AUTHOR Mendenhall, Susie B.
TITLE A Personalized Reading Program in an Elementary Classroom: Report on a Tested Model. Research Monograph No. 14.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. P. K. Yonge Lab. School.
PUB DATE Mar 76
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; Grouping (Instructional Purposes); *Individualized Reading; Peer Acceptance; Program Effectiveness; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Reading Research; *Self Concept; Story Reading
IDENTIFIERS Sustained Silent Reading

ABSTRACT

A personalized reading program for children in the elementary grades is described. The program consists of three interrelated parts: self-selection and sharing of books, skill development according to individual needs, and individual teacher-pupil discussion and evaluation conferences. Sustained silent reading, oral reading once a week to the teacher, bookselling, and skills work in small groups or individual work with materials such as SR' kits were some of the activities utilized in the personalized reading program. The program in the P.K. Yonge Laboratory School was investigated regarding achievement, self-esteem, and social acceptance gains and their interrelations. Treatment group, sex, and race were the three independent variables. Results indicated that the personalized reading program students had higher gains on reading tests in grades two and four and comparable levels in grades three and six. The control group had higher reading test scores in the first grade, while the experimental group had higher scores on self-esteem and social acceptance. In subsequent grades, these measures increased for experimental females, control males, and experimental whites. (MKM)

A PERSONALIZED READING PROGRAM IN AN ELEMENTARY CLASSROOM: REPORT ON A TESTED MODEL

by

Susie B. Mendenhall, Project Director

Becky New, Photographer

Stephen Sledjeski, Data Analyst

March, 1976

Research Monograph #14

P. K. Yonge Laboratory School
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville 32611
(904) 392-1554

The project director is grateful to all those who cared enough to help make this study and publication possible.

Great and long-lasting appreciation is expressed to the following "special people":

The administration and my colleagues at P. K. Yonge for their support and interest in this study. It is because of these dedicated educators and the stimulating atmosphere they help provide that I have tried to cause change.

Marsha Granoff for all of her assistance with the testing and the collection of the data. She was an invaluable asset in the ongoing process of keeping up to date with all aspects of the project. Equally important was her personal interest in the project and her success in keeping me organized.

Becky New, Jeannie Pollard, and Karen Manget whose thinking is also reflected in the assumptions set forth within the monograph.

Drs. Sandi Damico and Hellen Guttinger, successful and experienced researchers, who continually gave support and encouragement.

Dr. Vynce A. Hines, Ms. Betsy West, and Dr. Hart Stringfellow for their research assistance and for their invaluable aid in analyzing and interpreting the results of the data.

"Experimental" teachers: Pat Felty, Carol Vihlen, Chris Graves, Shelia Knocke, Anne Junkins, and Rita Bustillo for their implementation of the model and all of the care, concern, and long hard hours of work that they invested to make this study possible.

"Control" teachers: Josephine Baumer, Norma Valldejuli, Gladys Wright, Sue Casey, Freddie Hiers, Anna Edmonson, Peggy Blitch, Nancy McMillin, Diana McPherson, and Esstoya Whitley for participating with us by yielding pre and post data on the children in their classrooms.

Ms. Ruth Duncan for helping me clarify my thoughts and this information and for spending endless hours helping to rewrite and edit these results.

Most important of all are the children whom I have taught. To them I am most deeply indebted, for it is they who have taught me about the teaching of reading. It is they who have shown me how important self-concept and feelings are. Because of their successes, others will find success, too.

PREFACE

Of critical concern in seeking creative ways to respond to a student of any age level as an individual is discerning how he feels about himself, about his relationship with his peers, about his relationship with others who are important to him, and about his learning environment.

The approach for individualizing instruction in reading described in this monograph reflects recognition of the tremendous impact of these factors on the student's personal and academic growth. Hence, although helping relationships are encouraged, and small groups may work together, there is no grouping according to ability--no red birds or blue birds; no airplane pilots or astronauts. Rather, reading experiences are personalized, emphasizing identification of the unique needs and interests of each child and tailoring his instruction and related activities to meet those needs.

Enhancement of self-concept is at the very core of personalization. As success builds upon success, the child comes to perceive himself as in control of his own behavior and learning. The frequency of self-directed selection of activities and experiences, including positive purposeful interaction with others, is observed to increase.

Personalization, designed to assist pupils in developing joy and independence in reading, is demonstrable in a number of ways. First, many varied, non-reading experiences generate a reservoir of sensory perceptions essential to translation of association with the known as well as the newly encountered into words. Experiences, of course, are with places, things, and people, both in and out of the classroom. Hence, field trips, both on and off campus, and resource people, from within the school or from outside, are frequently included in the day's activities.

Thus, a climate is established in which children are stimulated to want to know. Reading, then, becomes functional in the child's life, a necessary tool for satisfying his curiosity and opening ways to relating to others. The dynamics of the process enable each to establish and maintain good feelings about himself as learner, about the world as a place to learn, and about his peers as sharers in his learning and living. Although opportunities to express feelings about experiences may be primarily through talking and writing, activities in the arts, music, drama, and movement are most certainly included.

Demonstrating joy and independence in reading is the major goal, achievable only as the child experiences success and satisfaction as a reader. Responses of the seven elementary teachers who implemented the experimental approach described in this monograph indicate that, overall, their pupils did, indeed, demonstrate increased pleasure and independence in reading. What is more, these teachers attributed these changes in reading behavior to participation in this experimental program.

Ruth Duncan, Coordinator
Research and Dissemination
P. K. Yonge Laboratory School

CONTENTS

FIGURES

TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In order to help students feel good about themselves and become independent readers, a wide variety of needs must be met. This continues to be a persistent problem in teaching. Of utmost importance in developing solutions to the problem is the child and how he feels: about himself; about his relationship with his peers; about his learning environment. Since different children respond and learn in different ways, it is important continually to explore the use of many different techniques to assist young readers in becoming independent as readers.

This model provides for personalizing each child's reading experiences in an elementary classroom. The term "personalized" is preferred to "individualized" because of the major focus on the "person" in all aspects of the program. It is not possible to over emphasize the importance of personalization. Consequently, instruction is designed in light of the child's interests, special strengths and weakness in reading, and other personal qualities unique to each child.

