Words Matter: Effects of Manipulating Storybook Texts on Parental and Children's Math Talk Muanjing Wang, Elida V. Laski & Marina Vasilyeva

Background

- Quality and quantity of parental math talk is predictive of children's number **knowledge** (Gunderson & Levine, 2011)
- Parent-child interactions around math storybooks has been found to promote math learning (Purpura et al., 2021, Hojnoski et al., 2014; Anderson et al., 2005)
- Research in literacy indicates that extratextual parental talk offers unique **benefits in shared book reading** (Blewitt & Langan, 2016; Mol & Neuman, 2014)
- There is little information about how the features of storybooks affect parental math talk

Purpose & Hypotheses

Examine whether embedding mathematical language into storybook texts versus in the illustrations alone impacts parental and children's math talk

Alternative Hypotheses:

- Text with math embedded > only illustrations because it primes parents
- Only illustrations > text with math embedded because do not deviate from text

Method

Participants:

- Preschoolers (N=50), 52% female, M_{age} = 46.4 months
- Middle-to-high income families; highly educated parents

Conditions:

- **Implicit:** math concepts embedded *only* in illustrations
- **Explicit:** math concepts embedded in text *and* in illustrations

Other storybook features:

- Each of the 18 pages corresponds to one or more math concept
- Math concepts include: counting/cardinality/numeral identification, spatial skills (shape/patterning, size/height comparison), number comparison, and arithmetic
- Number of words and complexity of the texts are comparable in both conditions

Procedure:

- Parent-child dyads were randomly assigned to either the explicit (N = 24) or the implicit (N = 26) condition
- Parents read the storybook with their children over Zoom

- 40

Parental Math Talk

Quantity: Parents in the explicit condition produced more math-related utterances than those in the implicit **condition**, F(1, 48) = 10.68, p < 0.01, $\eta_p^2 = .18$

.09; counting/cardinality, p < 0.01, $\eta_p^2 = .22$; arithmetic, p = 0.046, $\eta_p^2 = .08$, and spatial talk, p = 0.01, $\eta_p^2 = .22$;



Children's Math Talk

• Quantity: Children in the explicit condition produced more math-related utterances than those in the implicit **condition**, F(1, 48) = 7.31, p < 0.01, $\eta_p^2 = .13$.

• Kind: There were no significant differences in the kind of math talk produced by children



