To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Shirley Carol Raines entitled "Listening-Thinking Tasks in Selected Language Arts Materials." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Curriculum and Instruction.

Robert S. Thurman
Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Lester N. Knight

Charles A. Chance

John T. Lovell

Accepted for the Council:

L. Evans Peterson
Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

Thesis
79 b
.R335
cop.2

LISTENING-THINKING TASKS IN SELECTED LANGUAGE ARTS MATERIALS

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Shirley Carol Raines

June 1979

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Robert S. Thurman for his assistance and guidance in the completion of this study and throughout my graduate studies. Gratitude is also expressed to the members of my committee: Dr. Charles A. Chance, Dr. Lester N. Knight and Dr. John T. Lovell. It has been a valuable learning experience to be associated with these educators.

This work is dedicated to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. James Athel Raines, my husband, Dr. Robert J. Canday, and my son, Brian.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to answer the following two questions: (1) In what frequencies were the thinking processes of literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation found in the listening tasks as described in selected language arts teachers' guidebooks for kindergarten through grade two? (2) What kinds of directions did prospective teachers receive in selected elementary language arts methods courses in planning listening tasks for children in kindergarten through grade two which involve the thinking processes of literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation?

To answer the first question, teachers' guidebooks to commonly used textbooks or kits for kindergarten, first, and second grades were reviewed. Using three forms developed for the study, the twelve selected sources were reviewed for frequencies of tasks, for distribution of tasks in the various thinking categories, for order of emphasis in the categories, and for harmony of findings with introductory statements describing the materials. The results were reported in terms of findings and comparisons of each grade level and of series across grades one and two.

To answer question two, a questionnaire was sent to sixteen language arts instructors in ten state universities

in Tennessee. Eight methods textbooks identified on the questionnaire were reviewed using the same form for analyzing the elementary teachers' guidebooks. In addition, instructors' responses to other questionnaire items were used to determine the attention given to the teaching of listening, such as types of materials presented to students, the amount of class time devoted to the teaching of listening, requirements of students, and ratings of the amount of emphasis placed on the thinking processes of literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation.

There were two conclusions drawn from the study. One, teachers who follow guidebooks in designing listening-thinking tasks are asking children to think primarily at the lowest level thought process of literal comprehension; two prospective elementary teachers receive more instruction in language arts methods courses in planning listening-thinking tasks which call for literal comprehension than for inferent inferential comprehension, evaluation, or appreciation.

The following recommendations were made for educators' implementation: (1) Classroom teachers must provide more listening tasks which involve the thinking processes of inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation than offered in teachers' guidebooks; (2) Since methods books stress literal comprehension, elementary language arts instructors must provide prospective teachers with more

materials and presentations on the higher-level thinking processes. (3) Educators must assess their textbooks and make selections which stress the higher-level thought processes. The tool developed for use in this study can be a helpful one for assessing textbooks.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Significance of the Study	1
	The Purpose	5
	Statement of the purpose	5
	Questions considered	5
	Limitations of the study	6
	Definitions of Terms	6
	Methods of Research	8
	Selection of teachers' guidebooks	8
	Analysis of teachers' guides	9
	Selection of materials used in college classrooms	11
	Analysis of materials used in college classrooms	12
	Organization of the Study	13
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RESEARCH RELATED TO LISTENING-THINKING TASKS IN LANGUAGE ARTS	15
	Review of Literature	15
	Review of Research	17
	Instructional textbooks	17
	Teacher questioning strategies	17
	Lessons in listening	20
	Effects of listening lessons on reading achievement	22
	Summary	26
III.	ANALYSES OF TEACHERS' GUIDES FOR SELECTED LANGUAGE ARTS TEXTBOOKS	27
	Textbooks Selected	27
	Reliability Study	28
	Analyses of Language Arts Teachers' Guidebooks for Kindergarten Through Grade Two	31
	Kindergarten selection findings	32
	Comparison of kindergarten sources	34
	Grade one selection findings	36
	Comparison of grade one sources	41
	Grade two selection findings	44
	Comparison of grade two sources	50
	Comparison of series across grades	54

CHAPTER PAGE

Summary of Findings 57

IV. ANALYSES OF SELECTED ELEMENTS IN ELEMENTARY LANGUAGE ARTS METHODS COURSES 61

Analyses of Language Arts Methods Textbooks 62
Comparison of Elementary Language Arts Methods Textbooks 73
Analyses of textbooks, example tasks 73
Analyses of textbooks, teaching listening directions 77
Analyses of Selected Elements of Elementary Language Arts Methods Courses 79
Time and materials devoted to teaching of listening 80
Requirements of students 80
Instructors' emphasis on thinking processes 82
Summary 85

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . 87

Summary of Findings 87
Conclusions 95
Recommendations for Educators' Implementation 97
Recommendations for Related Research 98

BIBLIOGRAPHY 100

APPENDIXES 105

A. FORMS USED IN THE REVIEWS 106

B. SAMPLES OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND ACCOMPANYING CORRESPONDENCE 112

C. ADOPTED TEXTBOOK LISTS BY STATES 117

VITA 127

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Grade One Language Arts Textbooks Reviewed	29
II.	Grade Two Language Arts Textbooks Reviewed	30
III.	Frequencies and Percentages of Listening-Thinking Tasks; Kindergarten Sources	33
IV.	Frequencies and Percentages of Listening-Thinking Tasks; Grade One Sources	37
V.	Frequencies and Percentages of Listening-Thinking Tasks; Grade Two Sources	45
VI.	Frequencies and Percentages of Listening-Thinking Tasks by Series and by Grade Level	55
VII.	Rank Order of Listening-Thinking Categories by Series and by Grade Level	59
VIII.	Elementary Language Arts Methods Textbooks Reviewed	63
IX.	Frequencies and Percentages of Listening-Thinking Tasks in Elementary Language Arts Methods Textbooks	66
X.	Rank Order of Listening-Thinking Categories in Elementary Language Arts Methods Textbooks	76
XI.	Summary of Rank Order of Listening-Thinking Tasks for Eight Methods Textbooks	78
XII.	Frequencies of Use of Materials on Listening in Addition to Class Lecture	81
XIII.	Frequencies and Percentages of Types of Student Requirements	83
XIV.	Instructors' Ratings of the Amount of Emphasis Placed on Thinking Processes	84

TABLE PAGE

XV. Comparison of Rank Order of Listening-Thinking Tasks in Teachers' Guidebooks, Methods Textbooks, and Instructors' Presentations 96

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the trends in language arts is an increased concern for the development of listening skills. Methods textbooks, professional publications, research reports, and other writings reflect an interest in speech and listening.[1] One of the apparent reasons for this interest is that studies have revealed that elementary students spend a significant portion of their time in listening tasks.[2] It seemed appropriate, therefore, to examine specific provisions for teaching listening tasks and their associated thinking skills within the language arts curriculum materials.

I. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Since elementary school children are expected to spend one-half of each school day listening, listening is then a primary source of information.[3] Even after children are able

---

[1]Kenneth L. Brown, "Speech and Listening in Language Arts Textbooks: Part I," Elementary English, 44:336, April 1967.

[2]Miriam E. Wilt, "A Study of Teacher Awareness of Listening as a Factor in Elementary Education," Journal of Educational Research, 43:626-36, April 1950: Edmund Amidon and Anita Simon, "Teacher-Pupil Interaction," Review of Educational Research, 35:130-39, April 1965.

[3]Wilt, 1950, 626-36; Amidon and Simon, 1965, 130-39.

to read, listening remains the main source of information processing because children are able to comprehend material on a higher level through listening than through reading. For young children who are not yet reading, an even greater dependency on listening exists.

The growing importance of listening in the curriculum and its long range effects on thinking have been recognized by the National Council of Teachers of English. In the N.C.T.E. report from the 1956 Commission of the English Curriculum, it was noted:

> Today, children, adolescents, and adults rely more and more on the spoken word for information about their local, national, and world communities. Their economic concepts, political ideals, and ethical standards are influenced, if not largely determined, by their listening. Attitudes toward marriage and family relationships, principles of nutrition and habits of food selection and consumption, understanding of human motives, and notions of personal habits are increasingly left to the tutelage of radio and television.[4]

The concerns expressed in 1956 continue to be concerns today, as the general public and government bodies examine the influences of television, advertising, and mass media control of information.

Professional literature on current educational problems makes frequent reference to the need for helping students think beyond the comprehension level.

---

[4]Commission of the English Curriculum of the National Council of Teachers of English, The English Language Arts (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956), p. 328.

If a major goal of instruction is to develop students with the ability to think critically and incisively about ideas, it is important to provide listening tasks that require the higher-level mental processes. A taxonomy of these thinking processes was devised by Smith and Barrett who placed the processes in the hierarchy of literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation and appreciation. The taxonomy was to be used as a tool, not as a complete classification instrument. The categories were logically derived by Smith and Barrett based on the works of learning theorists, such as Bloom and Guilford.[5]

The need to think beyond the literal comprehension level is true in reading as well as in listening. The National Assessment of Educational Progress studies indicate that today's students are comprehending at the literal level, but lack the abilities to make inferences and applications from their readings.[6] These studies imply that students having difficulty inferring and applying what is read will likely have difficulty in listening tasks, as well.

In a study of speech and listening provisions in language arts textbooks, Kenneth Brown found that just .63

---

[5]Smith and Barrett, 1974, pp. 51-52.

[6]Diane Lapp and Robert J. Tierney, "Reading Scores of American Nine Year Olds: NAEP's Tests," The Reading Teacher, 30:757-60, April 1977.

percent of the lessons and .57 percent of the pages emphasized listening. Brown concluded that, although authors and educators agree there should be an emphasis on speech and listening, the actual emphasis in the books does not support this opinion. Even though language arts textbooks apparently give little direct attention to speech and listening, many of the activities suggested rely on listening skills, whether the task is listening for content analysis of a story or listening for aesthetic enjoyment.[7]

Some of the materials from which teachers may receive assistance in planning listening-thinking tasks, when children's textbooks do not emphasize these activities, are teachers' manuals or guidebooks accompanying the textbooks. According to Brown,

> The textbook represents the opinions and research of not just one author but a team of experts. It supplies a systematic and graded record of information and potential classroom experience. The presence or absence of materials in a book does not necessarily indicate that materials presence or absence in classroom practice, but the textbook is one of the most influential materials that is used on a nationwide basis.[8]

Other possible sources of teacher assistance for planning listening-thinking tasks are the college level elementary

---

[7]Brown, 1976, p. 336.

[8]Kenneth L. Brown, "Speech and Listening in Language Arts Textbooks: Part I," Elementary English, 44:336, April 1967.

language arts methods course, the textbook selected for use in that course, and the instructor's presentations.

II. THE PURPOSE

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the directions kindergarten, first grade, and second grade teachers receive from selected language arts materials in preparing listening tasks requiring various thinking skills by children in kindergarten through grade two.

Questions Considered

The following questions were components of the larger purpose of the study.

I. In what frequencies were the thinking processes, listed below, found in the listening tasks as described in selected elementary language arts teachers' guidebooks for kindergarten through grade two?

A. Literal comprehension

B. Inferential comprehension

C. Evaluation

D. Appreciation

II. What kinds of directions did prospective teachers receive in selected elementary language arts methods courses for planning listening tasks for children in kindergarten

through grade two which involve the thinking processes of literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation?

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to (1) grade level materials for kindergarten, first, and second grades; (2) listening tasks as described in selected teachers' guides or manuals to language arts kits and textbooks for grade levels of kindergarten, first, and second grades; and (3) college level language arts methods classes for prospective teachers in elementary education programs.

III. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

The definitions of appreciation, evaluation, inferential comprehension, and literal comprehension were adapted from the work of Smith and Barrett.[9]

Appreciation. Appreciation is the psychological and aesthetic impact of the presentation on the listener. Appreciation calls for the student to be emotionally and aesthetically sensitive to the work. Examples of tasks that involve appreciation are: (1) emotional responses to the

---

[9]Richard J. Smith and Thomas C. Barrett, Teaching Reading in the Middle Grades (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1974), pp. 51-59.

content; (2) identification with characters and incidents; and (3) imagery.[10]

Evaluation. Evaluation is the process of making judgments about the content of a presentation by comparing it with external criteria, such as information provided by the teacher on the subject. Examples of evaluation tasks in listening are: (1) judgments of reality and fantasy; (2) judgments of fact or opinion; (3) judgments of adequacy or validity; (4) judgments of appropriateness; and (5) judgments of worth, desirability or acceptability.[11]

Inferential Comprehension. Inferential comprehension is the process of synthesizing the literal content, personal knowledge, intuition, and imagination as a basis for making conjectures or hypotheses. Examples of inferential tasks related to listening are: (1) inferring supporting details; (2) inferring main ideas; (3) inferring sequence; (4) inferring comparisons; (5) inferring cause and effect relationships; (6) inferring character traits; and (7) predicting outcomes.[12]

---

[10]Smith and Barrett, 1974, pp. 56-57.

[11]Smith and Barrett, 1974, pp. 55-56.

[12]Smith and Barrett, 1974, pp. 54-56.

Listening. Listening is defined as the process by which spoken language is converted to meaning in the mind.[13]

Literal Comprehension. Literal comprehension is the recognition or recall of ideas, information, and happenings that are explicitly stated. Examples of literal comprehension tasks are: (1) recall of details; (2) recall of main ideas; (3) recall of sequence; (4) recall of comparison; (5) recall of cause and effect relationships; and (6) recall of character traits.[14]

IV. METHODS OF RESEARCH

Selection of Teachers' Guidebooks

Teachers' guidebooks which accompanied commonly used textbooks in kindergarten, grade one, and grade two were the main sources of listening tasks reviewed. Common usage for materials in grades one and two was determined by the frequency with which a kit or textbook appeared on each of the following southeastern states' adoption lists: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. These states comprise the membership of the Southern

---

[13]Sara W. Lundsteen, Listening-Its Impact on Reading and the Other Language Arts (Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1971), p. 9.

[14]Smith and Barrett, 1974, pp. 53-54.

Association of Colleges and Schools. The five most frequently adopted selections for first grade and the five most frequently adopted for second grade were selected for the study. Since there were no materials adoptions specifically for kindergarten, the Peabody Language Development Kit and Alpha Time Kit were selected for review based on their wide use.

Analysis of Teachers' Guides

Three forms were developed to analyze the teachers' guides to determine the listening-thinking tasks contained in each. These forms were: the "Examination of Listening-Thinking Tasks" form, the "Source Master Sheet," and the "Grade-Level Compilation Sheet." Samples are provided in Appendix A.

The "Examination of Listening-Thinking Tasks" form was used to categorize the listening-thinking tasks. The form was tested in a pilot study and revised as necessary. It was used in the following manner. The investigator read each page of the selected language arts teachers' guide. When the teachers' guide indicated the student was expected to listen, the investigator analyzed the listening task and responded to information requested on the form. The textbook was used as a reference if the direction in the teachers' guide was unclear.

