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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of Study

The history of education has demonstrated that changing educational philosophies are often linked to social, political, and economic forces that reflect the moods and well being of the times. Thus, at the turn of the century when the industrial revolution was in full swing and the factories were filled with unskilled and immigrant labor the concept of vocational and technical schools emerged in order that the nations' industries be provided with the kind of well qualified personnel needed for continuous industrial growth and success. In the post Sputnik years of the 1950's when the race with the Soviet Union was one of scientific advancement, schools were forced into updating math and science curriculums and providing the nation with greatly increased numbers of engineers, technical and research scientists. The emphasis of the schools was on academic performance and preparing the college bound student for advanced scientific training.

When educational philosophy is viewed from the perspective of an historical link one can better understand the educational trends and movements confronting the schools of the 1970's. In this era of decreasing school enrollment and increasing school costs, parents and community members on the whole are demanding their right for input and
involvement in all areas of school business, including curriculum and
the establishment of educational standards. In the past, these areas
were usually left to the educational "experts."

Two of the leading movements in education today reflect this new
public concern with today's schools. First, there has been a vigorous
cry for a curriculum that gets "back to basics." This no frills, buckle
down approach eliminates many of the extra curricula activities found
prevalent in the schools of the late 1950's and 1960's. Budgetary
limitations have often pushed special teachers in the areas of art,
music, and dramatics by the wayside. The decreased funds have kept to
a minimum the number of supplementary aids and materials purchased by
classroom teachers. While schools increasingly have been equipped with
gymnasiums and libraries more often than not they do not have the per­
sonnel needed to operate them. In brief, back to basics means emphasis
on the skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Learning takes
place through time tested theories of repetition and drill. School is
a serious place where performance is rewarded and achievement acclaimed.

Accompanying this emphasis on the basics is public demand that
school personnel adequately demonstrate that they are accomplishing the
tasks they are being paid for. In this relatively new trend of accoun­
tability, communities are insisting on increased use of assessment
tools and that school officials be held responsible for the job they
are supposed to do, that is the education of their children. In recent
years, the question of assessment and accountability has taken many
interesting turns.
In some instances school systems have been brought to court concerning the education of their students. The *New York Times* reported that a high school graduate who was unable to find work because of his poor mastery of reading and other basic skills sued a local school system. With outside tutoring the student was able to master those skills that he had not mastered in the public schools. The public school officials were held responsible because they had not adequately trained the student in basic skills, skills he was capable of achieving, and the parents had never been informed their son had any academic problems. He had been promoted from grade to grade in a normal sequence and had always received passing grades.

In some school systems concern with adequate educational standards has led to the establishment of minimum standards. If a student does not achieve a particular level of performance he would not be allowed to enter senior high school or perhaps graduate with a certified diploma. In recent times the Board of Education of the State of Ohio began considering competency testing of both elementary and high school students throughout the state.\(^1\) If a statewide system of competency testing is adopted, individual school systems may find that they need to upgrade their standards in accordance with state prescribed guidelines. There is no doubt that during the early 1980's communities are going to closely monitor what is happening in their schools. They not only will watch budgetary spending but also what subject matter is being taught and how well that subject matter is being learned.

Against this backdrop, the study of literature continues to be recognized as an integral and necessary component of high school English curriculums. However, the importance of literary instruction at the elementary school level has not yet been widely recognized or accepted. This is illustrated in research by Tom\textsuperscript{2} which indicated that only one-fourth of the 582 fourth, fifth, and sixth grade teachers he studied followed a year long plan for reading aloud literature to their classes. Also Terry\textsuperscript{3}, who studied teachers from these same grade levels, found that approximately three-fourths of them limited their reading of poetry to their classes to an occasional or monthly basis. While more than half the teachers in the Tom study did indicate they read prose to their classes at least twice a week, they also indicated that time limitations, the importance of other subjects, and their lack of knowledge of children's books restricted their reading of literature.\textsuperscript{4}

Research has demonstrated in a preliminary way that literature deserves a more prominent place in elementary school curriculums. Note that the findings reviewed below show the impact literature can have throughout the early and middle childhood years.

Irwin\textsuperscript{5} who studied the systematic reading of stories to infants over an eight month period found that at age two and one half these

\begin{itemize}
  \item Tom, Chow Loy. \textit{What Teachers Read to Pupils in the Middle Grades.} Doctoral Dissertation. The Ohio State University, 1969.
  \item Terry, Carolyn Ann. \textit{A National Survey of Children's Poetry Preferences in the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Grades.} Doctoral Dissertation. The Ohio State University, 1972.
  \item Tom, C.L. \textit{What Teachers Read to Pupils in the Middle Grades.}, op. cit.
\end{itemize}
youngsters vocalized spontaneously more than children who had not been read to. At the nursery school level, Cazden⁶ found that the building and extending of ideas of children through discussion and reading of stories led to their increased performance in six areas of language development.

Cohen⁷ in her study of second graders, found that the incidental pairing of language learning with the reading of literature contributed to the strengthening of language in primary grade children who were retarded in reading. Fourth and fifth graders who received lessons in literature have been found to read a greater number of books, a greater variety of books, and rank reading higher as a pursuit than did children not receiving literary lessons.⁸

The above review of research begins to suggest the rich potential literature has to contribute to early and middle childhood students' learning experiences. More research is needed, however, to fully explore the above uses and to develop new means through which literary experience can be employed to foster the growth and development of children. The present study is conducted towards these ends: to further knowledge of the effects of literature on children by exploring aspects of children's perception and understanding of a literary work.


The Problem: Its Importance

The present study was designed to contribute to the understanding of children and their literature. Specifically, one purpose of this study is to empirically assess the reaction and understanding of children at three age levels to Hoban's book Bread and Jam for Frances. It was expected that the subjects, kindergarteners, third graders, and sixth graders, would respond to the book differently, reflecting the qualitative differences in their intellectual development. For example, Bread and Jam for Frances, like many story books, has a message to convey to young readers: namely, that it's important to try new foods. One aspect of this first purpose is to determine the extent to which children would grasp this message and could apply it in their own lives.

The second purpose was to identify the working assumptions that educators typically make about books as they select them for the classroom. Teachers of kindergartener and third grade children will be asked to predict how students in their classes would respond to Bread and Jam for Frances.

The third purpose was to explore the possibility of using this particular book as a means of assessing and evaluating children's abilities to make moral judgments.

The three purposes described above have the potential for direct use by classroom teachers. It was also felt that the present study would point to a new fruitful direction for researchers in the field of children's literature. Specifically, this method could provide a model

---

for those who are developing and assessing literature for use in classroom settings and for various types of remedial and therapeutic settings.

Research Design

The study involved the administration of a questionnaire to five groups of subjects. Each group of subjects was asked to respond to thirteen questions designed to reveal their knowledge and understanding of what happened in the children's storybook Bread and Jam for Frances.

Pilot Studies. Pilot studies were conducted (1) to establish that the stimulus book was of interest to children of the ages being studied and (2) to develop a questionnaire that was concise, suited to the children being tested, and yielded responses that revealed subjects' feelings and understandings about the stimulus book. Results of the children's preliminary pilot study indicated that the selected book was of interest to kindergarten, second, and third grade aged children but that the questionnaire needed revision to eliminate questions that were too wordy and those that did not yield needed information. The results of the children's pilot study indicated that the revised questionnaire did provide the kind of responses needed for analyzing children's reaction to and understanding of the selected storybook. This revised questionnaire was used in the present research. When this was completed, an adult form of the questionnaire was piloted with four teachers. It was found adequate for use in the final study.

Subjects. Seventy-five children from an upper middle class suburban Columbus, Ohio elementary school served as subjects. The 25 kindergarten, 25 third grade, and 25 sixth grade children were all making
normal school progress. The adult subjects were primary grade teachers enrolled in an advanced children's literature course offered at The Ohio State University.

**Testing.** Three variations of the same instrument were used to test the groups of subjects involved in the study. Kindergarten and third grade subjects were tested in the following manner: First, the stimulus book was read to each subject individually. Second, immediately following the reading of the book the author orally administered the questionnaire. The questioning and each child's responses were tape recorded. Sixth grade subjects were tested in the following manner: First, with the aid of an opaque projector the stimulus book was read orally to the class. Second, immediately following the reading of the story, sixth grade subjects were asked to respond to a written questionnaire. Each student received a copy of the questionnaire but was asked to follow along as the examiner read each question orally and then allowed time for response. The adult subjects were each given a copy of the stimulus book to read silently to themselves. Upon completing the reading they were then asked to respond to the written questionnaire.

**Limitations**

This investigation is just a beginning into viewing school literary programs and children's reaction to literature in a new way. The findings of the present study, however, may be limiting in several ways. 1) The children studied all attended one school located in an upper middle class white suburban neighborhood, thus limiting the generalizability of the present findings to other children. 2) Subjects'
reaction to and understanding of a single book was sought, thus limiting the generalizability of the present findings to other books.

3) The teacher subjects studied were all members of an advanced children's literature class. Their involvement in a graduate program in education limited the generalizability of the present findings to other teachers. 4) The possibility of author bias exists in that all testing was administered directly by the author.

Analysis

An analysis of the data was done to examine the three major areas of concern: (1) the determination of developmental differences, (2) teacher's predictability of students' responses, and (3) students' moral understandings. After establishing interscorer reliability, the author and an independent scorer categorized the responses to each question. Three by two chi square tests were performed to determine differences among the three age groups of subjects. Two by two chi square tests were performed to determine differences in responses between kindergarten and third grade subjects and their respective teachers. The responses to the questions bearing on children's moral understandings were examined and descriptive statistics were developed. Finally, descriptive statistics were used to evaluate the responses to questions designed to solicit subjects' opinions about various aspects of the story.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This review of literature focuses on four major areas of research concerned with the selection and utilization of children's literature in the classroom. While the study of literature has been considered as an important part of high school curriculums, only limited efforts have been made at designing and evaluating these programs and almost no effort has been made to design, evaluate, and institute literary programs for elementary aged children. For the most part past studies concerned with children's literature have been limited to those that assess children's literary preferences. More recently investigators have approached literature from the perspective of the assessment of literary response. This present study will draw together information from various areas of child development and literary research in order to provide much needed criteria for establishing effective literary experiences for children. First, consideration will be given as to what purpose the literary program plays in the educational life of the schoolchild. The goals both of specialists in the field of children's literature as well as those of authors will be explored. Second, consideration will be given as to what books children are reading. Research studies reviewing children's reading interests will be reviewed as well as an overview of the criteria used in library book selection.
Third, research reports focusing on children's responses to literature will be examined to see in what way children have been found to interact with the books they have been reading and the methodology which is available to assess this interaction. Fourth, the developmental needs of children will be explored in order to see how these needs are reflected in the literature which is available to children and in their interaction with that literature. The intention in analyzing and synthesizing these four important yet divergent areas is to gain a greater understanding of children, their literature, and how children interact with their literature.

The Literary Program

Experts' comments on the purposes of literature. From nursery schools through college classrooms, books and reading are considered to be the backbone of a sound educational program. While educators, librarians, and parents may not agree as to what constitutes good books or literature, none would argue that literature is not important to learning and serves many useful purposes in a child's growth and development.

Huck¹ in her textbook on children's literature in the elementary school has included the following contributions of literature to the growth and development of children. First, literature is a source of enjoyment for children—a form of entertainment that can help them laugh or make them cry. Books can tickle the insides of children and adults alike. They emote feeling and involvement.

Second, literature helps to stimulate and develop children's imagination. Through books children may broaden their perspective of the world around them. They may see familiar aspects of their environment in a new light or be exposed to new and unusual ideas not usually found in their present surroundings. Literature helps one explore the depths of one's own imagination as well as the imagination of others.

Third, literature provides children with the opportunity to vicariously experience events or happenings they might otherwise be unable to have. Through literature the past comes alive as one experiences the feelings and moods of the people and events of another era. Literature need not teach historical facts per se, but oftentimes does do so in a way history or social studies textbooks never can. Through the vicarious experiences of reading children also deal with the present by extending their outlook on the world beyond their immediate environment thus increasing their understanding of others and helping to develop tolerance and understanding of people different from themselves. Literature also helps children solve their own problems by seeing how others have coped with the problems they face.

Last, through literature one can experience the universality of life. Often a child, like an adult, feels alone in his fears or feeling about himself or his understanding of the world. Through literature one can find that one's own quests for answers about oneself and life are like those of many others both in the past and present.

In summary, literature has been known to be an important part of children's learning and growing years. The written word has contributed to both children and man as a whole by preserving the past and shaping
the future. Through books children gain knowledge, receive enjoyment and ponder the wonder of new ideas.

In addition to the above contributions of literature to a child's development and growth as a person, research findings have suggested that literature also serves to foster intellectual development. Studies by Irwin² of infants and Cazden³ of nursery school children both demonstrate that the reading of books to young children helps stimulate language acquisition and language development. Cohen's⁴ study of second grade children indicated that in classrooms where teachers read daily stories and conducted follow-up activities of these stories the children showed significant increases in vocabulary, work knowledge and reading comprehension over control classrooms where teachers had not been given specific instructions. Broening⁵ found that lessons in literature sparked fourth and fifth grade children to delve into greater amounts of independent reading. One might hypothesize that reading stories to older children might also contribute to vocabulary growth and increased reading proficiency.

In general, experts have agreed that children's literature serves a variety of important basic educative functions including that of extending information and serving as a model for social behavior. While


³Cazden, Courtney B., "Environmental Assistance to the Child's Acquisition of Grammar," op. cit.

⁴Cohen, Dorothy, "The Effect of Literature on Vocabulary and Reading Achievement," op. cit.

⁵Broening, Angela M. Developing Appreciation through Teaching Literature, op. cit.
most experts have denounced the use of literature as an academic, didactic tool, Stevens\(^6\) notes that in addition to the kinds of contributions made by literature illustrated by Huck, others have seen literature as serving other purposes and achieving other ends. First, writers have used their pens as a tool to portray life as it really is. The author sees himself as an observer and recorder of life providing for future generations a true portrayal of the world as it exists at a particular time. Second, and perhaps the oldest aim of writing is that of instruction. Literature has been seen as a tool for guiding behavior, as a way of teaching morals, as a way to make the world a better place to live. Books of this variety are written with an intent in mind with messages that are often explicit and designed specifically to get right to the point.

**Authors' purposes in writing.** Authors, like educators, differ somewhat in their approach to children's literature, yet as a group they encompass the same basic goals as those listed by the education experts. Authors also seem to agree with the basic philosophy expounded by fellow writer Mollie Hunter\(^7\) that a good children's book is one which is a good book in its own right, one in which adults, too, should find pleasure, profit, and interest. Referring to the poignant statement of Edward Blishen that a good book for children is one that has "the child's eye at the centre," Hunter admonishes that to write children's books well one must blend writer technique, passion, insight, 


and talent and apply them honestly while continually looking out from the story with the unguarded look and inexperience of childhood.

Hunter's first children's book, like those of other children's authors including Sydney Taylor and Julie Edwards, evolved from the requests and proddings of their own children. Other writers of children's books, many of whom wanted to be writers of adult fiction, stumbled upon the field of children's writing by happenstance; but once there devoted themselves fully and with the deepest respect for their profession.

When asked to respond to the question "Why do they write children's books?" authors presented the following kinds of responses each reflective of personal needs as well as recognizing the needs of young children. Expressing sentiments similar to that of author John Ciardi who states "I write for my own childhood" many writers seem to have a knack for remembering what it was like to be a child. With their uncanny instinct of what children's lives are like they write about the people and places in their own childhood and attempt to share the feelings they had as they grew. Their love for the imaginative, the fun, and sometimes the sadness of growing up is perhaps their way of telling children that it's all right to giggle and laugh, to have fears, or to live out one's fantasies. In part the goal these authors have is to preserve

---

8 Hopkins, Lee Bennett, *More Books by More People* (New York: Citation Press, 1974).


10 Hopkins, Lee Bennett, *Books are by People* (New York: Citation Press, 1969).
what we have all commonly known and experienced during childhood.

For some authors, the need to communicate special feelings to children seems to be particularly strong. de Regniers writes "I had to write *A Little House of Your Own*. I have a strong sense of privacy. I wanted to give the message to all the children in the United States of America that it is all right to want to be alone sometimes... If that book didn't get published, I was going to mimeograph it and put it in corn flakes boxes to get it to kids!"\(^{11}\).

Taking a different approach, Politi\(^{12}\) states that he writes because he wants to preserve the past for children by collecting it in stories and pictures and giving it back to them as part of their heritage. As mentioned earlier in the comments of the experts, the writing of Politi and others like him serves a two-fold purpose. First it allows for the vicarious learning experiences necessary for children to gain a fuller understanding of their past and present. Second, it provides for an educationally sound learning experience in the area of history and culture.

Unlike many children's authors, Geisel\(^{13}\) states that his books are specifically written to make a statement. While fanciful and entertaining, his stories present morals in an easily digested manner for children to learn. Like Geisel, Lionni\(^{14}\), too, presents to children lessons
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\(^{11}\)Ibid.


\(^{13}\)Ibid.

\(^{14}\)Hopkins, *Books are by People*, op. cit.
to be learned. According to Lionni his straightforward style of writing and his beautifully executed illustrations are not prepared specifically for children but are intended as a means to convey a message to be pondered and learned by all.

Else Minarik\textsuperscript{15} and Lilian Moore\textsuperscript{16} began their literary careers as a direct result of their working with children and having difficulty finding material they liked suitable for their children's needs. The books they created filled a gap by providing for the particular reading needs of their students.

It does not seem possible to establish a set of guidelines as to how to write good children's books or what subjects are considered appropriate for children's literature. The authors mentioned above have been outstanding contributors to the field, yet their views and approaches to children's literature are somewhat divergent. Most of these authors indicate that while they write they keep the needs of children very much in mind. Yet only a few of them work directly with children while they write. Scott\textsuperscript{17} states that when she is writing about something she is unsure about, she does a lot of talking with children. Kraus and Johnson's\textsuperscript{18} book \textit{A Hole is to Dig: A First Book of First Definitions} was a result of direct research with children in which boys and girls were asked to respond to such questions as "What

\textsuperscript{15}Hopkins, \textit{Books are by People}, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{18}Ibid.
is a hole?". There are other equally fine authors, however, who never try out their ideas on children.

