READING EN	JOTES
1928/14 ROWE 2012 19 MAY 202	0
WHAT INPUT QUALITY FEA	
	7.17.2
DEVELOPM	ENTI
WHY VOCABULARY?: Link to scholastic	achierement
QUANTITY Vs. QUALITY of speech?:	Taudence for both in mor work
CONVERSATIONAL CONFOUNDS: Most pro	
interaction but then the when active com	lext boosts correspondence between adult
and child verbal behavior	•
and Chine Chart Banishick	13.5004
N/50 /Bana 2 /2000 compress of 104:100	DISTANCE AND
No 50 (from a larger corps of 64; LDP Home visits: 14, 18, 22, 26, 30, 34, 35	Staglish as primary by PARENT-CHI (40.11)
Howie Visits 19, 18, 22, 20, 30, 39, 3	8 42 40, 50 #59 mo
	USED IN THE PRESENT STUDY
INPUT = MEASURE	es = OUTPUT
INPUT QUANTITY=	(PPVT STD SCORE)
# Words (tokens)	nonverbal meanre
of parental CDS	of receptive Vocabilary, age-
TUCAB. DIVERSITY = # word types	Standardized based on norming data
H word types	Ore wife
in parental CDS	RESULTS)
VOCAB. SUPHISTICATION # dichonory	
# dichenary	- HUGE VARIABILITY IN ALL MEASURES CALL AGES
words not known by 4th graders	- INCREASE IN RARE WORDS & DECONTEXT, UTTS WAGE
DECONTEXT. UTIS) =	- HIGHER SES: MORE & MORE DIVERSE WORDS & VOLAR
	Lo relation to vare words is wester at at older ages
O EXPLANATION: talk regreshing/making logical connections between concepts	to relation to decent is even weaker & at older ages
-1	-30 MO VOIAB: SES & prior voice = 29 To vanance
(2) PRETEND: talk within pretend play, incl. personal, scripts	no sig turther predictors
incl. personec, son prs	- 42 MO VOCAB: SES * prier vocab = 52 % vanance
3 NARRATIVE: talk about post on fiture	Lo diversity (9%) or rare words (6%) increase fit -54 mo vocab: SES + prior vocab = 72% variance to investig vits (+7% ich)
events	-54 MO VOCAB: SESS + Prior VOCAS = 727 Varian
3(5)	to novietive vHs (+772 ish) increase fit
Primary caregiver education	
(10-18 years of education)	QUANTITY -> DIVERSITY -> NARRATIVENESS Their view of optimal input over first 3.5 years
	Their view of optimal input over first 3.5
	- years

	QUESTIONS.
	- WHERE DOES CONVERSATION (OR AND ACTIVITY) COME IN?
	- HOW DO RARE WORDS (~6% OF THE INPUT) HAVE A LARGE IMPACT?
	- HOW ARE NAPRATIVE PRACTICES DIFFERENT BETWEEN THE
	PARTICIPATING SUBJOHMENITIES? DOES NAPIRATIVE LA ALWAYS DO THE SAME THING?
	"Consistent with an interactionist perspective toward language learning" (p 1773) 49 in the sense of Briner (1983) and Vygotsky (1978) of providing an appropriately challenging yet supportive learning environment
_	
-	
