Naming consistently reveals an age-related word finding deficit (Albert et al., 1988; Au et al., 1989; Bowles et al., 1987; Burke & MacKay, 1997; Mitrushina & Satz, 1995; Obler et al., 1995; Schmitter-Edgecombe et al., 2000). The task requires an individual to provide lexical information when presented with conceptual information (Humphreys et al., 1999; Martin et al., 1989; Nicholas et al., 1985). Stimuli directly activate semantic representations at the semantic network level, then indirectly activate the word name at the lexical level (Carr et al., 1982; Humphreys et al., 1999; Schmitter-Edgecombe et al., 2000). Aging has not been found to adversely affect semantic memory (Au & Bowles, 1991; Light, 1992; Maxim & Bryan, 1994; Obler et al., 1995; Peach, 1987); other reasons for age-related decline have been investigated, including breakdown in the access route from semantic representation to lexicon, with lexicon and semantic representation both remaining intact (i.e., transmission deficit hypothesis) (Au et al., 1995; Bowles & Poon, 1985; Burke & MacKay, 1997; Burke et al.,1991; Light, 1992; Obler et al., 1995; Rastle & Burke, 1996). Others have suggested that naming context may influence ability to retrieve words efficiently with age. That is, some contexts are easier naming contexts than others: sentence completion is easier than confrontation naming, particularly for objects, and both tasks are easier than definition naming (Hough et al., 1993; Pease & Goodglass, 1978; Rudel et al., 1980). However, influence of aging on this pattern has not been discerned (Goulet et al., 1994; Hough, 1998; Hough et al., 1993; Valdois et al., 1990).

Using descriptive analysis, Hough (1998) identified three distinct performance profiles in a group of typically aging adults on the *Test of Adolescent/Adult Word Finding* (*TAWF*) (German, 1990): 1) normal standard scores (SS) and performance across all subtests; 2) normal SS with specific impairment on Picture Naming: Nouns; and 3) abnormal SS with impaired performance on at least two subtests. The purpose of the current investigation was to confirm these descriptive results in a group of non-neurologically-impaired older adults. Cluster analysis with k-means procedure was used for confirmation of naming patterns on the *TAWF*.

METHOD

Fifty adults (25M, 25F) between 54 and 75 participated. All: passed a modified pure-tone hearing screening for older adults (Ventry & Weinstein, 1983; 1992); had normal or corrected visual acuity; were native English speakers and right-handed. There was no known history of neurological insult, head injury, psychiatric disturbance, alcoholism/substance abuse, learning disability/special education placement for any participant via self-report. All received the *Mini-Mental Status Examination* (*MMSE*) (Folstein et al., 1975) with no participant scoring < 27 (Table 1). All had normal scores on the *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised* (*PPVT-R*) (Dunn & Dunn, 1981) and *Western Aphasia Battery* (*WAB*) (Kertesz, 1982) (Table 2).

The *Test of Adolescent/Adult Word Finding* (*TAWF*) (German, 1990) was administered to all participants. It is a standardized test for examining word retrieval skills in adults, with six subtests: Picture Naming: Nouns, Sentence Completion, Descriptive Naming, Picture Naming: Verbs, Category Naming, and Comprehension. The test was administered/scored according to test procedures.

RESULTS

Overall *TAWF* results (standard scores (SS), mean accuracy percentage) are in Table 2. Hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA) (Ward's cluster method, Squared Euclidean Distance) was performed on these data to confirm presence of subgroups identified by Hough (1998; in press) (Table 3). HCA partitioned the sample into two groups (36 and 14 participants), differentiating between individuals scoring within/below normal, respectively, and confirming *TAWF*

performance, except one participant scoring below normal but clustered into the normal group. Box plots representing group subtest performance scoring above/below normal are in Figures 1 and 2, respectively. A third cluster revealed two distinct subgroups within the sample scoring within normal. Analysis revealed no performance differentials between subtests for one subgroup; however, HCA revealed that participants in the second normal sub-cluster demonstrated specific impairment on Picture Naming: Nouns, with normal performance on other subtests. Thus, HCA partitioned the sample into three distinct groups.

