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## ABSTRACT

The Assessment of Communication in Everyday Situations (ACES) was administered to sixty-three preschool and school-aged children in order to establish the reliability of ACES as a measure of communicative competence. Four types of reliability were studied: Alternate form, Test-retest, Internal consistency, and Rater reliability. Pearson Product Moment Correlations were computed for Overall scores, Social Use scores, Representational Use scores, and specific language use scores for the alternate form and test-retest studies. Results of these studies indicated that the three forms of ACES are parallel as well as stable over time. The Kuder-Richardson formula 20, used to compute the correlations for internal consistency of the three forms of ACES, suggest internal consistency. High, positive Pearson Product Moment Correlations were found for inter- and intra-rater reliability.
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## CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Speech Pathologists often observe that the language disordered child lacks the ability to make language shifis in terms of appropriateness of language to the social situation. When children show competence in the areas of articulation, grammar, and meaning, they are often overlooked by the speech pathologist as having disordered language due to inappropriate use. This inappropriate use of language usually results in misunderstandings and a breakdown in communication. Therefore, skill in communicating, in addition to competence in articulation, grammar, and meaning, should be concerned with ways of expressing and interpreting information so effectively that misunderstandings are avoided.

It is important for a child and a teacher to be able to communicate in order to exchange thinking or feelings about a subject, to receive information, and to give and receive instructions (Tough, 1976). Early academic achievement may depend to a great extent upon a child's abilities in the oral uses of language since oral language may be the only means of communication available to the child. Teachers are aware of the effect that inappropriate use of language has upon success of communication among peers and on the responses that the child will be able to make to experiences presented within the school curriculum. Inappropriate use of language may lead to misunderstandings and arguments among peers. In terms of academics, these children may appear not to understand concepts being presented to them because of an inability to follow directions, or they may in fact not understand concepts being presented because of an inability to understand information presented.

Since language development may play an important role in a child's intellectual or cognitive development (Vygotsky, 1962), the child who has developed only a limited variety of language uses and strategies must also be considered. A limited development of language uses and strategies may result in a child who can only report on past experiences but who cannot draw from those experiences in order to reason or predict and anticipate possibilities or project into experiences of others. It may lead to a child being able to label the components of an experience while being unable to make comparisons, recognize related aspects of situations, extract a central meaning from or reflect upon the meanings of experiences. Since education appears to be based on the ability to analyze and use past experiences to bring relevant knowledge to present experiences (Tough, 1976), it can be seen that language uses and strategies which may not be developed in a child may be precisely those needed for academic success. If either inappropriate language uses or limited variety of language uses exists when the child enters school, it may have a profound effect upon the child's academic achievement and social success.

To date, there are various means of measuring language structure including phonology, the sound system of language; syntax, the grammatical system of language; and semantics, the meaning system of language. However, there appears to be no standardized, systematic, and efficient means of measuring language uses. R. Jane Lieberman (1979) has designed an instrument, Assessment of Communication in Everyday Situations (ACES), which purports to measure not only linguistic competence, appropriate use of form, but also the appropriate use of language. This test was based on Joan Tough's (1976) seven uses of language: self-maintaining,
directing, reporting, towards logical reasoning, predicting, projecting, and imagining. ACES does utilize a systematic and efficient approach to the assessment of the uses of language. However, this test has yet to be examined for validity and reliability.

## Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to measure the reliability of the portion of ACES which examines the uses of language. This portion will be examined for test-retest reliability, alternate form reliability, rational equivalence, inter-rater reliability and intra-rater reliability.

## Hypotheses

1. There is a high positive correlation among the Overall scores on Forms 1, 2, and 3 of ACES.
2. There is a high positive correlation among Social Use and Representational Use scores on Forms 1, 2, and 3 of ACES.
3. There is a high positive correlation among use scores on Forms 1,2 , and 3 of ACES.
4. There is high test-retest reliability for each of the three forms of ACES.
5. There is a high positive correlation between the Social Use scores and Representational Use scores for each form of ACES.
6. There will be a high positive correlation between use scores for each form of ACES.
7. There is internal consistency within each of the three forms of ACES.
8. There is high intra-rater reliability for Form 1 of ACES.
9. There is high inter-rater reliability for Form 1 of ACES.

## Limitations of the Study

1. The subject pools were drawn from Watauga and Wilkes Counties in North Carolina and therefore may not be reflective of the total population of the United States.
2. The child who played the role of the friend may have participated in as many as six test administrations, three administrations for any one form.

## CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF RELATED IITERATURE

In the past fifteen to twenty years, there has been much research on normal and deviant aspects of language. Different disciplines have described language in different ways. Philosophers believed that the essential function of language was to describe the world. Sociologists examined language in terms of social usage and concentrated upon types of interaction. Psychologists have viewed language through the realm of learning theory. Linguists have been involved with the description of the form of normal language. Educators have looked at language in terms of what is necessary for academic success, with much emphasis on graphic skills. Speech and Language Pathologists are interested in the language user, especially the child or adult who uses language in a deviant way. Language, thus, covers a very broad category of human behavior.

For the purpose of this study, language has been defined as a system of arbitrary symbols which represents the real world and is used for the primary purpose of communication. Language is considered to be common knowledge among the members of the language community, with a shared system of rules and patterns. It is systematic, containing an organized set of symbols or a code. The rules governing the groupings and sequential arrangements of items are a feature of the code. The rule systems include phonology, the study of the sound system of language; syntax, the grammatical system of language; semantics, the meaning system of language; and pragmatics, the use of language (Bloom, 1978).

In the late 1950 's and early 1960 's, investigations of language were involved primarily with syntax of child language, both deviant and normal. Noam Chomsky (1957) developed the theory of Transformational Grammar which is primarily concerned with syntactic structures without considering context. In a transformational grammar, sentences are generated from abstract syntactic deep structures. Based on a hierarchy of phrase structure rules it is possible to change deep structures to surface structures through a variety of transformations. With syntax as the central focus, child language was not investigated until a child was twenty to twenty-four months of age, when early syntax, two word utterances, appears

In the 1960 's and 1970 's, researchers of child language (Brown, 1973; Schlesinger, 1971; Bloom, 1973; and Bowerman, 1973) began to look at Generative Semantics. They felt that transformational grammar did not adequately explain language, and that it was necessary to bridge the gap between cognitive development and language. Deep structures became semantic categories. Semantic relations worked on cognitive and perceptual grounds, and were considered to be representative of what children perceived in their environment, such as agents, actions, objects and locations. In this way, it became possible to examine language with the development of a child's first meaningful word, sometime between nine and eighteen months.

In the 1970's researchers (Bates, 1976; Hopper and Naremore, 1973; and Prutting, 1979) felt that by waiting until a child was nine months old too much information was being lost. They wished to examine communication before the first meaningful word and thus became interested in the Contextualist approach or pragmatics, which makes it
possible to examine child communication as early as two months of age. This is when the birth cry becomes differentiated in order to communicate changes in internal state.

Although until five or six years ago the study of the pragmatic area of language was largely ignored, it is not a new concept. The term pragmatics was first used in 1931 by a philosopher named. Pierce. Morris (1938), an anthropologist, redefined the term and divided the study of language into three areas, syntactics, semantics, and pragmatics. Syntax was defined as the relation of signs to one another; semantics as the relation of signs to the objects they refer to; and pragmatics as the relationship between signs and their human users and the condition under which the signs became a vehicle of communication. Pragmatics of language deals with principles that account for how language works. The knowledge of these rules and the ability to use them is what Hymes (1971) referred to as "communicative competence."

## Expanding the Notion of Competence

Linguistic competence is not sufficient to account for the realities of children as communicative beings. Linguistic competence refers to the ideal speaker/hearer's ability to judge the grammaticality of sentences, but does not explain how real chilaren judge the appropriateness of everyday communication. Hopper (1971) stated that the narrowness of the idea of linguistic competence could be seen in psycholinguistic research, where linguistic competence is defined as "knowledge of rules of grammar which underlies speaking" (Hopper, 1971, p. 29). Therefore it can be argued that linguistic competence ignores the issue of the communication situation in speech behavior.

Communicative competence, on the other hand, takes into account not only the implicit grammar but also the use of language (Hymes, 1971). In order to expand the notion on competence not only grammar but the totality of the speech act must be examined. The issue of the communication situation must be addressed since the situation can influence communication strategies. An example of this issue can be seen in the following situation:

Upon a child waking up in the morning, the Mother asks, "How do you feel this morning?" The child responds, "We
went to the zoo."
While the child's response was grammatically correct, it was not appropriate to the situation. Had the child responded, "I fine." the statement would not have been grammatically complete, but it would be appropriate to the situation. In other words, the first response was grammatical but was of no relevance because it made no sense in terms of the question. The second response, while not applying all the rules of grammar, was relevant since the answer to the question could be understood. Therefore, learning to communicate becomes a relationship between learning the forms of language and the function or use of language (Hopper and Naremore, 1973). The term competence must be expanded to include pragmatics, knowledge of use, in addition to linguistic knowledge.

Hymes (1972) defined eight areas which he felt accounted for the total speech event:

1. Act sequence includes the form and the content or topic of the message.
2. Act situation refers to the time and place of the speech event and to the psychological setting.
3. Participants include the audience, speaker, hearer, sender, receiver, addressor, and addressee.
4. Ends are defined as the purpose of the speech event in terms of goals and outcomes.
5. Key is the term used to describe the tone or manner of the speech event.
6. Instrumentalities include the channel of the speech event, whether written or verbal, and the form of speech.
7. Norms refer to the rules which govern speaking and the interpretation placed upon these rules.
8. Genres are defined as specific traditional categories or types of speaking and writing.

Of these eight areas in the speech act, only instrumentalities is being analyzed by linguistic technique. The other areas cannot be analyzed through the linguistic techniques currently available.

Cazden (1970) and Wood (1976) support the point of view that effective communication is not necessarily related to an elaborate vocabulary, grammatical correctness, or well-articulated speech sounds. Language may be incomplete or faulty in form; but due to its appropriateness to the situation, the message will be considered effective. Individuals who are effective communicators adjust their message to account for the persons involved in the communication, the time and place of the communication event, the subject matter, and the purpose or goal of the comrunication.

Hopper and Naremore (1971) view these aspects of situational context as parameters which influence the communication strategies which the individual will choose to employ. They define the personal context in terms of the effect of those involved in the communication interaction, whether by age, sex, educational status, or any other cultural aspect, will have upon the event. They also consider how individuals respond to their perception of the role people play in their lives. The physical context includes the effect of the time and place on the communication event. The message context considers what has been said just prior to the communication event. Each communication event is based on a prior event and all must be interpreted together. The context content deals with the fact that the topic will effect what is said, and how it is said. It is evident that in order for communication to be effective, it must be adapted to various factors of the communication situation: participants, setting, topic and task.

## Speech Acts

The philosophers' interest in language has emphasized the study of language use and intent. Two of the most significant contributors to this area of study are J. L. Austin and John Searle. They have been instrumental in shifting the focus of language study away from purely linguistic analysis to the analysis of how sentences function in communication. Thus, the focus of interest has become the communication act. In any speech situation there is a speaker, a hearer, and a speech act being performed by the speaker (Searle, 1975). The basis of Searle's (1969) theory of speech acts can be found in the work of

Austin (1962). Austin was interested in what communication can do. He believed that every communication act consisted of a locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary act.

> '/performing/ a locutionary act...is roughly equivalent to uttering a certain sentence with a certain sense and reference, which is again equivalent to meaning in the traditional sense. Second, we said that we also perform illocutionary acts such as informing, orderirg, warning, undertaking, etc., i.e. utterances which have certain conventional force. Thirdly, we may also perform perlocutionary acts: what we bring about or achieve by saying something such as convincing, persuading, detering, and even say, surprising or misleading (Austin, 1962, p. 108).

Searle (1969) expanded on Austin's work when he stated that speech acts, not sentences were the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication. The speech-acts theory became a way of analyzing the intentions of a speaker and how the listener reacted to those intentions. Searle (1969) defined four types of speech acts: utterance acts, propositional acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts. These four acts were viewed as parts of the total speech act and are all part of a total explanation of what is happening when a speaker says something to a listener. Utterance acts are the actual production of speech. They will always be present since an individual cannot perform a speech act without producing speech. Propositional acts are the production of meaningful sentences. Illocutionary acts are what Austin (1962) referred to as performatives, sentences which perform acts of promising, commanding, warning, begging and so forth. Perlocutionary acts refer to the effect or influence that the speech act has on the listener. In order to understand the speech-act theory, a better look must be taken at the illocutionary force or function of a
sentence. Searle (1975) presented a taxonomy of five functions of communication or illocutionary force:

1. Representatives -- the speaker is making an assertion which he believes to be true.
2. Directives -- the speaker is trying to get the listener to do something. In other words, the speaker is trying to control the behavior of the listener.
3. Commissives -- the speaker is committing himself to some further action.
4. Expressives -- the speaker reveals a psychological state such as attitude or mood.
5. Declarations -- the actual speech act brings about a new state of affairs.

This taxonomy was based on adult language. While it may be considered adequate for describing the function of adult communication, it has not been successful as a means to describe the function of the child's language. In terms of the young child, let us take another look at Searle's (1975) taxonomy:

1. Representatives -- young children do make assertions which they believe to be true.
2. Directives -- young children use directives from the preverbal stage on. This can be seen in the fact that an infant cries when he is hungry in order to get a parent to feed him.
3. Commissives -- young children will very rarely use this type of utterance. A commissive, linguistically, requires a complex sentence which children are not capable of making until they are approximately 3 to $3 \frac{1}{2}$ years of age.
4. Expressives -- these are heard in young children's language and usually take the form of hi, bye, or uh-oh.
5. Declaratives -- children are not capable of this speech act. Thus, it can be seen that while Austin (1962) and Searle's (1969, 1975) work form the theoretical framework for analyzing language according to intent and function, another taxonomy must be found for examining children's utterances.

