruption of cognitive-linguistic networks. The micro- and
16 macrolinguistic underpinnings of this disturbance, and the role of epilepsy and cognitive variables, are
17 yet to be explored. We examined the elicited language output of 16 individuals with TLE and 14 healthy
18 controls under separate monologic discourse tasks: a structured and constrained context, elicited by
19 description of the 'Cookie Theft' picture, and an unstructured, unconstrained context, elicited by
20 description of a 'Typical Day'. We hypothesised that language output in the unstructured context would
21 be characterised by verbosity to a greater extent than language elicited in a structured context. Following
22 transcription and coding, detailed multi-level discourse analysis suggested that a constrained context
23 gives rise to microlinguistic disturbances in individuals with TLE, reducing fluency, with more pauses
24 and fillers. Under an unconstrained context, as anticipated, classical aspects of verbosity emerge in
25 those with TLE, manifesting as longer speaking time, a longer duration of pauses, and a higher
26 proportion of repetitive or redundant statements. Macrolinguistic elements such as coherence and
27 informativeness are widely impacted, particularly disturbing language formulation. Correlations
28 suggest that microlinguistic disturbances are closely linked with the immediate impact of seizures on
29 cognitive-linguistic function, while macrolinguistic disturbances are more broadly impacted by disorder
30 severity and word retrieval deficits. These findings suggest that different psycholinguistic impairments
31 emerge as a function of differing linguistic challenges imposed by constrained and unconstrained
32 conversational contexts. We conclude that these patterns reflect a dynamic linguistic system taking
33 shape under specific contextual conditions.

34

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

35

Keywords: discourse; circumstantiality; verbosity; language; context; temporal lobe epilepsy.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

Highlights

- A multi-centre multi-level discourse analysis was carried out to examine language in temporal lobe epilepsy (TLE).
- Distinct linguistic impairments reflect task demands which differentially affect micro- and macrolinguistic features.
- In constrained conditions, individuals with TLE exhibit microlinguistic disturbances mainly affecting their fluency and output clarity.
- In unconstrained conditions, they are verbose and have disturbed coherence where they produce more content that is repetitive or redundant.

1. Introduction

Individuals with temporal lobe epilepsy (TLE) exhibit characteristically verbose language [1]. This pedantic, repetitive, highly-detailed, and peripheral style is termed ‘circumstantiality’ and was initially considered a personality feature of TLE [1,2]. It is now better conceptualised as a non-lateralised neurocognitive phenomenon attributable to subtle interictal disruptions of linguistic function. While language impairments in TLE are commonly identified clinically, proffered as a cognitive complaint, or detected on neuropsychological assessment at a single-word level [3,4], there is limited understanding of how these characteristic impairments relate to dysfunctional discourse.

Circumstantiality in TLE has been proposed to serve as a compensatory mechanism to overcome instances of word-finding difficulties [5,6]. This is disputed by Field and colleagues [7] who posit that lexical-processing deficits in left TLE do not account for circumstantiality, suggesting that micro- and macrolinguistic processes are dissociable, being those that relate to lexical-syntactic and suprasentential processes, respectively. Discourse processing deficits in narrative and conversational contexts are also found in right TLE, and are dissociable from lexical-syntactic impairments [8]. Similar patterns of macrolinguistic dysfunction are present following right hemisphere damage, particularly accompanying anterior lesions [9]. While their microlinguistic function appears intact, impairments emerge in coherence, producing more tangential output [9]. Right frontal regions, as components of complex networks, may therefore play a role in organising information in narrative discourse [9]. Disrupted projections from temporal to frontal regions in TLE [10] might engender similar patterns as those observed by Marini [9].

Fluency, cohesion, and coherence have been largely overlooked by TLE researchers to date. In this context, fluency, a microlinguistic element, relates to intrasentential or message-level transitions, and describes the rate of language production, rather than psychometrically-evaluated verbal fluency on tasks of orthographic lexical retrieval or semantic fluency [11]. Individuals with left TLE tend to pause longer than those with right TLE [12], and regardless of laterality, they use more noncommunicative fillers, abandon trains of thought, and produce more repetitions than controls [13]. Despite more frequent fluency disruptions, they are comparable with healthy controls in their *rate* of output, that is, words per minute [7,12]. Cohesion and coherence are macrolinguistic elements. Cohesion describes relatedness of meaning across sentences by making explicit and unambiguous connections to previously introduced content. Cohesive devices include conjunctions and personal referents; for example, *Sam was hungry. He made dinner* [14]. Cohesion relies on simultaneously monitoring output and the listener’s understanding which depends upon working memory [15] and lexical

1 retrieval [16]. Global coherence relates to discourse organisation above the sentence-level, that
2 is, how content is connected thematically to serve a particular goal or plan [17].

3 Demands on language production are thought to be influenced by type of elicitation
4 (Fergadiotis & Wright, 2011; Stark et al., 2019). Structured elicitation tasks, such as describing
5 a cartoon, provide a clear discourse topic and adequate linguistic scaffolding to facilitate
6 discourse planning and limit disturbances. In a structured narrative production task, participants
7 with TLE were not verbose when describing a six-frame cartoon, and instead were comparable
8 to healthy controls in the number of words and output duration, but were less fluent overall
9 [13]. There was no evidence to suggest that these disturbances to discourse related to laterality
10 of seizure onset [13]. Using the structured ‘Cookie Theft’ task [18] Hoeppner and colleagues
11 [19] reported verbosity in four of nine participants with left-localised focal impaired awareness
12 seizures (FIAS). They produced more words, dysfluencies, and non-essential details. Rather
13 than verbosity being a broad diagnostic feature in TLE, structure might facilitate discourse
14 processing in some individuals. While a subset were verbose in this structured task, verbosity
15 might be more widely distributed in an unstructured context, such as eliciting spontaneous
16 output in response to an open-ended question, which likely disturbs macrolinguistic
17 components regarding planning and coherence [20]. These processes rely on disparate aspects
18 of cognition and given network dysfunction in TLE, discourse disturbances are unlikely
19 lateralised [16]. Unstructured contexts are more representative of communicative function [21]
20 and are akin to the spontaneous language produced clinically where unusual language features
21 in TLE are anecdotally reported.

