

Supplemental Table 1. Characteristics of studies including inhibitory control tasks.

Study	<i>N</i>		Age (mos.)		Language <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>) ¹		EF tasks	Verbal loading	Outcome measure	Hedges's <i>g</i> (<i>SE</i>)	95% CI
	SLI	TD	SLI	TD	SLI	TD					
Response inhibition tasks											
Beck Mutch, 2001	11	12	105	97	76 (12.57)	108 (9.38)	Stroop (color/word)	V	Items completed in 45 s	−0.32 (0.41)	−1.57, 0.93
Bishop & Norbury, 2005b	17	18	112	103	69.67 (11.64)	101.47 (10.01)	TEA-Ch: Opposite Worlds	V	Time to completion: Opposite condition	−1.11 (0.36)	−2.27, 0.06
							TEA-Ch: Opposite Worlds	V	Time difference between conditions	−0.76 (0.34)	−1.90, 0.39
							TEA-Ch: Walk/Don't Walk	N	# correct trials	−1.30 (0.37)	−2.50, −0.11
Das & Åystö, 1994	60	163	170	146	81.4 (15.8)	—	Stroop (color/word)	V	Time to completion	−0.38 (0.15)	−1.14, 0.39
							Auditory selective attention (A)	N	Items correct subtract items incorrect	−0.58 (0.15)	−1.34, 0.19
							Auditory selective attention (B)	N	Items correct subtract items incorrect	−0.89 (0.16)	−1.67, −0.12
Dodwell & Bavin, 2008	16	25	79	79	77.25 (3.79)	96.76 (9.55)	Go/No-go variation	V	Omission & commission errors	−0.32 (0.32)	−1.42, 0.78
							Auditory continuous performance test	V	Total errors	−0.68 (0.32)	−1.79, 0.43
Epstein et al., 2014	12	22	139	133	76.5 (9.21)	111 (7.16)	Go/No-go (80/20)	V	Hit rate	−0.45 (0.36)	−1.62, 0.72
							Go/No-go (80/20)	V	RT	−0.25 (0.35)	−1.41, 0.92
							Go/No-go (80/20)	V	False alarms	0.02 (0.35)	−1.14, 1.18
							Go/No-go (50/50)	V	Hit rate	−0.22 (0.35)	−1.38, 0.94
							Go/No-go (50/50)	V	RT	−0.22 (0.35)	−1.38, 0.95
							Go/No-go (50/50)	V	False alarms	0.60 (0.36)	−0.57, 1.77
							Go/No-go (20/80)	V	Hit rate	−0.25 (0.35)	−1.42, 0.91
							Go/No-go (20/80)	V	RT	−0.12 (0.35)	−1.29, 1.04
							Go/No-go (20/80)	V	False alarms	0.22 (0.35)	−0.94, 1.38

Study	<i>N</i>		Age (mos.)		Language <i>M (SD)</i> ¹		EF tasks	Verbal loading	Outcome measure	Hedges's <i>g (SE)</i>	95% CI
	SLI	TD	SLI	TD	SLI	TD					
Finneran et al., 2009	13	13	62	63	2nd ²	64th ²	Go/No-go (40/60)	N	Accuracy (<i>d'</i>)	-1.03 (0.41)	-2.28, 0.22
							Go/No-go (40/60)	N	False alarms	-0.78 (0.40)	-2.06, 0.45
							Go/No-go (40/60)	N	Hit rate	-1.00 (0.40)	-2.25, 0.25
Hanson & Montgomery, 2002	12	12	192	192	68 (6)	107 (9.6)	Auditory continuous performance task	V	Hits	-0.25 (0.40)	-1.49, 0.98
							Auditory continuous performance task	V	False alarms	-0.38 (0.40)	-1.62, 0.86
Henry et al., 2012	41	88	138	118	3.8 ³ (2.5)	10.5 ³ (1.9)	Motor inhibition	N	Total errors	-0.90 (0.20)	-1.76, -0.03
							Verbal inhibition	V	Total errors	-0.39 (0.19)	-1.24, 0.47
Im-Bolter, 2003	45	45	121	122	5.58 ³ (1.94)	10.11 ³ (1.65)	Stroop (color/word)	V	Time difference between conditions	-0.54 (0.21)	-1.44, 0.37
							Stroop (color/word)	V	Time ratio (Stroop: neutral condition)	-0.19 (0.21)	-1.09, 0.71
							Antisaccade	N	Proportion correct	-0.68 (0.22)	-1.59, 0.23
							Antisaccade	N	Latency	-0.15 (0.21)	-1.05, 0.75
Kuntz, 2012	16	16	97	97	8.37 ³ (2.68)	11.75 ³ (1.77)	Auditory Stroop task: neutral, linguistic target	V	Proportion of errors	-0.84 (0.36)	-2.02, 0.33
							Auditory Stroop task: congruent, linguistic target	V	Proportion of errors	-0.65 (0.35)	-1.81, 0.52
							Auditory Stroop task: incongruent, linguistic target	V	Proportion of errors	-0.72 (0.36)	-1.89, 0.45
							Auditory Stroop task: neutral, perceptual target	N	Proportion of errors	-0.45 (0.35)	-1.61, 0.71
							Auditory Stroop task: congruent, perceptual target	N	Proportion of errors	-0.80 (0.36)	-1.98, 0.37
							Auditory Stroop task: incongruent, perceptual target	N	Proportion of errors	-1.02 (0.37)	-2.21, 0.17
							Visual Stroop task: neutral, linguistic target	V	Proportion of errors	-0.41 (0.35)	-1.57, 0.75
							Visual Stroop task: congruent, linguistic target	V	Proportion of errors	-0.42 (0.35)	-1.57, 0.74

