ED 075 093 PS 006 430

AUTHOR

Barnard, Douglas P.

The Effect of Incentives on Reading Readiness Skills. TITLE

Final Report.

INSTITUTION

Mesa Public Schools, Ariz.

SPONS AGENCY

National Inst. of Mental Health, Rockville, Md.

PUB LATE NOTE

31 Aug 72 106p.

MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58

EDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS

*Compensatory Education Programs; *Incentive Systems; *Parent Influence; Parent Participation; Preschool Education; *Preschool Programs; *Reading Readiness;

Reading Readiness Tests; Reading Skills;

Reinforcement; Technical Reports

IDENTIFIERS

Clymer Barrett Prereading Battery Test; Haywood Picture Motivation Scale; Murphy Durrell Letters in

Words Test; Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to investigate the effects of child and parent incentives on the acquisition of reading readiness skills of educationally disadvantaged preschool children. Ss were 121 students from Title I kindergarten classes. Four bilingual paraprofessionals were trained to interview parents, administer the pre- and post-tests, and operate the incentive systems at each of the schools. Of the four schools, parents of students in two schools were provided with cash incentives for attending each session. Children in two schools were involved in a progressive incentive system. For every four weeks, there was a subskills test (pre and post) and a different incentive plan, which progress from immediate reinforcement to delayed reinforcement to social reinforcement. Results showed that: (1) there was no statistically significant difference on the improvement of intelligence scores regardless of the child's motivational style or the incentive system used; (2) the parent and child incentive groups performed significantly better than the child or parent incentive groups on the visual discrimination test; (3) when intelligence is held constant, there was no statistically significant difference between ethnic groups on the Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Battery, but there was a statistically significant difference between ethnic groups on the informal reading readiness subskill test of matching letters; (4) the parent group receiving incentives demonstrated greater attendance behavior than those parents who did not receive incentives. (KM)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE OF THE OF THE STATE OF

The county of edge of the office of a property of the following the following of the county of the c

FINAL REPORT

THE EFFECT OF INCENTIVES ON READING READINESS SKILLS

Principal Investigator

Douglas P. Barnard, Ed. D. MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
549 North Stapley Drive Mesa, Arizona

Superintendent

George N. Smith, Ed. D. MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS 549 North Stapley Drive Mesa, Arizona

August 31, 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to PHS Research Grant MH-20817-01 from the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Mental Health.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to Tom Healey, a doctoral student at Arizona State University whose personal abilities and skills enabled the project to function smoothly. A special note of appreciation is extended to Dr. Edna Gilbert, Creative Arts Consultant, who created the games used in the project and supplied the "spark" during the training sessions. The design of the project, the precision teaching techniques, and the many project activities were greatly aided by the expertise of Miss Mary Ann Mohrbacher and Mr. Jim Brady. Their assistance and encouragement are appreciated.

The credit for the project success and real parent involvement belongs to the paraprofessionals; namely, Hortencia Lira, Mary Lou Montano, Sarah Valenzuela, and Olga Valocchi. Without these concerned and dedicated paraprofessionals, the entire project would have been less successful. They, above all others, assumed ownership of the program. A special thanks is due the teachers, Meryl Hale, Norma Heffron, Tawn Rudolph, Emma Wahl, Ruby Standifird, and the parents who participated.

Everyone associated with the project joins in a "thank you" to Mrs. Sylvia Thomas who so efficiently performed all clerical duties during the course of the project. A special thanks to Mrs. Rita Markwell who put up with all of us in typing the final report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRO	סטינכ	TIC	N	•		•		•			•	e	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	1
PURPO	OSE.	•	•			a	•	•	•	•	•		•	٠	•	•	•		•		•	2
RELAT	red	1.17	rer	ΑT	URE	: A	ND	RI	ESE	EAF	RCH	1.	•	•	•	•	4.	•	•	•	•	2
OBJE(CTIV	ES	OF	T	HE	ST	ימט	Υ.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	8
METHO	DO L	.OGY	•		• • •	•		•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	9
DATA	ANA	LYS	SIS	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•		•	•	•	14
RESUI	TS	ANI) ₍ C	ON	CLU	ISI	on:	5.	•	•	u	•	•	•	•	•	•	ė	•	2	57,	40
DISCU	JSSI	ON	•		• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	42
BIBLI	logr	API	ΙΥ	•		•	•	•	•	.,	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	46
							1	API	EN	IDI	X	Α										•
INDIV	/IDU ·	AL	TE	ST	SC	OR	_						; .	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	51
							1	API	EN	ID I	X	В										
A SYI	NOPS	IS	OF	٨	I DE	A	CT	[V]	T	ES	S.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	r	•	•	5 2
			-				i	۸PI	?EN	DI	X	С										
QUEST	rion	S A	UND	R	ESF	ON	SE	S 1	FRO	M	PF	ξE-	. P/	RE	NT	• 1	[N]	rea	lV I	E	'S	53



TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

APPENDIX D

FOLLO	V-UP	INTERVIEW	LE	TTE	RS T	ог	AREN	TS		•	•	•	•	54
				APP	ENDI	ХE								
SKILLS	S INT	RODUCED T	URI	NG :	PROG	RAM		•	•		•,	•	٠	5 5
				APP:	endi	ХБ								
TESTS	ADMI	NISTERED	ВҮ	INC	enti	VE	SCHE	DUL	В		•	•		50
				APP	ENDI	ХG								
POST-I	PAREN	T QUESTIC	NNA	IRE							•			57
			LI	ST	of T	ABL	ES							
Table	1.	Analysis Picture V								ody	•			15
Table	2.	Peabody I by Incent Scheffé M	ive	: Gr	oups				st •		•	•	•	16
Table	3.	Peabody I Motivation Method .									٠	•		16
Table	4.	Analysis Barrett F Discrimin	re-	Read	ding	Ba	tter				1 .			17
Table	5.	Clymer-Ba Visual Di Incentivo	rre Iscr	ett :	Pre- nati	Rea on	ding Test	by		ery				
Table	6.	Method . Analysis Barrett l Auditory	of Pre-	Rea	ding	Ba	tter	У	•	er-	,	•	•	18
Table	7.	Clymer-Ba Auditory Incentive	arre Dis	ett scri	Pre- mina	Rea tio	ding n by	Ba	tt	•	-		-	
		Method .			• •			•	•		•	•	•	19

LIST OF TABLES

Table	8.	۸r Ma	ia]	l y ch	si i1	s	į	s E	t	C t c	ov er	ar s	i •	aı	10	е •	1	ē o	r	•			•	•		•		•	20
Table	9.		ia]									ar •	i •	a)	10	•	i	ē o	r •					•	•	•		•	20
Table	10.	Ar Le	ia!	ly te	s i r	is S	o) JO	11	d	Co s	VC	ar	i •	a I	10	е.	1	Eo ·	r •				•	•	•	•		•	21
Table	11.	Ar Le	ia:	ly te	s i r	is (N;	o f	6) (v W	ar ri	i	i	1C 1 E	: e	j	ίο •	r	•	•		0	•	•			•	21
Table	12.	Ba	nal Lyn eti	me te	r. r)	- B	a V	1	u.	£ 1	-	Pr	.6	-]	₹€	a:	3	ŗŊ	g	ioi	1.		•	•	•	۰		•	22
Table	13.	Vi Ir	ly: ist	ua en	l ti	U i v	i; e	50	r	ir Qı	ni 19	na	b	i Y	7 (1 '	Te	9 S	t	b	7			у,	•	•		•	22
Table	14.	Ba	na: ur: is:	re	t	t	p.	re	•	R	ea	di	n	g	ì	e a	t i	fo te	r r)	C:	ly A	m	er di	to	r)	<i>7</i>		•	23
Table	15.	At Ma	na:	ly ch	s: i:	is ng		of Le	: t	Co to	ov er	3 I 5	·i	a:	n (:e	4	£o	r •	•	•		•		•	r			24
Table	16.	Ar Lo	ia et	ly te	s: r	is S	k	of i1	: . 1	Co S	οV	ar •	i.	a	n (e		fo •	r •	•				•	•	•			25
Table	17.	Ar Le	na: et	ly te	s: r	is N	a	o E		Co S!	ov ki	a1	i	a :	n (e •		fo •	r	•	•		•	•	•	•		•	25
Table	18.	S	Ki et	11	5	Ь	У	-	C	h	of oa	1 s	, e	b	t¢ y'	er t	h	е	me Se	es ch	ef	f	é	•	•	•		•	26
Table	19.	Ai Le	na et	1y te	s:	is (N	of an	: le	C s	ov)	ar Wr	i i	a	no i1	e lg	:	fo Sk	r	11	s	•	•	•	•	•		•	26
Table	20.	Pa	ar	en	t	A	t	r e	ħ	d	an	CE	•	b	y	1	n	ce	n	ti	ve		Sy	' 5 1	t e	n			27
Table	21.	P:	ar ys							e :	nd •	ar •	ìC	e		•	,	In		en	ti	ν	e •	·•	•	•		•	29
Table	22.		on Y														O)	pi •	n	io:	n		•	•	•	•	•	•	3(
Table	23.	A: Di	na ur	ly re	s	is 1	R	o i	i id	V i	ar ng	ia	ζε 31	ic ea	e d:	f in	o e	r S S	M	ur An	ph al	y	si	s	•	•	•	•	33

LIST OF TABLES

Table	24.	Analysis of Variance for Murphy Durrell Reading Readiness Analysis by Individual School	34
Table	25.	Individual Schools by the Scheffe Method	34, 35
Table	26.	Percentage Comparisons of Past and Present Students Ready to Begin a Formalized Reading Program	36

INTRODUCTION

A major problem faced by educators is the number of children entering school from low socio-economic areas without the necessary reading readiness skills to enter a formalized reading program.

As a result, it is no surprise to discover, as public school records clearly indicate, that children from low socio-economic areas do not, as a group, acquire the critical readiness skills as well as students from other socio-economic levels.

Some educators relate that the problem is the home environment, lack of language skills, lack of parental interest, poor child attitudes, etc. as the cause for the low achievement. Although these are valid contributors to the problem, educators must search for more effective means to accelerate achievement for this population. It is obvious that the child, faced with social, cultural and economic limitations, will need additional assistance to increase self-confidence and to develop the essential reading readiness skills so that he can achieve on par with children from other socio-economic levels.

There is little doubt that preschool programs are beneficial as many studies have demonstrated this empirically. Parents, paraprofessionals and teachers can be trained to improve the cognitive development of low socio-economic children at the preschool level. However, it has yet to be determined what type of incentive or motivational approach is the most effective to interest parents,



or what child motivational system and style results in more effective learning with disadvantaged children.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of child and parent incentives on the acquisition of reading readiness skills of educationally disadvantaged preschool children.

RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Importance of Parents

The effect of parental involvement is deemed essential for preschool programs. Karnes (25), Painter (40), Ohran and Radin (37), Gray and Klaus (20), and Deutsch (10) have indicated that parents from low socio-economic areas are capable of helping their children if given the opportunity and the appropriate instruction. The investigations by Crow, et al. (8), Fusco (15), Gordon (19), Mann (30), Weikart (54), and Levenstein (29) have also stressed the importance of parent behavior for the cognitive training of preschool children.

Schaefer (42) reported that the training of children in various skills has positive results. However once training ceases, the student tends to regress in the skill areas to a pre-training status. There is an apparent need to continue the stimulation of children upon completion of preschool programs. Parents and other family members are the logical stimulators since the home is the



child's environment. Skinner (48) and Schwitzebel (45) noted that motivation to learn, or the lack of it, is a behavioral response to environmental contingencies rather than a manifestation of non-concern or laziness. Parental training is needed not only to continue stimulating the child in a program but also to assist the parent with other children at home.

Although parental training is invaluable, the question is one of convincing parents to attend training sessions, and more important, how to sustain this involvement over a period of time. Parent-teacher workshops, potluck dinners, and other social affairs have generally generated a low rate of parental attendance. Informal coffee sessions at a parent's home appears to be one effective procedure (34). Another alternative is the use of payment to the parents as proposed by Singell and Yoder (47).

Niedermeyer (36), Stuart (51), and Karens (26) have used parent incentives with significant results. This approach might be the vehicle to entice and sustain parental involvement necessary to conduct the training to ultimately assist the child. Several parent incentive studies are presently being conducted by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare that will offer additional insight into this approach on a large scale basis.

Incentives to Motivate Children

Intrinsic and extrinsic motivational styles are the two classes of theories commonly referred to in the literature to motivate human performance. These motivational processes, especially



extrinsic, are common in middle socio-economic homes; whereas, the parents of low socio-economic homes of ten lack the understanding of the behavioral training necessary to train children for future school success. Haywood (22) stated:

"What appear to be deficits in cognitive ability, particularly in disadvantaged children ... may very well be deficits in inclination to achieve or deficits in motivational systems."

He indicated that disadvantaged "Head Start" children are significantly more extrinsically motivated than children from private preschools. Getzels (18) stated in reference to incentives and rewards that the promise of future reward is not sufficient. He elaborated further:

"The lower class child has experienced only a survival or subsistence ethic (not achievement ethic) with consequent high valuation on the present (not future) on immediate gratification (not deferred gratification) and concrete commitment (not symbolic commitment). Where the lower class child lives, hardly anyone ever gets to the top -- often one can hardly move across the street. And time is not important or potentially valuable if there is not going to be anything to do with it anyway. The commitment is to immediate and concrete gratification -- to the satisfaction of here and now -- for what does an appeal to symbolic success mean where success is measured only by subsistence or survival?"

Incentives is not a current innovation but has been used universally, in one form or another, as a means to improve behavior and academic performance. White (55) in 1886 discussed the importance of motivation and incentives as related to education.

Although incentives have been employed in education, they have been used more with atypical than typical students. Material

incentives and knowledge of results have commonly been utilized as primary reinforcers, whereas secondary reinforcers have included such things as points, tokens, money, and delayed social rewards. Praise has been classified as a primary and secondary reinforcer in the Mesa "Incentives Only" Project which contains a model for moving from primary to secondary reinforcers (1).