The form was divided into four sections. Section I called for source information, such as title of the language arts materials, publisher, date of publication, and grade level. Section II contained the directions for use of the form. Section III was information to further identify the task being analyzed, as page numbers, lesson numbers, titles, or abbreviations. Section IV was the actual categorization section to determine which thinking process was required in the listening task.

The "Source Master Sheet" was used to tabulate the scores for each category of listening-thinking tasks for each textbook or kit. The scores from each "Examination of Listening-Thinking Tasks" form pertaining to a single textbook or kit were entered on the "Source Master Sheet." After the compilation was made for each kit or textbook, the "Source Master Sheet" totals for each listening-thinking category were transferred to the third form, "Grade-Level Compilation Sheet." The purpose of the "Grade-Level Compilation Sheet" was: (1) to tabulate the frequency of occurrence of listening-thinking tasks for all the materials for each grade level; (2) to tabulate the frequencies across all materials for all three grade levels; and (3) to tabulate the frequencies to compare materials in a series. The frequencies were stated in raw scores and in percentages. To ascertain if the findings in each listening-thinking

category were in harmony with the goals, objectives, or the descriptions of the materials found in the introduction to the teachers' guides, the findings and goals were compared.

To determine whether or not the results of the investigation were reliable, two elementary education graduate students who had been elementary teachers reviewed ten percent of the materials from each source. The researcher instructed the two examiners in the use of the "Examination of Listening-Thinking Tasks" form, and the examiners demonstrated that they understood the instructions by reviewing sample tasks provided by the researcher. A systematic sample was drawn by reviewing every tenth page of the language arts materials. An average of 70.00 percent agreement with the two examiners' findings and the investigator's findings was deemed necessary to consider the study reliable. The average rate of agreement was 78.14 percent across all sources.

Selection of Materials Used in College Classrooms

To determine the kinds of directions prospective teachers receive in elementary language arts methods courses in planning listening-thinking tasks, a questionnaire was sent to language arts instructors at state universities in Tennessee. The universities included in the study were: Austin Peay State University, Clarksville; East Tennessee

State University, Johnson City; Memphis State University; Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro; Tennessee State University, Nashville; Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville; The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga; The University of Tennessee, Knoxville; The University of Tennessee at Martin; and The University of Tennessee at Nashville.

The investigator developed a questionnaire which was sent to sixteen instructors at the institutions listed above. The questionnaire, provided in Appendix B, requested the title, author, publisher, and date of publication for the textbook(s) the instructors selected for their elementary language arts methods courses. Instructors were also asked to indicate the types of materials on listening presented to students, the amount of time devoted to listening, their requirements of students, and an analysis of the amount of emphasis placed on the thinking processes of literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation. The information from the questionnaire was tabulated and converted to percentages of responses to each item.

Analysis of Materials Used in College Classrooms

The listening sections of each elementary language arts methods textbook reported on the questionnaire were reviewed by the investigator. Each textbook was reviewed for listening

tasks using the same forms and directions for reviewing the elementary teachers' guidebooks. These were: the "Examination of Listening-Thinking Tasks" form, the "Source Master Sheet" and the "Grade-Level Compilation Sheet." Sample forms are provided in Appendix A.

A reliability study was completed to compare the findings of the two college textbook examiners and the findings of the investigator. The researcher instructed two examiners, graduate students who had been elementary teachers, in the use of the "Examination of Listening-Thinking Tasks form. The examiners demonstrated they understood the instructions by reviewing sample pages from the college textbooks. The examiners reviewed a systematic sample of every tenth page that had been reviewed by the investigator. The average agreement rate between the college textbook examiners' findings and the investigator's findings was 79.56 percent across all sources.

V. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I contains an introduction to the study, a statement of the purpose, questions considered, the significance of the study, limitations of the study, definitions of terms, methods of research, and organization of the study.

Chapter II is a review of literature pertinent to the study.

Chapter III presents the results of the reliability study and findings of the investigations of listening tasks as described in selected teachers' guidebooks in kindergarten, first, and second grade language arts.

Chapter IV presents the results of the reliability study and the findings of the investigation of the selected language arts courses in teacher preparation in elementary education.

Chapter V contains a brief summary of the study, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future related research based on the findings of the investigation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RESEARCH RELATED TO LISTENING-THINKING TASKS IN LANGUAGE ARTS

This chapter is a review of related literature and research from 1966 through 1978, which provides a basis for the present study. Related literature on listening-thinking tasks includes the opinions of three recognized authorities: Devine, Lundsteen, and Wilt. Research findings on listening-thinking are divided into four categories: (1) instructional textbooks; (2) teacher questioning strategies; (3) lessons in listening; and (4) effect of listening lessons on reading achievements.

I. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In the January 1978, Journal of Reading, Thomas G. Devine of Boston University summarized the last fifty years of research and theorizing about listening. One section of that writing focused on how listening relates to thinking. In a discussion of the higher-level mental processes of listening, Devine noted that beyond the basic instruction in paying attention, the teaching of listening is actually training in thinking. The author concluded there are probably a variety of identifiable mental constructs involved in listening, especially listening of a higher order, such as

critical listening. Devine also indicated the need for further investigation in the area of listening-thinking.[1]

Listening-thinking was discussed in the National Council of Teachers of English publication, Listening-Its Impact on Reading and the Other Language Arts, by Lundsteen. She examined listening skills by comparing them with thinking skills and derived a hierarchy of listening skills. The hierarchy was based on what the child needs to be able to do to listen effectively. The listening-thinking relationship permeated the Lundsteen hierarchy from the prerequisite skill of sustained listening through the subsequent hierarchical steps of identifying content, applying criteria, and judging opinion from fact, to the last step of appreciative listening.[2]

Miriam E. Wilt focused on the nature of listening-thinking instruction in "Listening, What's New?" She proposed more attention be given to clear thinking in increased numbers of oral-aural activities. She concurred with authorities who, she said, generally recommended integrating of listening

---

[1]Thomas G. Devine, "Listening: What Do We Know After Fifty Years of Research and Theorizing?" Journal of Reading, 21:302-03, January 1978.

[2]Sara W. Lundsteen, Listening-Its Impact on Reading and the Other Language Arts (Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1971), pp. 34-63.

instructions with other language arts, but focusing on clear thinking in more oral-aural activities.[3]

II. REVIEW OF RESEARCH

Instructional Textbooks

To determine the instructional considerations given to listening, Kenneth L. Brown examined the provisions made in elementary language arts textbooks. Brown found that listening is not emphasized as a distinct area for direct instruction, nor are lessons in improvement in listening frequently related to speaking lessons. In the examination of fifty-four textbooks, he found that the extent to which listening was stressed, apart from other language arts study, was just over one-half of 1 percent of the lessons and of the pages. Brown also noted that many lessons contained oral exercises, but did not often seek to improve the child's skill in listening.[4]

Teacher Questioning Strategies

Instructional considerations of teacher questioning strategies in reading groups in the elementary classroom

---

[3]Miriam E. Wilt, "Listening, What's New?" in Language and the Language Arts, eds. Johanna S. Destefano and Sharon E. Fox (Boston: Little, Brown, 1974), pp. 79-85.

[4]Kenneth L. Brown, "Speech and Listening in Language Arts Textbooks, Part I, Part II," Elementary English, 44: 336-41 and 44:461-65, April and May, 1967.

have implications for the area of listening-thinking. Frank J. Guszak investigated reading lessons conducted by 106 second, fourth, and sixth grade teachers by analyzing teachers' questions in a reading circle time. The study was designed to determine the kinds of thinking questions teachers ask about reading assignments and how frequently the teachers' questions are met with congruent or correct study responses. The study also determined if teachers employ certain questioning strategies as they question about reading assignments. Analysis of the data revealed that nearly seventy of every one hundred questions asked by teachers were of a literal comprehension type. Guszak determined that much of the recall questioning was of a trivial nature and seemed to lead the student away from the basic literal understandings of the materials. He also noted a pattern of students being asked to make value judgments, but not being asked to give the supported thinking behind their judgments.[5]

Some studies indicate a need for refinement of teaching strategies in listening. Researchers Biskin, Hoskisson, and Modlin studied inferential thinking in the teaching-questioning strategies of prediction and reflection for listening comprehension and retention. Children selected for participation were a year or more below grade level in

---

[5]Frank J. Guszak, "Teacher Questioning and Reading," The Reading Teacher, 21:227-34, December 1967.

reading. Fifteen first graders and fifteen third graders were randomly assigned to two experimental groups and one control group. Each group had five subjects from the same level.

The groups were read two stories. The control group was simply read the stories. One experimental group was read the stories and used the teaching-questioning strategy of prediction. This involved the questioner interrupting the stories and asking the children to make predictions. After a few paragraphs, the children were asked to verify their predictions or modify them. The other experimental group used the strategy of reflections which involved a questioner asking a basic question of an interpretative type after the story was read. This interpretative question was followed with at least eight probing questions that supported the first one. The purpose was to cause the students to reflect on the main theme of the story.

Two weeks later, students from each group were asked to retell the stories. The children's retellings were taped and analyzed with the Goodman-Burke Reading Miscue Inventory. The experimental group in which the reflection technique was used produced greater recall than either of the other two

groups and the predictive strategy group had greater recall than the control group.[6]

Lessons in Listening

Studies on the effect of listening lessons have been conducted by Olsen, Kranzik, Blackburn, and Lundsteen. The Olsen, Kranzik, and Blackburn studies were populated by preschool children, first grade, and first through third grade students, respectively, while Lundsteen studied fifth and sixth grade students.

Marilou Rogers Olsen constructed and evaluated an instructional program of listening skills for preschool children. Using a behavior analysis approach of videotaped pre- and posttest sessions, Olsen found the preschoolers who had the program of listening instruction increased significantly at the 0.05 level in abilities to identify main ideas, recall details, recognize sequence, discriminate phonic elements, and respond appreciatively.[7]

Margery Kranzik constructed and evaluated a program of listening skills for first graders. The one semester study

---

[6]Donald S. Biskin, Kenneth Hoskisson and Marjory Modlin, "Prediction, Reflection and Comprehension," Elementary School Journal, 77:131-39, November 1976.

[7]Marilou Rogers Olsen, "A Program of Instructional Activities for the Development of Listening Skills in Pre-School Children" (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Utah, 1973).

was conducted with 155 students who had not yet developed reading skills. The treatment skills were: following directions; listening to obtain the main idea; and listening for details. Three groups were compared: one teacher-taught; one tape-taught; and one control group which had regular classroom instruction. Pre- and posttest scores on the Durrell Listening-Reading Series Test revealed that at the 0.05 level the experimental groups scored significantly better in the treatment listening skills than the control group. There were no significant differences in posttest means between the teacher-taught and the tape-taught groups.[8]

Susan Flemming Blackburn constructed, implemented, and evaluated a Title I listening program for primary grades in Albuquerque, New Mexico. She found an increase in listening abilities for grades one through three when a structured listening program was instituted for the 220 students. She evaluated the program by comparing the results of pre- and posttest scores on the Educational Testing Service's Comparative Primary Tests: Listening and a teacher's rating scale. Scores on the posttest indicated a statistically significant gain at the 0.05 level in listening abilities. Blackburn

---

[8]Margery A. Kranzik, "The Construction and Evaluation of Two Methods of Listening Skills Instruction and Their Effects on Listening Comprehension of Children in Grade One" (unpublished EdD dissertation, Ohio State University, 1972).

noted a high positive correlation existed between the test results and the teacher's rating scale.[9]

Fifth and sixth grade students were asked to make value judgments through listening in a study on critical listening conducted by Sara W. Lundsteen. An experimental group was taught a series of listening lessons designed to foster value judgments, such as detection of a speaker's purpose, analysis and judgment of propaganda, and analysis and judgment of arguments. Test results indicated that the experimental group made significantly greater gains at the 0.05 level than did the control group, which had regular English instruction.[10]

Effects of Listening Lessons on Reading Achievement

In the following four studies, elementary students' progress in listening was examined in the context of reading achievement. Listening programs and their associated reading-thinking achievements were examined by Ballenger, Taylor, Lewis, and Johnson.

Marcus Ballenger studied the effects of a planned daily program of listening on the development of reading skills of

---

[9]Susan Flemming Blackburn, "The Construction, the Implementation, and the Evaluation of a Title I Primary Class Listening Program" (unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Mississippi, 1976).

[10]Sara W. Lundsteen, "Critical Listening: An Experiment," Elementary School Journal, 66:311-15, March 1966.

first grade pupils of Negro-American, Mexican-American, and Anglo-American backgrounds. He compared the test scores of 117 experimental students in six experimental classrooms with test scores of six control groups of equal number. Both an experimental and a control classroom were located in each of six schools. Two schools were populated primarily by Negro-American students; two were primarily Mexican-American, and two were primarily Anglo-American. The test administered was the Science Research Associates Reading Achievement Tests. The study revealed that there was a statistically significant gain in the listening comprehension subtest at the 0.01 level in the scores for the Negro-American and the Mexican American students, but not for the Anglo-American students.[11]

In a study using elementary school children, Hazel Taylor found 147 third grade students profited from a regularly scheduled listening program. Statistically significant gains at the 0.05 level were found in reading comprehension, vocabulary, and total reading as measured by the Science Research Associates Achievements Test, Form C, and the Cooperative Primary Test, Listening, Form 12A. Analysis of data from pre- and posttests revealed the middle and lower

---

[11]Marcus Taylor Ballenger, "The Effects of a Planned Daily Program of Listening on the Development of Reading Achievement of First Grade Pupils," Dissertation Abstracts, 31 (1971), 3160A (Texas Tech University).

achievement groups seemed to benefit more from the planned listening lessons than the higher achievement groups.[12]

Another study which examined the effects of listening on reading comprehension was conducted by Susan Edwina Bivins Lewis. After receiving lessons in a planned listening program, sixty black, inner city children from grades one, two, and three scored higher than a control group of similar composition in listening comprehension, reading comprehension, and reading achievement. Instruments used to measure progress were the Durrell Listening-Reading Test and the MacGinite Achievement Test.[13]

A study which compares other variables was conducted by Gwen Parrott Johnson. The purpose of the investigation was to determine if, at the second and third grade levels, there was: (1) a statistically significant difference between the critical reading-listening abilities; (2) a statistically significant difference in the reading-listening abilities between boys and girls within grades; and (3) a significant statistical relationship between listening ability and reading achievement. The level of significance for the study

---

[12]Hazel Scott Taylor, "Analysis of the Effects of a Selected Program of Listening on Reading Increments of Third Grade Students," Dissertation Abstracts, 33 (1973), 4016-7A (Texas Tech University).