Helping each child to view himself in a positive light as a reader is of prime importance in this approach to personalizing reading instruction. Numerous studies document a direct relationship between a child's self-concept and the degree of his success in reading (2, 4, 5, 7, 8,). A personalized approach is more likely to insure that the self-concept increases in a positive direction. Two strengths of the approach are cited from Barbe (1) as major contributors to the development of positive attitudes toward reading.

1. Personalized reading instruction provides for the maximum exchange of information between teacher and student "in a person-to-person relationship" (1, p. 212).

2. Personalized reading instruction has a positive effect on attitudes toward reading because children are "taught how to select materials they can read and enjoy, urged to read both quantitatively and qualitatively" and to understand that the goal of reading instruction is to read (1, p. 216).

In addition to being consistent with the results of much research in reading and personality development, the model reflects the activation of certain assumptions. Commitment to these assumptions determines not only the climate of the classroom, but the attitudes, perceptions, and performance of the members of that classroom as well.

It is hoped that the values which are inherent in the assumptions upon which this approach is based are already recognized by teachers and administrators as being worthwhile and conducive to a stimulating, growth producing atmosphere in which everyone is actively engaged in the learning process. The focus of this model is upon each child and his feelings. The teacher - implementor creates the environment that nurtures and enhances the positive feelings and attitudes which each child develops about his various relationships. If the teacher cannot accept the statements which follow, this model will not work for him or her. Although this is by no means an all-inclusive list, the following assumptions are essential to the successful implementation of this model:

About Children

1. Children like to learn.

2. Children can become independent in their learning to a high degree.

3. Children need to be actively involved in making decisions about what they want to learn.

4. When children feel good about themselves they progress more readily.

5. Children will accept responsibility for their own behaviors when encouraged to establish their own goals for constructive participation and interaction.

6. Children learn from each other.

7. Children learn to read most effectively when they perceive reading as functional rather than as an end.

About the Role of the Teacher

1. In a classroom of 30 children, there are 31 teachers and 31 learners.

2. Good teachers like themselves and feel that they do make a difference.

3. Good teachers like children and think they are capable of learning and behaving in acceptable ways.

4. Good teachers realize that anxiety, related to skill as a reader, inhibits progress.

5. Good teachers realize that classifying, labeling, and grouping children for reading not only create psychological and sociological blocks but use nonproductive techniques.

6. A professional teacher is able to translate theory into practice.

7. An atmosphere of mutual respect and helpfulness is created as children are treated by the teacher like the teacher wants to be treated by children.

8. Good teachers are facilitators and resources for learning.

About Parents

1. Parents care about their children.

2. Parents are interested in what happens to their children at school.

3. Parents are vital partners in the educative process.

4. Parents have a need to know what is happening in school on a regular basis.

5. Parents want to hear good things about their children as well as the ways in which their children need to improve.

6. When reference is made to the need for improvement, they are especially interested in knowing what is being done to help their children improve.

About the Learning Environment

1. The learning environment is a significant factor in the learning process and, therefore, should be pleasant and stimulating.

2. Stimulation in the learning environment should include extension beyond the classroom walls and into the outside world.

3. The learning environment allows freedom to inquire, to explore, to "do one's own thing"; however, although freedom must prevail, limits do have to be determined cooperatively by students and teacher. At the same time, the teacher must reserve the right to make a judgment which may lead to saying "no".

4. School is a place to live learning, not simply to learn to live.

5. A child's learning must give meaning to his life and to the world around him.

6. The classroom activities must be so designed that children feel free to contribute and to know that their ideas are valued - regardless of differences in reading levels or any other kind of differences.

Reading is fun!

CHAPTER II

THE PERSONALIZED APPROACH

What is the Model?

As has been previously stated, this model provides for personalizing each child's reading experiences in an elementary classroom. A limited perception of individualizing instruction views each child as working by himself at his own pace and at his own level. In many individualized programs the child himself becomes almost a nonentity. On the other hand, personalizing the reading program recognizes that the child's feelings about himself, his peers, and others who are important to him, and how he feels about his learning environment, are of prime significance in determining the kinds of reading experiences which will occur during the year. It should be noted, also, that, in a personalized program, working at one's own pace does not prohibit small groups of children from working together on specific skills at times, when all members of a group need instruction in those skills.

How Do You Do It?

The personalized reading program is composed of three interrelated parts: self-selection and sharing of books, skill development, and conferences and evaluation.

Self-Selection and Sharing of Books

The students choose from a wide variety of library and text books. It is recommended that there be three to five books per child in the classroom. The classroom library may be stockpiled in some of the following ways:

1. Use the central library in the school. Have children visit the library on a regular basis. When they choose books to take home, have them also choose several books for the room's library. Periodically, return books from the room library for new ones checked out in the teacher's name.

2. Ask children to share books from home. Keep a master list of the titles of books children bring from their homes and have the children place their names in the fronts of the books for easy identification and retrieval when necessary.

3. Build up a library of paperback books and magazines through offerings of clubs such as Lucky or Arrow, or garage sales.

It has been found that the child establishes a balance on his own regarding the number of times he chooses books versus the number of times he asks the teacher to "pull" or select a book for him. To facilitate the selection of books by the child, he is taught to use the "Five Finger Method" (9) for choosing books. The procedure is to turn to the middle of the book, read the page, and bend a finger for each unknown word. Five fingers down indicates to the child that the book is too hard. Books are herein defined as any reading material the child chooses on his own or from the variety of materials the teacher pulls. Magazines, newspapers, comic books, experience-based books are viewed in the same light as basal readers and library books.

Every day the student is engaged in silent and/or oral reading, as well as other related activities. One day a week is set aside for "book selling". The children "sell" their books to other interested readers through a variety of ways. Veatch (11) lists the thirteen suggestions which follow:

1. Dramatize the book.
2. Change the ending of the story.
3. Put on a puppet show.
4. Make a book jacket for the cover.
5. Draw a picture about the story.
6. Make movies about the book.
7. Make up a play.
8. Write a story.
9. Pantomime something from the story.
10. Make up a song about the story.
11. Make cartoon pictures.
12. Make a model of something from the story.
13. Make a shadow box.

