

U.S. Congress

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91<sup>st</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 116—PART 28

NOVEMBER 16, 1970, TO NOVEMBER 23, 1970

PAGES 37263 TO 38592

prehensive Federal program for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and drug dependence, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

### EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT OF 1970—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 1080

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 3883, a bill entitled "The Emergency School Aid Act of 1970." I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). The amendment will be received and printed, and will be appropriately referred.

The amendment, No. 1080, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the amendment would add a new section authorizing an expenditure of \$80 million in Federal funds over the next 2 years for research, development, and production of educational television programs for children.

We have seen over the past year how one imaginative and dedicated group of individuals has successfully demonstrated that the television our children watch for so many hours every day can have an important impact on educational achievement and the development of cognitive and effective skills. I refer, of course, to *Sesame Street*, which has been widely acclaimed and which has unquestionably benefited children from disadvantaged inner-city communities, from middle-class suburbs, and from isolated rural areas by providing an effective medium for teaching them important facts and learning skills.

The Educational Testing Service report, over 400 pages in length and based on a year-long study using the most advanced techniques of social science analysis, proves beyond a doubt that children benefited educationally from watching *Sesame Street*.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks a summary of a report by the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, N.J., evaluating the results of *Sesame Street*, entitled "A Summary of the Major Findings in 'The First Year of Sesame: An Evaluation'" be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

These results are no surprise. They simply confirm what the citizens of my State and people throughout the Nation have discovered for themselves.

Our children no longer have to wait until they reach school age to begin learning the three R's. "*Sesame Street*" has changed all that.

It is preparing our children for school, and it is making education interesting. The people who created "*Sesame Street*" have made learning fun, and by so doing, made it effective.

In my State of Minnesota, "*Sesame*

*Street*" is broadcast over three educational television stations: KTCJ, channel 17; and KTCA, channel 2, both in Minneapolis, St. Paul, and KWCM, channel 10 in Appleton. John Schwarzwalder, general manager of the Twin Cities educational television stations, reports to me that the public response to the showing of "*Sesame Street*" has been tremendous. There has been 10 times as much mail about "*Sesame Street*" as there has been about any other program his stations have ever presented. And what have all the letter writers been saying about "*Sesame Street*"? John Schwarzwalder describes it as "universal acclaim."

Parents from Minnetonka, St. Paul, Sauk Rapids, St. Louis Park, Minneapolis, Lake City, and St. Cloud, and numerous other communities in Minnesota and across the land have written calling "*Sesame Street*" excellent, wonderful, educational and interesting, dynamic, unique, and by far the best thing that has happened in television. Mothers who operate the Northeast Minneapolis Cooperative Nursery School reported, for example, that:

Each mother has agreed her child has learned from this program.

Perhaps the best indication of people's reaction to "*Sesame Street*" was contained in a letter from a parent in Minneapolis, Minn., who wrote:

In the words of my three year old daughter when she sees *Sesame Street* "I like this stuff."

The popularity of this program is further reflected in the fact that churches, individuals and voluntary associations in St. Paul, St. Cloud, Minneapolis, and elsewhere have made financial contributions to educational TV stations so that they could continue broadcasting shows like "*Sesame Street*" and "Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood." It costs money to broadcast TV programs, but it costs even more money to research, develop, and produce sensitive, interesting and educationally effective programs like "*Sesame Street*." That is precisely the reason I am introducing this amendment today.

The amendment would provide Federal funds to nonprofit agencies to pay the costs of development and production of educational television programs for preschool children and children of all ages. Thirty million dollars would be provided next year and \$50 million the following year for the establishment of research, development, and production centers around the country. Programs would be made available free of charge for transmission by any television station, including commercial stations, although commercial sponsorship of the program broadcast would not be allowed.

If adopted, this amendment will provide the necessary backing, on a national basis, to develop and produce more programs like "*Sesame Street*." It will encourage the creation of TV programs that reach children of all ethnic, racial, and economic backgrounds wherever they live. And, it will help children throughout the country enjoy learning in the crucial developmental preschool years.

#### EXHIBIT 1

#### A SUMMARY OF THE MAJOR FINDINGS IN "THE FIRST YEAR OF 'SESAME STREET': AN EVALUATION"

(A report by Samuel Ball, Gerry Ann Bogatz)

#### BACKGROUND

In the summer of 1968, the Children's Television Workshop (CTW) began planning its *Sesame Street* program. All concerned recognized that the plans should provide for an independent evaluation of the program's impact. CTW asked Educational Testing Service (ETS)—a nonprofit educational measurement and research organization in Princeton, New Jersey—to conduct an evaluation to determine the extent to which *Sesame Street* accomplished its stated objectives during its first year on television.

