A Secondary Data Analysis Examining Personal Narratives of Filipino Language Dominant 4:0-4:11 Year Old Children in ECCD Monitored Day Care Centers in Metro Manila
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Abstract. This study describes the parts of a narrative, structural pattern, narrative productivity (total number of words, total number of clauses, number of C-units), and mean length of C-units present on nineteen typically developing Filipino-Dominant 4:0-4:11 year old children in ECCD-monitored day care centers in Metro Manila. Narrative samples were transcribed and then analyzed to identify narrative productivity, parts of narrative present and structural patterns presented by story theme and by all participants. The structural patterns have shown that children may already be in the transition phase from two-event to chronological narrative patterns, which is similar to the study of the personal narratives of 6-10-year-old African American children. Literature on Japanese and American children's narratives showed similar results for the parts shown by the participants in this study, with an orientation-complicating action-resolution pattern. Among the participants, the average number of C-units produced was 8.13, the average number of words 34.11, the average number of clauses 7.73 and the average number of MLCUs 4.43. This study provided preliminary data on the personal narratives of Filipino children 4:0-4:11 years of age who may still be explored and further explored in future studies.

1. Introduction
Speech-Language Pathologists (SLPs) evaluate and treat individuals with language impairments [1]. The knowledge and use of language are affected in children with this disorder [2]. As a result, their ability to participate effectively in social, educational and vocational situations is impaired [3]. One of the most obvious forms of social and educational participation is through narrative [4].

Narrative is a mode of communication in which a sequenced account or experience of events is produced [5]. Personal narratives are the most naturally used way for children to interact verbally with others and are a measure of semantic, cognitive and social skills [6]. A child's personal narrative reflects the information he / she has, based on his / her past experience, as required by autobiographical memory [7]. Those with difficulties in engaging in social discourse may be at risk of developing behavioral problems due to their difficulties in interacting with peers. Narrative production is therefore an important aspect of social interaction, since it is necessary to learn the skills, language understanding and expression needed to engage in daily conversations [8].
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Personal narratives are acquired at an early age and are the most common way for preschoolers to tell stories[9]. The ability to formulate better-constructed personal narratives begins to emerge at the age of 3 to 4 years. When children reach 4 years of age, they begin to produce narratives consisting of introduction, orientation and complication[10]. They also begin to state events and actions, but their utterances remain segmented. Even so, children at this age are capable of constructing causally related narratives[10]. Macrostructure is the 'general property' of a story that talks about the coherence of a story and its sequence of events. This is the first step in the assessment of children's narratives[11]. The High Point Analysis assessment tool is used to evaluate and analyze the macrostructure in terms of the parts and structural patterns of preschool children's personal narratives[12]. Parts of a personal narrative include an introductory / abstract, an orientation, a complicating action, an evaluation, a resolution and a coda[12]. On the other hand, the structural pattern is the form of a narrative that looks at the order of these parts and can be identified as non-narrative, one-event, two-event, miscellaneous, leapfrogging, chronological, end-to-point, or classical [12].

Microstructure refers to smaller narrative units and is used to judge content at the level of utterance. It consists of narrative productivity, which measures the total number of C-units (CUs), the total number of words (TNW) and the number of clauses, as well as the mean length of c-units (MLCU) [13]. The number of clauses, on the other hand, indicates the length of the story. In terms of complexity, MLCU is used to measure this. Makinen et al [14 ] stated that the longer the CU is in words, the more the CU consists of more than one clause, thus having a more complex narrative.

Currently, there are several literatures that focus on microstructure and the macrostructure of personal narratives on children from the US and Africa[15,16 ]. However, there are no data on the personal narratives of Filipino children 4 years of age. This forces SLPs to apply published Westernized norms that are not locally sensitive. Because of linguistic and cultural differences. Lack of research on personal narratives limits the practice of SLP in conducting narrative assessment, goal-setting and therapy procedures for Filipino children. This study may therefore contribute to normative indications for personal narratives in the local context. Due to linguistic and cultural differences Lack of research on personal narratives limits the practice of SLP in conducting narrative assessment, goal-setting and therapy procedures for Filipino children. The aim of this study is therefore to describe the parts of the narrative, structural pattern, narrative productivity (total number of words, total number of clauses, number of C-units) and mean length of the C-units present in the nineteen typical Filipino-Dominant 4:0-4:11 year old children in the ECCD-monitored daycare centers in Metro Manila.

