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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Oral language is the primary medium in which individuals communicate their thoughts, attitudes, feelings, and experiences, and attempt to understand their environment. When the child enters school, he possesses an intuitive knowledge of language or English grammar, the ability to distinguish between and articulate all or nearly all of the sounds in the language, and a background of successful verbal interactions with others (Harris and Smith, 1975). However, some children do not possess the linguistic ability to successfully engage in academic endeavors (Doyle, 1971). Consequently, these individuals are often designated as "disadvantaged" or "culturally deprived," possessing deficiencies in experience which are compounded by a slower rate of cognitive development and deficiencies in learning conditions (Wight, 1970).

A wide range of interest has been focused on the language skills of advantaged and disadvantaged students. This research has been motivated by the fact that disadvantaged students are often labeled as non-verbal or linguistically deprived, and their language considered a barrier to success in school. There have been many conclusions drawn and statements made in regard to this assertion.

Basil Bernstein (1958) makes a distinction between the language of advantaged and disadvantaged students, middle class and unskilled
working class children designated according to father's occupation and level of education. He believes that these individuals make different uses of vocabulary and the grammatical system of language. Bernstein further states that the language of the disadvantaged student represents a restricted code which is ideally suited for maintaining social relationships and adequate for sharing familiar experiences and opinions. However, it is inadequate for expressing original or personal opinions, clarifying or complex reasoning; dealing with anything hypothetical or beyond the present and explaining complex phenomena. The characteristics of restricted language use are as follows:

1) Short, grammatically simple, often unfinished sentences with a poor syntactic form (e.g., He stopping by ...).

2) Simple and repetitive use of conjunctions (e.g., so, then and because).

3) Inability to retain a formal subject through a speech sequence which results in a dislocated informational content (e.g., John went to the store with Dave and Larry so they could get their mother some groceries. The boy realized that he had forgotten the money upon reaching the store.).

4) Limited use of subordinate clauses used to simplify the initial categories of the dominant subject (e.g., The Hustle and the Bump involve highly complex movements in comparison to those executed in the exercises that Frances Goins, who is an expert in physical fitness and weight reduction, has our class perform daily. But the Hustle and the Bump, which are two of the latest popular dances ...).
5) Rigid and limited use of adjectives and adverbs (e.g., the big boys always chase us home. The big boys treat us badly. The big boys have brothers who also treat us badly.).

6) Infrequent use of impersonal pronouns as subjects of conditional clauses or sentences (e.g., "one").

7) Frequent use of statements where the reason and the conclusion are confounded to produce a categoric statement (e.g., "Don't open the door? Why? Because I am your mother and I told you so.").

8) A large number of statements and phrases that signal a necessity for the previous speech sequence to be reinforced -- "Wouldn't it," "You see," "Just fancy." This is referred to as "sympathetic complexity."

9) Frequent individual selection from a group of idiomatic sequences; (e.g., "Well ain't that the truth," or "Well, they say what goes around comes around.").

10) Meaning is implicit in the language (e.g., A child retells a story using a limited number of words which are closely tied to the context of the story to convey meaning.).

Bernstein felt that the restricted code develops naturally from the disadvantaged child's deprived background, and serves a useful purpose in it. The child who is raised in such an environment is believed to be trapped by the restrictions made on his language, and is unable to perform at the logical and conceptual level necessary for formal education. Thus, he describes the advantaged child as using an
"elaborated code," one which makes principles and operations explicit (universalistic meanings), in comparison to the restricted code of the disadvantaged child.

Research was initiated to investigate Bernstein's theory of social class differences in language predictability (syntactical and lexical elements) with high predictability revealed for working class speech and low predictability for middle class speech. Jones and McMillan (1973) found that the speech of lower class five-year-old children (according to the Blishen index for occupation) contained shorter communication units, showed less subordination, and produced context-bound meanings in contrast to middle-class children's performance on a task describing an abstract event.

Subsequently, Poole and Field (1971) investigated Bernstein's thesis of elaborated and restricted coding orientation in oral communication. Subjects were classified on the basis of their father's occupation and level of education into four groups: 1) skilled or semi-skilled (Group 1); 2) working class, unskilled (Group 2); 3) middle class, rural professional (Group 3); and 4) middle class, urban professional (Group 4). Significant differences were found in favor of the middle class subjects in the use of complex syntactical and descriptive resources of language. The urban professional performed best on the elaboration code with the rural professional, working class, skilled and the working class, unskilled following respectively. Consequently, the results of the study support Bernstein's theory of syntactic complexity.
However, Bernstein states that because a code is a restricted code does not mean that the child lacks the same tacit knowledge of linguistic rules as any other child. It means that there is a restriction on the contexts, situations in which language is used such as in socializing; disciplining; communicating information, attitudes, or feelings; and conditions, ways; formal or informal environmental stipulations or requirements, which will orient him to universalistic meaning and allow him to choose words which make meaning explicit. However, the child is able to use a more elaborated code under particular contexts.

Hymes (1972) also feels that it is scientifically absurd to describe a child coming to school as "linguistically deprived" so far as the presence of a regular grammar and the capacity for the creative use of language in social situations. However, he may indeed be "linguistically deprived" if the language of his natural competence is not that of the school; if the contexts which elicit the use of his language are absent in the school; and if the purposes to which he uses language; and the ways in which he uses language are absent or prohibited in the school.

Story retelling has emerged as a new method for obtaining connected speech samples from children, and has been used as an instrument to study the language acquisition (learning) process (John, et.al., 1970). The procedure for story retelling includes the following steps: 1) the child is told that after he has been read a story he will be asked to retell it; 2) the child is shown a sequence of pictures
corresponding to aspects of the text being read; 3) upon completion of the story, the child is shown the illustrations (separately and in proper sequence) while he retells the story; and 4) the child's responses are tape recorded for later analysis.

In studies of language development, presentation mode or condition of language use has been found to be an important factor. Various methods of story presentation, live; recorded; videotaped; have been used to measure story recall, comprehension, and general linguistic competence.

The present investigation differs from the basic method of story retelling in that the subjects are asked to retell stories without the use of pictures to cue their language performance. In addition the methods of story presentation: 1) pictures only (P), 2) pictures and recording (P + R), and 3) recording only (R) utilize the visual mode, combined visual and auditory modes and the auditory mode alone as stimuli for children's oral language production.

Milgram, et.al. (1971) investigated linguistic (number of words and sentences) and thematic (essential elements of the story) aspects of verbal behavior during story retelling. They found that when compared to disadvantaged children, advantaged children used more words, more sentences, more relevant sentences, and more essential themes. The differences for the advantaged children were greater on the linguistic categories as opposed to the thematic categories.

Blank and Sheldon (1971) conducted research using a story retelling test to investigate syntactic and semantic aspects of language
performance in kindergarten children. Intelligence and method of presentation were found to influence linguistic performance with children having higher mental ages showing better recall.

Gail Marshall (1975a) read five Caldecott books to two groups of ten kindergarten children. One group was classified as being from high socioeconomic families, and the other from low socioeconomic families. The children did not differ in their ability to retell the stories, although test scores on the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities showed that the low socioeconomic group was significantly poorer in visual and auditory association than the high socioeconomic group. When the children were shown the pictures and asked to retell the stories from them, both the high and low socioeconomic children retold stories radically different from the text.

In a follow-up study using only one of the Caldecott stories (Make Way for Ducklings) and twelve middle-class girls (5 years 6 months to 10 years 9 months of age), Marshall (1975b) read the story to the subjects without showing them the pictures. She found that when asked to retell the story without the pictures the younger subjects omitted ambiguous elements of the story, but followed the text. The older subjects followed the text and the plot of the story, but sometimes changed the sequence of events.

Hawkins (1969) found a difference between the storytelling performance of middle-class and working class five-year-old children. When presented with a series of four pictures and asked to tell a story, there was a significant difference in the children's use of language.
The middle-class children used language which was more context free in meaning, while the working class children used language which was closely tied to the context of the pictures.

Wetstone and Friedlander (1974) conducted an investigation to compare the effects of three different modes of presentation of a storytelling program on children in kindergarten through third grade. The modes of presentation used were a) conventional classroom presentation; b) a closed circuit videotape presentation; and c) an audio cassette presentation. The results suggest that the live presentation and audio cassette presentation were similar in their effects on the performance of the kindergarten, second, and third grade students. However, first graders performed best with live presentation and poorest with audio cassette presentation. The videotape presentation elicited the best performance with kindergarten students showing the greatest improvement.

Campbell and Campbell (1976) compared two modes of storytelling--live reading and recorded reading--to determine if pre-kindergarten or preschool children from Title I schools would retain more information from a story told live than from a recording. The data supported their original hypothesis that children who heard the story told live by a teacher would use considerably more correct themes and words in story retelling than children who heard the same story from a recording.

With these ideas in mind, the present investigation examines the effects of three different methods of story presentation on the language performance of a select group of third grade students.
**Statement of the Problem**

What effect will three different methods of story presentation: 1) pictures only (P); 2) pictures and recording (P + R); and 3) recording only (R) have on the mean number of words produced; vocabulary sophistication; and the language complexity of a select group of third grade students? (See pages 10 and 11).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to determine if different methods of story presentation will enhance or decrease language performance (mean number of words or fluency (excluding garbles); vocabulary sophistication or word frequency; and language complexity), and to determine if any of these story telling procedures interact with the student's sex, race, and educational background of his/her parents. The identification and selection of variables for this investigation are the result of a survey of the literature on racial and social class differences in language skills; sex (boys and girls) and the race (black and white) differences in reading ability; and the relationship between listening and reading, and social differences in listening abilities.

**Hypotheses**

The investigation attempts to answer the following questions:

1) If third grade students are presented stories by one of three methods: 1) pictures only (P); 2) pictures and recording (P + R); and 3) recording only (R), will it have a differential effect on their language performance as measured by the mean number of words produced or fluency, excluding
garbles; vocabulary sophistication or word frequency; and language complexity during story retelling?

2) What are the main effects of the students' sex, race, and the educational background of the students' parents for the three methods of story presentation?

3) What are the interaction effects of students' sex and race; students' sex and educational background of the students' parents; and race and educational background of the students' parents for the three methods of story presentation?

4) What is the interaction effect of students' sex, students' race, and educational background of the students' parents for the three methods of story presentation?

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of clarity and consistency, the following terms will have these meanings in the context of this study.

1) Educational Background of Parents: Membership in professional or non-professional class as indicated by the Parent(s) level of education. Receipt or non-receipt of Aid to Dependent Children will be used as an index for classifying students into each category.

a) Professional Class: One or both parents having four years of college and who do not receive Aid to Dependent Children.

b) Non-professional Class: One or both parents having a high school diploma or below who receive Aid to Dependent Children.
2) **Language Performance**: The total number of words produced by students; vocabulary sophistication; and the language complexity of students.

a) **Vocabulary Sophistication**: A measure of "word frequency" for each word (including adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, nouns, and verbs). Proper nouns, prepositions and conjunctions will be excluded. Word frequency scores will be derived from *The American Heritage Word Frequency Book*. An average frequency score will be obtained for each group of subjects.

b) **Language Complexity**: A measure of syntactic maturity developed by Frank O'Hare (1973). The following three of O'Hare's six factors will be considered:

1) **Words per T-unit**: (A t-unit or minimal terminal unit consists of one main clause plus any additional clauses attached to it. It may be a simple or complex sentence but not a compound sentence. For example, "They started off with the King and Queen and then they threw them off the ship....") This will be obtained by dividing the number of words used by the subject by the number of T-units excluding garbles.

2) **Clauses per T-unit**: This will be obtained by dividing the number of subordinate and main clauses by the number of main clauses excluding garbles.
(e.g., This is a story about a girl (main clause) who fell into the water (subordinate clause).

3) Words per Clause: This figure will be computed by dividing the number of words by number of subordinate and main clauses excluding garbles. In addition to the above measures the mean number of T-units per group/per treatment will be obtained.

c) Garbles: Words that add no meaning or are extraneous to the T-unit. Repetitions of words, false starts or changes in the beginning of a T-unit, and confused wordings will be considered as garbles and eliminated from the T-unit count (Fox, 1970).

Organization of the Study

Included in this first chapter are an introduction to the area of examination, a statement of the problem, purposes of the study, hypotheses, and definitions of terms.

Chapter II will be a review of some of the related literature. Chapter III will be a discussion of the research methodology including the population, selection technique, instrumentation and the analysis of the data.

Chapter IV will present the results obtained from an analysis of the data.

Chapter V will include a summary of the study and implications.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to determine if different methods of story presentation will enhance or decrease language performance (total number of words; vocabulary sophistication or word frequency; and language complexity), and to determine if any of these storytelling methods interact with the student's sex, race, and educational background of his/her parents. A review of the related literature on social differences in language skills; sex (boys and girls), social and/or race (black and white) differences in reading ability; and the relationship between listening and reading; and social differences in listening abilities will follow this organizational format:

I. Social Differences in Language Facility
II. Reading Achievement
   A. Sex Differences
   B. Social/Racial Differences
III. Listening Ability
   A. Relationship to Reading
   B. Social Differences
IV. Summary

Social Class Differences in Language Ability

"Language facility" is defined as the degree of ability to comprehend auditory and visual symbols such as spoken words, or pictures; to
to relate visual or auditory symbols in meaningful ways; and to put ideas into words or gestures (Worley and Story, 1967). Numerous studies have been undertaken to discover the presence of differences in language facility between individuals of varying socioeconomic levels. These studies have been initiated due to the importance of competence in spoken language to reading development (Hall, 1976).