## Other Taxonomies

According to Halliday (1975), early infant vocalizations do not contain form or structure but do contain expression and meaning in terms of the function the vocalization serves. Bates (1976) also found that pragmatic function may be fulfilled by means other than linguistic utterances. Children have been noted to effectively communicate messages before they have little or any control over language. Dore (1975) attempted to use a speech acts analysis for child language beginning at the one word stage. He described these one word utterances as "primitive speech acts," each of which contains a "rudimentary referring expression" and a "primitive force." The rudimentary referring expression was the single word and the primitive force was the intonation pattern which accompanied the word. The intonation pattern was used by the listener to clarify the intent of the utterance. From this beginning, Dore (1976) expanded his work in an attempt to describe child language in a speech acts framework. He made video recordings of seven, three-year-old children in a free play, preschool situation while they were interacting with each other and with their teacher. From these
recordings, Dore (1976) identified a list of numerous illocutionary acts which he placed into the following six categories:

1. Requests -- solicit information or action.
2. Responses -- complement the immediately preceding utterance.
3. Descriptions -- represent verifiable aspects of content.
4. Statements -- express analytical facts, beliefs, attitudes, and so forth.
5. Conversational devices -- regulate conversation.
6. Performatives -- accomplish acts merely by being said. This work was an important first step in identifying how preschool children can and do perform speech acts.

Halliday (1975) in his report of his son, Nigel's language development, begins to integrate child and adult language functions in terms of the speech acts framework. He theorized that language is at the center of socialization and that the structure that language takes is a reflection of the changing function of language, from its beginnings through its adult form. From an analysis of Nigel's language in context, Halliday (1975) showed how the early system was transformed into the adult system of language functions. This progression took place in three phases. Phase $I$, which for Nigel covered a period from approximately $10 \frac{1}{2}$ months to 18 months, was characterized by idiosyncratic communication. These communications did not necessarily contain adulttype words but were inclusive of the child's vocabulary of utterances. As Phase I proceeded, the utterances did become recognizable as adulttype words. Phase I contained the following six functions:

1. Instrumental -- a means of getting things -- the "I want" function, comparable to Searle's (1975) directive function.
2. Regulatory -- communication used to direct the behavior of others -- the "Do as I tell you" function, comparable to Searle's (1975) directive function.
3. Interactional -- communication used to maintain interaction between the child and someone else -- the "Me and you" function, most like Searle's (1975) expressive function.
4. Personal -- communication used to express feelings and attitudes -- the "Here I come" function, comparable to Searle's (1975) expressive function.
5. Heuristic -- communication used to find out about the environment -- the "Tell me why" function.
6. Imaginative -- communication used by the child to create a world of his own -- the "Let's pretend" function.

Phase II, which for Nigel began between $16 \frac{1}{2}$ and 18 months and ended about two years, was a period of transition. During this phase, a. seventh specific function emerged, the informative or "I've got something to tell you" function. In this function, language was used to convey a message. However, during Phase II the seven aforementioned functions merged into two major functions, the pragmatic and the mathetic. The pragmatic function was defined as "language as doing." It was a derivative of the instrumental and the regulatory functions of Phase I. The mathetic function was defined as "language as learning" and was derived from the personal and the heuristic functions. The interactional function of Phase I contributed to both the pragmatic and the mathetic functions of Phase II. In Phase II, the system was
described as becoming more complex as the child was able to play different roles as the user of language. Halliday (1975) defined these roles as that of the observer in the mathetic function and that of the intruder in the pragmatic function. It was in this phase that dialogue containing linguistic conventions began.

Phase III, which for Nigel began at approximately two years, was the beginning of the adult system. Its two main functions were the ideational, or the use of language to describe the real world, and the interpersonal function, or the means by which the individual participated in the speech situation. The ideational function took over the role of the observer, while the interpersonal function took over the role of the intruder. A third function, the textual, was also identified. This function appeared to be the one that enabled the other two functions to work. It was derived from the imaginative, informative, pragmatic, and mathetic functions. While Halliday's (1975) system appears to represent a detailed analysis of the functions of language, it should be noted that in Phase II and Phase III there are only three functions by which to analyze and classify all of the functions of child language. As noted by Tough (1977), Halliday's (1975) classifications do not adequately differentiate between numerous areas of child language.

From an examination of Piaget's theory, Joan Tough (1976), a British educator, believed that a classification system which would represent a greater range of differences in meanings expressed by children than those already mentioned, could be developed. She based her work on the theoretical viewpoints of Vygotsky, Luria, Lewis,

Bruner and Bernstein and defined seven uses of language which she felt were necessary in order for a child to achieve academic success:

1. Self-maintaining -- the use of language to create an awareness of the speaker's identity and to promote the individual's position in relation to others.
2. Directing -- use of language to control or regulate the physical actions and operations performed by others.
3. Reporting -- use of language to provide information about past and present experiences.
4. Toward Logical Reasoning -- use of language which employs rational thought and argument to interpret experiences.
5. Predicting -- use of language to extend communication beyond the immediate present or past experiences to events that have not yet occurred and which may never take place.
6. Projecting -- the use of language within an unfamiliar or external context.
7. Imagining -- use of language by an individual to create his or * her own world.

Each of these seven uses can be further divided into strategies of use, which are the means by which the child reveals the purpose or intent of his speech, such as labeling or comparing. The seven uses can also be grouped according to social use, self-maintaining and directing, and according to representational or cognitive uses, reporting, towards logical reasoning, predicting, projecting, and imagining.

In a longitudinal study to test the validity of her classification system, Tough (1977) recorded 64 children at 3 years of age. She again recorded these children at $5 \frac{1}{2}$ and 7 years of age. At the outset of the
study, Tough (1977) divided the children into two groups, 32 of whom had entered nursery school and 32 who had not and were not expected to enter nursery schocl. The two groups were further divided in half, into groups of "advantaged" and "disadvantaged" children. Advantaged children were considered to be those children whose parents practiced professions reached through higher education. The disadvantaged children were considered to be those children whose parents completed their education at the minimum age and worked at semi-skilled or unskilled jobs. All children included in the study achieved a minimum IQ of 105 as measured by the Stanford-Binet Scale of Intelligence (1960). The first language of the mother of each participant had to be English. The data was collected in three phases each lasting two years.

At 3 years of age, the children were recorded in a free play situation with a companion. The duration of the tape-recordings was for one hour or until the children wished to leave the room. No taperecording of less than three quarters of an hour was used. At the ages of $5 \frac{1}{2}$ and 7 , recordings were made of interviews with the children. These interviews were based on situations that required the children to use language for the purposes which appear necessary for academic success. All uses and strategies did appear in the transcribed data at each age level.

From the taxonomies discussed here, it appears that the one presented by Tough (1977) is the only one which will allow for the classification of the majority of utterances used by children. It also provides a simple, yet efficient, means of classification. Further, it appears to be the only one that looks at a large enough population to insure some amount of validity and reliability.

Ricillo (1978) used an interview format to assess communicative competence in children $2 \frac{1}{2}$ to 4 years of age. A series of pre-established probes centered around seven functional uses of speech made up the interview. The functions represented were: 1) contactive -- initiating communication, 2) conversative -- keeping interaction going, 3) descriptive, 4) directive, 5) explanatory, 6) narrative and 7) persuasive. Each child was given two chances to respond to the probe. Responses were judged as either appropriate or inappropriate. The only measure of reliability reported was that of interobserver reliability. The correlation coefficients reported ranged from 0.78 to 0.81 .

Tough (1976) developed a picture description task for the appraisal of language use. Since both preschool and school age children are familiar with looking at books and pictures, the format represented a common activity. Two sets of six pictures each were designed to provide enough detail so that when questioned about the pictures, a child could demonstrate the full range of his language use. By use of questions and comments, the examiner guides the child into making an overall interpretation of the picture. In order to make the interpretation, the child must recognize sufficient detail in regard to actions and incidents which involve the various characters in the stories. Responses are tape-recorded and analyzed according to Tough's (1976) framework for classification of language use.

The use of picture story situations is seen also in the work of Pagel (1978). He used situations of interpersonal conflict involving two boys of the same age. Each story describes a confrontation and requires the child to resolve the conflict in terms of what he feels
the main character in the story should do. To aid in the decision, five alternatives are presented at the end of each story, one violent and four nonviolent.

Blank, Rose, and Berlin (1978) developed the Preschool Language Assessment Instrument to assess children's skills in terms of their ability to deal with language demands of the academic setting. The test is to be used with children ages 3 to 6 , and includes three major components of classroom discourse defined by Moffet (1968): speakerlistener, the topic, and the level of discourse. The speaker-listener relationship refers to teacher-child interaction; topic represents perceptually based experiences common to any preschool program; and level of discourse reflects the increasing distance between a child's perception of the world and the language the child chooses to represent these perceptions. Blank et al. (1978) considered language which represents preceptions to lie along a continuum. Their test has been divided into four main levels of perception: 1) matching perception, 2) selective analysis, 3) reordering perception and 4) reasoning about perception. Test items are presented in a two-dimensional, black and white booklet format. Due to the variability of natural discourse, the authors have interspersed items from each of the levels throughout the test. The test can be used to analyze a child's performance in two ways. The first way in which the test can be used is based on a 0 to 3 point scoring system. The scores can be totaled and a mean score derived for the overall test or summed according to each of the four discourse skills, and a mean score can be derived for each category. The scores can also be used to compare the child's mastery of discourse skills to those of other children in the same age group.

As reported by Blank et al. (1978), rater reliability among four raters giving identical scores ranged from .81 to .93 across protocols. The correlation for split-half reliability for each of the four categories were: Group $I=.64$, Group $I I=.80$, Group III $=.83$, and Group IV $=.88$. Content, discriminative, and construct validity was also examined.

Ritti (1978) used six picture story sequences of three, black and white line drawings each, in order to study development of the social functions of speech. The stories include a card game, swimming, bicycle riding, bedtime, the bus stop, and school. These stories were presented to 240 middle-class, second, fourth, and sixth grade students. In response to the stories, the children were asked to write a statement which they would say in each situation. In addition, the children were asked to circle yes, no, or sometimes in response to ten alternate responses provided by the examiner in order to indicate whether or not the child would make a particular response to the situation. The five social speech function categories used in the analysis were developed by Soskin and John. These included: 1) informative -- object statements about the self, 2) directives -- direct regulatory statements, 3) inductives -- indirect messages that reveal inner physical or psychological states, 4) evaluations -- value statements and 5) expressives -- messages that may or may not effect the listener while discharging emotion. The results of this study indicated that choice of speech function message was affected by situation, and age and sex of the child.

Schachter, Kirshner, Klips, Fredricks, and Sanders (1974) developed a scoring system for the functions of spontaneous, interpersonal preschool speech from the viewpoint of the child's need to talk. The
scoring system, "Functions of Interpersonal Spontaneous Preschool
Speech" (FIS-P), was developed inductively. Schachter et al. (1974) developed their scoring system from 6,000 statements delivered by 150 preschoolers. These preschoolers consisted of four groups, advantaged and disadvantaged, black and white, all of above-average IQ. In addition, a fifth group of disadvantaged, black of lower IQ was used. The criteria for inclusion of a statement were: 1) the statement had to be spontaneous and 2) it had to be interpersonal. The FIS-P scoring system was used with twelve, three-minute language samples per child. Speech was observed in a free play situation, on at least two different days and on four days when possible. The observer hand recorded all utterances as well as the context and tone of each utterance. The scoring system consists of category scores and additional scores. Within the category scores, there were nine subdivisions: 1) expressive, 2) desire implementing, 3) possession rights implementing, 4) ego-enhancing, 5) self-referring-including, 6) joining, 7) collaborative, 8) learning implementing and 9) reporting. These nine categories were considered all inclusive of interpersonal spontaneous statements. Categories one through four covered personal motives; categories five through seven covered social motives; and categories eight and nine covered other motives not related to personal or social motives. Additional scores were used for appended scores, nonscores and listener designations.

The . 70 level of agreement for reliability was considered as adequate for this system. Interscorer reliability was . 73 agreement. For an assessment of the reliability of subject stability, results from a previous study (Schachter, 1971) in which 11 4-year old children
were observed by one observer, were used. Reliability was .97 . Coefficients were also calculated for those FIS-P scores which were produced by at least seven of the eleven subjects. The median consistency coefficient of reliability was .67 .

After reviewing several measures of language use, it can be seen that there are problems with each, including limited age range, lack of standardization, classification systems which were not all inclusive, difficult or inappropriate means of data collection and scoring procedures that are too involved. None of these measures represents an easy, efficient, standardized means of analyzing the use of language in children. These measures purport to measure communicative competence, yet none of them looks at linguistic competence.

## Assessment of Communication in Everyday Situations

The Assessment of Communication in Everyday Situations (Iieberman, 1979), which is based on Tough's (1977) taxonomy, was designed as a test of communicative competence. The test elicits spontaneous language through the use of situations familiar to a young child. Props are used to make the situations more real to the child. This test examines language in terms of syntax, morphology, and use of language. Two children are involved in the test situation, the subject and a friend selected by the subject. Test items are presented to both the subject and the friend. In this way, the Assessment of Communication in Everyday Situations provides an opportunity for the subject to use each of the seven uses and thirty-six strategies of Tough's system in an interactional situation with either the examiner, who takes on various roles such as a mommy, a daddy, a saleslady and so forth, or with the friend.

The children are also left alone for five minutes of free play during which time their conversation is recorded. The test administration is entirely recorded for later scoring. No scoring or recording is done during the administration so as not to interrupt the normal flow of conversation. Scoring values of 2,1 , and 0 are assigned to responses in terms of appropriateness of use and strategy. The score of 2 is given for a spontaneous appropriate response; a score of 1 is given for an appropriate response after a prompt; and a score of 0 is given for an inappropriate response. Syntax is analyzed for each response through the use of Developmental Sentence Scoring (Lee, 1974).

Content validity for the three forms of ACES was determined by asking 56 experts to judge whether or not specific test items would elicit correct responses. Out of 56 judges, there was 83 percent agreement that the test items from Form 1 would measure what they were purported to measure. The percentages of agreement for Forms 2 and 3 were 85 percent and 81 percent respectively (Peebles, 1980).

Of all the measures of communicative competence examined, it * appears that the Assessment of Communication in Everyday Situations is the only one to systematically examine the intent of communication. It
also, although less systematically, examines the topic, setting, and participants of the communication act. In addition, it is the only test which includes an analysis of the linguistic competence of a child's language. Just as it was felt that the use of communication could not be overlooked during the evaluation of a child's language, neither can linguistic competence be omitted, as it is an integral part of a child's communicative competence. Since the initial content validity study on ACES indicated good validity, this reliability study
was undertaken in the hope that a test of communicative competence which is easy to administer and score, efficient, and standardized has been developed.