Among the questions the research tried to answer are these:

What, overall, is the impact of *Sesame Street*?

What are the moderating effects of age, sex, prior achievement level, and socioeconomic status (SES) on the impact of *Sesame Street*?

Do children at home watching *Sesame Street* benefit in comparison with children at home who do not watch it?

Do children in preschool classrooms benefit from watching *Sesame Street* as part of their school curriculum?

Do children from Spanish-speaking homes benefit from *Sesame Street*?

What are the effects of home background conditions on the impact of *Sesame Street*?

The Children's Television Workshop's innovative educational program received substantial support from both public and private agencies. The original agencies included the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Ford Foundation, the National Center for Educational Research and Development in the U.S. Office of Education, the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, and the National Institute of Child Care and Human Development. Other agencies that subsequently provided support included the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the National Foundation of Arts and Humanities, and the John & Mary R. Markle Foundation.

The results of ETS's research study are described in detail in the report entitled "The First Year of *Sesame Street*: An Evaluation." This Summary brings together a few of the major findings in the full report.

#### HIGHLIGHTS OF THE FINDINGS

In its first season of 26 weeks, *Sesame Street* showed that television can be an effective medium for teaching 3-to-5-year-old children important simple facts and skills, such as recognizing the labeling letters and numerals, and more complex higher cognitive skills, such as classifying and sorting by a variety of criteria. The ETS research results reveal that *Sesame Street* benefits children from disadvantaged inner-city communities, middle class suburbs, and isolated rural areas—all the groups studied in this evaluation.

The potential of educational television as a teaching medium is suggested by three primary findings of the research:

First, children who watched the most learned the most. The amount of learning that took place—that is, the gains a child showed between being tested for certain skills before watching *Sesame Street* and being tested for the same skills after—increased in relation to the amount of time the child watched the program.

Second, the skills that received the most time and attention on the program itself were, with rare exceptions, the skills that were best learned. An analysis of the content of the show revealed, for example, that more time (13.9 percent) was devoted to let-

ter-related skills than to any other single subject; it was in the areas of letters and numbers that the children's gains were the most dramatic. In addition to acquiring skills that were directly and deliberately taught, it appears that there was some transfer of learning that some children learned to do things—such as recognize full words or write their own names—which were not taught on the program.

Third, the program did not require formal adult supervision in order for children to learn in the areas the program covers. Children viewing *Sesame Street* at home showed gains as great as, and in some cases greater than, children who watched in school under the supervision of a teacher. This finding has special significance in light of the fact that more than four-fifths of all children 3 and 4 years of age do not attend any kind of school, and more than a quarter of all 5-year-olds do not.

The major finding—that children learned more the more they watch—holds true across age, sex, geographical location, socioeconomic status (SES), mental age (intelligence), and whether children watch at home or at school. In all eight goal areas in which the children were tested, gains in learning increased steadily with amount of viewing. Gains were greater on certain tests and subtests, however, and some groups of children showed greater gains than others.

The 3-year-old children gained the most; 5-year-olds gained the least. This is, 3-year-old children who viewed the show a great deal had higher attainments at posttest than those 4- and 5-year-olds who viewed the show less, even though the younger children scored lower at pretest than the older children. This finding has important implications for education in general, for it suggests that 3-year-old children are able to learn many skills that have traditionally been introduced at later ages.

A similar phenomenon appeared with advantaged and disadvantaged children. Although the disadvantaged children started out with considerably lower achievement scores on the skills being taught, those who watched a great deal surpassed the middle class children who watched only a little. It thus appears that such television programs can reduce the distinct educational gap that usually separates advantaged and disadvantaged children even by the time they enter first grade.

An extremely provocative, although highly tentative, finding suggests that *Sesame Street* may be particularly effective for teaching some skills to children whose first language is not English and who do not test well or perform well in school. A very small sample of children from Spanish-speaking homes in the Southwest made more spectacular gains than any other subgroup of children.

*Sesame Street* was more successful in promoting certain of its educational goals than others. The research suggests why, and provides clues for improving the programming. It appears that in some cases the relative lack of success resulted from an initial underestimation of children's prior knowledge and skills, and in other cases from an initial overstatement of prior knowledge. It was also found that learning was greater when skills were presented in direct fashion (as letters were) rather than indirectly (as initial sounds were).

#### THE SAMPLE AND THE TESTS

Approximately 1,200 children were originally selected from five different locales: Boston, Massachusetts; Durham, North Carolina; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Phoenix, Arizona; and a rural area in the Northeastern part of California. The sample, which finally numbered 943, included disadvantaged chil-

dren from the inner city, advantaged children from suburban areas, children from rural areas, and disadvantaged Spanish-speaking children. Overall, the research sample included more boys than girls and more lower class than middle class children. More of the disadvantaged were black than white; most of the children were 4 years old, although some were 3 and some were 5; and more of the sample's children viewed *Sesame Street* at home than at school.

