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Ed.D., University of Massachusetts
Directed by Professor David Evans

Various Folklore programs in oral narratives exist at a number of schools in the United States, particularly between kindergarten and junior high school. Much has been written about them in both popular and scholarly publications. This study investigates the Curriculum and Folklore theories rationalizing their practice. For example, a number of oral-narrative projects exhibit a highly literary and text-oriented bias typical of the traditional approach in Folklore scholarship. This approach is being effectively challenged by a significant number of contemporary folklorists and linguists who argue that Folklore scripts, like linguistic grammars, although important, are necessary but not sufficient information about the social context and performance which gave birth to them. To test the validity of that assumption, this study, using the t-test for two matched groups, conducted an experiment involving 3 teachers and 71 elementary and junior high school students from or near Amherst, Massachusetts. A statistical analysis of the higher experimental-group's scores showed
the results to be significant, i.e., about .04, thus strongly attributing the difference in the scores of the two groups to the main-effect. However, more experiments will be necessary, not only to independently verify the results of this study, but also to address the many educational and folklore issues it raises.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study is, first of all, to generate a conceptual framework for evaluating teaching approaches to oral narratives at the pre-college level, particularly elementary and junior high schools. Secondly, the purpose is to test experimentally, the validity of the implicit assumption that the performance approach yields better "dividends" than the text approach in story-telling.

The significance of the study lies in its potentially important contribution to folklore education. The scope and significance of folklore education in the United States has been well documented in a number of studies, including a doctoral dissertation by Charles Snow Guthrie (1976) entitled, "A Study of Kentucky Folklore as a Resource for High School English Programs of the State." The author cites an impressive array of studies between 1944 and 1975, which shows an increase in the use of folklore in high school English courses in Kentucky. He found, for example, that forty percent of the high schools having "phase-elective" English courses, offered Folklore. In response to his questionnaire, the majority of English department chairpersons of schools offering folklore as well as sixty percent of the responding teachers believed than an anthology of Kentucky material would be helpful as a textbook (p. 3). Although Guthrie's study emphasizes the period between 1944 and 1976 as encompassing
extensive activities in classroom folklore, earlier history is replete with attempts at systematizing or formalizing the use of Folklore in the classroom, for example, the Danish and Swedish folk high schools. Their curriculum was deeply indebted to Gruntvig who felt very strongly that folklore should be the center of liberal education, a "school for life." Gruntvig (Kulich 1964) was attracted by the new educational theories of Rousseau and Pestalozzi, which stressed the importance of adapting education to the pupil and developing his/her natural abilities. In the United States, following Dewey's pioneering studies, a number of schools and programs modeled after the Scandinavian Folk High School movement, were founded (p. 418).

One of the pre-eminent advocates of the use of folklore in schools is Richard M. Dorson who has argued:

... There is a pressing need for intelligent compilation of source readings, for surveys and comprehensive guides which will serve as useful manuals for teacher and student (Guthrie, p. 9).

On the general question of Folklore scholarship and its raison d'etre in the academic community, he argues:

... Folklore should strive for as complete autonomy as possible as a separate and independent field of learning, fully equal to other humanities and social sciences. By any tests one can apply - the density of the scholarly literature, the specialized nature of the concepts and techniques, the international community of professionals--Folklore is a full-time academic enterprise (Dorson 1972: 297-288).

Already, folklore is being significantly offered by hundreds of schools in the United States. Hector Lee (1970) in an article entitled, "American Folklore in the Secondary Schools," gives a number of useful
reasons for the use of folklore in U.S. schools, viz:

a. Imparting an understanding of society and of the student;

b. Providing a ready means of motivation for a variety of reasons; and

c. Enabling the teacher and student to work together on projects collecting local history, legends and items of material culture which will help the school and the community preserve for future use, the elements of local significance, past and present (p. 994).

Wigginton's Foxfire series is perhaps one of the best examples of the above-mentioned purposes put to excellent use.¹

The study under investigation then, is not at variance with these purposes and if successful will hopefully contribute significantly to their realization. For one, though various theories and definitions of oral narratives abound in the literature, hardly any research has been undertaken to show experimentally the degree to which the use of Folklore in the classroom either confirms or belies these theories and definitions. The present study is therefore a small yet critical step in that direction.

Definition of Terms

The major terms used for the purposes of this study are defined below:

1. Folklore - when not capitalized, the terms will be used interchangeably with oral narratives, story telling, folktales or fairy
tales--although "oral narratives" will be the preferred phrase. Specifically this interchangeability pertains to the "lore," since "folk" obviously cannot be synonymous with "oral narratives." When capitalized Folklore will refer to the field, study or discipline thereof.

2. Folk - will refer to any group of people whatsoever who participate in a folkloric event whether or not the people constituting the group share, according to Alan Dundes (1965), at least one common feature (p. 2).

3. Folkloric Event - will be defined as predominantly oral, irrespective of whether it is fictitious, nonfictitious, traditional, or urban, as long as it is artistically communicative and takes place in small groups. The latter, "artistic communication in small groups" is indebted to Dan Ben-Amos (Bauman-Paredes, 1972).

4. Text - any written synopsis or documentation of a folkloric event organically divorced from the event as a living entity.

5. Curriculum - will refer to any documented educational goal(s) with an objective or means such as a syllabus or any other format for the attainment of those goal(s).

Methodology

The methodology will comprise the literary and experimental components. The literary segment will entail the review of the literature in the field using primarily written sources. In reviewing the literature, the investigator will endeavor to show the historical roots of Folklore and its relationship to other fields, primarily Anthropology and Linguistics. The literature of the performance or
context theorists will be used to critique certain traditional and dominant schools of Folklore in terms of either their functional or philosophical relationship with texts of Folklore.

Since this study subscribes to the performance approach and its criticism of the major traditional schools, the experimental component will test the hypotheses of the performance approach and their usefulness in a classroom context.

The procedure followed will involve a teacher-training segment whose goal will be to enable previously untrained teachers to acquire minimal performance skills to be used in the program. Following the selection of the script of an oral narrative, the investigator will pilot-test the program among a comparative group of children in order to improve the program prior to its implementation. Using the t-test, two matched groups of elementary and junior high school children will be given the test whose results will be qualitatively described and statistically analyzed for their significance.

Because of the limited nature of the project, no follow-up research will be undertaken as part of the present study.

Statement of the Problems

In terms of this study two problems are significant. The first is theoretical and the second has to do with application of folklore in a concrete situation such as a classroom. By theoretical is meant basically the proliferation of definitions of Folklore which tend to yield diverse approaches to the subject leading to numerous divergent conclusions. Francis Lee Utley (Dundes, 1965) uncovered, for instance,
the existence of twenty-one definitions (all by American Scholars) in Funk and Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology and Legend. In his research into each definer's idea of the province of folklore, Utley reaches the following conclusion:

... thus the statistical weight of authority is for the exclusion of bad science, mass culture, survival, communal and matters of origin and for the inclusion of oral (verbal, unwritten) tradition (transmission), primitive culture and subcultures of civilized society both rural and urban. As for the materials of folklore, art and literature are a clearly unanimous choice. Custom and belief win the suffrage of about half of the definers, and languages are excluded (Dundes, p. 10).

These divergences have different theoretical and methodological implications and therefore pose numerous problems in Folklore scholarship.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In 1977, in a symposium sponsored by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, William Bascom (1977) reviewed earlier scholarship in folklore with respect to two questions which he considered fundamental. The first question was: "How are we to explain similar tales that are found in different societies, sometimes separated by great distances?" Secondly, "How do we explain those startling and even shocking events in myth and folktales which are completely at variance with the accepted cultural norms, and which would be condemned as sins or punished as crimes if they were actually committed in the society in which the narratives were told" (p. 2).

Bascom identified several schools of thought and their responses to the two questions. The schools are: Grimm's Law, Muller's 'Law', the Indianist or Diffusionist Theory, the Natural Allegorical School, the Cultural Evolutionists, Classical Freudianism, Neo-Freudianism, the Myth-Ritual School, Structuralism, and the Finnish School. As a background to the understanding of both the Folklore and Bascom's questions it will be necessary to delve more into the schools even though for our purposes only three, i.e., The Culture Evolutionists, the Finnish School and the Freudians (and their variants) are critical.

Besides raising the two questions, Bascom also discussed at length the postulations of these schools. His discussion of them will be summarized here as well as the schools' answers to his questions.
Grimm Brothers and Grimm's Law

The Grimm Brothers' research activities were initiated after the discovery in philological studies that the languages of Europe were related. Jacob Grimm, the inventor of Grimm's Law, attempted to identify words in German narratives with reconstructed words of the proto-European language. Using the etymological technique, he believed it possible to determine the original characters and objects in the narratives thereby reconciling the differences among existing variants and possibly explaining some of the deviations in narratives from cultural norms. The Grimm Brothers' answer to the issue of tales traveling from one area or culture to another, was that tales in Europe were created by the Aryan people who carried them into Europe from their places of origin. Aryan was used as a racial category rather than a cultural one. Their answer was therefore diffusion through migration of a population.

The Max Muller Approach

Muller, a German linguist and Sanskrit scholar, traced German to a reconstructed Aryan Language. Although he accepted the Grimm's premise of the Aryan origins of European narratives, he insisted that Aryan was a linguistic term, not a racial one. He elaborated Grimm's Law by attempting to show that the original Aryan religion and mythology were based on sun-worship. Like the Grimm Brothers, he explained the shocking incidents in European narratives as the result of the misinterpretation of a once reasonable language. He considered narratives broken-down myths whose meaning was "further obscured by the mangling of words as a result of what he called the 'disease of
language" (Bascom, p. 3). He believed that their true meaning could only be understood by reconstructing the original Aryan words using the etymological approach.

The Indianist or Diffusionist Theory

First put forward by Theodore Benfey in 1859, this theory traced the path of Indian stories in both Eastern and Western Literature. It postulated that folktales originated in India and spread into Europe through diffusion. Like Müller, Benfey was a German Sanskrit scholar and philologist. While agreeing with Müller and the Grimm Brothers, that the folktales could travel through the migration of people, he pointed out that Indian stories had, besides Europe, also spread to China and Tibet.

The Native Allegorical School

Indebted to Max Müller, this school believed that myths and folktales came from allegories about various natural phenomena. They disagreed however with Müller or the Grimm Brothers, about the similarity of tales across geographic and cultural boundaries. According to this school, similar tales in different societies were the result of independent invention derived from common sources in nature. The shocking elements in narratives were not the result of a disease in language and neither were they really shocking. Accordingly, when their true meanings were understood, the narratives were pleasant allegories about nature.
The Cultural Evolutionists

This school dealt a severe blow to the nature allegorical school and the Aryan theory of the Grimm Brothers and Max Muller. The cornerstone of their approach was their hypothesis that all people evolved in one evolutionary path through three absolutely identical stages of savagery, barbarism and civilization. This assumption was critical for Folklore theory since it gave rise to polygenesis as a way of explaining multiple existence. Since people were supposed to be everywhere the same, it was postulated that likewise folklore emerged during the stage of savagery. In 1884 Andrew Lang, one of the leading cultural evolutionists, stated in an article entitled, "Methods of Folklore":

... There is a science, Archeology, which collects and compares the similar but immaterial relics of old races, the surviving superstition and stories, the ideas which are in our time, but not of it. Properly speaking, Folklore is only concerned with the legends, customs, beliefs of the Folk; of the classes which have least been affected by education, which shares least in progress. But the student of folklore is thus led to examine the usages, myths and ideas of savages which are still retained, in rude enough shape by the European peasantry (Bascom, 1977:10).

Besides associating Folklore exclusively with the European peasantry, the Cultural Evolutionists offered a methodological approach to the study of oral narratives. Since the European peasants retained only "survivals" of savagery, the technique or method for studying a European custom was, according to them, to seek a fuller form which was presumed to exist in "savage" cultures, past or present. This belief also explains why cultural evolutionists traveled extensively to such places as Africa, Australia and the Americas, in search of these
so-called savages. Lang, for example, who is credited by Dorson (Dundes, 1965) with having dealt a severe blow to Max Müller's solar-mythology concepts, published in 1887 a two-volume study, *Myth, Ritual and Religion*. It contained world-wide evidence to support his claim that "primitive peoples everywhere possessed similar beliefs, tales, and customs, which survived in classic Greek myths and in modern peasant lore" (Dundes, 1965:61).

As for the issue of shocking or anti-social elements in these tales, the cultural evolutionists' answer was that perhaps these elements were not so anti-social or irrational during the Europeans' first or savage stage of their evolution, when these elements were normal and acceptable.

Although the unitary-evolution theory was accepted almost without reservations by the scholarship of the latter half of the nineteenth century, few anthropologists today subscribe to the ideas of polygenesis and psychic unity as satisfactory explanations of seemingly parallel cultural phenomena (Dundes, 1972:53). The extended discussion here of the cultural evolutionists attests to the school's significant contributions to such fields as Anthropology, Folklore and Psychology and to the fact that the use of Folklore in contemporary western classrooms consciously or unconsciously betrays a cultural evolutionist bias. More will be said about the Cultural Evolutionists later.

**Freudianism**

Freud, in *Totem and Taboo* (1912), utilizing the reconstructions of the cultural evolutionists, cited the Australian aboriginal people, as
examples of the earliest stage of human culture in which cannibalism was practiced. He analyzed the origins of society in terms of one of the basic tenents of psychoanalysis, the Oedipus Complex. Human beings, like animals, Freud maintained, once lived in hordes with the eldest male controlling all females. But the young males rebelled, banded together, killed the eldest male, ate him, and ostensibly committed incest with their mothers and sisters. Later, feeling guilty for killing their father, they tried to atone through a ritual act of commemoration centering around his image, or totem. Interestingly, Otto Tank and Bronislaw, while basically subscribing to the Oedipus Complex, found notable exceptions to Freud's claim that the complex was universal. Rank showed it to exist only among Indo-European speaking peoples as well as parts of northern Africa, China and the Pacific. Malinowski found that in the Trobriand Islands, instead of a desire by the young males to kill the father and mate with the mother, there was a desire to kill the mother's brother and marry the sister. Being a matrilineal culture, the mother's brother, and not the father, was the authority figure.

On the question of polygenesis, the Freudian's hypothesis is similar to the cultural evolutionists'. They too believed that person, psychologically, is everywhere the same, via the Oedipus Complex, of course. The association with the Cultural Evolutionists is no way intended to discredit this important movement. Ernest Jones in "Psychoanalysis and Folklore (Dundes, 1965), makes a credible assessment of Freudianism in Folklore. He maintains that unconscious impulses may be called primitive in the sense of being infantile and because they represent a lower stage in mental evolution, one out of which more
highly differentiated forms of mental activity develop (p. 91). In relating this process to Folklore, Jones extrapolates that "there is a far-reaching parallelism between survivals of primitive life from the racial past and survivals from the individual past" (p. 92).

Carl Jung (1927) gives an interesting interpretation to the Freudian approach. He desexualizes the libido concept and asserts that the "love" a child first displays toward his mother results from the fact that she provides protection and nourishment. In time this kind of love may come to be sexual, described as Oedipus Complex, when displayed by a boy and Electra, for the girl (Dundes, 1965:118). As for the similarities in forms and themes exhibited by myths and tales in various parts of the world, Jung said they were to be explained as expressions of a collective unconscious. As part of his/her psyche he said, each individual has a component which is the repository of the history of humankind's experiences (p. 118).

The Myth-Ritual School

This school traces its origins to Jane Harrison's book, Themis (1912), and was strongly foreshadowed in Sir James Frazer's first edition of the Golden Bough (1890). According to this school, myths had their origin in ritual, the story which the ritual enacts. Lord Raglan (1936), who stressed diffusion as an explanation for similar tales in different societies, compared twenty-one hero tales, five of which had been analyzed in Freudian terms by Otto Rank, and found regicide, based on an ancient Egyptian and Mesopotamian ritual. Of the forty-eight myths which Rank and Raglan had jointly cited, in only
four does the hero actually marry his mother, i.e., Judas, St. Gregory, Watu Gunung and Oedipus (Bascom, p. 9). Thus again, the Oedipus Complex failed both in its universal claim and as a theory to explain shocking and anti-social elements.

Structural Analysis

Structural Analysis is more recent in the field. Claude Lévi-Strauss, a prime figure in this movement, has sought universal structures of binary opposition and mediation in myth, in an attempt to resolve structural relations among variants of myths. Levi-Strauss' work came on the heels of the publication in the West of Vladimir Propp's work on the internal structure of Siberian texts, originally published in the Soviet Union in 1928. Propp analyzed the plots of a group of these folktales in their minimal units of action which he called "functions." He not only found that in his samples these units were limited in number to thirty-one, but also that the sequence of these units was identical. Hence, the moment the units were identified, their basic structure or morphology was revealed. However, before the pre-eminence of Strauss' work and the publication in 1958 of Propp's work, historically Axel Olrik's article, "Epic Laws of Folk Narrative," first published in 1909 by Zeitschrift fur Deutsches Altertum has to be credited with being one of the critical forerunners. Olrik favored an analytical approach of folktales, myth, legend and folksong, through reified super-organic laws without reference to individuals. This precluded consideration of the psychology of individuals to explain what folklore is or does (Dundes, p. 130). This approach therefore takes
the folk out of folklore and relegates the narrator to a blind obeyer of abstract epic laws. According to Olrik, since these laws are above humans, they are autonomous processes and need no explanation or verifications through reference to origin, development or operation (p. 129). Closely allied to this approach is the concept of automigration, according to which tales can move by themselves without people necessarily moving or migrating, for example, the children's circle game in which a message is whispered from the first to the last child (p. 130).

