

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THREE READIBILITY METHODS  
IN AN INTERGROUP COMMUNICATION SITUATION

by

SANDRA B. ERNST

B.J., University of Missouri, 1965

3735

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Technical Journalism

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY  
Manhattan, Kansas

1970

Approved by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Deny R. Leaming  
Major Professor

LD  
2668  
T4  
1970  
E75  
O.2

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
CHAPTER I. SURVEY OF PROBLEM AREA . . . . .	3
Intergroup Relations (3)--Communication (9)--Language Factors (14) --Intergroup Communication (18)--City Planners (25)--Research Questions (26)	
CHAPTER II. RESEARCH DESIGN . . . . .	28
Hypotheses (28)--Research Methods (29)--Sample (32)--Limitations of Method (33)	
CHAPTER III. FINDINGS . . . . .	35
Reading Ease Formula Comparisons (35)--"Cloze" Procedure Comparisons (43)--Group Comparisons (48)--Summary of Hypothesis (52)	
CHAPTER IV. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	55
Conclusions (55)--Limitations and Further Research (56)--Implications (57)	
FOOTNOTES . . . . .	62
APPENDIX . . . . .	67
City Planning Exam Question (68)--In-Group Analysis: Pilot Study (70) --In-Group Analysis: Instructions to the Coder (88)--In-Group Analysis: Original Code Sheet (92)--In-Group Analysis: Revised Code Sheet (94) --"Blanked" Messages used in the "Cloze" Tests (96)	
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	101

# **ILLEGIBLE DOCUMENT**

**THE FOLLOWING  
DOCUMENT(S) IS OF  
POOR LEGIBILITY IN  
THE ORIGINAL**

**THIS IS THE BEST  
COPY AVAILABLE**

**THIS BOOK  
CONTAINS  
NUMEROUS PAGES  
WITH DIAGRAMS  
THAT ARE CROOKED  
COMPARED TO THE  
REST OF THE  
INFORMATION ON  
THE PAGE.**

**THIS IS AS  
RECEIVED FROM  
CUSTOMER.**

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. A Communication Model . . . . .	10
2. Description of high-low scores . . . . .	46
3. Cloze completion averages . . . . .	47
4. Cloze completion by roles . . . . .	48
5. Cloze completion by educational level . . . . .	49
6. Point system for In-Group scoring . . . . .	74
7. Student In-Group scores from pilot study . . . . .	75
8. Media In-Group scores from pilot study . . . . .	76
9. Inter-coder agreement percentages . . . . .	76
10. Revised point system for In-Group scoring . . . . .	80
11. Weighting system for "use" category . . . . .	81
12. Revised inter-coder agreement percentages . . . . .	83
13. Media Fog and In-Group scores . . . . .	85
14. Comparison of media Fog scores . . . . .	86

## LIST OF PLATES

Plate	Page
I. Student Fog and In-Group Scores . . . . .	37
II. Fog Count: Students and Magazines . . . . .	40
III. In-Group Scores: Students and Magazines . . . . .	42
IV. Student Planners' High-Low Pattern . . . . .	45
V. Average Cloze Scores . . . . .	51