

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 464

CS 009 670

AUTHOR Parrish, Berta; Hiatt, Richard
 TITLE Assessing the Effects of Developmental Education Courses: An Integrative Evaluation Model.
 PUB DATE 89
 NOTE 47p.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Evaluation; *Developmental Programs; Educational Research; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; Longitudinal Studies; Mathematics Instruction; Models; Reading Instruction; Writing Instruction
 IDENTIFIERS Developmental Curriculum; *Embry Riddle Aeronautical University AZ; Student Surveys

ABSTRACT

To develop a more realistic and informative evaluation model, a longitudinal study was conducted during 1988-1989 to assess the effects of the developmental education courses in mathematics, reading/study skills, and writing at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (ERAU) in Prescott, Arizona. Five quantitative and three qualitative measures were collected and analyzed in regard to academic performance, retention, and student satisfaction data on the 226 students enrolled in the courses during the fall of 1986. Experimental statistics included the correlation of retention, reading score, future grade point average, as well as a comparison to a similar control group who were not placed in the developmental courses. Descriptive statistics included data gathered by a mailed questionnaire and 60 personal interviews on degree of satisfaction, skills usage, and perception of proficiency gained from instruction in these classes. Analysis suggests that developmental courses are effective in addressing the basic mathematics, reading/study skills, and composition skill deficiencies of many entering college students. Three-fourths of the students interviewed felt they were reading and writing as well as other college students. (Appendixes consist of a cover letter and student questionnaire; cover letter and interview questions; an outline of continuing activities and an analysis of the return on the university's investment. Sixteen references are attached.) (MM)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Berta Parrish

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) "

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

ED308464

Assessing the Effects of Developmental Education Courses: An Integrative Evaluation Model

A Research Study
resulting from a
Research Development Grant
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University
Prescott Campus
Spring 1989

Dr. Berta Parrish, Humanities/Social Studies
Professor Richard Hiatt, Math/Physical Science
ERAU - Prescott

CS009670

ABSTRACT

Because Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University has made a commitment to the quality of its educational programs, research studies on student outcomes and institutional effectiveness are necessary. A longitudinal study was conducted during 1988-89 to assess the effects of the developmental education courses in mathematics, reading/study skills, and writing to develop a more realistic and informative evaluation model. Five quantitative and three qualitative measures were collected and analyzed in regards to academic performance, retention, and student satisfaction. data on the 226 students who were enrolled in the courses during the fall of 1986.

The experimental statistics included the correlation of retention, reading score, future grade point average, and success in the required college level courses, as well as a comparison to a similar control group who did not place in the courses. The descriptive statistics included data gathered by a mailed questionnaire and sixty personal interviews on degree of satisfaction, skills usage, and perception of proficiency gained from instruction in these classes.

The quantitative data suggests that the courses are effective in addressing the basic mathematics, reading/study skills, and composition skill deficiencies of many entering college students. The success rate of all three classes are high, ranging from 91% to 64%. Also, the developmental humanities courses are meeting the objective of preparing students for the subsequent college level

course: 72% of the students receive a passing grade. Although the retention rate of 40% is low, the grades received in the developmental courses do predict future grade point average and success in the college level class. Other indicators of effectiveness are the data from the matched SAT/ACT group. No significant differences were found in retention or grade point average, even though the experimental group was inadequately prepared for college at matriculation. The developmental courses successfully intervened in time to make these marginal students academically competitive without a significantly different attrition rate.

The qualitative data corroborates and extends the quantitative statistics. According to the questionnaire results, over three-fourths of the students consider the developmental courses helpful. Ninety-one percent of the writing students and 82% of the math students felt that the courses prepared them for college level work. Furthermore, over three-fourths of the students interviewed felt that they are reading and writing as well as other college students.

Recommendations based on the analyzed information include a continuation of the developmental course structures with slight instructional modifications suggested by student responses. Since the highest percentage of positive responses related to a caring instructor, careful selection of adjunct and full-time faculty must be maintained. Placement procedures must be investigated since many students felt they were misplaced. We feel that the study

should be replicated in two years to determine the effect of the 1987 admission standards policy, especially on grade point averages and retention.

In conclusion, this research study verifies that the developmental education courses at ERAU, Prescott have a positive effect on student academic performance and earn a high degree of student satisfaction even though they are mandatory and do not carry degree credit. When implemented, the recommendations should only improve an already effective and valuable academic program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Introduction	1
Method	3
Results.	5
Discussion	19
Conclusions and Recommendations.	25
References	27
Appendices	
A. Student Letter and Questionnaires.A1-4
B. Interview Letter and QuestionsB1-4
C. Continuing Activities and Return to UniversityC1-2

Universities across the nation are committed to improving and strengthening the educational quality of their academic programs. One way in which institutional effectiveness is evaluated is by assessing student outcomes and reactions after completing certain academic requirements. This study assesses the effectiveness of the developmental education courses in reading, writing, and mathematics. It is based upon the academic performance, retention, and student satisfaction data of the 226 students who were enrolled in the courses during the fall of 1986.

The results not only provide valuable evaluative and retention data, but they also include conclusions and recommendations for instructional and curriculum decisions. Furthermore, the research design and procedures create a prototype for evaluating college developmental education which goes beyond the current use of pre-and-post test scores.

The recent literature on developmental education contains advice on evaluation. In the past, evaluation has focused on quantitative data only. However, many researchers (Maxwell, 1971; Sanders, 1980; Dumont, 1982; and Shea, 1984) now agree that evaluation cannot be measured by standardized test performance, or improved grade point average, or retention figures, or other hard data analysis alone. While this emphasis is important, it does not evaluate all the areas of improvement that occur as outcomes in special college programs. Qualitative research offers insight into student ideas, values, and individual interpretation of experience (Silverman, 1983). It provides researchers with information

concerning the students' affective development and thus enhances quantitative documentation. Student reactions regarding learning, satisfaction, and suggestions for instructional material and objectives can only be gathered through questionnaires and personal interviews.

Therefore, an integrative evaluation model was used which included both experimental and descriptive statistics to provide a more comprehensive assessment of reading/study skills, writing, and mathematics course goals (Maring, Shea, & Warner, 1987). The following questions were investigated:

- 1) What percent of students taking developmental course work in the fall of 1986 were retained after 4 semesters of class work ending December of 1988?
- 2) Is the grade in developmental course work a predictor of retention?
- 3) Is the post-test standardized reading score a predictor of future grade point average?
- 4) Is the grade in developmental course work a predictor of future grade point average?
- 5) Is the grade in developmental course work a predictor of the grade in the subsequent required college level course in humanities and mathematics?
- 6) Using two groups of students with the same SAT scores, where one group took developmental courses and one did not, is there a significant difference in retention and grade point average?
- 7) How do students evaluate the developmental courses they have taken (satisfaction, skills usage, and perception of proficiency gained)?

METHOD

The following information was collected from the registration office on the 226 freshmen or transfer students who were enrolled in MA105: Quantitative Skills, HU117: Reading and Study Skills, and HU106: Developmental English in the fall of 1986 and placed into a database using dBaseIII+:

- a) student names
- b) developmental course(s) enrolled in
- c) fall 1988 retention data
- d) fall 1988 cumulative grade point averages
- e) verbal and nonverbal SAT/ACT scores
- f) post-test Nelson Denny standardized reading test scores
- g) grades from developmental and college-level courses

Grade distributions for the developmental courses and the introductory college level humanities and mathematics course (HU 122 and MA 111 in most cases) were compiled. Comparative analyses were conducted to ascertain whether the grade in the developmental class predicted retention and success in the subsequent humanities and mathematics course. This was derived by applying the Chi-square technique with frequency distributions corresponding to grades received. Only grades received in the first attempt to complete the developmental course were used; second, and third attempts were not included in the study. The data involving course performance were inclusive of only letter designations reported at the end of the semester, thereby excluding the designations for incomplete (I) and withdrawal (W).

Current cumulative grade point averages were obtained in the records office and the post-test Nelson Denny Reading Test scores were compiled by the HU117 Course Monitor in the Humanities

Department. The Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation was used to determine whether the developmental course grade and post-test reading score are predictors of a student's grade point average two years later.

In order to compare the impact on GPA with a control group, 20 students with an entering Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) score of 400 to 450 on the verbal and nonverbal sections who did not place into the developmental courses by the departmental placement tests were selected. American College Testing (ACT) scores were converted to SAT equivalents by using the conversion formula (Vroonland, 1988):

$$\text{SAT} = \text{ACT} \times 20 + 55$$

A t-test was conducted to discover whether there is a significant difference between the equal ability groups.

In addition, the retention data were analyzed and reported in percentages. If the student was not enrolled in the fall semester of 1989, he or she was included in the attrition count. This procedure did, unfortunately, count as drop-outs a few students who are planning to eventually return to ERAU.

An investigator-developed questionnaire was field tested for each of the three developmental courses after a review of the literature provided two examples (Pasch, 1980; Laritsky & Brewer, 1984). A multiple choice format was used with "a" through "e" revealing degrees of agreement, disagreement, and non-applicability. A cover letter with directions, the three questionnaires, a scan-tron answer sheet, and a return envelope

were sent by registered campus mail to the 92 remaining students in the initial 226 population. (Questionnaire materials are included in Appendix A.) The data collected from the questionnaires were analyzed by percentages and are reported in this study with the questions.

Twenty students were then randomly selected from each developmental course and personally interviewed by the investigators. Semi-structured, open-ended questions were developed to gather further detailed information concerning perceived value of courses, suggestions for course improvement, and other important information. (Interview questions are included in Appendix B.) Probing was used whenever necessary, and some extraneous information was discussed, but not reported in the study. Data from the interviews are reported by categorizing when possible and listing each response when not possible. Common responses are given a number to represent the number of times that answer was provided. Interview responses are reported under each of the questions.

RESULTS

The results of this study are presented in a combination of tables and prose in response to each of the research questions. Additional statistical analyses that were later considered necessary to interpret the results are also described.

- 1) What percent of students taking developmental course work in the fall of 1986 were retained after 4 semesters of class work ending December of 1988?

The percentage of students in Table 1 reveals the enrollment status two years after each of the developmental courses in which they were enrolled.

TABLE 1: OVERALL RETENTION

Course	%	# Retained	# Not Retained
MA 105	40%	92	137
HU 117	38%	42	69
HU 106	38%	54	90

Student SAT/ACT scores were correlated with the retention figures: MA 105 has a correlation of 0.16 with the nonverbal SAT score; HU 117 has a rate of 0.4 with the verbal SAT score; and HU 106 has a rate of 0.24. None of the three are considered statistically significant. Of students who took both the humanities courses and the math course (an N of 28) the correlation is 0.22, again too low for significance.

2) Is the grade in developmental course work a predictor of retention?

Table 2 contains the grades received as well as the number breakdown for retention (R represents those retained, and NR those not retained). The overall pass rate (students receiving a C or above) for each of the courses is as follows: MA 105 with 63%, HU117 with 91%, and HU106 with 84%.

TABLE 2: GRADE AS PREDICTOR OF RETENTION

Grade	MA105		HU117		HU106	
	R	NR	R	NR	R	NR
A	13	13	23	23	19	14
B	26	17	11	17	24	29
C	7	16	8	6	12	26
D	6	11	1	9	0	9
E	5	21	0	13	0	14

df = 4 at the .01 level of significance $\chi^2 > 13.28$
is significant

The Chi-square test indicates that the grades earned in MA 105 and HU 106 do serve as a predictor of retention with 13.74 and 21.3 respectively. Grades earned in HU117 (8.06) do not serve as a retention predictor at this level of significance.

- 3) Is the post-test standardized reading score a predictor of future grade point average?

Table 3 presents the statistics regarding reading scores and grade point average (GPA).

TABLE 3: READING SCORE AS PREDICTOR

	\bar{x}	θ	max.	min.
Post-test score	10.91	1.88	14.4	6
GPA	2.17	.87	3.8	0

With a Pearson's Coefficient of Correlation of .12, the correlation is very low, not statistically significant to consider the post-test reading scores as a predictor of a student's future grade point average.

4) Is the grade in developmental course work a predictor of future grade point average?

Yes, a grade in each of the three developmental courses serves as a predictor of future grade point average. HU 117 and HU 106 have a fairly high correlation of 0.76 and 0.77 respectively. MA 105 has a lower correlation of 0.60, but it is within the range to be considered statistically significant.

5) Is the grade in developmental course work a predictor of the grade in the subsequent required college level course in humanities and mathematics?

A Chi-square test reveals that grades earned in all three courses do serve as predictors for grades in the required college level courses (HU122 and MA111 in most cases) with the following figures: MA105 with 64.8; HU117 with 33.7; and HU106 with 33.23. Table 4 contains a grade matrix for students in the developmental courses and the required college level courses.

TABLE 4: GRADE MATRIX
HU 122

	A	B	C	D	F
A	7	15	2	0	2
B	2	8	14	9	4
C		9	9	6	4
D			3	1	1
F					

HU 122

	A	B	C	D	F
A	7	15	6	5	3
B		6	10	2	1
C		5	3	2	1
D				3	2
F			1		1

H
U
1
1
7

MA 111

	A	B	C	D	F
A	6	12	2	2	2
B	3	8	15	3	6
C		2	3	5	10
D				8	2
F			1	1	3

M
A
1
0
5

df = 16 at the .01 level of significance $\chi^2 > 32.00$ is significant.

Table 5 presents the number and percent of students who passed the developmental courses and earned a C or better in HU122 and MA11.