Raglan, though closely associated with Freudianism, analyzed in "The Hero of Tradition" (1934) what he called "incidents" in the stories of a number of certain Greek traditional heroes. He found that when these stories were divided into these incidents, certain types of incidents ran through all or most, of the stories (Dundes, p. 165). In all, there were twenty-two such incidents. However, these incidents have so far proved not to be universal as Clyde Kluckhon so well showed in "Recurrent Themes in Myths and Mythmaking" (Dundes, 1965), in which he examines Raglan's "incidents" cross-culturally. Although he basically agrees to Levi-Strauss' concept of the progressive mediating role of myths toward binary oppositions, he recommends further empirical data before bold universal claims can be made.

Elli Kongás Maranda though steeped in structural analysis nonetheless concedes, unlike Raglan, that, "culture, verbal arts included, is a living thing or it is nothing. . . . I choose to maintain that folkloric utterances are created whenever they are made" (Paredes/Bauman, 1972:60).
The Finnish School of Folklore

This school goes back to the time of the Grimm Brothers. Through the historic-geographic method, it attempts to trace the probable place of origin and development of individual tales by comparing large numbers of variants. Dated literary variants are placed in chronological order and oral variants are arranged geographically. The narrative is analyzed in terms of its basic traits or motifs and its variants or different versions. The frequency of one of these versions implies that it may be the earliest version of the trait, or, if one version is found in all the older literary texts, it may be the earliest. Even though the Finnish School makes a commendable effort in explaining the distribution of variants of a tale-type in terms of diffusion, it has shown little, if any, interest, in the deviations in narratives from cultural norms.

A critique of the Finnish school, particularly the Aarne-Thompson index\(^2\) has come from various sources. Archer Taylor (Dundes, 1965), for example, lists three problems arising from the use of literary sources to study the diffusion of oral narratives. These problems have to do with the fact that, (1) Folklore is in many cultures, indistinguishable from literature; (2) literature contains elements borrowed from folklore; and (3) writers have imitated folklore (p. 37). Francis Lee Utley, in an article entitled "Folk Literature: An Operational Definition" (Dundes, 1965), maintains that "the only trustworthy kind of folk literature is that collected under conditions which give such information about the immediate information as enables us to check his claim to be a bearer of oral tradition" (p. 14). He goes on
to say, however, that even with such a biographical sketch, "can we be sure we have a genuine folktale and not one of several things that look to the unwary, much like it: a literary invention out of whole cloth or a literary retelling by a popularizing writer, a careless collector, an expurgating guardian of the morals of children, an author re-writing for religious, political, or commercial reasons, a genius like Scott or Percy or Chaucer?" (p. 14).

The Finnish School, however, has an international reputation and its highly acclaimed work, the Aarne-Thompson index, is widely utilized today in Folklore scholarship. Therefore, while it systematically tries to answer Bascom's first question by tracing the root and route of individual tales, this school has shown very little interest in analyzing anti-social elements in oral narrative.

**The Contextual or Performance Approach**

The performance approach will be dealt with at much greater length than has so far been the case with the other schools. This is primarily because it is a major concept in this study both as a tool for critiquing traditional folklore concepts and as an experimental unit in the testing of these "new ideas."

What is a contextual or performance approach? Although it has many distinguished advocates, basically it seeks to shift the emphasis in the study of oral narratives from the texts or scripts of these narratives to the folkloric event which always occurs within a certain cultural-specific context. Without delegitimating the role of texts in oral narratives, it places texts firmly in the context of the
folkloric act. The question of origins and diffusion of tales therefore becomes unimportant since each folkloric context is unique and cannot be duplicated. Bascom (1963), for example, has written:

... anthropologists have come to the conclusion that the search for ultimate origins, whether by means of the cultural evolutionists' approach or the age-area concept, is a hopeless one where historical documents or archeological evidence is lacking. ... This conclusion has been reached after many serious attempts to reconstruct history using a wide variety of data and although anthropologists have not completely abandoned the subject of distribution of specific tales, the question of diffusion and possible origins is receiving less and less attention and is approached with increasing care (p. 31).

This view is shared by Alan Dundes (1965) in an article entitled, "The Search for Origins." He repudiates the historical-geographists, cultural evolutionist, and some of the Freudian pre-occupation with origins and argues that "the historical records go back only so far in the evolution of man. Without some concrete historical evidence, it is difficult, if not impossible to provide a plausible explanation for the existence of an item of folklore in a particular place" (p. 55).

Dan Ben-Amos (Bascom, 1977) argues that any analysis of oral narratives has to consider the social, verbal and personal elements involved. In his study of Benin narratives he has uncovered culturally-specific definitions of the modes of oral narrative presentation as well as differences among story tellers, all of which have profound implications for Bascom's two questions and Olrik's concept of superorganic laws governing oral narratives, in which the narrator is a blind obeyer of abstract epic laws. Ben-Amos' analysis has affirmed the concept of "native standards" as opposed to "academic standards" for the definitions
and analysis of oral narratives.

Ben-Amos' conceptual framework of what should constitute folklore puts the textual or superorganic approach in a larger context which, while clarifying some definitional and developmental conflicts plaguing the study of Folklore, also enormously expands the field. Rather than perceiving Folklore as explicable only in terms of verified super-organic laws as scholars like Olrik maintained, Ben-Amos sees these super-organic structures simply as folkloric forms—like artifacts and mentifacts—for, once created, he says, their indigeneous and cultural context are not required for their continuous existence. He goes on:

Tales and songs can shift media, cross language boundaries, pass from one culture to another, and still retain sufficient traces of similarity to enable us to recognize a core of sameness in all their versions. Folk art objects can outlive their users and even exist whether their culture as a whole has become extinct, so that they are literary survivals of ancient times. . . . In sum, the materials of folklore are mobile, manipulative and transcultural (Dandes-Bauman, p. 4).

On the other hand, Ben-Amos argues that Folklore is very much an organic part of culture. Further,

Any divorce of tales, song or sculptures from their indigenous locale, time, and society inevitably introduces qualitative changes into them. The social context, the cultural attitude, the rhetorical situation, and the individual aptitude are variables that produce distinct differences in the structure, text and texture of the ultimate verbal, musical, or plastic product. The audience itself, be it children or adults, men or women, a stable society or an accidental grouping, affects the kind of folklore genre and the manner or presentation. Moreover, the categorization of prose narratives into different genres depends largely upon the cultural attitudes toward the
tales and the indigenous taxonomy of oral tradition. Thus, in the process of diffusion from one culture to another, tales may also cross narrative categories; and the same story may be myth for one group and "Marchen" for another. In that case the question of the actual generic classification of the tale is irrelevant, since it does not depend on any autonomous intrinsic features but rather on the cultural attitude toward it. Finally, unlike written literature, music and fine art, folklore forms and texts are performed repeatedly by different people on various occasions. The performance situation, in the final analysis, is the crucial context for the available text (p. 5).

A large part of Ben-Amos' assertions are based on his field research in storytelling, including those conducted in Benin. Commenting on the Benin storytellers and their musical instruments, the "akpata" and the "asologun," Ben-Amos (1975) observes that both the storytellers and the instruments serve as a symbol of marginality and instability within the storytelling context. The symbolic meaning of the akpata and the asologun and of their artists allegedly has three dimensions, namely the social, the cognitive and the expressive. Socially, the narrator is a marginal character, whose position within Benin society is uncertain. He is dependent upon his hosts and not the other way around. Cognitively, the instruments and their players are associated with outcast figures in religious and political structures such as witches, the spirits of the night and unsuccessful rulers. At a time when the listeners are searching for happiness, the akpata and asologun represent the state of sorrow and depression. In the expressive dimension, the heroes of the professional storyteller are rural magicians and other powerful rural people or suffering characters on the margins of Benin society (p. 54).
Undoubtedly the contextual approach strongly answers Bascom's two questions with a relativistic approach and is more inclusive. Even though it starts off challenging some of the basic tenets of traditional theory, its inclusiveness, as well as its new interpretation, promises to resolve some of the problem alluded to, under Statement of the Problem. Nonetheless, the discussion of the problems persists in Folklore scholarship. But for our purposes the performance or contextual approach seems to make sense as a hypothesis. The following chapter will therefore examine statements by more advocates of this approach in relation to some of the traditional approaches.
CHAPTER III

THE PERFORMANCE-APPROACH
AND THE
CRITIQUE OF THE EXCLUSIVE TEXT-APPROACH

For many scholars of the performance-centered approach Malinowski was their forerunner. Richard Bauman (Bascom, 1977), in an essay entitled, "Settlement Patterns," (1977), points out two important formulations by Malinowski: (a) he directed attention to the situational setting of folkloric performance and (b) he stressed the context of the situation as the key to social meaning (p. 123). Following extensive field studies of the myths, legends and tales of the Trobriand Islanders, Malinowski (1926) wrote in 1926:

... the text, of course, is extremely important, but without the context, it remains lifeless. ... The interest of the story is vastly enhanced and it is given its proper character by the manner in which it is told. The whole nature of the performance, the voice and the mimicry, the stimulus and the response of the audience mean as much to the natives as the text; and the sociologist should take his cue from the natives. All these elements are equally relevant. All must be studied as well as the text. The stories live in native life and not on paper, and when a scholar jots them down without being able to evoke the atmosphere in which they flourish, he has given us but a mutilated bit of reality (p. 29-30).

Undoubtedly Malinowski's "discovery" stimulated other ethnographic studies whose contributions confirm his position. Writing about Hindu narratives, Handoo (1978), for instance notes:

Unlike written literature, a piece of oral narrative may not provide all those elements which are necessary for a stylistic study, if
only its text is taken into consideration. No one can deny the importance of text in a given piece of oral narratives; but it is the extra-text elements and their relationship that make a piece of oral narrative meaningful and communicative. . . . A student of oral narratives while examining the text of oral art or scrutinizing its qualities of structure and language cannot escape the fact that the texts he handles are unlike the text of written literature, not possessing a constant form. While the author of a literary piece has sufficient scope of polishing and perfecting his creation, the narrator delivers his piece as the words pour from his mind, because composition and performance are not two processes for him (p. 21).

In discussing a culture thousands of miles from Handoo's India, Ruth Finnegan (1971) in her research into Lamba culture makes a similar observation:

... the fascination with this approach (text) however, has sometimes blinded commentators to the significance of African prose narratives. There has been a tendency to play down the significance of the contemporary verbalization and performance as a whole in favour of an attempt to trace back the detailed history of certain elements of its subject matter. Local artistry, inventiveness and meanings are minimized and concentration focused on external origins (p. 322).

In a related topic, Harold Scheub (1975) quotes a Zulu performer as saying, "to discuss the meaning of this narrative, I must perform it again" (p. 29-30). Perhaps Scheub's book, The Xhosa Ntsomi, is a compelling testimony to the importance of "local inventiveness" and the "polishing and perfecting" of the oral narratives. Besides having an excellent collection of oral narratives, including the "same" tales performed by different people, Scheub has examples of oral narratives performed by children with a lengthy discussion of the process of matura-
tion determined by time and audience response, inter alia.
Although disparate and seminal work had been done in the sixties, the high point of the performance or enactment-centered approach came with the publication in 1977 of *Frontiers of Folklore* which was first in a series of publications by the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS). Earlier work was important because it showed the high degree to which the performance-approach was indebted to other disciplines, such as sociolinguistics. In a paper entitled, "The Contribution of Folklife to Sociolinguistic Research," Dell Hymes (Bauman and Paredes, 1972) makes the following observation:

... Linguists have observed speech but have symmetrically analyzed just those aspects of it that have answered the problem of formal grammar. They have abstracted from speech as a structured activity. Social and expressive aspects of speech have been attended to only when they have intruded enescapably into grammar. ... Anthropologists and other social scientists have used the data of speech but typically they have abstracted from its linguistic characteristics ... they do not characterize the ways in which what was said is a function of how it is said (p. 43).

Dell Hymes is quick to point out, however, that sociolinguists are equally indebted to those folklorists who have made the social dynamics of a tale, one of their primary concerns (p. 41.).

One of those folklorists is of course, Dan Ben-Amos. In tearing apart both the concept and method of the traditional text-oriented approaches, Ben-Amos (Bauman and Paredes 1972) states

... so far, most definitions have conceived of folklore as a collection of things. These could be either narratives, melodies, beliefs or material objects. All of them are completed products or formulated ideas; it is possible to collect them. The collection of things requires a methodological abstraction of objects from their actual context. No
doubt this can be done; often it is essential for research purposes. Nevertheless this abstraction is only methodological and should not be confused with or substituted for the true nature of the entities. Moreover, any definition of folklore on the basis of these abstracted things is bound to mistake the part for the whole. To define folklore, it is necessary to examine the phenomena as they exist. In its cultural context, folklore is not an aggregate of things, but a process—a communicative process, to be exact (p. 9).

Using primarily the idea of the socially limited nature of folklore as a constraint and borrowing from Dell Hymes' (1962) term, "communicative event," Ben-Amos goes on to define folklore as a communicative process in a small group, meaning that "both the performers and the audience have to be in the same situation and be part of the same reference group. This implies communication in a situation in which people confront each other face to face and relate to each other directly. In sum, folklore is artistic communication in small groups" (p. 9).

In the same publication, Richard Bauman (1972) attacks the largely traditional view of folklore as a function of a shared identity. Borrowing in part from Jansen's (Dundes, 1965) Esoteric/Exoteric concept of folklore, he attacks even Dundes' (1965) relatively open view of folk as comprising people who share at least one common factor. Bauman suggests the need for a new conceptual and empirical strategy in the study of the social base of folklore that will focus upon those social identities which are relevant to the performance of folklore within the context of particular situations and events. He points out:

... Once the necessary orientation is made, it becomes apparent that folklore may be found in both symmetrical and asymmetrical relationships; members of particular groups or social
categories may exchange folklore with each other, on the basis of shared ideas or with others, on the basis of differential identity (p. 38).

As part of the evidence from the field, Bauman refers to a study by James Teit in which members of Tahltan and Tlingit societies of northwestern Canada often came together and spent weeks competing in story telling (p. 34).

A large part of the discussion so far has focused on the work done in the early 1960's and '70's, which can be correctly called a period of intense questioning of the text-oriented approach. The work that comes out of the 1977 publication by the AAAS (i.e., American) marks the beginnings of a discussion about the departures of the context or performance approaches from the traditional ones, primarily the diffusionist and cultural evolutionist schools.

Apart from issues of origins and abnormalities in Folklore, aesthetic issues are raised by some of the advocates of the performance approach. In an article entitled, "Toward an Enactment-Centered Theory" Roger D. Abrahams (Bascom 1977) discusses some of the aesthetic elements inherent in performance. In his analysis he cites the contributions of William James and Schiller and comes up with a number of insights:

There are two obvious ways of departing from the everyday expressive codes: intensification (like ceremonial formalization), or by playful inversion. The former stylizes the serious dimension of everyday behaviors; the latter seriously up-ends these serious goal-oriented or teleological patterns. The serious apparently serves social order, the ludicrous comments upon society and its orders, and not always very kindly. The ludicrous could hardly exist with the serious, whose very patterns it inverts... (p. 90).
Taking his cue from Kenneth Burke's (1968) dictum that "there are no forms of art which are not forms of experience outside of art", Abrahams (Bascom, 1977) rhetorically asks why there is a need to embody a range of recurrent experiences and behaviors in enactments. His answer:

Standard psychological and functional theory would apply a "replay" or catharsis explanation, such as: framing an enactment permits the controlled replaying of anxiety-laden experience while embodying a restatement of cultural norms, teaching and celebrating the group's sense of order at the same time. Common sense affirms this approach, for we know we tell stories out of our own embarrassment, our confusing and even traumatic experiences, and each time we tell them we have moved the upset more toward some class of experiences-in-common, therefore more under control (p. 95).

Harold Scheub (Dorson, 1972) complements Abraham's discussion with the concept of the "expansible image" and "core clichés." According to Scheub, a Xhosa ntsomi is "the objectification of ancient songs, chants and sayings whose conflict and resolution are derived from these remembered cove-clichés and shaped into a plot during performance. The core-cliches move the plot forward, and incorporate many non-verbal elements as well as song and dance" (p. 115).

The Expansible Image, on the other hand, is the repetition of the core-cliche to advance the plot and delineate character and conflict. According to Scheub (1975) the Expansible Image is at the heart of the structure of the ntsomi tradition and is a key aesthetic principle. For example, core-cliches are well known by members of the Xhosa audience and the path of the story can be more or less predicted, in Ntsomi performances. This predictability helps to "establish anticipation in the aesthetic experience of the members of the audience and that anticipation
is purposefully interfered with: friction is introduced" (Bascom, p. 61). Scheub finds an analogous attitude in I.A. Richard's comment about poetry, that

... rhythm and its specialized form, metre, depend upon repetition and expectancy ... .

Equally where what is expected recurs and where it fails, all rhythmical and metrical effects spring from anticipation. As a rule this anticipation is unconscious ...

This texture of expectation, satisfaction, disappointment, surprisals, is rhythm ...