2. Methodology

2.1. Study Design
This utilized a descriptive, cross-sectional secondary data analysis from a previous study D. Jacinto,[17] This study design examined the relationship between variables of a certain population at a single point in time. This permitted the current researchers to describe the trend in the chosen participants.

2.2. Secondary Data Analysis
This was followed by a descriptive, cross-sectional secondary analysis of data from the previous study D. Jacinto [ 17 ]. A total of 19 audio-recorded speech samples were analyzed and the guidelines in the Orthographic Transcription Protocol were followed. After obtaining an orthographic transcription of audio-recorded speech samples, the transcriber-analyst used the inclusion and termination criteria to classify which of the narrative samples were personal narratives. The criteria for inclusion included personal narratives. No exclusion criteria were set for this study as all samples were used. Fictional narratives, scripts and narratives with unintelligible phrases have been discarded. Narratives with unintelligible phrases have been resolved by repeating the unintelligible word or phrase for a maximum of 5 repetitions. The transcriber-analyst identified the parts, structural pattern, number of
CUs, TNWs, total number of clauses, and MLCUs per participant when selecting all personal narratives from the narrative samples.

2.3. Macroanalysis
Two levels of macro-analysis have been performed. The researcher first identified and labeled each of the CUs as part of the narrative according to the Hudson & Shapiro "and Labov & Waletzsky" study. After the identification of the parts, the structural pattern of the narrative was classified using the McCabe and Rollins study.

2.4. Microanalysis
In order to describe the narrative productivity of the participants, the transcriber-analyst first summed up the number of CUs per personal narrative, then the TNWs used in each narrative sample were added by adding all the words based. After obtaining the TNW, the number of clauses was counted for each narrative sample using the rules made.

3. Result and Discussion
This study used personal narrative samples from nineteen Filipino children, 4 years of age. A total of 60 narratives have been discarded as fictional narratives, non-narrative samples, or unintelligible. Forty-five personal narratives remained of the thirteen participants. Thirty-eight of which were elicited using story prompts (TV show, favorite hobby, fighting, getting hurt, getting sick), three samples were elicited through prompt questions, and four were elicited through neutral questions. An average of three personal narratives per participant were produced from thirteen samples. The duration of each audio sample ranged from three minutes to nineteen minutes.

Figure 1 summarizes the frequency and percentage of the narrative parts present in all narrative samples. The most frequently produced parts were all narratives, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, and resolution. Coda was the least part of it produced. Percentage = total number of narratives showing the specific part of the speech sample / total number of participants x 100.

The story prompts used influenced the structural patterns as illustrated in Table 1. Fighting has prompted five types of patterns, most of which are leap-rogging. In getting hurt, the type of narratives most likely to be triggered are two-event and end-to-point. In narratives elicited by the prompted questions, the same number of two-event, leap-rogging and chronological patterns were elicited. For narratives elicited by neutral prompts, the classical pattern was mostly elicited. The TV show quickly
produced a 100% chronological pattern of narratives. Favorite hobby elicited the same number of chronological and bi-event patterns. It caused a miscellaneous pattern to get sick.

**Table 1. Summary of Parts of a Narrative Among All Samples**

| Part of a Narrative | Fighting | Getting Hurt | Elicited through neutral question | Elicited through prompted question | TV Show | Favourite Hobby | Getting Sick |
|---------------------|----------|--------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|----------------|-------------|
| N=18                | N=15     | N=4          | N=3                              | N=2                               | N=2     | N=1            |
| Classic Narrative   | 1        | 1            | 2                                | 0                                 | 0       | 0              |
| Chronological       | 5        | 3            | 0                                | 1                                 | 2       | 1              | 0           |
| End at High Point   | 1        | 4            | 0                                | 0                                 | 0       | 0              |
| Leapfrogging        | 6        | 2            | 1                                | 1                                 | 0       | 0              | 0           |
| Miscellaneous       | 0        | 0            | 1                                | 0                                 | 0       | 0              | 1           |
| Two-event           | 5        | 5            | 0                                | 1                                 | 0       | 1              | 0           |

The microstructure of the samples was analyzed in terms of narrative productivity and MLCU. Further analysis was done with the story prompts. Table 2 summarizes the mean and standard deviation of the CUs, TNW, and the total number of clauses of all samples.

