

# An overview of the adaptation of MAIN to Lithuanian and research using the Lithuanian MAIN

**Ineta Dabašinskiė\***

Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

**Laura Kamandulytė-Merfeldienė**

Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

---

This paper describes the Lithuanian version of the Multilingual Assessment tool for Narratives (MAIN) and presents research that used MAIN for narrative analysis of Lithuanian-speaking monolingual and bilingual typically-developing children and children with a language disorder. Our target group is preschool and primary school children, as we believe that narrative and general language skills at preschool and early school age should be investigated to establish the tendencies or even standards of this age group and to identify children who need language therapy or help in the learning process. This study is a contribution to the international network of MAIN by reinforcing a better understanding of narrative studies and the use of MAIN in Lithuanian research.

---

## 1 Introduction

Children are constantly exposed to different kinds of narratives. They listen, read and produce stories in interactions at home, school and other social environments. To comprehend and produce narratives, diverse language and cognitive skills are required; therefore, narratives have been investigated extensively in order to demonstrate developmental differences in children's story knowledge and their ability to produce coherent and linguistically cohesive stories (e.g., Berman, 2009; Bliss et al., 1998; Hickmann & Schneider, 2000; Pesco & Kay-Raining Bird, 2016; Sah, 2013). Many studies in the field highlight the correlation between early narrative abilities and later literacy development (Babayigit et al., 2021; Dickinson & McCabe, 1991; McCabe & Rollins, 1994; Suggate et al., 2018). Since language comprehension and expression of knowledge through language are required for much of academic performance (Hughes et al., 1997), therefore, in recent years, the interest in children's narrative development cross-linguistically has increased.

---

\* Corresponding author: ineta.dabasinskiene@vdu.lt

Although the importance of narrative comprehension and production tasks is highlighted by a large number of international scholars (e.g., Bohnacker & Gagarina, 2020), narrative studies in Lithuania can still be characterised as very scarce. The successful cooperation of researchers within the COST program (Action IS0804 Language Impairment in a Multilingual Society: Linguistic Patterns and the Road to Assessment 2009-2013) has provided a solid basis for many languages, including Lithuanian, to start individual research and to participate in cross-linguistic studies that could offer evidence for universal and language-specific features of the results (Armon-Lotem et al., 2015). The first stage of adapting the Multilingual Assessment Instrument for Narratives (MAIN, Gagarina et al., 2019) to Lithuanian took place in 2012–2013, and pilot studies by Ingrida Balčiūnienė were conducted successfully. A few studies using the Lithuanian MAIN have been conducted with young monolingual, bilingual and language-impaired children, and the results are already partly available for readers (Balčiūnienė, 2013; Balčiūnienė & Dabašinskienė, 2019; Balčiūnienė & Kornev, 2016; Blažienė, 2015, 2016a, 2016b; Dabašinskienė & Krivickaitė-Leišienė, 2019).

MAIN has been used with different populations of children (mono- and multilingual, typically developing, and impaired) and adults in a range of different cultures and countries (e.g., Bohnacker, 2016; Gagarina, 2016; Kapalkova et al., 2016; Kunnari et al., 2016; Tsimpli et al., 2016). MAIN contains four different picture tasks that can be used for elicitations of telling and retelling. The studies conducted in Lithuanian mainly used the *Baby Birds* story to elicit narratives from children and have so far only employed the telling mode.

This paper gives a brief description of the Lithuanian language, then shortly describes the main principles of the adaptation of MAIN to Lithuanian and presents the Lithuanian studies that used MAIN for narrative analysis of monolingual and bilingual children and children with language disorders in preschool and early school age.

## 2 A brief description of the Lithuanian language

Lithuanian is the state language of the Republic of Lithuania. Lithuania has 2.6 million inhabitants, and the majority speak Lithuanian; the two biggest minority groups are Russian- and Polish-speaking communities. Since 2004, when Lithuania joined the EU, many Lithuanians have emigrated and formed diasporas in various European countries.

Lithuanian together with Latvian form the Baltic branch of the Indo-European language family. Lithuanian is considered one of the most conservative living Indo-European languages, morphologically rich and highly inflected; thus, the analysis of Lithuanian grammar structures is an important area of interest for linguists. Below we briefly sketch the Lithuanian morphological system.