The three subgroups were originally identified by Hough (in press, 1998) via SS and each participant's subtest performance relative to the overall *TAWF* grand mean accuracy percentage (85.1) and one standard deviation below this mean (73.4) (Tables 4, 5, 6). This information, in addition to SS and HCA, confirmed the three *TAWF* patterns. Group One: participants having normal SS and normal accuracy percentages for all subtests (Figure 3). Group Two: participants having normal SS but selective impairment on Picture Naming: Nouns. Mean accuracy percentage on this subtest was greater than one standard deviation below overall *TAWF* grand mean for all participants (Figure 4). Group Three: individuals with SS below normal. Participants exhibited abnormal scores on Picture Naming: Nouns and at least one other subtest (Category Naming) relative to overall *TAWF* grand mean.

A k-means procedure, performed to corroborate findings based on the HCA and mean percentage data, substantiated the HCA, differentiating between the same groups of individuals performing within/below normal. The k-means procedure partitioned the sample into 3 clusters: 27, 9, and 14 participants were designated to Groups One, Two, and Three, respectively, except one participant displaced from Group Three to Group Two from the original analysis (Hough, 1998; in press).

Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between age, gender, education, *PPVT-R* SS, *TAWF* SS and accuracy percentage revealed significant positive correlations between *PPVT-R* and both *TAWF* scores (SS: $r = .885$; $p<.0001$; accuracy percentage: $r = .758$; $p<.0001$).

DISCUSSION

Results confirmed presence of three distinct patterns of performance on the *TAWF* identified by Hough (in press; 1998) with non-neurologically-impaired adults: 1) normal SS and performance across subtests (54%); 2) normal SS with impairment on Picture Naming: Nouns (18%); and 3) abnormal SS with impairment on two subtests (Picture Naming: Nouns, Category Naming) (28%). Word retrieval patterns of these groups may represent variances in naming among typically aging adults. Performance variability between individuals increases with advancing age on naming (Benton & Sivan, 1984; Morse, 1993; Ylikoski et al., 1999). However, significant relationships were not observed between age and *TAWF* or *PPVT-R*.

Group Two and Three subtest patterns revealed lowest and highest performance on Picture Naming: Nouns and Verbs, respectively. Object picture naming is the easiest naming task for normally developing children (Weigel-Crump & Dennis, 1986). Picture naming declines with age regardless of naming objects or actions (Nicholas et al., 1985; Obler et al., 1995; Ramsay et al., 1999); others have found decline in noun naming with inconclusive verb findings (Burke et al., 1991; Peach, 1987). Better performance on Verbs than Nouns may relate to increased verb usage with age (Peach, 1987; Ulatowska et al., 1985). Verbs do not involve as much specificity as needed for nouns (Gentner, 1982). Increased noun specificity requires more interaction between semantic representation and the lexicon during noun production. As one ages, this interaction may be less accessible (Bowles & Poon, 1985; Obler et al., 1995) or disrupted by a transmission deficit (Burke & MacKay, 1997; Rastle & Burke, 1996).

Variables and predictors have been examined for identifiying neurologically healthy individuals at risk for cognitive decline including naming impairments (Flicker et al., 1991; Goulet et al., 1994; Lipton et al., 1996; Neils et al., 1995; Valdois et al., 1990; Ylikoski et al., 1999). Current *TAWF* findings should be considered relative to identified predictors of decline or successful aging.

REFERENCES

Albert ML, Heller HS, & Milberg W (1988). Changes in naming ability with age. *Psychology and Aging*; 3(2), 173-178.

Au R, Albert ML, & Obler LK (1989) Language in normal aging: Linguistic and neuropsychological factors. *Journal of Neurolinguistics,* 4, 347-364.

Au, R. & Bowles N. (1991). Memory influences on language in normal aging. In D. Ripich (ed.), *Handbook of Geriatric Communication Disorders*. Austin, Tx.: PRO-Ed, Inc., pp. 293-305.

Au R, Joung P, Nicholas M, Obler LK, Kass R, & Albert ML (1995). Naming ability across the adult life span. *Aging and Cognition,* 2, 300-311.