22 The examination of naturalistic output that we will describe here is novel and addresses
23 the paucity of detailed, systematic, and appropriate investigation of language in this population.
24 This study aimed to characterise language impairments in TLE by examining discourse under
25 structured (Cookie Theft) or unstructured (Typical Day) conditions. To date, spontaneous
26 output in TLE has been largely examined with aphasia batteries which are appropriate to detect
27 focal impairments following stroke, but are not, by design, sensitive to the subtle language
28 changes that characterise TLE [4]. Given that microlinguistic processes are language-specific,
29 and underpinned by subtle interictal disturbances [22], we hypothesised that individuals with
30 TLE would have microlinguistic disturbances in fluency, marked by more frequent hesitations
31 and false starts, irrespective of contextual demands. On the other hand, given the reliance of
32 macrolinguistic processes on broader aspects of cognition including planning and working
33 memory [16,23], we anticipated that macrolinguistic disturbances would emerge when there
34 were fewer constraints on output and therefore greater demands on high-level language
35 systems: individuals with TLE would be comparatively verbose, using more words and

1 speaking for a longer duration, and would additionally exhibit disturbances to cohesion and
2 coherence.

3

4

2. Material and Methods

2.1 Participants

6 This study included 30 participants, 16 with focal unilateral TLE (comprising nine
7 mesial), and 14 age- sex- and education-matched healthy controls. These individuals
8 experience seizures of temporal lobe origin, typically focal aware seizures (FAS) or FIAS and
9 are patients of either The Royal Melbourne Hospital or the Alfred Hospital in Melbourne,
10 Australia. Diagnoses are made as part of a comprehensive team in accordance with
11 International League Against Epilepsy criteria [25]. Consensus on the basis of seizure
12 semiology, video electroencephalography, magnetic resonance imaging, positron emission
13 tomography, and inter-ictal single-photon emission computer tomography provided
14 unambiguous diagnoses with a localised seizure focus, 11 of which had left hemisphere
15 involvement.

16 Inclusion criteria were: English as a first language; a diagnosis of drug-resistant TLE at
17 the time of recruitment [24]; no prior neurosurgical resection; full scale IQ >70; no reported
18 history of substance-related and addictive disorders, no formally diagnosed psychiatric
19 disorders, and not currently experiencing a major psychiatric episode (e.g., psychosis). None
20 of these individuals were receiving additional treatments for the control of seizures (e.g., vagal
21 nerve stimulation) and none had a history of developmental language disorder or other
22 neurological condition (e.g., stroke). By assessment, three individuals with TLE reported no
23 seizures in the preceding 12 months on their current anti-seizure medication (ASM) regimen
24 [24]. Analyses were performed both with and without these drug-responsive participants to
25 determine whether their inclusion in the sample was a robust choice. We found no difference
26 in key outcome measures and these individuals were subsequently retained in the sample. Their
27 reduced epilepsy burden at that point in time is reflected in the 13-point Seizure Frequency
28 Rating [26]; considering seizure frequency, type, and ASM usage. Healthy controls comprised
29 family members or partners of TLE participants, and where necessary were recruited from the
30 community via convenience sampling to ensure the groups were demographically comparable
31 by appropriately age-, education-, and sex-matching to those with TLE.

32 This multi-site study received ethical approval from the Melbourne Health Human
33 Research Ethics Committee in accordance with ethical standards of the 1964 Declaration of
34 Helsinki. All participants provided written informed consent.

35

1 **2.2 Neuropsychological Assessment and Discourse Elicitation**

2 This study involved neuropsychological and language assessment (Table S2),
3 conducted by a single registered psychologist. Given the COVID-19 lockdown conditions in
4 Melbourne, Australia at the time of collection, these assessments were predominantly
5 completed via telehealth (Table 1). Lexical retrieval was assessed using the Boston Naming
6 Test (BNT) [27], the Controlled Oral Word Association Test (COWAT) [28], the Auditory
7 Naming Test (ANT) [29] with minor modifications to suit the Australian lexicon, and the Verb
8 Generation Task (VGT) developed to examine verb retrieval (Appendix S1).

9 Discourse-level language was examined via two forms of elicitation: one being
10 unstructured and unconstrained (Typical Day) by prompting participants “tell me about a
11 typical day in your life”; and the other being narrative-based, structured, and highly constrained
12 in its content (Cookie Theft of the Boston Diagnostic Aphasia Examination; [18]). The cartoon
13 image was presented on an A4 sheet of paper at the bedside, and via screen sharing for
14 telehealth assessments and remained visible throughout their description to minimise any
15 memory contribution. Participants were encouraged to take enough time to understand the
16 cartoon and were prompted to “tell me everything you see happening in this scene”. There was
17 no time limit imposed for either task and the order of presentation was identical for all
18 participants. The researcher minimised verbal and non-verbal participation and participants
19 were required to make a definitive statement to conclude the task e.g., “I’m finished”.
20 Participants were prompted “is there anything else?” where a particularly brief, simplified
21 description reasonably indicated a misunderstanding of task requirements, or where greater
22 than five seconds of silence had elapsed without self-disclosing their completion.

23

24 **2.3 Recording and transcription**

25 Language samples were audio recorded for subsequent transcription and analyses. A
26 Yeti microphone and Audacity® software was used at the bedside, while telehealth output was
27 recorded from the Zoom session [30]. All audio files were then manually transcribed verbatim
28 and segmented by a single researcher within four weeks of the file being obtained. Statement
29 segmentation aligns with methodology applied by Stein and Glenn [31] and Trabasso and van
30 den Broek [32], where a single statement refers to a predicate and its corresponding arguments.
31 This promotes consistent proposition-based extraction of content [33], rather than by
32 communicative unit (C-unit). Pause lengths were manually extracted from Audacity® software.
33 Sample lengths refer to the total number of completed words, excluding words filling pauses
34 such as “um” “uh” [34,35].