Lithuanian nouns are inflected for gender (feminine and masculine), number (singular and plural), and case (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, locative, vocative). There are 12 different declension types of the noun. Adjectives agree with the noun in gender, number and case (*graž-us* ‘nice-MS-SG-NOM’, *or-as* ‘weather’-MS-SG-NOM’). Some adjectives are inflected for comparative and superlative degrees (*ger-as* ‘good’, *ger-esn-is* ‘better’, *ger-iaus-ias* ‘the best’) and can have a definite form (*geras-is* ‘the good one’). A few

of them function as nouns (*greit-a* ‘fast’ – *greit-oji* ‘ambulance’). Pronouns have the grammatical categories of gender, number and case. Lithuanian is a pro-drop language; personal pronouns are frequently omitted in the spoken language. Adjectival pronouns agree with nouns in gender, case and number (*šit-a* ‘this-FM-SG-NOM’, *mergait-ė* ‘girl-FM-SG-NOM’) and can have a definite form. Numerals are grouped into cardinal and ordinal. Ordinal numerals function like adjectives and are inflected for number, gender and case (*penkt-as* ‘the fifth-MSs-SG-NOM’, *autobus-as* ‘bus-MS-SG-NOM’). Lithuanian verbs are inflected for person (1st, 2nd, 3rd), number (singular, plural), tense (present, past simple, past frequentative, future) and mood (indicative, subjunctive, imperative). In addition, Lithuanian verbs have non-finite forms (infinitive, active and passive participle, half-participle and gerund). The category of aspect in Lithuanian is still debated (Holvoet, 2014). However, traditional grammatical descriptions consider it a lexical rather than morphological category. Lithuanian has many different types of adverbs that are usually formed from adjectives or verbs; some of them are inflected for degrees of comparison. Prepositions are used with genitive, accusative and instrumental cases of nouns.

As for the derivational morphology of Lithuanian, complex words are mainly formed by employing derivation and composition, the former being much more productive than the latter (Kamandulytė-Merfeldienė et al., 2021). Among the means of derivation, suffixal derivatives are the most typical. In contrast, prefixal and circumfixal (prefixal-suffixal) derivatives, as well as conversions (inflectional changes), are much rarer in the word-formation system of Lithuanian (Stundžia, 2016). In the nominal word-formation system, suffixal derivatives are much more frequent than prefixal ones. In verbal derivation, however, prefixal derivation prevails. In inflectable derived words, suffixes and prefixes, being the main derivation formants, are accompanied by inflections that are usually different from the inflectional paradigm of the base words and, thus, serve as a secondary means of derivation, e.g., *rank-a* ‘arm’ → *rank-ov-ė* ‘sleeve’ (Stundžia, 2016, see also Kamandulytė-Merfeldienė et al., 2021).

The word order in Lithuanian is fairly flexible. It signifies “the functional (theme-rheme) sentence perspective and, to a much lesser degree, the syntactic relations between sentence constituents” (Ambrasas et al., 1997, p. 690). The position of the lexical item in the sentence can change because its syntactic function is shown by its grammatical form (Ramonienė et al., 2019). Thus, word order can be variable and structurally fixed. Variable word order shows different syntactic patterns depending on the information structure and the communicative function of the sentence; expressive and stylistic factors also play an important role (Ambrasas et al., 1997, p. 690). The neutral pattern of word order in Lithuanian is SVO; for example, it is common to place the subject initially followed by the predicate with the object (Ramonienė et al., 2019, p. 239). Structurally fixed word order applies mostly to the placement of prepositions, the interrogative particle, negation and attributive clauses (Ambrasas et al., 1997, p. 691).

Studies on narrative production, in most cases, investigate the story structure (referred to as ‘story grammar’ or ‘macrostructure’) and language (or ‘microstructure’) of the narrative. In Lithuania, the research using MAIN chiefly concentrates on microstructural features of the narrative due to the language characteristics mentioned above. The next section will briefly present the process of adapting MAIN to Lithuanian.

### 3 Adapting MAIN to Lithuanian

The Multilingual Assessment Instrument for Narratives (MAIN) was translated and adapted to Lithuanian by Ineta Dabašinskienė and Ingrida Balčiūnienė. This process consisted of two phases<sup>1</sup> (1<sup>st</sup> version in 2012, 2<sup>nd</sup> version in 2020). The scholars followed the guidelines prepared by Gagarina et al. (2012, 2015, 2019). The first phase of MAIN adaptation included the adaptation of the MAIN instrument during the COST Action IS0804 Language Impairment in a Multilingual Society: Linguistic Patterns and the Road to Assessment (2009-2013) mentioned above. A revised version of MAIN was released in 2019 (Gagarina et al., 2019) and included some changes and clarifications in the instruction part. Thus, minor revision and adaptation were also needed for other languages. The revised version served as a base for the final version of the Lithuanian MAIN, which was prepared in 2020 by Ineta Dabašinskienė.

