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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to study the influence of remedial reading instruction in vocabulary and comprehension on self concepts and reading achievement of selected elementary students. The study took place in five elementary schools in Lafayette Parish, Louisiana.

Statement of the Problem

The following null hypothesis was tested for several variables using the .05 level of significance: no significant difference in reading achievement and self concepts will result from remedial reading instruction.

Procedure

The students who participated in the study were 117 third, fourth, and fifth grade students from five schools. The study lasted for twenty-four weeks during the 1975-76 school year.

Students were selected from a nonrandomized population and were divided into two groups. The experimental group received approximately 120 minutes of remedial reading instruction weekly in addition to regular reading instruction. The control group received all reading instruction in the regular classroom. Students were pretested and posttested with the Nelson Reading Test, Form A and Form B and the Piers-Harris
Children's Self Concept Scale. Fifteen teachers and four teacher-clerks worked with students along with other students who were members of the regular classroom organization. The experimental design for this study was the nonrandomized, control group, pretest-posttest method.

Analysis of Data

In order to adequately test the hypothesis, students were divided into the following subgroups: group, experimental and control; sex, male and female; race, black and white; grade, third, fourth, and fifth; residence, city and rural, and; socioeconomic status, grade completed and income. An analysis of covariance was computed for each group for self concepts and reading achievement. The F-ratio was tested for significance.

Findings

1. Remedial reading instruction did not significantly affect self concepts and reading achievement of students by group.

2. There was a significant difference between self concepts of the experimental group and the control group by sex. Female students in the control group had higher self concepts than female students in the experimental group. The male control group had higher self concepts than the female experimental group.

3. Race and residence (location) were not significant factors in self concept differences between groups.
4. Education and income were not significant factors in self concept differences between groups.

5. There was a significant difference in reading achievement between the experimental group and control group for vocabulary. The control group achieved higher than the experimental group.

6. Sex was not a significant factor in reading achievement between the experimental group and the control group.

7. Race was not a significant factor in reading achievement between the experimental group and the control group.

8. Residence (location) was not a significant factor in achievement between the experimental group and control group.

9. Education of parents did significantly influence achievement between groups in vocabulary. Income was not a significant factor in achievement between groups.

Conclusions

Remedial reading instruction did not significantly contribute to differences in achievement between the experimental group and control group by sex, race, grade, or residence.

Recommendations

1. More research should be done on a parish-wide basis involving more remedial reading students for a longer
period of time. This will allow for greater indepth study of variables.

2. Research should be conducted on follow-up of remedial reading instruction and follow-through by classroom teachers of reading.

3. Future research on self concepts and reading achievement should include some data on past experiences of students.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

One of the most difficult problems that is faced by teachers in the elementary school today concerns helping students develop the skills and knowledge necessary for learning to read adequately. No clear-cut solution to solving reading problems has been found, although many programs and practices have been tried with the aim of diagnosing and correcting the causes of poor reading. Programs funded by federal grants, professional organizations, and private agencies have been established to help schools and education systems to correct the reading problem. Tisdale (1970) noted that the passage of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) in 1965 resulted in tremendous growth in projects aimed at improving the quality of education and particularly reading. The passage of this legislation has encouraged the widespread adoption of innovative ideas and teaching practices.

Cowart (1970) found that the constant changes on the social and technological order have created many of the problems faced in teaching today. Problems associated with effective teaching were created, to some degree, by population mobility and the ability of more people to attend school. The ability of people to travel freely and social changes
that resulted in more people attending school with different backgrounds created problems for teachers. Cultural differences were not easy to understand. However, changes in teaching strategies and materials were designed to help teachers cope with the problems faced in teaching.

Modification in reading instruction and changes made in reading programs were based on sound principles of learning in order to serve useful purposes in the teaching-learning process. The ultimate goal of any change was to improve the instructional program of the school to meet the needs of students.

Harris and Smith (1972) found that many students who failed in elementary school had average or better than average intelligence. There was no one cause for this problem, but it was attributed to a combination of factors that eventually required special assistance from various people in education and in related fields.

Bush and Huebner (1970) observed that about ninety percent of a student's school work involved reading, and as problems arose in reading programs, changes were made to provide relief to students who experienced reading difficulties. Therefore, school personnel had to experiment with different reading programs and different techniques of reading instruction to solve reading problems. Reading programs were aimed at developing positive self concepts, as well as mastery of specific reading skills. According to Purkey (1970), the
image that the student had influenced his school achievement and his outlook on life.

The Lafayette Parish Public School System, Lafayette, Louisiana, during the 1975-76 school year, operated twenty-five Reading Improvement Laboratories in schools classified as "target schools" by federal guidelines. The laboratories were located throughout the Parish in selected primary, intermediate, junior, and senior high schools where remedial reading instruction was provided for many students who had reading problems. During the school year 1974-75, 2,806 students, out of a public school enrollment of 28,802, were enrolled in the program. Of the 2,806 students, 1,071 were from schools with grades three, four, or five or some combination thereof. The Reading Improvement Program, which was federally funded under Title I, began functioning in the school system in 1966. While some evaluation had been conducted annually since 1966, its scope had been limited to students receiving remedial reading instruction in the Reading Improvement Program.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to examine remedial reading instruction in vocabulary and comprehension skills and to evaluate the influence of this instruction on self concept and reading achievement of students. Selected students from third, fourth, and fifth grade classes were evaluated for twenty-four weeks.
The null hypotheses were stated as follow:

1. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group.

2. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group according to sex.

3. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group according to race.

4. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group according to grade.

5. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students according to residence (city or rural).

6. There is no significant difference in the self concepts of students according to socioeconomic status (education and income of parents).

7. There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group.

8. There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group according to sex.
9. There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group according to race.

10. There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group according to grade.

11. There is no significant difference in the reading achievement of students according to residence (city or rural).

12. There is no significant difference in the reading achievement of students according to socioeconomic status (education and income of parents).

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

New educational programs should be evaluated to determine their effectiveness in educating students and their effect on students' self concepts. Because of inadequate research on many instructional programs, questions exist. Therefore, this study was important in the following ways:

1. This study provided data on the influence of remedial reading instruction on self concepts and reading achievement of selected students under controlled conditions. These data could be used to compare the effectiveness of remedial reading instruction to that of regular classroom reading instruction.
2. This study provided data that could be used by local school officials to further evaluate the Reading Improvement Program in the Lafayette Parish School System.

3. This study could serve as a guide for the individual school in expanding and improving the overall testing program.

4. Data collected and analyzed in this study could be used for studying the relationship of self concepts and school achievement in other areas of the school program.

DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

This study was limited to one hundred seventeen selected elementary students from grades three, four, and five. These students attended five target schools in Lafayette Parish, Louisiana. According to pre-existing data, these students were not achieving at their expected reading levels. Fifteen elementary teachers and four teacher-clerks worked with students in this study for twenty-four weeks. Four of the teachers were reading improvement teachers assigned to reading laboratories for remedial reading instruction.

The five schools selected for the study had been integrated and had student populations with diverse backgrounds. This was achieved by the system in 1972 by pairing schools and by transporting students. To arrive at adequate representation of students enrolled in the remedial reading program, the sample for this study was selected from a stratified
population to achieve representation according to sex, race, grade, reading achievement, residence, and socioeconomic status. Antecedent data comparable to that used by the Reading Improvement Program throughout the parish in screening students for the program were used for this study (Appendix A).

Students selected for the study had not received remedial reading instruction in reading laboratories in the system neither in any other systems based on information from school records.

Finally, this study was limited to an evaluation of remedial reading instruction in vocabulary and comprehension skills and the influence of this instruction on self concepts and reading achievement according to sex, race, grade, residence, and socioeconomic status. A period of twenty-four weeks was used to collect data on students for this study, beginning the third week in October, 1975, and ending the fourth week in April, 1976.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Reading improvement teacher. A special teacher employed by the Lafayette Parish School Board to teach remedial reading in a specially designed or assigned teaching station to selected students with specific needs.

Reading Improvement Program. A federally funded Title I program established to help correct reading deficiencies of qualified students.
Target school. A school whose percentage of low income students was greater than the low income of the parish average qualifying it for special allocations to enrich the curriculum.

Self concept. Refers to the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself: it was used to express an attitude of approval or disapproval and indicated the extent to which the individual believed himself to be capable, significant, and worthy (Coopersmith, 1967).

Pairing. A method of arranging two or more schools within a zone used to help achieve an integrated system of education.

PROCEDURE

The following table (Table 1) presents data on the selection of subjects for this study. These data were for school, grade composition, grades included in the study, number of students in the study, and the location of schools. These data were for the school year 1975-76.

The nonrandomized, control group, pretest-posttest design was used for this study. This design was used because of the population from which the sample was selected.

Permission was granted by the Superintendent of the Lafayette Parish School System and the principals of the five schools to conduct the study (Appendix B). Written permission was also granted by parents to use their children
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade Composition</th>
<th>Grade Included in Study</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Location of School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alice Boucher</td>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Wallace James</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Place</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the study, to administer tests to the children, and to make use of data on children's Cumulative Records (Appendix B).

To protect the confidentiality of data collected, names of students were not recorded or used in the study. A coded system was used instead.

The *Nelson Reading Test, Revised Edition, Form A* and *Form B, Grades 3-9,* and the *Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale, The Way I Feel About Myself,* were used as pretests and posttests for the experiment. Pretests were administered by the researcher and a helper during the third week in October, 1975, to all students in the sample. Posttests were administered to students during the fourth week in April, 1976, by the researcher and a helper.

All students included in the study received daily classroom instruction in reading for fifty minutes. Students in the experimental group received remedial reading instruction outside the classroom. This was in addition to regular classroom reading instruction. The experiment was conducted for twenty-four weeks for the purpose of analyzing the results of remedial reading instruction to determine if there was significant influence on the self concepts and reading achievement of students.

**ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY**

Chapter 2 presents a review of the related literature. Chapter 3 focuses on the design of the study, the instruments,
selection of subjects, treatment of subjects and statistical analysis. Chapter 4 presents the analysis of data. The summary, conclusions, and recommendations are presented in Chapter 5. The bibliography and appendices follow.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Reading is a multifaceted process that is dependent upon many factors. Results of research and opinions from professional literature dealing with many factors from 1960 through 1975 will be presented in this chapter. The area of reading, with particular emphasis on remedial reading, reading programs, and self concepts and reading achievement will be reported. These areas will be presented under major headings with subparagraph headings as they relate to reading achievement of students.

STUDIES AND OPINIONS RELATED TO READING

Research in reading is not new. However, with the increasing number of students who had difficulty with learning to read, many agencies, study groups, and institutions had re-evaluated reading programs. They wanted to know what needed to be changed and initiated and supervised controlled programs in order to improve reading skills. The skills that the individual acquired were powerful forces in one's life. Success in education, social life, and peer relationship depended upon how well the individual was able to master these skills.
The following studies and opinions were related to reading of elementary school students. The studies and opinions were restricted to those pertaining to reading principles as they related to this study.

**Social factors.** Spache and Spache (1973) found that the reading process was based on many social roots. Studies conducted by Peterson (1974); Callaway, Jerrolds, and Gwaltney (1974); Dwyer (1974); and Macmillan (1968) supported the theory that the factors of age, sex, and socioeconomic status influenced reading in many ways. Consideration of these factors differed in their purpose, breadth, and quality among societies.

**Intelligence and sex.** Jantz (1974) studied 3,188 sixth-grade students according to sex, socioeconomic status, and intelligence, and found differences in the levels of reading performance. White students had higher average test scores than nonwhite students. Students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds scored higher than did students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. Higher I. Q. groups also had higher mean scores than did groups having lower mean I. Q. scores. Jantz concluded that in formulating and assessing the goals of reading, attention should be given to individual differences in performance, interest, and capabilities of students.

Scott and Seifert (1975) found that children from small families secured higher scores on nine variables of
the Iowa Test of Preschool Development than did children from large families. The differences, however, were statistically significant in only one area, which was expressive language.

SUMMARY

Research studies and opinions of a person in the field of reading indicated that many problems studied were influenced by social factors and intelligence. Planned activities for improving reading skills were dominant in the reading process.

STUDIES AND OPINIONS RELATED TO REMEDIAL READING

Research in remedial reading instruction was shown to be necessary when skills important for effective reading had not been developed in the student during early developmental reading. For remedial reading to be effective, several stages were thought needed before any remedial instruction took place. Research indicated that remedial instruction was based on a thorough diagnostic-prescriptive approach designed for the specific needs of the student.

The following studies and opinions were related to remedial reading. Only selected studies and opinions having significance to this study were used.

Screening. Dechant (1968) observed that the screening of students separated those who most likely needed special attention from those who were not likely to have need of it.
The purpose of the screening process was to identify the overall reading proficiency of the class and helped locate other students who were in need of diagnosis. Various instruments were used in the screening process. However, no corrective or remedial activities were assigned to any student until a thorough diagnosis of reading difficulties had been performed.

**Diagnosis.** Botel and Granowsky (1973) observed that it was more productive to first examine the instructional program as a basic source of reading failure before attempting to diagnose and prescribe for deficiencies in the student. Bond and Tinker (1967) and Miller (1971) found that any attempt to give the student remedial instruction in reading was based on a thorough diagnosis of reading needs and personal characteristics of the individual. A variety of diagnostic instruments was available for selection of the one or ones which best served the needs of the students.

**Remedial instruction.** Miller (1971) observed that some children seemed to learn to read better through the use of one of their senses or a combination of two or more senses. It was believed that a remedial reading period should not be too long and should have no less than two activities for a one-half hour period or from three to four activities for a full hour.

Harris (1970) found that remedial reading instruction was planned to be sensitive to the needs of students. The central tasks of remedial reading instruction were to help the
learner change his feelings about reading, as well as help remediate deficient skills. To accomplish this goal, Harris found that attention was focused upon performing the following tasks in remedial reading instruction:

1. The poor reader was helped to feel that he was liked, appreciated, and understood.

2. Success experiences were needed to supply the basis for overcoming the negative aftereffects of frustration.

3. Active effort was simulated and sustained by use of both intrinsically interesting reading matter and extrinsic or somewhat artificial incentives.

4. The learner became involved as fully as possible in the analysis of his reading problem and evaluation of the results from remedial instruction.

Miller (1971), Bond and Tinker (1967), and Zintz (1972) observed that planning remedial work with the students was useful. The classroom teacher of reading was the pivotal teacher for all remediation activities in reading. This approach allowed the classroom teacher of reading to follow-up on skills discovered deficient in students and those skills worked on in remedial instruction.

Buerger (1966) found that remedial reading assistance during grades three through seven did not appear to have a long-term effect on the mental ability of students as reflected by I. Q. scores. Vocabulary and comprehension skills did not improve significantly according to test scores. Nevertheless, this study did show that the combined educational
results of remedial assistance given to groups demonstrated overall long-term progress that approached significance. Buerger concluded that instead of long-term remedial assistance, efforts should be devoted to developing supportive help for readers with problems.

Silberberg (1973) found that there was very little difference among four samples of students studied; three experimental groups and one control group employing a different remedial assistance approach. The experimental group using the auditory-phonics method did show a higher overall gain than did the other experimental groups using the visual-sight approach and the kinesthetic approach. This research showed that by the middle of the fourth grade, much of the gains had disappeared. Silberberg concluded that there was not sufficient evidence to support that one method had any greater long-term effect on reading achievement than any one of the other methods.

Webster (1968) reviewed previous research on teaching reading to the disadvantaged learner and observed that:

1. Most reading programs for the disadvantaged learner failed to consider his characteristic learning problem.

2. Not enough emphasis was placed on specific behavioral modification desired in the student.

3. Disadvantaged students often were not properly identified.

4. Too many remedial programs were of a "one-shot nature."
Webster maintained that longitudinal studies of reading efforts served to enhance understanding of problems in reading instruction, progress made, and overall program effectiveness.

Johns (1975) studied reading preferences of urban students in grades four through six and found that inner-city students in the intermediate grades expressed reading preference for stories or books that depicted middle-class settings, characters with positive self concepts, and with positive group interactions.

Factors contributing to reading deficits. Webster (1968) believed that certain factors present in the early life of a child contributed significantly to reading deficits. Some of the major contributing factors to reading deficits in disadvantaged children were: (1) stimulus deprivation, (2) poor language development, (3) auditory and visual discrimination deficits, and (4) vocabulary and articulatory problems. Webster concluded that these deficits were not easily overcome by children. Instruction designed to remediate deficits should be sensitive to the unique characteristics and needs of learners.

SUMMARY

Instruction in remedial reading followed a carefully structured diagnostic survey of reading problems of the student. Only after screening and diagnosing of reading problems were prescriptions to remediate used. Research
studies related to remedial reading were varied in their results. However, overall results indicated that in order for remedial reading instruction to be effective, planned work with the student and classroom teacher of reading was necessary. The classroom teacher had the responsibility of following up on skills remediated outside the classroom, and worked closely with the student in all facets of his work.

PROGRAMS RELATED TO REMEDIAL READING

A good reading program was centered upon flexibility that involved planning for the needs of students in classroom settings such as remedial instruction. Many programs and approaches for teaching remedial reading were implemented in order to improve skills in reading. Some were more successful than others, yet, new programs and new approaches continued to be a part of the reading process to help remediate deficient reading skills of those students with reading problems.

The following programs and approaches used in remedial reading were related to this study. The results were varied with some being more significant than others.

Tutorial programs. Nelson and Peoples (1975) compared the results of two remedial reading programs using non-professional volunteers. One program used the Sullivan Programmed Reading Series and star charts where students who had earned stars for accurate reading had them exchanged among their parents. Paraprofessionals, who were university students enrolled in a seminar on reading behavior, were used
as tutors. Students referred to the program were either tutored in their homes or at the university. The second program was less structured and used volunteer women who were high school graduates. These volunteers were given a variety of reading materials to use according to their best judgment. Results from the two programs favored the Sullivan Program where activities were more structured.

Oakland and Williams (1975) evaluated two methods of peer tutoring on thirty-three third and fourth grade students. Forty-six fellow students were selected to serve as tutors in three different programs: total tutorial program, supplementary tutorial programs, and nontutorial program (control group) where students received their reading instruction from classroom teachers. From this study, differences among the three groups' scores were not statistically significant. Reading achievement of students having their peers as tutors in the study was neither above nor below that of students having teachers as instructors. The results suggested that peer tutoring could be used, particularly to supplement the teacher-directed classroom instructional program. This allowed the teacher greater latitude to work in other areas of need.

Compensatory programs. McCormick and Williams (1974) studied a compensatory program of several groups where each one had a different association with the program. The results of this study indicated significant group differences in self concepts according to the time and type of program in
which the group was enrolled. McCormick and Williams also found that the level of academic achievement and reality of level of aspiration were related variables that could change within a brief period of time. They concluded that students made their greatest gains during the summer residential part of the program. One possibility of this showing was the drastic environmental change resulting from on-campus experience of students.

Resource centers. Wurster (1974) evaluated a reading resource center at an elementary school involving 142 second, third, and fourth grade students who were educationally disadvantaged. These students attended one of the resource centers for one hour each day in groups of ten or less and used Educational Development Laboratories (EDL) material. An evaluation of the program revealed that the students:

1. Were successful in improving reading level achievement.

2. Needed to place more emphasis on word meaning, paragraph meaning, and word study skills.

3. Did not contribute to increased feelings of personal worth and self-reliance.

4. Contributed to improved student attitude toward reading.

5. Contributed only slightly to improved attendance patterns.

Thompson (1971) also found that changing the physical setting of students made a difference in their feelings while
receiving remedial reading instruction for six weeks. The results studied showed that forty-one percent of the students receiving remedial reading instruction in a different physical setting had positive value in academic achievement.