Differences in language facility have been noted in the language patterns and socialization of advantaged and disadvantaged children. Milner (1951), Ward (1971), Carey (1966) and Deutsch (1965), Kirk (1972) report the existence of qualitative differences in verbal exchanges between children and adults, and the stimuli input in lower socioeconomic class homes. In a study of language acquisition by children in Rosepoint, Louisiana, Ward found that children maintain their parents' attention longer if they are silent. It is in the street or with the peer group that the child does most of his talking. Consequently, parents in Rosepoint spend very little time expanding their children's utterances.

It is these early verbal interactions during the preschool period which prepare a child for the middle class oriented school setting (Milner, 1951; Carey, 1966). Golden et.al. (1974) concluded that language contributes to socioeconomic level differences in learning and intellectual development. Johnson (1974) found that when Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale performance I.Q. is controlled, social class, racial, and sex differences in language do not exist, except for measures of dialect.
Various studies analyzed the nature of language abilities of advantaged and disadvantaged children in the preschool or kindergarten years. Howard (1970) investigated differences in the ways children of varying backgrounds (middle and lower) relate to their personal world, and to verbal commands of adults as measured by the Personal Social Inventory (PSR) section of the Pre-School Inventory Test. The children were classified into three socioeconomic groups: Low socioeconomic group No. 1, Low socioeconomic group No. 2, and High socioeconomic group No. 3. The father's level of education averaged up to the tenth grade for Group I, the eleventh grade for Group 2, and exceeded two years of college for Group 3. Other areas of investigation include comprehension of spoken words; meaningful reactions to spoken words; fluency, and ability to express ideas in a meaningful manner according to the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. Results indicate that kindergarten children from high socioeconomic level families were more competent in 1) relating to their personal world and responding to the instructions and requests of adults; 2) using grammatical terms; and 3) displaying verbal facility.

Christenson (1972) examined the effects of two kindergarten programs: Adapted Kindergarten (AK) and Non-adapted Kindergarten (NK); social class, and sex upon the oral syntactic language facility of eighty (80) middle and lower class children. Middle or lower social class was derived from an adaptation of the Hollingshead-Redlick Index of Social Position. Class status was determined by the occupation of the child's father and the number of years of education completed.
The AK program consisted of 1) weekly presentations of a stimulus; 2) opportunities for children to interact with the stimulus and discuss it with their teacher and other children; 3) a written record of children's dictations using their exact words; and 4) follow-up language activities such as literature, poetry, creative dramatics, music, or rhythm. The NK program included activities and stimuli similar to the AK program with the exception of dictated stories and follow-up activities left to the teacher's discretion.

During the pretest and posttest periods, each child was asked to tell the story in his own words, and answer questions related to it. The responses were then segmented into single and multi T-units.

Two conclusions were drawn from the study. First, neither teaching approach, social class status, nor sex alone exerted a significant effect on the oral language facility of kindergarten children during the first half of the school term as revealed by the average length of T-units. Children who participated in the Adapted Kindergarten program used a significantly greater number of multi T-units than the Non-adapted Kindergarten group. Middle class children showed a significantly greater increase in the number of multi T-units than lower class children. Secondly, the combined effect of teaching approach, social class status, and sex is likely to significantly influence the oral language facility of kindergarten children as measured by changes in T-unit length during the first five months of school.

Minimal terminal units, T-units consisting of one main clause plus any additional clauses attached to it, have been found to be an
effective measure of syntactic maturity (Hunt, 1963; Fox, 1970; O'Hare, 1973; Quisenberry, 1974; and Simmons, 1976). In a study measuring syntactic maturity and vocabulary diversity in the oral language of middle class kindergarten students in grades one through three, Fox (1970) found an increase in each measure of syntactic maturity: 
1) the average number of words per T-unit; 2) the number of words in the total T-units for each response; and 3) vocabulary diversity (excluding word count) through succeeding grade levels. Vocabulary diversity referred to the number of different words used by the subject in his/her total response and the corrected type token ratio.

Quisenberry (1974) compared vocabulary diversity and syntactic structures in groups of advantaged and disadvantaged four-year-olds. The children were classified by their father's occupation using the Dictionary of Occupational Titles. Specifically, the intent of the study was to determine if significant differences exist with regard to social class in 1) vocabulary diversity as measured by type-token ratio; 2) syntactic maturity as measured by T-unit length; 3) the number of T-units elicited in an interview situation; and 4) the types of transformations and restricted transformations, which are characterized by omissions, deletions, substitutions, and redundant words or phrases.

Pictures of wildlife and farm animals were used as stimuli to elicit oral languages. Afterwards, each child participated in an interview situation where the experimenter encouraged spontaneous speech from the child as he played with toys.
Some findings of this study were that:

1) the vocabularies of disadvantaged children were as diverse as those of the advantaged children;

2) the language of advantaged children, as measured by the mean lengths of T-units, was syntactically more mature than the language of disadvantaged children;

3) the advantaged children talked more than the disadvantaged children in an interview situation;

4) advantaged children used the auxiliary "be"; conjunction (e.g., "We're going there today."); subordinate conjunction (e.g., "But I'm gonna see if you can stand up."); and subordinate clause transformations significantly more often than disadvantaged children ("I thought I saw another one."); and

5) disadvantaged children used restricted forms such as verb phrase omission (e.g., "This a horse."), determiner omission (e.g., "He's funny deer."), subject deletion (e.g., "[Those people are] going swimming," and subject verb deletion (e.g., "[I rode to] my house.") which led to the conclusion that disadvantaged children use more fragmented language in communicating with adults in an interview.

Bruck and Tucker (1974) also found differences in favor of middle class children over lower class (based on the occupation of the father) kindergarten children in the acquisition of school language and communicative and grammatical abilities, Imitation, Object Manipulation,
Production Wh-questions (what, when, where and why), Story Telling, and Abstract Design Tasks were used as test areas. They concluded that both groups of children, especially the lower class ones, needed specific help in the use of effective speech in the classroom. Templin (1957) and Melear (1971) further substantiate these findings.

The use of enrichment programs or activities has been researched as an alternative for preventing deficiencies in language noted for disadvantaged children (Christenson, 1972). Cynthia Deutsch (1967), et.al. examined the effects of an enrichment program stressing the development of language, cognition, perception and a positive self-image upon the language development of socially disadvantaged four-year-old black children over a two year period. The children were categorized by socioeconomic classes using the Institute for Developmental Studies Socioeconomic Scale, and randomly assigned to either the experimental or control group.

Using the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities as a measure of language development, the experimental group was found to be superior to the control group. The researchers concluded that early enrichment helps to prevent language disability associated with social disadvantagement, where an absence of the training may cause declining language performance with age.

Sassenrath and Madden (1974) concluded from their study of the effectiveness of three language development programs; 1) Distar; 2) Peabody; and 3) Standard, a program which incorporated language skill into daily activities in listening, speaking, reading and
writing on disadvantaged monolingual (English) and bilingual (English and Spanish) kindergarten children, that such programs appear to be beneficial for economically disadvantaged children in the areas of school readiness, auditory discrimination, and psycholinguistic abilities. Bruck and Trucker concluded that while the concept of compensatory education - to provide lower class children with specific training skills necessary for school - might be sound, existing programs may not be relevant to the needs of lower class children.

In 1967, Story and Worley examined the degree of difference in language facility between beginning first grade boys and girls of low socioeconomic status and those of higher socioeconomic status. The lower socioeconomic group included public school children whose parents earned approximately $3,000 or less per year before taxes and withholding. High socioeconomic status referred to public school children whose parents earned $8,000 or more per year.

Each child was tested using the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA), which yields a language score in years and months. The mean score of the low socioeconomic group was 5 years, 11 months, in comparison to 7 years, 1 month for the high socioeconomic status group. Results also indicate that boys scored higher than girls in each group by one month. Low socioeconomic status girls received the lowest score for all groups. The greater than one year (1-2) difference found between the low and the high socioeconomic groups led to the conclusion that many low socioeconomic first graders may enter school with definite language disadvantages.
In another study, Loban (1963) examined children in kindergarten through grade six to study language use and control; communicative effectiveness; and the relationship among language in oral, written, listening, and reading forms. The median socioeconomic status of the group was slightly below middle class. He found that language utterances increase with age. He also found that individuals who are high in general language ability maintain this ability in spoken language, which appears to be basic to competence in reading and writing. Loban concluded that language proficiency may be culturally, as well as, individually determined. Children of the lower socioeconomic levels may be at a disadvantage at school if they receive a restricted code experience and if their linguistic environment stresses only limited features of language skills.

The nature and difference in areas of oral language competence: fluency; vocabulary; use of connectives; and reading were examined by Rodgers (1974) et al., using high, middle, and low Canadian urban populations (based upon urban census data). Answers were sought to the following questions:

1) Do Canadian urban children, beginning Grade 1 differ significantly among themselves in oral expressive language?

2) Is their language competence related to reading achievements?

3) Is socioeconomic background related to the subjects' language and/or reading achievement?

Fluency was measured by the description and elaboration of events in a picture selected from the Peabody Language Development Kit, and
by the retelling of a familiar story (The Three Bears). Three types of vocabulary measures were used: 1) a standardized vocabulary test, a sub-test of the Lorge Thorndike Intelligence Test; 2) a range of vocabulary count which was derived from the child's response to the picture used in the fluency test; and 3) a definition test of common words which grouped responses as being descriptive, functional, or classificatory in nature. The connectives score was obtained from a twenty item sentence completion test. Lastly, reading achievement was measured at the end of the second grade by the Cooperative Primary Test, which yields scores for Word Analysis, Listening and Reading Comprehension.

Rodgers, et.al. found significant differences in oral language competencies, which correlated highly with the socioeconomic area in which the children lived. Children from low socioeconomic areas were more likely to score low on the oral language measures than those from middle or high socioeconomic areas. Conversely, children from high socioeconomic areas had higher achievement on the oral language measures than those from middle socioeconomic areas. When reading performance was evaluated at the end of the second grade, significant differences were found between the socioeconomic level groups on all three readiness measures. The researchers concluded that a relationship exists between socioeconomic area of habitation and oral language competence.

Acknowledging the differences between the home environments of children from low socioeconomic levels and those in the middle and upper classes, Uhl (1972) et.al., investigated the language skills of
upper-middle and low socioeconomic level children. Specifically, the study was designed to assess and compare the receptive and expressive vocabularies of second grade students using the same stimulus words to measure both vocabularies. The term receptive vocabulary was used to refer to the child's listening vocabulary when the stimulus was presented orally. Expressive vocabulary referred to the child's expression of word meanings. The study attempted to detect the existence of sex differences in both expressive and receptive vocabularies.

Form B of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test was used to assess receptive and expressive vocabularies of the children. The following results were obtained: 1) the receptive vocabulary was significantly higher for both the low and upper-middle socioeconomic level children; 2) the receptive vocabularies of the upper-middle socioeconomic level children were significantly higher than those of the low socioeconomic level children; 3) the expressive vocabularies of the upper-middle socioeconomic level children were greater than those of the low socioeconomic level children; 4) the differences between the receptive and expressive vocabularies of the low socioeconomic level children were significantly greater than those of the upper-middle socioeconomic level children; 5) the receptive vocabularies of the boys were significantly larger than that of the girls; 6) no significant sex differences were found between the receptive or expressive vocabularies within the upper-middle socioeconomic level children, but boys were significantly higher than the low socioeconomic level girls on the measures of both the
receptive and expressive vocabularies. The study suggests that the major objective of the school should be to develop the low socioeconomic level child's awareness and perception of stimuli which they encounter in developing their vocabularies.

**Sex Differences in Reading**

Emmett Betts (1970) cautions that sex differences in readiness for reading may be over-emphasized. Moreover, there is considerable overlap between the sexes. Girls, as well as boys, may be characterized by speech defects and delayed language development.

Language development, on the average, is more favorable for girls. As a group, girls have a higher degree of probability for speaking in sentences earlier; using longer and more sentences than boys and achieving clearer enunciation of all the phonemes of the language younger than boys. Thus, upon entering school, girls tend to have two distinct advantages: 1) a greater ability to sit still and to do sedentary type activities or school related activities; and 2) a greater facility with language (McCarthy, 1953; Zintz, 1969; Austin, 1971; Brownell, 1973; Rubin, 1974). Rubin found that although girls entered kindergarten with more advanced language and readiness skills, boys derived greater gains in readiness and language skills from attending kindergarten. Recent research focusing on various complexities of language, as opposed to speech alone, have not found significant differences based on sex (Menyuk, 1963; O'Donnell, 1967; Fox, 1970; Christenson, 1972; Shepherd, 1974).
The incidence of sex differences in learning rates among elementary school children has been documented in the United States since 1909. Sex differences in reading ability have been documented since 1932 (Hahn, 1966; Peterson, 1972; Klein, 1977). While some data collected at the end of the first grade reveal few or no sex differences in reading achievement, (Manning, 1966; Spencer, 1966; Sheldon, 1966); there is evidence indicating that girls obtain better scores on reading achievement tests (Gates, 1961; Spache, 1966; Sassenrath and Maddux, 1975).

In an examination of test scores for 13,114 pupils - 6,646 boys and 6,468 girls - in grades 2 through 8; Gates found that girls were superior to boys in speed of reading, reading vocabulary, and level of comprehension on the Gates Reading Survey Test. Beyond the first grade the evidence shows that girls tend to remain superior in reading achievement at least through the elementary grades (Betts, 1950; Weintraub, 1966).

Various factors have been postulated to explain the significantly higher achievement of girls in reading development. Reilly (1970) suggests that the differences in reading achievement of males and females may be a function of auditory-visual integration skills. Another study investigated the effect of organizational climate and male-female sex on the language arts achievement of disadvantaged sixth grade students (Gies, 1973). Significant differences were rated in vocabulary, reading, and overall language arts achievement as a result of the interaction of the climate-sex variables. It was found that females
scored higher in vocabulary, reading, and overall language arts achievement, but not in the mechanics of writing in open-climated incidents as compared to closed. Girls also scored higher than boys on the same dependent variables in an open climate. However, boys' vocabulary achievement was higher than girls in a closed climate, but not in reading, mechanics of correct writing, and overall language arts achievement.

