DOCUMENT RESURE

IR 007 399

ED 172 773

AUTHOR TITLE

SPONS AGENCY

PUB DATE CONTRACT GRANT NOTE

Bikson, Tora K.: Bikson, Thomas H. Interactive Closed Circuit Television: Educational Implications for the Severaly Visually Impaired. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.; Rehabilitation Services Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C. 8 Apr 79 300-75-0123

RSA-14-P-55846/9 31p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, California, April B, 1979) ; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE DESCRIPTORS

MF01/PC02 Plus Postage. *Closed Circuit Television; *Educational Television; Interaction; *Man Machine Systems; Media Research; *Television Research; *Visually Handicapped

ABSTRACT

Interactive classroom talevision (ICTS) systems were installed in two special education classrooms to evaluate their impact on the learning experiences of severely visually impaired students. During a 3-year experimental period, data were collected from approximately 14 elementary students measuring achievement, visual-motor integration, visual memory, and relevant social psychological dimensions. Outcomes were examined in within-subject analyses assessing the extent and pattern of change over time. Results indicated significant improvements across measurement areas. Achievement scores approximated grade normal by the final year, suggesting that the experimental system provided educational opportunities comparable to those experienced by the fully sighted. (Author/JVP)

***************** Reproductions supplied by EDES are the best that can be made from the original document. ****************************** INTERACTIVE CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION: EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

FOR THE SEVERELY VISUALLY IMPAIRED

Tora K. Bikson and Thomas H. Bikson The Rand Corporation

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-ATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-SENTOFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Interactive closed circuit classroom television systems were installed in two special education classrooms to evaluate their impact on learning experiences of severely visually impaired students. During a three-year experimental period data were collected from approximately 14 elementary students measuring achievement, visual-motor integration, visual memory, and relevant social psychological dimensions. Outcomes were examined in within-subjects analyses assessing extent and pattern of change over time. Results indicated significant improvements across measurement areas. Achievement scores approximated grade normal by the final year, suggesting that the experimental system provided educational opportunities comparable to those experienced by the fully sighted.

*PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas H. Bikson.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Prepared for presentation to the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, Session 4.10, April 8, 1979.

INTERACTIVE CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION: EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS FOR THE SEVERELY VISUALLY IMPAIRED

Tora K. Bikson and Thomas H. Bikson

The Rand Corporation

April 1979

An Interactive Classroom Television System (ICTS) is a way of creating a visual classroom environment for partially sighted students by making use of the magnification, brightness and contrast capabilities of television cameras and monitors. More precisely, an ICTS is a multicamera, multimonitor closed circuit television system linking a series of student desks, a teacher's desk, and a roomviewing camera. Such a system permits teachers and their partially sighted students to be in continuous two-way visual communication with one another (See Fig. 1). Moreover, it allows partially sighted students to function visually in classroom situations that are closely akin to those experienced by their fully sighted peers; that is, they can read ordinary printed matter, look at pictures, write with pen or pencil, do workbook problems, correct each others' papers, see Thus, an ICTS constitutes a the clock on the wall, draw or paint. complex visual aid that enables severely impaired students to make the fullest possible use of their residual vision. This paper presers the results of a three-year demonstration project whose aim was to evaluate the effects of an ICTS on the learning experiences of partially sighted elementary school students in special education programs in two southern California school districts. The assumption underlying the research was that even severely impaired students have residual visual capabilities which, given an appropriate aid, can be put to use to maximize learning and provide educational outcomes comparable to those of the fully sighted.

This research was supported by grants from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education (contract 300-75-0123) and from the Rehabilitation Services Administration (grant 14-P-55846/9).

SUBJECTS AND PROCEDURES

Students in the two participating species education programs were eligible to take part in the ICTS projects as if they were partially sighted, i.e., if acuity in the better can even with corrective lenses did not exceed 20/70 but was better them light perception or projection alone; b) if, given multiple improved, nonvisual Kandicaps did not seriously interfere with use of the controls; and c) if they were nominally assigned to grade levels the through six for enrollment purposes, regardless of actual performance level. Approximately 14 students met these criteria and became subjects in the three-year research project; more than 80 percent were legally blind.

Teachers in the participating special education programs were trained to operate the ICTS and were encouraged to employ ordinary grade-appropriate curricular materials (e.g., texts, work sheets, paper-and-pencil games); however, actual choices of materials and lesson plans were entirely their own. Teachers were required to have their students spend two hours per day using the ICTS for academic instruction in group as well as individualized activities. In addition, they could use the ICTS as much or as little as they pleased in non-academic activities such as music, art and drama. It was hypothesized that such an ICTS program would significantly improve the learning experiences of the partially sighted subjects in the demonstration.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Program outcomes for subjects were conceptualized in terms of four areas. Of primary importance was the impact of the ICTS on academic achievement in basic elementary school skills. Basic skills, for the purpose of this evaluation, were restricted to reading and mathematics achievement as measured by appropriate subtests of the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS). A second area of concern was the relationship of the ICTS to visually dependent perceptual—motor processes such as visual motor integration (assessed by the Development Test of Visual Motor Integration, or VMI) and visual memory (assessed by the visual sequential subtest of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, or ITPA). For the partially sighted

student making use of residual vision by means of an ICTS, these processes are important mediators of information encoding and decoding, and thus could have a substantial influence on learning.

Next the project sought to determine what effect, if any, the ICTS had on self and social attitudes (e.g., self esteem and peer affiliation) thought to be significant in students' school experiences For this purpose we employed both a verbal self-report instrument (the Self Observation Scales, or SOS) and a symbol manipulation task using geometric shapes and relationships to stand for self and social constructs (the Self Social Constructs Test, or SSCT). The final evaluation domain assessed only during the third project year, was facial affect decoding and encoding. It was supposed that for partially sighted students social competence is in part visually mediated--that the ability accurately to perceive and respond to social stimuli is an important part of psychosocial development which most likely involves successful affect decoding and encoding. The former was measured by the Inter-Person Perception Test (IPP:), while the latter was measured in terms of scores on a facial expression production task devised by Ekman (v. P. Ekman and W. Friesen, Unmasking the Face, Prentice Hall, 1975).

Measures were administered primarily on a pre-post basis each academic year. An exception was achievement testing: because scores are known to change little from spring to the following fall, postmeasures collected in one year served as premeasures for the succeeding year unless the student changed test levels. Where possible, scores were represented in terms of age or grade level equivalents and/or their distance from an age or grade normal outcome. Because the number of subjects enrolled in the project during any given year was small and because there was little reason to expect normally distributed data, evaluation outcomes within years were investigated primarily by the use of nonparametric analyses relying only on ordinal properties of scores. Examining pre-to-post changes was of primary interest. For this purpose, Wilcoxen matched-pairs signed-ranks tests (within subjects) were used. Between-subjects comparisons exploring outcome differences as a function of such factors as site or age group (grades one through three versus grades four through six)



were assessed with the Mann Whitney U statistic.

In order to investigate changes within subjects over time, longitudinal analyses were undertaken at the end of the project. For this purpose, data were grouped on the basis of "participation year" for all subjects for whom at least two years of measures were available. Defining participation years I and II as a subject's first and second year of enrollment in the project (independently of calendar year) generated a sufficiently large sample for repeated measures analyses of variance. Longitudinal analyses employ both time of measurement (pre-to-post) and participation year (I and II) as repeated independent factors; where appropriate, such analyses also include grade-or age-group as crossed independent factors.

Results.

