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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There is concern among educators that students are not as skilled in the area of listening as they could or should be. As a result of this concern an oral communication program was developed in Alameda County, California to improve students' listening skills.

Statement of the Problem

It was the purpose of the study to determine the effectiveness of the Alameda County Oral Communication Program in an itinerant speech and hearing program in Central Washington. The study sought to answer the question:
1. Does the use of the Alameda County Oral Communication Program in Listening effect a change in the language skills of public school age children? 2. Does the program have greater effect at one grade level than at another?

Importance of the Study

Skill in listening is not only a necessary competency in school, but in all activities. Edna Furness (1955:525) stated: "Long before man expressed his thoughts in writing, ideogram, or alphabet, he communicated orally. So that for centuries listening was the principle procedure by which a man acquired an education and enlarged his experiences vicariously." Paul Rankin (1928:630) wrote:
"Listening, or the ability to understand spoken language, is the most frequently used of the four language arts."
As time goes on and society progresses, listening is becoming more and more important. We still, however, are trying to find effective ways to teach this skill. Robert Canfield (1961:147) stated this clearly:

Day in and day out our ears are bombarded by volleys of spoken words. To interpret verbal messages and to tune out verbal noise are essential skills in our time. How to teach these listening skills is a vital question for the classroom teacher.

Even though it is recognized that listening skills are essential, and that they should be taught in the schools, not much seems to have been done. In 1955, Herbert Hackett (1955:349-51) indicated that there was not enough evidence that listening could be taught. He stated that there was a lack of work and research to prove that it could be taught. Edward Pratt (1956:315) thought that the area of listening was being neglected in our schools. M. C. Letton (1957:181) stated: "Only a small amount of research has been directed toward finding out more about listening, and there is meager evidence that listening is being taught in the classrooms of America."

None of the schools involved in this study had a program for improving listening skills in operation. All of the teachers and administrators involved stated a need for such a program. When the Tri-County Special Education Program, which provided the speech therapy for the schools involved, gained access to the Alameda County Oral Communi-
cation Program in Listening, they suggested that this study be undertaken.

Limitations of the Study

The study was limited to groups of students in Grades 3, 5, and 7 in the Royal City, Warden, and Coulee City school districts, Grade 10 in the Coulee City school district, and Grade 11 in the Royal City school district.

Data collection was limited to the administration of the Hackett Test of Oral Language Comprehension Skill as a pre-program and post-program test.

Definition of Terms

1. Listening Skills Methods of learning and communication involving comprehension of oral language. In the Alameda County Program the following tasks were included in this comprehension:

1. Identifying main ideas.
2. Providing examples by details.
3. Reinstating sequences of ideas.
4. Inferring main ideas from specifics.
5. Identifying mood and humor.
6. Applying standards to judge persuasion.
7. Predicting sequences of thought.
8. Inferring connotative word meanings.
9. Identifying sequence inconsistencies or ambiguities.
10. Inferring speaker's purpose.
For an example of each of these tasks, see Appendix A.

2. Alameda County Oral Communication Program In
Listening A program designed by Robert Gagne and Marie
Hackett (1967-68) to improve listening comprehension in
the public school situation. Lessons were designed for
four grade levels, emphasizing certain tasks at each level.
These grade level emphases are listed in Appendix B. The
difficulty of the lessons at each level corresponded with
the grade level of the students.

3. Hackett Test of Oral Language Comprehension
Skill A test designed by M.G. Hackett (1968) to yield
pass-fail information on each task listed above as part of
listening comprehension. The test measured skills at four
levels, and was constructed to meet criteria of difficulty
at each level, including: 1. language complexity, 2.
vocabulary, and 3. interest. Two forms of the test were
used, an oral form (Form 1), and a printed form (Form 2).
The Hackett Test was a specific part of the total program,
and was included in the program packet. Appendix C con-
tains an example of test items.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There is no universally accepted definition of listening to be found. Listening is a process that involves a multitude of skills and abilities. It has been described as a process of learning, of thinking, and of communication. It involves such skills as interpretation, discrimination, and concentration. Since it is so difficult to accurately describe what listening is, there are many difficulties involved in testing and teaching listening. There are other skills to which listening is related, and there are many factors that affect listening.