35

1 **2.4 Discourse variables and coding practices**

2 Based on models of discourse production and discourse examination in clinical
3 populations, select discourse variables were used as the basis for the discourse analysis. These
4 relate to key linguistic components at both the micro- and macrolinguistic level, being lexical-
5 syntactic and suprasentential, respectively. A description of all nodes coding is presented in
6 Table S3. Transcript coding was completed using NVivo 12 software by a single researcher
7 who was blind to participant characteristics, other than data acquisition date. Each transcript
8 was coded twice by the same reviewer, with an intra-rater agreement of 94% across coding
9 occasions. Where discrepancies were identified, the researcher re-considered the criteria to
10 produce a final decision. Any ambiguities in the description of criteria for coding to nodes were
11 clarified.

12

13 **2.5 Coding agreement**

14 A second expert researcher was assigned to blindly code a random subset of transcripts
15 in NVivo. In line with other similar discourse analyses, this was determined to be 12.5% [36]
16 and included five transcripts of each task. Inter-rater agreement was determined on a point-by-
17 point basis for each node to allocate as well as appropriate statement segmentation. The second
18 researcher had access to the complete, disambiguated code-book for this process (Table S3).
19 For nodes, percentage of agreement was 90%, while for the segmentation of statements, that
20 is, determining each predicate and its corresponding arguments, agreement was 92%,
21 surpassing the minimal accepted requirement level of 80% [37]. Coding discrepancies were
22 discussed among the reviewers and resolved via consensus. Once again, any ambiguities in
23 node descriptions were resolved and their coding was updated (Table S3).

24

25 **2.6 Statistical Analyses**

26 Jamovi software [38] was used for all analyses. For sample characteristics,
27 neuropsychological measures, and discourse variables group-specific measures of central
28 tendency and group-differences were computed. Many of the data were skewed and to be
29 conservative, non-parametric tests (Mann-Whitney U test) have been applied across all
30 analyses for the purpose of uniformity. Data that did not violate assumptions of normality are
31 indicated in table notes. Contingency tables (X^2 test of independence) were used for categorical
32 variables. The rank biserial correlation (RBC) was used as a non-parametric estimate of effect
33 size, reflected as small $0.1 < 0.3 < 0.5$ large. Micro- and macrolinguistic discourse variables
34 that significantly distinguished individuals with TLE from controls were then subject to
35 correlation analyses, to examine their relationship to clinical and cognitive characteristics, and

1 are reported as Spearman's rank correlation coefficients. To ensure that the analyses were not
2 sensitive to an artifact such as group, we ran the analyses with left and right TLE separately
3 and then together. These analyses suggested no difference in discourse outcomes between left
4 and right TLE or relative to healthy controls when individuals with TLE were considered as
5 separate left and right groups or a single group. Consistent with the notion that high-level
6 language functions are not lateralised, all individuals with TLE were subsequently treated as a
7 single group. This methodological point is further addressed in the discussion. To account for
8 Type I error, a false detection rate (FDR) of 0.05 was applied to primary analyses [39].

10 3. Results

11 3.1 Sample characteristics

12 Individuals with TLE and healthy controls were comparable across most demographic
13 characteristics and many aspects of neuropsychological function (Table 1 and Table S2). Those
14 with TLE reported higher rates of depressive symptomatology than healthy controls. A lexical
15 retrieval deficit broadly emerged in TLE, and they reported more frequent and distressing word
16 finding difficulties than controls. Rather than total raw or scaled scores for the number of
17 correct items, *delays* in word retrieval for BNT and ANT appeared to be more sensitive to
18 failures of lexical retrieval—increased mean response time latencies and increased tip-of-the-
19 tongue (TOT) states, i.e., responding >2000ms post-stimulus *or* requiring phonemic
20 prompting. Individuals with TLE also demonstrated longer latencies on VGT. Relative to
21 controls, individuals with TLE also produced fewer words within a semantic category. See
22 Table S2 (Supplementary Material).

1 **Table 1**
 2
 3 *Sample characteristics for TLE group and healthy controls*

Variable	Control (n = 14)		TLE (n = 16)		p	Effect size
	Median (Q1, Q3)	Range	Median (Q1, Q3)	Range		
Age [years]	51.50 (26.00, 55.50)	50	43.50 (32.50, 55.50)	44	0.92	0.03
Education [years]	15.50 (12.00, 18.00)	9	14.00 (11.75, 17.00)	15	0.45	0.17
Estimated IQ ^a	107.75 (97.63, 111.88)	41	103.75 (95.88, 107.00)	50.50	0.20	0.28
Age at Diagnosis [years]	N/A	N/A	26.50 (21.00, 46.25)	50		
Epilepsy duration [years]	N/A	N/A	7.50 (3.50, 16.25)	41.50		
Seizure Burden Rating	N/A	N/A	6.50 (2.00, 7.00)	8		
Last seizure [weeks]	N/A	N/A	10.00 (4.00, 34.00)	75		
Current ASMs	N/A	N/A	2.00 (1.00, 2.00)	3		
Laterality, Left [n, %]	N/A	N/A	11 (69)			
Mesial focus [n, %] [^]	N/A	N/A	9 (56)			
Sex, Female [n, %]	7 (50)		7 (44)		0.73	0.06
Handedness, Right [n, %]	12 (86)		13 (81)		0.74	0.06
Telehealth [n, %]	14 (100)		15 (94)		0.34	0.17

4 *Note.* TLE = Temporal Lobe Epilepsy; ASM = Anti-seizure Medication. For continuous variables, group differences were computed using
 5 Mann-Whitney U test, effect size reported is the rank biserial correlation coefficient. ^aSuggests that data does not violate assumptions of
 6 normality on Shapiro-Wilk. For discrete variables, percentages of each group reported, group differences computed using X² test of
 7 independence, effect size reported is phi-coefficient. Estimated IQ reflects a composite between TOPF scaled score and WASI-II FSIQ-2
 8 score. Seizure frequency calculated on 13-point rating scale (0-12) considering ASM usage, frequency, and type of seizure (So et al., 1997).
 9 [^]Of these individuals 5 had a diagnosis of left TLE. Non-mesial cases comprise 4 neocortical (3 left, 1 right), and 3 non-lesional.

