

skills in a manner that would encourage participation so that he would perform those skills when the television set was turned off. It was also hoped that he would incidentally acquire new skills necessary for media literacy to prepare him for future instructional television programmes since without a good grasp of televisual literacy the child would not be able to benefit fully from the content and formats presented in more complex programmes. (Solomon 1974).

The question arises as to whether there is any superior medium for achieving the abovementioned objectives. According to Arnheim (1969) visual images and symbols are capable of communicating and expressing meaningful information that cannot be formulated in any other mode, and other theorists Gombrich (1974), Jenkins, Neale and Peno (1967) also argue that the visual mode is a more effective instructional medium than is the verbal mode of language. However, as Worth (1974) has noted, there is no purpose in arguing that the visual is superior to the verbal mode since both are important in developing symbolic thought. For instance, language as opposed to pictures allows a more accurate selection of meaning between alternatives whilst pictures offer a wider choice of elements from which vast amounts of information can be extracted. Visual displays provide more alternatives and more opportunity for enquiry than do words, whilst words indicate concisely and directly the message to be conveyed.

The present research did not investigate whether it would be more effective to teach the child via a verbal rather than a visual presentation; instead it mixed the two forms using a verbal commentary with a visual display. Rohwer (1970) offers support

for this mode of instruction since he feels that children should be taught to use both verbal and visual kinds of activities to increase their own powers of learning. The child cannot always rely on the world to offer up information in the best ways, and so he should be equipped to transform information himself into a form that renders it maximally memorable. (Rohwer 1970 p 402).

By what process was the visual medium able to encourage the development of the young child's thinking and behaving. Although this study did not investigate the mechanisms of media literacy, Jenkins, Neale and Deno (1967) have noted that a picture employs a very dense symbol system which arouses great activity for the selection of cues and causes the transformation of these cues into one or more internal verbal descriptions. Thus the child is drawn into active cognitive participation with the medium which triggers new modes of perceiving and conceptualising. For example, the presentation of a matching skill in Bright Rides probably induced the child to actively compare and select cues necessary for matching. This skill was then translated into a concise internal verbal statement to be stored and used in future matching tasks. In addition the televisual mode encourages the following forms of thinking in the viewer : -

- i) Two visual displays placed side by side activate comparison and discrimination, (Gropper 1970); ii) two visuals presented successively activate a continuation mode (Solomon 1974);
- iii) a caricature makes the viewer fill in the missing information (McLuhan 1965) and iv) various other specialised techniques can elicit an understanding

of irony, personification and deliberate overstatement or understatement (Millerson 1961). It thus appears that the televisual mode can induce a range of new thinking skills in the young viewer, although the manner in which this occurs would have to be investigated more fully in a future study.

Bright Rides was presented to children in the crèche or nursery school setting. Yet it is questionable whether this setting was suitable for the presentation to have its greatest effect. Singer and Singer (1976) contend that in nursery school settings where children watch television together in large viewing groups, less learning occurs than when they watch individually or in small groups. In addition they suggest that learning from a television programme increases if the child is accompanied by an adult mediator who explains events and encourages participation in the programme. Thus Bright Rides should have been presented in a setting for individual viewing such as the home, during a time when parents could join their children in televiewing. However, since Bright Rides could not be broadcast on the national network<sup>i</sup> it was not possible to show the programme in each home and the child-care centres became the next best venue. The presentation of the programme in the crèches proved generally to be effective and these results pave the way for further large scale research into the effects of Bright Rides in other schools and centres.

---

<sup>i</sup> Bright Rides which was filmed by Witsvision, the Wits University television studio, does not comply with levels of technical performance required by S A T V and so will have to undergo modifications before it can be telecast nationally.

In addition it is hoped that Bright Rides will soon be presented on the national network to be viewed and tested in the home setting.

#### 12.5.2 The Effective Use of Bright Rides:

The effective utilisation of educational television still seems to be a confused issue. Roberts and Schramm (1971) and Twyford (1969) consider that television instruction is successful when the programme content is well organised, meets high pedagogical standards and is presented in a learning context. However, it is the view of the present author that these criteria are too general and vague to be of practical value. Allen (1971) has noted that the specific characteristics that bring about learning are yet to be determined and that research has so far ignored such questions. Nevertheless, it appears that formative or planning research into recent television programmes is providing the much needed body of information about the most effective and important elements of television presentations.

The childrens television workshop, created in 1968 used formative research methods in the production of Sesame Street and the Electric Light Company, two American Educational programmes. These programmes were modified and improved according to research into their appeal comprehensibility, activity eliciting potential and amount learnt by the viewers.

Bright Rides also employed formative research methods setting out to develop an educational programme by research and revision. As has been noted previously the objectives of Bright Rides were to teach a range of cognitive skills through entertainment and

happiness. The cognitive skills test, used to measure how much learning had taken place, showed that there was room for improvement in the televised teaching method. As has been noted the content analysis showed that entertainment was consciously integrated into the programme and it was observed that the children enjoyed the presentation. However more extensive research into appeal was not conducted and so presents itself as a topic for future research. In addition credibility, internal compatibility of elements, comprehensibility, memorability, and many other programme attributes should be investigated in future research on Bright Rides in the search for the most effective way to present cognitive skills to the preschooler.

According to Palmer (1974), formative research typically makes use of the combined effort of producers and researchers in a cyclic process of empirical evaluation and production revision. The producers present various selections of television material for testing by the researchers after which stage production techniques are modified by the producer according to the recommendations of the researchers. This process requires the highest level of team workmanship if the researcher-producer model is to be effective. Palmer (1974) notes the producers must have the ability not only to see the implications of the research but also to carry these implications through into the form of new and revised production approaches.

In the production of Bright Rides the producer and researcher were one and the same person. This situation certainly enabled intimate co-operation between researcher and production 'teams' since the producer witnessed the research into the production.

and the researcher was present during the actual production. However, this partnership was limited in that the ideas of only one person were being investigated and modified. Research which involves the use of a team of producers and a team of preferably multi-disciplinary researchers enriches the quality of the production and subsequent research. Palmer (1974) notes that the increasing prominence of television education necessitates the use of production teams whose members possess a diversity of highly specialised talents.

In the absence of a team of producers and researchers working directly on the production of Bright Rides, use was made of the suggestions of people not directly involved in the production, yet experienced in production techniques and advanced research methods. These ideas while providing valuable input to the programme were limited in that feedback from the advisors was not available during all stages of the production.

#### 12.5.3 Formative Research as the Methodology for the Present Study:

The initiation of formative research into the South African context was considered an exciting and important project, as to date there is a paucity of relevant indigenous South African programmes although formative-research could help develop such programmes. In addition it is an exciting prospect to investigate new forms of research such as the formative approach which departs from the traditional hypothesis oriented research model but which nevertheless contributes to a new body of research methodology.

The main objective of formative research recommendations is that they appear likely to contribute to the effectiveness of the

product or procedure being developed. It is not necessary that they be validated by the research out of which they grew since establishing their validity is the function of summative research.

At this stage Palmer (1974) notes there is no tradition of accumulated knowledge in the area of formative research practice. This is partly because so little research of this type has been carried out, but it is even more a result of the fact that it has only recently come to be recognised as a distinct and systematic field of endeavour. Palmer considers that the lack of literature on formative research is in no way commensurate with its promise for education.

"The promise of the approach is that it will provide designers of educational products and practices with empirical data far more directly pertinent to their respective media, materials and learning conditions than are the results of traditional more basic research. For the field of educational television in particular, it offers ways to bring about planned effects .... and a means for ensuring in advance that programmes will achieve their objectives". (p 307).

According to the results of the research on Bright Rides, the way is open to produce and improve educational programmes along the identified objectives, of education through entertainment. With continued research into the programme, it is hoped that Bright Rides will become an increasingly important teacher of cognitive skills necessary for school readiness. To this end those skills that were not successfully taught, such as letters knowledge necessary for prereading, matching, sorting and attitudes toward the self, others and school, ought to be modified and skills which were successfully taught should be improved. In addition new cognitive skills could be introduced such as a test of the content presented in Bright Rides or a test of imaginative play. Because of the formative research

procedure adopted in this production Bright Rides may be continuously modified to include those cognitive skills which educationalists might deem desirable at any point of time.

#### 12.6 Criticisms:

Although various criticisms have been made throughout the main body of the discussion, three areas still remain to be examined critically. These are criticisms (i) with regard to the use of television as a medium of instruction; (ii) in connection with the production of Bright Rides and (iii) in respect of the testing procedure.

##### 12.6.1 Televisual Mode of Instruction:

- (i) The televisual mode used in this study may have been ineffective as a teaching device for Coloured preschoolers who do not have a high degree of televisual literacy. As Gross (1974) notes, there is a level of sophistication necessary for the proper understanding of visual images.

"Pictures and films often convey misleading impressions of scale, distance, time and relationship. By overcoming the limitations of space and time they may also fail to communicate the reality and importance of these dimensions" (p 77).

In addition images conveyed via these media may be deliberately or inadvertently false. The potential for misleading and confusing fiction and reality, seem to be as great with photographs and films as with words and actions, and quite possibly much greater (Gross 1974).

Salomon (1974) points out that a particular range of aptitudes is necessary for the child to understand a programme like Sesame Street, or Bright Rides. This study sample was not tested to determine levels of perseverance, impulsivity, and initial general knowledge, which are factors that may have determined the amount learned from the programme as a whole. In addition, no investigation was made into more specific media variables like "zooming in" on details and relating them to contexts or connecting discrete time segments which require more detailed aptitudes. Salomon (1972) found that students with low ability of this kind fail to infer the appropriate relations between part and whole. Thus a zoom-in may not have activated in this sample the process that would ensure the extraction of the information required by the producer's objectives. In this way a low degree of literacy in the televisual medium could severely restrict the information a subject would extract from that symbolic display.

- (ii) Apart from media literacy, individuals also differ in terms of concerns and interests and intentions at any given time. What the child sees depends upon what he is looking for or upon his perception of the task. For this reason it became difficult to predict the kind of information any particular learner would extract from Bright Rides. The M-Test used in this study, probably measured only a small amount of learning that took place, namely that part that the producer was interested in testing. However, it did not necessarily reveal the greater part of the child's learning,

namely that which the child personally wanted to learn from the programme.

- iii) A third criticism may be levelled at the assumption made in chapter 3 that children will learn cognitive skills after relatively brief exposure to a television programme. Although it has been noted that American Indian preschoolers were able to learn from a 20 minute video portrayal of television models (Henderson et al 1975) more research into the amount of learning possible from brief exposure will have to be conducted to conclusively accept Henderson et al's results. It should be noted however, that Bright Rides was viewed three times a week for four weeks, and a number of sequences were repeated in each programme such that exposure was concentrated even though it was conducted over a short period of time. Results from this study indicate that the scores of children improved after viewing Bright Rides. Thus if the period of televiewing to which the present sample were subjected is regarded as brief in the sense that televiewing continued for only a month then the results of this study lend support to Henderson et al's findings mentioned above.

#### 12.6.2 Production Defects:

- i) The programme had several technical defects. For instance dark patches, light flashes and inconsistent sound levels occurred in some sequences. The reason for these defects was that the television studio was being closed for renovation towards the end of filming. Thus portions of dark film had

to be hurriedly transferred onto videotapes, and editing of the programmes had to take place in an unsound-proofed editing room equipped with inadequate facilities. Furthermore editing and sound dubbing was performed by an unprofessional team of editors, namely the producer and a television technician, and so technical perfection was further restricted.

- (ii) As has been noted previously in this chapter, letters were not effectively taught since they were not presented phonetically. It appears that letter sounds are more readily understood by preschoolers, than are letter names since sounds relate more easily to words in everyday conversation than do letter names which often have little relation to the word in which they appear. Thus letter naming and recognising would have been more effectively learnt through the phonetic presentation of letters.

### 12.6.3 The Testing Procedure:

- (i) Testing of preschool children presents many problems of administration and scoring (Anastasi 1968). In this study, the main problem appeared in connection with the establishment of rapport

"for young children are often shy with strangers, easily distracted and possibly negative to the demands made of them" (Anastasi p 262).

The use of untrained testers has been discussed in Chapter 9 above, and it has been shown that whilst there are advantages to using untrained testers (Bogatz & Ball 1971), this might have detracted from the performance of the children. Testing was usually performed in a small room at the child care

centres, and in several cases, anxiety, distraction, negativism as well as shyness were reported. In addition Almy (1975) notes that there is daily variation in the young child's test performance which detracts from the reliability of test results.

Anastasi (1968) contends that a skilled and experienced examiner is a prerequisite in the testing of young children in order to recognise "signs of fatigue, drowsiness, fear, inattention, and other adverse conditions". (p 262).

The examiner must be able to adjust his procedure accordingly to these conditions.

- (ii) Two-dimensional drawn pictures were used in the testing procedure which may be unsuitable for cultures unaccustomed to representative drawing. A two-dimensional reproduction of an object is not a perfect replica of the original; it simply represents certain cues which as a result of past experience lead to the perception of the object. According to Anastasi (1961) if the cues are highly reduced, as in a simplified or schematic drawing, and if the necessary past experience is absent, the correct perception may not follow. A considerable body of empirical data exists, indicating marked differences in the perception of pictures by persons in different cultures (Hudson 1971, Ortner 1963, Miller 1973, Segall, Campbell and Herskowitz 1966), thus it is possible that the Coloured sample did not have sufficient exposure to two-dimensional drawings for the test to provide reliable results.

In addition the present study showed a television programme which used a type of pictorial representation requiring the correct

perception of televised pictures of objects as the stimulus while the response was tested according to two-dimensional drawings. Televisual literacy requires a different perceptual set to that of drawn pictures and thus the test might not have provided valid results from the television programme. Future research should investigate the use of a televisual method of testing televisual stimuli.

- (iii) The M-test was constructed to test the sequences shown in Bright Rides and for this reason the test items relate specifically to cognitive skills shown in Bright Rides and not universally to any range of cognitive skills. Although the M-test correlates significantly with the DAP ( $r = 0,652$ ) it does not correlate significantly with the PPVT ( $r = 0,056$ ) indicating that the M-test measures skills of non-verbal intelligence rather than skills of verbal intelligence. Common variance shared by the M-test and DAP is relatively low (0,425) and far lower (0,003) with the PPVT indicating that very few skills are common to the M-test, DAP and PPVT. Although the M-test may be able to test effectively what it set out to test (test-retest reliability), if it does not have objective reference to another test of similar nature its applicability is limited. Thus it could be said that the major criticism of the M-test is that it is not based on an objective framework in that it does not share high common variance with the DAP and PPVT. Nonetheless it is possible that the M-test will share common variance with a test not included in the present study. However, this assumption lies outside of the realm of this investigation and may be verified only in a future study.

(iv) The Peabody Picture Vocabulary test and the M-test have not been standardised on the Coloured South African population and this factor may have affected the results obtained from this group. The Peabody which was standardised on North American children contains content which is often unfamiliar to White westernised children, let alone to Coloured children who are not usually exposed to American or Anglo-Saxon vocabulary stimulation. The M-test which was based on the original American battery, for testing Sesame Street, was adapted with the conscious motivation of finding a culturally suitable test for Coloured preschoolers. Yet it was also restricted in that it was constructed within terms of the Westernised bias of the present writer. Coloured school teachers and parents were consulted as to the suitability of items on the test, and a pilot study was conducted, but the validity of this test is still doubtful until it is standardised over a large population of Coloured preschoolers.

Test content is one of the parameters along which cultures differ (Anastasi 1968). Most language and non-reading tests call for items of information that are specific to certain cultures. For example they may require the examinee to understand the function of such objects as the telephone, the violin, the postage stamp, or the mirror. Persons reared in certain cultures may lack the experimental background to respond correctly to such items. The problems of testing people with dissimilar cultural backgrounds has received considerable attention since the midcentury (Anastasi 1968). Diverse cultures or subcultures further

the development of different skills and knowledge, and these differences are reflected in test scores. Anastasi (1968) notes that a minority group is often referred to as culturally disadvantaged when its scores do not equal the scores of the majority. In this way when the individual of a subculture is placed in competition with individuals of a culture in which he was not reared and shows cultural differences, he is perceived as culturally disadvantaged. Conversely, the culturally advantaged individual suffers when displaced from his mother culture.

- (v) Testing was conducted in English or in Afrikaans according to the language preference of the child. Yet many of these children spoke an imperfect English or Afrikaans, intermixing the two languages randomly in their conversation. Thus their comprehension of questions and their subsequent answers might have been impeded by questioning in one language medium. Anastasi (1968) notes that language is a known difficulty in cross-cultural testing. The translation of a test from one language to another causes problems regarding the comparability of norms and the equivalence of scores. The simple translation of a test is never sufficient, and adaptation and revision of content is generally required.

Yet Anastasi (1968) notes that nonlanguage tests are often more culturally loaded than language tests. Investigations into a wide variety of cultural groups in many countries have found... larger group differences in performance of nonverbal tests than in verbal tests (Anastasi 1961, Irvine 1969, Jensen 1968, Ortner 1963, 1972, Vernon 1965). Ortner has noted that whilst one

can translate verbal tests into another language, it is

"well-nigh impossible to translate and adapt test performance from one culture to another". (p 76).

