



THE COMPREHENSION OF SPATIO-TEMPORAL TERMS
BY CHILDREN OF PRIMARY SCHOOL AGE

Lynette Campbell, B.A. (Hons.)

Thesis submitted for the [Degree of Doctor of Philosophy]

(Degree awarded: Master of Arts)
Department of Psychology

The University of Adelaide

JANUARY, 1982

awarded 14-12-83

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| SUMMARY | (x) |
| STATEMENT | (xiv) |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | (xv) |
| CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 SEMANTIC DEVELOPMENT THEORIES | 4 |
| 1.1.1 Semantic Feature Theory | 4 |
| 1.1.2 Prototype Theory | 30 |
| CHAPTER 2. RESEARCH ON THE SEMANTICS OF ANTONYM PAIRS | 47 |
| 2.1 ACQUISITION OF THE ANTONYM RELATIONSHIP | 47 |
| 2.2 ORDER OF ACQUISITION OF ANTONYM PAIRS | 48 |
| 2.3 COMPREHENSION OF SINGLE TERMS | 53 |
| 2.4 COMPREHENSION OF COMPARATIVE TERMS | 55 |
| 2.4.1 <i>More/Less</i> | 55 |
| 2.4.2 <i>Same/Different</i> | 61 |
| 2.4.3 <i>Bigger/Smaller</i> | 63 |
| 2.5 NONSIMULTANEOUS ACQUISITION OF ANTONYMS | 64 |
| 2.5.1 Dimensional Adjectives | 65 |
| 2.5.2 Contrastive Pairs | 72 |
| 2.5.3 Locatives | 75 |
| CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH ON THE SEMANTICS OF <i>SPATIO-TEMPORAL</i> PAIRS | 81 |
| 3.1 SPATIAL/RELATIONAL ANTONYMS: <i>IN FRONT OF/BEHIND</i> | 81 |
| 3.2 TEMPORAL ANTONYMS: <i>BEFORE/AFTER</i> | 85 |
| 3.3 SPATIO-TEMPORAL TERMS: <i>IN FRONT OF (AHEAD OF) BEHIND; BEFORE/AFTER; FIRST/LAST</i> | 93 |
| 3.4 CONTEXTUAL EFFECTS: NON-LINGUISTIC AND LINGUISTIC | 102 |

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| CHAPTER 4. UNDERSTANDING OF THE ANTONYM RELATIONSHIP IN THE <i>SPATIO-TEMPORAL</i> SEMANTIC FIELD | 108 |
| 4.1 METHOD | 116 |
| 4.1.1 Subjects | 116 |
| 4.1.2 Experimental Design | 117 |
| 4.1.3 Procedure | 118 |
| 4.2 RESULTS | 119 |
| 4.3 DISCUSSION | 124 |
| CHAPTER 5. CHILD AND ADULT CONCEPTIONS OF <i>SPATIO-TEMPORAL</i> TERMS | 130 |
| 5.1 METHOD | 143 |
| 5.1.1 Subjects | 143 |
| 5.1.2 Experimental Design | 144 |
| 5.1.3 Procedure | 145 |
| 5.2 RESULTS | 146 |
| 5.2.1 Method of Analysis | 146 |
| 5.2.2 Dimensional Solutions | 148 |
| 5.2.3 Frequency Data | 150 |
| 5.3 DISCUSSION | 154 |
| CHAPTER 6. THE EFFECT OF SENTENCE CONTEXT ON PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN'S COMPREHENSION OF <i>SPATIO-TEMPORAL</i> TERMS | 163 |
| 6.1 METHOD | 176 |
| 6.1.1 Subjects | 176 |
| 6.1.2 Experimental Design | 177 |
| 6.1.3 Procedure | 178 |
| 6.2 RESULTS | 179 |
| 6.2.1 Analysis of Correct Responses | 180 |
| 6.2.2 Error Analysis | 185 |
| 6.3 DISCUSSION | 189 |

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| CHAPTER 7. THE EFFECT OF SENTENCE CONTEXT ON THE COMPREHENSION OF <i>SPATIO-TEMPORAL</i> TERMS BY ADULTS | 203 |
| 7.1 METHOD | 209 |
| 7.1.1 Subjects | 209 |
| 7.1.2 Experimental Design | 209 |
| 7.1.3 Procedure | 210 |
| 7.2 RESULTS | 212 |
| 7.2.1 Analysis of Correct Responses and Reaction Times | 212 |
| 7.2.2 Error Analysis | 216 |
| 7.3 DISCUSSION | 217 |
| CHAPTER 8. THE EFFECT OF SENTENCE CONTEXT ON THE COMPREHENSION OF <i>SPATIO-TEMPORAL</i> TERMS BY CHILDREN WITH DELAYED LANGUAGE | 228 |
| 8.1 METHOD | 235 |
| 8.1.1 Subjects | 235 |
| 8.1.2 Experimental Design | 236 |
| 8.1.3 Procedure | 237 |
| 8.2 RESULTS | 238 |
| 8.2.1 Analysis of Correct Responses | 238 |
| 8.2.2 Error Analysis | 241 |
| 8.3 DISCUSSION | 242 |
| CHAPTER 9. THE EFFECTS OF AN AMBIVALENT OR DUAL MEANING LINGUISTIC CONTEXT ON PRIMARY SCHOOL CHILDREN'S COMPREHENSION OF <i>SPATIO-TEMPORAL</i> TERMS | 251 |
| 9.1 METHOD | 257 |
| 9.1.1 Subjects | 257 |
| 9.1.2 Experimental Design | 258 |
| 9.1.3 Procedure | 260 |