## Importance of Reliability

There are three essential elements in the development of a good test: standardization, validity, and reliability. Standardization indicates that the group that the test has been administered to was well defined and that careful records had been kept of the group's performance. Selecting a well-defined group is important because validity and reliability will be based upon this group. A test is valid when it measures the characteristics that it was designed to measure. Reliability refers to consistency of measurement from one time to the next, or precision of measurement. The reliability coefficient tells what amount of the test variance is nonerror variance. Test validity is dependent upon reliability. A test will not be valid if it is not reliable. However, a test can be reliable without being valid. That is, a test may measure consistently from one time to the next without measuring the characteristics the test purports to measure (Roscoe, 1975).
"Concern over reliability comes from the necessity for dependability in measurement" (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 442). For example, if a cash register in a grocery store cannot be relied upon to give an áccurate total of a consumers purchases from one time to the next, it is of no value to either the grocery store or the consumer for it is undependable. Neither the consumer nor the store personnel would know which total was accurate unless they added up the purchases themselves; therefore, the cash register becomes worthless. If a test is
undependable, it cannot be relied upon to give an accurate measurement of the same objectives from one time to the next. Therefore, an examiner who uses an unreliable test would not know which score was an accurate measure. Also, if a test is not reliable, little faith can be placed in the data collected from the test. Conclusions drawn from an unreliable test would be subject to question (Kerlinger, 1973).

Rarely are tests ever perfectly reliable, and even highly reliable tests are subject to some degree of variance. This degree of variance is referred to as the standard deviation of a test. When selecting a test, it is important that the tester know the level of confidence, reliability, that can be placed in the score and the standard error of measurement for the test. The standard error of measurement is computed from the reliability coefficient and the standard deviation (Miller, 1972). There are several ways of determining reliability; each defines the variance or error of measurement in a slightly different way. Certain kinds of inconsistencies and not others are taken into account by each type of reliability. Each type of reliability then has its own significance (Issac and Michael, 1971).

Test-retest reliability refers to the administration of the same test to the same sample on two different occasions. A correlation between the two test scores for each subject is ascertained. This type of reliability may also be referred to as a coefficient of stability which implies that the characteristics being measured are fairly stable over a period of time. Test-retest reliability assumes that there is no practice effect or fatigue effect and that it is practical to administer the test twice to the same set of subjects in a short period of time. Error when using this type of reliability is due to any factor
which will cause an individual to achieve two different scores for the two administrations (Roscoe, 1975).

Coefficient of equivalence, also referred to as alternate forms, equivalent forms, or parallel forms, accounts for the administration of two parallel forms of the same test being administered to the same group of subjects. Because the forms are parallel but contain different test items, the tests may be administered fairly close in time. Therefore, the error introduced by change in ability through time will be minimal. Practice and fatigue effects will also be greatly reduced. Another type of error will be introduced in relation to the extent to which the two parallel forms are not equivalent (Roscoe, 1975).

Internal consistency is a measure of the homogeneity of the test items. This type of reliability coefficient may be obtained in two ways. The split-half technique requires that $a$ test be administered only once. The test items are split into two halves, usually by odd items and even items, which are scored separately. A correlation coefficient is calculated between the two test scores. The second method is through the use of the Kuder-Richardson formula 20. This formula examines the intercorrelation of test items and the extent to which the test items measure the same characteristics. This formula may be used with tests that have more than two categories of response. The advantages to these means of determining a reliability coefficient are that there is no time lag between administration and that the condition of administration and that the condition of administration will be constant. However, the definition of reliability refers to consistency of measurement over time. This method does not take into account the effect of testing on two separate occasions (Ferguson, 1971).

Inter-rater reliability examines the amount of agreement among different individuals scoring the test. It is necessary to determine whether or not the score is the product of the test itself, or the product of the scorer. If the test can be objectively scored, the rater should have no influence over the results. Another way to examine rater reliability is to look at intra-rater reliability, or the extent to which a rater will score the same test the same way on two different occasions. If a test cannot be scored consistently by one rater, there is very little chance it will be scored consistently by a group of raters (Larson, Backlund, Redmond and Barbour, 1978).

CHAPTER III
METHODS

## Subjects

Twenty-one children, ages 3 years, 9 months to 4 years, 3 months, were selected at random from a population pool of approximately 35 4-year old children enrolled at either the United Methodist Day Care Center, the Appalachian Early Learning Center, the Watauga County Child Development Center, or SHAPES Montessori School, all of Boone, North Carolina. In addition, 21 children, ages 5 years, 9 months to 6 years, 3 months, were selected at random from a population pool of approximately 35 6-year old children enrolled in kindergarten at Moravian Falls Elementary School, Wilkesboro, North Carolina. Another 21 children, ages 7 years, 9 months to 8 years, 3 months, were selected at random from a population pool of approximately 35 8-year old children enrolled in second grade at C. C. Wright Elementary School, Wilkesboro, North Carolina. Some of the children not selected from these population pools were used as the subjects' friend during test administration. Other children who participated in the test administrations as the friends were selected by the subjects from their classmates. If a child who had been selected to be a subject was also selected to be a friend, the child received the tests as a subject prior to acting as a friend. No child was allowed to act as a friend on any one form of ACES more than three times.

```
                    Apparatus
    Wollensak, portable, audio, tape recorders (Model 2620) and
Realistic, condensor, lapel microphones (Model 33-1056A) were used to
```

record all test administrations. Ampex, sixty-minute, lo-noise, audio, recording cassettes were used for the recordings.

## Procedures

Training procedures for test administration. Six graduate students and three faculty members from the Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology were trained on each of the three forms of ACES. The test format and administration procedures were presented and discussed. Appropriate and inappropriate responses to test items were devised. Practice testing was performed by each of the trainees on other members of the group. After each trainee had administered the test, a second administration by each trainee was critiqued by the group. The next stage of training consisted of test administration to preschool and school-aged children by each of the trainees on at least three occasions. A fourth administration by each trainee was videotaped and then critiqued by the group as a whole. Following review of the videotapes, changes in test administration were made to facilitate data collection. After the changes in the test procedures had been mastered, videotapes of the administration of the test to preschool and school-aged children by each of the trainees were critiqued by the group as a whole.

Training procedures for scoring. The training group consisted of six graduate students and two faculty members from the Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology. A number of transcripts of actual test administrations for each of the three forms at each of the three age levels was prepared. A series of transcripts was scored by each
member of the group with intervening periods of discussion and instruction. This procedure was continued until greater than 90 percent accuracy in scoring was attained by each member in the group for all three forms of the test at the three age levels that were used in the study.

## Experimental Design

The 4-year old and 8-year old age groups were divided at random into three groups of seven each. Each group of seven subjects was tested on one of the following schedules: Form 1, Form 1, Form 2; Form 2, Form 2, Form 3; or Form 3, Form 3, Form 1. All testing was completed on any one subject within a one-month time period.

The 6-year old age groups were all tested on a Form 1, Form 1 schedule. Testing schedules were developed in this manner to ensure that both a test-retest and alternate form situation existed with equal populations from the 4 -year old group and the 8-year old group being represented. The addition of the 6-year old group in the testretest situation for Form 1 was made to determine what effect a larger sample size would have on reliability.

The members of each of the above groups were assigned at random for testing to one of seven testers. Each group had members tested by from four to six testers. All tests were scored by the seven members of the testing group.

Rater-reliability. Each of seven raters scored and rescored a set of five tests which had been administered to the 6-year old age group. The tests were scored and rescored one week apart and were scored in random order at each session. Each rater was supplied with
a blank copy of the test, an answer form, directions for scoring, definitions and examples of the 7 uses and 36 strategies (Appendix A), a. written transcript of each test and the audio tape of the test. Raters were permitted to listen to each test item twice when necessary and were permitted forty-five minutes to score each test.

Data Analysis
For Hypotheses 1 through 6 and 8 and 9, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation formula (<compat>́<compat>ᅩ) for raw scores (Runyon and Haber, 1976) was used to analyze the data:

$$
r=\frac{\sum X-\frac{\left(\sum X X \sum Y\right)}{n}}{\sqrt{\left[\sum X^{2}-\frac{\left(\sum X\right)^{2}}{\pi}\right]\left[\sum Y^{2}-\frac{\left(\sum Y\right)^{2}}{n}\right.}}
$$

For Hypothesis 7, the Kuder-Richardson formula 20 ( $\underline{\underline{r}}_{\mathrm{xx}}$ ) was used to analyze the data for internal consistency (Ferguson, 1971).


The correlation coefficients for alternate forms, test-retest, inter-rater and intra-rater reliability were derived from the Pearson Product Moment Correlation. The Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 was used to test for internal consistency. A high correlation was defined as . 71 or above, coefficient of determination equaling .50 or higher (Guilford, 1956). For the overall scores on alternate form and testretest reliability, a difference between the correlation coefficient and coefficient alpha of less than 20 points (Nunnally, 1967) was included in the definition of a high correlation. All of the correlation coefficients were analyzed for levels of confidence using a onetailed test of significance since a prediction that the correlations would be positive was made (Roscoe, 1975). The results are discussed in terms of the combined 4- and 8-year old population unless otherwise stated. The discussions were based on combined populations as each segment of the total population contributed equally or near equally to the correlations.

## Restatement of Hypotheses

Ho 1.1 The correlation between Overall scores for Forms 1 and 2 of ACES is zero.

Ho 1.2 The correlation between Overall scores for Forms 1 and 2 of ACES is zero.

Ho 1.3 The correlation between Overall scores for Forms 3 and 1 of ACES is zero.

Ho 2.1 The correlation between the Social Use scores and the correlation between the Representational Use scores (see p. 17) for Forms 1 and 2 of ACES is zero.

Ho 2.2 The correlation between the Social Use scores and the correlation between the Representational Use scores for Forms 2 and 3 of ACES is zero.

Ho 2.3 The correlation between the Social Use scores and the correlation between the Representational Use scores for Forms 3 and 1 of ACES is zero.

Ho 3.1 The correlation between the use scores (see pp. 16-17) for Forms 1 and 2 of ACES is zero.

Ho 3.2 The correlation between the use scores for Forms 2 and 3 of ACES is zero.

Ho 3.3 The correlation between the use scores for Forms 3 and 1 of ACES is zero.

Ho 4.1 The correlation between an initial test and a retest on Form 1 of ACES is zero.

Ho 4.2 The correlation between an initial test and a retest on Form 2 of ACES is zero.

Ho 4.3 The correlation between an initial test and a retest on Form 3 of ACES is zero.

Ho 5.1 The correlation between the Social Use scores and the correlation between the Representational Use scores for Form 1 of ACES as determined in a test-retest situation is zero.

Ho 5.2 The correlation between the Social Use scores and the correlation between the Representational Use scores for

Form 2 of ACES as determined in a test-retest situation is zero.

Ho 5.3 The correlation between the Social Use scores and the correlation between the Representational Use scores for Form 3 of ACES as determined in a test-retest situation is zero.

Ho 6.1 The correlation between use scores for Form 1 of ACES as determined in a test-retest situation is zero.

Ho 6.2 The correlation between use scores for Form 2 of ACES as determined in a test-retest situation is zero.

Ho 6.3 The correlation between use scores for Form 3 of ACES as determined in a test-retest situation is zero.

Ho 7.1 The correlation for internal consistency of Form 1 of ACES is zero.

Ho 7.2 The correlation for internal consistency of Form 2 of ACES is zero.

Ho 7.3 The correlation for internal consistency of Form 3 of ACES is zero.

Ho 7.4 The correlation for internal consistency between Forms 1 and 2 of ACES is zero.

Ho 7.5 The correlation for internal consistency between Forms 2 and 3 of ACES is zero.

Ho 7.6 The correlation for internal consistency between Forms 3 and 1 of ACES is zero.

Ho 8 The correlation for intra-rater reliability is zero.
Ho 9 The correlations for inter-rater reliability are zero.

A summary of the hypotheses is presented in tabular form (Tables 1, 5, 9 and 10).

## Alternate Forms

 three forms of ACES were all found to be high, positive correlations at the . 005 level of statistical significance; $\underline{\underline{x}}=.97$ for Forms 1 to 2, .93 for Forms 2 to 3, and . 89 for Forms 3 to 1 (Table 2). The coefficient of determination ( $\underline{\underline{r}}^{2}$ ), the portion of the variance shared by two variables (Kerlinger, 1973) was .95 for Forms 1 to 2, . 87 for Forms 2 to 3, and . 80 for Forms 3 to 1. Coefficient alpha ( $r_{x x}$ ) between the three sets of test forms was . 94 , . 93 and . 93 respectively. This indicates that the three forms of ACES are alternate or parallel forms of the same test and that they do measure the same characteristics overall. When the tests were divided into the two subsets of Social Use and Representational Use, the correlation coefficients, with the exception of the correlation between Social Uses Form 3 and 1, were all found to be high, positive correlations at the .005 level of statistical significance (Table 3). The coefficients of determination for the subsets of Social Use revealed shared variance of Forms 1 and 2 to be .63, . 60 for Forms 2 and 3, and .43 for Forms 3 and 1. The coefficients of determination for the subsets of Representational Use revealed a shared variance for Forms 1 and 2 to be .93, . 88 for Forms 2 and 3, .69 for Forms 3 and 1. It was expected that both $\underline{\underline{r}}$ and $\underline{\underline{r}}^{2}$ for Social Use and Representational Use would be lower than $\underline{\underline{r}}$ and $\underline{\underline{r}}^{2}$ for the Overall scores since Social Use is a combination of only two of the seven subcategories or uses of language measured by ACES and Representational Use is a combination of five of the seven uses. However, even
these somewhat lower correlation coefficients and coefficients of determination indicate that these subsets are probably parallel to one another, Social Uses to Social Uses and Representational Uses to Representational Uses, thus measuring the same characteristics. When the tests were subdivided even further by the seven specific language uses, a clear pattern of co-relationship could not be identified (Table 4). The $\underline{\underline{x}}$ and $\underline{\underline{r}}^{2}$ for the use of Self-maintaining between Forms 1 and 2 do suggest parallelism. This was also noted for the use of Reporting between Forms 1 and 2, and Forms 2 and 3; Towards Logical Reasoning between Forms 2 and 3, and 3 and 1; Predicting between Forms 1 and 2; and Projecting between Forms 2 and 3. The uses of Directing and Imagining did not show any co-relationships among tests. The apparent lack of consistent co-relationship among various use scores from test to test may have been due to the small sample population tested and/or to the relatively few items employed to measure each language use: 6 test items for Self-maintaining, 5 for Directing, 9 for Reporting, 7 for Towards Logical Reasoning, 7 for Predicting, 5 for Projecting, and 3 for Imagining.