In reviewing these different purposes, styles, and goals of children's authors one sees why, as in good adult literature, the types and approaches of good children's literature vary. The quality of the book does not seem to rely on whether or not the book was written in a very directed way with an explicit point for children to grasp or whether it was written in a nondirected more subtle manner. All books do indeed impart some sort of message to the child. While the manner in which this is done may vary, the quality of it determines the success of the book. Good children's authors are hard to come by. Those that have achieved recognition in their field take great pride in their literary efforts. They recognize the importance and the uniqueness of the child and are proud to be a part of and an influence on children's lives.

In this era of school accountability it seems logical to ask whether or not the books children read are truly accomplishing the purposes and goals set out for them?" Both experts in the field of children's literature and the authors themselves agree that children's literature should achieve specific goals related to a child's learning and experiencing his environment. It is important to note, however, whether in fact books are achieving the purposes they have sought to achieve. This present study will address itself to the problem of goal achievement.
Books Reach Readers

Not all authors have the determination of de Regniers who knew her own book was good and who said if her book wasn't accepted by a publisher she would have published and distributed it herself. She "knew" her message was one that needed to be conveyed to certain children. The problem of getting the right book to the right child at the right time is not one to be easily solved. In looking at the sources available to children in their selection of books one finds that during their early years their contact is often limited to those available to them within the home—a nursery rhyme collection, a group of inexpensive "Golden Books," and books representative of the times such as Walt Disney books or Sesame Street books. Beginning at school age, however, most children come into contact with a library and its services—either a school library or a community library. It is at this point that the child becomes an active participant in the selection of his literature. Numerous studies have been conducted to see which books most interest which children.

Children's reading interests. For many years researchers have tried to identify what books interest children and what subject areas they most prefer reading about. Weintraub¹⁹ and Purves and Beach²⁰ both quote from several sources in their reviews of research on


children's reading interests. On the basis of the large number of sources they present, the authors similarly concluded that findings in the area of children's reading interests are often conflicting and frequently contradictory. Weintraub attributed this situation to several different kinds of problems. First, different methods were often employed to collect information on children's reading interests. Second, the content was categorized in different ways, that is, definition of terms varied from one study to the next, meaning that stories about animal pets were a category in some studies, included in with wild animals in others and under "science interests" in others. Third, researchers varied with regard to how vigorous they were in using controls and in the measurement of reliability of their instruments. Fourth, the sources of measuring reading interests differed. Purves and Beach, indicating similar problems, suggested that if in the future a synthesis of results from studies of this nature is to be achieved, it is essential that the use of one or two investigatory techniques with its accompanying standardization is essential. In spite of these problems, however, the work that has been done has provided a wealth of information about children's reading interests but information that needs to be viewed cautiously. On the following pages are the results of some of these studies.

Since the present investigation is concerned with the literary perceptions of young, middle and older aged elementary school children, efforts will be made to specifically look at the interests of
these aged groups. Smith and Byers have both carefully explored the interests of first grade children. Their differences in approaching the topic illustrates the above mentioned problem of methodology and their findings are somewhat contradictory. Smith identified preferences by tabulating and recording the library book choices of first grade children. From a record of their choices she identified five areas of interest to first grade children: humor and fantasy; real animals; nature and science; holidays and birthdays; fairy tales.

Byers identified the interests of first grade children by tape recording the unstructured sharing period of children from thirty-four different communities in fourteen different states over a six month period. Her sample included rural as well as urban classrooms and children from varying social classes. Her basic assumption was that children would be interested in reading about the same kinds of things as they liked to talk about. The five highest interests in her findings differed somewhat from Smith: science and nature; possessions; personal experiences; family and home activities; outdoor recreation.

Using an interest inventory instrument is a more common technique employed to assess children's reading interests, particularly with older children. Among the several researchers who have sought to identify the interests of middle elementary school aged children is Wolfson


23 Wolfson, Bernice J., "What Do Children Say Their Reading Interests Are?" The Reading Teacher 14:2 (1960) : 81-82, 111.
who orally administered a reading interest inventory to 2000 boys and girls in grades three through six. Wolfson found that while boys' choices as a group were significantly different from those of girls, both groups showed a high interest in social studies and fantasy and a low interest in plants.

Norvell\(^{24}\) found that children in grades three through six liked stories that included action, humor, animals, patriotism, and holidays. They did not like stories about nature or fairies or stories that were didactic in nature.

A 1969 *School Library Journal*\(^{25}\) indicated that the books most frequently chosen by children in grades three through six were those involving the topics of science interest (dinosaurs, rockets, etc.); social studies (the North American Indian, the Civil War); and recreational activities (sports books, cooking, sewing, etc.).

Using a different approach, in an attempt to control for interest based on book availability, Schulte\(^{26}\) sought the preferences of over 6,500 fourth, fifth, and sixth grade children representing urban, suburban, small town, and rural areas by assessing their response preference to fictitious annotated book titles. Her findings, conflicting somewhat with others, indicated that fourth, fifth, and sixth graders showed a
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high interest in realistic fiction with fourth and fifth graders also showing a high interest in fanciful tales. Biography was a second high choice for sixth graders. Social studies was of low interest to children of all grades with poetry being a second low choice for fifth and sixth graders and recreational interests for fourth graders.

While at the current stage of research development it does not seem possible to pinpoint which subject areas are of most interest to particular aged children, it does seem appropriate to say that children do have reading preferences and that these preferences do affect their selection of books. One could easily assume that the books likely to have the greatest impact on children are those involving subjects of most interest to them. When presenting children with literary selections, educators must necessarily be aware of children's interests.

Professionals select books. As mentioned earlier, once a child has reached school age he becomes an active participant in selecting which books he chooses to read. For the most part children's book selection is a product of either the classroom, school, or community library. Most books that have reached these library shelves and consequently the hands of children have already undergone a screening process by either a professional librarian or a schools' teachers.

In order to decide which books to purchase most professionals seek out the guidance of professional journals and recommended book lists as well as research findings on children's reading preferences and children's literature. Added to this the librarian or teacher makes selected judgments as to the particular wants and needs of the particular population being served and in what ways it may differ from
other groups of a similar nature. Since there are so many new children's books being published each year, no librarian or teacher would have the time needed to evaluate each of the new publications. Highly regarded professional journals such as The Horn Book Magazine, the Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books, and The Booklist provide reviews of newly published books. From reading these reviews, teachers and librarians create a much smaller list of books they might be interested in purchasing and personally review these. When a library collection is lacking in a particular interest area professionals can seek out needed books in such diverse areas as science or books involving women in a non-sexist way by referring to recommended lists of books specially prepared for that area.

One could conclude from this that most books available to children are of relatively high quality. However whether or not the book contributes to the child's growth in some way or another is not known. Since children can read only a limited number of books throughout their childhood it is important to provide them with those books that will be of most value to them at any one moment. To do this the librarian or teacher guiding the child's reading must have a thorough knowledge of the books available, be aware of the needs of individual students, and skillful in fostering a good match between student and book.

A limited number of studies have explored teacher's knowledge of children's reading interests often as a related finding to another investigation. Most researchers in this area have concluded that teachers have not been particularly predictive of student's interests. Studies of children's poetry interests conducted during the late 1920's
and early 1930's by Huber, Bruner, and Curry,27 Eckert,28 and Mackintosh29 all illustrate the finding that teacher-student opinions of preferred poems are not in agreement. Teachers in all three studies were unable to accurately predict the best grade placement of a poem and whether children would have a greater preference for modern versus traditional poems. Studies in the 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's by Kyte,30 Norvell,31 and Nelson32 continue to confirm this earlier finding. A more recent investigation by Terry33 noted that teachers found enjoyable the same poems preferred by children. She cautioned, however, that teachers' predictions may have been influenced by their prior knowledge of children's preferences. While similar studies on teacher-pupil prose preferences have not been conducted it would seem likely that similar conclusions could be drawn. This present study is designed to find out more about the teacher's knowledge of children's needs and understandings of a children's book.


31 Norvell, George W., What Boys and Girls Like to Read, op. cit.


Once a book reaches the hands of a child, his experience with the book is often a private, emotional interchange between him and the story. Educators are just beginning to explore the various aspects and nature of literary response, a child's reaction to a book. Among the earliest and most perceptive scholars of literary response is Rosenblatt who explored the realm of the literary experience both as it affects the individual as a person and the teacher with the individual within the classroom situation. Rosenblatt feels that literature can be a powerful potential educational force because the individual's whole personality tends to become involved in the literary experience. She states "...literature can be an important means of bringing about the linkage between intellectual perception and emotional drive that we have agreed to be essential to any vital learning process."

While Rosenblatt has emphasized that the literary experience is a personal one involving an interchange between the reader and the book, she has not ignored the role of the teacher in a classroom literature program. According to Rosenblatt the teacher should 1) create an atmosphere that provides students with the opportunity to react freely, 2) help the student to develop the habit of reflecting upon his primary response to books, 3) create a situation in which the student becomes aware of possible alternative responses. The teacher's role is considered to be one of setting the stage, providing support, and creating

an atmosphere conducive to thinking.

In an attempt to bring together the many findings of literary studies, Purves and Beach\textsuperscript{35} reviewed fifty years of research in the area of literature and the reader. Their comprehensive review was divided into categories exploring the various aspects of response including those of factors in understanding, those of the general effects of literature, factors in literary learning, and the development of literature tests. They concluded that the studies tended to support the notion set forward by Rosenblatt that literary reading and understanding is an active process involving both the literary work and the reader. In essence it is the interaction between reader and a particular work that produces the literature. They state further that while research has demonstrated that response to literature consists of understanding, judgment, process of response, and satisfaction; at present studies have not sufficiently probed the connections between these areas and the relationship these areas have to the psychological, cognitive, and personal concerns of individual readers. They recognize and support the need for more comprehensive research in the area and have provided a strong base from which research can begin.

Squire,\textsuperscript{36} one of the earliest researchers to systematically investigate literary response, sought to achieve a reliable, systematic, quantitative description of the literary responses of high school students.

\textsuperscript{35}Purves, Alan C. and Beach, Richard, Literature and the Reader: Research in Response to Literature, Reading Interests, and the Teaching of Literature, op. cit.

students. Before beginning the experimental treatment, each of his fifty-two subjects completed a battery of measures including a diagnostic reading test, an I.Q. test, a test to determine personality predispositions, a test of attitudes toward materialistic values and toward security and affection in their home, and a measure of their socioeconomic status. The verbal responses of his subjects were recorded immediately after they read each of six sections of four short stories. The responses were then placed into one of the following categories: 1) literary judgments, 2) interpretational responses, 3) narrational reactions, 4) associational responses, 5) self involvement, 6) prescriptive judgments, 7) miscellaneous.

Squire's findings revealed that subjects gave more interpretational reactions than summaries or responses involving literary judgment, self involvement, personal associations, or prescriptive judgments. Six sources of difficulty were found to be particularly widespread in the subjects' literary interpretations. First, subjects failed to grasp the meaning of the story. Second, they made irrelevant associations. Third, they often relied on stock responses. Fourth, they were "happiness bound," always feeling things would "work out right." Fifth, they tended toward critical predisposition. And sixth, they sought to achieve certainty in interpretation and were unwilling to hold judgment in abeyance. Other important findings were 1) that socioeconomic status was related to subjects' response pattern, 2) a strong positive relationship was found between responses of literary judgment and those of self involvement, 3) individual interpretations were generally found to be unrelated to intelligence or reading ability.
Within a short number of years following Squires' work, several other researchers also sought out answers to the question of measuring literary response. Like Squire, Forehand attempted to measure the responses of high school students to a literary work. While Squire elicited responses to stimulus material and then categorized these responses according to the nature of their content, Forehand initially proposed that response to literary works falls into four categories—understanding, interpretation, evaluation, taste—and then proceeded to develop measurement instruments in each of these four categories. His measurement techniques included the use of multiple choice tests in the area of understanding, the writing of an essay in the area of interpretation, and adjective pair evaluative scale in the area of evaluation, and a literary preference questionnaire in the area of taste.

In working with elementary school aged subjects Burgdorf designed an instrument to study the ability of intermediate grade children to draw inferences from selections of children's literature. Responses of 432 fourth, fifth, and sixth grade children from different socioeconomic classes were studied. Half the children read the selected story to themselves, the other half listened while the selection was read to them. The children were then interviewed individually with a questionnaire designed to elicit inferences in eight different categories of information: 1) purpose or intent of author, 2) setting of the story,
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3) elements of style, 4) plot development, 5) characterization, 6) realism, 7) reader identification, 8) value judgments regarding desirability of aspects of the story. Responses to the questions were rated by specially trained interviewers. Burgdorf summarized her findings as follows: 1) scores of children who listened to the story being read to them were significantly higher than those who had read the story to themselves, 2) the ability to draw inferences was significantly higher in grade five as compared with grade four and in grade six compared with grade five, 3) there were no significant differences between the scores of boys and girls, 4) mental age was significantly related to literary scores, 5) vocabulary and comprehension reading scores were significantly related to the scores of those children who had read the story to themselves but not to those who were read to, 6) while there were differences in scores between children of varying social classes these differences did not achieve significance.

Monson's effort to develop a technique for gathering information on children's response to literature focused on reactions to specific qualities of literature. Employing a sample of 635 fifth grade children representing different socioeconomic classes, Monson asked subjects to read humorous excerpts from five books. Five types of humor were represented in the selections: humor of character, humor of surprise, humor of the impossible, humor of words, and humor of situation. Following the reading of the stories, subjects were divided into four groups each responding to one of the following assessment instruments:
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first, subjects wrote their own idea about why the selection was funny and what the funniest part of the selection was; second, a true-false questionnaire; third and fourth, multiple choice questionnaires with questions related to the humor in the stories. Her findings indicated that those children who responded to the more structured tests made more positive responses than the children who responded by writing their comments about the story. Girls, however, were found to be less influenced by the form of questioning than boys.

In their study of the critical reading ability of children as young as five, Wolf, Huck, and King defined critical reading as "...an analytical evaluative type of reading in which the reader analyzes and judges both the content of what is stated and the effectiveness of the manner in which the material is presented." Both comprehension and the use of thinking to evaluate ideas were considered to be components of critical reading. As stated, their definition of critical reading encompasses many of the same components studied in the area of literary response.

Six hundred fifty-one children from grades one through six representing a population of twenty-four intact classroom groups participated in the Wolf, Huck, King study. It was assumed that children of all ages could be taught to read critically. Twelve classroom groups were assigned to the experimental condition, twelve were considered as a control group. The authors' findings were as follows: 1) children in grades one through six can learn to read critically, 2) teaching

40 Wolf, Willavene, Huck, Charlotte S. and King, Martha L., Critical Reading Ability of Elementary School Children (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Research Foundation, 1967).
children to apply logical reasoning to printed materials is one effective means of increasing their growth in critical reading ability, 3) instruction in critical reading does not interfere with elementary school children's growth in other basic reading skills, 4) general reading ability is highly related to critical reading ability, 5) intelligence is related to critical reading ability. From these results one might conclude that it may be possible to influence some aspects of children's response to literature.

Purves\textsuperscript{41} has provided the most extensive and comprehensive work in the area of literary response. In devising an evaluative technique that attempted to categorize and score responses to literature, Purves identified four categories for analyzing the criticism of a literary work: 1) Engagement-involvement; an attempt to evaluate the ways a reader has experienced a particular literary work, 2) Perception; the ways a reader has looked at a literary work as something distinct from himself, 3) Interpretation; the reader's attempt to find meaning in the literary work, to generalize about it, draw inferences from it, to find analogues in it, 4) Evaluation; why the reader thinks the work is good or bad. Purves' measurement techniques have been used as a standard for other researchers.

Brown\textsuperscript{42} employed the Purves technique in his 1970-71 National Assessment of Literature. His work represented a federal government
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commission's attempt to measure achievement of nine year olds, thirteen year olds, seventeen year olds, and young adults twenty-six through thirty-five in the area of literature curriculum. Brown tape recorded subjects' verbal responses to several literary works in order to measure the extent subjects became engaged in, found meaning in, and evaluated a work of literature. Of particular interest here is their response to Evaline Ness's *Sam, Bangs, and Moonshine*. After subjects silently read the story as it was being read aloud, they were asked to respond individually to the following four questions: 1) What was the name of the story? 2) Tell me what you most want to say about the story. 3) What did you especially notice in the story? 4) Tell me what you think about the story. The tape recorded responses were evaluated by trained scorers and rated as inadequate, barely adequate, adequate, or superior. Findings indicated differences in the distribution of statements among the categories related to the stimulus and the age of the respondent. Most nine year olds made a large number of engagement-involvement and evaluative statements about *Sam, Bangs, and Moonshine*. The proportion of interpretive statements increased with age, while the proportion of evaluative responses decreased.

A more recent report of Purves's work indicates that he is refining his work on literary response and is now looking at what the reader brings to the text as well as how the text itself determines the

---


nature of the response. In other words, the reader himself is seen as actively participating in determining the message of the literary work as well as the author. The four aspects of literary response explored were: 1) Whether response to literature contains some cognitive areas including ability to read, a background of certain kinds of information, and logical processes of thinking and decoding complex messages. 2) Response to literature includes the ability to perceive sensuous aspects of language. 3) Literary response includes judgmental acts; the liking or disliking of the experience. 4) Literary response includes an experiential, psychological, and conceptual framework the reader has before picking up the book. In his present work Purves has included both poems and short stories again collecting results through use of a taped interview. His preliminary findings are: 1) Third grade children respond primarily with literal aspects of the selections and tend to evaluate what they read from an affective point of view, i.e., "it was funny." 2) Fourth grade children respond similarly to third graders except they tend to compare themselves to the characters and to elaborate more fully on their evaluative responses. 3) Fifth grade children respond more fully, particularly in the retelling of the stories. They talk about their evaluations and their personal reactions to what they read, often including the formal aspects of the literary works in their evaluations. 4) Sixth grade children begin to interpret the literary works. 5) Seventh grade children respond with an additional increase in interpretational responses. 6) Eighth grade students begin to look for hidden meanings in the author's writing.
In summary, literary response has been seen as the interaction between a literary piece of work and the reader. While the researchers mentioned above have indicated the difficulties involved in measuring literary response, each was successful in developing a technique to do so. Their methodology differed yet their findings were found to be quite similar. For the most part all of the above studies indicated that as children mature their responses to literature differ. Responses of young children tend to be literal and affective in nature. The responses of older children are more evaluative. As shown by Purves, not until sixth grade are a great many interpretational statements made and not until eighth grade do subjects tend to look for hidden messages in the stimulus literature.

Burgdorf found that when the stimulus literature was read aloud to the children rather than reading it independently their responses tended to be of a higher quality. This technique has been employed by Purves and will also be employed in the present study.