**Approaches.** Lane (1974) investigated the initial teaching of the alphabet as a remediation approach to improve the reading achievement level of severely disabled sixth grade students. A prescribed program was used for 100 days with eleven boys and three girls. This study indicated that some positive results developed under controlled conditions.

LaBudde and Smith (1973) observed from research that the school librarian worked in the remedial instruction program with the regular reading teacher. The librarian helped extend reading for remedial students by providing additional reading material suitable for their specific needs and interests.

**SUMMARY**

Remedial reading instruction provided many opportunities for remediation of reading skills among students with reading deficits. A variety of materials, programs, and approaches were used to help students overcome their deficits in reading. Research and opinions by many in reading indicated that there was no one program nor any one approach used in isolation to correct reading deficits of students. Classroom teachers, remedial reading teachers, and other specialists...
worked cooperatively in providing flexible programs and materials to meet the needs and interests of students.

Peer tutoring and volunteer tutorial program results indicated that these programs were effective under certain conditions. Many other remedial program results showed significant gains in students' achievement, while some programs did not experience similar success. Nevertheless, any program or approach used to help remediate deficient reading skills had some structure.

STUDIES AND OPINIONS RELATED TO SELF CONCEPTS AND READING ACHIEVEMENT

The theory of self concept had become a significant variable to be considered in reading. The student's feelings about himself, toward others, and toward reading in particular influenced his academic achievement. Berretta (1970) found, after reviewing research on the self concept, that an adequate self concept was an important component of successful reading skills.

The following studies and opinions were related to self concept and reading achievement of elementary students. They dealt with feelings, instruction, home environment, self concepts and achievement, intelligence and achievement, enhancing the self concept, and materials and approaches.

Feelings and reading. Rowell (1973) found that feelings toward reading were not entirely dependent upon achievement in any particular reading skill. The results of
this study indicated that a change in feelings was more highly correlated with achievement in those skills calling for the least number of operations. Rowell concluded that operations with the least number of activities were far more appealing and influential in changing students' feelings toward reading.

Purkey (1970) observed that students who felt good about themselves and their abilities had a good outlook and were more likely to perform well in school. There was a significant relationship between how the student felt about himself and academic underachievement. Feelings of achievement enhanced the learning of the student which helped his self-image to improve or to become positive.

Instruction, feelings, and reading. Squire (1969) found that methods and conditions of teaching did affect one's feelings toward reading. Feelings that the student took to the book and the feelings that he derived from reading the book were pertinent factors in the reading process.

Harris and Smith (1972) observed that most individuals had experienced at some time or other, loving a character in a book because of past experiences that were pleasant. Therefore, they held the view that stories were read and discussed for personal feelings and for developing positive feelings.

Home environment. Horn (1970) emphasized that the occupation of the parent had a direct relationship on the self concept of a child. A child whose parents were employed
in skilled positions gave evidence of greater overall achievement in school. This observation was supported, according to Horn, by most National Merit Scholarship winners coming from parents employed in skilled job positions. This had a direct bearing on self-image and academic achievement of their children. When a student competed successfully with peers in a school environment, the home was conducive for study and provided for the other basic needs of the student. Horn concluded that there was a relationship between family income and the student's performance in school. Banfield (1974) and Kahn (1974) also found that the home environment was one of the significant factors on which success in school achievement was dependent.

Quandt (1972) observed that children who came from poor homes and had other social problems expected to fail in school. These children seldom developed the habit of achievement in reading or in any other subject.

Cundick, Gottfredson, and Willson (1974) studied changes in eighty-four Indian children participating in a foster-home placement program for five or more years. When compared to national norms, the mean achievement score for this group declined with successive years of participation in the program. Factors of greatest influence were language spoken in the home, home stability, cultural background, and education of the parents.
Self concepts and achievement. Gowan (1960) found that achievers were characterized by self-confidence, self-acceptance, and a positive self concept. Caplin (1966) also observed that children who possessed more positive self concepts tended to have higher academic achievement. These studies showed that there was a significant positive relationship between self concepts and academic achievement.

Intelligence and achievement. Kroll (1974) experimented with both high-ability and low-ability intermediate-grade students and found that high-ability students learned equally well from two treatments. Conversely, low-ability students learned less from the treatments of listening and reading than did high-ability students using the same treatments.

Enhancing the self concept. Mason (1975) observed that there were many ways to help a student change his self concept. The classroom teacher was the best person in the school to provide the help because the student had a close relationship with the teacher. This help was best given when the teacher recognized the unique needs of students and their accomplishments.

Glock (1972) stated that a sincere teacher would help a student develop a positive self concept by:

1. Accepting himself as a person of worth.

2. Realistically appraising his abilities and limitations.
3. Recognizing both good and bad points.
4. Realizing that he should be open to change both internally and externally.
5. Accepting his shortcomings without blaming himself.
6. Having pride in his own thoughts and inclinations.

Glock also observed that the self concept changed, and that the teacher inspired the necessary confidence in the student. Self concepts developed gradually so that progress in developing self esteem was made difficult on account of long previous periods when children thought ill of themselves. However, the teacher worked to restore in the student self-confidence and a feeling of wanting to achieve. Such an enhancement of self concept enabled the child to learn the pleasures and skills of reading.

**Materials and approaches.** Dixon (1974) found that students who received special reading literature pertaining to their problems in reading exhibited a significantly higher reading achievement level when compared to the group counseling and reading group, but showed no significant differences on the variable of self concept.

Klosterman (1970) observed that an eclectic approach to teaching reading based on the needs of the individual student produced greater growth in reading achievement. In one program where tutors worked with students individually
and in small groups, significantly greater gains in vocabulary, comprehension, and total reading achievement were made over students in the control group. Duff (1974) also found that when tutors were used with first through fourth grade students, a well-organized and efficiently administered pupil-tutoring program favored improved academic achievement.

SUMMARY

Research indicated that self concept and reading achievement were closely related. The factors of home environment, family status, the position that the parent held in providing a livelihood, intelligence, and materials and approaches influenced academic achievement of students. Students having parents in skilled positions had a positive self image and usually experienced greater academic achievement than did students who came from homes with low family status.

Many writers in the field of reading indicated that the classroom teacher, along with the student's home environment and his attitude toward reading, were the key factors in building positive self concepts. When these factors were of a positive nature, they enhanced the student's self-confidence, self-reliance, his outlook on life, and particularly reading.
RESEARCH BEARING ON THIS STUDY

Considerable research was conducted on the influence of self concepts, sex, race, residence, and socioeconomic status of parents upon reading achievement. Many of these studies showed different results. Wylie (1961) and Purkey (1970) reviewed extensively literature pertaining to the self concept and reading achievement. Purkey observed that much of this research was done since 1960. Most of it was concerned with the relationship between the self and success in school, how the successful student viewed himself versus how the unsuccessful student saw himself.

The following studies were related to self concept, sex, race, residence, and socioeconomic status of parents in one way or a combination of ways. Only selected studies related to the above variables with emphasis on reading achievement and instruction were reviewed.

**Self concept and achievement.** Seay (1960) found that for boys with approximately normal and equal language factors of intelligence, no significant differences were found between levels of self concept of pupils with persistent reading problems and levels of self concept of pupils with reasonably normal reading abilities. There appeared to be a positive association with the experiences conducted in a remedial program and the self concepts of students.

Wattenberg (1962) studied the association linking low self concepts to reading problems in kindergarten children.
It was observed that because of the complexity of the self concept, it appeared that it stood in a casual relationship to reading achievement, or that they both were functions of some other conditions or process.

Lewis (1972) studied the relationship of self concept to reading achievement of first grade children according to self concept training and whether there was a correlation between self concept gain scores and reading achievement. It was found that there was no significant gain in reading achievement scores, except in word meaning. There was no significant correlation between self concept scores and reading scores for both the treatment and control groups.

Caplin (1966) found that children attending the defacto segregated school had less positive self concepts and had lower levels of aspiration than did children attending the newly desegregated or long desegregated school. There was a positive relationship between self concept and academic achievement and between levels of aspiration and academic achievement. Stenner and Katzenmeyer (1976) found that the self concept was shown to significantly add to the prediction equation for academic achievement.

Brookover, Peterson, and Shailer (1962) and Bledsoe (1967) found that girls had higher mean self concept scores than did boys. Self concept was related to school achievement. Bledsoe observed a correlation between self concept and intelligence for boys as significant and positive, but for girls, the correlation was not significant.
Brookover, Lepere, Hamachek, Shailer, and Erickson (1965) found from two previous studies that significant associations in changes in self concept and academic achievement did not appear over a short period of time. Change in self concept was followed by change in academic achievement.

Vilhotti (1973) and Alvord and Glass (1974) studied the relationship between self concept and academic achievement and found that achieving students had a higher total self concept than students who were underachieving. Other factors of positive relationship were the influence of parents, peer group influence, attitude of student, and overall home and school environment. Black (1974) observed that children with deficient performance on achievement tests tended to perform in a manner suggesting a more negative view toward self than did similar children with adequate achievement test performance.

Simon and Simon (1975) concurred with previous research that there were significant positive correlations between self-esteem and school achievement. Simon and Simon also found that sex differences in the relationship between self-esteem and academic achievement varied as other related factors such as home environment, family status, and attitude of the student varied.

Sex, race, and achievement. Dwyer (1974) found that sex-role standards of Caucasian children contributed
significant variance to reading and arithmetic achievement scores, but were stronger for males than females. Males tended to achieve higher in some subjects than did females. Peterson (1974) found a significant difference between the sex variable and self-concept-mean-gain scores of kindergarten children. The female gain scores were significantly higher than the male gain scores.