[13]Susan Edwina Bivins Lewis, "Listening Effects on Reading Comprehension of Black Inner City Children at Levels One, Two, and Three," Dissertation Abstracts, 37 (1976), 1962-3A (Saint Louis University).

was 0.05. Johnson found a significant difference in the mean scores between second and third graders, with third graders scoring higher. No statistically significant difference was noted between boys' and girls' critical reading-listening ability. There was a positive correlation of 0.56 between listening ability and reading achievement. She recommended teacher training and materials development to focus on critical reading-listening processes.[14]

Albert Lawrence Cavicchi of New York University developed instructional materials for listening based on eighty-nine concerns expressed by seventy-five elementary school teachers. One of the concerns most often noted was listening comprehension. Cavicchi's listening materials included a teacher's guide which focused on the interrelatedness of listening experiences with other curriculum areas. He also advocated the development of more materials in the listening field.[15]

---

[14]Gwen Parrott Johnson, "An Investigation of Growth in Critical Reading-Listening Ability in Grades Two and Three," Dissertation Abstracts, 35 (1975), 5579-80A (The Florida State University).

[15]Albert Lawrence Cavicchi, "Part I: The Development of a Guide for the Teaching of Listening Based upon Inner-City Elementary School Teachers' Concerns and Questions. Part II; A Guide for the Teaching of Listening in the Elementary School," Dissertation Abstracts, 34 (1974), 7619-20A (New York University).

III. SUMMARY

In the review of related literature, Devine, Lundsteen, and Wilt agree on the importance of listening instruction in the language arts program. They further emphasize the close association of listening and thinking.

A review of listening-thinking research findings reveals that (1) instructional elementary language arts textbooks generally do not emphasize listening lessons, (2) teacher questioning strategies tend to reflect literal comprehension, not inferential comprehension, (3) lessons in listening usually produce more effective listeners, and (4) listening lessons can have a positive effect on reading achievement.

The review of literature and research suggests that children are capable of higher-level mental processes when appropriate teaching strategies and materials are employed. The literature and research also suggests that more emphasis needs to be placed on listening-thinking materials and teaching strategies.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSES OF TEACHERS' GUIDES FOR SELECTED LANGUAGE ARTS TEXTBOOKS

The findings and discussion of data presented in this chapter relate to the following question: "In what frequencies were the thinking processes of literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation found in the listening tasks as described in elementary language arts teachers' guidebooks for kindergarten through grade two?" Included in this chapter are the textbook selections, the results of the reliability study completed on these selections, and the answers to the question stated above.

I. TEXTBOOKS SELECTED

Teachers' guidebooks for the twelve most commonly used elementary language arts textbooks were the sources of listening tasks. The textbooks were used as references when the directions in the guidebooks needed clarifying. Common usage for materials in grades one and two was determined by the frequencies with which a kit or textbook appeared in the adoption list of each of the following southeastern states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and

Virginia. These states comprise the membership of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The five most frequently adopted selections for first grade and the five most frequently adopted selections for second grade were selected for the study. Since there were no materials adoptions for kindergarten, the Peabody Language Development Kit and Alpha Time Kit were selected for review based on their wide use. In Appendix C, each of the eleven states' adoption lists are presented. The first grade selections reviewed are presented below in Table I, and the second grade selections reviewed are presented below in Table II.

II. RELIABILITY STUDY

To determine whether or not the results of the investigation were reliable, two elementary education graduate students who had been elementary teachers conducted a reliability study. The researcher briefed the two examiners in the procedures of the study. The examiners then read every tenth page from each teachers' guide. When the teachers' guide indicated the children were expected to listen, the examiners analyzed the task and responded to information requested on the "Examination of Listening-Thinking Tasks" form. A sample form is provided in Appendix A. For the findings to be considered reliable, the agreement rate between the investigator and the examiners had to be 70.00 percent or higher.

TABLE I

GRADE ONE LANGUAGE ARTS TEXTBOOKS REVIEWED

Titles	Publisher and Date Published	No. of Adoptions
Patterns of Language	American Book Company, 1974	6
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1974	6
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc., 1975	6
Composing Language: Steps	Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974	5
Secret Hand	Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974	4

TABLE II

GRADE TWO LANGUAGE ARTS TEXTBOOKS REVIEWED

Titles	Publisher and Date Published	No. of Adoptions
Patterns of Language	American Book Company, 1974	6
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1973	6
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc., 1975	6
The Macmillan English Series: Text-Workbook	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1974	4
Tiger Tree	Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974	4

The examiners reviewed 194 pages and had a 78.11 mean percentage agreement rate with the investigator. The mean of the percentages of agreement between examiner I and the investigator was 74.52 percent and the mean of the percentages of agreement between examiner II and the investigator was 81.76 percent. Since the percentage of agreement exceeded the 70.00 percent deemed necessary for the purposes of the study, the results were considered reliable.

III. ANALYSES OF LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHERS' GUIDEBOOKS FOR KINDERGARTEN THROUGH GRADE TWO

Twelve elementary language arts teachers' guidebooks for kindergarten through grade two were reviewed to determine how frequently selected listening-thinking tasks occurred. The tasks were categorized according to the thinking level, literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation, or appreciation. The reviews are reported in terms of: (1) findings for kindergarten selections; (2) comparison of kindergarten sources; (3) findings for grade one selections; (4) comparison of grade one sources; (5) findings for grade two selections; (6) comparison of grade two sources; (7) comparison of series across grades; and (8) a summary of findings.

Kindergarten Selection Findings

The frequencies and percentages of listening-thinking tasks from two kindergarten sources, the Peabody Language Development Kit and Alpha Time Kit, are presented below in Table III.

The review of the Peabody Language Development Kit revealed the greatest number of listening-thinking tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, appreciation, and evaluation. Of the 1,065 tasks, more than four-fifths (82.54 percent) were literal comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided among inferential comprehension with 10.14 percent, appreciation 4.32 percent, and evaluation 3.00 percent. This emphasis on literal comprehension was in harmony with statements in the introduction to the Peabody Language Development Kit which described the exercises and activities. The amount of emphasis on inferential comprehension and on evaluation was not great and this was in keeping with the introductory description to the activities. Appreciation was not mentioned in the introduction as one of the objectives and little attention was given to it in the tasks.[1]

---

[1]Lloyd M. Dunn, Kathryn B. Horton, and James O. Smith, Peabody Language Development Kit Manual (Circle Pines, Minnesota: American Guidance Service, 1968), pp. viii-xi.

TABLE III

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF LISTENING-THINKING TASKS; KINDERGARTEN SOURCES

Title of Selection	Categories								Total Number Tasks
	Literal Comprehension		Inferential Comprehension		Evaluation		Appreciation		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
Peabody Language Development Kit	879	82.54	108	10.14	32	3.00	46	4.32	1,065
Alpha Time Kit	1,381	60.23	710	30.96	22	0.96	180	7.85	2,293

An analysis of the distribution of tasks in the Alpha Time Kit revealed the greatest number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, appreciation and evaluation. Of the 2,293 total tasks, three-fifths (or 60.23 percent) were literal comprehension and nearly one-third (or 30.96 percent) were inferential comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided between appreciation with 7.85 percent and evaluation with 0.96 percent. This emphasis was in harmony with statements in the introduction to the Alpha Time Kit in which five components of the program were described. Four of the components were literal comprehension, and the remaining one was inferential comprehension. Evaluation and appreciation were not directly mentioned in the introduction to the Alpha Time Kit, although in the study more than 8.00 percent of the tasks were categorized as evaluation and appreciation.[2]

Comparison of Kindergarten Sources

The two kindergarten sources were compared in terms of the total number of listening-thinking tasks, the distribution of tasks, and the order or emphasis in the various categories. Alpha Time had approximately twice as many listening-thinking

---

[2]Elayne Reiss and Rita Friedman, Alpha Time Kit Professional Guide (Plainview, New York: New Dimensions in Education, 1972), p. ii.

tasks as the Peabody Language Development Kit. The order of emphasis for both kits was literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, appreciation, and evaluation. An analysis showed that the Alpha Time Kit had more than one and one-half times as many tasks in the literal comprehension category as the Peabody Language Development Kit. Approximately seven times as many tasks were categorized as requiring inferential comprehension in the Alpha Time materials as in the Peabody Language Development materials. In the evaluation category, the Peabody Language Development Kit contained one and one-half times more tasks than the Alpha Time Kit; however, this represented only a small amount of the total number of tasks. In the appreciation category, the Alpha Time Kit contained approximately four times as many tasks as the Peabody Language Development Kit.

In comparing the percentage of tasks in each listening-thinking category from the two sources, the analysis revealed more than four-fifths (82.54 percent) of the Peabody Language Development tasks and slightly more than three-fifths (60.23 percent) of the Alpha Time Kit tasks were literal comprehension. Somewhat more than one-tenth (10.14 percent) of the Peabody Language Development Kit tasks and nearly one-third (30.96 percent) of the Alpha Time Kit were inferential comprehension. Appreciation listening-thinking tasks occurred

in 4.32 percent of the Peabody Language Development Kit tasks and in 7.85 percent of the Alpha Time Kit tasks. Evaluation was the least frequently occurring category for both sources in nearly 1 percent of the Alpha Time Kit tasks and 3 percent of the Peabody Language Development Kit tasks.

Grade One Selection Findings

The first grade selections reviewed were: (1) Patterns of Language; (2) Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write; (3) Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking; (4) Composing Language: Steps; and (5) Secret Hand. The frequencies and percentages of tasks for the grade one sources are presented below in Table IV.

Patterns of Language contained 642 tasks. The greatest number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, appreciation, and evaluation. Of the 642 tasks, approximately seven-eighths (87.07 percent) were literal comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided among inferential comprehension with 7.48 percent, appreciation 2.80 percent, and evaluation 2.65 percent. This emphasis on literal comprehension was in harmony with the nine strands introduced in the scope and sequence chart for the first grade Patterns of Language. Inferential comprehension and appreciation were mentioned in the nine strands, but not stressed. Evaluation was not discussed in the

TABLE IV

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF LISTENING-THINKING TASKS; GRADE ONE SOURCES

Title of Selection	Categories: Literal Comprehension f	Literal Comprehension %	Inferential Comprehension f	Inferential Comprehension %	Evaluation f	Evaluation %	Appreciation f	Appreciation %	Total Number Tasks
Patterns of Language	559	87.07	48	7.48	17	2.65	18	2.80	642
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write	332	89.49	22	5.93	4	1.08	13	3.50	371
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking	172	53.58	85	26.48	25	7.79	39	12.15	321
Composing Language: Steps	45	60.81	13	17.57	5	6.76	11	14.86	74
Secret Hand	121	51.49	64	27.23	15	6.38	35	14.90	235

introductory section and fewer than 3.00 percent of the tasks were categorized as evaluation.[3]

There were 371 listening-thinking tasks in Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write. The greatest number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, appreciation, and evaluation. Of the 371 tasks, approximately seven-eighths (89.49 percent) were literal comprehension. The remaining were divided among inferential comprehension with 5.93 percent, appreciation 3.50 percent, and evaluation 1.08 percent. This emphasis on literal comprehension was in harmony with the objectives listed in the introduction to the teachers' edition of Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, since each objective stated was a literal comprehension objective. There was reference to inferential comprehension in the description of preparation for independent writing, in which some listening was indicated. No reference was made to evaluation or to appreciation in any objective which related to the area of listening.[4]

Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking contained 321 listening-thinking tasks. The greatest

---

[3]H. Thompson Fillmer and others, Patterns of Language, Level One (New York: American Book, 1974), pp. TG 3-5, 7.

[4]Mildred A. Dawson and others, Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, Level One (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973), p. i.

number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, appreciation, and evaluation. The majority of the 321 tasks were literal comprehension (53.58 percent). More than one-fourth (26.48 percent) were inferential comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided between appreciation with 12.15 percent and evaluation with 7.79 percent. This emphasis on literal comprehension was in harmony with the description of the program in the introduction to the teachers' guide.

The inferential comprehension emphasis was in harmony with the references describing the questioning format and the formulating and testing hypothesis format. Although evaluation and appreciation were not directly mentioned in the introduction, evaluation occurred in 7.79 percent of the tasks and appreciation in 12.15 percent.[5]

Composing Language: Steps contained 74 listening-thinking tasks. The greatest number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, appreciation, and evaluation. Of the 74 tasks, three-fifths (60.81 percent) were literal comprehension and approximately one-sixth (17.57 percent) were inferential comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided between appreciation with 14.86 percent and evaluation with 6.76 percent. This emphasis

---

[5]John S. Hand and others, Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking (River Forest, Illinois: Laidlaw Brothers, 1975), pp. T3-4.

on literal comprehension was in harmony with the description of the eight strands found in the introduction to Composing Language: Steps. Two descriptions of the strands included references to types of inferential comprehension, generalizing and predicting outcomes. One strand was called appreciation and related mostly to literature. Although evaluation was not mentioned in the descriptions, more than 6.00 percent were categorized in this area.[6]

There were 235 listening-thinking tasks in Secret Hand. The greatest number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, appreciation, and evaluation. The majority of the 235 tasks were literal comprehension (51.49 percent). More than one-fourth (27.23 percent) were inferential comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided between appreciation with 14.90 percent and evaluation with 6.38 percent. This emphasis on literal comprehension was in harmony with the listening and thinking skills and with the appropriate behaviors listed in the introduction section. On the other hand, the introduction placed greater emphasis on inferential comprehension than was found in the tasks. More than one-half of the subskills listed in the introductory materials were inferential while only slightly more than one-fourth of the tasks fell into

---

[6]Cecelia Pollack and Diane L. Glassner, Composing Language: Steps (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1974), pp. viii-xi.

this category. Even though appreciation was listed in the description of listening, understanding of literature and creative dramatics subskills, 14.90 percent of the tasks were categorized as appreciation. Although no references were made to evaluation in the subskills and appropriate behaviors list, more than 6.00 percent of the tasks were in this category.[7]

Comparison of Grade One Sources

The five sources were compared in terms of the total number of listening-thinking tasks, the distribution of tasks, and the order of emphasis in the various categories. The frequencies and percentages of listening-thinking tasks in the grade one sources are provided in Table IV (page 37).

The numbers of tasks ranged from 74 in Composing Language: Steps to 642 in Patterns of Language. The order of emphasis was the same in each of the first grade language arts teachers' guides—literal comprehension, followed by inferential comprehension, appreciation, and evaluation. In all five of the sources, literal comprehension was the most frequently scored listening-thinking category; however, the amount of emphasis varied from about one-half to approximately seven-eighths. In Patterns of Language and Language for

---

[7] Cornelia M. Nachbar and others, Secret Hand (New York: Webster Division, McGraw-Hill, 1974), pp. T-6—T-12.

Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, approximately seven-eighths (87.07 percent and 89.49 percent, respectively) of the tasks were literal comprehension and in Composing Language: Steps approximately three-fifths (60.81 percent) of the tasks were literal comprehension. In Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking and in Secret Hand, slightly more than one-half of the tasks (53.58 percent and 51.49 percent, respectively) were categorized as literal comprehension. This emphasis was in harmony with the introductory descriptions on the textbooks found in each of the teachers' guidebooks.