The findings of Monson indicated that testing instruments that were structured in nature tended to produce higher quality responses than those that were open ended. The proposed study will consequently be semistructured rather than unstructured, including open ended questions, but questions that call for a particular kind of response.

As suggested by Purves, one must look not only to what the reader responds to the stimulus material at the present but also to what the reader brings to the material before reading. The proposed study will evaluate children's responses in terms of their cognitive qualities, qualities held by the children before reading the selected literature,
as well as their literal qualities. In conclusion, the studies above have illustrated the value of studying literary response in children and some of the ways this study can most effectively be accomplished. The present study hopes to go beyond these present findings in search of some of the reasons determining children's differing responses and examining teachers' awareness of children's differing responses.

**Developmental Needs**

If one makes the assumption that in order to fully understand literary response one must look toward what the child has brought to the literature as well as what he draws from it then a study of the child's cognitive and psychological makeup precludes an understanding of his response to literature. In the proposed study the responses of three different age groups of children will be examined. It is expected that the responses of these three groups will be different since each of the groups represents a different level of cognitive growth. To help children select books, react to books and communicate their ideas about literature to others, teachers must be understanding and predictive of the kinds of responses to be expected from different aged children. It is hoped that this present study will contribute to a teacher's awareness of and understanding of children's reaction to literature.

The leading authority today in the field of cognitive growth is psychologist, educator, epistemologist, Jean Piaget. On the following pages is an outline of the basic principles and stages of Piaget's theory of cognitive development as well as a brief commentary on how
each of these stages can be reflected in the literary selections and understandings of the child.

**Piaget's theory of cognitive development.** Basic to Piagetian theory are the premises that all learning occurs through direct interaction with the environment and the child's ever increasing ability to organize the result of that interaction in a meaningful way. Piaget has postulated two necessary steps through which all new experiences are incorporated into the individual's realm of knowledge. 1) Assimilation, a process through which new experiences are adapted to present understandings. The new experiences are brought into the individual's system only to the extent that the individual can integrate them with existing experiences. 2) Accomodation, a process through which the individual's system of understandings is changed by the new experiences. In other words, present understandings change to accomodate the new experience. Both the processes of assimilation and accomodation are ongoing processes through which all new learnings are channeled.

According to Piaget, from infancy to adulthood cognitive development passes through four major stages of growth: sensorimotor, pre-operational, concrete operations, and formal operations. The first stage of cognitive development, the sensorimotor stage, represents approximately the time of birth to age two years. During this time the infant learns simple motor coordinations and gradually extends his understanding of the world beyond that of his own being. The youngest of infants is totally dependent on spontaneous happenings to trigger off natural reflex actions. This reflexive behavior, however, is gradually replaced by voluntary movements as the child consciously
repeats those actions that had been left to chance. New, accidental actions, become new, learned responses. As the child widens his realm of experience by combining actions into a sequence and by controlling actions through intent, he also begins applying familiar modes of activities to new situations and investigating new objects through experimentation. Approaching his second birthday the child is now able to experience objects through observation and mental combinations as well as direct action. No longer bound to the here and now, he is aware of the permanency of objects, uses objects for their own innate qualities and is adept at exploring and utilizing his familiar environment.

From approximately age fifteen months, books of appropriate interest and difficulty should be included in the everyday environment of the young child. Characteristically the child at this age likes books involving feeling and touching such as Pat the Bunny45 by Kunhardt and Feed the Animals46 by H. A. Rey, books that illustrate familiar people or places such as Goodnight Moon47 by Brown, and books that are simply illustrated such as the many ABC picture books. Books, such as the ABC ones, allow for much opportunity of interaction and discussion between parent and child, the kind of interchange that enables the child to build vocabulary and gain mastery over the spoken word. Books such as Goodnight Moon incorporate familiar qualities of the child's environment in story form. It is not unusual for young children to request

45Kunhardt, Dorothy, Pat the Bunny (Golden Press, 1962).
46Rey, H.A., Feed the Animals (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company) n.d.
hearing this or other similar stories over and over again until they are comfortably able to integrate all aspects of the story into their realm of experience. The popularity of books such as Pat the Bunny and Feed the Animals is due to the young child's continual dependence on his direct sensory experiences for learning to take place.

The child's increasing use of language signals the end of the sensorimotor stage of development and the beginning of Piaget's second stage of development, the preoperational one. Stage two, occurring approximately from age two through age seven, can be divided into two major substages, the preconceptual sub stage (ages two to four) and the intuitive sub stage (ages four to seven). During the preconceptual stage of development the child's view of the world is still limited to only that which he has directly experienced. As an egocentric thinker the child assumes that everyone thinks as he does and that people will understand him even if he has not conveyed his thoughts and feelings directly to them. Play, imitation, and language are the vehicles by which the child confronts new experiences and development occurs. Characteristically a child at this age is an animistic thinker, views things strictly on the basis of outward appearance, reasons transductively, and has a tendency to let his desires distort his thinking. As the child approaches the substage of intuitive thought one begins to see involvement in more and more activity requiring logical thought.

The greatest achievement of the intuitive sub stage child is his new use of symbols, language or other ones, to express and convey thoughts, extend learning, and structure play. The child's fluency with language, however, can be misleading when words are found to be
used appropriately but without comprehension. Thinking at this age remains quite egocentric, bound by the immediate environment and to a large extent simply the verbalization of mental processes.

Young preoperational aged children's behavior towards books is often similar to that of a sensorimotor stage child. The child may request that the same book be read over and over again until its content is fully integrated into his realm of experience. Books reflecting animistic thought such as *Corduroy* by Freeman, *Curious George* by Rey; books about familiar people and places that help children gain mastery and confidence over their environment; books such as Burningham's *Mr. Gumpy's Outing* that are repetitive and cumulative building to a brief but predictable conclusion are all favorites of young preoperational aged children.

The older preoperational aged child's environment often includes nursery school, kindergarten, and a greatly expanded environment. His mastery of himself and his language is often reflected in his choice of books. The child at this age likes books with interesting language such as "I Can't Said the Ant" by Cameron. Less dependent on the continual repetition of the same books, the older preoperational aged child is more interested in a variety of books about familiar aspects of his environment, each helping to broaden experiences and contributing
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to the child's understanding of how his world operates.

What is perhaps most difficult to remember about the preoperational child is that while his language may be quite sophisticated, his outlook and understanding of the world is still very egocentric and dependent on a single perspective. Books are interpreted and understood only to the extent they fit into the individual's past experiences. The youngest children to be included in the proposed study are at the preoperational stage of development.

Most characteristic of the third stage of development, the stage of concrete operations, is the decrease in egocentrism and increase in thinking of a sociocentric nature. During the concrete operational stage of thought (approximately ages seven or eight through eleven or twelve) the child is able to order and relate experience to an organized whole and to view an event from different perspectives. Much of the child's thinking changes from that of an inductive mode to that of a deductive one. While the concrete operational aged child is still bound to those events or objects that are a direct product of his perception and action the child operates quite capably and independently within the realm of his "here and now" world.

The ability of the concrete operational aged child to view his environment through more than one perspective enables him to learn vicariously through the experiences and thoughts of the characters in the books he reads. Since the peer group is the primary influence on children of this age, the child often elects to read stories about children his own age; often stories that reflect adventure, excitement, humor, mystery, or great achievement. Independent reading becomes a
means through which the concrete operational child gains greater understanding of the world about him by trying out the roles of the heroes and heroines of the books he reads. The third grade children to be included in the proposed study should be at the concrete operational stage of development.

Between the ages of eleven and fifteen the child achieves the last stage of intellectual development, the ability to think and to reason beyond one's own realistic world and one's own beliefs. Through his more refined cognitive abilities the formal operational child begins to rely upon pure symbolism rather than a physical reality, approaching problems in a systematic way by means of hypothesis. It is during this stage of development that personality development crystallizes. The individual establishes his own rules and values. This last stage of development, one of formal operations, is a stage of ideas and of reasoning.

Since the children of sixth grade age to be studied in the present research are between eleven and twelve years of age, it is expected that many of them will have entered the formal operational level of thinking and that their responses will reflect that thinking. While children of this age are not yet ready to read all that adult literature has to offer, they are capable of the same kind of high level thinking that adults are. Children of this age can hold onto multiple ideas at the same time and follow them through to their conclusion. They should be able to interpret various kinds of symbolic language and appreciate their subtle use in literature. The literature of the transitioning formal operational child should be a very rich and full one.
In summary, throughout his growing years the child is limited in his understanding of the world about him by those experiences he has had and the levels of development he has achieved. Piaget has often stated that while one can coach a child to parrot back some particular information one cannot actually change or influence his beliefs. A child will believe only that which fits into his current understandings until such time as his experiences ready him for a new level of development. A child's responses to literature necessarily reflect these notions. Books for the very young child should include ones that allow him to touch and feel the pages and ones about familiar parts of his environment. As children mature their interests and needs from books also change. Books help to broaden the child's perspectives by taking him away from his immediate environment to adventuresome new places. Through books the intermediate aged child can try out new roles and learn vicariously through the experiences of the heroes and heroines of his literature. As the child reaches preadolescence and he becomes capable of more sophisticated thinking his literature must reflect his new needs and provide him with the challenge and excitement of a full literary experience.

**Language and thought of the child.** Particular attention should be given to Piaget's views on the language and thought of the child because of the close link between a child's understanding and use of oral language and that of his understanding of literature, a form of written language. Piaget's earliest investigations into the language and thought of the child preceded and precipitated his theoretical work in the area of cognition. While the kinds of things he noted in his
early work have all been incorporated into his general developmental theory his observations of the language of school aged children similar to the ages of the subjects employed in this present study are of particular interest.

According to observations made by Piaget, approximately half of the total spontaneous speech of children six and a half years old is egocentric in nature and as such is in keeping with the theoretical proposition that children of this age are at the preoperational stage of development. When children between the ages of six and seven were told a story and then asked to retell the story, Piaget found that while the child may have understood the story he was unable to present his understanding in an ordered fashion. By age seven and eight the retelling was quite ordered. The younger child of six and seven was also prone to selecting only material from the story that was of interest to him in his retelling and would sometimes distort material in favor of his previously formed conceptions. In explanation of these findings Piaget hypothesizes that the ability to communicate one's thought objectively does not appear in children until about the age of seven or seven and one half, the onset of the concrete stage of development. It is at this time that the child's thinking moves away from that of egocentricity and the child can begin to handle logical thought. It is therefore to be expected that children of kindergarten age, who are at the preoperational stage of development will have a different understanding and command of language than those of third grade age who

---

should be well into the concrete operational stage of development. It is also to be expected that the responses of sixth grade children, particularly those who have entered the formal operational level of development will differ from those of third graders.

**Research on child development and literature.** Researchers are only recently exploring the relationship between child development and literature. While much of the foundation for studying this area is rooted in Piaget's theory of cognition, researchers should also look at the work of others. Chukovsky, for example, a poet and linguist by profession, observed and recorded the language of children for more than 40 years. With great sensitivity to the language of the child and its relationship to literature his observations, as exemplified by the following two examples, provide rich opportunity for research exploration.

Chukovsky\textsuperscript{53} observed that children take great pleasure in their own "playing" with words and in the word play of nonsense verse. His observations led him to believe that nonsense verse seemed to help children separate reality from fantasy. With increased understanding of the order and nature of their real world, children appeared to take great pleasure in a game of self-deception because they knew they were deceiving themselves. In other words children found pleasure in the verse because they were suited to their developmental level of cognition.

---

Chukovsky also believed that fairy tales serve a similar function in children's lives. He looked to the evidence that up to the ages of seven and eight children seemed to have a specific need for fairy tales, then lost interest in them. To explain this observation, he speculated that in addition to stimulating the imagination fairy tales helped orient a child to his world, enriched his spiritual life and contributed to his moral development. They served a useful function in his development.

Favat, like Chukovsky believed there was a strong link between children's developmental needs and their literature. In his research, Favat identified those elements of fairy tales that he felt were responsible for children's apparent delight and need for them at one age level and their rejection of them later in their development. By comparing the characteristics of fairy tales with the characteristics Piaget ascribed to children between the ages of six and eight (the point of children's highest interest in fairy tales), Favat identified the following five areas of commonality. 1. Belief in magic; that an object, thought, place or event could magically be used to influence another object. 2. Belief in animism. 3. Moral beliefs; a morality of adult constraint, expiatory punishment. 4. Absence of causal relationships. 5. Egocentrism. While these points of commonality explained children's interest in the tales, Favat also sought to explain why there was a loss of interest in these tales among older children.

---

Favat speculated that children's apparent need to read fairy tales was related to a crisis point in their lives, a point in which implicit convictions were about to be shattered. He identified the crisis point as the time at which convictions are consciously affirmed and most tenaciously held. Children between the ages of six to eight, preparing to leave the preoperational stage of thought, found in fairy tales a confirmation of their beliefs in animism, magic, morality of constraint, and egocentrism. Favat suggested that as the child matures and gains confidence in a new conception of the world, he no longer had a desire to return to the old and consequently rejected fairy tales as being too unlike the world he now understood.

Schlager's study of children's selection of Newbery award books adds further credence to the notion that children's interest in a particular type of book is dependent on developmental factors. Schlager analyzed and compared the behavioral characteristics observed by Piaget and Erickson of children between ages of seven and twelve to the behavioral characteristics exhibited by the heroes and heroines of those Newbery books with the highest and lowest circulation among children over a three year period. She concluded that those books which best reflected the child's perception of the world were the books children liked best.

In summary, research has demonstrated that children's interest in books may be reflective of their developmental needs and interests.

This study will look not only to children's interests in literature as reflective of their development but also their response to literature.

Moral development. A special effort to focus on moral development is being made because the stimulus book for the proposed study is one that conveys a very specific message to the child, a message designed to influence a socially desirable behavior. The means by which this is accomplished falls into the category of moral judgment.

As in language development, a child's moral development follows a developmental line paralleling that of cognitive growth. According to Piaget, during the childhood years a child's view of morality is different from that of an adult's. Through his experiences, particularly in his relationships with peers, the child develops the ability to make more mature moral decisions and achieves adult levels of morality.

Piaget has identified two basic levels of moral judgment or development. Level one—moral realism—is described by the following features: 1) Conformity to a rule or to an adult regardless of the nature of the rule or adult's command is of utmost importance. 2) The letter of the law not simply the spirit of the law is followed. 3) Evaluation of an act or event is in terms of its conformity with established rules not in terms of motive.

Most children are wholly at this level of development through the age of six or seven. Right and wrong behavior are clearly defined along lines dictated by rules and the adults who make those rules. Piaget

illustrated the kind of responses or behaviors to be expected from a child at this level of development by describing children's reactions to pairs of stories that described children involved in wrongful behaviors. His findings indicated that the level one child would decide about the seriousness of wrongful behavior on the basis of the falseness of a statement or the amount of material damage rather than the motive or intent of the participants.

In other areas Piaget found that if a level one child was hit by another child in school, he may not necessarily strike back because school rules dictated that no fighting was allowed. When faced with the dilemma of selecting a punishment for a child who had misbehaved, level one children tended to select the punishment that was the worst without consideration of matching the punishment to the deed.

As the child matures and the focus of his life turns increasingly towards his peer group, concepts of level two moral development, the level of cooperation, begin to emerge. It is during this time that the notions of reciprocity and equalitarian justice, basic to level two moral development, replace the earlier notions of adult constraint and expiatory punishment. During level two moral development a child considers both intent and motive before determining the degree of wrongful behavior. Morality has now moved from simple obedience and compliance with rules and authority to a consideration of what is fair or just within a particular situation.

In several different situations Piaget has investigated and described the types of behaviors one might expect in children of level two moral development. To illustrate, at an early stage of level two
development, the child lives by the guidelines an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. Therefore, unlike the level one child who may not have returned the blows of another, the level two child would most likely have felt that to return the blows was entirely unjustified. The level two child is capable of making his own moral judgments based on the consideration of the fairness of the situation.

In observing children at play Piaget has found that among their peers level two children are successful at establishing and maintaining their own moral code and of enforcing group imposed standards and punishments. To maintain this code of conduct level two children react swiftly in disciplining transgressors by 1) depriving the transgressor of the thing he has misused, 2) requiring the transgressor to pay for or replace a broken or stolen object, 3) censuring the transgressor, and 4) allowing the material consequences of the act itself to stand as the transgressor's punishment.

In other areas of level two moral development Piaget has explored the notions of collective and communicable responsibility, the belief in imminent justice, and the notions of retributive and distributive justice. In all areas level two children were found to react differently than level one children. While collective responsibility was in general found lacking in the moral make-up of all children, a group of older children would demonstrate the notion of collective responsibility if they had a particular desire to declare their solidarity. Imminent justice was found to occur in almost all children age six and under while by age nine or ten only half the children held these beliefs. By age eleven and twelve the percentage dropped to almost a third. Within
the area of retributive and distributive justice Piaget found that with younger children the authority to execute punishment outweighed the notion of equality whereas with older children the opposite was true. At the highest level of development the notion of equalitarianism by itself gave way to a more complex conception of justice, one of "equity" in which equality was seen in relationship to each individual and the circumstances surrounding the situation.

In summary, Piaget has described two major periods or levels in the development of the sense of justice in the child. In the first level, including the child's first seven or eight years of life, justice is subordinated completely to adult authority. Children of these ages rely on the world of adult authority and the rules presented by adults to make decisions involving moral judgment. Between the ages of eight and eleven the child progressively adapts an attitude of equalitarianism. The child is now at the stage of concrete operations, a time in which both cognitive and moral reasoning growth occurs primarily through an interchange and contact with peers. Towards the ages of eleven and twelve pure equalitarian justice is tempered by the considerations of equity. The child of this age, capable of formal operations, can see the many sides to a problem and make a decision based on the logical consideration of all factors. In the present study children's recognition of the use of parental discipline will be examined as well as their suggestions of how discipline should be handled.

Kohlberg's and other research on moral development. Lawrence Kohlberg and his disciples have been the leading investigators of the development of moral reasoning in children in the United States. After
expanding and refining Piaget's basic two level theory into a six stage theory, Kohlberg developed a test of moral reasoning abilities based on his six stage theory. Including subjects from ten years old through adulthood Kohlberg systematically classified their responses to nine moral decision making stories and identified and explored the changes found in their moral reasoning abilities as subjects moved from one stage to another. Much recent research in the area of moral development is based on the use of Kohlberg's test of moral reasoning abilities.