... Evidently there can be no surprise and no disappointment unless there is expectation and most rhythms perhaps are made up of as much of disappointments and post-ponements and surprises and betrayals as of simple straight forward satisfaction (Bascom, p. 60).

Richard Bauman (Bascom 1977) notes that this type of aesthetic analysis, while largely bound with anthropology and linguistics is "evidence [of] a new rapprochement between folklore and literature" (p. 128). He further notes:

One of the most notable features of the new literary perspective in folklore is the departure from an emphasis on folklore as collective, traditional, anonymous literature, as something to which the performer might contribute stylistic shaping at best, destructive garbling at worst, but nothing to be compared seriously to the creative and individual effort of the author of written literature (p. 129).

Coupled with the interest in folklore and literature have been recent studies in rhetorical or morphological structures in oral narratives, no doubt stimulated by such pioneers as Olrik, Propp and Levi-Strauss, referred to earlier. Works by such scholars as the Herskovites (1958); the Marandás (1971); Alan Dundes (Dorson 1972); and Bascom (1975) are worthy of note.
The enactment or performance-centered exponents have no doubt made an impressive criticism of the traditional cultural evolutionist and diffusionist schools. First, by making context rather than text their primary area of inquiry, they have been able to penetrate areas of folklore which were previously glossed over and have made folklore more empirical. Ruth Finnegan (1970) traces the traditional limitations back to the conceptual Framework of the anthropologists and folklorists of the nineteenth-century. Such literature, she states, "was supposed to be the work of communal consciousness and group authorship rather than, as in 'civilized' communities, of an individual-inspired artist. It was supposed to have been handed down word for word from the 'dim before-time' or from 'back ages,' for no individual creativity or imagination could be expected of 'primitive' peoples" (p. 36). Since the "dim-before-time" is becoming dimmer and dimmer as it becomes more and more remote, insistence upon the text concept and method as either the sole or only legitimate approach will inevitably result in folklore extinction. Because each oral narrative performance has a unique set of circumstances, the context approach makes the analysis of oral narratives a dynamic venture with limitless possibilities. For one, it makes the text, however old, part of a living and continuous venture. Second, the performance approach has challenged the static concept of folk as either an ethnic or class-bound entity, a notion which still has some contemporary apologists. In an article entitled, "Africa and the Folklorists," Dorson (1972) for instance, states that, "two main conditions for the study of folklore are just being realized in Africa: the appearance of an intellectual class with a culture partly different
from that of the mass of the people, and the emergence of national states. In the tribal culture all the members share the values, participate in the rituals and belong fully to the culture even if some hold privileged positions as chiefs or diviners" (p. 4). Unfortunately, Dorson does not define "tribe" or its matrix of relationships. He seems to assume a homogeneity (linguistically, regionally, etc.) which a number of traditional societies lack. Alan Dundes' concept of folk, already mentioned, is of course an improvement even though it, too, has shortcomings.

Finally, the performance approach is a potential boon for Folklore education and a good complement to some of the new and dynamic curriculum theories that take into account the malleable and diverse background of pre-college level schools across the United States. As more and more educators perceive folklore as having little to do with ethnicity or "the days of yore," Folklore will cease being a quaint, class, or ethnically-loaded subject. Because of the uniqueness of each performance situation, every classroom using this approach can thus construct its own curriculum. Rather than narrowing the field of inquiry, the performance approach broadens it by making the folkloric event contemporaneous, contextual as well as textual. Whereas textualization freezes or standardizes the event, performance makes it unpredictable, thereby increasing the permutations of story telling either by the same story tellers or groups thereof. Each event can thus be instructive about function, antecedes, group dynamics and interplay, all of which broaden the event far beyond what the text alone can say. The next chapter will discuss, within a historical context, a number of
curriculum concepts as well as selected folklore curriculum models which will be analyzed with regard to whether or not they are in tandem with certain criteria of relevance generated by the discussion.
CHAPTER IV

CONTEMPORARY STUDIES AND CURRICULA IN FOLKLORE EDUCATION

Background

What are the aims of folklore education and how are they achieved in a formal school setting?

The following description, given by Charles Snow Guthrie (1976) is perhaps one of the most useful for our purposes:

. . . folklore offers a potential in addition to that of conventional literature, for enabling the student to understand himself and other people and consequently to adjust himself to the demands of society. It also offers a potential as a background for writing, discussion and thinking. In addition to that, through the activity of making a collection of the lore of his own community, the use of folklore in a school program can enable a student actually to communicate with people outside his family and immediate friends (p. 2).

Unfortunately, Guthrie's description, though useful for classificatory purposes, fails to give any specific criteria for either judging the folkloric item or choosing the proper curriculum model for translating precept into process. Such criteria would certainly advance both the direction of the folklore processes and the attendant criticism of those processes, a focus that in the long run is good for folklore education. While there is no doubt that Guthrie's description of the use of folklore may be well grounded in an important theory of the aims of education, how those aims are either obtained or hindered is an equally important evaluative consideration. John Dewey (Archambault, 1964) for example, in discussing the aims of education, stated that "education must promote creativity and stability, individuality and
self-consciousness." He argued that the chief means to attain this are to be found in the environment of the school in general and in the method of instruction in particular. He stated further that "the pupil is constantly made to share in activities and indeed to corporate in planning the curriculum and hence the total environment of the school" (p. xxvii).

Because of the proliferation of studies in folklore and the multifaceted ends they are meant to serve, this section in addition to being highly selective of those studies, will use two criteria of relevance. The first criterion will deal with the extent to which either the text or performance approach plays a significant role in any folklore program or design. The second will concern the theoretical justification for the choice of the educational curriculum to carry out the program.

The debate about curriculum is ancient in the history of educational theory. One important example is characterized by Dewey who, at the turn of the twentieth-century bitterly condemned the "old school" for the passivity of its methods and the uniformity of its curriculum. According to Dewey, the educational center of gravity had too long been in the teacher, the textbook anywhere and everywhere you please, except in the immediate instincts and activities of the child himself. The essence of the new education, Dewey observed, was to shift this center of gravity back to the child (Cremin, 1961:118). Essentially, Dewey's theories and methods set the tone and background for theorists like Decker Walker, James MacDonald, Ralph Tyler and Bobbit, who have made their own unique contributions to educational and curriculum theory. However, in spite of the general similarities of their
variables, there are varying interpretations of these variables and how they are put to use. Sonia Nieto (1977), for example, in a paper entitled, "Curriculum Models and the Education of Third World Students," has devised three criteria of relevance to evaluate curriculum theories, using three categories, namely, Traditional, Reformer and Interactional. Although this classification was designed specifically to analyze the appropriateness of certain curriculum models for the education of Third World students, they are also useful for our discussion of folklore education. Of Tyler's approach for instance, she states:

Although Tyler maintains that no attempt is made to answer these questions, he suggests particular data sources which, in fact, do answer them. He proposes three data-sources: the child, the subject matter specialist and society. Each source he maintains, should be considered in planning any curriculum. However, it is the interpretation of these data-sources that is used not necessarily interaction with them. Thus, for example, it is the study of the child that is meant when a child is used as a data-source, not specific recommendations from the child concerning the curriculum (p. 25).

The four questions referred to by Nieto come from Tyler's reknown book, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction (1969), namely,

a. What education purposes should the school seek to attain?

b. What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?

c. How can these educational experiences be organized?

d. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?

And while she credits Goodlad for reforming Tyler's system by identifying four decision-making levels in curriculum development (the
instructional, institutional, ideological and societal) she nonetheless rejects his model as inappropriate basically because "he (Goodland) . . fails to deal with another fundamental question: where do values come from . . . [for] values are not the same for everybody, nor are they universal" (p. 36). For Nieto, MacDonald and Freire provide the most appropriate models for her purposes since, both value collectivity and community concerns, both also value individual and cultural differences. Kliebard (Pinar, 1975), after an exhaustive critique of the Tyler Rationale which he characterizes as "the most persistent theoretical formulation in the field of curriculum" (p. 70), comes to the same conclusion as Nieto. He suggests that the Rationale is "imperishable" since "it duly compromises between warring extremes and skirts the pitfalls to which the doctrinaire are subject" (p. 81). For example, says Kliebard, Tyler's three sources of educational objectives, proceed primarily from the value-laden first tenet (i.e., what educational purposes should the school seek to attain?) and "encapsulate several traditional doctrines in the curriculum field over which much ideological blood had been spilled" (p. 71). Although MacDonald's leaves some questions and is to some extent idealistic, using it can bring about changes in schools . . . Freire's model answers questions of idealism by stressing the inadequacy of education alone to bring about change (p. 60).\(^5\)

Ghory and Sinclair (1975) while extolling curriculum reforms of the past, particularly since the 1960's, regret the fact that generally reforms seem to crystallize by interlocking with the system or the bureaucracy of the school and by forcing reform-minded educators to the margins where they are alienated and disconnected from the very settings
they desire to improve. Their solution:

We propose that by acting to learn what students think about the conditions designed for their learning, teachers will move toward a position of responsibility for curriculum. When teachers familiar with student behavior gain access to student perception the impact of the learning environment becomes more clear to them. In sum the strength of an approach using student perceptions to investigate learning environments is that it allows both teachers and students to convert environments producing negative limits for behavior into settings that act as positive agencies encouraging learning.

Perhaps the most important contribution made by Ghory and Sinclair to curriculum education was their delineation of the processes of curriculum construction, namely:

a) the expressed dimension, i.e., a written statement expressed in terms of intended learning objectives, learning opportunities, a sequence of content and evaluation procedures, such as the syllabus;
b) the implied dimension or hidden curriculum, such as the unintended learning that results from what is included or omitted in the content that is taught; and,
c) the emergent dimension, which includes the ongoing alterations, adjustments and additions that are made in the expressed and implied curriculum in order to ensure harmony between the uniqueness of the individual learner and the character of the curriculum. Being basically followers of Tyler, however, they eschew an indepth discussion of values.

Lest we be accused by Kliebard (Pinar 1975) of "the a historical posture in the field of curriculum [manifested in] the singular lack of dialogue between present day practitioners and their forebears" (p. 41), a historical purview is essential in
order to put the spectrum of theories into some perspective.

In an article entitled, "Persistent Curriculum Issues in Historical Perspective," Kliebard traces the emergence of the curriculum field as a self-conscious field of specialization from around the year 1918 with the publication of Franklin Bobbitt's book, *The Curriculum* and Clarence Kingsley's, *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*. He characterizes these books as some of several influential works in the field and contends that their publication was followed in the 1920's by a proliferation of activities directed toward curriculum reform which was largely shaped by "a drive for the Americanization of immigrants, a faith in the methods of science and a concern for the uplift of the masses. To a large degree, the curriculum field . . . was believed to be a reaction against . . . a kind of education what was static, irrelevant to modern life, and nonfunctional" (p. 40). According to Kliebard, any critical act in an educational sense is by necessity an act that is critical of the dominant normative structure of the larger society. Educational criticism, hence, becomes cultural, political and economic criticism.

Unlike Kliebard, Cremin (Pinar, 1975) traces the important beginnings of curriculum to William Harris' formalistic curriculum for St. Louis schools in the 1870's. Cremin complains that during the Progressive Era alluded to by Kliebard, "acknowledging other domains of education and then proceeding to ignore them became characteristic of the Era" (p. 17). He strongly believes that, "education and politics are inextricably intertwined, that one cannot discuss the ends and means of education apart from the most fundamental questions of value, and
that education proceeds through a variety of institutions of which the school is only one" (p. 17). Michael Apple's "The Hidden Curriculum and the Nature of Conflict" (Pinar, 1975) adds an important insight into the discussion of values by pointing out that, "There has so far been very little examination of how the treatment of conflict in the school curriculum can lead to political acquiescence and the acceptance by students of the perspective on social and political conflict that acts to maintain the existing distribution of power and rationality in the society" (p. 96). Further, he maintains that subjects dealing with science tend to advance a sectarian position as objective and to ignore the fact that any scientific position is the culmination of a series of struggles among scientific postulations and personalities with sometimes divergent and even conflicting ethical values and lifestyles.

Besides the question of values is the issue of goals in curriculum. Kliebard (Pinar, 1975) uses a metaphoric framework which condenses an otherwise long discussion. He divides the filed into three areas: (1) The Metaphor of Production. This type of curriculum treats the student as a raw material which will be transformed into a finished and useful product under the control of a highly-skilled technician. The outcome is carefully plotted in advance according to rigorous design specifications and when certain means of production prove inefficient, they are discarded in favor of more effective ones.

(2) The Metaphor of Growth. The curriculum here is like a greenhouse where students will grow and develop under the care of a wise and patient gardener. The plants that grow are of every variety, but the gardener treats each according to its needs.
(3) The Metaphor of Travel. The curriculum is a route over which students will travel under the leadership of an experienced guide and companion. Each traveler is affected differently since its effect is a function of the intelligence and interests of the traveler, as well as the shape of the route (p. 85).

Using realistic terms, Macdonald (Pinar, 1975), on the other hand, argues that curriculum theory and theorizing are still at a formative stage varying "from essentially epistemological statements to the . . . statements of a philosophy of living" (p. 5). He agrees with Huebner's (1968) analysis that curriculum theory can be categorized according to the various uses of language by theorists, namely, (1) descriptive, (2) explanatory, (3) controlling, (4) legitimizing, (5) prescriptive, and (6) affiliative (p. 6). Macdonald concludes that it is difficult to formalize such a diverse and wide-ranging field. He attributes this difficulty specifically to the fact that so far there has been a failure to identify the fundamental unit of curriculum with which to build conceptual systems (p. 11-12).

What then is the state of curriculum art? In an article, "Curriculum: State of the Field" written for a special issue on curriculum, published in The Review of Educational Research, Goodlad (1969) concludes:

During the past decade, significant progress has been made in the precise definition of curricular objectives, in the analysis of ends/means relationships and in the effective ordering of stimuli for learning. Substantial progress has been made in extending both the understanding of the evaluative process and the use of evaluative data in diagnosing the possible causes of discrepancies between curricular expectancies and curricular accomplishments. In the realm of explaining curricular realities
however, we appear to know little more in 1969 than we knew in 1960. Curricular theory with exploratory and predictive power is virtually non-existent (p. 374).

Kliebard (Pinar 1975) on the other hand, sees the problem of curriculum, since the 1930's, as one limited by its heavy indebtedness to the production model and the utilitarian criterion applied to all schools as they have evolved over the past half-century. He advises that "the task of the next fifty-years--is essentially one of developing alternatives in the mode of thinking and the limited framework that has so clearly dominated our first fifty-years" (p. 49). Much work, therefore, lies ahead.

General Observations

The examination of the history of both the curriculum models and the performance approach has raised more issues and questions, for, both fields are relatively young and do not boast a consistent "line." For example, since oral narratives from the point of view of performance unlike written literature, do not possess a constant form, should the curriculum design be constantly changing? Is the performance approach inherently in conflict with the Tyler Rationale, so text-oriented and so persuasive in the U.S. schools? Who should determine values in this approach and how does the determination affect the curriculum process? There are some of the many questions, some or all of which cannot possibly be answered by this investigation. It seems, however, safe to say that whatever curriculum model is deemed appropriate has to be shaped largely by values guiding the audience-narrator interaction and performance in each relative context. An example of the mediating
nature of values has to do with the question of anti-social or abnormal elements in the texts of some oral narratives. As Ben-Amos has already pointed out, the values and taxonomy of each context should dictate the kind of decision each group makes. A pre-packaged curriculum approach then, may not be a good idea. Further, because oral narratives are an expressive form, an oral narrative curriculum cannot afford to look at students as aggregates, since each student's performance is a unique event and a function of, _inter alia_, each student's character and aptitude. Such a curriculum then, may have a certain element of unpredictability, a feature which, perhaps, a school system so steeped in standardized procedures, and uncompetitive teacher salaries, cannot countenance. As Hector Lee (1970) has pointed out:

> No ready-made plans or mail order material will work, since both must grow from the milieu, the community and the cultural mixture of the class. There are, of course, some good collections of American folklore available that can be used as guides and convenient resources. But effective folklore projects should go far beyond what can be found in printed sources (p. 994).

It would appear, therefore, that like its folkloric counterpart, the curriculum design for the performance approach has to be relativistic rather than universalistic as claimed by a number of curriculum experts, past and present. But to say that it should be relativistic is not to undermine what are considered universal human values, such as respect for human life and dignity.

**Criteria for Review of Selected Folklore Curriculum Models**

The preceding historical review highlights, first of all, the importance of an underlying curriculum approach as a vehicle for
translating educational aims into a viable program. Second, it enables
one to have a rational, analytical approach for assessing educational
aims in a specific program. Consequently, in assessing folklore curri-
culum models in the next section, two criteria for review will be used:

(1) To what degree does the model utilize the performance
approach?

(2) To what degree is the relative context of each situation
taken into account? By relative context is meant such
things as cultural values, the consideration of each
child's unique background, as well as narrator-audience
interaction.

In analyzing some of the curriculum models, certain terms will be
used to facilitate classifications of these models into manageable cate-
gories. The use of these terms do not denote a theoretical position or
standard categories in either Folklore or Curriculum scholarship. They
are, therefore, didactic and the investigator's creation. These terms
are, the Motivational Model, Affective Model, Independent Model and will
be described separately.

The Motivational Model

The term, motivational, is used to describe a folkloric venture
of, usually, a short duration whose main purpose is to motivate students
in another subject such as literature or music.