Other studies have examined the relationship between differences in attention and reading during the first grade. Samuels and Turnure (1974) found that girls were significantly more attentive than boys and achieved higher word recognition scores on words randomly selected from the Dolch List of Basic Sight Words. Word recognition was found to be related to increasing degrees of attention for both boys and girls.

Schultz (1973) investigated the effect of attention by first graders on reading achievement using the Stanford Achievement Test, Primary I, Form W, Paragraph Meaning Subtest. The following conclusions were drawn: 1) neither girls nor boys in the first grade are superior in their ability, or willingness to attend; 2) there is a relationship between reading achievement and attention in beginning reading; 3) reading achievement scores were significantly higher among those who were more attentive; and 4) reading achievement scores were more closely related to attention than to intelligence quotient.

Biological or genetic differences between boys and girls; and cultural expectations of male and female roles are other possible

The failure to provide ample opportunities for sex role identification at school is another issue which has been investigated in research on sex differences. Research conducted by Johnson (1973) and Preston (1962) explored the effect of a preponderance of female teachers at the elementary level on the reading achievement of American boys. Johnson used the Gates-MacGinitie Test which measures comprehension and vocabulary, and the Wisconsin Design Word Attack Battery on more than one thousand elementary children from grades two, four, and six. Sample populations were tested in Canada, England, Nigeria and the United States. Johnson found that in England and Nigeria, boys scored higher than girls on most tests, while girls in Canada and the United States scored higher. The study by Preston contrasted American and German fourth and sixth grade students on the Gates Reading Survey. He found that American girls exceeded American boys at both grade levels with the reverse true in the German sample. He also reports that the incidence of reading retardation is greater among boys in America, and the
reverse among German students. The results in both studies were attributed to the fact that there are more male teachers at the elementary level in Nigeria, England and Germany as compared to Canada and the United States.

To eradicate classroom practices which affect sex differences in reading, homogeneous grouping by sex has been investigated. Studies by Stanchfield (1973) and Criscuolo (1968) investigated the effect of sex segregation on the achievement of boys in beginning reading. As part of a continuing research project, Stanchfield conducted between 1962 and 1972, a population of five hundred and fifty (550) first grade students, representing socioeconomic and racial cross sections, were taught beginning reading with grouping arrangements of all boys, all girls, and mixed boy-girl groups. Materials were designed according to individual learning patterns with a special appeal to boys. Using the Detroit Beginning Primary Test and the Harsch and Soeberg Survey Test of Primary Reading Development, results showed that grouping by sex did not prove significantly better than heterogeneous grouping for boys.

In a study of inner-city first graders, Criscuolo (1968) used the Merrill Linguistic Readers (1966 Edition) and a self-designed evaluation instrument and found similar results. In another study using the SRA Test of Mental Abilities, Tagatz (1966) concluded that a lack of significant differences and unfavorable reactions of teachers to homogeneous grouping suggest that boys and girls can profitably remain together for instruction at the first and second grade.
There may be certain dangers to sex-segregated grouping. Stauffer (1968) associates two dangers with such grouping: 1) blaming the immaturity of boys for reading when it may be the result of poor teaching and; 2) having the teacher believe that this special administrative arrangement dispels individual differences among children.

In considering the research on sex differences in reading achievement, the key to understanding might be individual differences among students (Kolczynski, 1973 and Klein, 1977). McNeil (1964) supports this belief when he concluded that auto-instruction (programmed instruction) may be a more appropriate teaching method in that it removes boys from negative admonitions by female teachers and reduces peer group interaction which may stimulate boys to demonstrate aggressive or inattentive behavior. When programmed lessons were used in reading instruction for boys and girls, boys' achievement was higher. However, when the subjects were returned to their regular classroom, girls' achievement was higher. This result was attributed to the fact that boys were perceived by their classmates as receiving more negative comments from teachers. In a replication of McNeil's research, Slobodian (1967) found no significant difference between the reading achievement of boys and that of girls. The following results were obtained from students' perceptions of the teacher's behavior toward boys and girls in their reading group:

1) boys were seen as receiving more negative comments than girls;
2) boys were nominated more often than girls as having fewer opportunities to read; and

3) no significant differences were observed between students' nomination of classmates praised and frequently chosen to read by the teacher and students considered to be the best readers, although boys were viewed as the best readers.

The present study does not support McNeil's hypothesis that differential treatment of boys and girls by first grade teachers is a major factor in girls' superiority in reading development.

Research by Tanyzer suggests that boys and girls should be taught separately in the first grade, without regard for the basal reading system used. In 1966, Tanyzer sought to determine the effects of three different basal reading series, which incorporate a highly analytic approach, focusing on word structure and the phonetic characteristics of words; 2) the Early-to-Read Initial Teaching Alphabet program which stresses a combination of the phonic and language experience approach; and 3) the Scott Foresman (1966) Basic Reading Series which utilizes an eclectic approach, on the reading achievement of first grade children. Differences were noted according to sex and different levels of intelligence. The results revealed that sex failed to produce significant differences among any of the three reading treatment groups. Within the three basal systems, girls achieved higher mean scores in comparison to those for boys. In subsequent testing on the Stanford Achievement Test, significant differences occurred between girls and boys on the Spelling and Paragraph Meaning
Subtests. As a result, Tanyzer suggested that boys be granted a longer period before exposure to formal instruction in reading.

Social/Racial Differences in Reading Achievement

The term "Standard English" is accepted as the basis for academic instruction and is generally associated with the status of the "educationally elite" in all socioeconomic levels. *Websters New Standard Dictionary of the American Language* (1964) defines it as "generally recognized as excellent and authoritative; generally used, and regarded as proper for use in speaking and writing; and ... not vulgar or solecistic (violating the rules of conventional grammar and usage)."

Due to the connotative aspect of Standard English, there has existed a tendency to classify language which differs from the school, textbook, and teacher as divergent or nonstandard.

To dispel the idea of a "Standard English" and to understand the implications of instruction for the culturally different; it must be realized that no one speaker can command in speaking and/or writing, all of the words and locations of Standard English (Shores, 1972). Johanna DeStefano (1974) agrees with these contentions as evidenced by her statement that "There is no Standard English. We must think in terms of local standards. There are regional standards but no Standard English."

All dialects should be considered as functional in instruction even though some might be viewed as more prestigious than others (Harris and Smith, 1975). Ralph Fasold and Walter Wolfram (1970) suggest that Black English, the dialect spoken by lower class black
children, is a fully-formed linguistic system in its own right and not merely an underdeveloped form of Standard English (Hodges, 1972). As a result, teachers must develop a more positive attitude toward Black English (Harris and Smith, 1975).

Individuals who speak divergent dialects are often considered disadvantaged, possessing limited experiences which result from an environment that does not provide adequate stimulus input (Doyle, 1972). Subsequently, the nature of a conflict between the school and the home or subcultural environment; the limited development of the disadvantaged students' linguistic abilities and its divergence from the language of the school are considered factors in poor academic performance. As a result, disadvantaged or culturally different black individuals have scored extremely low on tests of reading achievement (Meier, 1973).

William Labov and Clarence Robins (1969) substantiate the existence of a conflict between the values of the urban ghetto and those of the school in the emphasis placed upon reading achievement or success in school. In a study of two Harlem street gangs, the Cobras and the Jets, Labov and Robins found that none of the boys read above grade level, and only one individual read at grade level. They were also unable to read beyond the fifth grade level regardless of age. It can be surmised that success in reading was considered to be irrelevant to the boys because it did not affect their status or position in the gang. The researchers concluded that the use of a "cultural intermediary," a young black male with highly developed
reading skills, might help to bridge the ever expanding gap between the values of the street subculture and the goals of the school.

In defense of the linguistic competence of inner city, low socioeconomic black children, Levy (1973a) contends that these individuals do possess the necessary vocabulary, syntax, linguistic concepts and ability to begin reading instruction. In a study using picture books depicting urban and suburban residential schools, children and adults from various ethnic and racial groups, and animals; the researcher suggested that students select one or more books from which to tell stories. Levy found that disadvantaged, inner city, black children are not non-verbal as indicated by their linguistic competence or vocabulary; linguistic maturity based upon the mean length of T-units; and linguistic complexity or adjective plus noun, genitive plus noun, and adverbial phrase structures within T-units. Cohen and Kornfield (1970) also found that urban disadvantaged black children possess most of the conceptual vocabulary required in beginning basal readers.

Loban (1966) suggests that unless speakers of a social dialect learn to use standard English, many of them will be denied access to economic opportunities or entrance to many social groups. Consequently, Cullinan, et.al. (1974) have found that black children do progress in the ability to reproduce standard English forms as they matriculate through regular programs in the primary grades.

A survey of some of the related literature of lower class, disadvantaged, black individuals indicates that they are often times
deficient in reading readiness and reading ability skills in comparison to middle class, advantaged individuals (Henderson, 1968; Miller, 1969; Rodgers, 1974). With this information in mind, Spache (1966) and others engaged in research to determine the effect of an intensive and extended readiness program upon the reading achievements of first grade students, black and white boys and girls. Students in the experimental and control group were administered a battery of tests which consisted of the Pinter-Cunningham Primary Test, Form A Revised; and six readiness tests to measure auditory discrimination, visual discrimination and auditory language ability.

The readiness program focused on 1) developing skills in auditory discrimination, visual discrimination, and auditory language ability; and 2) delaying formal reading instruction for students in the second, third and fourth quarters of the distributions of readiness achievement scores for periods of approximately two, four, and six months, respectively. Growth curves for each skill indicated a period of relatively rapid development, followed by a decrease in the rate of change.

The results reflected the greatest growth for girls; white pupils; white control group students, and black experimental group students. All white groups were found to be superior to the corresponding Negro groups. The results further indicated that the black experimental population significantly exceeded the white experimental group in reading achievement at the next to the lowest quartile of the reading readiness test battery, but not by any significant amount at all other levels.
Thus, the investigator concluded that the experimental readiness pro-
gram was more successful among black students than whites in producing
reading achievements.

Alliotti (1970) found that white, middle class advantaged first
grade children scored significantly higher than black, disadvantaged,
first grade children in the ability to interpret or "read a picture,"
a skill which is considered to be an indicator of school readiness.
He found that sex was not related to the children's performance on
The Picture Interpretation Test (Form I), which is based on the draw-
ing used in verbal forms of the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking.
Alliotti concluded that the results indicate perceptual impairment
among disadvantaged children which may account for problems in reading
performance.

In a related study, Mortenson (1968) used upper, middle, and
lower class (according to the Duncan Socio Economic Index Scale) first
grade boys and girls to determine the extent of difference in their
performance on pre-reading visual and auditory discrimination tasks
with socioeconomic status and sex as independent variables. The follow-
ing results were obtained: 1) upper and middle socioeconomic level
students performed significantly better than the lower socioeconomic
level students on auditory and visual discrimination tasks; and 2) sex
was an important factor, with girls performing significantly better
than boys in visual discrimination of letters and words; auditory
discrimination of beginning sounds; total visual discrimination and
total auditory discrimination. However, girls did not perform better
than boys on shape completion, auditory discrimination of medial and ending sounds, and intelligence. Significant differences were also found in the performance on auditory and visual discrimination tasks within each of the three socioeconomic levels. When the effect of I.Q. was controlled, there were significant differences in favor of upper and lower socioeconomic level students. Middle socioeconomic level students performed better than lower socioeconomic students on all tasks except visual discrimination of words and auditory discrimination of middle sounds. Kirk (1972) also found that both middle class and lower class black children were superior to other ethnic groups in short-term auditory sequential memory as measured by a digit repetition test of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities.

Copple (1975) examined the degree to which children of middle and lower socioeconomic classes confused similar letters. The three dependent variables examined in the study were 1) single-feature difference in contrast with multiple differences between the letters distinguishing trigrams; 2) standard-present versus standard-absent matching; and 3) use of the over-lay procedure. Middle class students made significantly fewer errors in comparison to lower class subjects both preceding and following training. No significant differences occurred in the effect of the training variables based on socioeconomic status.

Stennett (1972) et.al., investigated processes underlying the relationship between socioeconomic status and the development of reading skills among first and second grade students. The study attempted
to examine the adequacy of the following hypothesized relationships:
1) socioeconomic status differences are associated with different family structures; 2) language patterns and communication are molded by family structure; 3) language shapes cognitive styles along a dimension of reflection-impulsivity; 4) and that a reflective cognitive style, which is characteristic of higher socioeconomic individuals, results in the tendency for beginning readers to pay more attention to the graphic dimension of words. This phenomenon is characteristic of first grade children who show the highest achievement in reading.

Findings of the study supported the hypothesized causal sequence relationship between socioeconomic status and reading achievement. Cognitive style was found to be related to the degree of reading achievement for beginning readers and the type of errors made. Findings suggest that lower socioeconomic children are less reflective and develop less mastery in reading achievement than higher socioeconomic boys. The researchers felt that the measure of socioeconomic status and the distribution of the sample failed to produce a significant relationship between socioeconomic status and reading achievement.

Wakefield and Silvaroli (1969) attempted to determine if significant differences existed in the speech patterns of low socioeconomic Negro, Spanish surname, and Anglo children. Using the Indiana Conference Scheme of 1959, the researchers wanted to know if any differences were influenced more by the **ethnic** or economic backgrounds of children in those three subgroups.
Twenty (20) beginning first graders classified as low socio-economic individuals according to either the Warner's Index of Status Characteristics or receiving aid under Public Law 89-10, were asked to compose stories about pictures presented to them. After analyzing the stories for types and frequency of sentence patterns and mazes (hesitations, false starts, and meaningless repetitions), the researchers concluded that the economic background of the subjects appeared to elicit a stronger influence on language than ethnic background.