TABLE 5: REQUIRED COURSE PASS RATE

Course	Number passed	Percent passed
MA 111	51 out of 94	54%
HU 122	52 out of 73	71%
HU 122	69 out of 96	72%

6) Using two groups of students with the same SAT scores, where one group took developmental courses and one did not, is there a significant difference in retention and grade point average?

Table 6 and Table 7 present the results of the t-test to determine the effect of the developmental courses on retention and GPA in contrast to a control group.

TABLE 6: GPA DIFFERENCES

Course	Experimental Group			Control Group			t-test
	n	\bar{x}	s	n	\bar{x}	s	
MA 105	17	2.57	.58	26	2.65	.94	- .31
HU 117	15	2.22	1.48	26	2.65	.94	- .53
HU 106	12	2.17	1.27	26	2.65	.94	-1.31

$n_1, n_2 < 30$ $df = 41$ MA 105, $df = 39$ HU 117,
 $df = 36$ HU 106 $t > 1.96$ or $t < - 1.96$ is significant

The t-test reveals that there is no statistically significant differences at the .05 level between the two matched groups. Even though the experimental group needed the developmental classes when the students entered ERAU, two years later there is no difference in GPA from those students with the same SAT/ACT score who did not need the developmental instruction.

TABLE 7: RETENTION DIFFERENCES

Course	Experimental Group			Control Group			t-test
	n	x	s	n	x	s	
MA 105	17	.71	.47	26	.5	.51	+1.36
HU 117	15	.40	.51	26	.5	.51	- .58
HU 106	12	.42	.51	26	.5	.51	- .45

$n_1, n_2 < 30$; $df = 41$ MA 105, $df = 39$ HU 117, $df = 36$ HU 106

Again the t-test reveals there is no statistically significant difference between the two matched groups regarding retention.

7) How do students evaluate the developmental courses they have taken (satisfaction, skills usage, and perception of proficiency gained)?

Data for this research question were collected by a questionnaire for each developmental course and personal interviews. Tables 8 through 13 present the results of the questionnaires and interviews for MA105, HU117, and HU106 respectively.

TABLE 8
STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF MA 105: QUANTITATIVE SKILLS

	A	B	C	D	F
1. I feel that MA 105 prepared me for my <u>next</u> math course.	41%	41%	17%	0%	0%
2. I feel that MA 105 has helped me do better in classes <u>other than mathematics</u> .	15%	41%	11%	28%	4%
3. As a result of MA 105, I feel differently about math than I did before I started.	20%	24%	46%	9%	2%
4. I feel that regular attendance in MA 105 was important to my grade.	43%	39%	4%	13%	0%
5. I feel that my instructor cared how I did in class.	24%	59%	4%	13%	0%
6. I feel that I was properly placed in MA 105.	30%	35%	4%	26%	0%
7. I feel that in general MA 105 was helpful.	43%	39%	4%	13%	0%

* 46 students responded out of 92 enrolled Fall 1988, yielding a 50% return rate.

TABLE 9
MA 105 INTERVIEW RESPONSES

1. **What was the reason you needed to take a brush up course in Algebra?**
 I haven't taken a math course for years. - 10
 My background in high school was weak. - 6
 I hadn't taken a math during the summer. - 2
 With the confusion of registration, I couldn't
 concentrate on the placement test. - 1
 I needed a short review before the placement test. - 1

2. **Did MA 105 prepare you for your next mathematics courses?**
 yes 14 no 6

- If not, why?**
 I was prepared for the next course before taking MA 105. - 3
 Most of the material I needed was not taught in MA 105. - 2
 MA 105 was too easy in comparison MA 111.

3. **What skills did you learn that helped you in your next math course?**
 I learned to study because homework was required. - 6
 I learned the basic concepts of Algebra. - 3
 Repetition forced me to learn.
 Good review of the skills needed in Algebra.

4. **What improvements could we make in MA 105?**
 Give a better placement test, I shouldn't have taken it. - 3
 Give credit for the class toward your degree.
 Cover more material.
 Move at a faster pace.
 None. - 14

5. **Would a review session given by instructors the day before the placement test have helped?**
 yes 8 no 12

6. **Do you have any suggestions regarding ERAU's current math curriculum?**
 No suggestions (okay the way it is). - 5
 Have math teacher teach math. - 2
 MA 112 is a waste of time. - 2
 Put trig in MA 105.
 No exams the week before the finals.
 Change the title of MA 112, good course.
 Condense MA 105 to cover more material.
 Math is too difficult, don't need calculus.

* 20 students were personally interviewed, representing 18% of fall 1986 MA 105 students who were enrolled in the fall of 1988.

9

TABLE 10
STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF HU 117: READING AND STUDY SKILLS

	A	B	C	D	E
1. I feel that my overall reading ability was improved in HU117.	42%	31%	24%	3%	0
2. I feel that the study skills taught in HU117 have helped me do better in my other classes.	21%	42%	34%	3%	0
3. I feel that my instructor cared how I did in class.	62%	31%	3%	3%	0
4. I feel that I was properly placed in HU117.	32%	24%	24%	17%	3%
5. I feel more confident in myself as a student as a result of HU117.	24%	17%	35%	17%	6%
6. I feel that in general HU117 was helpful.	28%	45%	17%	10%	0

I feel that the following skills have been helpful in the courses I have taken:

	A	B	C	D	E
7. Previewing	24%	42%	34%	0	0
8. Textbook Reading:SQ3R	31%	41%	28%	0	0
9. Summarizing	21%	55%	24%	0	0
10. Vocabulary	21%	45%	34%	0	0
11. Speed Improvement	24%	42%	31%	3%	0
12. Note taking Tips	24%	45%	28%	3%	0
13. Time Management	31%	39%	24%	6%	0
14. Stress Reduction	21%	38%	31%	10%	0
15. Preparing for Exams	14%	55%	21%	10%	0

Two Comments: 1. The instructor was able to make the subject more enjoyable for the class. 2. Overall, the course has been an asset to the courses I have taken. If possible, it would be nice if seminars on Stress Reduction or a few other skills could be given as refreshers.

*29 students responded out of 42 enrolled Fall 1988, yielding a 69% return rate.

TABLE 11
HU117 INTERVIEW RESPONSES

1. **Do you think taking HU117 helped in later college courses?**
Yes - 15 No - 5

If so, which ones and how.

- I read more now than ever before. - 5
- Taught me how to study. - 3
- I never read before; now I read for pleasure. - 3
- I learned how to read a textbook. - 3
- I comprehend more and read faster now. - 2
- Taught me how to write a book report. - 2
- I have dyslexia and yet it got me up to the 12th grade level
- It was tedious. I didn't know enough about what I was doing to improve my skills.
- I feel that friends who don't take the course, do less well even back home.

Student comments on which courses HU117 has helped:

- All of Business courses. - 2
- Helped in every course when I have to read.
- Speed and comprehension needed in lots of classes.

2. **What are some of the things you studied in HU117 that you feel has helped the most?**

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| Time management - 9 | Textbook study - 4 |
| Speed reading - 8 | Summarizing - 4 |
| Note taking - 7 | Skimming - 2 |
| Vocabulary - 6 | Stress reduction - 2 |
| Exam preparation - 5 | Goal setting - 1 |

3. **Is there any reading or study skill you have needed for college courses that was not included in HU117 and should be?**

- None - 11
- How to study calculus/math. - 2
- How to read difficult material, beyond the college level.
- More memory improvement.
- More on reduction of test anxiety.
- How to write a physics lab report.
- Get more specific: how to read different types of texts.
- More on how to study reading and lecture notes.
- How to stop procrastination.

4. **Now after two (2) years, what suggestions for improvement can you make for HU 117?**

- No suggestions. - 3
- Liked the speed machines. - 4
- Liked the book reports. - 3
- Workload helped introduce to college work. - 3
- When I look back, it's scary to actually learn something.
- More time needed for vocabulary book.

Reduce amount of summaries.
Not enough vocabulary work.
More vocabulary tests needed.
Emphasize the need for the course more.
Add an overview for speeches.
More time necessary.

5. **What did you like the best about HU 117?**

My reading skills improved. - 5
Okay as is - 4 Vocabulary book
Instructor - 4 Summary writing
Study skills - 3 Book reports
How to read a text -3 Individual book choice
I like many things.
Improving amount and desire to read.
Made me feel more confident because I saw my progress: I
was getting fast and getting 90% instead of 40%.

What did you like the least about HU 117?

Speed machines, but they helped. - 4
Everything helped. - 3
Can't remember. - 3
Efficient Reading book. - 3
Vocabulary tests. - 2
Tedious, pointless work.
7:40 am time.
Keeping up on notebook work.
Books were helpful, but not enjoyable.

6. **Do you think additional reading or study assistance is needed at ERAU?**

No - 10 Yes - 6 Don't know - 4

Suggestions:

Advanced reading class as elective. - 5
Additional study help by professors, not tutors. - 2
More organized study groups needed on campus - 2
I signed up at Yavapai College Learning Center for a 1 hour
study skills class so I could use the faculty tutoring
in all subjects.
Tutors here know less than I do.

7. **Do you think you are reading as well as other college students?**

Yes - 15 No - 5

Comments:

Below average in speed. - 5
I still have trouble remembering what I read. - 2
Yes, except for notetaking. I write every word.
Now I do; I didn't before HU117.
For technical reading, yes.
Vocabulary could be better.
Comprehension isn't as good as it should be.

* 20 students were personally interviewed, representing 48% of fall 1986 HU117 students who were enrolled in the fall of 1988.

TABLE 12
STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF HU 106: DEVELOPMENTAL ENGLISH

	A	B	C	D	E
1. I feel that the writing techniques and skills taught in HU106 prepared me for my next Humanities class.	58%	33%	6%	3%	0
2. I feel that the writing techniques and skills taught in HU106 have helped me do better in classes other than Humanities.	40%	48%	12%	0	0
3. I feel that my HU106 instructor cared how I did in class.	76%	21%	3%	0	0
4. I feel that I was properly placed in HU106.	36%	36%	19%	6%	3%
5. I feel that in general HU106 was helpful.	43%	45%	12%	0	0
6. I feel that my present level of writing proficiency is average for the demands of college instruction.	36%	49%	15%	0	0

I feel that the following activities have been helpful:

	A	B	C	D	E
7. Developing a Thesis Statement	48%	46%	6%	0	0
8. Using Transitional Words	42%	43%	10%	0	0
9. Outlining an Essay	42%	42%	13%	3%	0
10. Types of Introductory, Supporting, and Conclusion Paragraphs	55%	42%	3%	0	0
11. Punctuation	40%	54%	6%	0	0
12. Spelling Tests	21%	40%	36%	3%	0
13. Journal Writing	16%	36%	36%	12%	0
14. Writing Better Sentences	42%	55%	3%	0	0

One comment: This class did seem to help at the time, but too much information in a short period of time made for less retention of all the skills I thought.

*33 students responded out of 54 enrolled Fall 1988, yielding a 61% return rate.

TABLE 13
HU106 INTERVIEW RESPONSES

1. **Do you think taking HU106 helped in later Humanities and other college courses?**

Yes = 18 No = 2

Is so, which ones and how?

I had a poor or no background in English. - 7
Grade in HU122 higher because of HU106. - 6
I needed a review of the basics. - 5
Helped gear me up for college work. - 3
It fo'lds right in HU122. - 3
Probably wouldn't be here if I didn't take it.
It has helped in just about every course I've taken.
Helped me learn the English language better.
Concentrated too much on basics. I felt misplaced.

Student comments on which courses HU106 has helped:

Reports for AS405, AS415, AS 105; Almost all Business courses;
Psychology; Speech; Computer Science courses.

2. **What are some of the things you studied in HU106 that you feel has helped the most?**

Structure of an essay - 10	Essay question writing -2
Thesis statement - 5	Transitional words - 2
Sentence structure - 3	Journals - 2
Punctuation and grammar - 3	Brainstorming
Outlining - 3	Fear of writing disappeared
Spelling Tests - 3	Don't know

3. **Is there any writing skill you have needed for college courses that was not included in HU106 and should be?**

None - 14
Use essay topics and exams from other classes.
Include how to write business and lab reports.
Preparation for different teacher expectations.

4. **Now, after two (2) years, what suggestions for improvement can you make for HU106?**

No suggestions. - 7
Keep assignments related to aviation. - 3
Make it mandatory for all freshman.
Stress the importance of the class early.
Use Air Science reports as examples.

Journals helped me organize my thinking.
Loved the class; still using a few papers.
Change the textbook.
More writing practice.
Journals didn't help.
More practice at looking at sentence structure.
Use computerized spelling instead of tests.

5. **What did you like the best about HU 106?**

Instructor - 8 Review - 2
Relaxed atmosphere - 5 Essay topics - 2
Writing experience - 2 Journals - 2
Meeting other foreign students

What did you like the least about HU 106?

Nothing specifically. - 5 Too much like high school. -2
Journals. - 4 Doesn't count for degree.
Can't remember. - 3 Don't like English classes.
Spelling tests. - 3

6. **Have all your writing needs been served by the Writing Lab?**

Haven't ever used it. - 8 Yes - 3
Haven't used it since HU 106. - 2
Used in once. - 2 Use instructor instead.
Used it twice. - 3 Use Yavapai College.
Learning. Center instead.
Use it a lot. - 2

Why haven't you used the Writing Lab? (Asked of those who have never used it or used it only once or twice.)

Person was too critical of my writing.
Limited time it's open.
Needs more hours.
I should go more often.

7. **Do you think you are writing as well as other college students?**

Yes - 16 No - 4

Comments: Yes, but when I came to ERAU, definitely not.
More spelling and vocabulary needed.
No, I need to go back to 106 for review!