Motivational Models abound in varying forms in the literature.
One form tends to be sparse of detail as exemplified by David Gale's,
"February Folklore." In it Gale makes an implicit definition of folklore
which this study has shown to be false:

... customs or tales handed down from generation to generation. February abounds with folklore, especially legends, those tales connected to historical events, but probably not themselves true.6

He writes, inter alia, about the Chinese Zodiac and certain activities to be assigned to students in February. Unfortunately, Gale has not included any objective evaluative guide or criteria for these projects. Judging from the self-evaluated success of some of these models, chances are Gale was more able in February to arouse significant student interest in English. For instance, Wogaman's Folklore Can Be Fun, in evaluating his approach concludes that "many of the students became so interested in obtaining all of the information possible that they did more than was requested for the assignment" (p. 208). In the case of "February Folklore," assuming Gale was successful at all in February, one wonders how his English assignments were received by the students the rest of the year. Did each month have its own "game" of folklore? Did the presumed success in February spill over into March? If so, was it because the February assignments were to some degree permanently integrated into any subsequent English syllabus? His concept of folklore is another contentious issue. He talks of "customs" without elaboration or reference to folklore scholarship's varied uses of the term. Moreover he seems to imply through his use of the connective "or" that customs and tales are interchangeable concepts. The rationale for the students' collection of "folkloric" materials seems predicated upon intellectual enlightenment and stimulation or motivation. Our criteria for folkloric and curriculum relevance seem irrelevant in this study (or vice-versa) and therefore no purpose is served
by any indepth analysis of Gale's "February Folklore."

Another form the Motivational Model tends to take, is exemplified by Guthrie's earlier-mentioned dissertation, *A Study of Kentucky Folklore As a Resource for High School English Programs of the State.* Among other things, the study offers a series of samples of Kentucky tales gleaned from books and periodicals between 1815 and the 1970's.

Unfortunately, Guthrie's study is too text-based. The samples, although appropriately naming the storytellers nonetheless fail to give more details about them or to provide oral and enactment data, or non-verbal elements of the events. Other important facets such as audience composition, participation or reaction are not discussable, due to the nature of the collection. Although Guthrie's study is not about the independent use of folklore, however the nature of the folklore has to be well understood before it is put to the service of English. Even in terms of the best interest of English, discussion of such items as rhetorical and compositional parallels and disjunctions between the oral and written "structures" would have been a great service.

Thus, while his work is valuable as a survey, it is lamentable insofar as it fails to bridge the knowledge gap which he decries vis-à-vis the majority of teachers of English who use folklore in Kentucky. Without the pedagogical tools to evaluate its aims and objectives, it is difficult to discern first how the material can be applied in a classroom context and secondly, how its effectiveness can either be evaluated or repeated in varying locales. It should be gainsaid that since scripts tend to cross ethnic, geographic and cultural bounds, the notation of such elements as the name of the storyteller, the function of
the tale in other societies, etc., may be of limited use if each context (e.g., the classroom) has its own way of reinterpreting the script.

The Affective Model

The phrase Affective Model generally takes the form of studies in ethnic pride. In this section, three studies including a dissertation, will be discussed.

Clarence G. Seckel Jr. in a paper entitled, "African Oral Literature in the Secondary School Curriculum" makes an impressive appeal for the incorporation of his recommendations into Black Studies Curricula. Although he makes a creditable case for the inclusion of "oral literature" and rightly stresses the importance of the story teller and audience, his approach toward the subject is too text-oriented. Furthermore, inspite of his reference to the story teller and the audience there is no analysis of the elements of performance which define the uniqueness of each oral narrative event. His recommendations for the study of the subject such as, Nine African Plays for Radio (Henderson and Pieterse, 1973) and Yoruba Poetry (Beier, 1970), are to a great extent examples of what Carvalho-Neto (1971) calls aesthetic projection, or the expressive or popular use of folklore. Further scrutiny of Seckel's work reveals a functionalist approach to African verbal art forms. He seems more concerned with how these forms function in general or super-organically, which texts are wont to do.

As for the use of the word "curriculum," Seckel either through over-sight or presumption, has not defined it. A series of questions naturally arises from this omission. How would the material be
integrated into the curriculum? Who would teach it and what qualifications would they be required to have? Would it be read and performed or simply read? The importance of curriculum cannot be overemphasized.

Another example of the Affective Model is "Nho Lobo: Folktales of the Cape Veredian People."9 Probably because it is a teacher's guide, it is more specific in its curriculum proposals. The guide for example, has a list of folktales followed by discussion questions on text comprehension. No requirement exists for the enactment of these tales despite the author's awareness that "the folklore of the Cape Veredian people like that of other cultures, comes from an oral tradition [and] the tales are always changing in the re-telling, adapting to the changing needs and experiences of the people" (p.V). Unfortunately, this perception is lost in the over-textualization and highly literary nature of the curriculum, despite the recommendation contained in the study's abstract that "suggestions include acting out the story with different endings, and Americanizing the tale using American characters" (p.I), there is only one such activity. One is left wondering how well the student would score in the comprehension tests had performance been the primary communicative approach. Besides the highly textual orientation of this approach, other problems exist as well.

For one, the study's definition of folklore is too narrow and too functionalist, "the folklore of the Cape Veredian people, like that of other cultures, comes from an oral tradition. The stories, poems, and sayings have been handed down by word of mouth, rather than in written form" (p. 8). Besides conceptually contributing to the demise of Folklore by making a reference strictly to traditional oral
transmission, the description is self-defeating since its own method of transmission and inquiry are certainly not oral. And while it is true that oral narratives "show what behavior is good and what is dis-approved of" (p. 9), it is equally true, as Bascom (1977) has so well pointed out, that oral narratives also contain anti-social elements. One then wonders what the value system is for screening good or bad behavior in either fiction or real life. Moreover, in the absence of a theoretically-grounded curriculum attitude, it is difficult to foresee how a teacher in the United States might deal with the qualitative changes that are either necessitated by or result from the transplantation linguistically or otherwise of a Cape Verdean folklore genre. This study then, also fails to satisfy any of our criteria.

The Independent Model

By independent model is meant those models of educational folklore whose *raison d'être* is not to further the aims of another subject such as English or Social Studies, but rather to serve the interest of folklore as an independent academic pursuit.

The independent model selected for analysis, viz, Coverdale's (1977) Ghana Folklore Curriculum goes beyond simply laying down the track, to use Kliebard's (Pinar, 1975) metaphoric classification of curriculum approaches. It contains a training and evaluation section, as well as a mechanism for incorporating amendments by users of the model. Because she believes that Folklore should be treated as an independent discipline, Coverdale deals with folklore issues within an educational context in more depth than has been the case with the models
surveyed so far. Coverdale states for instance:

... never has folklore been a significant subject in the public schools or in the educational processes of the learner to warrant recognition. Nor has folklore been a viable subject outside of English, Music, Physical Education and Home Economics. Further, Folklore has lacked the instructional sophistication which practitioners rely upon when teaching traditional subject matter (p. 43).

Since her study exhibits good grounding in curriculum theory and holds ample promise for those interested in a rational integration of folklore and educational theories, her dissertation is therefore a "model" model. Because of the complexities created by the interdisciplinary nature of her research, one can come up with a number of inconsistencies in her work and generally indulge in nitpicking. The appraisal will therefore be basically in terms of the criteria of relevance.

In describing the place of oral narratives of Ashanti culture in Ghana, Coverdale uses a rather narrow base when she alleges that "folktales are stories that portray the tricks of the spider Ananse, the little hares, the tortoise and the antelope, all in a humorous context that exhibits the discomfort of the powerful members of the animal world through their tiny adversaries" (p. 7A). She then goes on to give implicitly a more inclusive description, which has different implications and may even be construed as somewhat contradictory to the first:

Those folktales told for entertainment often have drum rhythms, chorus and mime as accompaniment. In such cases, the listener becomes a part of the story.

The latter statement implies that Ashanti tales, are also told for reason other than entertainment. If that is the case, then the oral
narrative persona may be said to include humans as well as animals. For example, Susan Feldman's book, *African Myths and Tales* (1970), contains an Ashanti Tale, "How the Lesser Gods Came into the World" (p. 76) with human characters. It would, therefore, have served Coverdale's analysis well, had she given different categories of oral narratives, their values and the types of characters that tend to populate them.

Perhaps the most commendable aspect of Coverdale's analysis is her recognition of the importance of the story teller:

A good story teller will draw the audience into the story to make some type of response. Through these stories, the Africans are able to see their own lives and traditions (p. 7A).

Unfortunately this insight is first of all blurred by a thicket of texts, questionnaires, tests, etc. Secondly, no theoretical construct emerges from it. This thicket is exemplified by her description of the curriculum approach:

The folklore curriculum for this study is designed to utilize the contributions of folklorists and others by developing performance objectives [viz, answers to questionnaires] for various genres within each category. For example, if folktales are being taught, students might learn to listen to or read folktales--answer questions that imply something about behavior patterns of the culture create a dramaturge or play and/or write another story using the same figure or character in a similar situation to predicament (p. 10).

Besides undermining her own complaint about the contributory or subsidiary role of folklore to other disciplines, her curriculum approach is too inadequate to meet the demands of this highly dynamic form. Needless to say, the highly spontaneous nature of an oral narrative event cannot be fully captured on paper.
With regard to the second criterion, namely, the degree to which the curriculum takes into account the composition or context of the participants in the project, Coverdale notes that the group included some students from different cultural backgrounds such as Colombians, Japanese, Chinese and Indians. "It was clear from their responses on the questionnaire" she notes, "that the learning activities were not alien to them. Since these students felt more comfortable with the activities of the Ghanaian Folklore Curriculum (GFC) it may have been more effective if they had utilized their own folklore, instead of what was suggested" (p. 105). This statement is perhaps the most important self-criticism insofar as it recognizes the importance of context and the backgrounds of the participants. However, although she asserts that it might have served some of these students' educational interests to have utilized their own folklore, she implies that the students from the United States did not do well. Further, no reference is made to their folklore. The cultural evolutionist tone is, therefore loud and clear that folklore is somehow only associated with non-Western people, implying by the same token that Westerners have no folklore. Furthermore, student direct participation in and contribution to the oral narrative event is relegated to secondary creative endeavors such as playwriting or short story writing, both of which do not involve per se performance and which, in any case, are literary activities or examples of the expressive use of folklore. How unfortunate then, that because of the use of Tyler's model and the extreme textualization of the GFC approach, the child became restricted to literary media in a subject that is quintessentially creative play, for
both the individual and the collective. Coverdale's evaluation of her own study registers a similar regret (p. 97). It should be gainsaid, however, that Coverdale's model has unrealized potential. Charnofsky (1971) for instance, to whom she pays some tribute and who happens to be an ardent advocate of folklore in the public schools, views the combination of folklore and activity-oriented instruction methods as a valuable tool and believes that the school curriculum is generally bombarded with various skills such as observing, collecting, analyzing and other processes which have made the school curriculum synchronized and sterile (Coverdale, p. 30).

Another model of the Independent variety is contained in *Folklore in the Elementary Schools* (1968), a report prepared by the Tri-University Project in Elementary Education at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln. The report involved ten researchers in consultation with Dorothy Howard whose folklore teaching approach has been lauded in a number of publications. One of the commendable aspects of this report is that while it recognizes the place of the text in the teaching of folklore, it opts unequivocally for performance:

> The importance of the study of the folklore - in the classroom, in the playground and in the community - lies not in the folkloric materials themselves as much as [in] the nature of the folk process of transmission of the lore - the human situations in which the lore is transmitted from teacher to child, from parent to child and neighbor to child. Folklore lives by its functions; dies when it no longer functions; cannot be given successful artificial respiration through books (p. 23).

To reinforce this position, the report makes reference to Eric Fromm's contention that, "man in order to feel at home in the world, must grasp
it not only with his head, but with all his senses, his eyes, his ears, with his whole body. Body and mind cannot be separated in this or in any other aspect" (p. 15). Also cited in the report is Dorothy Howard's study entitled, "The Rhythms of Ball-Bouncing and Ball-Bouncing Rhymes," which, among other things, notes:

... children's rhyme chanting is no mere academic activity. The rhyme is expressed and the whole body participates in that expression. The rhymes chanted by one child or by a group of children have a function in dramatic play life of children similar to that of the Greek chorus in Greek drama. The chanting voice is a part of a larger pattern or movement (p. 16).

The study notes further that "Much communication between child-teacher and child-learner on the playground is, in the most literal sense non-verbal; that is, communication by gesture or action-with-things, in a context which, somehow, carries the meaning" (p. 3). This performance-oriented attitude toward folklore is reflected in the guide for teachers who use the manual. For example, under the heading "Lore of the Playground and the Street" teachers are encouraged to familiarize themselves with rhyme games, ball games, blindfold games, games with bones, circle games, games with toys, etc. However, a word of caution should be voiced here. These games should be viewed as a necessary but not sufficient condition for both teachers and student, for the mastery of the performance of oral narratives. A number of studies, e.g., Scheub (1975), have shown that although a certain amount of spontaneous playfulness is involved in the performance of oral narratives, discipline and protracted learning are required. In recognition of the importance of apprenticeship and primary sources, the Nebraska study gives a list
of certain school children and adults who can serve as resources in various communities.

As for our criterion concerning the context and student participation in the formulation of the folklore projects, the report recommends specifically that, "the teacher can learn to let the child talk and she can learn to listen to what they say" (p. 24). The study is also sensitive to regional, age, and cultural differences, not only in the way the folklore is presented but also in the curriculum attitude informing it:

To say that the child's total curriculum includes the learning that takes place in the home and neighborhood as well as what takes place in the classroom is to belabor the old cliche which has been the embroidery in education textbooks ever since World War I. The embroiders weave their own variation upon the basic theses of Jean Jacques Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel and John Dewey. The belaborers memorize their textbook, Apostle's creed and recite it along with the pledge of allegiance on proper occasions (p. 21).

In terms of the curriculum context, teachers are encouraged to give students such assignments as collecting the lore of the home, e.g., family religious customs, family language and beliefs, family relationships, etc. Other recommended assignments include the lore of the community such as legends and local history, community celebrations or special people in the community. The study also encourages the teachers to tirelessly talk to students in order to elicit verbal and written responses about matters of interest to them. According to the report, a wise teacher looks for clues and follows them; records all kinds of information about the background of the lore, as well as the seemingly common place or quaint; writes down gathered information
in the exact words of the informant whose background is carefully recorded; records the information in the language spoken; and devises systematic record-keeping files. In this report, the teacher is the prime mover of curriculum for, "she can be objective and scientific enough for her practical purposes in her classroom-laboratory with thirty-six children, all reliable informants; and her findings can be valid as basis for determining curricula, procedures and methods in her own classroom" (pp. 23-24). Also strongly recommended is recognition of the history, culture and contribution of minority groups to American civilization, to be included in textbooks and curricula of all schools (p. 17).

Basically, this report does meet our criteria of relevance, i.e., performance and context. What it fails to do, however, is to put the issues of theoretical conflicts in some historical or comparative context. Another problem concerns its attitude to conflict, which favors eschewing conflict rather than frontally resolving it. For example, it refers to some of the archaic and traditional forms of punishment such as throwing an eraser at a noisy child or having the teacher's stern eyes rove the room and then goes on to say, "[this] does not indicate that these practices are dominant, nor does this report imply either condemnation or approval of the practices described" (p. 23). No reason is given for this neutral position.

Although the Nebraska study has elements of an Independent Model, it also has others. For instance, the model recommends, among other things, the use of folkloric material for written composition assignments and gives excellent examples emanating from their approach, of
the expressive use of Folklore.

**General Assessment of the Text-Oriented Approach**

To conclude this section, perhaps the place of texts can now be put in proper perspective. This study in no way supports to denounce or to burn books. Scripts have a number of advantages. For one, they form a strong basis for the enactment of oral narratives in different contexts often beyond cultural and regional boundaries. For example, there is no doubt that a good storyteller can transform a foreign script into a new folklore form through performance. One of the values of the Aarne-Thompson index is not only the preservation in some form of oral narrative history, but also the facilitation of multicultural education and understanding. The written word, it seems, tends to move more effectively than the spoken words, across all manner of demarcations, particularly in the long run and over great distances. Scripts are also a more economic way of preserving resources. A strictly oral preservation of folkloric materials through such media as video and tape recorders, is not only expensive but ultimately non-oral in the sense of not directly involving the viewing audience, to cite one example. Many other positive elements of script exist of course, and cannot all be enumerated here. However, in terms of the relationship between texts and performance, one thing is clear: texts without performance, as Ben-Amos insinuated earlier, are superorganic and lifeless. It is through enactment that they come to life and get transformed into a new form dictated by context. Another succinct point is that although in many cases performance can exist without physical texts,
performance can be helped, not hurt by scripts, if their relationship is properly understood.

In examining the preceding curriculum models, it became obvious that the relationship between text and context is not understood by a number of studies which come under the label of folklore. Neither was there an awareness of the need for the development of appropriate curriculum models for the teaching of folklore, particularly before college. If the review of the literature has done anything, it is hoped that it has awakened an awareness of the kinds of tools that are necessary for successfully finishing the task of creating appropriate folklore curriculum models for the teaching of oral narratives in the schools.
CHAPTER V

EXPERIMENTAL COMPONENT

Purpose and Significance of the Experiment

The purpose of the experimental component was to test the validity of the hypotheses that the performance approach rather than exclusive textualization yields better results in any educational folklore program, whether its goals are affective, cognitive or recreational. Most of the performance hypotheses make a lot of sense on an intuitive level and many have corroborative evidence from field studies. However, few, if any studies, have been carried out in formal educational settings whose environment and objectives are not necessarily parallel in every respect with those obtaining in the field.