The producers of *Sesame Street* established specific educational goals for the program. Measurement instruments, all developed by ETS specifically for this evaluation, were used to assess progress toward those goals and "transfer of learning" effects. The eight major tests and their subtests were:

**Body parts test.**—Pointing to Body Parts; Naming Body Parts; Function of Body Parts (point); and Function of Body Parts (verbal).

**Letters test.**—Recognizing Letters; Naming Capital Letters; Naming Lower Case Letters; Matching Letters in Words; Recognizing Letters in Words; Initial Sounds; and Reading Words.

**Forms test.**—Recognizing Forms and Naming Forms.

**Numbers test.**—Recognizing Numbers; Naming Numbers; Numerosity (See sample Item 2.); Counting; and Addition and Subtraction.

(Matching Subtest for letters, numbers, and forms.)

**Relational terms test.**—Amount Relationships; Size Relationships; and Position Relationships (See sample Item 5).

**Sorting skills test.**

Classification skills test.—Classification by Size; Classification by Form; Classification by Number; and Classification by Function (See sample Item 6).

**Puzzles test.**

All of the tests followed the same basic format. The test materials were simple and were administered to the children individually by a trained adult from the child's neighborhood. Information was also collected on each child's home background and on how much he watched *Sesame Street* during the season.

The group of 943 children was divided into quartiles according to how much they had watched *Sesame Street* during the course of the study. All subsequent analyses were based on these quartiles. They ranged from Q1, in which children watched *Sesame Street* rarely or never, through Q4, in which children watched the program an average of more than five times a week. (*Sesame Street* was so popular that there were few true non-viewers; many children in Q1 watched the program occasionally.)

#### OVERALL RESULTS

For the sample as a whole, children in the highest viewing quartiles performed better on the tests than children in the lowest quartiles. Children who watched the most (Q4) had the highest pretest scores (that is, they started out ahead), had the highest posttest scores, and gained the most from pretest to posttest. The general tendency—to gain more with more viewing—was greater on some tests than on others, however. It was especially pronounced on the Letters, Numbers, and Classification tests; it was least marked on the Body Parts Test.

#### DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

Of the total sample of 943 children, 731 were considered to be from disadvantaged backgrounds. For them as for the total group, gain scores increased in relation to the amount they viewed *Sesame Street*.

In terms of the grand total score for the 203 test items common to both pretest and posttest, Q1 children gained 19 points, Q2

children gained 29 points, Q3 children gained 38 points, and Q4 children gained 47 points. (See Table 11 and Figure 2a.) Some of the gains made by Q1 children are assumed to be largely a function of maturation, since many of them never watched the show. However, the greater gains of children in other quartiles are largely a function of their viewing frequency. The same sort of relationship was observed among separate totals for all of the eight major tests. The greatest gains were in the Letters, Numbers, and Classification tests. (See Table 11 and Figures 2b, 2c, 2d, and 2e.)

Complex statistical analyses were conducted to determine whether the observed differences could have occurred by chance, were significantly affected by other factors, or were—as they appeared to be—largely a function of amount of viewing. (See full report for description of statistical techniques used.) Amount of viewing proved to be by far the most important variable—that is, its effect was equally felt irrespective of sex and whether the children watched at home or at school.

In order to isolate sharply the effect of amount of viewing, two matched groups of children were the subjects of a special study (the Age Cohorts Study). Group 1 was 53 to 58 months of age at the time of pretesting; Group 2 was 53 to 58 months of age at the time of posttesting. In addition to being of the same chronological age at the point of comparison, they were of comparable mental age and they lived in the same communities. There were, in short, no observable differences between the two groups in important matters of previous attainments, IQ, and home background. There were more than 100 disadvantaged children, who were not attending school, in each group.

The pretest scores of Group 1 (before the children could have watched *Sesame Street*) were compared with the posttest scores of Group 2 after the Group 2 children had watched the program. The frequent viewers in Group 2—children in Q3 and Q4—scored about 40 points higher on the 203 common items than the comparable children in Group 1 who had never watched the show. (See Table 45 and Figure 10a.) Equally significant is the fact that infrequent viewers (Q1) in Group 2 differed by only about 12 points from comparable children in Group 1 who had not viewed *Sesame Street* at all. In short, holding maturational effects, IQ, previous attainments, and home background constant, the frequent viewers made large and important gains.

