DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 375 SP 001 514

AUTHOR Koff, Robert H.: Feldman, David H.

TITLE Systematic Changes in Adult Word-Association Norms

1910-1967: Implications for the Language of the

Classroom.

INSTITUTION Stanford Univ., Calif. Stanford Center for Research

and Development in Teaching.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau

of Research.

REPORT NO RM-28
BUREAU NO BR-5-0252
PUB DATE Apr 68

CONTRACT OEC-6-10-078

NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the American Psychological

Association meeting, San Francisco, September 1968

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$0.80

DESCRIPTORS *Education Majors, *Language Patterns, *Verbal

Stimuli, *Word Lists

ABSTRACT

Word associations to 51 stimulus words selected from the Kent and Rosanoff stimulus list were obtained from 110 graduate and 75 undergraduate teacher trainees. Associations were analyzed so that comparisons between teacher-trainee associations and several adult normative collections could be made. Response homogeneity was found to increase significantly from 1910 to 1967, and undergraduate Ss were found to have significantly more response homogeneity than graduate Ss. Teacher trainees demonstrated a high degree of response homogeneity to the list of stimulus words. Although they are not significantly different in their associative habits from other adult populations, future research should examine the possible effects that response homogeneity may have on the language used in the classroom. (Author/JS)



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF NEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPHNOUS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

STANFORD CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN TEACHING

Research Memorandum No. 28

Systematic Changes in Adult Word-Association Norms 1910 - 1967: Implications for the Language of the Classroom 1 2

by

Robert H. Koff Stanford University

and

David H. Feldman Stanford University

This memorandum is a draft for interoffice circulation. Corrections and suggestions for revision are solicited. The memorandum should not be cited as a reference without specific permission of the authors. It is automatically superseded upon formal publication of the material. The research and development reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, under the provisions of the Cooperative Research Program.

- 1 A paper prepared for presentation at the American Psychological Association Meeting, San Francisco, September 1, 1968.
- ² The authors gratefully acknowledge the valuable assistance of David C. Berliner in the collection of data and the helpful comments of David C. Chambers.

School of Education Stanford University Stanford, California

April 1968

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Wiss Kawasaki

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."



Abstract

word associations to 51 stimulus words selected from the Kept and Rosanoff stimulus list were obtained from 185 graduate and undergraduate teacher-trainees. Associations were analyzed so that comparisons between teacher-trainee associations and several adult normative collections could be made. Response homogeneity was found to increase significantly from 1910 to 1967 and undergraduate 8s were found to have significantly more response homogeneity than graduate Ss. The findings were discussed in terms of the cumulative effect of "mass culture" on associations over time and the impact that response conformity may have on the use and meaning of language in the classroom.



Systematic Changes in Adult Word-Association Norms 1910-1967: Implications for the Language of the Classroom

Ъу

Robert H. Koff Stanford University

David H. Feldman Stanford University

Intuitively, the language that teachers and students use in the classroom should be related to a variety of pupil performance characteristics. Bellack, et. al. (1966) examined the effects of language used in the classroom and were able to develop a list of rules for the language game of teaching. Smith and Meux (1960) investigated the effects of the logic of verbal communication on pupil behavior, Getzels and Jackson (1962) investigated the relationship between teacher-student communication variables and creativity and intelligence, and Taba (1964) developed a system for representing the impact of teacher verbal behavior on patterns of student cognitive performance. Thus several investigations of teacher-student verbal interactions have shown that the "language of the classroom" is significantly related to patterns of student performance.

The study of word associations represents the interaction of two old and active fields of research, the area of personality dynamics (or individual differences) and the area of cognition (or the various aspects of knowing). Recent word association research has been concerned with the impact of "mass culture" on free associations as they are related to intelligence and social class (Entwisle, 1966), language development in children (Brown & Berko, 1960), and systematic changes in associations of children over time (Palermo & Jenkins, 1964; Koff, 1965).



there was a significant tendency for superordinate responses to decrease with time. Jenkins and Russell are the only investigators who have explored the issue of systematic change in free associations, but their findings were based on groups of adults who did not plan to become teachers.