Jantz (1974) found that the adjusted mean scores in a study showed sex, race, socioeconomic, and intelligence differences in the level of reading performance of sixth grade children. Female children had higher mean scores than nonwhite children. Children of higher socioeconomic status scored higher, on the average, than did children of lower socioeconomic status. However, Banfield (1974) stated that raising a family's income did not necessarily improve its way of life, and could conceivably make things worse by providing a life style not familiar to the subjects.

Sheare (1975) found in a longitudinal investigation that sex differences in self concept could be found, but there was no consistent pattern. Both peer acceptance and self concept increased without significant sex differences, and there were significant grade level differences. Hence, many factors influenced the self concept that could not be easily controlled or changed by outside influence.

Morris (1975) found that conclusive relationships among classroom interaction, self concept, socioeconomic
status, and sex of kindergarten and first grade children were not found. However, it was observed that certain trends suggested that some changes increased as teacher-pupil classroom interaction increased.

**Social factors and achievement.** Macmillan (1968) found the variables of parent's occupation and attendance of children were predictors of school achievement of Spanish-speaking children. The variables of family size, family organization, sex, and preschool experience were not significant as predictors of school achievement. It was observed that the immediate advantage of preschool experience did not carry through. Scott and Seifert (1975) found that children from small families had higher scores in all nine skill areas of the *Iowa Test of Preschool Development* than children from large families. However, only in expressive language were the differences statistically significant.

Callaway, Jerrolds, and Gwaltney (1974) examined the relationship between reading and language achievement and certain social and adjustment factors of students. It was found that white students scored higher than black students in both reading and language. There were no significant differences in reading achievement between males and females, but in language development, females scored significantly higher than males. There were no significant differences in reading or language between groups whose fathers or mothers worked and those whose fathers or mothers did not work.
The social position of the principal wage earner did not relate to any significant differences in reading. In language, children of clerical and sales workers, technicians, and owners of little businesses scored significantly higher than children of skilled manual employees.

Sciara and Jantz (1974) investigated father absence and its apparent effect on reading achievement of black children from low-income families. They found that in all cases children from father-present homes had higher mean reading scores than those children from father-absent homes. The greatest differences in reading scores were from those children with I. Q. scores exceeding 100.

Programs and reading achievement. Gerke (1975) studied the effects of assigning exceptional elementary children to regular classes on self concept and reading achievement. There was no effect on the reading vocabulary of mentally retarded educable and emotionally disturbed children in comparing segregated special education classrooms with integrated classrooms utilizing a resource room. Brookover and Schur (1967) found that if the child perceived that he was unable to learn a subject, his self concept became one of the limiting factors of school achievement.

Nichols (1968) observed that a university tutoring program produced no significant differences in the amount of change between groups on comprehension and vocabulary subtests. One form of the vocabulary subtest did favor the
control group slightly. There were no significant differences in self concept between the groups. Significant differences were found on three of the twelve attitude factors: Creative Expression, Recreational Activities, and Adult and Peer Interaction.

**Instruction and reading achievement.** Bosher (1974) and Dixon (1975) found that special methods of instruction had some effect on self concept and reading achievement of children in some areas studied, but showed no significant effect in others. Blankenship (1975) observed in a study of first grade children that ten hours of creativity training did not significantly increase reading achievement and self concept. The experimental group improved in fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration while the control group did not improve significantly on any of the variables. Hence, creativity training did not improve significantly reading achievement and self concept development, but did improve significantly creative performance.

Dempsey (1975) found from a study of open and traditional classrooms that the basic skills of vocabulary and language needed more structure, direct instruction, and guidance than the open classroom provided. The traditional classroom was as conducive to the development of self concept in the areas studied as was the open classroom. However, it was concluded that the open classroom possibly offered an alternative to the formal, traditional approach in some subjects at the third-grade level.
Smith (1968) found that specialized reading instruction provided experiences that aided in increasing both reading efficiency and the majority of self concept scores in children studied. Smith (1970) observed in a study designed to improve the self concept, attitudes toward school, and reading achievement of intermediate-grade Negro children, that no significant improvement was made in school performance as measured by achievement tests. There was no significant improvement in terms of overall attitudes toward achievement. The control group had greater acceptance of responsibility for their school performance than did the experimental group. The experimental group adopted a more positive attitude toward academic competence and physical appearance than did the control group.

SUMMARY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Literature researched for this study showed that many factors influenced self concept and reading achievement. Social factors, intelligence, instruction, and the image that the learner had of himself were some of the factors that were essential for a successful reading program. It was concluded that if problems in reading developed, a carefully screened and diagnostic program for students should be initiated before remedial reading instruction is given.

Social factors, intelligence, instruction, and the image the learner had of himself proved to be significant in reading achievement and self concept development. Therefore,
there was no one factor that proved conclusive, but a combination of programs and materials did benefit many students. The home environment and attitude of the student were also important factors in self concept and reading achievement.
Chapter 3

PROCEDURE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to examine remedial reading instruction in vocabulary and comprehension skills, and to evaluate the influence of this instruction on self concept and reading achievement of selected students. The students were selected from five elementary schools in Lafayette Parish, Louisiana. They participated in this study for twenty-four weeks during the school year 1975-76. These students were from grades three, four, and five, and were selected from a stratified population. Students assigned to the remedial reading program, in addition to their regular reading instruction, were the experimental group, and students assigned to classroom teachers for all of their reading instruction constituted the control group.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The experimental design for this study was the non-randomized, control group, pretest-posttest method (Mouly, 1970). The Experimental design is shown as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>T₁</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>T₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>T₁</td>
<td></td>
<td>T₂</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The nonrandomized, control group, pretest-posttest design was used in order to have a representative sample for this study. Instead of matching students experimentally, a statistical technique was used to adjust mean scores of students who were not evenly matched on all variables studied (Garrett, 1966) and (Popham and Sirotnik, 1973).

THE INSTRUMENTS

The Nelson Reading Test, Revised Edition, Form A and Form B, Grades 3-9, was used to measure skills in vocabulary and paragraph comprehension. The standardization of the test involved four regions of the United States and a sample of 17,957 students. Mean levels were adjusted so that they would be applicable to each grade level (Nelson, 1962). The test was used widely to measure specific reading skills. Its usability made it feasible for this study in that it was a group test and could be scored easily.

Robinson (1965), as reported by Buros (1965), observed that the Nelson Reading Test had a total reliability coefficient of .91 between Form A and Form B when administered to 622 students in grades three through nine. When compared with other reading tests, in each case, results indicated that a substantial relationship existed between the Nelson Reading Test and the other tests used for comparison.

Form A and Form B of the Nelson Reading Test were composed of two major sections: Vocabulary which had 100 items and was timed for ten minutes and Paragraph Comprehension
which had twenty-five paragraphs and seventy-five questions with a time limit of thirty minutes.

The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale was used because of its internal consistency index and the ease in which it was administered to third, fourth, and fifth grade children. The scale has a test-retest average reliability of .71. It is a group test with eighty statements that were read to subjects; each who was provided with an answer sheet, as recommended in the manual. Approximately twenty minutes were required for administering the test.

Norms for the Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale were based on 1,183 public-school children ranging from grade four through twelve. No consistent sex differences were noted in scores.

SELECTION OF SUBJECTS

The following table (Table 2) presents the school, grade composition, location of school, number of students in the experimental group by grade, number of students in the control group by grade, school enrollment, and racial composition. These data were for the school year 1975-76.

After students were selected, parents were sent letters (Appendix B) requesting permission to use data from their children's cumulative records, and also permission to administer a series of tests for the study. After permission had been granted in writing by parents, assignment of students to the experimental group and to the control group was made
Table 2

Distribution of Group by School, Grade Composition, School Location, Number of Students in Study and Grade, School Enrollment and Percentage of Enrollment by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade Composition</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Boucher</td>
<td>K-3</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Wallace James</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle Place</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>5-8</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by the researcher, with the help of school officials at each school included in this study.

Criteria used by the Lafayette Parish School Board in selecting students for the Reading Improvement Program were also used in selecting students for this study (Appendix A). Factors used were results from parish-wide standardized tests, attendance record, level of reading achievement and teachers recommendations to the reading laboratory teachers. The final selection of students, based on the above factors, was made by the researcher.

A sample of 117 students who qualified for remedial reading instruction under the Reading Improvement Program or were experiencing similar problems in school was taken from a stratified population of the five schools. A stratified population was necessary in order to arrive at adequate representation of sex, race, socioeconomic status, and residence. Grades three, four, and five were selected on the basis of previous reading problems associated with these grades and the age level of this group of students.

To protect the confidentiality of data collected on students, names were not recorded or used in the study. A coded system was used instead.

Teachers used to instruct students were selected on the basis of regular assignment at the particular school. They were either Reading Improvement Program teachers or regular classroom teachers who taught reading to students assigned to the particular class.
Students included in this study were not taught in isolated groups, but were taught with other students in their regular classes or in remedial reading classes. Four of the teachers used were remedial reading teachers assigned to reading laboratories by the Lafayette Parish School Board. Because Myrtle Place Elementary School did not have a reading laboratory, students who qualified in grades three and four were transported to J. Wallace James School for their remedial reading instruction. Teacher-clerks worked with remedial reading teachers in the laboratories. Remedial reading instruction followed a planned program of diagnostic and prescriptive analysis of students' needs.

TREATMENT OF SUBJECTS

All students who served in this study received regular classroom instruction in reading. There were no changes in schedules to accommodate students. Students assigned to the experimental group received remedial reading instruction in reading laboratories for approximately one hundred twenty minutes weekly for twenty-four weeks in addition to regular reading instruction. The control group received all reading instruction through the regular classroom teacher, including corrective reading. Students in the study attended classes with other students, including remedial reading.