Although the amount of viewing did not vary markedly according to age of the children, test scores did. At the time of the pretest, as would be predicted, 3-year-olds did less well than 4-year-olds, and 4-year-olds did less well than 5-year-olds. In terms of gains, however, the results were reversed. Although the most-frequent-viewing 3-year-old group started out, at pretest, lower than any 5-year-old group, by the time of the posttest the 3-year-olds who viewed most frequently scored higher on the average than 4-year-olds in Q1, Q2, and Q3, and higher than 5-year-olds in Q1 and Q2. Even 3-year-olds who viewed only two or three times a week gained a great deal compared with other age groups. (See Tables 12a, 12b, 12c and Figure 3a.)

Some test results were clearly related to age. Among frequent viewers, the largest gains on the Body Parts Test were made by 3-year-olds; 3- and 4-year-olds gained more than 5-year-olds in Number; and 5-year-olds showed higher gains than the others in Reading Words (which indicates a transfer of learning) and in Initial Sounds (which was taught indirectly on *Sesame Street*). In short, goals that were indirectly taught were better learned by older viewers, and transfer

of learning was more apparent among them, as would be expected. Generally, where specific knowledge and skills were taught directly, young children gained more than the others.

ADVANCED CHILDREN

There were 169 children in the study who were considered to be advantaged. They scored higher on the pretest than other groups, and they watched more of the show, on the average, than any of the groups of disadvantaged children. Relatively small amounts of viewing produced relatively large gains among these children. (See Table 24 and Figure 7a.)

SPANISH-SPEAKING CHILDREN

There were only 43 Spanish-speaking children included in the study, and there was considerable variation among them in the extent to which they had been exposed to English before watching *Sesame Street*. Owing to this variability and the small size of the sample, conclusions must be drawn with great caution.

The largest concentration of Spanish-speaking children was in Q1, leaving only 18 in frequent-viewing groups. These frequent-viewing children gained almost in-

credible amounts; in fact, the gains among Q3 Spanish-speaking children were as high as those for Q4 children in the rest of the study. In the Letters Test, the Q4 Spanish-speaking children started lowest at pretest and scored highest at posttest. Other Letters subtests, and tests of Numbers, Forms, Sorting, Relational Terms, and Classification, showed the same phenomenon: a low start with subsequent very high gains for the children who viewed most.

RURAL CHILDREN

The rural children in the study scored relatively low on pretests and made great gains with viewing. Their parents tended to be better educated than those of the disadvantaged city children. The large gains they made suggest that *Sesame Street* holds great promise as an educational medium for children who live on remote farms or in small villages.

SESAME STREET IN THE SCHOOLS

The teachers whose classes watched *Sesame Street* as a part of the study were asked to indicate their reactions to the program. Although they admired *Sesame Street* for its effectiveness as one means of teaching young children, they were divided in their

opinions about the appropriateness of its use in the classroom. Some felt strongly that the show took up valuable time that could better be given to other activities; others felt that it was a worthwhile addition to the school day.

CHILDREN, PARENTS, AND SESAME STREET

Children who watched *Sesame Street* the most—and hence learned the most—tended to have mothers who often watched the show with them and often talked to them about it. In these same homes, the parents tended to have somewhat higher expectations for their children.

OVERALL CONCLUSION

In terms of its own stated goals, *Sesame Street* was in general highly successful. The ETS study shows that 3-to-5-year-old youngsters from a variety of backgrounds acquired important simple and complex cognitive skills as a result of watching the program. Those who watched the most gained the most.

The overall conclusion is that the potential of educational television as an effective medium for teaching certain skills to very young children has been demonstrated by *Sesame Street*.

TABLE 11.—PRETEST AND GAIN SCORES FOR ALL DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN (BY QUARTILES)

[N=731]