The purpose of the present inquiry was to examine the word associations of a group of teacher-trainees and to relate their associative response patterns to the potential effect they may have on the use and meaning of language in the classroom. Within the context of this paper teachers are viewed as primary transmitters of the culture and as such are significant determiners of the language used in the classroom. This paper presents first the associations of a group of teacher-trainees to a standardized list of stimulus words selected from the Kent and Rosanoff (1910) stimulus list. Second. differences in associative patterns between college education major undergraduates and Master of Arts in Teaching graduate students are examined. Third, comparisons of teacher-trainee associations with several adult normative collections are made. In conclusion, speculations are made as to the effects that "response homogeneity" may have on the use and meaning of language for students in the classroom.

Method

The sample consisted of a total of 185 education students divided as follows: 75 undergraduates who attended a large state college and 110 Master of Arts in Teaching graduates who attended a private university. Ss completed the test materials during their regular educational psychology classes in the fall of 1967. Each S was given a test booklet which contained 100 stimulus words from the Kent and Rosanoff stimulus list. However, only 51 words selected from the stimulus list were analyzed for the present study. The criteria for selection of these stimulus words were those employed by Koff (1965).

Test conditions and instructions were kept as similar to the Russell and Jenkins (1960) study as possible. The following instructions were read aloud to the Ss.



This is one of the studies of verbal behavior being done at the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching. This particular experiment is on free-association.

Do not write your name on the outside of the paper passed to you.

When you open these sheets, you will see a list of 100 stimulus words. After each word, write the first word that it makes you think of.

Start then to go on to the next word.

Use only a single word for each response.

Do not skip any words.

Work rapidly until you have finished all 100 words.

When you are through, turn your paper over and write on the back the letter that appears on the board at that time.

Are there any questions?

Ready? Now go.

In order to place moderate time pressure on <u>S</u>s the letter "A" was written on a blackboard at the front of the room at the beginning of the test period, and succeeding letters were placed on the blackboard a five-minute intervals.

Test administration in the present study differs in certain respects from previous word association studies. The major difference in testing procedure was that Ss were not required to put their names on their test booklets. It was felt that this procedure would serve to decrease response homogeneity because of the anonymity it guaranteed each S. Ss were asked after they had completed the questionnaire whether it made any difference to them that they had not put their names on their test booklets. Ss were unanimous in their agreement that they would not have responded differently had they been asked to write their names on the test booklets. It is recognized that variations in test procedures may have an effect upon response production, but studies by Clousing (1927), Boyer and Elton (1958) and Jenkins and Russell (1960) suggest that oral-individual or group administration procedures have had little effect on responses.



Results

The data were analyzed in order to answer the following questions:

(1) Do state college education Ss show more response homogeneity
than university graduate teacher-trainees? (2) Is the trend toward
increased response homogeneity continued in a sample of teachertrainees? (3) Is response homogeneity more pronounced for teacher-trainees
than for the general adult population?

Table 1 shows the stimuli, primary responses and average percentage of primary, secondary and tertiary responses for the graduate and undergraduate teacher-trainees. Out of a total of 51 stimulus words, 13 showed primary response changes. That is, undergraduate and graduate teacher-trainees responded with the same primary response a total of 38 times. From the percentage of the total number of associations that the primary, and primary, secondary and tertiary responses represent it can be seen that there is a high degree of response agreement between the two groups even though the undergraduate Ss show more response homogeneity. The primary responses for the 51 stimulus words shown in Table 1 accounted for 39.3 and 42.7 percent of the responses for the graduate and undergraduate Ss respectively. These average percentages are not significantly different from each other. For the graduate Ss the primary, secondary and tertiary responses accounted for a total of 52.9 percent of the total number of responses. For the undergraduate Ss this figure was 61.5 percent, a significant (p $\langle .05 \rangle$) increase of 8.6 percent (Johnson, 1949, pp. 93-97).