Inferential comprehension was the second most frequently occurring category of listening-thinking tasks in the grade one sources with scores ranging from approximately one-twelfth to one-fourth of the tasks. In Secret Hand and in Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading Talking, approximately one-fourth (27.23 percent and 26.48 percent, respectively) of the tasks fell into this category as did 17.57 percent or one-sixth of Composing Language: Steps. In Patterns of Language and Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, 7.48 percent and 5.93 percent, respectively, of the tasks were categorized as inferential comprehension. This emphasis was in harmony with the introductory descriptions found in four of the teachers' guidebooks. Secret Hand was an exception with more emphasis placed on inferential comprehension in the description than was found in the tasks.

The third most frequently occurring category of listening-thinking tasks in the grade one sources was the appreciation category with the distribution of scores ranging from 2.80 percent to 14.90 percent. More than 12.00 percent of the tasks were in this category in three sources, Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking; Composing Language: Steps; and Secret Hand. Approximately 3.00 percent were appreciation tasks in Patterns of Language; and in Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write. This amount of emphasis was in harmony with the introductory description of Composing Language: Steps. This emphasis was generally in harmony with descriptions of Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking in which no reference was made to appreciation and in Secret Hand, in which it was only implied.

Evaluation was the least frequently occurring category in each of the sources with the distribution of scores ranging from 1.08 percent in Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write to 7.79 percent in Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking. The other sources fell in between with Composing Language: Steps and Secret Hand with 6.76 percent and 6.38 percent, respectively, and Patterns of Language with 2.65 percent. This small amount of emphasis on evaluation was in harmony with the introductory descriptions since none of the guidebooks presented statements on evaluation.

In summary, the amount of emphasis placed on each of the listening-thinking categories in the grade one guidebooks was generally in harmony with the introductory statements describing the materials. Literal comprehension was the dominant category in the findings of this study, and the dominant category in the introductory descriptions of the lessons. Inferential comprehension received the second greatest amount of emphasis in the findings of this study, and was in harmony with four of the five guidebooks' introductory statements. Appreciation received the third greatest amount of emphasis in the findings of this study, which was in harmony with three of the five guidebooks' introductory statements describing lessons. Evaluation received the least amount of emphasis in the findings of this study, and none of the introductory statements in the guidebooks contained references to evaluation.

Grade Two Selection Findings

The second grade selections reviewed were: (1) Patterns of Language; (2) Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write; (3) Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing; (4) The Macmillan English Series: Text-Workbook; and (5) Tiger Tree. The frequencies and percentages of listening-thinking tasks for the grade two sources are presented below in Table V.

TABLE V

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF LISTENING-THINKING TASKS; GRADE TWO SOURCES

Title of Selection	Categories								Total Number Tasks
	Literal Comprehension		Comprehension		Evaluation		Appreciation		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
Patterns of Language	508	71.65	131	18.48	53	7.48	17	2.39	709
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write	425	77.98	76	13.95	29	4.77	18	3.30	545
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing	289	63.52	117	25.91	13	2.86	36	7.91	455
The Macmillan English Series: Text-Workbook	216	84.71	33	12.94	6	2.35	0	0.00	255
Tiger Tree	215	55.41	112	28.87	22	5.67	39	10.05	388

Patterns in Language contained 709 tasks. The greatest number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation. Of the 709 tasks, approximately seven-tenths (71.65 percent) were literal comprehension, and less than one-fifth (18.48 percent) of the tasks were inferential comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided between evaluation with 7.48 percent and appreciation with 2.39 percent. This emphasis on literal comprehension was in harmony with eight of the nine strands introduced in the scope and sequence chart for the second grade Patterns of Language. Although receiving little attention in the nine strands of the scope and sequence chart, in the study inferential comprehension tasks comprised 18.48 percent of the total tasks. Appreciation was mentioned, but not stressed in the introduction section, and this is in harmony with the findings in which only 2.39 percent of the tasks were categorized as appreciation. Evaluation was not mentioned in the introduction to the guidebooks, and 7.48 percent of the tasks were scored as requiring evaluative thinking.[8]

There were 545 listening-thinking tasks in Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write. The greatest number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential

---

[8]H. Thompson Fillmer and others, Patterns of Language, Grade Two (New York: American Book, 1974), pp. TG2-5.

comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation. Of the 545 tasks, approximately three-fourths (77.98 percent) were literal comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided among inferential comprehension with 13.95 percent, evaluation 4.77 percent, and appreciation with 3.30 percent. This emphasis on literal comprehension was in harmony with each objective listed in the introduction to the teachers' edition of Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write. There was reference to inferential comprehension in the description of independent writing, while in the study 13.95 percent of the tasks were inferential. No reference was made to evaluation or appreciation in any objective which related to the area of listening, and according to the study, little attention was given to either category in the tasks.[9]

Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing contained 455 listening-thinking tasks. The greatest number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, appreciation, and evaluation. The majority of the tasks were literal comprehension, about five-eighths or 63.52 percent. About one-fourth (25.91 percent) were inferential comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided between appreciation with 7.91 percent and evaluation with 2.86 percent. This emphasis on literal

---

[9]Mildred A. Dawson and others, Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, Level Two (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973), p. i.

comprehension and the attention given to inferential comprehension was in harmony with the description of the program in the introduction to Experiences in Language: Listening, Talking, Reading, Writing. Evaluation was not directly mentioned in the introduction to the guidebook, and this was in harmony with the findings of the study since less than 3.00 percent of the tasks were evaluation. Appreciation was also not mentioned in the introduction; however, approximately 8.00 percent of the tasks were categorized as requiring appreciation.[10]

There were 255 listening-thinking tasks in The Macmillan English Series: Text-Workbook. The greatest number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation. Of the 255 tasks, more than four-fifths (84.71 percent) were literal comprehension. Approximately one-eighth (12.94 percent) of the tasks were inferential comprehension. The remaining tasks were evaluation with 2.35 percent. No task was categorized as appreciation. This emphasis on literal comprehension was in harmony with the introductory description of teaching procedures found in the teachers' manual section of The Macmillan English Series: Text-Workbook. The attention to inferential comprehension was also in harmony with the

---

[10]John S. Hand and others, Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing (River Forest, Illinois: Laidlaw Brothers, 1975), pp. 2-4.

teachers' manual since references were made to generalizing and predicting, which are inferential comprehension processes. However, the lack of emphasis on appreciation was not in harmony with the introduction which devoted much attention to this category. There were no references to evaluation in the introduction, and there were few evaluation tasks found in the review.[11]

Tiger Tree contained 388 listening-thinking tasks. The greatest number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, appreciation, and evaluation. The majority of the 388 tasks were literal comprehension with more than one-half (55.41 percent). More than one-fourth (28.87 percent) were inferential comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided between appreciation with 10.05 percent and evaluation with 5.67 percent. This emphasis on literal comprehension was in harmony with the listening and thinking skills and with the appropriate behaviors listed in the introduction section of the Tiger Tree teachers' guidebook. The emphasis on inferential comprehension was not substantiated since more than one-half of the subskills listed in the introductory section were inferential, while only approximately one-fourth of the tasks

---

[11]Thomas Clark Pollock, Helen Gates Ellzey, and Arthur B. Gregor, The Macmillan English Series: Text-Workbook, Grade Two (New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1974), pp. 2-4.

were inferential comprehension. Appreciation occurred in one-tenth (10.05 percent) of the tasks of the study; yet there was no direct reference to appreciation in the introduction, although it seemed to be implied in the descriptions of listening, creative dramatics, and literature. There was no reference made to evaluation and little attention was given to evaluation in the tasks.[12]

Comparison of Grade Two Sources

The five sources were compared in terms of the total number of listening-thinking tasks, the distribution of tasks, and the order of emphasis in the various categories. The frequencies and percentages of listening-thinking tasks in the grade two sources are provided in Table V (page 44).

The most frequently occurring listening-thinking category in the five sources was literal comprehension, with all sources having at least one-half of the tasks in this category. In three of the sources, approximately three-fourths of the tasks were literal comprehension, The Macmillan English Series: Text-Workbook, Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write and Patterns of Language. In Tiger Tree and in Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing, approximately one-half of the tasks were literal comprehension. This emphasis was in harmony with the

[12]Cornelia M. Nachbar and others, Tiger Tree (New York: Webster Division, McGraw-Hill, 1974), pp. T4-6.

introductory descriptions of the textbooks found in each of the teachers' guidebooks.

Inferential comprehension was the second most frequently occurring category of listening-thinking tasks in the grade two sources with 12.94 to 28.87 percent. In Tiger Tree and in Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing, more than one-fourth of the tasks (28.87 percent and 25.91 percent, respectively) were in this category. In Patterns of Language, nearly one-fifth (18.48 percent) of the tasks were categorized as inferential comprehension; while in Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write and in The Macmillan English Series: Text-Workbook, more than one-eighth of the tasks were inferential. This emphasis was generally in harmony with the introductory descriptions of the textbooks found in four of the five teachers' guidebooks, except for Tiger Tree, in which there were fewer inferential comprehension tasks than the introduction suggested.

Evaluation was the third most frequently occurring category of listening-thinking tasks in three of the five second grade sources: Patterns of Language, Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, and The Macmillan English Series: Text-Workbook. It ranked fourth in Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing and in Tiger Tree. The percentage of evaluation tasks ranged from 2.35 percent to 7.48 percent. Patterns of Language contained more than 7.00 percent, and there was approximately 5.00

percent in Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write and in Tiger Tree. There was somewhat more than 2.00 percent in Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing, and in The Macmillan English Series: Text-Workbook. None of the introductory sections in the teachers' guidebooks presented statements on evaluation, and according to the study, little attention was given to evaluation tasks.

Appreciation was omitted or was the least frequently occurring category of listening-thinking tasks in three of the five second grade sources: in Patterns of Language; in Language for Daily Use: Let's talk and Write; and The Macmillan English Series: Text-Workbook. For the two sources, Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing and Tiger Tree, appreciation was the third most frequently occurring category. Appreciation percentages ranged from 0.00 to 10.05. Approximately one-tenth (10.05 percent) of the tasks in Tiger Tree and nearly 8.00 percent of the tasks in Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing were categorized as appreciation. In Language for Daily Use: Let's talk and Write and in Patterns of Language, appreciation tasks were 3.30 and 2.39, respectively. None of the tasks was categorized as appreciation in The Macmillan English Series: Text-Workbook, and this was not in harmony with the introductory statements since references were made to appreciation. The amount of emphasis on appreciation was generally in harmony with the introductory

descriptions in the teachers' guidebooks. Little emphasis was found in the tasks, and there was little attention in the introductions.

In summary, the comparison of the amount of emphasis placed on each of the listening-thinking categories in the grade two guidebooks revealed the findings were generally in harmony with the introductory statements describing the materials. Literal comprehension was the most frequently scored category in the study, and the introduction statements most frequently described literal comprehension. Inferential comprehension received the second greatest amount of emphasis in the findings of this study and was generally in harmony with four of the five language arts guidebooks. Evaluation received the third greatest amount of emphasis in three of the grade two sources. Appreciation received the third greatest amount of emphasis in the remaining two sources and did not occur in one source. None of the guidebooks presented introducing statements on evaluation, and the amount of emphasis on evaluation in the tasks was relatively small. The amount of emphasis on appreciation was also relatively small, and this emphasis was in harmony with the guidebooks' description of the contents since most did not include references to appreciation, although it was mentioned in two guides and implied in one.

Comparison of Series Across Grades

To determine whether there was continuity in the amount of emphasis, the listening-thinking tasks in the eight elementary language arts teachers' guidebooks which were part of a series for first and second grades were analyzed and compared according to the total number of listening-thinking tasks, the order of emphasis in the categories, and the distribution of tasks. The names of the series are presented below in Table VI. The series were: Patterns of Language for grades one and two; Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write for grades one and two; Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking for grade one and Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing for grade two; and Secret Hand for grade one and Tiger Tree for grade two.

In Patterns of Language grade two, there were approximately 10 percent more tasks than in grade one. Although the order of emphasis in the listening-thinking categories was the same for both grades, the degree of emphasis differed. In the grade one teachers' guidebook, approximately 87.00 percent of the tasks were literal comprehension as compared to approximately 72.00 percent in grade two. Conversely, at the grade two level, more than 18.00 percent of the tasks were inferential comprehension compared to approximately 7.00 percent in the grade one materials. In the evaluation category, the grade two teachers' guide had approximately three times the percentage

TABLE VI

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF LISTENING-THINKING TASKS BY SERIES AND BY GRADE LEVEL

Title of Selection	Grade	Categories: Literal Comprehension f	Literal Comprehension %	Inferential Comprehension f	Inferential Comprehension %	Evaluation f	Evaluation %	Appreciation f	Appreciation %	Total Number Tasks
Patterns of Language	1	559	87.07	48	7.48	17	2.65	18	2.80	642
Patterns of Language	2	508	71.65	131	18.48	53	7.48	18	2.39	709
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write	1	332	89.49	22	5.93	4	1.08	13	3.50	371
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write	2	425	77.98	76	13.95	26	4.77	18	3.30	545
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking	1	172	53.58	85	26.48	25	7.79	39	12.15	321
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing	2	289	63.52	117	25.91	13	2.86	36	7.91	455
Secret Hand	1	121	51.49	64	27.23	15	6.38	35	14.90	235
Tiger Tree	2	215	55.41	112	28.87	22	5.67	39	10.05	388

of tasks as the grade one guide. The percentage of appreciation tasks were approximately the same for both grade levels.

The Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write grade two materials contained approximately 15 percent more tasks than grade one. For both grade levels, literal comprehension and inferential comprehension ranked one and two, respectively. The order of emphasis for the third most frequently occurring category was appreciation in the grade one material and evaluation in the grade two materials. The least frequently occurring category in the grade one materials was evaluation and in the grade two materials was appreciation. The grade one teachers' guidebooks contained approximately 89.00 percent literal comprehension tasks, while in grade two approximately 78.00 percent were in this category. The percentage of inferential comprehension tasks was more than twice as great in the grade two materials as in grade one, and relatively little attention, less than 5.00 percent of tasks, was given to evaluation or appreciation in either source.

Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing, grade two, contained approximately 14 percent more listening-thinking tasks than Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking for grade one. Although the order of emphasis was the same for both grades, the degree of emphasis differed. In the grade two teachers' manual,

literal comprehension tasks made up approximately 64.00 percent of the total as compared with approximately 54.00 percent in grade one. The materials contained approximately the same percentage of inferential comprehension tasks for both grade levels. While evaluation tasks were relatively few in either of the grade level guidebooks, the percentage was approximately three times as great in grade one as grade two. The percentage of appreciation tasks also was greater for grade one than for grade two.

Tiger Tree, the grade two source, contained approximately 17 percent more listening-thinking tasks than Secret Hand, the grade one source. Although the order of emphasis was the same for both grade level materials, the degree of emphasis differed. Both grade level sources contained more than 50.00 percent literal comprehension tasks and more than 25.00 percent inferential comprehension tasks. There were relatively few evaluation tasks for either grade level; however, the percentage for the grade one materials was slightly greater than for grade two. Appreciation tasks made up slightly greater percentage for grade one than for grade two.