8. **What do you like the best about ERAU?**

Small size study body and classes. - 8
Instructors friendly and available. - 8
Aviation interest and degree at same time. - 5
People - 4 Fewer distractions. - 2
West - 2 Hands-on teaching.
Fun place to be - 2 Outdoor sports.

9. **What do you like the least about ERAU?**

Limited social activity if under 21. - 3
Cost too much - 2

Money more important than student. - 2
Too military oriented. - 2
Misleading information on flight line. - 2
Too far from big city. - 2
Not enough electives.
More study area needed.
More effort is needed to help us graduate, not just enroll.

*22 students were personally interviewed, representing 40% of fall 1986
HU 106 students who were enrolled in the fall of 1988.

DISCUSSION

An evaluative assessment of ERAU's developmental courses by student academic performance and student perceived instructional value is the purpose of this study. The conclusions are based on the descriptive and inferential analyses presented.

The data suggest that the courses are successful in addressing basic mathematics, reading, and composition skill deficiencies of many entering college students. HU 117 has the highest percentage of students achieving a satisfactory grade (91%), then HU 106 (84%), and MA 105 (64%). These completion rates are significantly higher in reading and writing courses than the course completion rate of 2,785 two- and four-year institutions. A national survey conducted by Margaret Cahalan and others (1986) reveals that remedial courses were successfully completed by an average of about 74% of those taking reading, 71% taking writing, and 68% taking mathematics. Also, the developmental humanities courses are meeting the objective of preparing students for the subsequent required college level course. The performance of students reveals adequate preparation for HU 122, Freshman Composition and Literature I. Seventy-two percent of the developmental students receive a passing grade in HU 122. This percentage is almost the same as that Bellot and Bowman (1983) found

in their comparative assessment of student performance in developmental and freshman English courses. In contrast, MA 105 may not be preparing students adequately for MA 111, Intermediate Algebra, since only 54% receive a passing grade in MA 111. However, this figure is within the 26% to 50% pass rate of one-third of the 165 developmental math programs reported in a national survey by McDonald (1988). The MA 105 figure may be explained by the fact that in the fall of 1986, there were no admission requirements and many of the developmental students who failed MA 105 or MA 111 did not have high school algebra and could not work at the pace at which the material was covered.

Other indicators of success are the data from the matched-groups comparison. No significant differences are found in retention or grade point average between the developmental and the nondevelopmental students. This finding is consistent with evaluative information from other studies (Maxwell, 1971; Fairbanks, 1974). It is highly improbable that the developmental students who entered with inadequate proficiency would outperform the proficient control group. Therefore, the fact that the deficiencies were remediated in time for competitive academic achievement without a significant difference in attrition is noteworthy and encouraging.

In contrast, grades received in the developmental courses do serve as predictors of future grade point average when analyzed alone. Furthermore, the grades received in developmental English and mathematics are also predictors of retention. In addition to the grade from the reading class not correlating to retention, a student's overall reading ability does not correlate to future grade point

average. This finding conflicts with evaluative data from other college programs (Chand, 1985; Maxwell, 1971). The fact that reading ability does not positively correlate to academic performance could be explained by the nature of ERAU's math and science oriented curriculum or that the average reading score of 10.9 grade equivalent is sufficient for academic success.

The information analyzed from the questionnaires seems to corroborate the overall success of the developmental courses. All three courses are considered helpful: 88% for HU 106, 82% for MA 105, and 73% for HU 117. The highest ratings relate to a caring instructor with 97% (HU 106), 94% (HU 117) and 83% (MA 105) of the students feeling their instructor cared about their progress. Placement views received a greater divergence with 72% (HU 106), 65% (MA 105), and 56% (HU 117) of the students feeling properly placed. Another area of difference is the percentage of students who feel that the developmental courses prepared them for the college level course ninety-one percent of the developmental English students feel like it did, but only 55% of the developmental math students feel like MA 105 prepared them for MA 111. In addition, 88% of the English students feel that HU 106 has helped them perform better in classes other than humanities.

The information gained from the personal interviews again support the general response of student satisfaction with the developmental courses. Furthermore, many valuable suggestions and reactions were received.

MA 105 Summary of Interview Responses

Seventy percent of the students interviewed think MA 105 helped in later college classes and felt no improvement could be made in the course. Fifty percent have been out of school for some time and have forgotten the mathematics they once learned. Thirty percent relate a very poor background in high school mathematics, some having never even completed beginning algebra. The largest complaint (15%) is that they do not feel they were placed correctly into MA 105, and ten percent do not believe the material was covered was at a fast enough pace. Forty percent feel that a review of algebra conducted before the placement exam would have refreshed their mathematical skills enough to change the results of their placement exam. Other suggestions include: college credit should be given for MA 105, and MA 105 should be taught by mathematics teachers (one instructor was an engineer).

HU 117 Summary of Interview Responses

Seventy-five percent of the students interviewed think that HU 117 helped in later college courses. Forty percent commented that they now read much more than before the course, and in particular read more for pleasure. Fifty percent of the comments related to learning how to study better. Several suggestions of adding specific reading and study skills were given; however, the majority feel that the course includes everything they needed for college study. Course improvement suggestions varied from liking the speed reading machine and the book reports, to more time needed for vocabulary work and tests. Students most like the idea that their reading skills

improved. Other repeated responses include liking their instructor and study skill instruction the most. Among the least liked aspects about HU 117, the speed reading machines are mentioned the most, although all the respondents agree they were helpful. The reading text and vocabulary tests are the next least liked items. Fifty percent of the students feel that additional reading or study assistance is not needed. Twenty-five percent say they would enroll in an advanced reading course. Other ideas include more organized study groups and additional help by professors. Seventy-five percent of the students feel that they are currently reading as well as other college students. Inferior speed, retention, comprehension, and vocabulary are mentioned by the twenty-five percent who still think they are reading below the college level.

HU 106 Summary of Interview Responses

An overwhelming 91% of students feel that HU 106 helped in later humanities and other courses. Reasons for this include limited background (35%), higher grades in the college level course (40%), a review of basics (25%), and an introduction to college work (15%). HU 106 is not considered helpful by two students, and they consider themselves as misplaced in the beginning, and consequently, consider the course as being too easy. Seventy percent of the respondents feel that HU 106 includes every writing skill that it should cover. Suggestions include specific essay topics from other classes, instruction on lab reports, and preparation for teacher expectations. Thirty-five percent have no suggestions for improvement. The most popular suggestion is to keep the assignments related to aviation

topics. Other responses vary considerably.

The most liked aspects of HU 106 are the instructor (90%) and the relaxed atmosphere (25%). Essay topics, review, journals, and the writing experience itself, all share ten percent of the comments. Twenty-five percent of the students have no particular reply to the most disliked aspect of HU 106; however, journal writing receives 20%, with spelling tests receiving 15%. Eighty percent feel that they are currently writing as well as other college students.

Other questions concern the use of the Writing Lab and overall reactions to ERAU in general. Forty percent of the students have never used the Writing Lab. Reasons include the limited hours of the lab and an overcritical tutor. Only twenty-five percent feel the Writing Lab serves all their writing needs. The most liked features of ERAU are the small size of the student body and classes and the friendly and available instructors. The most disliked features are the increasing size and the "Riddle Run Around", local slang referring to bureaucratic insensitivity, inflexibility, and incompetence.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the collected and analyzed data, the following conclusions and recommendations are offered:

Conclusions

The developmental courses are making a difference in the student's academic performance and the students themselves perceive the influence since they consider the instruction helpful to later college courses. Although the retention percentage is low, the grades received in the classes do predict future grade point average and success in the subsequent college level courses. When compared to an equally matched SAT/ACT group, there are no significant differences in later GPA or retention of the developmental students. This means that the courses are indeed successfully intervening to make college success possible without an unreasonable attrition rate.

Recommendations

1. Continue the developmental course structure with slight instructional modifications:
 - a. Include the quadratic formula in MA 105.
 - b. Modify the journal assignment in HJ 106.
 - c. Substitute the spelling tests in HU 106 with computerized instruction.
 - d. Add additional vocabulary tests and instruction in HU 117.

2. Continue to select and to screen adjunct and full-time instructors for sufficient training, a caring attitude, and a student-oriented philosophy.
3. Investigate the efficacy of the placement procedures. The Math department has experimented with two methods since the fall of 1986; the Humanities department needs to evaluate its procedure which was implemented 1986.
4. Expand the hours of the Writing Lab. Encourage developmental students to use the services during enrollment in the course and afterwards.
5. Administer the questionnaires as course evaluation for MA 105, HU 117, and HU 106 to identify any changes in student responses.
6. Compute the graduation rate of the remaining 96 students of the original 226 population.
7. Replicate the study in two years to determine the effect of the 1987-88 admission standards policy, especially on the GPA and the retention data.

REFERENCES

- Bellot, F. & Bowman, H. (1983). Comparative Assessment of College Student Performance in Developmental and Freshman English Courses. Nashville, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 239-300).
- Cahalan, Margaret, et al. (1986). College Level Remediation: Fast Response Survey System Report No. 19. Washington, D.C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247-290).
- Chand, Sunil, (1985). The impact of developmental education at Triton College. Journal of Developmental Education, 9 (1), 2-5.
- Dumont, Richard, (1982). A Comparison of Methodological Approaches for Evaluating the Quality of Basic Skills Programs. Cookeville, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 220-051).
- Fairbanks, Marilyn, (1974). The effect of college reading improvement programs on academic achievement. 23rd Yearbook of the National Reading Conference Interaction: Research and Practice, 105-114.
- Heerman, Charles (1983). Research on college reading programs and student retention efforts. Reading World, 23, 203-211.
- Maring, G., Shea, M. & Warner, D. (1987). Assessing the effects of college reading and study skills programs: A basic evaluation model. Journal of Reading, 30, 402-408.
- Maxwell, Martha, (1971). Evaluating college reading and study skills programs. Journal of Reading, 15, 214-221.
- McDonald, Anita, (1988). Developmental Mathematics instruction: results of a national survey. Journal of Developmental Education. 12(1), 8-15.
- Pasch, Marvin, (1980). Outcome Evaluation: Student Development Program. Cleveland State University, Ohio, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 202-261).
- Sanders, Victoria, (1979). A Meta-Analysis: The Relationship of Program Content and Operation Factors to Measured Effectiveness of College Reading - Study Programs, unpublished dissertation.
- Shea, Mary Ann, (1984) An Evaluation Paradigm for University Reading and study skills Program Courses, unpublished dissertation.

Silverman, Sharon, (1983). Qualitative research in the evaluation of developmental education. Journal of Developmental and Remedial Education, 6 (3), 16-19.

Vroonland, Jewell, (1988). Personal communications, Oct. 25, 1988.

Wepner, Gabriella, (1987). Evaluation of a postsecondary remedial mathematics program. Journal of Developmental Education. 11 (1), 6-9.

Zaritsky, J. & Brewer, F. (1984). Students Who Have Completed Basic Skills Courses at La Guardia Community College: A Survey. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250-662).

Appendix A

Letter and Student Questionnaires



EMBRY-RIDDLE
AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY

Dear Student,

Our records show that you were enrolled in one or more of the developmental education classes in the fall of 1986. We are currently conducting a research study to assess the impact of these courses. The attached questionnaire is to help the Humanities and the Mathematics Departments improve the contents and expectations of MA 105: Quantitative Skills, HU 117: Reading and Study Skills, and HU 106: Developmental English.

Please complete each section of the questionnaire that relates to the course(s) you have had. Your honest and complete replies will help future ERAU students as we redesign and update these courses based on your valuable input.

After completing the questionnaire by using the attached scan-tron answer sheets, with a number two pencil, place the appropriate answer sheets and questionnaires in the same envelope as you received everything in, and it put into the box labeled "Humanities/Math Survey" in the post office lobby or on the desks of the Humanities secretary (Building 36) or the Math/Physical Science secretary (Building 34) by Wednesday, November 9.

Thank you for giving us approximately 10 minutes of your busy time. We truly appreciate it, and the results of the survey will make a difference!

Sincerely,

Berta Parrish
Humanities

Dick Hiatt
Math/Physical Science

HUMANITIES/MATH SURVEY

SECTION A. COMPLETE THIS SECTION IF YOU HAD MA 105,
QUANTITATIVE SKILLS.

Directions: Use the attached scan-tron answer sheet for MA 105.
In the following questions, mark one of the following responses:

- (a) if you strongly agree with the statement
- (b) if you agree
- (c) if you disagree
- (d) if you strongly disagree
- (e) if the item is Not Applicable to the course section you had

1. I feel that MA 105 prepared me for my next math course.
2. I feel that MA 105 has helped me do better in classes other than mathematics.
3. As a result of MA 105, I feel differently about math than I did when I started.
4. I feel that regular attendance in MA 105 was important to my grade.
5. I feel that my instructor cared how I did in class.
6. I feel that I was properly placed in MA 105.
7. I feel that in general MA 105 was helpful.

Please include any comments in the blanks on the pink side of the scan-tron sheet.

NOTICE: Twenty (20) students who took each of the developmental courses in the fall of 1986 will be interviewed for further detailed information and suggestions. Would you like to participate? Mark one of the following: Yes No

If you marked "Yes" please provide your name below and put this sheet into the envelope along with the answer sheets. Thank you!

NAME: _____

HUMANITIES/MATH SURVEY

SECTION B. COMPLETE THIS SECTION IF YOU HAD HU 117, READING AND STUDY SKILLS.