10

11 **3.2 Cookie Theft: Constrained Output**

12 The groups were comparable in most aspects regarding output volume and coherence,
 13 including sample length, duration of output, duration excluding pauses, total number of
 14 statements, total core units, proportion of non-progression to novel statements, and syntactic
 15 simplicity. There was the strongest statistical evidence for group differences in fluency (see
 16 Table 2), as these relationships held when FDR correction was applied. This included
 17 individuals with TLE producing significantly more fluency disruptions, which include more
 18 false starts, clarity disruptors, and hesitations such as pausing more frequently at non-
 19 grammatical junctures when compared to healthy controls. There was weaker evidence for
 20 disturbed cohesion, pause duration, and production rate which did not survive correction.
 21 Individuals with TLE produced more elements that disrupted cohesion, including more ‘other’
 22 referents, which are incomplete, ambiguous, or missing. There was some indication of a longer
 23 duration of pauses, and a slower production rate than healthy controls. The relative ranking of
 24 effect sizes are presented in Figure 1. Examples of this output are provided in Supplementary
 25 Material, Table S4.


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Table 2

Group differences in discourse features in constrained output: Cookie Theft task

Cookie Measure	Control		TLE		Mean Difference	Statistic	p	r
	Median (Q1, Q3)	Range	Median (Q1, Q3)	Range				
Sample length	90.00 (76.00, 136.75)	124.00	99.00 (76.25, 115.25)	147.00	-1.00	111.00	0.98	0.01
Spontaneous duration (seconds) ^a	41.46 (34.40, 57.68)	65.59	54.98 (39.71, 62.26)	67.47	-7.72	82.00	0.22	0.27
Pause duration	12.34 (6.61, 16.07)	14.68	17.07 (11.88, 27.49)	48.65	-6.56	56.00	0.02*	0.50
Duration excluding pauses (seconds) ^a	30.33 (23.78, 40.50)	51.08	33.11 (25.56, 40.98)	42.81	-1.09	109.00	0.92	0.03
Production rate (words/second) ^a	2.33 (2.13, 2.47)	1.08	2.04 (1.60, 2.22)	1.32	0.38	53.50	0.02*	0.52
Total statements	13.00 (10.00, 15.75)	14.00	13.00 (11.00, 18.75)	18.00	-1.00	94.00	0.46	0.16
Fluency disruptors ^{^a}	0.28 (0.21, 0.35)	0.26	0.38 (0.32, 0.41)	0.42	-0.11	43.50	0.005***†	0.61
Pauses (non-grammatical) ^{^a}	0.08 (0.06, 0.11)	0.13	0.14 (0.11, 0.17)	0.17	-0.06	39.50	0.003***†	0.65
Disrupted Cohesion	1.00 (0.00, 2.00)	3.00	3.00 (0.75, 4.00)	8.00	-2.00	58.50	0.02*	0.48
Cookie core units ^a	16.00 (14.00, 19.25)	15.00	16.50 (15.00, 18.25)	14.00	-1.00	102.00	0.69	0.09
Proportion non- progression to task-on novel units	0.33 (0.26, 0.43)	0.49	0.39 (0.27, 0.64)	2.40	-0.28	86.00	0.29	0.23
Syntactic Simplicity [^]	0.04 (0.03, 0.08)	0.11	0.06 (0.05, 0.09)	0.20	-0.02	77.00	0.15	0.31

Note. Metrics marked ^ are expressed relative to sample length. Group differences computed using Mann-Whitney U test, ^adenotes that assumptions of normality held for these analyses. Effect sizes (r) expressed as the rank biserial correlation (RBC) coefficient, where * = p < .05, ** = p < .01. † = significance holds on false detection rate (FDR) correction. ^aSuggests that data does not violate assumptions of normality on Shapiro-Wilk.



1
2 **Figure 1.** Mean differences on discourse variables between TLE and Healthy Controls for
3 Cookie Theft task, represented as absolute value effect size (r , small $0.1 < 0.3 < 0.5$ large), * =
4 significant difference, † = difference holds on FDR correction. Microlinguistic features are
5 represented in black, while macrolinguistic features are grey.

6
7
8

9 **3.3 Typical Day: Unconstrained Output**

10 Group differences emerged in coherence, informativeness, and circumstantiality of
11 output (see Table 3). The relative ranking of effect sizes can be visualised in Figure 2. Examples
12 are provided in Supplementary Material, Table S5. There was the strongest statistical evidence
13 for group differences in spontaneous duration, pause duration, and proportion of non-
14 progression to novel units, which remained significant on FDR correction. Compared to
15 healthy controls, individuals with TLE spoke for longer and had a longer duration of pauses.
16 With regards to informativeness, those with TLE had a higher proportion of non-progression
17 statements to task-on novel statements than healthy controls, that is, they produced more
18 statements that did not progress content than statements that did. There was weaker evidence

1 for a longer sample length in TLE, more frequent pauses at non-grammatical junctures, and a
 2 longer duration excluding pauses, suggesting that the longer duration of pauses in TLE did not
 3 account for the difference in spontaneous duration. While those with TLE produced more total
 4 statements, this difference was not significant.