Qualities and Objectives of Listening

Maurice Lewis (1960:455-59) stated that reading skills and listening skills are identical. He set forth these criteria for good listeners:

1. The good listener is aware of the importance of listening in the learning process.
2. He understands the roles of the speaker and the listener.
3. He listens clear through before drawing a conclusion.
4. He follows directions given orally.
5. He adjusts listening to the purpose at hand.
6. He enjoys listening.
7. He is a critical listener.

Lewis also listed the following principles of learning that apply to listening:

1. Children learn what they practice.
2. Children need to understand what it is they are trying to learn.
3. Children need to become aware of their ability to listen.
4. Children need opportunities to discover that they can improve their listening ability.
5. Oral reading should be taught so that it fosters good listening.
6. Oral language is taught with an emphasis upon communication.
7. Children should have the opportunity to listen to difficult material read to them by the teacher.
8. Individual differences in listening should be recognized.

Walter Petty (1962:574-77) wrote that listening and reading skills are different, and he made these three statements about listening:

1. Listening comprehension is, in general, superior to reading comprehension.
2. The superiority of listening comprehension is decidedly more marked for the easy than for difficult materials.
3. The relative superiority of listening comprehension is in inverse proportion to intelligence and reading speed.

He then lists three instructional implications of the previous statements:

1. A greater amount of instruction should be given through oral means rather than through writing.
2. Material that is relatively easy to understand may best be given orally and material that is more difficult should be presented visually.

3. Pupils of lower intelligence should have a greater proportion of materials presented to them by speaking than by having them read it.

Sam Duker (1961:170-74) presented four key principles of listening:

1. Listening should be pleasurable rather than threatening.

2. Plan so that the amount of listening required is not too great. Studies show that demands of listening are often unreasonable, and teachers do not realize it.

3. Pupils should listen to each other, and the teacher should listen to the pupils.

4. Listening should be for rather than at.

Teaching Listening

Harold Anderson (1960:91-106) set up these guidelines for the teaching of listening:

1. Establish a favorable listening climate. Much that goes on in schools actually breeds poor listening habits. Question-answer recitations, going over textbook assignments, delivery of book reports to show to the teacher that the book has been read, and repetitious announcements and lesson assignments are not conducive to building good listening habits. There should be abundant opportunities for meaningful listening. The student should have something worthwhile to which to listen, a reason for listening, someone to whom they care to listen, and facility for listening. All listening situations in school should be made conducive to the practice of good listening habits. All teachers should share in the responsibility of teaching listening.

2. Make clear to pupils at all grade levels why good listening habits are important and what skills are needed to be a good listener. There should be an awareness of the role of listening in modern life, and of the relationship between good listening and school
achievement. Pupils should be informed about the skills, abilities, attitudes, and appreciations which constitute good listening.

3. An awareness on the part of both pupils and teacher of the similarities and differences in reading and listening. The ear is the receiver in one and the eye in the other. There are important differences in the effectiveness of these organs as receptors. Hearing may be impaired and vision may be superior or vice versa. There may be degrees of impairment in both. In listening, the speaker sets the pace; in reading, the reader sets it for himself. The reader may pause or stop to think, but the listener must keep listening. Listening is more of a socialized activity than is reading. The style of speech and the personality of the speaker give the listener an advantage over the reader. The appearance and manner of the speaker also have an effect upon the listener.

4. Provision for systematic instruction in listening. The program should provide an analysis of the skills needed in effective listening and practice in these skills. Students should know how to analyze their own listening habits. Instruction should be provided concerning the purposes of listening. Reasons for listening include: to be informed, to be entertained, to get the main idea, to note details, and to follow a story. Pupils need to understand the effect on the listener of such factors as the speaker's use of voice, mannerisms, expressions, gestures, and use of words.

Duker (1961:170-74) states these purposes of teaching listening:

1. To develop a listener who listens. A listener should not only know how to listen, but should do it.

2. Selective listening. Select something worth listening to.

3. Skillful listening. Identifying main ideas, details, structure, etc.

4. Critical listening. The listener is concerned about the purposes of the speaker.

5. Courteous listening.

6. Attentive listening. The listener concentrates and he is selective. He shuts out noises and dis-
7. Retentive listening. The listener remembers what he heard.

8. Curious listening. The listener asks questions of himself as he listens.

9. Reactive listening. The listener actively reacts and changes.

10. Reflective listening. The listener ties in his philosophies and feelings with what he is listening to.

Duker states that teaching this kind of listening can become a way of teaching the art of living.