The list is posted in the room, and ideas are added by the children. Books are sold to another student to spark interest in receiving and reading books. Mathematics is correlated in this activity as the "book seller" decides how much money to start with and in what denominations by which to count. For example, if he decides to count by nickels and start with $1.00, "selling" should go for $1.00, 1.05, 1.10 until the book is "sold". Book selling is a voluntary experience; hence, not all books that are read are necessarily shared.

One day a week is set aside for Sustained Silent Reading (6). A timer is set and everyone reads silently for that amount of uninterrupted time. Initially, length of time is short but gradually is increased to whatever length is appropriate for the students and teacher. If a child encounters a word he does not know,

the word may be written down with a page number beside it and reviewed with the teacher after the time expires. An alternative procedure is for children to work in pairs, sharing with each other what they read and helping each other with the words they do not know. It has been found that the children also enjoy sharing ideas from their reading which they have found interesting.

Skill Development

Word analysis skills, such as consonant blends or vowel combinations, and comprehension skills, such as sequencing or main ideas, are classified and filed into specific categories. The materials for this "lab" are prepared by the teacher from dittoes and torn-up workbooks.

Each student is pretested and then proceeds through the spectrum of skills as long as competence is demonstrated. Worksheets, games, and learning centers provide additional aid and reinforcement, as needs are noted. Students are involved in the selection of activities designed to correct skill deficiencies and decide on an individual basis when to take a posttest in the area being corrected.

Work in skill development activities takes place two days a week. The date and assignment to be completed by a child are indicated on his individual Skill Sheet, a duplicate of the model presented in Figure I.

FIGURE I

SKILL SHEET

NAME _____

Write on this sheet after you do a skill development activity.

Date	Today I did	This is how I feel about it	This is how Mrs. Mendenhall (teacher) feels about it
Put Here	What area & What # Example: Initial Consonants #14	Tell me. Also Put Number right / Number altogether Example: 12/12	

In order to keep skill development activity cards in reusable condition, the card, when in use, is placed in a transparent acetate envelope(magic bag) on which the student marks with washab' agic markers. When he has completed an activity, he checks his sneet with a teacher's manual and then, in the third column of the Skill Sheet, records how he felt about doing the activity. The teacher reviews the completed skill development activity as soon as possible and records her reactions in the last column on the child's Skill Sheet. Further directions are given by indicating the date and the nature of the next activity in the first two columns of the Skill Sheet which is then returned to the child's individual file or notebook folder. As class time is again scheduled for skill development activities, each child gets his folder, cleans his acetate envelope, selects the assigned skill development activity, inserts it, and completes it, thus continuing the cycle. While the children - especially younger ones - are first beginning to use the skill lab, it ought to be easier for the teacher to retrieve the skill development activity sheet from a central pile and refile them herself in the lab. As they continue to use the lab, they can be taught to refile for themselves.

Increasing independence is a major goal of this approach. Hence, by the end of the year, older students who are ready to go on or who want to be taught to program themselves may be taught how to decide on the basis of their pretest scores which worksheets are applicable to correct a particular skill deficiency. One helpful technique is to encourage students to record this desire themselves; for this purpose, a box of markers stating "I'll do it" are kept in any place in the room that is easily accessible to children. When a child is ready to program himself, he simply gets one of the markers and places it in his folder. This signals the teacher that the student wishes to be left on his own. The teacher, of course, is always available to help if needed and will remain sufficiently attuned to sense a need even when not verbalized by the child.

Introduction to and instruction in the Science Research Associates lab also is provided two days a week for the purpose of developing and integrating the comprehension and word analysis skills with a specific story. This occurs only after the other aspects such as self-selecting and sharing of books of the personalized reading program have become established practices.

There are several ways of introducing the SRA lab to the children:

1. There are detailed instructions in the manual as to placement of children in appropriate colors.

2. Records might be available from previous teachers to help guide placement.

3. Use the SORT or the level of the book they're reading and lower to include the factor of comprehension. (Let the children help.)

Flexibility is important in using the SRA lab materials. It is important for the children to experience success and develop positive feelings about this method of developing skill. It is also important to allow children the freedom to change colors after mutually decided goals have been reached. Children know when something is too easy and unchallenging; they also know when something is too hard. Many times the philosophy of "trying it on for size" can apply to the SRA lab as the children can read stories from one or more colors and then decide in which color they feel successful, yet challenged.

When the children have demonstrated an ability to work independently in both labs, there are several alternatives to the management of this skill development component:

1. All of the children can work in the skill development lab at the same time 2 days a week and the SRA lab another 2 days.

2. The class can mentally be divided into two groups. This division occurs by the colors in which they are working so that for two days a week each child works in the SRA lab and for another two days he works in the Reading Skills Sheet lab (see Figure II).

3. The children can cooperatively decide during a class meeting the best way to manage their time efficiently in meeting their needs. The only conditions imposed are that some time for two days be spent in the skills lab and some time two days be spent in the comprehension lab during the week.

To facilitate increasing independence in the use of the lab both the weekly schedule (Figure II) and instruction for use of the lab are posted on charts (Figure III).

FIGURE II

Example of Weekly Schedule

Monday - Thursday:	Tan and Gold SRA
	Aqua-Purple-Orange-Olive-Blue-Brown-Green-Red Reading Skill Sheets
Tuesday - Friday:	Aqua-Purple-Orange-Olive-Blue-Brown-Green-Red SRA
	Tan and Gold Reading Skill Sheets
Wednesday:	All do Sustained Silent Reading.

FIGURE III

SRA Lab

1. Pick a story from the color you're working in
2. Read it.
3. Write answers on the appropriate answer sheet.
4. Check answers with key. Use a pen.
5. Complete appropriate Progress Chart.
6. File papers in your folder.
7. Return story and answer key to the appropriate place in the lab.