5
 6
 7
 8
 9


Table 3

Group differences in discourse features in unconstrained output: Typical Day task

Cookie Measure	Control		TLE		Mean Difference	Statistic	p	r
	Median (Q1, Q3)	Range	Median (Q1, Q3)	Range				
Sample length	134.50 (92.00, 203.25)	298.00	188.00 (143.00, 453.00)	546.00	-73.50	59.00	0.04*	0.44
Spontaneous duration (seconds) ^a	57.43 (43.65, 85.15)	89.13	89.26 (64.83, 191.66)	211.04	-42.38	50.00	0.01*†	0.52
Pause duration ^a	14.64 (10.57, 18.96)	26.19	28.23 (19.06, 53.53)	54.76	-13.64	34.00	0.001**†	0.68
Duration excluding pauses (seconds) ^a	40.74 (31.70, 62.30)	84.52	62.22 (45.76, 134.73)	158.67	-29.10	54.00	0.03*	0.49
Production rate (words/second) ^a	2.33 (2.04, 2.68)	1.24	2.30 (2.15, 2.50)	1.28	0.13	93.50	0.63	0.11
Total statements	25.00 (17.25, 31.50)	50.00	29.00 (24.50, 70.0)	29.00	-11.00	65.50	0.09	0.38
Fluency disruptors ^{^a}	0.34 (0.27, 0.36)	0.41	0.36 (0.28, 0.42)	0.36	-0.05	79.00	0.27	0.25
Pauses (non-grammatical) [^]	0.10 (0.08, 0.12)	0.16	0.14 (0.11, 0.16)	0.14	-0.03	51.00	0.02*	0.51
Disrupted Cohesion	1.00 (0.00, 6.75)	13.00	4.00 (3.00, 6.50)	15.00	-2.00	68.50	0.11	0.35
Proportion non- progression to task-on novel units	0.39 (0.24, 0.51)	0.95	0.78 (0.51, 0.91)	3.17	-0.35	45.00	0.009**†	0.57
Syntactic Simplicity ^{^a}	0.11 (0.03, 0.13)	0.20	0.10 (0.06, 0.11)	0.17	0.01	98.50	0.79	0.06

Note. Metrics marked ^ are expressed relative to sample length. Group differences computed using Mann-Whitney U test, ^a denotes that assumptions of normality held for these analyses. Effect sizes (r) expressed as the rank biserial correlation (RBC) coefficient, where * = p < .05, ** = p < .01. † = significance holds on false detection rate (FDR) correction. ^aSuggests that data does not violate assumptions of normality on Shapiro-Wilk.

10
 11
 12
 13



1
2 **Figure 2.** Mean differences on discourse variables between TLE and Healthy Controls for
3 Typical Day task, represented as absolute value effect size (r , small $0.1 < 0.3 < 0.5$ large), * =
4 significant difference, † = difference holds on FDR correction. Microlinguistic features are
5 represented in black, while macrolinguistic features are grey.

6
7

8 **3.4 Correlations**

9 The relationships between these discourse variables surviving FDR correction and
10 demographic, epilepsy-specific, and cognitive variables are reported in Table 4.

11 **3.4.1 Cookie Theft Correlations.** Microlinguistic components distinguished
12 individuals with TLE from healthy controls and relate closely to seizure characteristics.
13 Fluency disruptions correlated significantly with epilepsy variables including disease duration
14 and time since last seizure. The number of non-grammatical pauses also significantly correlated
15 with the time since their last seizure.

16 **3.4.2 Typical Day Correlations.** All three variables of interest, including micro- and
17 macrolinguistic elements, correlate strongly with epilepsy-specific variables relating to seizure

1 frequency and the number of ASMs. Pause duration and the proportion of non-progression to
 2 novel units are also related to disease duration and the time since last seizure. The increased
 3 proportion of non-progression units correlates with more TOT states.

4
 5 **Table 4**

6 *Correlations between key discourse variables, demographic, clinical, and cognitive characteristics*

7

Variables of interest	Cookie Theft		Typical Day		
	Fluency disruption	Pauses (non-grammatical)	Spontaneous Duration	Pause Duration	Non-progression to novel units
Age at assessment	-0.01	-0.08	-0.05	-0.13	0.14
Years of Education	-0.15	0.08	-0.37	-0.23	-0.33
Disease duration	0.50**†	0.47**	0.43*	0.55**†	0.57**†
Time since last seizure	0.58***†	0.56**†	0.41*	0.53**†	0.48**†
Seizure frequency rating	0.40*	0.47**	0.46*†	0.57**†	0.46*†
Number of ASMs	0.44*	0.48**	0.48*†	0.58**†	0.63**†
IQ composite	-0.25	-0.00	-0.43*	-0.42**	-0.25
Victoria Stroop Dots	-0.15	-0.09	-0.11	-0.03	0.35
WAIS-IV Digits Backwards	0.19	0.19	-0.37*	-0.21	-0.16
Animals	-0.22	-0.20	-0.20	-0.36	-0.25
OLR	-0.30	-0.09	-0.24	-0.31	-0.01
Lexical retrieval TOT	0.40*	0.33	0.40*	0.44*	0.50**†
Lexical retrieval latency	0.20	0.21	0.38*	0.41*	0.32
HADS depression	0.13	0.27	0.19	0.31	0.38*

8 *Note.* ASM = Anti-seizure Medication; IQ = Intelligence Quotient; WAIS-IV = Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Fourth Edition;
 9 WMS-IV = Wechsler Memory Scale, Fourth Edition; OLR (COWAT) = Orthographic Lexical Retrieval (Controlled Oral Word Association
 10 Test); TOT = tip of the tongue state; HADS = Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. Reported as Spearman rank correlation coefficients. *p
 11 < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001. † = hold on FDR correction.

12
 13 **4. Discussion**

14 Our findings suggest that individuals with TLE are not more impaired in one
 15 communicative context than another, but rather distinct linguistic impairments emerge and are
 16 hypothesised to reflect task demands. One task is highly constrained, structured, visually
 17 prompted, and contains a focused and finite set of elements to communicate, while the other is
 18 highly unconstrained, unstructured, and therefore particularly vulnerable to the effects of
 19 verbosity.

20 Under conditions of constrained output, there is a specific focus on providing a
 21 complete description of the visual stimulus. To produce a narrative, individuals are limited in

1 their lexical choices and direction of output to meet task demands, and therefore have less
2 agency and less variability in their output. According to our findings, the restricted scope of
3 discourse poses a linguistic challenge to individuals with TLE, who might otherwise change
4 direction when faced with a lexical retrieval deficit. In this context their fluency is
5 predominantly impacted, cohesion to a lesser extent, and no overall pattern of circumstantiality.
6 The strongest evidence was for disturbed fluency, including more frequent false starts, clarity
7 disruptors and non-grammatical hesitations than in healthy controls, reflecting a disturbance
8 overall output quality. In this context, dysfluencies plausibly represent compensations for
9 lexical retrieval deficits. These findings are consistent with those of both Hoeppe and
10 colleagues [19] who found greater dysfluencies on this Cookie Theft task across *all* individuals
11 with FIAS, and in Bell and colleagues [13] on a narrative task. While there was some
12 suggestion in our findings that production rate was slower in TLE, at this stage we do not have
13 robust evidence to suggest any difference in disturbed output rate relative to healthy controls,
14 consistent with previous findings [7,12]. While Hoeppe and colleagues [19] reported a
15 verbose subset of participants with left-localised FIAS, Bell and colleagues [13] suggested that
16 individuals with TLE were similar to healthy controls in speaking time and total number of
17 words, and were therefore not verbose. These are consistent with the present finding that there
18 was no evidence of circumstantiality among individuals with TLE in this context.