## Test-Retest

The correlation coefficients between Overall scores in a testretest situation for each of the three forms of ACES for the combined 4- and 8-year old population were all found to be high, positive at the . 005 level of statistical significance; $\underline{x}=.90$ for test-retest on Form 1, . 94 for test-retest on Form 2, and. 91 for test-retest on Form 3 (Table 6). The coefficients of determination revealed shared variance between the initial test on Form 1 and the retest to be .81 ,

TABLE 1
Summary For Alternate Forms

| Hypotheses | 4-Year Olds | 8-Year Olds | Total <br> Population | Decision |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ho 1.1 | $\underline{r}=.92$ | $\underline{r}=.58$ | $\underline{x}=.97$ | Rejected |
| Form | $\bar{p}=<.005$ | $\bar{p}=>.05$ | $\bar{p}=6.005$ |  |
| 1 and 2 | $\frac{r_{x x}}{d f^{\prime}}=5$ | $\frac{r_{x x}}{d f}=5.68$ | $\begin{aligned} & r_{x x}=.94 \\ & d f \end{aligned}=12$ |  |
| Ho 1.2 | $\underline{r}=.77$ | $\underline{r}=.89$ | $\underline{r}=.93$ | Rejected |
| Form | $\bar{p}=<.025$ | $\bar{p}=<.01$ | $\underline{p}=<.005$ |  |
| 2 and 3 | $\begin{aligned} & r_{x x}=.92 \\ & d f=5 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{r_{X x}}{d f}=4.93$ | $\frac{r_{x x}}{d f}=11.93$ |  |
| Ho 1.3 | $\underline{r}=.69$ | $\underline{r}=.42$ | $\underline{r}=.89$ | Rejected |
| Form | $\bar{p}=>.05$ | $\bar{p}=>.05$ | $\bar{p}=<.005$ |  |
| 3 and 1 | $\frac{r_{x x}}{d f^{t}}=4$ | $\frac{r_{x x}}{d f}=5.78$ | $\frac{r_{x x}}{d f}=11$ |  |
| Ho 2.1 | $\underline{r}=.88$ | $\underline{r}=.12$ | $\underline{r}=.79$ | Rejected |
| Form | $\bar{p}=<.005$ | $\underline{p}=3.05$ | $\underline{p}=<.005$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { and } 2 \\ & \text { SII } \end{aligned}$ | $d f=5$ | $\mathrm{d} f=5$ | df $=12$ |  |
| RU | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.89 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=5.005 \\ & =5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.69 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=3.05 \\ & \text { 位 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & r=.97 \\ & \frac{p}{p}=<.005 \\ & d f=12 \end{aligned}$ | Rejected |
| Ho 2.2 | $\underline{r}=.23$ | $\underline{r}=.80$ | $\underline{r}=.77$ | Rejected |
| Form | $\bar{p}=>.05$ | $\underline{p}=<.05$ | $\bar{p}=<.005$ |  |
| 2 and 3 | $d f=5$ | $d f=4$ | $\mathrm{df}=11$ |  |
| RU | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.83 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=<.025 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & r=.96 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=\langle .005 \\ & \frac{1}{d}=4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & r=.94 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=<.005 \\ & d 1 \end{aligned}$ | Rejected |
| Ho 2.3 | $\underline{\underline{r}}=.55$ | $\underline{r}=.22$ |  | Accepted |
| Form | $\bar{p}=3.05$ | $\bar{p}=3.05$ | $\bar{p}=<.01$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3 \text { and } 1 \\ & S U \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{d} f=4$ | $\mathrm{d} f=5$ | df $=11$ |  |
| RU | $\begin{aligned} & r=.44 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=y^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{x}=.45 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=5.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & r=.83 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=<.005 \\ & =11 \end{aligned}$ | Rejected |

## TABLE 1 (Continued)

| Hypotheses | 4-Year Olds | 8-Year 0lds | Total Population | Decision |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ho 3.1 | $\underline{r}=.76$ | $\underline{r}=.31$ | $\underline{r}=.73$ | Rejected |
| Form | $\bar{p}=4.025$ | $\bar{p}=3.05$ | $\bar{p}=<.005$ |  |
| 1 and 2 | $\overline{d f}=5$ | $\overline{d f}=5$ | $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{~d} f}=12$ |  |
| SM |  |  |  |  |
| DR | $\underline{r}=.64$ | $\underline{r}=-.72$ | $\underline{r}=.26$ | Accepted |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\bar{p}}{d f}=>.05 \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{p}=<.05 \\ & d f=5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{p}=>.05 \\ & d f=12 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $R P$ | $\underline{r}=.67$ | $\underline{r}=-.20$ | $\underline{r}=.88$ | Rejected |
|  | $p=<.05$ | $\bar{p}=>.05$ | $\bar{p}=<.005$ |  |
|  | $\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{df}}=5$ | $d f=5$ | $\overline{d f}=12$ |  |
| IR | $\underline{r}=.19$ | $\underline{r}=-.13$ | $\underline{r}=.59$ | Accepted |
|  | $\frac{p}{p}=>.05$ | $\underline{p}=7.05$ | $\overline{\mathrm{p}}=<.025$ |  |
|  | $\mathrm{d} f=5$ |  | $d f=12$ |  |
| PD | $\underline{r}=.63$ | $\underline{x}=.75$ | $\underline{r}=.77$ | Rejected |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{p}=>.05 \\ & d f=5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{p}=<.05 \\ & d f=5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{p}=\langle .005 \\ & d f=12 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| PJ | $\underline{r}=.09$ | $\underline{r}=.30$ | $\underline{\mathrm{r}}=.51$ | Accepted |
|  | $\bar{p}=>.05$ | $\bar{p}=7.05$ | $\bar{p}=<.05$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| IM | $\underline{r}=.64$ | $\underline{r}=.35$ | $\underline{r}=.67$ | Accepted |
|  | $\bar{p}=>.05$ | $\bar{p}=>.05$ | $\frac{p}{p}=<.005$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Ho 3.2 <br> Form <br> 2 and 3 <br> SU | $\underline{r}=-.17$ | $\underline{r}=.05$ | $\underline{r}=.46$ | Accepted |
|  | $\mathrm{p}=>.05$ | $\underline{p}=3.05$ | $\bar{p}=>.05$ |  |
|  | $\mathrm{d} f=5$ | $\mathrm{d} f=4$ | $\mathrm{df}=11$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| DR | $\underline{r}=.48$ | $\underline{r}=.26$ | $\underline{r}=.63$ | Accepted |
|  | $\underline{p}=>.05$ | $\underline{p}=3.05$ | $\underline{p}=<.025$ |  |
|  | $d f=5$ | $d f=4$ | $\mathrm{df}=11$ |  |
| RP | $\underline{r}=.62$ | $\underline{x}=.72$ | $\underline{r}=.85$ | Rejected |
|  | $\bar{p}=>.05$ | $\bar{p}=3.05$ | $\underline{p}=<.005$ |  |
|  | $\overline{d f}=5$ | $\overline{\mathrm{d}} \mathrm{f}=4$ | $\overline{d f}=11$ |  |

TABLE 1 (Continued)

| Hypotheses | 4-Year Olds | 8-Year Olds | Total <br> Population | Decision |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IR | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.53 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=5.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.69 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=4.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{\bar{p}}=\langle 88 \\ & \frac{d f}{d f}=11 \end{aligned}$ | Rejected |
| PD | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.33 \\ & p=3.05 \\ & d f=5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=-.05 \\ & p=7.05 \\ & d f=4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.64 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=\langle .01 \\ & \text { 位 } \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
| PJ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.64 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=>.05 \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.18 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & r=.75 \\ & p=<.005 \\ & d f=11 \end{aligned}$ | Rejected |
| IM | $\begin{aligned} & r=.76 \\ & p=\langle .025 \\ & d f=5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.00 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underline{r}=.51 \\ & p=>.05 \\ & d f=11 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ho } 3.3 \\ & \text { Form } \\ & 3 \text { and } 1 \\ & \text { SM } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.42 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{r}=.57 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=5.05 \\ & d \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.69 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=11 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
| DR | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.52 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{x}=-.71 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=<.05 \\ & d x \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.11 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=11 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
| RP | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=-.54 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.24 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=7.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.56 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=11 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
| IR | $\begin{aligned} & r=.88 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=\langle .025 \\ & =4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{r}=-.05 \\ & p=>.05 \\ & d f=5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underline{r}=.77 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=\langle .005 \\ & =11 \end{aligned}$ | Rejected |
| PD | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.02 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.05 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=5.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.57 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=11 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
| PJ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.23 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{\underline{p}}=-.10 \\ & d f=5 \\ & d f=5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.43 \\ & d f=.05 \\ & d f=11 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
| IM | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.76 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.60 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=5.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.61 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=11 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |

TABLE 2

## Correlation Coefficients For Alternate Forms By Overall Scores

| Forms | 4-Year Olds | 8-Year Olds | Total Population |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 to 2 | $.92^{* *}$ | .58 | $.97^{* *}$ |
| 2 to 3 | $.77^{*}$ | $.89^{* *}$ | $.93^{* *}$ |
| 3 to 1 | $.69^{*}$ | .42 | $.89^{* *}$ |

```
Forms 1 to 2 *p=.05 **p=.005
4-year olds - cases= 7, df= 5
8-year olds - cases= 7, df= 5
total population - cases=14, df=12
Forms 2 to 3
4-year olds - cases= 7, df= 5
8-year olds - cases=6, df=4
total population - cases=13, df=11
Forms 3 to 1
4-year olds - cases= 6, df=4
8-year olds - cases= 7, df= 5
total population - cases= 13, df= 11
```

TABLE 3
Correlation Coefficients For Alternate Forms By Social Use Scores and Representational Use Scores

TABLE 4
Correlation Coefficients For Alternate Forms

.94 between the initial test and retest of Form 2, and .83 between the initial test and retest of Form 3. The coefficient alpha between each of the three sets of tests was $.92, .94$, and .94 respectively. When the tests were divided into subsets of Social Uses and Representational Uses, the correlation coefficients were all found to be high positive at the .005 level of statistical significance (Table 7). The coefficients of determination for the subsets of Social Uses revealed the shared variance between the initial test on Form 1 and the retest to be .56 , between the initial test on Form 2 and the retest to be .75 , and between the initial test on Form 3 and the retest to be $\cdot 77$. The $\underline{r}^{2}$ for the subsets of Representational Uses revealed the shared variance between the initial test on Form 1 and the retest to be .82 , . 88 for the initial and retest on Form 2, and . 83 for the initial and retest on Form 3, again indicating a high test-retest reliability. When the tests were subdivided into the smaller units of language use, the majority of the correlations did indicate test-retest reliability (Table 8). The $\underline{x}$ and $\underline{\underline{r}}^{2}$ for the initial test and retest of Form 1 for the uses of Selfmaintaining, Reporting, Predicting, and Imagining are high positive. The $\underline{x}$ and $\underline{x}^{2}$ for the initial test and retest of Form 2 for the uses of Self-maintaining, Directing, Reporting, Towards Logical Reasoning, Predicting, and Projecting are all high positive. The $\underline{\underline{r}}$ and $\underline{\underline{r}}^{2}$ for specific language uses on the initial test of Form 3 and the retest are high positive for the uses of Self-maintaining, Reporting, Towards Logical Reasoning, Predicting, Projecting, and Imagining. This indicates that the aforementioned language uses do have high test-retest reliability and do measure the same characteristics over time. In addition, the specific use scores with high test-retest reliability for
any of the three forms are a good indication of the overall score reliability over time, although, they would be a somewhat lower estimate. It should be noted that test-retest reliability is usually affected by practice effect.

In an attempt to determine the effect of a larger population on reliability, a group of 6-year old children was added to the test-retest population for Form 1. The effect of this new population was to mildy depress both the correlation coefficient, from .90 to .86 , and the coefficient of determination from .81 to .74. The alpha coefficient was .92. The correlation coefficient for Social Use scores was moderate but still indicated a substantial relationship at the .005 level of statistical significance. The coefficient of determination was .26 . The correlation coefficient between Representational Use scores was high positive, $\underline{r}=.88, \underline{p}=.005, \underline{r}^{2}=.77$. The only specific use scores which indicated a high positive correlation were Reporting, $\underline{r}=.76, \underline{p}=.005, \underline{r}^{2}=.58$, and Predicting, $\underline{r}=.75, \underline{p}=.005$, $\underline{\underline{r}}^{2}=.56$.

One of the sources of variance may be related to the stability of a child's language system at various ages. Since the 6-year old group was the largest contributor to the above results, it may be that their system of language use is in a higher state of fluctuation than either the 4-year old or 8-year old age groups. It is known that children develop the concept of "home talk" and "school talk" (Hopper and Naremore, 1973). It may be that the language systems of 4-year old children are more stable because they have not yet been exposed to this difference; the 8 -year old children may have already overcome dealing with the two
systems; whereas, the 6-year old children may be in a state of transition.

## Internal Consistency

The coefficient alpha ( $r_{x x}$ ), which measures the homogeneity of test items, was found to be high positive for all three sets of alternate forms of ACES (Table 9); $\underline{r}_{x x}=.94, \underline{r_{x x}}=.93$, and $\underline{r x x}=.93$, respectively. For the test-retest situation, the $\underline{r}_{x x}$ for each form was also found to be high positive; for Form 1, $\underline{r}_{\mathrm{xx}}=.92, .94$ for Form 2, and .94 for Form 3. When the 6-year old population was included in the Form 1 test-retest, the $r_{\mathrm{XX}}$ was . 92 .

## Rater Reliability

Seven raters each scored and rescored five tests. The results of these scorings revealed that the correlation for intra-rater reliability was high positive overall; $\underline{x}=.84, p=<.001, \underline{x}^{2}=.71$ (Table 10). The correlations for inter-rater reliability among six of the seven raters was also high positive, ranging from $\underline{x}=.95, p=<.001$ to $\underline{x}=.73, \mathrm{p}=<.009$. The seventh rater obtained correlations between $.61, p=<.03$ and $.86, p=<.001$ (Table 10). This indicated that a rater will score the same test in the same manner on two separate occasions and will score tests given to different subjects in the same manner.

