

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 175

PS 003 065

AUTHOR Jones, Shuell H.  
TITLE Curricular Intervention in Language Arts Readiness for Head Start Children. Tulane University, Head Start Evaluation and Research Center Annual Report to the Office of Economic Opportunity.  
INSTITUTION Tulane Univ. of Louisiana, New Orleans. Head Start Evaluation and Research Center.  
SPONS AGENCY Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D.C.  
PUB DATE 31 Aug 69  
NOTE 74p.  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$3.80  
DESCRIPTORS Class Management, \*Compensatory Education Programs, \*Language Arts, Language Skills, \*Preschool Programs, \*Program Evaluation, Reading Readiness, Teacher Aides, Teacher Behavior  
IDENTIFIERS Gates MacGintie Reading Test, Head Start, Metropolitan Readiness Test, Stanford Binet

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to determine the effectiveness of a "packaged" language development program, on the general cognitive, intellectual, and language development of preschool children. A selected basic language program (Buchanan Language Readiness Program) and supplementary materials (other language programs), were used to collect data on 13 Head Start classes in Mississippi and Alabama. Different levels of teacher preparation and/or variations in the use of supplementary materials and reinforcement procedures were part of the research design. Four trained classroom monitors, using an intervention checklist designed for the study, reported observations each week for the five experimental groups and twice monthly for the two control groups. (A lengthy anecdotal record is included in this report.) Children were pre- and posttested on selected measures of language development. The standardized tests did not yield significant achievement results, but because of a late start, the prescribed language program was not completed. It is recommended that the following areas receive emphasis: teacher inservice training and supervision, adequate preparation of aides before they are placed in the classroom, parent involvement, and longitudinal studies of children in curricular intervention studies. (NH)

F-OEO  
OEO-4123

ED038175

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION  
& WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED  
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR  
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF  
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-  
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-  
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

**TULANE UNIVERSITY**

**Head Start Evaluation and Research Center**

**Shuell H. Jones, Ed.D.**

**Center Director**

**Annual Report to the  
Office of Economic Opportunity  
Contract Number 4123**

**August 31, 1969**

PS003065

**Curricular Intervention in  
Language Arts Readiness  
for Head Start Children**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**The 1968-69 Research Problem and Description.....1**

**Monitor Observations.....15**

**Statistical Information----Alabama.....35**

**Statistical Information----Mississippi.....45**

**Data Analyses--Alabama and Mississippi.....55**

**Conclusions and Recommendations.....64**

**Appendices A and B.....67**

**CURRICULAR INTERVENTION**

**IN**

**LANGUAGE ARTS READINESS**

**FOR**

**HEAD START CHILDREN**

**Shuell H. Jones  
Tulane University**

Project Head Start experiences are intended to generate improvement in many factors of the pre-school child's readiness to cope with the demands of education in the elementary school. In particular, the production of significant cognitive change is a salient objective of Project Head Start.

**The Problem**

The purpose of this investigation was to determine if pre-school educational instruction in a specific area (i.e., reading readiness) would improve achievement in that area and in related areas (e.g., reading, language, and intellectual development.)

**Description of the Material**

**Used in the Curricular Intervention**

The basic material selected for use in each of the experimental classes was the Reading in Language Arts Program, authored by Cynthia Buchanan. The Readiness in Language Arts Program is a Sullivan Associates Program, published by Behavioral Research Laboratories of

Palo Alto, California. In addition to the basic material, the Readiness in Language Arts Enrichment materials, published by Behavioral Research Laboratories was used in two experimental classes. Four of the experimental classes used supplementary material designed by Rebecca Swanson of the University of South Carolina. The Reinstein Reinforcement Program was used in two of the experimental classes in addition to the Readiness in Language Arts series and the Swanson Supplement.

The following will describe each of the materials used in the experimental classes:

A. Readiness in Language Arts

The basic program consists of six "Giant Books". Book One is immediately followed by Book Two, Book Two by Book Three, etc.

The material is continuous and overlapping and presents a complete basic readiness program in language arts. The program is entirely teacher administered, requiring all student responses to be oral. The teacher stands the demonstration "Giant Book" in its easel at the front of the class. Following her specially prepared teacher's manual, she explains the content of each page, elicits responses, and provides a check for each response. Although each step of the program is carefully organized, the teacher is free to stop at any moment to expand a concept, answer a question, or introduce new information. She may cover as many pages as she wishes. She may review at her discretion by simply turning back the pages.

In Readiness in Language Arts, the children are first taught the basic concepts: directions, spatial relations, and color. Then,

step-by-step, the children are introduced to the alphabet and letter sounds. At the end of the program, the children will be reading--not by memorizing the words, but by understanding the sound-symbol relationships of English.

Readiness in Language Arts has as its specific objectives the teaching of:

**A. Basic Skills**

**Directions:** Left and right, up and down, top and bottom, under and over, first and last, front and back.

**Spatial Relations:** A straight line, a curved line, a circle, a square.

**Colors:** The children learn the colors one by one.

**B. The Alphabet**

When the children have a firm background in basic concepts, the letters of the alphabet are introduced, first small letters, then the capital letters.

