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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

When art is good, it is infectious; when experience is vital, even though vicarious, it produces a response in the participant. What is the response produced in members of an audience by the experience of perceiving the oral interpretation of a selection of literature? According to the theory of oral interpretation, the audience is joined in the communion of the author and the reader when the interpretation is artistic. Under certain circumstances, the audience might even embrace not only the reader and the author, but also one another in a kind of union.

What is the nature of this audience response? What are the cues in performance that influence it? To what extent can these cues be isolated by perceiving performances in different ways: the face-to-face situation, the television situation, and the audio tape situation? These are the over-all questions that this exploratory investigation is posing.

Importance of the Study

The preceding questions stem from certain basic considerations that are of importance in this age. The
fact that our time is one of accelerated expansion is primary. Transportation procedures, communication devices, new techniques for the transmission of knowledge, efficiency of production, new approaches to the study of speech, faster methods, complex specializations: all indicate that a rapid growth in many directions is dwarfing the traditional culture. Scientific advances on outer space and scientific advances on finer analyses of man contribute to the opening of broader vistas for development.

Evidences of a tendency to lull creative or independent thinking into a state of passivity also are prevalent. The very accelerated expansion with its technical development and rise of automation is drawing more and more people into working at routine tasks and into being made content with an escape type of mass entertainment. The few are being challenged by creative enterprises and expanding activities; the many are being relegated to the carrying out of routine tasks through the specialized techniques of big business, the assembly line, and mass communication.

The specific demands and the detailed needs of the age are also creating opportunities for the development of more and more specialists. Technical advances and expanding endeavors foster specialization as a way of
meeting their needs. The rapid tempo at which these developments are taking place encourages the narrow depth of the specialist without providing also for the wide base of the generalist to cope with the problems of relationships in the culture of a new age.

Today, a further question, stemming from the preceding analyses, obstructs the view. It concerns the development of certain qualities of human sensitivity and compassion and imaginative conceptualization that leads to the survival of human beings who acknowledge the worth of both the individual and humanity. That literature can make a contribution to this development has long been accepted in the humanities tradition. That the oral interpretation experience also has a valuable contribution to make to this development is being explored experimentally in this study.

Any insight into the nature of audience response in the oral interpretation experience, into the cues that influence the response, and into ways of isolating such cues is an important exploratory step toward developing more effective and more efficient methods of fostering those qualities of sensitivity and compassion that make for human worth. The fostering of such qualities may be vital in the nuclear age to the question of mere physical survival.
Statement of the Problem

The general purpose of this study was to investigate possible differences in audience response to the oral interpretation of three selected short stories when the performances were perceived by three different methods: face-to-face; television; and audio tape. The audience response was measured in four ways: (1) aesthetic response; (2) degree of interest; (3) quality of technique in performance; and (4) comprehension of content. The experimental design was planned to indicate differences between methods and between stories in aesthetic response, in degrees of interest, in quality of performance, and in comprehension of content, if differences exist.

In order to locate possible differences that might reveal indications about the nature of the audience response, about the cues that influenced the response, and about ways of isolating such cues, the following questions were asked.

About aesthetic response

1. Is there any significant difference in aesthetic response when the oral interpretation of a short story is perceived by three different methods: face-to-face, audio tape, and television?

2. Is there any significant difference in comprehension of the aesthetic response groups when the oral
interpretation of a short story is perceived by the three preceding methods?

3. Is there any significant difference in aesthetic response when three short stories of differing content value are perceived by the same method?

About degree of interest

1. Is there any significant difference in degree of interest when the oral interpretation of a short story is perceived by three different methods: face-to-face, audio tape, and television?

2. Is there any significant difference in comprehension of the degree of interest groups when the oral interpretation of a short story is perceived by the three preceding methods?

3. Is there any significant difference in degree of interest when three short stories of differing content value are perceived by the same method?

About quality of technique

1. Is there any significant difference in the judgment of quality of technique when the oral interpretation of a short story is perceived by three different methods: face-to-face, audio tape, and television?

2. Is there any significant difference in comprehension of the judgment of technique groups when the oral
interpretation of a short story is perceived by the three preceding methods?

3. Is there any significant difference in judgment of the quality of technique when two short stories of differing content value are perceived by the same method?

Each of the three questions under the preceding sections was developed into a series of null hypotheses in order to collect specific information that would provide answers to the preceding questions within the limitations of this experiment. The following is a sample set of hypotheses developed about aesthetic response.

1. There is no significant difference in aesthetic response between the face-to-face method and the audio method of perceiving a performance of oral interpretation.

2. There is no significant difference in comprehension of the aesthetic response groups between the face-to-face and the audio methods of perceiving a performance of oral interpretation.

3. There is no significant difference in aesthetic response between the television method and the audio method of perceiving a performance of oral interpretation.

4. There is no significant difference in comprehension of the aesthetic response groups between the television and the audio methods of perceiving a performance of oral interpretation.
5. There is no significant difference in aesthetic response between the face-to-face method and the television method of perceiving a performance of oral interpretation.

6. There is no significant difference in comprehension of the aesthetic response groups between the face-to-face and the television methods of perceiving a performance of oral interpretation.

7. There is no significant difference in aesthetic response between stories one and two when perceived by each of the three methods.

8. There is no significant difference in aesthetic response between stories one and three when perceived by each of the three methods.

9. There is no significant difference in aesthetic response between stories two and three when perceived by each of the three methods.

A similar set of nine hypotheses was prepared for the groups using the degree of interest scale and another set for those using the technique scale.

Definition of Terms

Certain terms that were used in this study were defined in the following ways:

Aesthetic response. This was indicated in the study by the score obtained from the aesthetic response scale.
which gave a numerical value to the response to the situation, to the emotions and mood, and to the imagery in the literature as read orally.

**Degree of interest.** This was indicated by the score obtained from the degree of interest scale which included seven steps on a bi-polar scale between extremely interesting and uninteresting.

**Technique.** This was indicated by the score obtained from the technique scale which gave a numerical value to the judgment of technique in three categories: facial expression, other bodily expression, and vocal expression.

**Comprehension.** This was indicated by the number of correct responses obtained to questions about the content of the three short stories that were read orally to the audience. The questions were limited to matters of intellectual content.

**Short story.** This term indicated an imaginative prose selection, known in literary types as a short story.

**Oral interpretation or interpretation.** This term was defined as the communicating of a literary selection to an audience by an oral reading that is the "full revelation of whatever experience is inherent in the literature."^1

---

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature pertinent to this study is to be found in areas that are concerned with some kind of audience response to various elements in the investigation. There is no study in the experimental literature that is concerned directly with the response to the oral interpretation of literature as the problem was set up for this investigation. These were the six areas for review: (1) response to television presentations in the teaching-learning process; (2) response to visual cues in the non-verbal, vocal communication situation; (3) response to aural cues in the non-verbal, vocal communication situation; (4) response to listening cues in the communication situation; (5) response to content cues in the communication situation; and (6) influence of perception upon response in the communication situation. The present position of research in each of these areas is presented briefly as it pertains to the investigation under consideration. There is no attempt to present a detailed review of the literature in each of the areas.
Response to Television Presentations in the Teaching-Learning Process

One small section of a recent study is concerned with the response of a television audience to the reading of dramatic literature, but even in this case, the focus of the study is on the response to the visual production techniques, not on the response to the literature as presented. Cobin and McIntyre presented the dialogue in a selection of dramatic literature from one camera that remained fixed to one audience; to a second audience, the character differentiation was presented by switching between two cameras. Two different passages were presented to the audiences in reverse order for two trials. The students responded to the overall impact of the reading on a seven-point scale ranging from excellent to miserable. They also rated the television technique on a similar scale. The differences were measured by a t-test. The television technique ratings were significantly different in favor of the fixed, one-camera technique for both trials on one of the passages, but not on the other passage. The overall impact of the reading also showed a significant difference in favor of the

1 Martin T. Cobin and Charles J. McIntyre, The Development and Application of a New Method to Test the Relative Effectiveness of Specific Visual Production Techniques for Instructional Television (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1961).
fixed, one-camera technique for the same passage, but for only one of the trials.

The Cobin-McIntyre study also contains a section in which the audio dimension alone is contrasted with the audio plus video dimension in the reading of two similar literary passages. These passages were read to the student audiences after they had received a careful explanation over television of the contribution to comprehension of the syntactic patterns of the spoken language. The passages were presented first with distorted syntactic patterns, then with proper patterns as tests to the two groups, while the sequence of the passages and the audio and audio plus video dimensions were reversed from trial to trial. The students responded to comprehension tests on the content of the passages. When the scores were analyzed by a t test, no significant differences were disclosed.

The two preceding sections are the only parts of the study by Cobin and McIntyre that are concerned with the oral reading of passages from literature. Some other sections of the study, however, that are concerned with the response to televised instruction by means of specific techniques, have implications for the present investigation.

One section of the experiment explored the differences in audience response to instruction presented by the audio dimension only and by the audio and visual dimensions. No
significant difference was disclosed on comprehension of instructional content as measured by the objective questions; no significant differences were disclosed on any of the more clearly evaluative dimensions on the semantic differential type attitude scale. Significantly different reactions in favor of the group receiving instruction by the audio plus video method were noted on three dimensions: fast-slow; soft-hard; and large-small.

The difference in audience response to a constant close-up of the instructor with no camera movement and to a variety of shots was investigated. An analysis of variance for a ten-dimension semantic differential type attitude scale gave an F significant at the one percent level on both trials. A pattern of preference for the constant close-up was indicated by t test comparisons on individual scales although there is not a significant difference for every scale. No significant difference was noted in the t test comparisons of achievement on tests of instructional content.

The preceding production procedure was repeated in another section of the experiment in which any difference in eye contact between the two methods was removed. The responses to attitude scales and to instructional content revealed no significant differences between the methods.
A summary of the results of the preceding experimental study with its 26 sections suggests that the students reacted favorably to simplicity of production. The preceding study is reported in some detail because of the pertinence of some of its implications to the present investigation.

Implications from the television research in the teaching-learning process have been summarized by Holmes in the following way:

The results from reports seem to indicate that students' attitudes toward television are more accurately described as attitudes toward other elements involved in the total teaching-learning process.

There seems to be little relationship between information gain and students' attitudes toward television.

The instructor is by far a more reliable predictor of information gain and students' attitudes, than is a particular communication condition.

Small classes, in numbers of students, are more important to students than the communication conditions.

An experienced instructor is much more important, in the opinion of students, than are the communication conditions.²

The preceding summary of implications is based upon the pertinent research reports available through the published literature or through personal solicitation through March 31, 1959. When Holmes speaks of "communication conditions" in the preceding summary, however, it is important to remember that he is referring only to the media used—television or face-to-face performance. Such items as instructor and class size are vital parts of "communication conditions" when the phrase is defined in communication theory.

A report from the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Advancement of Education lends support to the preceding implications and adds corroborating data from the National Program in the Use of Television in the Public Schools and other programs at the elementary and secondary school and college level, some of which were included in the Holmes' analysis.  

3 Response to Visual Cues in the Non-Verbal, Vocal Communication Situation

Experimental studies in this area show considerable variance in procedures, including variety in methods of

scoring the judgments of the audience members. They offer some evidence, nevertheless, that audiences do interpret visual cues to the speaker's emotions and attitudes.

An early study by Feleky dates back as far as 1914. In it she used photographs of herself in which she tried to express various emotions and have subjects match them with words chosen from a list provided. An expression was named by a specific word with a fairly high frequency, but the results were somewhat misleading since words with similar meaning were also selected for the same expression.

During the next years, a number of investigators used still pictures, photographs, or sketches made from photographs, to have subjects identify emotions in facial expression. Landfeld and Ruckmich observed that areas of common feelings and "primary emotions," such as joy and sorrow, love and hate, can be observed more accurately. As with other studies, however, it was difficult to note what was accurate without a criterion.

---


Landis' approach to the study of facial expression was somewhat different. He actually tried to arouse various emotions in his subjects, to take films of the expressions, and to compare with photographs that had been taken previous to the experimental procedure. He also analyzed recorded verbal reactions. He concluded that there was no evidence in his experiment that "in a given situation of emotional nature, there will be for most individuals a certain pattern of facial expressions."

Blake made a study of bodily expression excluding the face and concluded that the face made a significant contribution to the interpretation of emotional expression.

A study that tackled the problem of language and word meanings connected with facial expressions was that of Dusenbury and Knower. Movies, slides, and printed photographs were used as stimuli; the expressions were matched

---


8 Ibid., p. 478.

9 William H. Blake, A Preliminary Study of the Interpretation of Bodily Expression (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1933), No. 574.

with groups of three words that seemed best to name the expression under consideration. The word groups had been set up as criteria from a previous step that had subjects match them with three commercial sets of pictures. The conclusions offered by these investigators are extremely pertinent to the present study:

Interpretation of the facial expression of emotional tendencies and attitudes may be made with a high degree of reliability.

There are significant individual and group differences in ability correctly to interpret facial expressions of the emotions.

Patterns of facial expression extended in time as on a short moving picture are judged more accurately than are still photographs of the same emotional tendencies.

Accuracy in the interpretation of facial expression of the emotions is influenced by the conditions under which such expressions are judged.\textsuperscript{11}

A later experiment by Tolch built upon the study by Dusenbury and Knower to investigate whether or not expressions of emotion could be consistently identified with only visual cues of the face. He concluded "that people do communicate with each other facially and that the meaning is specific and clear when the expression is placed in the proper context."\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., p. 434.
Other studies have been made about the response to visual cues of emotion, but the preceding investigations contain clues that are pertinent to the present experiment.

A study by Krug in the area of intelligibility was also loosely related to visual cues and to auditory and content cues of the next two sections. He concluded that "the contribution of visual cues to the intelligibility of speech presented in a bisensory manner is relative and dependent upon the type of speech sample presented, the intensity of the auditory component, and the configuration of hearing loss."¹³

Response to Aural Cues in the Non-Verbal, Vocal Communication Situation

A number of studies have been concerned with the voice and its relation to personality through the years. The voice has also been reported to carry meaning besides that of the language symbols. This idea is pertinent to the present investigation. Dusenbury and Knowler presented some empirical evidence to indicate that the voice revealed

information about the attitudes, moods, emotions, and personality of the speaker. This information was secured from the inflectional patterns, the tones, the loudness, and the rate of the speaker through non-verbal, vocal communication.\(^{14}\) That the degree of emotional tension together with the age, sex, and personality of the speaker can be evidenced from the voice is reported by Duncan.\(^{15}\)

Some other investigations that are very pertinent to the present study have been conducted by Davitz and Davitz.\(^{16}\) They are concerned with the identification of emotions through content-free vocal communication. The first study was concerned with relatively untrained speakers and


and listeners. Could the one group communicate feelings reliably by content-free, nonverbal speech; could the other group identify the expressions of feeling reliably? The results showed that feelings could be identified beyond chance expectancy, but the success was not uniform. Anger was identified correctly 65 percent of the time; pride and love less than 25 percent of the time.

The next study tried to account for this difference in identification by posing the following question: Could objective similarity of expression be a function of experienced or subjective similarity of the feelings portrayed? The investigators hypothesized that if this is true, "the accuracy of discrimination between the expressions of two feelings should be inversely related to the subjective similarity of those feelings." They found that "accuracy of communication and subjective similarity to other feelings do indeed covary; the correlation of -0.29, while statistically significant, does not, however, have much predictive value." 17

The investigators then studied the relation of emotional dimensions to speech characteristics. They used the three dimensions of emotional meaning, valence, strength, and activity, from the research of Osgood, Suci, and

---

17 Ibid., "Vocal Correlates of Emotional Communication," p. 82.
They used the four speech characteristics of loudness, pitch, timbre, and rate. Judges responded to a Semantic Differential type rating scale after listening to recorded validated stimuli for loudness, pitch, timbre, and rate. From these data, the investigators studied the relation between the three aspects of emotional meaning and the four qualities of speech.

As a result of the study, it was found that both valence and strength were related curvilinearly to each of the speech variables, but that activity was related in a linear and strikingly positive way. The correlation for the separate speech variables ranged from 0.59 to 0.88. "Subjectively rated 'active' feelings, such as anger or joy, were expressed with a relatively loud voice, high pitch, blaring timbre, and fast rate; 'passive' feelings, such as despair or boredom, in contrast, were expressed with a relatively quiet voice, low pitch, resonant timbre, and slow rate." 19


The preceding investigators drew implications for further investigation from Lindsley's physiological theory, and they saw the expenditure of energy as a measure of the different levels of the activity dimension of emotion.

S. Blau reported on a study that investigated the reactions of blind and normal adolescents to emotional stimuli. The results have some bearing on the present investigation. His findings show that "the blind tend to 'listen for' emotional expressions in speech," but that "they are less accurate than the sighted in interpreting nonverbal, vocal cues correctly."20

Response to Listenability and Readability Cues in the Communication Situation

"No more than one half of the responsibility for effective communication rests with the speaker" according to Toussaint.21 Since that half was pertinent to the present investigation, however, some review was made of the literature concerning the speaker's contribution to listening. The following refers to the presentation of informative


material while the material of the present investigation involves imaginative material. Insofar as the results of some studies may have implications for the present investigation, however, the literature was surveyed and the following studies are reported.

Leo Goodman-Malamuth II constructed seven language samples to represent seven levels of predicted readability according to the Flesch formula. Each sample was presented to groups of tenth grade pupils at four different rates, since his purpose was to study the effects of reading rate upon listenability. One of the findings of his study, however, is pertinent to the present investigation, namely, that use of predicted readability from the Flesch formula might be used as a gross indicator of listenability with an accuracy of plus or minus one rank of listenability within a total range of the first five ranks.

Harwood compared reading comprehension with listening comprehension at various levels of reading difficulty.23

---


He reported that the differences in comprehension for the series as a whole in favor of reading were not significant.

The effectiveness of listening and reading as means of receiving test materials was studied by Westover. He reported that listening and reading were equally effective as methods of receiving test materials.

One of the factors that has an influence on listening is the speaker's rate. Between 145 and 160 words per minute is an optimal rate for informational material according to Leo Goodman-Malamuth, II. A later study by Diehl, White, and Burk indicated that altering the rate from 126 words per minute to 172 words per minute does not significantly affect listener comprehension nor listeners' ratings of the quality of delivery. This study was also concerned with informational material.

The effect of pitch change on listening was investigated by Diehl, White, and Satz, who concluded that the


use of interval and inflection does not affect comprehension, although members of an audience prefer the speaker who uses them.

Cartier reported on human interest factors. According to his results, when other factors are fully controlled, speed of delivery and sentence length have marked effects on comprehension, but Flesch's "human interest" count does not help.

From the point of view of the audience, one factor having a fairly clear influence on listening is intelligence. Different measures of intelligence and listening have been used by a number of investigators, such as Brown and Carlsen, Stromer, and Haberland. All report a strong relationship between measures of intelligence and listening skill.


O'Neill\textsuperscript{32} and Kramer\textsuperscript{33} report a clear relationship between listening and the visual presence of the speaker. There was a statistically significant advantage in listening favoring the situation in which the speaker was present.

Although the studies reported in the preceding section were concerned with the presentation and reception of informative material, nevertheless they seem to have some bearing on the present investigation.

Response to Content in the Communication Situation

Most of the studies in this area have been concerned with content of informative material, but some of them are being reported because of their implications for the present investigation.

Does good organization of the material make a significant difference in listeners' comprehension? Beighley\textsuperscript{34}


reported that listeners comprehend disorganized material as well as organized in both immediate and delayed testing. McClendon\textsuperscript{35} reported that notetaking made no significant difference in listener comprehension in both immediate and delayed testing.

The matter of attention was investigated by Karraker,\textsuperscript{36} who concluded that 'set' as a factor in attention is an ambiguous term. Brown,\textsuperscript{37} however, came across a factor that he called 'anticipatory set.' When he investigated this notion with college students, he reported a significant difference in listening in favor of the group receiving the introductory material that was aimed at producing an expectation or 'set' of what was to come.