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

There were twelve language arts teachers' guidebooks reviewed in the study to determine the frequencies of occurrence of the thinking processes of literal comprehension,

inferential comprehension evaluation, and appreciation found in listening tasks as described in the guidebooks for kindergarten through grade two. There were two selections at the kindergarten level and five selections each at the first and second grade levels. A summary of the rank order of the amount of emphasis for each listening-thinking category by grade level and by series is presented in Table VII below.

When comparing the categories of listening-thinking tasks for the twelve sources from kindergarten, first, and second grades, literal comprehension dominated the categories across the three grade levels. This emphasis was in harmony with the introductory statements in the twelve sources. Inferential comprehension ranked second across the grade level materials, and this emphasis was in harmony with ten of the twelve sources' descriptions of the contents of the language arts materials. The third ranked category was appreciation in the kindergarten and first grade sources and was generally fourth in the second grade sources. The amount of emphasis on appreciation was relatively small, and little attention was given to appreciation in the objectives listed in the guidebooks. Evaluation ranked last in the amount of emphasis in kindergarten and grade one, and it ranked third in the grade two sources. The amount of emphasis on evaluation was relatively small, and none of the introductions referred to evaluation.

TABLE VII

RANK ORDER OF LISTENING-THINKING CATEGORIES
BY SERIES AND BY GRADE LEVEL

Company; Grade	Literal Comprehension	Inferential Comprehension	Evaluation	Appreciation
American Book Company; Grade One	1	2	4	3
American Book Company; Grade Two	1	2	3	4
Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.; Grade One	1	2	4	3
Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.; Grade Two	1	2	3	4
Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.; Grade One	1	2	4	3
Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.; Grade Two	1	2	4	3
Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company; Grade One	1	2	4	3
Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company; Grade Two	1	2	4	3

The comparison of the teachers' guidebooks in each series for the amount of emphasis in each listening-thinking category revealed that literal comprehension dominated the categories across the series used in grades one and two, while inferential comprehension ranked second across the series. The third ranked category was appreciation in all except two of the second grade textbooks. Evaluation generally ranked last in the amount of emphasis, except in two of the second grade textbooks, where it was third.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSES OF SELECTED ELEMENTS IN ELEMENTARY LANGUAGE ARTS METHODS COURSES

Elementary language arts methods courses are possible sources for prospective teachers to receive directions in planning listening-thinking tasks. Instructors in these courses can use a variety of means to assist the prospective teacher, including textbooks, class presentations, and assignments.

To answer the question as to the kinds of directions prospective teachers receive from elementary language arts methods classes in planning listening-thinking tasks for children, a questionnaire was sent to instructors in selected Tennessee universities. The instructors were asked to identify the textbooks used in their courses, the types of materials presented to students, the amount of class time devoted to listening, and their requirements of students, and to rate the amount of emphasis they place on the various thinking processes for prospective teachers to use with children.

The questionnaire was sent to sixteen instructors at the following ten universities in Tennessee: Austin Peay State University, Clarksville; East Tennessee State University, Johnson City; Memphis State University; Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro; Tennessee State University,

Nashville; Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville; The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga; The University of Tennessee, Knoxville; The University of Tennessee at Martin; and The University of Tennessee at Nashville. Twelve of the sixteen instructors (or 75.00 percent) responded. Of the twelve, ten were currently teaching elementary language arts; the two who were not currently teaching did not complete the questionnaire. The ten instructors represented eight of the ten institutions. The responses to the questionnaire was tabulated to determine which language arts methods textbooks were used, what types of materials were presented to students, how much class time was spent on the the teaching of listening, what types of assignments were required of students, and how the instructors rates the amount of emphasis placed on the various thinking processes.

I. ANALYSES OF LANGUAGE ARTS METHODS TEXTBOOKS

The ten instructors who were presently teaching an elementary language arts methods course listed the textbooks used in their courses. A total of eight different textbooks was named. Bibliographical information and the frequency of selection for each book is provided in Table VIII below.

The listening sections from the eight selected sources were analyzed to determine what kinds of directions prospective teachers receive in planning listening tasks involving the various thinking processes. To determine whether or not

TABLE VIII

ELEMENTARY LANGUAGE ARTS METHODS TEXTBOOKS REVIEWED

Author(s)	Titles	Publisher and Date Published	Frequency of Selection
Burns, Paul C., Broman, Betty L.	The Language Arts in Childhood Education	Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1975	2
Hennings, Dorothy	Communication in Action: Dynamic Teaching of the Language Arts	Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1978	2
Petty, Walter T., Petty, Dorothy C., Becking, Marjorie F.	Experiences in Language	Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976	2
Ruben, Dorothy	Teaching Elementary Language Arts	Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975	2
Green, Harry A., Petty, Walter T.	Developing Language Skills in the Elementary School	Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975	1
Kean, John M., Personke, Carl	The Language Arts: Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School	St. Martin's Press, 1976	1*
Knight, Lester N.	Language Arts for the Exceptional: The Gifted and the Linguistically Different	F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1974	1*
Smith, James A.	Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School	Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1973	1*

*One instructor selected three textbooks for the elementary language arts methods course.

the results of the analyses were reliable, two elementary education graduate students who had been elementary teachers conducted a reliability study on example listening tasks. The researcher briefed the two examiners in the procedures of the study. The examiners read the selected pages from each methods textbook and when the textbook gave an example of a listening task to be used with children, the examiners analyzed the task and responded to information requested on the "Examination of Listening-Thinking Tasks" form. A sample form is provided in Appendix A. For the findings to be considered reliable, the mean agreement rate between the investigator and the examiners had to be 70.00 percent or higher.

The examiners reviewed twenty pages or 10.00 percent of the pages included in the study, and had a 79.56 mean percentage agreement rate with the investigator. For the eight sources, the average of the percentages of agreement between examiner I and the investigator was 80.47 percent and the average of the percentages of agreement between examiner II and the investigator was 78.65 percent. Since the mean percentage of agreement exceeded the 70.00 percent deemed necessary for the purposes of this study, the results were considered reliable.

Each methods textbook was reviewed in terms of the total number of example listening-thinking tasks, the order of emphasis in each category, the distribution of tasks in the

various thinking categories, and other general directions for the teaching of listening. The frequencies and percentages of tasks in each listening-thinking category are presented below in Table IX.

The Language Arts in Childhood Education contained 105 tasks. The greatest number of listening-thinking tasks called for literal comprehension followed by evaluation, inferential comprehension, and appreciation. Of the 105 tasks, three-fourths (75.24 percent) were literal comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided among evaluation with 12.38 percent, inferential comprehension with 8.57 percent, and appreciation with 3.81 percent. Other directions in the teaching of listening included a list of suggestions for helping elementary students develop a positive attitude toward listening, activities to enhance listening attitude, and a presentation of four major approaches to the teaching of listening: correlated, interrelated, separated, and listening learning center.[1]

The methods textbook, Communication in Action: Dynamic Teaching of the Language Arts, contained 96 listening-thinking tasks. The greatest number of example tasks called for literal comprehension followed by evaluation, appreciation, and inferential comprehension. The majority of the

---

[1]Paul C. Burns and Betty L. Broman, The Language Arts in Childhood Education (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1975).

TABLE IX

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF LISTENING-THINKING TASKS IN ELEMENTARY LANGUAGE ARTS METHODS TEXTBOOKS

Title of Textbook	Categories: Literal Comprehension f	Literal Comprehension %	Inferential Comprehension f	Inferential Comprehension %	Evaluation f	Evaluation %	Appreciation f	Appreciation %	Total Number Tasks
The Language Arts in Childhood Education	79	75.24	9	8.57	13	12.38	4	3.81	105
Communication in Action: Dynamic Teaching of the Language Arts	56	58.33	6	6.25	26	27.08	8	8.34	96
Experiences in Language	44	73.33	7	11.67	5	8.33	4	6.67	60
Teaching Elementary Language Arts	31	63.27	10	20.41	6	12.24	2	4.08	49
Developing Language Skills in the Elementary School	15	62.50	6	25.00	2	8.33	1	4.17	24
The Language Arts: Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School	26	56.52	5	10.87	14	30.43	1	2.18	46
Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School	36	75.00	4	8.34	1	2.08	7	14.58	48

TABLE IX (continued)

Title of Textbook	Categories: Literal Comprehension f	Literal Comprehension %	Inferential Comprehension f	Inferential Comprehension %	Evaluation f	Evaluation %	Appreciation f	Appreciation %	Total Number Tasks
Language Arts for the Exceptional: The Gifted and the Linguistically Different	91	67.91	17	12.69	15	11.19	11	8.21	134

96 tasks (58.33 percent) were literal comprehension. More than one-fourth (27.08 percent) of the tasks were evaluation. The remaining tasks were divided between appreciation with 8.34 percent and inferential comprehension with 6.25 percent. In addition to the listening-thinking tasks, Communication in Action: Dynamic Teaching of the Language Arts presented directions for involving children in the dynamics of listening, engaging children in informal listening, engaging children in critical-analytical listening, engaging children in critical-judgmental listening, and engaging children in appreciative listening.[2]

Another language arts methods textbook, Experiences in Language, contained 60 listening-thinking tasks. The greatest number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation. Of the 60 tasks, approximately three-fourths (73.33 percent) were literal comprehension. Approximately one-eighth (11.67 percent) were inferential comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided between evaluation with 8.33 percent and appreciation with 6.67 percent. Other directions on listening included readiness activities, as rhyming and using music and rhythms; listening activities by grade levels; listening lessons on selected details, finding the main idea, following

---

[2]Dorothy Grant Hennings, Communication in Action: Dynamic Teaching of the Language Arts (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978).

directions, getting word meanings, distinguishing between the relevant and irrelevant and drawing inferences; and teaching resources as tape and cassette recorders and records.[3]

There were 49 listening-thinking example tasks in Teaching Elementary Language Arts. The greatest number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation. Of the 49 tasks, five-eighths (63.27 percent) were categorized as literal. The remaining tasks were divided among inferential comprehension with 20.41 percent, evaluation with 12.24 percent, and appreciation with 4.08 percent. The chapter on listening also presented suggestions for the teacher on classroom management for listening training which included a discussion of: the importance of listening; the listening environment; purposes for listening; and organization and planning for listening which included a list of sixteen teaching tactics to promote good listening habits.[4]

Developing Language Skills in the Elementary School contained 24 tasks. The greatest number of listening-thinking tasks called for literal comprehension followed by

---

[3]Walter T. Petty, Dorothy C. Petty, and Marjorie F. Becking, Experiences in Language (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976).

[4]Dorothy Rubin, Teaching Elementary Language Arts (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975).

inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation. Of the 24 tasks, five-eighths (62.50 percent) were literal comprehension. One-fourth (25.00 percent) called for inferential comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided between evaluation with 8.33 percent and appreciation with 4.17 percent. In addition to the example tasks, Developing Language Skills in the Elementary School presented a guide for teachers to follow in analyzing their instructional tasks and listening lessons. Sample lessons were provided for the following listening purposes: listening for details and for main ideas; for directions; for distinguishing relevant from irrelevant material; for drawing inferences; for identifying mood and for judging persuasion. The text also included instructions on selection of listening activities, individualized instruction and teaching aids.[5]

One professor selected three textbooks to be used in conjunction with each other, The Language Arts: Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School; Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School; and Language Arts for the Exceptional: The Gifted and Linguistically Different. The latter book was described in the foreword as being supplementary material. Each textbook is discussed separately

---

[5]Harry A. Greene and Walter T. Petty, Developing Language Skills in the Elementary School (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975).

and then in combination of the three to determine what directions students receive from the combined sources when planning listening-thinking tasks.

Listening-thinking tasks numbered 46 in The Language Arts: Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School. The greatest number of example tasks called for literal comprehension followed by evaluation, inferential comprehension, and appreciation. The majority of the 46 tasks were literal comprehension (56.52 percent). Nearly one-third (30.43 percent) were evaluation tasks. The remaining tasks were divided between inferential comprehension with 10.87 percent and appreciation with 2.18 percent. Other directions in the teaching of listening included were: media listening programs; the teacher's role in promoting effective listening; a list of listening skills for discussion with children; teaching/learning strategies for listening skill development and for general and critical listening; and ideas for interrelating listening and the other language arts.[6]

The textbook, Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School, contained 48 listening-thinking tasks. The greatest number of tasks called for literal comprehension followed by appreciation, interential comprehension, and evaluation. Of the 48 tasks, three-fourths (75.00 percent)

---

[6]John M. Kean and Carl Personke, The Language Arts: Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976).

were categorized as literal comprehension. The remaining tasks were divided among appreciation with 14.58 percent, inferential comprehension with 8.34 percent, and evaluation with 2.08 percent. The directions included discussions of setting conditions for creative teaching of listening, ways teachers can improve the listening of children, four types of purposeful listening and contrived situations to help children develop skills in each.[7]

Language Arts for the Exceptional: The Gifted and the Linguistically Different, according to the foreword, is a textbook designed as supplementary material for an elementary language arts methods course. This source had 134 tasks with the greatest number of listening-thinking tasks calling for literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation. Of these tasks, more than two-thirds (67.91 percent) were literal comprehension. One-eighth (12.69 percent) were inferential comprehension, and the remaining tasks were divided between evaluation (11.19 percent) and appreciation (8.21 percent. Suggestions were presented in this text for extending listening skills and a list of numerous strategies for teaching listening.[8]

---

[7]James A. Smith, Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973).

[8]Lester N. Knight, Language Arts for the Exceptional: The Gifted and the Linguistically Different (Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1974).

II. COMPARISON OF ELEMENTARY LANGUAGE ARTS METHODS TEXTBOOKS

The eight methods textbooks were compared in terms of the total number of example listening-thinking tasks, the distribution of tasks, and the order of emphasis in the various categories. Comparisons were also drawn of other directions in the teaching of listening.

Analyses of Textbooks, Example Tasks

The number of example listening-thinking tasks ranged from 24 in Developing Language Skills in the Elementary School to 134 in Language Arts for the Exceptional: The Gifted and Linguistically Different, a supplementary textbook. The amount of emphasis in the listening-thinking categories varied among the sources. Approximately three-fourths of the tasks were literal comprehension in three books: The Language Arts in Childhood Education, in Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School, and in Experiences in Language, while two books had slightly more than one-half, Communication in Action: Dynamic Teaching of the Language Arts and The Language Arts: Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School. The remaining books fell in between, Language Arts for the Exceptional: The Gifted and the Linguistically Different, Teaching Elementary Language Arts and Developing Language Skills in the Elementary School.

The distribution of inferential comprehension tasks ranged from 6.25 percent to 25.00 percent. Approximately one-fourth of the tasks were inferential comprehension in two textbooks: Developing Language Skills in the Elementary School and Teaching Elementary Language Arts. In six books, approximately one-tenth or fewer of the tasks were inferential: The Language Arts in Childhood Education; Experiences in Language; The Language Arts: Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School; Language Arts for the Exceptional: The Gifted and the Linguistically Different; Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School; and Communication in Action: Dynamic Teaching of the Language Arts.