19 The overall hypothesis was that verbosity, and ultimately macrolinguistic dysfunction,
20 were more likely to be featured when output was spontaneous and unconstrained, and is
21 supported by our findings. Individuals with TLE produced more microlinguistic errors in total,
22 although these errors are proportional to those in healthy controls when considering sample
23 length. While unstructured contexts have higher planning demands [12], in the current
24 unconstrained context, content is familiar and therefore individuals are likely to have a more
25 specific and refined lexicon for their personal lives, within a known semantic space.
26 Presumably this familiarity limits the impact of lexical retrieval deficits on fluency. By virtue
27 of saying more, their output does not seem as disrupted in its fluency as we might anticipate.
28 With the freedom of spontaneous discourse, a different set of linguistic challenges emerge
29 where macrolinguistic deficits prevail among those with TLE, impacting suprasentential
30 mechanisms. According to our findings, they tend to deviate more from the topic of
31 conversation; producing longer output, pausing for longer duration, and being less concise and
32 informative in the content they communicate, that is, they say more about less. Producing more
33 repetitive and redundant units that do not contribute to content progression disrupts coherence
34 and represents a communicative issue. At a non-linguistic level, it has also been hypothesised
35 that verbosity in TLE might have a social desirability component. In attempting to maintain

1 social contact and be understood they become particularly repetitive and loquacious [22]. A
2 constrained, impersonal task such as the Cookie Theft might not elicit verbose output given a
3 weaker social-motivation component, potentially because the task is straight forward, largely
4 invariable in its overall portrayal, not reliant on self-representation, and not followed by
5 questions about its content. In contrast, the unstructured questioning regarding a Typical Day
6 is more likely to elicit this social need to maintain face via elaboration, clarification, and self-
7 disclosures irrelevant to task goals.

8 Discourse production is cognitively demanding [40]. Importantly, microlinguistic
9 processes are considered language-specific, and underpinned by subtle interictal disturbances
10 [22]. The present findings regarding microlinguistic disturbances align closely with our
11 understanding of cognitive and linguistic systems, where we see differences in aspects of
12 function that are presumed to be directly modified and compromised by seizures generally. For
13 example, seizure burden, ASM usage, and their impact on processing speed [41,42] have
14 ramifications for disrupting fluency, particularly in relation to non-grammatical pauses and
15 pause duration, which are more highly determined by fundamental neurolinguistic systems,
16 and correlate significantly with disease duration and recent seizures. These disturbances are
17 disproportionately observed among individuals with TLE, regardless of context. On the other
18 hand, syntactic complexity is presumed and found to be comparable between groups as it is
19 socio-linguistically determined [43] and therefore remote from the effects of seizure activity.
20 Instead, macrolinguistic processes rely on broader aspects of cognition [16]. As a network
21 disorder, these systems are vulnerable to disturbances in TLE with seizure focus and
22 propagation into distal regions [23]. The increased demands on linguistic and non-linguistic
23 cognitive systems involved in planning and organising spontaneous discourse potentially
24 account for the observation that macrolinguistic impairments become more overt when task
25 constraints decrease, but might not be sufficiently captured by the limited scope of
26 psychometric measures. These macrolinguistic disturbances are more vulnerable to the broader
27 syndromal effects specific to TLE, including neurotoxicity and the impact of seizure activity
28 and subsequent widespread cortical dysfunction which confer a degree of compromise in high-
29 level language systems. This is mirrored in significant correlations between spontaneous
30 duration and proportion of non-progression units with seizure frequency and number of ASMs,
31 as indicators of disorder severity, as well as increase in TOT states being correlated with
32 proportionally higher-non-progression units.

33 The sample size is in keeping with similar studies and is appropriate for the scope of a
34 discourse analysis which focuses on thoroughly characterising language use [44]. Participants
35 were well-matched on demographic characteristics. Of note, each discourse type was elicited

1 using a single task and it is difficult to discern whether something inherent in these tasks might
2 have given rise to these findings. However, examining errors relative to sample length, rather
3 than raw values, has adequately equated these tasks to make appropriate comparisons. Future
4 research could consider including multiple tasks with similar demands to confirm these findings.
5 This study is concerned with high-level linguistic function which is not represented in brain
6 tissue in a modular or focal fashion. There are many senses in which right and left TE are
7 cognitively and linguistically distinct. While more fundamental aspects of cognitive-linguistic
8 function can be localised or lateralised, this is not the expectation for higher-order language, as
9 a higher cortical function. When dealing with linguistic function there is no a priori reason for
10 thinking about this as a lateralised function. Functions as complex as this are seldom as localised
11 as lateralised as one might think, and instead relate to widely distributed networks. In light of
12 this, right and left TLE participants have been considered as a single diagnostic group. While
13 this might sound counterintuitive, there was no sense in which the groups were distinguishable.
14 This approach was supported by our analyses which indicated that there were no differences in
15 discourse outcomes when considered as separate groups or collectively, and ultimately that
16 treating them as a single group was a robust choice. We would like to highlight that this is
17 preliminary research and the first of its kind to address naturalistic output with detailed discourse
18 analysis which generated a very large body of data for each participant. For each participant a
19 very large corpus of data is acquired, rather than dealing with single, disparate data points. This
20 allows the examination of complex functions. Future research with more evenly distributed
21 groups might be useful to confirm the veracity of these findings. Additionally, accounting for
22 language dominance, atypical activation, and reorganisation is an important future direction.
23 Procedures for lateralisation of language are typically only conducted as part of surgical
24 decision-making, and as such this information was not uniformly available for this sample.
25 Lastly, most assessments were completed via telehealth given COVID-19 lockdown conditions,
26 where fewer rapport-building opportunities and technical disruptions [45] might promote
27 brevity. Individual differences in responses to this format might have impacted their output and
28 ultimately conflated findings, although these conditions were comparable among both groups.