Directions: Use the attached scan-tron answer sheet for HU 117. In the following questions, mark one of the following responses:

- (a) if you strongly agree with the statement
- (b) if you agree
- (c) if you disagree
- (d) if you strongly disagree
- (e) if the item is Not Applicable to the course section you had

1. I feel that my overall reading ability was improved in HU 117.
2. I feel that the study skills taught in HU 117 have helped me do better in my other classes.
3. I feel that my instructor cared how I did in class.
4. I feel that I was properly placed in HU 117.
5. I feel more confident in myself as a student as a result of HU 117.
6. I feel that in general HU 117 was helpful.

I feel that the following skills have been helpful in the courses I have taken:

7. Previewing
8. Textbook Reading: SQ3R
9. Summarizing
10. Vocabulary
11. Notetaking Tips
12. Speed Improvement
13. Time Management
14. Stress Reduction
15. Preparing for Exams

Please include any comments in the blanks on the pink side of the scan-trom sheet.

NOTICE: Twenty (20) students who took each of the developmental courses in the fall of 1986 will be interviewed for further detailed information and suggestions. Would you like to participate? Mark one of the following: _____ Yes _____ No

If you marked "Yes" please provide your name below and put this sheet into the envelope along with the answer sheets. Thank you!

NAME: _____

HUMANITIES/MATH SURVEY

SECTION C. COMPLETE THIS SECTION IF YOU HAVE HAD HU 106,
DEVELOPMENTAL ENGLISH

Directions: Use the attached scan-tron answer sheet for HU 106.
In the following questions, mark one of the following responses:

- (a) if you strongly agree with the statement
- (b) if you agree
- (c) if you disagree
- (d) if you strongly disagree
- (e) if the item is Not Applicable to the course section you had

1. I feel that the writing techniques and skills taught in HU 106 prepared me for my next Humanities class.
2. I feel that the writing techniques and skills taught in HU 106 have helped me do better in classes other than Humanities.
3. I feel that my HU 106 instructor cared how I did in class.
4. I feel that I was properly placed in HU 106.
5. I feel that in general HU 106 was helpful.
6. I feel that my present level of writing proficiency is average for the demands of college instruction.

I feel that the following activities have been helpful.

7. Developing a Thesis Statement
8. Using Transitional Words
9. Outlining an Essay
10. Types of Introductory, Supporting and Conclusion Paragraphs
11. Punctuation
12. Spelling Tests
13. Journal Writing
14. Writing Better Sentences

Please include any comments in the blanks on the pink side of the scan-tron sheet.

NOTICE: Twenty (20) students who took each of the developmental courses in the fall of 1986 will be interviewed for further detailed information and suggestions. Would you like to participate? Mark one of the following: _____ Yes _____ No

If you marked "Yes" please provide your name below and put this sheet into the envelope along with the answer sheets. Thank you!

NAME _____

Appendix B

Letter and Interview Questions

EMBRY-RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL UNIVERSITY

PRESCOTT CAMPUS

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 15, 1988
TO:
FROM: Berta Parrish
SUBJECT: Interview

You have been randomly selected to participate in an important research study.

I am currently interviewing twenty (20) students who completed either HU 117: Reading and Study Skills or HU 106: Developmental English in the fall of 1986. The purpose of the 20-minute personal interview is to get your opinions of the course's value and impact to your subsequent college performance.

The information will help the Humanities Department improve both courses to make them more beneficial to ERAU students. Please help us.

If you cannot make the appointment time stated below, call me at extension 837 or stop by Building 36 and make an appointment for a more convenient time. Thank you in advance for keeping the appointment if you can and calling if you cannot.

I am looking forward to seeing you again!

Appointment Time:

Appointment Date:

HU 117
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Do you think taking HU 117 helped in later college courses?

If so, which ones and how.

2. What are some of the things you studied in HU 117 that you feel have helped the most.

3. Is there any reading or study skill you have needed for college courses that was not included in HU 117 and should have been.

4. Now, after two (2) years, what suggestions for improvement can you make for HU 117? (If probing is needed, ask about materials, textbooks, assignments, methods, instructors.)

5. What did you like the best about HU 117?

What did you like the least about HU 117?

6. Do you think additional reading or study assistance is needed at ERAU? (If probing is necessary, ask about the possibility of workshops, one-hour modules, an advanced reading course.)

7. Do you think you are reading as well as other college students?

HU 106
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Do you think HU 106 helped in later Humanities and other college courses?

If so, which ones and how.

2. What are some of the things you studied in HU 106 that you feel has helped the most?

3. Is there any writing skill you have needed for college courses that was not included in HU 106 and should be?

4. Now, after two (2) years, what suggestions for improvement can you make for HU 106? (If probing is necessary, ask about materials, textbook, assignments, methods, instructors.)

5. What did you like best about HU 106?

What did you like the least about HU 106?

6. Have all your writing needs been served by the Writing Lab?

7. Do you think you are writing as well as other college students?

8. What do you like the best about ERAU?

What do you like the least about ERAU?

Appendix C

Continuing Activities and
Return to the University

PLANS FOR CONTINUING ACTIVITIES

University Plans

Our plans include continuing to monitor retention rates for the Prescott Campus as well as keeping track of the number of students enrolled in our three remedial classes. The mathematics department will change its method of placing students in remedial mathematics classes in the fall of 1989.

Mathematics placement tests for MA 111 will no longer be required and students will be placed based on courses taken in high school as well as the grades that they received for these classes. The actual placement will be done by students after receiving counseling and recommendations. Since MA 111 is equivalent to high school intermediate algebra, universities across the nation are beginning to eliminate this course and require college algebra instead. Embry-Riddle is moving toward this view also and MA 111 may be considered a remedial course in the future. This leads to the possibility of removing MA 105 (first year high school algebra) from our curriculum because of the lack of students with that poor of a background and is turn making MA 111 a remedial course. Placement and retention rate will continue to be monitored. There are no absolutes and changes in placement procedures and in course content will be on-going.

Our study indicated that the humanities remedial courses are meeting the needs of the students. No major changes are anticipated however, the current placement procedure will be investigated and possible improvements recommended to the department chair and course monitors.

The other listed recommendations of the study will be also monitored and evaluated when they have been implemented or completed.

Dissemination Plans

We are currently writing a manuscript, "An Integrative Model for Evaluating College Developmental Courses," for submission to a professional journal. This will allow other developmental educators to adapt our research design and procedures to their own needs.

In addition to the manuscript, our paper has been accepted by the Western College Reading and Learning Association Regional Conference in Flagstaff, Arizona in October 1989. The presentation topic is methods of student outcome assessment and retention. Also, Dr. Parrish plans to submit a paper on this evaluation model to the National Association of Developmental Educators Annual Conference in Dallas in the spring of 1990.

ANALYSIS OF THE RETURN OF THE UNIVERSITY'S INVESTMENT

This study contributes to ERAU's continuing efforts to gather pertinent and necessary student outcome information. The results prove that the developmental courses are meeting their academic goals without an unreasonable attrition rate. The data also shows a high degree of student satisfaction with the courses. The suggestions given by the students will serve to strength the educational program for future ERAU students.

This type of information is valuable for curricular planning and also for the upcoming SACS accreditation review in 1993. This study indicates ERAU's strong commitment to improving the educational quality of its academic programs by providing university funds for institutional effectiveness research. It also shows ERAU's commitment to furthering the professional development and research opportunities of its faculty.

This study will also enhance the University's image with professional educators. The publication of the manuscript and the three conference paper presentations will put Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University's name among other research institutions who are encouraging the scholarly activity of their faculty. The investigators' names and institutional affiliation will be published in the journal and on the conference programs.

Lastly, the grant has enabled two faculty members to extend their scholarly inquiry and attain publication. This is an investment in the professional careers and abilities of the investigators.

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 465

CS 009 675

AUTHOR Ahn, Woo-Kyoung; And Others
 TITLE Schema Acquisition from a Single Example. Technical Report No. 470.
 INSTITUTION Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.; Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for the Study of Reading.
 SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
 PUB DATE May 89
 CONTRACT OEG-0087-C1001
 NOTE 30p.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; *Concept Formation; Educational Research; Higher Education; *Learning Processes; *Learning Strategies; *Learning Theories; *Schemata (Cognition)
 IDENTIFIERS Schema Theory

ABSTRACT

A three-part study compared similarity-based learning (in which concepts are formed based on similarity among multiple examples) and explanation-based learning (in which general schema are acquired from a single example) in schema acquisition. Subjects, 16 undergraduates enrolled in introductory psychology courses at the University of Illinois and 4 paid subjects, participated in the first experiment; 30 students and 10 paid subjects participated in the second experiment; and 60 students participated in the third experiment. Subjects were asked in the first experiment to produce a general description of the schema, in the second experiment to generate another instance, and in the third experiment to answer yes or no questions about the schema. Results indicated that subjects could acquire a plan schema from a single example in knowledge-rich domains as predicted by the explanation-based approach. Results also indicated that subjects were not able to carry out explanation-based learning if they did not have sufficient domain knowledge and if the schema to be acquired was not structured by causal constraints. (Eight tables of data are included; 42 references are attached.)
 (RS)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF READING

Technical Report No. 470

SCHEMA ACQUISITION FROM A SINGLE EXAMPLE

Woo-Kyoung Ahn
Raymond J. Mooney
William F. Brewer
Gerald F. DeJong

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

May 1989

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, Illinois 61820

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Anderson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

The work upon which this publication was based was supported in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement under Cooperative Agreement No. OEG 0087-C1001, with the Reading Research and Education Center. The publication does not necessarily reflect the views of the agency supporting the research.

ED308465

CS009675

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD
1988-89

Beck, Diana

Commeyras, Michelle

Foertsch, Daniel

Hartman, Doug

Jacobson, Michael

Jehng, Jihn-Chang

Jimenez, Robert

Kerr, Bonnie

Kerr, Paul

Meyer, Jennifer

Moran, Juan

Ohtsuka, Keisuke

Roe, Mary

Schommer, Marlene

Scott, Judy

Stallman, Anne

Wilkinson, Ian

Wolff, Phillip

MANAGING EDITOR
Mary A. Foertsch

MANUSCRIPT PRODUCTION ASSISTANTS
Delores Plowman
Nancy Diedrich

Abstract

Three experiments were conducted to compare similarity-based learning and explanation-based learning in schema acquisition. Similarity-based learning approaches hypothesize that concepts are formed based on similarity among multiple examples. Explanation-based learning approaches hypothesize that a general schema can be acquired from a single example by connecting instantiations of existing schemata and generalizing the connected portion of the example. The present experiments demonstrated that subjects could acquire a plan schema from a single example in knowledge-rich domains as predicted by the explanation-based approach. These experiments also showed that subjects were not able to carry out explanation-based learning if they did not have sufficient domain knowledge and if the schema to be acquired was not structured by causal constraints.

SCHEMA ACQUISITION FROM A SINGLE EXAMPLE

Two contrasting trends have emerged in recent research on concept formation: similarity-based approaches and explanation-based approaches. Similarity-based approaches hypothesize that concepts are formed based on similarity among *multiple examples* (Murphy & Medin, 1985). Explanation-based approaches, which have appeared more recently, emphasize the role of prior knowledge in learning. Some models developed in the area of artificial intelligence hypothesize that a *single example* is sufficient to acquire a concept if a machine has sufficient domain knowledge (DeJong & Mooney, 1986; Mitchell, Keller, & Kedar-Cabelli, 1986). These models have had some success in dealing with machine learning, but there is no experimental evidence showing that humans can learn concepts based on a single example using explanation-based approaches. The present experiments demonstrated that subjects could acquire a schema from a single example in a knowledge rich domain while failing to acquire a schema from a single example in situations where they did not possess relevant domain knowledge.

Similarity-Based and Explanation-Based Learning

Similarity-Based Approaches to Concept Learning

Psychology. Many models of concept learning have been proposed which assert that similarity of features constitute the structural basis of categories (Wattenmaker, Nakamura, & Medin, 1987). These models place little if any emphasis on the role of domain knowledge in acquiring a concept. Most theories taking a similarity based approach were developed to account for the data from laboratory studies where the learning task involves the inductive learning of a simple concept from a large number of instances (Franks & Bransford, 1971; Posner & Keele, 1968, 1970; Reed, 1972).

In one class of similarity-based theories, prototype models, the features used for concept formation are assumed to be independent. But for more realistic concepts it is difficult to use central tendency of independent features as a way to represent a prototype because these concepts involve relationships between several concepts (Farah & Kosslyn, 1982). The problem of relational features led to the appearance of strength models (Anderson, 1982; Anderson, Kline, & Beasley, 1979; Elio & Anderson, 1981; Hayes-Roth & Hayes-Roth, 1977). For example, Anderson's ACT generalization model (Elio & Anderson, 1981) is a type of frequency model in which the frequency of occurrence of features and all their possible combinations determine the exemplar's representation. In this type of frequency model the generalization process occurs by finding *commonalities* between two productions and replacing the constants by variables.

Research in schema theory has generally focused on describing the structure of schemata. Much less attention has been devoted to the process of how schemata are acquired. However, the few discussions of the issue that occur in the schema literature tend to be frequency models (Rumelhart & Norman, 1978; Schank & Abelson, 1977, p. 227; Thorndyke & Hayes-Roth, 1979; Van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983). For example, Rumelhart has proposed three basic processes involved in schema acquisition; accretion, tuning, and restructuring (Rumelhart & Norman, 1978; Rumelhart & Ortony, 1977). Schema restructuring is the process involved in creating new schemata through either schema induction or patterned generation. Patterned generation is similar to learning through analogies and schema induction is a form of learning by contiguity. In particular, they state that "if certain configurations of schemata tend to co-occur either spatially or temporally, a new schema can be created, formed from the *co-occurring* configuration" (Rumelhart & Ortony, 1977, p. 46).

