



Representations involved in short-term versus long-term word learning by preschool children with and without phonological disorders

Holly L. Storkel, Jill R. Hoover, Junko Maekawa

University of Kansas

Types of Representations

- Sublexical: individual sounds (e.g., /b/, /i/, /t/)
 - ♦ Indexed by phonotactic probability
 - ♦ Phonotactic probability: likelihood of occurrence of a sound sequence
- Lexical: sound sequence corresponding to a whole-word form (e.g., /bit/)
 - ♦ Indexed by neighborhood density
 - ♦ Neighborhood density: number of words that differ by one phoneme from a given word (e.g., /bit/ -- /fit/, /but/, /bin/)

Questions

- Which representations, sublexical or lexical, are involved in word learning by preschool children?
 - ♦ Does this vary across short- versus long-term word learning?
 - ♦ Does this vary by phonological development status?

Participants

- 17 preschool children with phonological disorders, but normal development in other areas of language and cognition
- 17 preschool children with typical development matched in age and vocabulary to the children with phonological delays

	Children with phonological disorders	Children with typical development
Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation Percentile Rank	7* (1-16)	62* (27-93)
Chronological Age	58 months ¹ (41-79 months)	56 months ¹ (36-68 months)
Receptive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test Standard Score	103 ¹ (88-118)	105 ¹ (90-115)
Expressive One Word Picture Vocabulary Test Standard Score	102 ¹ (79-117)	104 ¹ (84-126)

*Significant difference, $t(32) = 9.52, p < 0.001$
¹Comparison not statistically significant, $t(32) < 0.90, p > 0.35$

Short-Term Word Learning Task


- 16 nonwords that fully crossed low/high phonotactic probability and low/high neighborhood density (n = 4 per probability/density condition)
- Nonwords randomly paired with 16 novel objects, balancing semantic category across probability/density conditions
- Nonword-object pairs embedded in a story context, providing 24 exposures to each nonword-object pair
- Learning was measured in a picture-naming test 1-week post-exposure

Short-Term Word Learning Results

- 2 Phonotactic Probability (low, high) x 2 Neighborhood Density (low, high) x 2 Group (phonological delay, typically developing) ANOVA
 - ♦ Phonotactic Probability was significant, $F(1, 32) = 5.34, p = 0.03, \eta_p^2 = 0.14$
 - ♦ Density x Group interaction was significant, $F(1, 32) = 4.44, p = 0.04, \eta_p^2 = 0.12$


Children with phonological disorders

- ♦ No statistically significant results



Children with typical development

- ♦ No statistically significant results



Long-Term Word Learning Task


- 121 real words that fully crossed low/high phonotactic probability and low/high neighborhood density
 - ♦ Across probability/density conditions, words were matched for canonical structure, word length (syllables and segments), age-of-acquisition, and word frequency
- Learning was measured in an expressive picture-naming test and a receptive picture-pointing test

Long-Term Word Learning Results

- 2 Phonotactic Probability (low, high) x 2 Neighborhood Density (low, high) x 2 Test (expressive, receptive) x 2 Group (phonological delay, typically developing) ANOVA
 - ♦ Phonotactic Probability x Group interaction was significant, $F(1, 32) = 6.11, p = 0.02, \eta_p^2 = 0.16$
 - ♦ Neighborhood Density was significant, $F(1, 32) = 21.42, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.40$


Children with phonological disorders

- ♦ Neighborhood Density was significant, $F(1, 32) = 10.83, p = 0.005, \eta_p^2 = 0.40$



Children with typical development

- ♦ Phonotactic Probability was significant, $F(1, 32) = 4.47, p = 0.05, \eta_p^2 = 0.22$
- ♦ Neighborhood Density was significant, $F(1, 32) = 10.67, p = 0.005, \eta_p^2 = 0.40$



Summary & Conclusions

- Both sublexical and lexical representations are involved in word learning by preschool children
 - ♦ Sublexical representations affect short-term or immediate word learning regardless of phonological development status
 - May be critical in initiating word learning and forming an initial representation in long-term memory
 - ♦ Lexical representations affect long-term word learning regardless of phonological development status
 - May be critical in integrating a new representation with existing representations in long-term memory
- Differences in word learning were observed based on the status of phonological development
 - ♦ Potential differences in the use of lexical representations for short-term word learning but results not statistically significant within group
 - ♦ Differences in the use of sublexical representations for long-term word learning
 - Children with normal phonological development appear to show residual effects of phonotactic probability in long-term word learning
 - Children with phonological disorders do not show an effect of phonotactic probability on long-term word learning
 - Different types of representations may be used in parallel in long-term word learning by children with typical development but sequential in children with phonological disorders



This research was supported by NIDCD 06545 and the staff of the Word and Sound Learning Lab. A copy of this poster is available at www.ku.edu/~wrdring. For additional inquiries, contact hstorkel@ku.edu.