Discussion of results is organized according to the order in which outcome areas were described above. Achievement evaluation results over the three years of the demonstration generated the following conclusions. First, pre-post comparisons showed ICTS subjects improving significantly in both reading and mathematics each year, as expected. Further, at the end of the first year the following pattern of gains was evident: older students were significantly farther from grade normal in both reading and mathematics than were younger students, an outcome to be expected given the cumulative nature of educational deficits; and all students performed significantly better in mathematics (i.e., scored closer to grade normal) than in reading (see Table 1). We inferred that relative superiority of mathematics scores was attributable to the fact that doing computations requires less scanning than does reading. However, students' scores were systematically inferior to grade normal in both skill areas at the end of the first year. The second year's data revealed a contrasting gains pattern: substantially greater improvement occurred in reading than in mathematics, so that no statistically significant differences remained between scores in the two skill areas; apparently a second year of ICTS experience enabled students to learn

5

the visual scanning skills requisite for advances in reading achievement (see Table 2). Finally, by the end of the third year of the demonstration, students achievement scores in both skill areas were not significantly different from grade normal (see Table 3).

Tables 4 and 5 present cell means (N = 17) and values of F with. related significance levels for examined sources of variation in reading and mathematics scores studied longitudinally. Table 4 treats reading results as obtained grade equivalent scores (upper half) and as distances between obtained and grade normal scores (lower half); Table 5 is organized similarly. As the analysis summary indicates, reading scores in grade equivalents exhibit a highly significant main effect for pre-post change, a result anticipated on the basis of within-year findings. The average gain was 4.7 months in participation year I and 1 year 6 months in participation year II, or an average gain of 1 year 2.2 months in reading equivalents per year among two-year students. While participation year itself yields no main effect, the change-by-year interaction terms is significant; reading gains are substantially greater in a student's second year, a finding that corroborates within-year conclusions. The analysis of distances between obtained and grade normal reading scores, in contrast, finds no source of variation to significantly influence results. It is interesting to note that while lower-level students! scores tend to be less distant from grade normal (in part reflecting floor effects), it is higher level students whose scores show a net decrease in distance from grade normal over two participation years. Comparable findings come from longitudinal analyses of mathematics scores. As Table 5 indicates, mathematics scores exhibit strong main effects for pre-to-post change across two participation years. Average gain in grade equivalents was 6.8 months in the first participation year and 1 year 1 month in the second, for an average ninemonth gain per 10-month school year. Here, however, the change-byyear interaction is not statistically significant. The analysis of distances between obtained and grade normal mathematics scores, like that for reading scores, shows no significant source of varia-It is interesting, nevertheless to note the similar pattern

of mean discrepancies in relation to grade level. That is, while grade level does not yield a main effect, the average discrepancy tends to be smaller for younger than for older students, while older students show more systematic decreases in discrepancy during the two years.

The investigation of the two visually dependent perceptualmotor skill areas yielded an interesting and related pattern of results. With respect to visual-motor integration students' scores showed a significant increase in the first year although at post test they remained substantially behind developmental age norms. Visual sequential memory scores were higher, on average, by the end of the first year as well but not by a statistically significant margin (see Table 6). In contrast, the second year's data manifested just the opposite sorts of results: VMI scores tended in general to increase but not systematically; ITPA visual sequential memory scores, on the other hand, showed strong and significant improvements. It seemed likely that visual-motor coordination increased as students learned to use the ICTS, during the first year of the demonstration. But scanning, as we have seen, was more difficult and apparently required a longer learning period. Thus, visual sequential memory scores (partly dependent on scanning skills) did not evidence significant positive change until the second year, during which reading (also scan-dependent) improved as well (see Table 7). These conjectures were supported by examining intercorrelations among achievement and visually dependent skill scores. While ITPA scores were associated with mathematics achievement, they were much more closely correlated with reading achievement. The third year's outcomes showed further (and significant) gains in VMI scores, with subjects topping out on the ITPA subtest (see Table 8).

Longitudinal results are given in which tables 9 and 10 present cell means and values of F with related significance levels for independent factors expected to influence visual-motor integration and visual sequential memory (N = 17); scores represent age equivalents in months. The analysis summary in Table 9 (upper half) indicates a highly significant main effect for overall rate of pre-post

7

change in visual-motor integration, an encouraging result since fallto-spring gains reached statistical significance during only two of the three project years. The average gain in month equivalents was 12.1 for participation year I and 14.2 for participation year II, of an average gain of 13.2 months in developmental equivalents per year in visual-motor integration among two-year students. Dependent measures in the lower half of Table 9 represent distance of obtained scores from age-normal scores in terms of months. Here the rate of change approaches significance, suggesting that students were making strong, stable progress toward developmentally normal performance in visual-motor integration. In addition, age level significantly influenced scores, with older students beginning and remaining much further benind developmental norms than younger students. Longitudinal analysis of VMI scores, then, supported conclusions drawn from within-year data: while students showed improvement across project years, measured both as gains in developmental months and as decreases in distance from age-normal visual-motor functioning, they were unable to eliminate the discrepancy between obtained and developmentally expected scores, with older students being at the most severe disadvantage.

Contrasting findings come from the analyses of visual sequential memory scores. As Table 10 (upper half) indicates, none of the examined sources of variation had a major effect on visual sequential memory. Participation year is the strongest independent factor and approaches statistical significance, suggesting that the second year of ICTS experience was important in promoting visual sequential skills. Outcomes at the end of the second participation year averaged 15.1 months higher than outcomes attained at post-test time 12 months earlier; these findings tend to corroborate interpretations of within-year studies (where only the second project year produced significant gains) and are strengthened by results of the longitudinal investigation of reading and mathematics scores. The examination

of distances between obtained and age-normal scores is summarized in the lower half of Table 10 where only one main effect is evident: older students' visual sequential memory performance was substantially more discrepant with developmental norms than was the performance of younger students. The cell means suggest that gains on age norms are found primarily among the younger students, with older students neither losing ground nor advancing. Consequently, the fact that by the end of the project no significant differences existed between obtained and grade-normal scores was primarily a function of the scores of younger students. These results, together with the longitudinal analysis of VMI scores, suggest that it may be more difficult for students to overcome deficits in perceptual motor skills related to visual impairment than to overcome related achievement deficits. If so, it could be supposed that while perceptual motor skills surely facilitate transfer of academic information and while some level of skill acquisition is requisite for reading and mathematics achievement, age-normal perceptual motor function is not necessary to grade-normal achievement.

The third evaluation area, self and social attitudes, seemed most recalcitrant to change. Two different measurement methods were chosen to assess a set of attitudes thought to be relevant to school success. The experimentally developed Self Social Constructs Test (SSCT), a nonverbal instrument that makes use of spatial symbols and their arrangement to represent self and social schemata, was employed to assess four constructs: self esteem, social distance from teachers and peers, and scope of peer attachment. The second attitude instrument employed, the nationally normed Self Observation Scales (SOS), is a set of verbal ves-no items designed to assess self-acceptance, social maturity, school affiliation, and self security. Results for the two instruments on a within-year basis are presented in Tables 11 through 17: As is evident, school-relevant self and social attitudes did not show positive difference scores over the three years generally commensurate with achievement and related visual skill gains. Specifically, the first year's data yielded no overall sig-. nificant gains on any psychosocial measure except for social maturity 9

