DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 618   CS 011 114

AUTHOR   Slater, Wayne H.
TITLE   Causal Relations and Their Effects on the
              Comprehension of Narrative Texts.
PUB DATE   19 Dec 92
NOTE   16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
              National Reading Conference (42nd, San Antonio, TX,
              December 2-5, 1992).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143) --
              Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Grade 4; Intermediate Grades; *Reading Comprehension;
              Reading Research; *Recall (Psychology); Short Term
              Memory
IDENTIFIERS   *Causal Connectives; Causal Inferences; *Narrative
              Text

ABSTRACT
        A study examined three variables derived from earlier
research on comprehension and recall of narrative text: time in
short-term memory; causal connections allowed; and referential
connections allowed. Subjects, 84 randomly selected fourth graders in
three suburban public elementary schools, read 8 short texts that
each contained 4 embedded goals, and then orally recalled as much as
they could remember from each text. Subjects' free recall was
audiotaped, transcribed, and analyzed. Results indicated that: (1)
causal chain status and number of causal relations were related to
the memorability of a text; (2) readers retained the endmost
proposition(s) from the causal chain in short-term memory as they
read; (3) both the number of processing cycles that a proposition
remains in short-term memory and the number of connections it forms
to other propositions influenced its memorability; and (4) causal
connections contributed to the coherence of a narrative text.
Findings add support to the claim that short-term memory is a
bottleneck in the comprehension process, and that the goal of
narrative comprehension is to discover a sequence of causal links
that connect a text's opening to its final outcome. (Two tables of
data are included; 24 references are attached.) (RS)

Wayne H. Slater
University of Maryland
Curriculum and Instruction
2311 Benjamin Building
College Park, MD 20742-1175
Phone: (301) 405-3128
Fax: (301) 314-9055
Internet: ws22@umail.umd.edu

Causal Relations and Their Effects on the

Comprehension of Narrative Texts

19 December 1992

Running head: CAUSAL RELATIONS AND THEIR EFFECTS ON COMPREHENSION

Causal Relations and Their Effects on the

Comprehension of Narrative Texts

This study represents an effort to contribute to the growing body

of research attempting to unify two separate approaches to the study of

comprehension and recall of narrative text (Fletcher & Bloom, 1988;

Slater, 1992; van den Broek, 1988). The first approach supported by the

work of Trabasso and his colleagues (Trabasso & Sperry, 1985) describes

comprehension as a problem-solving task in which the reader discovers a

series of causal links that connect a narrative text's introduction to

its conclusion. The second approach supported by the work of Kintsch

and van Dijk (van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983) focuses on the importance of

short-term memory as a hindrance in the comprehension process. Fletcher

and Bloom (1988) merge these two approaches by assuming that the most

likely causal antecedent to the next sentence is held in short term

memory. From their perspective, this allows a reader to determine the

causal structure of a text within the constraints of a limited-capacity

short-term memory. The objectives of the present study are to examine

three variables derived from their hypothesis: 1) time in short-term

memory; 2) causal connections allowed; and 3) referential connections

allowed to account for the percentage of the variance in fourth-graders'

free recall from eight short narrative texts.

Theoretical Framework

Underlying the coherent representation of a text is an active

process in which the reader finds connections between events by means of

inferences (Collins, Brown, & Larkin, 1981; Fletcher, 1981; van den

Broek, 1988). The inferences that unite events into a network of ideas

are largely causal in nature (Black & Bower, 1980; Fletcher & Bloom,

1988; Graesser, 1981; Mandler & Johnson, 1977; Trabasso, Secco, & van

den Broek, 1984). That is, the reader uses prior knowledge of

psychological and physical causality to find causes and consequences of

focal events, and thereby establishes coherence in text.

Using notions about causality from philosophy (Mackie, 1980;

Toulmin, 1964); rhetoric (Corbett, 1990; Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca,

1969); artificial intelligence (Schank, 1975; Lehnert, 1978), and

cognitive psychology (Mandler & Johnson, 1977; Stein & Glenn, 1979;

Trabasso, Secco, & van den Broek, 1984), Trabasso and van den Broek have

developed a general model for comprehension that identifies causal

relations between events. The model represents events and their

relations as causal networks and finds a critical, causal chain through

the network that identifies the important events, states, and actions in

the story.