Some very pertinent information about response to the content of educational radio programs was reported by the British Broadcasting Corporation.\textsuperscript{38} The subjects for this


\textsuperscript{38} J. Treneman, "Does It Make Sense Today," Report on the Fourth Experimental Series, BBC Further Education Experiment. August, 1950 (mimeo.).
study were chosen from a sample group of 240 tutorial classes, who were classified according to age, education, and occupation. The purpose of the program series was to provide perspective to current ideas. They offered statements by the members of the tutorial classes, statements by authorities, and a free discussion summed up by the main speaker. Five subjects were treated in five programs: (1) Some Aspects of Economics; (2) the State; (3) Learning; (4) Interpretations of History; and (5) Religious Belief. The experimental subjects responded to a series of self-ratings and objective tests, some before the broadcast, some immediately after the broadcast, and some a week later. In summing up the results, the investigators reported

... that the interest scale and the knowledge scale are not the same, and the most accessible listener is to be found among the receptive but uninformed part of the audience.

... that there is practically no constant link between interest and background knowledge. There is, however, a slight tendency for background knowledge to be combined with understanding of the broadcast. In other words, what a listener gets out of the programme is dependent to some extent on the knowledge (and not the interest) that he brings to it. What he describes as interest (or appreciation) seems to be his recognition of the fact that the subject holds something of significance for him. It is impossible to give a more specific definition, because this attitude is a purely personal one.

... that listeners' answers to the question, 'Did you find the broadcast easy or difficult?'
bore so little relation to their background knowledge or their ability to recall its main points, that they carry very little weight.\textsuperscript{39}

The investigators also reported on the recall of content.

The case put by the students was usually more easily remembered than anything else. This is probably because they were identified with a personality, and, in some cases, with strong personal feelings.\textsuperscript{40}

In the second half of the report, the investigators give a detailed statistical analysis together with a summary of their findings.

In nearly every case, the top interest rating, which may be taken as indicating enthusiasm, goes with only a little knowledge or understanding. More moderate degrees of 'interest' accompany higher levels of understanding.\textsuperscript{41}

Thus the outstanding result of our investigation is that by far the most important factors making for intelligibility are the intelligence and educational level of the listeners on the one hand, and the interest aroused by the content of the talk on the other.

... There is a tendency for understanding and retention to vary with previous knowledge of the subject. Perhaps the most interesting

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., p. 4.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., p. 5.
\textsuperscript{41} Report on the Fourth Experimental Series, "Does It Make Sense Today," Part II, Analysis of evidence and some further conclusions, October, 1950, p. 6 (mimeo.).
Figure in the table above is the only statistically significant one—suggesting that memory of an educational broadcast after an interval of days varies with the knowledge (not the interest) the listener brings to it.\textsuperscript{42}

Vernon reports on the relative influence of style and content on intelligibility.\textsuperscript{43} By means of partial correlation and factorial analysis, he held the interest factor constant and then isolated certain qualities of presentation. He reported that "the variance in intelligibility attributed to stylistic factors is estimated at not more than 15 percent as compared with 40 percent attributable to content or interest factors."\textsuperscript{44} Among the stylistic factors that improve comprehension, he notes the following.

Concreteness of treatment as well as of subject matter is valuable, and it may be indicated to some extent by many active verbs and few abstract nouns . . . . Various measures of conversational speech, personal and 'human interest' words, also failed to show any relevance. Apparently dramatisations and discussions, as contrasted with 'straight' talks, though they may have other useful effects, do not necessarily improve comprehension.

The complexity of distinguishing these factors in practice was noted:

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., p. 19.

\textsuperscript{43} P. E. Vernon, "The Intelligibility of Broadcast Talks," BBC Report, November, 1950 (mimeo.).

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid., p. 11.
Although our results clearly indicate the primacy of content or interest factors, it is not possible in practice to distinguish these sharply from factors of style and presentation.\(^{45}\)

Later in the study Vernon noted that the addition of a verbal commentary to a silent film dealing with a practical problem was more effective if given in the second person, and that the Flesch human interest or conversational language yielded negligible or negative results.

Joseph Trenaman reported on the results of further BBC experiments.\(^{46}\) He indicated that age was a highly significant factor in recall, and that on delayed recall the scores from a talk and from a dramatized program were almost reversed with the talk losing 43 percent of its points and the dramatized program losing only 14 percent.

While the reports in this section are concerned with the responses to the presentation of informative material, even the one about dramatized material, there are many conclusions, nevertheless, that seem very pertinent to the present investigation and for that reason they are reported in some detail.

\(^{45}\) Ibid., p. 12.

\(^{46}\) Joseph Trenaman, "Understanding of Broadcasts on Science," paper read to the meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, September 5, 1950.
Influence of Perception Upon Response

A few studies are reported in this area simply to offer evidence that could foster a deeper understanding of audience response in the present experimental situation. Just as visual cues had an effect on response as reported in section two of this chapter, so too, language had an influence on the reproduction of visually perceived forms according to the report of Carmichael, Hogan, and Walter. Ehrenzweig reported on the influence of the inarticulate form elements in a work of art on the unconscious structure of the perception processes. The viewers actively create or passively enjoy these unconscious form elements according to his observations.

Foley reinforced this view somewhat by reporting that perceptual differentiation was influenced by the "compactness" of the pattern and not by the representative nature of the context. He experimented with 126 college women as subjects with a form of code substitution for small squares.


One group used "meaningful" substitutions; the other group used "meaningless" ones.  

Bruner described perception in the individual in terms of a three-step cycle. Perception begins with an expectancy, or "Perceiving takes place in a tuned organism . . . we are always to some extent prepared for seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting some particular thing or class of things." Then, the perception cycle continues with the informational input from the external stimulus. It concludes with the individual checking or confirmation process according to the principles of congruency with the original expectancy.

Bruner further theorized about the way in which these sets were formed. Sets are formed through past perceptual activity and experience. In any given situation, the "set" will select, organize, and transform the present stimulus information. The extent to which this is done will depend upon the strength of the set, which comes from the frequency of past confirmations, the number of

---


alternatives, and motivational and cognitive support among other things.\textsuperscript{51}

Allport summarized certain laws about thresholds for perception.\textsuperscript{52} If the stimulus information was congruent with expectancy then the threshold for recognition of the stimulus was lower than if the stimulus were incongruent with expectancy.

Postman, Bruner, and McGinnies reported that value-orientation lowered the threshold for acceptable stimulus objects and raised it for unacceptable objects.\textsuperscript{53}

Bruner and Postman pointed out that the threshold may be lowered or raised by threatening stimuli.\textsuperscript{54} Bettinghaus explored the operation of the principle of congruency in the actual speaking situation. He reported that "shifts in attitude toward the speaker and toward the speech topic were such as to produce congruous attitudinal structures." He also indicated that the shift toward congruity seemed to

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{52} Allport, F. H., Theories of Perception and the Concept of Structure (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1955).


be determined more by the listener's attitude toward the speaker than by his attitude toward the topic.\textsuperscript{55}

The preceding studies were reported as something of a small sample to give some indication of the possible far-reaching influences of perception upon the audience response in the present investigation.

Implications from the Literature for Procedures in the Investigation

1. Since non-verbal visual and audio cues had influenced the interpretation of emotional tendencies and attitudes, suggestions for both visual and audio cues were imbedded in the construction of the measuring instruments.\textsuperscript{56}

2. Since the intelligence and educational level of the audience has been shown to be related to skill in listening, and since sex had been indicated as a possible influence in sensitivity to non-verbal visual cues and to perception, the subjects were matched for sex, educational level, and scores on the Ohio State Psychological Examination.\textsuperscript{57}


\textsuperscript{56} Tolch, \textit{op. cit.}
Dusenbury and Knower, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{57} Trenaman, \textit{op. cit.}
Brown and Carlson, \textit{op. cit.}
Stromer, \textit{op. cit.}
Haberland, \textit{op. cit.}
Dusenbury and Knower, \textit{op. cit.}
Tolch, \textit{op. cit.}
Vernon, \textit{op. cit.}
Bruner and Postman, \textit{op. cit.}
Allport, \textit{op. cit.}
Blake and Ramsey, \textit{op. cit.}
\textit{op. cit.}
3. Since the Flesch readability formula had been suggested as a gross indicator of listenability, the stories selected were scored for readability.⁵⁸

4. Since introductory material that produced a "set" or expectancy of what was to come had increased comprehension, each story was prepared with an appropriate introduction.⁵⁹

5. Since the retention of an educational broadcast had varied with the knowledge about the subject that the listeners brought to it, the three stories were chosen to offer different content (subject, style, emotions, and mood).⁶⁰

6. Since the rate and pitch of the speaker had been strongly related to skill in listening, the reader's rate was controlled between 130-140 words a minute, and the pitch was rated as having either a high degree or an unusually high degree of excellence of inflection by eight expert judges.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Leo Goodman-Malamuch, II, op. cit.
⁵⁹ Brown, op. cit.
⁶⁰ Trenaman, op. cit.
⁶¹ Leo Goodman-Malamuch, II, op. cit.
Diehl, White, and Burk, op. cit.
Diehl, White, and Satz, op. cit.
7. Since studies from response to television presentations had indicated a student attitude preference for the fixed, one-camera technique in presenting dramatic literature, the fixed, one-camera production procedure was followed for the bulk of each story. 62

8. Since studies from response to television presentations in the teaching-learning process had indicated a pattern of preference for the constant close-up, this production procedure was followed for the bulk of each story. 63

9. Since the instructor had been identified as a far more reliable predictor of information gain and students' attitudes than a particular communication condition, the performer was selected for outstanding artistic skill and experience. 64

62 Cobin and McIntyre, op. cit.
63 Ibid.
64 Holmes, op. cit.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

This experimental study was devised to explore audience response to the oral interpretation of literature as perceived through different media: television, audio tape, and the face-to-face situation. The experimental procedure was developed in six main stages: (1) the preparation of the tests for measuring audience response, (2) the selection of the subjects for the audience, (3) the selection and the preparation of the materials for oral interpretation, (4) the production of the performances, (5) the organization and testing of the subjects, and (6) the organization and treatment of the data. These six stages were overlapping at many times, but they will be considered independently for purposes of analysis.

The Preparation of the Tests for Measuring Audience Response

Six tests were used for measuring audience response to the oral interpretations: (1) the Aesthetic Response scale, (2) the Technique scale, (3) the Degree of Interest scale, (4) a multiple-choice comprehension test for "The
Trouble," (5) a multiple-choice comprehension test for "The Fight He Couldn't Win," and (6) a multiple-choice comprehension test for "A Battle over the Teacups."

The development of the Aesthetic Response scale and of the Technique scale followed four stages that finally resulted in the present scales. The results indicate that the readers are being identified as significantly different one from the other at the 1 percent level by the use of the scales. The Aesthetic Response scale measures the response to the introduction separately from that to the emotions and mood, the images, and the situation. The Technique scale measures facial expression and other bodily movement and voice changes.

The Degree of Interest scale indicated the degree of interest of each member of the audience on a seven-point bi-polar scale that ranged from "extremely interesting" to "uninteresting." A space was provided for free descriptive response on the part of the rater if he desired to clarify his mark on the scale.

---

1 Sister I. Marie Wulftange, S.N.D., "Developing Rating and Semantic Differential Scales for Oral Interpretation." (Talk delivered at the Interpretation Section of the Speech Association of America convention, New York, December, 1961.) See Appendix A for complete copy.
Each of the three comprehension tests consisted of 30 questions about the content of the short story. Each question was designed as a multiple-choice item with five possible responses. The tests followed the general construction practice of randomizing correct answers and avoiding tricks of language, interpretation, and reasoning. A check of the content of the tests was made by having ten senior high school students of superior ability on the twelfth grade level respond to these tests while having free access to copies of the stories and as much time as desired. All ten achieved perfect scores on the test. Copies of the Degree of Interest scale and of the comprehension tests may be seen in Appendix B.

The Selection of the Subjects for the Audience

Of the total 120 subjects selected for the experiment, 45 responded to the Aesthetic Response scale plus a comprehension test; 45 responded to the Degree of Interest scale plus a comprehension test; and 30 responded to the Technique scale plus a comprehension test. Of the 45 students responding to the Aesthetic Response scale, 15 responded to Story 1; 15 responded to Story 2; and 15 to Story 3. Of the 45 students responding to the Degree of Interest scale, 15 responded to Story 1; 15 to Story 2; and 15 to Story 3. Of the 30 students responding to the
Technique scale, 15 responded to Story 2, and 15 responded to Story 3. The diagrams in Figures 1 and 2 summarize the research design.

Under the Aesthetic Response scale, of the 15 responding to Story 1, five responded to the Face-to-Face performance; five to the Audio Tape performance; and five to the television performance. Of the 15 responding to Story 2, five responded to the Face-to-Face performance; five to the Audio Tape performance; and five to the television performance. Of the 15 responding to Story 3, five responded to the Face-to-Face performance; five to the Audio Tape performance; and five to the Television performance. All 45 responded to a comprehension test for the specific story.

Under the Degree of Interest scale, of the 15 responding to Story 1, five responded to the Face-to-Face performance; five to the Audio Tape performance; and five to the Television performance. Of the 15 responding to Story 2, five responded to the Face-to-Face performance; five to the Audio Tape performance; and five to the Television performance. Of the 15 responding to Story 3, five responded to the Face-to-Face performance; five to the Audio Tape performance; and five to the Television performance. All 45 responded to a comprehension test for the specific story.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Story 1</th>
<th>Story 2</th>
<th>Story 3</th>
<th>All Stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Tape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Methods</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Research design for Aesthetic Response scale and for Degree of Interest scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Story 2</th>
<th>Story 3</th>
<th>All Stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Tape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Methods</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. Research design for Technique scale
Under the Technique scale, of the 15 responding to Story 2, five responded to the Face-to-Face performance; five to the Audio Tape performance; and five to the Television performance. Of the 15 responding to Story 3, five responded to the Face-to-Face performance; five to the Audio Tape performance; and five to the Television performance. All 30 responded to a comprehension test for the specific story.

The subjects for the nine cells under both the Aesthetic Response scale and the Degree of Interest scale were chosen from the students who were available in English 418 classes at the times of the telecasts, since the time was set to fit into the closed-circuit programming schedule of WOSU-TV. The students for responding to Story 1, Story 2, and Story 3, and to the three different media were divided into cells on the basis of sex, educational level, and raw scores from the verbal section of the Ohio State Psychological Examination. Table 1 gives the distribution according to sex; Table 2 gives the distribution according to the educational level; and Tables 3 and 4 give a comparison of the means of the raw scores according to the verbal section from the Ohio State Psychological Examination. The largest difference between means was explored statistically by an analysis of variance.
Table 1

SEX DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetic Response Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Degree of Interest Scale** |      |        |
| STORY 1                    |      |        |
| Face-to-Face               | 4    | 1      |
| Audio                      | 4    | 1      |
| Television                 | 4    | 1      |
| STORY 2                    |      |        |
| Face-to-Face               | 2    | 3      |
| Audio                      | 2    | 3      |
| Television                 | 2    | 3      |
| STORY 3                    |      |        |
| Face-to-Face               | 2    | 3      |
| Audio                      | 2    | 3      |
| Television                 | 2    | 3      |

| **Technique Scale** |      |        |
| STORY 2             |      |        |
| Face-to-Face        | 3    | 2      |
| Audio               | 2    | 3      |
| Television          | 2    | 3      |
| STORY 3             |      |        |
| Face-to-Face        | 2    | 3      |
| Audio               | 2    | 3      |
| Television          | 2    | 3      |
Table 2
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate Level--</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Response Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 1</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 2</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 3</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Interest Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 1</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 2</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 3</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 2</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 3</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

**AESTHETIC RESPONSE SCALE ANALYSIS OF SUB-GROUPS**

Means of Raw Scores of Verbal Section from Ohio State Psychological Examination and a Sample Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th>Audio</th>
<th>Television</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>$\sigma^2$</th>
<th>$F_{exp}$</th>
<th>$F_{.05}$</th>
<th>$F_{.01}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>324.0</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>296.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Sample Estimated Standard Error of the Distribution of Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Face-to-Face</th>
<th>Audio</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>$\sigma^1 - \sigma^2$</th>
<th>$t_{exp}$</th>
<th>$t_{.25}$</th>
<th>$t_{.01}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Sample Estimated Standard Error of the Distribution of Differences between Story Cells for the Face-to-Face Group (see Fig. 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>$\sigma^1 - \sigma^2$</th>
<th>$t_{exp}$</th>
<th>$t_{.25}$</th>
<th>$t_{.01}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Sample Analysis of Variance between Story Cells for the Face-to-Face Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>$\sigma^2$</th>
<th>$F_{exp}$</th>
<th>$F_{.05}$</th>
<th>$F_{.01}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>324.0</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>151.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

DEGREE OF INTEREST SCALE ANALYSIS OF SUB-GROUPS

Means of Raw Scores of Verbal Section from Ohio State Psychological Examination and a Sample Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>$F_{exp}$</th>
<th>$F_{.05}$</th>
<th>$F_{.01}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Story 1</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 2</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>84.05</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story 3</td>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Sample Estimated Standard Error of the Distribution of Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story 2</th>
<th>$\overline{x}<em>{1} - \overline{x}</em>{2}$</th>
<th>$t_{exp}$</th>
<th>$t_{.25}$</th>
<th>$t_{.01}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Sample Estimated Standard Error of the Distribution of Differences between Story Cells for the Television Group (see Fig. 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story 1</th>
<th>$\overline{x}<em>{1} - \overline{x}</em>{2}$</th>
<th>$t_{exp}$</th>
<th>$t_{.25}$</th>
<th>$t_{.01}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STORY 1</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 2</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Sample Analysis of Variance between Story Cells for the Television Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story</th>
<th>$\overline{x}_{1}$</th>
<th>$\overline{x}_{2}$</th>
<th>$F_{exp}$</th>
<th>$F_{.05}$</th>
<th>$F_{.01}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STORY 1</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>304.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 2</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>68.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and by an estimated standard error of the sampling distribution of differences to check the significance of differences among cells. No cell was significantly different from another at the five percent level of confidence.

The subjects for the six cells under the Technique scale were chosen from the students who were available in Speech 505 classes at the times of the telecasts. The students for responding to Story 2 and to Story 3 were divided into cells on the basis of sex, educational level, and marks for skill in performance at the end of the sixth week of the quarter, since skill in performance has been shown to be related to skill in evaluating performance. Table 5 gives the distribution for the Technique scale.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LETTER GRADE</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STORY 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORY 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face-to-Face</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The means for the various cells under the Aesthetic Response scale, the Degree of Interest scale, and the Technique scale were explored for the following reasons: (1) to offer a reasonable assurance that obtained differences (if any) in the over-all comprehension scores of cells were not a function of ability differences; (2) to offer reasonable assurance that the over-all educational level of each cell was not dissimilar; (3) to minimize any sex differences that might exist in response.

The subjects from the English 418 classes were selected on a voluntary basis although one class period was devoted to the project. This was done because each class was divided into three sections, and each section was assigned to a different room. The number of students in each English 418 class allowed a few extra to be assigned to each cell to compensate for those who were absent on the assigned day.

Selection and Preparation of Materials for Interpretation

The study was limited to an oral interpretation of imaginative prose selections, known in literary types as short stories. The material for oral reading did not include poetry or other types of prose selections.
The short stories chosen met the following criteria:
(1) the copy was high on the Flesch Human Interest scores;
(2) the copy was low on the Flesch Reading Ease scores;
(3) the story was of general interest and appeal to both sexes;
(4) each story differed in the emotional and mood values of content and style;
(5) the copy was not identifiable with any specific holiday, season, day, or month;
(6) the copy was adaptable to an oral interpretation of not more than 22 minutes; and
(7) each story constituted a sense-making whole.