Benton AL & Sivan AB (1984). Problems and conceptual issues in neuropsychological research in aging and dementia. *Journal of Clinical Psychology,* 6, 57-63.

Bowles NL, Obler LK, & Albert ML (1987). Naming errors in healthy aging and dementia of the
Alzheimer's type. *Cortex,* 23, 519-524.

Bowles NL, & Poon LW (1985). Aging and retrieval of words in semantic memory. *Journal of
Gerontology,* 40(1), 71-77.

Burke DM, & Mackay DG (1997). Memory, language, and ageing. *Phil. Trans. of the Royal Society of London,* 352, 1845-1856.

Burke D, Mackay DG, Worthley J, & Wade E (1991). On the tip of the tongue: What causes word finding failures in young and older adults? *Journal of Memory and Language,* 30, 542-579.

Carr TH, McCauley C, Sperber RD, & Parmelee CM (1982). Words, pictures, and priming: On semantic activation, conscious identification, and the automaticity of information processing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance,* 8, 757-777.

Dunn LM, & Dunn LM (1981). *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised*. Circle Pines, Minn.: American Guidance Services.

Flicker C, Ferris SH, & Reisberg B (1991). Mild cognitive impairment in the elderly: Predictors of dementia. *Neurology,* 41, 1006-1009.

Folstein MF, Folstein SE, & McHugh I (1975). Mini-mental state: A practical method for grading the cognitive state of patients for the clinician. *Journal of Psychiatric Research,*12, 189-198.

Gentner D (1982). Some interesting differences between verbs and nouns. *Cognition and Brain Theory,* 4(2), 161-178.

German D (1990). *Test of Adolescent/Adult Word Finding*. Allen, Texas: DLM Teaching Resources.

Goulet P, Ska B, & Kahn HJ (1994). Is there a decline in picture naming with advancing age? *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research,* 37, 629-644.

Hough, M.S. (1998). Word finding patterns in normal aging. Paper presented at the annual Clinical Aphasiology Conference, Asheville, June.

Hough, M.S. (In Press) Incidence of word finding deficits in normal aging. *Folia Phoniatrica et Logopedica.*

Hough MS, DeMarco S, Bedsole J, Fox B, & Pabst MJ (1993). Word finding errors in four groups of brain-damaged adults. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, Anaheim.

Humphreys GW, Price CJ, & Riddoch MJ (1999). From objects to names: A cognitive neuroscience approach. *Psychological Research,* 62, 118-130.

Kertesz A (1982). *Western Aphasia Battery*. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Light LL (1992). The organization of memory in old age. In Craik F, Salthouse T (eds.), *The Handbook of Aging and Cognition*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., pp. 111-165.

Lipton RB, Sliwinski M, & Buschke H (1996). Cognitive decline in normal aging: Removing the effects of preclinical dementia. *Neurology,* 46, A402-A403.

Martin N, Weisberg RW, & Saffran E (1989). Variables influencing the occurrence of naming errors: Implications for a model of lexical retrieval. *Journal of Memory and Language,* 28, 462-485.

Maxim J. & Bryan K (1994). *Language of the Elderly: A Clinical Perspective*. San Diego: Singular Publishing Group, Inc..

Mitrushina M, & Satz P (1995). Repeated testing of normal elderly with the Boston Naming Test. *Aging Clinical Experimental Research,* 7, 123-127.

Morse, CK (1993). Does variability increase with age? An archival study of cognitive measures. *Psychology and Aging,* 8, 156-164.

Neils J, Baris JM, Carter C, Dell'aira AL, Nordloh SJ, Weiler E, &Weisiger B (1995). Effects of age, education, and living environment on Boston Naming Test performance. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research,* 38, 1143-1149.

Nicholas M, Obler L, Albert M, & Goodglass H (1985). Lexical retrieval in healthy aging. *Cortex,* 21, 595-606.

Nicholas M, Obler LK, Albert ML, & Helm-Estabrooks N (1985). Empty speech in Alzheimer's
disease and fluent aphasia. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research,* 28, 405-410.

Obler LK, Au R, & Albert ML (1995). Language and aging. In Huntley RA, Helfer KS (eds.), *Communication in Later Life*. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann, pp. 85-98.