29

30

5. Conclusions

31 These distinct patterns of impairment reflect a dynamic linguistic system taking shape
32 under specific contextual conditions. In this functional system, micro- and macrolinguistic
33 discourse components are differentially affected depending on task demands. Discourse in
34 unconstrained conditions aligns closely with the clinician's anecdotal reporting of verbosity in
35 TLE which often does not map onto standardised assessment. This speaks to the demands of

1 naturalistic clinical contexts where patients are asked open-ended questions. While this study
2 has considered contextual demands on discourse, further research is essential to fully
3 characterise the nuances of the neurolinguistic impairments in TLE beyond the single-word
4 level. A future focus on circumstantiality in other constrained and unconstrained contexts is a
5 viable avenue. Understanding language in naturalistic contexts provides better opportunities to
6 consider how disturbances to language in TLE impact daily communication demands, and
7 ultimately social and occupational functioning.

8

1

2 **Acknowledgement of funding:** This work was financially supported by the Australian
3 Government Research Training Program Scholarship (Stipend and Fee offset) awarded by the
4 Australian Commonwealth Government and the University of Melbourne to the first author.

5

6 **Author Contributions:**

7 **Fiore D'Aprano:** Conceptualisation (equal); Methodology (equal); Investigation (lead); Data
8 Curation (lead); Formal Analysis (lead); Project Administration (lead); Visualisation (lead);
9 Writing – Original Draft Preparation (lead); Writing – Review & Editing (equal).

10 **Charles B. Malpas:** Conceptualisation (equal); Methodology (equal); Formal Analysis
11 (supporting); Resources (equal); Writing – Review & Editing (equal), Supervision (equal)

12 **Stefanie E. Roberts:** Data curation (supporting); Methodology (equal); Validation (lead)

13 **Michael M. Saling:** Conceptualisation (equal); Methodology (equal); Resources (equal);
14 Writing – Review & Editing (equal), Supervision (equal)

15

16 **Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest:** None of the authors has any conflict of interest to disclose.

References

- 1 [1] Waxman SG, Geschwind N. The Interictal Behavior Syndrome of Temporal Lobe
2 Epilepsy 1975.
- 3 [2] Bear DM, Fedio P. Quantitative Analysis of Interictal Behavior in Temporal Lobe
4 Epilepsy. *Arch Neurol* 1977;34:454–67.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archneur.1977.00500200014003>.
- 6 [3] Bartha L, Benke T, Bauer G, Trinkka E. Interictal language functions in temporal lobe
7 epilepsy. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2005;76:808–14.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.2004.045385>.
- 9 [4] Dutta M, Murray L, Miller W, Groves D. Effects of Epilepsy on Language Functions:
10 Scoping Review and Data Mining Findings. *Am J Speech-Language Pathol* 2018;27
11 1S:350–78. https://doi.org/10.1044/2017_AJSLP-16-0195.
- 12 [5] Brandt J, Seidman LJ, Kohl D. Personality characteristics of epileptic patients: A
13 controlled study of generalized and temporal lobe cases. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol*
14 1985;7:25–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01688638508401240>.
- 15 [6] Mayeux R, Brandt J, Rosen J, Benson DF. Interictal memory and language impairment
16 in temporal lobe epilepsy. *Neurology* 1980;30:120–120.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1212/wnl.30.2.120>.
- 18 [7] Field SJ, Saling M, Berkovic S. Interictal Discourse Production in Temporal Lobe
19 Epilepsy 2000. <https://doi.org/10.1006/brln.2000.2335>.
- 20 [8] Lomlomdjian C, Múnera C, Low D, Terpiluk V, Solís P, Abusamra V, et al. The right
21 hemisphere’s contribution to discourse processing: A study in temporal lobe epilepsy.
22 *Brain Lang* 2017;171:31–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bandl.2017.04.001>.
- 23 [9] Marini A. Characteristics of Narrative Discourse Processing after Damage to the Right
24 Hemisphere. *Semin Speech Lang* 2012;33:68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0031-1301164>.
- 25 [10] Stretton J, Thompson PJ. Frontal lobe function in temporal lobe epilepsy. *Epilepsy Res*
26 2012;98:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eplepsyres.2011.10.009>.
- 27 [11] Wood AG, Saling MM, Abbott DF, Jackson GD. A neurocognitive account of frontal
28 lobe involvement in orthographic lexical retrieval: An fMRI study. *Neuroimage*
29 2001;14:162–9. <https://doi.org/10.1006/nimg.2001.0778>.
- 30 [12] Howell RA, Saling MM, Bradley DC, Berkovic SF. Interictal Language Fluency in
31 Temporal Lobe Epilepsy. *Cortex* 1994;30:469–78. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452\(13\)80342-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-9452(13)80342-5).
- 32 [13] Bell B, Dow C, Watson ER, Woodard A, Hermann B, Seidenberg M. Narrative and
33 procedural discourse in temporal lobe epilepsy. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc* 2003;9:733–9.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355617703950065>.
- 35 [14] Halliday MAK, Hasan R. *Cohesion In English - Cohesion in English* -Longman 1976.
- 36 [15] Mozeiko J, Le K, Coelho C, Krueger F, Grafman J. The relationship of story grammar
37 and executive function following TBI. *Aphasiology* 2011;25:825–36.
38 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2010.543983>.
- 39 [16] Coelho CA, Grela B, Corso M, Gamble A, Feinn R. Microlinguistic deficits in the
40 narrative discourse of adults with traumatic brain injury. *Brain Inj* 2005;19:1139–45.
41 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02699050500110678>.
- 42 [17] Glosser G, Deser T. Patterns of discourse production among neurological patients with
43 fluent language disorders. *Brain Lang* 1991;40:67–88. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934x\(91\)90117-j](https://doi.org/10.1016/0093-934x(91)90117-j).
- 44 [18] Goodglass Kaplan, Edith, H. The assessment of aphasia and related disorders. 1972.
- 45 [19] Hoepfner JAB, Garron DC, Wilson RS, Koch-Weser MP. Epilepsy and Verbosity.
46 *Epilepsia* 1987. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-1157.1987.tb03619.x>.
- 47 [20] Barch D., Berenbaum H. The effect of language production manipulations on negative
48 thought disorder and discourse coherences disturbances in schizophrenia 1997.
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52