Conferences and Evaluation

At least once a week, an individual in-depth conference is held. At this time, the child reads aloud from his book, discusses his skill development sheets and the SRA lab, plans for book selling, and shares any other reactions about his reading activities he wishes. Reactions may be about the level of difficulty he experienced or whether or not he liked the book. The child may want to indicate others in the room whom he feels might like the book and why. He may want to discuss characters he liked or did not like and why. He may want to share emotions generated or discuss experiences and problems he has had similar to those presented in the book. There really is no limit to the variety of reactions which may be stimulated in discussing the book during this one-to-one conference. Time is a factor, however. To be used to the greatest benefit, the teacher should review the child's folder briefly ahead of time and have in mind some pertinent questions and comments to facilitate interaction.

Additional oral reading the other four days of the week is done with parent volunteers, teacher helpers, other students, or into the tape recorder. A record of all reading is kept on a 3 x 5 card (see Figure IV). The card is filled out by the listener after the reader has read first silently and then orally to him.

FIGURE IV

3 x 5 card to record oral reading experiences

Your Name:		
Name of Book:		
Date Began:		
Date	Pps. read orally	Initial of listener
9-4-74	86-89	S.M.

Classroom management is an important factor when children are perceived as individuals with needs which must be met through tailored and prescribed instruction. Yet, there are several alternatives to managing the wide diversity of activities so that these one-to-one conferences can be held.

If the framework of the classroom is bound by limited blocks of time spent on specific areas such as language arts, the teacher can still schedule the individual conference. The other children might be working on related activities such as skill development, their own silent and oral reading, and/or preparation for book selling. Other suggestions for activities could easily come from the children. Both the teacher's need to work with one child without being interrupted and the children's need to complete the other activities without the teacher's help or explanation can be resolved through class discussions. The outcome of these meetings can be mutually established goals through which the needs of both the teacher and the children would be met.

If the framework of the classroom is such that all aspects of the curriculum can be integrated throughout the entire day, the student can then be free to choose the order in which he will complete the required learning tasks. He is responsible for undertaking each task and expected to complete it before the day is over. The teacher is therefore able to schedule blocks of time he or she is available for conference for which children sign up voluntarily when they are ready to talk. This flexible structure makes it possible to hold individual conferences with many children every day and at least once a week for all children.

CHAPTER III

REACTIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FROM THE FIELD TEST

TEACHER

The model as described in Chapter II was presented to the field test teachers in a three-day workshop held at P. K. Yonge in August, 1974. These teachers were involved because they wanted to be; i.e., they volunteered. They already were believers in the learning theory underlying individualizing a child's learning experiences but now wanted to learn "how". They also could accept the assumptions discussed in Chapter II as being essential to the success of this model.

The format of the workshop was designed to encourage participants to be involved actively in the goal-setting and activity-planning aspects. Much of the time was spent discussing alternate ways to achieve the substantive parts of the model. The three "constants" were the three interrelated components: self-selection and sharing of books; skill development; and conferences and evaluation. The teachers committed themselves to providing experiences for the children in these three areas; yet, there were no constraints on how this was to be done. The model utilizes a word attack skill lab and an SRA lab. This skill development "constant" could also be met, for example, through worksheets, games, groups based on need, and different kinds of comprehension activities.

It must be apparent, therefore, that the teacher and her ingenuity and creativity are highly valued in this model. Hence, the reactions of the field test teachers to this model are of utmost concern. It is felt that this type of "soft data" is just as important as the results of the "hard data" or testing information presented in Chapter IV.

These teachers used this model for an entire year in their classrooms. The range of their daily contact with children included rural and city settings; grades ranging from 1 through 6, public and private schools; upper and lower economic classes; and a mixture of races. Following a year's implementation of the model, the teachers of the experimental groups were asked to respond to a questionnaire designed to evaluate the model. Questions asked are included as an appendix. Selected comments and summary reactions follow:

Instructions were personalized.

> Each child's needs were identified through a pretest:
> Instruction was personalized to meet the needs.
> Each child was able to work at his own pace.

The children's self-concepts changed.

> "It helped the children make decisions and feel good about their decisions. It increased independence and helped decrease feelings of competition . . . ."

> "They were able to finish many books - - not just one basal reader a year - - thus, their concept of reading changed."

The children's attitudes toward reading changed.

> "Many children mentioned that they now thought of reading as fun . . . ."

> "The children enjoyed reading because it was individualized. They were able to read a whole story by themselves instead of in a group situation."

> "Now, they see reading as a pleasurable, informative, and exciting experience."

In one-half of the field test classrooms, all of the children chose their own books all of the time. In the other one-half of the classes, at least three-fourths of the children chose their own reading books.

Two-thirds of the teachers used the SORT as a means of gauging level of readability. There also was a consensus that the grade equivalency needed to be lowered as the SORT doesn't include a comprehension measure.

The children read silently almost daily and orally at least once a week to the teacher. Teachers also expressed good feelings about the one-to-one conferences held as part of the oral reading time.

> "They (children) thought of this as a special time . . . ."

> "I felt better able to prescribe what each child needed through reading one-to-one. The children felt more comfortable and talked about some of the difficulties they were experiencing in reading."

Two-thirds of the teachers taught their children to use the five finger method for choosing books.

> "They would use it as a guideline; they seemed to feel good about being able to choose their own books."

> "It helped greatly with new children coming into the room by getting them reading right away."

Reactions to book selling were mixed. Most of the teachers liked the idea but felt that there had not been enough creative types of sharing.

> "The children enjoyed it and it was interesting. They usually just told about books. Only one puppet show was attempted. Some drew pictures."
>
> "Book selling succeeded at the end when a college student took three students out of the room and worked with them (usually on arts and crafts) to prepare for book selling."

The teachers also reported about the interest of the children toward book selling:.

> "The children were shy about selling their books."
>
> "At first the children were interested, but gradually lost interest."
>
> "My children loved book selling. Even though they mostly told about their books, they loved the bidding and often wanted to have it more than once a week."

All of the teachers responded positively to Sustained Silent Reading whereby the children and teacher read for uninterrupted periods of time.

> "My children loved it. We enjoyed it, especially after our weekly library trips. We did it on an average of two times a week, 15 minutes each time."
>
> ". . . About the beginning of November, the children decided (voted) they wanted SSR every day for 15 minutes. Most of the children found it easier to read when everyone else was reading. Most of the children learned to relax and really enjoy reading (as a source of pleasure)."
>
> "I think SSR is one of the best aspects of the model. Initially the first one-half of the year, we did it every day. The kids really looked forward to it and would ask when it was time . . . ."