Other related areas of study in moral development include those studies that explore the relationship between cognitive and moral development. In comparing test results of logical thinking and moral reasoning of first grade students, Hardeman found that while non-conservers were low in moral reasoning abilities, logical thinking was not directly related to moral reasoning abilities. Stuart and Selman had also found that while a certain level of cognitive


development was a necessary condition to high level moral reasoning, cognitive development alone was not found to be the sole determinant of moral development. Researchers, however, have been unable to identify what factors actually do determine one's level of moral development.

As in cognitive development, several researchers have attempted to demonstrate that one can change a child's level of moral reasoning through teaching. Although none of the researchers demonstrated that teaching can change a child's level of moral reasoning, their studies did demonstrate that one can influence a change in a child who is nearing the next level of development by exposing him to situations in which discussion and experience would lead the youngster towards the next developmental level. Thus, problems of moral dilemma posed in literary works may prove to successfully provide children with one kind of experience and the opportunity needed to help them refine and develop their moral reasoning abilities. Knowledge of this, coupled with Kohlberg's means of measuring moral reasoning ability, demonstrates the need to experiment with this and other ways of approaching children with ideas involving moral judgment. This present study will attempt to


explore some aspects of a literary work serving as a stimulus for children's thoughts and growth in moral reasoning abilities.

Summary and implications of literature review. Four areas of literary study, the purpose the literary program plays in the educational life of the school child, what books children are reading, children's response to literature, and the developmental needs of children have been presented in the preceding literature review. It is this present author's belief that these four areas complement each other and together can contribute to a better understanding of children and their literary experiences.

This present study will combine both the findings and the approaches of researchers in the above mentioned areas in ways not previously studied. Specifically, it is hoped that new contributions will be made to the literature in three areas. First, the present study will view children's literary response from the perspective of a child's cognitive, language, and moral development rather than from age related differences. In doing so, this author will look towards the theoretical notions of Piaget as a possible explanation for individual differences found in the present study. Second, because of the important role the teacher (or other significant adult) plays in the selection and guidance of children's literary experiences, the proposed study will also investigate teacher's understanding of children's response to a literary work in hopes this will provide us with better information on how to help significant adults improve children's literary experiences. Third, the present study is designed to explore the possibility of using literature as a means of assessing and evaluating children's moral understanding.
Through combining the results of these various areas it is hoped that the findings generated by this study will provide additional needed information to help establish higher quality and more relevant literary experiences for children.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

As the preceding review of literature has indicated at the present time research has contributed limited information on the interactive process between a student and a literary work. This present study has been designed to broaden our understanding of this interactive process and set the stage for future inquiries into this problem. This chapter describes the procedures followed in the present investigation as well as the procedures employed in organizing the data for analysis.

Research Design

The present study adopted variations of the same semi-structured open-ended questionnaire for use with five different groups of subjects. Each group was asked to respond to questions designed to reveal the subject's recall of, understanding of, and reaction towards a particular children's storybook. Responses to the questions of all subjects were then categorized in order to facilitate comparison of responses among groups.
Criteria for Selection of Storybook

Several criteria were developed to aid in the selection of a book appropriate to the present investigation. It was decided that the story must: 1) be of interest to young children, 2) be of good literary quality, 3) involve a conflicting situation in which the child who reads the book or is read to is able to make some sort of value judgment about the plot or the characters involved in the story, 4) contain a theme, plot, or conflicting situation which falls into one of the categories studied by Piaget in his work on moral judgment.

Among the several books considered were The Fish from Japan by Elizabeth K. Cooper,1 The Story About Ping by Marjorie Flack,2 Bread and Jam for Frances by Russell Hoban,3 Train Ride by John Steptoe,4 and Sam, Bangs, and Moonshine by Evaline Ness.5 Bread and Jam for Frances was selected because the investigator felt it met the established criteria and its easy to follow text would be understood by children as young as kindergarten age.

According to the criteria established for the present investigation, the following evidence supports the selection of Bread and Jam

1Cooper, Elizabeth K. The Fish from Japan (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1969.)

2Flack, Marjorie. The Story About Ping (New York: Scholastic Book Services, 1966.)


for Frances. In meeting criteria one, the book would be of interest to young children, research reported in the review of literature indicated that children in grades one through three favored books involving humor and animals. First grade children were also shown to favor stories involving home and family life. Bread and Jam for Frances is representative of all these characteristics.

Bread and Jam for Frances also meets the second criteria of high literary quality. In 1964, when it was first published, positive reviews were included in the leading reviewing journals of children's books including the Horn Book Magazine, the Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books and The Booklist. Since then it has been included in several recommended booklists including Sragow's Best Books for Children, Root's Adventuring with Books, and the Children's Catalog, Eleventh Edition. All of the reviewers suggested that this particular book was most suited to children in the four to eight year old age range.

In meeting the needs of criteria three, that of presenting to children a conflicting situation, one in which a value judgment can be made, a synopsis of the plot illustrates that, indeed, a conflict exists

---

6Horn Book Magazine. 40(6), 1964, 605.
7Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books. 18(3), 1964, 36.
and is resolved. Frances, who would eat only bread and jam, undergoes an experience that teaches her the importance of trying new foods. Children could make a value judgment as to how the conflict was handled and resolved by the storybook characters.

In meeting the needs of criteria four, that of containing a theme, plot, or conflicting situation studied by Piaget, the story Bread and Jam for Frances involves a subtle use of parental pressure or punishment that brings about the change of behavior in a child. Among the areas of moral judgment explored by Piaget was that of punishment. Bread and Jam for Frances therefore meets the requirements for criteria four.

Presentation of the Book

Several researchers have investigated the effectiveness of presenting prose and poetry either through an auditory presentation or a visual presentation. In their review of the literature, Day and Beach\textsuperscript{12} found that approximately half the research favored visual presentation and half favored auditory presentation. While they concluded that neither auditory nor visual presentation per se is more favorable to comprehension, a combined visual and auditory presentation of material led to more efficient comprehension than the presentation of the material in either an auditory or visual manner alone. Therefore, to maximize student comprehension of the stimulus book a combined auditory visual approach was used with kindergarten, third, and sixth grade subjects. Adult subjects were given individual copies of the stimulus book and

Children's Preliminary Study

A preliminary study was designed to explore children's reaction to the selected stimulus book, to determine whether it was of interest and appropriate to the comprehensive level of the children, and to test out selected types of questions for use in the pilot study.

Population. Subjects employed in the preliminary study were drawn from two separate sources. First, six kindergarten aged children whose parents had signed consent forms were randomly selected from the kindergarten classroom of a private nursery-kindergarten school located in the university area of Columbus, Ohio. The children who attend the school were primarily of middle to upper middle class background and from families in which one or more parents were affiliated with the Ohio State University. Second, four third grade children were randomly selected from among thirteen third grade children in a combined second-third grade classroom in a middle to upper middle class suburban community in the Columbus, Ohio metropolitan area.

Procedure. The procedures followed were the same for kindergarten and third grade subjects. First, the subject was told that he/she had been selected to help some people find out about what kinds of books children liked. As the subject and examiner walked to the testing room rapport was established. With the examiner sitting next to the child and the storybook Bread and Jam for Frances between them, the examiner turned on the tape recorder and began reading the story. Upon finishing the story, the examiner immediately administered testing.
If a child seemed unable to answer a question or was unresponsive the examiner repeated the question phrasing it in a slightly different way. For example, in question 9, instead of "Can you tell me what you've learned from this story?" a rephrased question was asked, "What do you think you learned from this story?". An unresponsive child was probed in this manner two times. Similarly if a child's response was not related to the question asked, the original question was repeated or the child was asked to repeat or explain his response. If necessary this type of probing was repeated two times.

Results. It was determined during the testing situation and by the positive answers to question 8 that Bread and Jam for Frances was of interest and appropriate comprehensive level to children of kindergarten and third grade age. After each day of testing the experimenter analyzed the children's responses to see which questions were most effective in revealing children's feelings and understanding of the story and in what areas more questioning was needed. An overview of the responses indicated that the open-ended or diversive questions were more revealing of children's understandings than the closed ended or conversive ones. It was also found that some questions were too wordy and a simpler presentation was needed. Finally, the children's reactions to the story demonstrated a need for a question to better assess whether or not they had understood the author's subtle techniques of plot development. These findings were used to revise the instrument for use in the Pilot Study.

\[13\text{See Appendix A.}\]
Development of Instrument

The preliminary study suggested that semistructured open-ended questions were best suited to the needs of the present investigation. It was felt that while data from closed-ended questions were more easily analyzed, they did not always allow for subject's explanation of their responses or for sufficient depth and scope of response. The adoption of an open-ended questionnaire followed the practices of other researchers in related areas of study, including Ballou, Burgdorf, and Piaget.

In his book on moral development, Piaget, a leader in the field of investigating children's intellectual growth and understanding of the world, defended his open-ended questioning method of studying children's moral development. Piaget's technique for studying children's moral judgment involved the use of two stories that illustrated children in moral predicaments and then asking the child to make a comparative judgment about these stories. Using a method of clinical interrogatory characteristic of his work, Piaget questioned children about their evaluation of the stories. Realizing that a child's verbal judgment tends to lag behind his behavioral actions Piaget felt that children's reactions to the realistic dilemmas of the posed stories more clearly


15Burgdorf, Arlene B. A Study of the Ability of Intermediate-Grade Children to Draw Inferences from Selections of Children's Literature, op. cit.

represented children's actual beliefs and probable actions than posing questions of a similar nature in the abstract. Piaget further stated that while other methods of research, such as behavioral observation may be preferable methodologically in determining aspects of children's beliefs, they were not always easily executed. Through non-judgmental questioning and probing of children's reactions to the posed dilemmas, Piaget assumed he had a realistic assessment of children's moral beliefs.

Similarly, this present study presented children with a story that demands of children a certain degree of judgment or evaluation about a realistic problem common to childhood. Questions were designed in such a way as to (1) insure that the child has understood what happened in the story, (2) to probe into the child's understanding and evaluation of the story's happening, and (3) to confirm a child's verbal comprehension of the story by presenting a situation in which the understanding of the story would have to be transferred to a new situation. The questions were presented in the open-ended form to allow for a greater amount of freedom in a child's explanation. When necessary, in a non-judgmental manner the examiner probed children to seek from them a clearer understanding of their responses or a more complete explanation of their thoughts.

Instrument for Pilot Study. Questions adopted for use in the pilot were designed to elicit subjects' responses to the stimulus storybook in four areas: (1) content of the story, (2) opinions on selected aspects of the story, (3) understanding of subtle literary techniques employed in plot development, and (4) understanding and ability to
apply the message of the story. The questions selected for use and the rationale for their selection are presented below:

Questions of Content

Can you tell me what happened in this story?
This question, following a practice of Piaget, was designed to determine whether the child had direct recall of the content of the story.

How did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his desk?
This question was designed to reveal whether or not subjects recognized Frances' emotional state.

Why did she feel that way?
This question was designed to reveal whether subjects realized the cause of Frances' feelings.

Questions of Opinion

How old do you think Frances is?
This question was designed to be exploratory in nature. It was thought that the child's response may reveal a measure of egocentricity in the child's thinking.

Did you like this book?
This question was designed to reveal whether or not the book had been of interest to the child.

What was it you liked about the book?
This question was designed to see whether subjects liked the book because of the message it conveyed.

Do you think Frances will always try new things now?
This question was designed to clarify the message of the story and see whether the subject thought Frances had learned something from her recent experience.

Did anything like the story of Frances ever happen to you?
This question was designed to be exploratory in nature to see whether children identified closely with Frances.
Can you tell me about it?
This question sought from children their own interpretation of an experience similar to that of Frances.

What did you do?
This question sought from children their own solution to a problem similar to Frances'.

Questions Concerning Subtleties in Plot Development

Why was Frances skipping rope more slowly?
This question was designed to ascertain whether the subject understood that Frances' slower skipping was related to her unhappiness with her bread and jam diet.

Was the mother worried about Frances' hurting her teeth by eating too much jam?
This question was designed as an indicator of whether the child was aware of Frances' mother's plan to help Frances realize the need for trying new foods.

Why did Frances' mother give her bread and jam?
This question was designed to test the subject's understanding of the plot development of the story.

Questions of Understanding

Can you tell me what you learned from this story?
This question was designed to probe directly into the subject's understanding of the story.

Did you know that before you read the story?
This question was exploratory in nature, seeking out the possibility that prior experiences may have influenced a subject's understanding of the story's message.

One day Frances' mother makes scallops. Frances decides she doesn't want any. She wants bread and jam. What would you do if you were her mother or father? Why would you do that?
This question was designed to reveal whether the children had understood the message of the story and whether they could apply it.
This is the story of another child — Chris. Chris went to Pat's house for lunch. They had salami sandwiches and milk for lunch. Chris doesn't like salami. What should he (she) do? This question was designed to reveal whether the subject could transfer the lesson learned from this story to another situation.

The questions in the pilot were ordered so that those involving content and plot development came first followed by those involving understanding and applying the message of the story. Opinion questions were scattered throughout the questionnaire to provide the subject with easy to answer items that relieved some of the tension built up from the more thought provoking questions.

Children's Pilot Study

The pilot study was conducted to test the suitability of the proposed instrument, to strengthen the experimenter's familiarity with the open-ended questioning procedures, and to develop a system of scoring responses.

Population. Subjects employed in the pilot study were drawn from the same sources as those of the preliminary study. Four kindergarten children were randomly selected from a middle to upper middle class private nursery-kindergarten school and five third graders were randomly chosen from a combined second-third grade classroom in a middle to upper middle class suburban school. Three of the five and six year old kindergarten subjects were male, one was female. The ages of the third grade subjects ranged from seven to nine years old and included children who had served as subjects for the preliminary study were considered ineligible for the pilot study.
two male third grade subjects and three female subjects.

**Procedures.** The procedures followed in the pilot study were identical to those utilized in the preliminary study and were described earlier. Upon completing the reading of the story and administering Pilot K-3, the experimenter thanked the subject for his help and walked with him back to his classroom.

**Results.** Pilot study questions were divided into two categories for scoring. With the exception of question one, questions concerned with the content, plot development, and understanding and applying the story's lesson were examined by the experimenter and judged to be appropriately or inappropriately responsive to the story. The responses to the opinion questions, questions 2, 6, 8, and 11 were tallied and their results presented in summary form. Table 1 (see pages 68, 69) lists those questions that were scored as appropriately and inappropriately responsive and the results of kindergarten and third grade pilot study subjects' responses.

The results of the opinion questions were tallied and are presented in summary form in Table 2 (see page 70).

The responses to question 1, "Can you tell me what happened in the story?" were scored by tallying how many of the six major events in the story were recalled by each of the subjects. The results of question 1 are as follows: kindergarten subjects recalled a mean number of 17% of the major events of the story. Third grade subjects

---

18 See Appendix B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Criteria for appropriate response</th>
<th>% kindergarteners appropriately responsive</th>
<th>% third graders appropriately responsive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. How did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his desk?</td>
<td>Children's responses were scored appropriate if they thought Frances felt sad, unhappy or bad.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Why did she feel that way?</td>
<td>Children's responses were scored appropriate if they attributed Frances' feelings to her tiring of a bread and jam diet and/or her desire to try new foods.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c. Why did Frances' mother give her bread and jam?</td>
<td>Children's responses were scored appropriate if they were aware that the mother gave Frances bread and jam as part of a plan to change her eating habits.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Why was Frances skipping rope more slowly?</td>
<td>Children's responses were scored as appropriate if the subject stated that Frances was becoming increasingly unhappy with her diet of bread and jam.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Criteria for appropriate response</td>
<td>% kindergarteners appropriately responsive</td>
<td>% third graders appropriately responsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Was the mother worried about Frances' hurting her teeth by eating too much jam?</td>
<td>Children's responses were scored as appropriate if the children indicated that the mother was worried and that she was doing something about it by implementing her plan.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. You're right OR You were right for a real long time but one day Frances' mother makes scallops. Frances decides she doesn't want any. She wants bread and jam. What would you do if you were her mother or father? Why would you do that?</td>
<td>Children's responses were scored as appropriate if they included the notion that Frances should first try a little dinner then she could have bread and jam or if they indicated that the mother should give Frances bread and jam and institute her plan once again.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a. Can you tell me what you learned from this story?</td>
<td>Children's responses were scored as appropriate if the subject stated that the story's lesson was to try to eat (or like) all different kinds of foods.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. This is a story of another child--Chris. Chris went to Pat's house for lunch. They had salami sandwiches and milk for lunch. Chris doesn't like salami. What should he (she) do?</td>
<td>Children's responses were scored as appropriate if the subject stated that Chris should eat the sandwich, Chris should eat some of the sandwich, or Chris should try it.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Kindergarten Response</td>
<td>Third Grade Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How old do you think Frances is?</td>
<td>Mean age response of 5.2 years.</td>
<td>Mean age response of 6.3 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you think Frances will always try new things now?</td>
<td>All subjects responded positively.</td>
<td>All subjects responded positively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Did you like this book?</td>
<td>All subjects responded positively.</td>
<td>All subjects responded positively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a. Did anything like the story of Frances ever happen to you?</td>
<td>20% responded positively.</td>
<td>25% responded positively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recalled a mean number of 50% of the major events of the story. 19

Analysis of pilot study data. The results of the pilot study were examined for trends and information that would give evidence that the questions were successful in seeking out information that was responsive to the problems posed in this investigation. The following conclusions were drawn from the pilot study: (1) The subjects liked the stimulus book, thus confirming the notion that this was a story that was of interest to young children. (2) Subjects' responses to content questions indicated that third graders were more able to recall the events of the story than kindergarteners, thus indicating the possibility of developmental differences. (3) Subjects' responses to questions concerning the subtleties of plot development indicated that no kindergarteners and less than half the third graders had been able to follow the author's intentions in plot development, again indicating a possibility of developmental differences. (4) Subjects' responses to questions determining children's understanding and applying the message of the story indicated that while half the kindergarteners and 80% of the third graders had understood the message of the story, no kindergarteners and only 60% of the third graders could apply this understanding to a parallel situation. When applying the message to characters other than those in the story even fewer subjects were appropriately responsive. (5) Subjects' responses to opinion questions indicated that

19The following six events were considered major to the story. (1) Frances would eat only bread and jam. (2) Frances didn't want to try other foods. (3) Mother developed a plan to outsmart (trick) Frances. (4) Mother gave Frances only bread and jam. (5) Frances realized she didn't want only bread and jam. (6) Frances began eating other foods.
third graders perceived Frances to be older than did kindergarteners, a possible indication of egocentric thinking by kindergarteners.