Donald Bird (1960:31-33) points out that listening is not identified with any of the traditional areas of the curriculum. It is not included in speech, nor is it to be found in English. He states that teachers should study their own listening behavior. He lists four approaches to teaching listening:

1. The direct approach. Take class time for teaching listening.

2. The integrated approach. Re-orient reading and writing and tie listening in with other communication skills.

3. The incidental approach. Incidental learning of listening skills takes place during the day.

4. The eclectic approach. This is a combination of the first two approaches.

Annabel Fawcet conducted a study in listening involving two teacher-presented lessons and one taped lesson. The S.T.E.P. listening tests were used to evaluate the subjects' progress. Results of the study showed that students who receive listening training show significant im-
provement in listening ability. Students who received di-
rect instruction showed the most improvement. There was no
significant difference between boys and girls in listening
ability. The study also showed that listening ability is
related particularly to reading, language, and arithmetic.
Report card grades in language, reading, and arithmetic are
not as closely related to listening ability as scores of
standardized achievement tests. She concluded that lis-
tening can be improved through instruction and every child
should have the opportunity to learn listening.

A study by Edward Pratt (1956:315-20) involved five
listening lessons including such tasks as observing de-
tails, finding listening clues, following oral directions,
finding relations between main ideas and supporting ideas,
and making inferences. Pratt drew the following conclu-
sions from the study: 1) Teaching listening skills can be
effective. Many of these skills are complex and need to be
developed gradually. 2) The effectiveness of instruction
of listening is independent of levels of intelligence. 3)
Instruction may be more effective with certain listening
skills. 4) There is a positive correlation between reading
and listening. 5) There is a positive correlation between
listening and intelligence.

Sue Trivette (1961:276-77) conducted a study at the
fifth grade level that was very similar to Pratt's study.
Listening tasks included finding main ideas, picking out
details, making inferences, finding meanings, and following
directions. Results of her study agreed with the results of the Pratt study.

Robert Canfield (1961:147-51) reported a study designed to determine the effectiveness of two types of instruction in listening. Fifth graders were used in the study, which compared direct instruction with indirect instruction. Direct instruction was designed to improve listening through practice of listening skills and discussions of the qualities of a good listener. Indirect instruction was designed to improve listening through systematic use of listening in the social studies program. In this study he sought answers to the following questions: 1) Can the listening skills of fifth graders be improved through a series of 12 lessons that provide direct instruction in listening? 2) Can the listening skills of fifth graders be improved through a series of 12 lessons that provide indirect instruction in listening? 3) Will the gains of the group that received indirect instruction be greater than the gains of a control group that received no planned instruction in listening? 4) What is the relationship of listening to such variables as intelligence, reading, and report cards? Three groups of fifth graders were selected from two elementary schools in Syracuse, New York. In the direct instruction group, lessons involved the following skills: Listening for main ideas when they are stated in key sentences. Inferring main ideas when they are not stated. Listening for main ideas expressed as a feeling.
Distinguishing between main ideas and important details.
Distinguishing between relevant and irrelevant details.
Listening for main ideas based on opinions. Listening for transitional phrases. In each session the teacher read aloud short paragraphs for the students to analyze. In the indirect instruction group, the teacher read aloud social studies selections that dealt with foreign countries. The main purpose in reading the selections was to develop concepts in social studies, but it was felt that the lessons provided opportunities to use and improve listening skills. The S.T.E.P. test, listening test 4a and 4b, was used to measure pre-test and post-test gains. Results show that the group that received direct instruction in listening made a gain on the test of 4.36 which was statistically significant at the 1% level. This was the greatest gain made by any of the groups. The group that received indirect instruction made a gain of 3.49, which was also statistically significant at the 1% level. The control group made a gain of 1.42 which was not significant at the 5% level. The usual language arts program apparently led to some gains in the listening of students in this group. Canfield concluded that even though the group that had the direct instruction made the greatest gain, the indirect method of instruction is also useful. Both methods are valuable, and perhaps they should be combined.

Most of the studies on teaching listening are similar to the Pratt and Canfield studies. For the most part
they involve similar or identical listening skills, and the results are generally in agreement on the effects of direct and indirect methods of instruction.