The significance of this experiment, then, lies in its potential, to show the strength and limits of the performance approach in the classroom.

Procedure

Several steps were undertaken to implement the program. They consisted of a search for teachers of elementary and junior high school students; two teacher training sessions in general Folklore history and theories with an emphasis on the performance approach; formulation of a questionnaire for testing the effects of the text versus performance; and implementation of the program in the schools with which the teachers were affiliated. The testing method used was the t-test for two matched groups. The results were then qualitatively described and
statistically analyzed for their significance.

Teacher Training

Although five teachers initially registered for the workshop, for our purposes only the three who participated in the implementation of the program will be considered. All three were in either their late 30's or early 40's.

Clara is African-American and teaches first graders at Wildwood Elementary School in Amherst, Massachusetts. She has been an elementary school teacher for almost twenty-one years, and has used folklore in the last ten years. She mentioned four reasons for her use of oral narratives among her predominantly white students, (1) as a motivational tool, (2) for multicultural education, (3) for use in developing literary characters for other literature courses, and (4) as part of the literature and language courses to help students develop reading, writing and listening skills as well as a creative imagination. She had a large collection of drawings by children based on their perception of oral narratives that they had heard or read about. Thus narratives, whether oral or written, also contributed to the visual arts. The oral narratives were, however, not taught as part of a course in Folklore, but rather as an adjunct to a reading course. Her teaching of oral narratives was mostly text-bound. She had never heard of the performance approach.

Lori is a white, first-grade teacher of exclusively white students at Davenport Elementary School in Chesterfield, Massachusetts. When the teacher-training program began in May, 1983, she had never used or
heard about the performance approach either, although in her ten-year teaching career she had always read narratives from books. Her interest, like Clara's, in joining the workshop was motivated by a desire to know more about oral narratives in the context of the investigator's experiment. Some of the reasons for her use of oral narratives included, helping the kids formulate "story-schemers" or structures; enabling kids to make predictions about "logical outcomes" in their reading and writing of stories in general; creating visual clues to help students understand the meaning of stories; and promoting multicultural education. Talking to her shortly before completion of this study, she informed the investigator that since his last visit to conduct the experiment, which involved most of the students in the school-(about 24 out of 30)-interest in oral narratives had so heightened, that the school successfully applied for a grant for puppetry story telling. Also, a folklore unit, in whose running she played an important part, had been established by the school.

Jewel's use of narratives is more or less similar to Clara's and Lori's, with the exception that her students were fifth and sixth graders. She was interested in oral narratives, as morality tales; for understanding parallels between fictitious and real characters; for multicultural education; for stimulating conversation and ideas; and as part of the language arts program. Jewel, who is African-American and teachers at Pelham Elementary School near Amherst, had never heard of the performance approach even though she had used written narratives virtually during all her fifteen-year teaching career.

It could be said then, that in spite of the geographic and ethnic
distinctions as well as the self-selected nature of the teachers, their uses of narratives in general appear very similar. Unfortunately since they did not have fixed syllabi, it is not possible to give an assessment of their day-to-day activities. Further, all the three teachers indicated that their use of narratives in class was not unique since folklore in general was an adjunct of other subjects such as literature or language arts. Thus, in spite of their selected nature, the teachers were representative, statistically speaking, of a teacher and student constitutency (virtually all white) whose approach to the teaching of narratives was, by and large, similar.

First Workshop

The workshop, which took place between 3 and 6 p.m. in May, 1983, and consisted of two three-hour segments, was conducted at the University of Massachusetts. The first segment consisted of a pre-lecture questionnaire (see Appendix A), an hour-long lecture on the review of the literature; and a reading and performance demonstration by the investigator, of a narrative. A Post-Textualization-and-Demonstration questionnaire was then filled out by the participants (Appendix B).

The purpose of the Pre-lecture Questionnaire was to assess the degree to which the participants were familiar with folklore literature and performance in order to tailor the lecture, and other training and experimental materials accordingly. Although all the participants responded to the questionnaire, for our purposes, only the responses of those who implemented the program in their schools will be considered.
Of the three, two indicated having taken a course in Folklore while the third had not. In spite of their familiarity, neither as indicated under Teacher-Training had ever heard of the performance approach.

The Post-Textualization/Demonstration Questionnaire was conducted after the investigator had read and subsequently performed the demonstration narrative. In answer to question 1: "Overall, was the story more interesting when read from a text or when performed?" all participants preferred performance. They felt that since their students liked movement and playfulness, the performance approach might stimulate participation by students making them more receptive to the educational goals in their respective program.

The text, "The Tortoise and the Tug of War," was eventually selected through consensus, to constitute the program. It was chosen primarily because of its foreignness relative to the kinds of oral narratives that the teachers may have used in their classes. It was felt that the selection of a narrative like "Jack and the Bean-Stalk" might distort the results of the experiment in terms of prior knowledge. Moreover, the teachers' interests in multicultural education was not at variance with the choice of this narrative. Although other stories were considered, none seemed as full of character exposition, moral and educational undertones and of a symbolic or metaphoric texture as the "Tortoise and the Tug of War." Furthermore, it was short enough to accommodate a perceived short attention-span of the students as well as a two-class period during which the experiment would be conducted.
Program Narrative: The Tortoise and the Tug of War

Everybody knows that the hippopotamus is very strong. In fact, he is considered one of the strongest of all the animals.

Well, one day the tortoise went to the hippopotamus and he said to him, "You are thought to be so strong. But would you be surprised if I told you that I could pull you out of the river?"

The hippopotamus smiled at the tortoise. "What! You are joking! Pull me out of the river? You are too small. It cannot be done."

"But I can do it," the tortoise insisted.

"I would be very much surprised if you did," said the hippopotamus. "But I am willing to try it."

So the tortoise set a date with the hippopotamus to try their strength.

Then the tortoise went to the elephant. "You are so strong," he said. "But can you believe that I can pull you into the river?"

"Impossible!" said the elephant. "You are too small."

"But I am sure I can do it," insisted the tortoise.

"Well, then, we will try," agreed the elephant. And a date was set for the trial--the same date that had been set with the hippopotamus.

The tortoise got a very strong rope. And on the day set for the trial, everybody was there, to see what would happen.

The tortoise went down into the river and gave one end of the rope to the hippopotamus. "Hold this," he said. "But do not begin pulling until I tug the rope. then you can start."

The tortoise went up out of the water as if he were ready to pull.
against the hippopotamus. But he went up to the elephant. He gave him the other end of the rope. "Hold this," he said. "But do not begin pulling until I tug on the rope. Then you can start."

Then he left the elephant and made as if he were going into the water and tugged at the rope. Then he hid.

The hippopotamus and the elephant began to pull. They tried their best to pull each other either way. And this tug of war went on from morning till noon.

Finally the hippopotamus thought, with surprise, "Can it be true that the tortoise is this strong?" And at the same time, the elephant thought to himself, "Can it be possible that the tortoise is this strong?"

The hippopotamus became so curious that his curiosity overshadowed his reluctance to being defeated by the tortoise. And he began walking slowly up out of the deep part of the river toward the land, to see whether indeed it was the tortoise pulling on the other end of the rope.

And the elephant became so curious that his curiosity finally overshadowed whatever honor he might achieve at winning the contest. And he began walking slowly toward the river's edge to see whether it was truly the tortoise who was pulling on the other end of the rope.

When the elephant and the hippopotamus met in the shallow water at the edge of the river, they found that they had been pulling against each other. But the elephant had been pulled into the river, and the hippopotamus had been pulled out of the river, by the clever tortoise (Warren and Walker, 1961).
Deleted for the program, from this narrative text is the last line: "Strength may lie in wit, as well as in muscle." It was felt that the test questionnaire should be constructed in such a way that they could form their own conclusion without the aid of a heavy-handed moral line. It should be pointed out that this narrative is one of several printed versions. Feldman (1963) for example, collected one version which rounds Tortoise's character by showing him as a despised loser of a series of tug-of-war contests. In that text, the pitting of elephant against hippopotamus therefore, marks Tortoise's sweet revenge and a restoration of a modicum of respect for him by his fellows. Unfortunately, that version was not discovered until after the experiment and in any case, the selected narrative has sufficient complexities and ambiguities for the student population in question. In conjunction with the selection of "Tortoise and the Tug of War," a series of questions was generated which resulted in the formulation of the following question and answer sheets with the asterisks indicating the correct response:

Please enter (x) against the correct item on the following questions:

1. The tug-of-war between elephant and hippopotamus went on from morn-
   till night:
   a) Yes ( )
   b) No ( )

2. Tortoise was a trickster:
   a) Yes ( )
   b) No ( )
3. Did tortoise hold the rope and pull hippopotamus out of the water:
   a) Yes (  )
   *b) No (  )
4. Hippopotamus was stronger than elephant:
   a) Yes (  )
   *b) No (  )
5. Elephant pulled hippopotamus out of the water:
   a) Yes (  )
   *b) No (  )

The first question tests the ability of the student to recall facts without making any judgements about them. It was felt that isolated facts or facts that are mentioned only once with no subsequent cues, might be harder to remember than if they were repeated. The question then is, which of the two methods serves the function of recall better, the text or performance?

Question number 2, although involving a certain degree of value judgement, was presumed to imply an accurate description of tortoise's character, relative to the variant or version used in the program. In Feldman's version, referred to earlier, trickster may not be an accurate description since the reversal by tortoise of his defeats might be construed as heroic by some. Had Feldman's version been used, the question might therefore have been ambiguous for a number of respondents.

Question 3 sought to find out if the students understood the metaphoric and literal distinction of the word "pull." The literal answer was, of course, the correct response.
Both question 4 and 5 in one sense tested whether or not the students were listening to the specific facts of the story and not following some pre-conceived notion of which animal is stronger. In another sense it tested their logical reasoning, for the sum total of a stand-off between hippopotamus and tortoise is zero. It would have been interesting had either of the questions been phrased differently, e.g., "tortoise was stronger than elephant" or "tortoise pulled elephant out of the water" or if both questions had appeared together. In the of the program script, however, it would be fair to say that, not the elephant but the tortoise, pulled the other one out.

It was generally felt that the questionnaire was reasonable, workable and quantifiable.

Second Workshop

The primary purpose of the second workshop on May 8th, was to provide an opportunity for participants to practice performing the selected story, "Tortoise and the tug of War" and to get feedback on their performances. Three aspects of performance were emphasized, (1) Mimicry. Participants took part in exercises in which they mimicked sounds and movements of animals such as chickens, birds, cows, as well as exercises imitating different human characters.

(2) Audience participation. In practicing a narrative, the teachers were encouraged to elicit as much response as possible from students. They were told that interruptions in general, should be encouraged
without, however, the loss of control of the story.

The emphasis on these two points, although selective and arbitrary, can be born out by both the literature on performance already described and by the works of scholars in other fields such as communications studies, psychology and the visual arts. Without audience participation the event loses its essential folkloric dimension besides covering up elements about the students' personality, which may be of great use in their general educational growth. Practice continued until each participant felt they were on the road to achieving the minimal confidence and competence to perform before their students during the implementation of the program. When they had achieved that confidence, an arrangement was made with the investigator to carry out the program at an agreed upon time, at the school.

Limitations

The project had several limitations. The first was the highly limited time available to train teachers to become performers of oral narratives, and thus the necessity to concentrate their training on the one story which was to constitute the program. Another problem was the shortness of the time during which it was possible to administer each segment of the program, all due to the constraints imposed by the change-of-period format of the schools' curricula. Consequently, the whole program in each school had to be administered within two hours.

Most teachers had never had any training in the performing arts, let alone in folklore performance with its demand for quick responses to unrehearsed and spontaneous situations particularly on the part of the audience.
In terms of the measurement, i.e., comprehension, to test the success or failure of the main effect, it could be gainsaid that other factors may be just as important as comprehension. Laughter, for instance, or any of the many physical reactions to the performance of a tale, as the review of the literature indicated, may be equally or even more important. However, the qualitative and unquantifiable nature of these makes them high unsusceptible to precise measurements.

The coerced participation of the students in the program should also be noted, coupled with the fact that the teachers were self-selected, not randomly sampled. This limitation (coerced student participation) is important since it seems to fly in the face of our curriculum criterion of student participation in the formation of the curriculum. One must make the assumption, however, that since all the teachers indicated in one of the training questionnaires that folklore (albeit of a textual nature) was already an informal part of the curriculum, then the criterion was not severely compromised. Furthermore, one can assume that the novelty to the student of teachers performing a tale, may serve as compensation. The rich texture of the text, particularly its metaphoric layers presented the investigator and the teachers with problems of what questions would elicit appreciation of these layers, without confusing the students. A literal layer was therefore, opted for, perhaps resulting in missed educational opportunities.

Finally, the fact that only one variant (and a written one at that) of the story was used, limited the scope of the program from a folklore standpoint. Besides this limitation, one can go further by pointing out the limitation imposed by the tale having been translated from the Ashanti language into English.
Pilot-Testing the Design

The program was pilot-tested by the investigator with the following expectations:

a. to find out whether or not the questionnaire was intelligible and applicable to a group of students whose school, age-range and grade-classifications approximated those of the true-test group;
b. to be able to simulate generally an analogous environment as a rehearsal;
c. to improve the instrument;
d. to assess the educational value and impact of the instrument.

The school selected was Hampshire After Hour School Program (HAHSP) situated in one classroom located at the Fort River Elementary School in Amherst. The teaching staff, none of whom taught formally at Fort River Elementary School, consisted of five teachers, including the head teacher. The students numbered nineteen, ranging in age from three to twelve. As the name suggests, the school serves the working parents who cannot afford to secure facilities to take care of their children for at least two hours after school, before the end of their working day. The school emphasizes in painting, drama, dancing, and in the summertime, a rehearsed dramatized presentation of an oral narrative staged with the students' original paintings and colorful costumes forming a backdrop. The tales are selected from texts and are multicultural, e.g., China, Africa, Japan, Native America, etc. Also in the summertime, a vegetable garden is communally tended.
with the harvest bound for charity. The ambiance and curriculum are multicultural and international, the student composition more multi-ethnic than is usually the case in the Amherst regional school system. Because only one room was available for the test, the design had to be altered in one respect. Rather than randomly selecting control and experimental groups, all seventeen students participated in both the text and performance treatments. The test scores of these treatments were therefore, of limited value for purposes of verifying the hypothesis of this study. What was important, however, was to ensure a smooth rehearsal, followed by any adjustments that might be necessary prior to the true test. Further, although the head teacher had not participated in the workshops, he was quite familiar with the performance approach, having worked with the investigator for two years during which both he and the investigator tried the approach with the HAHSP students.

With regard to the composition of the group, the information solicited by the investigator had to do with age, and grade level. Gender, however, could be extrapolated from the names of the students without complete certainty. As with the true test group, it was felt that partly because of the time constraint and partly because the aggregate scores and not individual scores were being considered, an indepth study of each student was unnecessary. Such a study, in any case, may have introduced a multitude of unmanageable factors.

With the help of the teachers, the test began at 4:30 p.m. on Monday, May 23, 1983. The head teacher read the text, "The Tortoise and the Tug of War," slowly, clearly, with a dramatized voice and in
such a way that he was satisfactorily heard by all the students. At the completion of the story, all the students were given the questionnarie to complete. In administering the test, students were instructed to direct any questions they had to the teachers and the investigator. And since two of the students could not read well, they received help from two teachers who made sure that the two students' responses were not loudly verbalized. Despite the limitations imposed by the necessity of using only one room for a project that requires at least two spacious ones, students were physically separated and monitored in such a way as to make the prospects of neighborly help extremely difficult. They were also informed that the test was not meant to test their intelligence.

At 4:50 p.m. all the answer sheets were returned. Following a short break, the head teacher performed the "Tale of Tortoise and the Tug of War," which had previously been read to the same group. Likewise, the same questionnarie was given to this group. At 5:45, the whole process ended.

Pilot-Test Results

At the end of the testing session, the investigator had solicited orally from the students, three types of responses in order to assess the educational value and the impact of the performance approach. One set concerned any confusion or lack of understanding associated with any part of the Comprehension Test. The second set had to do with the students' preference for either the text or performance approach. The third dealt with what they perceived to be the educational value of the story and/or story-telling.
With regard to the issue of confusion or lack of understanding, the most contentious question seems to have been the fifth one, as the following results show:
### Table 1
Hampshire After School
Pilot Test Results - Text Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>Answers Per Student</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Gender Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7/16</td>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>14/16</td>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>12/16</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>11/16</td>
<td>8/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>8/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4375</td>
<td>.5625</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>.1250</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>.2500</td>
<td>.6875</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td></td>
<td>.6875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>Incorrect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Hampshire After School
Pilot Test Results - Performance Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2+</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>.2000</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>6/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.6000</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td>5/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
<td>8/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.6000</td>
<td>.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.6000</td>
<td>.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.6000</td>
<td>.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>§</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td>.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7/17</td>
<td>9/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>1/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>14/17</td>
<td>16/17</td>
<td>11/17</td>
<td>19/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7882</th>
<th>.2118</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Correct percentages: 91.18%, 52.94%, 94.12%, 95.88%, 94.12%, 11.76%, 82.33%, 35.29%, 94.17%, 78.82%, 21.18%
Although the Pilot-Test Results seem to indicate questions 1 and 5 as constituting problems for the respondents, with hindsight (vis-à-vis the test results from the other groups) question 5 was the more problematic. With regard to this question, the confusion seems to have risen out of the students' disregard for differentiating between the literal and metaphorical use of the work, "pull."