Artificial intelligence. In artificial intelligence, the traditional approach to learning has also been a similarity-based one. Many machine learning systems for concept acquisition learn new concepts by examining a large number of examples and counter-examples of a concept and then searching for a description in the representation language which includes all of the examples while excluding all of the counter-examples (see Dietterich, London, Clarkson, & Dromney, 1982; Dietterich & Michalski, 1983 for overviews of such methods; Mitchell, 1982). Much of the research in this area has involved developing methods for controlling this search and heuristically guiding it towards "simple" concept descriptions. Using toy trains as examples, Medin, Wattenmaker, and Michalski (1987) compared the biases and representational constraints of inductive learning systems to those exhibited by human

subjects performing inductive learning tasks. They found that like many machine learning systems, human subjects tend to adopt simple conjunctive descriptions.

Problems with Similarity-Based Learning

Similarity-based approaches to concept formation do not take into account the learner's prior knowledge, intentions, or goals. This approach may thus not give an adequate account of learning in knowledge rich domains. Recently the similarity-based approach to categorization has been criticized on a number of grounds (Medin & Wattenmaker, 1987; Murphy & Medin, 1985; Wattenmaker, Nakamura, & Medin, 1987). In particular, these investigators argue that the similarity-based approach is insufficient because there are no constraints on what features or correlations should be selected and no constraints on how features should be weighted depending on contexts. In artificial intelligence, similar issues have been raised suggesting that generalization acquired by similarity-based learning cannot be justified (Mitchell et al., 1986; Schank, Collins, & Hunter, 1986).

Similarity-based approaches have not taken into account the possibility that subjects can apply their prior knowledge in the active processing of exemplars. Most laboratory studies on concept formation or schema acquisition used simplified and artificial materials as stimuli (e.g., dot patterns or biographical descriptions of fictitious people). These kinds of exemplars could have prevented subjects from applying their prior knowledge, resulting in categorization strategies which may not be those used in natural settings. The behavior observed in these experiments may not be a simplification of more complex behavior but may involve a qualitatively different form of learning. Millward (1980) called letter strings, stylized faces, and dot patterns "pseudoconcepts" because there is no functional core. In other words, according to him, these concepts do not have any significance for subjects thus subjects cannot use their rich background knowledge in learning these concepts. Millward raises the possibility that different kinds of processes are used in learning pseudoconcepts compared to the learning of realistic concepts, such as rooms and restaurants.

Recently a number of experimental results have been reported which cannot be explained without taking into account the subjects' knowledge-based interpretation of the input stimuli. For example, Murphy and Medin (1985) have shown that people do not select any arbitrary correlation among features but they prefer causal correlations. For example, this study showed that people tended to relate the feature of dizziness to earaches rather than to weight gain. Medin, Wattenmaker, and Hampson (1987) showed that people abandoned undimensional sorting (i.e., sorting based on one dimension) in favor of sorting by correlated properties when features could be causally connected.

Example. In addition to these empirical findings, a concrete example of these processes can be seen in the following passage which was one of the experimental passages used. This example is about a cooperative buying scheme called *Kyeah* which is used in Korea.

Tom, Sue, Jane, and Joe were all friends and each wanted to make a large purchase as soon as possible. Tom wanted a VCR, Sue wanted a microwave, Joe wanted a car stereo, and Jane wanted a compact disk player. However, they each only had \$50 left at the end of each month after paying their expenses. Tom, Sue, Jane, and Joe all got together to solve the problem. They made four slips of paper with the numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4 written on them. They put them in a hat and each drew out one slip. Jane got the slip with the 4 written on it, and said, "Oh darn, I have to wait to get my CD player." Joe got the slip with the 1 written on it and said, "Great, I can get my car stereo right away!" Sue got number 2, and Tom got number 3. In January, they each contributed the \$50 they had left for the month. Joe took the whole \$200 and bought a Pioneer car stereo at Service Merchandise. In February, they each contributed their \$50 again. This time, Sue used the \$200 to buy a Sharp 600 watt 1.5 cubic foot microwave at Service Merchandise. In March, all four again contributed \$50. Tom took the money and bought a Sanyo Beta VCR with wired remote at Service Merchandise. In April, Jane got the \$200 and bought a Technics CD player at Service Merchandise.

Similarity-based learning theories do not provide a clear account of how learning could occur with a single example. In fact, they might predict that no generalization can occur from a single example. These approaches would not typically be able to use the explanatory structure of the example in the

generalization process. However, it seems to us that with materials such as that just given, people may be able to distinguish relevant and irrelevant features of the example from a single exposure and to abstract the general plan. If it can be shown that people can, in fact, generalize and abstract a concept from a single example, this serves as a fundamental problem for those approaches which assume that generalization occurs by noticing commonalities between multiple examples.

Explanation-Based Approach to Learning

Explanation-based approaches to learning emphasize the role of people's background knowledge in concept acquisition (Murphy & Medin, 1985; Wattenmaker, Nakamura, & Medlin, 1987). This prior knowledge provides explanations for how concepts are formed. Therefore, if people have enough domain knowledge, it should be possible to acquire a schema from even a single example by generalizing its explanation (Mitchell et al., 1986).

Recently, a group of researchers in artificial intelligence have developed models of concept formation in which domain knowledge plays an important role in constructing explanations that separate relevant features from irrelevant ones. These models emphasize that the system must be able to explain why the given example is an instance of the concept under study (Mitchell et al., 1986). The explanation process is very important for learning since it results in justified generalizations which avoids spurious correlation.

Learning in GENESIS. Based on an idea originally proposed by DeJong (1981), Mooney and DeJong (1985) developed a natural language system called GENESIS which uses explanation-based learning to improve its ability to understand natural language narratives by learning new plan schemata. Since the stimuli used in the current experiments are also narratives describing novel plan schemata, this particular system will be described in further detail.

GENESIS acquires a schema by explaining and generalizing a single specific instance of a plan performed by a character in a narrative. Established techniques in natural language processing (Schank & Riesbeck, 1981) are used to "understand" narratives by constructing explanations for the actions in the story. Characters' actions can be explained in terms of later actions which they enable or in terms of ultimate goals which they achieve. GENESIS constructs explanations by causally connecting instantiations of lower-level schemata from the system's current knowledge base. The resulting causal model of the narrative is similar to Johnson-Laird's mental model (1983) and Van Dijk and Kintsch's situation model (1983) in that it is a global representation of specific events and states.

When the system detects that a character has achieved an important goal (i.e., a goal arising from a known theme, Schank & Abelson, 1977) by combining actions in a novel and unfamiliar way, it generalizes the specific explanation for how the goal was achieved into a general plan schema. In the current GENESIS system (Mooney, 1988), generalization is performed by a general explanation-based learning technique called EGGS (Mooney & Bennett, 1986) which variabilizes the explanation and removes irrelevant information while maintaining the validity of the explanation. The resulting generalized explanation is then packaged into a schema and indexed so that it can be subsequently retrieved and used for future narratives.

Genesis' operation is best illustrated by an example. Consider the case in which GENESIS learns a schema for someone murdering another individual in order to inherit their wealth. Before processing a narrative which describes a specific instance of this schema, the system has schemata for murdering and for inheriting; however, it does not have a schema for "murder for inheritance." The specific explanation the system constructs for this narrative allows it to answer a number of questions about why characters performed the actions mentioned in the text. Also, by generalizing this explanation, GENESIS learns a new schema which it calls "MurderInherit" based on the names of the existing schemata which compose it. The learned schema is characterized by a set of variables or slots (which are indicated by a leading "?" [e.g., ? x 1]) and by a set of constraints which specify necessary properties and relationships of these variables and actions in which the variables take part. For example, the murderer (?a5), the victim (?d1), and the inherited item (?o4) are all variables of the new schema and the fact that ?a5 is the heir of ?d1 and that ?or is valuable are constraints. Below is the actual input/output trace produced by the system for this example:

Input: Claudius was Agrippina's husband and owned an estate.
 Agrippina gave him a poisonous mushroom and he died. She inherited the estate.
 Thematic goal achieved: Agrippina is happy that Agrippina has the estate.
 Explanation suitable for generalization.
 Pruning . . . Generalizing . . . Packaging . . . Creating New Schema: (MurderInherit ?a5 ?o4 ?d1)
 ?a5 is a character. ?d1 is a person. ?a5 murders ?d1. ?or is an inanimate object. ?or is a
 valuable. ?d1 has ?or. ?a5 is ?d1's heir. ?a5 inherits ?d1's ?o4.
 Having: ?a5 murdered ?d1. Suggest MurderInherit
 Ready for questions:
 > Why did Agrippina give Claudius the mushroom?
 So Claudius would eat the mushroom and so Claudius would die.
 > Why did Claudius eat the mushroom?
 Because Claudius was hungry.
 > Why is Claudius dead?
 Because Agrippina poisoned Claudius with the mushroom.
 > Why did Agrippina kill Claudius?
 So Agrippina could inherit Claudius's estate.
 > Why did Agrippina inherit the estate?
 Because Claudius was Agrippina's husband, because Claudius had the estate and because
 Agrippina poisoned Claudius with the mushroom.
 > Why is Agrippina Claudius's heir?
 Because Claudius was Agrippina's husband.

The newly learned schema is added to the system's existing knowledge base where it can be used to aid in the understanding of subsequent narratives. A complete technical description of GENESIS and the general EBL mechanism underlying it (EGGS) is presented in Mooney, 1988.

Problems with Explanation-Based Learning

A system based on explanation can only function effectively when it has sufficient knowledge about the domain and the schema to be learned is organized by causal constraints. Therefore, explanation-based learning should not occur for domains in which the understander does not have sufficient knowledge to provide an explanation for why certain features are relevant for the schema. However, explanation-based approaches do not make a clear prediction about what people do when they want to learn a new schema and have insufficient knowledge to construct an explanation.

In particular, explanation-based systems provide no mechanism for making use of similarities across multiple examples. Lebowitz (1986) suggested integrating similarity-based and explanation-based learning. His UNIMEM system stores all the specific examples without making any generalization and looks for commonality among these specific instances. If it finds one, it tries to construct an explanation for the commonality. More recent work in this area has focused on using explanation-based learning to select relevant features for a similarity-based learning system (Danyluk, 1987). However, neither of these systems have been interpreted as psychological models of learning.

Overview of Experiments

The following three experiments tested both the psychological validity of explanation-based learning and its limitations. Each experiment had two conditions, an explanation-based learning condition (EBL) and a non-EBL condition. The EBL conditions made use of plan schemata in knowledge-rich domains and tested whether or not subjects could acquire an abstract schema from a single example. It was predicted that subjects would be able to acquire a schema from a single example if they have sufficient domain knowledge and if the schema is determined by causal constraints. The non-EBL conditions examined schema acquisition with materials where the subjects did not have appropriate background knowledge to use explanation-based learning. For this condition, it was predicted that the subjects would not be able to use explanation-based learning to acquire a correct schema in a single trial. For each experiment, a different task was used to test whether or not subjects had formed a schema from a single instance.

Conditions and Schemata Used in the Experiments

The EBL condition. The three schemata to be learned by the subjects in the EBL conditions were selected with the following restrictions. First, major constituents in each schema were causally related in terms of an important goal. In other words, the underlying schema was a "plan" schema in which characters try to achieve a goal (Schank & Abelson, 1977). Second, the schemata were selected to be composed of elements that undergraduate subjects could understand and explain using aspects of their existing knowledge. Third, the schemata were chosen to be ones not already known by undergraduate subjects. To insure that this last condition was met, the subjects were asked, after the completion of each experiment, whether they had previously heard of any of the plans described in the passages. The data for subjects who stated that they had heard of any of the plans were discarded.

Three different schemata were selected which met these criteria: (a) A cooperative buying scheme that is used in several nonwestern cultures; (e.g., in Korea the system is called "Kyeah" and in India it is called a "chit fund" (see the earlier section for an example of this schema); (b) a technique used by art thieves for making additional money by fencing copies of a stolen collectable; (c) a confidence game known as the "phony bank-examiner ploy" (Wharton, 1967).

The non-EBL condition. A different set of criteria were used to select the schemata for the non-EBL conditions. First, the schemata were selected to be ones with a goal that was not likely to be known by American undergraduate subjects. With a schema of this type it should be difficult for subjects to construct a coherent causal model. Second, the schemata were selected to contain some un-explainable components such as social conventions for which explanations and causal models are not appropriate. Third, the schemata were chosen to be ones for which subjects did not have a pre-established schema.

Using these criteria, two schemata were selected for the non-EBL conditions: (a) A potlatch ceremony carried out by certain North American Indians in which hosts of the potlatch give away valuables to improve their status; and (b) a traditional Korean wedding ceremony which has many conventional actions quite different from Western ones.

Schema Learning Tests

Three tasks were developed to measure the degree to which subjects were able to acquire a schema from a single instance. The tasks were (a) producing a general description of the schema (Experiment 1), (b) generating another instance (Experiment 2), and (c) answering yes/no questions about the general schemata (Experiment 3). In Experiment 1, subjects were asked to generate a general description (schema) of the specific instance they read. Experiment 2 tested how well subjects could generate new instances of a schema. Schema processes are presumed to be generative, where generative means a process that can deal with an infinitely large number of new instances (Bartlett, 1932; Rumelhart, 1980). Therefore this task is an additional way of testing the quality of a schema acquired from a single example. However, the tasks used in Experiments 1 and 2 may not give a full picture of what subjects had learned because these tasks require subjects to write down a complete account and they may not choose to write down everything they have learned. The use of discourse conventions (Grice, 1975) may lead subjects to omit obvious components of the schema. Therefore in Experiment 3, subjects were asked direct yes/no questions about all the constraints and variables of the schema to be acquired.