- (vi) Conditions for testing the experimental group were possibly different to those for testing the control group since pretesting of the experimental group took place six weeks before that of the control group and posttesting of the experimental group took place six weeks before that of the control group. Whilst a time lapse of six weeks is not considered a crucial space of time in terms of cognitive development stages, it is possible that new cognitive skills were learnt during this period without the intervention of Bright Rides. Furthermore, scores of the experimental group might have been better than those of the control group since testers had become a familiar friendly phenomenon in the crèches by the time the experimental group was tested, whilst they constituted an unknown and possibly fearsome prospect to the control group in the early stages of testing.

In a design in which control and experimental groups are pretested and posttested concurrently, one eliminates the possibility that the aforementioned extraneous variables will affect scores. However, in this study, the possibility that viewers would inform non-viewers of what they had seen, or that jealousy might arise between viewers and non-viewers, was considered more detrimental to unbiased comparisons than the possibility that unknown skills would be learnt by the children. It is certainly a difficult task to introduce an attractive entertaining intervention into the environment of some children,

to the exclusion of others in their proximity without affecting the feelings of the excluded group. The present author considers that the feelings of young children cannot be disregarded in the pursuit of scientific research since, ethically, research should not override human considerations and practically, research would be impeded by hostile emotions.

(vii) In order to evaluate the effectivity of Bright Rides, the study used one control group which did not see the television programme which was then compared to the experimental group which saw the television programme. However, additional control groups should have been included to eliminate extraneous contaminating variables. It will be recalled that at two crèches, sad attitudes decreased from pretest to posttest on the control group, indicating that the simple intervention of testers or interested adults into the school environment improved attitudes towards the self and others. A control group of interested adults, simulating the attention paid to children by the testers should thus have been included to eliminate this effect.

(viii) An arbitrary decision was made as to the grouping of viewers into regular and rare viewing groups. It was considered that four times a week constituted regular viewing and three or less times a week was rare viewing, yet these allocations were not based on tested guidelines. Whilst scores did not generally differ between regular and rare viewers, differences might have been found if, for example, three times a week or more was considered as regular viewing.

However, it appears that research often involves the use of some arbitrary guideline (Palmer 1974, Kerlinger 1964, Lesser 1974), and thus the decision to allocate the groups in the abovenamed manner should not be viewed too seriously.

Another criticism may be levelled at the fact that the children alone were asked how often they viewed television. It is possible that the younger children did not give entirely accurate records of their viewing frequencies which might have affected scores. Parents should have been asked how often they considered their children watched television to corroborate the results indicated by the children. Yet this method is also problematic since some parents might not have known how often their children watched television.

- (ix) The M-test was not used to its best effect. Whilst each subtest was broken down into various subsections, scoring revealed only a global score for each subtest. For example counting, number correspondence, number identification, and so on all constituted the numbers subtest, yet a total score for numbers was the only measure indicated in the results. Thus one was unable to identify which subsection of a test was best learned or best performed.
- (x) The guidelines for the scoring of the Draw a Person test, although ostensibly objective, often called for a subjective interpretation.

### 12.7 The Need for Further Study and Research:

Throughout the chapters of this dissertation the need for further research has been indicated and new questions growing out of the study have been asked. It is now pertinent to highlight a few aspects which will require further study.

- (i) Bright Rides set out to teach a set of explicitly defined cognitive skills and the M-test was designed to test whether those cognitive skills were in fact learned. There is a danger, however, that what the programme intended to accomplish was not what the test actually measured. Future research would thus be of considerable value if it could find the means to test the intended objectives more closely. This could be achieved by including more items into each subtest or by questioning a child directly about what he learned from each film segment.

In addition, a programme like Bright Rides is likely to produce unintended consequences, either beneficial, harmful or both and thus a complete evaluation should include these outcomes along with those that are intended. However, since by definition, unintended effects cannot be anticipated in advance, it is difficult for research to identify where to look for them. It appears that unintended effects might have their source in episodes where novel elements have been deliberately added in order to make them more humorous or more interesting. For instance in one sequence of Bright

Rides, a pugnacious puppet Big Problem, crushes the square which Fuzzy Joe is demonstrating and exists laughing while Fuzzy Joe is left to repair the square.

Although the outcome is positive, in that Fuzzy Joe finds that he can construct a triangle, it is possible that children will learn other unintended lessons, for instance that crumbled squares always turn into triangles or else that it is acceptable to laugh at the misfortune of others.

Future research should thus investigate methods of identifying unintended effects with a view to enhancing them if they are beneficial or to limiting them if they prove harmful.

- (ii) One of the methods of identifying unintended outcomes is by observing the reactions of the sample children to the programme. Palmer (1974) used observational research to investigate the appeal comprehensibility and activity eliciting potential of Sesame Street. While most research into television's effects on children has been conducted by means of standardised pencil-and-paper tests, observational research is gaining acceptance as a valid and important method which will provide valuable information in further research on Bright Rides.
- (iii) Posttesting was conducted one week after the last of the twelve programmes was shown in the centres and was the only test to evaluate the effectivity of Bright Rides. It should be noted that the pretest which was conducted prior to showing the programme was used only to establish a baseline level of cognitive skills performance. Future research would thus be valuable in introducing a range of tests to be conducted after each programme

had been shown with a view to establishing which programmes were the most or least effective. In addition, posttesting should also be conducted each month for approximately one year after the series has been completed, to ascertain whether Bright Rides has long term learning effects on its viewers. In conducting such research the introduction of control groups would be necessary to remove the effect of extraneous variables on learning during the course of the year.

- (iv) Lesser (1974) notes that no single form of instruction works equally well for all children, and that while television may be an excellent medium for some children it is a very poor one for others. Similarly the presentation of a particular television programme to one group of children may be effective while it is unsuitable for another. Bright Rides aimed at reaching a group of culturally disadvantaged children and in this it appears to have been successful. However, it was hoped that Bright Rides would soon be broadcast nationally and thus a priority for future research would be to investigate whether it would be of value to other groups like a middle class or culturally advantaged sample. Such research would be of value in indicating whether Bright Rides should be modified in order to attract a larger audience whilst still retaining its appeal.

However, its value would be diminished if such results were used to compare the scores of middle and lower class children.

Culturally advantaged children who have a range of educational experiences wider than that of culturally disadvantaged children are likely to perform better than their disadvantaged counterparts. Furthermore, as Lesser (1974) notes previous research by Jensen (1969) and Shockley (1971) have supplied enough "invidious comparisons" among ethnic groups to generate strong reservations to this type of research. (Lesser 1974 p 145). Thus the purpose of future research would be to create a programme from which all children would benefit regardless of their background, socio-economic status or race. To this end it would be important to make statistical comparisons within groups rather than between groups, since it would be valuable to determine whether lower socio-economic viewers learn more than lower socio-economic non-viewers, but irrelevant to note whether lower socio-economic viewers learn more than middle socio-economic viewers.

- (v) As has been previously indicated, the M-test was not standardised on the Coloured preschool population. Thus while the results indicated that learning occurred in this sample, these results are not conclusive. Future research should thus be launched into the testing of a large group of Coloured preschoolers as well as groups of other preschoolers who might in future be the next viewers of Bright Rides.
- (vi.1) The research recommendations described so far concern the best methods to evaluate learning from Bright Rides and how to improve this production. Perhaps Bright Rides could serve an even more important purpose by beginning to correct misconceived ideas about how children learn from the visual media, and to

understand which methods will allow the most effective use of televisual instruction. Lesser (1974) notes that although many studies have been conducted into the televiewing habits and preferences of children, "we are ignorant about how children do learn from the visual media". (p 150).

Long-term research on a programme like Bright Rides would certainly provide some understanding of this problem, but long-term research should extend beyond any single series of programmes.

It is thus pertinent now to examine how educational television can be used most effectively and then to consider a number of questions relating to the effect of television on our lives and on the lives of our children.

According to Bruner (1966) one of the weaknesses of educational television is that it "aspires to self-sufficiency, failing to join skilfully with other media and techniques". (p 58).

Ide (1974) also considers that "television cannot stand alone in the educational process, and hence will be utilised most successfully in a mix with other media". (p 350).

Future studies should investigate how other media or teaching techniques might be combined with televised instruction. For instance in the classroom, a lesson could be conducted in the following way. A teacher introduces the lesson, switches on the television to an animated portrayal of the subject, switches off the television to conduct a role-play in which the children themselves are involved, explains what has been seen

and performed by means of charts or diagrams, and calls for comments from the students.

In the home, a television programme like Bright Rides viewed by itself would also not produce important effects on children unless it was reinforced by other influences in their lives. Bogatz and Ball (1971) and Singer and Singer (1976) have indicated that when a parent or adult mediator explains and encourages participation in the programmes, children learn more than if they are left to view the programmes alone. Future studies should thus investigate the effects on parents and children who the two are encouraged to view television together. For instance it is proposed that the child's self-concept might improve in the presence of an older person admiring his response to the television programme. In addition viewing together might create an appetite for learning from each other which might be of greater importance than the learning of a set of skills. Future research could also investigate the proposal that when adults take the opportunity to watch a child respond and learn, they develop more constructive expectations of the child that in turn have important consequences for the child's expectations for himself.

In addition to these proposals a number of questions are posed which indicate new avenues for research.

- (a) When children begin watching television for the first time, at whatever age this occurs, how does the experience affect their perception of themselves and the world around them?
- (b) Can television help people understand their own thoughts and feelings as well as the thoughts and feelings of others?

- (c) What cognitive effects does television have on children as young as one or two years of age? Do the formats of television "supplant in" the mental operations of the young child, making him develop televisual schemas?
- (d) Will the young South African child growing up with television develop cognitively, socially and politically in a different way to the individual who did not see television throughout his life?
- (e) More specifically, since cognition and social values are said to be closely linked (Feuerstein & Rand 1975), will the separate development model presented by S A T V cause individuals to have a more insular conception of their society as opposed to individuals previously exposed to printed media, such as the newspapers, which often emphasized the common collectiveness of men rather than their separate ethnic differences?

Questions of this nature require long-term research on a variety of programmes. While television is still in its infantile stages in South Africa, there appears to be no pressing need to answer these questions immediately. However, television is destined to become more important in our daily lives and so future research should begin investigating these proposed questions.

### 13. Summary and Conclusion:

The major aim of this study was to demonstrate that cognitive skills can be acquired through watching a television programme which intends to teach a range of cognitive skills.

However, in fulfilling this aim it was considered important to produce a television programme that would not only educate, but would entertain at the same time. To this end, special entertaining devices were written into the script of Bright Rides and these appeared to have appeal for the viewing children in that they sang, laughed and clapped while they watched the programme. A number of adult viewers, however, indicated that appeal and interest could have been increased, for example, by presenting popular puppets more regularly, but comments were generally favourable as to the entertainment level of Bright Rides.

The fact that Bright Rides was entertaining was perhaps one of the most important outcomes of the study since it was the view of the producer that if a childrens' education programme lacks the incentive of fun and enjoyment it should not be presented at all. It is for the very reason that entertainment and excitement have been neglected in many education practices, that education has come to be viewed as tedious and uninteresting. Clearly it is time to revitalise the whole process of education, and enjoyable educational television can lead the way in this venture.

It was also considered necessary to teach cognitive skills that would help prepare the child for school, despite the views of certain education critics that educational television programmes should supercede school curricula and teach the child skills that he will never learn at school. In this study, culturally disadvantaged children were the televiewing sample, and since these children often lack mediated learning experiences, necessary for school readiness, and usually flounder when they enter school,

Bright Rides aimed to help prepare them face school without the fears of future failure. Whether this ideal was achieved could only be measured in future years when the child would enter school, but the present study set its task at investigating whether Bright Rides was effective in teaching cognitive skills to these preschoolers. The results indicated that while some skills were taught successfully, others were not, and thus that while Bright Rides has the potential to instruct, it has scope for improvement.

In the testing of cognitive skills, it became apparent that mastery would not be achieved in any skill that was taught. However, this fact did not detract from the results, since Bogatz and Ball (1971) have noted that mastery learning is rare in any educational programme. The producer did not expect that Bright Rides would teach any skill perfectly, nor was it viewed as the only means a child would have throughout his educational career of achieving mastery in any skill area. It was simply seen as an impetus to interest children in a range of learning possibilities and to make some learning impact, and in this venture it appears to have succeeded.

The intended effects of Bright Rides, namely the teaching of cognitive skills were tested by means of the M-test, a test of cognitive skills, specially adapted for this programme. However, an important unintended outcome also occurred. A significant improvement was made by viewers on Peabody Picture Vocabulary and Draw a Person scores, indicating that intelligence measures were also being positively affected by

Bright Rides. This result demonstrated that the unintended effects of a television programme are often more important than the intended effects and implied that if a programme like Bright Rides could help raise the measured intelligence scores of its viewers, formats of this type should be exploited with a view to raising the intelligence levels of future generations.

Another aim of the study was to ascertain whether some children learnt or benefited more than others, after watching Bright Rides. Whilst isolated differences occurred on a number of tests, it appeared that child care centre differences, sex differences, language and televiewing differences did not significantly affect most scores of the sample.

From these results one might conclude that children from these different groups all benefited from the programme, although some of the older, English speaking, regular television viewers at Jubilee and Dorkas crèches might have grasped the intentions of the programme faster than others.

Older children probably understood the programme better than the younger children because of their more advanced stage of cognitive development. English speakers heard the programme in their mother tongue, in contrast to Afrikaans speakers; regular televiewers were probably more television literate than rare televiewers and children at the two crèches probably had more to learn from a television presentation than had their counterparts at the nursery school who received real life instruction in cognitive skills acquisition.

These results also highlighted the potential of Bright Rides for future viewers for if it was beneficial to most of its present viewers it could be of value to larger groups of children of different races, education standards, intelligence levels and socio-economic status.

Bright Rides was presented in the child care centres and received enthusiastic reports from staff members of those centres. However, as has been mentioned above, it was hoped that Bright Rides would be broadcast nationally to reach the child in his home, to take the place of absent mediated learning experiences or to supplement existing learning experiences. It was also envisaged that parents should be encouraged to join their children in televiewing so that parents and children would gain an appreciation of how much they could learn from each other, and that parents would develop realistic expectations of their children through contact during these televiewing experiences.

It was noted however, that although the programme appeared effective for the present viewing group, the results indicated that improvements should be made in the production of Bright Rides and in the test to measure what was learned. However, the function of formative research is continuously to revise and improve a process or product, and thus research into Bright Rides has only begun. The results gained from this study, pertaining to the production and pedagogical effects, must now be injected into a new production with new or modified objectives. In its role as the initiator of a cyclic process of research, Bright Rides is perhaps

most constructive since it can provide new material and ideas for the national network of South Africa in the hope of finding the best methods to teach South African children.

To conclude, as has been mentioned above, the study on Bright Rides was conducted as an experiment into the production and testing of an educational programme and to the extent that it has provided new ideas in these areas, which may be used in future programmes, it has been of value.. However, since psychological research aims to establish a general rule from a specific example, the production of Bright Rides will prove most useful if it can provide a greater understanding of educational television in general, and the manner in which children learn from it.

As yet educational television is still an undiscovered area of research, although its potential has been perceived and recorded. Lesser (1974) notes that television has opened unique opportunities for children since it provides

"vivid visual portrayals of the world beyond classrooms and neighbourhoods, and children respond to them as they have never responded to verbal and abstract education" (p 150).

Bright Rides demonstrated that children respond enthusiastically to a televisual presentation, and further that if the programme is exciting and stimulating they will learn joyfully from it.

It has shown that culturally disadvantaged children can learn a range of cognitive skills from its presentation, although the method by which they learn those skills is still not understood. It has also shown that measured intelligence scores increase and that

attitudes to self, school and others might be improved through watching a programme that encourages positive attitudes. These findings must be tested in other productions and with other samples, but they provide important conclusions which if further exploited may stimulate South African childrens' educational television to great achievements.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, W.H. Instructional Media Research : Past, Present and Future. Audiovisual Communication Review, 1971, Vol. 19, pp. 10.
- Almy, H. The Early Childhood Educator at Work. McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.
- Anastasi, A. Psychological Tests : Uses and Abuses. Teachers College Record, 1961, Vol. 62, pp. 389 - 393.
- Anastasi, A. Psychological Testing. New York, MacMillan Publishing Co. Inc. 1968.
- Ancona, L. Il film come elemento nella dinamica dell'aggressività, Revue Internationale de filmologie, 1963, 13, pp. 27-32.
- Arnheim, R. Film as Art. Berkeley, Univ. of California Press, 1957.
- Arnheim, R. Visual Thinking. Berkeley, Univ. of California Press, 1969.
- Balare, C.G.M. Social Class Differences in the Performance of Nigerian Children on the Draw-A-Man Test. In L.J. Cronbach and P.J.D. Drenth (Eds) Mental Tests and Cultural Adaptation, the Hague, Mouton, 1972 pp. 355 - 363.
- Ball, S. Personal Communication to C. Galaun, Nov. 1976.
- Bandura, A. Influence of Model's Reinforcement Contingencies on the Acquisition of Imitative Responses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, Vol. 1, pp. 589 - 595.
- Bandura, A. Social Learning Theory of Identificatory Processes. In A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of Socialisation Theory and Research, Chicago : Rand McNally, 1969, pp. 213 - 262.
- Bandura, A. Psychological Modelling, Conflicting Theories. Chicago, Aldine Atherton, 1971.
- Bandura, A. & Huston, A.C. Identification as a Process of Incidental Learning. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, Vol. 63 (2), pp. 311 - 318.
- Bandura, A. & Kupers, C.J. Transmission of Self Reinforcement Through Modelling. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, Vol. 69, pp. 61 - 69.
- Bandura, A. & McDonald, F.J. The Influence of Social Reinforcement and the Behaviour of Models in Shaping Childrens' Moral Judgements. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963 b, Vol. 67, pp. 272 - 281.