Like all MAIN language versions, the Lithuanian MAIN consists of four parallel stories (*Cat, Dog, Baby Birds, Baby Goats*). Each story is a carefully designed six-picture sequence based on the theoretical model of multidimensional story organisation (Gagarina et al., 2012, 2019). When the MAIN pictures were developed, the depicted objects and characters were carefully chosen and designed for a variety of cross-cultural environments and piloted in different countries (Bohnacker & Gagarina, 2020), including Lithuania. Thus, the MAIN picture sequences did not require any major re-evaluation or cultural adaptation for Lithuanian. The characters and contexts in the four MAIN picture sets/stories were familiar to children and did not show any difficulties in comprehension. The most significant contribution of the first attempts to adapt and pilot MAIN is related to Balčiūnienė's postdoctoral research (2013).

Following the instructions of the colleagues responsible for the MAIN adaptation to different languages, we have tried to stay as close as possible to the English version; however, due to linguistic peculiarities, especially its morphological and syntactic structures, the Lithuanian version of MAIN is not a direct translation of the English instrument. If the straightforward translation of the stories was not possible, some phrases were substituted with expressions more suitable, natural, and logical for the Lithuanian language. For example, changes have been made when there was a need to consider word order or other syntactic or morpho-syntactic relations. Terms like 'little birds' and 'baby goats' were changed into diminutives (*paukščiuk-ai* 'birds-DIM', *ož-iukai* 'goat-DIM'), some verbs with prefixes (*iš-skrid-o / nu-skrid-o* 'flew away-PREF-PAST-3', *pa-mat-ė* 'saw-PREF-PAST-3) and/or other derivational affixes were used (*nu-si-vij-o* 'chased away-PREF-REF-PAST-3'), and more conjugations of verbs were employed.

The next section gives an overview of results from the studies conducted with the Lithuanian MAIN.

---

<sup>1</sup> The first Lithuanian version of MAIN was developed in 2012. The methodology was translated and adapted into Lithuanian by Ingrida Balčiūnienė and Ineta Dabašinskienė. The second version was revised by Ineta Dabašinskienė in 2020, following the revised MAIN (Gagarina et al., 2019).

## 4 Studies on Lithuanian narratives using MAIN

The adaptation of MAIN and the general awareness of the narrative as an ecological tool (Botting, 2002) for evaluating the language have led to a growing number of publications in the field of the acquisition of Lithuanian. Thus, the three subsections will shortly provide the information on the studies conducted with different populations, first, starting with Lithuanian-speaking monolingual children and adults (Section 4.1), followed by bilingual children (Section 4.2), and finishing with the group of children with developmental language disorder (Section 4.3).

### 4.1 Lithuanian as L1

The first study on MAIN narrative analysis in Lithuanian as L1 was conducted by Balčiūnienė (2013). Her research focused on the main linguistic features, i.e., microstructure of oral narratives by Lithuanian-speaking children and adults. The analysis was based on the data of 240 typically-developing monolingual Lithuanian participants divided into 12 age groups in order to obtain as detailed as possible age-related results: 1) 4–5 years; 2) 5–6 years; 3) 7–9 years; 4) 10–12 years; 5) 13–15 years; 6) 16–19 years; 7) 20–29 years; 8) 30–39 years; 9) 40–49 years; 10) 50–59 years; 11) 60–69 years; and 12) > 69 years. All participants were asked to tell the *Baby Birds* story. The study investigated a number of linguistic features such as general productivity, lexical diversity, and syntactic complexity. The results, regarding the age effect, are not unexpected, and demonstrated that the mean length of utterance (MLU), the total number of words, the type/token ratio (TTR) and syntactic complexity increased with the age. The main findings showed that although children at age four can already create simple narratives, this ability is only fully mastered at the school age or even later, at the age of twenty (Balčiūnienė, 2013), and it is undoubtedly related to the impact of formal education, life experiences and the development of specific cognitive functions (logic, planning, concentration). The findings on the syntactic complexity, lexical diversity, and general productivity of the narratives have illustrated the main features of the Lithuanian narrative microstructure, characteristic of the typically developing language. Although statistical methods were not applied and we do not know if results are statistically significant, this study has served as a basis for further research, including narrative abilities in bilingual and language-impaired children.