Factors Affecting Listening

Charles Brown (1965:129-38) cites three studies of the listening of children. The first study was on listening ability and radio and television habits. Results of the study showed that:

1. Children who watch television are better listeners. This was supported at the 1% level of significance. The mean listening score was 20% higher for these children.

2. Children who watch 2 or fewer hours are not better listeners than children who watch 4 or more.

3. The hypothesis that girls are better listeners than boys was not supported.

The second study was on the relation of listening ability to number and family position of children. Results showed that family position had no effect on listening. Family size did have an effect in non-Amish families. The third study was concerned with relationships between listening, reading, intelligence, and scholastic achievement. The following results were drawn from the study:

1. The hypothesis that listening and intelligence are highly correlated was supported.

2. The hypothesis that listening and reading scores are correlated was supported.

3. The hypothesis that listening is more highly correlated to intelligence than reading was not supported.

Thomas Devine (1967:152-59) states that learnings
in listening can be permanent. He proposes that personality factors, seating, and family position do not affect listening, but that it may be influenced by television. (This was proven by the study reported by Brown.)

Ralph Nichols (1948:154-63) states that intelligence, reading comprehension, vocabulary, and the ability to make inferences all are factors that affect listening. In this article he lists a great number of these factors.

Edna Furness (1955:525-31) lists the following problems, among many others, as having effects on listening: auditory discrimination problems, speech problems, fatigue, discomfort, emotional maladjustments, lack of readiness, lack of interest, and lack of purpose.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Selection of Subjects

For the experimental group, subjects in Grades 3, 5, 7, and 11 in Royal City, Grades 3, 5, 7, and 10 in Coulee City, and Grades 3 and 5 in Warden were used. Subjects in all grades involved in Royal City and Warden, and Grades 3, 5, and 7 in Coulee City were randomly selected by assigning each student a number and then drawing numbers. Grade 10 in Coulee City, because of the small size of the particular class used, was selected as a class group, so random selection was not necessary. There were two groups at each grade level, with the exception of Grade 10 at Coulee City.

Control group subjects from Grades 3, 5, 7, and 11 in Royal City, and Grades 3, 5, and 7 in Warden were selected by rooms rather than by random selection of students. All of the students from a room served as a test group. There were two groups at each grade level. Coulee City was unavailable for the control group.

The Oral Communication Program in Listening

The program consisted of a series of taped lessons at four levels. Level A was used with Grade 3, level B
with Grade 5, level C with Grade 7, and level D with Grade 11. There were twenty-two lessons, each approximately fifteen minutes in length. The lessons were constructed so that each two consecutive lessons involved the same listening task; thus the program could be presented in eleven lessons of approximately one-half hour each. Lessons were at appropriate levels of difficulty for each grade level. (See Appendix D.)

Administration of the Test

The experimental groups were given the Hackett Test as a pre-program test. One group at each grade level was given Form 1 of the test, the other group at each grade level was given Form 2. In Grade 10 at Coulee City only Form 2 was used. In Form 1, all of the instructions and the test were presented to the subjects on tape. In Form 2, the instructions were read to the subjects by the examiner, and then they read the test items. The test contained two practice items and twenty-two test items. The instructions were identical for all four grade levels, as were the practice items.

The control groups were given the Hackett Test as a pre-program test. One group at each grade level was given Form 1, and the other group was given Form 2. The same procedures were followed as with the experimental groups.

Administration of the Program

After administration of the pre-program test, the
experimental groups received the series of twenty-two taped lessons. The classroom teachers presented the lessons to their rooms, following the instructions in the program manuals provided to them. Teachers were given individual instruction on the presentation of the lessons of the program. All lessons and instructions to the students were on tape, but at specific intervals the students could ask the teacher questions. (See Appendix D.)

The control groups, after administration of the pre-program test, received no specific listening lessons of any type.

**Administration of the Test**

After an average time of fifty-two days, during which the lessons were presented, the experimental groups were again given the Hackett Test as a post-program test. Each was given the identical test that they had as a pre-program test.

After an average time of fifty-two days, during which they had no listening lessons, the control groups were given the Hackett Test as a post-program test.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In Alameda County, California, a program was developed to improve listening comprehension in the public schools. The study was undertaken to determine the effectiveness of the Alameda County Program in public schools in Central Washington. Purposes of the study included finding out whether use of the program effects a change in the language skills of public school children and whether the program has greater effect at one grade level than at another. None of the schools involved had a listening skills program in operation prior to the study.