Test and subtest	Maximum possible score	Q <sub>1</sub> N=198				Q <sub>2</sub> N=197				Q <sub>3</sub> N=172				Q <sub>4</sub> N=164			
		Pretest		Gain		Pretest		Gain		Pretest		Gain		Pretest		Gain	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Grand total	203	75.62	24.73	18.63	20.04	84.42	27.60	29.11	22.51	87.74	27.63	37.97	25.29	97.54	32.16	47.36	26.15
Body parts total	32	18.11	6.51	3.88	5.71	20.00	6.35	4.38	5.50	21.69	6.04	4.74	5.31	22.47	6.05	5.24	4.88
Pointing to body parts	5	3.07	1.40	0.71	1.38	3.51	1.34	0.59	1.21	3.69	1.15	0.51	1.22	3.88	1.14	0.69	1.05
Naming body parts	15	8.24	2.92	1.36	2.67	9.28	2.95	1.40	2.69	9.70	2.53	1.68	2.49	10.37	2.44	1.79	2.27
Function of body parts (point)	8	4.77	2.39	1.10	2.64	4.94	2.29	1.53	2.31	5.34	2.13	1.56	2.17	5.48	2.30	1.87	2.06
Function of body parts (verbal)	4	2.03	1.55	0.72	1.72	2.27	1.43	0.85	1.53	2.35	1.54	0.99	1.53	2.74	1.48	0.89	1.35
Letters total	58	13.07	5.95	4.30	7.43	14.42	7.37	8.22	9.26	14.95	7.00	11.89	11.00	17.98	10.12	15.97	1.19
Recognizing letters	8	2.26	1.67	0.65	2.31	2.38	1.89	1.37	2.41	2.50	1.84	2.06	2.55	3.04	2.12	2.56	2.62
Naming capital letters	16	1.24	2.36	1.35	3.44	1.47	3.25	3.31	4.90	1.49	3.02	5.17	5.15	2.85	4.53	7.25	2.68
Naming lower case letters	8	0.47	1.06	0.37	1.63	0.63	1.42	1.02	2.30	0.44	1.09	1.91	2.42	1.00	1.89	2.60	5.64
Matching letters in words	4	2.81	1.21	0.65	1.21	3.03	1.22	0.72	1.18	3.13	1.16	0.67	1.08	3.24	1.07	0.65	1.11
Recognizing letters in words	4	1.34	1.11	0.31	1.40	1.36	1.07	0.58	1.38	1.35	1.08	0.82	1.55	1.49	1.20	1.16	1.53
Initial sounds	4	0.68	0.74	0.14	1.08	0.80	0.76	0.19	1.16	0.94	0.81	0.11	1.21	0.89	0.81	0.30	1.16
Reading words	6	0.02	0.16	0.02	0.28	0.06	0.49	0.05	0.55	0.03	0.20	0.18	0.60	0.12	0.59	0.37	0.75
Forms total	20	8.43	3.50	2.29	3.77	9.89	4.61	3.15	4.05	10.04	3.64	4.29	4.07	10.64	3.50	5.49	3.52
Recognizing forms	4	1.96	1.20	0.41	1.64	2.16	1.20	0.38	1.62	2.12	1.26	0.69	1.72	2.13	1.15	1.10	1.52
Naming forms	4	0.87	1.08	0.64	1.29	1.34	1.31	0.86	1.43	1.29	1.22	1.28	1.43	1.39	1.27	1.83	1.34
Numbers total	54	16.18	8.20	5.43	7.05	18.56	9.38	8.52	8.23	19.64	10.10	10.88	9.51	23.69	11.15	13.01	9.52
Recognizing numbers	6	1.64	1.40	0.60	1.71	1.76	1.52	1.26	1.91	1.77	1.52	1.67	2.10	2.38	1.87	1.78	2.11
Naming numbers	15	1.12	2.58	1.13	2.96	1.57	2.95	2.43	3.96	1.56	3.07	3.74	4.01	3.09	4.04	5.15	4.44
Numerosity	6	2.93	1.50	0.92	1.68	3.47	1.72	0.92	1.69	3.59	1.72	0.97	1.79	4.05	1.72	1.11	1.56
Counting	9	4.35	2.51	1.24	2.34	4.74	2.62	1.81	2.38	5.22	2.56	1.79	2.53	5.72	2.50	1.74	2.41
Addition and subtraction	7	1.30	1.29	0.64	1.56	1.64	1.61	0.72	1.53	1.93	1.78	0.76	1.84	2.13	1.82	1.04	1.79
Matching subtest	11	7.83	2.76	1.26	2.87	8.38	2.55	1.50	2.50	8.90	2.19	1.12	2.09	9.32	1.77	1.02	1.82
Relational terms total	17	9.07	2.98	1.11	3.18	9.88	3.06	1.52	3.34	10.08	2.77	1.80	2.93	10.15	3.13	2.47	3.34
Amount relationships	9	4.37	1.73	0.63	2.04	4.52	1.99	0.93	2.34	4.64	1.90	1.00	2.21	4.73	1.95	1.23	2.22
Size relationships	2	1.64	0.58	0.09	0.70	1.75	0.46	0.13	0.54	1.73	0.49	0.19	0.51	1.73	0.46	0.18	0.51
Position relationships	5	2.69	1.46	0.27	1.68	3.10	1.34	0.39	1.63	3.19	1.28	0.52	1.39	3.24	1.33	0.80	1.50
Sorting total	6	2.30	1.33	0.47	1.85	2.54	1.44	0.81	1.82	2.52	1.50	1.38	1.76	2.73	1.39	1.64	1.71
Classification total	24	10.57	4.15	1.67	4.41	11.98	4.63	2.96	4.78	12.06	4.68	4.56	4.97	12.88	4.60	5.32	4.67
Classification by size	2	1.08	0.74	0.08	1.03	1.10	0.78	0.27	0.95	1.13	0.78	0.32	0.92	1.20	0.74	0.43	0.85
Classification by form	6	1.98	1.26	0.51	1.53	2.45	1.48	0.87	1.70	2.53	1.44	1.22	1.84	2.69	1.45	1.48	1.58
Classification by number	6	1.87	1.29	0.49	1.65	2.26	1.31	0.48	1.78	2.28	1.47	1.00	1.82	2.64	1.52	1.11	1.85
Classification by function	9	5.19	1.95	0.75	2.27	5.65	2.04	1.34	2.20	5.63	1.94	1.90	2.17	5.88	1.91	2.02	1.95
Puzzles total	5	1.88	1.40	0.43	1.86	2.04	1.37	0.80	1.64	2.15	1.28	0.83	1.58	2.41	1.45	0.98	1.57