### 4.2 Lithuanian as L1 and L2 in bilingual children

The first study that analysed both macro- and microstructural characteristics of Lithuanian as a heritage language was conducted by Balčiūnienė and Dabašinskienė (2019). Typically-developing (TD) sequential bilingual (Lithuanian L1/English L2; n=12) and monolingual Lithuanian children (n=12) (mean age 74 months) were asked to tell the *Baby Birds* story. The bilingual children were born in the UK and were exposed to Lithuanian mostly at home as both parents were speakers of Lithuanian. The examined macrostructural characteristics were story structure, structural complexity, and internal state terms. The parameters were scored following Gagarina et al.'s (2012, 2015) guidelines. Macrostructural measures did not show any

significant statistical differences between the groups: monolingual and bilingual children demonstrated similar results in using *story structure* (SS) elements, and *structural complexity* (SC) did not reveal any significant difference between the groups either. Thus, our hypothesis that bilinguals with schooling experience would outperform monolinguals in macrostructural measures was not confirmed. This prediction was based on Berman's (1988) findings that preschoolers show poorer development than early-school-age children. However, although our subjects had different schooling experiences (the bilingual children have already attended primary school for 2–3 years, while the monolinguals have only been to kindergarten), they are of the same age. Slightly better (but statistically not significant) results for bilingual children suggest that future research with a larger sample of subjects is needed. The microstructure displayed statistically significant differences between the groups regarding general productivity and lexical diversity. The bilinguals performed better for general productivity, but lexical diversity was higher in the group of monolingual children; thus, the results are not straightforward. The parameters of the cohesion, *number of horizontal links* (TNHL) and the *number of temporal/ causal links* (TNTCL), need a more detailed explanation, as a significantly higher number of horizontal links was found in the narratives produced by the bilinguals. However, this finding alone does not indicate better cohesion. The monolinguals were able to combine different cohesive devices (labelling, describing events, horizontal links, and temporal/causal links), while the bilingual group preferred horizontal links only. A dominance of horizontal links in the production of the bilingual group might indicate that other cohesive devices are less-elaborated.

The second study of bilingual Lithuanian-speaking children (Dabašinskienė & Krivickaitė-Leišienė, 2019) primarily aimed to examine the general linguistic performance (microstructure) in Lithuanian using the narrative elicitation (telling) procedure (of the *Baby Birds* story) in a group of Russian-Lithuanian sequential bilingual 6-year-old children (n=25). These children lived in Kaunas and Vilnius and attended a state kindergarten for minority children with Russian as the main language of instruction; additionally, they had 3–4 hours weekly of Lithuanian classes. A control group of monolingual Lithuanian preschool children was tested as well. The results displayed statistically significant differences between the bilingual and monolingual groups for two measures, general productivity and syntactic complexity. The analysis of the story length in words showed that the bilinguals produced much shorter stories than the monolinguals. The bilinguals performed significantly poorer in general productivity and syntactic complexity, but the lexical diversity was on the same level as in the group of monolingual children. Erroneous utterances were found in both groups; however, as it was expected, the bilingual group made significantly more errors than the monolingual one. The paper emphasised the influence of the linguistic environment, as the bilingual children were from two cities: Vilnius (the capital of the country with more linguistic diversity) and Kaunas (the second largest Lithuanian city, more linguistically homogeneous). The error analysis showed that children from Vilnius made more errors, but statistically this result was not significant. No cases were registered for code-switching in bilingual children from Kaunas, whereas children from Vilnius used code-switching. The results of the study suggest that

Russian-speaking children have more possibilities to advance their Lithuanian skills, thus demonstrating better results in an environment that stimulates talking Lithuanian.

Both these studies looked at the narrative production in Lithuanian from different perspectives, i.e., Lithuanian as a heritage language and as L2; thus, the results are hardly comparable. However, both studies emphasise the importance of the linguistic environment and the role of the schooling experience.