Insert Table 1 About Here

Table 2 shows the average percent of primary, and primary, secondary and tertiary associations for eight normative collections from 1910 to 1967. It is clear from Table 2 that the trend toward response homogeneity has been continued and replicated in the present sample. The average percent primary response in 1910 and 1967 was 25.2 and 41.3 respectively; an average increase of 16.1 percent. The average percent primary, secondary and tertiary responses was



45.2 in 1910 and 57.4 in 1967. Thus there has been an average increase in primary, secondary and tertiary response homogeneity of some 12.2 percent over the last 57 years.

The Russell and Jenkins 1952 sample shows slightly more response homogeneity than the 1967 sample (an average increase of 1.6 percent in the primary response category and 4.8 percent in the primary, secondary and tertiary category). These differences are not significant and may be attributable to variations in test administration. For example, Russell and Jenkins required Ss so write their names on test booklets, thus making the testing procedure more similar to individual administration than was the case in the present study. The differences are, however, so small that they do not seem to represent any systematic evidence that would indicate that response homogeneity in 1967 has increased significantly from 1952.

Insert Table 2 About Here

Table 2 also shows that teacher-trainee associations do not deviate significantly from earlier normative collections. However, the data do illustrate the fact that teacher-trainee associations are consistent with respect to the trend toward increased response homogeneity over time. To be more confident of this finding, however, teacher-trainees should be compared with more recent adult control groups.

Discussion

The results of this study have implications for issues of concern to investigators of word association patterns and to educators. The study showed that teacher-trainees are, on the average, as homogeneous in their associative responses as other adult populations sampled in the past and that undergraduate state college $\underline{S}s$ are significantly (p < .05) higher in response homogeneity than university M.A.T. $\underline{S}s$. The study also showed that there is a general trend toward increased response homogeneity over time, but that the data collected in the present study reflected no significant increase in the general



tendency for increased response homogeneity. In summary, response homogeneity has remained at about the same level since Jenkins and Russell's 1952 study of University of Minnesota students.

The finding that teacher-trainees in a graduate education program show significantly less response homogeneity than state college undergraduates is consistent with earlier results reported by Kent and Rosanoff (1910). In their study Kent and Rosanoff found that more highly educated Ss made less use of popular response words than less well educated Ss. However, the present finding is inconsistent with data interpretations made by Jenkins and Russell (1960). It is possible that the results for the present sample were due to factors other than education level; intelligence, age, or subtle differences in testing procedures may account for the differences found.

Perhaps an asymptote has been reached with respect to homogeneity of associations to this particular list of stimulus words. It would appear, however, that there is still room for greater response homogeneity since about 60 percent of the more recent adult word collections gave similar primary, secondary and tertiary responses. The years between 1910, 1925-1933, and 1952-1967 could be viewed as single time periods, with each study conducted during these periods serving as independent replications of the original. Although the number of years between studies has not been consistent, greater differences between samples are to be found when the number of years is increased between them.

The present study has not provided evidence which would support the "mass culture" hypothesis advanced by Jenkins and Russell.

Cross-cultural studies of association patterns from countries whose populations are exposed to varying degrees of "mass culture" are needed. Such studies ought to confirm the hypothesis that the greater the degree of exposure to "mass culture," the more likely there will ben increased associative response homogeneity. Entwisle (1966) has studied word associations of Amish children, but the stimulus words used in her study do not permit comparison with earlier samples.

The results of this study show that teacher-trainees demonstrated a high degree of response homogeneity to a selected list of stimulus



words. Although teacher-trainees are not significantly different in their associative habits from other adult populations, future research should examine the possible effects that response homogeneity may have on the language used in the classroom. Teachers should be made aware of the high associative response probabilities attached to certain combinations of verbal stimuli and be trained to change their verbal behavior in order to maximize the effects that such associative links may have on perceptual factors in word recognition and meaning.

It would seem that we are now in a position to inquire into what the effects of response homogeneity may have on pupil performance characteristics. What effect may response homogeneity have on such constructs as creativity, ideational fluency, short and long term memory, transfer, etc.? What relationships are there between social class variables and response homogeneity as they are manifested in the utilization of language in the classroom?