(SOS), an outcome not specifically associated with the demonstration and probably reflective of normal social development with increasing school experience (Table 11). Somewhat more encouraging results were manifest in the second year's data (Table 12)\which yielded significant positive changes in self esteem and peer attachment or affiliation scores (SOS, SSCT) generated by two quite different measurement methods. However, by the third year, only small and inconsistent changes appeared (Table 13): social distance from peers (SSCT) showed a significant decrease, but school affiliation scores (SOS) also yielded a significant decrease. Longitudinal repeated measured analyses essentially compoborate these conclusions. Résults for the three self-oriented attitude measures appear in Tables 14 and 15 (upper half). Here it is evident that the strongest source of variation in attitude toward self is grade level, older students exhibiting more favorable self constructs across fairly different measurement methods. Only self acceptance (SOS) also manifests a main effect for pre-post change in a positive direction; in the absence of support from measures of related constructs, however, this outcome is not strongly compelling. Tables 15 (lower half) through 17 present summary tables for repeated measures analyses of socially-oriented measures. As expected, strongest effects for change over time as well as grade level are generated by the social maturity measure (again interpreted as reflecting maturation). School reflective measures, in contrast, show the following results. SSCT measures of peer contact tapping aspects of intimacy and extensiveness show that while closeness to teachers is unaffected by any independent factor, older students seem to have more extensive peer networks and to feel closer to other students during the school year. On the other hand, the SOS measure of school affiliation evidence a decrease over the school year especially among younger students. These findings have led us to three conclusions. First, it would be desirable to locate or develop more sensitive and valid measures of self and social attitudes among handicapped students. Second, it is possible that the history of often-tested severely handicapped students engenders rather invariant failure expectations with attendant negative self images that are difficult to overcome; we were unable to observe positive changes in self and social constructs commensurate with strong gains in achievement and related visual skills. Finally, it seems particularly important to give special attention to the socioemotional climate for lower-grade visually impaired elementary school students.

The last evaluation domain comprised affect decoding and encoding. This assessment was introduced in the third year of the study on the hypothesis that social perception and social communication might be visually based skills that mediate interpersonal behavior for visually impaired students in somewhat the same way that visual symbolic capability mediates academic activity. If so, then it would be worthwhile to attempt to understand more about the self-social constructs of subjects by assessing hypothetically underlying skills. Table 18 presents within year results for the Inter-Person Perception Test. As is evident, at pretest subjects performed poorly on the facial affect recognition task (IPPT), and no statistically significant overall gains in affect decoding were attained. In part the absence of recognition gains seemed due to the task stimuli. Although every effort had been made to improve the contrast in the standard stimulus photographs for the IPPT, subjects still had difficulty discriminating facial details. While novel test development lay beyond the scope of .the project, results from the affect encoding task led us to believe that a better stimulus set would have produced better results. With respect to affect encoding ("making a face" conventionally representative of a specified affect), ICTS subjects scored profoundly worse than matched fully sighted controls (Table 19). However, within a year, subjects had made significant advances so that post test scores compared favorably with the pretest scores of the controls; no significant differences remained between them (Figures 2-6). Because reproduction is usually regarded as more difficult than recognition, we suspect that recognition scores are depressed due to an inadequate measurement method. We believe that, affect decoding and encoding among partially sighted students is an area well worth further exploration, particularly in relation to development of social competence among the visually handicapped.

In summary, three years of evaluation data suggest that the ICTS had a strong and stable positive impact on the learning experiences of partially sighted elementary school students. Effects are most visible in reading and mathematics achievement, where students have closed the gap between their own and grade normal outcomes. The greatest need is for developing methods to enhance self and social constructs, perhaps by using the ICTS to facilitate interpersonal competence. Overall it was our conclusion that the ICTS can be used to maximize the learning orportunities of severely visually impaired students and to provide educational experiences comparable to those of the fully sighted.

Table 1
CTBS SCORES, 1975-1976

| | • | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | , | Readi | ıg | Mathema | tics | 46. F |
| Subject | Grade Normal | Distance Post from test Grade Score Normal | Pre- Pre- test° Post Score Change | Distance Post- from test Grade Score Normal | Pre- Pre- test Post Score Change | Post-test: Reading - Mathematics |
| Site 1 - 101 - 102 - 103 - 104 - 105 | 6.9 5.9 3.9 4.9 | 5.4 -1.5 1.8 -4.4 3.3 -0.6 5.2 +0.3 1.5 -0.4 | 4.6 +0.8 1.5 +0.3 3.6 -0.3 5.8 -0.6 0.6 +0.9 | 4.9 -2.0 3.7 -2.2 4.0 +0.1 5.9 +1.0 2.1 +0.2 | 5.2 -0.3 2.9 +0.8 3.8 +0.2 4.4 +1.5 0.5 +1.6 | +0.5 -1.9 -0.7 -0.7 -0.6 |
| Site II 201 203 205 210 Means | 3.9 6.9 1.9 6.9 | 3.0 -0.9 3.1 -3.8 1.8 -0.1 2.3 -4.6 | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | 2.5 -1.4 3.3 -3.6 2.7 +0.8 3.6 -3.3 | $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | +0.5 -0.2 -0.9 -1.3 |

Theoretical beginning first grade score; this student bottomed out on the fall CTBS.

- ...



Table 2
CTBS SCORES, 1976-1977

| | <u> </u> | | • • | | | | · | · · | | |
|---------|--|-----------------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| | | | Readi | ng | | | Mathema | | | |
| | | Post- | Distance from | Pre- | Pre- | Post- | Distance .from | Pre- | Pre- | Post-test: |
| Subject | Grade Normal | tes t Score | Grade Normal | test Score | Post Change | test S c ore | Grade Normal | test S c ore | Post Change | Reading - Mathematics. |
| Site I | | | | · 7 | - | | | | | |
| 102 | 6.9 | 2.1 | -4.8 | 1.8 | +0.3 | 4.0 | -2.9 | 3.7 | +0.3 | -1.9 |
| 103 | 4.9 | 5.1 | +0.2 | 3.3 | +1.8 | 5.8 | +0.9 | 4.0 | +1.8 | -0.7 |
| 104 | 5.9 | .6:1 | +0.4 | 5.2 | +1.1 | . 6.7 | +0.8 | 5.9 | +0.8 | -0.4 |
| Site II | | | • | | | | | | | |
| 201 | 4.9 | 5.1 | +0.2 | 3.0 | +2.1 | 3.4 - | -1.5 | 2,5 | +0.9 | +1.7 |
| 203 | 7.9 | 4.8 | -3.1 | 3.1 | +1.7 | 3.0 | -4.9 | 3.3 | -0.3 | +1.8 |
| 210 | 7.9 | 3.5 | -4.4 | 2.3 | +1.2 | 4.4 | -3.5 | 3.6 | +0.8 | -0.9 |
| 211 | 1.9 | 1.7 | -0.2 | 0.1 | +1.6 | 1.3 | -0.6 | 0.1 | +1.2 | +0.4 |
| 213 | 4.9 | 5.7 | +0.8 | 5.5 | +0.2 | 5.1 | +0.2 | 4.0 | +1.1 | +0.6 |
| 214 | 2.9 | 1.9 | -1.0 | 1.2. | +0.7 | 1.8 | -1.1 | 0.1 | +1.7 | +0.1 |
| 215 | 6.9 | 4.9 | -2.0 | 2.2 | +2.7 | 3.3 | -3.6 | 3.6 | , -0.3 | +1.6 |
| Means | The state of the s | a. | -1.39 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | +1.34 | | -1.62 | | +0.8 | +0.2 |