All of the teachers made or at least started a skills lab patterned after the project director's. They were asked how the lab worked for them and whether they had suggestions for its improvement.

> "Excellent. Being able to work at their own rate made the children more relaxed. Knowing that most of the

other children did not know where they were in the lab and really didn't care to know gave each child much self-confidence and avoided any type of peer pressure."

"I pulled the sheets my children were to do. They did not use the lab themselves. They did like the individuality."

"My top kids couldn't utilize it except for reinforcement. But low level kids loved it. It was successful."

The following suggestions for improving the lab were offered:

1. Teacher grade the sheets--allows the teachers to pick up on mistakes immediately.

2. Laminate it.

3. Color code it. "(The children) didn't have any trouble finding the sheet they were assigned to do."

The teachers also used tapes, workbooks, games, worksheets, learning centers, System 80, to help teach skills in addition to the lab. Skill groups based on need were also used as a means of teaching skills. Two-thirds of the teachers pulled groups two or three times a week. Others worked with individuals when the need arose. Yet, in spite of the various methods used, all of the teachers provided some type of activity to build skill development at least twice a week.

All but one of the teachers had SRA labs and felt that they were very effective. The children enjoyed it, and made good progress.

"The kids programed themselves in SRA, once we decided upon the level. The ratio was written down, and if they felt they were ready to move to another level, we conferenced and discussed it. Usually they were ready to move. They know their capabilities in most cases."

There were many children in all of the classes who did not participate in SRA because the lab could not meet their individual needs. The following methods were then used to develop their comprehension skills:

1. Discussions during conferences, focusing on main ideas, details and sequences;

2. Skill sheets from Continental Press;

3. Barnell Loft Skill Series;

4. Tapes with questions at the end;

5. Tapes of Dolch words;

6. CLOZE paragraphs;

7. Hangman-spelling games;

8. Book - audiotape combinations.

The following kinds of record-keeping systems were used:

For one-to-one conferences:	3x5 cards
	day sheets
	file folders for each child with skills, books read, and comments.
For skill development:	skill sheet
	check list of skills which corresponded to the sequence of skill lab.
For recording of books the children read:	bookworm displayed around the room
	3x5 cards
	extra card for vocabulary word study from book

Perhaps the most important question asked of the field test teachers was whether they intended to continue to use this model. All said "yes", and their reasons are reflected in the following statements.

"It seems to be very effective and the children enjoyed it."

"Most children were really turned on to reading . . . Each child was able to progress at his own level and I was able to completely individualize each child's program. I think this model has given many children much self-confidence in reading--which was previously lacking."

"Several parents contacted me the second month of school, asking what I was doing to their child - the child was reading at home. I feel this speaks highly of the program. I will definitely use this system again!"

All of the teachers had previously had experience teaching reading via ability groups. They were asked to comment on their feeling relative to personalized versus ability grouping.

"The children enjoyed reading individually instead of in a group type situation. It made the shy child really like reading a lot more."

"My children enjoyed reading alone to me. I feel that the round robin reading frightens some children and causes a poor self-concept. In this model, each child is truly an individual with individual needs."

"I also liked the idea of the students' choosing their own books. As it turned out, they read the basals I had in the room, the only difference was that they were able to finish them in a much shorter period of time as opposed to their going through them with a group."

"It is far better than ability grouping. The kids said so!"

A question might be asked: Is the model adaptable to children who are not yet reading or are reading below grade level? In all of the field test classrooms, there were such children, and unfortunately, some were labeled as "low" or "slow". All of the teachers felt that the emphasis this model placed on self-concept was especially important to these children. Equally important, they felt, was the protection from other children's being aware of different reading levels. Much of this is because of the absence of round-robin situations which often foster peer pressure and peer expectations. The one-to-one conference, they reported, was often spent working on additional skills or developing experience stories which were later made into books by the child. Because these conferences were private, no one ever needed to know what happened except the child and the teacher.

The point is that this model provides focus for the child. The key is personalization. All aspects of the three components can be designed to meet each one's needs. As a result, success is attainable by the child in a warm, accepting, caring learning environment. Such an environment is created by a teacher who values children and their need to learn, to feel good about themselves, to set goals and achieve them, and to become increasingly independent.

CHAPTER IV

INSTRUMENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS

The Personalized Reading Program was investigated regarding achievement, self-esteem, and social acceptance gains and their interrelations. Treatment group (experimental or control), sex (male or female), and race (black or white) were the three independent variables providing a 2 X 2 X 2 factorial design. Data were analyzed either by grade level or level of achievement testing.

Achievement Test Results

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted on the gain scores of pre- and posttesting for each level of achievement testing. These test grade levels were as follows:

1. Stanford Early School Achievement Test (SESAT) was administered to first graders.

2. Standard Achievement Test (SAT) - Level I was administered to second graders.

3. SAT - Level II was administered to second and third graders.

4. SAT - Level III was administered to second, third, and fourth graders.

5. SAT - Level I was administered to reading laboratory students.

6. Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) was administered to the third grade, using Primary II as pretest and Elementary as posttest.

Raw scores were used in the analysis for all test grade levels except for test grade level six. Since different test levels were used at pre- and posttesting, standard scores were used in the analysis of the MAT data.