ERIC **
*Full Text Provided by ERIC

Stimuli, Primary Responses and Average Percentage of Primary and Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Responses for 185 Graduate and Undergraduate Education Students Table 1

| Stimulus Response Ss Making Response | | UNDERGI | UNDERGRADUATES | | | GRADUATES | |
|--|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|------|---------------------|-----------|--|
| e Chair 64.91 93.2 73.8 light 84.9 95.9 95.9 95.9 95.9 Noman 89.0 97.3 56.2 98.8 Nallow 26.0 97.3 54.8 Bard 28.8 54.8 91.1 18.2 23.8 Rain High 19.2 69.3 68.5 Hill 18.8 k White 65.8 78.1 84.9 72.1 16.4 37.0 18.1 18.2 23.1 18.1 18.1 18.1 18.1 18.1 18.1 18.1 1 | Stimulus | Response N ∻ 75 | Making Imary (% | | Response N = 110 | జ్ఞక | Ss Making Prima: Secondary, and Tertiary (%) |
| Light 84.9 95.9 95.2 38. Health 37.0 56.2 38. Health 37.0 56.2 38. Health 28.0 97.3 75. Shallow 26.0 97.3 75. Hard 28.8 54.8 54.8 23. Hard 28.8 54.8 54.8 23. Hod 19.2 68.5 11.1 18. K White 65.8 78.1 78.1 78.1 78.1 K White 65.8 78.1 78.1 78.1 78.1 K White 49.3 73.0 Yellow 16. K Sour 42.5 75.3 75.0 75.3 75.3 K Sour 42.5 75.3 75.0 75.3 K Sour 42.5 75.3 75.3 75.3 Hot 52.1 75.3 75.3 75.3 Hot 52.1 75.3 75.3 75.3 K Shoe 28.8 63.0 70.e 19. How 72.2 76.7 81ack 13. How 72.2 76.7 81ack 14. Low 63.0 75.3 76.7 Low 63.0 75.3 76.7 Low 63.0 75.3 76.7 Low 63.0 75.3 76.7 Low 64.7 76.7 76.7 Low 72.2 76.7 76.7 Low 72.2 76.7 76.7 Low 72.2 76.7 76.7 Low 74.7 76.7 76.7 Low 74.7 76.8 76.7 Low 74.7 76.8 76.7 Low 74.7 76.7 76.8 Low 74.7 76.8 Low 74.7 76.7 76.8 Low 74.7 76.7 76.8 Low 74.7 | Table | Chair | • | • | | | 82.0 |
| Health 37.0 56.2 38 Woman 89.0 97.3 38 Shallow 26.0 53.4 29 Shallow 26.0 54.8 24.3 22 Hard 28.8 54.8 54.8 23.3 teain High 19.2 49.3 Hill 18 e Home 41.1 52.1 40 33 k Tall 52.1 40.3 41 40 e Home 40.1 52.1 40 40 40 e Table 49.3 74.0 Yellow 40 | Dark | Light | | • | | • | • |
| Woman 89.0 97.3 75 Shallow 22.0 53.4 22 Hard 28.8 54.8 23 Hard 49.3 68.5 31 tain High 19.2 49.3 Hill 18 tain Home 41.1 52.1 40.3 37.0 t Table 49.3 73.0 Yellow 40 erfly Beautiful 16.4 37.0 Yellow 40 erfly Beautiful 16.4 37.0 Yellow 50 t Table 49.3 73.0 Yellow 54 t Sour 40.3 73.0 Yellow 54 t Sour 52.1 74.0 54 n Hot 52.1 75.3 54 40 e Black 41.1 61.6 71.2 60.3 60.3 60.3 e Blue 72.2 76.7 | Sickness | Health | • | • | | • | 00 |
| Shallow 26.0 53.4 29 Hard 28.8 54.8 54.8 23 Eafn High 19.2 49.3 68.5 111 18 e Home 41.1 52.1 49.3 Hill 18 e White 65.8 78.1 40.3 73.0 78.1 40.0 r Table 49.3 73.0 Yellow 16 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 17 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 16 40.0 17 17 17 17 18 17 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 18 | Man | Woman | • | 97.3 | | 5 | 85.0 |
| Hard 28.8 54.8 54.8 71.0 | Deep | Shallow | • | • | | • | |
| ng Food 49.3 68.5 Hill 31 tain High 19.2 49.3 Hill 18 e Home 41.1 52.1 Hill 18 t White 65.8 78.1 40 37.0 40 | Soft | Hard | • | • | | | |