The distribution of evaluation tasks ranged from 2.08 percent to 30.43 percent. In two textbooks, more than one-fourth of the tasks were evaluation, in The Language Arts: Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School, and in Communication in Action: Dynamic Teaching of the Language Arts. Approximately one-eighth of the tasks were evaluation in The Language Arts in Childhold Education and Language Arts for the Exceptional: The Gifted and the Linguistically Different. In two sources, 8.33 percent of the tasks were evaluation, in Experiences in Language and in Developing Language Skills in the Elementary School. The remaining book contained 2.08 percent evaluation tasks, Creative Teaching of the Language Arts.

Appreciation tasks ranged from 2.18 percent to 14.58 percent. The highest percentage, 14.58 percent, of evaluation tasks was found in Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School. Two sources contained approximately 8.00 percent appreciation tasks, Communication in Action and Language Arts for the Exceptional: The Gifted and the Linguistically Different. One textbook had 6.00 percent appreciation tasks, Experiences in Language. Three sources had approximately 4.00 percent appreciation tasks, Developing Language Skills in the Elementary Schools, Teaching Elementary Language Arts and The Language Arts in Childhood Education. The remaining textbook contained just over 2.00 percent appreciation tasks, The Language Arts: Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School.

The comparison of the language arts methods textbooks revealed all eight gave greatest emphasis to literal comprehension. While inferential comprehension ranked second in four of the textbooks, it was third in three of the sources and fourth in one source. Evaluation was the second ranking category of emphasis in three books, third in four books and fourth in one book. The appreciation listening-thinking category was ranked second by one textbook, third by one textbook and fourth by six textbooks. The rank order of emphasis for each listening-thinking category for each elementary language arts methods textbook is presented below in Table X. A summary of the rank order according to

TABLE X

RANK ORDER OF LISTENING-THINKING CATEGORIES IN ELEMENTARY LANGUAGE ARTS METHODS TEXTBOOKS

Title of Textbook	Categories			
	Literal Comprehension	Inferential Comprehension	Evaluation	Appreciation
The Language Arts in Childhood Education	1	3	2	4
Communication in Action: Dynamic Teaching of the Language Arts	1	4	2	3
Experiences in Language	1	2	3	4
Teaching Elementary Language Arts	1	2	3	4
Developing Language Skills in the Elementary School	1	2	3	4
The Language Arts: Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School	1	3	2	4
Language Arts for the Exceptional: The Gifted and the Linguistically Different	1	2	3	4
Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School	1	3	4	2

listening-thinking categories is presented below in Table XI.

Analyses of Textbooks, Teaching Listening Directions

In addition to the comparison of the eight textbooks' listening-thinking tasks, the methods books were also compared according to other directions in the teaching of listening. Five of the eight textbooks were used individually as the only methods book selected for the elementary language arts course. Three of the textbooks were used in conjunction with each other for one instructor's course: The Language Arts: Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School, Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School and Language Arts for the Exceptional: The Gifted and the Linguistically Different.

All eight textbooks presented guidance in the selection of listening activities according to the purpose of the activity, as listening for main ideas and distinguishing relevant from irrelevant materials. Each textbook also included references to teaching aids, as cassette recorders and records. Seven of the eight books contained suggestions for the teacher's attitude to provide a good listening environment.

Language Arts in Childhood Education was the only methods book to categorize the teaching of listening into four major instructional approaches: correlated,

TABLE XI

SUMMARY OF RANK ORDER OF LISTENING-THINKING TASKS FOR EIGHT METHODS TEXTBOOKS

Listening-Thinking Categories	Ranking			
	1	2	3	4
Literal Comprehension	8	0	0	0
Inferential Comprehension	0	4	3	1
Evaluation	0	3	4	1
Appreciation	0	1	1	6

interrelated, separated and listening learning centers. Other textbooks mentioned these approaches, but devoted more attention to the approach of interrelating listening with other subject areas; however, they did not categorize their presentations accordingly. Only Experiences in Language presented readiness activities in listening and categorized activities according to grade levels, although most of the other textbooks did suggest the level or age appropriateness of their activities.

In general, while the textbooks presented directions in the teaching of listening, the degree of specificity varied widely. Seven of the eight textbooks presented suggestions within discussion sections and in sample lesson plans. The one textbook designed as a supplementary text presented extensive lists of ideas for teaching listening.

III. ANALYSES OF SELECTED ELEMENTS OF ELEMENTARY LANGUAGE ARTS METHODS COURSES

Instructors of elementary language arts methods courses responded to a questionnaire addressing selected elements of their courses. Instructors indicated the types of materials presented to students, the amount of class time devoted to the teaching of listening, their requirements of students, and ratings of the amount of emphasis they place on the thinking processes of literal comprehension, inferential

comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation, as related to children's listening.

Time and Materials Devoted to Teaching of Listening

Instructors were asked whether a topic on listening was included in their elementary language arts methods course and, if so, how much class time was devoted. All of the instructors responded that they included a topic in a series of two or more class meetings and presented materials on listening in addition to class lecture. The frequencies and percentages of use of materials on listening in addition to class lecture are shown below in Table XII. The most commonly indicated material was a sample listening lesson plan with 90.00 percent of the instructors using this material, followed by other duplicated materials for students' files at 80.00 percent and sample listening center plans at 70.00 percent. The least commonly indicated was bibliographical references on listening, which were used by 30.00 percent. Each instructor replied that at least a series of

Requirements of Students

Instructors were requested to indicate whether they required students to prepare any materials on listening and whether any of the following types of materials were required: (1) research paper; (2) sample listening lesson for children; (3) sample listening center; and (4) on-site work with

TABLE XII

FREQUENCIES OF USE OF MATERIALS ON LISTENING IN ADDITION TO CLASS LECTURE

Materials on Listening	Percentages	
	Yes	No
No materials presented	0.00	100.00
Bibliographical references	30.00	70.00
Sample listening lesson plan given to students	90.00	10.00
Sample listening center plan given to students	70.00	30.00
Other duplicated material for students' files	80.00	20.00

N = 10

children on listening. The frequencies and percentages of responses to each requirement are presented below in Table XIII.

Ninety percent of the instructors required students to prepare materials on listening. The most commonly required material was the sample lesson plan with 80.00 percent making this requirement, followed by 60.00 percent requiring a sample listening center and 60.00 percent requiring on-site work with children. None of the instructors required a research paper on listening.

Instructors' Emphasis on Thinking Processes

Instructors were requested to rate the amount of emphasis they place on the various thinking processes related to children's listening by using the scale of 1 = dealt with in detail; 2 = mentioned, not stressed; 3 = not dealt with. The ratings are presented below in Table XIV. According to their ratings, instructors emphasized the thinking processes of literal comprehension, followed by evaluation, inferential comprehension, and appreciation. Seventy percent of the instructors replied they dealt with literal comprehension in detail and 30.00 percent replied it was mentioned, but not stressed. While evaluation was dealt with in detail by 70.00 percent of the instructors, 20.00 percent responded that it was mentioned, but not stressed,

TABLE XIII

FREQUENCIES AND PERCENTAGES OF TYPES OF STUDENT REQUIREMENTS

Types of Student Requirements	Percentages	
	Yes	No
Do you require students to prepare assignments on listening?	90.00	10.00
Types of requirements:		
Research Paper	0.00	100.00
Sample Lesson Plan	80.00	20.00
Sample Listening Center	60.00	40.00
On-Site Work with Children	60.00	40.00

N = 10

TABLE XIV

INSTRUCTORS' RATINGS OF THE AMOUNT OF EMPHASIS PLACED ON THINKING PROCESSES

Thinking Processes	Emphasis: Dealt with in Detail f	%	Mentioned, not Stressed f	%	Not Dealt with f	%
Literal Comprehension	7	70.00	3	30.00	0	0.00
Inferential Comprehension	6	60.00	4	40.00	0	0.00
Evaluation	7	70.00	2	20.00	1	10.00
Appreciation	5	50.00	5	50.00	0	0.00

N = 10

and 10.00 percent indicated that evaluation was not dealt with. Inferential comprehension was next in the rating of the thinking processes, with 60.00 percent dealing with it in detail and 40.00 percent mentioning but not stressing it. The appreciation thinking process was dealt with in detail by 50.00 percent of the instructors, according to their rating, and mentioned, but not stressed, by 50.00 percent.

IV. SUMMARY

Selected elements in elementary language arts methods courses were analyzed to determine what kinds of directions prospective teachers received in planning listening tasks for children in kindergarten through grade two which involve the thinking processes of literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation. The selected elements were listening sections in eight language arts methods textbooks, types of materials on listening instructors presented to students, the amount of class time devoted to the teaching of listening, requirements of students and instructors' ratings of the various thinking processes they emphasize for prospective teachers to use with children.

The review of the methods textbooks revealed literal comprehension received the greatest emphasis in listening-thinking tasks followed by inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation. In seven of the eight textbooks, prospective teachers receive directions in teachers'

attitude to provide a good listening environment. In all eight books, directions were provided in selection of listening activities for a variety of purposes, in teaching aids and major approaches for incorporating listening in the language arts curriculum.

In addition to the elementary language arts methods textbooks, other selected elements in the methods course were analyzed to determine directions prospective teachers received in planning listening tasks. Instructors indicated they present a topic on listening in two or more class meetings, and that the most frequently presented material was sample lesson plans followed by duplicated materials for students' files, sample listening center plans and bibliographical references. The most frequent requirement of students was a sample listening lesson. Sample listening center plans and on-site work with children were the next most frequent requirements. Instructors also stated they emphasize the various thinking processes in the following order: literal comprehension, evaluation, inferential comprehension, and appreciation.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Elementary school children are expected to spend approximately one-half of each school day listening. Listening provides the main source of information for children outside the classroom as well.

Language arts authorities agree that the communication process consists of four interrelated areas: writing, reading, speaking, and listening. Research indicates that children who receive instruction in listening become more effective listeners, are capable of higher-level mental processes and achieve significant gains in reading.

Authorities further agree that the area of listening instruction is neglected. Research reveals that textbooks give little direct instruction in the teaching of listening, although many of the activities in the directions for classroom use rely on listening skills.

I. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study investigated the directions kindergarten, first grade, and second grade teachers receive from selected language arts materials in preparing listening tasks requiring various thinking skills by children in kindergarten through grade two. The two questions considered were:

1. In what frequencies were the thinking processes of literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation found in the listening tasks as described in selected language arts teachers' guidebooks for kindergarten through grade two?
2. What kinds of directions did prospective teachers receive in selected elementary language arts methods courses in planning listening tasks for children for kindergarten through grade two which involve the thinking processes of literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation?

To answer the first question, teachers' guidebooks to commonly used textbooks or kits for kindergarten, first, and second grades were reviewed. Since there were no language arts adoptions specifically for kindergarten, the Peabody Language Development Kit and the Alpha Time Kit were reviewed based on their wide use.

Using three forms developed for the study, the twelve selected sources were reviewed to determine the listening-thinking tasks contained in each. The investigator read each page of the teachers' guide and categorized the listening tasks according to the thinking level required of the student. To be certain the investigator was categorizing the tasks consistently, a reliability study was made using two

examiners, elementary education graduate students who had been teachers. The average agreement rate between the investigator and the examiners was 78.14 percent, which exceeded the 70.00 percent deemed necessary for the study. The twelve selected sources were reviewed for frequencies of tasks, for distribution of listening tasks in the various thinking categories, for order of emphasis in the categories, and for harmony of findings with introductory statements describing the materials. The results were reported in terms of findings and comparison of kindergarten selections, findings and comparison of grade one sources, findings and comparison of grade two sources, and findings and comparison of series across grades one and two.

To answer question two, a questionnaire was sent to sixteen language arts instructors in ten state universities in Tennessee. They were asked to identify language arts texts they were using and to describe the attention given to teaching listening-thinking tasks. Of the twelve who responded, only ten representing eight universities, were currently teaching such a course.

The ten instructors identified eight textbooks. Each textbook reported on the questionnaire was reviewed by the investigator, using the same form which was used for analyzing the elementary teachers' guidebooks. The investigator read the listening sections in each methods textbook and categorized the listening tasks according to the thinking

process required of the child. To be certain the investigator was categorizing the tasks consistently, a reliability study was made with two examiners for the college methods books. The average rate of agreement between the investigator and the two examiners was 79.56 percent, which exceeded the 70.00 percent deemed necessary for the study. The eight methods textbooks were reviewed for the total number of listening-thinking tasks, the order of emphasis in the categories, the distribution of tasks in the various thinking categories, and general directions for the teaching of listening.

In addition, instructors' responses to other questionnaire items were used to determine the attention given to the teaching of listening. Instructors indicated the types of materials presented to students, the amount of class time devoted to the teaching of listening, their requirements of students, and ratings of the amount of emphasis placed on the thinking processes of literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation.

In answering the first question concerning the frequencies of the various thinking processes in listening tasks described in the twelve elementary language arts teachers' guidebooks, it was evident that literal comprehension dominated the thinking categories across the three grade levels. Inferential comprehension was second and generally appreciation was third, while evaluation was last in the rankings.

The greatest frequencies of listening-thinking tasks in the kindergarten kits' guidebooks were in the literal comprehension category followed by inferential comprehension, appreciation, and evaluation. In the first grade selections reviewed, the distribution of listening tasks indicated the order of emphasis was the same in each, literal comprehension followed by inferential comprehension, appreciation, and evaluation. In the second grade selections, the order of emphasis was the same for three of the five sources, literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation. The other two sources placed more emphasis on appreciation than evaluation.

Literal comprehension was stressed in the introduction to the kindergarten materials and this was in harmony with the findings of the study, since between three-fifths and four-fifths of the tasks fell in this category. In the first grade materials, literal comprehension tasks comprised from one-half to seven-eighths of the total, and this was also in harmony with statements in the introductions to the materials. Likewise, in the second grade, the most frequently occurring category was literal comprehension with one-half to three-fourths of the tasks in this category, and these findings were also in harmony with the introductions to the materials.

Inferential comprehension was the second most frequently occurring category of listening-thinking tasks in materials for all three grade levels. In the kindergarten materials,

one-tenth to three-tenths of the tasks required inferential thinking, which was in harmony with the introductions to the materials. In the first grade materials, inferential tasks ranged from one-twentieth to approximately one-fourth of the total tasks. In the second grade materials, inferential tasks ranged from approximately one-twelfth to one-fourth of the total, and this was in harmony with four of the five sources' introductory statements.

Appreciation was generally the third most frequently occurring listening-thinking category across the three grade levels; however, little attention was given to appreciative thinking in the introductions to the materials. In the two kindergarten guidebooks, appreciation made up approximately 4 to 8 percent of the tasks. In the first grade materials, the distribution of scores ranged from approximately 2 to 15 percent in the five sources. In the second grade materials, appreciation tasks ranged from 0 to 10 percent.