- Bandura, A. & Menlove, F.L. Factors Determining Vicarious Extinction of Avoidance Behaviour Through Symbolic Modeling. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, Vol. 5, pp. 16 - 22.
- Bandura, A. & Mischel, W. Modification of Self-Imposed Delay of Reward Through Exposure to Live and Symbolic Models. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, Vol. 2, pp. 698 - 705.
- Bandura, A. Ross, D. & Ross, S.A. Vicarious Reinforcement and Imitative Learning. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963 a, Vol. 67, pp. 601 - 607.
- Bandura A. Ross, D. & Ross, S.A. A Comparative Test of the Status, Envy, Social Power, and Secondary Reinforcement Theories of Identification Learning. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963 c, Vol. 67, pp. 527 - 534.
- Bandura, A. & Walters, R.H. Social Learning and Personality Development. New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Bane, M.J. & Jencks, C. The Schools and Equal Opportunity (1972) in Leiner, M. Children of the Cities. New York, Plume Books, 1975.
- Barthes, R. Image - Music - Text. Essays Selected and Translated by Steven Heath. Fontana, Great Britain, 1977.
- Bates, E. & Silvern, L. Social Adjustment and Politeness in Preschoolers. Journal of Communication, 1977, Vol. 27 (2), pp. 104 - 111.
- Bereiter, C. & Engelmann, S. Observations on the Use of Direct Instruction With Young Disadvantaged Children (1966) in J.L. Frost, (Ed) 1968.
- Bereiter, C. & Engelmann, S. Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Preschool. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Berkowitz, L. Violence in the Mass Media. In L. Berkowitz, Aggression : A Social Psychological Analysis. New York, McGraw Hill, 1962, pp. 229 - 255.
- Berlyne, D.E. Structure and Direction in Thinking. New York, Wiley 1965.
- Bernstein, B. A Socio-Linguistic Approach to Social Learning. (1965) in J.L. Frost (Ed) 1968.
- Bernstein, B. Social Structure, Language and Learning in J.P. de Cecco (Ed) 1969.
- Biblow, E. Imaginative Play and the Control of Aggressive Behaviour. In J.L. Singer (Ed), The Child's World of Make Believe : Experimental Studies of

- Imaginative Play. New York, Academic Press, 1973 pp. 104 - 128.
- Block, C.E. Communicating with the Urban Poor. An Exploratory Inquiry. Journalism Quarterly, 1970, Vol. 47 pp. 3 - 11.
- Blood, R. Social Class and Family Control of Television Viewing. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1961, Vol. 7, pp. 205 - 222.
- Bogatz, G.A. & Ball, S. The Second Year of Sesame Street : A Continuing Evaluation. Vol. 1. Princeton, New Jersey. Educational Testing Service. Nov. 1971.
- Bower, R.T. Television and the Public. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.
- Bowlby, J. Child Care and the Growth of Love. London, The Whitefriars Press Ltd., 1961.
- Brindley, M. Western Coloured Township : Problems of an Urban Slum. Johannesburg, Ravan Press, 1976.
- Brittain, V.C. Some Early Findings of Research on Pre-School Programmes for Culturally Deprived Children. In J.L. Frost (Ed) 1968.
- Broadbent, D.E. Perception and Communication. New York, Pergamon Press, 1958.
- Brown, T.R. Children and Television. London, Collier and MacMillan, 1976.
- Brown, R. & Bellugi, V. Three Processes in the Childs Acquisition of Syntax. Harvard Educational Review, 1964, Vol. 34, pp. 133 - 151.
- Bruner, J.S. The Course of Cognitive Growth. American Psychologist, 1964, Vol. 19, pp. 1 - 15.
- Bruner, J. Studies in Cognitive Growth. New York : Wiley, 1966.
- Olver, R. & Greenfield, P.
- Bryan, J.H. & Walbeck, N.B. Preaching and Practising Generosity : Childrens Actions and Reactions. Child Development, 1970, Vol. 41, pp. 329 - 353.
- Bryan, J. & Schwartz, T. Effects of Film Material Upon Childrens Behaviour. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, Vol. 75, pp. 50 - 59.
- Bugelski, B.R. Learning Theory and the Reading Process. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual Conference on Reading, University of Pittsburgh, July 1968.
- Cameron, P. & Janky, C. The Effects of TV Violence Upon Children : A Naturalistic Experiment. Proceedings of the 79th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association. American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C. 1971, pp. 233 - 234.

- Capecchi, V. & Livolsi, M. The Socialisation Process in Pre-Adolescent Children. Rome, Radiotelevisione Italiana, Servizio Opinioni, 1973.
- Cassirer, H.R. Radio as the Peoples Medium. Journal of Communication. 1977, Vol. 27 (2), pp. 154 - 157.
- Castell, P.J. & Goldstein, J.H. Social Occasions for Joking : A Cross Cultural Study. In A.J. Chapman and H.C. Foot (Eds). Its a Funny Thing Humour. International Conference of Humour and Laughter. New York, Pergamon Press, 1977.
- Cattell, R.B. Factor Analysis. New York, Harper, 1952.
- Charlesworth, W.R. The Role of Surprise in Cognitive Development in D. Elkind & J.H. Flavell (Eds). Studies in Cognitive Development, New York : Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Child, D. The Essentials of Factor Analysis. London, Holt, Rinehart & Winston Ltd., 1970.
- Chu, G.C. & Schramm, W. Learning from Television - What the Research says. Washing D.C, National Association of Educational Broadcaster's, 1967.
- Coates, B. Pusser, H. & Goodman, I. The Influence of Sesame Street and Mister Roger's Neighbourhood on Children's Social Behaviour in the Preschool. Child development, (in press) 1975.
- Coffin, T.E. Television's Impact on Society. American Psychologist, 1955, Vol. 10, pp. 630 - 641.
- Comstock, G. Christen F.G, Fisher M.L, Quarles, R.C, & Richards, W.D. Television and Human Behaviour : The Key Studies. Santa Monica, C.A., Rand, 1975.
- Comstock, G. & Lindsey G. Television and Human Behaviour : The Research Horizon, Future and Present. Santa Monica C.A. Rand, 1975.
- Cooney, J.C. Report on the Potential Uses of Television in Preschool Education. New York, Carnegie Corporation, 1967.
- Croce, M.A. Controllo dell'effetto mnestico Zeigarnik con material filmico fermatico. Revue internationale de filmologie, 1963, 13, pp. 45 - 50.
- Cruise O'Brien, R. Professionalism in Broadcasting in Developing Countries. Journal of Communication, 1977, Vol. 27 (2), pp. 150 - 153.
- Dahlgren, P. Television in the Socialisation Process : Structures and Programming of the Swedish Broadcasting Corporation - in G.A. Comstock and E.A. Rubinstein (Eds). Television and Social

- Behaviour. Vol. 1. Media Content and Control. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1972, pp. 533 - 546.
- Day, H.I. & Berlyne, D. Intrinsic Maturation. In G.S. Lesser (Ed) Psychology and Educational Practice, Glenview, Illinois, Scott Foresman, 1971.
- De Cecco, J.P. The Psychology of Language Thought and Instruction Readings. Great Britain, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.
- De Fleur, M. Occupational Roles as Portrayed on Television. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1964. Vol. 28, pp. 57 - 74.
- De Fleur, M.L. Theories of Mass Communication. New York, David McKay Co. Inc. 1970.
- Dennis, W. Goodenough Scores, Art Experience and Modernisation. Journal of Social Psychology. 1966, Vol. 68, pp. 211 - 228.
- Deregowski, J.B. & Byth, W. Hudsons Pictures in Pandora's Box. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1967, Vol. 1, pp. 315 - 323.
- Dickenson, D. Personal Communication. 1978.
- Dieuzide, H. Educational Technology for Developing Countries. In D.R. Olson (Ed) 1974.
- Dizard, W.P. Television a World View. Syracuse University Press, 1966.
- Edelstein, A.S. Perspectives in Mass Communication. Copenhagen, Einar Harcks Forlag, 1966.
- Edgar, P.M. Social and Personality Factors Influencing Learning From Film and Television. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, February 1973.
- Efron, E. & Hickey, N. TV and Your Child : In Search of an Answer. New York, Triangle Publications (TV guide), 1969.
- Elkind, D. Developmental Studies of Figurative Perception. In L.P. Lipsitt & H.W. Reese (Eds) Advances in Child Development and Behaviour. Vol. 4, New York, Academic Press, 1969.
- Ellis, R.R. Educational Programming for Preschool Children (1967) in J.L. Frost, (Ed) 1968.
- Epstein, R. Aggression Toward Outgroups as a Function of Authoritarianism and Imitation of Aggressive Models. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, Vol. 3, pp. 574 - 579.
- Erikson, E.H. Childhood and Tradition in Two American Tribes. Psychoanalytic Studies, Child, 1945, Vol. pp. 319 - 350.

- Erikson, E.H. The Problem of Ego Identity. Journal of American Psychoanalysis Association, 1956, Vol. 4, pp. 56 - 121.
- Feshbach, S. The Drive-Reducing Function of Fantasy Behaviour. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, Vol. 50, pp. 3 - 11.
- Feshbach, S. & Singer, R. Television and Aggression. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass, 1971.
- Feuerstein, R. The Deficiency Cognitive Functions : lecture delivered at Wits University, June 1978.
- Feuerstein, R. & Rand, Y. Mediated Learning Experiences : An Outline of the Proximal Etiology for Differential Development of Cognitive Functions. International understanding, New York 1975.
- Fowler, W. The Design of Early Development Learning Programs for Disadvantaged Young Children in J.L. Frost, (Ed) 1968.
- Freire, P. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. England, Penguin Books Ltd., England 1972.
- Freud, S. New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis : New York, W.W. Norton and Co., 1933.
- Friedrich, L. Stein, A. & Susman, E. The Effects of Prosocial Television and Environmental Conditions on Preschool Children. Paper presented at American Psychological Association meetings, 1975.
- Frost, J.L. (Ed) Early Childhood Education Rediscovered. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.
- Frost, J.L. & Rowland, T. Cognitive Development and Literacy in Disadvantaged Children : A Structure-Process Approach. In J.L. Frost, (Ed) 1968.
- Gattegno, C. Towards a Visual Culture : Educating Through Television. New York, Avon Books, 1969.
- Gentile, F. & Miller, S.M. Television and Social Class. Sociology and Social Research, 1961, Vol. 45, pp. 259 - 264.
- Gerbner, G. Violence in Television Drama : Trends and Symbolic Functions. In G.A. Comstock and E.A. Rubinstein (Eds) Television and Social Behaviour. Vol. 1 : Media Content and Control. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Gerbner, G. & Gross, L. The Scary World of TV's Heavy Viewer. Psychology Today, April 1976, pp. 41 - 45, & 89.
- Gehartz-Franck, I. Neber Geschehenestaltungen In der Auffassung von Filmen Durch Kinder. Leipzig : Barth 1955.

- Gesell, A. The Ontogenesis of Infant Behaviour. In L. Carmichael (Ed) Manual of Child Psychology, New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1954.
- Getzels, J.W. Preschool Education. (1966). In J.L. Frost (Ed) 1968.
- Ginsburg, H. The Myth of the Deprived Child, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, Inc. 1972.
- Ginsburg, H. & Oppen S. Piaget's Theory of Intellectual Development. New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1969.
- Gomberg, A.W. The Four-Year Old Child and Television : the Effects on His Play at School. Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1961.
- Gombrich, E.H. Art and Illusion. New York, Pantheon Books, 1961.
- Gombrich, E.H. The Visual Image. In D.R. Olson, (Ed) 1974.
- Goodenough, F.L. & Harris, D.B. Studies in the Psychology of Children's Drawings. Psychological bulletin, 1950, Vol. 47 pp. 369 - 433.
- Goodman, N. Languages of Art, Indianapolis, Bobbs - Merrill Co. 1968.
- Gray, I. TV Trial Has Them Worried. The Star May 8 1978 pp. 8 (entertainment section).
- Gray, I. Let's Put the View in Viewing. The Star, July 17, 1978.
- Green, R.L. (1967) Some Effects of Deprivation on Intelligence Achievement and Cognitive Growth. (1967) In J.L. Frost, (Ed) 1968.
- Hofmann, L.J. & Morgan, R.F.
- Greenberg, B.S. & Dervin, B. Use of the Mass Media by the Urban Poor. New York - Praeger, 1970.
- Greenberg, B. & Dominick, J. Racial and Social Class Differences in Teenagers' Use of Television. Journal of Broadcasting, 1969, Vol. 13, pp. 1331 - 1334.
- Gropper, G.L. The Design of Stimulus Materials in Response Oriented Programs. Audiovisual Communication Review, 1970, Vol. 18, pp. 129 - 160.
- Gross, L. Modes of Communication and the Acquisition of Symbolic Competence. 1973 In D.R. Olson (Ed) 1974.
- Gurevitch, M. The Structure and Content of Television Broadcasting in Four Countries. In G.A. Comstock & E.A. Rubinstein (Eds) Television and Social Behaviour, Vol. 1 Media Content and Control. Washington, DC., Government Printing Office 1972, pp. 374 - 385.
- Handelman, D. & Kapferer, B. Forms of Joking Activity : A Comparative Approach. American Anthropologist. 1972, Vol. 74, pp. 484 - 517.

- Harris, D.B. Children's Drawings as Measures of Intellectual Maturity. A Revision and Extension of the Good-enough Draw-A-Man Test. New York, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1963.
- Harwood, A.C. The Way of a Child. An Introduction to The Work of Rudolph Steiner For Children. Anthroposophical Publishing Company, London 1952 (1940).
- Harwood, A.C. The Recovery of Man in Childhood. A Study in the Educational Work of Rudolph Steiner. Hodder and Stoughton. New York, 1975 (1958).
- Hawkes, T. New Accents. Structuralism and Semiotics. London Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1977.
- Head, S. Content Analysis of Television Drama Programs. Film Quarterly, 1954, Vol. 9, pp. 175 - 194.
- Henderson, R.N.  
Swanson, R.  
Zimmerman, B.J. &  
Bergan, J.R. Televised Cognitive Skill Instruction for Papago Native American Children. Unpublished Paper, submitted to G. Comstock and G. Lindsey for Television and Human Behaviour The Research Horizon Future and Present, 1975. pp. 67 - 68.
- Henker, B.A. The Effect of Adult Model Relationships on Children's Play and Task Imitation. Dissertation Abstracts 1964, Vol. 24 (11), p. 4797.
- Henningsson, R.  
& Filipson, L. Television Viewing of 3 - 8 Year Olds. Stockholm Sveriges Radio Audience and Programme Research Department. 1975.
- Hicks, D.J. Imitation and Retention of Film-Mediated Aggressive Fear and Adult models. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 1965 Vol. 2 (1), pp. 97 - 100.
- Hildreth, C.H.  
Griffith, N.L. &  
Gauvran, M.E. Metropolitan Readiness Tests: Manual of Directions. U.S.A. Harcourt, Brace & World Inc. 1965.
- Himmelweit, H.T. Television Revisited. New Society 1962 Vol. 5, pp. 17.
- Himmelweit, H.  
Oppenheim, A.N. &  
Vince, P. Television and the Child : an Empirical Study of the Effects of Television on the Young. London : Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Hoban, G.F. &  
Van Ormer, E.B. Instructional Film Research 1918 - 1950, New York, Arno Press, 1972.
- Holt, J. Big Bird, Meet Dick and Jane. Atlantic Monthly, May 1971.
- Holt, J. How Children Fail. Harmondsworth, Penguin 1972.
- Honstead, C. The Development Theory of Jean Piaget (1968). In J.L. Frost, (Ed) 1968.

- Horner, V.M. Misconceptions Concerning Language in the Disadvantaged (1966). In J.L. Frost, (Ed) 1968.
- Huck, S.W. & McLean, R.N. Using a Repeated Measures Anova to analyse the Data from a Pretest-Posttest design: A Potentially Confusing Task. Psychological Bulletin 1975, Vol. 82 (4) pp. 511 - 518.
- Hudson, W. Cultural Problems in Pictorial Perception. South African Journal of Science. 1962 a, Vol. 58 (7), pp. 189 - 196.
- Hudson, W. Pictorial Perception and Educational Adaptation in Africa. Psychologia Africana, 1962, Vol. 9, pp. 226 - 239.
- Hudson, W. The Study of the Problem of Pictorial Perception Among Unacculturated Groups. International Journal of Psychology 1967, Vol. 2, pp. 89 - 107.
- Hudson, W. The Eye of the Beholder. Newscheck, 1970, Vol. 7, pp. 16 - 17.
- Huey, E.B. The Psychology and Pedagogy of Reading. New York, MacMillan, 1908.
- Ide, T.R. The Potentials and Limitations of Television as an Educational Medium. In D.R. Olson, 1974.
- Illich, I. Deschooling Society. London, Calder and Boyers, 1971.
- Inhelder, B. & Piaget, J. The Growth of Logical Thinking : From Childhood to Adolescence. New York, Basic Books, Inc. 1958.
- Irvine, S.H. Factor Analysis of African Abilities and Attainments : Constructs Across Cultures. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, Vol. 71, pp. 20 - 32.
- Jenkins, J.R. Neale, D.S. & Deno, S.L. Differential Memory for Picture and Word Stimuli. Journal of Educational Psychology 1967, Vol. 58, pp. 303 - 307.
- Jensen, A.R. Social Class and Verbal Learning in J.P. De Cecco (Ed) 1967.
- Jensen, A.R. Social Class and Verbal Learning. In M. Deutsch., I. Katz, & A.R. Jensen (Eds), Social Class, Race and Psychological Development. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968, Ch. 4.
- Jensen, A.R. How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement? Harvard Educational Review, 1969 Vol. 39, pp. 1 - 123.
- John Vianney, Sr. Personal Communication 1978.
- Kael, P. Going Steady. New York. Little Brown, 1970.
- Kagan, J. The Determinants of Attention in the Infant. American Scientist, 1970, Vol. 58 pp. 298 - 306.