The problem with question 1 could well have been due to the indefiniteness of the time period referred to in the script, which reads: "and this tug of war went on from morning till noon." This, coupled with the way the question was phrased ("the tug of war between elephant and hippopotamus went on from morning till night") could very well have created problems in the minds of those who may associate the late afternoon with night or nightfall. The general adjustments made to the questions will be dealt with under, "Assessment of the Pilot-Test."

There was universal preference, however, for the performance approach. Pressed as to why they made such a preference, a number of students used words like, "dramatic," "doing it" without being able to provide details.

Regarding the last set of responses, i.e., the educational value, the question was put to them: "what does the story teach you or mean to you?" Most said it taught one that brain is superior to brawn. More will be said about educational value later.

Assessment of the Implementation of the Pilot

In discussing the implementation of a design, Fitz-Gibbon (1978) lists the following considerations:
1. Was random assignment adequate to assure initially equal groups?
2. Did the experimental group receive the program?
3. Did the control group not get the program or any piece of it?
4. Were confounds avoided?
5. Was there any difference between the number of cases lost from the experimental group and the number of cases lost from the control group? Was there any difference in the kinds of cases which had to be dropped from the analysis in each group? (p. 79).

Because the primary purpose of the pilot was to test the comprehensibility of the questionnaire, at least two of the above-mentioned conditions were not met, namely, (1) and (3). As mentioned earlier, all the students received both the text and performance treatments. There was an attrition, of only one, an unimportant detail also whose impact had to await the time when the program was properly tested.

Judging by the overall student results from the comprehension test it appears that the main effect (i.e., performance) did make a difference, for, in general, the Performance Group's scores, except for question 1, are higher than those of the Text Group (Tables 1 and 2). Another interesting cursory observation concerns the level of relative difficulty for both groups with respect to question 5. Yet, in spite of its difficulty, the Performance Group scored higher. However, any significant interpretation and meaning must await the results of the true test.
Improving the Instrument

In consultation with teachers about the results of the pilot test, it was decided that:

a) Question 5, i.e., "Elephant pulled hippopotamus out of the water," should not be amended in light of question 4, i.e., "Hippopotamus was stronger than elephant." It was felt that any student who correctly answered the latter should have no problem answering the former.

b) The word, "really," should be inserted into question 3 so that it read, "Did tortoise really hold the rope and pull hippopotamus out of the water?" This was done to ensure further distinction between the literal and metaphorical notions of the word, "pull."

c) The word "noon" should be substituted for "night" in question 1.

d) Each correct answer should be assigned the same weight, 1.00 so as to preclude splicing or having variable units which might introduce subjective or unequal evaluations.

e) In view of the text-approach's inability to repeat and invoke reinforcing images, it was decided that the story should be read deliberately and dramatically so that each character was identifiable through a distinct voice.

Other considerations concerned factors in the physical environment that might either help or hinder implementation, e.g., spaciousness. One of the most important findings in the pilot was the fact that the whole program could be carried out in one hour and a half, a duration that
that was well within the curriculum and administrative limits of the schools in question, namely within two hours.
As already pointed out under Teacher Training, although the teachers were self-selected and two of them did not belong to the mainstream, ethnically speaking, their schools' curriculum approaches to folklore were very similar. This was more than confirmed when the investigator arrived at the schools for the experiment. At Davenport, drawings by students literally covered every space on the walls of the three classrooms—the third being a music and drawing room. The teacher explained that they emanated from storytelling and multicultural educational projects. Drawings of folk heroes like Muhammad Ali, adorned the walls of a quite spacious room.

At Wildwood, drawings also adorned the walls not only of the classroom where the experiment took place, but also of the main corridor in front of the principal's office. Many of these drawings were related to storytelling and were the children's impressions of stories either read to them by the teacher or performed to them by visiting storytellers. Besides the drawings were numerous story books, either illustrated or in need of illustration. Wildwood is at least four times as big as Davenport and therefore facilities, such as the drawing room and classroom, are at least twice as big.

At Pelham, though drawings were evident, the emphasis seemed to be more on reading and writing. Sometimes out of these came creative writing. But essentially, Pelham, with a population of about two-hundred students and in spite of its having higher grade levels, was not
much different from the other schools, folklore-wise. As in Wildwood, the teacher occasionally invited storytellers to her class.

For the three schools, the student population was homogeneous with the exception of one Asian (Wildwood) and four Black students (Wildwood and Pelham). Pelham had fifth and sixth grade students while Davenport and Wildwood had first and second graders.

With the exception of seventeen students in the pilot, seventy-one students divided almost evenly between the Experimental and Control Groups, participated in the project.

Davenport Chesterfield Elementary School

On June 6, 1983, the investigator arrived at the school around 12:30, while the students were out to lunch. The participant-teacher introduced the investigator to the principal in this country school of about 45 students, as well as to a second grade teacher who had graciously agreed to "lend out" her students for the program. The two classrooms involved were visited and inspected. They were fully sound proof and very spacious. After ascertaining the total number of students involved in the project, corresponding numbers of approximately one-inch-squared papers cut from typing paper, were labelled either "1" or "2," folded in two and deposited in a can. Around 1:00 p.m. all necessary pre-test arrangements had been completed.

Program Implementation

At 1:30, in the non-participating teacher's classroom, the investigator formerly met the first and second grade students who were to
participate in the program. All had been informed of the visit beforehand. The purpose and design of the program and their role in it were explained. They were firmly reassured that the program was not an intelligence test but an opportunity for each and all of them to make a valuable contribution to an important issue.

Physically separated in the room according to whether they were first or second graders, each student drew from a can one piece of folded paper and was asked to hold on to it. Those drawing "I's" were designated the Experimental or Performance Group and met in the participant-teacher's class, two classrooms away. The Control or Text Group remained occupied under the supervision of the second grade teacher who was not a participant.

The Experimental Group consisted of seven female students and five males. Within the first group, there were, one six-year-old, four seven-year-olds, one eight-year-old and one nine-year-old. Broken down by grade, 6 were in the first grade and 6 were in the second. The Control Group had eight boys, three girls and one whose gender could not be extrapolated from the name on the answer sheet. Four boys were seven years old, three were eight years old and one did not give his age. By grade, nine were in the first grade and three in the second.

**Experimental or Performance Group**

The teacher began performing the story at 1:45, while the investigator sat unobtrusively out of the view of the audience. The students were highly attentive and some seemed eager to participate in the shaping of the story. The teacher had two
students play the parts of the hippopotamus and the elephant by having them pulling an imaginary rope. Several students interjected with comments, one of which was completely unrelated to the story which threw off the teacher for a minute until she was able to re-direct the story back on track. At 2 p.m., the performance was over and the answer sheets distributed. Since it was a spacious classroom, students easily found places where they could neither give nor receive help from their peers. Although all the students could read, to ensure that everybody understood the questions, the teacher read each one slowly at least twice. Questions or points of clarification were settled in private consultations with either the teacher or the investigator. At 2:15 the process ended.

Control Group

At 2:30, the Control Group was brought to the participant-teacher's classroom. The teacher read the story from the text, deliberately and with a dramatized voice. Although attentive looking, the overall response of this audience was passive, and non-participatory, almost as if they had heard the story many times before. At the end of the story, they found separate places in the room. Each question was read by the teacher twice, or more if requested, and each student was given ample time to read and answer all the questions. At 2:50, the last student submitted his answer sheet.

As a token of gratitude to the students and the teachers, the investigator performed a different story to the combined groups. Since the Control Group had not had the benefit of the performance
treatment, the session would give them a chance to observe performance in order to be able to form an opinion about which approach appealed to them more. At the end of performance, without exception, all raised their hands in favor of performance. At 3:30 the program was concluded.

Wildwood Elementary School

The program took place on June 9, 1983. Wildwood was an interesting, yet not exceptional case. The interest was due to the investigator having visited the participant-teacher's class on two occasions in 1983. Because it was felt that those visits might introduce unpredictable elements, the investigator, with the help of a tape recorder, observed the whole process unnoticed by the students. Another change involved cancellation of the investigator's performance to the combined groups, since they had already been exposed to performance and had all voiced a preference for performance. Fortunately as had been the case at Chesterfield, a second grade teacher not only "lent out" her students for the project, but also supervised whichever group was not receiving the program at the time. Using the same method of selection used at Davenport, two groups were randomly selected. Of the eight students in the Performance Group, seven were in the second grade and one in the first; they were evenly divided by gender; and of the four males, one was six years old, one was seven and two were eight years old. Among the female students, two were seven years old and two were eight years old. The Text Group, on the other hand, had four boys, one of whom was six years old, two were seven years old and only one was eight
All the three girls were eight years old. Of all the students, five belonged to the second grade, one to the third and one did not put down his grade level.

At 10 o'clock, after making sure that the classroom was adequate for testing, the teacher read the script slowly and with a dramatic voice. At 10:08, the reading over, the teacher-participant administered the comprehension test, a not-so-difficult task considering the size of the Control Group, and the spaciousness of the classroom. By 10:20 the Control Group was out and the Experimental Group in. As had been the case with the Control Group, the Experimental Group was emphatically told that the purpose of the test was not to measure intelligence, but to solicit their contribution to an important investigation. The teacher repeated this at least three times.

Although her style was not as demonstrative, surprisingly this teacher, like the one at Chesterfield, used two students (plus one) to simulate hippopotamus, elephant - and the river. She also used questions to probe and involve the audience, a phenomenon that was absent from the Control Group. At 10:50, the performance was over and the comprehension test administered accordingly. At 11:05 the whole program was complete.

It should be pointed out that both the Control and Experimental Groups answered two short essay questions which they wrote on their answer sheet. The questions were: "What does the story teach you?" and "Which animal did you like in the story and why?" The decision to insert the question was made after Davenport where the questions had been put orally, a technique that is sometimes hard to document.
Pelham Elementary School

Pelham was the last school to receive the program. As in the case of Davenport and Wildwood, where two different grades were mixed, the cooperation of a non-participant teacher was paramount and, fortunately, always available. The experience at Davenport which had twenty-four students came in handy at Pelham where the student population was bigger i.e., thirty-two altogether.

The following described the breakdown of the Performance and Text Groups according to gender, grade and age:

Performance Group:

Gender: boys, 7; girls, 9
Age: one 10-year old; eleven 11-year olds; and four 12-year olds
Grade: 12 sixth-graders; 4 fifth-graders

Control Group:

Gender: girls, 4; boys, 11; not recorded, 1
Age: four 10-year olds; four 11-year olds; and eight 12-year olds
Grade: 6 fifth-graders; 1- sixth-graders

The size of the classroom where the students waited before, during and after the test, was as spacious as the one where the test took place.

After being randomly assigned, the Control Group received the program at 11:15 after the teacher had read the script loudly, slowly and with vocal emphasis. Like all the other teachers, she read the script extremely well, a testimony of a sound literary education. The investigator and the teacher then administered and proctored the test accordingly.
The test was over at 11:30.

The Experimental Group took the program at 11:40. The performance itself was interesting in a number of ways. Because the teacher did not completely trust her ability to recall all the details of the story, she thrice consulted the text. Fortunately, this distraction seemed to serve as a dramatic interlude, a pause to give the performance time to sink in. These fifth and sixth graders revelled, teased, laughed and even challenged certain details in the story. Even little digressions seemed to fuel the excitement. Although the teacher's style was not overly demonstrative, her dialectic approach, particularly her humorous portrayal of animal characters, seemed to amuse her audience to no end. At 12:05 the test was over. Immediately following the test all the students were assembled in one classroom, where the investigator performed an oral narrative. Since they had already written their responses about what they saw as the educational value of the story, at the end of performance they were asked which mode of presentation they preferred. Again the preference was overwhelmingly in favor of performance.

Qualitative Assessment of Program Implementation

As an important part of the assessment of the program, Fitz-Gibbon's five criteria will be used as a backdrop. In the context of this study, however, randomization and contamination will be the paramount criteria. To facilitate discussion, schools will be generally dealt with under a topic, rather than as separate entities.
Randomization

One of the main purposes for randomization is to ensure equality, particularly in the absence of a pre-test. This was particularly true in this study where grade, gender and age were so variable. In all cases, students were mixed and distributed to each group using numbers "1" and "2" drawn from a can whose folded contents had been thoroughly stirred. The total number of these pieces of paper corresponded to the number of students.

Contamination

In all the schools, the physical locations of the two classes in which the two groups were kept, were not only well separated but also sound proof except when the door was open. The acoustics inside the test room were very good. Once selected, the two groups were kept apart. After either the E-Group or C-Group had concluded the test, they were (under supervision) made to walk in a line and not permitted to communicate with any member of the other group, until the very end of the program.

Apart from the fact that in all the schools the test room was spacious and the students made to sit back to back, what considerably reduced or even eliminated cheating, however, seems to have been the clearly stated purpose of the test as having absolutely nothing to do with intelligence testing.

Questions from the students about the questionnaire were dealt with extremely privately and were confined to explaining the questions, although such cases were very rare, certainly not more than five in
all the three schools. The rest of the students were businesslike in answering them. The average time it took for the questionnaire to be completed was less than 10 minutes.

There were no confounds.

This section sought to give a general description of the implementation of the program as well as a qualitative appraisal of the environment(s) in which it was carried out. This description will serve as an important background for the analysis of the data resulting from the experiment. The data themselves will be analyzed descriptively and statistically. This division is important for, while a descriptive analysis may show certain quantitative patterns between the C- and E-Groups, that knowledge does not enlighten one about the significance of the patterns, and their main cause(s). Hence, the critical importance of the statistical analysis.
CHAPTER VII

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The first analysis will be descriptive and will rely on a number of appendices and tables. The statistical analysis will be shorter in line with the wisdom that the computer speaks for itself.

Descriptive Analysis

A cursory look at either the individual school or all schools combined shows consistently higher scores by the E-Group compared to its counterpart, except with respect to Question 2 for Wildwood and Question 5 for Pelham.

Table 3
Comparison of Control and Experimental Group Results for all Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.9167</td>
<td>.9167</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>.7500</td>
<td>.9167</td>
<td>.9167</td>
<td>.7500</td>
<td>.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>.4285</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.8572</td>
<td>.8572</td>
<td>.4285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.9125</td>
<td>.9375</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>.8125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.9375</td>
<td>.6250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This pattern can be traced to the difference in the number of correct versus incorrect answers on the Questionnaire. Davenport, for example, has 12 overall incorrect entries for the E-Group, compared to 22 for the C-Group, a difference of about 30 percent of the share of total incorrect entries between them (Appendices 3 & 4). Pelham registered 11 incorrect answers in the E-Group compared to 17 for the C-Group, a difference of about 22 percent (Appendices 5 & 6). At Wildwood the E-Group had 8 while the C-Group had 9 on an approximately 6 percent difference (Appendices 7 & 8).

Going back to Table 3, the total difference between the Control and Experimental Groups was approximately 10 percent in favor of the E-Group, a result, presumably, of the Main Effect only. This assumption, of course, precedes the statistical analysis which should tell what the significance of this difference is. It is also made in view of the randomization of the process and in spite of seeming influences by such factors as age and/or grade implicit in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.9167</td>
<td>.9167</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.8125</td>
<td>.9375</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>.8125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood</td>
<td>.5715</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.8571</td>
<td>.8571</td>
<td>.4285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On three questions, 3, 4, and 5, Pelham scores higher than the other schools. However, this may very well be a reflection of the higher level of literacy on the part of the older students at Pelham. Although of interest, it is irrelevant in terms of the main effect, since the Control Group was not given the performance treatment. However, the scores of the Experimental Group were markedly different:

Table 5
Aggregate Scores of the Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>.7500</td>
<td>.9176</td>
<td>.9176</td>
<td>.7500</td>
<td>.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.9375</td>
<td>.6250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of the E-Group, the test results show no consistent pattern to favor the older students at Pelham. On the contrary, Pelham's scores are lower, particularly with respect to Wildwood. At this juncture it is hard to attribute any significance to the fact that Wildwood scores higher, in both the C- and E-Groups, than Davenport with a similar age group. Could it be the fact that the older students are less orally oriented than the first and second graders? If so, how does this explain their enthusiasm during the performance of the narrative? If they are more literary oriented, how come their Experimental scores are higher than those of Davenport? Looking at some of the questions separately, it is interesting to note that among the C-Groups, Pelham scored relatively much better on Question 5, where better cognition and
literacy may have played an important part. However, the E-Group scores show Pelham and even Wildwood doing poorly compared to Davenport, on the same question which, incidentally, tended to be the most problematic. Again, this contradiction initially seems to dispel age or grade differences as influencing the outcome of the test.

Another way to look at the data is by examining the students' individual scores in both groups, in order to determine, overall, whether or not grade differentials had an effect on the outcome. For example, at Davenport there were nine first-graders, compared to only three second-graders in the Control Group. The grades' levels were evenly divided in the Experimental Group--i.e., six and six. The following table tabulates the differences in the scored according to grade. For a more detailed account, see Appendices 3 to 8.