The materials selected for oral interpretation consisted of three imaginative prose selections, known as short stories in literary types: (1) "The Fight He Couldn't Win," by Thomas Barclay Thomson; (2) "The Battle over the Teacups," by August Derleth; and (3) "The Trouble," by J. F. Powers. (See Appendix C for copies of the stories.) Stories 1 and 3 were rated "Dramatic" and Story 2 was rated "Highly Interesting" according to the Flesch Human Interest Formula as shown in Tables 6 and 7.²

² Human interest according to the Flesch formula equals 3.635 times the number of personal words per hundred words plus .314 times the number of personal sentences per hundred words. Personal words are defined as all first, second, and third person pronouns except neuter pronouns, and all words having natural masculine or feminine gender. Personal sentences are defined as spoken sentences and speech tags marked by quotation marks or not, questions, commands, and requests, and other sentences addressed directly to the reader, exclamations and incomplete sentences whose full meaning has to be inferred from the text. From Rudolph Flesch, "A New Readability Yardstick," Journal of Applied Psychology, 32: 228-230 (June, 1948).
### Table 6
SILENT READING HUMAN INTEREST SCORES FROM THE FLESCH FORMULA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Interest Scores</th>
<th>Typical Magazine</th>
<th>Description of Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Dull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>Mildly interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 40</td>
<td>Digests</td>
<td>Interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 60</td>
<td>New Yorker</td>
<td>Highly interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 100</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>Dramatic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 7
NUMERICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF STORIES FROM THE FLESCH FORMULA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Number</th>
<th>Sample of Words</th>
<th>Personal Words</th>
<th>Personal Sentences</th>
<th>Human Interest Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73.328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 1, "The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas Barclay Thomson.  
Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.  
Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
Stories 1 and 3 were rated "Very Easy" and Story 2 was rated "Easy" according to the Flesch Reading Ease Formula as shown in Tables 8 and 9. This predicted readability was used as a gross predictor of listenability with an accuracy of plus or minus one rank of listenability within the total range of the first five ranks. Each story was judged also for general interest and appeal as well as for the emotional and mood values of content and style by a board of eight experts, four male, four female. Four of the judges were instructors in English on the senior high school level. All held at least the M.A. degree. (See Appendix D for a copy of the questionnaire for the judges.) All the judges considered Stories 1 and 3 to be of general appeal to both sexes and to various ages; seven of the judges considered Story 2 to be of general appeal to both sexes and to various ages. A follow-up interview with the other one judge revealed that he considered Story 2 to

---

3 Reading Ease equals 206.835 minus .836 times the average number of syllables per hundred words, minus 1.015 times the average number of sentences per hundred words. From Rudolph Flesch, "A New Readability Yardstick," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 32: 228-230 (June, 1948).

4 Leo Goodman-Malamuth II, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Speaking Rate upon Listenability" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1956).
### Table 8
SILENT READING EASE SCORES FROM THE FLESCH FORMULA*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Ease Scores</th>
<th>Typical Magazine</th>
<th>Description of Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 30</td>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Very difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 50</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 60</td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Fairly difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 70</td>
<td>Digests</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 80</td>
<td>Slick-fiction</td>
<td>Fairly easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 90</td>
<td>Pulp-fiction</td>
<td>Easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 to 100</td>
<td>Comics</td>
<td>Very easy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Flesch, op. cit., adapted from Table 5.

### Table 9
NUMERICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF STORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Number</th>
<th>Sample of Words</th>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Syllables</th>
<th>Reading Ease Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>94.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>86.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>99.111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 1, "The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas Barclay Thomson.
Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.
Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
have general interest and appeal to both sexes and to various ages, but not to the same extent as the other two stories. The emotional and mood values were identified in the following ways: (1) "The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas Barclay Thomson, those of family life; (2) "The Battle Over the Teacups" by August Derleth, those of intrigue and mystery; and (3) "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers, those of a social problem. The results are tabulated in Table 10.

The preceding stories were chosen to offer different emotional and mood values of content and style. J. F. Powers, the author of "The Trouble," published his first story, "He Don't Plant Cotton," in Accent. His stories have also appeared in The New Yorker, The Reporter, and elsewhere. Two collections of his stories have been published: Prince of Darkness and The Presence of Grace. For the past few years, he has been at work on a novel, from which he has gleaned several short stories for The New Yorker. "The Trouble" is one of his earlier stories, and it is written with a kind of naturalistic realism. The writing is punctuated with little conversation; rather, it simply sets down details with a kind of photographic exactness and lets the facts speak for themselves. The details are organized, however, by both selection and structure to highlight the impact of the theme.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Number</th>
<th>Appeal of Both Sexes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Appeal of Various Ages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes 8 No 0</td>
<td>Yes 8 No 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes 7 No 1</td>
<td>Yes 7 No 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes 8 No 0</td>
<td>Yes 8 No 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Number</th>
<th>Emotional and Mood Values of Content and Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>those of family life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>those of intrigue and mystery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>those of a social problem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 1, "The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas Barclay Thomson.

Story 2, "A Battle Over the Teacups" by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
"The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas Barclay

Thomson is written in a kind of romanticized realism. Although this story has the same Human Interest Rating on the Flesch formula as the former one, the fact that it was first published in *Liberty Magazine* gives an indication of the difference between its style and that of the preceding story. "The Fight He Couldn't Win" is punctuated frequently with emotional conversation, and the writing in general tends toward the sentimental rather than the naturalistic.

August Derleth, a Wisconsin author, is well known for his detective stories as well as for other short stories, poetry, and biography. "A Battle over the Teacups" was reprinted in the *World's Great Spy Stories* in 1944. The oriental flavor of the language and the atmosphere of intrigue and suspense differentiate the style and mood of this story from the two preceding ones, although the Human Interest Rating on the Flesch formula differs from the others by only one level.

The copies of Stories 1 and 3 were cut so as to be read orally in 20 to 22 minutes and to be faithful to the content and style values of the whole. Story 2 was able to be read orally in 15 to 17 minutes without any adaptation. The three stories then met the seven criteria mentioned at the beginning of this section.
Production of the Performances

Three kinds of performances were presented to three different audiences: a face-to-face performance to the first audience; a performance from an audio-tape to the second one; and a television performance to the third one. The performances were presented to a student audience in a normal classroom viewing and listening situation, by the same performer, with the same style and quality of presentation as judged by experts from the Department of English. The differences in performances were those inherent in the nature of the three different media.

The audio tape and the video tape were made at the same time from the same performance so that the quality would be identical. The three television performances were then judged from the video tape by a panel of three experts from the Department of English as to the extent to which the performances were faithful to the content, style, and emotional and mood values of each short story. Each face-to-face performance was judged by still a different expert from the Department of English as to the extent to which the performances were faithful to the content, style, and emotional and mood values of each short story. Finally, an authority in the area of interpretation judged the television performances and gave a delayed judgment of the
quality of the face-to-face performances. These independent judgments showed a high degree of agreement. The performances by the three media—face-to-face, television, and audio tape—were then judged to be of equal quality. The results are summarized in Table 11.

The actual production of the preceding performances followed four phases: (1) the arranging for time on the closed-circuit television at WOSU-TV and the arranging for use of the facilities and personnel; (2) the locating of the talent and the arranging of an agreement for cooperating with the research project; (3) the planning of the program and the making of the video tapes; and (4) the presentation of the programs to the respective audiences. These four phases were overlapping at many times, but they will be considered independently here for purposes of analysis.

The first phase, arranging for time and facilities over WOSU-TV, consisted primarily of identifying the key persons in the station operation, of setting up appointments, of discussing and clarifying the proposed project, of writing letters to make the request formal and official, of reminding the officials concerned about the proposed project by means of telephone and personal contacts, until, at last, definite action was taken in the appointment of a director from the station for the making of the
Table 11
QUALITY OF PERFORMANCES AS SECURED FROM FOUR EXPERTS
JUDGING PERFORMANCES BY TELEVISION AND
FACE-TO-FACE INDEPENDENTLY

I would judge this oral interpretation to be true to the
intent of the writer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>to a very slight degree</th>
<th>to a limited degree</th>
<th>to a typical degree</th>
<th>to an outstanding degree</th>
<th>to an exceedingly high degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Number of Judges Marking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Number</th>
<th>to a typical degree</th>
<th>to an outstanding degree</th>
<th>to an exceedingly high degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (TV)</td>
<td>3 (TV &amp; F-F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 (TV)</td>
<td>3 (TV &amp; F-F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (TV &amp; F-F)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 1, "The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas
Barclay Thomson.

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August
Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
video and audio tapes. Since the investigator's asking for time over the closed-circuit operation of WOSU-TV posed financial and policy problems, apparently, as well as practical ones for the Operations Manager, the request was made far in advance of the desired time to allow difficulties to be faced and surmounted. It was quite possible that the difficulties would be faced, but not surmounted, of course, and then other plans would need to be made. In this specific case, however, the difficulties were surmounted and a director from the station was appointed to work with the investigator in making a video tape.

The second phase, concerning the locating of the talent and the arranging of an agreement for cooperation, was also carried on in stages. The first contact was made before approaching the personnel of WOSU-TV in order to have a definite program suggestion as well as a research suggestion at the first interview. The talent secured was a student technician in the Department of Speech who had a wide background of study and experience in the area of professional interpretation and theatre. She had studied at the Neighborhood Playhouse School of Theatre in New York; had spent three years at The Playhouse in Cleveland; and had devoted approximately six years to professional theatre in New York. Among other achievements, she had made a movie, Distant Drums, with Gary Cooper and had made a
39-week series of movies for television. Her broad background was being used now to assist with the training of students in the Department of Speech. This student technician was very interested in cooperating with the research project. Production procedures from there on consisted of conferences about the oral interpretation of the three short stories selected for the project; of meetings to offer encouragement and stimulation in the changing and tiring process of rehearsal and preparation; of communications, both oral and written, setting specific dates and times for rehearsal and for the making of the video tape; and of final specific directions for controlling possible variables of performance in the actual face-to-face productions (see Appendix F for samples).

The third phase, the planning of the program and the making of the video tapes, consisted of two steps. The first involved the planning of the program. This included having discussions and conferences for arranging the details of production of the program with the director from the station so that both he and the investigator would be looking at the program from approximately the same point of view. The second involved sitting next to the director in the control room and approving and suggesting while he actually directed the settings and the rehearsals and the tapings of the three programs of readings in accordance
with the wishes of the investigator insofar as possible under the circumstances.

The fourth phase included the presentation of the three types of each program to the three different audiences. The coordinators of the student audiences and the performer were given specific directions for the face-to-face presentations (see Appendix F for samples). According to their reports, the presentations followed through according to plan. The coordinator of the audio tape performances was also given specific directions, and according to his report, the presentations followed through according to plan. The coordinator of the video tape performance ran into a series of complications. Unpredictable difficulties in the presentation of the television programs had been foreseen by the investigator, however, so that she, herself, acted as the coordinator of the video taped programs to try to prevent any serious occurrences that might completely invalidate the study.

Five days before the day for presenting the three programs simultaneously to three different audiences, the investigator checked the duplicated weekly program sheet about the scheduling of the three programs over the closed-circuit system at the proper times. Not one of the three programs was scheduled correctly. In the light of the fact that at least three members of the station personnel in
charge of operations and programming had assured the investigator that the only time a channel was available was at the time assigned, this mistake seemed to indicate the need for further investigation and precaution on the part of the investigator. When the assigned classrooms were checked again with the scheduling room, some further crossed-wires were reported. All these uncovered mistakes were corrected according to the report of the operations manager given three days before the scheduled experimental telecast. As late as 40 minutes before the scheduled start of the first program, the operations manager read over the telephone to the investigator an exact corrected schedule of the programming for the three experimental presentations. The test pattern was to be put on ten minutes before each telecast, and the telecast was to begin promptly at 9:03 or 10:03 or 1:03.

The test pattern for the first program went on about seven minutes before the hour; the test pattern for the second program went on about one minute before the hour and was preceded by loud music and film clips completely foreign to the experiment so that the television set could not be kept on until the test pattern actually appeared; the test pattern for the third program was put on the air about 60 seconds before the actual telecast was to begin. In the last case, a telephone call had
been put through to the tape room at WOSU-TV when the class bell rang at three minutes before the telecast proper was to begin.

The rooms assigned for the viewing had been suggested by the personnel of WOSU-TV and approved by the personnel of WOSU-TV and approved by the personnel of the scheduling room as being the best as far as technical condition of the sets and operation were concerned, since they were used regularly four days a week for telecourses. A check had been made by the investigator in one of these rooms five days before the experimental run, and all were performing satisfactorily in agreement with the reports. It was not possible to check the room for the third program because it was being used regularly for classes and because it was deemed not necessary, since the other reports from the station personnel and the scheduling room had been verified. Two hours before the experimental run, however, the investigator managed to examine the sets in the assigned room only to discover that they had been partially disconnected. A contact was made with a professor in that building who was supposed to be teaching a regular television course in that room according to the information that had been given the investigator. It turned out that the television course had been given the previous quarter and had been discontinued in that room because viewing conditions were not satisfactory. With his help,
two of the sets better for viewing were connected and arranged for use at the next hour.

Besides the telephone call mentioned in the preceding paragraph, two other telephone calls had been put through to WOSU-TV in the morning, one at 8:40 and another at about 9:30 to stop a playing of the video tape on the closed-circuit channels at a time other than that destined for the experimental run for fear of having the stimulus invalidated. To what extent this experimental tape had been used inadvertently on the various channels of WOSU-TV or in any other ways on preceding days is an open question. The operations manager, the program director for making of the video tape, the director of operations in the tape room at WOSU-TV and the one at Derby Hall—all knew that the video tape in question was for use with an experimental research project at specific times on a specific day. They had agreed to cooperate with the project and had carried out all operations except this last one (which did not depend upon them directly) of presenting the video tapes for viewing.

When the investigator discovered that the video tape was being used on the morning of the experimental run, an attempt to explore the possibility of any previous experience with the video tape stimulus was launched by the coordinator of the television group by having the subjects
respond "Yes" or "No" to a simple question about whether or not the subject had ever watched any television program on the television sets in various classrooms around the campus, and, if so, to write the name and subject of the telecast as closely as he could remember it. When the discovery about using the video tapes was made, it was too late to send directions to the coordinators of the audio-tape audience and of the face-to-face audience. Since a sample one-third of the subjects in the audience, those in the television group, had not viewed the experimental video tape previously, according to their reports, it is possible that the other two-thirds of the subjects were also uncontaminated although no check could be made.

The Organization and Testing of the Subjects

The subjects were organized for perceiving the performances in the following way. The investigator distributed an explanatory sheet with directions for the project to each of the students present at the six English 418 classes at the class session preceding the experimental project (see Appendix F for a sample sheet). The students were then told that they would be asked to listen to or to listen to and to view an oral reading of a short story and then to respond to two tests which would be used by the investigator only. They were given an opportunity to ask
questions and clarify any points. The direction sheets assigned each student to a specific room for viewing at the following meeting of the class. The viewing design is summarized in Figures 3 and 4. A pack of materials, consisting of a comprehension test and one of the three scales, was labeled for each student and delivered to the coordinator assigned to each of the three rooms. The same coordinator was assigned for all three periods (9:00; 10:00; and 1:00) to the Audio Tape audience room; three different coordinators were assigned to the Face-to-Face audience room, one for the first story (9:00 A.M. period), one for the second story (10:00 A.M. period), and one for the third story (1:00 P.M. period). Each of these three coordinators rated the quality of the performance in the Face-to-Face audience room by both immediate and delayed recall (eight weeks). These ratings are reported in Table 6. Each coordinator was supplied with several extra packs of material and a sheet of directions to take care of any students who arrived in the wrong room either because of absence at the preceding period or because of any other reason (see Appendix F for a copy of the directions).

Interviews were held with each of the coordinators about matters of procedure. Three minutes after the bell had rung for each period, the reading was to begin, by the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Aesthetic Response Scale</th>
<th>Degree of Interest Scale</th>
<th>Technique Scale</th>
<th>All Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room for Face-to-Face</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room for Audio Tape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room for Television</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Methods</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 3.** Viewing design for Story 2 and Story 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Aesthetic Response Scale</th>
<th>Degree of Interest Scale</th>
<th>All Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room for Face-to-Face</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room for Audio Tape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room for Television</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Methods</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 4.** Viewing design for Story 1
face-to-face performance in the first room; by audio tape, in the second room; and by the television performance in the third room. The coordinator was told to carry out the following directions for the face-to-face performance. After the students had been settled, he was to open the door of the classroom. This opening of the door was the signal for the reader to enter, to walk to the podium in the front of the room and to start the introduction that preceded the respective story. At the end of the story, the reader was simply to leave the podium and to walk from the room. This entrance and exit procedure was similar to that of the entrance to and the exit from the circle of light in the television production. After the presentation, the coordinator was to wait until the students had responded to the tests, to collect the pack of materials that each student handed to him before leaving, and to transfer these materials to the investigator who would call for them.

The coordinator was told to follow the following directions for the audio tape performance. After the students had been settled, he was to start the tape recorder (which he had set up and adjusted and checked before the ringing of the bell) for the respective story. At the end of the story he was to turn off the recorder, wait until the students had responded to the tests, to collect the pack of materials that each student handed to him before
leaving, and to transfer these materials to the investigator who would call for them.

The coordinator was told to follow these directions for the television performance. He was to turn on each set to be used in the classrooms ten minutes before the ringing of the bell, to adjust the reception on the test pattern that WOSU-TV personnel had agreed to televise ten minutes before each hour, to turn off each set at the end of the respective story, to wait until the students had responded to the tests, to collect the pack of materials that each student handed to him before leaving, and to transfer these materials to the investigator.

The preceding instructions were repeated on the morning of the performances by a concise note to the performer and the coordinators recalling procedures.

The Organization and Treatment of the Data

The raw scores of the comprehension tests were obtained from the number of correctly answered questions recorded on the first column of the standard IBM answer sheets that were used by the students with ordinary pencils. An answer key was constructed from the last column of one of these sheets that matched in position with each of the subject's answer sheets. Incorrect or no responses were then easily checked with a red pencil. Each answer
sheet was corrected twice. The number of correct responses the subject made on the questions was called a score. These scores were marked at the top of the answer sheet. These scores became the basis for further statistical computation about the comprehension of the stories. All raw scores can be seen in Appendix G.

The raw scores for the aesthetic response scales were obtained by adding the numbers checked or circled under the response section and marking the total at the top. Since these scores were weighted in inverted order with the highest possible score being 3 and the lowest possible score being 21, it was necessary to convert the raw scores into the regular numerical order when interpreting the results. The raw scores in the original inverted order may be seen in Appendix G.

The raw scores for the technique scale were obtained by adding the numbers checked or circled and marking the total at the top. Since these scores were weighted also in inverted order, it was necessary to convert the raw scores into the regular numerical order when interpreting results. The raw scores in the original inverted order may be seen in Appendix G.

The raw scores for the Degree of Interest scales (marked Preference Scale on the sample) were obtained by noting the number checked or circled on the scale and
multiplying by three so as to give a weighting comparable to that of the two preceding scales. With these scales also, it was necessary to convert the raw scores into the regular numerical order when interpreting results.

Since the scores of these samples represented measurements on matched pairs of subjects, a difference score for each pair of measurements was obtained. These difference scores were treated exactly like any other kind of measurements. 5

The mean of the differences between two methods or between two stories was found by adding the differences between the two sub-groups chosen for consideration and dividing by five.

The standard deviation of the mean difference was found by finding the square root of the product of five times the sum of the squared differences minus the sum of the differences squared and dividing that square root by five. 6

The standard error of the mean of the differences

6 Ibid., p. 170.
was found by dividing the standard deviation by the square root of four.7

The value of the critical ratio, \( t \), was found by dividing the mean of the differences by the standard error of the mean of the differences. The ten percent, five percent, and one percent probability values of \( t \) were read from Table N of *Measurement and Statistics* by Virginia L. Senders.8

The \( t \) test was used to test the significance of the difference between the method groups and the story groups under the aesthetic response scale, the degree of interest scale, and the technique scale respectively. The \( t \) test was used to test the significance of the difference between the method groups under the comprehension tests for the respective stories.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE EXPERIMENT

This experiment took place at the Ohio State University and involved the testing of the responses of 120 students to the oral interpretation of a short story. Each of 45 students responded individually to an Aesthetic Response scale and a comprehension test—15 for Story 1, 15 for Story 2, and 15 for Story 3. Of each 15, five responded to a face-to-face presentation, five to an audio presentation, and five to a television presentation. Each of another group of 45 students responded individually to a Degree of Interest scale and a comprehension test with the same subdivisions as the preceding group. Each of another group of 30 students responded individually to a Technique scale and a comprehension test—15 for Story 2 and 15 for Story 3, with each 15 being divided into groups of five to a face-to-face presentation, five to an audio presentation, and five to a television presentation. The experiment was performed to investigate audience response to the oral interpretation of a short story by three methods of presentation: face-to-face, audio tape, and television. This response was explored in the areas of
aesthetic response, degree of interest, rating of technique, and comprehension of content.