Criteria for Correct Schema Acquisition

The present experiments employed the constructs of constraints and variables as a criterion to judge how well subjects acquired the schema from the passage they read. For example, in the *Kyeah* schema described in the earlier section, the participants, the amount of money, etc., are variables while the statement that "the method should be fair to all the participants" is a constraint. If subjects acquired the correct schema, they should be able to recognize which aspects of the underlying schema were constraints and which were variables. It is important to note that unlike most concept formation experiments, the criterion for how well subjects formed the concept is not based on independent

attributes or features but on the variables and constraints which specify the relational properties of the concept.

Instance Versus Abstract Input

Experiments 2 and 3 involved two groups; (a) an instance group which received a specific instance of the schema; and (b) an abstract group which was directly taught the content of the schema through a direct abstract description of it. In all of the experiments, the instance group was given only a single instance of the schema. Thus any learning that occurred in this group would be outside the domain of learning theories which required multiple instances. The abstract group was given explicit information about the schema, so if the instance group performs as well as the abstract group on a task requiring knowledge of the general schema, then it is assumed that the subjects in the instance group had also acquired the schema. Table 1 provides an overview of the experiments.

[Insert Table 1 about here.]

Experiment 1: Abstract Descriptions

Experiment 1 investigated whether subjects could acquire a schema from a single instance by giving them a single instance and asking them to write a general abstract description of the schema.

Method

Materials

An instance passage was developed for each of the EBL and the non-EBL schemata described in the earlier section.

EBL instance. In the instance passages for the EBL condition, all of the variables were instantiated so that there were specific names for the characters (e.g., Tom, Mr. Miller), specific dates, and so on. Also, the passages contained specific instantiations of all the constraints of the schema, such as the goals of the plans (e.g., "Participants want items which they cannot afford" in the Kyeah schema) and the methods used to achieve the goals (e.g., "Each participant donates small amount of money at particular intervals" in the Kyeah schema). One of the EBL instance passages was given in the Introduction.

Non-EBL instance. In the instance passages for the non-EBL condition, all the variables were instantiated but these passages differ from those for the EBL condition in that the goal or the motivation of actions (e.g., "improving a chief's status by giving away valuables" in the potlatch schema) was *not* included; they would not provide the knowledge required for explanation-based learning. An example of one of the non-EBL passages follows:

Yanagi is a Kwakiutl chief and a descendent of Monaga. One day, Yanagi decided to hold a potlatch and invited Kaoka, a chief of a tribe whose ancestor is Monaga, and four of his followers. Yanagi's family gathered fresh and dried fish, berries, and animal skins. On June 6th, the appointed day, the guests paddled up to the host's village and went into Yanagi's house. There they gorged themselves on salmon and wild berries while dancers masked as beaver gods entertained them. While Yanagi's wife and daughter-in-law wearing seashell necklaces were busy serving food to the guests, Yanagi and his cousins, Egulac and Hiipe, arranged the wealth they had gathered in neat piles. Kaoka, the guest chief, stared at Yanagi as Yanagi danced up and down, telling the visitors about how much he was about to give them. As he counted out the boxes of berries and fish, Yanagi said Kaoka was poor. Yanagi's followers said "Do not make any noise, tribes. Be quiet or we shall cause a landslide of wealth from our chief, the overhanging mountain." At the climax of the potlatch, Yanagi and his first son, Managi, stood up and started burning animal skins. Yanagi's wife, hugging her son, watched their destruction. Finally, Yanagi, Joam, and Hiipe gave the remaining piles of gifts to Kaoka and his first son. Laden with gifts, the guests paddled back to their own village.

Prior to the experiment, a list of constraints and variables was prepared by analyzing each schema within the framework outlined earlier. (See Table 2 for the complete lists of constraints and variables for the Kyeah and Potlatch schemata.)

[Insert Table 2 about here.]

Subjects

Sixteen undergraduate students at the University of Illinois participated in the experiment in partial fulfillment of a course requirement for introductory psychology and there were four paid subjects. The paid subjects were distributed across the experimental conditions.

Design and Procedure

Each subject was given instance passages and was told for each one to "write, in abstract terms, a description of the general technique illustrated in the narrative." Ten subjects received the three EBL instance passages and 10 subjects received the two non-EBL instance passages.

In order to make sure the subjects understood the instructions, they were given a sample narrative and an appropriate abstract description. This example narrative was included to show subjects what level of abstraction was expected. The demonstration narrative was about skyjacking and was selected to be unrelated to the schemata used in the experimental passages. The demonstration passage did not provide any specific information that could be used in determining which aspects of the experimental passages were variables and which were constraints. A correct analysis of the instance passages could only be carried out by the reader providing an explanation for the individual instance. For example, in the demonstration passage, an airplane was mentioned in both the demonstration narrative and its corresponding general description since it was a constraint of the skyjacking schema. In one of the experimental passages (*Kyeah*), a VCR was mentioned, yet, it was not a constraint in the *Kyeah* schema and so should not be incorporated in the general description.

After reading the instructions, all of the subjects read the first passage, wrote a general description for it, and continued, in the same fashion, with the remaining passages. Subjects were allowed to work at their own pace. All the subjects read the passages in the same order. Subjects were allowed to refer to the appropriate instance passage while they were writing the general description. After finishing the experiments, subjects were asked whether they had previously heard of any of the techniques described in the passages. In both conditions, no more than two subjects said they had heard of a similar technique and the data from these subjects were discarded, giving a total of 10 subjects in each condition.

Scoring Methods

Each constraint and each variable in the schema was scored as either: correctly mentioned (C), incorrectly mentioned (I), or omitted (O). The scoring criteria for variables and constraints were as follows: A variable was considered to have been identified if an abstract term, such as "group" or "something," was used to refer to it. However if the subject's description retained the specific constant used in the instantiated passage, it was scored as incorrect. A constraint was scored as correct if the subject's description contained a statement consistent with the pre-established list. A constraint was scored as incorrect if the subject's description contained a statement inconsistent with any constraint in the constraint list. For example, in the *Kyeah* schema, the statement, "the order of getting money is decided by the most powerful person in the group" would have been scored as incorrect since it was inconsistent with the constraint, "order must be assigned randomly."

Two judges independently scored the constraints and variables for the data from five randomly sampled subjects using the established list of constraints and variables. The percentage of agreement between the two judges was 87%. Since the reliability of the scoring was reasonably high, the scores from one of the judges were used for the final analysis.

Depending on how the omitted constraints or variables are treated, there are several possible ways to calculate the percent correct from the three types of response scores. In the present study, omitted constraints were considered to be incorrect. In other words, the percent correct for constraints was the number of items correctly mentioned out of the total number of constraints $[C / (C+I+O)]$. This method is more conservative than one which ignores omissions and calculates the percent correct based on only the items explicitly mentioned $[C / (C+I)]$. The subjects could have omitted some constraints simply because they were lacking motivation, or because they assumed these constraints were implied in their descriptions. So the scoring method used in this study will probably be an underestimate of the actual amount of schema acquisition on a single trial.

However, for variables, the logic for how to score omits reverses. In communicating, people frequently leave out unimportant components such as the variables (Grice, 1975). Thus, counting "omits" as errors is conservative. One could argue that the subjects knew the omitted variables and should be given credit for the omits $[(C+O) / (C+I+O)]$. However, instead of using this liberal method, omissions were ignored in the present analysis and the percent correct for variables was calculated based on only the items explicitly mentioned $[C / (C+I)]$.

Results and Discussion

In the EBL-condition, 74.9% of the constraints were explicitly mentioned in the subjects' general descriptions. However, in the non-EBL condition, only 18.1% of the possible constraints were correctly mentioned in the subjects' general descriptions. In the EBL condition, subjects identified 89.3% of the variables while those in the non-EBL condition identified 75.4%. Table 3 gives the data for each individual schema in each condition.

[Insert Table 3 about here.]

In addition to the strict scoring, it is also interesting to examine the data on omits. The subjects in the EBL condition omitted only 24% of the constraints and 32.9% of the variables while those in the non-EBL condition omitted 74.6% of the constraints and 66.1% of the variables.

An example of one of the descriptions of the Kyeah schema in the EBL condition follows. Variables are indicated by a V and by a number which corresponds to the relevant variable in Table 2. Correct constraints are indicated by a C and by the corresponding constraint number from Table 2: Suppose in a group of people (V2, V4) each person would like to buy something expensive (V1, C7), but over a period of time (V3), each person cannot earn enough to buy what he would like (C1). By using random selection (V8, C2), each person could be assigned a number. When the group had saved enough money (V5, C5) together (C6) to purchase an item (C3), the person with the first number would get his item. This would continue for the rest of the group until everyone had gotten what he wished (C3).

In this description, six variables (V1, V2, V3, V4, V5, and V8) were correctly identified, two variables (V6 and V7) were omitted, and none of variables were treated as constants by the subject. Also, seven constraints (C1, C2, C3, C5, C6, C7, and C8) were judged to be correctly mentioned and two constraints (C4 and C9) were omitted.

An example of a general description written by one of the subjects for the potlatch schema in the non-EBL condition follows. Variables are indicated by a V and by a number which corresponds to the relevant variable in Table 2. Correct constraints are indicated by a C and by the corresponding constraint number from Table 2:

If someone (C1) wanted to honor a relative of theirs (C3, C4), they would invite them (V1) over and give them gifts (V3) and food (V4). They would try to collect as many gifts to give as they could and make sure the visitors were happy (C6) and comfortable with food and entertainment. Before the visitors left they would be given as much as they could take home with them to show their love for their relatives.

In this subject's description, three variables (V1, V3, and V4) were scored as correct and no variables were retained as constants. One constraint (C4) was scored as correct, three constraints (C1, C3, and C6) were scored as incorrect, and the remaining three constraints (C2, C5, and C7) were omitted.

The results of the EBL condition in Experiment 1 showed that individuals are able to form correct schemata from single examples. The subjects were fairly successful at forming plan schemata from single examples as measured by their abilities to write a general description. However, the performance of the subjects in the non-EBL condition was very poor. They obeyed fewer constraints and omitted more constraints and variables from the schemata.

Experiment 2: Generating New Instance

Experiment 2 investigated schema acquisition by examining the ability of subjects to generate a new instance of a schema after having been exposed to a single original instance. It was predicted that in the EBL condition, there would be little or no difference between the instance group and the abstract group while in the non-EBL condition, the performance of the instance group would be much lower than that of the abstract group.

Method

Materials

An abstract description designed to give explicit information about the schema was developed for each of the schemata in the EBL and the non-EBL condition. In the abstract passages, the content of each schema was described in general terms. No specific instances were mentioned in the abstract passages and all the variables were mentioned in general terms such as "a number of people" instead of "4 people," and "at a regular interval" instead of "every month," and so on. For the three schemata in the EBL condition, all the constraints including the goal of the plan and methods of achieving the goal were given in general terms. Following is the abstract passage for the Kyeah schema:

Suppose there are a number of people (let the number be n) each of whom wants to make a large purchase but does not have enough cash on hand. They can cooperate to solve this problem by each donating an equal small amount of money to a common fund on a regular basis. (Let the amount donated by each member be m .) They meet at regular intervals to collect everyone's money. Each time money is collected, one member of the group is given all the money collected ($n \times m$) and then with that money he or she can purchase what he or she wants. In order to be fair, the order in which people are given the money is determined randomly. The first person in the random ordering is therefore able to purchase their desired item immediately instead of having to wait until they could save the needed amount of money. Although the last person does not get to buy their item early, this individual is no worse off than they would have been if they waited until they saved the money by themselves.

For the two schemata in the non-EBL condition, all the cultural conventions in the ceremony and all of the explanation including the goal and procedures of the ceremony were given explicitly in the narrative. However, the non-EBL schemata contained a number of actions and objects which are cultural conventions and thus have no causal explanation. For these aspects of the ceremonies it was not possible to provide an explicit explanation (e.g., why, by custom, a bridegroom gives a wooden goose to a future father-in-law). Still in the abstract passages for the non-EBL condition, all of these non-causal actions and objects were explicitly described as constraints. Following is the abstract passage for potlatch schema:

One of the most famous of the institutions described by ethnographers is the potlatch ceremony of the native Indians of the northern Pacific Coast of North America. Potlatching tribes included the Coast Salish of Washington and British Columbia and the Kwakiutl, who live farther north. The potlatch was generally a festive event. When the chief of a tribe is not content with the amount of respect he was getting from his own followers and from neighboring chiefs, he held a potlatch. The family titles to which the chief lays claim belong to his ancestors, and there are other people who can trace descent from the same ancestors and so they were entitled to vie with

him for recognition as a chief. Every chief therefore feels the obligation to justify and validate his chiefly status. The prescribed manner for doing this is to hold a potlatch. Each potlatch is given by a host chief and his followers to a guest chief and his followers. The object of the potlatch is to show that the host chief is truly entitled to chiefly status and that he is more exalted than the guest chief. To prove this point, the host chief gives the rival chief and his followers quantities of valuable gifts. The sponsor's prestige grows directly with the magnitude of the potlatch, the volume of goods given away in it. The guests' status is reduced by receiving gifts but they have no choice but to receive the gifts. During the ceremony, various kinds of food are served while dancers masked as several gods entertain the guests. Sometimes, the host chief destroys the valuables in front of the guests.