| teain High 19.2 49.3 Hill 18 b Mome 41.1 52.1 k White 65.8 78.1 k White 65.8 78.1 t Tall 52.1 84.9 trily Beautiful 16.4 37.0 r Table 49.3 73.0 t Sour 42.5 75.3 the Blow 9.6 27.4 n Man 57.5 the Blow 65.8 75.3 the Black 41.1 61.6 trilul Pretry 17.8 60.3 t Smooth 45.2 60.3 t Shoe 28.8 63.0 t Blue 23.3 50.7 Black 54.1 show 63.0 75.3 the Blue 23.3 50.7 Black 54.1 the Boy 72.2 76.7 86.0 the Boy 72.2 76.7 86.0 the Boy 72.2 76.7 86.0 the Rouri 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14.1 the Rouri 16.4 79.5 the Boy 72.2 76.7 the Boy 72.2 76.7 the Rouri 16.4 7.5 63.0 the Rouri 16.4 7.5 64.2 the Rouri 16.4 7.5 65.1 the Rouri 16.5 65.1 th | E sting | Food | | • | | ä | 5 |
| E Home 41.1 52.1 37 K White 65.8 78.1 58.1 58.1 t Tall 52.1 84.9 40.0 40.0 t Table 49.3 77.0 Yellow 16 t Sour 42.5 75.3 50.0 9 t Blow 9.6 27.4 Stop 9 t Blow 9.6 27.4 Stop 9 t Blow 57.5 74.0 54.0 54.0 n Man 57.5 74.0 54.0 54.0 t Black 41.1 61.6 61.6 61.6 61.6 61.6 61.6 61.6 61.6 61.6 61.6 72.2 7 | Mountain | High | 19.2 | • | H111 | | 47.0 |
| k White 65.8 78.1 t Tall 52.1 84.9 erfly Beautiful 16.4 37.0 r Table 49.3 75.0 r Table 49.3 75.0 r Sour 42.5 75.3 tle Blow 9.6 27.4 n Man 57.5 76.0 Fast 65.8 74.0 k Black 41.1 61.6 tl Pretcy 17.8 37.0 Ugly 19 Smooth 45.2 60.3 Toe 19 In Thread 38.4 79.5 Black 13 Boy 72.2 76.7 Black 14 In Buse 43.8 63.0 Toe 38 Sweet 43.8 63.0 Toe 38 Kouni 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14 Kouni 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14 Kenty 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14 | House | Home | 41.1 | 52.1 | | • | 47.0 |
| t Tall 52.1 84.9 40 erfly Beautiful 16.4 37.0 Yellow 16 r Table 49.3 73.0 Yellow 16 r Table 49.3 73.0 Yellow 16 r Sour 42.5 75.3 75.3 39 tle Blow 9.6 27.4 Stop 9 r Hot 52.1 75.3 75.3 54.8 Elect 41.1 61.6 61.6 19 r Smooth 45.2 60.3 70.0 Ugly 19 r Shoe 28.8 63.0 Toe 19 shoe 72.2 76.7 Black 138 63.0 Toe 19 r Blue 23.3 56.7 Black 138 66.0 10 r Nar 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14 ler War 24.7 45.2 | Black | White | | 78.1 | | • | 0.39 |
| erfly Beautiful 16.4 37.0 Yellow 16 r Table 49.3 73.0 Yellow 13 t Sour 42.5 75.3 39 tle Blow 9.6 27.4 Stop 9 tle Blow 57.5 74.0 54.0 54.0 n Wan 57.5 71.2 54.0 54.0 te Black 41.1 61.6 08.1 19 tiful Present 44.1 61.6 08.1 19 th Smooth 45.2 60.3 10 19 th Shoe 23.3 50.7 Black 13 Boy 72.2 76.7 Black 54 Low 63.0 75.3 54 ch 43.8 63.0 54 ch 45.2 54.7 45.2 54 | Short | Tall | 52.1 | • | | • | 68.0 |
| r Table 49.3 73.0 t Sour 42.5 75.3 t Sour 42.5 75.3 t Sour 42.5 75.3 t Blow 9.6 27.4 Stop 9 74.0 74.0 Nan 57.5 74.0 14.1 75.3 Effet Black 41.1 61.6 In Smooth 45.2 60.3 Shoe 28.8 63.0 Iow 63.0 75.3 Sweet 43.8 63.0 Iow 63.0 75.3 Iow 72.2 76.7 Iow 75.3 76. | Butterfly | Beautiful | 16.4 | . • | Yellow | 16.0 | 36.0 |
| tt Sour 42.5 75.3 39 ttle Blow 9.6 27.4 Stop 9 n Man 57.5 74.0 54.0 54.0 54.0 54.0 54.0 54.0 54.0 5 | Chair | Table | 49.3 | • | | 32.0 | 59.0 |
| tle Blow 9.6 27.4 Stop 9.6 n Man 57.5 74.0 74.0 54.0 54.0 54.0 Hot 52.1 75.3 71.2 71.2 Fast 65.8 71.2 71.2 Black 41.1 61.6 61.6 ciful Pretry 17.8 37.0 Ugly 19 37.0 n Smooth 45.2 60.3 Shoe 28.8 63.0 Toe 19 le Thread 38.4 79.5 Blue 23.3 50.7 Black 13.8 63.0 Cow 63.0 75.3 60.3 Low 63.0 75.3 60.0 Sweet 43.8 63.0 h Roun: 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14 14 ler War 24.7 45.2 15. | Sweet | Sour | 42.5 | • | | 39.0 | 74.0 |