Peach RK (1987). Language function; In Mueller HG, Geoffrey VC (eds.), *Communication Disorders in Aging*. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet University Press, pp. 238-270.

Pease DM, & Goodglass H (1978). The effects of cuing on picture naming in aphasia. *Cortex,* 14, 178-189.

Ramsay CB, Nicholas M, Au R, Obler LK, &Albert ML (1999). Verb naming in normal aging. *Applied Neuropsychology,* 6, 57-67.

Rastle KG & Burke DM (1996). Priming the tip of the tongue: Effects of prior processing on word retrieval in young and older adults. *Journal of Memory and Language,* 35, 586-605.

Rudel RG, Denckla MB, Broman M, & Hirsch S (1980). Word finding as a function of stimulus context: Children compared with aphasic adults. *Brain and Language,*10, 111-119.

Schmitter-Edgecombe M, Vesneski M, & Jones DWR (2000). Aging and word finding: A Comparison of spontaneous and constrained naming tests. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology,* 15(6), 479-493.

Ulatowska HK, Cannito MP, Hayashi MM, & Fleming SG (1985) Language abilities in the elderly. In HK Ulatowska (ed.), *The Aging Brain: Communication in the Elderly*. San Diego: College-Hill Press, pp. 125-139.

Valdois S, Joanette Y, Poissant A, Ska B, & Dehaut F (1990). Heterogeneity in the cognitive profile of normal elderly. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology,* 12, 587-596.

Ventry I & Weinstein B (1983). Identification of elderly people with hearing problems. *ASHA,* 25, 37-42.

Ventry I & Weinstein B (1992). Considerations in screening adults/older persons for handicapping hearing impairments. *ASHA,* 34, 81-87.

Weigel-Crump C & Dennis M (1986). Development of word finding. *Brain and Language,* 27, 1-23.

Ylikoski R, Ylikoski A, Keskivaara P, Tilvis R, Sulkava R, & Erkinjuntti T (1999). Heterogeneity of cognitive profiles in aging: Successful aging, normal aging, and individuals at risk for cognitive decline. *European Journal of Neurology,* 6, 645-652.

Table 1: Participant Characteristics Including Gender and Means, Standard Deviations
and Ranges for Age, Educational Level, and *Mini-Mental Status Examination
MMSE*)

Gender		Age	Education	*MMSE*
25 Males	Mean:	63.8	12.1	29.1
25 Females	S.D.:	5.7	2.8	1.6
	Range:	54-75	4-18	27-30

Table 2: *Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised* Standard Scores, *Western
          Aphasia Battery* Cortical Quotients, and *Test of Adolescent/Adult Word Finding
          (TAWF)* Standard Scores and Mean Accuracy Percentage across subtests

	PPVT-R	WAB	TAWF SS	TAWF Mean
Mean:	101.9	97.2	98.7	85.1*
S.D.:	10.4	2.2	19.6	11.7
Range:	88-125	93.9-100	70-157	60-100

*Overall grand mean

Table 3. Hierarchical Cluster Analysis Using Ward's Cluster Method for Identification of
Subgroups Based on *TAWF* Standard Scores

```
 C A S E    0         5        10        15        20        25
Label   Num  +---------+---------+---------+---------+---------+

        6
       41
       17
       19
       16
       20
       35
       50
        2
       14
       15
        5
       12
       34
       18
       47
       37
        7
       36
       22
        3
       32
       42
        4
       13
       43
       44
       11
       23
        1
       21
       38
       48
        8
       40
       28
       30
       31
       27
       49
       24
       25
       39
       46
       29
       33
       45
        9
       26
       10
```

Table 4: Mean Percentage of Accuracy on *TAWF* Subtests for Group One: Participants with
Normal Word Retrieval Scores