- Kagan, J. Change and Continuity in Infancy. New York, Wiley, 1971.
- Kagan, J. & Kogan, N. Individuality and Cognitive Performance. In P.H. Mussen (Ed) Manual of Child Psychology. New York, Wiley, 1970.
- Kaiser, H.F. Computer Programme for Varimax Rotation in Factor Analysis. Educational Psychology Measurement, 1959, Vol. 19, pp. 413 - 420.
- Katz, E. Can Authentic Cultures Survive New Media? Journal of Communication, 1977, Vol. 27 (2) pp. 113 - 121.
- Kerlinger, F.N. Foundations of Behavioural Research. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Klein, G. & Hockley, J. Television Teaching Techniques : An Introduction To the Production and Presentation of Educational Television. Angus and Robertson Pty. Ltd. Sydney Australia, 1972.
- Kniveton, B.H. Social Learning and Imitation in Relation to Television. In R. Brown (Ed) 1976.
- Kniveton, B.H. & Stephenson, G.M. The Effect of Pre-Experience on Imitation of an Aggressive Film Model. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1970, Vol. 9, pp. 31 - 36.
- Kniveton, B.H. & Stephenson, G.M. The Effect of Social Class on Imitation in a Pre-Experience Situation. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1972, Vol. 12, pp. 225 - 234.
- Koenig, A.E. & Hill, R.B. (Eds) The Farther Vision - Educational Television Today. Wisconsin, The University of Wisconsin Press 1969.
- Kohlberg, L. Cognitive Stages and Preschool Education (1966) in J.L. Frost, (Ed) 1968.
- Kohlberg, L. Early Education : A Cognitive-Developmental View. Child Development 1968, Vol. pp. 1013 - 1057.
- Lavatelli, G.S. A Piaget-Derived Model for Compensatory Preschool Education (1966). In J.L. Frost (Ed) 1968.
- Lefkowitz, M. Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J.S. Status Factor in Pedestrian Violation of Traffic Signals. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, Vol. 51 pp. 704 - 705.
- Leiner, M. (Ed) Children of the Cities. New York, Plume Books, New American Library, 1975.
- Lesser, G.S. Learning, Teaching, and Television Production for Children : the Experience of Sesame Street. Harvard Educational Review, 1972, Vol. 42(2), pp. 232 - 270.
- Lesser, G.S. Children and Television : Lessons from Sesame Street. New York, Vintage Books, 1974.

- Liebert, R.M.  
Neale, J.M. &  
Davidson, E.S.      The Early Window - Effects of Television on Children and Youth. New York, Pergammon Press Inc., 1973.
- Liebert, R.M.  
Odom, R.D. Hill,  
J.H. & Huff, R.L.      Effects of Age and Rule Familiarity on the Production of Modeled Language Constructions. Developmental Psychology, 1969, Vol. 1, pp. 108 - 112.
- Loevinger, J.      Intelligence as Related to Socio-Economic Factors. National Soc. Study Educ. 39th Yearbook, 1940, Part 11 pp. 159 - 211.
- Lomax, A.      Appeal for Cultural Equity. Journal of Communication, 1977, Vol. 27 (2), pp. 125 - 138.
- Lovaas, O.I.      Effect of Exposure to Symbolic Aggression on Aggressive Behaviour. Child Development, 1961, Vol. 32, pp. 37 - 44.
- Luria, A.R.      The Role of Speech in the Regulation of Normal and Abnormal Behaviour. New York, Pergammon Press, Inc. 1961.
- Lyle, J.      Television in Daily Life : Patterns of Use Overview. In E.A. Rubinstein, G.A. Comstock and J.P. Murray (Eds) Television and Social Behaviour, Vol. 4. Television in Day to Day Life : Patterns of Use. Washington D.C., Government Printing Office, 1972, pp. 1 - 32.
- Lyle, J. &  
Hoffman, H.R.      Childrens Use of Television and Other Media. In E.A. Rubinstein G.A. Comstock and O.P. Murray (Eds) Television and Social Behaviour Vol. 4 Television in Day to Day Life : Patterns of Use. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office 1972, pp. 129 - 256.
- Martin, T.H.  
Byrne, R.B.  
Wedemeyer, D.J.      Balance : An Aspect Of the Right to Communicate. Journal of Communication. 1977, Vol. 27 (2), pp. 158 - 162.
- Mausner, B.      Studies in Social Interaction : The Effect of Variation in One Partner's Prestige on the Interaction of Observer Pairs. Journal of Applied Psychology. 1953, Vol. 27, pp. 391 - 393.
- Meyersohn, R.B.      Leisure and Television : A Study in Compatibility. Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, 1965.
- Miller, R.J.      Cross-Cultural Research in the Perception of Pictorial Materials. Psychological Bulletin, 1973, Vol. 80, pp. 135 - 150.
- Millerson, G.      The Technique of Television Production, New York, Hastings House, 1961.
- Mischel, W. &  
Grusec, J.      Determinants of the Rehearsal and Transmission of Neutral and Aversive Behaviours. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, Vol. 3, pp. 197 - 205.

- Mukerji, R. Roots in Early Childhood for Continuous Learning (1965) in J.L. Frost, 1968.
- Murray, J.P. Television in Inner-City Homes : Viewing Behaviour of Young Boys. In E.A. Rubinstein, G.A. Comstock, & J.P. Murray (Eds) Television and Social Behaviour Vol. IV. Television in Day-to-Day Life : Patterns of Use. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972, pp. 345 - 394.
- Mussen, P. & Rutherford, E. Effects of Aggressive Cartoons on Children's Aggressive Play. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, Vol. 62, pp. 461 - 464.
- McCall, R.B. Fundamental Statistics For Psychology. New York, Harcourt, Braile & World Inc., 1970.
- McLuhan, M. Understanding Media. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- McLuhan, M. Understanding Media : The Extension of Man. New York, McGraw Hill Book Co. 1965.
- Newson, J. & Newson, E. Patterns of Infant Care in an Urban Community. London - George Allen & Urwin, 1963.
- Noble, G. Children in Front of the Small Screen. Great Britain, Constable and Co. Ltd., 1975.
- Olson, D.R. (Ed) Media and Symbols : The Forms of Expression, Communication, and Education. The 73rd Yearbook of the National Society For the Study of Education, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Olson, D.R. & Bruner, J.S. Learning Through Experience and Learning Through Media. In D.R. Olson (Ed) 1974.
- Ortar, G. Is a Verbal Test Cross-Cultural? Scripts Hierosolymitana, (Hebrew University, Jerusalem), 1963, Vol. 13, pp. 219 - 235.
- Ortar, G. Some Principles for Adaptation of Psychological Tests. In L.J. Cronbach and P.J. Drenth (Eds) Mental Tests and Cultural Adaptation. The Hague : Mouton, 1972 pp. 111 - 120.
- Packard, R.G. Psychology of Learning and Instruction - A Performance Based Course. Ohio, Bell and Howell, 1975.
- Paivio, A. On the Functional Significance of Imagery. Psychological Bulletin 1970, Vol. 73 (6) pp. 385 - 392.
- Paivio, A. & Yarmey, A.D. Pictures Versus Words and Stimuli and Responses in Paired-Associate Learning. Psychonomic Science, 1966, Vol. 5, pp. 235 - 236.
- Palmer, E.L. Formative Research in the Production of Television for Children. In D.R. Olson (Ed) 1974.

- Parker, H.            The Beholders Share and the Problem of Litteracy  
in D.R. Olson (Ed) 1974.
- Piaget, J.            The Psychology of Intelligence. New York,  
Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc. 1950.
- Piaget, J.            The Child's Conception of Number. London,  
Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1952.
- Piaget, J.            Les Mecanismes Perceptifs. Paris, Presses  
Univer France, 1961.
- Piaget, J.            Play, Dreams, and Imitation in Childhood. New  
York, Norton and Company Inc. 1962 a.
- Piaget, J.            The Origins of Intelligence in Children. New  
York, W.W. Norton & Co. Inc. 1962 b.
- Piaget J. &  
Inhelder, B.        The Child's Conception of Space. London,  
Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd. 1956.
- Pool, I.            The Changing Flow of Television. Journal of  
Communication, 1977, Vol. 27 (2), pp. 139 - 149.
- Reese, H.W.        Imagery and Contextual meaning. Psychological  
Bulletin, 1970, Vol. 73, (6), pp. 404 - 414.
- Reeves, B.F.        The Responses of Children in Six Small Viewing  
Groups to Sesame Street Shows Nos. 261 - 274.  
New York, Childrens Television Workshop. 1971.
- Roberts, D.F. &  
Schramm, W.        (Eds) The Process and Effects of Mass Communication.  
Urbana, Univ. of Illinois Press, 1971.
- Rogers, C.            Freedom to Learn. Columbus Ohio, Charles F.  
Merril, 1969.
- Rohwer, W.D. Jr.    Images and Pictures in Childrens Learning :  
Research Results and Educational Implications.  
Psychological Bulletin, 1970, Vol. 73 (6),  
pp. 393 - 403.
- Roscoe, J.T.        Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioural  
Sciences. New York, Holt, Rinehart, & Winston,  
Inc. 1969.
- Rosenbaum M.E.  
& Tucker I.        The Competence of the Model and the Learning of  
Imitation and Non-Imitation. Journal of Experi-  
mental Psychology 1962, Vol. 63 (2), pp. 183 -  
190.
- Rosenblith, J.F.    Learning by Imitation in Kindergarten Children.  
Child Development, 1959, Vol. 30, pp. 69 - 80.
- Rosenhan, D. &  
White, G.M.        Observation and Rehearsal as Determinants of  
Pro-Social Behaviour. Journal of Personality and  
Social Psychology, 1967, Vol. 5, pp. 424 - 431.

- Russel, B. Sceptical Essays. London, Allen & Unwin 1928.
- Russell, D.H. Childrens Thinking. Boston, Ginn & Company, 1956.
- Salomon, G. Can We Affect Cognitive Skills Through Visual Media? An Hypothesis Initial Findings. AV-Communication Review, Winter 1972.
- Salomon, G. Annual Report of the First Year of Research on Cognitive Effects of Media, Israel Hebrew U. of Jerusalem, submitted to the Spencer Foundation September 1974.
- Salomon, G. Cross Cultural Distribution of Television : A study of Its Effects on Mental Skills, Israel. The Hebrew U. of Jerusalem. August 1974.
- Salomon, G. Sesame Street in Israel. Its Instructional and Psychological Effects on Children. Israel. The Hebrew U. of Jerusalem, 1974.
- Salomon, G. What is Learned and How is it Taught : The Interaction Between Media, Message, Task and Learner. In D.R. Olson (Ed) 1974.
- Salomon, G. Annual Report of the Second Year of Research on Cognitive Effects of Media. Israel. The Heb. U. of Jerusalem. Submitted to the Spencer Foundation 31 October 1975.
- Salomon, G. Annual Report of the Third Year of Research on Cognitive Effects of Media, Israel Heb. U. of Jerusalem. Submitted to the Spencer Foundation December 1976.
- Salomon, G. & Cohen, A.A. Television Formats, Mastery of Mental Skills and the Acquisition of Knowledge. Israel School of Education, Communication Inst. Hebrew U. of Jerusalem. 1975.
- Sapir, E. (1931) Communication, in J.P. de Cecco (Ed) 1969.
- Sarson, E. (Ed) Action for Childrens Television - the First National Symposium on the Effect on Children of Television Programming and Advertising. Avon Books, New York, 1971.
- Schermann, A. Cognitive Goals in the Nursery School. 1966. In J.L. Frost 1968.
- Schramm, W. & Chu, G.C. Learning from Television : What the Research Says. Stanford, Stanford University Institute for Communication Research, 1967.
- Schramm, W. Lyle, J. & Parker, E.B. Television in the Lives of Our Children. California Stanford University Press, 1961.

- Segall, M.H.  
Campbell, D.T. &  
Herskowitz, M.J.      The Influence of Culture on Visual Perception.  
Indianapolis : Bobbs-Merrill, 1966.
- Shaw, G.B.      Man and Superman. London, Penguin, 1903  
(repr. 1946).
- Shmukler, D.      A Study Relating Television Viewing in South  
African Preschoolers to their Spontaneous Play.  
In Press (submitted to S.A. Journal of  
Psychology). 1976.
- Shockley, W.      Negro IQ Deficit : Failure of a Malicious  
Coincidence Model Warrants New Research Pro-  
posals. Review of Educational Research,  
1971, Vol. 41, pp. 227 - 248.
- Shultz, T.R.      A Cognitive Developmental Analysis of Humour.  
In A.J. Chapman and H.C. Foot (Eds.), Humour and  
Laughter : Theory, Research and Applications.  
London, Wiley, 1976.
- Shultz, T.R.      A Cross-Cultural Study of the Structure of Humour.  
In A.J. Chapman and H.C. Foot (Eds.) It's a Funny  
Thing Humour : Int. Conference of Humour and  
Laughter, New York, Pergamon Press 1977.
- Singer, J.L. &  
Singer, D.G.      Fostering Imaginative Play in Preschoolers : Tele-  
vision Viewing and Live Adult Effects. Journal of  
Communication, 1976 in press.
- Singer, D.G. &  
Singer, J.L.      Family Television-Viewing Habits and the Spontan-  
eous Play of Preschool Children. American Journal  
of Orthopsychiatry 1976 (in press).
- Singer, J.L. &  
Singer, D.G.      Imaginative Play and Pretending in Early Childhood :  
Some Experimental Approaches. In A. Davids (Ed)  
Child Personality and Psychopathology, Current Topics,  
Vol. 3, New York, Wiley & Sons, 1976.
- Smythe, D.W.      Reality as Presented by Television. Public opinion  
Quarterly, 1954 Vol. 18, pp. 143 - 156.
- Sonquist, H.D. &  
Kamm, C.K.      Applying Some Piagetian Concepts in the Classroom  
For the Disadvantaged (1967). In J.L. Frost,  
(Ed) 1968.
- Stein, A.H. &  
Lynette, K.      Television Content and Young Childrens Behaviour.  
In Television and Social Behaviour, 1972 b, Vol. 2,  
pp. 202 - 317.
- Stein, G.M. &  
Bryan, J.H.      The Effect of a Television Model Upon Rule Adoption  
Behaviour of Children. Child Development, 1972,  
Vol. 43, pp. 268 - 273.
- Steiner, R.      The Roots of Education. London, Rudolph Steiner  
Press, 1968.

- Streicher, L.H. & Bonney, N.L. Children Talk About Television. Journal of Communication, 1974, Vol. 24, pp. 54 - 61.
- A Survey of Race Relations in South Africa, compiled by Gordon, L., Blignaut, S., Moroney, S., and Cooper C., Natal, Natal Witness 1978.
- Toffler, A. Future Shock. London, Pan Books, 1970.
- Travers, R.M.W. Transmission of Information to Human Receivers. Audio-Visual Communication Review, 1964, Vol. 12, pp. 373 - 385.
- Travers, R.M.W. Man's Information System. Scranton P., Chandlers 1970.
- Troup, F. Forbidden Pastures : Education Under Apartheid. England, International Defence and Aid Fund, 1977.
- Twyford, L.C. Educational Communications Media. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Toronto, Collier-MacMillan Canada Ltd., 1969.
- U man, P.A. A Normative Study of the Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test on a Turkish Sample. In L.J. Cronbach & P.J.D. Drenth (Eds.), Mental Tests and Cultural Adaptation, The Hague, Mouton, 1972, pp. 365 - 370.
- Van der Merwe, H.W. & Groenewald, C.J. (Eds) Occupational and Social Change Among Coloured People in South Africa. Juta & Company, Ltd. - Cape Town 1976.
- Van Zyl, J.A.R. & Tomaselli, K.G. (Eds.) Media and Change. Johannesburg, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977.
- Venter, A.J. Coloured : A Profile of Two Million South Africans. Cape Town, Human and Rousseau, 1974.
- Vernon, P.E. Intelligence and Cultural Environment. London, Methuen, 1969.
- Von Feilitzen, G. The Functions Served by the Media in Brown, R. (Ed.) 1976.
- Von Feilitzen, G. & Linne, O. Living Habits and Broadcast Media Behaviour of 3 - 6 Year Olds. Stockholm, Sveriges Radio Audience and Programme Research Dept. 1969.
- Vygotsky, L.S. Thought and Language. New York, John Wiley and Sons Inc. 1962.
- Warner, W.L. Meker, M. & Eells, K. Social Class in America. Chicago, Science Research Associates, 1949.
- Wertham, F. School for Violence. 1964 In O.N. Larsen (Ed)

- Violence and The Mass Media, Harper & Row : New York 1968.
- Whorf, B.L. The Relation of Habitual Thought and Behaviour to Language, In L. Spier (Ed) Language, Culture and Personality : Essays in Memory of Edward Sapir. Wisconsin, Sapir Memorial Fund. 1941.
- Whorf, B.L. Language, Thought and Reality. John Carroll (Ed) Cambridge, Mass. Mit. Press, 1956.
- Wiley, R.E. Family Viewing, a Balancing of Interests. Journal of Communication, 1977, Vol. 27 (2), pp. 188 - 192.
- Winer, B.J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1962 (1971).
- Worth, S. The Uses of Film in Education and Communication. In D.R. Olson, 1974.
- Yap, M. We Won't Pay More Rent, Say Coloureds. Rand Daily Mail, May 5 1977.
- Youngblood, G. Expanded Cinema, New York E.P. Dutton & Co. 1970.