Incentives have been used in many different contexts. The recent U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity Performance Contracting experiment concluded that incentives were not effective to improve or accelerate the basic skills competencies of disadvantaged students (3). Chadwick and Day (5) used material reinforcers to improve behavior and academic performance as did Risely and Hart (41). Barnard (2) reported that incentives to students resulted in better behavior, and students were able to attend to a given task for a longer period of time than the control group. Fygetakis and Gray (16) used tokens that could be exchanged for toys that resulted in improved language skills of linguistically divergent preschool children. Heitzman (24) also used tokens as the incentive to significantly improve basic skills achievement of migrant primary school students. Although material incentives appear to change behavior and performance, they might not be the most effective incentive.

Spence (49) reported that candy rewards resulted in poorer performance than verbal statements of right or wrong with preschoolers and elementary children. A similar finding was reported by Marshall (31) in a laboratory learning experiment with Caucasian



ΰ

kindergarten children. Unikel, Strain, and Adams (53) reported no difference with candy versus teacher praise when worke and six year old Anelo children in Project "Head Start".

Secondary reinforcers establish their value by the exchange of points or tokens for goods, services and privileges. One requirement for specific behaviors, which serves as the criteria for incentives delivery, is that they must be public events, open to reliable observation (33). Public records of rewardable behavior, i.e., circling numbers on cards (6); writing names on the blackboard (43); placing marbles in a holder (31); and writing out a little blue ticket (52) have been used as secondary reinforcement systems.

In some studies, tokens were exchanged for candy or toys (24, 32, 38). Tickets to special events were used as the exchange in a study by Bushell, Wrobel and Michaelis (4), and special privileges was the exchange used by Packard (39). Once a system for delivery and exchange has been established, secondary incentives seem to be as effective as primary incentives to influence behavior.

The effects of teacher verbal support and teacher praise have been widely studied as a social incentive. Thirty-three studies, performed over the previous 50 years on the use of praise and blame as incentives, were reviewed by Kennedy and Willcutt (27). In this review it was concluded that:



"... when one corrects for practice, as with the use of a control group, praise is a reasonably stable incentive from study to study, contributing an incremental effect upon the performance and learning of school children."

The use of incentives in education appears to be an effective motivational technique, but strict control of environment is necessary (44, 46). Davidoff (9) generalized that the behavior should be important and demonstrate a definite relationship to the attainment of various goals in education. Once performance objectives are defined, the criteria for incentive delivery must be determined.

The criteria for delivery has been varied, ranging from immediate rewards for minute changes in behavior to the delay of the incentives over a lengthy period of time. However, most incentive delivery systems are very short in time duration (13). The use of an incentive for a correct answer is common as indicated by the work of Staats, Finley, Minke and Wolf (50), Wolfe, Giles and Hall (56) and Frase (14). Clark (7) stressed that, whatever, the criteria of gain should be relative to ability and performance of the subject population.

Studies involving direct, personal delivery of incentives have been of the variety of teacher praise, special attention, and rewards. A variation of this pattern was used by Hart and Risley (21) in a preschool situation which paried teacher praise with snacks when the desired performance was attained.

Although there are many studies showing the different incentive delivery systems for different groups, no research to date



could be located relating the effect that different incentive delivery systems have in accelerating achievement with the same group of students with different motivational styles.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This investigation sought information relevant to the following questions:

- 1. Is there a statistical significant difference in intelligence scores as related to the motivational style of the subjects and the incentive delivery system?
- 2. Is there a statistical significant difference between motivational style and the incentive delivery system on reading readiness achievement?
- 3. Is there a statistical significant difference between motivational style and the incentive delivery system on reading readiness subskill achievement?
- 4. Is there a statistical significant difference between ethnic groups and the incentive delivery system on reading readiness achievement?
- 5. Is there a statistical significant difference between ethnic groups and the incentive delivery system on reading readiness subskill achievement?
- 6. Is there a statistical significant difference with parental attendance behavior between those receiving incentives and those not receiving incentives?
- 7. Is there a statistical significant difference on the retention of reading skills between the four groups of low socio-economic level children and four groups of middle socio-economic level children after a three months' lapse of time?



METHODOLOGY

The subjects involved in this study were 121 students from Title I schools in kindergarten classes which were randomly selected from seven Title I schools in Mesa, Arizona. Each of the four schools involved had a morning and afternoon kindergarten session with approximately 20 students per class and a total of 166 students involved in the initial testing session. Because of transfers, illness, etc., only 121 students took all pre and post test instruments. Individual test scores, by schools, can be found in Appendix A.

Title I schools were selected because of the composition of various ethnic groups which met the low socio-economic criterion. The Indian population was limited as this group elected to have their own preschool program on the reservation. This resulted in decreased numbers for statistical analysis, necessitating the ethnic groups to be placed into Anglo and non-Anglo groups for analysis purposes.

Procedures

The study was conducted from September 1971 to February 1972. After the schools were selected, four bilingual paraprofessionals from the community were hired in August and trained in the goals and procedures of the program. Practice in administering the tests utilized in the study was given along with interviewing procedures and techniques for conducting inservice training with parents. Each paraprofessional had the responsibility of operating the incentive



system at one of the four Title I schools. A synopsis of aide activities is presented in Appendix B.

The first duty of the paraprofessional was to personally contact and interview parents of the children in specified Title I schools. Each interview sought to determine the willingness of the parents to participate, their feelings toward incentives, the best day and time for training sessions, and what type of incentive would seem most appropriate for them. No effort was made to conceal the fact that some parents would/would not receive incentives. A copy of the questions posed and the responses can be found in Appendix C. The interview was followed by a letter to each of the four groups (see Appendix D) explaining the program.

The second responsibility of the aide was to administer the necessary tests at the school. The tests used were the Peabody

Picture Vocabulary Test to determine intelligence levels, the Haywood Picture Motivation Scale to determine the motivational style of each child, the Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Battery Test to determine the child's level of pre-reading skills, and an adapted portion of the Murphy-Durrell Letters in Words Test for reading subskills. Testing was conducted in quiet, well-lighted rooms on an individual basis. If any signs of child frustration or emotional upset were noted by the examiner, the testing was terminated. Alternate forms of the same instruments, with exception of the Haywood Picture Motivation Scale, were administered at the end of 20 weeks to measure gains.



On-Going Program

Training sessions were held for the four paraprofessionals on each Friday. Creative activities designed to teach specific reading readiness skills were developed and explained to the classroom teachers so that they could coordinate them with their schedule. Materials were collected weekly so that the four paraprofessionals could provide the necessary materials to conduct the inservice training for parents on Mondays. Parents would then develop the games to be used on Tuesday of every week in the classroom. The games and other material produced were given to each parent to take home for activity with other children in the home environment. Teachers and aides were available in the classroom, but basically the parents operated the program. Techniques to help parents with behavioral problems were presented by a psychologist. Health and nutrition workshops were conducted by district personnel for all parents.

The skills to be introduced during training were divided into seven areas following Durrell's (11) hierarchy of teaching letter names (see Appendix E): matching letters directly, identifying letters shown, identifying letters named, and writing letters from dictation. A test for each area was developed and administered at the beginning and end of each incentive schedule every four weeks (See Appendix F). Approximately every four weeks training progressed to a new skill area, so that by the end of the project, training in all skill areas was completed. Special individualized instruction was given by project aides to those children having difficulty in



order to keep them at the same level as the other children. Charting of the progress of each child was maintained with precision
teaching charts so that children dropping behind were quickly identified.

Incentive Delivery System

Parents

Of the four schools, parents of students in two schools were provided with cash incentive. That is, if they attended the Monday session, they were paid five dollars. If they participated on Monday and Tuesday, they were paid ten dollars weekly. If they did not attend, no incentive was given. Parents in the other two schools were not provided any monetary incentive.

Child Incentive

The incentive system for children was set up in a progressive manner. Children in two schools were in the incentive system. The study was designed so that for every four weeks, there would be a subskills test (pre and post) and a different incentive plan. Four basic steps were taken in moving children from immediate physical gratification to a socially motivated incentive system. These steps were as follows:

First Four Weeks - Matching Letters

 Immediate reinforcement - items such as candy, cereal, etc. were given immediately for accomplished short-term tasks.



Second Four Weeks - Identifying Letters Shown

2. Delayed reinforcement - candy was given on a point type system at intervals for across and tasks.

Third Four Weeks - Identifying Letters Named

3. Delayed reinforcement material rewards such as toys were exchanged for points instead of candy at spaced intervals.

Fourth Four Weeks - Naming and Writing Letters from Distation

4. Social reinforcement - praise was given at appropriate points. Children accomplished tasks for the "good of the group". Those who finished first assisted slower children until the entire group had accomplished a task. Field trips were also included as a social reward.

Children in the other two groups did not receive any incentive other than the normal teacher and parent praise.

Research Design

Each of the four schools were to follow the same type of reading readiness program. The teacher aides, who would work with parents, and the classroom teachers received the same pre-session training. Each of the four schools served as one incentive system:

Franklim School - Incentives to child and parents

Irving School - Incentives to parents

Lehi School - Incentives to child only

Lincoln School - No incentives

To evaluate results by ethnic groups achievement and incentive delivery system, a 2 x 4 factoris design was used with raw test data.



A 3 x 4 design was utilized to assess the achievement effect of motivational style and incentive delivery system. A 2 x 3 x 4 design was planned but had to be abandoned because of a lack of sufficient numbers in the various cells.

In an effort to assess the retention of any achievement noted in February, an alternate test, the <u>Murphy-Durrell Reading Readiness</u>

<u>Analysis Test</u> was administered to all kindergarten children in the school district in May for comparison to the preschool children not in the program.

DATA ANALYSIS

The first question investigated was:

Is there a statistical significant difference in intelligence scores as related to the motivational style of the subjects and the incentive delivery system?

The <u>Haywood Picture Motivation Scale</u> (23) was administered to the 121 subjects in the study. Of this group, 33 subjects (19 Anglo, 14 non-Anglo) were judged to be intrinsically motivated, 63 subjects (45 Anglo, 18 non-Anglo) were mixed and did not demonstrate either intrinsic or extrinsic motivational patterns, and 25 subjects (21 Anglo, 4 non-Anglo) were rated as being extrinsically motivated.

The motivational styles will be referred to as I-intrinsic, E-extrinsic, and M-mixed or no preference. The incentive delivery systems will be referred to as CH-Parent (incentives given to child



and parent); Parent (only parents received incentives); None (no incentives given to child or parents), and CH (incentives given to child only).

To assess the change in intelligence, the <u>Peabody Picture</u>

<u>Vocabulary Test</u> Form A served as the covariate, and the <u>Peabody</u>

<u>Picture Vocabulary Test</u> Form B was the dependent variable in the analysis of covariance presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Analysis of Covariance for Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Scores

Source	s.s.	df	MS	F
Motivational Levels	207.562	2	103.781	0.736
Incentive Group	91.856	3	30.619	0.217
M.L. x I.G.	2274.383	6	379.064	2.690*
Error	5219.280	108	140.919	

There were no statistical significant differences between motivational style or incentive delivery systems. There was an interaction effect, however, and to locate the differences, the Scheffé "a posteriori" comparison method (12) was utilized with adjusted means. The analysis by incentive system and by motivational style is presented in Tables 2 and 3 respectively which are on the following page.



Table 2. Peahody Picture Vocabulary Test by Incentive Groups by the Scheffe Method

Incentive Groups	Incentive Group Favored	F
Ch-Parent - Parent	Parent	0.030
Ch-Parent - Child	Child	0.180
Ch-Parent - None	None	0.436
Parent - Child	Child	0.066
Parent - None	None	0.237
Child - None	None	0.044

There was no statistical significant difference, however, the no incentive groups had a higher adjusted mean score; the child incentive group had a higher adjusted mean than the parent or CH-parent group; the parent incentive group had a higher adjusted mean than the CH-parent group.

Table 3. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test by Motivational Style by the Scheffe Method

Motivational Style	Motivational Style Favored	F
I - M	M	1.152
I-E	E	0.302
M-E	M	0.132

Although there was no statistical significant difference located, the mixed motivational style had a higher adjusted mean score than the intrinsic or extrinsic subjects. The extrinsic group had a higher adjusted mean than the intrinsic group.



The second question was:

Is there a statistical significant difference between motivational style and the incentive delivery system on reading readiness achievement?

To assess the motivational style and achievement by incentive system, the <u>Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test</u> Form B was used as the covariate, and the post-test scores of the visual discrimination section of the <u>Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Battery</u> was the dependent variable in the analysis of covariance as presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Analysis of Covariance for Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Battery, Visual Discrimination Subtest

Source	S.S.	df	MS	F
Motivational Styles	85.092	2	42.546	0.453
Incentive Groups	1183.640	3	394.547	4.205**
M.L. x I.G.	866.981	6	144.497	1.540
Error	10132.624	108	93.821	

There was a statistical significant difference noted by incentive groups, and there was no statistical significant difference by motivational style nor was there an interaction effect. The Scheffé "a posteriori" comparison method was utilized with adjusted means to locate the difference by incentive groups and is shown in Table 5 on the following page.



Table 5. Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Battery Visual Discrimination Test by Incentive Group by the Scheffe Method

Incentive Groups	Incentive Group Favored	F
Ch-Parent - Parent	Parent	9.310*
Ch-Parent - Child	Child	20.849**
Ch-Parent - None	None	6.177
Parent - Child	Child	2.107
Parent - None	Parent	0.968
Child - None	Child	6.757

The parent incentive group and the child incentive group performed statistically significantly better than the child and parent incentive group. The child incentive group had a higher adjusted mean score than any other group. No other statistical significant differences existed.

Table 6. Analysis of Covariance for Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Battery Auditory Discrimination Test

Source	s.s.	df	MS	F
Motivational Styles	6.431	2	3.216	0.034
Incentive Groups	857.794	3	285.931	3.063*
M.L. x I.G.	149.345	6	24.891	0.267
Error	10083.214	108	.93.363	



Table 6 shows the analysis of covariance for the auditory discrimination subtest of the <u>Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Battery</u> which was used as the dependent variable, and the <u>Peabody Picture</u> <u>Vocabulary Test Form B was utilized as the covariate.</u>

Style for was there an interaction effect. There was a statistical significant difference by incentive groups and the Scheffé "a posteriori" technique was conducted to locate the difference which is shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Battery Auditory Discrimination by Incentive Groups by the Scheffe Method

Incentive Groups	Incentive Group Favored	F
Ch-Parent - Parent	Ch-Parent	2.696
Ch-Parent - Child	Child	3.965
Ch-Parent - None	None	2.753
Parent - Child	Child	14.148**
Parent - None	None .	12.877**
Child - None	Child	0.281

The child incentive and the no-incentive group performed statistically significantly better than the parent incentive group. There were no other statistical significant difference noted although the child incentive group had a higher adjusted mean than the no-incentive group.