**Organization of data.** The means of each of the sub-groups in the tables are abbreviated as $M$. $\overline{d}$ identifies the differences between the means, while the standard error of the mean of the differences is abbreviated $\overline{SE_d}$ ($\sigma$). The standard error of the mean of the differences is the number of units, above or below the difference, within which the true difference will be located about 68 times in 100.

**Interpretation.** Since the $t$ ratio of difference formula was used to ascertain the significance of any obtained difference, the following levels of significance were accepted. If the obtained $t$ ratio was less than 1.53 (the $t$ ratio for the ten percent level of confidence), the difference between the means was interpreted as "insignificant." If the obtained $t$ ratio was equal to or more than 1.53 but less than 2.13 (the $t$ ratio for the five percent level), the difference was interpreted as "tending toward significance." If the obtained $t$ ratio was equal to or more than 2.13 (the $t$ ratio for the five percent level), the difference between means was interpreted as "significant."
Data from the Aesthetic Response Scores and the Corresponding Comprehension Scores

**Problem one.** One problem of this section was to explore the aesthetic response scores of the audiences in two ways: (1) by analyzing the differences in aesthetic response when the oral interpretation of a short story was perceived by three different methods: face-to-face, audio tape, and television; (2) by analyzing the differences in aesthetic response to the oral interpretation of three different short stories when perceived by the same method. The statistical results for (1) are shown in Table 12; the statistical results for (2) are shown in Table 13. A concise view of the two preceding tables is given in Table 14.

The difference in aesthetic response between the face-to-face method and the audio method of presentation tends toward the significant in favor of the face-to-face method in the cases of all three stories. The difference between the television method and the audio method of presentation tends toward the significant in favor of the face-to-face method in the cases of all three stories. The difference between the television method and the audio method of presentation tends toward the significant in favor of the television method in the case of one story—number 3. There are no significant differences in the cases of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>dM</th>
<th>SEd.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>t .10</th>
<th>t .05</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>F-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.536</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>F-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>F-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13
DIFFERENCES IN AESTHETIC RESPONSE SCORES BETWEEN STORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( d_{M} )</th>
<th>( \text{SE}<em>{d</em>{M}} )</th>
<th>( t_{\text{exp}} )</th>
<th>( t_{.10} )</th>
<th>( t_{.05} )</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F-F</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.655</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories 1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Audio** |             |                 |                  |        |        |       |
| Stories 1 & 2 | 2.6      | 2.976           | 0.87             | 1.53   | 2.13   | ---   |
| Stories 1 & 3 | 1.0       | 1.483           | 0.67             | 1.53   | 2.13   | ---   |
| Stories 2 & 3 | 3.6       | 1.886           | 1.90             | 1.53   | 2.13   | 3     |

| **TV**    |             |                 |                  |        |        |       |
| Stories 1 & 2 | 3.6      | 1.435           | 2.50             | 1.53   | 2.13   | 1     |
| Stories 1 & 3 | 0.2       | 0.583           | 0.34             | 1.53   | 2.13   | ---   |
| Stories 2 & 3 | 3.4       | 1.72            | 1.87             | 1.53   | 2.13   | 3     |
Table 14
SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES IN AESTHETIC RESPONSE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>$d_M$</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>F-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TS(3)</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Number of Methods</th>
<th>$d_M$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S(TV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 and 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S(F-F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 1, "The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas Barclay Thomson.

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
other two stories. The difference between the face-to-face method and the television method of presentation is not significant in the cases of all three stories.

The difference in aesthetic response between Stories 1 and 2 is significantly in favor of Story 1 in the television presentation, but there is no significant difference in the cases of the other two methods of presentation. The difference between Stories 1 and 3 is not significant in any of the three methods. The difference between Stories 2 and 3 is significantly in favor of Story 3 in the face-to-face presentation and is tending toward significance in the audio and the television methods.

Problem two. A second problem of this section of the study was to explore the comprehension scores of the subjects who were also responding to the aesthetic response scale. The statistical results are shown in Table 15 and Table 16. The difference in comprehension scores between those responding to the face-to-face presentation and to the audio presentation is not significant; between those responding to the television presentation and the audio presentation is not significant; and between those responding to the face-to-face presentation and to the television presentation is not significant. In short, there is no
Table 15
DIFFERENCES IN COMPREHENSION SCORES OF AESTHETIC RESPONSE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$d_M$</th>
<th>$SE_{d_M}$</th>
<th>$t_{exp}$</th>
<th>$t_{.10}$</th>
<th>$t_{.05}$</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; F-F</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; F-F</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.336</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6039</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; F-F</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.0856</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 1, "The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas B. Thomson.

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>(d_M)</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16

**SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES IN COMPREHENSION SCORES OF AESTHETIC RESPONSE GROUP**

Story 1, "The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas B. Thomson.

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
significant difference in comprehension scores between any of the groups.

Data from the Degree of Interest Scores and the Corresponding Comprehension Scores

Problem one. One problem of this section of the study was to explore the degree of interest scores of the audiences in two ways: (1) by analyzing the differences in the degree of interest scores when the oral interpretation of a short story was perceived by three different methods: face-to-face, audio tape, and television; (2) by analyzing the differences in degree of interest scores to the oral interpretation of three different short stories when perceived by the same method. The statistical results for (1) are shown in Table 17; the statistical results for (2) are shown in Table 18. A concise view of the two preceding tables is given in Table 19.

There is no significant difference between the face-to-face method of presentation and the audio method of presentation in the case of any of the three stories. In the case of Story 2, there is a significant difference between the television method and the audio method of presentation in favor of the television method, a tending toward significance for Story 1 in favor of television, but there is no significant difference between methods in the case of Story 3. Between the face-to-face and the
Table 17
DIFFERENCES IN DEGREE OF INTEREST SCORES BETWEEN METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$d_{M}$</th>
<th>$SE_{d_{M}}$</th>
<th>$t_{exp}$</th>
<th>$t_{.10}$</th>
<th>$t_{.05}$</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.437</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; F-F</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Story 2**          |         |              |           |           |           |       |
| F-F & Audio          | .6      | 2.749        | .218      | 1.53      | 2.13      | ---   |
| TV & Audio           | 4.2     | 1.529        | 2.74      | 1.53      | 2.13      | TV    |
| F-F & TV             | 3.0     | 1.643        | 1.82      | 1.53      | 2.13      | TV    |

| **Story 3**          |         |              |           |           |           |       |
| F-F & Audio          | 1.2     | 1.2          | 1.0       | 1.53      | 2.13      | ---   |
| TV & Audio           | .6      | .6           | 1.0       | 1.53      | 2.13      | ---   |
| F-F & TV             | 1.8     | 1.2          | 1.50      | 1.53      | 2.13      | ---   |

Story 1, "The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas B. Thomson.

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups," by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
### Table 18

DIFFERENCES IN DEGREE OF INTEREST SCORES BETWEEN STORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$d_M$</th>
<th>$S_E d_M$</th>
<th>$t_{exp}$</th>
<th>$t_{.10}$</th>
<th>$t_{.05}$</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F-F</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.557</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories 1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.437</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.837</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories 1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.749</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.749</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories 1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.529</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 1, "The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas B. Thomson.

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble," by J. F. Powers
### Table 19

**SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES IN DEGREE OF INTEREST SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>$d^M$</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TS(1)TV</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S(2)TV</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S(1)TV</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TS(2)TV</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Number of Methods</th>
<th>$d^M$</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 and 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 and 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S(Audio) 3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 and 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S(Audio) 3</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 1, "The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas B. Thomson.

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
television methods of presentation, there is a significant difference in favor of the television method in the case of Story 1, a difference that is tending toward the significant in favor of the television method in the case of Story 2, and a difference that is not significant in the case of Story 3.

There is no significant difference in the degree of interest scores between Stories 1 and 2 by any of the three methods of presentation. Between Stories 1 and 3, there is a significant difference in favor of Story 3 by the audio method of presentation. There is also a significant difference between Stories 2 and 3 in favor of Story 3 by the audio method of presentation; no significant difference by the face-to-face method; and no significant difference by the television method.

Problem two. A second problem of this study was to explore the comprehension scores of the subjects who were also responding to the degree of interest scale. The statistical results are shown in Table 20, and a concise view is given in Table 21. There is no significant difference in comprehension scores between the face-to-face and the audio groups or between the television and the face-to-face groups in the case of any of the three stories. There is a significant difference in comprehension
Table 20
DIFFERENCES IN COMPREHENSION SCORES OF THE DEGREE OF INTEREST GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(d_M)</th>
<th>(\text{SEM}_M)</th>
<th>(t_{exp})</th>
<th>(t_{.10})</th>
<th>(t_{.05})</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0677</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8602</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.749</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 1, "The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas B. Thomson.

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
Table 21

SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES IN COMPREHENSION SCORES OF THE DEGREE OF INTEREST GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>$d_M$</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S(1&amp;2)</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 1, "The Fight He Couldn't Win" by Thomas B. Thomson.

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
scores between the television and the audio groups in favor of the television group in the case of Stories 1 and 2, but there is no significant difference in the case of Story 3.

Data from the Technique Scores and the Corresponding Comprehension Scores

Problem one. A problem of this section of the study was to explore the technique scores of the audience in two ways: (1) by analyzing the differences in technique ratings when the oral interpretation of a short story was perceived by three different media: face-to-face, audio tape, and television; (2) by analyzing the differences in technique ratings of the oral interpretation of three different short stories when perceived by the same method. The statistical results for (1) are shown in Table 22; the statistical results for (2) are shown in Table 23. A concise view of the two preceding tables is given in Table 24. The difference in technique ratings between the face-to-face method and the audio method of presentation is not significant in the case of both stories. (Only two stories were used for this section--Stories 2 and 3.) Between the television method and the audio method of presentation, there is no significant difference in the case of both stories. For the television method and the face-to-face method of presentation, there
Table 22

DIFFERENCES IN TECHNIQUE SCORES BETWEEN METHODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$d_M$</th>
<th>SEd M</th>
<th>$t_{exp}$</th>
<th>$t_{.10}$</th>
<th>$t_{.05}$</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
Table 23

DIFFERENCES IN TECHNIQUE SCORES BETWEEN STORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( d_M )</th>
<th>SE( d_M )</th>
<th>( t_{exp} )</th>
<th>( t_{.10} )</th>
<th>( t_{.05} )</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F-F</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Audio** |           |             |               |               |               |       |
| Stories 2 & 3 | 3.6 | 3.39 | 1.06 | 1.53 | 2.13 | --- |

| **TV** |           |             |               |               |               |       |
| Stories 2 & 3 | 2.2 | .8 | 2.75 | 1.53 | 2.13 | 3 |

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
Table 24
SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES IN TECHNIQUE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>$d_M$</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; F-F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S(3)</td>
<td>TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stories Number of Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Number of Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 and 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
is a significant difference in the case of Story 3 in favor of television.

The differences in technique ratings between Story 2 and Story 3 show no significant difference in the case of the face-to-face method and the audio method of presentation, but there is a significant difference in the case of the television method of presentation in favor of Story 3.

**Problem two.** A second problem of this section of the study was to explore the comprehension scores of the subjects who were also responding to the technique scale. There is no significant difference between the comprehension scores of either story in the case of the face-to-face method, the audio method, or the television method of presentation. The statistical results are shown in Tables 25 and 26.

**Interpretation of the Data**

Since this study is exploratory in nature, the data are being analyzed for two purposes: (1) to note any trends in differences that are consistent at the .10 level of confidence or better; (2) to note any differences at the .10 level of confidence or better that are supported by other trends in the data.
Table 25
DIFFERENCES IN COMPREHENSION SCORES OF TECHNIQUE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$d_M$</th>
<th>$S_{Ed_M}$</th>
<th>$t_{exp}$</th>
<th>$t_{.10}$</th>
<th>$t_{.05}$</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.927</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Story 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
Table 26
SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES IN COMPREHENSION SCORES
OF TECHNIQUE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of Stories</th>
<th>$d_{M}$</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 2, "A Battle over the Teacups" by August Derleth.

Story 3, "The Trouble" by J. F. Powers.
Synthesis of the aesthetic response data. Out of six comparisons between a method with an audio dimension only and one with both audio and visual dimensions, four of the comparisons of aesthetic response scores tend toward a significant difference in favor of the methods with both audio and visual dimensions. These differences are significant at the .10 level of confidence. Three of the four visual dimensions are in the face-to-face situation; one in the television situation.

It is Story 3 that shows this difference in favor of the television method; it is also Story 3 that shows a difference in technique scores at the .10 level of confidence of the television method over the face-to-face method; Story 3 is also rated by the board of expert judges as having a television performance quality of "an exceedingly high degree" while the other two stories are rated one lower on the scale with "an outstanding degree." The data seem to be indicating a real difference in quality of television performance in the case of Story 3 from that in Stories 1 and 2. Perhaps this difference is reaching through the television method to influence aesthetic response scores in Story 3 that were not reached in Stories 1 or 2. Some interaction between an exceedingly high degree of television performance and the amount of aesthetic response may be hypothesized.
Any influence of excellence of performance quality does not seem to show in the aesthetic response data from the face-to-face method, however. All three stories show a difference significant at the .10 level in the face-to-face method even though the judges rated Story 3 one notch higher in performance quality than the other two. Perhaps some interaction between the face-to-face personality and the amount of aesthetic response may be hypothesized. Possibly the quality of performance as rated in the television method is also interacting with the television personality of the performer.

None of the groups compared show any significant differences in comprehension scores. This includes those groups that do show a significant difference (.10 level) in aesthetic response scores. Since 44 out of 45 comprehension scores were located in the upper third of the possible range, it may be hypothesized that there is a certain minimum level of comprehension upon which the degree of aesthetic response depends. A degree of comprehension falling below that level may hinder aesthetic response as measured by the scale used in this study.

Synthesis of the degree of interest data. Out of six comparisons involving television as one of the methods for perceiving the performance, four show a significant difference in favor of television. Two of these
differences are significant at the .05 level; two at the .10 level. All four are concerned with performances of either Story 1 or Story 2. There are no significant differences in the case of Story 3.

The same Story 3, however, is significantly superior (.05 level) to both Story 1 and Story 2 in the degree of interest scores when perceived by the audio method. The preceding data lead to the hypothesis that the medium of television for performance can increase the degree of interest scores for short stories whose content falls below a certain interest level. Story 3 is the only one that was given the highest possible ratings on content and performance values by the experts; Stories 1 and 2 were rated one notch lower.

None of the other differences between any of the groups compared was significant at the .10 level or better.

Two stories, 1 and 2, that show significant differences in the degree of interest in favor of the television method over the audio also show significant differences in comprehension in favor of the television method at the .05 level. Stories 1 and 2 are distinctly different in content and style from Story 3 which shows no significant differences in the degree of interest nor in comprehension. It is Story 3, however, that shows significant differences (.10 level) in aesthetic response scores in favor of the television method over the audio.
Synthesis of the technique data. Of the six comparisons made of technique scores, only one shows a difference significant at the .10 level. This is for Story 3 between the face-to-face method and the television method in favor of television. There is no significant difference between the face-to-face method and the television method for Story 2, nor between the audio method and either the face-to-face or the television method for Story 2 and Story 3. The hypothesis is suggested, therefore, that technique can be rated as effectively from voice cues only as from the combination of vocal and visual cues for ordinary performances. It may well be that the individual who gives effective voice cues in his performance is also the one who will give effective visual cues for ordinary performances.

The one significant difference (.10 level) between the face-to-face and the television performance is in the case of Story 3—which performance was rated as being true to the intent of the writer to an exceedingly high degree. An hypothesis may be formed that in the case of an exceptionally high quality of performance, the intimate television screen highlights the skill of technique more than the face-to-face performance. This highlighting of the skill of technique may also be interacting with the high
quality of content in Story 3 and the television personality of the performer.

The comprehension scores for the technique groups show no significant differences and no consistent pattern of any kind.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

What is the response produced in members of an audience by the experience of perceiving the oral interpretation of a selection of literature? What is the nature of this response? What are the cues in performance that influenced it? To what extent can these cues be isolated by perceiving performances in different ways: the face-to-face situation, the television situation, and the audio tape situation? These are the over-all questions that this experimental study was asking.

Summary

The preceding questions were asked in order to gain some empirical evidence about response to the interpretation situation. Such evidence was intended to lead to insight into the nature of such response; such insight, in turn, could lead to explorations with methods of fostering the development of those qualities of sensitivity and compassion that make for human worth. That literature can make a contribution to this development has long been accepted in the humanities tradition.
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There was no literature in the field about the specific type of problem pursued in this investigation. A number of related fields, however, offered evidence that was pertinent to the present study.

**Response to television presentations.** Studies from the response to television presentations in the teaching-learning process indicated a student attitude preference for the fixed, one-camera technique in presenting dramatic literature and in presenting instruction. They also showed no significant differences on the more clearly evaluative dimensions of the semantic differential type attitude scale nor on the comprehension scale between the audio only and the audio plus video methods. The reports indicated that attitudes of students toward television are more accurately described as attitudes toward other elements involved in the total teaching-learning process.

**Response to visual cues.** Studies ranging from 1914 to 1959 reported with increasing emphasis and as a result of more carefully controlled methods that emotional tendencies and attitudes can be interpreted with a high degree of reliability by means of facial expression. The conditions under which the expressions are judged influence the accuracy of the interpretations.
Response to aural cues. The voice carried meaning other than that of the language symbols according to the reports of investigators in this area. One of the later studies related Osgood's emotional dimensions of valence, strength, and activity to the speech characteristics of loudness, pitch, timbre, and rate.

Response to listenability cues. A series of experiments with material devised according to the Flesch readability formula indicated that the Flesch formula might be used as a gross indicator of listenability, although the Flesch human interest formula did not help comprehension. The rate, pitch, and visual presence of the speaker influenced comprehension, while the intelligence of the audience was strongly related to skill in listening.

Response to content. Introductory material that produced a "set" or expectation of what was to come increased comprehension according to one group of studies. Another group of studies indicated that a factor making for intelligibility in their experimental series was the interest aroused by the content of the talk as related to the intelligence and educational level of the listeners. There was a statistically significant difference to indicate that the retention of an educational broadcast varies with knowledge that the listener brings to it.
Influence of perception upon response. The unconscious influence of form elements; the functioning of the perception cycle with its set and its congruency; the influences upon thresholds of perception of motivational and cognitive and value supports: these were some of the samples presented from the literature to indicate the far-reaching influences of perception upon the audience response.

Procedures. One hundred twenty students were divided into matched groups for perceiving the oral interpretation of three selected short stories when the performances were presented by three different methods: face-to-face, television, and audio tape. The students were matched for sex, educational level, and raw scores on the verbal selection of the Ohio State Psychological Examination. Their responses were measured in four ways: (1) aesthetic response; (2) degree of interest; (3) judgment of quality of technique in performance; and (4) comprehension of content. From the data collected and analyzed, the questions posed in Chapter I were answered.

Conclusions

About Aesthetic Response

1. There is a difference in aesthetic response consistently tending toward significance between the face-to-face and the audio methods of perceiving the oral
interpretation of a short story in favor of the face-to-face method.

2. There is no significant difference in aesthetic response between the face-to-face and the television methods of perceiving the oral interpretation of a short story.

3. There is a difference in aesthetic response that is consistently either significant or tending toward significance between Stories 2 and 3 when perceived by the same method.

4. There is a difference in aesthetic response tending toward significance between the television and the audio methods of perceiving the oral interpretation of Story 3 in favor of the television method, but there are no significant differences in the cases of the other two stories.

5. There is no significant difference in comprehension of the aesthetic response groups between any of the methods of perceiving the oral interpretation of a short story.

About Degree of Interest

1. There is a difference in degree of interest that is consistently either significant or tending toward significance between the television and the audio methods and between the television and the face-to-face methods of perceiving Stories 1 and 2 in favor of the television
method. There are no significant differences in the case of Story 3.

2. There is a significant difference in comprehension of the degree of interest groups between the television and the audio methods of perceiving Stories 1 and 2 in favor of the television method. There are no significant differences in comprehension between any of the other groups.

3. There is no significant difference in degree of interest between the face-to-face and the audio methods of perceiving the oral interpretation of a short story.