Subjects were selected from three school districts for an experimental group. Four grade levels were involved in two of the districts and two grade levels in the third. There were two groups at each grade level. Control group subjects were selected from two school districts, at four grade levels in one district and at three grade levels in the other, with two groups at each grade level. Both the experimental and control groups were given the Hackett Test of Oral Language Comprehension as a pre-program test. After the test the experimental group received twenty-two taped lessons contained in the Alameda County Program, while the control group received no listening lessons.
After an average interval of fifty-two days, both the experimental and control groups were given the Hackett Test as a post-program test.

The Effectiveness of the Alameda County Oral Communication Program in Listening

For all four levels of Form 1 of the Hackett Test, an analysis of the difference between the means of the differences yielded a $t = .34$, which is not significant at the 1% level. The program proved most effective at level A, where $t = 2.34$, which is significant at the 5% level. For level B, $t = .04$, for level C, $t = .67$, for level D, $t = .79$. None of these statistics is significant at the 1% level. Form 2 of the test showed no significant results at any of the levels. Means of differences and variances are presented in Tables I-V.

**TABLE I**

**MEAN OF DIFFERENCES AND VARIANCES BETWEEN PRE-PROGRAM AND POST-PROGRAM RESULTS OF THE HACKETT TEST ALL LEVELS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$v$</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>10.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II
MEAN OF DIFFERENCES AND VARIANCES
BETWEEN PRE-PROGRAM AND POST-PROGRAM
RESULTS OF THE HACKETT TEST
LEVEL A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m=4.93</td>
<td></td>
<td>m=2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v=16.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>v=11.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE III
MEAN OF DIFFERENCES AND VARIANCES
BETWEEN PRE-PROGRAM AND POST-PROGRAM
RESULTS OF THE HACKETT TEST
LEVEL B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m=0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>m=1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v=12.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>v=6.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE IV**

**MEAN OF DIFFERENCES AND VARIANCES**
**BETWEEN PRE-PROGRAM AND POST-PROGRAM**
**RESULTS OF THE HACKETT TEST**
**LEVEL C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean m</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance v</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>8.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE V**

**MEAN OF DIFFERENCES AND VARIANCES**
**BETWEEN PRE-PROGRAM AND POST-PROGRAM**
**RESULTS OF THE HACKETT TEST**
**LEVEL D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean m</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance v</td>
<td>18.99</td>
<td>10.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Teaching listening is neglected in the public school curriculum. There is a need for development and research in the area of teaching listening skills. A program was developed in Alameda County, California to help meet this need. The Alameda County Oral Communication Program in Listening was designed to improve listening comprehension of children in the public schools. The program was set up on four different grade levels, emphasizing certain listening tasks at each level. Difficulty of the tasks was relevant to the grade level involved. The purposes of the study were: 1) To determine the effectiveness of the Alameda County Program in an itinerant speech therapy program in Central Washington. 2) To determine if the program effects a change in the language skills of public school children. 3) To determine if the program is more effective at one grade level than at another.

Subjects for the study were selected from the Royal City, Coulee City, and Warden school districts. All three districts participated in the experimental group, while only Royal City and Warden were available for the control group. Students from four grade levels were randomly
selected for the experimental group. The control group consisted of students at four grade levels selected by rooms. Both the experimental and control groups were given the Hackett Test of Oral Language Comprehension as a pre-program test. The test consisted of twenty-two items at appropriate levels of difficulty at each grade level. After administration of the test, the experimental group received a series of twenty-two taped lessons, each approximately fifteen minutes in length. Each lesson was designed to improve a specific listening skill. The control group received no specific listening lessons after administration of the pre-program test. After an average time of fifty-two days, both groups were given the Hackett Test as a post-program test.

Results of the study show that the Alameda County Program had significant results at the third grade level. Other levels did not show statistically significant gains.

Conclusions

Significant gains at level A and not at any of the other levels would perhaps suggest that listening skills tend to either remain static or improve with maturity. Maturity is undoubtedly a factor in the acquisition and use of listening skills. Perhaps after a certain point in listening development, listening skills tend to stay on the same plane, or they tend to improve enough through maturity to be relatively unaffected by specific instruction. Further study on the effects of maturity upon listening skills
could prove to be most interesting and valuable.

Another factor which could have had an effect in the program is teacher bias. The teacher's attitude and treatment of the program would have effects on the students' listening performance.

