

University of Texas of the Permian Basin

FalconCommons

College of Education

Dissertations & Theses

8-1980

Prototype and Distinctive Feature Processing in Young Children as Related to Nonsense Words

Janice Faye Wallace

Follow this and additional works at: <https://falconcommons.utpb.edu/utpb-edu>



Part of the [Early Childhood Education Commons](#)

PROTOTYPE AND DISTINCTIVE FEATURE PROCESSING IN YOUNG CHILDREN
AS RELATED TO NONSENSE WORDS

APPROVED BY SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Spencer K. Thompson
Chairman

Alan Marcus

Robert F. Shingler

John L. Frayer

AA09982

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS OF THE PERMIAN BASIN

BF
455
W35
1980
C.1

PROTOTYPE AND DISTINCTIVE FEATURE PROCESSING IN YOUNG CHILDREN
AS RELATED TO NONSENSE WORDS

by

JANICE FAYE WALLACE, B.S.

RESEARCH PROJECT REPORT

Presented to the Faculty of Education
The University of Texas of the Permian Basin
in Partial Fulfillment
for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS OF THE PERMIAN BASIN

August 1980

Prototype and Distinctive Feature Processing

1

Abstract

Human learning processes have long been topics of interest and research. Two processes, prototype and distinctive feature, were investigated in 20 kindergarteners in two groups of 10 each. I hypothesized that the prototype processing group would perform better than the distinctive feature group because of the age and probable cognitive development of the children. Group EI was given instructions and trained to form prototypes of verbally presented nonsense words for classification. Group EII was directed and trained to determine distinctive feature rules of the same nonsense words for classification. A transfer design was used to test learning. EI reflected prototype learning with the same prototype and different distinctive features (as in training) used on the transfer test. EII reflected distinctive feature processing since a different prototype but same distinctive features (as in training) was used on the transfer test. Results do not support the hypothesis since there were no significant differences ($p > .25$) between the two groups. However, possible methodological problems are indicated and further research suggested.