

# **Patterns of Naming Objects and Actions in Cypriot Greek Children with SLI and WFDs**

**Maria Kambanaros and Kleanthes K. Grohmann**

*Cyprus Acquisition Team and University of Cyprus  
kambanaros@gmail.com and kleanthi@ucy.ac.cy*

**Abstract:** This paper reports on the first picture-naming study involving children with specific language impairment that investigates the lexical category of verbs and compares performances with noun retrieval for the same children. Apart from a control group consisting of typically developing children, another impaired or delayed population was included: children with word-finding difficulties. All children tested are monolingual speakers of Cypriot Greek, and comparisons with Standard Modern Greek are presented.

**Key words:** acquisition, GOAT, lexical access, nouns, specific language impairment, verbs, word-finding difficulties

## **1. Introduction**

Specific Language Impairment (SLI) is a severe limitation in language ability in the absence of other factors that typically accompany language problems, such as hearing impairment, low non-verbal IQ, or neurological damage (Leonard, 1998). SLI is the most common type of developmental language disorder and the most studied, for both practical and theoretical reasons (see e.g. the collection of contributions in Levy & Schaeffer, 2003), with a high incidence affecting an estimated 5-7% of children (Tomblin et al., 1997), boys somewhat more than girls (Paul, 2001). However, no study has been conducted on the prevalence of SLI in Greek Cypriot children (at a local level); moreover, few studies specifically investigate SLI in preschool years (at an international level). At present, SLI is identified only on the basis of behavioral data and non-verbal IQ performance scores within the normal range. Language performance one to two standard deviations below peers is considered the critical cut-off level. No standardized assessment tools exist for the identification, screening, and diagnosis of SLI in CG. Historically, English-speaking preschool children with SLI have been characterized by their impoverished verbal morphology systems.

There is increasing evidence that language development depends on multiple underlying faculties that are distinctly specified genetically (Bishop et al., 2005) and the majority of children presenting with SLI have variable deficits in different components of the grammar (syntax, morphology, phonology) as well as other aspects of language such as vocabulary. In addition, it has been documented that children with SLI and/or word-finding difficulties (WFDs) are less accurate at naming pictures of common objects (nouns) than age-matched peers with typical language development. It is suggested that these lexical difficulties are related to a breakdown at the level of the phonological word form, that is, children with SLI/WFDs are unable to process this information successfully to retrieve the target word.

So far, to our knowledge, no picture-naming study involving children with SLI has investigated the lexical category of verbs (i.e. actions) and compared performances with noun retrieval for the same children, other than Sheng & McGregor (2010), which came out only after our research was completed). This study sets out to do this, investigating

Greek Cypriot children of all three groups (SLI, WFDs, and typical language development). Nouns and verbs are highly variable in meaning. Verbs denote events, i.e. what happens to things, including actions, while nouns typically denote entities such as people, animals, and objects or concepts. Verbs appear semantically more complex, since verb processing requires an understanding of relational concepts — whereas nouns are usually non-relational and only need single object reference. Furthermore, a verb's central meaning is linked to two kinds of information: thematic role assignment and argument structure. The same verb often has multiple meanings when accompanied by different nouns making its underlying meaning less transparent compared to the noun.

Cypriot Greek (CG), the variety of the Greek language spoken in Cyprus and acquired as a first language by most local children prior to grade 1, is an under-described dialect. Very little is known about the language acquisition process of typically developing (TD) children for CG. In order to identify SLI in CG, and compare children presenting with SLI as well as TD children, normative information on CG development needs to be established to create a relevant knowledge base. Standard Modern Greek (SMG) is the “high” variety used in schools (throughout the entire education system); CG is the “low” variety used almost exclusively in oral form and daily communication (i.e. informal contexts). Children usually come in touch with SMG when they enter primary school, but it might be more frequent among urban preschoolers, especially in Nicosia, the capital.

SMG is a highly inflected (fusional) language, with a complex morphology (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton, 1997). Morpho-phonological word forms are inflected according to *grammatical category*, for instance *kov-o* ‘cut-1SG’ is a verb and *psalid-i* ‘scissors’ a noun. Thus, nouns and verbs are differentiated by different suffixes, and they are also marked for phi-features (person, number, and, with nouns, gender); nouns are also obligatorily case-marked. Information about the grammatical category and about syntactic features (such as person, tense, and mood for verbs or gender and case for nouns) are prominent features in SMG as they must be accurately projected, marked, and expressed during single-word production. Verbs and nouns in SMG are considered of similar morphological complexity given that each word class respectively has several conjugational patterns. Nevertheless, SMG makes a fundamental distinction between nominals and verbs with an especially rich verbal morphology (Stephany, 1997:185). In all these respects, the understudied CG patterns just like the well-known SMG grammar.