4. There is a significant difference in degree of interest between Stories 1 and 3 and between Stories 2 and 3 in favor of Story 3 when the oral interpretations are perceived by the audio method. There are no significant differences between stories by the other methods.

About Judgment of Quality of Technique

1. There is no significant difference in the judgment of technique between the face-to-face and the audio methods nor between the television and the audio methods for either Story 2 or Story 3.

2. There is no significant difference in comprehension of the technique groups between any of the methods for either Stories 2 or 3.

3. There is a difference tending toward significance in the judgment of technique between the face-to-face
method and the television method in favor of television for Story 3, but not for Story 2.

4. There is significant difference in the judgment of technique between Stories 2 and 3 by the television method in favor of Story 3, but there is no significant difference in the cases of the other two methods.

Implications

Nature of the Response

The response produced in members of an audience by the experience of perceiving the oral interpretation of a selection of literature has been described in this experimental investigation in terms of four dimensions: aesthetic reaction, degree of interest, judgment of quality of technique, and comprehension of content. Insofar as these four components showed varied differences in response to similar conditions of methods of perceiving the performances, of content of the stories, and of composition of the audience, one may conclude that the four dimensions are separate wholes that make up four parts of the nature of this response. There is no implication that these four parts constitute the whole of the nature of that response, nor that the parts of these four dimensions are mutually exclusive.
Table 27

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences in Aesthetic Response</th>
<th>Number of Stories or Methods</th>
<th>Tending Towards Significance (10) or Significant (.05)</th>
<th>Favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between F-F &amp; Audio</td>
<td>3 stories</td>
<td>F-F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between F-F &amp; TV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between TV &amp; Audio</td>
<td>1 story (3)</td>
<td>TV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Stories 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>3 methods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Stories 1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between all combinations of groups: COMPREHENSION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences in Degree of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between TV &amp; Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between TV &amp; Audio:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPREHENSION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between TV &amp; F-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between F-F &amp; Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Stories 1 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Stories 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences in Judgment of Quality of Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between F-F &amp; Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between TV &amp; Audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between F-F &amp; TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Stories 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between all combinations of groups: COMPREHENSION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cues that Influenced the Response

1. There is some evidence consistently tending toward significance to indicate that the aesthetic response dimension has components linked not only to the visual cues of performance in the face-to-face situation, but also to the content of the story.

2. There is also some evidence tending toward significance to indicate an interaction of the face-to-face personality or of the television personality with both the content of the story and the visual cues of performance. The fact that Story 3 was tending toward significant superiority to Story 2 in producing aesthetic response by all three methods, and that the same Story 3 was being used when the television method was tending toward significant superiority over the audio method in producing aesthetic response suggests an interaction that merits further investigation.

3. There is significant evidence that links the degree of interest dimension with the content of the story.

4. Both the degree of interest and the comprehension of a story with lower content values (1 and 2 in the experiment) can be increased by means of perceiving the oral interpretation by television. Perception by the television method increases the degree of interest when the content values fall below a certain level. Further studies
with different content levels might place the preceding level more exactly. The present investigation indicates that an oral interpretation whose content falls below the top rating on a five-point scale will be enhanced as far as the degree of interest is concerned by perceiving the performance over television. The members of the audience were second quarter college freshmen, however, who may be considered to be in the upper fifty percent, at least, of the intelligence range of the population.

5. There is significant evidence that quality of technique can be judged as effectively by the audio method only as by the audio and visual method, either television or face-to-face. This suggests a possible relationship of qualities of technique with Osgood's three major dimensions of emotions—valence, strength, and activity—that merits further investigation. Davitz and Davitz investigated such a relationship with nonverbal, vocal cues.¹

6. There is also some slight evidence to indicate that an exceptionally high rating of degree of technique will be associated with the highest level of content. Whether or not the highest rating for technique would be

given to an oral interpretation performance of content that is not of the highest level merits further investigation. Level of content and judgment of quality of technique may be interacting in ways that can be identified.

Method of Isolating Cues

The experimental design that was used in the present investigation has been found to be very effective as a means of isolating cues in audience response to performance. Further progress in methods of securing larger numbers of qualified judges for validating stimuli will greatly enhance its value.

Synthesis and Recommendations

This study found a significant difference in the degree of interest between stories of different content values; a difference consistently tending toward significance in aesthetic response between stories of different content values; and an implication that the judgment of the quality of technique was influenced by the content value of the selection.

This study also found a significant difference in the degree of interest and in comprehension of content between the television and the audio methods, in favor of television, for stories whose content fell below the top rank of quality; a difference consistently tending toward
significance in aesthetic response between the face-to-face method and the audio method; and an implication that the quality of technique interacted with the quality of content to influence the aesthetic response in the television method.

The following recommendations are offered:

1. Audio tapes or records that combine top quality of content and performance should be used to arouse interest in literature.

2. Audio tapes or records that do not combine top quality of content and performance have value for studying technique, but they should be used with caution for other purposes.

3. Audio tapes may be used for purposes of delayed evaluation of technique with an accuracy that is not significantly different from that secured from the face-to-face performance.

4. The face-to-face performance should be used to arouse a relatively full aesthetic response to the literature.

5. The television performance should combine top quality of content and performance to secure a relatively full aesthetic response to the literature.
The following questions are suggested for further study:

1. Can the aesthetic response scale be revised to make finer discriminations?

2. Is there any significant relationship between Osgood's major dimensions of emotion and aesthetic response as defined by the scale used in this study? Between the major dimensions of emotion and the components of aesthetic response?

3. Is there any significant relationship between Osgood's major dimensions of emotion and response to technique in oral interpretations? Between Osgood's major dimensions of emotion and response to the visual and aural components of technique?

4. Can a method be devised of using invisible television cameras for a face-to-face performance? Of using some other television technique that would not destroy the normal classroom face-to-face viewing situation?
APPENDIX A

DEVELOPING RATING AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALES FOR ORAL INTERPRETATION

Talk Delivered at the Interpretation Section of the Speech Association of America Convention, New York, 1961
DEVELOPING RATING AND SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALES FOR ORAL INTERPRETATION

Poetry reminds one of vicarious experience, of life, of beauty, of art; of the rapture of an Edna St. Vincent Millay, "Oh world! I cannot hold thee close enough!"; of the insight of a Richard Lovelace, "Stone walls do not a prison make, Nor iron bars a cage"; of the sensory imagery of D. H. Lawrence in his snake that

reached down from a dissure in the earthwall in the gloom
And trailed his yellow-brown slackness
soft-bellied down, over the stone trough
And rested his throat upon the stone bottom;

of the understanding of a Shakespeare in Romeo's "He jests at scars, That never felt a wound." In short, poetry reminds one of the rainbow hues of literature.

Rating scales, on the other hand, remind one of standard deviations, of the significance of the error, of the sum of squares, of F scores, of the analysis of variance. In short, rating scales remind one of the complex world of measurement. Can these two worlds that apparently are not even on the same continuum work together to reinforce each other?
The problem of the rating scale seems to be similar to that of the Bunny in Arthur Guiterman's verses, *Strictly Germproof*. Remember the story?

The Antiseptic Baby and the Prophylactic Pup
Were playing in the garden when the Bunny gamboled up;
They looked upon the Creature with a loathing undisguised;
It wasn't Disinfected and it wasn't Sterilized.

They said it was a Microbe and a Hotbed of Disease;
They steamed it in a vapor of a thousand-odd degrees;
They froze it in a freezer that was cold as Banished Hope
And washed it in permanganate with carbolated soap.

In sulphurated hydrogen they steeped its wiggly ears;
They trimmed its frisky whiskers with a pair of hard-boiled shears;
They donned their rubber mittens and they took it by the hand
And elected it a member of the Fumigated Band.

There's not a Microccus in the garden where they play;
They bathe in pure iodoform a dozen times a day;
And each imbibes his rations from a Hygienic Cup--
The Bunny and the Baby and the Prophylactic Pup.¹

Will the oral interpretation rating scale be elected a member of the literary band in like manner? We'll

¹ Edwin Markham, comp., *The Book of American Poetry*. 
briefly sketch the story of its development, and let you decide for yourself.

The problem with the rating scale from the beginning was one of getting a valid measurement of an aesthetic response. A valid measurement is as objective as possible; an aesthetic response is subjective and elusive. If a rating scale is to be useful as a teaching tool for oral interpretation, it should contribute to the accomplishment of the primary course objectives. The objectives of oral interpretation courses reported most frequently in American universities according to the survey published in 1960, focus attention either directly or indirectly on the literature that is being read. We decided, therefore, that this attempt to measure the performance in oral interpretation should be concerned with evaluating the response to the literature as read, not simply with evaluating the techniques used to encourage such a response.

The construction of the original scale took place last year toward the end of the Winter Quarter at the Ohio State University. It was built upon a foundation

---

that had been laid during the previous year at the University of Dayton, where the students had been organized in small groups for performance in interpretation. Those students proposed to assemble a check list of significant criteria for performance in interpretation. They did intensive research among the many textbooks in oral interpretation to locate the criteria considered significant by the respective authors; they also consulted special authors for light on choosing areas of concentration under which to group the criteria. The three areas chosen were represented by the following three words: RELAX, CONTROL, SUGGEST.

Students wrote paragraphs of criticism about other students' performances under the three preceding areas. They gleaned the specific points for criticism from any of the references they had used as well as from class lectures. They wrote freely in their own language and from

3 Constantin Stanislavsky, My Life in Art (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1924).


their own point of view. A list of 306 descriptive phrases was culled from these essays. The phrases were checked for repetition and ambiguity and reduced to 42. They were then checked for pertinency and adequacy by comparison with check lists and suggestions for evaluation in textbooks by Bacon and Breen, Cobin, Crocker, Dolman, Lee, Lowrey and Johnson, Smith and Lynn, and Woolbert and Nelson. The concepts and descriptive phrases for the scale were chosen from the residual set of phrases.

The scale itself was adapted to the measurement of performance by combining a concept about performance with polar opposite descriptive phrases. Seven-step scales were used, since research by Osgood and Stagner indicated that seven alternatives were used effectively by college students. 4

The rating scale now began to be steeped in that vapor of a thousand odd degrees. We began to use it for evaluating performances.

We expect a measuring instrument to show differences among the objects measured if such differences exist.

---

In measuring the performances of an entire class, we should expect to locate differences in performance skill. The data in Table I will show what we found . . . and what we did not find. You will note that the F score was only 1.9042; for the readers to be different one from another at the 1 percent level, the F score would need to be 2.66 or larger. Some instructors may still find the scale in the original form a useful instrument for arousing discussion about significant criteria in the performance situation and for fostering insight. As a measuring instrument, however, the scale was not functioning very accurately.

**TABLE I**

**INTERPRETATION SCALE--ORIGINAL FORM**

\( (V_p = \text{readers}; V_k = \text{judges}) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>( V_p )</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>1% level</th>
<th>( V_k )</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>1% level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-N</td>
<td>506.92</td>
<td>1.9042</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1826.67</td>
<td>6.861</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The revised version reduced the number of items by combining some that overlapped and eliminating others that were vague or complex. When an analysis of variance was made of the scores, the F scores for the differences among the readers were all significant at the 1 percent level. (See Table II.) Now the scale was differentiating among the readers.
The scale was also doing something else, however, something that we weren't too happy about. It was focusing attention on techniques of performance to an extent that was distracting the audience from attention to the literature. Could we not develop a scale that would concentrate the attention of the audience on the literature as read? That is what we started to do; that is what we still wanted to do.

So, Professor Keith Brooks suggested that we make some exploratory runs with semantic differential scales. This is a sample of semantic differential scales that we developed for a lyric poem. (See p. 123.) The essential operation of measurement is the successive allocation of a concept, such as uncle, water, daughter, to a series of descriptive scales defined by polar adjectives. Instead of using a concept, we used the oral interpretation of a lyric poem. In setting up these scales of polar
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALES FOR PERFORMANCE
IN INTERPRETATION

(Name of the lyric poem)

pleasurable ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ painful
awkward ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ graceful
harmonious ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ dissonant
plaintive ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ jubilant
safe ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ dangerous
fetid ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ fragrant
rising ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ falling
hellish ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ heavenly
wholesome ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ morbid
weak ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ strong
spacious ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ constricted
light ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ heavy
slow ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ fast
changeable ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ stable
numb ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ tingling
usual ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ unusual
mature ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ youthful
savory ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ tasteless
muted ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ resonant
sensitive ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ insensitive
adjectives, it was necessary to locate pairs that isolated and identified the major factors operating in meaningful judgments. According to studies made by Osgood and others, three factors appear to be dominant in the meaningful judgments operating through this semantic space. They are evaluation, potency, and activity. They appear in most of the analyses made and in roughly the same orders of magnitude. Some others have been isolated in specific studies, such as receptivity, novelty, stability, and tautness, but these factors are not so stable as the first three.

Research by the preceding authors has demonstrated repeatedly that subjects vary the meanings of concepts along certain scales, such as the evaluation scale: pleasurable-painful, quite independently of variation along other scales, such as the activity scale: slow-fast. Some lyric poems judged pleasurable may also be judged fast; and some lyric poems judged pleasurable may also be judged slow. Therefore, meanings vary multidimensionally, as Osgood phrases it, and an oral interpretation scale must recognize this fact.

---

In constructing the scales, then, it was desirable to use polar adjectives from the various dimensions that have been isolated. We have the evaluation dimension—pleasurable-painful; the potency dimension—weak-strong; the activity dimension—slow-fast; the novelty dimension—usual-unusual; the receptivity dimension—muted-resonant; the stability dimension—changeable-stable; the tautness dimension—numb-tingling.

In applying these scales to a lyric poem instead of to a concept like uncle or water, just how do they work? Some of you may be interested in using the scales to respond to a short lyric poem that we will read to you, and then, you can see for yourself. (If you are reading this silently, you may be interested in giving an oral interpretation of the poem for yourself.) The directions are the same as those for other semantic differential scales.

If, after listening to the poem (or reading it yourself), you feel that the poem as a whole is very closely related to one or other end of the scale, you should place your mark in the space at that end. If you feel that the poem as a whole is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your mark in the second space from the end. If the poem as a whole seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral),
then you should mark in the third space from the end. The
directions toward which you check, of course, depend upon
which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteris­
tic of the lyric poem you are judging. If you consider
the poem to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the
scale equally associated with the poem, or if the scale is
completely irrelevant, unrelated to the poem, then you
would place your mark in the middle space. Work at fairly
high speed through the items. It is your first impres­
sions, the immediate "feelings" about the items, that we
want.

In preparing for reading, I have marked the scales
as I hope to interpret the poem. After the reading, you
can mark the scales according to your response to the poem
if you wish. Then I will place my markings on the scale
and you can compare your response. Thus, a reader (and a
student in a class) can have some idea as to whether or
not he is securing the response from his audience that he
wants.

INTRODUCTION TO THE READING: Have you ever had the
experience of lying in a hammock on a summer evening and
watching the stars? Maybe it was a winter evening that
was cloudless and still, and you were in your car. What­
ever season it was, Sara Teasdale puts into words some of
the deep feelings we have when we watch the heavens.
Stars
by Sara Teasdale

Alone in the night
On a dark hill
With pines around me
Spicy and still.

And a heaven full of stars
Over my head,
White and topaz
And misty red,

Myriads with beating
Hearts of fire
That seem
Cannot vex or tire;

Up the dome of heaven
Like a great hill,
I watch them marching
Stately and still.

And I know that I
Am honored to be
Witness
Of so much majesty.

Marks will vary in both direction and intensity. It is not likely that a reader can hope that his marks for intensity will be matched in the majority of items with those of the audience; but we think he might hope that the direction of his marks will be matched in the majority of items with those of the audience.

We did some exploring also with marking semantic differential scales for characters in narrative prose.

---

Sara Teasdale, *Collected Poems*. 
selections, but we shall confine ourselves in the time that is left to the insights received from the explorations. One of the most important of these is concerned with the modifiability of the semantic space. Past research has shown us that, when the sample of concepts being judged is limited in some way, the nature of the factors operating through the semantic space may change. When the judgments were limited to sociopolitical concepts, for example, such as people and policies, there seemed to be a merging of the second and third factors into what might be called a "Dynamism factor." An hypothesis that had been formed and that was brought out again by the use of these scales for a literature selection is this: the greater the emotional or attitudinal loading of a set of concepts being judged, the greater the tendency of the semantic framework to collapse into a single, combined dimension.7

With this lead, the revised interpretation scale split into two forms: the aesthetic response scale and the technique scale. The first measures the response to the mood and emotions, to the imagery, and to the situation in the literature as read. (See p. 129.) The second evaluates the facial and other bodily expression

7 Osgood, op. cit., p. 74.
### Aesthetic Response Scale for Performance in Interpretation

#### Name of Reader _______________________ Date _______________

#### Title of Selection ______________________

**DIRECTIONS:** Mark the scales below after making as objective a description as possible. Place your check mark toward that end of the scale where the description more nearly fits the reader's performance. Make your mark near the end if the performance fits perfectly; farther away as the performance moves away from the perfect mark. Few performers are perfect in all items.

Mark **INTRODUCTION** as soon as reader announces title of the selection.

**INTRODUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aroused anticipation</th>
<th>Led anticipation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for the selection</td>
<td>away from the selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do not mark **RESPONSE** until reader has completed the entire story.

**RESPONSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotions and mood</th>
<th>Emotions and mood were vague or inappropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>were definite and appropriate</td>
<td>were vague or inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Images were dull or overdone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>were vivid and sensitive</td>
<td>were dull or overdone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Situation was vague, weak, or contrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>was clear and convincing</td>
<td>was vague, weak, or contrived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRODUCTION SCORE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSE SCORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SCORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAME OF OBSERVER** _______________________

Arranged by S. M. Wulftange  
General Communication  
The Ohio State University
THE TECHNIQUE SCALE FOR PERFORMANCE
IN ORAL INTERPRETATION

Name of Reader ____________________________ Date ______

Title of Selection ______________________________________

DIRECTIONS: Mark the scales below after making as objective a description as possible. Place your check mark toward that end of the scale where the description more nearly fits the reader's performance. Make your mark near the end if the performance fits perfectly; farther away as the performance moves away from the perfect mark. Few performers are perfect in all items.

Do not mark until the reader has completed the entire story.

**TECHNIQUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facial expression</th>
<th>Facial expression (or lack of it) enhanced mood and distracted from mood and meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other bodily movement</th>
<th>Other bodily movement (or lack of it) enhanced mood and distracted from mood and meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice changes</th>
<th>No voice changes in tone, tempo, and intensity made effective made selection suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL SCORE ______

NAME OF OBSERVER ____________________________

Arranged by S. M. Wulftange
General Communication
The Ohio State University
and the vocal expression. (See p. 130.) The data from the use of these scales are given in Tables III and IV.

The results indicate that the readers are being identified as significantly different one from the other at the one percent level. In the case of the Aesthetic Response Scale, which measures the response to the literature as read, we note that in three of the cases, the judges tend to agree with each other very closely.

Thus, the 'Bunny' of the original rating scale has been transformed into the Aesthetic Response Scale and the Technique Scale. The results of this study may give us deeper insight into teaching techniques that will help us accomplish the primary objectives of the course in oral interpretation. Then, perhaps, we may really find that the rating scale has been elected a member of the literary band.

Katherine Wulftange
TABLE III
AESTHETIC RESPONSE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>V_p</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>1% level</th>
<th>V_k</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>1% level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - E</td>
<td>33.32</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - J</td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>2.053</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - O</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P - T</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>7.334</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U - X</td>
<td>77.04</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IV
TECHNIQUE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readers</th>
<th>V_P</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>1% level</th>
<th>V_k</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>1% level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - E</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - J</td>
<td>12.786</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - O</td>
<td>41.536</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.662</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P - T</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U - X</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>39.12</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>7.285</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

DEGREE OF INTEREST SCALE
AND
COMPREHENSION TESTS
DEGREE OF INTEREST SCALE FOR PERFORMANCE IN INTERPRETATION

Name of Reader ___________________________ Date __________
Title of Selection _______________________________________

DIRECTIONS: Mark the scales below after making as objective a judgment as possible. Place your check mark toward that end of the scale where the description more nearly fits the reader's performance. Make your mark near the end if the performance fits perfectly; farther away as the performance moves away from the perfect mark.