Subjects

Thirty undergraduate students at the University of Illinois participated in the experiment in partial fulfillment of a course requirement for introductory psychology and there were 10 paid subjects. The paid subjects were distributed across the experimental conditions.

Design and Procedure

Twenty subjects (the instance group) were given the instance passages and 20 subjects (the abstract group) were given the abstract schema descriptions. Within each group, 10 subjects were in the EBL condition and 10 subjects were in the non-EBL condition. Subjects in the EBL condition received the three EBL passages and those in the non-EBL condition received the two non-EBL passages.

Both groups were given instructions asking them to generate another instance of the technique described in the passage. The actual instructions for two groups were slightly different because of the differences in the types of materials read by the groups. Subjects in the instance group were told that for each experimental passage, they were to "write another story in which characters use the general method illustrated in the story but that is otherwise as different as possible." Subjects in the abstract group were told that for each passage, they were to "write a story in which particular individuals use the technique described in the passage in a specific case." Besides the instructions, the procedure was the same as in Experiment 1.

Scoring Method

The scoring method used in this experiment was the same as that described for Experiment 1 except for the following changes. In this experiment, variables were scored as correct if the subjects changed the value of the variables given in the instance passage (e.g., "three people" instead of "four people"). But if the subjects' description retained the specific variable used in the instance passage, it was scored as incorrect as in Experiment 1. In the abstract group no score for variables was possible because there were no constants to variabilize in their passages (e.g., number of participants, items purchased, etc.).

As in Experiment 1, two judges independently scored the data from five subjects' responses. There was 91.8% agreement between the two judges. Given this high degree of agreement, the final results were based on the data scored by one of the judges.

Results and Discussion

In the EBL condition, the average percent correct for constraints in the instance group was 78.8% while it was 73.6% for the abstract group. In the non-EBL condition, the average percent for constraints in the instance group was only 11.4% while it was 61.0% for the abstract group. Table 4 gives the percentages for each individual schema.

[Insert Table 4 about here.]

There was no difference between the two conditions in the number of changed variables. The instance group in the EBL condition correctly changed 66.3% of the variable items and the instance group in the non-EBL condition correctly changed 72.9%. However, the instance group in the non-EBL condition

omitted 61.1% of the variables while the instance group in the EBL condition omitted only 20.8% of the variables.

An example of a new instance of the Kyeah schema written by a subject in the instance group of the EBL condition follows. Variables are indicated by a V and by a number which corresponds to the relevant variable in Table 2. Correct constraints are indicated by a C and by the corresponding constraint number from Table 2.

Bill, Kim, John and Mary (V2, V4) were all business associates (C9). Bill wanted some land in northern Illinois, Kim wanted a new house in Switzerland, John wanted a new Porsch 928S with all accessories, and Mary wanted to take a trip around the world (V1, V7, C7). The only problem was they each only had \$25,000 (V6, C5) left unspent at the end of each month (V3, C1). They all got together and picked random variables on Bill's business computer (V8, C2). Mary was farthest from her variable so she would have to wait till last to get her trip around the world. John nailed his variable and jumped enthusiastically saying, "Yeah, I get to get my new Porsch 928S right now." They each talked with their banker and drew the \$25,000 out (C4) and pooled it together (C6) after the first month (V5) and the next day John drove up in his new, black, 928S with all accessories (C8). At the end of the next month they again pooled their money and Kim got her chalet in Switzerland. Again at the end of the next month they pooled their money and Bill got his land in northern Illinois. Finally, after the fourth month they pooled their money together and Mary left for her trip around the world (C3).

In this description, six variables (V1, V4, V5, V6, V7, and V8) were correctly identified and two variables (V2 and V3) were treated as constraints. All nine constraints were judged to be explicitly mentioned and thus scored as correct.

An example of a new instance of the potlatch schema written by a subject in the instance group of non-EBL condition follows. Variables are indicated by a V and by a number which corresponds to the relevant variable in Table 2. Correct constraints are indicated by a C and by the Corresponding constraint number from Table 2.

Joan decides to have a family reunion (C1, C3) and invites many of her distant relatives (V1, C4). One of which is John. So John and his family go to Joan's house on June 23 (V2), the day of the party. John and his family ate and mixed with the rest of the relatives. Then Joan began walking around talking about the wealth of individuals at the party and when she got to John, she said that he was poor. Then she began to throw food (V4) away and when she was done she gave John and his family the left-overs (V3). John and his family left with the food.

In this description, four variables (V1, V2, V3, and V4) were scored as correct, no variable was scored as incorrect, and five variables (V5, V6, V7, V8, and V9) were omitted. One constraint (C4) was judged as correctly mentioned, two (C1 and C3), incorrectly mentioned, and four constraints (C2, C5, C6, and C7) were omitted.

The results of Experiment 2 showed that in the EBL condition, subjects given a single instance of a schema generate new instances as well as the subjects overtly given the abstract schema. However, in the non-EBL condition, subjects given a single instance were not very successful in generating new instances of the schemata compared to the performance of the subjects overtly given the abstract schema. The non-EBL instance group omitted more variables and mentioned more incorrect constraints than the abstract group.

Experiment 3: Yes/No Questions

Experiment 3 investigated schema acquisition from one instance by asking subjects a series of explicit questions about the schemata. In Experiments 1 and 2, it is possible that the subjects did not make the effort to change the values of all the variables and to mention all the constraints in their written texts even though they had, in fact, acquired the appropriate information. Experiment 3 directly tested the subjects' understanding of all of the variables and constraints by asking yes/no questions about each of the constraints and the variables in each schema.

Method

Materials

The passages used in this experiment were the same as those used in Experiment 2 (i.e., the instance and the abstract versions of the schemata in the EBL and the non-EBL conditions).

A set of yes/no questions was developed to test the constraints and variables for each schema. For each constraint or variable in a given schema, there was one corresponding question. For the constraint, "Each participant donates the same amount," the question was "Can some people consistently donate less than others and have the system work? (correct response--no)" For the variable, "Number of participants does not matter," the question was "Is there any particular number of people required for this plan? (correct response--no)" In the EBL condition, there were 46 questions about the constraints and 46 questions about the variables. (See Ahn, 1987 for the complete set of questions.) In the non-EBL condition, there were 23 questions about the constraints and 18 questions about the variables. (See Ahn, 1987 for the complete set of questions.) None of the questions referred to specific situations from the example passage and all the questions were written in general terms so that the same questions could be used for individuals who had read both instance and abstract passages. The expected answer was "yes" for half the questions and "no" for the other half.

Subjects

Sixty undergraduate students at the University of Illinois participated in the experiment in partial fulfillment of a course requirement for introductory psychology.

Design and Procedure

There were two experimental groups in this experiment (an instance group and an abstract group) and two conditions (an EBL and a non-EBL condition). Each group received a booklet containing one of the appropriate sets of passages. Thirty subjects received the instance passages (instance group) and 30 subjects received the abstract passages (abstract group). Fifteen subjects in each group received the three EBL passages and 15 in each group received the two non-EBL passages. The same yes/no questions were used for both groups within each condition.

Both groups were asked to answer the questions about each narrative with "yes" or "no" and to justify their answers for each question. Besides the instructions, the procedure was the same as in Experiment 1.

Results and Discussion

The data were scored according to the pre-established criteria which would be expected as a result of a full understanding of the schema. In the EBL condition, the average overall percent correct for the instance group was 85.4% and that for the abstract group was 81.1%. There was no significant difference between the two groups, $t(28) = 1.62, p > .10$. In the non-EBL condition, the average percent correct for the instance group was 58.5% and that for the abstract group was 86.2%. There was significant difference between the two groups, $t(28) = 10.49, p < .001$.

For the questions about variables, in the EBL condition the percent correct for the instance group was 84.7% and that for the abstract group was 79.3%. This difference was not significant, $t(28) = 1.40, p > .10$. For questions about constraints, the mean score for the instance group was 86.1% and the mean for the abstract group was 82.7%. This difference was also not significant, $t(28) = 0.8315, p > .10$. However, in the non-EBL condition, for both variable and constraint questions, the percent correct for the abstract group (85.6% and 86.7%, respectively) was higher than those for the instance group (55.6% and 59.4%, respectively), $t(28) = 5.77$ and $t(28) = 6.6185, p < .0001$. Table 5 contains the percent correct for each narrative.

[Insert Table 5 about here.]

In the EBL condition, an examination of the subjects' justifications for incorrect answers showed that most of the "errors" were not due to the subjects' failure to generalize in an explanation-based manner but were due to the subjects' generating a schema slightly different from the one that the text was intended to convey. Some of the yes/no questions made assumptions about the execution of the plan which could be relaxed to generate an even more general schema. Within those answers scored as incorrect, 54.7% of the example group's justifications and 52.9% of the abstract group's justifications presented arguments which were based on a causally consistent interpretation of the schema. For example, for the question, "In the above plan, is it necessary that the number of meetings be the same as the number of people in the group?" one subject responded "No" and then justified the answer by writing, "it's irrelevant. They could collect money every week and then at the end of the month the one person gets it all." This individual clearly understood the constraint but used this knowledge to answer the yes/no question differently than the preestablished answer. An example of a causally inconsistent justification can be seen in one subject's response to the question, "Is there any particular number of people required for this plan?" The subject answered, "Yes, four is the only number of people that will make this plan work."

In the non-EBL condition, among those items marked as incorrect, 3.1% of the instance group's justifications and 8.0% of the abstract group's justifications presented arguments which were consistent with the schema. These low percentages in both groups are probably due to the opaque or the non-causal aspects of the non-EBL: schemata, which made it difficult for the subjects to develop alternative explanations.

In general, the results of Experiment 3 showed that for the EBL condition, there was no difference between the instance group and the abstract group in their understanding of the variables and constraints in the schemata. Thus this experiment provided strong evidence that subjects given a single instantiated schema in the EBL condition can acquire the underlying schema as well as a group given explicit information about the schema. However, in the non-EBL condition, subjects in the instance group were much worse at answering yes/no questions about the non-EBL schema than was the group given explicit information about the schema.

Besides the comparison of overall percent correct in each group and each condition, an analysis of the percent correct for each variable and constraint was carried out for the non-EBL condition. The analysis showed that there were large differences between the abstract group and the instance group in the scores for specific questions. Tables 6 and 7 list the questions for which the difference in percent correct between the two groups was larger than 30%. These questions could largely be grouped into four categories; (a) schema goals, (b) specific domain knowledge, (c) non-causal components and schema assimilation not a category but a type of response within the categories, (d) unfamiliar variables.

[Insert Tables 6 & 7 about here.]

Schema Goals

The instance group was not able to answer questions related to the goal of the potlatch schema (i.e., "improving a chief's status"). They did not understand the culture of the Northwest American Indians so they could not comprehend the chief's goals. However, in the case of the Korean wedding ceremony schema, subjects could easily identify the goal of the ceremony (i.e., two people getting married) from the instance passage even though it was not stated. For this schema there were not large differences between two groups in the questions related to the goals of the main actors. It appears that knowledge about schema goals is one important component that allows explanation-based learning for narratives that describe intentional actions.

Specific Domain Knowledge

Questions requiring relatively specific domain knowledge caused large differences between the instance group and the abstract group on certain items. In the potlatch schema, for example, the subjects did not know that "The tribes that carry out potlatch ceremonies are American Indians living in

northwestern America." Therefore, they could not develop an explanation for the story based on the different value system of those American Indians. Similarly, for the Korean wedding ceremony schema, the subjects did not know that "A bridegroom and a bride should be strangers until the day of a wedding ceremony." Subjects who are missing specific domain knowledge may find it difficult to develop consistent causal relationships for the events in the passage.

Non-causal Components

The Korean wedding ceremony schema contained a number of conventional actions. For example, in a Korean wedding ceremony, it is necessary that a bridegroom give his future father-in-law a wooden goose before the ceremony and that the bride should wear a blue dress. These actions are simply traditional parts of the ceremony and cannot be causally related to the goal. The instance group did not realize that these components were non-causal constraints and tended to treat them as variables.

Unfamiliar Variables

The instance group was able to identify the variables in the non-EBL passages which are also frequently variables in other schemata (e.g., date of ceremonies or colors of clothing). However, there was a large difference between the instance group and the abstract group for the questions about unfamiliar variables. The subjects knew that the ceremonies were part of another culture so they might have been biased to treat unfamiliar variables as constraints. For example, more than half of the subjects in the instance group thought it was necessary for the bridegroom to pass under the oldest tree in the bride's village, which is, in fact, a variable.

Schema Assimilation

For some of the items it is obvious that the subjects attempted to use their background knowledge to carry out explanation-based learning and where the background knowledge did not match the structure of the experimental schemata they made many errors. In the instance passage, describing the Korean wedding ceremony schema, the bridegroom brought two rings. The subjects used their knowledge of western weddings and mistakenly considered this variable to be a constraint. In fact, on this item, the percent correct for the instance group (20%) was considerably below chance level. Therefore, this data suggest that even in the non-EBL condition, the subjects were trying to interpret the instance in terms of their prior knowledge, and this process could result in dramatic misunderstanding of a new concept in domains where they do not have appropriate background knowledge.

General Discussion

Comparison Between the EBL Condition and the Non-EBL Condition

The results from these experiments suggest that subjects could acquire a general schema from a single example in a knowledge rich domain. An overview of the results from these experiments can be found in Table 8. Subjects who read a single specific example of a new schema could produce fairly good general descriptions of the schema (Experiment 1), they could generate a new instance of the schema as well as those who were directly taught the schema (Experiment 2), and they could answer direct questions about the schema as well as a group directly taught the schema (Experiment 3).