Evaluation was generally last in the ranking of listening-thinking categories for the three grade levels and received little attention in the introductions to the materials. In the kindergarten materials, less than 1 percent to 3 percent of the tasks were scored in this category. In the first grade guidebooks, evaluation tasks ranged from just over 1 percent to approximately 8 percent. Similarly, for the second grade guidebooks, the range was from approximately 2 to 8 percent.

Reviews of methods textbooks and instructors' responses to a questionnaire were used to answer the second question concerning the kinds of directions prospective teachers receive in their language arts methods courses in planning listening tasks which involve the various thinking processes. An analysis of the eight methods books revealed that listening tasks, used as examples, were generally distributed in the following order: literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation. Literal comprehension tasks ranged from one-half to three-fourths of the total. The amount of stress on inferential comprehension ranged from one-fifteenth to one-fourth of the tasks. Evaluation was the second most frequently occurring category in three of the eight methods textbooks, while the percentage range for all eight methods books was from approximately 2 to 30 percent. Appreciation was the least frequently occurring of the thinking categories in the scoring of the example listening tasks with from approximately 2 percent ot 15 percent. In addition to the listening tasks, the methods textbooks in general presented prospective teachers with directions in teacher behavior to provide a good listening environment, in selection of listening activities for a variety of purposes, in teaching aids, and in major approaches for incorporating listening activities in the language arts curriculum.

Prospective teachers also received directions in planning listening tasks from their instructors in the elementary

language arts methods courses. Instructors indicated they present a topic on listening in two or more class meetings, as well as sample lesson plans, duplicated materials, sample listening center plans and bibliographical references. Instructors most frequently require their students to produce a sample listening lesson, followed by a sample listening center plan and on-site work with children. According to their ratings of the amount of emphasis they place on the various thinking processes, literal comprehension received the most stress followed by evaluation, inferential comprehension, and appreciation.

In view of these findings, the following summary is presented:

1. Literal comprehension received the greatest amount of emphasis on the thinking processes in listening tasks in teachers' guidebooks, methods textbooks, and instructors' presentations.

2. Inferential comprehension received the second greatest amount of emphasis of the thinking processes in listening tasks in teachers' guidebooks and the methods textbooks; however, it was third in the instructors' presentations.

3. Evaluation was second of the thinking processes in the amount of emphasis in listening tasks in the instructors' presentations, third in the methods books, and fourth in the teachers' guidebooks.

4. Appreciation was third of the thinking processes in the amount of emphasis in the teachers' guidebooks and fourth in the methods books and instructors' presentations.

5. Authors of elementary teachers' guidebooks, authors of methods books, and methods instructors concentrate on the literal comprehension thinking process, while inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation thought processes receive relatively little attention.

6. Teachers' guidebooks stressed inferential comprehension more than methods textbooks or instructors' presentations.

7. Instructors of elementary language arts methods courses emphasized evaluation in their presentations and evaluation received more emphasis in the methods textbooks than in the teachers' guidebooks.

8. Teachers' guidebooks, methods textbooks, and instructors' presentations place little emphasis on appreciation in listening-thinking tasks.

Table 15 is a comparison of the rank order of listening-thinking tasks in teachers' guidebooks, methods textbooks, and instructors' presentations.

II. CONCLUSIONS

In view of the findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Teachers who follow guidebooks in designing listening-thinking tasks are asking children to think

TABLE XV

COMPARISON OF RANK ORDER OF LISTENING-THINKING TASKS IN TEACHERS' GUIDEBOOKS, METHODS TEXTBOOKS, AND INSTRUCTORS' PRESENTATIONS

	Listening-Thinking Categories Ranking			
Language Arts Materials	Literal Comprehension	Inferential Comprehension	Evaluation	Appreciation
Teachers' Guidebooks	1	2	4	3
Methods Textbooks	1	2	3	4
Instructors' Presentations	1	3	2	4

primarily at the lowest level thought process of literal comprehension.

2. Prospective elementary teachers receive more instruction in language arts methods courses in planning listening-thinking tasks which call for literal comprehension than for inferential comprehension, evaluation, or appreciation.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EDUCATORS' IMPLEMENTATION

Since elementary school children are expected to spend a great portion of each school day listening, and listening is a primary avenue of information for children, the following recommendations are made for educators' implementation:

1. Classroom teachers must provide more listening tasks than found in guidebooks which involve the thinking processes of inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation.

2. Since methods books stress literal comprehension, elementary language arts instructors must provide prospective teachers with more materials and presentations on the thinking processes of inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation.

3. Educators must assess their textbooks and make selections which stress the higher-level thought processes of inferential comprehension, evaluation, and appreciation, as well as literal comprehension. The "Examination of

Listening-Thinking Tasks" Form is a useful tool for assessments of textbooks.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RELATED RESEARCH

The current study has implications for related research.

1. The present study should be replicated using other elementary language arts materials, other methods textbooks and other instructors of elementary language arts methods courses to verify the validity and reliability of the findings.

2. Since the "Examination of Listening-Thinking Tasks" Form can be a useful tool for categorizing the tasks, it is recommended that attention be given to refining the tool and attempting to rate the levels of difficulty of thinking within each category.

3. A similar study should be made with curriculum materials from other subject areas: mathematics; science; social studies; and reading; to determine what the listening-thinking emphasis is in these subjects.

4. A study should be made of elementary language arts materials designed for use with children in grades three, four, and five, to determine what listening-thinking processes are taught older children.

5. Teachers' in-class practices in listening tasks should be investigated and compared to the directions found in guidebooks and methods textbooks to determine the extent

to which the four categories of listening-thinking tasks are used.

6. In-service programs need to be studied to determine the amount of attention given to listening-thinking learnings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amidon, Edmund, and Anita Simon. "Teacher-Pupil Interaction," Review of Educational Research, 35:130-39. April 1965.

Ballenger, Marcus Taylor. "The Effects of a Planned Daily Program of Listening on the Development of Reading Achievement of First Grade Pupils," Dissertation Abstracts, 31 (1971), 3160A (Texas Tech University).

Biskin, Donald S., Kenneth Hoskisson, and Marjory Modlin. "Prediction, Reflection and Comprehension," Elementary School Journal, 77:131-39. November 1976.

Blackburn, Susan Flemming. "The Construction, the Implementation, and the Evaluation of a Title I Primary Class Listening Program." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1976.

Brown, Kenneth L. "Speech and Listening in Language Arts Textbooks: Part I," Elementary English, 44:336-41. April 1967.

Brown, Kenneth L. "Speech and Listening in Language Arts Textbooks: Part II," Elementary English, 44:461-65. May 1967.

Burns, Paul C., and Betty L. Broman. The Language Arts in Childhood Education. Chicago: Rand McNally College, 1975.

Cavicchi, Albert Lawrence. "Part I: The Development of a Guide for the Teaching of Listening Based upon Inner-City Elementary School Teachers' Concerns and Questions. Part II: A Guide for the Teaching of Listening in the Elementary School," Dissertation Abstracts, 34 (1974), 7619-20A (New York University).

Commission of the English Curriculum of the National Council of Teachers of English. The English Language Arts. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.

Dawson, Mildred A. and Others. Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, Level One. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973.

Dawson, Mildred A. and Others. Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, Level Two. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973.

Devine, Thomas G. "Listening: What Do We Know After Fifty Years of Research and Theorizing?" Journal of Reading, 21:302-03. January 1978.

Dunn, Lloyd M., Kathryn B. Horton, and James O. Smith. Peabody Language Development Kit Manual. Circle Pines, Minnesota: American Guidance Service, 1968.

Fillmer, H. Thompson and Others. Patterns of Language, Level One. New York: American Book, 1974.

Fillmer, H. Thompson and Others. Patterns of Language, Level Two. New York: American Book, 1974.

Greene, Harry A., and Walter T. Petty. Developing Language Skills in the Elementary School. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975.

Guszak, Frank J. "Teacher Questioning and Reading," The Reading Teacher, 21:227-34. December 1967.

Hand, John S. and Others. Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking. River Forest, Illinois: Laidlaw Brothers, 1975.

Hand, John S. and Others. Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing. River Forest, Illinois: Laidlaw Brothers, 1975.

Hennings, Dorothy Grant. Communication in Action: Dynamic Teaching of the Language Arts. Chicago: Rand McNally College, 1978.

Johnson, Gwen Parrott. "An Investigation of Growth in Critical Reading-Listening Ability in Grades Two and Three," Dissertation Abstracts, 35 (1975), 5579-80A (The Florida State University).

Kean, John M., and Carl Personke. The Language Arts: Teaching and Learning in the Elementary School. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1976.

Knight, Lester N. Language Arts for the Exceptional: The Gifted and the Linguistically Different. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock, 1974.

Kranzik, Margery A. "The Construction and Evaluation of Two Methods of Listening Skills Instruction and Their Effects on Listening Comprehension of Children in Grade One." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1972.

Lapp, Diane, and Robert J. Tierney. "Reading Scores of American Nine Year Olds: NAEP's Tests," The Reading Teacher, 30:757-60. April 1977.

Lewis, Susan Edwina Bivins. "Listening Effects on Reading Comprehension of Black Inner City Children at Levels One, Two, and Three," Dissertation Abstracts, 37 (1976), 1962-3A (Saint Louis University).

Lundsteen, Sara W. "Critical Listening: An Experiment," Elementary School Journal, 66:311-15. March 1966.

Lundsteen, Sara W. Listening-Its Impact on Reading and the Other Language Arts. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1971.

Nachbar, Cornelia M. and Others. Secret Hand. New York: Webster Division, McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Nachbar, Cornelia M. and Others. Tiger Tree. New York: Webster Division, McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Olsen, Marilou Rogers. "A Program of Instructional Activities for the Development of Listening Skills in Pre-School Children." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1973.

Petty, Walter T., Dorothy C. Petty, and Marjorie F. Becking. Experiences in Language. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976.

Pollack, Cecelia, and Diane L. Glassner. Composing Language: Steps. New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1974.

Pollock, Thomas Clark, Helen Gates Ellzey, and Arthur B. Gregor. The Macmillan English Series: Text-Workbook, Grade Two. New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1974.

Reiss, Elayne, and Rita Friedman. Alpha Time Kit Professional Guide. Plainview, New York: New Dimensions in Education, 1972.

Rubin, Dorothy. Teaching Elementary Language Arts. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Smith, James A. Creative Teaching of the Language Arts in the Elementary School. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1973.

Smith, Richard J., and Thomas C. Barrett. Teaching Reading in the Middle Grades. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1974.

Taylor, Hazel Scott. "Analysis of the Effects of a Selected Program of Listening on Reading Increments of Third Grade Students," Dissertation Abstracts, 33 (1973), 4016-7A (Texas Tech University).

Wilt, Miriam E. "A Study of Teacher Awareness of Listening as a Factor in Elementary Education," Journal of Educational Research, 43:626-36. April 1950.

Wilt, Miriam E. "Listening, What's New?" Language and the Language Arts, ed. Johanna S. Destefano and Sharon E. Fox. Boston: Little, Brown, 1974.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

FORMS USED IN THE REVIEWS

SAMPLE

EXAMINATION OF LISTENING-THINKING TASKS FORM

I. Source of Information: Study Number _____

Title of Materials: _____

_____

Publisher: _____

Date of Publication: _____ Grade Level: _____

II. Directions for Examiner: The space under III is for page numbers and any notes, descriptive words, or comments you may choose to enter to assist you in determining the appropriate thinking process. Section IV on the next page is for categorization of the listening tasks. In Section IV place the page number or lesson number in the appropriate blank under each thinking process each time it is required by the listening task. Please total the number of entries under each thinking column. After completing the form, sign and date under Section III.

III. Task Identification

Page No.(s) _____

Comments, Notes:

Examiner: _____

Date: _____

IV. Thinking Processes

Literal Comprehension

Definition: Recognition or recall of ideas, information or happenings that are "explicitly stated." Examples:

1. Recall of details
2. Recall of main ideas
3. Recall of sequence
4. Recall of comparison
5. Recall of cause and effect relationships
6. Recall of character traits
7. Recall of other ideas, information, happenings

Total Entries ☐

Inferential Comprehension

Process of synthesizing literal content, personal knowledge, intuition and imagination as a basis for making conjectures or hypotheses. Examples:

1. Inferring supporting details
2. Inferring main ideas
3. Inferring sequence
4. Inferring comparisons
5. Inferring cause and effect relationships
6. Inferring character
7. Predicting outcomes
8. Other inferential comprehension

Total Entries ☐

Evaluation

Process of making judgments about the content of a presentation, comparing it with external criteria. Examples:

1. Judgments of reality and fantasy
2. Judgments of
3. Judgments of adequacy or validity
4. Judgments of appropriateness
5. Judgments of worth, desirability or acceptability

Total Entries ☐

Appreciation

The psychological and aesthetic impact of the presentation on the listener, calling for the student to be emotionally and aesthetically involved. Examples:

1. Emotional response to content.
2. Identification with characters and incidents
3. Imagery

Total Entries ☐

SAMPLE

SOURCE MASTER SHEET

Title: _____ Publisher: _____
Date of Publication: _____ Grade Level: _____

CATEGORIES

Study Number	L.C.	I.C.	E.	A.
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

L.C. is literal comprehension; I.C. is inferential comprehension; E. is evaluation and A. is appreciation.

Total number of tasks per source: _____
Percentages: L.C._____; I.C. _____; E. _____; A. _____

SAMPLE

GRADE-LEVEL COMPILATION SHEET

L.C. is literal comprehension; I.C. is inferential comprehension; E. is evaluation; A. is appreciation

Kindergarten

Title of Materials: (1) _____

_____

Total Number of Tasks:_____Frequencies: L.C._____
I.C._____E._____A._____

Title of Materials: (2) _____

_____

Total Number of Tasks:_____Frequencies: L.C._____
I.C._____E._____A._____

First Grade

Title of Materials: (1) _____

_____

Total Number of Tasks:_____Frequencies: L.C._____
I.C._____E._____A._____

Title of Materials: (2) _____

_____

Total Number of Tasks:_____Frequencies: L.C._____
I.C._____E._____A._____

Title of Materials: (3) _____

_____

Total Number of Tasks:_____Frequencies: L.C._____
I.C._____E._____A._____

Title of Materials (4) _____

Total Number of Tasks:_____Frequencies: L.C._____
I.C._____E._____A._____

Title of Materials: (5) _____

_____

Total Number of Tasks:_____Frequencies: L.C._____
I.C._____E._____A._____

Compilation (continued)

Second Grade

Title of Materials: (1) _____

_____

Total Number of Tasks:_____Frequencies: L.C._____
I.C._____E._____A._____

Title of Materials (2) _____

_____

Total Number of Tasks:_____Frequencies: L.C._____
I.C._____E._____A._____

Title of Materials: (3) _____

_____

Total Number of Tasks:_____Frequencies: L.C._____
I.C._____E._____A._____

Title of Materials: (4) _____

_____

Total Number of Tasks:_____Frequencies: L.C._____
I.C._____E._____A._____

Title of Materials (5) _____

_____

Total Number of Tasks:_____Frequencies: L.C._____
I.C._____E._____A._____

_____

Totals for Kindergarten: _____ Frequencies in Percentages: L.C._____; I.C._____; E._____; A._____

Totals for First Grade: _____ Frequencies in Percentages: L.C._____; I.C._____; E._____; A._____

Totals for Second Grade: _____ Frequencies in Percentages: L.C._____; I.C._____; E._____; A._____

APPENDIX B

SAMPLES OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND ACCOMPANYING CORRESPONDENCE

SAMPLE

Shirley Carol Raines
The University of Alabama
College of Education
P.O. Drawer R
University, Alabama 35486

July 15, 1978

Dr. Jane Doe
University of Tennessee
College of Education
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

Dear Dr. Doe:

The attached questionnaire is a part of the study I am completing for the degree of Doctor of Education in curriculum and instruction at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. The study is to investigate the directions teachers receive from selected language arts materials in preparing listening tasks requiring various thinking skills by children in kindergarten through grade two.