TABLE 45.—PRETEST AND POSTTEST SCORES FOR DISADVANTAGED, AT-HOME CHILDREN (BY VIEWING QUARTILES)

[Group 1=children who were 53 to 58 months old at time of pretest. Group 2=children who were 53 to 58 months old at time of posttest (age cohorts)]

Test and subtest	Maximum possible score	Q <sub>1</sub>		Q <sub>2</sub>		Q <sub>3</sub>		Q <sub>4</sub>									
		Group 1 N=31, pretest		Group 2 N=26, posttest		Group 1 N=33, pretest		Group 2 N=33, posttest									
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD								
Grand total	203	76.77	22.27	88.42	21.83	81.97	18.90	101.70	24.78	90.37	25.21	130.33	29.59	99.04	36.42	139.33	35.99
Body parts total	32	17.87	6.49	21.04	6.01	20.24	5.74	22.91	5.84	21.93	5.57	26.83	3.73	22.87	5.51	26.75	4.58
Pointing to body parts	5	3.13	1.50	3.31	1.46	3.91	1.04	3.88	1.08	3.78	0.97	4.39	0.78	4.17	1.15	4.42	0.93
Naming body parts	15	8.58	2.85	9.15	2.69	9.39	3.29	9.97	2.58	10.22	2.41	11.67	2.14	10.43	2.37	11.50	2.38
Function of body parts (point)	8	4.03	2.37	5.77	2.16	4.55	2.12	6.15	2.05	5.52	1.83	7.17	1.15	5.48	2.31	7.29	1.20
Function of body parts (verbal)	4	2.13	1.48	2.81	1.41	2.39	1.22	2.91	1.42	2.41	1.55	3.61	0.61	2.78	1.35	3.54	0.93

Footnotes at end of table.



TABLE 12b.—PRETEST AND GAIN SCORES FOR ALL DISADVANTAGED 4-YEAR-OLD CHILDREN (BY QUANTILES)

[N = 433]

Table with 17 columns: Test and subtest, Maximum possible score, and four quartiles (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4) each with Pretest and Gain scores (Mean and SD). Rows include Grand total, Body parts total, Letters total, Forms total, Numbers total, Matching subtest, Relational terms total, Position relationships, Sorting total, Classification total, Peabody raw score, and Hidden triangles total.

TABLE 12c.—PRETEST AND GAIN SCORES FOR ALL DISADVANTAGED 5-YEAR-OLD CHILDREN (BY QUANTILES)

[N = 159]

Table with 17 columns: Test and subtest, Maximum possible score, and four quartiles (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4) each with Pretest and Gain scores (Mean and SD). Rows include Grand Total, Body parts total, Letters total, Forms total, Numbers total, Matching subtest, Relational terms total, Position relationships, Sorting total, Classification total, Peabody raw score, and Hidden triangles total.

TABLE 24.—PRETEST AND GAIN SCORES FOR ALL ADVANTAGED CHILDREN (BY QUARTILES)

[N=169]