Performance on various comprehension tasks such as question

answering, priming, causal-chain events, and number of causal

connections support the notion that readers, in an attempt to generate a

coherent representation of a text, identify and infer causal

relationships between the various components of the text (Liu, 1988).

Direct causal connections between events constrain answers to questions

and determine activation of one event by another (Suh, 1988). In

addition, events that are on the causal path through the story and that

have many connections are recalled and summarized more often and rated

as more important than those that are dead end or have few connections

(Black & Bower, 1980). These findings support the psychological

validity and importance of individual causal connections between pairs

of events as well as of the representation of the overall structure of a

narrative as a causal network. They also suggest that the Trabasso and van den Broek (1985) model for identifying the causal structure of a story captures important properties of readers' mental representation of a text.

Given this background, the following hypotheses were tested: 1) that Trabasso's causal analysis can be extended to the level of individual propositions; 2) that the propositions most useful for understanding the causal structure of a text are held in short-term memory during comprehension; 3) that both the amount of time a proposition spends in short-term memory and the number of connections this allows to other propositions influence its recall; and 4) that both referential and causal connections contribute to the coherence of a text.

Method

Subjects. Subjects for the study were 84 randomly selected fourth graders in three suburban public elementary schools. All subjects were native speakers of English.

Materials. Using methods, procedures, and analyses developed by Fletcher and Bloom (1988), eight short narrative texts were used in this research. Each consisted of 10 sentences and contained four embedded goals. The organization of these goals was systematically varied across texts. Specifically, four separate goal hierarchies (deep, shallow, unbalanced, and balanced) were generated and two texts were written to conform to each. The purpose of this manipulation was to produce variation in the effort required to hold the most subordinate goal in short-term memory. The more deeply embedded the goal structure, the greater the effort should become.

The eight texts were organized into two sets. Each set was composed so that four of the texts in each set were used as fillers and four were used as targets. Texts that were used as fillers in the first set were used as targets in the second set and vice versa. Each set included one target text corresponding to each of the four goal structures. Subjects were randomly assigned to each text set. Test booklets were constructed that contained a page of instructions followed by the eight texts in the following sequence: two filler texts at the beginning, four target texts, and two filler texts at the end, followed by free-recall instructions for each of the four target texts. Each subject recalled the target texts in the same order in which they had been presented. Each text and each recall were on a separate page.

Procedures. The experiments consisted of two phases. During the first phase, each subject was instructed to read the eight texts once through at his or her normal reading speed, paying close attention because later he or she would be asked to recall them. In the second phase, each subject was given the titles from the four middle texts on separate 3 x 5 index cards and instructed to orally recall as much as they could remember from each text, using the exact words if possible. All recalls were audiotaped and then transcribed for scoring.

Scoring. The propositional content of each text was derived using procedures recommended by Bovair and Kieras (1985) and Turner and Greene (1978). The resulting list of propositions was then used to score subjects' free-recall protocols. A strict scoring criteria was adopted such that a subject was credited with recalling a proposition only if it or a close paraphrase of it was explicitly present in the recall protocol. Two independent raters scored each protocol. Overall

agreement between raters was approximately 90% and all discrepancies

were resolved through discussion. After the protocols were scored, the

results were used to calculate the probability of recall for each

proposition.

Results

Effects of Causal Structure. Multiple regression analyses were

carried out on the recall probabilities of each proposition in each

text. The independent variables were 1) whether or not a proposition

was from a state on the causal chain (causal chain status), 2) the

number of direct causal connections a proposition's state had with the

other states in the text (causal connections possible) and 3) the

number of direct referential connections a proposition had with the

other propositions in the text (referential connections possible).

Causal chain status was a categorical independent variable, with

propositions from states on the causal chain receiving a score of one,

and propositions not on the causal chain receiving a score of zero. All

analyses were conducted on the eight texts combined as well as

independently. Because of the theoretical relatedness of the

independent variables, a check of multicolinearity was conducted

(Pedhazur, 1982). The results of this check indicated no

multicolinearity.