TABLE 5
Summary For Test-Retest

| Hypotheses | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4-Year } \\ & \text { Olds } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6-Year } \\ & \text { Olds } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8-Year } \\ & \text { Olds } \end{aligned}$ | Total Pop. | Decision |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ho 4.1 | $\underline{r}=.96$ | $\underline{r}=.73$ | $\underline{r}=.16$ | $\underline{r}=.86$ | Rejected |
| Form 1 | $\bar{p}=<.005$ | $\bar{p}=<.005$ | $\underline{\underline{p}}=>.05$ | $\underline{\underline{p}}=<.005$ |  |
|  | $r_{\mathrm{xx}}=.93$ | $\frac{r_{\mathrm{xx}}}{d f}=1.89$ | $\frac{r_{x x}}{d f}=.71$ | $r_{x x}=.92$ |  |
| Ho 4.2 | $\underline{x}=.95$ |  | $\underline{r}=.76$ | $\underline{r}=.93$ | Rejected |
| Form 2 | $\bar{p}=<.005$ |  | $\bar{p}=<.05$ | $\bar{p}=<.005$ |  |
|  | $r_{x x}=.93$ |  | $r_{x x}=.90$ | $r_{x x}=.94$ |  |
|  | $\frac{\lambda x}{d f}=5$ |  | $\frac{+x x}{d t}=4$ | $\frac{x x}{d f}=11$ |  |
| Ho 4.3 | $\underline{r}=.80$ |  | $\underline{r}=.49$ | $\underline{r}=.91$ | Rejected |
| Form 3 | $\overline{\mathrm{p}}=<.05$ |  | $\bar{p}=>.05$ | $\overline{\mathrm{p}}=<.005$ |  |
|  | $r_{X X}=.93$ |  | $r_{\mathrm{xx}}=.88$ | $r_{x x}=.94$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ho 5.1 | $\underline{r}=.40$ | $\underline{r}=.43$ | $\underline{r}=.32$ | $\underline{r}=.51$ | Accepted |
| Form 1 | $\underline{p}=>.05$ | $\underline{p}=<.05$ | $\underline{p}=3.05$ | $\bar{p}=<.005$ |  |
| SU | $\mathrm{df}=4$ | $\mathrm{d} f=16$ | $\mathrm{df}=5$ | $\mathrm{df}=30$ |  |
| RU | $\underline{r}=.99$ | $\underline{r}=.79$ | $\underline{r}=-.10$ | $\underline{r}=.88$ | Rejected |
|  | $\frac{p}{d f}=\langle .005$ | $\bar{p}=\langle .005$ | $\bar{p}=>.05$ | $\bar{p}=<.005$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ho 5.2 | $\underline{r}=.77$ |  | $\underline{r}=.83$ | $\underline{x}=.77$ | Rejected |
| Form 2 | $\underline{p}=<.025$ |  | $\underline{p}=<.025$ | $\underline{p}=<.005$ |  |
| SU | $\underline{d f}=5$ |  | $\overline{d f}=4$ | $\bar{d} f=11$ |  |
| RU | $\underline{r}=.90$ |  | $\underline{r}=.25$ | $\underline{r}=.94$ | Rejected |
|  | $\bar{p}=<.005$ |  | $\bar{p}=>.05$ | $\bar{p}=\langle .005$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ho 5.3 | $\underline{r}=.84$ |  | $\underline{r}=.52$ | $\underline{r}=.65$ | Accepted |
| Form 3 | $\bar{p}=<.025$ |  | $\underline{p}=>.05$ | $\underline{p}=<.01$ |  |
| SU | $\mathrm{d} f=4$ |  | $\mathrm{d} f=5$ | $d f=11$ |  |
| RU | $\underline{r}=.82$ |  | $\underline{r}=.40$ | $\underline{x}=.78$ | Rejected |
|  | $\bar{p}=<.025$ |  | $\bar{p}=7.05$ | $\bar{p}=<.005$ |  |
|  | $\overline{d f}=4$ |  | $d f=5$ | $\bar{d} f=11$ |  |
| Ho 6.1 | $\underline{r}=.77$ | $\underline{r}=.58$ | $\underline{r}=.25$ | $\underline{r}=.68$ | Accepted |
| Form 1 | $\mathrm{p}=<.05$ | $\underline{p}=<.05$ | $\underline{p}=>.05$ | $\underline{p}=<.005$ |  |
| SM | $\mathrm{d} f=4$ | $\mathrm{df}=16$ | $\mathrm{d} f=5$ | df $=30$ |  |

TABIE 5 (Continued)

| Hypotheses | 4-Year <br> 0lds | 6-Year <br> 0lds | 8-Year <br> 0lds | Total <br> Pop. | Decision |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

DR

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\frac{r}{p}=-.60 & \frac{r}{p}=.48 & \frac{r}{p}=.26 & \frac{r}{p}=.29 \\
\text { Accepted } \\
d f=4 & \frac{p}{d f}=\langle .025 & \frac{p}{d f}=16 & \frac{p}{d f}=>.05
\end{array}
$$

RP

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
r=.75 & r= & \underline{r}=.31 & \frac{r}{p}=-.05 \\
\frac{p}{p}=\langle .05 & \frac{p}{d f}=>.05 & \frac{p}{d f}=>.05 & \frac{p}{d f}=\langle .005 \\
d f=4 & \text { Rejected }
\end{array}
$$

LR

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\frac{r}{p}=.52 & \frac{r}{p}=.70 & \frac{r}{p}=-.54 & \frac{r}{p}=.54 \\
p=>.05 & \text { Accepted } \\
d f=4 & \frac{p}{d f}=16 & \frac{p}{d f}=5 & \frac{p}{d f}=3.005
\end{array}
$$

PD

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
r=.41 & r=.67 & r=.77 & r=.74 \\
p=\rangle \text { Rejected } \\
d f=4 & \frac{p}{d f=<.005} & p=\langle .025 & p=<.005
\end{array}
$$

PJ

IM

Ho 6.2
Form 2
SM

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
\frac{r}{p}=.68 & \frac{r}{p}=.45 & \frac{r}{p}=.36 & \frac{r}{p}=.64 \\
=>.05 & =\langle .05 & \text { Accepted }
\end{array}
$$

DR

RP

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{r}{p}=.62 \\
& p=>.05 \\
& d f=5
\end{aligned}
$$

LR

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underline{x}=.70 \\
& \frac{p}{d}=<.05 \\
& d f=5
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\frac{r}{p}=.79 & \frac{r}{p}=.92 \\
\frac{p}{d f}=4.05 & \frac{p}{d f}=4.005
\end{array} \text { Re jected }
$$

PD

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{r}{p}=.59 \\
& \frac{p}{d f}=5.05
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\frac{r}{p}=.52 & \frac{r}{p}=.77 \\
\frac{p}{d f}=4.05 & \frac{p}{d f}=.005
\end{array} \quad \text { Rejected }
$$

TABLE 5 (Continued)

| Hypotheses | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \text {-Year } \\ & \text { Olds } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6-Year } \\ & \text { Olds } \end{aligned}$ | 8-Year <br> Olds | Total Pop. | Decision |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PJ | $\begin{aligned} & r=.89 \\ & \frac{p}{p}=<.005 \\ & d f=5 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.45 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.94 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=1.005 \end{aligned}$ | Rejected |
| IM | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=1 . \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=5.000 \\ & \text { 友 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=-.22 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=>.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.66 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=<.01 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
| Ho 6.3 <br> Form 3 <br> SM | $\begin{aligned} & r=.96 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=<.005 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.36 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.69 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=1.005 \\ & =11 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
| DR | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.59 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=4 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.48 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & r=.11 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=>.05 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
| RP | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.56 \\ & d f=.05 \\ & d f=4 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.91 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=5.005 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.56 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=11 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
| $L R$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.79 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=4 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.14 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=>.05 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.77 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=<.005 \\ & =11 \end{aligned}$ | Rejected |
| PD | $\begin{gathered} \frac{r}{p}=.69 \\ \frac{p}{d f}=4 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.76 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=5.025 \\ & =5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=>.57 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=11 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
| PJ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.80 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=4 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.22 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=3.05 \\ & =5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{x}=.43 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=3.05 \\ & =11 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
| IM | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=1 . \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=4 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.28 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=3.05 \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{r}{p}=.61 \\ & \frac{p}{d f}=\langle .025 \\ & =11 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |

TABIE 6
Correlation Coefficients For Test-Retest
By Overall Scores

| Forms | 4-Year 01ds | 6-Year 01ds | 8-Year Olds | Total Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | . $96 * *$ | .73** | . 16 | . $86 * *$ |
| 2 | . $95^{* *}$ |  | .76* | . $93 * *$ |
| 3 | . $80 *$ |  | . 49 | . $91 * *$ |
| ```4-year olds - cases= 7, df= 5 6-year olds - cases= 18, df=16 8-year olds - cases= 7, df= 5 total population - cases=32, df=30``` |  |  |  |  |
| ```Form 2 4-year olds - cases= 7, df= 5 8-year olds - cases= 6, df=4 total population - cases= 13, df= 11``` |  |  |  |  |
| ```Form 3 4-year olds - cases= 6, df=4 8-year olds - cases= 7, df=6 total population - cases= 13, df= 11``` |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 7
Correlation Coefficients For Test-Retest
By Social Use Scores and Representational Use Scores

| Forms | 4-Year Olds | 6-Year 01ds | 8-Year Olds | Total <br> Population |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |
| SU | . 40 | . 43 | . 32 | . 51 |
| RU | . $99 * *$ | . $79 * *$ | -. 10 | . $88 * *$ |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| SU | - 77* |  | .83* | -77** |
| RU | . $90 * *$ |  | . 25 | . $94 * *$ |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| RU | . $82 *$ |  | . 40 | . $78 * *$ |
| Form 1 |  |  | * $\mathrm{p}=.05$ | **p=.005 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4 \text {-year olds - cases }=7, \mathrm{df}=5 \\ & \text { 6-year olds - cases }=18, \mathrm{df}=16 \\ & \text { 8-year olds - cases }=7, \mathrm{df}=5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Form 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 4-year olds - cases=?, df= 5 |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8-year olds - cases }=6, d f=4 \\ & \text { total population }- \text { cases }=13, d f=11 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Form 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 -year olds - cases=6, df=4 |  |  |  |  |
| 8-year olds - cases= 7, df=5 |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 8
Correlation Coefficients For Test-Retest
By Specific Language Uses

| Use | Form 1 |  |  |  | Form 2 |  |  | Form 3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 4- | 6- | 8- |  | 4- | 8- |  | $4-$ | 8- |  |
|  | Year | Year | Year | Total | Year | Year | Total | Year | Year | Total |
|  | Olds | Olds | Olds | Pop. | Olds | Olds | Pop. | Olds | Olds | Pop. |
| SM | . $77 *$ | . $58 *$ | . 25 | .68* | . 06 | .79* | . $87{ }^{* *}$ | . $96 * *$ | . 36 | . $69 * *$ |
| DR | -. 60 | . 48 | . 26 | . 29 | . 92 ** | .60 | .83** | . 59 | . 48 | . 11 |
| RP | . $75^{*}$ | . 31 | -. 05 | . $76 * *$ | . 62 | . 19 | . $78 \% *$ | . 56 | . $91 * *$ | . $56 *$ |
| LR | . 52 | . $70 * *$ | .54 | . $54 *$ | .70* | .79* | . 92 ** | .79* | . 14 | . 77 ** |
| PD | . 41 | . $67 *$ | -77* | . $74 * *$ | . 59 | . 52 | - 77 \%** | . $69 *$ | . $76 *$ | . $57 *$ |
| PJ | .68* | . 45 | . 36 | .64** | .89** | . 45 | . $94 * *$ | .80** | . 22 | . 43 |
| IM | .83* | -. 10 | -. 64 | . 46 | 1.00** | -. 22 | . $66 *$ | 1.00** | . 28 | .61* |

Form 1 *p $=.05 \quad{ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}=.005$
4-year olds - cases $7, \mathrm{df}=5$
6-year olds - cases $18, \mathrm{df}=16$
8-year olds - cases $7, \mathrm{df}=5$
total population - cases $32, \mathrm{df}=30$
total population - cases 32, $d f=30$
Form 2
8-year olds cases $6, d \in 4$
4 -year olds - cases 7, df= 5
total population - cases $13, \mathrm{df}=11$
4 -year olds - cases 6, df= 4
8 -year olds - cases 7, df= 5
total population - cases $13, \mathrm{df}=11$

## TABLE 9

Summary For Internal Consistency

| Hypotheses | 4-Year <br> Olds | 6-Year <br> Olds | 8-Year <br> 0lds | Total <br> Pop. | Decision |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

TABIE 10
Summary For Rater Reliability

| Hypothesis | $\underline{\underline{r}}$ | Decision |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ho 8 | . 84 | Rejected |
| Intra-rater | $\mathrm{p}=<.001$ |  |
| Ho 9 |  |  |
| Inter-rater |  |  |
| 1 to 2 | $p=\begin{gathered} .76 \\ p .009 \end{gathered}$ | Rejected |
| 1 to 3 | $p=<.90$ | Rejected |
| 1 to 4 | $p=\stackrel{.93}{<.001}$ | Rejected |
| 1 to 5 | $p=\stackrel{.82}{<.002}$ | Rejected |
| 1 to 6 | $\begin{aligned} & .62 \\ & \mathrm{p}=<.027 \end{aligned}$ | Accepted |
|  |  |  |
| 1 to 7 | $p=\stackrel{.94}{<.001}$ | Rejected |
|  |  |  |
| 2 to 3 | $p=\stackrel{.88}{<.001}$ | Rejected |
|  |  |  |
| 2 to 4 | $\mathrm{p}=\stackrel{.78}{2.004}$ | Rejected |
|  |  |  |
| 2 to 5 | $p=\begin{aligned} & .81 \\ & p=.002 \end{aligned}$ | Rejected |
|  |  |  |
| 2 to 6 | $p=\stackrel{.67}{<.02}$ | Accepted |
|  |  |  |
| 2 to 7 | $\mathrm{p}=\stackrel{.79}{<.003}$ | Rejected |
|  |  |  |
| 3 to 4 | $p=\begin{aligned} & .93 \\ & \underline{<} .001 \end{aligned}$ | Rejected |
|  |  |  |


| Hypothesis | $\underline{r}$ | Decision |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 to 5 | $p=\begin{aligned} & .95 \\ & <.001 \end{aligned}$ | Rejected |
| 3 to 6 | $\begin{gathered} .83 \\ p=<.002 \end{gathered}$ | Rejected |
| 3 to 7 | $p=8.87$ | Rejected |
| 4 to 5 | $\begin{aligned} & .90 \\ & \mathrm{p}=<.001 \end{aligned}$ | Rejected |
| 4 to 6 | $\begin{gathered} .69 \\ p=<.014 \end{gathered}$ | Accepted |
| 4 to 7 | $\begin{aligned} & .90 \\ & p=<.001 \end{aligned}$ | Rejected |
| 5 to 6 | $\begin{gathered} .86 \\ p=<.001 \end{gathered}$ | Rejected |
| 5 to 7 | $p=<.80$ | Rejected |
| 6 to 7 | $p=<.61$ | Accepted |

In this study, an attempt was made to establish the reliability of the Assessment of Communication in Everyday Situations. Twenty-one children, ages 3 years, 9 months to 4 years, 3 months, and 21 children, ages 7 years, 9 months to 8 years, 3 months, were selected at random to receive the various forms of ACES in both test-retest and alternate form situations. An additional group of 21 children, ages 5 years, 9 months to 6 years, 3 months, were selected at random to receive Form 1 as a test and retest. After discarding tapes of poor quality and dividing the children into various groups, the following sets of children were actually used: test schedule $1,1,2$, seven 4 -year olds and seven 8 -year olds; test schedule 2,2,3, seven 4-year olds and six 8-year olds; test schedule 3,3,1, six 4-year olds and seven 8-year olds; test schedule 1,1 eighteen 6-year olds.