| n Man 57,5 74.0 74.0 84.0 85.1 75.3 71.2 75.3 71.2 75.3 71.2 71.2 71.2 71.2 71.2 71.2 71.2 71.2 | Whistle | Blow | • | _ | Stop | 0.6 | 21.0 |
| Hot 52.1 75.3 35 Fast 65.8 71.2 71.2 Fast 65.8 71.2 71.2 Black 41.1 61.6 Ho Smooth 45.2 60.3 10919 19 Shoe 28.8 63.0 Toe 19 It Thread 38.4 79.5 Black 13 Boy 72.2 76.7 Black 13 Sweet 43.8 63.0 75.3 660 A Round 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14 | Women | Man | • | • | ı | 54.0 | 68.0 |
| Fast 65.8 71.2 e Black 41.1 61.6 Efful Pretcy 41.1 61.6 Efful Pretcy 41.1 19 Efful Pretcy 41.1 19 In Smooth 45.2 60.3 19 In Thread 28.8 63.0 Toe 13 Blue 23.3 50.7 Black 13 Boy 72.2 76.7 54 Low 63.0 75.3 60 Sweet 43.8 63.0 16.4 37.0 14 In Round 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14 In War 24.7 45.2 15 | Cold | Hot | | 75.3 | | 35.0 | 71.0 |
| e Black 41.1 61.6 38 Efful Pretry 17.8 37.0 Ugly 19 A Smooth 45.2 60.3 19 A Shoe 28.8 63.0 Toe 19 Ie Thread 38.4 79.5 Black 13 Bo 72.2 76.7 Black 54 Low 63.0 75.3 60 Sweet 43.8 63.0 75.3 60 A Round 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14 Ier War 24.7 45.2 15 | Slow | Fast | • | 1 | | 48.0 | • |
| Eiful Pretty 17.8 37.0 Ugly 19 h Smooth 45.2 60.3 37.0 19 h Shoe 28.8 63.0 Toe 19 le Thread 38.4 79.5 Black 13 Bo 72.2 76.7 Black 54 Low 63.0 75.3 60 Sweet 43.8 63.0 56.0 h Round 16.4 37.0 51 ler War 24.7 45.2 15 | White | Black | 41.1 | • | | • | • |
| h Smooth 45.2 60.3 Toe 19 Shoe 28.8 63.0 Toe 19 le Thread 38.4 79.5 Black 13 Blue 23.3 50.7 Black 54 Boy 72.2 76.7 Black 54 Low 63.0 75.3 60 Sweet 43.8 63.0 birt 14 h Round 16.4 45.2 15.4 | Beautiful | Pretry | . • | • | Ugly | • | 45.0 |
| Shoe 28.8 63.0 Toe 19 le Thread 38.4 79.5 Toe 13 Blue 23.3 50.7 Black 13 Boy 72.2 76.7 Black 54 Low 63.0 75.3 60 Sweet 43.8 63.0 55.3 60 h Roung 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14 ler War 24.7 45.2 15 | Rough | Smooth | 45.2 | 60.3 | | • | • |
| le Thread 38.4 79.5 38 Blue 23.3 50.7 Black 13 Boy 72.2 76.7 54 Low 63.0 75.3 60 Sweet 43.8 63.0 53.0 h Round 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14 ler War 24.7 45.2 15 | Foot | Shoe · | • | • | Toe | • | 47.0 |
| Blue 23.3 50.7 Black 13.8 54.7 | Need le | Thread | | • | | | 64.0 |
| Boy 72.2 76.7 54. Low 63.0 75.3 60. Sweet 43.8 63.0 36. h Round 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14. ler War 24.7 45.2 15. | Red | Blue | • | | Black | • | • |
| Low 63.0 75.3 60. Sweet 43.8 63.0 37.0 Dirt 14. ler War 24.7 45.2 15. | Girl | Boy | • | 76.7 | | • | • |
| Sweet 43.8 63.0 36. h Round 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14. ier War 24.7 45.2 15. | High | Low | • | 75.3 | | • | 0 |
| Round 16.4 37.0 Dirt 14. War 24.7 45.2 15. | Sour | Sweet | | | | • | 57.0 |
| War 24.7 45.2 15. | Earth | Rouna | | . • | Dirt | • | 37.0 |
| | Soldier | War | 24.7 | 45.2 | | 5. | 31.0 |