CTBS SCORES, 1977-1978

| | | | Readi | ng | | | Mathema | tics | · | |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Subject - | Grade Normal | Post- test Score | Distance from Grade Normal | Pre- test Score | Pre- Post Change | Post- test Score | Distance from Grade Normal | Pre- test Score | Pre- Post Change | Post-test: Reading - Mathematics |
| Site I 103 104 | 5.9 6.9 | 5.4 7.8 | -0.5 +0.9 | 5.1 6.3 | +0.3 | 7.1 .6.5 | +1.2 | 5Ŷ8 6.7 | +1.3 +0.9 | -1.7 +1.3 |
| Site II 201 204 207 208 210 212 213 215 216 217 | 5.9 3.9 2.9 2.9 8.9 2.9 5.9 7.9 4.9 | 6.9 0.3 1.9 1.6 5.0 1.9 10.0 6.3 7.1 7.1 | +0.11 -3.7 -1.1 -1.4 -3.10 -1.1 +4.2 -1.7 -2.3 -2.3 | 5.1 0.2 1.7 0.1 3.5 1.7 5.7 4.9 4.3 3.4 | +1.8 +0.1 +0.2 +1.5 +1.5 +0.2 +4.5 +1.6 +2.10 +3.9 | 5.7 0.6 4.5 1.6 5.0 2.9 7.0 5.6 6.5 5.7 | -0.3 -3.4 +1.7 -1.4 -3.1 -0.1 +1.2 -2.4 +1.7 +0.9 | 3.4 0.1 3.2 1.2 4.4 1.5 5.1 3.3 5.2 2.8 | +2.3 +0.5 +1.3 +0.4 +0.6 +1.4 +1.11 +2.3 +1.3 +2.11 | +1.2 -0.3 -2.6 +0.0 +0.0 -1.0 +3.0 +0.7 +0.6 +1.4 |
| Means | | | -0.2 | | +1.6 | | -0.4 | | +1.3 | +0.2 |

Table 4 ...
LONGITUDINAL READING SCORE ANALYSIS

CTBS READING SCORES (grade equivalents)

. Participation Year

| Rate of Change | I | II | |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | 2.4 | |
| Pre | 3.2 | 3.4 | |
| Post | 3.7 | 5.0 | |
| Source | F | <u>p</u> | |
| Participation Year Rate of Change Year X Rate | .91 14.29 4.05 | n.s. .002 .06 | |

DISTANCE BETWEEN OBTAINED AND GRADE NORMAL READING SCORES.

Participation Year

| Rate of Change | Grade | Level | Grad | e Level |
|-------------------|-------|--------|--------|----------|
| • 8 = | Lower | Higher | Lower. | Higher |
| Pre | -0.2 | -2.0 | -0.4 | -2.1 . ' |
| Post | -0.8 | -2.2 | -1.0 | -1.1 |

| « <u>Source</u> | <u>F</u> | | P |
|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Participation Year | .01 | La Vince | n.s. |
| Rate of Change | 12 | • | 🥕 "ni.s. |
| Grade Level | .64 | · | n.s. |
| Year X Rate | .61 | · • | n.s. |
| Year X Grade | .06 | | n.s. |
| Rate X Grade | 1.62 | 17 | n.s. |



CTBS MATHEMATICS SCORES (grade equivalents)

| | Participat | ion Year | 1 | |
|--|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|
| Rate of Change | ı | II | | |
| | | |] | |
| Pre | 3.2 | 3-,7 | | |
| Post | 3.9 | 4.8 | | |
| Source | F | P | | |
| Participation Year ** Rate of Change Year X Rate | 1.15 19.87 1.14 | n.s. < .001 n.s. | \ a ' | |

DISTANCE BETWEEN OBTAINED AND GRADE NORMAL MATHEMATICS SCORES Participation Year

| • | • | 1 j" | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-------------|-------------|--------|--|
| Rate of Change | Grade | Level | Grade Level | | |
| 79-19- | Lower | · Higher | Lower | Higher | |
| Pre | -0.05 | -2.0 | -0.6 | -1.8. | |
| Post | -0.6 | -1.9 | 0 | 1.5 | |
| | | · | <u> </u> | | |

| Source | <u>F</u> | | <u>P</u> . |
|--------------------|----------|----|------------|
| Participation Year | .01 | | n.s. |
| Rate of Change | .04 | • | n.s. |
| Grade Level | 1.40 | | n.s. |
| Year X Rate | 1.79 | | n.s. |
| Year X Grade | .01 | • | n.s. |
| Rate X Grade | .15 | 18 | n.s. |

Table 6 .
VISUALLY DEPENDENT SKILLS, 1975-1976

| Age | | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | <u> </u> | | | · · · | |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|---------------------------|
| Age | | | VMI | | | - ITP | A^{a} | | |
| Site I 101 | Subject | (Years- | test from Age | test Post | test | from Age | test | Post | |
| $ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | Site I. 101 102 103 104 | 11-7 11-3 9-2 9-10 | 8-8 -35 6-10 -53 7-10 -16 10-11 +13 | 6-10 <u>+</u> 0 6-5 " + 17 7-10 +37 | 5-7 10-5 ^b 10-5 ^b | -68 +15 + 7 | | | +15 -31 + 6 |
| Means -20 +13 -20 +8 | 201 203 204 205 206 207 208 | 12-4 0-10 6-7 6-1 5-5 5-8 | 9-6 -34 4-1 -33 7-4 +9 4-9 -16 5-3 -2 4-9 -11 7-10 -47 | 5-6 +48 4-9 - 8 6-5 +11 4-6 + 3 4-4 +11 4-4 + 5 7-4 + 6 | 6-6 5-7 6-2 10-5 5-7 4-10 | -70 -15 - 5 +52 + 2 -10 71 | 7-10 4-4 , 6-2 4-10 6-2 3-1 | -16 +15 + 0 +67 - 7 +21 | +36 · -18 +14 +68 - 4 - 1 |

 a_{ITPA} was not administered to Madison subjects in fall 1976.



 $^{^{}b}$ Ceiling scores.

Table 7
VISUALLY DEPENDENT SKILLS, 1976-1977

| | | | | | : | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|--------------------------------|---|---|
| | ٥ | | ٠. | VMI | | | | ITE | Α . | • |
| | Subject | Age (Years- months) | Post- test Score | Distance from Age Normal | Pre- test Score | Pre- Post Change | Post- tést Score | Distance from Age Normal | Pre- test | Pre- Post Change |
| | Site I 102 103 104 | 12-3 10-2 10-10 | 8-7 6-5 11-9 | -44 -45 +11 | 6-10 7-10 10-11 | -17 | 5-10 10-5 10-5+ | + 3 | 5-7 10-5+ 10-5+ | $\begin{array}{ccc} a & +3 \\ a & +0 \\ a & +0 \end{array}$ |
| d s | Site II 201 203 204 207 208 210 211 212 213 214 215 | 9-6 13-4 7-10 6-5 6-8 12-9 7-2 6-10 9-10 8-3 11-8 | 9-6 7-11 4-9 5-3 6-10 9-4 5-0 5-0 9-6 5-0 6-10 | ± 0 -65 -37 -14 + 2 -41 -26 -22 - 4 -39 -58 | 6-7 ₆ 7-4 ⁶ 4-4 5-3 5-7 6-3 4-4 4-9 6-7 5-7 | +35 + 7 + 5 + 0 +15 +35 + 8 + 3 +35 - 7 -21 | 9-6 6-10 6-2 10-5 6-2 7-10 5-10 6-6 10-5+ 5-10 | -16 - 4 + 7 -29 | 7-3 7-10 5-7 6-2 4-4 7-3 4-7 5-7 6-10 6-6 9-9 | + 7 +51 +22 + 7 +15 +11 |
| `_ | Means | | | -27 | 7.6 | +_9' | | -15 | | +13 |

a_{Ceiling score}.