Do NOT mark until the reader has completed the entire story.

This oral interpretation was extremely interesting : ___:___:___:  : ___:  : ___: uninteresting

OTHER COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________

Name of Observer ____________________________________________
COMPREHENSION TEST FOR
"A FIGHT HE COULD NOT WIN" BY THOMAS BARCLAY THOMSON

DIRECTION: The five choices for each item in the test are numbered respectively 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. On the accompanying answer sheet, fill in the space that corresponds to the number selected. DO NOT MARK ON THIS PAPER. MARK ONLY ON THE SPACES ON THE ANSWER SHEET. If you wish to erase on the answer sheet, do so very carefully and completely, and then fill in the space for the number selected.

1. Uncle Dud lived with his nephew
   1. because he could work in the fields.
   2. because he had done his own cooking since his wife died.
   3. because he liked to cook.
   4. because his cabin had burned and he could not get help to build it again.
   5. because he was lonely.

2. Uncle Dud had fixed a special dinner that evening
   1. to celebrate his nephew's birthday.
   2. to get the two men ready for the next day's plowing.
   3. to prepare the two men with good warm victuals before the disagreement that was coming.
   4. to try out a new recipe.
   5. to show his skill as a cook.

3. Giles, the father of the boy Caleb, was
   1. a fine upstanding man, still on the good side of forty.
   2. beginning to turn gray at the temples.
   3. a loud, noisy fellow who drank too much.
   4. a hard worker who made life hard for Uncle Dud.
   5. a gray-haired man, well on the other side of sixty.

4. Caleb, the son, was
   1. shorter than his father, but heavier.
   2. taller than his father, thought not so hefty.
   3. dark-haired with fine features.
   4. wiry and lanky.
   5. good-looking in a dark and oily way.
5. Giles spoke first at the table and told his son
1. that he should not read that night but go to sleep early to get ready for the next day.
2. that he should prepare to take a load of hay to town on the following day.
3. that they would do no work on the morrow so he could take a good rest.
4. that he had to go to town that evening and he wanted Caleb to go with him.
5. that he should wash dishes for Uncle Dud.

6. Caleb said
1. that he was glad to have a chance to go to bed early for a change.
2. that he was going to visit his girl friend at her home.
3. that he was going to keep company with the devil and his cohorts that night.
4. that he was going to play cards with his friends.
5. that he was going to a dance with Zalie that evening.

7. Caleb's girl friend, Zalie Hall, was
1. a tall girl with rather loud manners.
2. a brown-eyed girl, saucy as a redblrd, and shy.
3. a mousy girl, completely dominated by her father.
4. a striking red-haired beauty.
5. a blond vampire.

8. Uncle Dud had taken the whip that hung on the deer horns during the boy's growing-up days and
1. dropped it over behind the cupboard
2. thrown it in the fire.
3. hid it under his bed.
4. placed it in the chest in Giles' room.
5. given it to Caleb.

9. Caleb said that
1. his girl friend was only doing what her Pa directed.
2. his girl friend thought Caleb's father was a big fool.
3. his father should not interfere with his son's life.
4. nobody was leading him where he didn't want to go.
5. his father should take care of his own business.

10. Giles had always been hard on his son because
1. he was letting out his bitterness over his wife's death.
10. (Continued)
  2. he wanted to make a man of him.
  3. he was irritated by the boy's smart answers.
  4. he reminded him of his dead wife.
  5. he was afraid of him.

11. Caleb left the table and stalked into his room
  1. only after he had thrown over his chair and
     smashed his plate.
  2. after he had told Uncle Dud to leave.
  3. without finishing his meal.
  4. without saying a word to his father.
  5. after he had told his father he was leaving home.

12. Uncle Dud was living with his nephew Giles because
  1. he preferred it to the old soldiers' home
  2. he liked it better than his lone cabin far up on
     the Knob.
  3. he was hired to help with the plowing.
  4. he drank too much and needed someone to care
     for him.
  5. he was good at taking care of the poultry.

13. Uncle Dud opened the door to Caleb's room and discovered
  1. that the boy had thrown himself across the bed,
     fully dressed, and was sound asleep.
  2. that the boy was packing his belongings.
  3. that the boy was lying in bed and reading.
  4. that the boy was stalking around the room like an
     angry bull.
  5. that the boy had donned his Sunday suit and left
     by the window.

14. Giles stalked into the kitchen
  1. for the second time to scold Uncle Dud for his
     laziness.
  2. to tell Uncle Dud to prepare a lunch for the
     next day.
  3. to shift the cupboard and get the whip.
  4. to help Uncle Dud with the work.
  5. to tell Uncle Dud to feed the chickens.

15. Giles spoke short to Uncle Dud
  1. for the third time that evening.
  2. for the last time in his life.
  3. for the good of his son.
  4. to make him angry.
  5. for the first time in his life.
16. The only riding critter left in the stable was
   1. a mule too ornery mean to die.
   2. a plowing horse that was on its last legs.
   3. a high-spirited black stallion.
   4. a shetland pony.
   5. a colt.

17. Uncle Dud took a short cut to Harmony
   1. to prevent his riding critter from kicking.
   2. in order to get there ahead of Giles.
   3. to see the moon shining through the trees.
   4. to prevent his having to ride so long without
      a saddle.
   5. to take the mip from his jug.

18. When he got to Harmony, Uncle Dud saw the puffy-fat
    figure of Hark Hall
    1. dancing with his daughter.
    2. fighting with Giles.
    3. standing on a barrel and haranguing the people.
    4. aiming a shot-gun at Giles.
    5. peddling mountain dew outside the dance hall.

19. There were two sets in the hill country:
    1. the folks who went dancing and the folks who
       went drinking.
    2. the folks who went to meetin', and the folks
       who followed good times.
    3. the folks who raised corn and the folks who
       raised live-stock.
    4. the folks who used horses and the folks who
       used mules.
    5. the folks who belonged to sewing circles and
       the folks who belonged to drinking circles.

20. When Uncle Dud saw Caleb dancing with Zalie,
    1. he called out his warning in a loud voice.
    2. he pulled Caleb away and thrust him out the door.
    3. he told Caleb he was a good-for-nothing.
    4. his old heart warmed with pride.
    5. he ran over and pulled Zalie away from him.

21. Zalie tried to make Caleb see that
    1. he should be ashamed of being browbeaten by his
       father.
    2. he should go home to his father and never see
       her again.
    3. he should be glad that he could be proud of his
       father.
21. (Continued)
4. he should leave home and be independent.
5. he should imitate his father and hold to his
tight way of living.

22. When Caleb met his father outside the hall,
1. the boy walked fast to meet his father and
growled, "What do you want?"
2. the boy immediately smashed into him with
his fist.
3. the boy meekly followed him to the buggy and
went home.
4. the boy openly flaunted him and dared him to
use the whip.
5. the boy got scared and ran away.

23. Before Giles took religion so hard
1. he had been a dandy who never got his clothes
dirty.
2. he had been a quiet, studious man.
3. he had been an enemy of Hark Hall.
4. he had courted Zalie's mother.
5. he had been a lusty fighter.

24. Uncle Dud began to grieve for Giles
1. when he realized that Giles was getting licked.
2. when he saw the boy pounding Giles' face till
it bled.
3. when he heard Zalie crying out for them to stop.
4. when he saw the boy trip Giles and fling him down.
5. when he heard the crowd booing him.

25. There'd be a wild celebration from Satan's followers
1. if Giles knocked out his own son before their eyes.
2. if Giles turned on Hark Hall and chased him away.
3. if Giles got licked by his own son before their
eyes.
4. if Giles gave up and ran off.
5. if Giles forced his son to come home.

26. The boy, Caleb, let his father lick him
1. so Zalie wouldn't be mad at him.
2. so Hark Hall would stop selling his mountain dew.
3. so the folks would stop crowding around and
yelling.
4. so Zalie would marry him.
5. so Giles wouldn't be shamed before these people.
27. When the boy, Caleb, got up and faced his father, he said
   1. that he would go home with his father now.
   2. that he would never speak to his father again.
   3. that he and Zalie had come together and that he would be takin' her home.
   4. that he was ashamed of his father.
   5. that he was ashamed of himself.

28. When Zalie fluttered down to kneel beside Caleb,
   1. she scolded him for getting into a fight with his father.
   2. she began crying so hard she became hysterical.
   3. she wiped the blood from his face in silence.
   4. she whispered that she was proud and glad that he'd let his father win.
   5. she called out to her father to run away.

29. When he stood looking down at Zalie and Caleb, Giles knew
   1. that Zalie was a dangerous woman.
   2. that Uncle Dud was a trouble-maker.
   3. that his son had let him win the fight.
   4. that he should not have begun the fight.
   5. that he was the stronger and the better man.

30. Giles had said that Zalie could never ride in his buggy or step foot inside his cabin, but now
   1. Caleb insisted on taking Zalie home in the buggy.
   2. Uncle Dud invited Zalie to visit the cabin.
   3. Zalie refused to ride in the buggy.
   4. Giles himself helped Zalie into the buggy, his big hands gentis.
   5. Caleb decided to walk home with Zalie.
COMPREHENSION TEST FOR

"THE TROUBLE" BY J. F. POWERS

DIRECTIONS: The five choices for each item in the test are numbered respectively 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. On the accompanying answer sheet, fill in the space that corresponds to the number selected. DO NOT MARK ON THIS PAPER. MARK ONLY IN THE SPACES ON THE ANSWER SHEET. If you wish to erase on the answer sheet, do so very carefully and completely, and then fill in the space for the number selected.

1. The four kids watched at the window all that afternoon because
   1. they wanted to see another colored person getting killed.
   2. they wanted to see rats run out from under a tenement.
   3. they wanted to see some whites get killed for a change.
   4. they wanted to see the guns and the clubs.
   5. they wanted to see the fences get pushed over.

2. The crowd of people that brought Mama home
   1. came up the stairs, sadly and quietly.
   2. locked Old Gramma and the four kids in the next room.
   3. broke down the door and barged right in.
   4. pushed Old Gramma and the four kids out the door.
   5. came tramping up the stairs and banging on our door.

3. When they brought Mama in, Old Gramma
   1. fainted, and some old woman friend of hers took care of her.
   2. began weeping and moaning.
   3. rushed the four kids into the next room.
   4. ran out to get help from the neighbors.
   5. began sipping some hot water.

4. Mama had been injured so that
   1. a bone had pokes through the flesh of arm and something terrible was wrong with her chest.
   2. her two legs were broken and hanging awkwardly.
   3. it took five people to carry her.
   4. the people who brought her home were all crying.
   5. Old Gramma was afraid of her.
5. Somebody brought in
   1. a white doctor to take care of Mama
   2. a quack from the neighborhood.
   3. the landlady.
   4. the woman next door to help Mama.
   5. a colored doctor who had a little black bag.

6. The Doctor wasn't very hopeful about helping Mama
   1. but he decided to try.
   2. so he left without trying.
   3. so he played with the four kids.
   4. so he helped some of the others instead.
   5. so he tried to help Old Gramma instead.

7. When the Doctor asked some men and women what had happened
   1. he walked into the corridor to talk to them.
   2. he became angry at what they told him.
   3. he called Old Gramma to hear the details.
   4. he frowned at the remarks of the man with the glasses on who talked about organizing and fighting the thing to a finish.
   5. he gathered the four kids around him and had them ask questions too.

8. The old woman friend of Old Gramma's asked me to open a can of soup
   1. and got a meal together for us kids.
   2. and heated some soup for Old Gramma.
   3. and gave some soup to the Doctor.
   4. and heated some soup for Mama.
   5. and got a meal together for Daddy when he came home.

9. When the old woman said that the boy wasn't the first boy in the world to lose his mother
   1. he wondered was she crazy and yelled that he wasn't going to lose his mother.
   2. he began crying.
   3. the four kids began to cry.
   4. the Doctor told the woman to keep quiet.
   5. Mama opened her eyes and looked at all of them.

10. Old Gramma came out of her room, looked at Mama, and then
   1. began to tirade against the people who had done this.
   2. fainted for the second time.
   3. buried her head in her hands and began to cry.
   4. went over and whispered to the Doctor.
   5. went over and took a drink of water.
11. Old Gramma went over to the grocery store
   1. to get some potatoes.
   2. to get some meat.
   3. to get some candles.
   4. to get some iodine.
   5. to get some bandages.

12. Old Gramma and Mama were
   1. from Tennessee.
   2. from New Orleans.
   3. from New York.
   4. from the hill country.
   5. from the West.

13. One of the whites chasing the coloreds was blowing a
    bugle like folks do when
    1. they give the starting signal for a race.
    2. they get lost in the woods.
    3. they blow 'taps.'
    4. they call a group of campers together.
    5. they go fox hunting in Virginia.

14. Finally, a white man, the one with the tan tivvy bugle,
    was being chased down the alley
    1. by about three dozen rats.
    2. by about a million colored.
    3. by about a million whites.
    4. by three mad dogs.
    5. by two policemen.

15. When the alley hit our building,
    1. it divided into two sections.
    2. it opened onto a street heavy with one-way traffic.
    3. it was littered with garbage cans and debris.
    4. it made a sharp right turn.
    5. it came to a dead end.

16. The white man was saved when
    1. he came rushing around the garage to the alley.
    2. he ran through the space between the warehouse
       and the Victory.
    3. Old Gramma opened our back door and took him in.
    4. the police arrived and used tear gas.
    5. he turned into the junk yard behind the furniture
       warehouse.

17. The boy was glad that the white man was saved because
    1. he knew the white man very well and liked him.
17. (Continued)
1. the white man had a business in the neighborhood.
2. the boy's Daddy liked the white man.
3. the white man had been kind to him.
4. he did not see what difference it could make to Mama if the white man lived or died.

18. The boy thought that the trouble is that somebody gets cheated or insulted or killed and everybody else tries to make it come out even
1. by cheating and insulting and killing the cheat­ers and insulters and killers.
2. by reporting the offenders to the police.
3. by pretending that nothing happened.
4. by forgiving and forgetting.
5. by burning others' houses.

19. The doctor stepped away from the window because
1. he was cold and shivering.
2. he was afraid the coloreds down below would yell up did he see the white man pass by.
3. he was dodging the bullets that came whizzing by.
4. he picked up the bugle that had been thrown in the window.
5. he walked over to the white man and told him to get out.

20. Old Gramma ran out into the alley
1. and pointed her old yellow finger in about three wrong directions.
2. and told the coloreds that the white man was inside.
3. and cried out that the white man was hiding in the junk yard.
4. and was knocked down by the mob.
5. and scolded the coloreds for their behavior.

21. When there was noise again in the alley, the Doctor said to the white man
1. "How did you get involved in this riot, anyway?"
2. "The colored mobs are more orderly than the white mobs."
3. "Why did you ever join with a mob?"
4. "The white mobs are as bad as the colored mobs."
5. "You could leave now; it's a white mob this time; you'd be safe."
22. When Daddy came in
   1. he ran over to the Doctor and began plying him with questions.
   2. he ran over to Mama and fell down on his knees like he was dead.
   3. he ran over to Old Gramma and asked her what was going on.
   4. he ran over to the Baby and cradled her in his arms.
   5. he ran over to the window and called out to the mob that the white man was in the room.

23. When the baby toddled over to Daddy
   1. Daddy didn't move or say anything, if he even knew she was there.
   2. Daddy held her close.
   3. Daddy pushed her away very gently.
   4. Daddy told Carrie to take care of the baby.
   5. Daddy looked at Old Gramma for assistance.

24. After the doctor told Daddy something about the white man, Daddy cried out in a loud voice,
   1. "Well, tell him to get out quick before I hurt him!"
   2. "Did you believe that story?"
   3. "Innocent! What's an innocent white man doing in this neighborhood now? Answer me that!"
   4. "I didn't ask him to come in!"
   5. "Old Gramma, why did you bring this man in here?"

25. Carrie said she'd never kneel down to God again because
   1. she didn't believe in God any more.
   2. Mama told her never to kneel down to God again.
   3. Old Gramma didn't want her to kneel down.
   4. the doctor didn't kneel down and the white man.
   5. it must be a white God too!

26. The doctor stepped over to the bed because
   1. Old Gramma cried out in alarm.
   2. the priest motioned to him.
   3. Daddy told him to see what was the matter.
   4. the baby toddled over to the bed.
   5. Carrie began crying.

27. Daddy began shaking all over, and
   1. he picked up the baby and ran out the door.
   2. he ran to Old Gramma and buried his head in her lap.
27. (Continued)
   3. he ran to the doctor and grabbed him by the coat lapels.
   4. he ran to the bed and sank to his knees.
   5. he ran to the white man and grabbed him by the throat.

28. The doctor grabbed the white man and was taking him to the door when Daddy cried out,
   1. "You caused this! You and your kind!"
   2. "Don't be afraid."
   3. "Get the hell out of here!"
   4. "Wait a minute, mister!"
   5. "Run, man run!"

29. Daddy walked draggily over to the white man, and said
   1. "I hope you're satisfied now."
   2. "Get out!"
   3. "That's your doing."
   4. "You are a murderer!"
   5. "I wouldn't touch you."

30. Old Gramma said "Jesus!" and stumbled on her knees by Mama, and
   1. all the children began drying.
   2. all the children left the room.
   3. all the children went out with Daddy.
   4. all the children went away with the doctor.
   5. all the children went away with the old woman friend of Old Gramma's.
**COMPREHENSION TEST FOR**

"A BATTLE OVER THE TEACUPS" BY AUGUST DERLETH

**DIRECTIONS:** The five choices for each item in the test are numbered respectively 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. On the accompanying answer sheet, fill in the space that corresponds to the number selected. DO NOT MARK ON THIS PAPER. MARK ONLY IN THE SPACES ON THE ANSWER SHEET. If you wish to erase on the answer sheet, do so very carefully and completely, and then fill in the space for the number selected.

1. The Northern war lord, General Wah Hsu-Liang, boarded the train in search
   1. of a war criminal.
   2. of a deserter.
   3. of Mr. Lu-Gen.
   4. of his run-away son.
   5. of the pretty Chinese woman.

2. The Northern war lord, Wah Hsu-Liang, was collaborating
   1. with the Japanese.
   2. with the Russians.
   3. with the Americans.
   4. with the English.
   5. with the Chinese patriots.

3. Mr. Shaw, the man in the compartment next to Mr. Lu-Gen, was
   1. an American
   2. a banker.
   3. a detective.
   4. an Englishman.
   5. a Frenchman.

4. Mr. Shaw was conscious of tense danger because he knew enough of Manchurian politics
   1. to realize that his compartment was in a dangerous position.
   2. to comprehend that Mr. Lu-Gen was afraid of the General.
   3. to understand that the General was kindly disposed toward Mr. Lu-Gen.
   4. to realize that Mr. Lu-Gen had often thwarted the policies of General Wah.
   5. to understand that the General was looking for the Chinese woman.
5. Mr. Lu-Gen had long been a thorn in the side of the Japanese and their puppets
   1. because of his intrigues with a rival party among the Japanese.
   2. because of his great intangible army of Chinese patriots who performed extraordinary exploits of sabitage and espionage.
   3. because of his popular position with the Chinese puppet government.
   4. because of his wealth.
   5. because of his happy family life.

6. Mr. Lu-Gen replied "Everything is possible" without a flicker of emotion
   1. when the American exclaimed about his grave danger.
   2. when his pretty woman companion showed fear of his being killed.
   3. when General Wah accused him of trying to escape.
   4. when General Wah told him they would execute his son.
   5. when the Japanese soldiers asked him, "Are you Mr. Lu-Gen?"

7. Mr. Lu-Gen believed that danger keeps its distance
   1. so long as a man carries a gun.
   2. so long as a man talks in a loud voice.
   3. so long as a man keeps his head.
   4. so long as a man is frightened.
   5. so long as a man never smiles.

8. Lu-Gen asked the woman
   1. to distract the General while Lu-Gen escaped.
   2. to sit in another compartment so she would not be captured too.
   3. to drop poison in the General's drink.
   4. to sit down and talk with the American.
   5. to go to the dining car and bring tea.