Study	<i>N</i>		Age (mos.)		Language <i>M (SD)</i> ¹		EF tasks	Verbal loading	Outcome measure	Hedges's <i>g (SE)</i>	95% CI
	SLI	TD	SLI	TD	SLI	TD					
							Visual Stroop task: incongruent, linguistic target	V	Proportion of errors	−0.64 (0.35)	−1.81, 0.52
							Visual Stroop task: neutral, perceptual target	N	Proportion of errors	−0.79 (0.36)	−1.97, 0.38
							Visual Stroop task: congruent, perceptual target	N	Proportion of errors	−0.77 (0.36)	−1.94, 0.40
							Visual Stroop task: incongruent, perceptual target	N	Proportion of errors	−0.77 (0.36)	−1.94, 0.41
							Auditory Stroop task: neutral, linguistic target	V	RT	−0.52 (0.35)	−1.68, 0.64
							Auditory Stroop task: congruent, linguistic target	V	RT	−0.54 (0.35)	−1.70, 0.62
							Auditory Stroop task: incongruent, linguistic target	V	RT	−0.59 (0.35)	−1.75, 0.58
							Auditory Stroop task: neutral, perceptual target	N	RT	−1.13 (0.37)	−2.33, 0.06
							Auditory Stroop task: congruent, perceptual target	N	RT	−0.94 (0.36)	−2.13, 0.24
							Auditory Stroop task: incongruent, perceptual target	N	RT	−0.98 (0.37)	−2.16, 0.21
							Visual Stroop task: neutral, linguistic target	V	RT	−1.30 (0.38)	−2.51, −0.09
							Visual Stroop task: congruent, linguistic target	V	RT	−1.15 (0.37)	−2.34, 0.05
							Visual Stroop task: incongruent, linguistic target	V	RT	−1.18 (0.38)	−2.38, 0.02
							Visual Stroop task: neutral, perceptual target	N	RT	−0.70 (0.36)	−1.86, 0.47
							Visual Stroop task: congruent, perceptual target	N	RT	−1.07 (0.37)	−2.26, 0.12
							Visual Stroop task: incongruent, perceptual target	N	RT	−1.36 (0.38)	−2.58, −0.15
Lukács et al., 2015	31	31	94	94	17.9 ⁴ (9.31)	35.35 ⁴ (6.35)	Verbal Stroop task	V	Accuracy difference between conditions	0.25 (0.25)	−0.74, 1.23
							Verbal Stroop task	V	RT difference between conditions	0.05 (0.25)	−0.93, 1.04
							Nonverbal Stroop task	N	Accuracy difference between conditions	0.171 (0.25)	−0.81, 1.15