Table 8
WISUALLY DEPENDENT SKILLS, 1977-1978

| | <u>.</u> | VMI | | ITI | PA | |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Subject | Age (Years | Post- Distance I test from Age t Score Normal S | | Post- Distance test from Age Score Normai | test Post | |
| Site I 103 104 107 | 11-2 11-10 6-1 | 9-4 -22 12-8 +10 4-9 -16 | 6-5 +35 11-9 +11 4-1 +8 | $\begin{vmatrix} 10-5+a & + 0 \\ 10-5+a & + 0 \\ 3-4 & -33 \end{vmatrix}$ | $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | |
| Site II 201 204 207 208 210 212 213 215 216 217 | 10-6 8-10 7-5 7-8 13-9 7-10- 10-10 12-8 9-11 9-10 | 11-1 + 7 5-7 -39 5-7 -22 7-4 - 4 6-10 -83 6-0 -22 9-6 -16 9-4 -40 6-7: -40 7-11 -23 | 9-6 +19 4-9 +10 5-3 + 4 6-10 + 6 9-4 -30 5-0 +12 9-6 ± 0 6-10 +30 7-2 - 7 9-6 -19 | $ \begin{vmatrix} 10-5+ & + 0 \\ 5-10 & -36 \\ 9-9 & +29 \\ 9-9 & +25 \\ 6-10 & -83 \\ 6-6 & -16 \\ 10-5^a & + 0 \\ 7-3 & -65 \\ 10-5^a & + 6 \\ 10-5 & + 7 \end{vmatrix} $ | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | |
| Means | | -24 | + 6 | -13; | (b) | , |

a_{Ceiling score}.

The frequency of positive nonscoreable changes (i.e., changes beyond ceiling) renders mean change infeasible to calculate for the final project year.

LONGITUDINAL VISUAL MOTOR INTEGRATION STUDY

VMI SCORES (age equivalents in months)

| | Participa | tion Year |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| Rate of Change | I | II |
| ,\$re | 73.1 | 82.4 |
| Post | 85.2 | 96.6 |
| <u>Source</u> | F | P |
| Participation Year Rate of Change Year X Rate | 1.46 14.67 .09 | n.s. < .001 n.s. |

DISTANCE BETWEEN OBTAINED AND AGE NORMAL VMI SCORES Participation Year

| Rate of Change | Age J | Level | Age Level | | | | |
|----------------|--------|--------|-----------|--------|--|--|--|
| | Lower | Higher | Lower | Higher | | | |
| Pre | -17.0, | -41.0 | -20.6 | -39.6 | | | |
| Post | -17.3 | -30.5 | -14.2 | -31.9 | | | |

| Source | <u>F</u> | | P |
|--------------------|----------|----------------|----------|
| Participation Year | .00 | | n.s. |
| Rate of Change | 2.98 | • | .i0 |
| Grade Level | 5.27 | and the second | 03% |
| Year X Rate | .006 | | n.s. |
| Year X Age | .00 | يمخ وري | n.s. |
| Rate X Age | :75 | F. | n.s. |

Table 10 LONGITUDINAL VISUAL MEMORY STUDY

ITPA SCORES (age equivalents in months)

| Rate of Change | · . I | II . | |
|---|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| | | , | |
| Pre | 76.67 | 92.17 | |
| Post | 82.89 | 98.0 | |
| Source | F | P | |
| Participation Year Rate of Change Year X Rate | 2.36 1.59 .002 | .14 n.s. n.s. | * 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |

DISTANCE BETWEEN OBTAINED AND AGE NORMAL ITPA SCORES

Participation Year

| | | I | 1. | l. | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|----------|--------------|--------|--|--|--|
| Rate of Change | Age I | Level | Age Level | | | | |
| | Lower | Higher | Lower | Higher | | | |
| in and a second | · | | y y se entre | | | | |
| Pre | -6.8 | -39.8 | -13.2 | -28.1 | | | |
| * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Post | -10.2 | -37.3 | -1.8 | -40.9 | | | |
| | | | No. 188 | | | | |

| Source | \mathbf{F} | | <u>P</u> |
|--------------------|--------------|---|----------|
| Participation Year | .08 | | n.ś. ` |
| Rate of Change | .01 | • | n.s. |
| Grade Level | 6.31 | • | .02 |
| Year X Rate | · 1.67 | | n.s. |
| Year X Age | .00 | | n.s. |
| Rate X Age | 1.67 | | n.s. |

Table 11 PSYCHOSOCIAL OUTCOMES, 1975-1976

SELF SOCIAL CONSTRUCTS TEST

| | Self | -Accept | ance | Soci | al Matu | rity | School Affiliation | | | Self-Security | | |
|---------|-------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|--------|--------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------|-------|------------------------|
| | Post- | Pre- test | Pre- | Post- | test | | | Pre- test- Score | Pre- Post Change | ì | test | Pre- Post Change |
| Subject | Score | Score | Change | Score | Score | Change | 30016 | 2016 | Grange | Jeore | 30016 | Change |
| Site I | | · | | , | | | | | | | | |
| 101 | 65 | 61 | +1 / | -53 | 54 | - 1 | 59 | 58 | + 1 | 67 | 61 | + 6 |
| 102 | 54 | 60 | - 6 | 54 | 50 | + 4 | 59 | 54 | · + 5 | 46 | 55 | -9. |
| 103 | 56 | 63 | -7 . | 55 | 56 | - 1 | . 55 | 58 | · 3 | 65. | . 66 | - 1 |
| 104 | 65 | 64 | + 1 | · 57 | 56 | + 1 | - 59 | 58 | + 1 | 67 | 66 | . +1 |
| 105 | - 64 | 48 | +16 | [#] 56 | 53 | + 3 | 57 | . 33 | +24 | 67 | 67 | <u>+</u> 0 |
| | 1 | | ٠, | ŀ | | • • | Ì | ٠, | | | | |
| Site II | | | • | | | | | | | | | • |
| 201 | . 57 | 52 | + 5 | 56 | 57 | - 1 | 31 | 44 | -13 | 63 | 59 | + 4 |
| ຶ 203 | - 60 | 59 | + 1 | 58 | 60 | - 2 | 61 | . 59 | + 2 | 5.7 | 57 | ± 0 · + 3 |
| 204 | 55 | - 56 | - 1. | 26 | 24 | + 2 | 52 | 56 | - 4 | 25 | 22 | + 3 |
| 205 | 55 | 38 | +17 | 55 | 49 | + 6 | -43 | 52 | - ∙ 9 | 58 | 46 | +12 |
| 206 | 43 | 41 | + 2 | 30 | 24 | + 6 | 55 | . 43 | +12 | 34 | · 37 | - 3 |
| 207 | 40 | 42 | - 2 | 30 | 2 9 | + 1 | 28 | 41 | -13 | 46 | 50 | _ 4 |
| 208 | ∖ 53 | 53 | + 0. | 39 | 37 | + 2 | 46 - | 60 | -14 | 45 | 48° | 3 |
| 210 | - 51 | 43 | + 0 + 8 | 51 | 41 | +10 | 46 | 51 | - 5 | 52 | 45 | . + 7 |
| | ł. | | | 1 | | | | | | , | | : |
| Means | - 55 | € 52° | + 2.7 | 48 | 2.5 | + 2.3 | 50 | 51 | - 1.2 | 53 | . 52 | + 1.0 |

 $a_{\text{T-scores}}$: scales are standardized with $\bar{x} = 50$ and s.d. = 10.