Participants			Picture Naming: Nouns	Sentence Completion	Descriptive Naming	Picture Naming: Verbs	Category Naming
	SS	Mean					
2	111	95.8*	97	100	92	95	95
3	95	91.8	89	94	100	90	86
4	105	89.8	92	81	100	90	86
5	104	94.4	95	100	92	95	90
6	111	96.2	97	94	100	95	95
7	109	91.4	95	94	92	86	90
12	113	95.6	84	94	100	100	100
13	102	89.2	81	88	92	90	95
14	116	94.8	92	100	92	95	95
15	123	96.4	95	100	92	95	100
16	146	99	100	100	100	100	95
17	157	100	100	100	100	100	100
18	105	89.6	92	88	92	86	90
19	135	99	95	100	100	100	100
20	128	97.4	97	100	100	95	95
22	93	89.2	89	94	83	90	90
32	102	89.4	89	81	92	95	90
34	113	95.4	89	88	100	100	100
35	100	95.2	100	94	92	95	95
36	102	90.2	89	94	92	81	95
37	109	91.4	92	88	92	90	95
41	111	96.2	97	94	100	95	95
42	105	89.6	95	81	92	90	90
43	102	89	84	88	92	86	95
44	100	87.8	81	81	92	95	90
47	109	91.4	97	88	92	90	90
50	123	96.2	100	94	92	100	95
Mean:	112.2	93.4	92.7	92.5	95.0	93.3	93.8
S.D.:	14.9	3.6	5.6	6.6	3.9	5.1	4.1

Rg: 93-157 87.8-100   81-100   81-100   83-100   81-100   86-100

*Mean percentage of accuracy across all subtests

Table 5: Mean percentage of accuracy on *TAWF* subtests for Group Two: Participants with a selective word retrieval impairment

Participants	SS	Mean	Picture Naming: Nouns	Sentence Completion	Descriptive Naming	Picture Naming: Verbs	Category Naming
1	90	87.6*	73	100	83	100	82
8	109	89	68	100	92	90	95
11	95	85.6	71	94	92	95	76
23	98	89	70	94	100	100	81
28	95	83.8	59	100	75	90	95
38	93	88.6	65	88	100	95	95
40	90	85	68	75	92	95	95
48	90	87.6	70	88	100	90	90
Mean:	95	87.0	68	92.4	91.8	94.3	88.6
S.D.:	6.4	2.0	4.3	8.6	9.0	4.2	7.8
Rg:	90-109	83.8-89	59-73	75-100	75-100	90-100	76-95

*Mean percentage of accuracy across all subtests

Table 6: Mean Percentage of Accuracy on *TAWF* Subtests for Group Three: Participants
With Abnormal Standard Scores

Participants			Picture Naming: Nouns	Sentence Completion	Descriptive Naming	Picture Naming: Verbs	Category Naming
	SS	Mean					
9	78	67.2*	65	75	67	81	48
10	75	62	68	63	50	86	43
21	81	82.8	72	88	83	100	71
24	70	60	43	75	58	57	67
25	83	75	54	88	67	95	71
26	76	64.6	62	75	58	71	57
27	76	66.4	49	56	75	81	71
29	74	74.8	72	75	75	86	66
30	76	64.8	54	63	50	86	71
31	74	65.4	54	75	50	81	67
33	75	59	59	81	50	81	48
39	83	74	54	88	67	90	71
45	78	68.6	54	88	58	86	57
46	81	78.6	70	94	67	95	67
49	72	68.6	49	75	67	81	71
Mean:	76.8	69.1	58.6	77.3	62.8	83.8	63.1
S.D.:	3.9	6.5	9.1	10.8	10.4	10.3	9.9
Rg:	70-83	59-82.8	43-72	56-94	50-83	57-100	43-71

*Mean percentage of accuracy across all subtests

Figure 1.

Figure 2.

Figure 3.

Figure 4.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: Box plot representing range, upper and lower quartiles, and median scores for participants with standard scores within normal limits on *TAWF*.

Figure 2: Box plot representing range, upper and lower quartiles, and median scores for participants with abnormal standard scores on *TAWF* (Group Three).

Figure 3: Box plot representing range, upper and lower quartiles, and median scores for the first cluster of participants with standard scores within normal limits on *TAWF* (Group One).

Figure 4: Box plot representing range, upper and lower quartiles, and median scores for the second cluster of participants with standard scores within normal limits on *TAWF* but selective impairment on one subtest (Picture Naming: Nouns) (Group Two).