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| CHAPTER 9 (continued) | |
| 9.2 RESULTS | 261 |
| 9.2.1 Spatial Contexts | 262 |
| 9.2.2 Temporal Contexts | 264 |
| 9.2.3 Analysis of Combined Spatial and Temporal Context Data | 267 |
| 9.2.4 Spatial/Temporal Contexts | 269 |
| 9.3 DISCUSSION | 273 |
| CHAPTER 10. CONCLUSIONS | 282 |
| 10.1 RESEARCH FINDINGS | 285 |
| 10.1.1 The Variables of Verbal I.Q. and Sex | 285 |
| 10.1.2 Corroboration of the <i>Semantic Feature Theory</i> | 287 |
| 10.1.2 (a) Markedness | 288 |
| 10.1.2 (b) Is the spatial sense of <i>spatio- temporal</i> terms primary? | 292 |
| 10.1.3 Children's Conceptions of <i>Spatio- Temporal</i> Terms | 295 |
| 10.1.4 The Effects of Sentential Context | 298 |
| 10.2 APPLICATION OF THE THEORETICAL MODELS TO THE PRESENT RESEARCH RESULTS | 301 |
| 10.3 FUTURE RESEARCH | 304 |
| 10.4 CONCLUSION | 305 |
| APPENDICES | 307 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 361 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 5.1 Dimensional Solution for Child Subjects from P.C.O. | 149 |
| 5.2 Dimensional Solution for Adult Subjects from P.C.O. | 149 |
| 5.3 Frequency (as a percentage) of Each Rating Score for Antonym Pairs | 153 |
| 6.1 Predicted Performance of Child Subjects | 190 |
| 6.2 Experimental Performance of Child Subjects | 190 |
| 7.1 Predicted Performance of Adult Subjects | 219 |
| 7.2 Experimental Performance of Adult Subjects - <u>Percentage Correct</u> | 219 |
| 7.3 Experimental Performance of Adult Subjects - <u>Reaction Time</u> | 219 |
| 8.1 Predicted Performance of Language-Delayed Subjects | 244 |
| 8.2 Experimental Performance of Language-Delayed Subjects | 244 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| 2.1. Featural Analysis of Dimensional Adjective Pairs. | 49 |
| 4.1. Predicted order of Acquisition of Word Pairs in the <i>Spatio-Temporal</i> Semantic Field based on E. Clark (1972). | 112 |
| 4.2. List of 10 <i>Spatio-Temporal</i> Pairs used in the Study. | 117 |
| 4.3. The two Experimental Lists (L1 and L2) used. | 118 |
| 4.4. Classification of All Subjects' Responses | 120 |
| 4.5. Classification of Subjects' Responses to Each Word Pair. | 121 |
| 4.6. Sex x Response Type. | 122 |
| 4.7. I.Q. Score (<i>P.P.V.T.</i>) Response Type. | 122 |
| 4.8. Three-factor A.O.V. (Subject x Response x Stimulus Term) | 123 |
| 5.1. Dictionary Definition of <i>Spatio-Temporal</i> Terms. | 132 |
| 5.2. Componential Analysis of English Prepositions. | 135 |
| 5.3. Percentage Variance Attributed to the First Two Dimensions of the <i>P.C.C.</i> Solutions for Child and Adult Groups. | 148 |
| 5.4. Child Mean Similarity Ratings for Each Word Pair. | 151 |
| 5.5. Adult Mean Similarity Ratings for Each Word Pair. | 151 |
| 6.1. Mean Values and Ranges of Age and I.Q. (<i>P.P.V.T.</i>) for Subjects at Each Year Level. | 176 |
| 6.2. Correct Responses for Each Year on <u>Congruent</u> versus <u>Incongruent</u> Sentence Pairs. | 180 |
| 6.3. Number of Correct Responses x Experimental Sentence Pairs at Each Year Level. | 181 |