As Table 1 indicates, causal connections possible, causal chain

status, and referential connections possible each accounted for

significant proportions of variance when entered into the analysis

alone. In addition, both causal chain status and causal connections

possible uniquely accounted for significant proportions of variance,

Insert Table 1 about here

while referential connections possible failed to account for any significant unique variance. The interactions of causal chain status with both referential connections possible and causal connections possible were not significant. These results support the findings reported by Trabasso and van den Broek (1985), Fletcher and Bloom (1988), and Slater (1992). However, like the Fletcher and Bloom (1988) and Slater (1992) studies, they extend those findings to individual propositions.

Effects of Short-Term Memory Allocation. Each of the short-term memory allocation strategies tested in the earlier studies (leading edge, current-state, or current state plus goal) was fit to the free-recall data in two steps. First , a minimum X^2 criterion was used to find the value of p which produces the best fit between predicted and observed recall probabilities in the equation $Pr(recall) = 1-(1-p)^k$ for each combination strategy and text. This provides a measure of how time in short term-memory alone influences free recall   Next, separate multiple regression analyses on the probability of recall were computed for each strategy, using three independent variables: 1) time in short-term memory, 2) the number of direct causal connections a proposition's state had with the other states as allowed by their co-occurrence in short-term memory (causal connections allowed), and 3) the number of direct referential connections a proposition had with other propositions as allowed by their co-occurrence in short-term memory (referential connections allowed). Independent variables were

checked for multicolinearity. None was found. Again, the effects of text and its interactions with the other variables were nonsignificant, so all results are presented with the texts combined.

All three full models account for significant amounts of variance while the current-state model accounts for the most, .26, p <.01. Next is the current-state plus goal model, .22, p <.001, and then the leading-edge model, .16, p <.001. Within the current-state model, all three variables individually account for significant proportions of variance, time in short-term memory, .19, p <.001, causal connections allowed, .20, p <.001, and referential connections allowed, .02, p <.05. However, only time in short-term mem,ry and causal connections allowed accounted for significant amounts of unique variance, .04, p <.01 and .06, p <.01, respectively.

Comparison of Structural and Processing Analyses. A direct comparison of the variables employed in the structural analyses (causal chain status, caus 1 connections possible, and referential connections possible) with the variables employed in the processing analyses (time in short-term memory, causal connections allowed, and referential connections allowed). As Table 2 indicates, this analysis revealed that although both the structural and processing analysis variables alone account for significant amounts of variance, the processing

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

analysis variables from the current-state model accounted for both more variance and a significant amount of unique variance.

Discussion

Several important findings are derived from this study and confirm findings in earlier studies (Trabasso & van den Broek, 1985; Fletcher & Bloom, 1988). First, Trabasso and van den Broek's (1985) finding that causal chain status and number of causal relations are related to the memorability of a text is supported. Second, findings support the notion that readers retain the endmost proposition(s) from the causal chain in short-term memory as they read. This is consistent with the general outline of the comprehension model proposed by Kintsch and van Dijk (1978). Third, findings support the contention that both the number of processing cycles that a proposition remains in short-term memory and the number of connections it forms to other propositions influence its memorability. Fourth, straightforward support from the data indicate that causal connections contribute to the coherence of a narrative text. But as in previous studies, the importance of referential connections remains less clear.

This study makes a contribution to the evolving line of inquiry which is attempting to integrate two approaches to the study of text comprehension and recall. The data support the claim that the goal of narrative comprehension is to discover a sequence of causal links that connect a text's opening to its final outcome. Additionally, the data support the view of short-term memory as a bottleneck in the comprehension process. It appears that readers use local causal relations to identify the propositions that are the most likely antecedents of the next sentence they read. Held in short-term memory, these propositions allow readers to discover a causal path through a text within the constraints imposed by short-term memory. It is

interesting that goal information appears not to be held in short-term memory.   Goals are probably reinstated whenever local coherence breaks down.