Table 6

Comparison of Schools by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>*9 (.5800)</td>
<td>3 (.6000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>c (.8000)</td>
<td>6 (.8000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 (1.0000)</td>
<td>6 (.5667)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1 (.8000)</td>
<td>7 (.8000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (.8333)</td>
<td>10 (.7600)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (.8500)</td>
<td>12 (.8833)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates the number of respondents, while the bracketed figure is the total average per answer.
Looking at the figures horizontally, no definite conclusions can be drawn. For one, the total number of respondents is grossly unequal particularly at Wildwood. Only one case, Davenport, has the total number of respondents equally divided between the first and second graders in the Experimental Group. The score here is the same for both groups, i.e., .8000. One cannot however, draw a general conclusion about grade level from the case of Davenport alone. In the Control Group at Davenport for instance, the second graders did better than the first graders, although the total number of second-graders was 67 percent less than that of first-graders. Under Pelham, fifth graders did better than sixth graders, in the Control Group, .8333 and .7600 respectively. There were 6 fifth-graders and 10 sixth-graders. Under the Experimental Group, the 12 sixth-graders did better than the 4 fifth-graders, .8833 compared to .8500. Al Wildwood, the horizontal results are mixed.

Vertically, however, the scores are more consistent in spite of the unequal number of respondents in each column. It should, however, be pointed out that this inequality is much less severe than in the horizontal categories. This consistency therefore tends to confirm the high probability of performance, and not grade differentials, as being responsible for variations in scores.

Another way to look at the scores is by age differentials:
Table 7

Age Differentials and Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildwood:</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>E-Group</th>
<th>C-Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (6) 1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (7) 2</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (8) 4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: Number inside the bracket indicates age-group. Number on the left of bracket indicates total number of responses in E-Group, while that on the right records responses in the C-Group.

Table 8

Age Differentials and Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Davenport:</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>E-Group</th>
<th>C-Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (6) 2</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (7) 5</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (8) 4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Age Differentials and Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pelham: Age</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (10) 4</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (11) 4</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (12) 8</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the beginning, it should be pointed out that as with grade differentials, the sometime small base of some age groups (e.g., only one ten year old in Pelham's E-Group) precludes any indepth analysis of any data. However, a cursory analysis can still be made. Looking at the tables of all the schools vertically, there is a pattern of the oldest age-group (with the exception of one case at Pelham) having higher scores than the youngest group in both the E- and C- Categories. The oldest group, however, does not enjoy a similar advantage with respect to the middle group. Out of six cases, in both the E- and C-Groups, the oldest group did poorly three times, two of which were in the E-Group; or put differently, two times out of three the younger or middle students did better in the performance category.

Earlier, the assumption was made that the higher the grade, the more likely it is that the level of literacy would also be higher. A look at the Text or Control Group scores according to age does not, however, bear out that assumption. At Wildwood, the oldest group's scores are lower than those of the younger groups. At Davenport, although the oldest group does better than both younger groups, the
youngest group, however, scores better than the older middle one. At Pelham the same is also true. Part of the explanation may lie in the fact that there is not necessarily an absolute correspondence between grade level and age. The same lack of correspondence exists in the E-Groups. This in no way suggests that age differences have any significance, an issue that has already been dealt with.

But were one to look at the scores horizontally age-wise, there appears to be a trend favoring the E-Group. Out of a total of nine cases, the E-Group does better in four, is tied in four cases and does poorly only once. Perhaps the reason it does poorly in this case is simply because the score of the whole group (E-Group at Davenport) is dependent upon one very low score (.40) by the only six-year old. One of the tied scores also has a base of one student for both the E- and C-Groups (Widlwood).

Again what emerges from this sketchy analysis is the suspicion that, however mixed the effect of other variables may be, the main-effect seems to hold. But before any statistical analysis is attempted, one more variable, gender, must be looked at:

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>E-Group</th>
<th>C-Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (M) 8</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (F) 3</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Gender Differentials and Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>E-Group</th>
<th>C-Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 (M) 4</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (F) 3</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

Gender Differentials and Test Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>E-Group</th>
<th>C-Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 (M) 11</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (F) 4</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between the two schools with similar grade levels, Wildwood and Davenport (grades 1 and 2) there is a consistent pattern of boys doing better than girls in both the E- and C-Groups. Among the older group (Pelham) however, the reverse is true. Besides these mixed scores, the unequal distribution of the population, genderwise, as was the case with the other variables (age and grade), seems to preclude any attempt at making generalizations. Again, as with the other variables the E-Group, except in one case out of a total of six, did better than the C-Group. For a detailed look at gender, age and grade see Appendices C to T.

One is therefore led to believe that the statistical analysis will establish the main-effect, Performance, as the only variable responsible for the differentials between the E- and C-Groups. If that
is the case, then the hypothesis of this study will have been advanced beyond the theoretical arena, inspite of all the constraints and limitations of this study.

Statistical Analysis

As already stated, descriptive analysis, though showing differences in the scores of the two groups, tells us nothing about what those scores mean, whatever their size may be. In the experiment under review, for instance, there is a consistent pattern of performance scores exceeding the text ones, yet there is no way of knowing with certainty, the degree to which the main-effect rather than chance or any other factor, may have been responsible for the 10 percent difference. In the literature (Fitz-Gibbons, 1978) the .05 figure or less is considered significant, which means that the probability of the outcome being a result of factors other than the main-effect is five times or less out of a hundred.

SPSS

On August 10, 1983, the investigator with the help of a staff member of the Computer Center at Gettysburg College, Pennsylvania, analyzed the data. The system computed the data in terms of: (a) the school, (b) grade, and (c) the main-effect.

Results

1. Out of a total population of 71, both the C- and E-Groups, were lumped together and entries were made on the basis of whether
they were on the one hand first or second graders, and on the other hand, whether they were fifth or sixth graders. The following results show the mean scores:

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39)+</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 = first and second graders
2 = fifth and sixth graders
+ Total population per grade group

Overall it appears that the higher the grade group, the better the scores of the C- and E-Groups combined per grade-group. In percentage terms, the difference is approximately 9 percent.

2. The second set of figures shows total average scores of the C- and E-Groups irrespective of grade or school, i.e., GRP:

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRP</th>
<th>Control (1)</th>
<th>Experimental (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between the two scores is approximately 10%.
3. The next category shows the scores in terms of school regardless of GRP, grade level or program group.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Davenport</th>
<th>Grades: 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Wildwood</th>
<th>Grades: 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Pelham</th>
<th>Grades: 5 &amp; 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, it seems as if grade level, i.e., Pelham with 5th and 6th grades has some effect on the outcome of the scores.

4. By GRP and Grade, the outcome is as follows:

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRP</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1&amp;2)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (5&amp;6)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. By School and GRP

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Davenport (1)</th>
<th>Wildwood (2)</th>
<th>Pelham (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Text</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Performance</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Graphically the consistent pattern of relationship between performance and Text can be mapped as follows

Table 18

Relationship Between Performance and Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td>Wildwood</td>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graphically, the consistent pattern of relationship between performance and Text can be mapped as follows.
Statistical Significance of the Study

Since some of the preceding tables seem to show differences in scores as being possibly attributable to age, as well as the main effect, the statistical significance computation is critical in showing whether these differences are caused by the main-effect or school or grade level. The following table shows the results of a statistical printout, including other possible sources of variation and their significance.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td>8.668</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.889</td>
<td>2.868</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRP</td>
<td>4.636</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.636</td>
<td>4.602</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>4.046</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>2.008</td>
<td>0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Way Interaction</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRP School</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>9.628</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.926</td>
<td>1.912</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>65.470</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75.099</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Essentially the above figures show the relationship between sources of variation (including chance or what is called residual), the mean squares of those sources of variation and the significance of F. This relationship, can be expressed as follows:

\[
F = \frac{\text{Group Mean Squares}}{\text{Residual Mean Squares}}
\]
With reference to the main effect or GRP, the value of $F$ becomes:

$$F = 4.636$$

$$\frac{4.636}{1.007} = 4.602$$

Thus, according to the last column, the significance of $F$ is .036. But before any conclusion can be drawn from this figure, the statistical significance of other sources of variation should be looked at. The significance of grade level or school is one such source, considering the fact that fifth and sixth graders scored a little higher than the first and second graders. However, the statistical significance in a two-way interaction between GRP and school was well above .05 at 0.623. Under Main-Effects the statistical significance of school was 0.142, also above the acceptable .05 figure. Thus, whether one uses 0.043 or 0.036, either figure unequivocally establishes the experimental treatment as being responsible for the 10 percent difference in test scores between the C- and E-Groups. Other possible sources of variation are therefore not responsible for these differences, including differences in the ability or style of the teacher, in the reading or performance of the oral narrative. The statistical analysis has therefore interpreted and clarified some of the issues which the descriptive analysis could not handle. Beyond all these figures, however, the educational implications posed by the success of this study have to be examined. What curriculum proposals emerge out of it? Can it be successfully duplicated? What problems are inherent in it? These are a few of the many possible issues being raised by this study.
CHAPTER VIII

EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF THE STUDY

The educational value of this study, however limited, can be described under two categories. First is the specific and immediate value to the affected population. The second is the possible long-run general educational value that can be extrapolated from the study.

Immediate Value

At the risk of repetition, one should deal at more length with some points which were alluded to before. To elicit the students' responses to what they perceived to be the study's immediate value, they were asked which of the two approaches, reading or performance, appealed to them more. At all the schools, with the exception of Wildwood, the question was posed orally after both groups had been combined after the program so that the investigator might perform a tale with them. Needless to say, performance was their unanimous choice. Considering the fact that it has taken a whole dissertation to try and establish the essential place of performance in folklore, perhaps the question was unfair though necessary to elicit their important opinions. Pressed as to why they found performance more appealing, a number of them thought performance was more entertaining. To organize their responses better, students at Pelham and Wildwood were asked to write their responses on the answer sheet. These responses, however, had no bearing on the questionnaire's scores and did not seek to differentiate
between the responses of the C- and E-Groups, but were intended to assess the qualitative and educational factors of the project. As already pointed out, the essay responses had to do with the following questions, a) what does the story teach you? and, b) which animal do you prefer? Also since the explicit "moral," "strength may lie in wit, as well as in muscle" had been deleted from both the text and performance, a number of divergent answers were anticipated. Interestingly enough, one student at Pelham came as close as one could in restating almost the exact words deleted from the script. He wrote that, "strength lies in wit and not always in muscles." Most of the answers, however, said that the story taught one that brain is superior to brawn. Hence, tortoise was the most admired animal. Some of the responses were quite interesting as the following edited sample indicates:

a. I liked the tortoise because he was seemingly innocent.

b. Not to believe, something's impossible--that strength isn't everything.

c. Curiosity and wits are stronger than muscle.

d. Strength can fool you.

e. You can be strong, but if your mind is weak, you are doomed and curiosity kills the elephant and hippo.

f. I liked the tortoise because he had a mind like mine.

g. Taught me nothing.

h. You can win a fight without a punch.

i. Trying to tell us not to be a trickster.

j. Those who are not the strongest may be the trickiest.

k. Do not listen to people you are curious about.

l. Never think you are stronger than others.
The preceding reactions seem to confirm the wisdom of deleting the explanatory or moral line. Without it, one learns about what the students think and not necessarily what the teacher or storyteller "dishes" out. Such a process is in line with our curriculum criterion of giving the students an expressive leeway for performance and curriculum structuring. It was never the intention of this study to measure the students' written responses against any preconceived correct answer. Needless to say, any desired moral ends of a program like this, would have to be determined by the particulars of each context as Ben-Amos (Bauman-Paredes, 1972) has so sagaciously pointed out.

Another way of assessing implicitly, the students' perception of what the educational value of the story might be is to compare the C- and E-Group scores per question per school. A glimpse at Table 3 in the preceding chapter shows that the combined E-Group scores for Question 1 was, on the average, .39 points better than the C-Group. Since this question simply required recall of factual information, it could perhaps be hypothesized that the performance approach tends to favor recall of information. On the other hand Question 2, besides requiring a matter-of-fact answer in terms of the character of the tortoise, involves making some kind of value judgement about the tortoise. Since, judging by the students' essay responses, he was a generally liked character, then the narrow difference between the E- and C-Groups might reflect an ambivalence in the students' attitude, between what the script prescribes and how the students feel about the tortoise's character, particularly the E-Group. In fact, the overall scores favor the C-Group on the Question by .07 mostly because of Wildwood's unfavorable
Questions 3 and 4 favor the E-Groups by average scores of .07 and .15 respectively per school. But these average scores are at least 50 percent less than the average scores under Question 1. Were it not for the relatively high score of .33 for Davenport under Question 5, the combined scores of Pelham and Wildwood, .19 and .20 respectively, would have given the C-Group a tremendous advantage. What is encouraging with respect to E-Group answers to Question 3 is that their advantage in a cognitive question is 15 percent, which is the highest average difference between average scores of answers to Question 1. Why this difference? Let's look at Question 3 for example: "Did tortoise really hold the rope and pull hippopotamus out of the water?" Recall, that following the pilot study, the word "really" was inserted to distinguish between the literal and a possible metaphorical perception of the question. If our hypothesis about the superiority of the performance approach in the recall of factual information is true with regard to Question 7, then it is true to a much lesser degree in the case of Question 3. However, there still remains the possibility that when the total impact of the story is taken into account, more students may have seen a metaphorical angle to it. Question 4, on the other hand, is cognitive and therefore requires more than mere factual recollection. It is also key to answering Question 5, for if hippopotamus was not stronger than elephant, it would seem to follow in the context of the story, namely the protracted stand-off, that none is stronger than the other. However, logically speaking, the obverse of hippopotamus not being stronger than elephant, is not necessarily that elephant is not stronger than hippopotamus. Thus for those students
either not paying adequate attention or listening with a preconceived notion of the superiority of elephant's strength, coupled with the fact that hippopotamus was unwittingly pulled out of the water, "no" could very well be the right answer for Question 5. Had this possibility been well considered following the pilot study results, an additional question like: "Hippopotamus pulled elephant out of the water" may have been extremely helpful. Another question which could have been added is, "Who pulled hippopotamus out of the water?" Certainly the problem with Question 5 points to a significant flaw in the design of the study that future research will perhaps rectify. Also, underlying and perhaps coloring most of the responses to the study was the mode of performance by the teacher, who, if experienced, could have reinforced certain reactions from the student as an aid to a successful response to the question. In looking at the scores under Question 5, Davenport should be examined very closely. In the investigator's opinion, the performance of the teacher at Davenport was the most remarkable. Perhaps the consistently better E-Group scores for that school, might be a reflection of that fact. Her mode or presentation, particularly her reiteration throughout the story, that the stand-off, represented equal strength between hippopotamus and elephant, is one case in point. On that question the school's E-Group scores, .33 advantage is a far cry from the negative .19 and .20 scores for Pelham and Wildwood, respectively. This comment is in no way intended to belittle the other teacher's contributions. Another important underlying fact in the preceding overall analysis is the fact that the script in question is only one variant for, Susan Feldman's script, referred to earlier, shows
Tortoise in a more complex light. This further explains how relative the telling of a tale is in terms of such factors as culture or the personality of the storyteller. No one should conclude however, that this relativity is an excuse to promote anti-social elements in the school or the youth. As already stated, each community of parents, teachers, administrators and students, has its own values and belief system, which should "screen" the permissibility or impermissibility of certain narratives.

In the short run then, the statistical significance of the results of this study is proof enough of its value.

Long Run Value

The most important long-run value lies in the possible successful duplication or widening of the experimental design used in this study which, hopefully, might result in the wide-scale use of performance in U.S. schools. Such widescale use will no doubt advance Folklore as an independent academic and aesthetic pursuit.

At the core of the performance approach is the issue of entertainment, which if successful, tends to be more memorable. The question may well be asked, "so what if it's more entertaining, that is not an important educational value?" Insofar as an educational tool makes the student participate more, leads to increased verbal expression and lack of stultifying self-consciousness, then it is of great service to the educational community. After all billions of dollars are spent each year on T.V. advertisements, movie industries, and in schools to successfully "sell" a product through, among other things, entertainment. But
performance is not just passive entertainment. It has values beyond mere comprehension or retention. For example, the purpose of the Teacher Training component included getting the audience involved, mimicking human and animal characters, sounds and movements. The teachers were asked to pass on or encourage these traits in their students. In the final analysis, making good storytellers out of students, should be an important criterion for measuring the success or failure of a long-range oral narrative program. Thus the importance of an appealing medium is not simply as a popularizing fad encouraged by mass media. A number of scholars have studied the relationship of oral narratives and games to a child's psychic growth and creativity. In discussing oral narratives for example, Bettelheim (1976) notes:

For a story to hold the child's attention it must entertain him and arouse his curiosity. But to enrich his life, it must stimulate his imagination; help him to develop his intellect and to clarify his emotions; be attuned to his anxieties and aspiration; give full recognition to his difficulties, while at the same time suggesting solutions to the problems which perturb him (p. 5).

Sutton-Smith (1972), in an attempt to show cross-culturally some correlation between oral narratives and children's games, compiled a list of 141 mostly traditional societies and assumed that "the strategic mode in folktales will occur in the same cultural setting as the strategic mode in games" (p. 342). The results of his inquiries were:

(a) the strategic mode of competition is modeled in both games and folktales in a number of cultures; (b) where the strategic mode of competition is modeled in one medium (i.e., games) it is likely to be modeled in the other (i.e., folk tales);
and (c) the strategic mode of competition as modeled in games and in folk tales is associated with both obedience training and cultural complexity (p. 354).