MANOVA resulted in significant differences for all six test grade levels overall and for each subscore tested ($p = .05$). F-ratios and degrees of freedom are provided in Table 1. In addition, treatment group differences were significant for test grade levels except level three. Those test grade levels (one and five) which consisted of first graders and those students in the reading laboratory, had higher gains in the control group than in the experimental group whereas

TABLE 1

F-Ratios and Degrees of Freedom for Achievement Test Gains by Six Test Grade Levels for all Scores Combined (Multivariate) and Individual Subscores (Univariate)

Sources of Variance	Test Grade Levels											
	1		2		3		4		5		6	
	F	df	F	df	F	df	F	df	F	df	F	df
Multivariate	28.11*	16,160	3.38*	35,137	1.73*	35,108	3.82*	15,114	5.56*	30,346	6.23*	16,58
Letters and Sounds	122.17*	8,81										
Aural Comprehension	3.63*	8,81										
Vocabulary			13.36*	7,36	3.55*	7,29	6.38*	5,43	8.32*	6,90		
Reading A			4.21*	7,36	4.34*	7,29			21.36*	6,90		
Reading B			3.55*	7,36	8.28*	7,29			16.20*	6,90		
Word Study Skills			15.94*	7,36	3.57*	7,29	4.04*	5,43	23.54*	6,90		
Reading Comprehension							4.64*	5,43				
Word Knowledge											9.22*	8,30
Reading											7.03*	8,30

*($p \leq .05$)

the experimental group had higher gains in test grade levels two and four. While there were no significant differences in test grade levels three and six, both levels' experimental groups obtained higher means than did the control groups (see Table 2).

Differences within the six test grade levels were examined further with regard to the variables of sex and race. The F-ratios, degrees of freedom, and n's are provided in Table 3. Group means are given in Table 2. As can be seen from the n's, cell sizes were extremely small in many instances. Hence, few inferences can be drawn from these cases. Several significant results, however, were reached with sufficiently large n's. For those in the first and fifth test grade levels, control males had significantly higher gains than experimental males, and control whites had significantly higher gains than experimental whites. In addition, in test grade level one the control males did significantly better than the control females who in turn did significantly better than experimental females. For test grade level two where second graders were administered the SAT - Level II, control whites performed significantly better than control blacks, and control females performed better than control males.

Looking at the overall achievement results, it appears that the experimental group did better on achievement than the control group except in grade one and in the reading laboratory (test grade levels one and five). While race and sex n's were too small for inferential conclusions, a general trend appeared such that blacks did better in the experimental group and whites in the control group; males did better than females.

Self-Esteem and Social Acceptance Results

Students' self-concept was measured by the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Test and social acceptance by the Ohio Social Acceptance Inventory. Both tests were analyzed by grade level. The Coopersmith was administered to grades one through four plus the reading laboratory and the Ohio to grades one through four. In both cases, the 2 X 2 X 2 factorial design was analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) with significance being considered for $p = .05$.

The results of the Coopersmith are presented in Tables 4 and 5. Table 4 lists F-ratios and degrees of freedom by grade, and Table 5 gives means and n's by grade. Significant differences were found in grades one and four. In grade one, the experimental group had a significantly higher gain in self-concept than did the control group. In grade four, the opposite effect was true; the controls did significantly better than the experimental group. Grade four also had significant interactions between treatment and sex and between treatment and race. Males and blacks did better in the control group and females and whites in the experimental group.

TABLE 2

Means of Subscore Gains for the Six Test Grade Levels of Achievement Testing by Various Subgroups (E: Experimental Group; C: Control Group; M: Male; F: Female; B: Black; and W: White)

Subscores by Test Grade Level	Subgroups									
	E	C	EM	CM	EF	CF	EB	CB	EW	CW
1:										
Letters and Sounds	12.05	13.35	12.53	14.24	11.70	12.68	22.50	8.17	11.50	14.07
Aural Comprehension	-1.90	-1.55	-3.00	-1.14	-1.09	-1.86	-1.50	-2.67	-1.92	-1.40
2:										
Vocab.	5.25	7.29	5.40	5.86	5.00	9.43	5.50	6.87	5.17	7.60
Reading A	10.38	6.49	11.80	6.81	8.00	6.00	8.00	2.40	11.17	9.55
Reading B	12.00	8.23	10.40	6.95	14.67	10.14	11.50	5.00	12.17	10.65
Total Reading	23.25	15.11	23.60	14.43	22.67	16.14	19.50	7.40	24.50	20.90
Word Study Skills	8.25	10.37	9.80	8.76	5.67	12.79	5.50	12.00	9.17	9.15
3:										
Vocab.	2.40	3.61	1.50	3.69	3.00	3.53	1.50	3.00	3.00	3.63
Reading A	6.60	6.39	4.50	6.88	8.00	5.87	8.00	1.00	5.67	6.57
Reading B	10.40	7.19	7.00	7.63	12.67	6.73	15.00	0.00	7.33	7.43
Total Reading	17.00	12.26	11.50	12.31	20.67	12.20	23.00	5.00	13.00	12.50
Word Study Skills	10.00	3.61	9.00	4.00	10.67	3.20	11.00	11.00	9.33	3.37
4:										
Vocab.	3.92	3.45	2.71	3.71	5.60	3.00	-	-19.00	3.92	4.16
Reading Comprehension	5.58	5.27	7.43	6.29	3.00	3.50	-	10.00	5.58	5.13
Word Study Skills	10.17	2.39	10.86	3.67	9.20	0.17	-	-4.00	10.17	2.59
5:										
Vocab.	3.16	3.61	2.87	3.06	4.25	4.83	-	3.91	3.16	3.36
Reading A	5.53	8.21	6.47	7.11	2.00	10.62	-	7.94	5.53	8.43
Reading B	8.74	7.23	8.00	6.43	11.50	9.00	-	7.11	8.74	7.33
Total Reading	14.58	15.34	14.87	13.43	13.50	19.54	-	15.00	14.58	15.62
Word Study Skils	6.74	8.13	5.13	8.04	12.75	8.33	-	8.49	6.74	7.83
6:										
Word Knowledge	10.83	7.46	12.50	4.77	9.17	8.88	15.00	7.50	10.00	7.44
Reading	6.75	7.65	6.50	11.67	7.00	5.53	5.50	-2.63	7.00	12.22

TABLE 3

F-Ratios, Degrees of Freedom, and n's for Achievement Test Gains by Six Test Grade Levels for Two Group Comparisons by Treatment, Sex, and Race (E: Experimental Group; C: Control Group; M: Male; F: Female; B: Black; W: White)