Stephenson (1972), in a study of the psycholinguistic abilities of black and white children from lower lower, upper lower, lower middle, and upper middle socioeconomic levels, found that socioeconomic status was significantly related to the level of performance by white children, but the relationship was not evident for black children. It affected the pattern of performance for black children.

Because of the difficulties experienced by disadvantaged or culturally different children in reading, several theories have been formulated to explain the nature of the problem. The first theory focuses on the limited cognitive skills and Genetic Inferiority attributed to such individuals. Arthur Jensen and Arthur Shuy support this theory. Jensen contends that blacks, on the average, score one standard deviation (15 pts.) below that of their white counterparts on I.Q. tests. He suggests that this also applies to scholastic achievement.
Jensen contends that these conditions originate from disadvantaged factors such as poor housing; nutritional deficiencies; and pregnancies in early life, later life; and succession. However, Shuy suggests that even if these conditions were controlled, blacks would still score eleven (11) points lower than whites (Butters, 1972).

The second theory explains reading difficulties of disadvantaged blacks in terms of Verbal Deprivation (Beretter and Englemann, 1966). Labov (1972) and Hymes (1972) and others strongly disagree with this assumption. Richard Rystrom (1973) believes that until we know what is average in terms of language development and how much deviation that exists among the averages, we cannot adhere to explaining language differences according to verbal deprivation.

There have also been several approaches or techniques suggested for use in teaching reading to the culturally different, black individual. The first approach focuses on teaching the child to speak Standard English before or simultaneously with instruction in reading. Rystrom (1970), in a study designed to determine if the dialect spoken by black children interfered with or had a causative effect on reading achievement, failed to find significant results between groups which were taught to speak standard white speech and those who were not.

The second approach entails providing or rewriting materials in the learner's dialect (Johnson, 1972; Schwartz, 1975). Inconclusive evidence has been presented concerning this suggestion. Herbert Simons and Kenneth Johnson (1974) found that second and third grade
black children who speak Black English did not read dialect texts significantly better than the standard texts. The study did not provide any evidence for the operations of grammatical interference in reading for black children. This study suggests that it is not necessary to write materials in the dialect of the black, culturally different individual. These conclusions must be considered in light of limitations in the population, the nature of the reading texts, the length of the experiment and the number of reading texts used. Hall, et.al., (1973) also found that black dialect did not interfere with the ability to comprehend Standard English.

The third approach to teaching reading to the culturally different, black individual entails accepting the language of the learner and making it his medium of exchange (Johnson, 1972). Many research endeavors have investigated variables connected with this approach to reading instruction.

Harris and Server (1969) compared two main approaches and four specific methods of reading to discover their effectiveness with disadvantaged urban black children. The two main approaches were 1) the skills-centered approach and 2) the language-experience approach. The four treatment methods included the following: 1) a skills-centered method utilizing basal readers, relying heavily on the instructions contained in the teacher's manuals; 2) a skills-centered method utilizing basal readers, but replacing the word attack lessons accompanying the basal reader with the phonovisual method of word-attack skills; 3) a language-experience approach including beginning reading materials
developed from the oral language of the children; and 4) a language-experience method which involved a heavy supplementation of audiovisual procedures. The researchers concluded that most disadvantaged, first grade black children can make substantial progress in beginning reading even though, they begin with extremely poor auditory perceptual abilities, limited or restricted vocabularies, and various other readiness handicaps. Furthermore, these children can learn to read by the same methods that have been successful in teaching middle class white children.

Dorothy Strickland (1973) developed a kindergarten program to expand the subject's range of linguistic competence by including the dialect used by them in reading and writing. The program attempted to answer the question: Will a special literature program emphasizing related oral language activities affect the oral language expansion and reading readiness of linguistically different, black, kindergarten children.

Forty-five (45) kindergarten children from a lower socioeconomic area participated in the experimental group. They were exposed to a literature-based oral language program that involved daily oral reading from selected children's books followed by oral language activities such as choral speaking, creative dramatics and role playing. The intent was to involve the children in active dialogue with special emphasis placed on the interaction and repetition of language patterns.

The control group consisted of forty-nine (49) subjects who were also exposed to daily oral reading, but did not participate in specific
oral language activities. Both groups were then tested on the Educational Study Center Bidialectal Task for Determining Language Proficiency in Economically Disadvantaged Negro Children which required children to repeat several tape recorded sentences after hearing them once. Each sentence was recorded in both Standard English and nonstandard black dialect.

The results revealed that both groups of subjects demonstrated an ability to repeat correctly more nonstandard structures than standard ones during the pretest period. During the posttest period, both groups improved in their ability to repeat standard structures, with the greatest growth indicated by the experimental group. Thus, Strickland concluded that the original hypothesis was confirmed, and that the language of linguistically different, black, kindergarten children may be expanded to include Standard English without replacing the child's native dialect.

Frank Gies, et.al., (1973) attempted to ascertain the effects of open-closed organizational climates and sex on the language arts achievement (vocabulary, reading, mechanics of correct writing, and overall achievement) of disadvantaged sixth grade students attending an inner-city school. No significant differences were found on the four dependent variables of language arts achievement based on organizational climate or sex.

Entwisle and Webster (1974) sought to determine the development of middle class and lower class children's expectations for their school performance during the first grade year, and the factors which
Influenced their expectations. Paying particular attention to expectations for performance in reading, it was found that both middle and lower class (both black and white) children had higher expectations in reading than their subsequent performance warranted. The lower class children were more optimistic about their reading performance. This resulted in a greater discrepancy between their expectations and actual performance. Nonetheless, lower class children's expectations were not weakened after receiving a low mark in reading. The researchers concluded that first graders are optimistic, in the majority of cases unrealistically so, about the possibility of success in school. Their expectations are highly resistant to change or teacher's expectations and evaluations, but are later modified to conform with their grades.

Summarily, Zintz (1969) suggests that the school must strive to reach the following goals with regard to disadvantaged students:

1) Avoid textbooks that emphasize and stereotype the middle class lifestyle;
2) Provide many types of experiences other than reading (i.e., role playing, and using audio-visual aids);
3) Teach them "school know how". This area includes learning to answer test questions, other questions; and utilizing guidance opportunities;
4) Fight against the anti-intellectual attitude that is likely to prevail;
5) Help boys to identify with mature, stable, striving successful adult male figures through reading;

6) Help children to select reading material that depicts people as they actually respond to the color, ethnic, or social class restrictions in housing, education, employment, and to evaluate critically what they read;

7) Acquaint them with examples of successful professional people originating from their own racial, ethnic, and class backgrounds; and

8) Encourage parents to accept and support the ambitions and aspirations expressed by their children.

Some educators and linguists (Hoffman, 1970; Horn, 1970; Johnson, 1972; Harris and Smith, 1975) believe that the teacher must become more tolerant of Black English, and knowledgeable about its vocabulary, grammar and phonology.

Listening

The field of language arts comprises four areas—speaking, writing, reading, and listening. Chronologically, children learn to listen before they speak, speak before they read, and read before they write (Lundsteen, 1971).

Listening may imply the ability to withdraw from some situations in an attempt to deal more effectively with others, and/or the willful concentration of attention upon impressions received through the senses (Scott, 1971).
Listening might be defined by describing its attributes. Listening represents the interaction of all the variables: phonemes, pause, stress, intonation, pitch, pronunciation, timbre, amplitude, time pressure, human beings, feedback, emotion, and 8000 bits of information per second — and more (Lundsteen, 1971). Thus, listening appears to be an essential mode of communication. It demands concentration, thinking, and energy. The majority of the time, it involves problem-solving that requires deductive and inductive reasoning. Without the complete use of listening skills, there can be no conscious hearing, seeing, thinking and doing (Scott, 1971).

The importance of listening to the other language arts was investigated by Rankin in 1928. Basically, he sought to determine how much of an individual's day is spent in communication, and which skill — reading, writing, speaking, or listening — is most frequently used. He discovered that approximately 70% of an individual's waking hours are spent in verbal communication of one form or another. Rankin also found that of that communication time, 11% was spent in writing, 15% in reading, 32% in speaking, and 42% in listening. Qualitatively, listening is the most important skill of all the language arts. We listen almost three times more than we read.

In comparing the areas of listening and reading, it has been found that both comprise the receptive phases of the language arts program. Both are mental processes requiring thought and action. When reading or listening, the child is actively engaged in the perception and comprehension of facts and ideas. Consciously or
emotionally he reacts to these facts and ideas, then relates what he sees or hears to his experiential background. Other similarities between reading and listening are as follows:

1) Both require the teacher to give attention to readiness which may include experience with the English language, speaking and listening, vocabulary enrichment for the task, interest in language activity, and ability to follow and remember a short sequence of sounds and ideas.

2) Both flourish in a relaxed social situation where the ideas and language in the material are at least partly familiar to the children.

3) The sound or even the word is not the unit of comprehension, but sounds and words do affect comprehension of the phrase, the sentence, the paragraph, and larger units of discourse.

4) Both use signals such as pause and intonation in oral language, and their corresponding punctuation marks.

5) Both take place in either individual or social situations (Caauwe, 1963).

Several studies have found a positive relationship between listening ability and/or comprehension, and reading ability and/or comprehension (Pratt, 1956; Hollow, 1955; Condon, 1965; Jackson, 1966; Fawcett, 1966; Brown, 1971). Fawcett found statistically significant relationships between other variables: mental age, chronological age, total oral language, grades in language arts and arithmetic, and listening ability. Among Fawcett's conclusions were that: students
who engage in listening instruction demonstrate significant improvement in listening ability in contrast to those who do not receive such instruction.

The question has been asked, "Is the visual mode of presentation superior to the aural mode?" Many (1965) conducted an experiment with three hundred and fifty-two (352) pupils from fourteen (14) sixth grade classrooms in three midwestern states or communities. Listening and reading tests were administered to the children. The listening test measured the following variables: 1) keeping related ideas in mind; 2) observing single details; 3) remembering a series of details; 4) following oral directions; 5) using contextual clues; 6) recognizing organizational elements; 7) selecting the main ideas; 8) drawing inferences; and 9) recognizing subordinate ideas that support main ideas. The reading test was an adaptation of the listening test with slides projected on a screen for children to read. The results of the study revealed that children at the sixth grade level comprehended better through the visual mode (reading) than the aural mode (listening). The marked tendency for the subjects to maintain their relative ranks on the test scores, without regard to the sensory mode used, appeared to contradict the educational belief that each child individually shows a sensory dominance, and that instruction should be adapted to this particular dominance - visual or aural.

In a related study Swalm (1974), using second, third and fourth grade students of above-average, average, and below-average reading abilities found that when all subjects were considered together there
were no significant differences between the effectiveness of listening and reading as modes for learning at any grade level. Specifically, it was found that above-average students in all three grades demonstrated a strong tendency to comprehend better when reading than they did when listening, with significant differences shown in second and fourth grades. Students with average reading ability also followed the pattern. However, listening was significantly more effective at all grade levels than reading for students with below-average reading abilities. Swalm concluded that both methods of learning should be used in lower elementary classrooms, but that the choice of one over the other depends upon the relationship of reading ability and the readability level of the material.

Studies have also examined the use of auditory and/or visual modalities for improving the reading skills of culturally deprived or disadvantaged children. Copple (1968) examined the techniques of presenting reading passages orally and oral questioning to train non-reading culturally deprived preschool children (as defined by their participation in Project Head Start) to answer questions similar to those included in reading skills tests. Three treatment groups were established. Group I received feedback on their performance pertaining to questions on intermediate training exercises. Group II did not receive any feedback on their performance. Group III did not receive any questions on intermediate training exercises.

The results showed that treatment for Group II had an inhibitory effect on listening comprehension over a period of time with different
materials for Head Start students. A general trend for increased performance on a daily basis was inferred from the study for subjects in Groups I and II, but not for subjects in Group III. The hypotheses that groups receiving questions would demonstrate higher achievement than a non-questioned group; and 2) that of groups receiving questions, a group receiving knowledge of its performance would learn faster and show the greatest achievements, were supported by the finding.

Schneeberg and Mattleman (1973) attempted to improve the language facility and reading skills of a select group of second and third grade inner-city children through materials and activities that utilized visual and auditory modalities which integrated various concepts through mediating activities. The subjects were pretested on group informal reading inventories, phonic inventories, and the reading and language subtests of the California Achievement Test.

The experimental treatment included daily one hour sessions at listening centers using cassette tapes and books. Stories were selected on the basis of the subject's interest and preference. Broad categories of activities were used as follow-up exercises. They included activities that stimulated further reading of the selection, enhanced comprehension of the material, and/or focused on word identification skills.

The results of the experimental program indicated that subjects became more skilled in handling books; showed increased attention spans in reading; and developed a much greater facility in using oral language. Statistically significant gains were also noted from pretest to posttest on both group informal reading inventories, phonic inventories, and the California Achievement Test.
Lubershane (1962); Marsden (1951); Lewis (1951); and Kelty (1953) found positive or superior gains in reading achievement: 1) identifying the main idea; 2) noting details; 3) drawing conclusions; 4) reading for general significance; and 5) overall reading ability and etc. for intermediate grade subjects from training in listening. However, Madden (1959); Merson (1961); and Reeves (1966) did not find any significant differences between groups who received training in listening and those who did not.

Several performance and linguistic variables have been investigated to determine their effect on the comprehension of sentences, and the ability to reproduce utterances. In 1972, Klinzing examined the listening comprehension of preschool children to determine if it varied significantly as a function of rate of presentation, sex, age, or interactions among these factors. Listening comprehension was measured by the accuracy with which children answered questions about stories and followed directions to perform simple tasks. The results failed to indicate significant differences. Rossiter's (1972) findings further substantiate and extend these findings. It was found that the older subgroup of preschool children provided significantly more correct responses to questions about stories and responded correctly to commands more often than younger preschool children. It was concluded that listening comprehension improves with age (Hampleman, 1958; Condon, 1965; Cohen and Klein, 1968; Beasley, 1973).

