SPLH 466 Language Science

Article Assignment 3

McGregor, K.K., Newman, R. M., Reilly, R. M., Capone, N. C. (2002). Semantic representation and naming in children with specific language impairment. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 45,* 998-1014.

　　　Ignore (1) Post Hoc Measures of Visual Complexity; (2) Post Hoc Analysis of Definition and Naming Mismatch; (3) Post Hoc Analysis of Definition & Drawing Concordance

During our in-class discussion, we will focus on the methods and data analysis of this article. You will work in pairs to administer the experimental tasks to each other during class.

Pre-discussion Assignment (10 points) DUE March 14th at the BEGINNING of class

Imagine you are working with a child who tends to make naming errors. You want better understand why this child makes naming errors, so you decide to replicate the procedures described in McGregor et al. (2002). There were three experimental tasks used in this study: Naming, Drawing, and Defining. Additionally, they administered a recognition task for a subset of the children with SLI. ***For your pre-discussion assignment you should come to class prepared to administer each of these tasks to one of your classmates.*** You will each take turns pretending to be a child in the study. Here is what you should prepare:

For when you are the experimenter:

1. Choose three words from the list of stimuli in Appendix A
2. Create a naming task for your three words (i.e. bring or draw pictures of your words)
3. Describe in 1-2 sentences how the researchers judged the drawings
4. Describe in 1-2 sentences how the researchers judged the definitions
5. Describe what the recognition task would look like for each of your three words (see p. 1006 under Post Hoc Analysis of Comprehension and refer to Appendix A)

For when you are the child:

6. Describe what the researchers considered *semantic* errors and *indeterminate* errors. Come prepared to make at least one error of each type when your partner is administering the naming task.

   You should also come prepared to draw drawings that would be rated as high accuracy as well as low accuracy and to provide good and poor definitions.

In class, I will provide you with scoring sheets for administering these tasks to each other. We will spend class administering the tasks to each other, analyzing our "data", and comparing it to what is reported in Tables 3, 4, and 5 in the article.

Post-discussion Assignment (20 points) DUE March 28th at the BEGINNING of class

Prepare a summary of the article with the following sections. Be sure to include headings for each section. ***BE SURE TO USE YOUR OWN WORDS*** Do not simply copy phrases and sentences out of the article. This summary should represent your own work and ideas.

1. Purpose (3 points)
2. Participants (1 point)
3. Independent variables (2 points)
4. Dependent variables (2 points)
5. Procedures (describe the experimental tasks) (2 points)
6. Analysis (describe how they analyzed their data) (2 points)
7. Results (3 points)
8. Conclusions (3 points)
9. Clinical implications (2 points)

#5, 6, and 7 will be the focus of the class discussion. For all of the other sections, you will need to find the information in the article.