Beyond reporting whether Greek Cypriot children with SLI and/or WFDs are less accurate than age-matched TD peers acquiring CG on naming pictures of objects and actions, the aims of this study are:

- (i) to look for any grammatical word class effects in naming performances of children with SLI and/or WFDs;
- (ii) to examine naming errors with reference to specific psycholinguistic models of lexical/word processing;
- (iii) to determine whether error types differentiate children with SLI and/or WFDs from TD peers;
- (iv) to determine effects of lexical/psycholinguistic variables on naming accuracies.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Participants

Three groups of children participated in this study:

- thirty TD children (15 girls and 15 boys), aged 6;0-6;11 years, with an average age of 6;3 — all children were recruited randomly from three public primary schools in the Nicosia district after approval from the Ministry of Education and upon written parental consent and no child was receiving speech and language therapy service
- seven children (2 girls and 5 boys), aged 6;4-11;0 years, with an average age of 8;10 — they were all diagnosed with SLI and recruited from speech-language therapists in private practices
- thirteen children (6 girls and 7 boys), aged 6;3-11;11 years, with an average age of 8;2 — they all had expressive language impairments, including WFDs and poor vocabulary development but not SLI and were recruited from speech-language therapists working in public primary education schools

Subject selection criteria included:

- a Greek Cypriot, monolingual CG-speaking background
- no history of neurological, emotional, or behavioural problems
- no obvious learning difficulties (teacher report)
- no gross motor difficulties
- hearing and vision adequate for test purposes
- normal articulation
- normal performance on screening measures of non-verbal intelligence (or as reported by school psychologist)
- medium-high socio-economic status

The distinction between SLI and WFD children was possible based on children's performances on two subtests of the Developmental Verbal Intelligence Quotient (DVIQI Stavrakaki & Tsimpli, 2000), the comprehension and production of morphosyntax and the sentence repetition subtest. Children with WFDs did not show particular difficulties in either domain.

## *2.2. Materials*

The Greek Object and Action Test (GOAT) developed by Kambanaros (2003) was administered to assess retrieval of object and action names. For the present study, 84 coloured photographs measuring 10x14cm in size were used, 42 depicting actions (verbs) and 42 objects (nouns). The GOAT was originally piloted on a group of twenty Greek monolingual adult speakers of SMG. Only items named with 80% accuracy or more were included in the test. (Subsequently, the GOAT was adapted to CG and piloted on CG-speaking adults as well as TD children.)

Object names are single, concrete inanimate nouns and include manipulated instruments such as garage tools, garden equipment, kitchen utensils, household items, office and personal implements, used for activities of daily living. Object names were not controlled for gender: 6 nouns were masculine, 15 feminine, and 21 neuter. This gender distribution is typical for SMG, also holding for CG (neuter > feminine > masculine) with the distance between feminine and masculine greater than that between neuter and feminine (Stephany, 1997:188). All verbs were monotransitive with either simple internal word structures of [root + affix] or more complex ones of [root + affix + affix]. Actions were restricted to past stereotypical roles, that is, a woman is shown performing household activities (e.g. sweeping), for example, and a man is performing more "manly" duties (e.g. hammering). These stereotypical roles depicted in the

pictures are deemed to be appropriate for this age and cultural group.

Also, coloured photographs could facilitate children's naming abilities given that (for at least) object recognition and naming, accuracy is significantly improved by the use of colour in target pictures (Rossion & Pourtois, 2004). All action names corresponded to either an instrumental verb (where an instrument is part of the action, e.g. cutting) or to a non-instrumental verb (e.g. climbing). All target nouns in object naming were also items in the noun comprehension task. All target verbs in action naming were also targets in the verb comprehension task.

Lemma frequencies for object and action names were calculated based on the printed word frequency count for SMG (Hatzigeorgiou et al., 2000); note that at this time, there are no word frequency data available for CG. A Mann-Whitney test revealed no significant difference between object and action lemmas ( $z = -0.154$ ,  $p = 0.878$ ). In addition, there was no significant difference in syllable length between object and action names either ( $z = -0.610$ ,  $p = 0.542$ ). Furthermore, object and action names were measured for key psycholinguistic variables, including age of acquisition (AoA), imageability, and picture complexity. Table 1 provides a summary of the characteristics of items in each word class.