Results of the alternate form study indicated that the Overall score, Social Use score, and Representational Use score all correlate significantly with their counterpart between each of the three forms of ACES. The coefficients of determination indicated that variance which occurred was shared variance. The correlations between specific use scores did not reveal any clear pattern of co-relationship. Therefore, the three forms of ACES do measure the same characteristics.

Results of the test-retest study for the combined 8- and 4-year old population indicated that the Overall scores, Social Use scores, Representational Use scores and the majority of specific use scores did correlate significantly from one test to the next. This indicated that
the various forms of ACES do measure the same characteristic over a period of time. When the 6-year old population was included in the test-retest situation for Form 1 of ACES, a lower but high positive correlation was the result.

The alpha coefficients between forms of the test and within test forms were all high positive for the combined 4- and 8-year old population. The alpha coefficient for Form 1 test-retest when the 6-year old population was included was also high positive.

To assess rater reliability, five tape recordings of 6-year old children on Form 1 were scored and rescored by seven raters which meant that a total of 450 items were scored in all. The correlation coefficient for intra-rater reliability was high positive at the .005 level of statistical significance. This indicated that a rater will score and rescore the same test on two separate occasions in the same manner. The correlation coefficients between six of the seven raters were also high positive varying between the .000 and .009 level of statistical significance. The seventh rater's correlation to the other raters varied between moderate but definite, and high positive.

## Suggestions for Further Research

The results of this pilot study established the reliability of an efficient, systematic assessment of language use for children ages 4 through 8. The information that can be obtained through the use of ACES yields valuable information not only to the speech and language pathologist, but also to the classroom teacher. For the speech and language pathologist, it can add the area of language use to present therapy procedures; and for the classroom teacher, it can add this area
of language to present language stimulation programs, aiding both normal and deviant users of language.

In order for ACES to be of even greater value, further research should include:

1. A replication of this reliability study with a larger sample population drawn from different geographic areas of the country.
2. A developmental study to establish test norms for the various age groups to be examined by ACES.
3. A hierarchical analysis of the seven specific language uses.
4. An examination of teaching strategies that may best be used to develop appropriate language uses for both normal and deviant users of language.
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## A FRAMEWORK FOR THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE USES OF LANGUAGE

Operational Definitions and Examples
I. SELF-MAINTAINING - the use of language to create an awareness of the speaker's identity and to promote his position in relation to others.
a. Referring to physical and psychological needs - includes utterances which seek to satisfy desires.

1. I want a new bicycle.
2. I need to wash my hands.
3. I want the yellow one.
b. Protecting the self and self interests - includes utterances spoken in defense of oneself and one's rights and property.
4. That's my bow.
5. Give me that back, I'm using it.
6. Don't take it, it's mine.
c. Justifying behavior and claims - includes utterances which give a psychological (appealing to internal states or motivations) or social (appealing to rules, conventions, what is expected or simply fact) reason for actions or demands.
7. Please let me go to the party. I promise to clean up my room.
8. I'm gonna mess your picture all up because I don't like it.
9. You can't play. You're too little.
d. Criticizing others - includes utterances which find fault with the listener often by belittling his status or abusing him by name calling.
10. You're a dummy.
11. You're not setting the table right.
12. I don't like your house, it's yukky.
e. Threatening others - includes utterances which promise to
bring about a state considered to be unpleasant to the
listener. A threat is usually accompanied by a statement of the external conditions under which the event will take place.
13. You better let me have a turn or I'll tell the teacher.
14. If you don't stop bothering us, I'll tell my mother.
15. Your house is ugly. I'm gonna mess it all up.
II. DIRECTING - the use of language to control or regulate the physical actions and operations performed by oneself and others.
a. Monjtoring own actions - includes the running commentary or monologue which accompanies and reflects upon the speaker's own ongoing activity.
16. I'll put some tape on here and over here.
17. I'll put the doors here and the window here.
18. I'm putting the peanut butter on this and the jelly on this.
b. Directing the actions of the self - includes the running commentary or monologue which guides and controls the speaker's own ongoing activity. It implies a measure of high concentration on precise, sustained or intricate activity which commonly occurs in the face of some difficulty or obstacle.
19. I have to slide this off and put the thing through the paper.
20. I'm pulling it, pulling it; it tore.
21. This is hard to open. I'm twisting it, turning it.
c. Directing the actions of others - includes utterances which are designed to guide a listener through an immediate action or series of actions.
22. Pick out a square. Put the door in the middle and the chimney on top.
23. Put the toy in the box, then put the paper over the box and tape it down. Next you put the bow on top.
24. Slide the wings through there and put the tail right here.
d. Collaborating in action with others - includes utterances made in a context of cooperation which propose or plan a course of action for the speaker and one or more listeners.
25. You put the plates and the cups out and I'll do the napkins and the silverware.
26. I'll look at the car and you look at the jump rope.
27. When you finish putting on the wheels, I'll put on the windows.
III. REPORTING - the use of language to provide information about past and present experiences.
a. Labeling - includes utterances which serve the simple purpose of identifying observed phenomena.
28. I see a pencil, kleenex, and an eraser.
29. I like the ball and the babydoll.
30. Peanut butter and jelly sandwiches and juice.
b. Referring to detail - includes utterances which serve to describe the criterial attributes of objects, actions and/or events.
31. I want the orange ball with the stars on it.
32. The nurse's kit has some tiny bandaids and a thermometer in it.
33. I use the one with the little bug sitting under the mushroom.
c. Referring to incidents - includes utterances which describe the occurrence of an action or event.
34. She's jumping rope and they're playing marbles.
35. We played with the shapes and I got to clean the blackboard.
36. The bandit is shooting his gun.
d. Referring to the sequence of events - includes utterances which accurately reflect the serial nature of several, related actions or incidents.
37. First we played Pin-the-Tail-on-the-Donkey and then Jean opened her presents.
38. I get up in the morning, get dressed, eat my breakfast and pack my lunch.
39. We played ball, flew an airplane and finally we ate lunch.
e. Making comparisons - includes utterances which link objects, actions or experiences through examination of similarities and differences.
40. My ball is bigger and it's a different color than this © one.
41. This lunchbox is little and this one is big.
42. On my picnic we didn't go to a park. We went to the beach.
f. Recognizing related aspects - includes utterances which posit an association between two or more actions or events.
43. The cowboy is driving the stagecoach and it's going very fast.
44. He was walking on top of the monkey bars in his new shoes and he slipped and fell.
45. The wind stopped blowing and my plane crashed.
g. Extracting or recognizing central meaning - includes utterances which impose a primary structure or coherence upon a situation or event and serve to unify the contributing parts into a composit whole.
46. The robber stole all the money from the stagecoach.
47. The dog wasn't happy with just one pork chop and he tried to get another one and lost them both.
48. Mom was in the kitchen making juice and she dropped something.
h. Reflecting on the meaning of experiences - includes utterances which express the speaker's attitudes or feelings about a situation.
49. I liked the party. We had a good time.
50. I feel sad aoout my best friend being in a different class.
51. I was mad because my plane crashed.
IV. TOWARDS LOGICAL REASONING - the use of language which employs rational thought and argument to interpret experiences.
a. Explaining a process - includes utterances which describe a particular method of doing something, generally involving several steps or operations.
52. You put on a blindfold and get turned all around. Then you pin the tail on the donkey.
53. Everybody gets in a circle and one person walks around the circle and taps everyone on the head. When he says goose you got to run and try to catch him.
54. You put the peanut butter on a piece of bread and the jelly on another piece and then you put them together.
b. Recognizing causal and dependent relationships - includes utterances which acknowledge a logical and relevant connection between two situations and which express this most commonly in terms of "how" and "why".
55. She gets a tummy ache cause she eats too much cake.
56. I can't write with this pencil cause it doesn't have a point.
57. If it rains, we can't go on the picnic.
c. Recognizing problems and their solutions - includes utterances which acknowledge obstacles to a course of action and suggest ways to surmount them.
58. That box is too small. I need a bigger one.
59. The red blouse is missing a button, I'll wear the white one.
60. That bag's got a hole in it. Let's use the other one.
d. Justifying judgments and actions - includes utterances which offer a reason or explanation for decisions and behaviors which apply only to a particular situation.
61. I don't want to buy the dog. One eye is missing.
62. I can't go with you now. I have to clean the blackboards first.
63. If she climbs the tree, she might fall and break her arm again.
e. Reflecting on events and drawing conclusions - includes utterances which evaluate the implications of an action or event and result in judgments.
64. It's not nice to take someone else's candy.
65. It's not nice to be greedy.
66. She's gotta be careful so she won't break her arm again.
f. Recognizing principles - includes utterances which provide an elemental rule or rules to explain observed phenomena.
67. It's worse for a big boy cause they should know better.
68. No, it's not right cause we should take turns.
69. The sun has been shining on the slide all day and it's very hot.
V. PREDICTING - the use of language to extend communication beyond immediate present or past experiences to events that have not yet occurred and which may never take place.
a. Anticipating/forecasting - includes utterances which contemplate future happenings.
70. My birthday is in the summer.
71. I'm gonna play on the swing.
72. We're going on Saturday.
b. Anticipating the detail of actions and events - includes utterances which delineate or describe future happenings or remote concerns.
73. I would like to have a dress-up party.
74. I'd like some sugar cookies and some chocolate milk.
75. She should put down the plates for each of us. Put the cups above the plates and the silverware on each side.
c. Anticipating the sequence of events - includes utterances which propose an ordered series of related actions or events.
76. First, I'll put the paper on, then I'll put a bow on top.
77. First I get dressed and then I eat breakiast.
78. We'll play in the park and then we'll eat.
d. Anticipating problems and possible solutions - includes utterances which acknowledge possible obstacles to a planned course of action and suggest ways to surmount them.
79. There won't be enough cake. She'll have to cut more pieces.
80. If the door was locked, I'd go over to Jeff's house and wait til Mom got home.
81. If it rains, we'll go to the movies.
e. Anticipating and recognizing alternative courses of action -
includes utterances which offer several different interpretations or explanations of a situation.
82. He might be running to catch a bus or he might have stolen a toy.
83. I could use a pen or a crayon.
84. We could have some lemonade or ice tea.
f. Predicting consequences of actions or events - includes
utterances which suggest a possible outcome of some immediate or future action or event.
85. The police might catch him and put him in jail.
86. If I'm not careful, I might fall down and hurt myself.
87. She'll have to clean it up.
VI. $\frac{\text { PROJECTING }}{\text { context. }}$ - the use of language within an unfamiliar or external
a. Projecting into the experiences of others - includes utterances which contemplate everyday occurrences from another's perspective.
88. He'll have to sleep on a hard bed.
89. She will make new friends.
90. She couldn't tie her shoes.
b. Projecting into feelings of others - includes utterances which reflect what it feels like to be another individual. Emotions and attitudes which are representative of another's point of view are expressed.
91. I think Jean feels happy.
92. She's sad, too.
93. He feels bad.
c. Projecting into reactions of others - includes utterances Which consider how another individual would respond to a particular situation or experience.
94. That's alright Jeff. I'll clean it up.
95. Alright quiet down or we won't go outside.
96. I don't want to climb the tree.
d. Projecting into situations never experienced - includes utterances in which the speaker conjectures about his own feelings and reactions to unfamiliar activities or events.
97. I'd be locked up in a cell and I wouldn't get much to eat.
98. I'd let everybody go home at noon.
99. The doctor would fix my arm.
VII. IMAGINING - the use of language by an individual to create his own world.
a. Developing an imaginary situation based on real life - includes utterances used to assume a make-believe role in a situation which is possible in everyday life.
100. May I take your order please. Yes, I'd like some coffee and a piece of blueberry pie. O.K. Coming right up.
101. Look! The horse is chewing on the fence. Hey, Tex come help me with this pony.
102. Hurry up! The judges are already seated and the rodeo is about to start. Let's buy our tickets.
b. Developing an imaginary situation based on fantasy - includes utterances used to assume a make-believe role in a situation which has never happened or could never happen.
103. I'm gonna radio the base ship. There's a falling star in our path.
104. Spiderman won't catch me this time. I'm gonna rob the bank.
105. Look! Tyrannosaurus Rex is eating the tree for lunch. We better get in the cave.
c. Developing an original story - includes a fictional account of incidents or events, generally consisting of an introduction, development, and conclusion.
106. One day Joey found an old dirty ball in the street. He picked it up and took it home. Then he washed it off and it was as good as new.
107. One day a little doggie got sick. Nurse Nellie gave him some medicine and made him all better.
108. One day I found a little silver cup in a drawer. My mom told me it was my baby cup so I polished it and put it on a shelf in my room.
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 男 } \\ & \text { Z } \\ & \text { 泉 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 包 } \\ & \text { 苳 } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{7}{\text { m }}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\text { m }}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{3}$ |  |
|  | \％ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\text { co }}$ | \％ |  |
|  | $\underbrace{\text { cosen }}$ |  |  | ． |
| z 0 0 0 |  |  |  | ． |
| 2 | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |
| 葸 | 产菏 | ¢ | $\dot{\sim}$ |  |