**Conclusions from Pilot Study data.** The possibility that there are developmental differences in children's reaction to and understanding of a children's storybook was supported by evidence in the pilot study. As a group, third graders were appropriately responsive to more questions in the areas of content, understanding the subtleties of plot development, and understanding and applying the message of the story than were kindergarteners. However, the results also indicated that even many of the third grade children were unsuccessful at understanding much of the stimulus story and of later applying its message. It was decided that the major study would include two substantial changes. First, sixth grade subjects would be included to see if this developmental trend continued and whether sixth graders were aware of most aspects of the story's plot development and message. Second, since few subjects spontaneously reported the punishment aspect of the story, it was decided that a question was needed to specifically ask the children directly whether they thought Frances was being punished.

**Adult Preliminary Study**

The preliminary adult study was designed to determine the suitability of the written form of the questionnaire.

**Population.** There were two adult subjects in the preliminary adult study. One was a kindergarten teacher with two years of teaching experience in a suburban Columbus, Ohio area school and the other was a parent of a third grade child who had been an elementary education major
in college. While the latter subject had not taught elementary school, she had several years experience teaching Sunday school classes and leading scout groups.

**Procedures.** The subjects were told that the study was designed to find out more about what kind of books children liked. They were each handed a copy of both the questionnaire and the book *Bread and Jam for Frances*. They were asked to read the book and on completion of the book, fill out the accompanying questionnaire.

**Instrument.** Adult preliminary subjects were asked to complete instrument Preliminary-A. While the majority of the questions included in Preliminary-A were identical to those included in the children's pilot study, the following two changes should be noted: (1) Questions were divided into two categories; one in which adults were asked to respond for themselves and a second in which adults were asked to respond as they would predict the children in their class would. (2) A direct question on whether Frances was being punished in the story was included.

**Results.** The results indicated that the written form of the questionnaire was suitable as a means of collecting data from adults. Several minor revisions were made in the instrument and a pilot study conducted.

**Adult Pilot Study**

**Population.** Two kindergarten student teachers working with children from middle class suburban schools were the subjects for the adult pilot study. Both agreed to participate after being asked by their university supervisor.

---

20 See Appendix C.
Procedures. Each subject was asked to read the stimulus book *Bread and Jam for Frances* and complete instrument Pilot-A.  

Results. The results indicated that the revised adult instrument was suitable for use in the major study.

Major Study

Population. Twenty-five children from one kindergarten class, twenty-five children from one third grade class, and twenty-five children from one sixth grade class served as subjects in the present investigation. All subjects, as determined by their teachers, were making normal progress in school. Because the sixth grade class had more than twenty-five students, subjects were randomly selected from among those eligible. Their school served an upper middle class neighborhood suburban to Columbus, Ohio.

The twenty-seven adults who served as subjects were primary grade teachers enrolled in an advanced children's literature class at the Ohio State University. They were asked by their respective professors if they would volunteer to participate in a study concerning children's literature. All students agreed to do so.  

---

21See Appendix D.

22The primary grade teachers who served as subjects included teachers of kindergarten, first, second, and third grades as well as teachers of primary grouped classrooms (1-3) and remedial reading. For the predictive questions, teachers of first grade children were asked to respond in the way the children in their classes would respond at the very beginning of the school year, thus like a kindergartener. Second grade teachers were asked to respond as their children would at the very end of the school year, thus similar to a third grader. Primary grouped classroom teachers responded for their third grade children. Remedial reading teachers selected which age group they were predicting. Hereafter those teachers who predicted kindergarteners' responses are referred to as kindergarten teachers. Those teachers who predicted third graders' responses are referred to as third grade teachers.
Included below is descriptive data on each of the five groups of subjects studied.

Table 3
Children's Ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th># Males</th>
<th># Females</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>Range of Ages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6 yrs. 1 mo.</td>
<td>5 yrs. 5 mo. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 yrs. 10 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Grade</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9 yrs. 1 mo.</td>
<td>8 yrs. 5 mos. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 yrs. 11 mos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Grade</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11 yrs. 6 mo.</td>
<td>11 yrs. 0 mos. -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 yrs. 7 mos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Teacher Experience and School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average # Years Taught</th>
<th>Type of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Grade</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedures. The procedures followed with kindergarten and third grade subjects were identical to those used in the preliminary and pilot studies and were described on preceding pages. Subjects were told they had been selected to help the examiner find out more about what kind of books children liked. Rapport with the subject was established while the examiner and subject walked to the testing location. The stimulus
book was placed between the subject and the examiner in such a way that the subject could follow along with the text and pictures as the examiner read the story. At the conclusion of the story the examiner administered the testing instrument, tape recording the subjects' responses. If a subject was unable or seemed reluctant to answer a particular question or if the subject's response was unresponsive to the question posed, the examiner probed two times for an acceptable response.

Sixth grade subjects were tested as a classroom group. Before testing was begun, the sixth grade class was told they had been selected to help the examiner find out more about what kind of books children liked. The examiner then began reading the stimulus book. With the aid of an opaque projector the children were able to follow along with the text and pictures of the story as the examiner was reading. At the conclusion of the story the examiner distributed the written testing instrument. The subjects were asked to follow along with the examiner as she read each question. When all subjects had indicated by placing their pencils down they had completed a question, the next one was read.

The adult subjects had been asked by their respective professors if they would be willing to participate in a study concerned with children's literature. When the examiner arrived she further explained that this study was designed to find out more about what kinds of books children liked. Individual copies of the stimulus book as well as the adult form of the testing instrument were then distributed to the adult subjects. The subjects were asked to read the book and then
complete the accompanying questionnaire.

Instruments. Three variations of the same instrument were administered in the major study and are attached as Appendix E.

Categorizing Subjects' Responses for Analysis

Coding of responses. The scoring categories were inherently developed for each question by the author on the basis of all the responses to a question. The procedures used in the coding process were as follows: Three or more responses that were the same, slightly similar, or of the same intent were grouped together and labeled accordingly. Those responses that did not fit into a category were grouped together as miscellaneous. A no response answer was recorded as such and later considered as miscellaneous. Some questions fell naturally into three categories, others into five or six. Those categories were then used as the basis of the development of an appropriately/inappropriately responsive scoring system.

Reliability of coding system. An independent scorer who was a former teacher and unfamiliar with the hypothesis of the study categorized all responses. The Guetzkow test of reliability was performed on each of the questions scored by both the author and independent scorer. The results are presented in Table 5 on the following page.

---

Table 5
Reliability Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. How did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his desk?</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Why did she feel that way?</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Why did Frances' mother give her bread and jam?</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Why was Frances skipping rope more slowly?</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Was the mother worried about Frances' hurting her teeth by eating too much jam? Why was (or wasn't) she worried?</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you think Frances will always try new things now? Why do you think so?</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. One day Frances' mother makes scallops. Frances decides she doesn't want any. She wants bread and jam. What would you do if you were her mother or father? Why would you do that?</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did you like this book? What was it you liked (or disliked) about the book?</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Can you tell me what you learned from this story? What do you think children learned from this story?</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. This is a story of another child - Chris. Chris went to Pat's house for lunch. They had salami sandwiches and milk for lunch. Chris doesn't like salami. What should he (she) do?</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As illustrated in Table 5, reliability ranged from .78 to .94. The mean for both the children and the adult subjects was .89. This level of reliability was considered sufficiently high to merit the adoption of these categories.

**Development of appropriately/inappropriately responsive categories.** Story content was used as the basis of dividing seven questions into the categories of either appropriately responsive to the nature of the story or inappropriately responsive. Included in Table 6 on the following pages is each of these seven questions and examples of responses considered appropriately responsive.

**Scoring of remaining questions.** Questions 2, 12, and 13 of the children's instrument sought individual subject interpretation of the questions posed and did not warrant the use of categories in the coding of responses. The responses to question 12 were all unique. The responses to question 2, "How old do you think Frances is?" were tallied. The responses to question 13 were presented and discussed in their relationship to moral development.

The following procedure was followed in the scoring of question 1, "Can you tell me what happened in the story?". Any event that 50% or more of the adult subjects identified as major to the story was considered as a major event of the story and as such should be recalled by both adult and child subjects.

**Analyses**

The following three analyses were planned to address the major problems suggested by this study: (1) The responses of each group of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his desk?</td>
<td>Sad/because she was tired of bread and jam; she had bread and jam all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did she feel that way?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tired of jam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jealous/she was tired of bread and jam; she only had bread and jam; she wanted Albert's lunch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanted Albert's lunch/she was tired of bread and jam; she had bread and jam all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did Frances' mother give her bread and jam?</td>
<td>To make her stop eating just bread and jam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To punish her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why was Frances skipping rope more slowly?</td>
<td>She wasn't happy she had bread and jam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She was thinking of her lunch (of bread and jam).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She was full of jam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She was sad, unhappy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the mother worried about Frances' hurting her teeth by eating too much jam?</td>
<td>She have it to make her stop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why was (or wasn't) she worried?</td>
<td>It wouldn't happen for a long time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances' mother makes scallops. Frances won't eat them. What would you do if you were her mother or father?</td>
<td>Have her try it/it's important to try new things; she might like them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his desk?</td>
<td>Make her eat scallops/it's important to try new things, she might like them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can you tell me what you learned from this story?</td>
<td>Let her have bread and jam/she'd get tired of it again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a story of another child—Chris. Chris went to Pat's house for lunch. They had salami sandwiches and milk for lunch. Chris doesn't like salami. What should he do?</td>
<td>Try new foods. Try it. Eat it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 (Continued)
subjects will be examined to ascertain if there are developmental dif-
ferences in children's perception and understanding of the book Bread
and Jam for Frances. Particular attention will be given to examining
this understanding in three ways: (a) their direct understanding of
the story, (b) their transfer of understanding to a situation parallel-
ing that of the story, and (c) their insights into a new situation in-
volving a related dilemma. (2) The predictive responses of kinder-
garten and third grade teachers will be compared to their respective
classroom aged groups. (3) The responses of the children will be
examined to see whether they perceived the storybook character as
being punished and how they felt about this punishment.

Other issues to be examined include: (1) the effect of egocentric
thinking on children's perception of Frances' age, (2) the effect years
of teaching experience have on teacher's predictability of children's
responses, and (3) what aspect of the book children and adults liked
best.
CHAPTER IV
Presentation, Analysis, Interpretation of Data

The findings of this study are presented on the following pages. Attention will be given to summarizing, analyzing, and interpreting data as it relates to those questions posed in Chapter I. The first part of this chapter will present and analyze data generated from all questions included in the testing instruments. The second part of this chapter will interpret and discuss the findings as they relate to developmental and other differences found among the three age groups of children studied. The third part of this chapter will examine aspects of teacher's predictive ability of children's responses. Finally aspects of moral understanding will be explored by ascertaining whether or not subjects perceived the concept of punishment in the story presented.

Presentation and Analysis of Data

Questions of content. The first question of content required identification of major events of the story while the second required recall of emotions specific to a particular event. The results are reported on the next page.
Table 7

Question: Can you tell me what happened in this story?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Percent students reporting</th>
<th>Percent teachers reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KGN</td>
<td>3RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances eats only bread and jam. Frances would not try new foods.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances given only bread and jam. Mother used a trick.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances tired of bread and jam/ Frances realized just bread and jam isn't so good.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances learned to like a variety of foods. Frances asked for something other than bread and jam.</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean percent reporting | 24% | 51% | 56% | 58% | 66.75%

In summary, as Table 7 shows, for all but one event 20% to 25% of the kindergarten subjects, more than 33% of the third grade subjects, and more than half the sixth grade subjects recalled the major events. More than half the kindergarten and third grade teachers recalled each major event.
Questions How did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his desk? Why did she feel that way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGN</td>
<td>14 (56%)</td>
<td>11 (44%)</td>
<td>10 (83.3%)</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>18 (72%)</td>
<td>7 (28%)</td>
<td>13 (86.7%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>19 (76%)</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 50% of the kindergarten subjects and three-fourths of the third and sixth graders responded appropriately to this question, thus suggesting that most had a good knowledge and clear recall of this particular event. Chi square tests recorded no significant differences in children's responses and none between the children and the responses predicted by their grade level teachers.

Questions concerning subtleties in plot development. Three questions were asked to assess children's understanding of points the author wanted to make using subtle literary techniques. The results are reported in the tables on the next page.

The following conventions are used in reporting data: (1) An asterisk (*) precedes those questions in which teachers were asked to respond as children in their classes would respond; (2) The raw score of subjects responding in a particular way is followed in parenthesis by the percentage; (3) In two-part questions the underlined part of the question was scored as appropriately or inappropriately responsive to the story; (4) Where there are significant differences in responses between kindergarten teachers and kindergarteners, or third grade teachers and third graders these differences are reported along the side of the table. These results will be referred to in the discussion of teacher's predictability of children's responses.
Table 9

*Question: Why was Frances skipping rope more slowly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGN</td>
<td>15 (60%)</td>
<td>10 (40%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>15 (60%)</td>
<td>10 (40%)</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
<td>7 (46.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>10 (40%)</td>
<td>15 (60%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

*Question: Why did Frances' mother give her bread and jam?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGN</td>
<td>1 ( 4%)</td>
<td>24 (96%)</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
<td>10 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>19 (76%)</td>
<td>6 (40%)</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>15 (60%)</td>
<td>10 (40%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x² = 24.91  2 df  
p < .001
Table 11

*Question: Was the mother worried about Frances' hurting her teeth by eating too much jam? Why was (or wasn't) she worried?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>19 (76%)</td>
<td>KGN T</td>
<td>9 (66.7%)</td>
<td>4 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x² = 5.28 1 df</td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>13 (52%)</td>
<td>12 (48%)</td>
<td>3RD T</td>
<td>11 (73.3%)</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>16 (64%)</td>
<td>9 (36%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x² = 8.46 2 df
p < .02.
In the latter two of three questions significant age-related differences were found in the responses of kindergarten, third, and sixth grade subjects. Teachers' predicted responses in both age groups were higher than student responses; at the kindergarten age level this difference was a significant one.

Questions of understanding. Three questions were asked to assess children's understanding of the story's message: the first required a direct response to the question of understanding the message; the second required a transfer of this understanding to a parallel situation; while the third required the transfer of this understanding to a new situation. The findings are reported on the next page.

Significant differences among the three age groups were found in two out of three questions with more third graders responding appropriately than first graders and more sixth graders than third graders. In all but one measure, teachers predicted a higher number of appropriate student responses than there were. These differences were significant in all three measures at the kindergarten level and in one measure at the third grade level.

Clearly the data supports the notion of developmental differences in children's understanding and application of this understanding to the story studied. However, there is also evidence that even among those older subjects studied many children did not grasp the message of the story.
### Table 12

**Question:** Can you tell me what you learned from this story?²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
<th>KGN vs KGN T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGN</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>23 (92%)</td>
<td>KGN T</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td>3 (25%)</td>
<td>$x^2 = 6.28$ 1 df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>12 (48%)</td>
<td>13 (52%)</td>
<td>3RD T</td>
<td>12 (80%)</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
<td>$x^2 = 6.28$ 1 df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>12 (48%)</td>
<td>13 (52%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .02$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 3.49$ 1 df  
$p < .10$

### Table 13

*Question: One day Frances' mother makes scallops. Frances decides she doesn't want any. She wants bread and jam. What would you do if you were her mother or father? Why would you do that?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
<th>KGN vs KGN T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGN</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
<td>20 (80%)</td>
<td>KGN T</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
<td>$x^2 = 3.49$ 1 df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>12 (48%)</td>
<td>13 (52%)</td>
<td>3RD T</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
<td>11 (73.3%)</td>
<td>$x^2 = 3.49$ 1 df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>16 (64%)</td>
<td>9 (36%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$p &lt; .10$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 10.06$ 2 df  
$p < .01$

²Teachers were asked, "What do you think children will learn from this story?"
Table 14

*Question: This is a story of another child - Chris. Chris went to Pat's house for lunch. They had salami sandwiches and milk for lunch. Chris doesn't like salami. What should he (she) do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Appropriately Responsive</th>
<th>Inappropriately Responsive</th>
<th>KGN vs KGN T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGN</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>17 (68%)</td>
<td>KGN T</td>
<td>11 (91.7%)</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>11 (44%)</td>
<td>14 (56%)</td>
<td>3RD T</td>
<td>10 (66.7%)</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>13 (52%)</td>
<td>12 (48%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2 = 11.55 \text{ 1 df  } p < .001\]
Questions of opinion. Each opinion question was designed to draw the kind of information that might prove useful to authors and teachers in writing and using literary works for children. Below are the responses to the four opinion questions.

Table 15

Question: How old do you think Frances is?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of subject ages</th>
<th>Average age of subject group</th>
<th>Age attributed to Frances</th>
<th>Age attributed to Frances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGN 5 yrs. 2 mos.- 7 yrs. 2 mos.</td>
<td>6 yrs. 1 mo.</td>
<td>5 yrs. 2 mos.</td>
<td>KGN T 6 yrs. 1 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD 8 yrs. 5 mos.- 9 yrs. 11 mos.</td>
<td>9 yrs. 1 mo.</td>
<td>7 yrs. 6 mos.</td>
<td>3RD T 6 yrs. 1 mo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH 11 yrs. 0 mos.- 12 yrs. 6 mos.</td>
<td>11 yrs. 8 mos.</td>
<td>6 yrs. 8 mos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to the question on age indicate that while kindergarteners judge Frances to be about a year younger than their own average age, third and sixth grade subjects saw them as two and five years younger. It is interesting to note that teachers agreed most closely with sixth graders' responses.
Table 16

*Question: Do you think Frances will always try new things now? Why do you think so?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message related response</th>
<th>Other Response</th>
<th>Message related response</th>
<th>Other response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGN</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>KGN T</td>
<td>6 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>15 (60%)</td>
<td>3RD T</td>
<td>9 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>20 (80%)</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 16.25$ 2 df
p < .001

All but two third graders, two kindergarten teachers and two third grade teachers stated that Frances would always try new things. The responses to "Why do you think so?" were separated into those who responded in ways related to understanding the message of the story (because she was tired of bread and jam, didn't like bread and jam any more, she had learned her lesson) and those who responded in any other way.