*Table 1: Characteristics of items in each word class*

	<i>Lemma frequency</i>	<i>Syllable length</i>	<i>AoA</i>	<i>Imageability</i>	<i>Picture complexity</i>
<i>Objects</i>	40.91	2.88 (0.803 SD)	2.98 (0.76 SD)	6.49 (0.49 SD)	6.49 (0.28 SD)
<i>Actions</i>	40.11	2.95 (0.731 SD)	2.82 (0.58 SD)	6.42 (0.16 SD)	6.16 (0.67 SD)

### *2.3. Procedure*

The order of the task (comprehension or production) was counterbalanced across the children tested. The object and action tasks were presented in one session. Testing was conducted in a quiet room at the school. Each child was tested individually by the first author of this study, who was assisted by a CG-speaking speech and language therapist.

*Comprehension:* Children were asked to point to the correct photograph from a set comprising the target object or action, and the two semantic distracters for each target object or action. Each child was asked to point to the picture of the object or action matching the spoken word heard. Two examples were provided before testing. If children failed to point to the correct picture, they were corrected. Children who pointed to more than one photograph were told that only one picture was correct. The instructions were repeated for children who did not point to any pictures. No time limits were placed and self-correction was allowed. (Only once was the target word repeated upon request.) If further repetitions of the same word were required the answer was scored as incorrect.

*Word production:* Children were asked to name the object or action represented in the photograph in a single word. Action names were required in the third person singular. Two examples were provided before testing. The stimulus question(s) was repeated once for children who did not respond. If no response was given, the item was scored as incorrect. No time limits were placed and self-correction was allowed. Responses were recorded and transcribed verbatim by the first-named author and checked by the second.

### 3. Results

We now present the results in terms of accuracy and proceed with a qualitative analysis, which we will discuss further in the next section. Regression analyses will also be briefly mentioned.

#### *Accuracy*

All three groups of children (TD, SLI, WFDs) scored ceiling, or close to, on the noun and verb comprehension tasks. Therefore, the results of two subtests of the GOAT are reported in the present study: object/noun naming and action/verb naming. The percentages of correct responses were calculated for object and action names as provided by all children. A summary of the results is given in Table 2 according to picture type.

*Table 2: Correct production percentages for object and action names*

	<i>SLI</i>	<i>WFD</i>	<i>TD</i>
<i>Object names</i>	67%	71%	77%
<i>Actions names</i>	68%	61%	72%

Overall, the TD and the children with WFDs — but not the children with SLI — demonstrated a grammatical word class effect, with object names significantly easier to retrieve than action names for both groups. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), carried out on the results from object naming performances between the three groups, revealed a statistically significant difference between the TD children and those with SLI — with the latter showing significantly more difficulties retrieving object names compared to TD peers. In contrast, the children with WFDs were significantly worse at retrieving action names compared to the group of TD children.

#### *Qualitative analysis*

Errors made by the children for object and action names were classified into semantic errors, grammatical word class substitutions, omission errors (“don’t know” responses), visual errors, and unrelated responses. Semantic errors were further divided into semantic types and semantic descriptions or circumlocutions. The latter involved describing the target action/object concept using more than one word (e.g., ‘hitting the nail’ for *hammering*). Semantic errors included coordinate (e.g., ‘comb’ for *brush*), superordinate (e.g., ‘tool’ for *hammer*), and associative errors (e.g., ‘bucket’ for *mop*), all semantically-related single lexical labels for the target word. Noun-to-verb substitutions (word-class errors) were those in which the action name was provided instead of the object name, or vice-versa (e.g. instead of *sweeping*, ‘broom’ was produced). Visual errors included responses where there is no semantic relationship between the child’s response and the target object/action word (e.g. (*nail*) *file* > ‘knife’). Unrelated responses included real-word responses lacking a relationship, of any form, with the target word.

(Table 3 below gives the percentages of errors in each category for object and action names.)

Interestingly enough, the qualitative analysis of errors revealed different error patterns for object and action names. Overall, there was a higher rate of omissions (the “don’t know” responses) for object names, in contrast to greater semantic description or circumlocution errors for action names.