9. The American retired to his own compartment and left the door open
   1. to get more air.
   2. because the hinges were broken.
   3. in the hope that he might hear what went on.
   4. because the woman asked him to do so.
   5. because he really forgot to close it.
10. Mr. Lu-Gen was a Chinese man
   1. with a shifty look in his eyes.
   2. with a hooked nose.
   3. with a modest demeanor and humble appearance.
   4. who wore an American suit.
   5. who talked very broken English.

11. General Wah Hsu-Liang
   1. was clever and witty and wise.
   2. was somewhat drunk and stumbling.
   3. was a small, wiry man with piercing eyes.
   4. was tall and heavy with a long, drooping mustache
      not very well cared for.
   5. was soft-spoken and smooth.

12. When Mr. Lu-Gen and the General came face-to-face
   1. the General cried in a loud voice, "Ah! At last!"
   2. Mr. Lu-Gen spoke first in rapid Chinese saying he
      was Lu-Gen.
   3. the General told the American to close the door.
   4. the General drew his gun.
   5. Lu-Gen flashed a knife.

13. Mr. Lu-Gen had set up a small reed table on which
   1. he spread out some papers.
   2. the General placed his gun.
   3. he placed absolutely nothing at any time.
   4. the two men rested both hands in full view.
   5. the woman placed cups and poured tea and cut a small
      lime fruit.

14. Lu-Gen took a small lacquer box from his pocket from
    which
    1. he shook a shite powder into his cup.
    2. he drew a small gold watch.
    3. he took a pinch of snuff.
    4. he shook some sugar into the General's cup.
    5. he took a small quill pen.

15. The General agreed
    1. that the troops were disobeying orders.
    2. that he did not like sweetening in his tea.
    3. that the ammunition would have been confiscated
       by the Japanese.
    4. that Lu-Gen's son was safe.
    5. that the Japanese were trying to bribe him.
16. The General was a "big man with the small brain" who
1. fought valiantly against the Japanese.
2. made accusations in a quiet, skillful way.
3. tried to hide his collaboration with the Japanese.
4. accused his neighbors with a sense of righteousness.
5. did his work without molesting other people.

17. When the General asked Lu-Gen to sign an order releasing
his ammunition and stores
1. Lu-Gen replied in an angry and forceful tone, "No."
2. Lu-Gen showed surprise at the request.
3. Lu-Gen looked at the woman for a sign.
4. Lu-Gen made no reply.
5. Lu-Gen looked at him without expression and said, "And if I do not desire to sign?"

18. The General threatened to execute Lu-Gen's son
1. by shooting him.
2. by drowning him.
3. by having him hanged, drawn, and quartered.
4. by mutilating him in the desired fashion.
5. by walling him up and starving him.

19. Lu-Gen answered the General's threat
1. by refusing to sign the order.
2. by making a bargain with the General.
3. by bribing the General to release his son.
4. by threatening the General with a gun.
5. by signing the desired order.

20. When Lu-Gen suggested that the General was being watched
by the Japanese, the General replied that
1. he had Japanese permission to stop the train.
2. the Japanese were in another part of the country.
3. his soldiers were keeping the Japanese under watch.
4. Lu-Gen was trying to make a fool of him.
5. he could take care of his own business.

21. When the woman dropped the teapot,
1. the General swore at the woman in an angry tone.
2. Lu-Gen reproved the woman in a calm voice.
3. the General thought he heard a shot.
4. Lu-Gen dropped something into the General's cup of tea.
5. she began to cry.
22. The General knew that something had been dropped into his tea
   1. because the woman had signalled to him.
   2. because he had seen the clumsy movement from the corner of his eye.
   3. because he expected to be tricked.
   4. because he didn't trust Lu-Gen.
   5. because the American whispered to him.

23. When Lu-Gen invited the General to drink, the General insisted
   1. that Lu-Gen drink first.
   2. that the woman drink with them.
   3. that the two men exchange teacups.
   4. that the two men drink no tea.
   5. that the American drink with them.

24. After the two men had drunk the tea,
   1. the General became dizzy and confused.
   2. the woman called a doctor.
   3. the General called his soldiers to carry out Lu-Gen's body.
   4. the woman fainted.
   5. Lu-Gen's face was white and strained, but the General was smiling

25. The General promised that Lu-Gen's son would be sent safely home
   1. because the General was afraid of Lu-Gen's friends.
   2. because the General had sympathy for the woman.
   3. because Lu-Gen had frightened the General.
   4. because the General said it was not his custom to break a promise.
   5. because the General was afraid of trouble with the Japanese.

26. When the war lord left Lu-Gen's compartment,
   1. he pulled the door shut after him.
   2. he dragged the woman along with him.
   3. he threatened the American with his gun.
   4. he had his soldiers search the American.
   5. he left the door wide open.

27. When Lu-Gen himself threw open the door of his compartment,
   1. his face was white and haggard and he was staggering.
   2. the woman threw her arms around his neck.
27. (Continued)
3. the American caught him just as he was falling.
4. he was angry and red-faced.
5. he did not look as if he had just taken poison.

28. Lu-Gen knew that the American had been watching the General and him
1. because he realized that the American was curious.
2. because he understood that the American wanted to help him.
3. because he observed the American in the mirror before his door.
4. because the woman had signaled to him.
5. because the American had told him that he intended to watch.

29. Lu-Gen was not worried about his son because
1. the boy was away at school in America.
2. the boy was quite safe in Chungking.
3. the boy was hiding in the mountains.
4. the boy was already dead.
5. he had no son.

30. Mr. Lu-Gen said that what he had dropped into the General's cup was
1. a bitter drug.
2. sugar.
3. salt.
4. a sleeping powder.
5. snuff.
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BY AUGUST DERLETH
A FIGHT HE COULD NOT WIN

by Thomas Barclay Thomson

It was a right good supper. Uncle Dud might be past working in his nephew's sorghum mill or plowing up his cornfield, but he'd done his own cooking since his wife died, forty years ago, and when he turned his hand to it, he took no shame in any company.

He'd turned his hand to it that evening. The fried pullet was browned to a turn, the way the boy Caleb liked it. There was gravy for the buttermilk biscuits, and the
young turnip greens were meated with a ham bone, the only way his nephew Giles—who was the boy's father—cared for them.

It was close to sundown, and the boy would have to be speaking up soon, and Uncle Dud wanted the two of them to have good warm victuals under their belts before any word was spoken between them.

Giles ate swiftly, as usual, and held his talk. Giles was a fine upstanding man, Uncle Dud admitted proudly to himself. He was still on the good side of forty.

Caleb, the buy, was taller, thought not so hefty. But give him time and he'd fill out and be even bigger than his father. They had the same big bony faces, the kind that makes for good looks, and the same tow hair curled tight.

Uncle Dud wished he knew what Giles was thinking. Back there when Giles was one of the devil's own, Uncle Dud had no trouble figuring out his thoughts. But Giles became a changed man the night his son Caleb arrived and his young wife Drussie died a-borning him. After that he embraced religion and took it hard. Mighty hard.

But the boy—Uncle Dud knew Caleb like his feet knew the winding path between the Knob and the brawling Bearclaw Creek below. When the boy showed no appetite, Uncle Dud tasted in his own throat the bitterness that was choking
Caleb, and fear made his food taste like chips. He'd fought through the bloody Battle of Shiloh without turning a hair, yet his hand shook like an old woman's at the thought of a ruction between the boy and his father.

"Speak up, boy!" he growled. "Git in the first shot!"

But Giles spoke first. "I'll have no book readin' abed tonight. We're gettin' us an early start to meetin' tomorrow, and there's the work to be done before we go."

The boy lifted his head at that, and it made Uncle Dud proud to see his own old fighting spirit in Caleb's blue eyes.

Caleb cleared his throat. "I'm ridin' down to Harmony tonight, Pa. To a--a dance."

Giles' head reared up, too. "You'll go to no dance shindig tonight, or any other night. I'll have no son of mine cronin' with the devil and his "They're no such!" Caleb flared back. "They're--she's good."

There! It was out at last. Uncle Dud sat still, knowing this was no time for his put-in. He saw Giles hunch forward. Giles didn't know how Zalie Hall had grown up, saucy as a redbird, only shyer, and how Caleb had been cast- ing sweet eyes at her. But he'd have to know now. Uncle Dud glanced quick at the deer horns where the whip had hung
during the boy's growing-up days, and was glad he'd dropped it over behind the cupboard.

Giles ground out, "What she you talkin' about?" What gal's tolin' you off into Satan's ways?"

The boy's big hands clenched.

Caleb said, "Aint nobody tolin' me where I don't want to go."

"Who is she?"

Caleb had been reared to mind, same as any boy that's worth his salt. So he answered, "It's Zalie--Zalie Hall."

"Hark Hall's gal!" Giles stood up, his eyes danger-lit. "Git yourself to bed. But first hear me. I'll not be havin' Hark Hall's gal ridin' in my buggy, nor steppin' foot inside my cabin. Don't let me hear you name her again!"

Caleb came to his feet, and Uncle Dud thought he was going to wade into his father then and there, but he didn't. He just stood there a minute, then stalked into the lean-to, which was his room. And he shut the door behind him, shut it tight. Giles made for outside, shoulders braced back, and Uncle Dud was glad the fracas was delayed. Once they tangled into each other, it would go to a finish; and whichever one lost, he'd drag his tail feathers mighty low for a time.

Giles was always hard on the boy, but Uncle Dud could understand that. Giles wanted to make a man of him,
and he'd done a right good job of it, for Caleb was one to put pride in the heart just to look at him, clear-eyed and afraid of nothing. There had been times when Uncle Dud had felt called upon to salve the boy's hurt like his mother would have done had she lived, but not once did he doubt that Giles was a fair man.

He remembered well the day he'd come to live with Giles. He'd been living alone, far up on the Knob, where the Bearclaw tails off into Turkey Forks; and one night his cabin burned to the ground.

He got out all right. And he saved his gun and his hound-dog and the Bible that had lain on the table where his wife kept it before she died. They said he had his jug on his arm when a group of fox hunters came up to the blaze--that was the part Uncle Dud didn't remember so well.

But he knew what followed after. He stretched a tarpaulin over a tree limb and made camp till he could get help to throw up another cabin.

The men would have done it, and gladly, but the women-folks raised objection.

"Old Uncle Dud is gittin' porely," they kept saying. "He cain't go on livin' alone. Do we build him another cabin, he'll get hisself burnt to a cinder, might he."
Anyhow, they stirred things up till nobody would help Uncle Dud build his cabin, and the pastor found a place for him down below in an old soldiers' home, and there seemed nothing he could do about it. So he climbed on his riding mule and started down the mountain, feeling low in his mind. He stopped by to see his nephew Giles; just to visit him and to leave him the Bible, for word had come of him turning religious.

"It was your great-grandpappy's," Uncle Dud told Giles. "There's a place in it to write down the boy's birthin'. You can have it and welcome."

I'm thankin' you," Giles said. "We'll keep it on the mantelshelf or by your bed, whichever you'd rather."

Uncle Dud's hand shook. "I'll not be beholden for my keep. Where they've got these old soldiers, the pastor says we're rightly owed a place to live for what we done to the Yanks. But with you---."

"You're my kinfolk," Giles broke in. "Only you'll do no drinkin' before my son."

That was fair enough, so Uncle Dud stayed and welcome. Never had he taken a drink or used cuss language before the boy, and never did Giles have an unkind work for him, though he knew of Uncle Dud's drinking and hated it.

A just man was Giles, yet he should have held his tongue about Zalie Hall. Her father was poor trash, true
enough; but he'd married a good woman, who was Zalie's mother, and Zalie was like her. And, what was more, Giles himself had run with Hark Hall when both were young, and a rakehelly pair they'd made for sure.

Uncle Dud dried the last skillet, wrung out the dishcloth, and spread it over the bowl of the dishpan. Then he went to the boy's door.

"It's me, Caleb," he called low. "Just old Uncle Dud."

When he got no answer he opened the door. He couldn't believe it, not even when he spied the open window and the empty spool peg where the boy hung his Sunday suit, and saw his everyday britches flung over the chair.

Caleb had gone to the shindig, whether or no.

Uncle Dud was back in the kitchen, when Giles stalked in, shifted the cupboard, and got out the whip, just as if he'd seen it put there. When he started for the door, Uncle Dud tried to stop him.

But for the first time in his life, his nephew spoke short to him.

"Be still. His horse is gone. I'm fetchin' him back, and I'll take no interference.

Giles went to the stable, and soon Uncle Dud saw him ride out in the buggy.
Though it was late in May, it seemed like the grand-
daddy of all winter winds swept down the mountain and into
Uncle Dud's marrow. His frame shook. Then he thought:
"What am I? An old granny, to be settin' here." And he
pulled himself together again.

There was only one riding critter left in the stable, his own mule, a mule too ornery mean to die.

"Easy, mule," Uncle Dud chided as he slipped the bit into the animal's mouth. "I ain't in the mood for triflin'."

He pushed the big ears through the bridle and let the mule out. There was no saddle, and when he straddled the mule's sharp backbone, he wished for a blanket, but decided against it.

"On your way, mule," he ordered, "but trot me easy. I ain't as young as I used ter be."

The mule did no worse than kick a couple of times as Uncle Dud rode him into the winding lane. Then he was on his way. Uncle Dud pulled him into a narrow path that wound through the trees, taking a short cut to Harmony. He had to get there before Giles.

It was a pretty night. Fiddle music came spilling up from below. Uncle Dud wished Giles would hear and profit and let the boy have his fun.

When Uncle Dud got there, there were plenty of young fellows outside the dance hall, talking to girls, and maybe
taking occasional mips from hidden jugs. Then he glimpsed the puffy-fat figure of Hark Hall and knew for sure about the jug. Hark never missed a chance to peddle his mountain dew.

There were two sets in the hill country; the folks who went to meeting, and the folks who followed good times, and the two didn't mix. Uncle Dud couldn't help thinking how Caleb must have been noticed when he showed up there. Just the way folks were eying him as he went up the steps and inside. But he paid them no heed, only to mark that Giles wasn't among them.

Caleb was there. He was dancing with Zalie, the prettiest girl on the floor. She was her mother right over again, according to Uncle Dud's recollection.

They didn't see Uncle Dud; they were that lost in each other. But Uncle Dud could hear Zalie's low voice.

"I wish you hadn't come, Caleb, honest. It's against your pa's religion, dancin' and such."

Caleb stuck out his jaw. "Pa ain't tellin' me what to do from now on. I'm my own man with the right to go where I please."

"No! No, Caleb!" She stopped dancing at the edge of the floor to look up at him. "Oh, I wish you could see like I do! I wish you could be glad you've got somebody to be proud over'. Your pa's never give you shame, Caleb. He
stands for what's good— He wants good for you! And some­body's got to stand for right things, Caleb! Can't you know that?"

Uncle Dud saw the tears in her eyes and felt clean tuckered, thinking of a pretty little thing like that hav­ing to be shamed by the carryings-on of her own father. Then all of a sudden he pounded his thigh with his fist. Here he was standing like a doddering old woman, forgetting what he'd come for! He touched the boy's arm.

"Your pa's on his way here, Caleb. With the whip. Git outside and light your horse, boy. Be off."

Caleb's mouth went grim. Zalie grabbed his arm, but he pushed her away—not spiteful, only as if he had to have more room—and made for outside.

Uncle Dud saw Zalie brush her eyes, but she followed him outside quiet enough, then pressed close beside him as they stood there, watching Giles climb out of the buggy, whip in hand. Giles spoke no word; but he saw the boy and went stomping toward him, looking bigger than the dance house it­self. And the boy walked to meet his father just as fast.

"What do you want?" came from the boy's throat.

Giles stopped, feet spread wide, big hands clenching the whip.

"I've come to take you home."

"No," the boy said, quiet.
The folks outside began edging close. Then Hark Hall laughed, loud this time, and Giles' face went like red clay. He lifted his whip arm, but it didn't fall. Caleb took one stride and plucked the whip away. Did it easy, too. Then he slung it as far as he could send it.

For a full minute they stood there, shoulders scrunched, heads down like two fighting roosters, and all at once Uncle Dud recalled what a lusty fighter Giles had been before he took religion.

Uncle Dud and Zalie were pushed to the front as the men made a fighting ring three deep about them, then waited, quiet, sizing up the two who stood there; Giles, a giant of a man, whose strength hadn't been frittered since youth, and the boy, taller than his sire and lighter by twenty pounds, yet young and tough as a second-growth hickory.

Uncle Dud didn't know who jumped first, but it made a powerful sound when they came together. And Giles' fist hit first, for the boy went backward. But he was up and at it with his next breath, arms flailing, leaving himself wide open.

"Give way, boy!" Uncle Dud quavered. "Cover up!" For he'd been a fighting man himself in his time.

Caleb was needle-witted and understood. When his father came raging in, the boy wasn't there. Then, almost in the same breath, he was there, throwing with both fists...
into Giles' face, smashing him back three times. But Giles was artful, too. Instead of trying to close in, he drove his big fist square into Caleb's face.

Zalie gave a little moan as the boy went down, to come up with a bloody nose. And she kept on moaning low through that next spell when the two hammered each other with might and main, when they locked their arms about each other and twisted and strained with every ounce of the strength in them, when Giles freed one arm and his fist pounded at the boy's face till it bled like a fresh-stuck pig.

Giles' voice whistled out between blows: "I'll—kill you afore—I leave you here—in Satan's way! I'm takin'—you home!"

"No!" That was the first time Uncle Dud took hope, for the boy wasn't breathing as hard as Giles. He wasn't tired. His eyes were still ablaze, but they didn't hold in them the thing that flickered in his father's a second later—fear. Giles was scared. Scared he was going to get licked.

It made Uncle Dud sick. Excepting for Zalie there to lean against, his old legs would have let him down then and there. He'd been worrying till now about how hard it would be for the boy to be shamed before the others. Now he grieved for Giles. He remembered how just and good Giles
had been. He thought of what Zalie had said to Caleb:
"Your pa's never give you shame. . . somebody's got to stand for right things!" And he knew the celebration there'd be from Satan's followers if his nephew Giles got licked by his own son—before their very eyes.

And Giles was getting licked. His breath was harsh now. When Caleb got his arms around him, Giles couldn't break. The boy took notice of it, and the look on his face wasn't good to see.

I'm an old woman, Uncle Dud told himself, all in a mommick over a fight. Only I can be standin' it—whichever way it does go.

Hark Hall's yell shrilled out: "You got him, bub. Turn the old sin-chaser round and kick him down the mounting! Hi-yi! We'll bust open another jug! Go to it young 'un!"

The boy's head jerked up. His big hands loosed their clutch behind his father's back—and Uncle Dud saw him lay himself wide open for what came—Giles' fist, with all Giles had behind it, smashing into his chin and sending him down, Sunday clothes and all, into the dust.

For a spell not a sound came. Folks even moved back at sight of Giles' face. Hark Hall slunk away, like a licked weasel hitting for cover.
Zalie had sort of fluttered down like a hurt bird to kneel beside Caleb. It took Uncle Dud a bit longer to get his old knees bent, and by that time she was cradling the yellow head, stopping the blood from his face with her handkerchief.

"I'm glad, Caleb! Glad!" Uncle Dud heard her whisper. "You couldn't rightly give Pa and these others somethin' to crow over! I'm so proud, Caleb!"

Zalie knew, then, that Caleb had let his father lick him so Giles wouldn't be shamed before these people. Giles knew it, too. Uncle Dud saw that, when Giles stood over them, looking down at the boy.

Caleb's eyes were open now, and they weren't puddled with fury any longer. Clear as daylight they were, but older than they'd ever seemed before.

Giles said, "Git up, Son. The buggy's over yon, waitin!"

Caleb got up. He didn't notice the stares of the crowd, and he faced his father, level-eyed.

He spoke as quiet as if he were saying, "Pass the salt" to his father. What he said was, "We rode double comin' here, Zalie and me. I'll be takin' her home the same way."

Giles' eyes were clear, too, as he looked into Zalie's pretty face. Maybe clear enough to see all the
pure goodness of her shining through those big brown eyes. Maybe clear enough to peer into the future and see which way would be best for them all—to hold the boy to his own tight way, or let him stretch out to the measure of the man he was cut out to be.

Giles had said Zalie could never ride in his buggy or step foot inside his cabin. Now he said, "Uncle Dud can drive you and Zalie home, Son. To our home. I'll ride your horse and lead Japheth. After you clean up, we can eat a bite before you take her on to her pa's." And Giles himself helped Zalie into the buggy, his big hands mighty gentle.