Table 16 shows the older children are significantly more likely to attribute Frances' trying new things to her having learned her lesson than were the younger subjects. The table also shows that teachers were predictive of students' responses.
Table 17

Question: Did you like this book? What was it you liked (or disliked) about the book?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message related response</th>
<th>Other response</th>
<th>Message related response</th>
<th>Other response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGN</td>
<td>5 (20%)</td>
<td>KGN T</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>3RD T</td>
<td>3 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>7 (28%)</td>
<td>18 (72%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All but three sixth graders, one kindergarten teacher and one third grade teacher indicated that they liked the book. The second part of the question was scored by tallying those responses related to the story's message in one category and all other responses in a second category. The number of subjects responding with message related answers was low for all three age groups, and the groups did not differ significantly. Teachers' responses were highly predictive of children's responses.

Table 18

Question: Did anything like the story of Frances ever happen to you? Can you tell me about it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive responses</th>
<th>Negative responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>23 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>17 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth grade</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>17 (68%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 5.26$ 2 df

$p < .10$
Examination of Table 18 indicates there were significant age-related differences with more third and sixth graders responding positively than kindergarteners. Examination of the elaborative responses of those subjects who responded positively indicate that at the kindergarten and third grade level many children indicated that like Frances they had preferred a particular food (i.e., peanut butter and jelly for lunch every day, ice cream always for dessert, toast and honey for breakfast). As did Frances they tired of the food and began eating other things. However, only 12.5% of the sixth graders described such an event with the remaining sixth graders either not responding, indicating they had tried something new or responded in a way unrelated to the question posed.

Questions posed to adult subjects only. Two questions of a general nature were posed to adult subjects only. The first involved teacher's evaluation of the book's appropriateness for the children in their class; the second involved an evaluation of children's potential to understand the author's subtle method of developing plot. The results of these questions are reported below.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Do you think the children in your class will be able to relate the lesson of Frances to their own lives?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

Question: Do you think the author's literary techniques of illustrating Frances' growing discontentment (for example, jumping rope more slowly) are effective with children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten teachers</td>
<td>9 (75%)</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade teachers</td>
<td>15 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developmental Differences: Interpretation and Discussion

The data was examined for evidence of developmental differences among the three age groups of children studied. In accordance with Piagetian theory it was expected that the responses of kindergarten children (average age six years one month), third grade children (average age nine years one month), and sixth grade children (average age eleven years eight months) would differ in accordance with their developmental level: kindergarten-preoperational; third grade-concrete operational; sixth grade-formal operations). Below is a discussion of data in the three areas of questions presented: content, understanding of subtleties, and understanding and applying the message of the story. Much of the data supports the suggestion of developmental differences.

Questions of content. Examination of the results of the first question, "Can you tell me what happened in this story?" would suggest that many subjects in all age groups were unable to report major events of the story and perhaps had not grasped the significance of the story's
events. Inspection of the data (see Appendix F) indicates that almost one third of the kindergarten subjects were unable to report any of the major events of the story, only two subjects reported that Frances' getting only bread and jam from her mother was deliberate, and no subjects reported all four major events. One might therefore conclude that while the story may be enjoyed by kindergarten aged children, the message posed is beyond the developmental comprehension level of most kindergarteners. While two third grade and four sixth grade subjects recalled all four major events, even in both the third and sixth grade age groups, two subjects were unable to recall any of the major events of the story.

Three researchers after having observed similar findings have hypothesized that children's responses to an open ended recall question such as that posed in the present study may be incomplete, that subject responses may not necessarily be reflective of the subject's knowledge. In his studies of the language and thought of children, Piaget\(^3\) advised that the recall responses of children may not be indicative of their understanding. In one particular series of studies, Piaget focused on data gathered from experiments in which a child had to tell or explain something to another. More specifically, a story was read to a particular child. A second child was brought into the room. The first child was asked to tell the story to the second child. Through careful observation and recording of the first child's retelling of the story, Piaget noted that in the younger subjects, the verbal explanation of

\(^3\)Piaget, Jean. *Language and Thought of the Child*, op. cit.
the first child was essentially egocentric: in other words, his thoughts were spoken from his own point of view and not from the point of view of the second child. The retelling of children between the ages of seven and eight and those between six and seven differed considerably. The former children almost always retold a story with a sense of order while the latter children were rarely able to do so. Among the younger children causal relations were rarely expressed but were commonly indicated by a juxtaposition of related events. However, Piaget did find that through questioning a child may have understood something but have been unable to coherently explain this understanding to someone else.

Applebee⁴, like Piaget, also found that responses of six year old children were different from those a few years older. In his experimental work Applebee asked six, nine, and adolescent aged children to tell him about their favorite story. Half the six year old subjects retold events of the story without attempting to organize them into categories or a general scheme. Nine year old and adolescent aged children, however, were successful at summarizing the story with subsequent categorization of events. Applebee explained his findings in terms of Piagetian developmental stages. The inability of six year old children to systematically organize the events of the story was seen as characteristic of preoperational thinking. The older subjects, capable of taking the perspective of the listener and capable of categorizing events of the story, were considered to be thinking at the concrete

In light of the above research it seems that similar factors are evident in the present study. Subjects were asked to recall "...what happened in the story?". While most made accurate statements about events of the story (she had spaghetti and meatballs, she liked to eat bread and jam, etc.) many comments, particularly from the younger subjects, were not put in sequential order and frequently reflected spontaneous rather than systematic recall. This type of response is reflective of egocentric thinking. For the most part kindergarten age subjects were unable to categorize their thoughts to identify major events but recalled only those parts of the story that had the most meaning for themselves. It is not surprising that the responses of third graders showed considerable improvement over those of kindergarteners. The majority of third graders, having reached the concrete level of cognitive development were better able to categorize and verbalize their thoughts and recall.

The major event with the lowest percent of recall required the identification of a causal factor in the story--the mother gave Frances only bread and jam. According to Piaget, young children rarely express causal relations but commonly identify them by placing them in juxtaposition with related events. The lower response to this major event is reflective of this finding and is perhaps indicative that this is a difficult concept to grasp.

It seems surprising that sixth graders' responses did not differ greatly from those of third graders. Table 7 indicates that the same percentage of third and sixth graders reported one major event of the
story and their identification of two other major events differed by only eight percent. On only one event did identification of the event by sixth graders differ considerably (20%) from those of third graders.

The results of the second recall of content question, "How did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his desk? Why did she feel that way?", revealed no significant age-related differences. More than 50% of the kindergarten subjects and approximately 75% of the third and sixth grade subjects appropriately identified and explained Frances' feelings.

While Piaget and Applebee suggested that young children may have some difficulty communicating their knowledge, another researcher, Monson, suggests that a difference in question format may lead to a difference in quality of response. In studying children's test responses to seven humorous stories Monson found that children who responded to more structured test techniques made more positive responses than did those who responded to unstructured techniques. Given Monson's findings, one might hypothesize that the more structured format of the second content question may have contributed to the higher number of appropriately responsive subjects.

In summary, three factors seem to be apparent from data generated from content questions. First, the evidence indicates that at the content level the story Bread and Jam for Frances was understood by subjects from all age groups studied with more than half the third and sixth graders responding appropriately to both content questions and

---

5Monson, Dianne. "Children's Test Responses to Seven Humorous Stories," op. cit.
one fourth the kindergarteners responding appropriately to the first question and half of them to the second. Second, the responses of third and sixth grade subjects do not differ as expected, perhaps indicating that for some questions third and sixth graders are operating at the same Piagetian stage of development. The finding that many sixth graders might be responding at the concrete level of development rather than formal should not be thought unusual. Since individuals may be at one level of development in some areas and at a different level in others it would be common, particularly at the transitional age of many of the sixth graders, for subjects to be operating at a concrete level of development when responding to literature.

Third, it is suggested that the low identification of major events by kindergarten aged children might be attributed to their inability to express their understanding. It was also hypothesized that increased number of appropriately responsive answers to the second content question could be attributed to the more structured format of the question.

**Questions concerning subtleties in plot development.** It was assumed that a child's understanding of the author's techniques of subtly developing plot was a necessary ingredient to and an indication of his comprehension of the story. In two out of the three questions sixth graders responded appropriately more often than third graders and third graders responded appropriately more often than kindergarteners. These differences were significant and in the predicted developmental direction, providing support for the findings of other researchers.

Research has indicated that before adolescence children may have difficulty understanding and relating to symbolic forms of language.
In an early study, Kyte\textsuperscript{6} found that in reacting to poetry, children often misunderstood figurative language. This misunderstanding frequently led them to dislike particular poetical works. Of more recent note is the work of Applebee\textsuperscript{7} who also found that until adolescence children reacted to common sayings such as "You must have gotten out of the wrong side of bed this morning," and "When the cat is away the mice will play" in a literal rather than symbolic sense. These findings are both in keeping with the theoretical framework established by Piaget who hypothesized that until the onset of formal operational thinking children's thinking is limited to the concrete. Consequently their literal rather than symbolic interpretation of figurative language is in keeping with their developmental level. When 76\% of the kindergarteners and 72\% of the third graders responded that Frances' mother gave her bread and jam because she liked it, their responses were of a literal sort and in keeping with the findings of previous researchers. The data supports the notion that symbolisms in language such as that presented in the subtleties of plot development are not within most young children's understanding. It is perhaps interesting to note that 40\% of the sixth graders responded in a similar manner, suggesting that they have not reached the level of formal operations.

Different age subject responses to the question, "Why was Frances skipping rope more slowly?" were not found to be significantly different. In fact, more kindergarten and third grade subjects'

\textsuperscript{6}Kyte, George C. "Children's Reactions to Fifty Selected Poems," op. cit.

\textsuperscript{7}Applebee, Arthur N. The Child's Concept of Story, op. cit.
responses were categorized as appropriately responsive than were sixth graders' responses. An inspection of sixth graders' responses reveals that 36% of the responses fell into the category of miscellaneous and included responses such as "she did not have enough nourishment" or or that "she wasn't getting the right food." Many sixth graders were drawing the logical conclusion that bread and jam was a poor diet, consequently leading to poor health and an inability to jump rope fast. While this response is representative of formal operational thinking it does not best describe the incident in relationship to the story.

**Questions of understanding.** When subjects were asked directly what had they learned from the story, third graders responded appropriately more often than kindergarteners but the responses of third and sixth grade subjects did not differ. Examination of the data indicates that 48% of the third and sixth graders could identify the message presented in the story. These findings suggest several factors. First, as seen in the content questions, the similarities in third and sixth graders' responses possibly indicate that children in these age groups are responding at a similar stage of development. Second, the ability to identify a story's meaning or lesson requires high level abstraction, a cognitive skill that many children apparently have not yet developed. Third, since less than half the third and sixth graders and even fewer kindergarteners were able to identify spontaneously the message presented in the story, this raises the question of how best to provide for and interpret student reaction to literature and how to promote better communication between student and author.
Responses to the question in which subjects were to transfer their understanding of the story's message to a parallel situation were consistent with predicted expectations, with more sixth graders responding appropriately than third graders, more third graders responding appropriately than kindergarteners. Less than half the third graders and only 64% of the sixth graders responded appropriately to this question thus indicating that many children either did not understand the message of the story or were unable to generalize from their understandings.

Responses to the question in which subjects were to transfer their understanding of the message of the story to a new situation were also consistent with predicted expectations with more sixth graders responding appropriately than third graders, more third graders responding appropriately than kindergarteners. These differences, however, were not significant. Again there is the indication that many children either did not comprehend the message of the story or were unable to generalize their understandings to a new situation.

The assumption was made that responses to the two questions requiring transfer of understanding would yield results closely related to children's behavior. If this is so, it would seem that many subjects did not assimilate the message of the story. The responses of several subjects as illustrated by this one, "That is what my mother told me to do", indicated that subjects often relied on previously learned habits or beliefs.

In summary, even at the sixth grade level understanding and transfer of understanding of the message of the story was limited. This finding provides support for the idea that perhaps the message of the
story or the context of the message was beyond the present comprehension level of many of the subjects studied. Results did confirm the existence of developmental differences.

**Opinion questions.** Opinion questions included a variety of different areas and were designed to help gain insight into some areas of children's perception of parts or events in a story; areas that perhaps have not previously been explored.

The fact that the three age groups differed in their estimate of how old Frances was may be reflective on the part of the younger subjects, of egocentric rather than logical thinking. On the average, kindergarten subjects perceived Frances to be younger than themselves by almost a year. A five-year-old Frances, the average response of kindergarteners would seem to be an unlikely possibility since the content of the story (and the environment of the subjects tested) would imply that, at minimum Frances must be six or a first grader because she stays at school for lunch. Most kindergarteners did not incorporate that knowledge into their responses. Third and sixth graders' responses that Frances was seven years six months and six years eight months were very realistic age choices and were perhaps reflective of the logical problem solving capabilities of these age groups.

Responses to the question "Do you think Frances will always try new things now? Why do you think so?" were reflective of subjects' understanding of the story and perhaps could be considered an additional measure of this understanding. A great majority of the subjects responded that Frances would always try new things. In explaining why they felt that way 80% of the sixth graders, 60% of the third graders
and 24% of the kindergarteners responded in ways relating to their understanding of the story's message (i.e., she had learned her lesson, she tried something new once and she liked it so she'll try other new things, she likes to try new foods now). When subjects were asked to relate directly to Frances within the context of the problem specific to the story, understanding of the story's lesson was at its highest. The most reasonable explanation of this phenomena seems to be related to the direct rather than indirect questioning procedure.

When subjects were asked if they liked the book and what it was they liked about the story almost all subjects indicated they had liked the story. This author had speculated that many subjects would like the story because of the message it conveyed. This did not prove to be so. An examination of responses (see Appendix G) reveals that while less than 30% of the subjects responded in message-related ways, 40% or more of subject responses from each age group fell into the miscellaneous category. This finding, at least among the younger subjects, is in keeping with Piagetian tradition\(^8\) in which it was found that preoperational stage children when pressed to elaborate on why they liked a story usually responded by linking their feelings with one or another memorable incidents in the story rather than integrating that feeling into a conceptualization of the whole story. The fact that many older subjects were also unable to express their liking of the story in a conceptual way may be due to their misunderstanding or disagreement with the message presented in the story.

\(^8\)Applebee, Arthur N. *The Child's Concept of Story*, op. cit.
The question "Did anything like the story of Frances ever happen to you?" was included as a measure of how closely the subjects identified with Frances. Approximately one third of the third and sixth graders indicated they had experienced a similar problem. The lower response of kindergarteners may in part have been a result of many kindergarten subjects' needs for an exact duplication of the events rather than a transfer to any similar eating problem.

In summary, the data from opinion questions resulted in the following findings: (1) Many kindergarten children may have been evaluating the age of Frances in an egocentric rather than logical way. (2) All age groups of subjects appeared to be better able to express their understanding of the lesson of the story when asked to explain why Frances would always try new things. (3) The book was liked by subjects in all age groups with many subjects expressing their liking for the book by describing an incident of the story. (4) One third of the subjects identified with Frances strongly enough that they could recall experiencing an eating problem similar to that of Frances.

**Teacher Expectation of Pupil Response**

The 27 teacher subjects included in the present study varied greatly in years of experience, in the type of students they taught, etc. An examination of the teachers' responses indicated that there was no systematic relationship between years of experience or their school's location. Therefore kindergarten teachers' responses were grouped together as were the third grade teachers.
Teachers of kindergarten and third grade aged children were asked to respond to seven questions the way they thought the children in their classes would respond. Teachers' predictions of these responses and actual responses of children at that grade level were then compared.

Data on teachers' predictability of children's responses reveals contrasting findings. In questions of content and understanding the author's subtle techniques of plot development, teachers were highly predictive of children's responses. In other words, with one exception, teachers had good knowledge of children's reaction to and understanding of these aspects of the story. In the exception, kindergarten teachers were inaccurate in predicting children's responses to why the mother was (wasn't) worried about Frances' hurting her teeth by eating too much jam. While more than half the kindergarten teachers predicted that children would respond that the mother gave Frances bread and jam to make her stop, only 24% of the kindergarten subjects responded that way with more than half their responses falling into the miscellaneous category.

Within the area of children's understanding of the message posed by the story and the application of this understanding, kindergarten teachers were not found to be predictive of children's responses. On all three questions concerned with children's understanding, kindergarten teachers predicted that their students would have considerably more understanding of the story than they in fact did.

Third grade teachers attributed greater understanding to their students when teacher and students were asked directly about what they had learned from the story. This difference, like those between
kindergarten teachers and kindergarteners, was a significant one. However, while third grade teachers' predicted responses of third graders' responses to questions concerning application of their understanding of the story's message differed by more than 20%, these differences were not found to be significant. It is interesting to note that while third graders' appropriate responses to the two applications of the message questions were within four percentage points, in one instance third grade teachers underestimated the number of appropriate pupil responses while on the other hand they overestimated it.

In summary, teachers at both the kindergarten and third grade age levels were highly predictive of children's responses to questions concerned with story content and the author's subtle techniques of plot development. However, teachers were not found to be predictive of children's responses to the important question of children's understanding of the story's message. Kindergarten teachers were additionally inaccurate in predicting students' responses to the application of their understanding to other situations.

In light of the above facts it is necessary to stress to teachers that they should keep several factors in mind when selecting literature for their classes' enjoyment: (1) The uncomplicated language of a story's text or a child's fluency in reading words does not necessarily reflect ability to comprehend reading material. (2) The moral, message, conflict, or events of a story must be discussed and clarified by students themselves; assumptions cannot be made by the teacher concerning students' understandings. (3) If the child's level of intellectual development is preventing him from reaching a mature understanding
of a story, discussion may contribute to the furtherance of intellec-
tual growth.

The findings of the present study were somewhat unexpected. It
was thought that teachers from both grade levels would not have a good
knowledge of children's developmental thinking as it relates to liter-
ature. While teachers were not found to be predictive of children's
understanding of the story they were highly predictive of other aspects
of literary response. It is speculated that some of the success in
predictability found in the teachers studied may be due to the selective
nature of the subject population. Since all adult subjects were graduate
students enrolled in an advanced children's literature class at the
Ohio State University, they were not necessarily representative of the
teaching profession as a whole.

Teachers' responses to several other questions also contribute to
greater understanding of children's response to literature. Included
below is a discussion of those questions related to teachers' expec-
tations of children's responses.

Teachers, like children, were asked if they liked the book and "What
was it you liked (disliked) about the book?". It had been anticipated
that the great majority of teachers would like the book because of the
message it conveyed to children. The data confirms that the book was
liked but teachers' reasons for liking the book were as diversified as
those of children, with several responding they liked the book because
of its humor or realistic portrayal of life.