Table 3: Mean percentages of errors for object and action names

	<i>SLI</i>		<i>WFD</i>		<i>TD</i>	
	object	action	Object	action	object	action
<i>semantic error (single)</i>	8.0%	6.2%	12.6%	16.3%	8.2%	5.4%
<i>semantic description</i>	3.8%	16.0%	2.0%	14.8%	3.4%	17.5%
<i>word class</i>	0.89%	0.6%	0.18%	—	1.0%	—
<i>omissions (“don’t know”)</i>	17.8%	8.9%	1.7%	6.2%	8.7%	3.4%
<i>visual</i>	1.5%	—	1.1%	—	0.95%	0.15%
<i>unrelated</i>	—	—	0.36%	0.73%	0.87%	0.79%

A one-way ANOVA carried out between the groups yielded the following results:

- A. Children with WFDs made significantly more semantic errors on object names than TD children.
- B. Children with WFDs made significantly more semantic errors for action names compared to both TD children and children with SLI.
- C. Children with SLI made significantly more omission errors than TD children for object names.

#### *Regression analyses*

Regression analyses were conducted with the object and action naming responses in relation to lemma frequency, rated AoA, rated imageability, syllable length, and rated picture complexity. Overall, there was a significant effect of AoA on object and action name retrieval, with more errors on words in both classes that were acquired at a later age. The fact that there were fewer errors with words earlier acquired supports findings from previous studies (cf. Masterson et al., 2008). There was no effect of syllable length for either object or action naming. Moreover, no other psycholinguistic variable had a significant effect on action naming accuracies.

We can now summarize our results as follows:

1. All three groups showed an effect of AoA, word imageability, picture complexity.
2. None of the three groups showed an effect of syllable length.
3. Only the TD children showed a frequency effect; object naming by the children with SLI and WFDs was not affected by the frequency of a given item.
4. AoA had a significant effect on retrieving action names for all three groups.
5. Word imageability and picture complexity significantly affected action naming for the children with SLI and WFDs.
6. Word frequency had no effect.
7. The TD children and the children with SLI had similar error types for action (semantic descriptions) and object names (omissions/“don’t know” responses).

#### 4. Discussion

The present study investigated object and action picture naming accuracy in three groups of CG-speaking children: TD six-year-olds, children with SLI, and children with WFDs in a highly inflected language (CG, patterning morphosyntactically for all items tested just as SMG). Modern Greek (whether CG or SMG) is a highly inflected language where nouns and verbs are clearly differentiated on the basis of inflectional suffixes (section 1).

Furthermore, this is only the second study in the literature, after the recent research by Masterson et al. (2008), to control for a range of variables that might affect picture naming performance in TD children, such as frequency, word length, imageability, AoA, and picture complexity.

Performances of children with WFDs on object and action naming can be differentiated from TD children and children with SLI based on error type: They make significantly more semantic errors on both word types (#A and #B), while children with SLI made more omission errors for object names than TD children (#C). The TD children and the children with SLI had similar error types for both object and action naming (#7). In addition, children with WFDs also showed a grammatical class effect: Action names are significantly more difficult to produce than object names plus same error type for verbs and nouns. No effect, however, was found for word frequency or syllable length (#6 and #2), that is, variables that operate at the level of the form (apart from object naming in TD children, #3); we will briefly address this below with reference to specific psycholinguistic models of (lexical) word processing.

Moreover, object and action naming was affected by the same variables (AoA, word imageability, and picture complexity) for both children with SLI and those with WFDs (#4 and #5). For the TD children, AoA affected action naming (#4), and all variables affected object naming (#1).

Generally, children with SLI are less accurate in (object and action) naming than the (younger) TD children, but interestingly, error type cannot differentiate the two groups. This suggests strongly that children with SLI are delayed — but *not atypical*. The fact that the children with SLI also showed no significant grammatical-class effect fully supports our initial hypothesis that CG children with SLI would show an undifferentiated grammatical class dissociation.

Why, then, are action names more difficult for TD children and children with WFDs? We suggest that the factors mentioned above already all play a role: (i) naming actions involves different processes to the naming of objects, (ii) verbs are acquired later, (iii) verbs are semantically more complex, and (iv) verbs are grammatically more complex. Regarding the children with SLI, we do not find a similar, i.e. statistically significant, effect. Of course these children present a delay *and* a word class effect; the reason for this might be a general delay in acquiring words; in addition, individual lexical items are poorly differentiated in their semantic-lexical representations and these representations may not be well organized. Note also that the fact that we find a trend for action names to be worse than object names in children with SLI, even though it is not statistically different as for the other two groups, might be a factor of individual performances: TD children and those with WFDs are arguably more homogenous groups compared to the children with SLI, which is known to present heterogeneously across a range of linguistic abilities. The larger point to make, which one might want to pursue further, is this: Inaccuracies in naming, and perhaps even word-finding problems in general, may vary with the pattern of language deficit.