Study	<i>N</i>		Age (mos.)		Language <i>M (SD)</i> ¹		EF tasks	Verbal loading	Outcome measure	Hedges's <i>g (SE)</i>	95% CI
	SLI	TD	SLI	TD	SLI	TD					
							Nonverbal Stroop task	N	RT difference between conditions	0.22 (0.25)	-0.76, 1.21
Marton et al., 2012	22	22	148	150	81.6 (13.8)	119.4 (9.5)	Stop signal task	N	Stop signal RT	-0.45 (0.30)	-1.52, 0.63
Oram Cardy, 2003	13	14	115	115	75 (8)	106 (13)	Stop signal task	N	% invalid trials	-0.93 (0.39)	-2.16, 0.30
							Stop signal task	N	Go signal % errors	-0.77 (0.39)	-1.99, 0.45
							Stop signal task	N	Go signal RT	-0.37 (0.38)	-1.57, 0.83
							Stop signal task	N	Stop signal % inhibitions	0 (0.37)	-1.20, 1.20
							Stop signal task	N	Stop signal RT	-0.97 (0.40)	-2.20, 0.27
Spaulding, 2008	31	31	56	56	43.51 (14.34)	101.7 (14.31)	Go/No-go with distractor	V	Accuracy	-1.23 (0.27)	-2.26, -0.20
							Go/No-go with distractor	V	RT	-1.09 (0.27)	-2.11, -0.07
							Stop signal task	V	Go trials % correct	-0.92 (0.26)	-1.92, 0.09
							Stop signal task	V	Stop trials % correct	-1.17 (0.27)	-2.19, -0.15
Spaulding, 2010	22	16	55	56	69.59 (10.63)	106.14 (9.08)	Stop signal task	V	Accuracy	-1.28 (0.33)	-2.40, -0.16
Tropper, 2009	12	22	139	134	76.5 (9.21)	111 (7.16)	Linguistic go/no-go (80/20)	V	Hit rate	-38.08* (4.63)	-42.30, -33.86
							Linguistic go/no-go (80/20)	V	RT	-0.25 (0.35)	-1.41, 0.92
							Linguistic go/no-go (80/20)	V	False alarm rate	2.38 (0.45)	1.06, 3.70
							Linguistic go/no-go (50/50)	V	Hit rate	-19.18 (2.35)	-22.19, -16.18
							Linguistic go/no-go (50/50)	V	RT	-0.22 (0.35)	-1.38, 0.95
							Linguistic go/no-go (50/50)	V	False alarm rate	68.35* (8.30)	62.70, 73.99
							Linguistic go/no-go (20/80)	V	Hit rate	-30.25* (3.69)	-34.01, -26.49

Study	<i>N</i>		Age (mos.)		Language <i>M (SD)</i> ¹		EF tasks	Verbal loading	Outcome measure	Hedges's <i>g (SE)</i>	95% CI
	SLI	TD	SLI	TD	SLI	TD					
							Linguistic go/no-go (20/80)	V	RT	-0.12 (0.35)	-1.29, 1.04
							Linguistic go/no-go (20/80)	V	False alarm rate	9.76 (1.23)	7.59, 11.94
							Nonlinguistic go/no-go (80/20)	N	Hit rate	-20.55 (2.52)	-23.66, -12.44
							Nonlinguistic go/no-go (80/20)	N	RT	-0.21 (0.35)	-1.37, 0.95
							Nonlinguistic go/no-go (80/20)	N	False alarm rate	4.11 (0.61)	2.58, 5.64
							Nonlinguistic go/no-go (50/50)	N	Hit rate	-23.43* (2.86)	-26.75, -20.12
							Nonlinguistic go/no-go (50/50)	N	RT	-0.37 (0.35)	-1.54, 0.79
							Nonlinguistic go/no-go (50/50)	N	False alarm rate	17.21 (2.12)	14.36, 20.06
							Nonlinguistic go/no-go (20/80)	N	Hit rate	-57.24* (6.95)	-62.41, -52.07
							Nonlinguistic go/no-go (20/80)	N	RT	-0.64 (0.36)	-1.81, 0.53
							Nonlinguistic go/no-go (20/80)	N	False alarm rate	-21.48 (2.63)	-24.66, -18.30
Resistance to distractor interference tasks											
Arbel & Donchin, 2014	10	10	99	99	72.4 (11.01)	112 (7.97)	Flanker task	N	Errors on incompatible trials	-0.66 (0.44)	-1.97, 0.64
							Flanker task	N	RT on incompatible trials	-0.29 (0.43)	-1.57, 1.00
							Flanker task	N	RT on correct trials	-0.21 (0.43)	-1.49, 1.08
							Flanker task	N	RT on incorrect trials	-0.44 (0.43)	-1.73, 0.85
							Flanker task	N	Error rate	-0.64 (0.44)	-1.93, 0.67
							Flanker task with feedback	N	RT on correct trials	-0.39 0.43	-1.68, 0.90
							Flanker task with feedback	N	RT on incorrect trials	-0.26 (0.43)	-1.54, 1.03
							Flanker task with feedback	N	Error rate	-0.62 (0.44)	-1.92, 0.68
Arbel, 2006	10	10	99	99	72.4 (11.02)	112.9 (7.98)	Flanker task	N	RT on correct trials after correct trials	-0.07 (0.43)	-1.35, 1.22