The Nelson Reading Test, Form A and the Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale were administered to students
during the third and fourth week in October, 1975, as pre-tests. Instructions for administering the tests were followed closely. The self concept scale statements were read to all students. Their answers were selected and circled either "yes" or "no" on an answer sheet.

After pretesting, the reading tests and self concept scale were hand scored by the researcher and coded. Students continued their regularly planned instructional program until the fourth week in April, 1976. The planned reading program for regular classroom instruction (control group) was planned to meet the needs of students. A variety of materials was used. Basal readers and supplementary readers were used for regular reading instruction. Other materials were also used as teachers deemed necessary to meet the needs of students. All students in this study received approximately fifty minutes of regular reading instruction in the classroom daily.

A planned remedial reading program followed a diagnostic-prescriptive approach for each student. The SRA Diagnostic Kit, Read On, Criterion Tests in Reading Skills, informal oral reading inventories, and teacher observation were the tools used as diagnostic instruments. Prescriptions for each student were developed according to his or her specific needs as indicated by diagnostic results. A series of reading programs and materials were available in the reading laboratories for remedial instruction. The teacher and teacher-clerk at each laboratory coordinated materials.
and directed activities of students both individually and in small groups.

At the conclusion of the experiment, Form B of the Nelson Reading Test was administered to students using the same procedure used for pretesting. The Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale was again administered to students as a posttest.

After posttesting was completed, the tests were hand scored, tallied, and coded. A form was developed (Appendix C) on which all coded information was recorded. This information was then transferred to coded sheets for computer processing.

Information not available on students' cumulative records at school was requested from parents through the use of a special form (Appendix B).

Socioeconomic status for this study was determined by the income and grade completed by parents of students included in the sample. An average was computed for grade completed and for income of both parents. In cases where there was only one parent, the grade listed as well as the income listed was used. This information was transferred to the coded sheets with the other information on each student. This procedure was used because of the kind of study conducted, because of the geographic area and because of the subjects used.

The analysis of covariance was used in this study to compare mean scores of groups in order to effect adjustment in final mean scores. This adjustment allowed for the
differences in some of the initial variables (Garrett, 1966 and Popham and Sirotnik, 1973). Pretest scores on the Nelson Reading Test and Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale served as co-variables. The following variables were used to divide the students into sub-groups for both self concept and reading achievement:

1. Group - experimental and control
2. Sex - male and female
3. Race - black and white
4. Grade - third, fourth, and fifth
5. Residence - city and rural
6. Socioeconomic status - grade completed and income.
Chapter 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter was to present and analyze the data on remedial reading instruction in vocabulary and paragraph comprehension skills, and to evaluate the influence of this instruction on self concepts and reading achievement. The subjects included in this study were 117 third, fourth, and fifth grade students. Five elementary schools located in Lafayette Parish, Louisiana, were used to provide the sample of students. Twenty-eight third grade students were assigned to the experimental group and twenty-three third grade students were assigned to the control group. Thirteen fourth grade students were assigned to the experimental group and seventeen fourth grade students were assigned to the control group. Eighteen fifth grade students were assigned to the experimental group and twenty-one fifth grade students were assigned to the control group. The study lasted for twenty-four weeks during the 1975-76 school year.

The following null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

1. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group.
2. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group according to sex.

3. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group according to race.

4. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group according to grade.

5. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students according to residence (city or rural).

6. There is no significant difference in the self concepts of students according to socioeconomic status (education and income of parents).

7. There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group.

8. There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group according to sex.

9. There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group according to race.

10. There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group according to grade.
11. There is no significant difference in the reading achievement of students according to residence (city or rural).

12. There is no significant difference in reading achievement of students according to socioeconomic status (education and income of parents).

Students were divided into the following subgroups to test the null hypotheses for both self concepts and reading achievement: group, experimental and control; sex, male and female; race, black and white; grade, third, fourth, or fifth; residence, city and rural; and socioeconomic status, education and income of parents.

An analysis of covariance was computed for each subgroup with pretest scores on the Nelson Reading Test and Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale as the covariant. An analysis was presented for each subgroup. The F-ratio was tested for significance at the .05 level. Adjusted means were presented for the subgroups along with mean gains.

The highest possible score on the Nelson Reading Test was 100 for Vocabulary and seventy-five for Paragraph Comprehension for each form, Form A and Form B. The highest possible self concept score was eighty on the Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale.
ANALYSIS OF DATA ON SELF CONCEPTS FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

The purpose of this section was to respond to null hypothesis number one: There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group. The analysis for group (Table 3) showed an F-ratio of 3.89 for the group. There was no significant difference between the self concepts of the experimental group, students who received remedial reading instruction, and the control group, students who received no remedial reading instruction. An inspection of the means (Table 4) indicated that the experimental group had a negative mean gain in self concepts while the control group had a positive gain. The mean difference of 4.09 was not significant. The null hypothesis was accepted.

SUMMARY

There was no significant difference between the self concepts of the experimental group and the control group. The experimental group had a negative mean gain while the control group had a positive mean gain. The null hypothesis was accepted.

ANALYSIS OF DATA FOR SEX

The purpose of this section was to respond to null hypothesis number two: There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental
Table 3

Self Concepts: Analysis for Group (Experimental and Control), Sex, Race, Grade, Residence, Education, and Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (Experimental and Control)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>332.91</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>339.45</td>
<td>3.97*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99.18</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.18</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>11768.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>12605.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
Table 4

Adjusted Means by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55.26</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59.35</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

group and those of students in the control group according to sex. The analysis for sex (Table 3) indicated an F-ratio of 3.97. There was a significant difference in self concepts by sex. The means (Table 5) showed that the female control group had a mean of 58.79 with a gain of 2.39. The mean for the female experimental group was 51.80 with a negative mean gain of 4.60. A t-test was computed to test the difference of 6.99 between the means. A t of 1.99 was significant at the .05 level. Students in the female control group had significantly higher self concepts than female students in the experimental group. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Male students in the control group had a mean of 59.92 with a gain of 3.53. Male students in the experimental group had a mean of 58.73 with a gain of 2.34. The mean difference of 1.19 was not significant. The mean difference of .06 between the female control group and the male experimental group was not significant. The mean difference of 8.12 between the male control group and the female experimental group was significant. A t-test was computed to test the difference. A t of 1.99 was significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was rejected.
Table 5

Adjusted Means by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>58.79</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>51.80</td>
<td>-4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>59.92</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>58.73</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

There was a significant difference between the self concepts in the experimental group and those of students in the control group according to sex. Female students in the control group had significantly higher self concepts than female students in the experimental group. The male control group had significantly higher self concepts than the female experimental group. The null hypothesis was rejected.

ANALYSIS OF DATA FOR RACE

The purpose of this section was to react to null hypothesis number three: There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group according to race. The analysis for race (Table 3) showed an F-ratio of .05. There was no significant difference in self concepts according to race. The mean (Table 6) of the black control group was 58.79 with a gain of 2.40. The mean of the black
The mean difference of 2.40 was not significant. The mean of the white control group was 59.92 with a gain of 3.53. The mean of the white experimental group was 54.14 with a negative gain of 2.26. The mean difference of 5.78 was not significant. The mean difference of 4.65 between the black control group and the white experimental group was not significant. The mean difference of 3.53 between the white control group and the black experimental group was not significant. The mean difference of 3.53 between the white control group and the black experimental group was not significant. The black and white control groups had higher self concepts than both experimental groups. The null hypothesis was accepted.

SUMMARY

There was no significant difference in self concepts between the experimental and control groups by race. However, the black and white control groups had slightly higher self concepts than did both black and white experimental groups. The null hypothesis was accepted.

ANALYSIS OF DATA BY GRADE

Null hypothesis number four read: There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group according to grade. The analysis by grade (Table 3)
Table 6
Adjusted Means by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>58.79</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>56.39</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>59.92</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>54.14</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

showed an F-ratio of .57. There was no significant difference in self concepts between the experimental and control groups in grades three, four, or five. The mean (Table 7) for the control group in grade three was 59.66 with a gain of 3.26. The mean for the experimental group in grade three was 56.90 with a gain of .51. The mean difference of 2.76 was not significant. The null hypothesis was accepted.

The mean for the experimental group in grade four was 52.12 with a negative gain of 4.27. The mean for the control group in grade four was 59.13 with a gain of 2.74. The mean difference of 7.01 was not significant. The null hypothesis was accepted.

The mean for the experimental group in grade five was 56.76 with a gain of .37. The mean for the control group in grade five was 59.27 with a gain of 2.88. The mean difference of 2.51 was not significant. The control group had slightly higher self concepts than the experimental group. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Table 7

Adjusted Means by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>59.66</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>56.90</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>59.13</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>52.12</td>
<td>-4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>59.27</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>56.76</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

There was no significant difference in self concepts between the experimental and control groups in grades three, four, or five. The control groups had slightly higher self concept scores than the experimental groups and they registered greater mean gains. The experimental group in grade four registered a negative mean gain. The null hypothesis was accepted.

ANALYSIS OF DATA BY RESIDENCE (CITY OR RURAL)

Null hypothesis number five read: There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students according to residence (city or rural). The analysis for residence (Table 3) indicated an F-ratio of .60. There was no significant difference in self concepts by residence. The mean (Table 8) for the city group was 56.46 with a gain
of .06. The mean for the rural group was 58.16 with a gain of 1.77. The mean difference of 1.70 was not significant. Students in the rural group had slightly higher self concept scores than students in the city group. Gains registered by the rural group were slightly higher than gains registered by the city group. The null hypothesis was accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>56.46</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>58.16</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY**

There was no significant difference in self concepts of students according to residence. Students in the rural group had slightly higher self concept scores than students in the city group. They also registered a slightly higher growth gain than did city students. The null hypothesis was accepted.