The third question was:

Is there a statistical significant difference between motivational style and the incentive delivery system on reading readiness subskill achievement?

To assess the motivational style on achievement with different incentive delivery systems on reading subskills, four non-standardized pre and post-test were administered when the incentive delivery system changed every four weeks. The pre-test of each of the four tests was used as the covariate, and the post-test was used as the dependent variable in an analysis of covariance. Each analysis is presented in Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11.

Table 8. Analysis of Covariance for Matching Letters

		1		
Source	S.S.	df	MS	· F
Motivational Styles	2.678	2	1.339	0.535
Incentive Groups	4.547	3	1.516	0.606
i.L. x I.G.	5.859	6	0.975	0.390
Error	270.164	108	2.502	
Error	270.164	108	2.50)2

Table 9. Analysis of Covariance for Letter Names

	df	MS	F
70.810	2	37.405	1.573
102.827	3	34.276	1.441
69.672	6	11.612	0.488
2568.190	108	23.780	
	74.830 102.827 69.672	76.830 2 102.827 3 69.672 6	76.830 2 37.405 102.827 3 34.276 69.672 6 11.612



Table 10. Analysis of Covariance for Letter Sounds

Source	s.s.	df	MS	ŗ
Motivational Styles	105.010	2	52.505	0.770
Incentive Groups	140.936	3	46.979	0.689
1.L. x I.G.	104.820	6	17.470	0.256
Error	7365.508	108	68.199	

Table 11. Analysis of Covariance for Letter (Name) Writing

S.S.	<u>df</u>	MS	F
38.889	2	19.444	0.466
126.554	3	42.185	1.011
195.573	6	32.595	0.781
4507.191	108	41.733	
	38.889 126.554 195.573	38.889 2 126.554 3 195.573 6	38.889 2 19.444 126.554 3 42.185 195.573 6 32.595

As indicated in Tables 8-11, there was no statistical significant difference in achievement on reading subskills by motivational style or incentive delivery systems. There was no interaction effect.

The fourth question was:

Is there a statistical significant difference between ethnic groups and the incentive delivery system on reading readiness achievement?

The analysis of covariance was used with the <u>Clymer-Barrett</u>

<u>Pre-Reading Battery Visual Discrimination Sub-Test</u> as the dependent variable and the <u>Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test</u> Form B as the covariate and is shown in Table 12.



Table 12. Analysis of Covariance for Clymer-Barrett
Pre-Reading Battery Visual Discrimination Sub-Test

Source	s.s.	a e	MS	F
Ethnic Groups	76.794	1	15.794	0.768
Incenti.e Groups	1269.868	3	423.239	4.232**
E.G. x I.G.	337.966	3	112.655	0.342
Error	11201.939	112	100.017	

Table 12 above indicates no statistical significant difference by ethnic groups but does show a statistical significant difference by incentive groups. There was no interaction effect. To locate the difference noted, the Scheffé "a posteriori" method was used and is presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Battery Visual Discrimination Test by Incentive Groups by the Scheffé Method

Incentive Groups	Incentive Group Favored	F
Ch-Parent - Parent	Ch-Parent	0.154
Ch-Parent - Child	Ch	0.653
Ch-Parent - None	None	7.158
Parent - Ch	Ch	1.542
Parent - None	None	10.379*
None - Ch	None	3.551



Table 13 indicates a statistical significant difference in favor of the no-incentive group over the parent incentive group. The no-incentive group had a higher adjusted mean than any other group. There were no other statistical differences located.

The analysis for the <u>Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Battery</u>

<u>Auditory Discrimination Sub-Test</u> was conducted with this test as the dependent variable and the <u>Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test</u>,

Form B as the covariate and is presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Analysis of Covariance for Clymer-Barrett
Pre-Reading Battery, Auditory Discrimination Sub-Test

					
Source	s.s.	df	MS	F	
Ethnic Groups	32.540	1	32.540	0.364	
Incentive Groups	591.764	3	197.255	2.204	
E.G. x I.G.	379.849	3	126.616	1.415	
Error	10022.955	112	89.491	`	
				· N	

Considering ethnic groups versus incentive delivery without motivational style, there was no significant difference by ethnic groups, incentive groups, nor was there an interaction effect.

The fifth question was:

Is there a statistical significant difference between ethnic groups and the incentive delivery system on reading readiness subskill achievement?

The reading subskills investigated were matching letters, letter recognition, letter names, and letter writing. In each analysis, the pre-test score for that skill served as the covariate



and the post-test score for each skill was the dependent variable in an analysis of covariance. The analysis for matching letters is presented in Table 15 below.

Table 15. Analysis of Covariance for Matching Letters

<u> </u>	df	MS	<u> </u>
11.761	1	11.761	4.945*
6.120	3	2.040	0.858
4.315	3	1.438	0.605
226.364	112	2.378	
	11.761 6.120 4.315	11.761 1 6.120 3 4.315 3	11.761 1 11.761 6.120 3 2.040 4.315 3 1.438

As indicated in Table 15, there was a statistical significant difference by ethnic groups. There was no statistical significant difference by incentive system nor was there an interaction effect.

To locate the differences noted, the Scheffe "a posteriori" method was utilized with adjusted means. The critical ratio for the .01 level of confidence was 6.84, the Scheffé comparison indicated an F of 6.907. This is statistically significant at the .01 level in favor of the non-Anglo ethnic group. The analysis for letter recognition is presented in Table 16 which appears on the following page.

There was no statistical significant difference by ethnic group or by incentive groups nor was there an interaction effect. The analysis of covariance for letter names is shown in Table 17 which is also on the following page.

Table 16. Analysis of Covariance for Letter Skills

				
Source	S.S.	df	MS	F
Ethnic Groups	101.610	1	101.610	1.600
Incentive Groups	101.165	3	33.722	0.531
E.G. x I.G.	228.174	3	76.058	1.197
Error	7113.618	112	63.514	

Table 17. Analysis of Covariance for Letter Name Skills

S.S.	df	M.S.	F
2.260	1	2.260	0.099
313,466	3	104.489	4.592**
157.712	3	52.571	2.310
2548.689	112	22.756	
	2.260 313.466 157.712	2.260 1 313.466 3 157.712 3	2.260 1 2.260 313.466 3 104.489 157.712 3 52.571

**p <.01

Although there was no statistical significant difference between ethnic groups, and no interaction effect, the above table indicates a statistical significant difference between incentive groups at the .01 level. Since a significant difference was noted between the four incentive groups, the Scheffé "a posteriori" comparison method was utilized to determine where the difference was located. This analysis is presented in Table 18 which is on the following page.



Table 18. A Comparison of Letter Names Skills by Schools by the Scheffe Method

Incentive Groups	Incentive Group Favored	F
Ch-Parent - Parent	Parent	8.358*
Ch-Parent - Child	Child	16.182**
Ch-Parent - None	None	0.444
Parent - Child	Child	1.304
Parent - Child	Parent	6.743
None - Child	Child	15.115**
*P<.05 **P<.01		

As shown in Table 18 above, the child incentive group showed a statistical significant difference over all incentive groups except the parent only group. The parent only group scored significantly better than the child and parent group.

The analysis of covariance for letter writing skills is illustrated in Table 19.

Table 19. Analysis of Covariance for Letter Name Writing Skills

s.s.	df	MS	F
100.419	1	100.419	2.340
63.298	3	21.099	0.492
9.519	3	3.173	0.074
4807.156	112	42.921	
	100.419 63.298 9.519	100.419 1 63.298 3 9.519 3	100.419 1 100.419 63.298 3 21.099 9.519 3 3.173



In this analysis there was no statistical difference located, and there was no interaction effect.

The sixth question was:

Is there a statistical significant difference with parental attendance behavior between those receiving incentives and those not receiving incentives?

Table 20 illustrates the attendance pattern of parents, and the number of times parents attended the training sessions by incentive system.

Table 20. Parent Attendance by Incentive System

	Incentive Systems							
Days Attended	Parent/Child	Parent	Child	None				
0-3	1	3	10	12				
4-6	1	2	4	5				
7-9	0	0	3	4				
10-13	2	2	0	4				
14-17	0	2	3	1				
18-21	0.5	3	0	2				
22-25	. 0	3	0	2				
26-29	2	3	1	0				
30-32	0	1	0	1				
TOTAL	6	19	21	31				



In order to evaluate the significance by incentive groups and parental attendance, the following formula by Garrett (17) was used:

$$SE\% = \frac{PQ}{N}$$

P = the percent occurrence of the observed behavior;

Q = (1-P), and N is the size of the sample.

The procedure used in testing the difference of the two groups was to consider P^1 and P^2 as being independent determinations of the common population parameter, P^1 and to estimate P by probing P^1 and P^2 with the pooled estimate of P being obtained from the following equation:

$$P = \frac{N^1 + N^2 + P^2}{N^1 + N^2}$$

In computing the participation percentage of the parent incentive groups with the percentage of participation of the non-parental incentive groups, the critical ratio of 5.087 was obtained. The T Table indicates that the CR at the .05 level and .01 level is 2.00 and 2.38 respectively. This indicates that there was statistically significantly greater parental participation at incentive sites than at non-incentive sites. Table 21, on the following page, indicates a breakdown of attendance by parents by incentive systems.



Table 21. Parental Attendance by Incentive System

Incentive System	Parents Able To Attend	Possible Days	Attendance	Avg. Attendance By Percent
Child/Parent	6	32	81	42%
Parent	19	32	311	51%
Child	23	32	165	22%
None	31	32	255	25%

Parental attitude concerning various factors of the study was also investigated. In an effort to arrive at a consensus of opinion the Leik (28) procedure was utilized for each incentive system.

Complete copies of the questionnaires can be found in Appendix G.

The results of the questions common to all questionnaires are presented in Table 22 which appears on the following page.

Table 22. Consensus of Parental Opinion by Incentive System

QUESTIONS		INCENTI	VE SYSTEM	
	Parent/Child	Parent	Child	None
1	.75	.83	1.00	.71
2	1.00	.75	no response	.59
3	.93	.93	.88	. 83
4	.75	.60	.79	.60
5	.80	.39	.93	.63
6	.80	.42	. 85	.76
7	.67	.78	.81	.65
8	.73	.84	.57	.76
9	.87	.88	.63	.51
10	.77	.92	.82	.53
11	.75	.82	.81	.61
12	.80	.77	.62	.55
13	.61	.86	-28	.44
14	.33	.45	~ ~	
15	.68	~ ~		
16	.60	** **	.48	
17	.78	.88	- 64	.54
18	.93	.98	.92	.70
19	.50	.52	.62	.53
20	.20	1.00	.90	.74

An index of consensus of .50 and above will be considered a consensus of opinion for each parental group; an index of .40 to .50 will be considered a moderate consensus; and an index below .40 will be considered a low consensus of opinion. A blank slot in Table 22 indicates that the questions were not asked of that group. Based upon these judgments, the consensus indicates that parents feel that ---

- --- the training sessions by the psychologist were helpful in aiding their understanding of early childhood problems and the importance of communication.
- --- the training in health and diet practices was helpful.
 - --- the reading skill games were helpful in aiding their child to gain the necessary pre-reading skills.
 - --- the training with the pre-reading games helped in their understanding of the skills necessary to prepare for formalized reading.
 - --- the work in the classroom gave them a better understanding of classroom and school practices. The parent only incentive group had a consensus index of .39 even though 13 parents indicated it helped very much, and 5 parents indicated not at all.
 - --- the participation in classroom procedures with the teacher present resulted in their feeling more comfortable with the teacher and teachers in general.
 - --- the use of bi-lingual aides was helpful in enhancing the effectiveness of the program.
 - --- they would attend a similar type program if it were offered again.
 - --- this type of program should be repeated and expanded to include more parents over a greater length of time.
 - --- the program helped their children in school as compared to the gain they would have made without this program.



- --- philosophically, they favor the use of incentives for children.
- --- philosophically, they favor the use of incentives for parents with the exception of the child incentives only school where the index of consensus was .28.
- at the two incentives sites, the parent incentive group indicated that incentives were effective in helping parents attend regularly, although the index of consensus at the child/parent incentive site was .33.
- --- incentives were effective in helping their children in school at the parent-child incentive sites. This question was not asked at the other sites.
- --- they use the incentive idea with their children at home.
- --- they would like to be involved in a program of this type that followed their children's progress throughout the primary grades.
- --- the meeting place for parent training (at the school) was appropriate.
- --- the time of day met with their approval.
- transportation was not a problem. The child/parent incentive site had an index of consensus of .20. Out of five parents who responded, two indicated it was a problem (great extent), and one stated it was quite a problem while two indicated it was no problem at all.

RETENTION ANALYSIS

The seventh question was:

Is there a statistical significant difference on the retention of reading skills between the four groups of low socio-economic level children and four groups of middle socio-economic level children after a three months' lapse of time?

The <u>Murphy-Durrell Reading Readiness Analysis</u> was the instrument utilized to assess the retention aspect of the study. Four non-Title I schools were randomly selected from a pool of 16 schools to compare with the four Title I schools involved in the study. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted between the two groups of schools and is presented in Table 23.

Table 23. Analysis of Variance for Murphy-Durrell Reading Readiness Analysis

Source	df	MS	F
Schools	231	521.024	
Groups	1	158.897	0.304
Error	230	522.600	

As illustrated above, there was no statistical significant difference between the two groups of schools. In an effort to determine if any of the experimental schools performed better than any of the control schools, an analysis of variance was conducted with the same test by individual school. This analysis is presented in Table 24 on the following page.



Table 24. Analysis of Variance for Murphy-Durrell Reading Readiness Analysis by Individual School

Source	df	MS	F
Schools	231	521.024	٠.
Ind. Schools	7	2401.655	5.196*
Error	224	462.255	

There was a statistical significant difference between the schools. To locate the differences, the Scheffé "a posteriori" was conducted, and the results are presented in Table 25.