Study	<i>N</i>		<i>Age (mos.)</i>		<i>Language M (SD)¹</i>		EF tasks	Verbal loading	Outcome measure	Hedges's <i>g</i> (<i>SE</i>)	95% CI
	SLI	TD	SLI	TD	SLI	TD					
Beck Mutch, 2001	11	12	105	97	76 (12.57)	108 (9.38)	Flanker task	N	RT on correct trials after incorrect trials	-0.06 (0.43)	-1.35, 1.22
							Alphabet visual search	V	Time to completion	0.51 (0.41)	-0.75, 1.76
							Alphabet visual search	V	Errors	-0.44 (0.41)	-1.69, 0.81
							Circles & sticks visual search: parallel search	N	Time to completion	0.52 (0.41)	-0.74, 1.77
							Circles & sticks visual search: serial search	N	Errors	-0.61 (0.41)	-1.87, 0.65
							Circles & sticks visual search: parallel search	N	Time to completion	-0.07 (0.40)	-1.31, 1.17
							Circles & sticks visual search: serial search	N	Errors	-0.35 (0.41)	-1.59, 0.91
							Visual matching	N	Total responses	0 (0.40)	-1.24, 1.24
							Cross out visual search	N	Total responses	0.39 (0.41)	-0.86, 1.63
Das & Åystö, 1994	60	163	170	146	81.4 (15.8)	—	Visual search (C)	N	Time to completion	-0.05 (0.15)	-0.81, 0.71
							Visual search (A)	N	Time to completion	0.26 (0.15)	-0.50, 1.02
Dispaldro et al., 2013	22	22	75	74	—	—	Visual attention	N	Accuracy	-0.38 (0.30)	-1.45, 0.69
							Visual attention: masked	N	Accuracy	0.20 (0.30)	-0.87, 1.26
							Visual attention: masked 140 ms	N	Accuracy	-0.67 (0.30)	-1.75, 0.42
							Visual attention: masked 260 ms	N	Accuracy	-0.43 (0.30)	-1.50, 0.64
							Visual attention: masked 380 ms	N	Accuracy	-0.14 (0.30)	-1.21, 0.93
							Visual attention: masked 1100 ms	N	Accuracy	-0.13 (0.30)	-1.20, 0.93
Eichorn et al., 2014	22	22	148	150	81.6 (13.8)	119.4 (9.5)	Distractor task	V	Accuracy	-0.56 (0.30)	-1.63, 0.52
							Distractor task	V	RT	-0.96 (0.31)	-2.06, 0.13
							Distractor task: verbal cuing	V	Accuracy	-1.13 (0.32)	-2.24, -0.02

Study	<i>N</i>		Age (mos.)		Language <i>M (SD)</i> ¹		EF tasks	Verbal loading	Outcome measure	Hedges's <i>g (SE)</i>	95% CI
	SLI	TD	SLI	TD	SLI	TD					
							Distractor task: verbal cuing	V	RT	−1.10 (0.32)	−2.20, 0.01
Marton, 2008, Sample A	40	40	76	76	66.63 ⁵ (24.37)	87.82 ⁵ (18.15)	Position in space	N	Trials correct	−0.48 (0.23)	−1.41, 0.45
Marton, 2008, Sample A1	21	40	77	76	—	87.82 ⁵ (18.15)	Position in space	N	Trials correct	0.01 (0.27)	−1.00, 1.02
Marton et al., 2007	15	15	107	106	72.53 (9.26)	25.71 ⁶ (5.59)	Listening span	V	Immediate errors	−1.47 (0.40)	−2.71, −0.22
							Listening span	V	Delayed errors	−0.72 (0.37)	−1.91, 0.46
							Listening span	V	Contextual distractions	−0.97 (0.38)	−2.18, 0.23
							Listening span	V	Perseverations	−0.81 (0.37)	−2.00, 0.39
Marton et al., 2012	22	22	148	150	81.6 (13.8)	119.4 (9.5)	Delayed match to sample: simultaneous presentation	N	Latency	−0.97 (0.31)	−0.97, 0.12
							Delayed match to sample: delayed presentation	N	Accuracy	0.35 (0.30)	−0.72, 1.42
Miller et al., 2006	20	15	167	167	5 ³ (2)	9 ³ (2)	Visual search: First position	N	RT	−0.74 (0.35)	−1.89, 0.42
							Visual search: Second position	N	RT	−0.88 (0.35)	−2.03, 0.28
							Visual search: Third position	N	RT	−0.74 (0.35)	−1.89, 0.42
							Visual search: Fourth position	N	RT	−1.04 (0.36)	−2.21, 0.13
							Visual search: Fifth position	N	RT	−1.31 (0.37)	−2.50, −0.12
							Visual search: Target absent	N	RT	−0.90 (0.35)	−2.06, 0.26
							Visual search: First position	N	% correct	0.16 (0.33)	−0.98, 1.29
							Visual search: Second position	N	% correct	−0.16 (0.33)	−1.29, 0.98
							Visual search: Third position	N	% correct	0.22 (0.34)	−0.91, 1.35
							Visual search: Fourth position	N	% correct	0.36 (0.34)	−0.78, 1.49
							Visual search: Fifth position	N	% correct	0.53 (0.34)	−0.62, 1.66