**Table 2. Summary of Narrative Productivity Among All Respondents**

| Metric                          | Median | SD  |
|---------------------------------|--------|-----|
| C-unit Count                    | 8.13   | 4.4 |
| Total number of words           | 34.11  | 18.13|
| Total Number of Clauses         | 7.73   | 4.06|

Table 3 summarizes the mean and standard deviations of the CUs, TNW and the total number of clauses of all samples per story prompt, where personal narratives generated the highest narrative productivity through neutral questions.

**Table 3. Summary of Narrative Productivity per Story Prompt**

| Story Prompt                          | C-unit Count | Number of words | Number of Clauses |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|
|                                       | Median       | SD  | Median | SD  | Median | SD  |
| Elicited through neutral questions    | 14.00        | 5.12 | 55.50  | 13.23 | 11.50  | 4.65|
| Favorite hobby                        | 4.50         | 0.71 | 21.50  | 0.71 | 4.50   | 0.71|
| TV show                               | 9.50         | 0.71 | 26.00  | 5.66 | 9.00   | 1.41|
| Fighting                              | 6.00         | 4.59 | 28.50  | 21.04 | 6.00   | 4.46|
| Getting hurt                          | 7.00         | 3.62 | 33.00  | 12.85 | 7.00   | 3.64|
| Getting Sick                          | 5.00         |      | 17.00  |      | 6.00   |     |
| Elicited through                      | 10.00        | 5.03 | 36.00  | 27.68 | 5.00   | 4.93|
prompted questions

Table 4 shows the average MLCU obtained per story prompt, where the prompt favorite hobby elicited the narrative with the highest MLCU.

| Story Prompt          | Mean Length of CU | Median | SD |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--------|----|
| Elicited through neutral questions | 4.35              | 0.73   |    |
| Favorite hobby        | 4.83              | 0.60   |    |
| TV show               | 2.72              | 0.39   |    |
| Fighting              | 4.15              | 1.54   |    |
| Getting Hurt          | 4.14              | 2.35   |    |
| Getting sick          | 3.40              |        |    |
| Elicited through neutral questions | 3.60              | 0.80   |    |

Thus, overall, this study described the personal narratives of the typically-developing Filipino language-dominant children 4:0-4:11 years old in terms of macrostructure and microstructure. Complicating action (100 %), orientation (100 %), evaluation (84.6 %) and resolution (84.6 %) were frequently identified in this study. The results of this current study showed that 4-year-old Filipino children had an average CU of 8.13, TNW of 34.11 and 7.73 clauses in their personal narratives. This suggests that the topic of conversation presented affects narrative productivity, as children tend to produce more sentence-based words and clauses when talking about themes that interest them and events that have already happened to them. The difference in the data collection method, the number of participants and their corresponding age groups are other factors that affected the results. The average MLCU of 4-year-old Filipino children in this study was 4.43. Since there are no data for comparison, there is no way to know how similar or different the performance of the participant was. Most of the children produced narratives that lack causality and sequence, which are some of the basic characteristics of narratives. They are needed to produce more CUs, as children should be able to elaborate events in their narratives. Since the events in the narratives were explicitly narrated, there are fewer words that shorten the length and complexity of each sentence and the number of CUs.

4. Conclusion

This study was able to describe the narrative productivity, the MLCU, the narrative parts and the structural patterns of personal narratives. The data collected from this study may be used as preliminary data for the description of macro and microstructures of personal narratives in Filipino children 4 years of age. Abstract parts, evaluation and resolution were meant to emerge as seen in some, but not in all, participants. Coda, on the other hand, was seen only in one participant; which may mean that this part is not yet present in their narratives. Different story prompts have produced different results in terms of macro and microstructure. Prompt fighting triggered all parts and higher structural patterns, neutral prompts achieved higher narrative productivity, and favorite hobby achieved higher MLCUs. The types of patterns, parts of a personal narrative, TNW, clauses, CUs, and MLCU can be expected to be present when working with children. These preliminary data can be used to guide speech-language pathologists through personal narrative assessment and intervention planning.
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