Teachers were also asked, "Do you think the children in your class
will be able to relate the lesson of Frances to their own lives?". All
but one third grade teacher responded in a positive way. Examination of teachers' responses to the question "What do you think children will learn from this story?" indicated that 75% of the kindergarten and 80% of the third grade teachers predicted that children would understand the message of the story. However, third grade teachers' predicted responses on both transfer questions were lower than that predicted for understanding and kindergarten teachers' predicted responses were lower on one transfer question. In other words, while teachers felt that children could understand and relate to Frances' dilemma, they also predicted that transfer of this understanding into behavior was more difficult. This was shown, in fact, to be true and can be best illustrated by examining children's responses to the question "Did anything like the story of Frances ever happen to you?" where children's responses were quite low with only 8% of the kindergarten and 32% of the third and sixth graders responding positively. Teachers' beliefs that children may be able to relate to and understand the message of the story but not necessarily to apply the message into behavior was substantiated by the data.

All but three kindergarten teachers responded positively to the question "Do you think the author's literary techniques of illustrating Frances's growing discontentment (for example, jumping rope more slowly) are effective with children?". This appeared to contradict the teachers' previous statements that the techniques were not appropriate or at minimum were beyond the comprehension of many children. Teachers may have believed (as one teacher added to her response) that the subtle techniques would have to be pointed out to the children. This observation
is a crucial factor in helping children improve their literary skills and to develop intellectual skills.

**Moral Understanding**

The question on punishment was included to investigate subjects' development in the area of moral decision making. The results of both student and adult subjects are presented below.

**Table 21**

*Question: Do you think Frances was being punished in this story?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGN</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>19 (76%)</td>
<td>KGN T</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
<td>10 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>13 (52%)</td>
<td>12 (48%)</td>
<td>3RD T</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
<td>7 (46.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>11 (44%)</td>
<td>14 (56%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-six percent of the kindergarteners, 48% of the third graders, and 56% of the sixth graders did not think Frances was being punished. It had been expected, particularly at the older age levels, that children would have recognized the parental behavior as punitive. It is hypothesized that those children who did not perceive Frances as being punished either (1) were unaware of the parents' motives in the story and thought the parents were giving Frances bread and jam simply because that is what she liked or (2) thought that the parents' actions did not fall into the realm of punishment but instead reflected behavior indigenous to the role of parenthood. Both these explanations may be
viewed as reflective of a child's intellectual and/or moral developmental level.

From an intellectual point of view, a child not recognizing the punishment may have been thinking egocentrically; Frances wanted bread and jam, got bread and jam, then wanted other foods and got other foods. This kind of thinking, a lack of search for an explanation or cause for the parental behavior, is most characteristic of children under the age of seven or eight, children who are preoperational thinkers. Children at this age would not have sought a cause for the parents' behavior and consequently would not have regarded their behavior as punitive. From a moral development point of view, the child's thinking may be seen as reflective of level one thinking, the level of adult constraint or moral realism. Characteristically children at this level of moral development would view parental behavior as actions appropriate to the role of adulthood and within the realm of justifiable behavior rather than punishment. A child at this stage would not judge the adult action but simply accept the actions. Both explanations illustrate that a lack of positive response may be reflective of a level of intellectual and/or moral development characteristic of preoperational or concrete operational children, or children who have not reached high levels of moral understanding.

Responses to follow-up questions of those subjects who reported that Frances was being punished demonstrate that these subjects were well aware of how she was being punished (one kindergartener and two sixth graders were inappropriately responsive), and accurate in identifying what she was being punished for (one kindergartener, one sixth
grader and one third grade teacher were inappropriately responsive). Their responses reflect a mature comprehension of the story. It was hoped that examination of responses of these same subjects to the question of how they would have punished Frances would reveal additional indication of their developmental understanding of punishment.

Kindergarteners' responses to this question were of a mixed variety including recommendations for a physical punishment such as a spanking, a recommendation to do the same thing Frances' parents did, and recommendations to simply tell Frances to eat the right food. Similarly, third graders also recommended following the same procedures as those followed by Frances' parents. Unlike kindergarteners, however, third graders also suggested that Frances not be given bread and jam but to give her other foods (implying that eventually she would eat the other foods) or to resort to punishments such as giving her no dessert or sending her to bed. While some sixth graders also recommended that they would punish Frances the same way Frances' parents did or that they would make her eat other food, their responses differed from those of the other age groups in that twenty-seven percent of the subjects did not respond to the question and eighteen percent said they would not punish her.

In summary, positive responses to this question from all age groups studied were lower than anticipated. In addition, responses to this question had been expected to reveal a developmental pattern with younger subjects selecting severe type punishments and older children more equalitarian type punishments. While there was an increase in the percentage of older subjects who wanted to punish Frances in a
reciprocal way, this was the only indication of a developmental dif­ference in the responses of kindergarteners and the responses of the older subjects. Several sixth graders seemed reluctant to reveal how they would punish Frances and did not respond to the question.

Teachers were found to be quite predictive of children's responses. The results to this question were inconclusive and demonstrate the need to develop and refine techniques of studying children's thinking in this area.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS

The reading and study of literature has always been a part of school curriculums. Now, as in the past, educators recognize the value of literature to the learner, seeing it as a source of enjoyment, a stimulator of the imagination, and as a vehicle for broadening students' horizons. More recently some educators have suggested that the full potential of the literary experience has not yet been explored. Toward this end they have begun applying their knowledge of both the learner and the learning process to the study of literature in hopes of discovering new ways of maximizing children's literary experiences. The present study is an example of such work.

In this study children from three different age groups and teachers of two of these age groups were asked to respond to the children's book Bread and Jam for Frances by Russell Hoban. In the story, Frances, portrayed animistically as a "badger" child of approximately six years, refuses to eat anything except bread and jam. The story reveals her parents' successful attempt to influence this behavior. In this investigation, three aspects of subjects' interaction with and understanding of this story were explored.

First, it was assumed that subjects' interaction with a piece of literature would reveal developmental differences brought to the
literary work. Cognitive understanding rather than reading ability or chronological age was seen as the major determior of the literary understanding. The present study then sought to identify the differing cognitive abilities of the children and to explore the effects these differing abilities had on their literary understanding and literary interaction. In order to maximize the reading experience, the question of providing the right match of literary work and reader is raised along with the need for considering the developmental capabilities of the child when selecting literary works.

Second, the present investigation explored teachers' understanding of the interaction process of student and a literary work. Within the classroom setting the teacher is seen as the instrumental agent in selecting literature for the child, providing the setting for literary interaction, and conducting discussions of literary selections. Consequently, because classroom teachers have such a significant impact on shaping a child's literary experience, this study looked into the question of teachers' understanding or predictability of students' reaction to a selected literary work. Without a good understanding of children's literary needs teachers' abilities to establish effective literary curriculums would be hampered.

Third, the present study explored the possibility of using literature as an instrument for assessing children's moral understandings. The selected literary work portrays parents in the role of disciplining or punishing a child for unacceptable behavior. This investigation sought children's reaction to, understanding of, and solutions to the storybook child's misbehavior.
In addition to the above major questions data on related issues were presented. The possible influences on successful teacher predictability of students' responses were considered in relationship to teacher experience or type of school. Children's internalization of the message of the story was examined as children were asked to apply their learnings from the story to other situations. Finally, information was sought as to whether or not both children and adults liked the selected literary work, what they liked about the story, and in what ways children's preferences differed from those of teachers.

Summary of Study. The 75 children studied were drawn from a middle class suburban school in the Columbus, Ohio metropolitan area. Twenty-five subjects were randomly selected from each of three classrooms; a kindergarten class, a third grade class, and a sixth grade class. The 27 adult subjects were primary grade teachers enrolled in one of two advanced literature classes at the Ohio State University. Adult subjects were asked by their respective professors if they would volunteer to participate in a study concerned with children's literature.

Subjects responded to parallel forms of the same testing instruments. Kindergarten and third grade subjects were tested individually with their responses placed on tape for later transcription and analysis. Sixth graders were tested as a classroom group and responded to a written testing instrument that paralleled that of kindergarten and third graders. Adult subjects received individual copies of the stimulus book and then responded to a written testing instrument. Subjects were asked to respond to questions concerned with the content of
the story, understanding the author's subtle techniques of plot development, understanding and applying the message of the story, questions of opinion, and a question on moral understanding.

The data was analyzed in the following manner. First, judges independently assigned responses to categories that had been established by the author. Second, responses to seven questions were divided into the categories of appropriately responsive to the nature of the story and inappropriately responsive.

Discussion and Conclusions

The three aspects of literary responses addressed in the present investigation are discussed below.

**Developmental differences.** As expected there was a definite developmental trend among the three age groups of children studied. This trend was evident in the: (a) questions of content, (b) questions concerned with the subtleties of plot development, and (c) questions of understanding. It is the belief of this author that the basis of this trend does not lie with children's chronological age or reading capabilities but can be found instead in their cognitive developmental growth. Using the theory of Jean Piaget as a framework it was possible to determine why certain age groups of students responded as they did.

The average age of six years one month of kindergarten subjects would suggest that for the most part their responses would be reflective of preoperational thinking. This type of thinking was in evidence throughout the data. The responses of most kindergarten subjects were egocentric in nature and reflected a general inability to analyze the
story and to apply logical problem solving skills to the questions posed. An example of this type of thinking at the content level included kindergarteners responses to the question "...what happened in this story?". On the average only one-fourth of the kindergarteners were successful at identifying major events of the story. While many kindergarten subjects responded with accurate statements (i.e., she had a baby sister), their responses lacked a sense of unity, a logical organization that placed events in a sequential or prioritized order. They responded in an egocentric way.

In another example, most kindergarteners responded to the question "Why did Frances' mother give her bread and jam?" by stating "...she wanted it." At their preoperational level of cognitive development, they had no need to search for a cause and effect relationship for the mother's behavior, consequently kindergarteners responded with what appeared to be a most obvious answer.

It had been expected that responses of most third graders would reflect a level of concrete operational thinking. For most questions substantial numbers of third graders responded in an appropriately responsive way, indicating a higher level of cognitive development than kindergarteners. However, many third graders still did not seem to grasp a full understanding of the story and failed to demonstrate responses representative of concrete operational thinking. This occurred particularly in questions concerned with the subtleties of plot development as well as in questions of understanding the message of the story. Only 24% of the third grade subjects responded that Frances' mother continued to give her bread and jam to make her tire of it,
while most third graders responded as did the kindergarteners, "Because she liked it." The former response, an appropriate one, suggests skills of logical-deductive reasoning and a level of understanding characteristic of thinking beyond the preoperational stage of development, while the latter represents a preoperational understanding of the story.

Forty-eight percent of third graders responded appropriately to two questions of understanding the message of the story. While the percentages show substantial gains over those of kindergarten subjects, they still appear somewhat low considering the recommendation of reviewers from the *Horn Book Magazine*, the *Bulletin of the Center for Children's Books* and others who have suggested that this particular book is most suited to children in grades kindergarten through three. It would appear that more than half the third graders were unsuccessful at abstracting from the story essential clues that lead to a full understanding of the story's theme. Since many third graders were eight years old, an age considered by Piaget to be a transitional one into the level of concrete operations, it seems likely that the somewhat low level of understanding of the story and subtleties of plot development may be attributed to the fact that many third graders had not yet made the transition into the level of concrete operations. This would seem to be in distinct contrast to both physical and intellectual differences found between kindergarteners who are just mastering the skills of accurately catching and throwing a ball and developing a sight vocabulary, and third graders who are usually proficient at many group sports and have mastered the art of reading. Yet in their reaction to the
stimulus book it appeared that less than half the third graders demonstrated an understanding of the story that differed substantially from that of kindergarteners.

For the most part, responses of sixth graders showed improvement over those of third graders. The differences between their responses however were not as great as those between kindergartener and third graders. It had been expected that the responses of the sixth graders whose average age was eleven years six months would be at the cognitive level of formal operations, reflecting a mature understanding of the direction and message presented by the story. The data did not support this. Sixth graders' responses to the three questions concerned with the subtleties of plot development indicated that on the average only 55% of their responses were rated as "appropriate." Further, less than half the sixth graders could identify the message of the story when asked "...what they learned from this story?".

A situation paralleling that of third graders may apply to sixth graders; that is, because of the transitional age of their development, many sixth graders may not yet have entered into the cognitive level of formal operations. This finding would appear to be quite tenable to Piaget's suggestion that children achieve the last stage of intellectual development between the ages of eleven and fifteen. Consequently, a great majority of the sixth grade children studied may have been responding from a concrete rather than formal operational level.

1 Of the seven questions categorized as appropriately/inappropriate responsive to the nature of the story, there were significant differences between kindergarteners and third graders three times, between third graders and sixth graders one time.
However, it would seem that a child in the concrete-operational stage of development should have been able to fully understand the story. Therefore, the data from all three groups may need an additional explanation.

One obvious explanation for poor performance would be low intellectual ability. However, since these children were making normal progress in their school work, this possibility could be ruled out. Another viable explanation may be that the poor understanding demonstrated by third and sixth graders may be due to their low level of development as it relates specifically to literary response. Children may not be experienced in responding to literature in an intellectually challenging manner. Their lack of experience may have contributed to a situation that while in other areas children are demonstrating particular levels of cognitive growth, these same levels are not found in the area of literary response.

**Teacher predictability.** Data from the present investigation indicated that in most areas of questioning, the adult subjects were predictive of children's responses. Of the eight questions in which adults were asked to predict children's responses, third grade teachers were predictive in their answers to seven questions and kindergarten teachers were predictive in their answers to four questions. More specifically, only in the area of understanding the message of the story was there a discrepancy in teachers' ability to predict student responses. Both kindergarten and third grade teachers greatly overestimated the number of children who could appropriately identify the message of the story. Kindergarten teachers, in addition, also overestimated the ability of children to apply the message of the story.
While teachers should be commended for their accurate predictions in most areas of questioning, attention must be focused on the fact that teachers thought that many more children would comprehend the message of the story than in fact did. Without the knowledge that children may not understand the story, teachers will not take the time to discuss and clarify the story with the children. Teachers must be cautioned to approach literature in such a way that assumptions are not made about children's understandings, and opportunities are provided for children to express and clarify their literary understandings.

Moral understanding. Data from the question on punishment indicated that 24% of the kindergarteners, 52% of the third graders and 44% of the sixth graders perceived Frances as being punished. It was expected that children in the higher levels of development would give more positive responses.

It was assumed that subjects' negative responses to the question of punishment were reflective of their moral understanding of the story. The researcher hypothesized that subjects who did not perceive Frances as being punished were responding at the moral development level of moral realism/adult constraint. In contrast, follow-up data from those subjects who did perceive Frances as being punished, indicated that in their recommendations of how they would punish Frances, only two kindergarteners and no third or sixth graders responded from a level of moral realism/adult constraint. Additional questioning of all subjects was recommended to ascertain a better understanding of all subjects' beliefs. It could be that the question used did not elicit the expected response.
In keeping with the context of earlier procedures, the following question might have been used: "While sitting at the dinner table Frances pushed her plate away and said, 'I don't like chicken. I want bread and jam.' Would you punish Frances for pushing her plate away? Why would you (or would you not) punish her? How would you punish her?" Through this additional questioning all subjects would have a greater opportunity to express their moral understandings and judgments. While the findings of the present study demonstrated the possibility of relating children's literature to children's judgments in the area of moral reasoning, it is felt that additional research is needed to further identify this relationship.

**Implications**

**Implications for practice.** The findings of the present study can be applied directly to the classroom. Recommendations in four related areas are made. First, in working with children and literature, it is important to clarify their understanding of material. The clarification process, which is not intended as a means of changing children's thoughts but of helping them identify and reflect upon their own beliefs and understandings, serves two purposes. For the student it provides a framework for approaching the study of literature; that is, the development of the practice of reflecting upon what they have read or heard before coming to conclusions. Such a practice fosters the development of logical deductive thinking and reasoning skills. For the teacher, this clarification process provides an accurate account of what children are thinking. Teachers can then act informatively on children's
understandings while working towards the refinement of evaluative skills.

The classroom clarification process can take place in many forms. Most frequently employed are the techniques of carefully planned teacher directed discussions and dramatizations. Through these and other techniques, teachers can accurately assess children's thinking and, using this knowledge, they can help children develop the skills of building a logical order, of conveying their understandings to another person, of assuming the perspective of another individual.

The findings of the present study have suggested that children's response to literature lags behind their development in other cognitive areas. In keeping with the Piagetian principle that one cannot change a child's level of development but can contribute to its growth by providing experiences that will bring him to a new level, teachers can and should actively seek out appropriate activities. Clarification can perhaps be the teacher's most effective tool in this process.

Second, inherently tied to the process of clarification is the need for teachers to listen carefully to what children are saying. There is a tendency to assume that children's thinking parallels that of the adult. The value of the clarification process would be greatly reduced unless teachers become effective listeners of what children are actually saying.

Third, teachers must carefully attend to the problem of the "match." The selection of appropriate literature for particular aged groups of children must go beyond the size of the print, the quality and number of illustrations, the reading ability of the children, etc. to also
include a critical analysis of the subject matter and the message the story conveys. An "easy to read" text or a six year old hero does not necessarily mean that the book is best suited to children of first grade age. One important purpose of books is to convey a message. But for the message to be received the reader must be developmentally ready and receptive to the idea.

Fourth, teachers should look to literature as an avenue for obtaining understandings about children's moral reasoning. While the present findings with regard to moral judgment were inconclusive, there was sufficient evidence to support the notion that many children did make moral judgments about the parents' actions and did view the story from a moral as well as entertainment perspective. In discussing these findings it was felt that the questioning procedures did not provide children with sufficient opportunity to reflect upon and express their thoughts. Teachers who carefully develop questioning procedures should be able to use literature as an effective means of gaining information about their children's moral thinking and to help foster their moral development.

Implications for research. The findings of the present study suggest the need for further research in several areas. First, there is a need for developing and refining assessment tools to analyze children's response to literature. While the present study and those of other researchers have been successful in identifying and categorizing children's responses, there are still many gaps, such as that of moral judgment, that need to be filled. To develop a sound base for future experimentation in literary programs, a comprehensive instrument,
adaptable to various age and ability groups, is needed. Standardization of a research instrument will allow for cross comparisons of the work of several researchers and will likely result in findings relevant to both the practitioner and the theoretician.