Table 1 continued

UNDERGRADUATES

GRADUATES

| | | | | *************************************** | | |
|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Stimulus | Response N = 75 | Ss Making Response Primary (%) | Ss Making Primary, Secondary and Tertiary (%) | Response N = 110 | Ss Making Response Primary (%) | Ss Making Prim Secondary and Tertiary (%) |
| Cabbage | Lettuce | 21.9 | 45.2 | Slaw | 0.6 | 24.0 |
| Hard | Soft | 65.8 | 75.3 | | 58.0 | 71.0 |
| Yellow | Red | 8.2 | 24.7 | Bird | 14.0 | 28.0 |
| Bread | Butter | 38.4 | 53.4 | | 28.0 | 43.0 |
| Boy | Girl | 75.3 | 87.7 | | 64.0 | 71.0 |
| Light | Dark | 68.5 | 78.1 | | 48.0 | 57.0 |
| Sheep | Calf | 30.1 | 56.2 | Lamb | 19.0 | 39.0 |
| Blue | Sky | 27.4 | 52.1 | | 23.0 | 35.0 |
| Hungry | Food | 52.1 | 58.9 | | 27.0 | 0.74 |
| Long | Short | 69.9 | 74.0 | | 0.09 | 69.1 |
| Harmer | Nafl | 4.49 | 75.3 | | 40.0 | 26.0 |
| Square | Round | 36.6 | 63.0 | | 38.0 | • |
| Doctor | Nurse | 26.0 | 47.9 | Lawyer | 19.0 | 47.0 |
| Ponq | Soft | 39.7 | 72.6 | | 50.0 | 0.69 |
| Lion | Tiger | 27.4 | 45.2 | | 14.0 | 36.0 |
| Heavy | Light | 54.8 | 65.8 | | 44.0 | • |
| Moon | Star(s) | 15.1 | 34.3 | | 22.0 | 35.0 |
| Quiet | Loud | 21.9 | 57.3 | | 24.0 | 42.0 |
| Salt | Pepper | 54.8 | 65.8 | | 45.0 | 55.0 |
| Street | Road | 12.3 | 30.1 | Car | 14.0 | • |
| King | Oueen | 68.5 | 76.7 | | 58.0 | 68.0 |
| Cheese | Cake | 13.7 | 33.0 | Mouse | 12.0 | 26.0 |
| Average Per | Percent | 42.7 | 61.5 | | 39.3 | 52.94 |
| | | | | | | |

^{4 2 4}

Rounded off to the nearest tenth percent. Rounded off to the nearest percent. Refers to significant difference (p<.05) between primary, secondary and tertiary response categories between graduate and undergraduate Ss.