Nelson (1976) used children between ages five through six, and six through nine to measure the singular and interacting effects of
speaking rate, sentence difficulty, and listener age and sex upon sentence comprehension. The hypotheses were that 1) sentence comprehension would increase with age; 2) sentence comprehension would be facilitated by a slower speaking rate; and 3) the effect of rate would be greater for younger children, and influenced by more difficult sentences. Sentence comprehension was measured with a pictured comprehension of three sentences divided into four syntactically marked groups with each one containing different versions of eight sentence types based on level of difficulty, and the Northwestern Syntax Screening Test.

Results revealed that age interacted with sex; age with sentence difficulty; and rate with difficulty and age. Speaking rate was found to have a slightly significant effect on sentence comprehension which suggests the need for standardizing language comprehension testing for both speakers of Standard English and non-standard speaking individuals. In comparison to Klinzing's research, Nelson found that increased differences were found in sentence comprehension based on age. Reduced sentence difficulty and speaking rate were also found to facilitate the comprehension of spoken language. Finally, younger children demonstrated improved comprehension of sentences at slower speaking rates only for less difficult sentences. The slower rate appeared to facilitate the comprehension of both "less" and "more difficult" sentences for the older children.

It has been hypothesized that a significant relationship exists between socioeconomic status and listening ability (Condon, 1965).
Krauss and Rotter (1968) found that middle class subjects (income over $6,500) were superior to lower class (income approximately $3,750) subjects both as speakers and listeners with greater differences shown in listening ability.

Studies have been undertaken to determine the effectiveness of listening in improving the spoken language or the ability to imitate Standard English by disadvantaged children. These studies have been based on the belief that language facility is an important factor for success in academic and work related experiences.

Gupta and Stern (1969) designed a study to test the effect of speaking on four-year-old black children's acquisition of standard sentence structures. The major hypothesis was that disadvantaged children who repeat sentences aloud will acquire greater ease in forming sentences by themselves than those who only listen to the spoken sentences.

The children were pretested on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test before their assignment to a treatment program: Verbal or Listening instruction. The following sentence patterns were included in each treatment program: Category 1, each sentence contained subjects, the verb "has" and an object; Category 2, each sentence contained a subject and a verb in the progressive tense; Category 3, each sentence contained a subject, a verb in the progressive tense, and an object; Category 4, each sentence contained a subject, the verb "is," a preposition, and an object; and Category 5, contained a subject, a verb in the present progressive tense and a prepositional phrase.
Among the findings were that the Verbal group obtained significantly higher scores than the Listening group in producing similar sentences. However, on a retention test administered several weeks after the experimental treatment, the Listening group obtained significantly higher scores as opposed to the Verbal group.

In a related study, Gnatt, et.al., (1975) investigated the relationship between syntactical divergency and the listening comprehension of forty-eight (48) third grade children from one Title I and one Non-Title I school. Specifically, the study dealt with the relationship existing among the following characteristics and school success:
1) measures of oral language production and measures of listening skill in black children; 2) differences in listening skills between black children from lower socioeconomic neighborhoods and those from middle class neighborhoods; 3) differences in language production measures as a result of socioeconomic level or type of tester (black male adult, white male adult, and black sixth grade children); and 4) the differences in the use of specific categories of standard and divergent English on the language production measures as a function of socioeconomic level or the type of tester.

The subjects were randomly assigned to three subgroups of sixteen (16) children each and interviewed by one of the three testers. The interview procedure involved asking each child to tell a story about a picture showing a boy and a girl in an urban neighborhood looking at several bags of groceries scattered on a sidewalk. Listening comprehension of Standard English was measured by the Word and Sentence Sections of the Durrell-Reading Series: Form D E Primary (1970).
The following results were obtained:

1) The relationship between measures of oral language production and measures of listening skill in black children were significant;

2) There were significant differences in listening skills between black children from lower socioeconomic neighborhoods and those from middle class neighborhoods favoring the Non-Title I schools;

3) Significant differences on Standard English production favored Non-Title I schools. The black adult tester elicited more divergent English than either the white adult tester or black peer tester. The black adult and black peer testers elicited significantly more words than did the white adult tester; and

4) The only significant effect for Standard English categories occurred for use of the copula, with Non-Title I school subjects showing significantly higher usage than Title I school subjects.

5) In analyzing divergent English categories, it was found that Title I school subjects used divergent negatives and negative past markers significantly more than did subjects in the Non-Title I school.

6) It was also found that the black adult and the black peer testers elicited significantly more negative past markers than did the white adult tester.
It was concluded that factors affecting achievement and language may be socio-culturally based rather than specifically related to uniform dialect divergency.

The assumption has been made that nonstandard black speakers cannot understand the Standard English in which beginning instructional materials are written. This results in varying degrees of reading difficulty for nonstandard speakers. Ramsey (1972), in an investigation of first grade black speakers' comprehension of Standard English and black dialect, found that the use of black dialect or Standard English did not significantly affect the subjects' ability to answer literal questions about the stories presented. However, the level of readiness for instruction and sex did affect their ability to answer literal questions. When subjects retold stories, the number of literal statements made were significantly greater for those who heard the stories in Standard English. Ramsey concluded that the findings of her investigation did not support the contention that materials which incorporate the features of black dialect should be developed for use in the reading instruction of black nonstandard speakers.

Other studies have also questioned the black nonstandard speakers' purported greater ability to comprehend black nonstandard dialect than to comprehend Standard English. Levy and Cook (1973) used thirty-two (32) second grade boys and girls to examine the relationship between dialect proficiency in standard and black nonstandard English and the auditory comprehension of stories presented in standard and black nonstandard English.
Half of the subjects received the auditory comprehension with stories and questions presented in Standard English dialect, and half received the auditory comprehension task with identical stories and questions presented in black nonstandard English. Among the findings were that the oral language of the subjects as revealed by a dialect proficiency test which required the subject to repeat sentences in black nonstandard and Standard English contained features of both Standard English and black nonstandard English. Although the subjects repeated more Standard English sentences, their speech could be considered as being bidialectal rather than primarily black nonstandard English or Standard English. Secondly, the subjects who heard stories in Standard English scored higher on auditory questions than when listening to the same stories in black nonstandard English. Therefore, the study failed to find that subjects who scored highest in black nonstandard dialect proficiency performed better in comprehending black nonstandard stories, or that subjects who scored highest in standard dialect proficiency performed better in comprehending Standard English stories.

Similar findings have been revealed in other studies. Eisenberg, et.al., (1968) found that when black and white low and middle socioeconomic class children heard lists of monosyllables spoken by educated speakers and white speakers, they had higher listening comprehension scores than when monosyllables were presented by uneducated speakers, and black speakers. They also found that white children had higher listening comprehension scores than black children regardless of the
race or educational level of the speaker. Quay (1971) found that in using either Standard English or black nonstandard English to test Project Head Start children on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test that there were no differences in I.Q. as a result of the type of communication systems used. Peisach (1965) provided additional evidence to support these findings in a study of children's comprehension of teacher and peer speech.

Summary

This review of literature included a discussion of social class differences in language skills, sex and race (black and white) differences in reading ability; the relationship between listening ability and reading ability, and social differences in listening abilities.

Chapter III contains a discussion of methodology, selection of the population, procedure, data collection, and data analysis.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

As stated earlier, the purpose of this study was to determine if different procedures in story presentation would enhance or decrease language performance (mean number of words or fluency, excluding garbles; vocabulary sophistication or word frequency; and language complexity), and to determine if any of these storytelling procedures interacted with the student's sex, race, and the educational background of his or her parents. The overriding goal was to determine what effect different methods of story presentation: 1) pictures only (P); 2) pictures and recording (P + R); and 3) recording only (R) would have on the mean number of words produced or fluency, excluding garbles; vocabulary sophistication or word frequency; and the language complexity of selected third grade students? Included are a description of the population selected for study, the procedure administered to the study group, the data collection procedure, the research design, the preparation of data for analysis, the method for analyzing the data, and statistical analysis of the data.

Population

Forty-eight (48) subjects were randomly selected from the population of third grade students in four elementary schools in the Columbus, Ohio Public School System. Schools B, C, and D were used to obtain the sample because of the inability of the investigator to
acquire all of the subjects from School A. Forty (40) subjects were selected from School A, two (2) subjects from School B, five (5) from School C, and one (1) from School D. Of the forty-eight (48) students, twenty-four (24) were male and twenty-four (24) were female. Of the male and female groups of subjects selected, twelve (12) were black and twelve (12) were white. Six (6) of one half of each group were from homes of professional class parents, and six (6) from homes of non-professional class parents.

Subjects were identified by the principals of each school from information supplied by teachers or on the basis of the principal's knowledge of the child's family background. The chronological age of the sample ranged from 8.0 to 10.11 years old.

Procedure

Data for the investigation were gathered during the weeks of April 26, 1977 through May 17, 1977. On April 15, 1977, the investigator discussed the nature of the study and the characteristics required for the sample with each principal. After receiving the names of the subjects, the investigator assigned them to appropriate categories according to sex, race, and the educational background of his or her parents. A letter which contained a brief description of the study and a request for the student's participation was given to the principal to be distributed to each potential subject. Each teacher was notified of the children selected from her class to participate in the study. This prepared the teachers for the entrance of the investigator into the classroom to take subjects to the examination room.
Second and third notices were sent on April 26, 1977 and March 5, 1977, respectively, to children who had not returned previous permission slips.

On the way to the examination room, the investigator attempted to relax the subject by engaging in small talk or informal conversations about the weather, school events, classroom activities and etc.

Each subject received all three methods of story presentation. Treatment I was a pictures only (P) presentation of a story. Treatment II was a pictures and recording (P + R) presentation of another story. Treatment III was a recording (R) of a third story. The following three stories selected from the Caldecott Award Winner Books which are presented by the American Library Association for outstanding artistic quality in picture books were used:


The Caldecott Books were selected because their artistic quality met the criteria of a good picture book in that the pictures alone tell the story (Huck, 1976).

The order of the treatment presentation, and the order of the stories in each treatment were randomized.
**Data Collection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeline's Rescue</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Funny Little Woman</td>
<td>P+R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Way for Ducklings</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = Madeline's Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P+R = The Funny Little Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R = Make Way for Ducklings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Way for Ducklings</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeline's Rescue</td>
<td>P+R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Funny Little Woman</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = Make Way for Ducklings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P+R = Madeline's Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R = The Funny Little Woman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The investigator explained to the subjects that they were participating in a study of three different methods of storytelling.

The remaining directions to the subjects were as follows:

- **Treatment I (Pictures Only):** "I am going to show you the pictures to a story entitled __________. After I have finished showing all the pictures, I would like you to re-tell or tell the story back to me. Your story will be tape recorded."
Treatment II (Pictures and Recording): "I am going to show the pictures and play a recording of a story entitled __________. When the story is finished, you are to retell or tell the story back to me. Your story will be tape recorded."

Treatment III (Recording Only): "I would like you to listen to a recording of a story entitled __________. When the recording is finished, you are to retell or tell the story back to me. Your story will be tape recorded."

Before each retelling, the investigator recorded the following information: 1) the day's date; 2) the treatment used; and 3) a description of the subject. The codes used are listed below:

P
(P)B,M,PC (P)W,M,PC (P)B,F,PC (P)W,F,PC

P+R
(P+R)B,M,PC (P+R)W,M,PC (P+R)B,F,PC (P+R)W,F,PC

R
(R)B,M,PC (R)W,M,PC (R)B,F,PC (R)W,F,PC
(R)B,M,nPC (R)W,M,nPC (R)B,F,nPC (R)W,F,nPC

P = Pictures Only
P+R = Pictures + Recording
R = Recording Only
M = Males
F = Females
B = Black
W = White
PC = Professional Class
nPC = Non-Professional Class
Each subject was limited to a period of seven (7) minutes for retelling. During pauses in the subject's retelling, the investigator encouraged him or her to continue their story by using one or all of the following statements: 1) What happened next? 2) Is there anything else you would like to say? and/or 3) Is that all that happened in the story?

Each subject was permitted to hear parts of his/her story retelling as the investigator checked to see if the subject's voice had properly registered on the tape recorder. The investigator then invited each subject to get a drink of water or to stretch their muscles after the first two treatments. After all three treatments, the subject was given either sugarless bubble gum or tootsie roll candies in appreciation for participating in the study, and returned to his/her classroom.

**Research Design**

Three treatments were used in 2 X 2 X 2 X 3 randomized block design (with repeated measures). There were four independent variables: race, sex, and educational background of the subject's parents, each varied two ways, and three treatments. The design required eight treatment groups.
TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Background</th>
<th>Male Race</th>
<th>Female Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>6 Ss</td>
<td>6 Ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>6 Ss</td>
<td>6 Ss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 48  Ss = Subjects
Educational Background of Parents
A. Professional Class (PC)
B. Non-professional Class (NPC)
This design was repeated for Treatments T2 and T3 as well.

Preparation of Data for Analysis

Two high school female students transcribed the tape recordings and typed the responses for analysis. A randomly selected sample of these transcripts were then checked by the investigator to ensure accuracy. The corrected copies were retyped without the use of punctuation or capitalization.

The data were then segmented into T-units, excluding garbles, by the investigator and a graduate research assistant. Dr. Frank Zidonis, Professor of Humanities and English Education at The Ohio State University, checked a sample of the transcripts previously segmented into T-units to serve as examples for analysis of the remaining data.

Analysis of the Data

Mean word count or fluency measure, excluding garbles, was observed by the investigator. Vocabulary sophistication or word frequency analysis was performed by transferring the information from
transcripts to the proper forms for computer processing. Word frequency scores for each word including adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, nouns, and verbs were derived from *The American Heritage Word Frequency Book*. An average frequency score was obtained for each group of subjects.