**ANALYSIS OF DATA BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (EDUCATION AND INCOME)**

Null hypothesis number six read: There is no significant difference in the self concepts of students according to socioeconomic status. The analysis for education of parents (Table 3) showed an F-ratio of .05. There was no significant
difference in self concept scores as related to education of parents. The mean (Table 9) for the experimental group was 9.4 (grade completed by parents). The mean for the control group was 9.4. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 9
Means for Education and Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Education (Grade Completed)</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>$8133.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8182.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis for income of parents (Table 3) indicated an F-ratio of .07. There was no significant difference in self concepts of students according to income. The mean (Table 9) income for the experimental group was $8133.95. The mean income for the control group was $8182.88. The difference of $48.93 was not significant. The null hypothesis was accepted.

SUMMARY

There was no significant difference in self concepts between the experimental group and control group according to education of parents. There was no significant difference between groups in self concepts of students according to income of parents. The null hypothesis was accepted for socioeconomic status.
ANALYSIS OF DATA ON READING ACHIEVEMENT FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP FOR VOCABULARY

The purpose of this section was to respond to null hypothesis number seven: There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group. The analysis for vocabulary (Table 10) showed an F-ratio of 5.19. There was a significant difference in reading achievement between the experimental and control groups. The mean (Table 11) for the experimental group was 22.15 with a gain of 2.52. The mean for the control group was 24.96 with a gain of 5.33. A t-test was computed to test the difference between the means. A t of 2.28 was significant beyond the .05 level. The null hypothesis was rejected for achievement in vocabulary skills.

The analysis for comprehension (Table 12) showed an F-ratio of 1.82. There was no significant difference in achievement. The mean (Table 11) for the experimental group was 19.34 with a gain of 2.22. The mean for the control group was 20.97 with a gain of 3.85. The difference of 1.63 between means was not significant. The control group achieved slightly higher than the experimental group. The null hypothesis was accepted for achievement in comprehension skills.
Table 10

Vocabulary: Analysis for Group (Experimental and Control), Sex, Race, Grade, Residence, Education and Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (Experimental and Control)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141.92</td>
<td>5.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95.02</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.71</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>205.54</td>
<td>3.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>199.90</td>
<td>7.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>12306.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>13042.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
Table 11
Adjusted Means by Group for Reading Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>24.96</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>20.97</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

There was a significant difference in reading achievement between the experimental group and the control group in vocabulary skills. The control group achieved significantly higher than the experimental group. However, achievement between the groups in comprehension skills was not significant, but the control group achieved slightly higher than the experimental group. The null hypothesis was rejected for reading achievement in vocabulary skills but accepted for reading achievement in comprehension skills.

ANALYSIS OF READING ACHIEVEMENT BY SEX

Null hypothesis number eight read: There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group according to sex. Analysis by sex (Table 10) for vocabulary showed an F-ratio of 3.48. The mean (Table 13) for the female control group was 23.28 with a gain of 3.65. The mean for the female experimental group was 21.71 with a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group (Experimental and Control)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.60</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71.36</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>263.24</td>
<td>5.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46.48</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>6491.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6942.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
gain of 2.07. The mean difference of 1.57 was not significant. The mean for the male control group was 26.64 with a gain of 7.01. The mean for the male experimental group was 22.60 with a gain of 2.96. The mean difference of 4.04 was not significant. The mean difference of 4.93 between the female experimental group and the male control group was not significant. The male control group achieved slightly higher than all other groups. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Analysis by sex for comprehension (Table 12) indicated an F-ratio of .00. There was no significant difference in achievement. The mean (Table 13) for the female control group was 20.50 with a gain of 3.38. The mean for the female experimental group was 19.80 with a gain of 2.68. The mean difference of .70 was not significant. The mean for the male control group was 21.43 with a gain of 4.31. The mean for the male experimental group was 18.87 with a gain of 1.75. The mean difference of 2.56 was not significant. The control group achieved slightly higher than did the experimental group. The mean difference between the female control and male experimental groups was not significant. The mean difference between the female experimental and male control groups was not significant. The null hypothesis was accepted.

SUMMARY

There was no significant difference in reading achievement for vocabulary between the female groups or the male groups. There was no significant difference between the
Table 13

Adjusted Means for Reading Achievement by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>23.28</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>26.64</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
female control group and male experimental group. The differ-
ence between the female experimental and male control groups
was not significant. Male students in the control group
achieved slightly higher than all other groups. The null
hypothesis was accepted.

There was no significant difference in reading
achievement for comprehension between the female groups or
the male groups. There were no significant differences in
achievement between the female experimental group and male
control group nor between the female control group and male
experimental group. Students in the male control group
achieved slightly higher than all other groups. The null
hypothesis was accepted.

ANALYSIS OF READING ACHIEVEMENT BY RACE

Null hypothesis number nine read: There is no sig-
nificant difference between the reading achievement of students
in the experimental group and that of students in the control
group according to race. The analysis of race (Table 10) for
vocabulary indicated an F-ratio of 1.64. There was no sig-
nificant difference between the groups. The mean in vocabu-
lary (Table 14) for the black control group was 24.06 with a
gain of 4.43. The mean for the black experimental group was
21.14 with a gain of 1.51. The difference of 2.92 between
means was not significant. The mean for the white control
group was 25.86 with a gain of 6.23. The mean for the white
experimental group was 23.16 with a gain of 3.53. The mean
difference of 2.70 was not significant. Both white and black control groups achieved slightly higher than white and black experimental groups. There were no significant differences between the black control group and white experimental group nor between the black experimental group and white control group. The null hypothesis was accepted.

The analysis by race (Table 12) for comprehension showed an F-ratio of 2.85. There was no significant difference in achievement between groups. The mean (Table 14) for the black control group in comprehension was 18.71 with a gain of 1.59. The mean for the black experimental group was 19.19 with a gain of 2.07. The difference of .48 between means was not significant. The experimental group achieved slightly higher than the control group. The null hypothesis was accepted.

The mean (Table 14) for the white control group was 23.22 with a gain of 6.10. The mean for the white experimental group was 19.48 with a gain of 2.36. The difference of 3.74 was not significant. The white control group achieved higher than all other groups and experienced the greatest gain. There was no significant difference between the black control group and the white experimental group nor between the white control group and the black experimental group. The null hypothesis was accepted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>24.06</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>23.16</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was no significant difference in reading achievement for vocabulary skills between the black control group and black experimental group. No significant difference existed between the white control group and white experimental group. There was no significant difference between the black control group and white experimental group nor between the black experimental group and the white control group. Both white and black control groups achieved slightly higher than black and white experimental groups. The null hypothesis was accepted.

There was no significant difference in reading achievement for comprehension skills between the black control and black experimental group. The experimental group achieved slightly higher than the control group. The difference between the white control group and white experimental group was not significant. No significant differences existed between the white control group and black experimental group nor between the black control and white experimental group. The white control group achieved slightly higher than all other groups. The null hypothesis was accepted.

ANALYSIS OF READING ACHIEVEMENT BY GRADE

Null hypothesis number ten read: There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in
the control group according to grade. The analysis for grade (Table 10) showed an F-ratio of 3.76 for vocabulary. There was a significant difference in reading achievement by grade. The mean (Table 15) for the control group in grade three was 22.35 with a gain of 2.71. The mean for the experimental group in grade three was 18.94 with a negative gain of .69. A t-test was computed to test the difference of 3.41 between the means. A t of 1.99 was significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was rejected for grade three.

The mean for the control group in grade four was 24.79 with a gain of 5.16. The mean for the experimental group in grade four was 22.57 with a gain of 2.94. A t-test was computed to test the difference of 2.22 between the means. A t of 1.99 was significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was rejected for grade four.

The mean for the control group in grade five was 27.75 with a gain of 8.11. The mean for the experimental group was 24.94 with a gain of 5.30. A t-test was computed to test the difference of 2.81 between the means. A t of 1.99 was significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was rejected for grade five.

Students in the control group of grade five had higher achievement in vocabulary skills than did all other groups. However, the experimental group in grade five achieved higher than all other groups except the control group in grade five.
Table 15

Adjusted Means for Reading Achievement by Grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Gain</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>22.35</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>21.07</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>22.57</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>27.75</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>23.15</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>24.94</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis for grade in comprehension skills (Table 12) showed an F-ratio of 5.26. There was a significant difference in achievement by grade. The mean (Table 15) for the control group of grade three was 18.67 with a gain of 1.55. The mean for the experimental group in grade three was 19.35 with a gain of 2.23. The difference of .68 between means was not significant. The mean for the control group in grade four was 21.07 with a gain of 3.95. The mean for the experimental group was 15.55 with a negative gain of 1.57. A t-test was computed to test the difference of 5.52 between means. A t of 2.29 was significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis was rejected.

The mean for the control group in grade five was 23.15 with a gain of 6.03. The mean for the experimental group in grade five was 23.11 with a gain of 5.99. The difference of .04 between means was not significant. The null hypothesis was accepted for grade five.

**SUMMARY**

There was a significant difference in reading achievements for vocabulary in grades three, four, and five. The control groups achieved significantly higher than the experimental groups. The null hypothesis was rejected.

There was no significant difference in reading achievement for comprehension skills between groups in grades three and five. The experimental group achieved slightly higher than the control group in grade three. There was only a .04
difference in achievement of groups in grade five. There was a significant difference in achievement between groups in grade four. The control group achieved significantly higher than the experimental group. The null hypothesis was rejected.

ANALYSIS OF ACHIEVEMENT BY RESIDENCE

Null hypothesis number eleven read: There is no significant difference in the reading achievement of students according to residence (city or rural). The analysis by residence (Table 10) for vocabulary indicated an F-ratio of 1.59. There was no significant difference in achievement by residence. The mean (Table 16) for the city group in vocabulary was 24.35 with a gain of 4.72. The mean for the rural group was 22.76 with a gain of 3.13. The difference of 1.59 between means was not significant. Students in the city group achieved slightly higher in vocabulary skills than rural students. The null hypothesis was accepted.