Test and subtest	Maximum possible score	Q <sub>1</sub> N=16				Q <sub>2</sub> N=31				Q <sub>3</sub> N=57				Q <sub>4</sub> N=65			
		Pretest		Gain		Pretest		Gain		Pretest		Gain		Pretest		Gain	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Grand total.....	203	95.44	23.90	26.69	16.04	102.13	21.65	38.65	17.02	112.77	24.36	40.46	18.83	110.83	25.63	45.25	22.87
Body parts total.....	32	24.13	5.77	3.19	4.97	25.74	4.90	2.52	4.31	26.37	5.64	2.35	4.28	25.71	4.79	3.14	4.50
Pointing to body parts.....	5	4.13	1.15	.25	.93	4.35	.75	.29	.86	4.30	1.10	.30	.98	4.49	.77	.09	1.03
Naming body parts.....	15	11.06	2.65	1.25	3.02	11.39	2.75	.87	2.51	11.86	3.20	.89	2.66	11.38	3.13	1.32	3.15
Function of body parts (point).....	4	5.94	2.11	1.13	2.22	6.71	1.44	.81	1.54	6.77	1.66	.79	1.59	6.40	1.63	1.23	1.63
Function of body parts (verbal).....	4	3.00	1.26	.56	.96	3.29	1.01	.55	.99	3.44	1.07	.37	1.11	3.43	1.07	.49	1.09
Letters total.....	58	15.19	8.79	8.06	9.26	16.81	7.03	12.48	10.10	19.25	10.21	17.09	9.99	18.62	8.86	19.63	11.46
Recognizing letters.....	8	2.25	2.08	1.19	2.14	2.48	1.69	2.52	2.57	3.07	2.10	2.81	2.10	3.34	2.05	2.78	2.51
Naming capital letters.....	16	1.75	3.77	1.33	4.39	2.55	3.91	5.87	4.89	3.77	4.92	7.65	5.24	3.69	4.26	8.72	4.80
Naming lower case letters.....	8	.56	2.00	1.13	1.54	.52	.81	1.97	2.23	1.02	1.55	3.37	2.51	.78	1.24	3.66	2.68
Matching letters in words.....	4	3.56	.81	.31	.87	3.45	.72	.55	.72	3.47	.87	.37	.72	3.26	1.08	.58	1.27
Recognizing letters in words.....	4	1.44	1.21	.38	1.20	1.35	.95	.52	1.18	1.42	1.18	1.09	1.26	1.42	1.21	1.20	1.50
Initial sounds.....	4	.63	.96	.19	1.33	.68	.70	.55	1.18	.95	.87	.39	1.35	.77	.80	.89	1.06
Reading words.....	6	0	0	.06	.25	0	0	.10	.30	0	.26	.30	.69	.03	.17	.35	.69
Forms total.....	10	10.63	3.48	3.00	4.23	11.35	3.20	4.32	2.74	12.37	3.05	3.88	3.59	12.31	3.15	4.62	3.39
Recognizing forms.....	4	2.44	1.36	.25	1.69	2.10	1.19	.94	1.44	2.47	1.10	.54	1.76	2.54	1.25	1.08	1.41
Naming forms.....	4	1.31	1.01	.88	1.82	1.32	1.14	1.29	1.22	1.81	1.17	1.10	1.23	1.68	1.00	1.46	1.20
Numbers total.....	54	22.13	10.37	8.69	5.38	24.13	8.65	12.06	6.79	28.07	9.80	12.16	8.17	27.50	10.83	12.40	7.68
Recognizing numbers.....	6	2.88	2.09	.63	1.50	2.23	1.75	2.16	1.64	2.18	1.98	2.05	2.14	2.98	1.80	1.85	4.93
Naming numbers.....	15	3.06	4.25	2.94	3.00	2.77	3.82	4.81	4.10	4.09	4.43	5.91	4.15	4.18	4.50	5.71	4.33
Numerosity.....	6	3.56	1.75	1.50	1.55	4.58	1.46	.68	1.17	4.89	1.16	.37	.94	4.85	1.31	.48	1.20
Counting.....	9	5.19	2.88	1.56	1.90	6.23	1.94	1.19	1.42	6.86	1.85	.84	1.49	6.46	2.39	1.18	2.11
Additional and subtraction.....	7	1.94	1.61	.50	1.51	2.06	1.59	1.16	1.37	2.51	1.30	.82	1.30	2.55	1.70	.74	1.53
Matching subtest.....	11	9.31	1.45	.81	1.17	9.95	1.01	.39	1.20	9.67	1.09	.65	1.11	9.32	1.60	1.05	1.74
Relational terms total.....	17	10.63	2.58	1.56	2.85	10.48	2.34	2.10	2.69	11.58	1.96	1.19	2.19	11.71	2.57	1.38	2.64
Amount relationships.....	9	4.75	1.39	1.13	1.15	4.68	1.54	1.52	1.67	5.61	1.46	1.40	1.72	5.52	1.52	.80	1.61
Size relationships.....	2	1.75	.58	.25	.58	1.90	.30	.10	.30	1.84	.41	.11	.41	1.89	.31	.05	.37
Position relationships.....	5	3.50	1.46	.13	1.82	3.19	1.25	.48	1.29	3.47	1.10	.60	1.33	3.89	1.09	.48	1.38
Sorting total.....	6	2.75	1.34	.50	1.41	2.81	1.22	1.52	1.29	2.99	1.41	1.65	1.83	2.86	1.41	1.75	1.54
Classification total.....	24	11.50	3.12	3.69	5.33	14.03	3.56	4.97	4.01	15.19	4.21	4.58	4.95	15.11	4.23	4.55	4.27
Classification by size.....	2	1.00	.73	.50	1.10	1.45	.68	.29	.64	1.47	.68	.37	.84	1.55	.66	.26	.78
Classification by form.....	6	2.38	1.41	.88	2.22	3.06	1.36	1.39	1.50	3.16	1.52	1.54	1.74	3.26	1.43	1.37	1.59
Classification by number.....	6	2.19	1.05	1.06	1.61	2.55	1.18	1.16	2.02	3.05	1.51	1.14	2.17	2.91	1.49	1.12	1.76
Classification by function.....	5	5.56	1.36	1.06	1.48	6.32	1.60	2.06	1.86	6.89	1.47	1.49	1.78	6.74	1.73	1.68	1.78
Puzzles total.....	5	2.75	1.18	.13	.96	2.23	1.15	1.23	1.41	2.93	1.42	.79	1.59	3.15	1.21	.48	1.60
Peabody raw score (pretest only).....	80	42.31	9.48			49.45	8.18			49.19	9.93			48.12	9.39		
Peabody mental age (months).....	10	4.38	1.97			62.33	13.34			62.49	15.55			60.29	15.51		
Hidden triangles total (posttest).....	10	4.38	2.20			4.71	1.13			4.33	1.46			4.45	1.31		
Which comes first total.....	12	6.00	2.88			7.06	2.93			7.79	2.49			8.40	2.83		