APPENDIX A1

SAMPLE PROGRAMME OF BRIGHT RIDES.

| PROGRAMME 3.<br>BRIGHT RIDES |        |                                                                                                                         | page 1.                                                                                                                                                 |
|------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY UNIT  |        |                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                         |
| shot                         | camera | video                                                                                                                   | audio                                                                                                                                                   |
|                              |        | PRESENTER<br>HOLDING BIRD'S NEST                                                                                        | HELLO - LOOK AT THIS - IT'S A BIRD'S NEST. I FOUND IT<br>UNDER A TREE AFTER WE HAD A BIG STORM. THE WIND AND THE<br>RAIN MUST'VE SHAKEN IT OFF THE TREE |
|                              |        | PRESENTER                                                                                                               | DO YOU KNOW WHAT KIND OF BIRD BUILDS A NEST LIKE THIS?                                                                                                  |
|                              |        | GRAPHIC OR SLIDE OF WEAVER<br>FOLLOWED BY TELECINE OF<br>WEAVERS HUMMING AROUND AND<br>BUILDING NESTS (IF<br>AVAILABLE) | IT'S A WEAVER.                                                                                                                                          |
|                              |        | PRESENTER WITH 3 BIRDS EGGS<br>AND 3 HENS EGGS                                                                          | WELL, WEAVERS LAY EGGS LIKE THESE. BUT HENS LAY BIGGER EGGS<br>- LIKE THESE.                                                                            |

| PROGRAMME 3. page 2.        |        |                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY UNIT |        |                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| BRIGHT RIDES.               |        |                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| shot                        | camera | video                                        | audio                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|                             |        | PRESENTER AT SIDE OF BOX WITH 4 COMPARTMENTS | NOW HERE'S A GAME WATCH CAREFULLY                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|                             |        | PRESENTER SINGS WITH GUITAR                  | 4 OF THESE THINGS LOOK LIKE EACH OTHER, 4 OF THESE THINGS LOOK LIKE EACH OTHER.<br>4 OF THESE THINGS LOOK LIKE EACH OTHER - BUT ONE OF THESE THINGS IS THE ODD ONE OUT.<br>CAN YOU GUESS WHICH ONE IS NOT LIKE THE OTHER BEFORE I FINISH THIS SONG? |
|                             |        | CHILD                                        | THIS ONE                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|                             |        | PRESENTER                                    | THAT'S RIGHT - THESE 3 ARE SMALL EGGS AND THIS ONE IS LARGE.<br>VERY GOOD.                                                                                                                                                                          |
|                             |        | PRESENTER SINGS WITH GUITAR                  | 4 OF THESE THINGS LOOK LIKE EACH OTHER<br>BUT ONE OF THESE THINGS IS THE ODD ONE OUT -<br>CAN YOU GUESS WHICH ONE IS NOT LIKE THE OTHER BEFORE I FINISH THIS SONG?                                                                                  |

| PROGRAMME 3.<br>BRIGHT RIDES. |        |                                             | page 3.                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|-------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY UNIT   |        |                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| shot                          | camera | video                                       | audio                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|                               |        | CHILD                                       | THIS ONE                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|                               |        | PRESENTER                                   | THAT'S RIGHT THERE ARE 3 EGGS HERE AND 1 SQUARE BISCUIT<br>HERE YOU ARE                                                                                                                                           |
|                               |        | CHILD TAKES AND EATS BISCUIT                | MM THANKS                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|                               |        | GRAPHIC OF HEN                              | O.K. WE'VE GOT A WHOLE LOT OF EGGS AND WE KNOW THEY WELPE LAID<br>BY A HEN LIKE THIS<br>YOU MAY HAVE SOME CHICKENS IN YOUR BACKYARD. IF YOU DON'T<br>YOU HAVE TO GET THE EGGS FROM SOME OTHER PLACE - RIGHT GAVIN |
|                               |        |                                             | RIGHT                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|                               |        | TELECINE OF SUPERMARKET<br>OR GENERAL STORE | YOU CAN BUY EGGS AT A GENERAL STORE OR SUPERMARKET RIGHT?                                                                                                                                                         |
|                               |        | CONSECUTIVE GRAPHICS                        | YOU CAN BUY SO MANY OTHER THINGS TOO.<br>LIKE FISH, MEAT, MEALIE MEAL AND SUGAR, FRUIT AND VEGETABLES,<br>BREAD, MILK AND CHEESE.                                                                                 |

| PROGRAMME 3.<br>BRIGHT RIDES |        |                                                                                                                       | page 4.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|------------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY UNIT  |        |                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| shot                         | camera | video                                                                                                                 | audio                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|                              |        | HUMPTY DUMPTY - LIFESIZE<br>SITS ON WALL MADE OUT OF<br>BOXES H.D. FALLS<br>KINGS MEN AND KINGS HORSES<br>BROKEN H.D. | DO YOU KNOW THE OLD NURSERY RHYME. HUMPTY DUMPTY SAT ON A WALL<br><br>H.D. HAD A GREAT FALL<br>ALL THE KINGS HORSES AND ALL THE KINGS MEN COULDN'T PUT<br>HUMPTY TOGETHER AGAIN.                                                            |
|                              |        | H.D.<br>SITS ON WALL<br>SAME 3 GET TOGETHER TO PUT<br>WALL TOGETHER                                                   | NOW HERE'S A DIFFERENT VERSION TO THAT NURSERY RHYME. IT'S<br>MY OWN NURSERY RHYME.<br>H.D. SAT IN FRONT OF THE WALL. H.D. SAW THE WALL TAKE A FALL.<br>ALL THE KINGS HORSES AND ALL THE KINGS MEN COULDN'T PUT THE<br>WALL TOGETHER AGAIN. |
|                              |        | PAN ONTO H.D. CHUCKLING AT<br>THEIR DIFFICULTY.                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|                              |        | H.D. HOLDING GRAPHICS<br>G.I.<br>GRAPHIC                                                                              | HEY I WANT TO TELL YOU ABOUT SOME OF MY FRIENDS, G, H AND I.<br>THEY BELONG TO THE ALPHABET AND WE FIND THEM AT THE BEGINNING<br>OF WORDS LIKE GARDEN, HEN, IRON                                                                            |
|                              |        | H.D. AND PAN ONTO GEN. G.<br>(3RD GRAPHIC)                                                                            | HERE'S GENERAL G.                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |

| PROGRAMME 3.                |        |                                                                                          | page 5.                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|-----------------------------|--------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY UNIT |        |                                                                                          | BRIGHT RIDES                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| shot                        | camera | video                                                                                    | audio                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|                             |        | GEN. G. MOVES MOUSTACHE<br>WITH VOICE<br>SLIDE WITH G. STUCK ON<br><br>GRAPHICS          | HELLO MY NAME'S GEN. G.<br>I WORK IN THE GARDEN AND LOOK AFTER THE GRASS. I OPEN<br>AND CLOSE THE GATE.<br>MY FRIENDS ARE<br>GARY GOAT AND GAVLE GOOSE<br>I ENJOY EATING GRAPES AND GEWEY GUM. |
|                             |        | HELEN HEN (FEATHER IN TAIL)<br>SHOWS HEAD AND HAT                                        | HI, I'M HELEN HEN. THIS IS MY HEAD<br>AND THIS IS MY HAT<br>HEAD AND HAT BOTH START WITH H.                                                                                                    |
|                             |        | GRAPHIC                                                                                  | I LIVE ON A HILL IN A HUT AND MY FRIEND IS HARRY THE HORSE                                                                                                                                     |
|                             |        | 3d GRAPHIC ARM SCRATCHES<br>WITH SWIVEL PIN GRAPHIC<br>ITCHY I<br>GRAPHIC<br><br>GRAPHIC | HI, I'M ITCHY<br>I LIVE ON ICE<br>AND WHEN I ITCH I SCRATCH MYSELF<br>I LIKE EATING<br>ICE CREAM<br>I IRON MY CLOTHES WITH AN IRON EVERY DAY.                                                  |

| PROGRAMME 3                 |        |                                                     | page 6.                                                                                                                                                                            |
|-----------------------------|--------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY UNIT |        |                                                     | BRIGHT RIDES                                                                                                                                                                       |
| shot                        | camera | video                                               | audio                                                                                                                                                                              |
|                             |        | ANIMATED GRAPHICS<br>2 PRESENTERS NAME<br>THE ITEMS | ONE BOY<br>TWO GIRLS<br>THREE DOGS<br>FOUR CARS<br>FIVE HOUSES<br>SIX CATS<br>SEVEN STARS<br>EIGHT TREES<br>NINE CANDLES<br>TEN FINGERS                                            |
|                             |        | REPEAT SEQUENCE                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|                             |        | PUPPET<br>GRAPHIC                                   | DO YOU REMEMBER ALL THE LETTERS WE'VE LEARN'T SO FAR<br>A FOR APPLE<br>B FOR BROOM<br>C FOR CLOWN<br>D FOR DOG<br>E FOR EAR<br>F FOR FENCE<br>G FOR GATE<br>H FOR HEN<br>I FOR ICE |

| PROGRAMME                   |                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | page 7 |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| BRIGHT RIDES                |                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |        |
| EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY UNIT | video                      | audio                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |        |
| shot camera                 | HUMPTY<br>DUMPTY (H. & D.) | HI, I'M BACK WITH ANOTHER<br>RHYME<br>H.D. WAS A LARGE OLD EGG<br>H.D. SHOOK HIS LEFT AND HIS RIGHT LEG<br>HE THREW HIS ARMS UP TO THE SKY<br>THINKING HE WOULD BE ABLE TO FLY<br>BUT H.D. HAD A GREAT FALL<br>FROM OFF HIS PLACE ON THE WALL<br>AND ALL THE KINGS HORSES AND ALL THE KINGS MEN<br>COULDN'T PUT HUMPTY TOGETHER AGAIN. |        |
|                             | GRAPHIC                    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |        |
|                             | PRESENTER                  | H.D. SHOWED US THAT WE HAVE TWO LEGS AND TWO ARMS<br>THAT'S ALL FOR NOW<br>SEE YOU SOON.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |        |
|                             |                            |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |        |

## APPENDIX A2

Editing of Programme 3.

| <u>VISION</u>                  | <u>INSERT<br/>NO</u> | <u>CONTENT</u>                                                                              | <u>DUR</u> | <u>SOUND</u>            |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|
| Film on<br>tape push-<br>cart  | 3-6                  | SONG: "Come along, come<br>along .... Bright Rides<br>run."                                 | 33"        | mute film<br>grams song |
| VTR                            | 2-32                 | Avril: "Hello, look at<br>this .... here is a game,<br>now watch carefully."                | 1'57"      | VTR                     |
| VTR                            | 2-14                 | Rahleen: "Now here is a<br>game, watch carefully ....<br>you may eat the biscuit."          | 1'35"      | VTR                     |
| Film on<br>tape<br>Supermarket |                      | "You may have some chickens<br>.... Bread, milk and<br>cheese."                             |            | mute film<br>sound fx.  |
| VTR                            | 1-4                  | H. Dumpty: "Do you know the<br>old nursery rhyme .... its<br>my own nursery rhyme."         | 36"        | VTR                     |
| VTR                            | 1-6                  | H. Dumpty: "H.D. sat in front<br>of the wall .... couldn't<br>put the wall together again." | 25"        | VTR                     |
| VTR                            | 2-19                 | H. Dumpty: "Hey I want to tell<br>you .... here is general G."                              | 45"        | VTR                     |

Editing of Programme 3 cont.

| <u>VISION</u>            | <u>INSERT<br/>NO</u> | <u>CONTENT</u>                                                            | <u>DUR</u> | <u>SOUND</u>            |
|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|
| VTR                      | 1-13                 | "Here is general G ..... I<br>iron my clothes with an iron<br>every day." | 1'14"      | VTR                     |
| VTR                      | 3-1                  | "One boy, 2 girls, 3 dogs<br>..... 9 candles, 10<br>fingers."             | 58"        | VTR                     |
| VTR                      | 3-2                  | "A for apple, B for broom<br>..... I for iron."                           | 52"        | VTR                     |
|                          | 2-42                 | a...b...c... g...h...i...                                                 |            |                         |
| VTR                      | 3-11                 | Avril: "H. Dumpty showed us<br>that ..... see you soon."                  | 16"        | VTR                     |
| Film on tape<br>pushcart | 3-5                  | "Come along, come along ....<br>Bright Rides run."                        | 33"        | Mute film<br>grams song |

## CONTROL GROUP

| Variable                                 |          | No. of Cases | Mean   | Standard Deviation | Kurtosis | Skewness | Minimum | Maximum |
|------------------------------------------|----------|--------------|--------|--------------------|----------|----------|---------|---------|
| Body Parts                               | Pretest  | 70           | 13,614 | 3,329              | -0,254   | -0,309   | 5,00    | 20,00   |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 14,657 | 3,737              | 0,663    | -0,572   | 3,00    | 20,00   |
| Geometric Forms                          | Pretest  | 70           | 1,871  | 1,493              | -1,291   | 0,280    | 0,00    | 5,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 2,186  | 1,975              | -1,292   | 0,334    | 0,00    | 6,00    |
| Identifying Community members and places | Pretest  | 70           | 2,571  | 1,923              | -1,003   | 0,322    | 0,00    | 6,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 2,414  | 1,672              | -0,753   | 0,211    | 0,00    | 6,00    |
| Matching                                 | Pretest  | 70           | 1,371  | 1,144              | -0,638   | 0,356    | 0,00    | 4,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 1,614  | 1,081              | -0,801   | 0,121    | 0,00    | 4,00    |
| Letters                                  | Pretest  | 70           | 1,071  | 1,265              | 0,450    | 0,532    | 0,00    | 5,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 0,629  | 1,310              | 1,245    | 0,278    | 0,00    | 8,00    |
| Numbers                                  | Pretest  | 70           | 18,871 | 6,174              | -0,652   | 0,077    | 0,00    | 45,00   |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 17,543 | 6,906              | -0,537   | 0,314    | 0,00    | 45,00   |
| Relational Terms                         | Pretest  | 70           | 5,443  | 2,275              | -0,289   | -0,628   | 0,00    | 8,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 4,829  | 2,309              | -0,566   | -0,686   | 0,00    | 8,00    |
| Classifying                              | Pretest  | 70           | 1,814  | 1,582              | -0,385   | 0,383    | 0,00    | 5,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 2,171  | 1,993              | -1,155   | 0,413    | 0,00    | 6,00    |
| Sorting                                  | Pretest  | 70           | 1,029  | 0,868              | 1,195    | 0,903    | 0,00    | 4,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 1,114  | 0,910              | 0,062    | 0,482    | 0,00    | 4,00    |
| Parts of Whole                           | Pretest  | 70           | 1,986  | 1,313              | -1,168   | -0,092   | 0,00    | 4,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 1,600  | 1,323              | -1,255   | 0,202    | 0,00    | 4,00    |
| Emotions                                 | Pretest  | 70           | 1,314  | 0,753              | -0,989   | -0,596   | 0,00    | 2,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 1,443  | 0,694              | -0,462   | -0,569   | 0,00    | 2,00    |
| Attitudes (Happy)                        | Pretest  | 70           | 5,957  | 2,281              | 0,791    | -0,214   | 0,00    | 8,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 6,257  | 2,090              | 1,823    | -0,906   | 0,00    | 8,00    |
| Attitudes (Sad)                          | Pretest  | 70           | 1,528  | 1,873              | 1,166    | 0,406    | 0,00    | 8,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 1,143  | 1,417              | 1,463    | 1,376    | 0,00    | 6,00    |
| Total (Mt)                               | Pretest  | 70           | 50,957 | 10,092             | -0,546   | -0,559   | 5,00    | 80,00   |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 50,214 | 11,847             | -0,656   | -0,254   | 11,00   | 89,00   |
| Peabody (PPVT)                           | Pretest  | 70           | 74,414 | 13,508             | -0,893   | -0,090   | 47,00   | 102,00  |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 73,929 | 14,639             | -0,547   | -0,218   | 40,00   | 103,00  |
| Draw a Person (DAP)                      | Pretest  | 70           | 4,158  | 1,624              | 1,348    | -0,569   | 0,00    | 8,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 4,034  | 1,719              | 0,871    | -0,494   | 0,00    | 7,09    |

## EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

| Variable                                 |          | No. of Cases | Mean   | Standard Deviation | Kurtosis | Skewness | Minimum | Maximum |
|------------------------------------------|----------|--------------|--------|--------------------|----------|----------|---------|---------|
| Body Parts                               | Pretest  | 70           | 14,185 | 3,712              | -0,901   | -0,436   | 5,00    | 20,00   |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 16,457 | 3,374              | -0,386   | -0,482   | 8,00    | 20,00   |
| Geometric Forms                          | Pretest  | 70           | 2,343  | 1,817              | -1,027   | 0,350    | 0,00    | 6,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 3,471  | 2,076              | -1,171   | -0,378   | 0,00    | 6,00    |
| Identifying Community members and places | Pretest  | 70           | 2,928  | 1,812              | -0,840   | 0,335    | 0,00    | 7,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 3,086  | 1,717              | 0,578    | 0,517    | 0,00    | 9,00    |
| Matching                                 | Pretest  | 70           | 1,271  | 0,947              | -0,906   | 0,163    | 0,00    | 3,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 1,857  | 1,243              | -0,927   | 0,139    | 0,00    | 4,00    |
| Letters                                  | Pretest  | 70           | 0,771  | 1,265              | 0,598    | 0,951    | 0,00    | 5,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 0,900  | 1,395              | 0,478    | 0,733    | 0,00    | 6,00    |
| Numbers                                  | Pretest  | 70           | 20,257 | 6,394              | -1,072   | -0,079   | 1,00    | 39,00   |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 23,800 | 6,361              | -0,972   | -0,162   | 3,00    | 45,00   |
| Relational Terms                         | Pretest  | 70           | 5,686  | 1,602              | -0,009   | -0,555   | 1,00    | 8,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 5,600  | 1,697              | -0,065   | -0,644   | 1,00    | 8,00    |
| Classifying                              | Pretest  | 70           | 1,614  | 1,796              | -0,564   | 0,467    | 0,00    | 6,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 2,829  | 1,941              | -1,102   | -0,069   | 0,00    | 7,00    |
| Sorting                                  | Pretest  | 70           | 1,057  | 0,849              | -0,645   | 0,328    | 0,00    | 3,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 1,400  | 1,095              | -1,004   | 0,161    | 0,00    | 4,00    |
| Parts of Whole                           | Pretest  | 70           | 2,129  | 1,141              | -0,935   | 0,042    | 0,00    | 4,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 1,986  | 1,186              | -0,822   | 0,028    | 0,00    | 4,00    |
| Emotions                                 | Pretest  | 70           | 1,500  | 0,631              | -0,211   | -0,489   | 0,00    | 2,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 1,743  | 0,502              | 1,090    | -0,820   | 0,00    | 2,00    |
| Attitudes (Happy)                        | Pretest  | 70           | 5,586  | 2,748              | -0,426   | -0,924   | 0,00    | 8,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 6,314  | 2,262              | 1,302    | -0,463   | 0,00    | 8,00    |
| Attitudes (Sad)                          | Pretest  | 70           | 1,971  | 2,576              | 0,263    | 1,195    | 0,00    | 8,00    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 1,429  | 2,110              | 1,064    | 1,671    | 0,00    | 8,00    |
| Total (Mt)                               | Pretest  | 70           | 53,743 | 12,774             | -0,954   | -0,102   | 20,00   | 83,00   |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 63,271 | 15,427             | -0,877   | -0,115   | 25,00   | 98,00   |
| Peabody (PPVT)                           | Pretest  | 70           | 71,543 | 12,452             | 0,261    | -0,719   | 35,00   | 94,00   |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 76,043 | 13,987             | -0,455   | -0,315   | 45,00   | 107,00  |
| Draw a Person (DAP)                      | Pretest  | 70           | 4,354  | 1,108              | 0,894    | -0,546   | 0,00    | 7,09    |
|                                          | Posttest | 70           | 4,730  | 1,039              | 0,446    | 0,564    | 3,00    | 8,00    |

## APPENDIX B1.1

MEANS OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES OF CHILDREN FROM THREE CHILD CARE CENTRES  
IN CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

|                         | Control Pretest |       |       | Control Posttest |       |       | Experimental Pretest |       |       | Experimental Posttest |       |       |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------|----------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|
|                         | J               | D     | HR    | J                | D     | HR    | J                    | D     | HR    | J                     | D     | HR    |
| No. of Ss in each Group | 25              | 23    | 22    | 25               | 23    | 22    | 24                   | 21    | 25    | 24                    | 21    | 25    |
| Body Parts              | 13.96           | 12.83 | 14.05 | 15.52            | 13.57 | 14.82 | 13.71                | 14.05 | 14.76 | 16.42                 | 15.38 | 17.40 |
| Geometric Forms         | 1.48            | 2.04  | 2.14  | 1.60             | 2.52  | 2.50  | 2.17                 | 2.62  | 2.28  | 3.25                  | 3.19  | 3.92  |
| Identifying             | 2.56            | 2.43  | 2.73  | 2.44             | 2.30  | 2.50  | 2.92                 | 2.29  | 3.48  | 3.25                  | 2.81  | 3.16  |
| Matching                | 1.16            | 1.09  | 1.91  | 1.60             | 1.17  | 2.09  | 1.29                 | 1.48  | 1.08  | 1.79                  | 1.81  | 1.96  |
| Letters                 | 0.96            | 0.78  | 1.50  | 0.68             | 0.22  | 1.00  | 0.68                 | 0.86  | 0.88  | 1.04                  | 0.86  | 0.80  |
| Numbers                 | 19.32           | 14.74 | 25.82 | 17.08            | 11.87 | 24.00 | 21.17                | 16.19 | 22.80 | 24.83                 | 20.24 | 25.80 |
| Relational Terms        | 5.56            | 4.35  | 6.45  | 4.80             | 4.48  | 5.23  | 5.13                 | 5.57  | 6.32  | 5.25                  | 5.05  | 6.40  |
| Classifying             | 1.68            | 1.30  | 2.50  | 1.88             | 1.57  | 3.14  | 1.71                 | 2.05  | 1.16  | 2.88                  | 2.71  | 2.88  |
| Sorting                 | 1.00            | 0.87  | 1.23  | 0.76             | 1.13  | 1.50  | 0.92                 | 1.00  | 1.24  | 1.04                  | 1.57  | 1.60  |
| Parts of Whole          | 2.24            | 1.52  | 2.18  | 1.40             | 1.48  | 1.95  | 2.00                 | 1.95  | 2.40  | 2.04                  | 1.81  | 2.08  |
| Emotions                | 1.40            | 1.13  | 1.41  | 1.40             | 1.22  | 1.73  | 1.67                 | 1.24  | 1.56  | 1.83                  | 1.71  | 1.68  |
| Attitudes Happy         | 5.84            | 5.83  | 6.23  | 5.24             | 6.30  | 7.36  | 5.04                 | 5.29  | 6.36  | 5.96                  | 6.38  | 6.60  |
| Attitudes Sad           | 1.24            | 1.74  | 1.64  | 1.64             | 1.30  | 0.41  | 2.64                 | 1.57  | 1.56  | 1.92                  | 1.05  | 1.28  |
| Total                   | 51.96           | 46.09 | 61.91 | 49.16            | 41.52 | 60.50 | 53.25                | 49.29 | 59.96 | 63.63                 | 57.14 | 68.08 |
| PPVT                    | 74.44           | 75.74 | 69.05 | 81.48            | 75.65 | 63.55 | 71.88                | 72.86 | 72.04 | 79.79                 | 78.76 | 70.16 |
| DAP                     | 3.83            | 3.77  | 4.94  | 3.79             | 3.55  | 4.81  | 4.33                 | 3.80  | 4.76  | 4.67                  | 4.47  | 5.01  |

Key: J = Jubilee Creche, D = Dorkas Creche, HR = Holy Rosary Nursery School.

## APPENDIX B1.2

MEANS OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES OF MALE AND FEMALE CHILDREN IN CONTROL  
AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

|                         | Control Pretest |        | Control Posttest |        | Experimental Pretest |        | Experimental Posttest |        |
|-------------------------|-----------------|--------|------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|
|                         | Male            | Female | Male             | Female | Male                 | Female | Male                  | Female |
| No. of Ss in each Group | 39              | 31     | 39               | 31     | 34                   | 36     | 34                    | 36     |
| Body Parts              | 13.69           | 13.52  | 14.67            | 14.65  | 14.23                | 14.13  | 16.18                 | 16.72  |
| Geometric Forms         | 2.23            | 1.42   | 2.49             | 1.81   | 2.29                 | 2.39   | 3.56                  | 3.39   |
| Identifying             | 2.90            | 2.16   | 2.59             | 2.19   | 2.91                 | 2.94   | 2.94                  | 3.22   |
| Matching                | 1.46            | 1.26   | 1.49             | 1.77   | 1.06                 | 1.47   | 1.79                  | 1.92   |
| Letters                 | 0.90            | 1.29   | 0.59             | 0.68   | 0.68                 | 0.86   | 0.79                  | 1.00   |
| Numbers                 | 17.10           | 21.10  | 16.05            | 19.42  | 17.21                | 23.14  | 21.15                 | 26.31  |
| Relational Terms        | 5.70            | 5.13   | 5.10             | 4.48   | 5.53                 | 5.83   | 5.50                  | 5.69   |
| Classifying             | 1.97            | 1.61   | 2.23             | 2.10   | 1.56                 | 1.67   | 2.71                  | 2.94   |
| Sorting                 | 1.08            | 0.97   | 1.18             | 1.03   | 0.94                 | 1.17   | 1.26                  | 1.53   |
| Parts of Whole          | 2.23            | 1.68   | 1.77             | 1.39   | 1.94                 | 2.31   | 2.03                  | 1.94   |
| Emotions                | 1.41            | 1.19   | 1.51             | 1.36   | 1.56                 | 1.44   | 1.77                  | 1.72   |
| Attitudes Happy         | 5.87            | 6.06   | 6.41             | 6.07   | 5.68                 | 5.50   | 6.32                  | 6.31   |
| Attitudes Sad           | 1.74            | 1.26   | 1.05             | 1.26   | 1.97                 | 1.97   | 1.35                  | 1.50   |
| Total                   | 50.67           | 54.32  | 49.69            | 50.87  | 49.91                | 57.36  | 59.97                 | 66.39  |
| PPVT                    | 73.77           | 75.23  | 74.00            | 73.84  | 71.06                | 72.00  | 76.88                 | 75.25  |
| DAP                     | 4.21            | 4.10   | 4.17             | 3.86   | 4.10                 | 4.60   | 4.51                  | 4.94   |

## APPENDIX B2.1

## MEANS OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES OF CHILDREN FROM THREE AGE GROUPS, IN CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

|                         | Control Pretest |       |       | Control Posttest |       |       | Experimental Pretest |       |       | Experimental Posttest |       |       |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-------|-------|------------------|-------|-------|----------------------|-------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|
|                         | 4               | 5     | 6     | 4                | 5     | 6     | 4                    | 5     | 6     | 4                     | 5     | 6     |
| No. of Ss in each group | 20              | 28    | 22    | 20               | 28    | 22    | 18                   | 25    | 27    | 18                    | 25    | 27    |
| Body Parts              | 11,20           | 14,71 | 14,41 | 12,00            | 15,68 | 15,77 | 12,00                | 14,30 | 14,86 | 13,25                 | 16,57 | 17,49 |
| Geometric Forms         | 0,90            | 2,11  | 2,45  | 1,05             | 2,86  | 2,36  | 1,83                 | 1,96  | 2,77  | 2,17                  | 2,78  | 4,37  |
| Identifying             | 1,30            | 3,18  | 2,95  | 1,55             | 2,82  | 2,68  | 1,50                 | 2,91  | 3,43  | 1,17                  | 3,04  | 3,77  |
| Matching                | 0,60            | 1,54  | 1,86  | 0,90             | 1,75  | 2,09  | 0,67                 | 1,09  | 1,60  | 0,83                  | 1,57  | 2,40  |
| Letters                 | 0,30            | 1,18  | 1,64  | 0,60             | 0,43  | 0,91  | 0,08                 | 0,57  | 1,14  | 0,92                  | 0,87  | 0,91  |
| Numbers                 | 8,75            | 21,89 | 24,22 | 6,75             | 20,32 | 23,82 | 5,48                 | 10,76 | 20,43 | 11,58                 | 22,43 | 28,89 |
| Relational Terms        | 3,30            | 6,14  | 6,50  | 3,85             | 5,25  | 5,18  | 4,92                 | 5,43  | 6,11  | 4,00                  | 5,74  | 6,06  |
| Classifying             | 0,90            | 2,07  | 2,32  | 1,20             | 2,18  | 3,05  | 0,92                 | 1,35  | 2,03  | 1,75                  | 2,65  | 3,31  |
| Sorting                 | 0,85            | 0,89  | 1,36  | 0,70             | 1,14  | 1,45  | 0,50                 | 1,13  | 1,20  | 1,00                  | 1,09  | 1,74  |
| Parts of Whole          | 1,50            | 2,21  | 2,14  | 0,70             | 1,96  | 1,95  | 1,42                 | 2,04  | 2,43  | 1,17                  | 1,87  | 2,34  |
| Emotions                | 1,10            | 1,46  | 1,32  | 1,30             | 1,36  | 1,68  | 1,17                 | 1,44  | 1,66  | 1,58                  | 1,74  | 1,80  |
| Attitudes Happy         | 5,40            | 5,75  | 6,73  | 5,35             | 6,57  | 6,68  | 3,25                 | 6,00  | 6,11  | 5,08                  | 6,48  | 6,63  |
| Attitudes Sad           | 1,15            | 2,11  | 1,14  | 1,00             | 1,29  | 1,09  | 3,42                 | 1,91  | 1,51  | 2,00                  | 1,44  | 1,23  |
| Total                   | 30,70           | 57,39 | 61,18 | 30,60            | 55,79 | 60,96 | 33,33                | 52,04 | 61,86 | 39,42                 | 60,35 | 73,37 |
| PPVT                    | 76,30           | 75,82 | 67,27 | 80,10            | 74,00 | 68,23 | 74,83                | 76,30 | 68,66 | 80,17                 | 77,48 | 73,69 |
| DAP                     | 2,48            | 4,46  | 5,30  | 2,27             | 4,47  | 5,08  | 3,20                 | 4,26  | 4,81  | 3,70                  | 4,56  | 5,19  |

key: (4) = 3 yrs 3 months to 4 yrs 4 months; (5) = 4 yrs 5 months to 5 yrs 6 months;  
(6) = 5 yrs 7 months to 6 yrs 8 months.

## APPENDIX B2.2

## MEANS OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES OF ENGLISH AND AFRIKAANS SPEAKING CHILDREN IN CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

|                         | Control Pretest |        | Control Posttest |        | Experimental Pretest |        | Experimental Posttest |        |
|-------------------------|-----------------|--------|------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|
|                         | Eng.            | Afrik. | Eng.             | Afrik. | Eng.                 | Afrik. | Eng.                  | Afrik. |
| No. of Ss in each group | 50              | 17     | 50               | 17     | 47                   | 22     | 47                    | 22     |
| Body Parts              | 14,02           | 12,23  | 15,22            | 12,41  | 13,68                | 15,18  | 16,09                 | 17,09  |
| Geometric Forms         | 1,92            | 1,88   | 2,05             | 2,59   | 2,06                 | 3,06   | 3,13                  | 4,27   |
| Identifying             | 2,68            | 2,12   | 2,50             | 2,00   | 2,81                 | 3,14   | 3,04                  | 3,14   |
| Matching                | 1,34            | 1,53   | 1,60             | 1,59   | 1,20                 | 1,27   | 1,94                  | 1,77   |
| Letters                 | 1,02            | 1,12   | 0,68             | 0,10   | 0,85                 | 0,64   | 1,06                  | 0,55   |
| Numbers                 | 10,30           | 19,65  | 16,82            | 18,06  | 19,23                | 22,04  | 23,04                 | 25,18  |
| Relational Terms        | 5,40            | 5,18   | 4,88             | 4,41   | 5,34                 | 6,55   | 5,49                  | 5,91   |
| Classifying             | 1,80            | 1,59   | 2,16             | 1,94   | 1,57                 | 1,73   | 2,62                  | 3,23   |
| Sorting                 | 1,04            | 0,94   | 1,04             | 1,47   | 1,02                 | 1,10   | 1,23                  | 1,82   |
| Parts of Whole          | 2,05            | 1,65   | 1,64             | 1,29   | 1,96                 | 2,41   | 1,89                  | 2,27   |
| Emotions                | 1,30            | 1,29   | 1,42             | 1,47   | 1,55                 | 1,36   | 1,79                  | 1,64   |
| Attitudes Happy         | 6,10            | 5,18   | 6,10             | 6,47   | 5,36                 | 5,98   | 6,36                  | 6,14   |
| Attitudes Sad           | 1,20            | 2,53   | 1,26             | 1,00   | 2,19                 | 1,59   | 1,38                  | 1,59   |
| Total                   | 50,96           | 53,10  | 50,04            | 47,41  | 51,36                | 50,55  | 61,32                 | 67,32  |
| PPVT                    | 74,02           | 69,29  | 76,94            | 64,94  | 70,79                | 72,69  | 70,45                 | 70,91  |
| DAP                     | 4,01            | 4,26   | 3,90             | 4,15   | 4,30                 | 4,49   | 4,71                  | 4,81   |