Study	<i>N</i>		Age (mos.)		Language <i>M (SD)</i> ¹		EF tasks	Verbal loading	Outcome measure	Hedges's <i>g (SE)</i>	95% CI
	SLI	TD	SLI	TD	SLI	TD					
Oram Cardy, 2003	14	14	115	115	75 (8)	106 (13)	Visual search: Target absent	N	% correct	0.15 (0.33)	−0.92, 1.28
							Visual search	N	Average RT	−1.23 (0.40)	−2.47, 0.01
							Visual search: First position	N	RT	−1.41 (0.41)	−2.67, −0.15
							Visual search: Second position	N	RT	−0.98 (0.39)	−2.20, 0.24
							Visual search: Third position	N	RT	−1.08 (0.39)	−2.31, 0.15
							Visual search: Fourth position	N	RT	−1.13 (0.40)	−2.37, 0.10
							Visual search: Fifth position	N	RT	−0.69 (0.38)	−1.90, 0.51
							Visual search: Target absent	N	RT	−0.69 (0.38)	−1.90, 0.52
Oram Cardy et al., 2010	14	28	115	116	75 (8)	105 (13)	Visual search	N	% invalid trials	0.30 (0.32)	−0.82, 1.41
							Visual search	N	% errors	0 (0.32)	−1.11, 1.11
							Visual search	N	RT	−0.71 (0.33)	−1.83, 0.42
Park et al., 2015, Sample A	42	89	108	108	—	—	Visual search	N	RT	−0.50 (0.19)	−1.35, 0.36
Park et al., 2015, Sample B	42	89	164	164	—	—	Visual search	N	RT	−0.81 (0.19)	−1.67, 0.05
Seiger-Gardner & Brooks, 2008	18	18	103	112	73 (12)	109 (11)	Naming with distractors A: early, neutral	V	RT	−0.78 (0.34)	−1.92, 0.36
							Naming with distractors A: early, neutral	V	Errors	−0.83 (0.34)	−1.98, 0.31
							Naming with distractors A: early, same onset	V	RT	−0.98 (0.35)	−2.13, 0.17
							Naming with distractors A: early, same onset	V	Errors	−0.56 (0.33)	−1.69, 0.57
							Naming with distractors A: early, unrelated	V	RT	−0.67 (0.34)	−1.80, 0.47
							Naming with distractors A: early, unrelated	V	Errors	−0.56 (0.33)	−1.69, 0.57