The part of the study the enclosed questionnaire addresses is the question: "Do prospective teachers receive direction in elementary language arts methods courses in planning listening tasks for children in kindergarten through grade two which involve the thinking processes of literal comprehension, inferential comprehension, evaluation and appreciation?"

Please complete the attached brief questionnaire. Your responses will remain confidential. At the top of each questionnaire is a code number identifying the institution and the instructor. This code will be used by me as the investigator, but will not be published or made available to any other individual or group of individuals. Your responses will be combined and reported as group results of instructors across the state of Tennessee, not on an individual or institution basis.

Your participation in the study is voluntary. Your responsibility as a subject in the study is simply to return the questionnaire and the consent form. You may withdraw at any time without penalty or prejudice from the research project. If you should desire to withdraw from the project, notify me at the address listed above.

Thank you for your time, effort and information.

Sincerely,

Shirley Carol Raines

SAMPLE

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

My signature below indicates I understand the use of the questionnaire and the use of the results of the questionnaire as outlined in the letter attached to this consent form. By returning this consent form and the enclosed questionnaire, I give my permission for my responses to be combined with other instructors' responses in colleges and universities and for those results to be reported as group results, as a part of the doctoral research study, "Listening-Thinking Tasks in Selected Language Arts Materials." I understand I may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or prejudice from the research project.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

QUESTIONNAIRE

Code Number_____

Please complete the following brief questionnaire. Place a check mark ( ) in front of the correst response or fill in the blank appropriately.

1. Do you teach an elementary language arts methods course:
   a.___Yes b.___No

2. What textbook(s) do you use for your language arts methods course? Please list full title, author, publisher, and date of publication. _____

   _____

3. In the elementary language arts methods course you teach, do you present a topic on listening? a___Yes b.___No

4. Please check the material you present on listening in addition to the lecture presented.
   a.___no material presented
   b.___bibliographical references
   c.___sample listening lesson plan
   d.___sample listening center plan given to students
   e.___other duplicated material for student's files

5. How much class time is devoted to listening? a.___one class meeting b.___less than one class meeting
   c.___a series of two or more class meetings.

6. Do you require your students to prepare any materials on listening? a.___Yes b.___No

7. Please check the materials you require students to prepare on children's listening.
   a.___research b.___sample listening lesson for children
   c.___sample listening center d.___on-site work with children on listening

8. Please check the following processes you emphasize for teachers to use with children. Please indicate the amount of emphasis placed on each. (1 dealt with in detail; 2 mentioned, not stressed; 3 not dealt with.)

   Emphasis for children
   a.___literal comprehension, recognition or recall of ideas, information or happenings that ate "explicitly stated," as recall of details, main ideas or sequence.

b.___inferential comprehension, the process of synthesizing the literal content, personal knowledge, intuition, and imagination as a basis for making conjectures or hypothesis, as inferring main ideas or predicting outcomes.
c.___evaluation, the process of making judgments about the content of a presentation by comparing it with external criteria, as judgments of reality and fantasy, judgments of fact or opinion, or judgments of desirability.
d.___appreciation, the psychological and aesthetic impact of the presentation on the listener, calling for the student to be emotionally and aesthetically involved, as emotional response to content, identification with characters or incidents or imagery.

APPENDIX C

ADOPTED TEXTBOOK LISTS BY STATES

ALABAMA

The following textbook adoption list was compiled from the Alabama State-Adopted Textbook List, published by the State Department of Education, State Office Building, Montgomery, Alabama 36130.

KINDERGARTEN

None

GRADE ONE

Patterns of Language, 1974 edition	American Book Company
The World of Language, Book Y, 1973 edition	Follett Publishing Company
Ginn Elementary English, 1975 edition	Ginn and Company
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, 1973 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
New Directions in English: All About You, 1973 edition	Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.
Composing Language: Steps, 1974 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Language and How to Use It, 1973 edition	Scott, Foresman and Company

GRADE TWO

Patterns of Language, 1974 edition	American Book Company
Keys to Good Language, 1975 edition	The Economy Company
The World of Language, Book E, 1973 edition	Follett Publishing Company
Ginn Elementary English, 1975 edition	Ginn and Company
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, 1973 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
New Directions in English: Backgrounds and Beginnings, 1973 edition	Harper and Row, Publishers,
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, and Writing, 1975 edition	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.

Macmillan English Series, 1973 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Language and How to Use It, 1973 edition	Scott, Foresman and Company

FLORIDA

The following textbook adoption list was compiled from the Catalog of State-Adopted Instructional Materials, published by the program coordinator, Florida Department of Education, Instructional Materials, Tallahassee, Florida 32304.

KINDERGARTEN

None

GRADE ONE

Patterns of Language, 1974 edition	American Book Company
The World of Language, Book Y, 1973 edition	Follett Publishing Company
Communication Skills Program, 1975 edition	Ginn and Company
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, 1973 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich,
Interaction, A Student-Centered Language Arts and Reading Program, 1973 edition	Houghton Mifflin Company
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, and Talking, 1975 edition	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.
Composing Language: Steps, 1974 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Macmillan English Series, 1973 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Secret Hand, 1974 edition	Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company

GRADE TWO

Patterns of Language, 1974 edition	American Book Company
The World of Language, Book E, 1973 edition	Follett Publishing Company
Communications Skills Program, 1975 edition	Ginn and Company
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, 1973 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Interaction, A Student-Centered Language Arts and Reading Program, 1973 edition	Houghton Mifflin Company
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing, 1975 edition	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.
Composing Language: Paths, 1974 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Macmillan English Series, 1973 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Tiger Tree, 1974 edition	Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company

GEORGIA

The following textbook adoption list was compiled from the Georgia Textbook List 1978, for Elementary and High Schools, published by Instructional Materials Section, Financial Services Division, Office of School Administrative Services, Georgia Deparment of Education, Atlanta, Georgia 30334.

KINDERGARTEN

None

GRADE ONE

Looking at Our Language Today, 1971 edition	American Book Company
Patterns of Language, 1974 edition	American Book Company
The World of Language, Book Y, 1972 edition	Follett Publishing Company
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, 1973 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
New Directions in English: All About You, 1973 edition	Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.

GRADE TWO

Asking About Our Language Today, 1971 edition	American Book Company
Patterns of Language, 1974 edition	American Book Company
The World of Language, Book E, 1972 edition	Follett Publishing Company
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, 1973 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

New Directions in English: Backgrounds and Beginnings, 1973 edition	Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.

KENTUCKY

The following textbook adoption list was compiled from the State Multiple List of Textbooks and the 1976 Textbook Adoptions for the Public Elementary and High Schools of Kentucky for the 1976-1981 Period for Adoption Group II, published by Kentucky Department of Education, Division of Instructional Media, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

KINDERGARTEN

None

GRADE ONE

Patterns of Language, 1974 edition	American Book Company
The World of Language, Book Y, 1972 edition	Follett Publishing Company
The World of Language, Book Y, 1973 edition	Follett Publishing Company
Ginn Elementary English, 1975 edition	Ginn and Company
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, 1973 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, 1975 edition	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.
Composing Language: Steps, 1974 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Secret Hand, 1974 edition	Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company

GRADE TWO

Patterns of Language, 1974 edition	American Book Company
The World of Language, Book E, 1972 edition	Follett Publishing Company
The World of Language, Book E, 1973 edition	Follett Publishing Company
Ginn Elementary English, 1975 edition	Ginn and Company
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, 1973 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing, 1975 edition	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.

Macmillan English Series, 1973 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Enjoying English 2, Linguistics, 1969 edition	Random House, Inc.
Tiger Tree, 1974 edition	Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company

LOUISIANA

The following textbook adoption list was compiled from the List of Adopted Materials, published by the State Department of Education, Materials of Instruction and Textbook Division, P. O. Box 44064, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70801.

KINDERGARTEN

None

GRADE ONE

Patterns of Language, 1974 edition	American Book Company
Language Experiences in Reading, 1974-76 editions	Encyclopedia Britannica Educational Corporation
Communications Skills Program, 1975 edition	Ginn and Company
Ginn Elementary English, 1975 edition	Ginn and Company
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, 1973 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich,
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, 1975 edition	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.
Composing Language: Steps, 1974 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Macmillan English Series, Language Activities, 1973 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Using Our Language, Book One, 1977 edition	Noble and Noble, Publishers, Inc.
Language Activity Cards, Series 1, 1974 edition	William H. Sadlier, Inc.
Language Exercises Series, 1973 edition	Steck-Vaughn Company
Today's Language Series, Arrow Book, 1974 edition	Steck-Vaughn Company
Secret Hand, 1974 edition	Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company

GRADE TWO

Patterns of Language, 1974 edition	American Book Company
Comprehension Skills Laboratory, Set B, 1976 edition	BFA Educational Media
Keys to Good Language, 1975 edition	The Economy Company
Language Experiences in Reading, 1974-76 editions	Encyclopedia Britannica Educational Corporation
Communications Skills Program, 1975 edition	Ginn and Company
Ginn Elementary English, 1975 edition	Ginn and Company
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, 1973 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing 1975 edition	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.
Macmillan English Series, Text-Workbook, 1973 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Composing Language: Paths, 1974 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Language Roundup, Bronco Book, 1976 edition	McCormick-Mathers Publishing Company
Using Our Language, Book 2, 1977 edition	Noble and Noble Publishers, Inc.
Language Activity Cards, Series 2, 1974 edition	William H. Sadlier, Inc.
Dinosaur Bones, 1973 edition	Scholastic Magazines, Inc.
Language Exercise Series, 1973 edition	Steck-Vaughn Company
Today's Language Series, Shell Book, 1974 edition	Steck-Vaughn Company
Tiger Tree, 1974 edition	Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company

MISSISSIPPI

The following textbook adoption list was compiled from the Mississippi State Textbook Publishing List, published by the Textbook Board, P. O. Box 1075, Jackson, Mississippi 39205

KINDERGARTEN

None

GRADE ONE

Ginn Elementary English, 1970 edition	Ginn and Company
How I Write, Book 1, 1972 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
Writing and Language, 1972 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
English Around the World, no publication date stated on textbook list.	Scott, Foresman Company

GRADE TWO

Ginn Elementary English, 1970 edition	Ginn and Company
How I Write, Book 2, 1972 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
Writing and Language, 1972 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
English Around the World, no publication date stated on textbook list	Scott, Foresman Company

NORTH CAROLINA

The following textbook adoption list was compiled from the Basic Textbooks, 1978-1979, published by the Division of Textbooks, Controller's Office, Department of Public Education, Education Building, Raleigh, North Carolina 27611.

KINDERGARTEN

None

GRADE ONE

Our Language Today, 1978 edition	American Book Company
Spectrum of English, 1978 edition	Glencoe
Language for Daily Use: Explorer, 1978 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, 1975 edition	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.

GRADE TWO

Our Language Today, 1978 edition	American Book Company
Spectrum of English, 1978 edition	Glencoe
Language for Daily Use: Explorer, 1978 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing, 1975 edition	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.

SOUTH CAROLINA

The review of the Catalogue of Adopted Textbooks for use in South Carolina Public Schools, published by the State Department of Education, Columbia, South Carolina, revealed:

KINDERGARTEN

None

GRADE ONE

None

GRADE TWO

None

TENNESSEE

The following textbook adoption list was compiled from the Tennessee Official List of Textbooks, published by the State Textbook Commission, 100 Cordell Hull Building, Nashville, Tennessee 37219.

KINDERGARTEN

None

GRADE ONE

None

GRADE TWO

The World of Language, Book E, 1973 edition	Follett Publishing Company
Language for Daily Use: Let's Talk and Write, 1973 edition	Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

TEXAS

The following textbook adoption list was compiled from the Current-Adoption Textbooks, 1978-79, published by Texas Education Agency, Textbook Division, 201 East Eleventh Street, Austin, Texas 78701.

KINDERGARTEN

None

GRADE ONE

Patterns of Language, 1974 edition	American Book Company
New Directions in English, All About You, 1973 edition	Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, 1975 edition	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.
Composing Language: Steps, 1974 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Secret Hand, 1974 edition	Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company

GRADE TWO

Patterns of Language, 1974 edition	American Book Company
New Directions in English, Backgrounds and Beginnings, 1973 edition	Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.
Experiences in Language: Listening, Reading, Talking, Writing, 1975 edition	Laidlaw Brothers, Inc.
Composing Language: Paths, 1974 edition	Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
Tiger Tree, 1974 edition	Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company

VIRGINIA

The review of Virginia School Textbook List, published by the State Department of Education, Richmond, Virginia, revealed:

KINDERGARTEN

None

GRADE ONE

None

GRADE TWO

None

VITA

Shirley Carol Raines was born in Jackson, Tennessee, on April 15, 1945. She attended elementary school in Bells, Tennessee, and graduated from high school there in June 1963. The following September she entered The University of Tennessee at Martin, and in June 1967 received her Bachelor of Science degree in Home Economics Education.

In the fall of 1967, she accepted an elementary teaching position in Louisville, Kentucky, and followed this experience with high school teaching in Indiana. In 1971, she moved to Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and entered the graduate school of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. After completion of her Master's degree in Child Development and Family Relationships, she became staff development coordinator and then director of Knox County Schools' Project Head Start. In addition, she was a part-time instructor in Child and Family Studies at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Shirley began her graduate studies in Education, Curriculum and Instruction, in 1974. In the summer of 1975, she completed a teaching practicum in Brixington Lane Infants' School in Exmouth, England. While a doctoral student, she taught at Roane State Community College and in conjunction with this assignment founded the Community Child Center. In July 1978, she moved to Tuscaloosa, Alabama, and

joined the early childhood/elementary education faculty of the University of Alabama.

The author is a member of Phi Delta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, Pi Lambda Theta, Delta Kappa Gamma, American Childhood Education International, National Association for the Education of Young Children, National Education Association, and Alabama Education Association.

She is married to Dr. Robert J. Canady and has one son, Brian.