Future research needs to investigate the conditions under which long-term memory is searched for missing antecedents or consequences. In addition, future research needs to systematically extend and replicate these findings with longer and more ecologically valid texts.

References

Black, J. B., & Bower, G. H. (1980). Story understanding as problem solving. Poetics, 9, 223-250.

Bovair, S., & Kieras, D. E. (1985). A guide to propositional analysis for research on technical prose. In B. K. Britton & J. B. Black (Eds.), Understanding expository text: A theoretical and practical handbook for analyzing explanatory text (pp. 315-363). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Collins, A. M., Brown, J. S., & Larkin, K. (1981). Inference in text understanding. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce, & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), Theoretical issues in reading comprehension (pp. 122-157). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Corbett, E. P. J. (1990). Classical rhetoric for the modern student (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Fletcher, C. R. (1981). Short-term memory processes in text comprehension. Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 20, 564-574.

Fletcher, C. R., & Bloom, C. P. (1988). Causal reasoning in the comprehension of simple narrative texts. Journal of Memory and Language, 27, 235-244.

Graesser, A. C. (1981). Prose comprehension beyond the word. New York/Heidelberg/Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Kintsch, W., & van Dijk, T. A. (1978). Toward a model of text comprehension and production. Psychological Review, 85, 363-394.

Lehnert, W. G., (1978). The process of question answering. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Liu, L. (1988). Reading between the lines: The assessment and promotion of comprehension by the use of questions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Mackie, J. L. (1980). The cement of the universe: A study of causation. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Mandler, J. M., & Johnson, N. S. (1977). Remembrance of things parsed: Story structure and recall. Cognitive Psychology, 9, 111-151.

Pedhazur, E. J. (1982). Multiple regression in behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). The new rhetoric: A treatise on argument (J. Wilkinson & P. Weaver, Trans.) Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press.

Schank, R. C. (1975). The structure of episodes in memory. In D. G. Bobrow & A. Collins (Eds.), Representation and understanding: Studies in cognitive science. New York: Academic Press.

Slater, W. H. (1992, April). The effects of causal links on seventh-graders' comprehension of short narrative texts. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Stein, N. L., & Glenn, C. G. (1979). An analysis of story comprehension in elementary school children. In R. O. Freedle (Ed.), New directions in discourse processing, Vol. 2, (pp. 53-120). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Suh, S. Y. (1988). Convergent evidence for reasoning during the comprehension of text. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.

Toulmin, S. E. (1964). The uses of argument. Cambridge, UK:

Cambridge University Press.

Trabasso, T., Secco, T., & van den Broek, P. W. (1984). Causal

cohesion and story coherence. In H. Mandl, N. L. Stein, & T.

Trabasso (Eds.), Learning and comprehension of text, (pp. 83-111).

Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Trabasso, T., & Sperry, L. L. (1985). Causal relatedness and

importance of story events. Journal of Memory and Language, 24,

595-611.

Trabasso, T., & van den Broek, P. W. (1985). Causal thinking and the

representation of narrative events. Journal of Memory and

Language, 24, 612-630.

Turner, A., & Greene, E. (1978). Construction and use of a

propositional text base. JSAS catalogue of selected documents in

psychology, Ms 1713.

van den Broek, P. (1988). The effects of causal relations and

hierarchical position on the importance of story statements.

Journal of Memory and Language, 27, 1-22.

van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). Strategies of discourse

comprehension. New York: Academic Press.

Table 1

Proportions of Variance Accounted for by Causal Connections Possible,

Causal Chain Status, and Referential Connections Possible

	R^2	
	Alone	Unique
Full Model = .22**		
Causal Connections		
Possible	.17***	.02**
Causal Chain Status	.19***	.04**
Referential Connections		
Possible	.01*	.00

  * p < .05.

 ** p < .01.

*** p < .001.

Table 2

Proportions of Variance Accounted for by both the Structural Analysis

and the Processing Analysis Variables

	R^2	
	Alone	Unique
Structural analysis variables	.22***	.02
Processing analysis variables	.26***	.05*

* $p < .05$.

*** $p < .001$.