Study	<i>N</i>		Age (mos.)		Language <i>M (SD)</i> ¹		EF tasks	Verbal loading	Outcome measure	Hedges's <i>g (SE)</i>	95% CI
	SLI	TD	SLI	TD	SLI	TD					
							Naming with distractors A: synchronous, neutral	V	RT	-0.60 (0.33)	-1.74, 0.53
							Naming with distractors A: synchronous, neutral	V	Errors	-1.08 (0.35)	-2.24, 0.08
							Naming with distractors A: synchronous, same onset	V	RT	-0.96 (0.35)	-2.11, 0.19
							Naming with distractors A: synchronous, same onset	V	Errors	-0.54 (0.33)	-1.66, 0.59
							Naming with distractors A: synchronous, unrelated	V	RT	-0.37 (0.33)	-1.50, 0.75
							Naming with distractors A: synchronous, unrelated	V	Errors	-0.66 (0.34)	-1.80, 0.47
							Naming with distractors A: late, neutral	V	RT	-0.99 (0.35)	-2.15, 0.16
							Naming with distractors A: late, neutral	V	Errors	-0.22 (0.33)	-1.34, 0.90
							Naming with distractors A: late, same onset	V	RT	-0.77 (0.34)	-1.91, 0.37
							Naming with distractors A: late, same onset	V	Errors	-0.75 (0.34)	-1.88, 0.39
							Naming with distractors A: late, unrelated	V	RT	-0.75 (0.34)	-1.89, 0.39
							Naming with distractors A: late, unrelated	V	Errors	-0.78 (0.34)	-1.92, 0.36
							Naming with distractors B: early, neutral	V	RT	-0.90 (0.34)	-2.04, 0.25
							Naming with distractors B: early, neutral	V	Errors	-0.21 (0.33)	-1.33, 0.91
							Naming with distractors B: early, rhyme	V	RT	-0.93 (0.34)	-2.07, 0.22
							Naming with distractors B: early, rhyme	V	Errors	-0.14 (0.33)	-1.26, 0.99
							Naming with distractors B: early, unrelated	V	RT	-0.91 (0.34)	-2.06, 0.24
							Naming with distractors B: early, unrelated	V	Errors	-0.59 (0.33)	-1.73, 0.54
							Naming with distractors B: synchronous, neutral	V	RT	-0.15 (0.33)	-1.27, 0.97
							Naming with distractors B: synchronous, neutral	V	Errors	-0.54 (0.33)	-1.67, 0.59

Study	<i>N</i>		Age (mos.)		Language <i>M (SD)</i> ¹		EF tasks	Verbal loading	Outcome measure	Hedges's <i>g (SE)</i>	95% CI
	SLI	TD	SLI	TD	SLI	TD					
							Naming with distractors B: synchronous, rhyme	V	RT	-0.43 (0.33)	-1.56, 0.70
							Naming with distractors B: synchronous, rhyme	V	Errors	-0.62 (0.33)	-1.76, 0.51
							Naming with distractors B: synchronous, unrelated	V	RT	-0.50 (0.33)	-1.63, 0.63
							Naming with distractors B: synchronous, unrelated	V	Errors	-0.11 (0.33)	-1.22, 1.01
							Naming with distractors B: late, neutral	V	RT	-0.71 (0.34)	-1.85, 0.43
							Naming with distractors B: late, neutral	V	Errors	-0.36 (0.33)	-1.48, 0.77
							Naming with distractors B: late, rhyme	V	RT	-0.75 (0.34)	-1.89, 0.39
							Naming with distractors B: late, rhyme	V	Errors	-0.72 (0.34)	-1.85, 0.42
							Naming with distractors B: late, unrelated	V	RT	-0.70 (0.34)	-1.84, 0.44
							Naming with distractors B: late, unrelated	V	Errors	-0.49 (0.33)	-1.62, 0.64
Seiger-Gardner & Schwartz, 2008	20	20	109	111	75 (12)	107 (8)	⁷ PWI: SA -150ms, phonological	V	RT	-0.34 (0.31)	-1.43, 0.76
							PWI: SA -150ms, semantic	V	RT	-0.27 (0.31)	-1.36, 0.83
							PWI: SA -0, phonological	V	RT	-0.31 (0.31)	-1.41, 0.78
							PWI: SA -0, semantic	V	RT	-0.30 (0.31)	-1.39, 0.80
							PWI: SA +150 ms, phonological	V	RT	-0.46 (0.31)	-1.56, 0.64
							PWI: SA +150 ms, semantic	V	RT	-0.49 (0.32)	-1.59, 0.61
							PWI: SA +300 ms, phonological	V	RT	-0.86 (0.32)	-1.97, 0.26
							PWI: SA +300 ms, semantic	V	RT	-0.87 (0.33)	-1.99, 0.25
							PWI: SA +500 ms, phonological	V	RT	-0.44 (0.31)	-1.54, 0.66
							PWI: SA +500 ms, semantic	V	RT	-0.49 (0.32)	-1.59, 0.61
Spaulding, 2010	22	22	55	56	69.59 (10.63)	106.1 (9.08)	Distractor interference: linguistic	V	Accuracy	-1.24 (0.32)	-2.35, -0.12

[illegible]