Group		Test Grade Levels																							
		1				2				3				4				5				6			
1	2	F	df	n_1	n_2	F	df	n_1	n_2	F	df	n_1	n_2	F	df	n_1	n_2	F	df	n_1	n_2	F	df	n_1	n_2
EM	CM	2.15	2,80	17	21	1.61	5,32	5	21	0.17	5,25	2	16	1.17	3,41	7	21	5.39*	5,86	15	53	3.17	2,29	6	9
EF	CF	4.17*	2,80	23	28	1.77	5,32	3	14	1.61	5,25	3	15	3.21*	3,41	5	12	3.92*	5,86	4	24	0.29	2,29	6	17
EB	CB	8.17*	2,80	2	6	4.81*	5,32	2	15	1.46	5,25	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1.96	2,29	2	8
EW	CW	4.64*	2,80	38	43	0.34	5,32	6	20	0.48	5,25	3	30	2.03	3,41	12	32	2.03*	5,86	19	42	2.26	2,29	10	18
EB	EW	7.36*	2,80	2	38	0.52	5,32	2	6	0.70	5,25	2	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0.54	2,29	2	10
CB	CW	3.83*	2,80	6	43	2.77*	5,32	15	20	1.44	5,25	1	30	5.39*	3,41	1	32	0.09	5,86	35	42	4.90*	2,29	8	18
EM	EF	1.98	2,80	17	23	0.53	5,32	5	3	0.19	5,25	2	3	0.62	3,41	7	5	1.96	5,86	15	4	0.90	2,29	6	6
CM	CF	3.83*	2,80	21	28	2.77*	5,32	21	14	1.44	5,25	16	15	2.49	3,41	21	12	1.05	5,86	53	24	4.90*	2,29	9	17
E	C	4.87*	2,80	40	49	2.85*	5,32	8	35	1.00	5,25	5	31	2.95*	3,41	12	33	6.57*	5,86	19	77	2.10	2,29	12	26

*($p \leq .05$)

TABLE 4

F-Ratios and Degrees of Freedom by Grade
for the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Test Gains

Source of Variance	Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Reading Lab	
	F	df	F	df	F	df	F	df	F	df
Treatment Effect	8.83*	1,72	0.07	1,39	1.41	1,62	5.98*	1,51	0.03	1,89
Sex Effect	2.91	1,72	0.12	1,39	1.38	1,62	0.00	1,51	0.03	1,89
Race Effect	0.00	1,72	1.35	1,39	0.22	1,62	2.29	1,51	2.59	1,89
Treatment X Sex	1.27	1,72	0.09	1,39	0.79	1,62	6.55*	1,51	0.00	1,89
Treatment X Race	0.15	1,72	0.44	1,39	0.35	1,62	5.29*	1,51	1.91	1,89
Sex X Race	0.00	1,72	0.04	1,39	0.15	1,62	0.37	1,51	0.32	1,89
Treatment X Sex X Race	0.37	1,72	0.00	1,39	0.00	1,62	0.00	1,51	0.00	1,89

* ($p \leq .05$)

TABLE 5

Means and n's for the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Test Gains by Grade by Treatment Group, Sex, and Race (E: Experimental Group; C: Control Group; M: Male; F: Female; B: Black; W: White)

Group	Grade									
	1		2		3		4		Reading Lab	
	$\bar{x}$	n	$\bar{x}$	n	$\bar{x}$	n	$\bar{x}$	n	$\bar{x}$	n
E	1.71	38	-0.38	8	1.00	17	-1.96	26	0.39	18
C	-2.12	42	-0.68	38	-0.49	53	2.41	32	0.52	77
EM	1.94	16	-2.40	5	1.38	8	1.56	9	1.21	14
CM	-2.28	18	-1.20	20	-0.92	26	2.35	20	0.79	53
EF	1.55	22	3.00	3	0.67	9	-3.82	17	-2.50	4
CF	-2.00	24	-0.11	18	-0.07	27	2.50	12	-0.08	24
EB	2.00	2	3.00	2	0.50	4	0.50	4	-	-
CB	-6.17	6	-2.17	6	0.88	17	-9.00	1	0.63	35
EW	1.69	36	-1.50	6	1.15	13	-2.41	22	0.39	18
CW	-1.44	36	-0.41	32	-1.14	36	2.77	31	0.43	42

Tables 6 and 7 list the results of the Ohio. F-ratios and degrees of freedom are given in Table 6, and means and n's in Table 7. Corresponding to the results found on the Coopersmith, significant differences were obtained in grades one and four. In grade one, the experimental group again had higher gains than the control group; blacks did significantly better than whites. Plus, there was a significant race-sex interaction; black females and white males made greater gains than white females and black males. In grade four, there was a significant difference by race; whites did better than blacks. Also a significant treatment-sex interaction existed where experimental females and control males did better than control females and experimental males.

Interrelation of Achievement, Self-Esteem, and Social Acceptance

Interrelations of achievement, self-esteem, and social acceptance were investigated utilizing Pearson product-moment correlations on the six test grade levels described in the results of the achievement data. Significant results ($p = .05$) varied from test grade level to test grade level. In test grade level one consisting of first graders, experimental males had a significant positive relationship between aural comprehension and the Coopersmith ($r = -.50$), but a significant negative relationship between aural comprehension and the Ohio ($r = -.63$). For those students in test grade level two who took the SAT - Level I, control males had a significant positive relationship between Reading Part A and the Ohio ($r = 0.47$). For test grade level three where students were administered the SAT - Level II, control females had a positive correlation between Reading Part A and the Coopersmith ($r = 0.59$) and control whites between Word Study Skills and the Coopersmith ($r = 0.37$). The fourth test grade level provided a negative relationship between Word Study Skills and the Coopersmith for experimental females ($r = .90$). The reading laboratory students who took the SAT - Level I had positive correlations with the Ohio and negative correlations with the Coopersmith. The experimental group had positive correlations between the Ohio and Reading Part A ($r = 0.51$); experimental females between the Ohio and Total Reading ($r = 0.96$); and experimental whites between the Ohio and Reading Part B ($r = 0.51$). Negative correlations existed for the experimental group between the Coopersmith and Reading Part B ($r = -.55$) and between the Coopersmith and Total Reading ($r = -.49$); and likewise for the experimental males ($r = -.60$ and $r = -.52$, respectively) and the experimental whites ($r = -.55$ and $r = -.49$, respectively). For the sixth test grade level, those students taking the MAT, there was a negative correlation for the control group between the Coopersmith and Total Reading ($r = -.39$).

