UTILITY OF NARRATIVE RETELL LANGUAGE SAMPLING TO EXAMINE TENSE MARKING

ARE YOU CURIOUS …

1. HOW DO YOU COLLECT A LANGUAGE SAMPLE?
2. HOW OFTEN DO SPECIFIC TENSE MARKERS OCCUR IN NARRATIVE RETELLS?
3. HOW CAN WE MEASURE TENSE MARKING?

QUESTIONS WE ANSWERED

1. What is the frequency of tense markers in the examiner scripts of a narrative retell task in English?

   a. Obligatory contexts for individual tense markers range from 0 to 34 depending on the tense marker and Mercer Mayer ‘frog’ story.

   b. Total number of obligatory contexts ranges from 69 to 79 across stories.

   c. Models of tense marker productivity range from 0 to 21 depending on the tense marker and story.

2. Which tense marking measures are most appropriate to track tense marking in narrative retell tasks based on the occurrence of specific tense markers in examiner scripts?

   a. Narrative retells yield obligatory contexts for most (5/6) tense markers [exception present tense].

      • At least 5 obligatory contexts for irregular past tense, regular past tense -ed, and copula be are modeled across all (4/4) frog stories.

      • Obligatory contexts for auxiliary be and do depend on the story.

   b. Sufficient models of productivity for irregular and regular past tense across all frog stories, and for copula be in most (3/4) frog stories.

      • [Note: Productivity scores award up to 5 points per tense marker; 1 point for each unique use of a tense marker].

      • Models of productivity for auxiliary be and do depend on the story.

WHAT WE FOUND

1. Obligatory contexts per tense marker by 4 frog stories

2. Models of productivity per tense marker by 4 frog stories

WHAT DOES IT ALL MEAN?

- Tense Marking Accuracy composite scores can be tracked in any frog story.

- Tense Marking Productivity scores depend on the frog story used.

- Narrative retell scripts can be modified to increase models of target tense markers.

- Note: Changes limit the ability to compare results to the reference database.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank members of the UT Dallas Bilingual Language Laboratory.

This work was funded in part by the Kala Singh Memorial Fund [American Speech-Language-Hearing Foundation], GA-2013-016 [Jerry M. Lewis, M.D. Mental Health Research Foundation]; and Grant 13180 [Anonymous Donor].

Contact info: Svenja.gusewski@utdallas.edu  Disclosure Statement: Authors #1, #2 and #3, Svenja Gusewski, Kimberly Jenkins, and Raúl Rojas, have no relevant financial or nonfinancial relationships to disclose.