| LIST OF TABLES (continued) | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 6.4. Significant Results of Three-way A.O.V. (Subjects x Spat x Cong) on the Data for Each Year. | 182 |
| 6.5. Four-way A.O.V. (Gr x Subjects x Spat x Cong) Results. | 183 |
| 6.6. Percentage of Responses in Each Year Category for Each Year Level. | 186 |
| 6.7. Number of Errors of Each Type made by Subjects at Each Year Level on <u>Congruent</u> and <u>Incongruent</u> Sentence Pairs. | 187 |
| 6.8. <i>Semantically Appropriate</i> Error Responses on <u>Incongruent</u> Sentence Pairs Considered in Relation to All Other Errors at Each Year Level (as percentages). | 188 |
| 6.9. <i>Predicted</i> versus <i>Non-Predicted</i> Errors on Each <u>Incongruent</u> Sentence Pair at Each Year Level. | 189 |
| 7.1. Number of Correct Responses x Experimental Sentence Pair. | 213 |
| 7.2. Three-way A.O.V. (Subjects x Spat x Cong) Results. | 214 |
| 7.3. Reaction Time x Experimental Sentence Pair. | 214 |
| 7.4. Number of Correct Responses x Presentation Order. | 215 |
| 7.5. Type of Error Response x Experimental Sentence Pair. | 216 |
| 7.6. <i>Predicted (P)</i> versus <i>Non-Predicted (N.P.)</i> Errors on Each <u>Incongruent</u> Sentence Pair. | 217 |
| 8.1. Prevalence of Speech and Language Disorders in a Therapeutic Population. | 229 |
| 8.2. Mean Values and Ranges of Chronological Age, Mental Age, Verbal I.Q. and Percentile for Experimental Subjects. | 236 |
| 8.3. Number of Correct Responses x Experimental Sentence Pair. | 239 |

| LIST OF TABLES (continued) | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 8.4. Significant Results of Three-way A.O.V. [(Sub x Spat x Cong) and (Sub x Mark x Cong)]. | 240 |
| 8.5. Percentage of Correct Responses on <u>Congruent</u> and <u>Incongruent</u> Sentence Pairs x Sex. | 240 |
| 8.6. Type of Error Response x Experimental Sentence Pairs. | 241 |
| 8.7. <i>Predicted</i> (P) versus <i>Non-Predicted</i> (NP) Errors on each <u>Incongruent</u> Sentence Pair. | 242 |
| 9.1. Mean Values and Ranges of Age and I.Q. (<i>P.P.V.T.</i>) for Subjects at Each Year Level. | 258 |
| 9.2. Spatial Responses in Spatial Contexts for Each Year. | 262 |
| 9.3. Spatial Responses in Each Spatial Context for Each Year. | 263 |
| 9.4. Significant Results of Chi-Square Analyses Performed on the Spatial Contexts Data. | 264 |
| 9.5. Temporal Responses in Temporal Contexts for Each Year. | 265 |
| 9.6. Temporal Responses in Each Temporal Context for Each Year. | 265 |
| 9.7. Significant Results of Chi-Square Analyses Performed on the Temporal Contexts Data. | 266 |
| 9.8. Significant Results of Four-way A.O.V. (Sub x Sex x Conx x Stim) Performed on the Spatial and Temporal Context Data for Each Year. | 267 |
| 9.9. Five-way A.O.V. (Gr x Sub x Sex x Conx x Stim) Results. | 268 |
| 9.10. Spatial Responses and Temporal Responses in Spatial/Temporal Contexts for Each Year. | 269 |
| 9.11. Spatial and Temporal Responses in Each Spatial/Temporal Context for Each Year. | 270 |
| 9.12. Significant Results of Chi-Square Analyses Performed on Spatial/Temporal Context Data. | 271 |

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 9.13. Significant Results of Three-way A.O.V. (Sub x Sex x Stim) on <u>Variability Index</u> Data for Each Year in Spatial/Temporal Contexts. | 272 |
| 9.14. Four-way A.O.V. (Gr x Sub x Sex x Stim) Results. | 273 |

SUMMARY

The research conducted in this thesis examined the development of the semantic system of *spatio-temporal* terms in children of primary school age. This investigation involved a series of experiments which looked at the child's awareness of the antonym relationship in this field as well as his conceptualisation of a limited subset of *spatio-temporal* terms. Later experiments further studied the effects of a linguistic context on the child's comprehension of these terms. In addition, data were gathered from both adult and language-delayed subjects in order to determine if children in the 7:0 to 12:0 year age group were functioning at an adult level with respect to their comprehension of *spatio-temporal* terms, and furthermore, to ascertain whether linguistic performance on a task involving these terms was affected by a developmental delay in language acquisition.

This research was conducted in the light of the *Semantic Feature Theory* as expounded by E. Clark (1973c) and H. Clark (1973). As such, two of the major hypotheses tested in the experiments were,

(1) Children will make more errors on *marked* than on *unmarked* members of *spatio-temporal* antonym pairs.