Study	N		Age (mos.)		Language M (SD) ¹		EF tasks	Verbal loading	Outcome measure	Hedges's g (SE)	95% CI
	SLI	TD	SLI	TD	SLI	TD					
Lorsbach et al., 1996	21	20	12	127	82.7	—	Sentence cloze task with interference	V	Suppression score	−0.61 (0.31)	−1.71, 0.49
Norbury, 2005	19	28	15	150	4.45 ³	9.82 ³	Suppression task: dominant meaning	V	Accuracy	−1.05 (0.31)	−2.14, 0.05
							Suppression task: subordinate meaning	V	Accuracy	−0.94 (0.31)	−2.03, 0.15
							Suppression task: total interference	V	Accuracy	−0.90 (0.31)	−1.98, 0.19
							Suppression task: dominant meaning	V	RT	−0.06 (0.29)	−1.12, 1.00
							Suppression task: subordinate meaning	V	RT	−0.27 (0.29)	−1.33, 0.80
							Suppression task: total interference	V	RT	−0.06 (0.29)	−1.12, 1.00
Tower tasks											
Lidstone et al., 2012	21	21	11	112	65	95	Tower of London	N	% problems correct	−0.80 (0.32)	−1.90, 0.30
							Tower of London	N	RT	0.23 (0.30)	−0.85, 1.31
Marton, 2008, Sample B	25	25	11	118	71.57 ⁵	92.49 ⁵	Tower of London	N	Accuracy (total score)	−0.62 (0.29)	−1.67, 0.43
							Tower of London	N	Total moves	0.1 (0.28)	−0.93, 1.13
							Tower of London	N	Total time	−0.36 (0.28)	−1.40, 0.68
							Tower of London	N	Initiation time	−2.68 (0.39)	−3.90, −1.46
							Tower of London	N	Execution time	−0.43 (0.28)	−1.47, 0.61
							Tower of London	N	Time violation	0.01 (0.28)	−1.02, 1.04
							Tower of London	N	Rule violation	−1.46 (0.31)	−2.56, −0.36
Weyandt & Willis, 1994	34	45	10	108	28.41 ⁸	39.15 ⁸	Tower of Hanoi	N	Total points	−0.54 (0.23)	−1.48, 0.40

Note. SLI = specific language impairment; TD = typically developing; EF = executive function; V = verbal; N = nonverbal; TEA-Ch = Test of Everyday Attention for Children (Manly, 1998); RT = reaction time; — = data not collected.

*Outlier (>3 *SD* from the mean effect size).

¹Standardized around *M* = 100, *SD* = 15, unless otherwise noted. ²Percentile rank. ³Standardized around *M* = 10, *SD* = 3. ⁴Raw score from sentence repetition test. ⁵Percent correct.

⁶Groups assessed with differing language measures. ⁷PWI = Picture-Word Interference paradigm; SA = stimulus asynchrony. ⁸Number of correctly identified pictures.