[Insert Table 8 about here.]

The results from the non-EBL conditions also support the account of explanation-based learning given earlier. The explanation-based learning approach predicts that when people lack sufficient knowledge to construct the explanation of a concept or when the constituents of a concept are not causally connected, they should fail to acquire a correct schema from a single example. This is what was found in these experiments.

The instance group in the non-EBL conditions did not produce general descriptions as well as those in the EBL conditions. More specifically, the instance group in the non-EBL conditions omitted

constraints more frequently than the instance group in the EBL conditions. Another major difference occurred when constraints were produced. In the EBL conditions, the constraints were almost always correct whereas in non-EBL conditions, a large percentage of constraints mentioned were incorrect.

The same contrast between the two conditions was found in the task of generating new instances of the schemata. The instance group in the non-EBL condition could not produce appropriate new instances of the schema. In addition, the instance group in the non-EBL condition omitted constraints more frequently and generated more incorrect constraints than the EBL group.

The yes/no question experiments, which eliminated some of the problems resulting from the methodology of using open-ended tasks, gave even clearer data. The subjects in the EBL condition could answer questions that required an understanding of the general abstract schema which was instantiated in the specific passage. The data showed that people can acquire a schema from a single example in knowledge-rich domains. The performance of subjects who read a single instance in domains for which they lacked knowledge was not as good as those in the EBL condition. This result highlights the role that background knowledge plays in the acquisition of a schema from a single instance.

Conclusions: Implications of the Results for Schema Acquisition Theories

As discussed earlier, traditional learning theories have assumed that multiple trials are required in acquiring a simple concept (Hayes-Roth & Hayes-Roth, 1977; Posner & Keele, 1968) or acquiring a more complex schema (Rumelhart & Norman, 1978; Schank & Abelson, 1977; Van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983). However, the present studies showed that people can learn a schema by generalizing the explanation of a single example if they can apply their background knowledge. None of the similarity-based approaches can explain the results found in the present experiments since these theories neglected the importance of prior knowledge in learning. As Murphy and Medin (1985) argued, similarity-based approaches are insufficient to explain the concept formation process. The results of the present research show that explanation-based learning is a viable psychological model of human learning in knowledge rich domains.

References

- Ahn, W. K. (1987). *Schema acquisition from a single example*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of Illinois, Champaign, IL.
- Anderson, J. R. (1982). Acquisition of cognitive skill. *Psychological Review*, 89, 369-406.
- Anderson, J. R., Kline, P. J., & Beasley, C. M. (1979). A general learning theory and its application to schema abstraction. In G. H. Bower (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation: Vol. 13*. New York: Academic Press.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- DeJong, G. F. (1981). *Generalizations based on explanations*. Proceedings of the Seventh International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Vancouver, BC.
- DeJong, G. F., & Mooney, R. J. (1986). Explanation-based learning: An alternative view. *Machine Learning*, 1, 145-176.
- Dietterich, T. G., London, B., Clarkson, K., & Dromney, G. (1982). Learning and inductive inference. In P. R. Cohen & E. A. Feigenbaum (Eds.), *The handbook of artificial intelligence: Vol. III*. Los Altos, CA: William Kaufman.
- Dietterich, T. G., & Michalski, R. S. (1983). A comparative review of selected methods for learning from examples. In R. S. Michalski, J. G. Carbonell, & T. M. Mitchell (Eds.), *Machine learning: An artificial intelligence approach*. Palo Alto, CA: Tioga Publishing Company.
- Denyluk, A. P. (1987). *The use of explanations for similarity-based learning*. Proceedings of the 10th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Milan, Italy.
- Elio, R., & Anderson, J. R. (1981). The effects of category generalizations and instance similarity on schema abstraction. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 7, 397-417.
- Farah, M. J., & Kosslyn, S. M. (1982). Concept development. In H. W. Reese & L. P. Lipsitt (Eds.), *Advances in child development and behavior: Vol. 16*. New York: Academic Press.
- Franks, J. J., & Bransford, J. D. (1971). Abstraction of visual patterns. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 90, 65-74.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts*. New York: Seminar Press.
- Hayes-Roth, F. (1977). Learning by example. In A. M. Lesgold, J. W., Pellegrino, S. D. Fokkema, & R. Glaser (Eds.), *Cognitive psychology and instruction*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Hayes-Roth, B., & Hayes-Roth, F. (1977). Concept learning and the recognition and classification of exemplars. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 16, 321-338.
- Johnson-Laird, P. N. (1983). *Mental models*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lebowitz, M. (1986). Integrated learning: Controlling explanation. *Cognitive Science*, 10, 219-240.

- Medin, D. L., Wattenmaker, W. D., & Hampson, S. E. (1987). Family resemblance, conceptual cohesiveness, and category construction. *Cognitive Psychology*, *19*, 242-279.
- Medin, D. L., Wattenmaker, W. D., & Michalski, R. S. (1987). Constraints and preferences in inductive learning: An experimental study of human and machine performance. *Cognitive Science*, *11*, 239-299.
- Millward, R. B. (1980). Models of concept formation. In R. E. Snow, P. Federico, & W. E. Montague (Eds.), *Aptitude, learning, and instruction: Vol. 2. Cognitive process analyses of learning and problem solving*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Mitchell, T. M. (1982). Generalization as search. *Artificial Intelligence*, *18*, 203-226.
- Mitchell, T. M., Keller, R. M., & Kedar-Cabelli, S. T. (1989). Explanation-based generalization: A unifying view. *Machine Learning*, *1*, 47-80.
- Mooney, R. J. (1988). *A general explanation-based learning mechanism and its application to narrative understanding*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Computer Science, University of Illinois, Champaign, IL.
- Mooney, R. J., & Bennett, S. (1986). *A domain independent explanation-based generalizer*. Proceedings of the National Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Philadelphia, PA.
- Mooney, G. L., & DeJong, G. F. (1985). *Learning schemata for natural language processing*. Proceedings of the Ninth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Los Angeles, CA.
- Murphy, G. L., & Medin, D. L. (1985). The role of theories in conceptual coherence. *Psychological Review*, *92*, 289-316.
- Posner, M. I., & Keele, S. W. (1968). On the genesis of abstract ideas. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *77*, 353-363.
- Posner, M. I., & Keele, S. W. (1970). Retention of abstract ideas. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *83*, 304-308.
- Reed, S. K. (1972). Pattern recognition and categorization. *Cognitive Psychology*, *3*, 382-407.
- Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce, & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rumelhart, D. E., & Norman, D. A. (1978). Accretion, tuning and restructuring: Three modes of learning. In J. W. Cotton & R. L. Klatzky (Eds.), *Semantic factors in cognition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rumelhart, D. E., & Ortony, A. (1977). Representation of knowledge. In R. C. Anderson, R. J. Spiro, & W. E. Montague (Eds.), *Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schank, R. C., & Riesbeck, C. (1981). *Inside computer understanding*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding: an inquiry into human knowledge structure*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Schank, R. C., Collins, G. C., & Hunter, L. E. (1986). Transcending inductive category formation in learning. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 9*, 639-686.
- Thorndyke, F. W., & Hayes-Roth, B. (1979). The use of schemata in the acquisition and transfer of knowledge. *Cognitive Psychology, 11*, 82-106.
- van Dijk, T. K., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. NY: Academic Press.
- Wattenmaker, W. D., Nakamura, G. V., & Medin, D. C. (1987). Relationships between similarity-based and explanation-based categorization. In D. Hilton (Ed.), *Contemporary science and explanations: Commonsense concepts of causality*. England: Harvester Press.

Table 1
Overview of the Experiments

Experiment	Test procedure	Form of input passage	Type of schema
1	Generating a general description		Instance EBL Non-EBL
2	Producing a new instance of a schema	Instance Abstract	EBL non-EBL EBL non-EBL
3	Answering yes/no questions about a general schema	Instance Abstract	EBL non-EBL EBL non-EBL

Note. Instance groups read only an instantiated description of a schema whereas abstract groups read a general description of a schema. In the EBL conditions, three schemata were used: Kyeah, Forging collectables, and Con game. In the non-EBL conditions, two schemata were used: Potlatch and Korean wedding ceremony.

Table 2

List of Constraints and Variables in the Kyeah Schema

Constraints	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. each individual cannot afford to pay for a desired purchase2. the method must be fair to everybody in the group3. the number of meetings must equal number of people4. each person contributes the same amount of money5. the money contributed should be affordable6. the money received = (the money donated per person) x (the number of participants)7. each person has roughly similar financial needs8. the needs should be approximately equal to money received9. the individuals trust each other
Variables	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. the items to be purchased do not have to be same for the different individuals2. the number of people in the group.3. the time period4. the people's identity5. when the money is collected6. the exact amount of money to be contributed7. the place where the individuals purchase their items8. the method of determining order

List of Constraints and Variables in Potlatch Schema

Constraints	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. the tribes are Indians in Northern Pacific Coast of America2. only a chief can hold a potlatch3. the host chief wants to improve his status4. the host chief should invite a guest chief who belongs to the same ancestors5. the host chief and his tribe feel happy6. the guest chief feels unhappy7. the guest chief must take the gifts
Variables	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. the number of people who attend the potlatch2. the day3. the particular valuables to be given4. what is eaten during potlatch5. the dancers' mask6. what people wear7. the way the valuables are destroyed8. what other people do during the potlatch9. the wealth of the guest chief

Table 3**Experiment 1: Performance of the Instance Group in Producing General Descriptions for EBL and non-EBL Passages**

Condition	Schema	Item	
		Constraint	Variable
EBL	Kycah	72.7	85.7
	Forging Collectables	82.9	98.0
	Con game	69.3	85.7
	Overall percent correct	74.9	89.3
Non-EBL	Potlatch	8.6	72.7
	Korean Wedding	22.9	78.6
	Overall percent correct	18.1	75.4

Note. The scores are the percentages of correctly identified constraints or variables.

Table 4

Experiment 2: Performance of the Instance Group and the Abstract Group in Producing a New Instance for EBL and Non-EBL Passages

Condition	Schema	Group		
		Instance		Abstract
		Constraint	Variable	Constraint
EBL	Kyeah	91.1	53.6	71.1
	Forging Collectables	68.8	80.0	81.3
	Con game	75.0	68.2	68.8
	Overall percent correct	78.8	66.3	73.6
Non-EBL	Potlatch	15.7	71.1	70.0
	Korean Wedding	9.3	76.0	56.4
	Overall percent correct	11.4	71.9	61.0

Note. The scores are the percentages of correctly identified constraints or variables.

Table 5**Experiment 3: Difference Between the Instance and the Abstract Group in Yes/no Questions for Each Schema for EBL and Non-EBL Passages**

Condition	Schema	Group	
		Instance	Abstract
EBL	Kyeah	84.8	81.4
	Forging	88.1	82.4
	Con game	82.1	77.9
Overall percent correct		85.4	81.1
Non-EBL	Potlatch	54.1	76.9
	Korean Wedding	61.9	92.8
Overall percent correct		58.5	86.2

Note. The scores are the percent of correctly answered yes/no questions.

Table 6**Experiment 3: Potlatch Schema: Yes/no Questions Showing More than a 30% Difference in the Performance Between the Example Group and the Abstract Group**

Questions	Group	
	Instance	Abstract
Schema Goals		
Would the guest chief be glad to receive the gifts? (No)	20.0	86.7
Was the guest chief poor? (No)	26.7	86.7
Specific Domain Knowledge		
Is this ceremony only carried out by members of the Kwakiutl tribe? (No)	46.7	93.3
Could the guest chief leave without taking the present? (No)	53.3	86.7
Unfamiliar Variables		
Could fish oil be one of the things that were given to the visitors? (Yes)	53.3	100
Could there have been dancers masked as the thunderbird gods? (Yes)	60.6	93.3
Can dried herring eggs be one of the foods to be served for the potlatch? (Yes)	60.0	93.3

Table 7**Experiment 3: Korean Wedding Ceremony Schema: Yes/no Questions Showing More than a 30% Difference in the Performance Between the Example Group and the Abstract Group**

Questions	Group	
	Instance	Abstract
Specific Domain Knowledge		
Is it necessary for the ceremony to take place between strangers? (Yes)	40.0	93.3
Would it matter if a chest carrier's first child was a daughter, and his next two children were sons? (Yes)	20.0	73.3
Is it necessary that the girl's older sister be married? (Yes)	46.7	86.7
Non-causal Components		
Is it necessary that the boy bring a wooden goose for the girl? (Yes)	40.0	93.3
Is it necessary for the boy to wear blue cloth for the ceremony (Yes)	46.7	100
Unfamiliar Variables		
Is it necessary for the boy to leave his house at 8 o'clock in the morning on the day of the ceremony? (No)	46.7	100
Is it necessary for the boy and the chest carriers to pass under the oldest tree of the village where the girl lives? (No)	33.3	100
Does the woman who prepared the table have to wear blue clothes? (No)	60.0	93.3
Is it necessary that the day to send "saju tanja" to the girl's family be chosen one month after the proposal? (No)	53.3	100
Do the chest carriers have to bring two golden rings for the ceremony? (No)	20.0	100

Table 8**Overview of Results from Experiment 1, 2, and 3**

Task	Item	EBL Item	Non-EBL Instance	EBL Instance	Non-EBL Abstract
General description	C	74.9	18.1	--	--
	V	89.3	75.4	--	--
New instance generation	C	78.8	11.4	73.6	61.0
	V	66.3	72.9	--	--
Yes/no questions	C	86.1	59.4	82.7	86.7
	V	84.7	55.6	79.3	85.6

Note. C = constraints; V = variables.