#### **4.3 Lithuanian children with a developmental language disorder**

The first, still unpublished, study conducted by Kamandulytė-Merfeldienė and Balčiūnienė examined the lexical diversity and grammatical errors in the narratives of 5–6-year-old TD monolingual Lithuanian children (n=80) and 5–6-year-old monolingual Lithuanian children with Developmental Language Disorder (DLD) (n=80). The DLD children's performance was characterised not only by a higher number of semantic errors but also by the lack of compensatory strategies: while the TD children usually replaced an unknown word with a semantically-related word, the DLD children were not able to find a proper word and used pronouns, adverbs, or fillers instead. This insufficient compensatory strategy led to numerous communicative failures. The study also revealed a large number of grammatical errors in the narratives of the DLD children. They struggled not only with complex grammatical structures, but also with quite simple ones, for example, substituting the nominative inflection *-as* with *-is*, e.g., *kat-is* instead of *katin-as* 'cat-MS-SG-NOM', or confusing the inflectional paradigms of frequent verbs, e.g., *griž-e* instead of *griž-o* 'come back-PAST-3'. The preliminary results suggest that the DLD children, due to limited meta-linguistic and linguistic competence, produce much more erroneous utterances and demonstrate a more restricted vocabulary.

## **5 Future directions**

The discussed studies on Lithuanian narrative production using the MAIN instrument have collected and analysed narratives from around 350 participants. The collected data can be used for more detailed and broader studies encompassing additional parameters and using diverse approaches for the interpretation of the results. The already obtained results have revealed interesting tendencies and it would be important to analyse them further from a language specific (typological), but also from a global story structure perspective. We hope that future studies will collect more data on diverse groups of Lithuanian-speaking children and that they will apply statistical methods for more reliable results. Moreover, we will continue to explore different MAIN picture sets, the telling and retelling modes and additional languages, especially in multilingual settings and populations.

## **References**

- Ambrazas, V. et al. (1997). *Lithuanian grammar*. Baltos lankos.
- Armon-Lotem, S., de Jong, J., & Meir, N. (2015). *Assessing multilingual children: Disentangling bilingualism from language impairment*. Multilingual Matters.

- Babayigit, S., Roulstone S., & Wren, Y. (2021). Linguistic comprehension and narrative skills predict reading ability: A 9-year longitudinal study. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 148–168.
- Balčiūnienė, I. (2013). Daugiakultūriškumo ir kalbos kaitos tyrimai globalizacijos kontekste: rišliojo pasakojimo analizės metodas lietuvių kalbos raidai tirti [Multiculturalism and language change in the context of globalisation: the related narrative analysis method for Lithuanian language development investigation]. *Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto mokslo klasteriai*, 2, 143–152.
- Balčiūnienė, I., & Dabašinskienė, I. (2019). Language dominance in bilingual acquisition: a case study of narrative production in Lithuanian. *Estonian papers in applied linguistics*, 15, 5–19.
- Balčiūnienė, I., & Kornev, A. (2016). Linguistic disfluency in children discourse: Language limitations or executive strategy? Computational linguistics and intellectual technologies. In *Dialogue 2016 - international conference proceedings* (pp. 59–72). Rosijskij gosudarstve.
- Berman, R. (1988). On the ability to relate events in narrative. *Discourse Processes*, 11, 469–497.
- Berman, R. (2009). Trends in research on narrative development. In S. Foster-Cohen (Ed.), *Language acquisition* (pp. 294–318). Palgrave MacMillan.
- Blažienė, A. (2015). Dvikalbių vaikų rišliojo pasakojimo produktyvumas ir leksinė įvairovė [Narratives of bilingual children: general productivity and lexical diversity]. *Taikomoji kalbotyra*, 7, 1–25.
- Blažienė, A. (2016a). Lietuvių kalbos gramatinių ypatybių įsisavinimo anglų kalbos aplinkoje sunkumai [Difficulties in acquiring Lithuanian grammatical features in an English-speaking environment]. *Bendrinė kalba*, 89, 1–20.
- Blažienė, A. (2016b). *Lietuvių vaikų leksikos ir gramatikos raida anglakalbėje aplinkoje* [Lexical and grammatical development of Lithuanian children in an English-speaking environment]. PhD Thesis. Vytautas Magnus University.
- Bliss, L. S., MacCabe, A., & Miranda, E. A. (1998). Narrative assessment profile: discourse analysis for school-age children. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, 31, 347–363.
- Bohnacker, U. (2016). Tell me a story in English or Swedish: Narrative production and comprehension in bilingual preschoolers and first graders. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 37, 19–48.
- Bohnacker, U., & Gagarina, N. (2020). Introduction to MAIN–Revised, how to use the instrument and adapt it to further languages. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, 64, xiii–xxi.
- Botting, N. (2002). Narrative as a tool for the assessment of linguistic and pragmatic impairments. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 18, 1–21.
- Dabašinskienė, I., & Krivickaitė-Leišienė, E. (2019). Lithuanian as L2: a case study of Russian minority children. In S. Lazdiņa, & H. F. Marten (Eds.), *Multilingualism in the Baltic States: societal discourses and contact phenomena* (pp. 205–237). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dickinson, D. K., & McCabe, A. (1991). A social interactionist account of language and literacy development. In J. Kavenaugh (Ed.), *The language continuum* (pp. 1–40). York Press.
- Gagarina, N. (2016). Narratives of Russian–German preschool and primary school bilinguals: Rasskaz and Erzählung. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 37, 11–17.
- Gagarina, N., Klop, D., Kunnari, S., Tantele, K., Välimaa, T., Balčiūnienė, I., Bohnacker, U., & Walters, J. (2012). MAIN: Multilingual Assessment Instrument for Narratives. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, 56, 1–140.
- Gagarina, N., Klop, D., Kunnari, S., Tantele, K., Välimaa, T., Balčiūnienė, I., Bohnacker, U., & Walters, J. (2015). Assessment of Narrative Abilities in Bilingual Children. In S. Armon-Lotem, J. de Jong & N. Meir (Eds.),



