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Introduction
Children’s ability to introduce referents in stories may vary according to whether the referent is animate as well as whether an animate referent is a main or secondary character. The Edmonton Narrative Norms Instrument (ENNI; Schneider, Dubé, & Hayward, 2005) developed a measure of referent introduction, First Mentions, that allows the assessment of a child’s ability to introduce referents in fictional stories (Schneider & Hayward, 2010). The current study looks at children’s ability to introduce referents with finer-grained analyses of referent introduction. Stories told by children aged 4-9 from the Edmonton Narrative Norms Instrument were analysed for effects of age, language status (typical development or language impairment), referent animacy, and character prominence on referent introduction scores.

Methods
Stimuli: ENNI story picture sets
Designed to conform to story grammar (Stein & Glenn, 1979)
Each set contains 3 stories that increase in length and complexity.
Each story set contains:
- Two main characters, different animals and genders, introduced in the first picture of the first story in the set.
- A secondary character introduced in the second story.
- Another secondary character introduced in the third story.
- The secondary characters are the same type of animal as one of the two main characters.
Thus the stories increase in referential difficulty; main characters can be distinguished in a number of simple ways (e.g., gender, animal), while the later characters are more difficult to differentiate referentially.
Participants
- ENNI normative sample, ages 4-9
- 300 children with typical development, 50 per age group
- 77 children with language impairment, 10-17 per age

ENNI pictures that introduce referents
Set A
Giraffe, elephant, ball  Second elephant (lifeguard)  Airplane  Third elephant, net

Set B
Rabbit, dog, sandcastle  Second rabbit (doctor)  Balloon  Third rabbit (balloon man)  new balloons
FM scoring:
0 = referent not mentioned
1 = fully inadequate mention, e.g., pronoun
2 = inadequate but informative mention, e.g., definite article + noun
3 = fully adequate mention, e.g., indefinite article + noun
See website for full description of scoring: http://www.rehabresearch.ualberta.ca/enni

Results for Animacy

*Mean numbers of each FM category for TD children by age group*
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*Mean number of each FM category for children with LI by age group*
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ANOVA comparison of FM scores for animate vs. object referents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>pEta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animacy</td>
<td>144.95</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>54.48</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language status (TD-LI)</td>
<td>120.91</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animacy x Age</td>
<td>18.09</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animacy x Lang. status</td>
<td>24.27</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age x Lang. status</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results: FM scores for main vs. secondary characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>pEta²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Character (main vs. secondary)</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language status (TD-LI)</td>
<td>86.21</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character x Age</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character x Language Status</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>n.s. (.13)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age x Language Status</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>n.s. (.07)</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Results

- Main effects were found for age, language status, animacy, and character prominence, with interactions between variables.
- Young children were more successful introducing inanimate than animate referents and main characters than secondary ones.
- Children with language impairments continued to have difficulty with animate and secondary referents until later ages than did children with typical development.
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