Table 25. Individual Schools by the Scheffé Method

School	School Favored	F
Franklin-Irving	Irving	6.548
Franklin-Lehi	Lehi	11.242
Franklin-Lincoln	Franklin	2.221
Franklin-Hale	Hale	7.287
Franklin-Webster	Webster	2.60
Franklin-Holmes	Ho1mes	0.351
Franklin-Whittier	Whittier	0.476
Irving-Lehi	Lehi	0.630
Irving-Lincoln	Irving	16.395*
Irving-Hale	Hale	0.020
Irving-Webster	Irving	0.896



Table 25. Individual Schools by the Scheffé Method (cont'd)

School	School Favored	F
Irving-Holmes	frving	3.876
Irving-Whittier	Irving	3.493
Lehi-Lincoln	Lehi	23.455**
Lehi-Hale	Lehi	0.427
Lehi-Webster	Lehi	3.030
Lehi-Holmes	Lehi	7.620
Lehi-Whittier	Lehi	7.090
Lincoln-Hale	Hale	17.552*
Lincoln-Webster	Webster	9.625
Lincoln-Holmes	Holmes	4.337
Lincoln-Whittier	Whittier	4.754
Hale-Webster	Hale	1.182
Hale-Holmes	Hale	4.439
Hale-Whittier	Hale	4.037
Webster-Holmes	Webster	1.040
Webster-Whittier	Webster	0.850
Holmes-Whittier	Whittier	0.010

^{*}P < .05 (CR 14.35) **P < .01 (CR 19.11)

The results by school indicate that of the four original Title I schools involved, Irving, Lehi, and Franklin Schools had higher mean scores than did Lincoln School. Irving and Lehi Schools had statistical significant differences, .05 and .01



respectively, better than Lincoln School. All four non-Title I schools had higher mean scores than Lincoln School with Hale School having a statistical difference at the .05 level.

Compared to past performance of the four Title I schools, the percentage of students entering first grade ready to read (Quartile A and B¹ on <u>Murphy-Durrell Reading Readiness Analysis</u> <u>Test</u>) was dramatically reversed for Irving and Lehi Schools. The past (1970 and 1971) and present (1972) results are presented in Table 26.

Table 26. Percentage Comparisons of Past and Present Students Ready to Begin a Formalized Reading Program

Schools	Past Performance	Present Performance
Franklin	37%	35%
Irving	18%	91%
Lehi	29%	87%
Lincoln	36%	40%
DISTRICT	49%	74%

The above table indicates that Irving and Lehi achieved higher than the district average even though they were considerably lower in the past. Franklin and Lincoln Schools did not perform equal to district scores.

RESULTS

The objectives of the study sought information relevant to seven questions. The data analysis indicated the following results for each question.

1. Is there a statistical significant difference in intelligence scores as related to the motivational style of the subjects and the incentive delivery system?

When pre-test intelligence scores are held constant, there was an interaction effect. There was no located statistical significant difference between motivational style and incentive system on the improvement of intelligence scores. The no-incentive group had a higher mean score than the other incentive groups, and the mixed motivational group had a higher mean score than the intrinsically or extrinsically motivated groups.

2. Is there a statistical significant difference between motivational style and the incentive delivery system on reading readiness achievement?

There was a statistical significant difference between incentive systems but no significant difference between motivational style on the improvement of reading readiness skills.

The parent and the child incentive groups performed statistically better than the other incentive systems on the visual discrimination test. The child incentive group had a higher mean



than the other groups.

The child and the no-incentive group performed statistically better than the other incentive groups on the auditory discrimination test. Once again, the child incentive group had a higher mean score than the other groups.

3. Is there a statistical significant difference between motivational style and the incentive delivery system on reading readiness subskill achievement?

There was no statistical significant difference between between motivational styles and incentive systems on the reading readiness subskills.

4. Is there a statistical significant difference between ethnic groups and the incentive delivery system on reading readiness achievement?

When ethnic groups are utilized, the no-incentive group performed statistically better than the parent incentive groups on the visual discrimination test. There was no statistical significant difference on the auditory discrimination test by ethnic group or by incentive system.

5. Is there a statistical significant difference between ethnic groups and the incentive delivery system on reading readiness subskill achievement?

There was a statistical significant difference between ethnic groups on the matching letters subtest. The non-Anglo group performed statistically better than the Anglo group.



There was no statistical significant difference between ethnic groups or incentive systems on the letter recognition test or on the letter writing test.

On the letter naming test, the child incentive group performed statistically better than the child/parent and the no-incentive group. The parent group did significantly better than the child/parent group.

6. Is there a statistical significant difference with parental attendance behavior between those receiving incentives and those not receiving incentives?

There was a statistical significant difference between parents who did receive incentives and those that did nont.

The parent group receiving incentives attended training sessions a greater number of times than those parents who did not receive incentives.

7. Is there a statistical significant difference on the retention of reading skills between the four groups of low socio-economic level children and four groups of middle socio-economic level children after a three months' lapse of time?

There was no statistical significant difference between the four experimental Title I schools and the four non-Title I schools on the end-of-year reading readiness test.



CONCLUSIONS

Within the limitations of the study and based upon the validity and reliability of the instruments utilized, the data appears to support the following conclusions:

- 1. There was no identified statistical significant difference on the improvement of intelligence scores regardless of the child's motivational style or the incentive system utilized.
- 2. When intelligence is held constant, there was a statistical significant difference by incentive system on the Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Battery (short form). The parent and the child incentive groups performed significantly better than the child/parent incentive groups on the visual discrimination test. On the auditory discrimination test, the child and the no-incentive group performed significantly better than the parent group. There was no statistical significant difference by motivational style.
- 3. When intelligence is held constant, there was no statistical significant difference between incentive systems or motivational style groups on the



informal reading readiness subskill tests.

- 4. There was no statistical significant difference between ethnic groups when intelligence is held constant on the Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Battery (short form). There was a statistical significant difference by incentive systems on the visual discrimination subtest. The noincentive group performed significantly better than the parent incentive group. There was no statistical difference between incentive groups on the auditory discrimination test.
- a statistical significant difference between ethnic groups on the informal reading readiness subskill test of matching letters. The non-Anglo group performed significantly better than the Anglo group. There was no other statistical difference between ethnic groups on the subskill tests. There was a statistical significant difference by incentive groups on the letter naming subskill test. The child incentive group performed significantly better than the child/parent and the no-incentive groups. The parent incentive



. .

group performed statistically better than the child/parent incentive group.

- 6. The parent group receiving incentives demonstrated greater attendance behavior (.01) than those parents who did not receive incentives.
- 7. There was no statistical significant difference between the four represented Title I Schools and the four non-Title I Schools on the Murphy-Durrell Reading Readiness Analysis Test.

DISCUSSION

Caution must be exercised in the interpretation of this data for two main reasons:

- 1) The parents at the parent/child incentive site numbered only two. On the visual discrimination subtest of the Clymer-Barrett Pre-Reading Battery, two groups had significant results superior to the parent/child group. Not only were there only two parents involved, but not the same two parents attended each session.
- 2) The <u>Haywood Picture Motivation Scale Test</u> is new and has not had the extensive exposure to researchers as have published standardized tests.



The fact that the child incentive groups had significant difference between each other, and that there was no statistical significant difference between child incentive groups and the non-incentive groups tends to make the notion that incentives is not the critical variable to improve achievement. Likewise, motivational style did not affect achievement on any measure as shown by the Haywood Picture Maria tion Scale Test. The only analysis that had an interaction fract was concerning the improvement of intelligence scores. In this analysis, the mixed motivational style group had a higher mean score than the intrinsic or extrinsic motivated groups.

The significant aspect of the study is that low socio-economic level children can learn the crimical readiness skills as well as their middle socio-economic level punterparts, and material incentives are not needed to accomplish the task. This is supported by the fact that there was no starillal significant difference in achievement between the four Title I schools and the four non-Title I schools. Historically, the Title I schools included in the study scored the lowest on the Murphy-Durrell Reading Readiness Analysis Test of the twenty schools in the district. The fact that two Title I schools reversed the ready/not ready to read percentage is historical in this community.

The suspected reason the two other Title I schools did not achieve similar dramatic results is twofold:



- At one site the teachers involved were more socially oriented than being concerned with reading readiness skills.
- 2) The remaining site had a new inexperienced teacher who was preoccupied with just operating a classroom. At both sites, the teachers are now following the program plan for the study. This change in teacher behavior can be attributed to this study.

An interesting finding was that the schools with the greatest achievement had more parental participation. Incentives did make a difference on the attendance pattern of parents. Initially, there was no attendance pattern difference between the four schools. As the project progressed, the parent incentive groups maintained their involvement but the non-parent incentive groups decreased in attendance behavior. The incentive probably influenced parents to prioritize their time as they were more consistent in their attendance than the non-incentive parents.

In summary, parental incentives are effective to maintain attendance at training sessions. Material type child incentives are apparently not needed to accelerate the achievement of low socio-economic level children. Assessing motivational style had no significant effect on achievement but could be important information for teacher classroom management techniques. The most significant factor continues to be the teacher-pupil relationship and teacher competencies. The implication is by assuring teacher



Additional research into this area would be more critical than other incentives projects on the acquisition of reading readiness skills of disadvantaged children.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 1. Barnard, D.P., et.al. "Project Directors' Perception of 'Incentives Only' Project" U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, OEO Pamphlet 3400-7, Washington, D.C., February, 1972.
- Barnard, Douglas P. "The Effect of Incentives on Achievement and Behavior of Disadvantaged Students." A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 4, 1972.
- 3. Battelle Columbus Laboratories. "The Office of Economic Opportunity Experiment in Educational Performance Contracting: The Incentive Only Sites." Research Report, February 7, 1972.
- 4. Bushell, D. Jr., Wrobel, P.D., and Michaelis, M.L. "Applying 'Group' Contingencies to the Classroom Study Behaviors of Preschool Children." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1:55-61.
- 5. Chadwick, B.A. and Day, R.C. "Systematic Reinforcement:
 Academic Performance of Mexican American and Black
 Students." Unpublished manuscript, Washington University, 1970.
- 6. Clark, C.A. and Walberg, H.J. "The Use of Secondary Reinforcement in Teaching Inner-City Children." Journal of Special Education, 1939, 3:177-185.
- 7. Clark, K.B., A Design for the Attainment of High Academic Achievement for the Students of the Public Elementary and Junior High Schools of Washington, D.C. New York:

 Netropolitan Applied Research Center, 1970.
- 8. Crow, L.D., et. al. Educating the Culturally Disadvantaged Child. New York: David McKay, 1966.
- 9. Davidoff, S.H. "The Development of an Instrument Designed to Secure Student Assessment of Teaching Behaviors That Correlate with Objective Measures of Student Achievement." ERIC Document ED039170, March, 1970.
- 10. Deutsch, Martin. "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process." Edited by A.H. Passow. Education in Depressed Areas. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1903, 163-180.



- 11. Durrell, Donald D. Improving Reading Instruction, New York:
 Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc. 1956.
- 12. Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. Second Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966, 296.
- 13. Fox, Karen F. and Jung, Steven M. "A Pilot Study of the Use of Incentives to Enhance School Learning." American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, California. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago, Illinois. April 4, 1972.
- 14. Fraze, L. "Questions as Aids to Reading: Some Research and Theory." American Educational Research Journal, 1968, 5:319-332.
- 15. Fusco, G.C. School-Home Partnership in Depressed Urban Neighborhoods, Office of Education, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1964.
- 16. Fygetakis, L. and Gray, B.B. "Programmed Conditioning of Linguistic Competence." <u>Behavioral Research and Therapy</u>. Pergaman Press, England. 1970, 8:153-163.
- 17. Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education.
 David McKay Co. Inc., New York, 1964, 235.
- 18. Getzels, Jacob W. "Pre-School Education" in Contemporary

 Issues in American Education: Washington, D.C. U.S.

 Government Printing Office, 1965, 108-109.
- 19. Gordon, I.J. "Early Child Stimulation Through Parent Education", Children's Bureau Final Report. Gainsville, Florida: Institute for Development of Human Resources, 1969.
- 20. Gray, Susan and Klaus, R. "An Experimental Preschool Program for Culturally Deprived Children." Child Development, 1965, 36:387-798.
- 21. Hart, B.M. and Risley, T.R. "Establishing Use of Descriptive Adjectives in the Spontaneous Speech of Disadvantaged Preschool Children." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1:;09-120.
- 22. Haywood, George. Quoted in Report on Education Research, Bi-weekly newsletter devoted to basic and applied

- research in education. Washington, D.C.: Capitol Publication, October, 1970, 6-8.
- 23. Haywood, Nancy. <u>Haywood Motivational Scale</u>. George Peabody College, Nashville, Tenn. 1971.
- 24. Heitzman, A.J. "Effects of a Token Reinforcement System on the Reading and Arithmetic Skill Learnings of Migrant Primary School Pupils." Journal of Educational Research, 1970, 10:455-458.
- 25. Karnes, M. "A Research Program to Determine the Effects of Various Preschool Intervention Programs on the Development of Disadvantaged Children and the Strategic Age for Such Intervention." Paper presented at the convention of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, illinois, 1968.
- 26. Karnes, M.B., et.al. "An Approach for Working with Mothers of Disadvantaged Preschool Children." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1968, 14:174-184.
- 27. Kennedy, W.A. and Willcutt, H.C.: Praise and Blame as Incentives." Psychological Bulletin, 1964, 62:323-332.
- 28. Leik, Robert K. "A Measure of Ordinal Consensus." Pacific Sociological Review, 1966, 9:85-90.
- 29. Levenstein, P. "Cognitive Growth in Preschoolers Through Stimulation of Verbal Interaction with Mothers." A Paper presented at the 46th Annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, New York, April, 1969.
- 30. Mann, M. "The Effects of a Language Program on Two Year Old Children and Their Mothers." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona. February, 1971.
- 31. Marshall, H.H. "Learning as a Function of Task Interest, Reinforcement, and Social Class Variables." <u>Journal of Educational Psychology</u>, 1969, 60:133-137.
- 32. McMains, M.J. "Children's Adoption of Self-rewarding Pattern: Verbalization and Modeling." <u>Perceptual and Motor Skills</u>, 1969, 28. 515-518.
- 33. Meacham, M.L. and Wiesen, A.E. Changing Classroom Behavior:

 A Manual for Precision Teaching. Scranton, Penn: International Textbook Co., 1969.