Let us close with some methodological issues that arose throughout this study. First, standard and standardized testing for SLI inclusion criteria (including non-language

specific measures) are not available in CG for preschool and school-aged children. Second, hearing was screened as within the normal limits, but this is not adequate to detect 'subtle' auditory processing deficits. Note also that neither the amount of speech and language therapy individual children (may) have received at the time of testing or the exact subtype of (SLI) disorder (e.g., grammatical versus phonological) were taken into consideration. As unfortunate as this may be, it is a flaw that underlies the majority of studies on SLI, certainly in the linguistic literature, and it might be a factor that wants to be controlled for more carefully in future investigations, independent of the language(s) the research is carried out in.

Within a psycholinguistic framework (whether following work based on Levelt, 1989 or Caramazza, 1997, to name just two models), we argue that spoken naming difficulties for CG children with SLI (and WFDs) for action and object names arose from a moderate impairment of lexical-phonological representations or access to them as is evident by the large number of omissions. Also, semantic errors arose when the target word node was relatively unavailable and semantically related ones were activated and produced instead.

In conclusion, based on our findings, there is no diagnostic consensus as to whether children with SLI have a specific (word) naming deficit or a more general lexical retrieval deficit. This is a potentially interesting finding in and of itself, since it might constitute another reflection of the often noted heterogeneity of SLI.

### Acknowledgements

We are grateful for all interaction with various members from the COST Action A33, especially Uli Sauerland (the Action's Coordinator), Ewa Hamann (the STSM Manager), and Naama Friedmann. We also acknowledge partial funding of this research through a short-term scientific mission grant awarded to the first author (COST-STSM-A33-3553).

### References

- Bishop, D.V.M., C.V. Adams & C.F. Norbury (2005). "Distinct genetic influences on grammar and phonological short-term memory deficits: Evidence from 6-year-old twins". *Genes, Brain and Behavior* 5, 158-169.
- Caramazza, A. (1997). "How many levels of processing are there in lexical access?" *Cognitive Neuropsychology* 14, 177-208.
- Hatzigeorgiou, N., M. Gavrilidou, S. Piperidis, G. Carayannis, A. Papakostopoulou, A. Spiliotopoulou, et al. (2000). "Design and implementation of the online ILSP corpus". *Proceedings of the Second International Conference of Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC)*, vol. 3, 1737-1740.
- Holton, D., P. Mackridge & I. Philippaki-Warbuton (1997). *Greek: A comprehensive grammar of the modern language*. London: Routledge.
- Kambanaros, M. (2003). *Verb and noun processing in late bilingual individuals with anomic aphasia*. Doctoral dissertation, Flinders University, Adelaide.
- Leonard, L.B. (1998). *Children with specific language impairment*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Levelt, W.J.M. (1989). *Speaking*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Levy, Y. & J. Schaeffer (eds). (2003). *Language competence across populations: Toward a definition of specific language impairment*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Masterson, J., J. Druks & D. Gallienne (2008). "Object and action picture naming in three and five year old children". *Journal of Child Language* 35, 373-402.
- Paul, R. (2001). *Language disorders from infancy through adolescence: Assessment and intervention*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. St. Louis, Miss.: Mosby.
- Rossion, B. & C. Pourtois (2004). "Revisiting Snodgrass and Vanderwart's object pictorial set: The role of surface detail in basic-level object recognition". *Perception* 33, 217-236.
- Sheng, L. & K.K. McGregor (2010). "Lexical-semantic organization in children with specific language



- impairment". *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 53, 146-159.
- Stavrakaki, S. & I.M. Tsimpli (2000). "Diagnostic Verbal IQ Test for Greek preschool and school age children: 12 standardization, statistical analysis, psychometric properties" [in Greek]. *Proceedings of the 8th Conference on Speech Therapy*. Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 95-106.
- Stephany, U. (1997). "The acquisition of Greek". In D.I. Slobin (ed.), *The crosslinguistic study of language acquisition*, vol. 4. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 183-334.
- Tomblin, J.B., N. Records, P. Buckwalter, X. Zhang, E. Smith & M. O'Brien (1997). "Prevalence of specific language impairment in kindergarten children". *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 40, 1245-1260.