## APPENDIX B3

MEANS OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES OF REGULAR TELEVIEWERS (TV)  
AND RARE TELEVIEWERS (NO TV) IN CONTROL AND EXPERIMENTAL  
GROUPS

|                         | Control Pretest |       | Control Posttest |       | Experimental Pretest |       | Experimental Posttest |       |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-------|------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|
|                         | TV              | NO TV | TV               | NO TV | TV                   | NO TV | TV                    | NO TV |
| No. of Ss in each group | 50              | 20    | 50               | 20    | 46                   | 24    | 46                    | 24    |
| Body Parts              | 13.54           | 13.80 | 14.56            | 14.90 | 14.07                | 14.42 | 16.22                 | 16.92 |
| Geometric Forms         | 2.08            | 1.35  | 2.52             | 1.35  | 2.24                 | 2.54  | 3.61                  | 3.21  |
| Identifying             | 2.46            | 2.85  | 2.28             | 2.75  | 2.87                 | 3.04  | 3.04                  | 3.17  |
| Matching                | 1.28            | 1.60  | 1.54             | 1.80  | 1.22                 | 1.38  | 1.87                  | 1.83  |
| Letters                 | 0.88            | 1.55  | 0.50             | 0.95  | 0.78                 | 0.75  | 0.91                  | 0.88  |
| Numbers                 | 17.82           | 21.50 | 17.36            | 18.00 | 20.48                | 19.83 | 23.61                 | 24.17 |
| Relational Terms        | 5.24            | 5.95  | 4.78             | 4.95  | 5.61                 | 5.83  | 5.52                  | 5.75  |
| Classifying             | 1.68            | 2.15  | 2.06             | 2.45  | 1.83                 | 1.21  | 2.93                  | 2.63  |
| Sorting                 | 0.98            | 1.15  | 1.10             | 1.15  | 1.07                 | 1.04  | 1.44                  | 1.33  |
| Parts of Whole          | 1.94            | 2.10  | 1.68             | 1.40  | 2.07                 | 2.25  | 1.91                  | 2.13  |
| Emotions                | 1.26            | 1.45  | 1.38             | 1.60  | 1.54                 | 1.42  | 1.74                  | 1.75  |
| Attitudes Happy         | 5.78            | 6.40  | 6.08             | 6.70  | 5.39                 | 5.96  | 6.28                  | 6.38  |
| Attitudes Sad           | 1.74            | 1.00  | 1.24             | 0.90  | 1.98                 | 1.96  | 1.37                  | 1.54  |
| Total                   | 49.16           | 55.45 | 49.78            | 51.30 | 53.76                | 53.71 | 63.02                 | 63.75 |
| PPVT                    | 75.72           | 71.15 | 75.70            | 69.50 | 72.91                | 68.92 | 78.35                 | 71.63 |
| DAP                     | 4.11            | 4.28  | 4.01             | 4.09  | 4.38                 | 4.30  | 4.80                  | 4.59  |

## APPENDIX B4.1

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |       |                | Experimental Group           |    |       |                |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|
|                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>BODY PARTS</u>            |    |       |                | <u>BODY PARTS</u>            |    |       |                |
| <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 1.628 | 0.160          | <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 2.890 | 0.015          |
| *Crèche differences          | 2  | 1.048 | 0.364          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 2.466 | 0.101          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 0.053 | 0.820          | Sex differences              | 1  | 2.034 | 0.102          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 2.636 | 0.089          | Age differences              | 2  | 6.077 | 0.006          |
| Language differences         | 2  | 3.009 | 0.065          | Language differences         | 2  | 0.603 | 0.553          |
| Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.100 | 0.754          | Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.012 | 0.914          |
| <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 20 | 1.299 | 0.255          | <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 18 | 2.002 | 0.042          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 1.861 | 0.174          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 6.802 | 0.003          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.964 | 0.423          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 5.879 | 0.003          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 1.087 | 0.370          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 3.441 | 0.044          |
| Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.336 | 0.717          | Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 1.669 | 0.204          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 2.356 | 0.113          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.514 | 0.603          |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | 1.109 | 0.344          | Sex by Language              | 1  | 7.761 | 0.002          |
| Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.276 | 0.603          | Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.296 | 0.590          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 5.436 | 0.010          | Age by Language              | 2  | 2.170 | 0.131          |
| Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 1.120 | 0.340          | Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 2.671 | 0.085          |
| Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 1.446 | 0.239          | Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 2.278 | 0.141          |
| <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 11 | 0.216 | 0.995          | <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 10 | 1.010 | 0.456          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.216 | 0.885          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.459 | 0.713          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.105 | 0.748          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.010 | 0.923          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 2  | 0.106 | 0.900          | Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 1  | 0.422 | 0.521          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 0.178 | 0.838          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 0.087 | 0.770          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 1  | 0.072 | 0.791          | Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 2  | 0.825 | 0.448          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.001 | 0.979          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.005 | 0.944          |
| Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.166 | 0.687          | Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.200 | 0.658          |

## APPENDIX B4.2

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |       |                | Experimental Group           |    |       |                |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|
|                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>GEOMETRIC FORMS</u>       |    |       |                | <u>GEOMETRIC FORMS</u>       |    |       |                |
| <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 1.785 | 0.121          | <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 2.768 | 0.018          |
| *Crèche differences          | 2  | 0.405 | 0.671          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 1.527 | 0.233          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 0.452 | 0.506          | Sex differences              | 1  | 0.015 | 0.902          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 3.666 | 0.038          | Age differences              | 2  | 5.393 | 0.010          |
| Language differences         | 2  | 0.934 | 0.405          | Language differences         | 2  | 0.403 | 0.672          |
| Televiowing differences      | 1  | 3.270 | 0.081          | Televiowing differences      | 1  | 6.033 | 0.020          |
| <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 20 | 0.710 | 0.778          | <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 18 | 0.819 | 0.666          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.411 | 0.667          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.110 | 0.897          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.500 | 0.680          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.720 | 0.548          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 0.518 | 0.673          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 0.462 | 0.634          |
| Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 1.268 | 0.297          | Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 2.308 | 0.116          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.071 | 0.931          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.442 | 0.646          |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | 0.043 | 0.958          | Sex by Language              | 1  | 0.156 | 0.696          |
| Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.270 | 0.600          | Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.087 | 0.770          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 0.320 | 0.723          | Age by Language              | 2  | 0.088 | 0.916          |
| Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 0.452 | 0.641          | Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 0.453 | 0.640          |
| Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.888 | 0.354          | Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.120 | 0.732          |
| <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 11 | 1.696 | 0.124          | <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 10 | 1.676 | 0.130          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.355 | 0.706          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.733 | 0.540          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 3.932 | 0.057          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 4.194 | 0.040          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 2  | 2.359 | 0.112          | Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 1  | 0.104 | 0.740          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 1.474 | 0.246          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 6.157 | 0.010          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 1  | 2.820 | 0.103          | Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 2  | 0.129 | 0.879          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 4.199 | 0.050          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 3.054 | 0.090          |
| Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 2.894 | 0.100          | Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.013 | 0.909          |

\*Crèche differences refers to differences between the three child care centres, Jubilee, Dorkan and Holy Rosary Nursery school.

- Underlined F scores are significant at the 0.5 level of significance.

## APPENDIX B4.3

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |       |                | Experimental Group           |    |        |                |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------------------------|----|--------|----------------|
|                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |                              | df | F      | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>IDENTIFYING</u>           |    |       |                | <u>IDENTIFYING</u>           |    |        |                |
| <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 0.240 | 0.980          | <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 3.065  | 0.011          |
| *Crèche differences          | 2  | 0.183 | 0.833          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 2.255  | 0.121          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 0.000 | 0.984          | Sex differences              | 1  | 1.343  | 0.255          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 0.343 | 0.713          | Age differences              | 2  | 11.025 | 0.000          |
| Language differences         | 2  | 0.305 | 0.740          | Language differences         | 2  | 0.179  | 0.837          |
| Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.765 | 0.389          | Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.063  | 0.804          |
| <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 20 | 1.105 | 0.395          | <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 18 | 1.266  | 0.273          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.522 | 0.599          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.118  | 0.889          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 1.989 | 0.138          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.732  | 0.540          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 0.141 | 0.934          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 1.396  | 0.262          |
| Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.430 | 0.655          | Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.885  | 0.423          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 1.876 | 0.171          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | 1.416  | 0.257          |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | 0.932 | 0.405          | Sex by Language              | 1  | 2.221  | 0.146          |
| Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.122 | 0.729          | Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 7.586  | 0.010          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 0.198 | 0.822          | Age by Language              | 2  | 0.438  | 0.649          |
| Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 2.956 | 0.068          | Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 0.246  | 0.784          |
| Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.979 | 0.331          | Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.263  | 0.612          |
| <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 11 | 0.728 | 0.703          | <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 10 | 1.198  | 0.329          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.902 | 0.452          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.341  | 0.796          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 2.427 | 0.130          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.021  | 0.886          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 2  | 0.726 | 0.492          | Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 1  | 0.290  | 0.589          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 0.753 | 0.480          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 5.565  | 0.025          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 1  | 0.364 | 0.551          | Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 2  | 0.256  | 0.774          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 3.078 | 0.090          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.499  | 0.485          |
| Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.601 | 0.444          | Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.547  | 0.465          |

## APPENDIX B4.4

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |        |                | Experimental Group           |    |       |                |
|------------------------------|----|--------|----------------|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|
|                              | df | F      | SIGNIF<br>OF F |                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>MATCHING</u>              |    |        |                | <u>MATCHING</u>              |    |       |                |
| <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 1.888  | 0.101          | <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 1.689 | 0.097          |
| *Crèche differences          | 2  | 1.098  | 0.347          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 0.631 | 0.539          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 3.220  | 0.083          | Sex differences              | 1  | 0.285 | 0.597          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 2.986  | 0.066          | Age differences              | 2  | 3.868 | 0.031          |
| Language differences         | 2  | 0.191  | 0.827          | Language differences         | 2  | 2.281 | 0.119          |
| Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.000  | 0.991          | Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.717 | 0.403          |
| <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 20 | 1.084  | 0.413          | <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 18 | 0.805 | 0.681          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.390  | 0.681          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.033 | 0.444          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.244  | 0.865          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.338 | 0.798          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 1.509  | 0.233          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 0.152 | 0.859          |
| Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.573  | 0.570          | Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.102 | 0.903          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.137  | 0.872          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.739 | 0.485          |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | 2.441  | 0.105          | Sex by Language              | 1  | 0.750 | 0.393          |
| Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 1.723  | 0.200          | Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.000 | 0.964          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 0.851  | 0.437          | Age by Language              | 2  | 0.128 | 0.880          |
| Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 1.859  | 0.174          | Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 1.716 | 0.196          |
| Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.963  | 0.335          | Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.160 | 0.684          |
| <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 11 | 2.241  | 0.040          | <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 10 | 0.832 | 0.602          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 1.400  | 0.241          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.265 | 0.850          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 3.095  | 0.089          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.129 | 0.722          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 2  | 1.608  | 0.210          | Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 1  | 0.446 | 0.509          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 3.498  | 0.044          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 1.787 | 0.191          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 1  | 1.779  | 0.193          | Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 2  | 0.173 | 0.842          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 17.272 | 0.000          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 3.766 | 0.061          |
| Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 3.290  | 0.080          | Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.071 | 0.792          |

\* crèche differences refers to differences between the three child care centres, Jubilee, Dorkan and Holy Rosary Nursery school.

• Underlined F scores are significant at the 0.5 level of significance.

## APPENDIX B4.5

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |              |                | Experimental Group           |    |              |                |
|------------------------------|----|--------------|----------------|------------------------------|----|--------------|----------------|
|                              | df | F            | SIGNIF<br>OF F |                              | df | F            | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>LETTERS</u>               |    |              |                | <u>LETTERS</u>               |    |              |                |
| Main Effects                 | 8  | 2.359        | 0.043          | Main Effects                 | 8  | 0.440        | 0.888          |
| *Crèche differences          | 2  | 2.045        | 0.148          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 0.229        | 0.796          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 0.117        | 0.735          | Sex differences              | 1  | 0.172        | 0.681          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 3.194        | 0.056          | Age differences              | 2  | 0.409        | 0.668          |
| Language differences         | 2  | <u>5.591</u> | <u>0.009</u>   | Language differences         | 2  | 0.491        | 0.616          |
| Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.030        | 0.864          | Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.095        | 0.760          |
| 2-Way Interactions           | 20 | 1.815        | 0.070          | 2-Way Interactions           | 18 | 1.555        | 0.134          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.394        | 0.678          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 2.151        | 0.153          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 1.017        | 0.399          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.924        | 0.440          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 2.421        | 0.086          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 1.305        | 0.285          |
| Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.790        | 0.463          | Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.777        | 0.468          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.003        | 0.997          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | <u>4.527</u> | <u>0.019</u>   |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | <u>4.011</u> | <u>0.029</u>   | Sex by Language              | 1  | <u>0.402</u> | <u>0.530</u>   |
| Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 3.021        | 0.093          | Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.148        | 0.703          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 0.771        | 0.472          | Age by Language              | 2  | 0.126        | 0.882          |
| Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 1.214        | 0.312          | Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 1.760        | 0.188          |
| Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.168        | 0.685          | Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.000        | 0.990          |
| 3-Way Interactions           | 11 | 0.774        | 0.662          | 3-Way Interactions           | 10 | 0.925        | 0.524          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.316        | 0.814          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 1.203        | 0.325          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 1.363        | 0.253          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.138        | 0.713          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 2  | 0.143        | 0.867          | Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 1  | 1.145        | 0.293          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 0.743        | 0.485          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 0.317        | 0.578          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 1  | 0.001        | 0.980          | Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 2  | 0.054        | 0.948          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 1.948        | 0.173          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.091        | 0.765          |
| Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.074        | 0.787          | Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.665        | 0.421          |

## APPENDIX B4.6

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |       |                | Experimental Group           |    |       |                |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|
|                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>NUMBERS</u>               |    |       |                | <u>NUMBERS</u>               |    |       |                |
| Main Effects                 | 8  | 0.880 | 0.545          | Main Effects                 | 8  | 0.693 | 0.695          |
| * Crèche differences         | 2  | 0.070 | 0.933          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 0.168 | 0.846          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 0.020 | 0.888          | Sex differences              | 1  | 0.040 | 0.843          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 1.235 | 0.306          | Age differences              | 2  | 2.059 | 0.144          |
| Language differences         | 2  | 0.837 | 0.443          | Language differences         | 2  | 0.130 | 0.878          |
| Televiowing differences      | 1  | 1.531 | 0.226          | Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.537 | 0.469          |
| 2-Way Interactions           | 20 | 0.750 | 0.746          | 2-Way Interactions           | 18 | 0.648 | 0.834          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.212 | 0.810          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.595 | 0.557          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.188 | 0.903          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.597 | 0.622          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 1.137 | 0.350          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 1.211 | 0.311          |
| Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.288 | 0.752          | Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 1.017 | 0.373          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.136 | 0.874          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.089 | 0.915          |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | 2.496 | 0.100          | Sex by Language              | 1  | 2.747 | 0.107          |
| Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.111 | 0.741          | Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.001 | 0.973          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 1.342 | 0.277          | Age by Language              | 2  | 0.303 | 0.740          |
| Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 0.181 | 0.835          | Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 0.605 | 0.511          |
| Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 1.232 | 0.276          | Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.023 | 0.881          |
| 3-Way Interactions           | 11 | 0.706 | 0.723          | 3-Way Interactions           | 10 | 0.707 | 0.611          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.250 | 0.860          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 1.392 | 0.263          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.019 | 0.891          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.135 | 0.716          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 2  | 0.728 | 0.491          | Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 1  | 0.019 | 0.891          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 0.949 | 0.161          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 0.333 | 0.568          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 1  | 0.713 | 0.406          | Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 2  | 2.410 | 0.166          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.002 | 0.967          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.947 | 0.338          |
| Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.020 | 0.880          | Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.098 | 0.756          |

\* crèche differences refers to differences between the three child care centres, Jubilee, Dorkas and Holy Rosary Nursery school.

Underlined F scores are significant at the 0.5 level of significance.