- 34. Meyerson, D. "Learning Intervention Systems Documentation of Educational Programs Utilizing Incentives to Students." U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Report, Unpublished, 1972.
- 35. Murphy, H.A. and Durrell, D.D. <u>Letters In Words</u>. Mass: Curriculumn Associates, 1970.
- 36. Niedermeyer, F.C. Parent-Assisted Learning. Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Inglewood, California, 1970.
- 37. Ohran, Shije and Radin, Norma. "Teaching Mothers to Teach:
 A Home Counseling Program for Low-Income Parents." Family Coordinator. In Press.
- 38. O'Leary, K.D., Becker, W.C., Evans, M.B. and Saudargas, R. A. "A Token Reinforcement Program in a Public School: A Replication and Systematic Analysis." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1969, 2:3-13.
- 39. Packard, R.G. "The Control of Classroom Attention: A Group Contingency for Complex Behavior." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1970, 3:13-28.
- 40. Painter, Genevieve. <u>Infant Education</u>, San Rafael, California: Dimensions Publishing Co., 1968.
- 41. Risley, T.R. and Hart, B. "Developing Correspondence Between the Non-Verbal and Verbal Behavior of Pre-School Children. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1963, 1: 267-281.
- 42. Schaefer, E.S. "Need for Early and Continuing Education,"
 A Paper presented at the 136th meeting of the American
 Association for the Advancement of Science, Chevy Chase,
 Maryland, December, 1969.
- 43. Schmidt, G.W. and Ulrich, '.E. "Effects of Group Contingent Events Upon classrom Noise." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1969, 2:171-179.
- 44. Schutz, R.E. and Baker, R.L. "The Experimental Analysis of Behavior in Educational Research." Psychology in the Schools, 1968, 5:240-256.
- 45. Schwitzebel, R.L. "Behavior Instrumentation and Social Technology." American Psychologist, 1970, 25:491-499.

- 46. Sidman, M. Tactics of Scientific Research. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.
- 47. Singell, L.D. and Yorder, W.J. "To Develop Alternative Incentive Model for Education Based on (but not restricted to) the Colorado Experiment in Λccreditation of School Districts by Contract." Final Report, Sept., 1970, New York University, Contract No. HEW-05-69-94.
- 48. Skinner, B.F. "The Design of Cultures." In R. Ulrich, T. Stachnik, and J. Mabry (Eds.) Control of Human Behavior. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1966.
- 49. Spence, J.T. A Study of Certain Factors Affecting Children's School Performance. ERIC Document ED011086, 1966.
- 50. Staats, A.W., Finley, J.R., Minke, K.A. and Wolf, M.
 "Reinforcement Variables in the Control of Unit Reading
 Responses." Journal of the Experimental Analysis of
 Behavior, 1964, 1:139-149.
- 51. Stuart, R.B. "Behavioral Contracting Within the Families of Delinquents." Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Miami, Sept, 1970.
- 52. Surratt, P.R., Ulrich, R.E. and Hawkins, R.P. "An Elementary Student as a Behavioral Engineer." Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1969, 2:85-92.
- 53. Unikel, I.P., Strain, G.S. and Adams, H.E. "Learning of Lower Socio-Economic Status Children as a Function of Social and Tangible Reward." <u>Developmental Psychology</u>, 1969, 1:553-555.
- 54. Weikart, D.P. "Preschool Programs: Preliminary Findings."

 Journal of Special Education, 1967, 2:163-181.
- 55. White, Emerson E. Elements of Pedagogy, Cincinnati, Van Antwery, Bragg and Co. 1886, 320-324.
- 56. Wolfe, M.M., Giles, D.K. and Hall, R.V. "Experiments with Token Reinforcement in a Remedial Classroom." Behavior Research and Therapy, 1968, 6:51-64.



APPENDIX A

INDIVIDUAL TEST SCORES BY SCHOOLS

```
06 03 1 081 065 0n 12 no 39 2 65 no 52 n5 n8 14
   BOTII 02
                                                              21 16 31 2
  CISNA 02
              06, 03 1 081 085 00 10 00 31 2 64 00 49 02 03 17
  GUTIN 01
              96 03 1 081 067 10 18 12 23 2 64 10 51 02 07 19 23 08
  "CO" CMMAH
              06 04 1 103 104 00 31 00 16 7 61 00 51 09 16 38 32
              06 02 1 100 091 nn 47 nn 31 2 34 nn 52 15 30 46 48 36
   SUGAD 02
   ALLER 02
                   2 127 112 47 49 09 52 2 61 47 52 43 47 52
              06 04 2 116 115 52 52 19 52 2 64 52 52 52 52
  CARSJ C2
                                                           52
                                                              52 52
                                                                    52 2
  COXET 02
              06 04
                   2 139 110 49 51 20 47 2 67 49 48 47 52
                                                           52 52 52
                                                                    52
  DIKEKTOI
              06 04 2 101 112 00 40 00 42 2 61 00 52 13 19
  EDGEY 01
              06 04 2 089 108 16 42 15 36 2 62
                                              16 52 06 09
                                                          34
                                                              28 10
  HARPA 01
              06 04 2 125 102 19 33 12 52 2 64 19 52 10 24
                                                          32
                                                                18
                                                                    39 2
                     096 097 00 19 00 26 2 59 00 47 01 03 24
  HILDC OI
             06 04
                   2
                                                                    27 2
  LIGHM 02
             06 04 2 078 095 27 52 07 52 2 59 27 51 42 49 52 52
KITCH NZ
             06 04 2 067 089 00009 000 18 2 68 00 49 00 01 30 30 00
  MLYEM 172
             06-04-2-120-091-00
                                31 00 16 2 62 00 48 00 10 25 29 10
  MYERC 02
             06"04 2 107 138 39 51 15"49"2 67 39"52"41"48 52"
-- RODRV OI
             06 03 2 091 087 00 33 00 44 2 72 00 52 11 14 29 34 24 36 2
  SHAHK 01
             06 04 2 095 106 28
                                51 16 42 2 68 28 52 24 28 47 49 40
  TRULA 02
             06 04 2 063 080 00 42 00 31 2 66 00 52 09 18 33 44 10 40 2
  TRULS 02
             06 04 2 090 088 00 40 00 13 2 59 00 51 07 15 32 41 16
             06 04 3 097 104 40 52 12 44 2 68 40 52 45 52 52 52
  TOWAK (1)
FLFTJ 07
             06 04 3 101 117 46 51 16 42 2 59 46 52 50 50 50 57 50 52
                                                                    52 1
 TOBRIJET
             06-04-3-100-116-00-46-00-36-2-60-00-52-09-25-43-52-22-34-1
SCHWR 02
             06 04 3 109 112 15 12 13 26 2 67 15 51 08 10 19 21 03 14 7
---ARMEJ 02
             07 03 1 116 101 00 49 00 10 1 60 00 51 15 36 45 51 36 52 2
- ARVIV 01
             07 03 1 105 087 00 30 00 26 1 64 00 51 14 20 33 43 16 28 1
             07 04 1 089 097 00 28 00 34 1 57 00 49 06 07 25 34 12 78 7
  IN CAMPS
CFRYD-07
             07 03 1 073 102 10 49 11 31 1 67 10 52 17 28 50 51 38 48 1
FFL 10 n2
            77 03 1 096 097 33 57 07 79 1 63 33 57 49 52 52 52 48 52 T
FIGUR OI
             07 03 1 061 102 00 52 00 31 1 61 00 52 41 49 52 52 52 52 1
GARCR-02
             07 03 1 056 097 00 49 00 23 1 60 00 52 02 21 44 52 26 38 1
HARRP 02
             07 04 1 120 123 46 52 12 47 1 59 46 52 45 50 52 52 44 46 1
             07 04 1 116 119 45 52 09 44 1 59 45 52 42 49 52 52 44 52 1
  TUNTS 02
             07-04-1-107-121-21-51-00-52-1-57-21-52-42-42-51-50-32-46-2
  MURRH-01
PRATOTOS
             07 04 1 112 116 00 52 00 36 1 58 00 52 25 41 51 52 44 52 1
 RAYLK OT
             07 04 1 121 134 47 47 16 47 1 66 47 52 40 43 52 52 52 52 1
ARRID 01
             07 03 2 089 074 no 46 00 31 1 63 no 52 08 21 41 49 24 36 7
BRUMS-02
             07-04-2-098-082-00-36-00-18-1-64-00-51-09-13-33-40-18-34-2
             07 03 2 098 093 00 31 00 29 1 63 00 48 03 10 27 35 30 24 2
  GALVG OI
 ~GLASO~02~
             07 02 2 094 097 00 52 00 10 1 61 00 51 21 33 48 52 42 50 2
---GUTIJ-02
             07 03 2 083 100 00 49 00 34 1 64 00 52 09 37 51 52 52 50 1
             07 03 2 067 067 00 19 00 26 1 68 00 52 01 01 01 18 06 06 2
  MOREF~01
--- MUNOD-----1
             07 03 2 090 099 00 52 00 23 1 57 00 49 14 25 51 48 40 50 1
OROZL 01 07 03 2 096 108 00 28 00 42 1 59 00 52 10 08 32 35 16 22 1
           77 04 2 116 119 30 52 09 29 1 60 30 51 49 52 52 52 52 52 1
PIFRR 02
SAINC-01-07-03-2-059-078-00-42-00-16-1-58-00-49-02-08-28-48-24-16-2
 TORRK-01-07-03-2-111-119-49-52-40-49-3-65-49-52-45-51-52-52-48-52-1
WRENM 02 07 04 2 065 089 00 42 00 21 1 68 00 51 06 11 29 35 32 36 2
FLORC-01 07 03 3 105 087 43 52 04 21 1 65 43 52 33 52 52 52 50 52 2
HILLG 02 07 02 3 103 097 28 52 06 34 1 64 28 50 50 52 52 52 52 52 52
            07 02 3 068 090 00 14 00 26 1 58 00 51 05 14 20 26 10
  JONEA 02
FOXLT 01 08 04 1 098 095 31 51 12 39 3 62 31 52 33 43 52 51 46 52 1
- BURDC-01
           08 04 2 089 089 16 49 08 44 3 69 24 52 36 44 51 47 48 46 7
  REATA 02
             08 04 2 107 108 21 45 12 49 3 68 21 51 33 41 46 47 36 42 1
  BUTLM 01 - 08 02 2 101 112 15 48 31 76 7 61 15 52 09 18 39 49 52 43 2
 TDALLL 01 - 08 02 2 081 095 16 43 19 49 3 25 16 32 27 36 48 48 40 52 2
           V 08 04 2 101 112 39 52 11 49 3 58 39 48 40 45 51 52 52 52 1
  EWARL 01 108 04 2 107 127 33 39 15 52 3 58 33 51 43 52 45 51 42 52 1
  FRIEKTOIT
             08 04 2 099 108 50 52 09 49 3 66 50 52 52 49 52 52 48 52 1
             08 04 2 094 104 00 51 10 39 3 61 00 51 11 18 38 50 44 47 1
  HALEL 02
```

08 04 2 120 106 52 51 10 49 3 63 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52 52