SELF-OBSERVATION SCALES^a

| , | Self-Este e m | | | Social Distance from Students | | | Social Distance from Teachers | | | Attachment to Peers | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Subject | Post- test Score | Pre- test Score | Pre- ' Post Change | test | Pre- test Score | Pre- Post Change | Post- test Score | Pre- test Score | Pre- Post •Change | Post- test Score | Pre- test " Score | Pre- Post Change | |
| Site I 101 102 103 104 105 | 39 24 26 29 | 38 34 27 28 23 | + 1 -10 - 1 + 1 - 3 | 2 7 9 2 8 | 7 c 10 7 5 | -5 -3 +2 -3 +2 | 2 6 12 2 11 | 2 -3 -4 -4 10 | + 0 + 3 + 8 + 2 + 1 | 24 23 18 24 21 | 24 18 21 24 23 | + 0 + 5 - 3 + 0 - 2 | |
| Site II 201 203 204 205 206 207 208 210 | 28 39 23 34 27 34 22 45 | 20 27 33 24 37 32 23 29 | + 8 +12 -10 +10 -10 + 2 - 1 +16 | 10 2 6 7 7 3 2 | 4 5 2 2 9 4 6 | +6 -3 +4 +5 -2 -1 -4 | 7 2 5 2 6 12 2 | 9 8 2 2 7 2 5 | - 2 - 6 + 3 + 0 - 1 +10 - 3 + 2 | 21 19 2 23 7 15 16 | 14 5 13 3 15 14 12 18 | + 7 +14 -11 +20 - 8 + 1 + 4 + 1 | |
| Heans Range | 30 | 29 (8 <u>-</u> 48) | + 1.2 | _5 . | 6 (2-12) | +0.4 | 6 | 5 (2-12) | + 1.3 | ∱ 18 | 16 (0-24) | + 2.2 | |

^{*}Negative changes are representative of decreased social distance (i.e., favorable change).

Table 12
PSYCHOSOCIAL OUTCOMES, 1976-1977

SELF SOCIAL CONSTRUCTS TEST

| | Self | -Accept | ance | Soci | al Matu | rity | School Affiliation | | | Self-Security . | | |
|----------|-------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Post- | Pre- test | Pre- Post | Post- test | Pre- | Pre- Post | Post- test | Pre- test | Pre- Post | Post- test | Pre- test | Pre< |
| Subject | Score | Score | Change | Score | Score | Change | Score | Score | Change | Score | Score | Change |
| Site I | . ʻ | | | | | ., | 7.5 | | | | | |
| 102 | 60 | 54 | . + 6 | 59 | 57 | + 2 | 60 | 56 | + 4 | 58 | 54 | + 4 |
| 103 | 62 | 43 | +19 | 57 | 50 | + 7 | 43 | 30 | +13 ' | 66 | 69 | - 3 |
| 104 | 63 | 63 | 0 | 60 | 60 | 0 | 59 | · 59 | . 0 | - 67 | 67 | 0 |
| Site II | | | ٠,, | } | | | | | | | | - |
| 201 | 58. | 58 | 0 | 51 | 52 | - 1 | 24 | * 30 | - 6 | 70 | 71 | - 1. |
| 203 | 59 | 61 | - 2 | 58 | 48 | +10 | 39 | 60 | -21 | - 55 | 50 | . + 5 |
| 204 | 53 | - 50 | + 3 | 44 | 24 | +20 | 40 | 51 | -11 | 55 | 30 | +25 |
| 207 | 61 | `49 | +12 | 38 | 38 | . 0 | 32 | 46 | -14 | 52 | 51 | + 1 |
| 208 | -55 | -56 | - 1 | 24 | 27 | - 3 | 51 | 47 | 0 +4 | - 36 | 34. | + 2 |
| 210 | 60 | 54 | " + 6 | 54 | 53 | + 1 | 43 | ·: 27 | +16 | 56 | 58 | ~ 2 |
| 211 | - 55 | 48 | + 7 | . 33 | 28 | + 5 | -36 | 36 | 0 | 51 | 37 | +14 |
| 212 | 58 | 49 | + 9. | 25 | 38 | -13. | 38 | 43 | - 5 | 47 | √ 60 | -13 . |
| 213 | 61 | 55 | + 6 | 56 | 54 | + 2 | 38 | 41. | - 3 | 63 | 54 | + 9 |
| 214 | 57 | 56 | + 1 | 42 | .27 | +15 " | 50 | _. 56 | - 6 | 53 | 52 | + 1 |
| 215 | 62 | 57 - | + 5 | 59 | 49 | +10 | 50 | 51 | 1 | 65 | . 56 | + 9 |
| lieans . | 59 | 54 | + 5.1 | 47 | - 44 | +_3.9 | . 43 | 45 | - 2.1 | 57 | 54 | + 3.6 |

T-scores: scales are standardized with x = 50 and s.d. = 10.

SELF-OBSERVATION SCALES

| | Self-Esteem | | | Social Distance from Students | | | al Dist m Teach | | Attach | Peers | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Subject | Post- Pre test tes Score Sco | st Post | Post- test Score | Pre- test Score | Pre- Post Change | Post- test Score | Pre- test " Score | Pre- Post Change | Post-S test Score | Pre- test Score | Pre- Post Change |
| Site I 102 103 104 | 33 | 26 + 3 24 + 9 16 +15 | 2 4' 9 | 4 7 2 | - 2 - 3 , + 7 | 6 6 2 | 5 7 2 | + 1 - 1 + 0 | 17 -5 -24 | 19 12 24 | - 2 - 7 0 |
| Site II .201 203 204 207 | 29 24 | 32 +12 30 - 1 41 -17 36 0 | 2 2 5 2 | 6 2 2 | - 4 + 0 + 3 + 0 | 2 42 .8 | 12 /2 2 2 | -10 + 0 + 6 +1 | 9 24 3 19 | 16 21 2 2 22 | - 7 + 3 + 1 - 3 |
| 208 210 211 212 213 | 34 36 22 40 | 26 + 8 31 + 3 28 + 8 20 + 2 31 + 9 | 2 12 2 6 7 | 2 12 2 5 8 | + 0 + 0 + 0 + 1 - 1 | 2 2 2 5 12 | 5 10 9 | + 0 -10 - 3 - 5 + 3 | 22 - 24 - 3 - 24 | 24 19 6 4 | 0` + 3 +18 - 1 + 3 |
| 214 215 Heans | 42 0 | 38 +10 27 +15 29 + 5.4 | 2 2 4 | 2° 4 4. | ± 0 - 2 - 0.07 | 2 2 | 12 2 6 | -10 ± 0 · | 19 24 17 | 9 24 16 | +10 0 + 1.3 |
| Range | # | (8-48) | | (2-1 | 2) | | (2-1 | 2) | | (0- | 24) |

Negative changes are representative of decreased social distance (i.e., favorable change).