The following procedures were used to analyze the data for a measure of language complexity:

1) **Words per T-unit.** This figure was obtained by dividing the number of words by the number of T-units.
2) **Clauses per T-unit.** This figure was obtained by dividing the number of subordinate and main clauses by the number of main clauses.
3) **Words per clause.** This figure was obtained by dividing the number of words by the number of subordinate and main clauses; and
4) **Mean number of T-units per/group per/treatment.**

The results were used to constitute the reference point from which the investigator answered the following questions:

1) If third grade students are presented stories by one of three methods: 1) pictures only (P); 2) pictures and recording (P+R); and 3) recording only (R), will it have a differential effect on their language performance as measured by the mean number of words produced or fluency, excluding garbles; vocabulary sophistication or word frequency; and language complexity during story retelling?
2) What are the main effects of the students' sex, race, and educational background of the students' parents for the three methods of story presentation?

3) What are the interaction effects of students' sex and race; students' sex and educational background of the students' parents and race and educational background of the students' parents for the three methods of story presentation?

4) What is the interaction effect of sex, race, and educational background of the students' parents for the three methods of story presentation?

Hypotheses

The following three (3) hypotheses were generated from a review of the related literature to predict the results from the presentation of stories to third grade students pictures only (P), pictures plus recording (P+R), or recording only (R).

1) There will be no significant difference in their language performance as measured by the total number of words produced, excluding garbles; vocabulary sophistication or word frequency; or language complexity during story retelling.

2) There will be no significant main effect for sex, race, and educational background of the students' parents for the three methods of story presentation.
3) There will be no significant interaction effect for sex and race; sex and educational background of parents, race and educational background of parents or sex, race and educational background of the students' parents for the three methods of story presentation.

**Statistical Analysis**

Story retelling performance was analyzed according to the total number of words produced or fluency, excluding garbles; vocabulary sophistication or word frequency; and language complexity. These figures were inserted into a $3 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial analysis of variance for subsequent, statistical analysis. Additional analysis were performed using the Mann-Whitney U Test.

**Summary**

The language skills of advantaged and disadvantaged or culturally different individuals, those who suffer from deficiencies in experience and in the conditions of learning, have received a wide range of interest (Wight, 1970). This research has been spurred by the fact that language development has been considered to be the major educational problem of the disadvantaged child. This study has attempted to determine if different methods of story presentation enhance or decrease language performance (mean number of words or fluency; excluding garbles; vocabulary sophistication or word frequency; and language complexity), and to determine if any of these storytelling procedures interact with the student's sex, race, and the educational background of his/her parents.
Three methods of story presentation: (1) pictures only (P); 2) pictures and recording (P+R); and 3) recording only (R) were the primary methods for the collection of data. A 3 X 2 X 2 X 2 factorial analysis of variance was used to analyze the data, which will provide the information needed to answer the questions posed by the researcher. The results of this analysis constitute the basis of the findings reported in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if different methods of story presentation would enhance or decrease language performance (mean number of words, excluding garbles, vocabulary sophistication or word frequency and language complexity); and to determine if any of these storytelling procedures would interact with students' sex, students' race, and the educational background of their parents. Data were statistically treated by the use of a $3 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial analysis of variance. Analysis of variance summary tables for each characteristic of language performance may be found in Appendix D. A presentation and analysis of the results of this investigation are the subject of the present discussion. The organizational format of this discussion considers the following dimensions:

I. Mean Number of Words Produced in Story Retelling or Fluency
II. Vocabulary Sophistication/Word Frequency
III. Language Complexity
   A. Mean Number of T-units
   B. Words Per T-unit
   C. Clauses per T-unit
   D. Words Per Clause
IV. Summary
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Mean Number of Words or Fluency

A total of thirty-seven thousand, three hundred and twenty-eight (37,328) words were spoken by all subject groups. An analysis of variance of the mean number of words uttered according to treatment, sex, race and educational background of students' parents indicate a significant treatment effect, p. 0001.

Treatment III, recording only (R) evoked more words from all categories of subjects than Treatment II, pictures and recording (P + R), or Treatment I, pictures only (P) (Figure 1). Mean scores for Treatment III (R), II (P + R) and I (P) were 318.03, 290.85, and 164.73 respectively. Post hoc analysis with the Mann-Whitney U-Test indicated a significant difference, p < .0001, between Treatments I (P) and Treatment III (R). A significant difference p < .0001, was also found between Treatment I (P) and Treatment II (P + R). The difference between Treatment II (P + R) and Treatment III (R) was not significant (p > .05).

Figure 2 shows the mean number of words used by students from professional and non-professional class parents. A significant main effect at the .05 level was found for educational background of students' parents. Students of professional class parents used significantly more words in story retelling across all three treatments than students of non-professional class parents. Figure 3 breaks down the data further according to class and sex. Professional class males produced more mean number of words per treatment than females of professional parents, however, these differences were not significant.
FIGURE 1
MEAN NUMBER OF WORDS PRODUCED ACROSS TREATMENTS BY ALL SUBJECTS
FIGURE 2
MEAN NUMBER OF WORDS USED BY STUDENTS OF PROFESSIONAL AND NON-PROFESSIONAL CLASS PARENTS
FIGURE 3
MEAN NUMBER OF WORDS USED BY
SUBJECTS ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND
OF STUDENTS' PARENTS AND STUDENTS' SEX
There were no significant main effects for sex or race for the three methods of story presentation. No significant interaction effects were found for students' sex and race, students' sex and the educational background of their parents. Analysis of the data did not reveal any significant interaction effect for students' sex X race X educational background of the students' parents for the three methods of story presentation.

**Vocabulary Sophistication/Word Frequency**

The second variable investigated was vocabulary sophistication or word frequency. Figure 4 depicts the word frequencies for all subjects by race and sex. Analysis of the data revealed a significant difference at the .0001 level between races. A significant interaction effect was found at the .0001 level between race and sex. As can be observed in the graph, white females, professional and non-professional classes, had significantly greater word frequency scores across treatments when compared to all other groups (p < .05). Both white and black males, professional and non-professional classes had significantly greater frequency of words (p < .05) than black females, professional and non-professional classes. No significant difference was found between white and black males, professional and non-professional classes and white females, professional and non-professional classes (p > .05). This can be seen in Figure 5.
FIGURE 4
MEAN WORD FREQUENCIES FOR ALL SUBJECTS
ACCORDING TO RACE AND SEX
FIGURE 5
MEAN WORD FREQUENCIES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF STUDENTS' PARENTS AND STUDENTS' RACE
Mean Number of T-units

One of the characteristics of language complexity investigated was the mean number of T-units (see page 11) for each category of subjects. The data indicate a highly significant treatment effect at the $p < .0001$ level.

Figure 6 shows the data for mean number of T-units produced for each of the three treatments. Treatment III, recording only (R) was found to produce the most T-units for all categories of subjects with a mean score of 37.60. Treatment II, pictures and recording (P + R) was second with a mean score of 34.29 and Treatment I, pictures only (P) was third with a mean score of 20.10. Post hoc analysis with the Mann-Whitney U-Test revealed significant differences ($< .0001$) between Treatment I (P) and Treatment II (P + R). There were also significant differences ($p < .0001$) between Treatment I (P) and Treatment III (R). The difference between Treatment II (P + R) and Treatment III (R) was not significant ($p < .05$).

Figure 7 presents the same data with the three treatments plotted according to sex and educational background of students' parents. It shows more clearly than Figure 5 that Treatment III produced the most words per T-unit with Treatment II producing the second most and Treatment I producing significantly less words per T-units than Treatments II or III. There were no significant main effects for students' sex, race, or educational background of their parents on the mean number of T-units obtained for each of the three methods of story presentation. There were no significant interaction effects for
Figure 6: Mean number of T-units produced across treatments by all subjects.
FIGURE 7
MEAN NUMBER OF T-UNITS ACCORDING TO
STUDENTS' SEX AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND
OF STUDENTS' PARENTS
students' sex and race, sex and the educational background of their parents, or race and the educational background of their parents for the three methods of story presentation. In addition, analysis of the data did not reveal any significant interaction effect for students' sex X race X educational background of their parents for the three methods of story presentation.

Words Per T-Unit

The second characteristic of language complexity investigated was the number of words per T-unit. This is depicted in Figure 8. A significant treatment effect at the .02 level was found for all categories of subjects. Post hoc analysis of the data with the Mann-Whitney U-Test revealed a significant difference, \( p < .00001 \), between Treatment I (P) and Treatment II (P + R). A significant difference at the .001 level was also found between Treatment I (P) and Treatment III (R).

Treatment III, recording only (R), was found to produce the greatest number of words per T-unit for all categories of subjects, with a mean score of 37.31. Treatment II, pictures and recording (P + R) was second with a mean score of 34.29 and Treatment I, pictures only (P) was third with a mean score of 20.10.

There were no significant main effects for students' sex, race, or educational background of their parents on the three methods of story presentation. There were no significant interaction effects for students' sex and race, or sex and the educational background of their parents for the three methods of story presentation. Analysis
**Figure 8**

Mean number of words per T-unit across treatments for all subjects.
of the data did not reveal any significant interaction effect for students' sex X race X educational background of their parents for the three methods of story presentation.

**Clauses Per T-Unit**

The third characteristics of language complexity investigated was the number of clauses elicited per T-unit. A highly significant \( p < .0001 \) treatment effect was found for all categories of subjects.

Figure 9 depicts the data for clauses per T-unit. Treatment III, recording only (R) was found to elicit slightly more clauses per T-unit with a mean score of 1.30 than Treatment II, pictures and recording (P + R), at 1.28. The mean score for Treatment I of 1.17 indicates that pictures only produced the fewest clauses per T-unit.

Post hoc analysis of the data for all groups of subjects with the Mann-Whitney U-Test revealed significant differences at the \( p < .0001 \) level between Treatment I (P) and Treatment II (P + R). A significant difference at the .001 level was found between Treatment I (P) and Treatment III (R). However, for Treatment II (P + R) and Treatment III (R) the differences were not significant \( p > .05 \).

Figure 10 shows the same data with the treatments plotted across sex and educational background of students' parents. It reveals that Treatment III was superior to the other two treatments. No significant main effects were observed for students' sex, race or educational background of their parents. There were no significant interaction effects for students' sex and race, sex and educational background of
FIGURE 9
MEAN NUMBER OF CLAUSES FOR T-UNIT ACROSS TREATMENTS FOR ALL SUBJECTS
FIGURE 10
MEAN NUMBER OF CLAUSES PER T-UNIT
ACCORDING TO STUDENTS' SEX AND EDUCATIONAL
BACKGROUND OF STUDENTS' PARENTS
their parents, or sex X race X educational background of their parents for the three methods of story presentation.

Figure 11 compares the mean number of clauses produced per T-units by subjects according to sex and educational background of parents. Although no significant differences were found between groups, males of professional class parents produced the largest number of clauses per T-unit in all three treatments. Females of non-professional class parents produced the lowest number of words per clause for all three treatments.

Words Per Clause

The final characteristic of language complexity examined was the number of words per clause and that is depicted in Figure 12. The data indicate a significant treatment effect at the .02 level for all categories of subjects. Post hoc analysis of the data with the Mann-Whitney U-Test revealed that Treatment I produced significantly more words per clause than Treatment III (p < .01). No significant differences were found between Treatment I (P) and Treatment II (P + R) or Treatment III (R) (p > .05).

No significant main effects were observed for students' sex, race, or educational background of their parents. There were no significant interaction effects for students' sex and race, sex and educational background of their parents, or sex X race X educational background of their parents for the three methods of story presentation.
FIGURE 11
MEAN CLAUSES PER T-UNIT ACROSS TREATMENTS ACCORDING TO STUDENTS' SEX AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF STUDENTS' PARENTS
FIGURE 12
MEAN NUMBER OF WORDS PER CLAUSE ACROSS TREATMENTS FOR ALL SUBJECTS
Summary

A significant treatment effect was found for all categories of subjects on the following measures of language performance: mean number of words produced; and language complexity which includes mean number of T-units, words per T-unit, clauses per T-unit, and words per clause. An overall level of significance, \( p < .0001 \), was found for the mean number of words produced, mean number of T-units and clauses per T-unit. Post hoc analysis of the data with the Mann-Whitney U-Test revealed significant differences between Treatment I, pictures only (P) and Treatment II, pictures and recording (P + R); and between Treatment I (P) and Treatment III, recording only (R). More mean number of words, mean number of T-units and clauses per T-unit were found in Treatment III than all other treatments. No significant differences were found between Treatment II (P + R) and Treatment III (R).

Overall significance at the .02 level was found for the number of words per T-unit and words per clause. Post hoc analysis showed a similar pattern of differences between Treatment I (P) and Treatment II (P + R) and Treatment I (P) and Treatment III (R) in favor of Treatment II (R) as to the previously mentioned measures of language performance. For words per clause, the significant difference was found between Treatment I (P) and Treatment III (R) with Treatment I (P) producing the most words per clause.

Students of professional class parents used significantly more words in story retelling across all three treatments than students
of non-professional class parents (p < .05). However, males of professional class parents produced more mean number of words per treatment than females of professional class parents. These differences were not significant.

Race, and race and sex produced highly significant differences at the .0001 level for vocabulary sophistication or word frequency. White females, professional and non-professional classes, had significantly greater word frequency scores across treatments when compared to all other groups (p < .05). Both white and black males, professional and non-professional classes, had a greater frequency of words (p < .05) than black females, professional and non-professional classes. No significant difference (p > .05) was found between white and black males, professional and non-professional classes.