Table 2

Average Per Cent of Primary and Primary, Secondary and Tertiary

Associations for Eight Adult Normative Collections: 1910-1967

| Sample | Year Collected | И = | | Average Per Cent Primary + Secondary + Tertiary Response |
|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|--|
| Kent/Rosanoff | 1910 | 1000 | 25.2 ² | 45.5 |
| O'Connor Schellenberg | 1925 1927 | 1000 925 | 35.1 28.8 | 55.4 48.6 |
| Keene | 1933 | 500 | 38.1 | 57.7 |
| Russell/Jenkins | 1952 | 1008 | 42.9 | 62.2 |
| Tresselt | 1959 | 108 | 40.1 | 58.7 |
| Koff | 1961 | 122 | 40.2 | 59.2 |
| Koff/Feldman ³ | 1967 | 185 | 41.3 | 57.4 |

- 1. Average percentages based on a sample of 51 stimulus words from the Kent-Rosanoff list. Criterion for stimulus inclusion was the same as that employed by Koff (1965).
- 2. Rounded to nearest tenth of a per cent.
- 3. Sample consists of 185 education students divided as follows: 75 undergraduates who attended a large state college and 110 Master of Arts in Teaching graduates who attended a private university.



References

- Bellak, Arno, et. al. The language of the classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.
- Boyer, R. A. & Elton, C. F. Effect of instructions on free associations.

 Journal of Educational Psychology, 1958, 49, 304-308.
- Brown, R. & Berko, J. Word association and the acquisition of grammar.

 Child Development, 1960, 31, 1-14.
- Clousing, J. The relation between personality trait ratings and free association responses. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Minnesota, 1927.
- Entwisle, Doris R. Word associations of young children. Beltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1966.
- Getzels, J. W. & Jackson, P. W. <u>Creativity and intelligence</u>. New York: John Wiley, 1962.
- Jenkins, J. J. & Russell, W. A. Systematic changes in word association norms: 1910-1952. <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</u>, 1960, 60, 293-374.
- Johnson, P. Statistical methods in research. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1949.
- Keene, C. M. Commonality of response on a word association test: A study of standardization procedures and an attempt to forecast moderate emotional maladjustment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1951.
- Kent, Grace H. & Rosanoff, A. J. A study of association in insanity.

 American Journal of Insanity, 1910, 67, 37-96, 317-390.
- Koff, Robert H. Public and private language modes: A study in word association. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Chicago, 1962.
- Koff, Robert H. Systematic changes in children's word-association norms: 1916-1963. Child Development, 1965, 36, 299-305.
- O'Connor, J. Born that way. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1928.
- Palermo, D. S. & Jenkins, J. J. Changes in the word associations of fourth and fifth grade children from 1916 to 1961. Research Bulletin No. 41, Department of Psychology, Pennsylvania State University, March. 1964.



- Russell, W. W. & Jenkins J. J. The complete Minnesota nor is for responses to 100 words from the Kent-Rosanoff word association test. Technical Report No. 11, 1954, University of Minnesota, contract N8 onr 66216, Office of Naval Research.
- Smith, B. O. & Meux, M. O. A study of the logic of teaching. Urbana, Illinois: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Tiinois, 1960.
- Taba, Hilda & Elzey, Freeman F. Teaching strategies and thought processes.

 <u>Teachers College Record</u>, 1964, 65, 524-534.
- Tresselt, M. R. The response and frequencies of response for 108 Ss (ages 34-41) to the Kent-Rosanoff word list. Psychological Newsletter, NYU, 1959, 10, 176-212.

ERIC