Table 12
PSYCHOSOCIAL OUTCOMES, 1977-1978

SELF SOCIAL CONSTRUCTS TEST

| | Self-Esteem | | Soci fro | Social Distance from Students | | | al Dis: m Teach | | Attach | Peers | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| S::::ject | Post- test Score | Pre- test Score | Pre- Post Change | Post- test Score | test | Pre- Post Change | Post- test Score | Pre- test Score | Pre- Post Change | Post- test Score | Pre- test Score | Pre- Post Change |
| Site I 103 104 107 | 27:=: 27 31 | 28 13 | - 3 - 1 +18 | 5 2 2 | 5 2 4 | + 0 + 0 + 0 2 | 8 2 2 | 3 2 8 | ± 0 ± 0 6 | 10 22 15 | 19 . 12 12 | - 9 +10 + 3 |
| 207 208 210 212 | 28 25 43 25 32 23 | 43 25 48 41 28 33 | -15 + 0 - ,5 -16 + 4 -10 | 3 4 12 · 2 2 2 | 2 7 7 2 12 6 | + 1 - 3 + 5 + 0 -10 - 3 | 7 6 12 2 12 8 | 6 12 2 12 12 12 | + 1 + 3 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 | 13 3 24 24 24 4 18 | 18 3 24 24 24 9 | - + + + + - + + - + + - + + |
| 213 215 216 217 | 30 - 22 - 35 - 28 | 39 30 25 17 | - 9 - 8 + 9 +11 | 2 2 2 2 | 7 5 3 | - 2 - 3 - 1 | 2 9 7 | 2 4 3 | ±++5 ++4 | 21 21 12 | 24 21 13 | - 3 + 0 - 1 |
| Means Range | 30 | 31 (0–48) | - 1.9) | 3 | 5 (2–12) | | 7 | (2-12) | + 0.2 | 16 | (0-24) | |

Negative changes are representative of decreased social distance (i.e., favorable change).

SELF-OBSERVATION SCALES

| | | <u></u> | | | | | | | | | | ` |
|-------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| | Self | -Accept | ance | Soci | al Matu | rity | Schor | V.Affil | iation | Self | -Securi | ty 🔍 🦠 |
| Subject | Post- test Score | test , | Pre- Post Change | test | Pre- test Score | Pre- Post , Change | Post- test Score | test | Pre- Post Change | Post- test Score | Pre- test Score | Pre- Post Change |
| Site I | • | | | | | | 2.7 | . 35 | 422 ÷ | 68 | 68 | ± 0 |
| 103 | 59 | 57 | + 2 | 57 | 54 | + 3 | 57 | | +22 +′ 0. | 67 | 67 | ± 0 ± 0 |
| 104 • | . 63 | 60 | + ,3 | 62 | 60 * | + 2 | .53 | 53 | ± 0, -16 | , | 58 | |
| · 107 | 46 | 63 ູ | -17 | . 21 | 44 | -23 | 33. | 49 | -16 | 33 | - 36 | |
| | | | • | | • | • | | | | | · · · | |
| Site II | | 60 | 4.1 | 64 | 64 | + 0 | 57 | 57 | + 0 | 64 | 62 | + 2 |
| 201 | 61 | 60 | + 1 - 2 | 40 | . 30 | +10 | 55" | 54 | Ŧ ĭ | 48 | 49 | " - 1 |
| 204 | 50 | . 52 | _ | 1 | 54 | 10 | 52 | 55 | - 3 | 62 | 61 | '+·1 |
| . 207 . | 61 | 60 | + 1 | 54 | | + 2 | 55 | 60. | - 5 - 5 | 61 | 59 | +. 2 |
| 208 | 53 | 59 | - ú | 52 | 54 | · | | 53 | + 1 | 64 | 54 | +10 |
| 210 | 。59 | 53 | + 6 | 61 | .: 63 | - 2 g | 31 | 41 | -10 | 47 | 53 | • |
| 212 | 54 | [*] 53 | + 1 ' | 33 | 27 | +6 | 1 | | _** | 52 | 67 | -15 |
| 2 13 | 5,8 | 61 | - .3 | 59 | 59 | ± 0 | 38 | 54 | | | 61 | - 4 |
| 215 | 59 | 62 · | - 3 | 62 | 57 | + 5 | 54 | 60 | - 6 | 57 | | _ |
| 216 | . 60 | 55 | + 5 | - 54 | . 49 | + 5 | 40 | . 28 | +12 | 61 | ` 56 | + 5 |
| 217 | 52 | c 49 | + 3 | 58 | 59 | - 1 | 56 | · · 55 | . +1. | ,36 | 46 | -10 |
| Means | 56 | 57 | · 0.7 | 52 | 52 | + 0.5 | 49 | 50 | - 2.3 | 55 | 58 | - 3. |

[&]quot;T-scores: scales are standardized with \bar{x} = 50 and s.d. = 10.



SELF-ESTEEM (SSCT)

Participation Year

| - | | | | TT |
|---|---|------|------|----|
| 1 | | | | TI |
| - | • | | | |
| | | | | |

| Rate of Change | Grade | Level | Grade Level | | |
|----------------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|--|
| | Lower | Higher | Lower | Higher | |
| Pre | 25.8 | 29.3 | 34.0 | 28.5 | |
| Post | 25.8 | 36.5 | 29.2 | 31.5 | |

| - Source | | <u>F</u> | The Armanian | | <u> P</u> |
|--------------------|----|-----------------|---|---|--|
| Participation Year | ۸. | .67 | | , | n.s. |
| Rate of Change | : | .52 | | | n.s. |
| Grade Level | | 2.40 | | • | 13 |
| Year X Rate | | 1.4 | • | | n.s., |
| Year X Grade | | 6.15 3.98 | | • | .06 |
| | | | • | | ······································ |

SELF-ACCEPTANCE (SOS)

Participation Year

| | • | |
|---|---|--|
| I | | |
| 1 | | |
| _ | | |
| | | |

| Rate of Change | Grade | Level | Grade Level | | | |
|----------------|-------|--------|-------------|--------|--|--|
| · | Lower | Higher | Lower | Higher | | |
| Pre | 52.5 | - 56.3 | 52.0 | 57.0 | | |
| Post | 53.2 | , 58.8 | 55.8 | 59.9 | | |

| Source | • . | <u>F</u> / | - | | P |
|--------------------|-----|------------|----------------|---|----------|
| Participation Year | | .23 | | | n.s. |
| Rate of Change | | • | | | .08 |
| Grade Level | | 5.56 | | | . 03 |
| Year X Rate | • | .44 | | • | n.s. |
| Year X Grade | | .002 | | | n.s. |
| Rate X Grade | | .03_ |) . () (**) | • | n.s. |

Table 15
LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF SELF-SOCIAL ORIENTATION

SELF-SECURITY (SOS)

| late of | | <u> </u> | 1 | |
|-------------|---------|----------|-------|--------|
| Change | | Level | Grade | Level |
| | Lower _ | Higher | Lower | Higher |
| | 1. 1. | | , , | |
| P re | 50.8 | 55.5 | 42.0 | 62.1 |
| | | | 1 | |
| | | | 1 | |
| Post | 48.5 | 58.3 | 47.5 | 60.1 |
| | | | | |

| Source | F | , <u>F</u> | • | P | |
|--|---|------------|---------|-------|-----|
| Participation Year | | .008 | | n.s. | ! . |
| Rate of Change | | 36 | | n.s. | , |
| Grade Level | | 8.90 | | .008 | |
| Year X Rate | • | 20 | | n.s. | ٠ |
| Year X Grade | | 1.33 | • • • • | 'n.s. | |
| Rate X Grade | | .12 | | n.s. | |
| and the second of the second o | | | | | |

SOCIAL MATURITY (SOS)

Participation Year

II

| Grade | Level , | Grade Level | | | |
|-------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Lower | Higher | Lower | Higher- | | |
| 40.2 | 51.7 | 29.0 | 54.5 | | |
| 38.5 | 55.8 | 34.8 | • 57.5 | | |
| | Lower 40.2 | Lower Higher 40.2 51.7 | Lower Higher Lower 40.2 51.7 29.0 | | |

| Source | <u>F</u> | | <u>P</u> . |
|--------------------|----------|-----|------------|
| Participation Year | .64 | | n.s. |
| Rate of Change | 5.07 | • | .04 |
| Grade Level | 35.23 | | .001 |
| Year X Rate | 1.56 | * | n.s. |
| Year X Grade | 2.24 | . 1 | .15 |
| Rate X Grade | .38 | 1 | n.s. |
| | | | |

LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD PEERS

SOCIAL DISTANCE FROM STUDENTS (SSCT) Participation Year

|] | E | | | • | • | | • | II |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|----|
| | | | | | | ٠ | | |

| Rate of Change | · 「 | Grade | Level | Grade Level | | |
|----------------|-----|-------|--------|-------------|--------|--|
| | , [| Lower | Higher | Lower | Higher | |
| Pre | | 4.7 | 6.8 | 3.0 | 5.5 | |
| Post | ÷ ; | 6.0 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 4.4 | |

| Source | <u>F</u> | | · <u>P</u> ··· |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----|----------------|
| Participation Year | 1.70 | | n.s. |
| Rate of Change | 1.24 | • | n.s. |
| Grade Level | . 84 | • | n.s. |
| Year X Rate | .07 | | n.s. |
| Year X Grade | .99 | · · | n.s. |
| Rate X Grade | 4.49 | Y | .05 |
| SCOPE OF PEER ATTACHMENT | (SSCT) | | |

Participation Year

| • - , | 7 | 1 " : | | •. |
|--------|---------------|--------------|-------------|----------|
| ate of | · | | | <u> </u> |

| late of Change | Grade | Level | cl Grade Level | |
|-------------------|-------|--------|----------------|--------|
| | Lover | Higher | Lower | Higher |
| Pre | 13.0 | 18.3 | 14.2 | 18.4 |
| Post | 12.5 | 22.2 | 12.5 | 17.5 |

| _ | | 16 | 4 . | | 70 | en e | |
|----------------|------|------------|------------|------|------|-------|---|
| Source | | <u>F</u> . | | ja v | | | |
| Participation | Year | .10 | | | n.s. | ٠ ، ، | |
| Rate of Change | | . • •03 | | | n.s. | | |
| Grade Level | , • | 4.94 | • | | .04 | | • |
| Year X Rate | | 1.93 | | | n.s. | | |
| Year X Grade | ; | . 29 | | . : | n.s. | • | |
| Rate X Grade | | 1.47 | | • | n.s. | | |
| | 10 | | C(X, C(X)) | | | 4 | |

Table 17

LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF SCHOOL ORIENTATION

SCHOOL AFFILIATION (SOS)

Participation Year

| | | Participa | LION Tear | |
|---------------------------------------|--|------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | 1 | | <u> </u> |
| Rate of Change | Grade | Level | Grade | Level |
| \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ | Lower | Higher | Lower | Higher |
| | Lower | | · | |
| Pre | 50.3 | 52.3 | 46.2 | 47.0 |
| . FIE | 30.3 | 5215 | | |
| | | | 3 | |
| | | | | |
| Post | 41.7 | 52.2 | 38.5 | 45.0 |
| • | _ | | <u> </u> | |
| ć | $E_{ij} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)$ | | | • |
| | <u></u> | <u>F</u> - | ^ P | , |
| Source | 9 m | • | • a . • | |
| Participation Ye | • | .46 | n. | _ |
| Rate of Change | | .22 .46 | 0 n. | • |
| Grade Level Year X Rate | | .02 | n. | |
| Year X Grade | | .10 | | s |
| Rate X Grade | | .65 | .0 | 7 |
| SOCIAL DISTANCE | FROM TEACHERS | (SSCT) | ation Year | |
| | | I | i lai | II — |
| Rate of | ` <u>.</u> | <u>.</u> | | |
| Change | Grade | Level | Grade | Level |
| 1 | Lower | Higher | Lower | Higher |
| | | | | |
| Pre | 6.3 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 6.8 |
| | • | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| Post | 5.7 | 6.0 | 5.3 | 4.3 |
| | | , | | |
| | | | | ** |
| | • * * | | | • |
| Source | | <u>F</u> | • | P |
| Participation | lear | .23 | n | .s. |
| Rate of Change | | .16 | n - | .s. |
| Grade Level | | .00 : . ! | | .s. |
| Year X Rate Year X Grade | | .12 | | .s. |
| Rate X Grade | | 10 | _ | .s. |
| | • | ે ડ | 0 | and the second s |



| INTERPERSON | DEDOCRATION | TECT | 1077_1078 |
|-------------|-------------|-------|-----------|
| INTERPERSON | PERCEPTION | rror, | 1311-1310 |

| | Pre- | Post- test | Pre- Post |
|---------|-------------|---------------|------------------|
| Subject | Score | Score | Change |
| Subject | 30010 | | |
| Site I | | | • |
| 103 | 5 ´ | 3 . | -2 |
| 104 | 10 | 10 | . +0 |
| 107 | 7 | 3 | - 4 |
| Site II | • | c | |
| 201 | 17 " | 9 : | -8 |
| 204 | | ; 6 · | +3 |
| 207 | - 3 · 5 | 7 | +2 |
| 208 | 9 ' | 9 | +0 |
| 210 | . · 8 | 8 | - 0 |
| 212 | 7 | 10 | √ T 3 |
| 213 | 10 | 10 | +0 |
| 215 | 14 | 11 | - 3 |
| 216 | 8 | 9 | +1 |
| 217 | 16 | . 10 | -4 |
| · | | | |
| Means | 9.2 | 8.1 | -0.9 |
| Range | ٠. | (0-20) | |
| | | | |

Table 19

FACIAL AFFECT PRODUCTION, 1977-1978

| • | | | | | |
|---------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Matched | · . | . 3 | . Pre-test | Post-test | Pre- |
| | Pre- | Post- | Distance | Distance | Post - |
| | test | test | .from Control | from Control | Change |
| · · · · | | | c. | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| 5.7 | 2.6 | 10.6 | ^ -3.1 | 1 4.9 | +8.0 |
| 5.4 | 1.4 | 7.8 | -4.0 | - 2.4 | +6.4 |
| 9.7 | 4.3 | 6.4 | -5.4 | +3.3 | +2.1 |
| | 3.0 | 10.5 | -5,9 ⁻ | +1.6 | +7.5 |
| | | 8.4 | -2.8 | +2.8 | +5.6 |
| | | 10.0 | -6.6 | +0.9 | +7.5 |
| | | 11.0 | -3,6 | +5.9 | +9.5 |
| | | 8.4 | -3.4 | +2.1 | +5.5 |
| | 3.3 | | -4.1 | +1.4 | +5.5 |
| • | 3.1 | 9.3 | -5.0 | +1.2 | +6.2 |
| | | 11.5 | -6.5 | +2.3 | +8.8 |
| | | 9.9 | -5.4 | +0.1 | 4.5.5 |
| | | 10.2 | -1.0 | +3.8 | +4.8 |
| | | 1 | | | |
| 7.5 | 4.0 | 9.4 | · -4.4 | +2.0 | +6.4 |
| • | • | | | ŗ | |
| 0-12 | | | | | <u>- </u> |
| | 9.7 8.9 5.6 9.1 5.1 6.3 7.4 8.1 9.2 9.8 6.4 | Control Pre- Score test 5.7 2.6 5.4 1.4 9.7 4.3 8.9 3.0 5.6 2.8 9.1 2.5 5.1 1.5 6.3 2.9 7.4 3.3 8.1 3.1 9.2 2.7 9.8 4.4 6.4 5.4 7.5 4.0 | Control Pre- Post- Score test test 5.7 | Control Pre- Post- Distance from Control 5.7 | Control Pre- Post- test test from Control from Control 5.7 |

a_{Control} subjects were administered the test only once.
b_{Partially} sighted students in Site II not selected as
∞experimental subjects.