(2) The spatial sense of *spatio-temporal* terms will be learnt before their temporal sense. This will result in differential error rates to terms which are seen as being spatially dominant (e.g. *in front of*, *ahead of*, *behind*) and temporally dominant (e.g. *before*, *after*).

The first experiment undertaken looked at the acquisition of the antonym relationship in the *spatio-temporal* semantic field by Year 3 (7:0 to 8:0 year old) children. The results of this study demonstrated that for children of this age the notion of "opposite" was a firmly established semantic relation. Therefore, it was concluded that any comprehension errors they make with such terms can be attributed to their dual meaning and how aware the children are of this dual meaning.

Consequently, the second experiment investigated both the child's and adult's conceptualisation of a limited subset of *spatio-temporal* terms (*in front, ahead, behind, before, after, first, last*) by asking them to rate such terms for similarity of meaning. This study found that both child and adult subjects perceived these terms as existing in a 2 dimensional semantic space whose dimensions could be labelled spatial and temporal. Furthermore, this semantic space was more fully differentiated in adults than children. Therefore, some development had occurred in the semantic system of these 7 *spatio-temporal* terms.

A third experiment was therefore conducted to consider this developmental change and how it was affected by linguistic, in particular sentential, context. This experimental design was employed with three subject populations, that is 7:0 to 12:0 year old children, adults, and language-delayed children (who were functioning linguistically at an 8:0 year old level according to Form (a) of the *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test*). The results of each study indicated that all subject groups were aware of how the semantic constraints operating within the structure of a sentence

affected their interpretation of the *spatio-temporal* terms *in front of*, *ahead of*, *behind*, *before* and *after*. Furthermore, this awareness seemed to reach an adult competence at Year 4 or around 9:0 years of age as was evidenced by the performance similarities of Year 4 and adult subjects on this task. In addition, the group of language-delayed subjects were found to be different and not merely delayed with respect to linguistic ability on this task as was indicated by a comparison of their performance with that of their linguistic age peers (Year 3 or 8:0 year olds).

The last experiment conducted, examined in more detail the effects of linguistic context on children's comprehension of the *spatio-temporal* terms *in front of*, *behind*, *before* and *after*. In addition to employing spatial and temporal contexts, as in the preceding study, this experiment utilised contexts whose meanings were ambivalent, that is, spatial/temporal contexts. (Such contexts allow either a spatial or a temporal semantic interpretation.) The findings of most interest in this study were those in spatial/temporal contexts. Subjects from Years 3 to 7 gave responses whose dominant meaning was temporal, that is, *before* and *after*, in such contexts. This was seen as indicating that children were aware of the dual sense of the temporally dominant pair *before/after* when provided with a spatial/temporal linguistic context. However, such a context failed to elicit the double meaning in children's semantic interpretations of the spatially dominant terms *in front of* and *behind*.

Overall, the results of these studies indicated few performance differences which could be attributed to variations in Verbal I.Q. or sex. This latter finding supports the research cited by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) which indicates that few reliable sex differences exist in linguistic abilities in the middle years of childhood. Furthermore, no performance differences were found which could be attributed to the *markedness* of the *spatio-temporal* term, in line with those predicted by E. Clark (1973c). Similarly, the spatial sense of *spatio-temporal* terms was not found to be prior in acquisition as predicted by H. Clark (1973) as differential error rates to spatially and temporally dominant terms generally proved to be insignificant.

In conclusion, a theoretical model was postulated to account for the primary school age child's comprehension of *spatio-temporal* terms. This model saw a possible amalgamation of *Semantic Feature* (E. Clark, 1973c) and *Prototype Theories* (Nelson, 1974a; Rosch, 1973; Palermo, 1978) as envisaged by Bowerman (1978b). Such a model incorporates the semantic featural notion of the former and the prototype concept of the latter to explain how the word-field of *spatio-temporal* terms is conceptualised by primary school age children and how this conceptualisation is affected by sentential context.

STATEMENT

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except when due reference is made in the text.

Signed__

Lynette Campbell

January, 1982.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisors Dr. J. Ingram and Mrs. I. Proske for their assistance throughout this research project. Special thanks are extended to Mrs. I. Proske for her support and readiness to read each draft of the manuscript in the final months.

I also wish to extend my appreciation to Mr. R. Willson for his help and guidance with the more difficult statistical analyses of the data.

I am grateful to Mrs. M. Blaber for both her ability to and willingness to type the manuscript even under heavy work pressure.

To the many students who participated in the research I give my thanks for your time and patience. My appreciation is also extended to the Principals and Teachers of Clapham, Hectorville, Magill, Marryatville and Unley Primary Schools who willingly allowed me to enter their schools to conduct my research.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents for their support and encouragement throughout the years of my research. I am also grateful for my mother's invaluable assistance in typing the first draft of the manuscript.