Students who had not had much experience with taped materials would probably tend to be more interested in the program than would students who had done much work with tapes. Also, some students would probably tend to be interested because the tapes would provide a change from listening to the teacher or a break in the daily routine.

Recommendations

Upon reviewing the results of the study, it would appear that the program should be continued at the third grade level, but further study should be conducted at the other three levels. A program of pre-training could be included to help prepare both students and teachers. Study could be conducted to find out why one group at level B showed a decrease in mean scores after the program. Studies could be conducted on maturity, teacher bias, interest, and other factors that would affect teaching listening skills. Results of the study should be compared with results of the program in Alameda County when they become available.
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APPENDIX A

LISTENING TASKS

1. Identifying main ideas. The student listens to a short passage and then states in his own words the general principle being communicated.

2. Providing examples by details. The student listens to a passage and then gives examples it contains when given the main idea.

3. Reinstating sequences of ideas. The student listens to a passage and then gives the sequences it contained.

4. Inferring main ideas from specifics. The student listens to a passage that is stopped before the main idea is given, and infers the main idea from specifics that were leading up to it.

5. Identifying mood and humor. After listening, the student chooses the mood represented by the passage.

6. Applying standards to judge persuasion. The student is asked to identify the device used by the speaker to persuade.

7. Predicting sequences of thought. A sequence of ideas is presented without a conclusion, and the student is asked to tell what will come next.

8. Inferring connotative word meanings. The student is asked to define an unfamiliar word through inferring the meaning.

9. Identifying sequence inconsistencies or ambiguities. The student states in his own words what is inconsistent in a sequence of ideas.

10. Inferring speaker's purpose. The student is asked what the speaker wants him to do.

11. Judging logical validity. The student chooses between correct and incorrect deductive logic.
## APPENDIX B

### GRADE LEVEL EMPHASES

#### Grade 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying main ideas</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing examples</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstating sequences</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferring main ideas</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Grade 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying main ideas</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing examples</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstating sequences</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferring main ideas</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying mood, humor</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging persuasion</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting sequences</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Grade 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying main ideas</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing examples</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstating sequences</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferring main ideas</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying mood, humor</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging persuasion</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting sequences</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (8,9,10,11)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Grade 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying main ideas</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing examples</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstating sequences</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferring main ideas</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying mood, humor</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging persuasion</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicting sequences</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferring word meanings</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying inconsistencies</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferring speaker's purpose</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judging logical validity</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

HACKETT TEST ITEM, LEVEL B

STORY 1

The bus moved up the side of the mountain. At times the trail was very narrow. On the right was the big rocky mountain. The bus driver sometimes looked down on the left side. Far below him the pine trees looked like grass. The bus driver was a little nervous.

Circle the number next to the statement that best shows the main idea of the story.

1. The mountain trail was very narrow.
2. The bus driver was a very nervous man.
3. Some of the pine trees looked like grass.
4. A bus was climbing up a big rocky mountain.
LISTENING LESSON 1 Aa

Instructions and Example

Boys and girls, today I am going to tell you some stories about Jack and his dad who went on a camping trip together. After each story I will read four sentences to you. Then I will ask you to choose the one sentence that best tells the main idea, what the story is all about. On your paper, you will draw a circle around the number that best tells the main idea.

Here is the first little story about the camping trip. Let's all listen carefully for the main idea.

Jack saw a large animal near the tent by the lake. It was big, black and fuzzy. The animal growled. It was a bear!

Now, on your paper circle the number that best tells the main idea.

1. Jack and his dad camped by the lake.
2. The animal was black.
3. Jack and his dad had a tent.

If you chose number 4, Jack saw a bear, you are correct. That is the main idea. Jack and his dad did camp by the lake in a tent and the animal was black, but the main idea was that Jack saw a bear.

Before we go on to the next story, I am going to stop
here so that you can ask your teacher any questions you have about the lesson.

The lesson contains four more items similar to this one. The section after the four choices, where the student was given the correct answer, was considered to be positive reinforcement for the student.
APPENDIX E

SAMPLE STUDENT ANSWER SHEET

Lesson 3Ab                      Name _______________          Grade ____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story 1</th>
<th>Story 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Story 3  Tell what happened.

Story 4  Draw a picture.