

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY



- Picture naming tasks are a popular way to study influences on lexical retrieval
- Large-scale picture naming databases or normative datasets are available for spoken languages, but lacking for sign languages!
- Factors influencing lexical retrieval include:

Lexical factors that influence sign retrieval: A large-scale ASL picture naming study

> Zed Sevcikova Sehyr & Karen Emmorey San Diego State University







Participants

• 21 deaf native ASL signers (M age = 31, SD = 6, 12 F, 13 native)

Stimuli (from CRL-IPNP) [10]

Objects Actions (n = 272)(n = 250)500ms 500ms 3000ms 3000ms response response How does picture naming in ASL compare to naming in English?

Response recoding set-up & coding



Metadata Control

- Lexical frequency (FREQ) [1, 2]
- **Iconicity** (ICON) [3,4,5,6]
- Phonological neighborhood density (ND) [7,8]; Parameter-based ND [11]: Signs must share Handshape, Location & Mov.
- Lexical class: Nouns vs. verbs [9]

Neighborhood density: Type of mapping: Many neighbors More iconic













What factors influence picture naming in ASL?



ELAN response glosses were compatible with ASL-LEX (asl-lex.org) [11]

Relationships among variables





بب ا		• 二 1	• / 仁					「つ
Ac	FREQ	06**	-	-		17**	.09**	Ö
	ICON	07**	.16*	-	09**		.03*	
	ND	.05**	-	-	06**	.08*		



- Frequency effect replicated for ASL lexical selection favors more frequent signs (i.e., principle of least effort, [12])
- Structured iconic mapping between picture and sign may play a key role in picture naming
- Phonological neighbors compete for retrieval during ASL picture naming
 - **ASL Picture Naming Database**
 - Build a normative database of pictures suitable for ASL; create a standardized test of vocabulary or ASL sign processing Will include lexical & phonological variants

What predicted response times?								
		В	SE	β	t	р	[95%	6 CI]
	ICON	-42	10	09	-4.4	<.000	-61	-23
Actions	FREQ	-23	8	06	-2.8	.005	-39	-7
	ND	2	0.9	.05	2.5	.011	.52	4
Objects	ICON	-27	4.9	09	-5.5	<.000	-37	-17
Objects	FREQ	-31	4.9	1	-6.3	<.000	-41	-22

What predicted sign agreement ((%)
		В	SE	β	t	р	[95%	6 CI]
Actions	ICON	.03	.01	.18	2.1	.037	0	.06
Ohiects	ICON	.02	.01	.14	2.0	.044	0	.03
	FREQ	.04	.01	.23	3.3	.001	.02	.06

- Sign iconicity sped up RTs, improved name agreement, and was the strongest predictor of naming, in line with existing studies [3,4,5,6]
- Frequent names were retrieved faster than less frequent names [e.g. 1,2,3]



- Valid responses (trials):
 - $M_{OBJ} = 88\%; M_{ACT} = 76\%$
- Object names were retrieved faster, more accurately & consistently than action names, similarly to English [9, 10]
- Frequency also predicted better \bullet naming agreement for objects [10]
- Denser neighborhoods may slow down action naming
- ASL nouns and verbs might be processed differently, as found for spoken languages [9, 10]
- References: [1] Oldfield & Wingfield (1964); [2] Emmorey, Gollan et al. (2013); [3] Vinson, D., Thompson, R. L., Skinner, R. & Vigliocco, G. (2015); [4] Baus, C. & Costa, A. (2015); [5] Navarrete, E., Peressotti, F., Lerose, L., & Miozzo, M. (2017); [6] Pretato, E., Peressotti, F., Bertone, C., & Navarrete, E. (2018); [7] Luce & Pisoni (1998); [8] Pierrehubert (2001); [9] Szekely et al. (2003, 2005); [10] Bates et al. (2003); [11] Caselli, Sevcikova Sehyr, Cohen-Goldberg, & Emmorey (2017); [12] Zipf, G. (1949) Supported by NSF BCS1625954 to KE & NSF BSC1918556 to KE & ZS Contact: <u>zsevcikova@sdsu.edu</u>