APPENDIX D
FORM 3 OF ACES - THE PICNIC
Instructions


[^1]



| $\begin{aligned} & \text { M } \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 曷 | ท | $\stackrel{0}{-}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\text { n }}$ |  |
|  | － | －宸 | － |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\cdots$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $z$ <br>  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\sim}{\underset{H}{4}}$ | $\stackrel{-}{\circ}$ | $\dot{\sim}$ | $\dot{m}$ |  |



|  |  | － |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { H } \\ & \text { Ho } \\ & \text { K } \end{aligned}$ | $\cdots$ | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{4}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\sim}$ |  |
|  | $\frac{1}{\square}$ | $\cdots$ | 号 | 吕 |  |
|  |  | 合 <br> $\underset{4}{4}$ <br> 3 3 3 3 <br> H O 0 0 0 <br> 品 |  | 8 <br> 8 <br> -1 $\stackrel{-1}{2}$ 3 | ； |
| z |  |  |  |  | ． |
| 른 | $\stackrel{*}{ }$ |  |  |  | ． |
|  | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\underset{*}{\infty}$ | $0^{\circ}$ |  |



| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nox } \\ & \text { O} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\stackrel{\square}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{m}{\square}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{n}$ | $\cdots$ |
|  | $\xrightarrow[\substack{0 \\ \text { L } \\ \hline}]{1}$ | 号 | － | － |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 忐 |  |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\sim}{\text { 槀 }}$ | $\pm$ | $\underset{*}{\text { n }}$ ． | $\stackrel{\square}{-}$ | $\stackrel{-}{\stackrel{-}{*}}$ |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M <br> \% <br> \% <br> \% <br> \% |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 易 | $\bigcirc$ | $\stackrel{\square}{-}$ | $\stackrel{9}{7}$ |  |
|  | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $\sum_{5}$ |  |
|  |  |  | $\stackrel{y}{3}$ $\stackrel{3}{3}$ <br>  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 隠 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | * |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 先000䍂 |  |  | － |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\cdots$ | $\therefore \quad 3$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ |  |
|  | － | ．$\quad$i | －$\sum_{0}^{1}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| z |  |  |  | ． |
| \％ |  |  |  |  |
| 帝 | $\dot{\sim}$ | กั | กั่ |  |



|  |  |  |  |  | － |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\pm$ | $\sim$ | $\sim$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\sim}$ |  |
| 朢 | H | 㨞 | －1 | 号 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Z <br> ¢ <br> H | ． |  |  |  | ． |
| $\underset{\sim}{5}$ | $\stackrel{\text { Ṅ }}{ }$ | คั่ | กั่ | $\stackrel{\circ}{*}$ |  |


| 部 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 号 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  |  |
| ， | $\%$ | ？ | 5 |  |
| 章 | \％ | $\stackrel{3}{1}$ | $\stackrel{\text { \％}}{\text { \％}}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 包管" | $\stackrel{3}{3}$ | \％ |  |  |
| 咅 | $\stackrel{\square}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{3}{\square}$ | $\frac{1}{5}$ |  |



| 븐 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 䏛 } \\ & \text { O} \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ |  | － |
|  |  | ： |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 苞 } \\ & \stackrel{\substack{k}}{ } \end{aligned}$ | － | $\cdots$ |
|  | $\frac{1}{2}$ | ： |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 끈 |  |  |
| 总 | － | $\stackrel{7}{4}$ |



| 薟 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $$ |  | ก | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ |  |
|  |  | ¢ | ？ |  |
| H <br> 4 <br> $Z$ <br>  <br>  | $\therefore$ |  |  |  |
| 资 |  |  |  | － |
| z 0 0 4 4 | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\sim}{5}$ |  | 守 | 年 |  |

APPENDIX E
SCORING FORM AND SCORE GUIDES

SCORI:G GUIDE
THE BIRTHDAY PARTY

| ITES | TARGET | CODE | FUTCIION | STPATSY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | SLi-P | 1.6 | Self-:aintaining | Questioning |
| 2. | Stec | 1.3 | Self-:Taintaining | Justifying behavior and claims |
| 3. | Pd-E | 5.7 | Predicting | Questioning |
| 4. | Pj-e | 6.5 | Projecting | Questioning |
| 5. | Rp-a | 3.1 | Reporting | Labelling |
| 6. | Pd-a | 5.1 | Predicting | Anticipating/forecasting |
| 7. | Pd-e | 5.5 | Predicting | Anticipating and recognizing |
| 8. | Pd-P | 5.6 | Predicting | Predicting the consequences of actions or events |
| 9. | Pj-a | 6.1 | Projecting | Projecting into the experiences of others |
| 10. | Pj-d | 6.4 | Projecting | Projecting into situations never experienced |
| 11. | Rp-p | 3.6 | Reporting | Recognizing related aspects |
| 12. | Rp-b | 3.2 | Reporting | Referring to detail |
| 13. | Im-c | 7.3 | Imagining | Developing an original story |
| 14. | Rp-e | 3.5 | Reporting | Makint comparisons |
| 15. | IR-g | 4.7 | Logical Reasoning | Questioning |
| 16. | Dr-d | 2.4 | Directing | Collaborating in action with others |
| 17. | IR-d | 4.4 | Losical Reasoning | Justifjing judzements and action |
| 18. | IR-C | 4.3 | Logical Reasoning | Recognizing problems and solutions |
| 19. | Pd-c | 5.3 | Predicting | Anticipating a sequence of event |
| 20. | Lr-c | 4.3 | Logical Reasoning | Recoenizing problems and solutions |
| 23. | DR-a | 2.1 | Directing | Monitoring own actions |
| 22. | SLE-b | 1.2 | Selp-Maintaining | Protecting the self and self-interest |
| 23. | Dr-c | 2.3 | Directing | Directing actions of others |
| 24. | Dree | 2.5 | Directing | Questioning |
| 25. | IR-a | 4.1 | Logical Reasoning | Explaining a process |


| ITRS | TAPGET | CODE | Euncrion | Smpanegy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 26. | SUSd | 1.4 | Sele-:aintainins | Criticizing others |
| 27. | S11-E | 1.5 | Selp-:aintaining | Threatening others |
| 28. | $\mathrm{Rp}-\mathrm{P}$ | 3.6 | Reporting | Recogniziñ related aspects |
| 29. | Rp-g | 3.7 | Reporting | Extracting or recognizing the central meaning |
| 30. | Rp-c | 3.3 | Reporting | Referming to incidents |
| 31. | Pj-b | 6.2 | Projecting | Frojecting into the fellings 0 I others |
| 32. | Stin | 1.6 | Self-Maintaining | Questioning |
| 33. | Im-a | 7.1 | Imagining | Developing an imaginary situation based on real life |
| 34. | Im-b | 7.2 | Imagining | Developing an imasinary situation based on fantasy |
| 35. | SM-a | 1.1 | Slef-Haintaining | Relerring to needs |
| 36. | Pd-d | 5.4 | Predicting | Anticipating problems and possible solutions |
| 37. | Pj-c | 6.3 | Projecting | Projecting into the reactions of others |
| 38. | LR-b | 4.2 | Iogical Reasoning | Reoognizing casual and dependent relationships |
| 39. | Dr-b | 2.2 | Directing | Directing the actions of the self |
| 40. | IR-e | 4.5 | Logical Reasoning | Reflecting on events and drawing conclusions |
| 41. | IR-P | 4.6 | Logical Reasonirg | Recognizing principles |
| 42. | Rp-d | 3.4 | Reporting | Referring to the sequences of events |
| 43. | Rp-h | 3.8 | Reporting | Reilecting on the meaning of experiences |
| 44. | Pd-a | 5.1 | Predicting | Anticipating/forecasting |
| 45. | Pd-b | 5.2 | Predicting | Anticipating the detail of events |


| ITET | TARGET | CODE | FUSTCIION | STPATEGY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Pd-P | 5.6 | Predicting | Predicting the consequences of actions or events |
| 2. | Pd-c | 5.3 | Predicting | Anticipating a sequence of events |
| 3. | Irae | 2.5 | Directing | Questioning |
| 4. | IR-C | 4.3 | Iosical reasoning | Pecognizing problems and solutions |
| 5. | sw-a | 1.1 | Self-Maintaining | Reperring to needs |
| 6. | PP-a | 3.1 | Reporting | Iabelling |
| 7. | IR-b | 4.2 | Logical Reasoning | Recognizing casual and dependent relationships |
| 8. | pame | 5.5 | Predicting | Anticipating and recognizing alternative courses of action |
| 9. | SIT-b | 1.2 | Self-Maintaining | Protecting the self and selfinterest |
| 10. | DR-b | 2.2 | Directing | Directing the actions of the selp |
| 11. | Rp-e | 3.5 | Reporting | Making comparisons |
| 12. | IR-b | 4.2 | Iogical Reasonins | Recognizing casual and dependent relationships |
| 13. | Rp-h | 3.8. | Reporting | Reflecting on the meaning of experiences |
| 14. | PJ-b | 6.2 | Projecting | Projecting into the feelings of others |
| 15. | PJ-a | 6.1 | Projecting | Projecting into the experiences of others |
| 16. | Rp-i | 3.9 | Reporting | Questioning |
| 17. | Sm- | 1.6 | Self-raintaining | Questioning |
| 18. | Rp-b | 3.2 | Reporting | Referring to detail |
| 19. | Im-c | 7.3 | Inasining | Developins an orisinal story |
| 20. | DR-a | 2.1 | Directing | Lonitoring own actions. |


| ITE: | TARGET | code | FuTCITO: | Smargey |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 21. | DR-c | 2.3 | Directing | Directing actions of others |
| $\begin{aligned} & 22 . \\ & 23 . \end{aligned}$ | SU-c/a | $\begin{aligned} & 1.3 \\ & 1.4 \end{aligned}$ | Sell Laintaining | justifyirz benavior and clains Critizing others |
| $24 .$ | DR-d | 2.4 | Directing | Collaborating in action mith others |
| 25. | pd-a | 5.1 | Predicting | Anticipatind/Forecasting |
| 26. | Pd-E | 5.7 | Predicting | Questioning |
| 27. | PJ-C | 6.3 | Projecting | Projectins into the reactions of others |
| 28. | PJ-e | 6.5 | Projectins | Questioning |
| 29. | IR-d | 4.4 | Losical Reasoning | Justipyins judgements and actions |
| 30. | IR-S | 4.7 | Logical Reasoning | Questioning |
| 31. | LR-a | 4.1 | Logical Reasoning | Explaining a process |
| 32. | Pd-£ | 5.6 | Predicting | Predicting the consequences of actions or events |
| 33. | Rp-1 | 3.6 | Reporting | Recognizing related aspects |
| 34. | SM-P | 1.6 | Self-Maintaining | Questioning |
| 35. | SLIme | 1.5 | Self-Waintaining | Threatening others |
| 36. | IR-9 | 4.6 | Logical Reasoning | Recognizing principles |
| 37. | Rp-d | 3.4 | Reporting | Referring to the sequence of events |
| 38. | Rp-S | 3.7 | Reporting | Extracting or recognizing the central meaning |
| 39. | IR-e | 4.5 | Losical Reasoning | Rerlecting on events and drawing conclusions |
| 40. | Im-a | 7.1 | Imaginins | Developing an inarinary situation based on real life |
| 41. | ITM | 7.3 | Imagining | Developing an imaginary situation based on Pentasy |
| 42. | Pd-b | 5.2 | Predictirg | Anticipating the detail of events |
| 43. | Pd-d | 5.4 | Predicting | Anticipating problems and possible solutions |
| 44. | Rivec | 3.3 | Reporting | Referming to incidents |
| 45. | Pj-d | 6.4 | Projecting | Projecting into situations never experienced |