Chapter V contains the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations for this investigation.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if different methods of story presentation would enhance or decrease language performance (mean number of words, excluding garbles; vocabulary sophistication or word frequency; and language complexity); and to determine if any of these storytelling procedures interacted with the students' sex, race and educational background of their parents.

A review of the related literature revealed that a wealth of information has been focused on the language skills of advantaged and disadvantaged students. Included in this review were a discussion of social differences in language skills; sex (boys and girls); social and/or race (black and white), differences in reading ability; the relationship between listening and reading; and social differences in listening ability. For direction in this investigation, the theories and research of Bernstein (1958), Hunt (1963), Loban (1966), O'Donnell (1967), John (1970), Hymes (1972), and O'Hare (1973) were used.

The investigation was focused on the following questions:

1) If third grade students are presented stories by one of three methods: (a) pictures only (P); (b) pictures and recording (P + R); and (c) recording only (R), will
it have a differential effect on their language per-
formance as measured by the mean number of words pro-
duced or fluency, excluding garbles; vocabulary
sophistication or word frequency; and language
complexity during story retelling?

2) What are the mean effects of the students' sex, race,
and educational background of their parents for the
three methods of story presentation?

3) What is the interaction effect of students' sex and
race; students' sex and educational background of the
students' parents; and race and educational background
of the students' parents for the three methods of
story presentation?

4) What is the interaction effect of students' sex, stu-
dents' race, and educational background of the students' parents for the three methods of story presentation?

Methods and Procedures

Forty-eight (48) subjects were randomly selected from the popu-
lation of third grade students in four elementary schools: School A,
School B, School C and School D in the Columbus, Ohio Public School System. Of the forty-eight (48) students, twenty-four (24) were male
and twenty-four (24) were female. Of the male and female groups of
subjects selected, twelve (12) were black and twelve (12) were white.
Six (6) or one half of each group were from homes of professional class
parents, and six (6) were from homes of non-professional class parents.
Three methods of story presentation were used in the study. Each subject received all three methods of story presentation. Treatment I was a pictures only (P) presentation of a story. Treatment II was a pictures and recording (P + R) presentation of another story. Treatment III was a recording (R) of a third story. The following three stories selected from the Caldecott Award Winner Books were used in the treatments:


After each method of story presentation, the subjects were asked to retell or tell the story back to the investigator. All stories were tape recorded. The tapes were transcribed by two female high school students. A randomly selected sample of these transcripts were checked by the investigator to ensure accuracy.

Summary of Findings

The findings of this investigation as they relate to the questions considered are as follows:

1) When third grade students are presented stories by Treatment III, recording only (R), and Treatment II, pictures and recording (P + R), there is a significant effect on their language performance as measured by the mean number of words produced or fluency (excluding garbles) and language complexity (excluding words per
clause). Treatment I, pictures only (P) produced more words per clause for all categories of subjects.

2) A significant main effect was found for the educational background of students' parents on the mean number of words used in story retelling. A significant main effect was also found for race on vocabulary sophistication or word frequency.

3) A significant interaction effect between sex and race was also found for vocabulary sophistication.

Conclusions

The following three hypotheses (3) were generated to predict the results of the presentation of stories to third graders in pictures (P), pictures and recording (P + R) or recording (R):

1) There will be no significant difference in their language performance as measured by the mean number of words produced or fluency, excluding garbles; vocabulary sophistication; and language complexity.

2) There will be no significant main effect for sex, race, and educational background of the students' parents for the three methods of story presentation.

3) There will be no significant interaction effect for sex and race; sex and educational background of students' parents, race and educational background of parents or sex, race, and educational background of students' parents for the three methods of story presentation.
As ascertained by the findings, Hypothesis 1 was rejected with $p < .0001$. For mean number of words produced or word fluency, mean number of T-units, and clauses per T-unit. Significant differences at the .02 level for words per T-unit and words per clause also support the rejection of Hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 2 was rejected at the .0001 level as a result of the effect of race on vocabulary sophistication/word frequency. It was also rejected at the .05 level for educational background as measured by mean number of words, excluding garbles, used in story retelling. Hypothesis 3 was rejected at the .0001 level from the interaction between race and sex for vocabulary sophistication/word frequency.

The investigator feels that the auditory mode appears to be the most effective medium for enhancing language performance (as defined in the present investigation) for third grade students designated by sex, race (black and white), and educational background (professional and non-professional) of students' parents. Presenting stories in both the auditory and visual modes appears to be the next effective medium, while the visual mode appears to be the least effective in enhancing language performance. Research by Wetstone and Friedlander (1974) and Swalm (1974) support these findings. The investigator agrees with Swalm's conclusions that both visual and auditory modes should be used for learning in lower elementary classrooms.

Because of the lack of consistent differences in language performance indicated for sex, race, and the educational background of students' parents, the investigator is unable to make any broad
generalizations about these variables. The absence of consistent sex distinctions in language is also supported from research by Menyuk (1963), O'Donnell (1967), Fox (1970), Christenson (1972), and Shepherd (1974).

Recommendations

As a result of the findings from the present investigation, the following recommendations for further research are suggested:

1) Research to examine and compare the effects of the methods of story presentation used in this investigation on the story retelling performance of various minorities, children with parents from different educational backgrounds, and children at succeeding grade levels.

2) Further research to examine the effects of three methods of story presentation: (1) live (L), (2) pictures and recording (P + R) and (3) recording only (R) on the language performance of a select group of third grade students and/or children at succeeding grade levels.

3) Research to examine the relationship between language performance as defined in the present investigation, derived from story retelling and measures of reading achievement obtained from standardized or informal indices.

4) Investigation to examine the effect of the race and educational background of the experimenter on the language performance, as defined in the present investigation, of children at various grade levels.
5) Validation of the measure of vocabulary sophistication or word frequency used in this investigation on the written performance of elementary school children differing according to sex, race and educational background of one or both parents.

Subsequent investigations should also be initiated to determine the implications of the present investigation for teaching and teacher training.
APPENDIX A

LETTER TO PARENTS ASKING CONSENT TO USE MINORS IN RESEARCH
April 4, 1977

Dear:

Your child __________________ has been selected to participate in a research project being conducted by Doris Walker-Dalhouse, a graduate student in Reading Education at The Ohio State University. The purpose of the research is to discover the effects of three different methods of story presentation: 1) Pictures only (P); 2) Pictures and Recording (P + R); and 3) Recording only (R) on the retelling performance of children. It is hoped that the information obtained in the study will help educators better understand children's language potential.

Your child will be given each treatment individually at school by Mrs. Walker-Dalhouse. He/she will be exposed to a different picture book in each of the three treatments. Following each treatment, your child will be asked to retell the story. Your child's responses will be tape recorded and coded by number so his/her true identity will not be revealed.

There is no potential physical, psychological, social, legal or other risk to your child from participating in the study. I believe that your child will enjoy the stories and feel that participating in the study will be an interesting educational experience for him/her.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 422-0711 or the school principal __________________ at ___________. If you would like your child to participate in the study, please complete the attached permission form. You are free to withdraw your permission at any time.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Doris Walker-Dalhouse
Consent to Participate as a Subject in Research for Minors

I consent to the participation of my child ____________________
in the research being conducted by Doris Walker-Dalhouse. The nature
and general purpose of the research procedures have been explained to
me.

I understand that any inquiries I may make concerning this study
will be answered, and I further understand that my child's name will
not be revealed in any publication, or in any manner related to this
research. Finally, I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent
and discontinue my child's participation at any time.

Parent's printed name _________________________________________________
Parent's signature ____________________________________________________
Address _______________________________________________________________
Telephone Number ______________________________________________________
Date ___________________________________________________________________
The Funny Little Woman

Long ago, in Old Japan, there lived a funny little woman who liked to laugh, "Tee-he-he-he," and who liked to make dumplings out of rice.

One morning, as she was patting and shaping the rice flour, one of the dumplings started to roll. It rolled across the table; it rolled to the edge of the table, and then fell right to the earthen floor. "Stop," cried the little woman. But the dumpling rolled and rolled until it rolled down a hole.

"Ungrateful dumpling," scolded the little woman, as she knelt and reached for it.

But just then the earth gave way, and head over heels she tumbled and tumbled until she found herself on a most unusual road. It was a hilly road lined with statues of the gods. "My dumpling! My dumpling! Where is my dumpling?" She shouted as she ran.

Soon she came to one of the statues. "Jizo Sama, did you see my dumpling?" "Yes, I saw your dumpling roll by three minutes ago, but you had better not follow it because the wicked oni live at the end of the road." "Oh, tee-he-he-he," laughed the funny little woman. "I'm not afraid of the oni," and she kept running down the road crying, "My dumpling! My dumpling! Has anybody seen my dumpling?"

"I have," said a very stern Jizo. "It rolled by me just two minutes ago. But don't run after it, for you will surely meet a wicked oni." "Oh, tee-he-he-he," laughed the little woman. "I'm not afraid of the wicked oni," and she ran even faster, shouting "My dumpling! My dumpling! Has anybody seen my dumpling?"

Soon she came to another Jizo and asked: "Dear Jizo, have you seen my dumpling?" "It rolled by just one minute ago, but hurry and hide behind me, for here comes a wicked oni!"

The wicked oni stopped and bowed to Jizo. "Good day, Jizo Sama!"

And very politely, Jizo said, "Good day." Sniff, sniff, sniff. "Jizo Sama," cried the wicked oni, "I smell the smell of humankind!" "Oh, said Jizo, "you only smell the breeze off the river." "No, no," said the wicked oni. "I smell the ___" "Tee-he-he-he." The little woman could not keep from laughing. "Tee-he-he-he."

Then the wicked oni put one large arm behind Jizo and pulled the woman out! "What are you doing to do with the little woman?" asked Jizo. "You won't hurt her will you?"
"Hurt her! I should say not," said the wicked oni. "I'm going to take her home and have her cook for all of us." "Tee-he-he-he," laughed the little woman, as the wicked oni took her down the road to a wide river. He put her into a boat and took her across the river to a strange house.

In the kitchen he gave her a large wooden paddle. "Now this is how you must cook our rice," said the wicked oni. "First put one, just one grain of rice in this pot. Stir it with this magic paddle and you will soon have a potful."

"Tee-he-he-he," laughed the little woman. "That's easy."

And soon after the wicked oni left she tried it out. One grain of rice and then stir! And as she stirred the one grain became two, two became four, then eight, sixteen, thirty-two, sixty-four, one hundred and twenty-eight, two hundred and fifty-six, and the pot was full!

"Tee-he-he-he," she laughed. "What fun I shall have making rice dumplings."

The weeks and the months passed as the little woman kept busy cooking rice for the wicked oni. (For oni eat more rice than most people!)

One afternoon she grew lonely for her little house and decided to return. First she tucked the magic paddle in her belt, then she went out the door. She looked to left and right — there were no oni to be seen.

She ran to the river, stopped, and looked behind — still there were no oni. Now, quietly she got into the boat; then away she went.

Since the river was wide, she had only reached the middle when the oni returned and found her missing.

Soon the oni were all on the bank watching her. Now, because oni do not swim, they thought of a plan to stop her. All of them got on their knees and drank the water from the river!

When the little woman found the boat stuck in the mud, she was too frightened to laugh, so she jumped from the boat and began running. Her feet stuck in the mud, her hands stuck in the mud, and she fell in the mud!

"Tee-he-he-he, tee-he-he-he, tee-he-he-he," roared the oni. The little woman made a funny sight! Of course, when they laughed, all the water fell from their mouths back into the river, so the little woman jumped in the boat and away she went.
After that, the little woman was very happy, for with her magic paddle, she could make more rice dumplings faster than ever. So she sold them and soon became the richest woman in all of Japan.

"Tee-he-he-he-he-he!"
Madeline's Rescue

In an old house in Paris that was covered with vines
lived twelve little girls in two straight lines.
They left the house at half past nine
In two straight lines in rain or shine.
The smallest one was Madeline.
She was not afraid of mice.
She loved winter, snow, and ice.
To the tiger in the zoo
Madeline just said, "Pooh pooh!"

And nobody knew so well
How to frighten Miss Clavel -
Until the day she slipped and fell.

Poor Madeline would now be dead
But for a dog
That kept its head,
and dragged her safe from a watery grave.

"From now on, I hope you will listen to me,
And here is a cup of camomile tea."

"Good night, little girls - I hope you sleep well,"
"Good night, good night, dear Miss Clavel!"

Miss Clavel turned out the light.
After she left there was a fight.
About where the dog should sleep that night.

The new pupil was ever
So helpful and clever.

The dog loved biscuits, milk, and beef
And they named him Genevieve.

She could sing and almost talk
And enjoyed the daily walk.

Soon the snow began to fly,
Inside it was warm and dry
And six months passed quickly by.

When the First of May came near
There was nervousness each year.
For on that day there arrived a collection
Of trustees for the annual inspection.
The inspection was most thorough,  
Much to everybody's sorrow.

"Tap, tap!" "Whatever can that be?"
"Tap, tap!" "Come out and let me see!"
"Dear me, it's a dog! Isn't there a rule
"That says DOGS AREN'T ALLOWED IN SCHOOL!"

"Miss Clavel, get rid of it, please,"
Said the president of the board of trustees.
"Yes, but the children love her so,
Said Miss Clavel, "Please don't make her go."

"I daresay," said Lord Cucuface.
"I mean - it's a perfect disgrace
"For young ladies to embrace
"This creature of uncertain race!"

"Off with you! Go on - run! Scat!
"Go away and don't come back!"

Madeline jumped on a chair.
"Lord Cucuface," she cried, "beware!
"Miss Genevieve, noblest dog in Grance,
"You shall have your VEN-GE-ANCE!"

"It's no use crying or talking.
"Let's get dressed and go out walking.
"The sooner we're ready, the sooner we'll leave -
"The sooner we'll find Miss Genevieve."

They went looking high
And every place a dog might go.