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AN AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1041 TO H.R. 19590

At the request of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TUDING), was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1041 to H.R. 19590, the Department of Defense Appropriations bill.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert C. Mardian, of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice J. Walter Yeagley, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, November 30, 1970, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

WE SHOULD RESUME DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH CUBA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in November, 1958 I was elected U.S. Senator. CXVI—2422—Part 28

ator. Ohio voters generously gave me a majority of approximately 153,000 over Senator "Honest John" Bricker, who had never been defeated for office in my State. Senator Bricker had served as attorney general of Ohio and for three terms as Governor of Ohio. In 1944 he was the Republican nominee for Vice President of the United States.

So feeling very good I dissolved my law firm, took the sign off the door, and decided to go to Florida and possibly to Cuba. Shortly before Christmas Day in 1958, I was vacationing in Florida, in celebration of my election victory which very few persons except myself had anticipated.

In the cocktail room of the Yankee Clipper where I was staying while gossiping with the bartender and others, I was told that the guerrillas in the Sierra Maestra mountains were overcoming the corrupt dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista, a former sergeant of the Cuban Army, whom the United States had been supporting. I was informed that our Central Intelligence Agency had been keeping Batista in power in Cuba despite the fact that he was a corrupt dictator and was despised by millions of poverty-stricken Cubans. Then also at a party at the Trade Winds I was told that Fidel Castro's guerrillas were winning the revolt there and the tyrant Batista, who had taken over by force, was abandoned by his followers and would be out before the New Year. Yet, the CIA and our Government officials in Washington seemed to have no intimation until suddenly Batista fled from Havana to rendezvous with his unlisted bank accounts in Switzerland. He then commenced the life of affluence and ease in gorgeous exile on

the sunswept, fashionable beaches of Spain along with other ex-dictators, kings and emperors.

It was startling news to the CIA, officials in the White House, and the American public when bearded Castro and his tattered followers triumphantly paraded in Havana and took over the government of this island of nearly 8 million people 90 miles from Key West. His regime has lasted and thrived from late December 1959 to this good hour.

The fact is that the Central Intelligence Agency from its Director right down the line to CIA operatives on the staff of our embassy in Havana were supporting the corrupt dictator, Batista, and were surprised and humiliated when suddenly Batista took off from Havana with his personal entourage.

The late great President John F. Kennedy directly following the Bay of Pigs debacle said:

That CIA, I would tear it into bits and throw it to the four winds.

This was a CIA operation from the outset, including training in Guatemala for invasion of Cuba and overthrowing the Castro regime with our air support.

Mr. President, the time is long past for the United States to resume diplomatic and trade relations with Cuba. The fact is that today 50 nations, including our neighbors, Canada and Mexico, recognize the Castro regime and enjoy a thriving international trade with the Republic of Cuba.

We might as well face the fact that the Castro regime is firmly entrenched. To our knowledge, no rebellion or guerrilla warfare is being waged against Fidel Castro and his government.

In January 1961, President Eisen-