TSAAH 01

```
08 04 2 111 125 49 52 02 42 3 57 49 52 48 52 42 52 50 52 1
  LANES 01
  MALAT 02
                04 2 103 127 30 40 08 49 3 62 30 50 50 36 47 52 44 51
  MARTR 02
             08 03 2 074 093 00 49 00 29 3 58 00 51 14 22
                                                           3.8 49 34 47
  RANDK
                   7 100 110 47 46 12 44
                                         3 67 47 49 49 49
        \mathbf{n}
             08-04-
                                                             57 46 49
                                                           52
  RAYJA
                04 2 101 085 20 31 13 23 3 68 20 50 08 12 23 43 06 44 1
        01
             0.8
             08 04 2 143 106 10 46 11 36 3 68 10 52
  RFFVC
        O ]
                                                    2]
                                                       34
                                                           45 46 42 48 1
  SHILD OF
                   2 097 102 45 51 10 49 3 67 45 52 41
                                                       57
                                                           52 51
  SHUMD 07
             08 04
                   2 114 112 39 49 11 52 3 62 39 52 52 52 48
                                                                 52 52
  STALT 02
                   2 081 119 18 39 09 44 3 67 18 67 18 40
                                                             73 36 46 1
  TATIAMETOT
             08 04 3 107 104 49 52 14 49 3 64 49 61 12 57 57 57
  ROYLL 01
             08 04
                   3 091 093 nn 45 nn 21 3 67 nn 43 55 78 39 46
                                                                 24 46 2
  ENDLR
        0.2
             08 04
                   3 115 097
                             28 36 08 26 3 68 28 $2
                                                    7.3 77
                                                           37
                                                                 42
  HFILC
       וח
             08 0413 099 123 10 5211574413766110149 26 47147752 3815272
  JONET 02
             08 0473 119 134 10 43 0075273767710748 117
                                                       27 44 46 16 46 1
  MCINA OT
             08 04 3 109 112 74 52 16 49 3 66 24 52 56 46 48 50 50 T
                     104 123 49 49 18 52 3 67 49 51 56 47
  MUS LW-U-L
                   4
             n8-04
                                                           57
                                                              57
                                                                 57
  PATTO OF
             08 04 3 118 117 26 52 13 49 3 64 76 52 70 39 49 51
  STURM 01
            108_04 3 117 085 09 45"10"44"3"67"09"52=16"33
                                                          46 51
             09 03 1 107 112 00 26 00 52 4 67 00 51 10 38
  CASTA 02
                                                          38 32
                                                                 24"26"2
  CLOUS 01
             09 04
                   1 099 121 50 47 20 52 4 67 50 52 44 52
                                                           52
                                                                 52
  COKEL 02
             09 04 1 111 106 14 26 16 39 4 74 14 50 45 42 30 31
  COREMICS
             09 03 1 105 090 00 31 00 16 4 61 00 47 07 40 33 35 06 16 1
----CURNA 02 --- 09 04 1 143 136 00 42 00 52 4 66 00 51 26 27 37 48 26 50 1
G000C 01 09 04 1 061 057 00 26 00 39 4 61 00 42 08 14 24 39 18 42 1
-- MCCLT 02 - 09-04-1 097 108 00-45-00-42-4-59-00-52-40-51-45-41-14-26-1
---NAVAD ::02----09-03-1:083:091-26-24-00-47-4-62-26-51-05-09-29-12-08-36-2-
- PALOJ NZ
             09 03 1 098 108 14 31 00 34 4 60 14 52 08 13 35 36 34 39 7
             09 04 1 118 125 52 52 14 49 4 61 52 52 52 52 52 52 42 50 1
-POLKG 02
--ULFRD 02-09-04-1-107-119-00-28-00-42-4-68-00-50-07-06-20-30-40-38-2-
--WFRRR-02---09-04-1-114-116-51-52-20-47-4-57-51-52-51-52-52-52-52-50-52-1
WOOLW 07 09 04 1 17 115 47 57 18 49 4 68 42 57 41 45 51 52 06 57 1
---WRIGM-02-
             09-04-1-077-086-00-16-00-26-4-72-00-50-07-11-25-26-26-36-2
---WRIGM-02-
             09-04-1-077-085-00-16-00-26-4-72-00-50-07-11-25-26-26-36-7
-CRANKOT
             09 04 2 116 108 49 52 10 52 4 62 49 52 52 52 52 52 50 52
CSADM-02
             09 04 2 107 115 00 33 00 23 4 61 00 45 03 12 26 34 30 38 7
  DELCM TOT
             09 03 2 087 091 26 52 18 47 4 68 26 52 39 52 52 52 50 49 1
  FLMEK-01
             09 04 2 094 110 19 50 00 34 4 61 19 50 30 41 50 50 36 50 7
FULAT 01
             09 03 2 111 123 28 49 11 52 4 67 28 52 29 49 52 52 52 52
  FLORP-02
             09 03 2 112 127 40 40 00 31 4 61 40 51 09 08 27 42 14 22
  TO LUGAD
             09 03 2 078 086 00 16 00 26 4 57 00 51 08 02 20 13 02 29 2
 HILLJ=0.1
             09 04 2 109 130 39 50 19 52 4 66 39 52 45 49 52 52 48 51
             09 04 2 118 121 43 51 00 52 4 64 43 51 37 44 50 52 30 38
 LARSV-02
 MARTS 01
             09 03 2 081 099 35 49 00 23 4 59 35 52 40 48 51 52 44 52 1
 PFROK-02
             09 04 2 118 115 00 51 00 49 4 63 00 52 39 17 42 42 48 52 2
 PHELM 02
             09 04 2 114 115 42 50 20 52 4 65 42 51 47 50 46 50 52 52
 POPEC 02
             09 04 2 116 115 28 47 19 44 4 61 28 49 39 36 50 47 36 42
 RICHO-02
             09 04 2 112 104 21 26 00 21 4 65 21 51 46 11 29 37 20 28 1
  TURLATO1
             09 04 2 111 123 27 51 12 42 4 58 27 51 25 36 49 49 42 51 2
 UNRUL 01
             09 04 2 089 099 28 46 19 49 4 59 78 50 26 76 43 47 40 48
 VITAC 01
             09 03 2 081 108 40 50 11 29 4 60 40 51 33 50 50 51 48 52
 WILLT 02
             09 04 2 103 112 51 57 10 39 4 59 51 51 50 52 52 52 52 50 52 1
 WINNG 02
             BFADAT 02
             09-04-3-109-106-22-37-13-42-4-6<del>5-22-5</del>2-42-43-37-42-26-28-2
 CONKJ-01
             09-04-3-105-104-50-52-00-52-4-61-50-52-51-52-52-52-52-52-2
  GIFFV-01
             09 04 3 109 091 18 45 07 42 4 61 18 51 27 46 51 52 44 47 2
 MCDOC OI
             PITTE-01
             09-04-3-142-108-42-46-00-42-4-61-42-52-31<del>-34-</del>49-51-4<del>0-38-2</del>
 RACKS OI
             09 04 3 103 101 00 47 00 36 4 59 00 49 14 19 52 51 16 39 1
 -RUTKM-01-
             09 04 3 111 103 47 52 0<del>6 34 4 59 47 52 52 52 52 52 48 5</del>2 1
 TIDWK-01-
             09 04 3 070 082 46 42 00 47 4 65 46 52 13 23 46 45 30 40 2
  TORRG 02
             09 03 3 105 110 37 51 14 52 4 68 37 52 49 52 52 52 36 50 2
```



APPENDIX B

A SYNOPSIS OF AIDE ACTIVITIES

AIDES HANDOUT

- I. SYNOPSIS OF THE STUDY: The present project intends to measure the effect of incentives on the acquisition of reading readiness skills that are normally taught to kindergarten children in Mesa Elementary schools.

 Incentives will also be offered to parents of these children to induce them to participate in and more fully understand the training being given to their children. The objectives of the study include:
 - A. To determine if preschool children are extrinsically motivated (EM) or intrinsically motivated (IM).
 - B. To determine if incentives are effective for the acquisition of reading readiness skills of children from minority backgrounds.
 - C. To determine if incentives given to parents are more effective than not on their attendance at parent training sessions.

II. SCHEDULE OF EVENTS - (General)

- A. First week (Sept. 7-10)
 - 1. Interviewing of parents
 - 2. Training in testing skills
- B. Second week
 - 1. Testing of children
 - 2. Training in skill areas
- C. Third week and thru project
 - 1. Parent training
 - 2. Parent interviews
 - 3. Work in the classroom

III. SCHEDULE OF EVENTS - (Specific)

- A. Parent interviews
 - 1. A questionnaire will be provided
 - 2. Initial interview
 - 3. One to one interviews each week after this



B. Parent Training

- Once a week aides will train parents in a group in the skill to be taught in the classroom the following week.
- 1. Once a week the aide will assist the parents in the classroom in teaching children the skill that is currently being worked on.
- 3. It will be the aides responsibility to handle parent problems in teaching skills, not the regular classroom teacher.

C. Aide Training

- Each week the aides will receive training in the skill to be taught to parents and children in the classroom.
- This training will be conducted by Dr. Douglas Barnard or another of the project's professional consultants.

3. TESTING:

- a. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
- b. Picture Motivation Scale (IM & EM)
- c. Clymer-Barrett Readiness Test
- d. Testing will be done at places provided by the schools.
- e. Any sign of child frustration or emotional upset noted while testing will immediately terminate the testing session.
- f. Approximately every four weeks re-testing and a new incentive system will be instituted.
- D. SCHOOLS The participating schools will be:
 - 1. Franklin Elementary School 245 East Main Street (962-7180)
 - 2. Lincoln Elementary School 930 South Sirrine (962-7271)
 - 3. Irving Elementary School 155 North Center (962-7671)
 - 4. Lehi Elementary School 2345 North Horne (962-7161)
- E. An aide will work at one of these four schools throughout the study in order to become most familiar with that school's personnel and method of mix operation.



F. Aides will be introduced to personnel they will be working with.

IV. GENERAL INFORMATION

- A. Aide pay will be \$2.00 per hour
- B. Aldes will work 6 hrs. a day, sive days a week.
- C. During school operation aldes mours will coincide basically with school hours.
- D. Aides will be reimbursed at the rate of 10¢ per mile for transportation in their cars directly connected with performance of their duties.



• • •

glas laaks Andaans Aasas akoka raa-markii raitakii mas

ERIC *

PAREMO QUESTICIMMERE

"Tacentives Only" Project

This questionnaire has been prepared to determine your likes and dislikes
in certain areas involved with the "Incentives Only" Project cerrently in
progress at your child's school. For the first two questions would you place
a number (1-4) in each of the blanks beside the questions showing your preference
for each choice. The numbers 1-4 correspond to the following preferences:
1 - Nould Take the year

- 2 Would like somewhat
- 3 Would not care

	4.		ntive for participating in the program	, I WO IS	uld t	liko Ind	:: 3r	ď	4 to	Ċ.
		(a)	Green Stamps				2		2	
		(ú)	lioney	8	: 2	2	2			
		(c)	Tickets to the movies for my child	. 3		}	. 2			
		(å)	Tickets to the zoo for my child	7	. ; 2	<u>)</u>		. :		
		(e)	Tickets to the movies for myself	2_	_:_2) :	1	:	1	
•	2.	,	Other (comment)	on of				: I··	Wou.	Lc
2nd 1 2	nra	While part fer to meet 1 4th (a)	icipating in the parent training porti At home with a group of other parents	on of the	the	ogra	ran, n.		wou!	ld
2nd 1 2	nra	While part fer to meet 1 4th (a)	icipating in the parent training porti	on of the	the	ogra	ran, n.		wou.	ld
1	nra	While part fer to meet 1 4th (a)	icipating in the parent training porti At home with a group of other parents At a central location in the neighbor	on of the	ich	prog	m.	οű		
1 ; 2 ; ; ;	 J 31.0 bro	Mile part	icipating in the parent training porti At home with a group of other parents At a central location in the neighbor other parents in the program. At the Center for Educational Advance	on of the in the hood wi	the project of the last of the	prog ogra a gr in S	m.	οΞ c,		



A Commence of the Commence of

In question 3, three the three days for parent participation in electrosm instruction (Londay, Mossley or Weinsteldy) in order of preference. Healer 1 being the most preferred day, I the next preferred, I the least preferred, the 4 if that day is not possible for attendance. 3. Of the days available for participating in classroom instruction (Honday, Tuesday and Wednesday) my order of profesence would be: Lat 2nd 3rd ____ (a) Monday _(b) Tuesday (c) Wednesday For the last rive questions simply place an X in the appropriate space. Parent training will occur approximately once a week. I will be available for this training: 0 (a) All the time 12 (b) Most of the time 😑 (c) Sometiues 1 (d) Very little (e) Nover 5. While participating in the parent training I would prefer to attend: 15 (a) In the morning 6 (b) In the afternoon Transportation: (a) I will have my own transportation (b) I will need to have transportation provided

7. Do you have TV in your home? 19 yes 3 no
8. Does your child watch "Sesame Screet"? 18 yes 4 no
Ethnic Group: White 7
Mexican 13
Negro 2

"Theentived Only" Project

This queuelonneire has been propared to desermine your likes and dislikes	
in al resin areas involved trich the "Theensives Only" Project currently in	
progress he your child's school. For the first two questions would you place	
a number (1-4) in each of the blanks beside the questions showing your preferen	ica
for each choice. The numbers 1-4 correspond to the following preferences:	

- 1 Mould like the most
- 2 Would like somewhat
- 3 Mould not care
- 4 Would like the least

(u)	ative for participating in the program, Green Stamps	1 .	17	21	2
(5)	Noney	8	8	23	2
(c)	Tickets to the movies for my child	_20_	9		2
(¿)	Tickets to the zoo for my child	32	4	, , 6	
(a)	Tickets to the movies for myself	3	9	20	7
(E)	Other (comment)	3	<u> </u>	1	. 3

				cipating in the parent training portion of the program, I would
st 2nd	3rd	4 SH		
_5	14	<u> </u>	_(a)	At home with a group of other parents in the program.
23	19		_(ઇ)	At a central location in the neighborhood with a group of other parents in the program.
- 23	<u>13.</u>	3	_(a)	At the Center for Educational Advancement on Main Street, Mosa.
42 2	.,		<u>(a)</u>	At my child's school with other parents in the program.
	3	3	(a)	At some other location. (Comment)



In speciology is, were this chief days for passive perclotyaction in elementoon in crucian (handay, Turnday or Madhanday) in order of preference. Mamber 1 baing the most prederred day, 2 the name preferred, 3 the least preferred, and 4 in this day to not possible for attendinger. 3. Of the days available for participating in elegation instruction (Monday, Tuesday and Meanesday) my order of preference would be: 16 4 24 ____(a) Nonday __ (b) Tuesday 13 | 18 12 ____ (c) iladnasday For the last five questions simply place on M in the appropriate space. 4. Perent training will occur approximately once a week. I will be available for this training: $_{\odot}$ $_{\odot}$ $_{\odot}$ $_{\odot}$ All the time 26 (b) Nost of the time 💆 _ (c) Somerinies _ = _(<) Very little <u>l</u> (e) Nover 5. While perticipating in the parent training I would prefer to attend: 23(z) In the morning 2+ (b) In the afternoon 6. Transportation: ___(a) I will have my own transportation (b) I will need to have transportation provided 7. Do you have TV in your home? 44 yes l no - 8. Does your child watch "Sesame Street"? 38 yes 7 no Ethnic Groups: White

> Mexican Negro

Mineschaller (n.i.) Medageer

ticle que blesculte has neux prepared es queenche yeur libbet est albittes
la Carralin arvau davohvād much alie minnentāves Cally" Project currently in
program ne your childfu son als. For one first two questions would you place
n number (1-4) in each of the blanks beside the questions showing your preferenc
for each choice. The numbers 1-4 contrespond to the following preferences:

- 1 Would Tibe the west
- 2 Mould like somewhat
- 3 Mould not care
- 4 Would like the lenst

		As an	incen	tive for participating in the progra	m, I vo lst	vld lik 2nd	ke: Brd	4 t n
			_(%)	Green Stamps	. 2 . :	4	.5	. 7
			_(b)	Noney	5	3	7	3
			_(e)	Tickets to the movies for my child	, 3	5	б	4
			_(£)	Tickets to the and for my child	9	3	4	2
			(ت)_	Tickets to the movies for myself	1		7	10
			_(1)	Other (comment)	1 .			
	prei Srd	Ter co	ಇಲು:	ciparing in the parent training port		,		I would
5	5	-5	<i>(a)</i>	At home with a group of other poront	s in th	e progr	ran.	
	5	£,		is a control location in the neighboother parerus in the program.	w booder	ith a g	roup o	ว์
2.	5	5	(2)	Ar the Center for Educational Advanc	idaent o	n Nain	Street	i, Nesa.
e see	<u>.</u>		(4)	Au my child's school with other pare	nos In	the pro	enaan.	
			(a)	At some other location. (Gemment) _				