- Assessing multilingual children disentangling bilingualism from language impairment* (pp. 243–269). Multilingual Matters.
- Gagarina, N., Klop, D., Kunnari, S., Tantele, K., Välimaa, T., Bohnacker, U., & Walters, J. (2019). MAIN: Multilingual Assessment Instrument for Narratives – Revised. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, 63, 1–36.
- Hickmann, M., & Schneider, P. (2000). Coherence and cohesion anomalies and their effects on children's referent introduction in narrative retell. In M. Perkins & S. Howard (Eds.), *New directions in language development and disorders* (pp. 251–260). Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Holvoet, A. (2014). Veikslo priešpriešos tipai [Types of aspect oppositions]. In A. Holvoet & L. Semėnienė (Eds.), *Gramatinių kategorijų tyrimai* (pp. 141–162). Lietuvių kalbos institutas.
- Hughes, D., McGillivray, L., & Schmidek, M. (1997). *Guide to narrative language. Procedures for assessment*. PRO-ED, Inc.
- Kamandulytė-Merfeldienė, L., Balčiūnienė, I., & Dabašinskienė, I. (2021). The acquisition of the Lithuanian derivational system. In V. Mattes, S. Sommer-Lolei, K. Korecky-Kröll & W. U. Dressler (Eds.), *Acquisition of derivational morphology: a cross-linguistic perspective* (pp. 198–216). John Benjamins.
- Kapalkova, S., Polišenska, K., Markova, L., & Fenton, J. (2016). Narrative abilities in early successive bilingual Slovak-English children: A cross-language comparison. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 37, 145–164.
- Kunnari, S., Valimaa, T., & Laukkanen-Nevala, P. (2016). Macrostructure in the narratives of monolingual Finnish and bilingual Finnish–Swedish children. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 37, 123–144.
- McCabe, A. & Rollins, P. R. (1994). Assessment of preschool narrative skills. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 3, 45–56.
- Pesco, D., & Kay-Raining Bird, E. (2016). Perspectives on bilingual children's narratives elicited with the Multilingual Assessment Instrument for Narratives. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 37, 1–9.
- Ramonienė, M., Pribušauskaitė, J., Ramonaitė, J. T., & Vilkienė, L. (2019). *Lithuanian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge.
- Sah, W. (2013). The development of coherence in narratives: Causal relations. In: *Proceedings of the PACLIC-27* (pp. 173–180).
- Stundžia, B. (2016). Word-formation in the individual European languages. Indo-European. Lithuanian. In P. O. Müller, I. Ohnheiser, S. Olsen & F. Rainer (Eds.), *Word-formation: An international handbook of the languages of Europe*, Vol. 5 (pp. 3089–3106). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Suggate, S., Schaughency, E., McAnally, H., & Reese, E. (2018). From infancy to adolescence: The longitudinal links between vocabulary, early literacy skills, oral narrative, and reading comprehension. *Cognitive Development*, 47, 82–95.
- Tsimpli, I. M., Peristeri, E., & Andreou, M. (2016). Narrative production in monolingual and bilingual children with specific language impairment. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 37, 195–216.