- 1 [21] Adams C, Lloyd J. Elicited and spontaneous communicative functions and stability of
2 conversational measures with children who have pragmatic language impairments. *Int*
3 *J Lang Commun Disord* 2005;40:333–47.
4 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13682820400027768>.
- 5 [22] Rao SM. Viscosity and social cohesion in temporal lobe epilepsy. *J Neurol Neurosurg*
6 *Psychiatry* 1992;55:149–52. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.55.2.149>.
- 7 [23] Shulman MB. The Frontal Lobes, Epilepsy, and Behavior. *Epilepsy Behav*
8 2000;1:384–95. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ebep.2000.0127>.
- 9 [24] Kwan P, Arzimanoglou A, Berg AT, Brodie MJ, Hauser WA, Mathern G, et al.
10 Definition of drug resistant epilepsy: Consensus proposal by the ad hoc Task Force of
11 the ILAE Commission on Therapeutic Strategies. *Epilepsia* 2010;51:1069–77.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-1167.2009.02397.x>.
- 13 [25] Engel Jr J. Report of the ILAE Classification Core Group. *Epilepsia* 2006;47:1558–68.
14 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-1167.2006.00215.x>.
- 15 [26] So EL, Radhakrishnan K, Silbert PL, Cascino GD, Sharbrough FW, O’Brien PC.
16 Assessing changes over time in temporal lobectomy: outcome by scoring seizure
17 frequency | Presented at the 48th Annual Scientific Meeting of the American Epilepsy
18 Society, New Orleans, LA.1. *Epilepsy Res* 1997;27:119–25.
19 [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-1211\(97\)01028-0](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-1211(97)01028-0).
- 20 [27] Kaplan , Goodglass, Harold., Weintraub, Sandra., Goodglass, Harold., E. Boston
21 naming test. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger; 1983.
- 22 [28] Strauss E, Sherman EMS, Spreen O. A compendium of neuropsychological tests:
23 Administration, norms, and commentary, 3rd ed. *A Compend Neuropsychol Tests*
24 *Adm Norms, Comment 3rd Ed* 2006:xvii, 1216–xvii, 1216.
- 25 [29] Hamberger MJ, Seidel WT. Auditory and visual naming tests: Normative and patient
26 data for accuracy, response time, and tip-of-the-tongue. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc*
27 2003;9:479–89. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S135561770393013X>.
- 28 [30] Zoom Video Communications Inc. Security Guide 2016.
- 29 [31] Stein, Nancy; Glen C. An Analysis of Story Comprehension in Elementary School
30 Children A Test of Schema n.d.
- 31 [32] Trabasso T, van den Broek P. Causal thinking and the representation of narrative
32 events. *J Mem Lang* 1985;24:612–30. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X\(85\)90049-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(85)90049-X).
- 33 [33] Davis GA, O’Neil-Pirozzi TM, Coon M. Referential cohesion and logical coherence of
34 narration after right hemisphere stroke. *Brain Lang* 1997;56:183–210.
35 <https://doi.org/10.1006/brln.1997.1741>.
- 36 [34] Nicholas LE, Brookshire RH. A System for Quantifying the Informativeness and
37 Efficiency of the Connected Speech of Adults With Aphasia. *J Speech, Lang Hear Res*
38 1993;36:338–50. <https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3602.338>.
- 39 [35] Stockbridge MD, Berube S, Goldberg E, Suarez A, Mace R, Ubellacker D, et al.
40 Differences in linguistic cohesion within the first year following right- and left-
41 hemisphere lesions. *Aphasiology* 2021;35:357–71.
42 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687038.2019.1693026>.
- 43 [36] Sherratt S. Multi-level discourse analysis: A feasible approach. *Aphasiology*
44 2007;21:375–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02687030600911435>.
- 45 [37] Kazdin AE. Single-case experimental designs in clinical research and practice. *New*
46 *Dir Methodol Soc Behav Sci* 1982;13:33–47.
- 47 [38] Jamovi. The Jamovi Project (Version 1.6) [Computer Software] 2021.
48 <https://www.jamovi.org>.
- 49 [39] Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and
50 Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. *J R Stat Soc Ser B* 1995;57:289–300.
51 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x>.
- 52 [40] Ulatowska HK, Allard L, Chapman SB. Narrative and Procedural Discourse in

- 1 Aphasia. 1990. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-3262-9_8.
- 2 [41] Englot DJ, Yang L, Hamid H, Danielson N, Bai X, Marfeo A, et al. Impaired
3 consciousness in temporal lobe seizures: role of cortical slow activity. *Brain*
4 2010;133:3764–77. <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awq316>.
- 5 [42] Kwan P, Brodie MJ. Neuropsychological effects of epilepsy and antiepileptic drugs.
6 *Lancet* 2001;357:216–22. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(00\)03600-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(00)03600-X).
- 7 [43] Labov , W. *Language in the inner city*. 1972.
- 8 [44] Potter J, Wetherell M. *Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and*
9 *behaviour. Discourse Soc Psychol Beyond Attitudes Behav* 1987:216.
- 10 [45] Frye WS, Gardner L, Campbell JM, Katzenstein JM. Implementation of telehealth
11 during COVID-19: Implications for providing behavioral health services to pediatric
12 patients. *J Child Heal Care* 2021;26:172–84.
13 <https://doi.org/10.1177/13674935211007329>.
- 14