In guarties 3, rate the three days for warest participation in classroom instruction (Londay, Tuesday or Wednesday) in order of preference. Mumber 1 being the most preferred day, 2 the next preferred, 3 the least preferred, and 4 if that day is not possible for attendance. 3. Of the days available for participating in classroom instruction (Monday, Tuesday and Mednesday) my order of preference would be: 3rd 1st 2nd (a) Honday (b) Tuesday (c) Nednooday For the last five questions simply place an X in the appropriate space. 4. Parent training will occur approximately once a week. I will be available for this training: 7 (a) All the time S (b) Host of the time 5 (c) Sometimes 1 (d) Very little (e) Maver 5. While participating in the parent training I would prefer to attend: 12 (a) in the morning 6 (b) In the afternoon 6. Transportation: (a) I will have my own transportation (b) I will need to have transportation provided 7. Do you have TV in your home? 18 yes Does your child watch "Sesame Street"? 14ycs White Ethnic Group: Mexican

> Negro Indian

The second in the second of the



PARENT QUESTIONMAIRE

"Incentives Galy" Project

This questionnaire has been prepared to determine your likes and dislikes in cortain areas involved with the "Incentives Only" Project currently in progress at your child's school. For the first two questions would you place a number (1-4) in each of the blanks beside the questions showing your preference for each choice. The numbers 1-4 correspond to the following preferences:

- 1 Would like the most
- 2 Would like somewhar
- 3 Would not care

, I. AS an	incentive for participating in the program (a) Green Stamps			_3rd	4th	:
	(b) Money	1	1	2_		•
,	(c) Tickets to the movies for my child		_3	1	3	
	(d) Tickets to the zoo for my child	4		3	3	!
	_(e) Tickets to the movies for myself		1	2	6	į.
2. While	_(f) Other (comment)	16 on of	the p	rogra	m, I 1	wou
prefer to 2nd 3 Hith	participating in the parent training porti	on of			m, I 1	WO U
2nd 3 Hith	participating in the parent training portimeet:	on of the	≥ pro{	gram.		WO u.
2nd 3 4th 9 14	participating in the parent training portioned: (a) At home with a group of other parents (b) At a central location in the neighbor other parents in the program.	on of the	≥ prog Lth a	gram. grou	p of	
2nd 3 4 6	participating in the parent training portioned: (a) At home with a group of other parents (b) At a central location in the neighbor other parents in the program.	on of the	≥ prog ith a n Nain	gram. grou 1 Str	p of	



In quistion 3, have the three days for parent participation in classroom instruction (Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday) in order of preference. Mumber 1 being the most preferred day, 2 the next preferred, 3 the least preferred, and 4 if that day is not possible for attendance. 3. Of the days available for participating in classroom instruction (Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday) my order of preference would be: 1st 2nd 3rd 4th (a) Monday 7 . 7 12 (b) Tuesday 12 2;1 9:6 (c) Hednesday For the last rive questions simply place an X in the appropriate space. Perent training will occur approximately once a week. I will be available for this training: 1st 2nd 3rd 4th All the time (a) 19 . Host of the time (b) (c) Sometimes (d) Very little (e) Naver While participating in the parent training I would prefer to attend: 18 (a) in the morning 7 (b) In the afternoon Transportation: I will have my own transportation (b) I will need to have transportation provided Do you have TV in your home? 23 yes <u>2</u> no Does your child watch "Sesame Street"? 17 yes 8 no Ethnic Group: White 25

> Mexican Negro

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW LETTERS TO PARENTS

MESA PUBLIC SCHOOLS & 805 W. MARNOT. () MESA, ARIZONA 85201 TELEPHONE: AREA CODE 802 - 902-7102

September 22, 1971

Dear Parants:

as you know from the interviewer that contacted you recently, a project is under way at your child's school that is intended to holp him/her improve the skills necessary for proper reading accomplishment. This program is unique in that it involves you, the parents, in the process. A child spends much more time away from school than in the classroom and much of his learning occurs at home under the influence of the parents. In order for parents to more fully participate in their child's education we have made available an opportunity for parents to take part in some of the actual classroom activity. In this way you may become more aware of what is actually going on in your child's classroom and be able to help him in various ways while he is at home.

The program of parent participation will begin on Monday September 27, in the Auditorium of your child's school. Mrs. Montano will be present at that time to go over some of the skills that will be taught during that week in the classroom. This session will begin at 9:00 a.m. and will last approximately two hours. In addition, for those parents who cannot make it in the morning, an identical session will be conducted in the afternoon beginning at 1:00 p.m. in the Teacher's Lounge. On the following day, Tuesday, September 28, at the beginning of your child's class (morning or afternoon), parents will meet at their child's classroom to participate in working with their child and other children using the skills and methods learned the previous day.

It will be necessary for you to attend both the training and classroom sessions to gain the full benefit of the program. If you can make just the training session, however, you are certainly welcome.

We encourage you not to bring other small children with you to the training or classroom sessions. However, we realize this may not always be possible and "babysitting" will be provided for children that are old enough to walk.



Incentives for parents will be offered in the form of money. Farents will receive \$10.00 per week if they attend both training and classroom sessions. If both sessions are not attended, no incentives will be offered.

It was very satisfying to find that so many parents were interested in this program. If you have any additional questions about the program they will be answered at the first training session or you may contact Mrs. Montano or Mr. Tom Mogley at the Center for Educational Advancement - phone: 952-7226. We're looking forward to seeing you at the first meeting!

Appreciatively,

thomas Milkeday

Mr. Thomas M. Healey

TME/st

META PODERS SONORED E DO W. MAIN DY. E MEDICALIZONA DEDIG TERROLLARIZONA CODE 102 - 502/9102

September 22, 1971

Later But Later But State & All Blook

Doar Parenus:

As you know from the interviewer that contacted you recently, a project is under any at your child's school that is intended to help him/her improve the skills necessary for proper reading accomplishment. This program is unique in that it involves you, the parents, in the process. A child spends much more time away from school than in the classroom and much of his learning occurs at home under the influence of the parents. In order for parents to more fully participate in their child's education we have made available an opportunity for parents to take part in some of the actual classroom activity. In this way you may become more aware of what is actually going on in your child's classroom and be able to help him in various ways while he is at home.

The program of parent participation will begin on Monday September 27, in Room 10 of your child's school. Mrs. Valocchi will be present at that time to go over some of the skills that will be taught during that week in the classroom. This session will begin at 9:00 a.m. and will last approximately two hours. In addition, for those parents who cannot make it in the morning, an identical session will be conducted in the afternoon beginning at 1:00 p.m. in Room 10. On the following day, Tuesday, September 28, at the beginning of your child's class (morning or afternoon) parents will meet at their child's classroom to participate in working with their child and other children using the skills and methods learned the previous day.

It will be necessary for you to attend both the training and classroom sessions to gain the full benefit of the program. If you can make just the training session, however, you are certainly welcome.

We encourage you not to bring other small children with you to the training or classroom sessions. However, we realize this may not always be possible and "babysitting" will be provided for children that are old enough to walk.

This nerves will be offered to the children during trainong. The object of intentives is to move towards a syntem of encentives where the child will seek social approval and inner satisfication rather than material things.

It was very taxislying to find that so many parents were interested in this program. If you have any additional questions about the program, they wall be answered at the first training session, or you may contact Mrs. Valocchi or Mr. Tom Healey at the Center for Educational Advancement - Telephone 962-7226. Weite looking forward to seeing you at the first meeting!

Appreciatively,

Mr. Thomas M. Healey

TMH/st

A se a refull fall folio della sulla latutti (j. latuar) per sulla sulla latutti (j. latuar) per sulla sulla

September 22, 1971

Deal Parents:

As you know from the interviewer that contacted you reconstly, a project is under way at your child's school that is intended to help him/her improve the skills necessary for proper reading accomplishment. This program is unique in that it involves you, the parents, in the process. A child spends much more time away from school than in the classroom and much of his learning occurs at home under the influence of the parents. In order for parents to more fully participate in their child's education we have made available an opportunity for parents to take part in some of the actual classroom activity. In this way you may become more aware of what is actually going on in your child's classroom and be able to help him in various ways while he is at home.

The program of parent participation will begin on Monday September 27, in the Conference Room of the Media Center of your child's school. Miss Lira will be present at that time to go over some of the skills that will be taught during that week in the classroom. This session will begin at 9:00 a.m. and will last approximately two hours. In addition, for those parents who cannot make it in the morning, an identical session will be conducted in the afternoon beginning at 1:00 in the Media Center. On the following day, Tuesday, September 28, at the beginning of your child's class (morning or afternoon), parent; will meet at their child's classroom to participate in working with their child and other children using the skills and methods learned the previous day.

It will be necessary for you to attend both the training and classicom sessions to gain the full benefit of the program. If you can make just the training session, however, you are certainly welcome.

We encourage you not to bring other small children with you to the training or classroom sessions. However, we realize this may not always be possible and "babysitting" will be provided for children that are old enough to walk.



to the perfect of the property of the perfect of the perfect was a man perfect was a manufactor of the property of the perfect of the property of the perfect of the property of the perfect of the perfe

Appreciatively,

Mr. Thomas M. Healey!

273/23

September 22, 1971

and the second of the second o

Doub Alexande

Personally a project is under any at your child's school than in the internet to make the resonant for the internet to the internet to the program is unique in that is shoolved you, she parenes, in the process. A child spends much more time every from school than in the classroom and much to his learning octors at home under the influence of parents. In order for parents to more fully participate in their child's time to have made available an opportunity for parents to take part in some of the desugl class. Som activity. In this way you may become more aware of what is actually going on in your child's classroom and be able to help him in various ways while he is at home.

One program of parent participation will begin on Monday, September 27, in the Music Room of your child's school. Mrs. Valenduald will be present at that time to go over some of the skills that will be taught during that week in the classroom. This session will begin at 9:00 a.m. and will last approximately two hours. In addition, for those parents who cannot make it the normany, an identical session will be conducted in the afternoon beginning at 1:00 p.m. in the Cafeteria. On the following day, Tuesday, September 28, at the beginning of your child's class (morning or afternoon), parents will meet at their child and other children using the skills and methods learned the previous day.

It will be necessary for you to attend both the training and clustroom sessions to gain the full benefit of the program. If you can make just the training session, however, you are cortainly selected.

We encourage you not to bring other small children with you to the training or classroom sessions. However, we realize this may not always be possible and "babysituing" will be provided for children that are old enough to walk.

The street of the second of th

To the following formers to beginn you are the first many parents. The control of the project of the control of

Appreclatively,

Holoman M. Hartry

Mr. Thomas M. Healey

TXII/st

ERIC

APPENDIX E

SKILLS INTRODUCTED DURING PROGRAM

LETTER NAME HIERARCHY SKILLS (11)

These are levels - hierarchy

- 1. Matching letters
- 2. Identify letters shown
- 3. Identify letters named
- 4. Name letters (individually)
- 5. Write letters from dictation

Letter Names

1. Match letters directly write the following on the blackboard

MTCFMO

Ask the children which letter is like the M (to the left.) Have a child come and circle the letter. Do the same with other letters. Have the children do similar exercises at their seats.

- 2. Identify Letters shown
 Hold up a card with a letter. Ask the children what
 letter it is. Have them circle the letter on their
 papers. (Card is held up in a timed situation)
 Continue with various letters.
- 3. Identify letters named
 Say the name of a letter. Have the children circle that letter on their papers. Continue with other letters.
- 4. Name letters (individually)
 Divide children into pairs. One child holds up a
 letter and asks the other one: "What is this letter?"
 The children take turns doing this the various letters.
- 5. Write letters from dictation
 Divide children into pairs. One child names a letter
 and the other child writes the letter. They take
 turns in going through the letters in this manner.

APPENDIX F

TESTS ADMINISTERED BY INCENTIVE SCHEDULE

	N C] 0 <u> </u>		وبروج والمتعاددة المتعاددة	Takkir anggi darphi dapah pink ti a ayang angga kanang	
	land land	R	D	0		
	*	<u> </u>	W		K	The state of the s
	S.	e 7.	4	e de la companya de l	-	L'I Tanana
The state of the s	4.	J	Y	8	S	
- Caronana Caranaga	S.			5-0	8	***************************************
The second second	ô.	C	E. G. P. C.	Q	J	
Language of the second	7.	R	4	P		
A Company	8.	74.5	B	R	G	
	9.	V			X	
	10.	S	en og	В	Y	-
-	II.	100 mm	P	A	gree Lo	
•	12.	Constant of the Constant of th	V	W	C. T.	The state of the s
Marie 12		record Jacob Casas	O		С	
					يعتبه بالمخال سيريا الطالا	5

een, p Grug
19
dar, me
of the state of th
0
Cana
A COLUMN TO A COLU

Nac	j. û	ويتحمل فيسري بالرواء بالمحمدات	المراجع	ير والارتباء منيستك، ميسانات دينه خير خدر (-1.1) گا
-		V	0	Ser e Service Ser e Service Se
2.	3 /	V /	tartanisti pin quo mung pagang p p p p p p p p p	A Constitution of the Cons
0.	3	W	P	
	5		72.2	
00	,	* 1777	S	
6.		X		
70	\$ 0			6-20-0-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-
Ö,		S	The state of the s	
Ĵ.	2		V	
10.		Come;	ang Luc	
3	C		2.20	grand .
12.	V		Ö	W
lo.				O

امر ال المانية المانية المانية S. L. S. َيْ تَ إِذَ 19, CERTIFICATION OF THE PARTY OF T VJ د د د د د د د د د د د Coard Garess 22. 1 S - 2 S C23. 24. ٠. ا ا Section 1 25. C 25.

ERIC

APPENDIX G

POST-PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

MESSACT OF THOUSENDENCE

12. 20 July 10.

This questionnaire has been propared to determine the effectiveness of the incontives program that has been gooddoted for the past oix months at your childs school. We would greatly appreciate it if you would answer these questions and make appropriate comments since the success of this program and future plans for cimilar programs depend heavily on your reaction to these type of questions.