SCORII:G GUIDE
GOING OR A PICRIC

| ITRE | TARGET | CODE | FUNCTI ON | stramggy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Pd-g | 5.7 | Predicting | Questioning |
| 2. | Sx-1 | 1.6 | Self-Maintaining | Questioning |
| 3. | Pd-c | 5.3 | Predicting | Articipating a sequence of events |
| 4. | Pd-a | 5.1 | Predicting | Anticipating/forecasting |
| 5. | IR-e | 4.5 | Logical Reasoning | Reflecting on events and drawing conclusions |
| 6. | Pj-a | 6.1 | Projecting | Projecting into the experiences of others |
| 7. | Pj-d | 6.4 | Projecting | Projecting into situations never experienced |
| 8. | IR-b | 4.2 | Logical Reasoning | Recogrizins casual and dependent relationships |
| 9. | Pd-d | 5.4 | Predicting | Anticipating problems and possible solutions |
| 10. | Pd-e | 5.5 | Predicting | Anticipating and recognizing alternative courses of action |
| 11. | Rp-a | 3.1 | Reporting | Labelling |
| 12. | LR-a | 4.1 | Logical Reasoning | Explaining a process |
| 13. | Dr-a | 2.1 | Directing | Monitoring own actions |
| 14. | $\mathrm{Dr}-\mathrm{b}$ | 2.2 | Directing | Directing the actions of the self |
| 15. | IR-C | 4.3 | Logical Reasoning | Recognizing probleas and solutions |
| 16. | Rp-6 | 3.7 | Reporting | Extracting or recognizing the central meaning |
| 17. | Rp-c | 3.3 | Reporting | Referring to incidents |
| 18. | Pj-e | 6.5 | Projecting | Questioning |
| 19. | SH-P | 1.6 | Self-iatntaining | Questioning |
| 20. | Sti-c | 1.3 | Self-ilaintaining | Justilying bebavior and clatms |
| 21. | Drec | 2.3 | Directing | Directing actions of others |
| 22. | In-5 | 4.7 | Logical Reasoning | Questioning |


| 23. | S: 5 | 1.2 | Self-Maintaining | Protecting the selp and sele interest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24. | Rp-1 | 3.5 | Reporting | Recognizing related aspects |
| 25. | Rp-h | 3.8 | Reporting | Reflecting on the meaning of experiences |
| 26. | Pj-c | 6.3 | Projecting | Projecting into the reactions of others |
| 27. | In-d | 4.4 | Lrogical Reasoning | Justifying judzements and actions |
| 28. | Dr-e | 2.5 | Directing | Questioning |
| 29. | - Pd-b | 5.2 | Predicting | Anticipating the detail of events |
| 30. | Dr-d | 2.4 | Directing | Collaborating in action with others |
| 31. | Rp-b | 3.2 | Reporting | Referring to detail |
| 32. | Rp-1 | 3.9 | Reporting | Questioning |
| 33. | Im-c | 7.3 | Imagining | Developing an original story |
| 34. | STIT-d | 1.4 | Self-Maintaining | Criticizing others |
| 35. | Sur-e | 1.5 | Self-ifaintaining | Threatening others |
| 36. | Pj-b | 6.2 | Projecting | Projecting into the feelings of others |
| 37. | Pd-P | 5.6 | Predicting | Predicting the consequences of actions or events |
| 38. | Pd-e | 5.5 | Precicting | Anticipating and recognizing alternative courses of action |
| 39. | Sifa | 1.1 | Self-Saintaining | Referring to needs |
| 40. | Sifoc | 1.3 | Self-ifaintaining | Justifyins behavior and clatms |
| $41:$ | In-a | 7.1 | Imagining | Developing an imasinery situation based on real life |
| 42. | Im-b | 7.2 | Imagining | Developing an inazinary situation based on Ientancy |
| - 43 | IR-1 | 4.6 | Logical Reasoning | Recosnizing principles |
| 44. | Rp-e | 3.5 | Reporting | Heking comparisons |
| 45. | $\mathrm{Rp}-\mathrm{d}$ | 3.6 | Reporting | Recosnizing related aspects |


| Mronth | Day | Year | Namo |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |



|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 朗 | $8{ }^{50}$ |  |  | O ${ }^{3}$ | － | 剅雨 |  |
|  | $\stackrel{\square}{*}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| － |  | － | 8989 | － |  | e | － | 8 | － |  |
| － |  |  | $\bigcirc$ | － | 1 | 1 |  |  | － | － |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  | 20］${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | － $0^{3}$ |  |
| － | $\frac{\square}{4}$ |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{4}{4}$ |  | H0 $\square^{\circ}$ | 5 | $\sqrt{\text { ma }}$ | E－${ }^{\text {a }}$ | ह－${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | \＃0． | 5 |
|  |  |  |  | $11$ |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $8^{80}$ |  |  | In9 E0 | 5 |  | 5 |  |  |
|  |  | － | － | － | ＋ | ＋ | －＇ | ＋ | － | － |
|  |  |  |  |  | － | － |  |  |  |  |
|  | 浱 | Ema | 河 | 为 | 豇里可 | － $0^{\text {a }}$ | － 0 － 50 | $55^{50} 0$ | 20等 | 50．$\overline{515}$ |
|  |  | － | （1） |  |  | \％ |  |  | \％ | （1） |

anamer



|  | $x 1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | $\leftarrow$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $E$ | 会 0 |  | 当 | 访 | 0 | Fic | E 20 | I 0 | คم |  | 江 5 | E－2 | R | 因 0 |








 | $x$ | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $N$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $=1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



APPENDIX F
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

## MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS <br> 4-Year 0lds

| Forti $1 \times 1$ | Means | Standard Deviations | Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SM | 4.17 | 2.56 | 6 |
| DR | 4.67 | 2.16 | 6 |
| RP | 5.33 | 2.73 | 6 |
| LR | 3.00 | 1.79 | 6 |
| PD | 5.33 | 3.20 | 6 |
| PJ | 3.33 | 2.50 | 6 |
| IM | 3.17 | 1.72 | 6 |
| SU | 8.83 | 3.92 | 6 |
| RU | 20.17 | 6.94 | 6 |
| TS | 29.00 | 10.60 | 6 |
| Form $1 \times 2$ |  |  |  |
| SM | 4.83 | 1.83 | 6 |
| DR | 5.50 | 1.22 | 6 |
| RP | 6.17 | 2.79 | 6 |
| LR | 5.50 | 2.81 | 6 |
| PD | 5.83 | 2.48 | 6 |
| PJ | 3.17 | 1.60 | 6 |
| IM | 3.33 | 1.21 | 6 |
| SU | 10.33 | 2.58 | 6 |
| RU | 24.00 | 6.36 | 6 |
| TS | 34.33 | 7.84 | 6 |


| Form $1 \times 3$ | Means | Standard Deviations | Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SM | 4.33 | 1.63 | 6 |
| DR | 5.00 | 1.90 | 6 |
| RP | 7.00 | 3.90 | 6 |
| LR | 3.67 | 4.03 | 6 |
| PD | 7.00 | 3.29 | 6 |
| PJ | 5.83 | 1.72 | 6 |
| IM | 4.33 | 1.50 | 6 |
| SU | 9.33 | 2.58 | 6 |
| RU | 27.83 | 10.52 | 6 |
| TS | 37.17 | 12.10 | 6 |
| Form $2 \times 1$ |  |  |  |
| SM | 2.29 | 1.60 | 7 |
| DR | 1.86 | 2.34 | 7 |
| RP | 7.43 | 4.12 | 7 |
| IR | 3.29 | 3.04 | 7 |
| PD | 6.57 | 4.83 | 7 |
| PJ | 3.86 | 3.39 | 7 |
| IM | 4.00 | 1.15 | 7 |
| SU | 4.14 | 3.48 | 7 |
| RU | 25.14 | 14.14 | 7 |
| TS | 29.29 | 17.21 | 7 |
| Form $2 \times 2$ |  |  |  |
| SM | 3.57 | 1.62 | 7 |
| DR | 3.14 | 2.79 | 7 |
| RP | 8.14 | 4.60 | 7 |
| LR | 4.14 | 2.79 | 7 |


| Form $2 \times 2$ | Means | Standard Deviations | Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PD | 8.29 | 3.55 | 7 |
| PJ | 3.86 | 3.18 | 7 |
| IM | 4.00 | 1.15 | 7 |
| SU | 6.71 | 2.69 | 7 |
| RU | 28.43 | 12.62 | 7 |
| TS | 35.14 | 14.76 | 7 |

Form $2 \times 3$

| SM | 4.57 | 2.44 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| DR | 3.00 | 1.41 | 7 |
| RP | 6.57 | 3.15 | 7 |
| LR | 4.00 | 2.52 | 7 |
| PD | 7.71 | 2.98 | 7 |
| PJ | 4.43 | 2.64 | 7 |
| IM | 3.29 | 1.60 | 7 |
| SU | 7.57 | 3.55 | 7 |
| RU | 26.00 | 9.88 | 7 |
| TS | 33.57 | 12.04 | 7 |

Form $3 \times 1$

| SM | 3.00 | 2.61 | 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| DR | 3.33 | 2.42 | 6 |
| RP | 7.50 | 3.02 | 6 |
| LR | 4.33 | 3.20 | 6 |
| PD | 6.50 | 2.88 | 6 |
| PJ | 4.33 | 3.20 | 6 |
| IM | 3.33 | 1.63 | 6 |
| $S U$ | 6.33 | 3.98 | 6 |


| Form $3 \times 1$ | Means |  | Standard Deviations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HU | 26.00 | 8.85 |  |
| TS | 32.33 | 11.81 | 6 |

Form $3 \times 2$

| SM | 5.00 | 3.90 | 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| DR | 4.83 | 2.14 | 6 |
| RP | 8.67 | 1.75 | 6 |
| IR | 6.67 | 2.58 | 6 |
| PD | 7.67 | 3.20 | 6 |
| PJ | 5.33 | 1.50 | 6 |
| IM | 3.67 | .82 | 6 |
| SU | 9.83 | 5.67 | 6 |
| RU | 32.00 | 7.77 | 6 |
| TS | 41.83 | 13.01 | 6 |

Form $3 \times 3$

| SM | 4.14 | 3.29 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| DR | 3.00 | 1.91 | 7 |
| RP | 7.43 | 2.99 | 7 |
| IR | 5.71 | 1.70 | 7 |
| PD | 6.57 | 4.83 | 7 |
| PJ | 5.71 | 3.35 | 7 |
| IM | 4.29 | .76 | 7 |
| SU | 7.14 | 4.38 | 7 |
| RU | 29.71 | 8.83 | 7 |
| TS | 36.86 | 12.38 | 7 |

MEANS AND STANDAFD DEVIATIONS
6-Year 01ds

| Form $1 \times 1$ | Means | Standard Deviations | Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SM | 6.28 | 2.02 | 18 |
| DR | 4.39 | 2.23 | 18 |
| RP | 9.78 | 2.88 | 18 |
| LR | 6.06 | 2.71 | 18 |
| PD | 9.83 | 2.46 | 18 |
| PJ | 6.11 | 1.53 | 18 |
| IM | 3.83 | . 51 | 18 |
| SU | 10.67 | 3.29 | 18 |
| RU | 35.61 | 5.95 | 18 |
| TS | 46.28 | 7.23 | 18 |
| Form $1 \times 2$ |  |  |  |
| SM | 7.50 | 1.62 | 18 |
| DR | 4.39 | 2.23 | 18 |
| RP | 11.11 | 3.01 | 18 |
| LR | 8.00 | 2.59 | 18 |
| PD | 10.22 | 2.13 | 18 |
| PJ | 7.00 | 1.78 | 18 |
| IM | 3.72 | . 96 | 18 |
| SU | 11.72 | 2.67 | 18 |
| RU | 40.06 | 7.52 | 18 |
| TS | 51.78 | 8.66 | 18 |

## MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS 8-Year Olds

| Form $1 \times 1$ | Means | Standard Deviations | Cases |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SM | 7.29 | 1.11 | 7 |
| DR | 4.57 | 1.99 | 7 |
| RP | 15.57 | 2.15 | 7 |
| IR | 8.00 | 1.53 | 7 |
| PD | 10.86 | 2.12 | 7 |
| PJ | 6.86 | 1.95 | 7 |
| IM | 4.14 | . 38 | 7 |
| SU | 11.86 | 2.12 | 7 |
| RU | 45.43 | 2.88 | 7 |
| TS | 57.29 | 3.64 | 7 |
| Form $1 \times 2$ |  |  |  |
| SM | 7.57 | 2.23 | 7 |
| DR | 5.00 | 1.29 | 7 |
| RP | 12.71 | 1.25 | 7 |
| LR | 9.29 | 1.60 | 7 |
| PD | 9.57 | 2.37 | 7 |
| PJ | 7.86 | . 90 | 7 |
| IM | 4.43 | . 97 | 7 |
| SU | 12.57 | 1.62 | 7 |
| RU | 43.86 | 3.18 | 7 |
| TS | 56.43 | 3.70 | 7 |


| Form $1 \times 3$ | Means |  | Standard Deviations |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| SM | 8.29 | 3.15 |  |
| SR | 5.71 | 1.11 | 7 |
| RP | 13.14 | 1.86 | 7 |
| LR | 8.71 | 2.14 | 7 |
| PD | 12.57 | .79 | 7 |
| PJ | 7.71 | 1.80 | 7 |
| IM | 4.29 | .76 | 7 |
| SU | 14.00 | 3.46 | 7 |
| RU | 46.43 | 3.70 | 7 |
| TS | 60.43 | 2.22 | 7 |

Form $2 \times 1$
SM
8.00
2.82

6
DR 4.83
2.14

6
RP
14.00
2.00

6
LR
11.33
2.16

6
PD
12.50
1.76

6
P
9.00
.89
6
IM
5.00
1.10

6
SU
12.83
3.43

6
RU
51.83
5.19

6
TS
64.67
8.21

6
Form $2 \times 2$

| SM | 7.33 | 1.97 | 6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| DR | 5.50 | 2.59 | 6 |
| RP | 11.33 | 1.51 | 6 |
| LR | 11.17 | 2.32 | 6 |


| Form $2 \times 2$ |  | Means |  |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| PD | 13.00 |  | Standard Deviations |
| PJ | 9.17 | 1.10 | 68 |
| IM | 5.50 | .84 | 6 |
| SU | 12.83 | 4.12 | 6 |
| RU | 50.17 | 2.99 | 6 |
| TS | 63.00 | 5.29 | 6 |

Form $2 \times 3$

| SM | 7.86 | 2.54 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| DR | 4.00 | .81 | 7 |
| RP | 15.71 | 1.89 | 7 |
| LR | 8.86 | 1.68 | 7 |
| PD | 12.86 | 1.46 | 7 |
| PJ | 8.00 | 1.15 | 7 |
| IM | 5.14 | 1.07 | 7 |
| RU | 11.86 | 1.95 | 7 |
| TS | 50.57 | 3.69 | 7 |

Form $3 \times 1$

| SM | 8.57 | 2.30 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| DR | 5.00 | 2.31 | 7 |
| RP | 14.29 | 1.38 | 7 |
| IR | 9.29 | 2.29 | 7 |
| PD | 10.86 | 1.68 | 7 |
| PJ | 8.86 | 1.21 | 7 |
| IM | 4.71 | 0.95 | 7 |
| SU | 13.57 | 3.10 | $?$ |

Form $3 \times 1$
RU
TS
Means
48.00
61.57

Standard Deviations
Cases
5.18

7
7.32

7
Form $3 \times 2$
SM
11.00
$\mathrm{DR} \quad 6.57$
1.82

7
$R P \quad 14.57$
1.81

LR
10.57
2.22

7

LR
PD
11.71
8.43
1.51

7
IM
4.86

SU
13.57
3.10

7

RU
50.14
4.38 7

TS
67.71
5.85

7

Form $3 \times 3$

| SM | 8.33 | 2.73 | 6 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| DR | 6.83 | 2.14 | 6 |
| RP | 16.17 | 2.23 | 6 |
| IR | 11.00 | 2.00 | 6 |
| PD | 12.17 | 1.17 | 6 |
| PJ | 9.00 | 1.26 | 6 |
| IM | 5.33 | 1.03 | 6 |
| SU | 15.17 | 3.06 | 6 |
| RU | 53.67 | 4.46 | 6 |
| TS | 68.83 | 6.85 | 6 |
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