In every place they called her name
But no one answered to the same.

The gendarmes said, "We don't believe
"We've seen a dog like Genevieve."

Hours after they had started
They came back home broken-hearted.

"Oh, Genevieve, where can you be?
"Genevieve, please come back to me."

In the middle of the night
Miss Clavel turned on the light.
And said, "Something is not right."
An old street lamp shed its light
On Miss Genevieve outside.

She was petted, she was fed,
And everybody went to bed.

"Good night, little girls, I hope you sleep well."
"Good night, good night, dear Miss Clavel!"

Miss Clavel turned out the light,
And again there was a fight,
As each little girl cried,
"Genevieve is mine tonight!"

For a second time that night
Miss Clavel turned on her light.

And afraid of a disaster,
She ran fast -
And even faster.

"If there's one more fight about Genevieve,
"I'm sorry, but she'll have to leave!"

That was the end of the riot -
Suddenly all was quiet.

For the third time that night
Miss Clavel turned on the light,
And to her surprise she found
That suddenly there was enough hound
To go all around.
Make Way for Ducklings

Mr. and Mrs. Mallard were looking for a place to live. But every time Mr. Mallard saw what looked like a nice place, Mrs. Mallard said it was no good. There were sure to be foxes in the woods or turtles in the water, and she was not going to raise a family where there might be foxes or turtles. So they flew on and on.

When they got to Boston, they felt too tired to fly any further. There was a nice pond in the Public Garden, with a little island on it. "The very place to spend the night." quacked Mr. Mallard. So down they flapped.

Next morning they fished for their breakfast in the mud at the bottom of the pond. But they didn't find much.

Just as they were getting ready to start on their way, a strange enormous bird came by. It was pushing a boat full of people, and there was a man sitting on its back. "Good morning," quacked Mr. Mallard, being polite. The big bird was too proud to answer. But the people on the boat threw peanuts into the water, so the Mallards followed them all round the pond and got another breakfast, better than the first.

"I like this place," said Mrs. Mallard as they climbed out on the bank and waddled along. "Why don't we build a nest and raise our ducklings right in this pond? There are no foxes and no turtles, and the people feed us peanuts. What could be better?"

"Good," said Mr. Mallard, delighted that at last Mrs. Mallard had found a place that suited her. But _____

"Look out!" squawked Mrs. Mallard, all of a dither. "You'll get run over!" And when she got her breath she added: "This is no place for babies, with all those horrid things rushing about. We'll have to look somewhere else."

So they flew over Beacon Hill and round the State House, but there was no place there.

They looked in Louisburg Square, but there was no water to swim in.

Then they flew over the Charles River. "This is better," quacked Mr. Mallard. "That island looks like a nice quiet place, and it's only a little way from the Public Garden." "Yes," said Mrs. Mallard, remembering the peanuts. "That looks like just the right place to hatch ducklings."
So they chose a cozy spot among the bushes near the water and settled down to build their nest. And only just in time, for now they were beginning to molt. All their old wing feathers started to drop out, and they would not be able to fly again until the new ones grew in.

But of course they could swim, and one day they swam over to the park on the river bank, and there they met a policeman called Michael. Michael fed them peanuts, and after that the Mallards called on Michael every day.

After Mrs. Mallard had laid eight eggs in the nest she couldn't go to visit Michael any more, because she had to sit on the eggs to keep them warm. She moved off the nest only to get a drink of water; or to have her lunch, or to count the eggs and make sure they were all there.

One day the ducklings hatched out. First came Jack, then Kack, and then Lack, then Mack and Nack and Ouack and Pack and Quack. Mr. and Mrs. Mallard were bursting with pride. It was a great responsibility taking care of so many ducklings, and kept them very busy.

One day Mr. Mallard decided he'd like to take a trip to see what the rest of the river was like, further on. So off he set. "I'll meet you in a week, in the Public Garden," he quacked over his shoulder. "Take good care of the ducklings." "Don't you worry," said Mrs. Mallard. "I know all about bringing up children." And she did.

She taught them how to swim and dive. She taught them to walk in a line, to come when they were called, and to keep a safe distance from bikes and scooters and other things with wheels.

When at last she felt perfectly satisfied with them, she said one morning: "Come along, children, follow me." Before you could wink an eyelash Jack, Kack, Lack, Mack, Nack, Ouack, Pack and Quack fell into line, just as they had been taught. Mrs. Mallard led the way into the water and they swam behind her to the opposite bank.

There they waded ashore and waddled along till they came to the highway. Mrs. Mallard stepped out to cross the road. "Honk, honk!" went the horns on the speeding cars.

"Qua-a-ack!" went Mrs. Mallard as she tumbled back again. "Quack! Quack! Quack! Quack!" went Jack, Kack, Lack, Mack, Nack, Ouack, Pack and Quack, just as loud as their little quackers could quack. The cars kept speeding by and honking, and Mrs. Mallard and the ducklings kept right on quack-quack-quacking.
They made such a noise that Michael came running, waving his arms and blowing his whistle. He planted himself in the center of the road, raised one hand to stop the traffic, and then beckoned with the other, the way policemen do, for Mrs. Mallard to cross over.

As soon as Mrs. Mallard and the ducklings were safe on the other side and on their way down Mount Vernon Street, Michael rushed back to his police booth.

He called Clancy at headquarters and said: "There's a family of ducks walkin' down the street!" Clancy said: "Family of what?" "Ducks!" yelled Michael. "Send a police car, quick!"

Meanwhile Mrs. Mallard had reached the Corner Book Shop and turned into Charles Street, with Jack, Kack, Lack, Mack, Nack, Ouack, Pack, and Quack all marching in line behind her.

Everyone stared. An old lady from Beacon Hill said: "Isn't it amazing!" and the man who swept the streets said: "Well, now, ain't that nice!" and when Mrs. Mallard heard them she was so proud she tipped her nose in the air and walked along with an extra swing in her waddle.

When they came to the corner of Beacon Street there was the police car with four policemen that Clancy had sent from headquarters. The policemen held back the traffic so Mrs. Mallard and the ducklings could march across the street, right on into the Public Garden.

Inside the gate they all turned round to say thank you to the policemen. The policemen smiled and waved good-by. When they reached the pond and swam across to the little island, there was Mr. Mallard waiting for them, just as he had promised.

The ducklings liked the new island so much that they decided to live there. All day long they follow the swan boats and eat peanuts. And when night falls they swim to their little island and go to sleep.
APPENDIX C

EXAMPLES OF TYPESCRIPTS OF ORAL DISCOURSE SEGMENTED INTO T-UNITS
there was this funny little lady and she was making rice dumplings one day when she was making them one fell off the table and went into a crack and then she went to the crack and the ground a little and she started to fall in and then there was this road after she got to the ground there was a road and so she followed it and there were some statues and she asked the statues where her dumpling went and one of the statues goes I saw it pass a few minutes ago but you better not follow it because at the end of the road there is an oni then the little lady laughed and kept going then she came to another statue and asked it it had seen her dumpling the statue said that he had saw it two minutes ago but she better not follow it because there is an oni at the end of the road she laughed and kept going and then she got to another statue and asked her if she had seen the dumpling the statue goes yes I saw it one minute ago but you better hide behind me because here comes the wicked oni so the lady got behind it and then the oni comes and says something to the statue and then the oni says he smell a human and the statue goes you just smell the water the oni goes no I smell a human being then the lady starts to laugh so the oni sticks his hand behind him and pulls out the funny little lady and then takes her and then takes her to a boat and then when they get to the house where all the oni live he gives her a big spoon and says put one grain of rice in the pot and stir with this magic spoon and you will get a pot full of rice so when the oni left the little lady
tried it out and first she put in one then put in two then four then eight and at least went to two hundred and fifty then she cooked it for a week and more than a month then she got lonely from her little house so then she looks to the left and the right and she sees no oni she runs down the steps and looks behind her no oni she runs and get into the boat and starts going but just as she was in the middle the oni saw her and since oni can't swim they made up a plan so they drank up all the water and then the little lady was frightened to laugh but then she had an idea she made some funny faces and then they laughed and then they let out the water then she stirred her was back to the boat then she climbed up the crack and got out and then she used the magic spoon to make rice dumplings faster since she made so many of them she started to sell them and she then became the richest person in japan
there once was these two mallards miss mallard and mr mallard and they were looking for a home first mr mallard mentioned this one spot but mrs mallard didn't like it because it looked like a place where turtles and foxes would be she didn't want to hatch her eggs where there were foxes and turtles so they went to this other place and they kept on and mrs mallard kept saying no there might turtles and foxes so finally they came to this one spot and they were too tired to go any farther so they went to the water and they saw a boat with this strange big bird pushing it with men on its back mr and mrs mallard said good morning to the swan and the swan was so proud it kept going on but the people on the boat threw peanuts to them then all of a sudden they almost got hit and then mrs mallard saw a island so they went over and made themself cozy and they got there just in time because their feathers started to come out and they couldn't fly until they got their new ones but of course they could still swim so they swim across and then started to walk then they saw michael the policeman and he gave them some peanuts then they went back to their island mrs mallard hatched eight eggs and they were mack and quack and jack and another one and mrs mallard wouldn't get up until they were hatched but only she would get up to get something to drink or eat her lunch or to count her eggs then one day they all hatched and mr mallard said i'll see you in about a week and mrs mallard says o k but mr mallard goes are you sure you know how to handle them and mrs mallard
said I sure do, and she sure did. She taught them how to fly and swim, and she taught them to get in line when she called. Then one day she thought that she was satisfied with what she had taught them, and they went out. First they went to the highway, but horns kept honking at them, and they kept quacking. So Michael came out and stopped the cars so that they could go through, and then after they went across he went and quickly called the police station and said send some police cars. There's a family of ducks, and the police goes. A family of what a family of ducks. So then they send some out there, and the garbage man goes well, ain't that nice? And then when they got down to this one road, there were the policemen waiting for them, and then the policemen when the ducks got to the other end, they turned around as to say thank you. Then they went to the public garden, and they went back to the island, and there was Mr. Mallard waiting for them as he had said.
Once there was these children and they lived on this rock and then they went on this bridge and they were excited and Madaline falls in she falls into the water and then all these men come running and getting her out but they couldn't then their dog comes and jumps in and pulls her out and then they go back home and she is real cold and sick and then they go to sleep and while their mother was out they get up and start having pillow fights and stuff and then they stopped and the next day everybody got ready and made their beds and got their dog neat for these people that were coming and then when they came they inspected the house and then the man saw the dog he goes he's got to go but everybody goes no the guy takes him and throws the dog out and then and everybody starts crying and the people leave then they have sort of a meeting to go on a search they go on a search they go to church yards they go down by the drug store but they don't find them then they go to sleep and then the mother hears a howling noise and she gets up and goes to look outside and she sees the dog and she brings it in and then she goes back to sleep and then she hears some hitting and stuff and screaming and she goes in and see the children are hitting each other and she stops it and then the dog has puppies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>642663.10</td>
<td>20.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Race (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6412.93</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Sex (A X C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41734.62</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Educational Background (A X D)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7021.29</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Race X Sex (A X B X C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11127.18</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1004.29</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5559.60</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7871.54</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Replicates</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1251342.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1974736.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p = .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14081.78</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17822.25</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Background (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>106929.00</td>
<td>4.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race X Sex (B X C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39138.03</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race X Educational Background (B X D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Educational Background (C X D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8433.36</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race X Sex X Educational Background (B X C X D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40200.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Replicates</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1037781.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1264411.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p .05
### TABLE 4

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

**SUMMARY TABLE FOR VOCABULARY SOPHISTICATION/WORD FREQUENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2256.46</td>
<td>2256.46</td>
<td>20.68***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.01</td>
<td>31.01</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Background (D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race X Sex (B X C)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3478.21</td>
<td>3478.21</td>
<td>31.88***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race X Educational Background (B X D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Educational Background (C X D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race X Sex X Educational Background (B X C X D)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.12</td>
<td>42.12</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Replicates</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4364.79</td>
<td>109.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10200.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < .05  
** **p < .01  
*** ***p < .001
### TABLE 5

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

**SUMMARY TABLE FOR VOCABULARY SOPHISTICATION/WORD FREQUENCY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Race (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Sex (A X C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Educational Background (A X D)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>12.09</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Race X Sex (A X B X C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.44</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Replicates</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>824.33</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                                       | 96 | 970.97|      |     |
### TABLE 6

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

**SUMMARY TABLE FOR NUMBER OF T-UNITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8104.60</td>
<td>4052.30</td>
<td>18.85***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Race (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81.76</td>
<td>40.88</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Sex (A X C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>349.18</td>
<td>174.59</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Educational Background (A X D)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Race X Sex (A X B X C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>143.51</td>
<td>71.76</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42.76</td>
<td>21.38</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>129.68</td>
<td>64.84</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>196.68</td>
<td>98.34</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Replicates</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17193.22</td>
<td>214.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>26247.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p .05  
** p .01  
*** p .001
### TABLE 7

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE**

**SUMMARY TABLE FOR WORDS PER T-UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>3.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Race (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Sex (A X C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Educational Background (A X D)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Race X Sex (A X B X C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Replicates</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>243.13</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>277.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p .05
TABLE 8  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE  
SUMMARY TABLE FOR CLAUSES PER T-UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>16.92***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Race (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>72.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Sex (A X C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90.51</td>
<td>45.26</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Educational Background (A X D)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2916.28</td>
<td>1458.14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Race X Sex (A X B X C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>66.09</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81.38</td>
<td>40.69</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Replicates</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3100.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p .01
TABLE 9
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR WORDS PER T-UNIT AND WORDS PER CLAUSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>3.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Race (A X B)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Sex (A X C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Educational Background (A X D)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment X Race X Sex (A X B X C)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X C X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B X C X D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Replicates</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>243.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>277.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p .05
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