If children's games and folk tales are closely linked with a child's growth and development, their function has meaning to the child beyond short run concerns for such issues as factual retention. The game or oral narrative performance, once the basic facts and plot have been mastered, is integrated into a total and meaningful experience. In the case of the oral narrative, once the child has not only learned the story line, but has also rehearsed a performance alone or in front of others, the question of factual retention becomes moot since the story becomes a part of the child's repertory, unless of course, there is an extended period in which the game is neither played nor the story performed. However, the emphasis is on performance, since if oral narratives are to be expressed the way games are, then it would be odd if children always carried story books around to read from, in order to express themselves through narratives. Thus their outside activities would reinforce those in class.

The advantage, in the long run, for any teacher who uses the performance approach is that the curriculum could be structured so that the teacher's or storyteller's performance would serve as a model for students to emulate in their own performance of the same or other stories. With regard to this point it should be mentioned that in the case of the three schools under review, storytelling was not a novelty since it was carried out as part of either reading or literature courses. The significant difference lay in their over-reliance on
reading scripts as well as their unsystematized approach to Folklore in general.

The importance of play and learning recently received concentrated attention in the publication of *Play and Learning*, edited by Brian Sutton-Smith (1970). Some of the sixteen articles, by scholars from different fields, were, "Play as Arousal Modulation;" "The Social Determination of Play;" "Communicational Controls in Social Play;" "Speech Play and Verbal Arts;" etc. In summarizing the writings of these scholars, Sutton-Smith discusses child development and play in terms of small changes over small time-spans (synchronic phenomena) and over large time-spans (diachronic shifts). He then raises interesting points:

An important issue is whether there are broad stages across kinds of children's play routines, games, sports, and whether distinctive kinds of play (games) have stages within their nature. Do these stages take on distinctive character, for example, from expressive imitation to competence to inversion? Finally there is the question of whether children's play and adults' play are really two different kinds of things (p. 6).

Certainly then, one of the long-run benefits of the performance approach is that it may expand the interdisciplinary tradition of Folklore by stimulating research of the type needed to answer new questions such as those suggested above by Sutton-Smith.

If stories were performed by students under conditions that allowed unencumbered creative expression by the individual and the group, then teachers might have an opportunity to be educated about the dynamism of a collective creative expression by her students. Hopefully such a practice might help the students' public speaking abilities, general confidence, or literary creativity, all of which are some of
the goals that their use of folklore is meant to accomplish. Digressions, unless they are meaningless or a result of bad behavior, should not be discouraged. These can be golden learning opportunities for everyone involved. One time, the investigator told some first graders the story of how a rabbit tricked a lion into having the lion carry the rabbit on his back, thus proving his point to the other animals that the lion was his father's "jackass," a word that is not considered vulgar in some English-speaking societies. At the end of the session, the storyteller recommended that they try telling the same story to their friends or family members. Seemingly flustered by this suggestion, one boy complained that if he told that story in his household, he would have to substitute "horse" for "jackass," since his father would never tolerate such a word.

In looking back at the experimental design of the study in long-run terms, one cannot help but appreciate the interesting struggle of both the teacher and the audience in forging a story, inspite of the fact that the approach was new to them. Whereas, when a story is being read from a text, the audience sits passively and listens, in a performance, opportunities exist for members of the audience to ask questions and add comments, thus making the story unpredictable, which adds to the tension and anticipation. In all the experimental sessions, students did not have to be goaded or coerced to participate. For some students it seemed an opportune moment to show off or tease the teacher. This teasing and showing off can perhaps be traced to the novelty of the method of presentation (performance) by the teacher, or to a lack of understanding on the part of some students, about the kind of
discipline necessary for the successful performance of an oral narrative, a discipline perhaps not so unique to oral narratives as a creative endeavor. In general, it is hoped that a performance-oriented curriculum can affect teachers and students alike in a number of secondary ways. Some of these, such as general creativity and public speaking, have already been mentioned vis-à-vis the students. The teachers, it is hoped, will find the performance approach useful in teaching other subjects where exclusive reliance on the text seems to be the norm. In that regard, one is reminded of the joke about an "ancient professor reading ancient notes to a class aging with boredom." Perhaps the fact that the storytellers in the experiment were teachers who had been given the most minimal training in story telling, is this study's most important long term potential. How wide, for instance, would have been the difference in the scores of the two groups had the teacher had all the necessary training or apprenticeship in story telling. There is no question that the best answer would have to involve teacher training or apprenticeship in story telling, not just as part of a general curriculum commitment to the teaching of oral narratives, but also as a follow-up to the findings of this study.

The question of possible long-run educational benefits cannot be exhausted in one chapter and by only one investigation. If anything, it is hoped that in the long run, this investigation will stimulate more research and interest in an interdisciplinary approach between folklore and education, particularly in the area of curriculum development. As this investigation has attempted to show, there is a growing
convergent literature in both disciplines. The next step is to apply the principles at least at the research level.
CHAPTER IX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

General Summary of the Study

The study was undertaken because the investigator had come to realize through experience and literature, that the performance of oral narratives seems to stimulate both youngsters and adults in a way that texts did not. In designing the experiment the intent was to test the validity of the hypothesis in a scientific and controlled environment. Inspite of its limited nature, the success of the investigation was important for corroborating field studies and the literature on the subject. Furthermore, this study has shown that the combination of the classroom and folklore should not necessarily be an alienating experience for either folklore or the classroom, for both need each other. Folklore needs the classroom in order not only to blossom in the expressive and active young imagination, but also to remain young, vital and disseminated in a systematic fashion. It also needs the classroom to preserve the necessary, though over-emphasized, scripts as part of the valuable resources in Folklore education. The ethnocentric cultural-evolutionist-bound approach to the definition of folklore, as being ancient, will surely consign it to the grave. Finding folklore in either antiquity or relatives thereof, is as futile as finding the ancient language in which the folklore was expressed. Even if the relatives of those ancients were found alive somewhere on earth, it is doubtful that their language would have failed to integrate new experiences, capable of altering the character of both the language and the folklore.
The classroom on the other hand needs the performance approach to resurrect it from the deadening letter of folklore instruction. The unpredictable nature of story telling with regard to form, content, and audience-storyteller interaction is perhaps both a boon and a curse to classroom education. A curse insofar as red tape and lethargy, may channel the folklore through the "true-and-tried" path. However, a boon for those teachers who pay more than lip service to the centrality of the child and learning from her/him. These educators should welcome a subject with a potential for observing children when they are being creatively expressive, collectively, and exhibiting their needs openly. The curriculum therefore has to be structured without regard solely to tradition (in a double sense) and in such a way that the expressive leeway of the folklore and the child is not significantly thwarted. It should be pointed out, however, that the present investigation was of a short-run nature and was concerned with a highly limited number of variables. As a permanent feature of the school curriculum, the place of folklore in the classroom will require further studies. In addition, administrative issues such as curriculum revision, teacher training, parent and communal involvement, will have to be addressed in every individual area of application.

Nonetheless, despite severe limitations, it is apparent that given all the possible sources of variation, the hypothesis "stood its ground."

Recommendations for future study

Although this study conclusively answers one question, it has also
raised other important issues.

One such issue is retention. In the issue of text vs. performance, performance has to demonstrate its consistency as a more memorable approach. Admittedly retention and even comprehension can be viewed as narrow areas of inquiry against other unquantifiable educational benefits inherent in the performance approach. One example, for instance, is how to measure or evaluate a good storyteller and what his or her place is in a school curriculum that deals with folklore or story telling in a peripheral manner or as an adjunct to another subject.

Another interesting issue is the effect the performance approach may have in special educational programs with a number of low achievers. As stated earlier, the performance graph was consistently parallel to and higher than the text one. Further studies could probably divide the higher and lower achievers into control and experimental groups respectively, to see whether the scores would tend to be equal. With respect to the present investigation, because the two groups were randomly sampled, it was never clear whether the students with lower scores in the experimental group were low achievers.

One cannot discuss traditional oral narratives in particular without reference to the antisocial elements, so pervasive in them. Many Freudians and Neo-Freudians such as Bruno Bettelheim see no problems with many of these elements as long as the children involved do not have psychological impairments. The major problem occurs, it seems, in an educational population with a diverse cultural background. A good example is a school population with black and white students. Although cannibalism occurs in the traditional oral narratives of many
people on earth, because of the history of colonialism and slavery, African stories involving cannibalism, may have an adverse effect on all the students involved. The question of gender would have to be looked at as well, since large numbers of traditional narratives are overtly and covertly sexist.

Finally, studies have to be undertaken to assess the impact of the performance approach to allied disciplines such as communications skills, composition, dance and music. Do children who have been affected by instruction in oral narratives do better than others in these subjects? Are those teachers involved in oral narratives better teachers in other areas, for example, history? Are these teachers more inspiring, like Christen Kold of the Danish school movement whose central tenet was "the living word." In discussing Christen Kilk and the "living word," Skrubbeltrang (1947) makes the following observation:

... hating all learning by rote, he yet spoke many a time so his hearers remembered his lectures for the rest of their lives. ... So sure and so vivid were they in every detail and so captivating the impression of his personality (p. 16).

Christen Kold was no accident. He came out of an oral tradition and yet his influence on a trade associated with text, was tremendous. Kold may be far behind us in the annals of history. Yet, if a systematic integration of folklore into the curriculum were undertaken without delay, many Kolds may not be too far down the coming road of history. It is hoped that this study is another small worthy step in that direction.
ENDNOTES

1 The Foxfire series involves a number of publications by Wigginton's students. In it folkloric practices such as log-cabin construction, weaving, etc., are described in painstaking detail. In many cases the experiences and projects the students write about are a result of long study and apprenticeship under certain knowledgeable people in the community.

2 Named after Stith-Thompson and Antti Aarne, it aims at reconstructing the entire life history of a tale working backward to the first local forms and from there to the ultimate archetype.

3 In discussing the "esoteric-exoteric" factor, William Hugh Hansen in "Esoteric - Exorietic Factor in Folklore," proposes three classes of material common among various conventional genres of folklore, i.e., narratives, songs, beliefs, proverbs, etc., to which the factor applies, viz:
   a. Folklore generally prevalent about a particular group;
   b. Folklore prevalent in one particular group about another particular group;
   c. Folklore prevalent within one group concerned only with that group.
(Quoted in Frontiers of Folklore (Bascom 1977:47.)

Taking issue with the Cultural Evolutionist definition of folk as comprising solely the European peasantry, Dundes in, "Who are the Folk" states that "the term 'folk' can refer to any group of people whatsoever who share at least one common factor whatever the linking factor may be" (Bascom 1977:2).

4 A good example is what is often referred to as the "Zulu tribe." Like other African societies, past and present, the Zulu people comprise an almagam of diverse peoples who were forged into a nation state by Shaka Zulu in the early part of the nineteenth century in South Africa.

5 Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed (New York: Herder & Herder, 1968), of course, went beyond the formal educational environment in the narrow sense of a classroom, where students are in numerous instances spoon-fed (Freire calls it "banking") to the non-formal realm where according to Freire the viability of an educational process, must be measured against the liberation it ensures to the participants and ipso facto to the whole society.

6 Instructor (February 1980), p. 86.


10 The names of the teachers are fictitious.
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APPENDIX A

Teacher Training Workshop
Pre-Lecture Questionnaire

1. Have you ever taken a course, a seminar or workshop in Folklore?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   If yes, how many?

2. In general, how familiar are you with Folklore as a branch of knowledge?
   a) Very familiar
   b) Familiar
   c) A little familiar
   d) Not familiar at all

3. Is Folklore a required subject in your school?
   a) Required
   b) Not required
   c) Optional

4. Do you employ Folklore in your teaching?
   a) Yes
   b) No
   If yes, please indicate what type of Folklore: myth, legends, story-telling, artifacts, ethnicity, multiculturalism, etc.

5. For what purpose(s) do you use any of the above-mentioned type(s) of Folklore?
6. If storytelling is one of the types used, how often is it used per day, per week, per month?

7. In using storytelling, what is your approach: reading from text, recitation without text, performing, other?

8. What expectations do you have in your use of storytelling? If any, are they met?

9. Have you ever had any training in drama, storytelling or any other performing arts? If so, how much?

10. How do students participate in the storytelling or folkloric event?

11. What is the age range and ethnic composition of your students?

12. Generally, what problems have you encountered in your use of Folklore?

13. How would you characterize your approach to teaching in general?
   a) Open
   b) Open with restrictions
   c) Authoritarian
   d) Authoritarian with some freedom
   e) Other

14. Why did you take this workshop?
APPENDIX B

Teacher Training Workshop
Post-Textualization/Demonstration Questionnaire

1. Overall, was the story more interesting when read from a text or when performed?
   a) More interesting with text.
   b) More interesting with performance.
   c) No difference.
   Please briefly explain.

2. What problem(s) do you foresee for your class in terms of the performance approach?

3. Would you be willing to use the performance approach as a substitute or complement for the Text?

4. Are you interested in becoming a seasoned storyteller? If so, why?

5. Following the lecture and demonstration, do you understand what the performance approach is about?
   a) Do understand.
   b) Don't understand.
   c) No difference.
### APPENDIX C

#### TABLE 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td>.6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>.2000</td>
<td>.8000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.6000</td>
<td>.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.6000</td>
<td>.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3/12</td>
<td>9/12</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>3/12</td>
<td>9/12</td>
<td>3/12</td>
<td>8/12</td>
<td>.2500</td>
<td>.7500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

TABLE 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$^6$</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.6000</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.6000</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.6000</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td>.6000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td>.6000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.6000</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7/12</td>
<td>6/12</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>1/12</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>6/12</td>
<td>6/12</td>
<td>8/12</td>
<td>4/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.5833</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.9167</td>
<td>.0833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correct Answer
$^6$Indeterminate
### APPENDIX D

#### TABLE 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Answers Per Student</th>
<th>Davenport, Chesterfield Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7/12</td>
<td>6/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correct Answer
§Indeterminate
### APPENDIX E

#### TABLE 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>.6000</td>
<td>.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.8000</td>
<td>.2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2/16</th>
<th>14/16</th>
<th>14/16</th>
<th>2/16</th>
<th>0/16</th>
<th>16/16</th>
<th>16/16</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>5/16</th>
<th>10/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.1250</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>.1250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0625</td>
<td>.9375</td>
<td>.3125</td>
<td>.6250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX F

#### TABLE 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Total   | .50   | .50    | .81 | .19    | .06   | .94    | .13 | .88    | .19    | .81    | .79 | .21    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Answers Per Student</th>
<th>Wildwood School Experimental Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/1/1/1/1/1/1/1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2/1/1/1/1/1/1/1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2/1/1/1/1/1/1/1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2/1/1/1/1/1/1/1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2/1/1/1/1/1/1/1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2/1/1/1/1/1/1/1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2/1/1/1/1/1/1/1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2/1/1/1/1/1/1/1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0/8/8/7/8/8/8/8</td>
<td>0/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0- 1.0000  .8750</td>
<td>-0-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX H

### TABLE 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers Per Student</th>
<th>Wildwood School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>3/7</th>
<th>4/7</th>
<th>7/7</th>
<th>0/7</th>
<th>1/7</th>
<th>6/7</th>
<th>1/7</th>
<th>6/7</th>
<th>4/7</th>
<th>3/7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4286</td>
<td>0.5714</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.1429</td>
<td>0.8571</td>
<td>0.1429</td>
<td>0.8571</td>
<td>0.5714</td>
<td>0.4286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correct Answer

§Indeterminate
## APPENDIX I

### TABLE 26

Aggregate Scores for All Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no*</td>
<td>yes*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.2500</td>
<td>.7500</td>
<td>.9167</td>
<td>.0833</td>
<td>.0833</td>
<td>.9167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.5833</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.9167</td>
<td>.0833</td>
<td>.0833</td>
<td>.9167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.1250</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>.1250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.8125</td>
<td>.1875</td>
<td>.0625</td>
<td>.9375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>.1250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.4285</td>
<td>.5715</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.1428</td>
<td>.8571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correct Answer
APPENDIX J

Table 27

Comparison of schools between the Control (C) and Experimental (E) Groups according to Test Score Achievement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Perfect Score (1.0000)</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>60%-79%</th>
<th>Under 60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.3333</td>
<td>.1667</td>
<td>.7500</td>
<td>.4167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelham</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.4375</td>
<td>.3750</td>
<td>.9375</td>
<td>.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire (Pilot)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.4706</td>
<td>.2500</td>
<td>.6471</td>
<td>.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildwood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.1250</td>
<td>.1429</td>
<td>.8750</td>
<td>.7143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages without Fort River (Pilot)</td>
<td>.2986</td>
<td>.2282</td>
<td>.8542</td>
<td>.6270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages with Pilot</td>
<td>.3416</td>
<td>.2337</td>
<td>.8024</td>
<td>.5923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K
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Correct Answers for E- and C-Groups
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Graph 4
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Graph 5

Correct Answers for E- and C-Groups
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Graph 6

Correct Answers for E- and C-Groups
All Schools Excluding HASP

Incorrect Answers for E- and C-Groups
All Schools Except Hampshire

Score

1

.5

0 1 2 3 4 5

Questions

NOTE: E - indicated by shaded areas