Second, there is a need for further investigation of the developmental differences found in the study. Three age groups of subjects had been selected for inclusion in the present study, representing three Piagetian stages of cognitive growth. Most kindergarteners had been expected to respond with a preoperational understanding of the story, third graders with concrete operational understanding and sixth graders with that of formal operations. It was found, however, that children's response to literature seems to lag behind their development in other cognitive areas. If that finding was replicated using the present research methodology, several investigations would be appropriate. 1. Using the book Bread and Jam for Frances the responses of children of different ages could be examined. 2. Other literary works should be used as stimulus material. 3. It would seem desirable to identify at what chronological ages literary responses reflect transitions from a stage of preoperational thinking to concrete operational thinking and from concrete operational thinking to formal operations. If critical age spans could be identified, then teachers could select literary works for children with these needs in mind. 4. Children's developmental level in response to literature could be directly compared to their responses in other areas such as concepts of conservation or geometry to see whether, in fact, response to literature lags behind these understandings.
Third, teachers were found to be highly predictive of student responses. It had been speculated that this high level of response was attributable to the select population of subjects. While the majority of these teachers were quite predictive of student responses, they were not predictive of the crucial question examining children's understanding of the story. A less select group of subjects may be found to be less predictive of student responses in all areas.

Fourth, literature should be selected and testing instruments developed to investigate the possibilities of linking literature and moral judgment. The findings of the present study have shown that many children do react to and respond to a moral issue posed in a literary work. Extensive research in the field of bibliotherapy has demonstrated that children with behavioral and emotional problems are helped through the vicarious experiences of a carefully planned reading program. Similarly, it would seem that children may benefit from exposure to and reflecting upon issues of moral concern raised by the heroes and heroines of literary works. Research may demonstrate the effect reading experiences can have on children's abilities to make moral judgments.

Last, while it is known that children do indeed respond to their literature and that their response can be measured, little has been done to develop a way to measure the influence of a planned literary program designed for either a particular child or group of children on their response to literature. This author would suggest the possibility of planning various curriculums to meet different goals: goals such as coping with problems of morality, building tolerance of people different from oneself, understanding the historical situations that created the
events and people in the past, to see if literature can and does influence either areas of understanding and coping behavior or could produce higher levels of literary response.
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APPENDIX A

Preliminary K-3
1. Can you tell me what happened in this story?

2. How old do you think Frances is?

3. How do you think Frances felt when Albert spread out his large lunch on his napkin and she had bread and jam to eat? Did you feel sorry for her?

4. Do you think Frances should have eaten her breakfast egg? Why do you think that?

5. For a few months now, Frances had been eating her meals like everyone else in the family. But one day Frances's mother makes scallops. Frances had never had scallops before and she decides she doesn't want any but wants bread and jam instead. What would you do if you were Frances's mother?

Frances's mother didn't think of doing that. She thought of three other things to do. Which of these three things do you think would be the fairest?
1) Tell her she'll have to eat her dinner or go to bed.
2) Tell her to try a little bit of everything on her plate and then she could have some bread and jam.
3) Explain to her why eating just bread and jam isn't good for her but let her eat just bread and jam anyway.

6. This is a story of another child. Chris was invited to Pat's house for lunch yesterday. Pat's mother gave him (her)* a salami sandwich for lunch. Pat doesn't like salami. What should he (she) do?
1) Ask if he (she) might have something else.
2) Tell Pat's mother he (she) isn't very hungry and eat just a little of the sandwich.
3) Eat the sandwich anyway.

7. Do you think boys and girls should always try a little bit of all the food on their plates? Why?

8. Did you like this book? What was it you liked about the book?

9. Can you tell me what you've learned from this story?

*The pronoun used was determined by the sex of the subject; him for a male subject, her for a female subject.
APPENDIX B

Pilot K-3
Pilot K-3

1. Can you tell me what happened in this story?

2. How old do you think Frances is?

3a. Show picture p. 19.  
   How did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his desk?  
   b. Why did she feel that way?  
   c. Why did Frances's mother give her bread and jam?

   Why was Frances skipping rope more slowly?

5. Was the mother worried about Frances's hurting her teeth by eating too much jam?

6. Do you think Frances will always try new things now? Why?

7a. (You're right OR You were right for a real long time but) One day Frances's mother makes scallops. Frances decides she doesn't want any. She wants bread and jam. What would you do if you were her mother or father?  
   b. Why would you do that?

8a. Did you like this book?  
   b. What was it you liked about the book?

9a. Can you tell me what you learned from this story?  
   b. Did you know that before you read the story?

10. This is a story of another child - Chris. Chris went to Pat's house for lunch. They had salami sandwiches and milk for lunch. Chris doesn't like salami. What should he (she) do?

11a. Did anything like the story of Frances ever happen to you?  
   b. Can you tell me about it?  
   c. What did you do?
APPENDIX C

Preliminary-A
Books are an important aspect of all classrooms. They help children develop their language abilities, they bring knowledge about new or unknown places or events, they stimulate imagination and simply bring joy to young readers and listeners. While there has been a great increase in the number of books for young children there has not necessarily been a great increase in the quality of books. It is hoped that this study will provide information on what contributes to a good children's book. Would you please read the accompanying book, Bread and Jam for Frances, and briefly respond to the following questions.

Thank you.

1. What were the major events of the story?

2. How old do you think Frances is?

3. Did you like this book? What was it you liked (or disliked) about the book?

4. What do you think children will learn from this story?

5. Do you think the children in your class will be able to relate the lesson of Frances to their own lives?
6. Do you think the author's literary techniques of illustrating Frances's growing discontentment are effective with children?

II. Would you please respond to the following questions the way you think (your child) the majority of the children in your class would respond.

1. Show picture page 19
   a. How did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his desk? ____________________________________________
   b. Why did she feel that way? ____________________________________________
   c. Why did Frances's mother give her bread and jam? ____________

2. Show picture page 21
   Why was Frances skipping rope more slowly? ________________

3. Was the mother worried about Frances's hurting her teeth by eating too much jam? _____________________________

4. Do you think Frances will always try new things now? Why?

5. (You're right OR You were right for a real long time but) One day Frances's mother makes scallops. Frances decides she doesn't want any. She wants bread and jam. What would you do if you were her mother or father? _____________________________
6. This is a story of another child - Chris. Chris went to Pat's house for lunch. They had salami sandwiches and milk for lunch. Chris doesn't like salami. What should he (she) do? __________________________________________________________

7a. Do you think Frances was being punished in this story? _____

b. How was she being punished? ________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

c. How would you have punished her? _____________________________

_______________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D

Pilot-A
I. Books are an important aspect of all classrooms. They help children develop their language abilities, they bring knowledge about new or unknown places or events, they stimulate imagination and simply bring joy to young readers and listeners. While there has been a great increase in the number of books for young children there has not necessarily been a great increase in the quality of books. It is hoped that this study will provide information on what contributes to a good children's book.

After reading the book, Bread and Jam for Frances, would you please respond briefly to the following questions?

Thank you.

I. 1. What were the major events of the story?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. How old do you think Frances is? ____________________________

3. Did you like this book? ________________________________________

   What was it you liked (or disliked) about the book? ______

                   ____________________________________________

4. What do you think children will learn from this story? ______

                   ____________________________________________
5. Do you think the children in your class will be able to relate the lesson of Frances to their own lives? ___________________

6. Do you think the author's literary techniques of illustrating Frances's growing discontentment (for example, jumping rope more slowly) are effective with children? __________________

II. Now I would like to ask a different kind of question. Would you please respond to the following questions the way you think the majority of the children in your class would respond.

1. If the children were shown the picture on page 19, how do you think they would respond to the following questions:
   a. How did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his desk? ____________________________
   b. Why did she feel that way? ____________________________
   c. Why did Frances's mother give her bread and jam? ________

2. If the children were shown the picture on page 21, how do you think they would respond to the following question: Why was Frances skipping rope more slowly? ____________________________

3. Was the mother worried about Frances's hurting her teeth by eating too much jam? ____________________________
   Why was (wasn't) she worried? ____________________________

4. Do you think Frances will always try new things now? ________
   Why? ____________________________
5a. Do you think Frances was being punished in this story? ____
b. (If yes)
   How was she being punished? ________________________________
c. What was she being punished for? ____________________________
d. How would you have punished her? ____________________________

III. How would the children in your class respond if after reading
Bread and Jam for Frances they were asked:

   1a. One day Frances's mother makes scallops. Frances decides
   she doesn't want any. She wants bread and jam. What would
   you do if you were her mother or father? ____________________
   ________________________________________________________
   b. Why would you do that? ________________________________

   2. This is a story of another child - Chris. Chris went to
   Pat's house for lunch. They had salami sandwiches and milk
   for lunch. Chris doesn't like salami. What should he (she)
   do? ____________________________
APPENDIX E

Instruments - Major Study

Instrument K-3

Instrument 6

Instrument A
1. Can you tell me what happened in the story?

2. How old do you think Frances is?

3a. Show picture page 19
   How did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his desk?
   b. Why did she feel that way?

4. Why did Frances's mother give her bread and jam?

5. Show picture page 21
   Why was Frances skipping rope more slowly?

6a. Was the mother worried about Frances's hurting her teeth by eating too much jam?
   b. Why was (or wasn't) she worried?

7a. Do you think Frances will always try new things now?
   b. Why do you think so?

8a. One day Frances' mother makes scallops. Frances decides she doesn't want any. She wants bread and jam. What would you do if you were her mother or father?
   b. Why would you do that?

9a. Did you like this book?
   b. What was it you liked (or disliked) about the book?

10a. Can you tell me what you learned from this story?
   b. Did you know that before you heard the story?

11. This is a story of another child - Chris. Chris went to Pat's house for lunch. They had salami sandwiches and milk for lunch. Chris doesn't like salami. What should he do?

12a. Did anything like the story of Frances ever happen to you?
   b. If yes, Can you tell me about it?

13a. Do you think Frances was being punished in this story?
   If yes,
   b. How was she being punished?
   c. What was she being punished for?
   d. How would you have punished her?
Bread and Jam for Frances

Name _____________________________________________________________
Age _______________ Birthday ________________

1. Can you tell me what happened in the story?
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

2. How old do you think Frances is? ________________________________

3a. How did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his
desk? ____________________________________________________________

b. Why did she feel that way? ______________________________________ 
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

4. Why did Frances's mother give her bread and jam? _________________

__________________________________________________________________

5. Why was Frances skipping rope more slowly? ________________________

__________________________________________________________________

6a. Was the mother worried about Frances's hurting her teeth by eating
too much jam? ____________________________________________________

b. Why was (or wasn't) she worried? _________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
7. Do you think Frances will always try new things now? __________
   Why do you think so? __________________________________________

8a. One day Frances's mother makes scallops. Frances decides she
doesn't want any. She wants bread and jam. What would you do if
you were her mother or father? ______________________________________
   b. Why would you do that? _______________________________________

9a. Did you like this book? _______________________________________
   b. What was it you liked (or disliked) about the book? ___________

10a. Can you tell me what you learned from this story? ___________
   b. Did you know that before you heard the story? _______________

11. This is a story of another child - Chris. Chris went to Pat's
house for lunch. They had salami sandwiches and milk for lunch.
Chris doesn't like salami. What should he (she) do? ___________

12a. Did anything like the story of Frances ever happen to you? _____
   b. Can you tell me about it? _____________________________________

13. Do you think Frances was being punished in this story? _________
If your answer was yes:

a. How was she being punished?

b. What was she being punished for?

c. How would you have punished her?
Instrument A

Books are an important aspect of all classrooms. They help children develop their language abilities, they bring knowledge about new or unknown places or events, they stimulate imagination and simply bring joy to young readers and listeners. While there has been a great increase in the number of books for young children there has not necessarily been a great increase in the quality of books. It is hoped that this study will provide information on what contributes to a good children's book.

After reading the book, Bread and Jam for Frances, would you please respond briefly to the following questions.

Thank you.

I. 1. What were the major events of the story?

2. How old do you think Frances is?  

3. Did you like this book?  

   What was it you liked (or disliked) about the book?  

4. What do you think children will learn from this story?
5. Do you think the children in your class will be able to relate the lesson of Frances to their own lives? ________________

6. Do you think the author's literary techniques of illustrating Frances's growing discontentment (for example, jumping rope more slowly) are effective with children? ________________

II. Now I would like to ask a different kind of question. Would you please respond to the following questions the way you think the majority of the children in your class would respond.

1. If the children were shown the picture on page 19, how do you think they would respond to the following questions:
   a. How did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his desk? ________________________________
   b. Why did she feel that way? ________________________________
   c. Why did Frances's mother give her bread and jam? ______

2. If the children were shown the picture on page 21, how do you think they would respond to the following question: Why was Frances skipping rope more slowly? ________________________________

3. Was the mother worried about Frances's hurting her teeth by eating too much jam? ________________________________
   Why was (wasn't) she worried? ________________________________

4. Do you think Frances will always try new things now? ______
   Why? ____________________________________________
5a. Do you think Frances was being punished in this story? ___
   If yes
b. How was she being punished? _____________________________
c. What was she being punished for? _______________________
d. How would you have punished her? ___________________________

III. How would the children in your class respond if after reading
      Bread and Jam for Frances they were asked:

   la. One day Frances's mother makes scallops. Frances decides she
doesn't want any. She wants bread and jam. What would you
do if you were her mother or father? _______________________

b. Why would you do that? _________________________________

   2. This is a story of another child - Chris. Chris went to
      Pat's house for lunch. They had salami sandwiches and milk
      for lunch. Chris doesn't like salami. What should he (she)
do? __________________________________________________________
APPENDIX F

Children's Responses to Identification of Major Events of the Story
Table 22

Kindergarteners' Responses

Question: Can you tell me what happened in the story?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frances would eat only bread and jam.</th>
<th>Frances given only bread and jam.</th>
<th>Frances tired of bread and jam.</th>
<th>Frances learned to like a variety of foods.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frances would not try new foods.</td>
<td>Mother used a trick.</td>
<td>Frances realized just bread and jam isn't so good.</td>
<td>Frances asked for something other than bread and jam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances would eat only bread and jam.</td>
<td>Frances given only bread and jam.</td>
<td>Frances tired of bread and jam.</td>
<td>Frances learned to like a variety of foods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances would not try new foods.</td>
<td>Mother used a trick.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 26 | 27 | X | X | X |
| 28 |
| 29 | X | X | X |
| 30 | X |
| 31 | X | X |
| 32 | X | X |
| 33 | X | X | X |
| 34 | X | X |
| 35 | X | X | X |
| 36 | X | X |
| 37 | X |
| 38 | X |
| 39 | X | X |
| 40 | X | X |
| 41 | X |
| 42 | X | X |
| 43 | X | X | X |
| 44 | X |
| 45 | X |
| 46 | X | X | X |
| 47 | X |
| 48 | X | X |
| 49 | X | X |
| 50 | X | X |
Table 24
Sixth Graders' Responses

Question: Can you tell me what happened in the story?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frances would eat only bread and jam.</th>
<th>Frances given only bread and jam.</th>
<th>Frances tired of bread and jam.</th>
<th>Frances learned to like a variety of foods.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frances would not try new foods.</td>
<td>Mother used a trick.</td>
<td>Frances realized just bread and jam isn't so good.</td>
<td>Frances asked for something other than bread and jam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Row | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 75 |
|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
|     | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  | X  |
APPENDIX G

Subject Responses According to Category
*Question: How did Frances feel when she saw Albert arrange his lunch on his desk? Why did she feel that way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sad</th>
<th>Unhappy</th>
<th>Wanted Albert's lunch.</th>
<th>Tired</th>
<th>Jealous</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
<th>She didn't want bread and jam.</th>
<th>She only had bread and jam.</th>
<th>She didn't have a lunch like him.</th>
<th>Albert's lunch looked real good.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGN</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGN T</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD T</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 26**

*Question: Why was Frances skipping rope more slowly?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>She was tired of jam.</th>
<th>She was thinking of her lunch (of bread and jam).</th>
<th>She was full of jam.</th>
<th>She ate too much</th>
<th>She was tired.</th>
<th>She was sad.</th>
<th>She was hungry.</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth grade</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten teachers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27

*Question: Why did Frances's mother give her bread and jam?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>She wanted it.</th>
<th>To make her stop.</th>
<th>To punish her.</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth grade</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade teachers</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28

*Question: Was the mother worried about Frances' hurting her teeth by eating too much jam? Why was (or wasn't) she worried?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wouldn't happen for a long time</th>
<th>She gave it to her to make her stop</th>
<th>Her teeth would fall out. It's bad for your teeth</th>
<th>Jam is sweet and isn't good for you.</th>
<th>She'd get sick.</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade teachers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 29

Question: Can you tell me what you learned from this story?  
Question: What do you think children will learn from this story?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Try new foods</th>
<th>Don't eat bread and jam (the same thing) all the time</th>
<th>Too much bread and jam isn't good</th>
<th>Sweets aren't (jam isn't) good for you</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth grade</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten teachers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30

*Question: One day Frances' mother makes scallops. Frances decides she doesn't want any. She wants bread and jam. What would you do if you were her mother or father? Why would you do that?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Try it</th>
<th>Let her have bread and jam</th>
<th>Make her eat scallops</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
<th>It's important to try new things</th>
<th>She'd get tired of it again</th>
<th>She liked it (bread and jam)</th>
<th>Because she wouldn't eat the scallops</th>
<th>Scallops are good for you</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KGN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6TH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGN T</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3RD T</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table 31**

*Question: This is a story of another child - Chris. Chris went to Pat's house for lunch. They had salami sandwiches and milk for lunch. Chris doesn't like salami. What should he (she) do?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Try it</th>
<th>Eat it</th>
<th>Ask for something else.</th>
<th>Don't eat it.</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Try it</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth grade</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade teachers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Table 32

*Question: Do you think Frances will always try new things now? Why do you think so?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes/no</th>
<th>She was tired of bread and jam.</th>
<th>Because she ate something new (or the spaghetti) and liked it.</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She didn't like bread and jam any more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>She learned her lesson/she tried other things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>25/0</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third grade</td>
<td>23/2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth grade</td>
<td>25/0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>10/1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third grade teacher</td>
<td>13/1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question: Did you like this book? What was it you liked (or disliked) about the book?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes/no</th>
<th>Tried something new.</th>
<th>Learned her lesson.</th>
<th>Tired of bread and jam.</th>
<th>Humor</th>
<th>Story was funny.</th>
<th>Spaghetti and meat-ball part.</th>
<th>Crying part.</th>
<th>Realness of Frances and story.</th>
<th>When she had bread and jam.</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kindergarten</strong></td>
<td>25/0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third grade</strong></td>
<td>25/0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sixth grade</strong></td>
<td>22/3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kindergarten teacher</strong></td>
<td>11/1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third grade teacher</strong></td>
<td>14/1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>