The analysis by residence (Table 12) for comprehension showed an F-ratio of .38. There was no significant difference in achievement by residence. The mean (Table 16) for the city group in comprehension was 20.52 with a gain of 3.40. The mean for the rural group was 19.78 with a gain of 2.66. The difference of .74 between means was not significant. The city group achieved slightly higher than the rural group. The null hypothesis was accepted.

There was no significant difference in vocabulary achievement of students by residence. Students in the city
group achieved slightly higher than students in the rural group. The null hypothesis was accepted.

No significant difference developed between groups in comprehension achievement by residence. Students in the city group achieved slightly higher than students in the rural group. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 16
Adjusted Means for Achievement by Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Vocabulary Gain</th>
<th>Comprehension Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>24.35 4.72</td>
<td>20.52 3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>22.76 3.13</td>
<td>19.78 2.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

There was no significant difference in reading achievement in vocabulary by residence. Students in the city group achieved slightly higher than students in the rural group. The null hypothesis was accepted.

No significant difference developed between groups in comprehension achievement by residence. Students in the city group achieved slightly higher than students in the rural group. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Null hypothesis number twelve read: There is no significant difference in reading achievement of students according to socioeconomic status. The analysis for education of parents (Table 10) in vocabulary showed an F-ratio of 7.31. Education of parents did influence achievement differences in vocabulary skills. The analysis for income showed an F-ratio of .21. Income did not influence the differences in vocabulary achievement of students. The null hypothesis was rejected for education of parents but was accepted for the income level of parents.

The analysis for education of parents (Table 12) in comprehension showed an F-ratio of 1.86. There was no significant influence of education of parents on achievement differences of students. The null hypothesis was accepted.

The analysis for income of parents in comprehension showed an F-ratio of .59. Income did not significantly influence achievement between groups. The null hypothesis was accepted.

SUMMARY

Education of parents influenced the differences in vocabulary achievement of students but did not significantly influence differences in comprehension skills. Income level of parents was not a significant factor for vocabulary and
comprehension skills. The null hypothesis was rejected for socioeconomic status.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. There was no significant difference between the self concept scores of the experimental group and the control group. The null hypothesis was accepted.

2. There was a significant difference between the self concept scores of the experimental group and the control group by sex. Female students in the control group had significantly higher self concepts than female students in experimental group. The male control group had significantly higher self concepts than the female experimental group. The null hypothesis was rejected.

3. There was no significant difference between the self concept scores of the experimental group and control group by race. The null hypothesis was accepted.

4. There was no significant difference between the self concept scores of the experimental group and control group according to grade. The null hypothesis was accepted.

5. There was no significant difference between the self concept scores of students by city or rural residence. The rural group had slightly higher self concept scores and gains than the city group. The null hypothesis was accepted.

6. There were no significant differences in the self concept scores of students according to socioeconomic status (education and income of parents). The null hypothesis was accepted.
7. There was a significant difference in reading achievement between the experimental group and control group in vocabulary skills. The control group achieved significantly higher than the experimental group. The null hypothesis was rejected.

There was no significant difference between groups for comprehension skills. The null hypothesis was accepted.

8. There was no significant difference in reading achievement between the experimental group and the control group according to sex. The null hypothesis was accepted.

9. There was no significant difference in reading achievement between the experimental group and control group by race. Black and white control groups achieved slightly higher in vocabulary than the black and white experimental groups. There was no significant difference in achievement between the experimental group and control group for comprehension. The null hypothesis was accepted.

10. There was a significant difference in reading achievement between the experimental group and control group in grades three, four, and five in vocabulary. The control group in each grade achieved significantly higher than the experimental group. The null hypothesis was rejected.

There was no significant difference in reading achievement for comprehension between the experimental group and control group in grades three and five. The null hypothesis was accepted.
There was a significant difference in achievement between groups in grade four for comprehension. The control group achieved significantly higher than the experimental group. The null hypothesis was rejected.

11. There was no significant difference in reading achievement between groups according to residence (city or rural). The null hypothesis was accepted.

12. Socioeconomic status (education of parents) significantly influenced the difference between the experimental group and the control group in vocabulary, but did not significantly influence achievement between groups in comprehension. The null hypothesis was rejected for education of parents.

Socioeconomic status (income of parents) did not significantly influence the difference in reading achievement between the experimental group and control group. The null hypothesis was accepted for income.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine remedial reading instruction in vocabulary and comprehension skills, and to evaluate the influence of this instruction on self concepts and reading achievement of selected students. The study took place in five elementary schools in Lafayette Parish, Louisiana during a period of twenty-four weeks.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The following null hypotheses were tested using the .05 level of significance:

1. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group.

2. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group according to sex.

3. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group according to race.
4. There is no significant difference between the self concepts of students in the experimental group and those of students in the control group according to grade.

5. There is no significant difference in the self concepts of students according to residence (city or rural).

6. There is no significant difference in the self concepts of students according to socioeconomic status (education and income of parents).

7. There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group.

8. There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group according to sex.

9. There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group according to race.

10. There is no significant difference between the reading achievement of students in the experimental group and that of students in the control group according to grade.

11. There is no significant difference in the reading achievement of students according to residence (city or rural).

12. There is no significant difference in the reading achievement of students according to socioeconomic status (education and income of parents).
PROCEDURE

After students were selected for the study, screened, and assigned to the experimental group and control group, pretests were administered to all subjects by the researcher and a helper. Tests results were scored, tallied and coded.

At the end of twenty-four weeks, posttests were administered to all students in the study, and results were posted using the same procedure as that used for pretesting.

Pretests were used as the covariant to make final adjustment indifferences of students that were not controlled during the selection process. The posttests measured differences and gains in self concept and reading achievement scores between the experimental group and the control group.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Students were divided into the following subgroups to test the hypothesis: group, experimental and control; sex, male and female; race; black and white; grade, third, fourth, and fifth; residence, city and rural; socioeconomic status, education and income of parents.

An analysis of covariance was computed for each subgroup. The F-ratio was tested for significance at the .05 level. An analysis of covariance table was presented that included each group for self concepts and reading achievement
for vocabulary and comprehension. Adjusted means tables were presented for the subgroups.

The study was limited to 117 elementary students in grades three, four, and five from five schools in Lafayette Parish, Louisiana. Students in the experimental group received remedial reading instruction in addition to classroom reading instruction. Students in the control group received regular classroom reading instruction only.

FINDINGS

The findings for the study are listed below:

1. There was no significant difference between the self concepts of the experimental group and the control group. The null hypothesis was accepted.

2. There was a significant difference between the self concepts of the experimental group and the control group by sex. Female students in the control group had significantly higher self concepts than female students in the experimental group. The male control group had significantly higher self concepts than the female experimental group. The null hypothesis was rejected.

3. There was no significant difference between the self concepts of the experimental group and control group by race. The null hypothesis was accepted.

4. There were no significant differences between the self concepts of the experimental group and control
group in grades three, four, and five. The null hypothesis was accepted.

5. There was no significant difference in the self concepts of students by residence. The null hypothesis was accepted.

6. There were no significant differences in the self concepts of students according to education and income of parents. The null hypothesis was accepted.

7. There was a significant difference in reading achievement between the experimental group and the control group. The control group achieved significantly higher than the experimental group. The null hypothesis was rejected.

8. There was no significant difference in reading achievement between the experimental group and the control group according to sex. The null hypothesis was accepted.

9. There was no significant difference in reading achievement between the experimental group and control group according to race. The null hypothesis was accepted.

10. There was a significant difference in reading achievement between the experimental group and the control group for vocabulary in grades, three, four, and five. The control group in each grade achieved significantly higher than the experimental group. The null hypothesis was rejected.

There was no significant difference in reading achievement for comprehension between the experimental group
and control group in grades three and five. The null hypothesis was accepted.

There was a significant difference in reading achievement between groups in grade four for comprehension. The control group achieved significantly higher than the experimental group. The null hypothesis was rejected.

11. There was no significant difference between groups in reading achievement according to residence (city or rural). The null hypothesis was accepted.

12. Socioeconomic status (education of parents) significantly influenced the difference between the experimental group and control group in reading achievement for vocabulary but did not significantly influence reading achievement in comprehension between groups. The null hypothesis was rejected for education of parents.

Socioeconomic status (income of parents) did not significantly influence the difference between the experimental group and control group in reading achievement. The null hypothesis was accepted.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were reached as a result of this study:

1. Remedial reading instruction did not significantly change the self concepts as tested between the experimental group and the control group.
2. Female students in the control group and male students in the control group as tested viewed themselves more positively than did students in the experimental group. Remedial reading instruction as tested did not significantly change the self concept scores of students by sex.

3. Race was not a factor in determining the differences in self concepts as tested of students in this study when the groups were experimentally and statistically matched.

4. Grade level was not a significant factor in self concepts tested as shown by the scores of students in this study.

5. Residence or location of students was not a significant factor in self concept score differences tested. It was noted that many students in the study were transported from one neighborhood to another neighborhood to attend school.

6. Education and income of parents were not significant factors in self concept score differences tested among students. Education and income means for parents in the experimental group and control group were evenly matched.

7. Remedial reading instruction did not significantly increase reading achievement as tested. In fact, the reverse occurred. The control group achieved significantly higher than that of the experimental group.

8. Male students in the control group achieved slightly higher than all other groups in reading achievement
as tested. One possible reason was that many male students in the control group appeared to be more school-oriented.

9. When the groups were matched by race, no significant differences occurred in reading achievement of students as tested. However, certain factors emerged that were not statistically significant as tested, but were important as secondary findings. The black experimental group progressed more in reading achievement than the black control group. The white control group had slightly higher reading achievement scores than the other group.