೨೦೫	each question. Select only one answer for each question.
1)	Did you feel that the training session by the psychologist was helpful in aiding your understanding of early child-hood problems and the importance of communication?
	Very Much Quite a Bit Some A Little Not at All TOS
2)	To what extent did the training in Health and Diet Practices help you and answer your questions?
	Great Extent Quite a Bit Some A Little Not at All 100
3)	Did you think the reading-skills games were helpful to your child in gaining the necessary pre-reading skills?
	Def. Yes Qual. Yes Undecided Qual. No Def. No IOC
	Did the training and work with the pre-reading games help you to better understand the skills necessary in preparation for reading?
,	Very Much Quite a Bir Some A Little Not at All TOC

	andebot		lasaroom	inalian na n	Arooodures. Arve you u	better : '
	Yery Ma	ioh Quiso a	Bit Some	a A Divole	Not at Al	1 100
:) After p caccher classro	ervicipatin present, a om teacher (g in elass o you feel and with t	esperq moon: Smoon erom: Soerq moon:	dures with ortable wit heraily?	the h the
	Def. Ye.	s Qual. Yes	s Undecid	ed Qual.)	to Def. No	TOC
. 73) To what learned	extent did during the	brogram " pye bre-z	eading game carry-over"	s and metho	ods you nome?
	27227 50					
	07.640 57	itent Quite	a Bit So	ome A Litt	le Not at	All TOC
3)	Did you helpful	think that in enhancin	the use of g the effe	C bi-lingua ectiveness	l aides was of the prog	: mam?
					. [(
	Very Muc	h Quite a :	Sit Some	A Little	Not at Al.	IOC
9)	Would you offered a	u attend a s again?	similar ty	pe of progr	am if it w	ere
					¢ 🔲	
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecide	d Qual. No		Ioc
10)		eel this typ to include	e of progr more parer	ram should hts over a	greater ler	i ánd Isth
•						
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	roc
11)	To what do in school without the	egree did yo as compared he program?	ou feel th l to the g	e program h ain he woul	nelped-your d have mad	child e
2	Very Much	Quite a Bi	.t Some	A Little N	ot at All	loc
			~			

12)	Philosoph For anile	Momlly, Co Spen4	you favor	the use of	incentiv.	93
				•		
	Dof. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	ICC
13)	Philosoph for parer	mically, do	you favor	the use of	incentive	3
·	Der. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	ICC
14)	Did you f helping y	cel the incourt ou attend r	entives us egularly?	ed were eff	ective in	i
<i>?</i>						
•	Very Much	Quite a B	it Some .	A Little N	Not at All	IQC
15)	Do you fe helping y	el the ince	ntives used n school?	i were effe	ctive in	
	Very Much	Quite a B	it Some /	Little N	ot at All	IOC
16)	To what exchildren	xtent do you at home?	use the i	ncentive i	dea with	your -
	Great Exte	ent Quite a	Bit Some	A Little	Not at .	All IOC
17)	Would you that follo primary gr	like to be wed your ch ades?	involved i ild's prog	n a programes ress through	m of this ghout the	type .
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yos	Undocidod	Qual. No	Der. No	IOC
18)	In retrosp parent tra	ect, did yo ining (at t	u feel tha he school)	t the meeti was approp	ing place	for
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC

19)	DI	a the time and days of mestings meet with yo	ur appi	.0721.2
] [
	De.	f. Yes Manl. Yes Undecided Qual. No Def.	No I	:00
20)	To	what extent was transportation a problem?	٠	
	Gre	eat Excent Quite a Bit Some A Little Not	at fil	TOC
21)	P10 101	case make any comments you would like under to	he	
	a.	Strengths of the Program:		
	. •		•	
,	·		•	
			•	
	ò.	Weaknesses of the Program:	•	
	•			
	c.	Recommendations for Improvement:		
,			,	
			·	
	٠			

TAREAT POST - QUESTIONNAIRE

"Effoot of Incentives"

Introduction

This questionnaire has been propared to determine the effectiveness of the incentives program that has been conducted for the past six months at your childs school. We would greatly appreciate it if you would answer these questions and make appropriate comments since the success of this program and future plans for similar programs depend heavily on your reaction to these type of questions.

	The second secon	011.
1)	Did you feel that the training session by the psycholo was helpful in aiding your understanding of early chil hood problems and the importance of communication?	gist d-
	Very Much Quite a Bit Some A Little Not at All I	00
2)	To what extent did the training in Health and Diet Practices help you and answer your questions?	
		I
	Great Extent Quite a Bit Some A Little Not at All	IC
3)	Did you think the reading-skills games were helpful to your child in gaining the necessary pre-reading skills	?
	Def. Yes Qual. Yes Undecided Qual. No Def. No 100) T
4)	Did the training and work with the pre-reading games help you to better understand the skills necessary in preparation for reading?	
	Very Much Quite a Bit Some A Little Not at All 10)C

ر کی	undersuun	ding of clas	undem und	achoon b	ivo you a i rocedures?	oebter
	Very Much	Quite a Bi	t Nome	A MARRIE	Not at All	l ICC
(ق	- veacher p	Vicipating 1: resent, do ye teacher and	ou leel m	076 00°°5	みたんれき かっしゅうエン	the n the
	Der. Yes	Qual. Yes T	Jndecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC
7)		xtent did the iring the pro	e pre-read gram lear	ding game: rry-over"	s and metho	ds you lome?
	Great Exte	ent Quite a	Bit Some	A Litt]	le Not at	All IO
. 8)	Did you th helpful ir	ink that the enhancing t	use of the back	oi-lingual iveness c	. aides was of the prog	ram?
	Very Much	Quite a Bit	Some A	Little	Not at All	IOC
9)	Would you offered ag	attend a sim ain?	ilar type	of progr	am if it w	ere
					د	
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes U	ndecided	Qual. No	Def No	IOC
10)	Do you fee expanded to of time?	l this type of include mor	of progra re parent	m should s over a	be repeated greater ler	l and igth
	Deř. Yes	Qual. Yes Ur	ndecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC
(11)	To what degin school a without the	gree did you as compared t e program?	feel the co	program b In he woul	elped-your d have mad	child e
	Very Much	Quite a Bit	Some A	Little N	Not at All	IOC

رکند	/ Palloca: for chi	phically, d ldreny	o you faver	the use of	? incentiv	6 J
	Def. Yes	o Qual. Yes	s Undecide	d Qual. No	Def. No	100
13)	Do you : helping	feel the ind your child	oentives us in school?	ed were eff	estive in	
	- Very Muc	n Quite a	Bit Some	A Little	Not at All	L IOC
14)	To what children	extent do y at home?	ou use the	incentive	idea with	your
					-	
	Great Ex	odino Quite	e Bit Som	i i ka mada da	and the second of the second of	1 100
15)	Philosop for pare	hically, do nts?	you favor	the use of	incentive	S
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC
16)	Would you that foll primary	like to be lowed your ogrades?	e involved child's pro	in a progra gress throu	am of this aghout the	type
•	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC
17)	In retros parent tr	spect, did y aining (at	ou feel that the school	et the meet) was appro	ing place priate?	for
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC
.8)	Did the tapproval?	ime and day	s of meetin	gs meet wi	th your	
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC

					!		
Gre	at Extent	Quite a Bit	Soma	A Little	a sok	t All	
Plo	nda maka d lowing ast	ny edhments) egories:	on Monj	.d like ur	ider th	e	
a.	Strengths	of the Progr	ran i				
				والمدارعة والمساورة والمراجعة والمراجعة والمراجعة والمراجعة والمراجعة والمراجعة والمراجعة والمراجعة والمراجعة			
	properties of the stage of the						
ò.	Weaknesse	s of the Prop	ran:				
					كالوديدة ومادوسي سيوادي		
	****			·			
					<u> </u>		
c .	Recommend	ations for In	nd Lo Aewe	nt:			
c.	Recommend	ations for In	wproveme	eno:			
c .	Recommend	ations for In	mproveme	ent:			

TIREAR POST - QUINTINE

"Bricks of Thountives"

This questionaline has been prepared to determine the effectiveness of the incentives program that has been goodwated for the past six months at your childs school. We would greatly appreciate it if you would answer these questions and make appropriate comments since the success of this program and future plane for similar programs depend heavily on your reaction to these type of questions.

	\cdot
1)	Did you feel that the training session by the psychologist was helpful in aiding your understanding of early child-hood problems and the importance of communication?
	Very Much Quite a Bit Some A Little Not at All IOC
2)	To what extent did the training in Health and Diet Practices help you and answer your questions?
	Great Extent Quite a Bit Some A Little Not at All IO
3)	Did you think the reading-skills games were helpful to your child in gaining the necessary pre-reading skills?
	Def. Yes Qual. Yes Undecided Qual. No Def. No TOC
4)	Did the training and work with the pre-reading games help you to better understand the skills necessary in preparation for reading?
	Very Much Quite a Bit Some A Little Not at All IOC

			erenia del Modifiere	1-08-00. - 208-001-0	noos jangot. Pis noa	. i. b b e .*
) }				
	Very Much	Quito a Bit	, Soma ,	: Tittle	Nov le All	. ICC
ć)	— కథిబర్గుత్తా నైన	Sheipacing in Mescht, do Mo teacher and	ಟ ಚಿತ್ರಗಳು	ora comfa	rtable with	he The
	·					
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes U	ಇದೆರಿಂದೆದೆಂದೆ	Qual. N	o Der. No	ICC
7)	To what as learned as	ttent did the pro	naon moar pro-ricad	ling game ry-over"	s and metho into the h	ća you ome?
					-	
	Grago Expe	ent Quite a	Bit Some	A Litt	le Not at	All IC
.6)	Did you th helpful in	ink that the enhancing t	: use of b he effect	i-lingual iveness (l aides was of the prog	ram?
	Very Much	Quite a 51t	Some A	Little	Not at All	IOC
9)	Would you offered ag	attend a sime	ilar type	of progr	cam if it w	ere
					. []	
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes U	ndecided	Quel. No	Def. No	ICC
10)		l this type of include mor	of progra se parent	m should s over a	be repeated greater les	d and esth
	Der. Yes	Qual. Yes Ur	ndecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC
11)	To what degin school a without the	gree did you as compared t e program?	feel the o the gar	program In he wou	helped.your ld have mad	child te
	Very Much	Quite a Bit	Some A	Little	Not at All	IOC

ال مه سد	lor ohile	irony do	you lavor t	ne use or	incentive	S
	Dar. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	Too
15)		eel the inc ou attend r		d were ef:	Teopive in	
	Very Much	Cuite a B	it Some A	. Little 3	lot at All	IOO
14)	Philosoph for paren	cically, do	you-favor t	he use of	incentive	S.
	Dof. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	ICC
15)	Nould you that foll primary g	like to be owed your crades?	involved i hild's prog	n a progra ress throu	m of this ghout the	rype
,	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC
16)	In retros parent tr	pect, did y aining (at	cu feel tha the school)	t the meet was appro	ing place priate?	for
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	TOC
17)	Did the tapproval?	ime and day	s of meetin	gs meet wi	th your	l
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC
18)	To what e	xtent was t	ransportati	on a probl	em?	
,						
	Great Ext	ent Quite	a Bit Some	A Little	Not at	All ICC

ERIC.

•	
	•
	The state of the s
р.	Weaknesses of the Program:
-	
c.	Recommendations for Improvement:
с.	Recommendations for Improvement:

TAREAT POST - QUASTIONNAIRE "Effect of Indentives"

1000000000

This question maire has been prepared to determine the effectiveness of the incentives program that has been conducted for the past six months at your childs school. We would greatly appreciate it if you would answer these questions and make appropriate comments since the success of this program and future plans for similar programs depend heavily on your reaction to these type of questions.

	•
1)	Did you feel that the training session by the psychologis was helpful in aiding your unlerstanding of early child-hood problems and the importance of communication?
	Very Much Quite a Bit Some A Little Not at All IOC
2)	To what extent did the training in Health and Diet Practices help you and answer your questions?
	Great Extent Quite a Bit Some A Little Not at All I
3)	Did you think the reading-skills games were helpful to your child in gaining the necessary pre-reading skills?
	Def. Yes Qual. Yes Undecided Qual. No Def. No IOC
4)	Did the training and work with the pre-reading games help you to better understand the skills necessary in preparation for reading?
	Very Much Quite a Bit Some A Little Not at All TOC

ر ر		nding of clas	seroom wad	usaroom p Eschool p	jive you a : Pocedures?	obtter (
	Wory Mus	h Quite a Bi	t Some	A Little	Not at All	. IOC
ΰ)		rideipating f present, do y m teacher and	ou leal m	AP MAN - 640.	かたのわりん やりゃち	he the
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. N	o Def. No	IOC
7)	To what learned	extent did th during the pr	e pre-read ogram "ca:	ding game rry-over"	s and metho into the h	ds you ome?
	Great Ex	cent Quite a	Bit Some	e A Litt:	le Not at .	All IOC
8)	Did you thelpful t	think that the	e use of h the effect	oi-lingual Liveness (L aides was of the prog	ram?
	Very Much	Quite a Bit	Some A	Little	Not at All	IOC
9)	Would you offered a	attend a singain?	nilar type	of progr	am if it we	ere
					•	
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes U	Indecided	Qual. No	Der. No	IOC
10)	Do you fe expanded of time?	el this type to include mo	of progra re parent	m should s over a	be repeated greater len	and gth
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes. U	ndecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC
11)		egree did you as compared one program?	feel the to the ga	program l in he woul	nelped-your ld have mad	child e
:	Very Much	Quite a Bit	Some A	Little 1	Not at All	IOC

/	ror ond	ldren?	you savor	rue dae oi	incentivo	:3
	Def. Yes	s Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Der. No	TOC
23,)	Philosog for pare	phically, do	you favor t	the use of	incentive	s
2	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC
14)	Would you that fol primary	u like to bo lowed your ogrades?	involved intild's prog	n a progra ress throu	em of this aghout the	type
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC
15)	In retro parent t	spect, did y raining (at	ou feel tha the school)	t the meet was appro	ing place priate?	for
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC
16)	Did the approval	time and day	s of meetin	gs meet wi	th your	•
	Def. Yes	Qual. Yes	Undecided	Qual. No	Def. No	IOC
17)	To what	extent was t	ransportatio	on a proble	em?	
	Great Ext	cent Quite	a Bit Some	A Little	Not at A	ll Ioc
18)	Please ma	ike any commo categories	ents you wou	ıld like ur	nder the	
	a. Stren	gths of the	Program:			
				;		<u>.</u>

	Clowing caregories:
n.	Strengths of the Program:
ŧ	
'n	Wastenages of the p
٠.	Weaknesses of the Program:
c.	Recommendations for Improvement:
	·
	•