Summation

Exactly what does the gamut of information above reveal? In summary, it implies that the Personalized Reading Program is best applied above the first grade and outside of reading laboratories

TABLE 6

F-Ratios and Degrees of Freedom by Grade
for the Ohio Self Acceptance Inventory Gains

Source of Variance	Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4	
	F	df	F	df	F	df	F	df
Treatment Effect	6.82*	1,48	0.01	1,39	3.68	1,63	1.62	1,52
Sex Effect	0.43	1,48	0.61	1,39	0.29	1,63	3.45	1,52
Race Effect	6.28*	1,48	0.05	1,39	0.16	1,63	4.87*	1,52
Treatment X Sex	0.17	1,48	0.94	1,39	0.32	1,63	10.38*	1,52
Treatment X Race	0.00	1,48	0.48	1,39	0.70	1,63	0.32	1,52
Sex X Race	7.14*	1,48	1.23	1,39	0.68	1,63	0.15	1,52
Treatment X Sex X Race	0.00	1,48	0.00	1,39	2.08	1,63	0.00	1,52

*($p \leq .05$)

TABLE 7

Means and n's for the Ohio Self Acceptance Inventory Gains by Grade by Treatment Group, Sex, and Race (E: Experimental Group; C: Control Group; M: Male; F: Female; B: Black; W: White)

	Grade							
	1		2		3		4	
Group	$\bar{x}$	n	$\bar{x}$	n	$\bar{x}$	n	$\bar{x}$	n
E	38.91	22	-0.88	8	-0.29	17	-9.41	29
C	20.81	32	-3.87	38	28.57	54	5.50	30
EM	44.20	10	10.60	5	4.13	8	-18.42	12
CM	21.00	14	0.35	20	22.69	26	24.40	20
EF	34.50	12	-20.00	3	-4.22	9	-3.06	17
CF	20.67	18	-8.56	18	34.04	28	-32.30	10
EB	-	-	1.50	2	21.50	4	26.60	5
CB	50.83	6	-12.17	6	28.17	18	28.00	1
EW	38.91	22	-1.67	6	-7.00	13	-16.92	24
CW	13.88	26	-2.31	32	28.78	36	4.72	29

where achievement gains are the major foci. The opposite is true for self-concept and social acceptance. The program seems to enhance self-esteem and social acceptance in the first grade with major emphasis on social acceptance. In the following grades, these measures increase for particular groups, specifically, experimental females, control males, and experimental whites.

APPENDIX

REACTIONS TO THE MODEL

1. Through this model were you able to identify each child's needs and then tailor the instruction to meet his needs?

2. Were the children able to work at their own pace?

3. Did the model help change self-concept? How?

4. Did it affect attitudes toward reading? How?

5. What was the ratio of your pulling books to students' choosing their own?

6. Did you use the SORT? How effective was it?

7. Did you teach your children the 5-finger method for choosing books? How effective was it?

8. Did your children read silently and orally every day?

9. How often did each child read to you?

10. Share your feelings about Bookselling. This goal was to spark interest in reading. Did it? Improvements? Include a sampling of ways your children shared, how you did it, and how often you did it.

11. Share your feelings about Sustained Silent Reading. This goal was to utilize you as a model and to read for uninterrupted periods of time. Improvements? Did it? How did you do SSR and how often?

12. Did you have a Skills Lab?

13. How did it work? Improvements?

14. If you did not have a Skills Lab, what did you use to teach skill development?

15. Circle any of the following that you also used to teach skills.
    worksheets games learning centers
    other (specify)

16. How often did you have skill groups that you taught? (on a weekly basis)

17. Did the children spend at least 2 days a week on skill activities? If more, indicate.

18. Did you teach any of the children to program themselves? Explain how they did it?

19. Did the children use the SRA lab at least 2 days a week? If more, indicate.

20. How effective was the SRA lab in teaching comprehension skills?

21. Share other techniques used to improve vocabulary for comprehension skills.

22. What kind of record-keeping system did you use for conferences? skill development? other? kids use for books?

23. How did your one to one conferences go with the children? Improvements?

24. Were you able to hear each child read once a week? If not, how did you compensate?

25. Did you use any of the suggested forms for record keeping? Share feelings?

26. Overall, how do you feel about this model in teaching kids to read? Its strengths? Its weaknesses? Would you use it again?

27. Which type of children do you feel it helped the most?

28. How do you feel about it vs. ability-grouped reading groups and using a basal reader?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Barbe, W. Educator's Guide to Personalized Reading Instruction. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.

2. Bruck, M. A Study of Age Differences and Sex Differences in the Relationship Between Self-Concept and Grade-Point Averages. Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1957.

3. Combs, Arthur W., Avila, Donald L., and Purkey, Wm. W. Helping Relationships: Basic Concepts for the Helping Professions. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1971.

4. Hamachek, D. E. A Study of the Relationship Between Certain Measures of Growth and the Self-Images of Elementary School Children. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1960.

5. Lamey, Mary. "Relationship of Self Perceptions of Early Primary Children to Achievement in Reading," Dissertation Abstracts, 1963, 24, 628-629.

6. McCracken, Robert A., and McCracken, Marlene J. Reading is Only the Tiger's Tail. San Rafael, California : Leswing Press, 1972, pp. 21-23.

7. Purkey, Wm. W. Self-Concept and School Achievement. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

8. Toller, Gladys. "Certain Aspects of the Self Evaluations Made by Achieving and Retarded Readers of Average and Above Average Intelligence," Dissertation Abstracts, 1968, 28, 976A.

9. Veatch, Jeanette. How to Teach Reading with Children's Books. New York: Citation Press, 1968, p. 9.

10. Veatch, Jeanette. Individualizing Your Reading Program. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959.

11. Veatch, Jeanette. Reading in the Elementary School. New York: Ronald Press Co., 1966, pp. 495-498.

12. Wattenberg, W., and Clifford, Clare. "Relation of Self-Concepts to Beginning Achievement in Reading," in W. Durr (Ed.) Reading Instruction: Dimensions and Issues. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1967.