## APPENDIX B4.7

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |       |                | Experimental Group           |    |       |                |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|
|                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>RELATIONAL TERMS</u>      |    |       |                | <u>RELATIONAL TERMS</u>      |    |       |                |
| <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 0.174 | 0.993          | <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 2.490 | 0.032          |
| * Crèche differences         | 2  | 0.168 | 0.846          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 2.234 | 0.123          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 0.248 | 0.623          | Sex differences              | 1  | 0.765 | 0.388          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 0.164 | 0.849          | Age differences              | 2  | 4.822 | 0.015          |
| Language differences         | 2  | 0.169 | 0.845          | Language differences         | 2  | 1.800 | 0.182          |
| Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.044 | 0.836          | Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.126 | 0.725          |
| <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 20 | 0.521 | 0.934          | <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 18 | 1.175 | 0.336          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.372 | 0.693          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 1.721 | 0.195          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.162 | 0.921          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.263 | 0.852          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 1.346 | 0.279          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 0.271 | 0.764          |
| Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 1.287 | 0.292          | Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 1.156 | 0.328          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.045 | 0.956          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | 2.689 | 0.083          |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | 0.928 | 0.407          | Sex by Language              | 1  | 0.138 | 0.713          |
| Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 1.169 | 0.289          | Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 4.432 | 0.043          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 0.626 | 0.542          | Age by Language              | 2  | 1.464 | 0.246          |
| Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 0.095 | 0.910          | Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 0.254 | 0.777          |
| Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.005 | 0.946          | Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.030 | 0.864          |
| <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 11 | 0.535 | 0.863          | <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 10 | 1.561 | 0.164          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 1.049 | 0.386          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 2.838 | 0.054          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 2.413 | 0.131          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.180 | 0.674          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 2  | 0.128 | 0.880          | Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 1  | 1.259 | 0.270          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 0.321 | 0.728          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 1.027 | 0.318          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 1  | 0.549 | 0.465          | Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 2  | 0.247 | 0.783          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.015 | 0.904          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.005 | 0.942          |
| Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.033 | 0.856          | Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.937 | 0.340          |

## APPENDIX B4.8

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |       |                | Experimental Group           |    |       |                |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|
|                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>CLASSIFYING</u>           |    |       |                | <u>CLASSIFYING</u>           |    |       |                |
| <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 0.825 | 0.587          | <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 0.695 | 0.693          |
| * Crèche differences         | 2  | 1.193 | 0.318          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 0.420 | 0.660          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 0.030 | 0.863          | Sex differences              | 1  | 0.294 | 0.592          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 1.466 | 0.247          | Age differences              | 2  | 1.853 | 0.361          |
| Language differences         | 2  | 0.459 | 0.636          | Language differences         | 2  | 0.606 | 0.511          |
| Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.136 | 0.715          | Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.318 | 0.577          |
| <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 20 | 1.069 | 0.426          | <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 18 | 0.775 | 0.712          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 1.321 | 0.282          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.494 | 0.615          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.556 | 0.640          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.262 | 0.852          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 2.101 | 0.122          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 0.237 | 0.791          |
| Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.376 | 0.690          | Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.676 | 0.516          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.339 | 0.715          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | 1.043 | 0.364          |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | 0.036 | 0.965          | Sex by Language              | 1  | 0.156 | 0.695          |
| Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.078 | 0.782          | Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 3.899 | 0.057          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 1.379 | 0.268          | Age by Language              | 2  | 0.291 | 0.750          |
| Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 1.759 | 0.190          | Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 1.209 | 0.312          |
| Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 1.050 | 0.314          | Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 1.117 | 0.298          |
| <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 11 | 0.730 | 0.701          | <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 10 | 1.180 | 0.340          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.711 | 0.554          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 2.198 | 0.107          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.020 | 0.867          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 4.047 | 0.053          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 2  | 2.231 | 0.126          | Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 1  | 4.175 | 0.049          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 0.280 | 0.758          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 0.079 | 0.781          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 1  | 0.138 | 0.713          | Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 2  | 3.903 | 0.030          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.420 | 0.522          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.036 | 0.850          |
| Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 2.766 | 0.107          | Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 5.154 | 0.030          |

\* crèche differences refers to differences between the three child care centres, Jubilee, Dorkas and Holy Rosary Nursery school.  
- Underlined F scores are significant at the 0.5 level of significance.

## APPENDIX B4.9

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |       |                | Experimental Group           |    |       |                |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|
|                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>SORTING</u>               |    |       |                | <u>SORTING</u>               |    |       |                |
| <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 1.714 | 0.137          | <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 1.575 | 0.172          |
| * Crèche differences         | 2  | 1.279 | 0.294          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 0.680 | 0.514          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 0.040 | 0.843          | Sex differences              | 1  | 0.632 | 0.432          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 1.264 | 0.298          | Age differences              | 2  | 2.098 | 0.139          |
| Language differences         | 2  | 2.386 | 0.110          | Language differences         | 2  | 1.460 | 0.247          |
| Televiewing differences      | 1  | 0.085 | 0.773          | Televiewing differences      | 1  | 1.144 | 0.293          |
| <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 20 | 0.672 | 0.821          | <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 18 | 0.886 | 0.597          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.235 | 0.792          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 1.404 | 0.260          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.207 | 0.691          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.276 | 0.842          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 0.292 | 0.831          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 0.346 | 0.710          |
| Crèche by Televiewing        | 2  | 0.726 | 0.492          | Crèche by Televiewing        | 2  | 0.206 | 0.815          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.256 | 0.776          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | 2.205 | 0.127          |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | 0.274 | 0.762          | Sex by Language              | 1  | 0.649 | 0.426          |
| Sex by Televiewing           | 1  | 0.412 | 0.526          | Sex by Televiewing           | 1  | 1.249 | 0.272          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 1.189 | 0.319          | Age by Language              | 2  | 1.005 | 0.377          |
| Age by Televiewing           | 2  | 1.871 | 0.172          | Age by Televiewing           | 2  | 0.093 | 0.911          |
| Language by Televiewing      | 1  | 0.001 | 0.979          | Language by Televiewing      | 1  | 0.773 | 0.386          |
| <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 11 | 0.417 | 0.936          | <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 10 | 1.549 | 0.168          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.505 | 0.682          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.374 | 0.772          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.669 | 0.420          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.431 | 0.516          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiewing | 2  | 0.012 | 0.988          | Crèche by Sex by Televiewing | 1  | 2.450 | 0.127          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 0.124 | 0.884          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 0.177 | 0.677          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiewing | 1  | 0.174 | 0.680          | Crèche by Age by Televiewing | 2  | 0.365 | 0.697          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 1.228 | 0.277          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.467 | 0.499          |
| Sex by Age by Televiewing    | 1  | 0.394 | 0.535          | Sex by Age by Televiewing    | 1  | 0.314 | 0.579          |

## APPENDIX B4.10

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |       |                | Experimental Group           |    |       |                |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|
|                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>PARTS OF WHOLE</u>        |    |       |                | <u>PARTS OF WHOLE</u>        |    |       |                |
| <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 1.789 | 0.120          | <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 1.817 | 0.110          |
| * Crèche differences         | 2  | 1.299 | 0.288          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 0.452 | 0.640          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 0.002 | 0.964          | Sex differences              | 1  | 0.683 | 0.415          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 3.039 | 0.063          | Age differences              | 2  | 1.229 | 0.306          |
| Language differences         | 2  | 0.636 | 0.537          | Language differences         | 2  | 4.209 | 0.024          |
| Televiewing differences      | 1  | 1.475 | 0.234          | Televiewing differences      | 1  | 0.002 | 0.964          |
| <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 20 | 0.599 | 0.881          | <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 18 | 0.627 | 0.852          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.197 | 0.822          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.150 | 0.862          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.322 | 0.810          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 1.034 | 0.391          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 0.021 | 0.996          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 1.410 | 0.259          |
| Crèche by Televiewing        | 2  | 1.213 | 0.312          | Crèche by Televiewing        | 2  | 0.928 | 0.406          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.693 | 0.508          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.056 | 0.946          |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | 0.213 | 0.809          | Sex by Language              | 1  | 0.877 | 0.356          |
| Sex by Televiewing           | 1  | 0.413 | 0.525          | Sex by Televiewing           | 1  | 0.130 | 0.721          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 0.192 | 0.827          | Age by Language              | 2  | 0.016 | 0.984          |
| Age by Televiewing           | 2  | 0.260 | 0.773          | Age by Televiewing           | 2  | 0.067 | 0.936          |
| Language by Televiewing      | 1  | 0.054 | 0.818          | Language by Televiewing      | 1  | 2.093 | 0.158          |
| <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 11 | 0.678 | 0.747          | <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 10 | 0.737 | 0.684          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.959 | 0.425          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.320 | 0.805          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.211 | 0.650          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.027 | 0.871          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiewing | 2  | 0.452 | 0.641          | Crèche by Sex by Televiewing | 1  | 0.072 | 0.790          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 0.641 | 0.534          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 0.658 | 0.423          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiewing | 1  | 0.266 | 0.610          | Crèche by Age by Televiewing | 2  | 1.281 | 0.292          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 1.981 | 0.170          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.040 | 0.843          |
| Sex by Age by Televiewing    | 1  | 0.257 | 0.616          | Sex by Age by Televiewing    | 1  | 0.044 | 0.836          |

\* crèche differences refers to differences between the three child care centres, Jubilee, Dorkas and Holy Rosary Nursery school.  
 - Underlined F scores are significant at the 0.5 level of significance.

## APPENDIX B4.11

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |       |                | Experimental Group           |    |       |                |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|
| EMOTIONS                     | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F | EMOTIONS                     | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 1.233 | 0.316          | <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 0.508 | 0.841          |
| * Crèche differences         | 2  | 2.166 | 0.133          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 1.097 | 0.346          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 0.474 | 0.496          | Sex differences              | 1  | 0.079 | 0.780          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 1.976 | 0.157          | Age differences              | 2  | 0.390 | 0.680          |
| Language differences         | 2  | 0.121 | 0.887          | Language differences         | 2  | 0.337 | 0.717          |
| Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.002 | 0.965          | Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.888 | 0.353          |
| <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 20 | 1.015 | 0.476          | <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 18 | 2.117 | 0.031          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 2.723 | 0.082          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.440 | 0.648          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 1.424 | 0.256          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.848 | 0.478          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 0.916 | 0.445          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 1.734 | 0.193          |
| Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 1.003 | 0.379          | Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 1.578 | 0.159          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.114 | 0.893          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | 1.474 | 0.244          |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | 1.044 | 0.365          | Sex by Language              | 1  | 0.210 | 0.650          |
| Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.191 | 0.665          | Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 1.114 | 0.299          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 0.073 | 0.930          | Age by Language              | 2  | 0.063 | 0.939          |
| Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 0.463 | 0.634          | Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 2.641 | 0.087          |
| Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.329 | 0.571          | Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 4.953 | 0.033          |
| <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 11 | 0.989 | 0.478          | <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 10 | 1.958 | 0.073          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 1.039 | 0.390          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.986 | 0.412          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.235 | 0.632          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.599 | 0.445          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 2  | 0.287 | 0.753          | Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 1  | 0.870 | 0.358          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 1.697 | 0.201          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 0.421 | 0.521          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 1  | 0.112 | 0.741          | Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 2  | 3.344 | 0.048          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.159 | 0.693          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 3.131 | 0.086          |
| Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.024 | 0.878          | Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 2.489 | 0.125          |

## APPENDIX B4.12

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |       |                | Experimental Group           |    |       |                |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|
| ATTITUDES (HAPPY)            | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F | ATTITUDES (HAPPY)            | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 2.661 | 0.025          | <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 0.245 | 0.979          |
| * Crèche differences         | 2  | 4.957 | 0.014          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 0.244 | 0.785          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 0.968 | 0.333          | Sex differences              | 1  | 0.044 | 0.834          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 0.693 | 0.508          | Age differences              | 2  | 0.128 | 0.880          |
| Language differences         | 2  | 0.637 | 0.536          | Language differences         | 2  | 0.665 | 0.521          |
| Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.153 | 0.698          | Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.004 | 0.952          |
| <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 20 | 1.053 | 0.440          | <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 18 | 1.357 | 0.220          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 3.243 | 0.054          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.135 | 0.874          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 2.917 | 0.051          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.203 | 0.894          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 1.447 | 0.250          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 0.608 | 0.551          |
| Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 1.699 | 0.201          | Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.110 | 0.896          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.038 | 0.443          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | 4.709 | 0.016          |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | 0.024 | 0.976          | Sex by Language              | 1  | 0.685 | 0.414          |
| Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.485 | 0.492          | Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.010 | 0.923          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 0.642 | 0.533          | Age by Language              | 2  | 0.965 | 0.392          |
| Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 2.619 | 0.090          | Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 0.037 | 0.864          |
| Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 2.216 | 0.147          | Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.009 | 0.925          |
| <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 11 | 2.312 | 0.035          | <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 10 | 0.368 | 0.932          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.478 | 0.700          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.124 | 0.945          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 1.595 | 0.217          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.717 | 0.403          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 2  | 3.837 | 0.033          | Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 1  | 0.003 | 0.958          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 8.041 | 0.002          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 0.106 | 0.747          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 1  | 0.080 | 0.779          | Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 2  | 1.104 | 0.344          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 2.760 | 0.107          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.123 | 0.728          |
| Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.189 | 0.667          | Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.163 | 0.689          |

\* crèche differences refers to differences between the three child care centres, Jubilee, Dorkan and Holy Rosary Nursery school.

- Underlined F scores are significant at the 0.5 level of significance.

## APPENDIX B4.13

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |       |                | Experimental Group           |    |       |                |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|
|                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>ATTITUDES (SAD)</u>       |    |       |                | <u>ATTITUDES (SAD)</u>       |    |       |                |
| <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 3.021 | 0.014          | <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 0.249 | 0.977          |
| * Crèche differences         | 2  | 8.030 | 0.002          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 0.396 | 0.676          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 2.004 | 0.160          | Sex differences              | 1  | 0.095 | 0.760          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 2.589 | 0.092          | Age differences              | 2  | 0.021 | 0.980          |
| Language differences         | 2  | 1.215 | 0.311          | Language differences         | 2  | 0.663 | 0.522          |
| Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.277 | 0.603          | Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.001 | 0.979          |
| <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 20 | 1.539 | 0.141          | <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 18 | 1.375 | 0.210          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 4.140 | 0.026          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.461 | 0.635          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 1.380 | 0.325          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.655 | 0.586          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 0.414 | 0.744          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 0.872 | 0.428          |
| Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 1.226 | 0.308          | Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.183 | 0.834          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 1.896 | 0.168          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | 3.988 | 0.028          |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | 1.586 | 0.222          | Sex by Language              | 1  | 0.421 | 0.521          |
| Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.592 | 0.440          | Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.002 | 0.969          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 1.639 | 0.212          | Age by Language              | 2  | 1.771 | 0.186          |
| Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 0.539 | 0.509          | Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 0.032 | 0.968          |
| Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.444 | 0.511          | Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.001 | 0.981          |
| <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 11 | 1.452 | 0.192          | <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 10 | 0.450 | 0.909          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.549 | 0.653          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.006 | 0.999          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.269 | 0.608          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.707 | 0.407          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 2  | 1.288 | 0.291          | Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 1  | 0.011 | 0.918          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 5.041 | 0.013          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 0.062 | 0.805          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 1  | 0.230 | 0.635          | Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 2  | 1.183 | 0.319          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.923 | 0.345          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.089 | 0.768          |
| Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.035 | 0.852          | Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.170 | 0.683          |

## APPENDIX B4.14

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF POSTTEST SCORES WITH PRETEST  
SCORES AS COVARIATES

| Control Group                |    |       |                | Experimental Group           |    |       |                |
|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|------------------------------|----|-------|----------------|
|                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |                              | df | F     | SIGNIF<br>OF F |
| <u>TOTAL</u>                 |    |       |                | <u>TOTAL</u>                 |    |       |                |
| <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 0.767 | 0.634          | <u>Main Effects</u>          | 8  | 0.925 | 0.510          |
| * Crèche differences         | 2  | 0.424 | 0.650          | Crèche differences           | 2  | 0.483 | 0.621          |
| Sex differences              | 1  | 0.031 | 0.862          | Sex differences              | 1  | 0.133 | 0.718          |
| Age differences              | 2  | 0.261 | 0.772          | Age differences              | 2  | 1.678 | 0.203          |
| Language differences         | 2  | 1.403 | 0.262          | Language differences         | 2  | 0.733 | 0.409          |
| Televiowing differences      | 1  | 1.938 | 0.174          | Televiowing differences      | 1  | 0.243 | 0.625          |
| <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 20 | 0.720 | 0.775          | <u>2-Way Interactions</u>    | 18 | 1.401 | 0.197          |
| Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 0.166 | 0.848          | Crèche by Sex                | 2  | 1.041 | 0.365          |
| Crèche by Age                | 3  | 0.201 | 0.895          | Crèche by Age                | 3  | 2.280 | 0.098          |
| Crèche by Language           | 3  | 0.083 | 0.461          | Crèche by Language           | 2  | 3.366 | 0.047          |
| Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.277 | 0.760          | Crèche by Televiowing        | 2  | 0.379 | 0.688          |
| Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.340 | 0.715          | Sex by Age                   | 2  | 0.927 | 0.406          |
| Sex by Language              | 2  | 1.228 | 0.308          | Sex by Language              | 1  | 4.034 | 0.053          |
| Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.012 | 0.915          | Sex by Televiowing           | 1  | 0.017 | 0.373          |
| Age by Language              | 2  | 1.652 | 0.209          | Age by Language              | 2  | 1.824 | 0.178          |
| Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 1.245 | 0.303          | Age by Televiowing           | 2  | 0.083 | 0.921          |
| Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 1.433 | 0.241          | Language by Televiowing      | 1  | 0.019 | 0.890          |
| <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 11 | 0.844 | 0.600          | <u>3-Way Interactions</u>    | 10 | 0.696 | 0.721          |
| Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.608 | 0.615          | Crèche by Sex by Age         | 3  | 0.756 | 0.527          |
| Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.772 | 0.387          | Crèche by Sex by Language    | 1  | 0.014 | 0.906          |
| Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 2  | 1.009 | 0.377          | Crèche by Sex by Televiowing | 1  | 0.489 | 0.490          |
| Crèche by Age by Language    | 2  | 1.312 | 0.285          | Crèche by Age by Language    | 1  | 0.295 | 0.591          |
| Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 1  | 1.313 | 0.580          | Crèche by Age by Televiowing | 2  | 0.863 | 0.432          |
| Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 1.514 | 0.220          | Sex by Age by Language       | 1  | 0.200 | 0.658          |
| Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.118 | 0.733          | Sex by Age by Televiowing    | 1  | 0.554 | 0.462          |

\* crèche differences refers to differences between the three child care centres, Jubilee, Dorkas and Holy Rosary Nursery school.

Underlined F scores are significant at the 0.5 level of significance

**Author** Galaun C

**Name of thesis** The acquisition of cognitive skills as a function of a television programme 1979

***PUBLISHER:***

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

©2013

***LEGAL NOTICES:***

**Copyright Notice:** All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

**Disclaimer and Terms of Use:** Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.