10. According to criteria used for selecting students for the study, and the design used, it is evident that students with related problems affecting reading achievement but who do not qualify for Title I instruction, will achieve, on the average, higher than students qualifying for remedial reading instruction by Title I guidelines. Therefore, as students were tested in this study, their scores indicated that remedial reading instruction did not foster improved self concepts or improved reading achievement.

11. Residence (location) is not significant in determining reading achievement of students. Modern communication facilities and mobility of students have brought the city student and rural student together.

12. While socioeconomic status was found to significantly influence reading achievement in vocabulary only, the total home environment, including income of parents and attitude of students, will affect how well students
achieve in school. Students in grade three appeared to be less positive in two of the schools included in the study. These students progressed least in self concepts and reading achievement as tested.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the data obtained and analyzed in the study, the following recommendations were made for further study:

1. More research should be done on a parish-wide basis using remedial reading students from one grade or a combination of grades with a comparable control group. The research should be longitudinal where groups are tested for differences between the beginning and end of the school year and for differences between the end and beginning of the school year. Differences between groups should be converted to grade equivalents and standard scores.

2. Further studies should be conducted using different reading tests and different self concept scales. The reading tests used should coincide with the instructional skill objectives determined by the teachers.

3. Further studies should be conducted on self concept and reading achievement that will allow for greater indepth study of the interaction of variables. These studies should be monitored and supervised closely for techniques of instruction.

4. More research should be directed in the area of follow-through procedures in remedial reading instruction by
the classroom reading teacher. This could increase continuity in instruction and perhaps allow for greater reading achievement by students.

5. Future research on self concept and reading achievement should include more related data on background of subjects studied.
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APPENDIX A

READING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM DATA
LAFAYETTE PARISH SCHOOL BOARD READING

IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM CRITERIA

1. Children with scores below the 29th percentile on the EDT or a -1.0 grade deviation from ability level as measured by other tests.

2. Children whose I. Q. scores are 75-90 (slow learners) and selected students whose I. Q. scores are above 90. It is expected that 60 percent of the participants can be classified as slow learners.

3. Children who have unsatisfactory attendance records and meet 1 and 2 above.

4. Priority will be given to students with greatest need.
TITLE: ESEA, Title I Reading Laboratory Teacher

QUALIFICATIONS: 1. Valid Louisiana Teacher's Certificate
                2. Special Courses in Remedial Reading above the Bachelor's Degree level.
                3. Not less than three years of successful teaching experience as a classroom teacher.

REPORTS TO: Supervisor, Reading Improvement

JOB GOAL: To improve the reading skills of specific pupils through specialized reading services offered in Title I reading Laboratories.

PERFORMANCE RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Identifies pupils in need of reading laboratory services through accurate diagnoses.

2. Prescribes instruction designed to improve the reading skills of each laboratory pupil.

3. Instructs pupils in a noncourse instructional situation in the reading laboratory.

4. Assists laboratory aides in making effective use of materials.

5. Attends professional conferences and in-service workshops.

6. Shares test data information with the classroom teacher.

7. Shares expertise as reading specialist in immediate school setting.

8. Designs materials to meet the needs of individual students.

9. Performs only those duties related to the particular grant under which employed.
TITLE: ESEA, Title I Teacher Clerk

QUALIFICATIONS: 1. High School diploma or a certificate of high school equivalence.
                 2. Reasonable typing is desirable.

REPORTS TO: 1. Supervisor, Elementary Education.
              2. Supervisor, Secondary Education.
              3. Supervisor, Reading Improvement Program.

JOB GOAL: To improve the learning environment for students by assisting a regular classroom teacher in the performance of his duties by performing activities of a nonteaching nature.

PERFORMANCE RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Works under the direction of the classroom teacher performing assigned tasks.

2. Arranges library materials, teaching materials, and audio-visual equipment.

3. Types examinations.

4. Grades and scores objective-type examination papers.

5. Computes and records test grades for grading periods.

6. Keeps students files.

7. Assists with monitoring class and with individual department.

8. Uses visual and graphic reproduction equipment.

9. Performs only those duties related to the particular grant under which employed.
APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE
Mr. Harold H. Gauthe, Superintendent
Lafayette Parish School Board
P. O. Drawer 2158
Lafayette, Louisiana

Dear Mr. Gauthe:

I am a doctoral student in the College of Education at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. This letter is an official request to conduct research for my dissertation in five Lafayette Parish Schools for a portion of the 1975-76 school year. The study will involve fifty-six students enrolled in the Reading Improvement Program at the five schools and a comparable control group of students in the regular classroom at each school. The study is scheduled to begin the third week of October, 1975 and end the fourth week of April, 1976. Upon completion of the dissertation, a copy will be forwarded to you.

The title of the study is "The Influence of Remedial Reading Instruction in Vocabulary and Comprehension Skills on Self Concept and Reading Achievement of Selected Elementary Students." Approximately thirty-seven students from Myrtle Place Elementary School, nineteen from J. W. James Elementary School, twenty-seven from Westside Elementary School, twenty from Scott School will be selected from a stratified population of students in the third through fifth grades.

Two pre and two post-tests will be administered to students selected for the study. All tests will be administered under group conditions and will be given by me or a representative who meets with your approval.

The study will benefit the Lafayette Parish School System by measuring the effectiveness of remedial reading instruction in vocabulary and comprehension skills under controlled conditions.

A copy of the proposal, as approved by my committee, will be sent to you later.

Sincerely,

James C. Jackson

Approved:

Dr. Helen M. Cookston, Major Professor
Dear Mr.

Thank you for allowing me to confer with you and your teachers concerning the proposed study I plan to do. Your continued cooperation and suggestions will be appreciated.

Enclosed is a group of labeled forms specifying the information needed for the study. Please have your Reading Teacher or classroom teachers of Reading who have students in the study complete the form(s) and return them in the self-addressed envelope within one week. The two groups of students should be as equal as possible in indicated group intelligence and group reading achievement.

While discussing the proposed study with Mr. Gauthe, it was concluded that all information secured about the individual student would be held in confidence.

Before beginning the study, written permission will be obtained from the parents of each child who will be included in the study.

Again, thank you for your support and I look forward to working with you, your teachers and your students on this project.

Sincerely,

James C. Jackson
Dear __________________________,

I am a student in the College of Education at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana. I am on leave from my job as Principal of J. Wallace James Elementary School, Lafayette, Louisiana, to complete course work for the doctorate degree.

This letter is a request to have your child (see name below) included in a study I must conduct in order to satisfy the degree requirements. The title of the study is "The Influence of Remedial Reading Instruction in Vocabulary and Comprehension Skills on Self Concept and Reading Achievement of Selected Elementary Students." I also need permission from you to check your child's Cumulative Record at school for reading achievement information for the study. No information obtained from your child's school records or obtained during the study will be identified by name at the conclusion of the study. All information about your child will be kept in strict confidence.

Your child's instructional program will not be disturbed beyond the pre and post-testing time, which will amount to approximately two and one-half hours.

After the study has been released by Louisiana State University, group results will be available through the principal of the school upon your request.

Your help is needed in conducting the proposed study. You can do this by permitting your child to participate. Please sign the attached form and return it by your child to his/her principal on tomorrow.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

James C. Jackson

Approved:

Harold H. Gauthe, Superintendant
Lafayette Parish School Board
Permission is hereby granted to have my child take part in the study and for you to use information requested from his/her Cumulative Record according to the conditions stated in your letter.

Signed: ____________________

Parent or Guardian
Dear Parent(s):

At the beginning of this school year (1975-76), you gave permission to have your child, __________________________, included in a study I am conducting while attending school at Louisiana State University. My committee believes that additional information on family education and family income will add meaning to the final results of my study.

I will appreciate your cooperation by providing the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Completed</th>
<th>Approximate Family Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father__________</td>
<td>Monthly______ or Yearly____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother__________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information provided for the study will be used for this purpose only. Names will not be included.

Please return your completed form (sealed) by your child tomorrow morning.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

James C. Jackson  
Phone 234-0795
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APPENDIX C
FORMS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>IQ</th>
<th>INDICATED READING</th>
<th>ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>PARENT AND ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## INFORMATION SHEET FOR A PROPOSED STUDY

**SCHOOL_____________________________**

**CONTROL GROUP (REGULAR CLASSROOM READING ONLY) YEAR________**

**INSTRUMENT(S) USED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>INDICATED IQ</th>
<th>INDICATED READING ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>PARENT AND ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>15.</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT NUMBER</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>NELSON READING TEST</th>
<th>PIERS-HARRIS SELF CONCEPT SCALE</th>
<th>SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (PARENTS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VOCABULARY</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>POST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>COMPREHENSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT NUMBER</td>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>NELSON READING TEST</td>
<td>PIERS-HARRIS SELF CONCEPT SCALE</td>
<td>SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS (PARENTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VOCABULARY COMPREHENSION</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>POST</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>POST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VITA

James Clyde Jackson, the son of the late Oren Horace Jackson and Mary Garner Jackson, was born in Winnfield, Louisiana, February 3, 1933. He was graduated from Winn Parish Training School in 1950. He received a Bachelor of Science degree in Elementary Education from Grambling State University in 1954. The Master of Education degree in Administration and Supervision was awarded to him by the University of Southwestern Louisiana in 1963. The Education Specialist degree in Administration and Supervision was awarded to him by the University of Southwestern Louisiana in 1971.

During the years 1954-58, he served in the United States Marine Corps. In 1959 he spent one semester as a teacher in the Webster Parish School System. From 1959 to 1963, he was a teacher in the Lafayette Parish School System. He was a principal of an elementary school in the Lafayette Parish School System from 1963 to 1976.

He is married to the former Bettye Jean Robinson and is the father of one daughter, Andrea, who was born September 3, 1959.