Uncle Dud was proud. Seemed as if his nephew Giles, as well as the boy, took after him fair and plenty.
THE TROUBLE

by J. P. Powers

We watched at the window all that afternoon. Old Gramma came out of her room and said, "Now you kids get away from there this minute." And we would until she went back to her room.

It was like waiting for rats as big as cats to run out from under a tenement so you could pick them off with a .22. Rats are about the biggest live game you can find in ordinary times and you see more of them than white folks in our neighborhood—in ordinary times. But the rats we waited for today were white ones, and they were doing most of the shooting themselves. Sometimes some coloreds would come by with guns, but not often; they mostly had clubs. This morning we'd seen the whites catch up with a shot-in-the-leg colored and throw bricks and stones at his black head till it got all red and he was dead. I could still see the wet places in the alley. That's why we kept looking out the window. We wanted to see some whites get killed for a change, but we didn't much think we would, and I guess what we really expected to see was nothing, or maybe them killing another colored.

There was a rumpus downstairs in front, and I could hear a mess of people tramping up the stairs. Then I got scared, empty scared all over, when they came down the hall.
on our floor, not stopping at anybody else's door. And
then there they were, banging on our door, of all the doors
in the building. They tried to come right on in, but the
door was locked.

Old Gramma was the one locked it. I went and told
her that was our door the people were pounding on and where
was the key. She reached down her neck and there was the
key all right. But she didn't act much like she intended
to open the door. She just stood there staring at it like
it was somebody alive. Then all of a sudden she was crying;
tears were blurry in her old yellow eyes, and she put the
key in the lock, her veiny hands shaking, and unlocked the
door.

They had Mama in their arms. I forgot all about Old
Gramma, but I guess she passed out.

A bone—God, it made me sick—had poked through the
flesh of Mama's arm, all bloody like a sharp stick, and
something terrible was wrong with her chest. I couldn't
look any more and my sister Carrie was screaming. That
started me crying. Tears got in the way, but still I could
see the baby, one and a half, and brother George, four and a
half; they had their eyes wide-open at what they saw and
weren't crying a bit, too young to know what the hell.

They put Old Gramma in her room on the cot and
closed the door on her and some old woman friend of hers
kept dipping a handkerchief in cold water and laying it on Old Gramma's head. They put Mama on the bed in the room where everybody was standing around and talking lower and lower until pretty soon they were just whispering.

Somebody came in with a doctor, a colored one, and he had a little black bag like they have in the movies. I heard the doctor say that he ought to set the bone, but honest to God he thought he might as well wait, as he didn't want to hurt Mama if it wasn't going to make any difference. He touched Mama's forehead a couple of times and it didn't feel good to him, I guess, because he looked tired after he did it. Finally he said, "I'll try," and he began calling for hot water and other things, and pretty soon Mama was all bandaged up white.

The doctor stepped away from Mama and over to some men and women, six or seven of them—and asked them what had happened. He didn't ask all the questions I wanted to ask—but I did find out Mama was on a streetcar coming home from the plant where Mama worked when the riot broke out in that section. Mr. Purvine said he called the mill and told Daddy to come home. But Mr. Purvine said he wasn't going to work tonight himself, the way the riot was spreading and the way the coloreds were getting the worst of it.

A man with glasses on said "The Negroes ought to organize and fight the thing to a finish." The doctor frowned at that. Mr. Purvine said he didn't know.
"If we must die," said the man, "let it not be like hogs hunted and penned in an inglorious spot!"

The doctor said, "Yes, we all know that."

They all left about this time, except the doctor and the old woman friend of Old Gramma's. She came out of Old Gramma's room, and when the door opened I saw Old Gramma lying on the cot with her eyes closed. The old women asked me if I could work a can opener, and I said, "Yes, I can," and she handed me a can of vegetable soup from the shelf. She got a meal together and us kids sat down to eat. I couldn't eat. I just drank my glass of water. The old woman said, Here, here, I hadn't ought to let good food go to waste and was that any way to act at the table and I wasn't the first boy in the world to lose his mother.

I wondered was she crazy and I yelled I wasn't going to lose my mother and I looked to see and I was right. Mama was just sleeping and the doctor was there in case she needed him and everything was taken care of and ... everything. The doctor didn't even turn away from the window when I yelled at the old woman, and I thought at least he'd say I'd wake my mother up shouting that way, or maybe that I was right and the old woman was wrong. Then he went over to feel Mama's wrist again. He did not touch her forehead this time.
Old Gramma came out of her room and said to me, "Was that you raising so much cain in her, boy?"

I said, "Yes, it was," and just when I was going to tell her what the old woman said about losing Mama, I couldn't. I didn't want to hear it out loud again. I didn't even want to think it in my mind.

Old Gramma went over and gazed down at Mama. She turned away quickly and went over to the doctor and whispered something to him.

Then Old Gramma said she'd be back in a minute and went out the door, slapslapping down the hall. I went to the window, the evening sun was going down, and I saw Old Gramma come out the back entrance of our building. She crossed the alley and went in the back door of the grocery store.

A lot of racket cut loose about a block up the alley. It was still empty, though. Old Gramma came out of the grocery store with something in a brown bag. She stopped in the middle of the alley and seemed to be watching the orange evening sun going down behind the buildings. The sun got in her hair and somehow under skin, kind of, and it did a wonderful thing to her. She looked so young for a moment that I saw Mama in her, both of them beautiful New Orleans ladies.
The racket cut loose again, nearer now, and a pack of men came running down the alley, about three dozen whites chasing two coloreds. One of the whites was blowing a bugle—tan tivvy, tan tivvy, tan tivvy—like the white folks do when they go fox hunting in the movies or Virginia. I looked down, quick, to see if Old Gramma had enough sense to come inside, and I guess she did because she wasn't there. The two coloreds ran between two buildings, the whites ran after them, and then the alley was quiet again. Old Gramma stepped out, and I watched her stoop and pick up the brown bag she had dropped before.

Another big noise made her drop it again. A whole smear of men swarmed out of the used-car lot and came galloping down the alley like wild buffaloes. Old Gramma scooted inside our building and the brown bag stayed there in the alley. This time I couldn't believe my eyes; I saw what I thought I'd never see; I saw what us kids had been waiting to see ever since the riot broke out—a white man that was fixing to get himself nice and killed. A white man running—running, God Almighty, from about a million coloreds. And he was the one with the tan tivvy bugle, too. I hoped the coloreds would do the job up right.

The closer the white man came the worse it got for him, because the alley comes to a dead end when it hits our building. All at once—I don't know why—I was praying for
that fool white man with the bugle to get away. But I
didn't think he had a Chinaman's chance, the way he was
going now, and maybe that's what made me pray for him.

Then he did a smart thing. He whipped the bugle
over his shoulder, like you do with a horseshoe for good
luck, and it hit the first colored behind him smack in the
head, knocking him out, and that slowed up the others. The
white man turned into the junk yard behind the furniture
warehouse and the Victory Ballroom. Another smart thing,
if he used his head. The space between the warehouse and the
Victory is just wide enough for a man to run through. It's
a long piece to the street, but if he made it there, he'd be
safe probably.

The long passageway must've looked too narrow to him,
though, because the fool came rushing around the garage next
to our building. For a moment he was the only one in the
alley. The coloreds had followed him through the junk yard
and probably got themselves all tangled up in garbage cans
and rusty bed springs and ashpiles. But the white man was
a goner just the same. In a minute they'd be coming for him
for real. He'd have to run the length of the alley again to
get away and the coloreds have got the best legs.

Then Old Gramma opened our back door and saved him.

I was very glad for the white man, until suddenly I
remembered poor Mama all broken to pieces on the bed, and
then I was sorry Old Gramma did it. The next moment I was glad again that she did. I understood now I did not care one way or the other about the white man. Now I was thinking of Mama, and I did not see what difference it could make to Mama if the white man lived or died. It only had something to do with us and him.

Then I got hold of a funny idea. I told myself the trouble is somebody gets cheated or insulted or killed and everybody else tries to make it come out even by cheating and insulting and killing the cheaters and insulter and killers. Only they never do. I did not think they ever would. I told myself that I had a very big idea there, and when the riot was over I would go to the public library and sit in the reading room and think about it. Or I would speak to Old Gramma about it, because it seemed like she had the same big idea and like she had had it a long time, too.

The doctor was standing by me at the window all the time. He said nothing about what Old Gramma did, and now he stepped away from the window and so did I. I guess he felt the same way I did about the white man and that's why he stepped away from the window. The big idea again. He was afraid the coloreds down below would yell up at us, did we see the white man pass by. The coloreds were crazy mad all right. One of them had the white man's bugle and he
banged on our door with it. I was worried Old Gramma had
forgot to lock it and they might walk right in, and that
would be the end of the white man and the big idea.

But Old Gramma pulled another fast one. She ran out
into the alley and pointed her old yellow finger in about
tree wrong directions. In a second the alley was quiet
and empty, except for Old Gramma. She walked slowly over
against our building, where somebody had kicked the brown
bag, and picked it up.

Old Gramma brought the white man right into our room,
told him to sit down, and poured herself a cup of hot water.
She sipped it and said the white man could leave whenever he
wanted to, but it might be better to wait a bit. The white
man said he was much obliged, he hated to give us any trou­
ble, and, "Oh, oh, is somebody sick over there?" when he
saw Mama, and that he'd just been passing by when a hundred
nig-—when he was attacked.

The doctor asked the white man did he work or own a
business in this neighborhood. The white man said, No, glanc­
ing down at his feet, no, he just happened to be passing by
when he was suddenly attacked like he said before.

There was noise again in the alley--windows breaking
and fences being pushed over. The doctor said to the white
man, "You could leave now; it's a white mob this time; you'd
be safe."

"No," the white man said, "I should say not; I
wouldn't be seen with them; they're as bad as the others almost."

"It is quite possible," the doctor said.

And then Daddy came in. He ran over to Mama and fell down on his knees like he was dead--like seeing Mama with her arm broke and her chest so pushed in killed him on the spot. He lifted his face from the bed and kissed Mama on the lips; and then, Daddy, I could see, was crying--the strongest man in the world was crying with tears in his big dark eyes and coming down the side of his big hard face. Mama called him her John Henry sometimes and there he was, her John Henry, the strongest man, black or white, in the whole damn world, crying.

He put his head down on the bed again. Nobody in the room moved until the baby toddled over to Daddy and patted him on the ear like she wanted to play. But Daddy didn't move or say anything; if he even knew she was there, and the baby got a blank look in her eyes and walked away from Daddy and sat down, plump, on the floor across the room, staring at Daddy and the white man, back and forth, Daddy and the white man.

Daddy got up after a while and walked very slowly across the room and got himself a drink of water at the sink. For the first time he noticed the white man in the room. "Who's he?" he said. "Who's he?" None of us said
anything. "Who the hell's he?" Daddy wanted to know, thunder in his throat like there always is when he's extra mad or happy.

The doctor said the white man was Mr. Gorman, and went over to Daddy and told him something in a low voice.

"Innocent! What's he doing in this neighborhood then?" Daddy said, loud as before. "What's an innocent white man doing in this neighborhood now? Answer me that!"

He looked at all of us in the room and none of us that knew what the white man was doing in this neighborhood wanted to explain to Daddy.

"I was just passing by," the white man said, "as they can tell you."

Old Gramma came and stood by Daddy's side and said she had called the priest when she was downstairs a while ago getting some candles. She was worried that the candles weren't blessed ones. She opened the brown bag then, and that's what was inside--two white candles.

Daddy got up from the table and said to the white man, "So help me God, mister, I'll kill you in this room if my wife dies!" The baby started crying and the doctor went to Daddy's side and turned him away from the white man, and it wasn't hard to do because now Daddy was kind of limp and didn't look like he remembered anything about the white man or what he said he'd do to him if Mama . . .
Then the priest from Our Saviour's came to our room. He was kind of young and skinny and pale, even for a white man, and he said, "I'm Father Crowe," to everybody in the room and looked around to see who was who.

The doctor introduced himself. The priest went over and took a look at Mama and nodded to the doctor and they went into Old Gramma's room together. The priest had a little black bag, too, and he took it with him. I suppose he was getting ready to give Mama Extreme Unction.

Daddy got up from the table mad as a bull and said to the white man, "Remember what I said, mister."

"But why me?" the white man asked. "Just because I'm white?"

Daddy looked over at Mama on the bed and said, "Yeah, just because you're white; yeah, that's why." . . . Old Gramma took Daddy by the arm and steered him over to the table again and he sat down.

The priest and the doctor came out of Old Gramma's room, and the priest took some cotton from his little black bag, dipped his fingers in holy oil, and made the sign of the cross on Mama's eyes, nose, ears, mouth, and hands, rubbing the oil off with the cotton, and said prayers in Latin all the time he was doing it.

"I want you all to kneel down now," the priest said, "and we'll say a rosary. But we mustn't say it too loud because she is sleeping."
We all knelt down except the baby and Carrie. Carrie said she'd never kneel down to God again. "Now Carrie," Old Gramma said, almost crying. She told Carrie it was for poor Mama and wouldn't Carrie kneel down if it was for poor Mama?

"No!" Carrie said. "It must be a white God too!"

Then she began crying and she did kneel down after all.

Even the white man knelt down and the doctor and the old woman friend of Old Gramma's, a solid Baptist if I ever saw one, and we all said the rosary of the five sorrowful mysteries. The priest rose and made the sign of the cross over Mama: "In nomine Patris et Filii and Spiritus Sancti."

He looked closer at Mama and motioned to the doctor. The doctor stepped over to the bed, felt Mama's wrist, put his head to her chest, where it wasn't pushed in, and stood up slowly.

Daddy and all of us had been watching the doctor when the priest motioned him over, and now Daddy ran to the bed. Shaking all over, he sank to his knees, and I believe he must've been crying again.

I began to get an awful bulging paid in my stomach. The doctor left the bed and grabbed the white man by the arm and was taking him to the door when Daddy jumped up, like he knew where they were going, and said, "Wait a minute, mister!"
The doctor and the white man stopped at the door. Daddy walked draggily over to them and stood in front of the white man, took a deep breath, and said in the still-est kind of whisper, "I wouldn't touch you." That was all. He moved slowly back to Mama's bed and his big shoulders were sagged down like I never saw them before.

Old Gramma said, "Jesus!" and stumbled down on her knees by Mama. Then the awful bulging pain in my stomach exploded, and I knew that Mama wasn't just sleeping now, and I could not breathe for a long while, and then when I finally could I was crying like the baby and brother George, and so was Carrie.
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JUDGES ON EMOTIONAL AND MOOD VALUES OF CONTENT AND STYLE
REQUEST: This story and the brief questionnaire are a part of an experimental study of audience response to the interpretation of literature. Will you read the story, please, and then check your answers on the questionnaire below. All opinions will be treated as confidential material.

AFTER READING THE STORY:

Mark only one of the following phrases. If more than one seems to apply, give your attention to the word, primarily, and make your decision.

NAME OF STORY: ____________________________________________

The content and style of this story make the emotional and mood values primarily those of

___ a humorous situation ___ family life
___ intrigue & mystery ___ courtship & love
___ horror & crime ___ nature
___ a social problem ___ an historical event
___ adventure

Do you consider this story to have a general appeal...

... to both sexes? Yes ___ No ___
... to various ages? Yes ___ No ___

(Excluding those below secondary school level.)

NAME ________________________________________________
Position _______________________________________________
DEGREES HELD WITH NAME OF UNIVERSITY AWARDING THEM:

Thank you very much.
APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JUDGES ON EMOTIONAL AND MOOD VALUES OF PERFORMANCES
REQUEST: This story and the brief questionnaire are a part of an experimental study of audience response to the interpretation of literature as perceived through different media. Will you listen to the story, please, and then check your answers to the questions below?

NAME OF STORY: __________________________________________

Mark only one of the following phrases. If more than one seems to apply, give your attention to the word, primarily, and make your decision.

THE CONTENT AND STYLE OF THIS STORY MAKE THE EMOTIONAL AND MOOD VALUES PRIMARILY THOSE OF

___ a humorous situation ___ family life
___ intrigue & mystery ___ courtship & love
___ horror & crime ___ nature
___ a social problem ___ an historical event
___ adventure

DO YOU CONSIDER THIS STORY TO HAVE A GENERAL APPEAL . . .

. . . to both sexes? Yes _____ No ______
. . . to various ages? (excluding those below secondary school level)Yes _____ No ______

CHECK ONE: I WOULD JUDGE THIS ORAL INTERPRETATION TO BE TRUE TO THE INTENT OF THE WRITER

___ to a very slight degree ___ to a limited degree
___ to a typical degree ___ to an outstanding degree
___ to an exceedingly high degree
OTHER COMMENTS: (Every observation will be helpful!)


NAME OF JUDGE


Thank you very much.
APPENDIX F

SAMPLE DIRECTIONS FOR STUDENTS AND COORDINATORS
REQUEST FOR COOPERATION

This project is part of an experimental study of audience response to the interpretation of literature as perceived through different media. Please report to the room listed below on Friday, February 16, at the time indicated.

When you enter the room assigned, get your papers from the coordinator who will be in the front of the room. Be seated quickly near the television set or the audio tape recorder or the reader's stand, depending upon your room assignment. Study the directions carefully while waiting for the program which will begin promptly at 9:02 or 10:02 or 1:02. PLEASE BE EARLY IF AT ALL POSSIBLE: AT LEAST, BE ON TIME. Late comers may impair the validity of the study.

NAME OF STUDENT __________________________________________

ROOM ASSIGNMENT __________________________________________

DATE:  February 16  TIME:  __________

COORDINATOR IN CHARGE: __________________________________

Thank you very much for your cooperation; we appreciate your assistance.

S. M. Wulftange
Director of SRM Project
DENNEY 213 - 10:00

If any student comes to Denney 213 for whom you do not have a packet of tests, please give him one of these without any name and ask him to write in his own name.

PLEASE . . . DO NOT SEND HIM TO ANY OTHER ROOM.
Best wishes for successful performances today . . . as usual!

This is just a last minute review of routine matters.

1) You might wish to leave your wrap in the ladies room on the second floor of Denney Hall.

2) When the bell rings at 9:00 o'clock or 10:00 o'clock or 1:00 o'clock, take up your stand in the corridor outside Room 213. It would be well to wait until most of the students have entered the classroom before taking your place in the corridor.

3) After two or three or four minutes, the instructor will open the door of Room 213. This opening of the door is your signal. Just walk into the room and over to the podium and begin your introduction.

4) At the end of your reading, just walk from the room in a manner similar to that in which you walked from the circle of light in the TV production.

GOOD LUCK . . . AND THANK YOU!
APPENDIX G

RAW SCORES OF THE SUB-GROUPS FOR EACH OF THE SIX SCALES
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-GROUP 1</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 4</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-GROUP 2</td>
<td>SUB-GROUP 5</td>
<td>SUB-GROUP 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB-GROUP 3</td>
<td>SUB-GROUP 6</td>
<td>SUB-GROUP 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RAW SCORES OF SUB-GROUPS FROM THE COMPREHENSION SCALE
OF THE AESTHETIC RESPONSE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-GROUP 1</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 4</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-GROUP 2</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 5</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-GROUP 3</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 6</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RAW SCORES OF SUB-GROUPS FROM DEGREE OF INTEREST SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-GROUP 1</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 4</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-GROUP 2</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 5</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-GROUP 3</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 6</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RAW SCORES OF SUB-GROUPS FROM THE COMPREHENSION SCALE OF THE DEGREE OF INTEREST GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-GROUP 1</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 4</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-GROUP 2</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 5</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-GROUP 3</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 6</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RAW SCORES OF SUB-GROUPS FROM THE TECHNIQUE SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-GROUP 1</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 2</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 3</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 4</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 5</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table lists raw scores for each sub-group for the technique scale.
RAW SCORES OF SUB-GROUPS FROM THE COMPREHENSION SCALE OF THE TECHNIQUE GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Group 1</th>
<th>Sub-Group 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Group 2</th>
<th>Sub-Group 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Group 3</th>
<th>Sub-Group 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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After graduation, I will be assigned to one of the projects conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame or to one with which they cooperate.