References

- Arbel, Y. (2006). *Error processing by individuals with specific language impairment: An ERP study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest (3224349).
- Arbel, Y., & Donchin, E. (2014). Error and performance feedback processing by children with specific language impairment—An ERP study. *Biological Psychology*, 99, 83–91. doi:10.1016/j.biopsycho.2014.02.012
- Beck Mutch, P. J. (2001). *Comparison of performance on tests of executive functions between children with and without specific language impairments* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest (3027561).
- Bishop, D. V. M., & Norbury, C. (2005b). Executive functions in children with communication impairments, in relation to autistic symptomatology. II: Response inhibition. *Autism*, 9, 29–43.
- Das, J. P., & Åystö, S. M. (1994). Cognitive performance of dysphasic students. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 9, 27–39. doi:10.1007/BF03172883
- Dispaldro, M., Leonard, L. B., Corradi, N., Ruffino, M., Bronte, T., & Facchetti, A. (2013). Visual attentional engagement deficits in children with specific language impairment and their role in real-time language processing. *Cortex*, 49, 2126–2139.
- Dodwell, K., & Bavin, E. L. (2008). Children with specific language impairment: An investigation of their narratives and memory. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 43, 201–218. doi:10.1080/13682820701366147
- Eichorn, N., Marton, K., Campanelli, L., & Scheuer, J. (2014). Verbal strategies and nonverbal cues in school-age children with and without specific language impairment (SLI). *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 49, 618–630.
- Epstein, B., Shafer, V. L., Melara, R. D., & Schwartz, R. G. (2014). Can children with SLI detect cognitive conflict? Behavioral and electrophysiological evidence. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 57, 1463–1467. doi:10.1044/2014_JSLHR-L-13-0234
- Finneran, D. A., Francis, A. L., & Leonard, L. B. (2009). Sustained attention in children with specific language impairment (SLI). *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 52, 915–929.
- Hanson, R. A., & Montgomery, J. W. (2002). Effects of general processing capacity and sustained selective attention on temporal processing performance of children with specific language impairment. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 23, 75–93. doi:10.1017/S0142716402000048
- Henry, L. A., Messer, D. J., & Nash, G. (2012). Executive functioning in children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 53, 37–45. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2011.02430.x
- Im-Bolter, N. (2003). *Executive processes and mental attention in children with language impairments* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest (305287968).
- Kuntz, B. P. (2012). *Selective attention in children with specific language impairment: Auditory and visual Stroop effects* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest (3508697).
- Lidstone, J. S. M., Meins, E., & Fernyhough, C. (2012). Verbal mediation of cognition in children with specific language impairment. *Development and Psychopathology*, 24, 651–660. doi:10.1017/S0954579412000223
- Lorsbach, T. C., Wilson, S., & Reimer, J. F. (1996). Memory for relevant and irrelevant information: Evidence for deficient inhibitory processes in language/learning disabled children. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 21, 447–466.
- Lukács, Á., Ladányi, E., Fazekas, K., & Kemény, F. (2015). Executive functions and the contribution of short-term memory span in children with specific language impairment. *Neuropsychology*, 30, 296–303. doi:10.1037/neu0000232
- Manly, T. (1998). *The Test of Everyday Attention for Children* (TEA-Ch). San Antonio, TX: Pearson.
- Marton, K. (2008). Visuo-spatial processing and executive functions in children with specific language impairment. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 43, 181–200. doi:10.1080/16066350701340719
- Marton, K., Campanelli, L., Scheuer, J., Yoon, J., & Eichorn, N. (2012). Executive function profiles in children with and without specific language impairment. *Journal of Applied Psycholinguistics*, 12, 57–73.
- Marton, K., Kelmenson, L., & Pinkhasova, M. (2007). Inhibition control and working memory capacity in children with SLI. *Psychologia*, 50, 110–121.
- Miller, C. A., Leonard, L. B., Kail, R. V., Zhang, X., Tomblin, J. B., & Francis, D. J. (2006). Response time in 14-year-olds with language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 49, 712–728.
- Norbury, C. F. (2005). Barking up the wrong tree? Lexical ambiguity resolution in children with language impairments and autistic spectrum disorders. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 90, 142–171. doi:10.1016/j.jecp.2004.11.003
- Oram Cardy, J. E. (2003). *Seeking cognitive markers of specific language impairment and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest (305256355).

- Oram Cardy, J. E., Tannock, R., Johnson, A. M., & Johnson, C. J. (2010). The contribution of processing impairments to SLI: Insights from attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 43, 77–91. doi:10.1016/j.jcomdis.2009.09.003
- Park, J., Mainela-Arnold, E., & Miller, C. A. (2015). Information processing speed as a predictor of IQ in children with and without specific language impairment in grades 3 and 8. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 53, 57–69.
- Seiger-Gardner, L., & Brooks, P. J. (2008). Effects of onset- and rhyme-related distractors on phonological processing in children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 51, 1263–1281.
- Seiger-Gardner, L., & Schwartz, R. G. (2008). Lexical access in children with and without specific language impairment: A cross-modal picture-word interference study. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 43, 528–551. doi:10.1080/13682820701768581
- Spaulding, T. J. (2008). *Attentional control in preschool children with specific language impairment* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest (3297961).
- Spaulding, T. J. (2010). Investigating mechanisms of suppression in preschool children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 53, 725–738. doi:10.1044/1092-4388(2009/09-0041)
- Tropper, B. (2009). *An electrophysiological and behavioral examination of cognitive control in children with specific language impairment* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest (3378653).
- Victorino, K. R. (2011). *Auditory selective attention and language processing in children with and without specific language impairment* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest (3478801).
- Weyandt, L. L., & Willis, W. G. (1994). Executive functions in school-aged children: Potential efficacy of tasks in discriminating clinical groups. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, 10, 27–38.
- Williams, D., Stott, C. M., Goodyer, I. M., & Sahakian, B. J. (2000). Specific language impairment with or without hyperactivity: Neuropsychological evidence for frontostriatal dysfunction. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*, 42, 368–375.
- Yang, H.-C. (2015). *Executive function in preschoolers with primary language impairment* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest (3718816).