**C. Reading and Spelling**

The children are first taught the short vowel sound for /a/ and the sounds /n/, /p/, and /t/ for n, p, and t. As each sound-symbol relationship is taught, the child learns to listen for the sound in familiar words. He relates it to the letter that represents the sound.

When these sound-symbols are mastered, the five short vowel sounds and the common sounds of the consonants are taught in a one-to-one linguistic progression---

that is, only one sound for each symbol. This method builds confidence. Upon successful completion of the program, the child should have a reading and spelling repertoire of 126 two-and three letter words.

B. Buchanan Readiness in Language Arts Enrichment Supplement

The enrichment package includes a teacher's manual, three sets of color books, ninety full-color enrichment cards, one set of letter cards and three sets of word cards. The manual explains how to use all the aforementioned materials. Each set of materials has its own section in the manual. The supplementary material is designed to reinforce each child's recently learned skills and to enhance his pleasure by meeting with success.

C. The Swanson Supplement<sup>1</sup>

The Swanson Supplement was developed primarily for use as enrichment and as a supplementary Program to the Buchanan Language Readiness Program from Behavioral Research Laboratories. The Swanson Supplement reinforces concepts initially presented in the Buchanan material; at the same time, the supplement focuses on numerous other readiness skills and fundamental concepts, which children usually acquire before beginning first grade.

Basic readiness skills were identified, were broken down into their more basic perceptual-motor components, and were placed in a developmental continuum. Activities were designed and arranged in tightly prescribed sequences for each of the skill areas focused upon.

---

<sup>1</sup>The description of the Swanson Supplement was drafted by Ann L. Mauer, Social Science Research Associate V. University of Texas, at Austin, Texas.

These activities were started at the lowest levels and were worked sequentially upward through more complex, higher-level skills which culminated in paper and pencil activities which required a rather high degree of concentration for each child. Materials were presented from concrete to more abstract levels of thinking and from simple to more complex learning. Positive reinforcement was "built into" the program to a large extent as each child experienced success at the different levels of activity, in that the tasks he was asked to perform were normally within his command, due to the graduated increase in difficulty level of the materials.

The Swanson Supplement focused on the following skills:

1. Development of Body Image; Body Movement Skills
2. Visual Discrimination
3. Figure-Ground Perception
4. Visual-Motor Perception
5. Form Perception
6. Spatial Relationships
7. Auditory Perception
8. Oral Language Skills

A child's activities included tasks such as: identification of body parts, fitting together simple puzzles, drawing lines, circles, and other forms, sorting objects according to color and shape, matching patterns in pictures, listening activities, stringing beads according to patterns, reproducing pegboard patterns, relating the body to other objects, performing drawing activities, body movement activities, and

PS 003065



so on. At the higher sequential levels, paper and pencil activities were utilized, including worksheets designed specifically for the program.

Activities and materials used to develop skill in each of the areas listed above were designed with the special characteristics of young children in mind. An attempt was made to integrate social, emotional, physical, and mental aspects of growth, development, and behavior of young children with some of the principles of learning which are thought to enhance the teaching-learning process.

The Swanson Supplement was used by six teachers in the experimental program, on a daily basis for thirty minutes, following the presentation of the Buchanan Program. Each lesson was arranged to include several activities relating to the eight areas of developmental skills desired by the author, with repetition a significant factor.

#### D. Reinstein Reinforcement Program<sup>2</sup>

The reinforcement treatment program was developed by Barry Reinstein, at the University of South Carolina, and has as its general function the reinforcement of concepts presented during the daily reading intervention program. The general purpose of the schedule are:

1. To provide opportunity for review of specific tasks presented in daily lessons.

---

<sup>2</sup>The description of the Reinstein Reinforcement Program was drafted by Ann L. Mauer, Social Science Research Associate V. University of Texas, at Austin, Texas.

2. To measure the child's ability to obey simple commands.
3. To strengthen and improve the child's motor coordination.
4. To assess the effect, if any, of a success-reward, failure-non-reward situation on the child's ability to learn and retain concepts presented earlier in the day's activities.

Each daily lesson has an accompanying set of reinforcement sheets. There are three of these per lesson, and the sheets are arranged in descending order: 3-2-1, from most difficult to easiest. All children are presented sheet #3. At the outset, the task is either completed or not, by the child. Should he complete the task correctly, he is then given a piece of candy. In addition, he is allowed to choose his activity for the succeeding 20 minutes from a list of four different activities. Every fourth success is reinforced with both candy and a small toy in addition. Should the child fail with picture #3, the reason of his failure is explained, and he is then presented with picture #2. Finally, should he fail with picture #2, he is given picture #1, the easiest of the three. If he fails to complete the task correctly, after three attempts, he does not receive candy, nor does he have the opportunity for free choice of activity for the day. Hopefully, then the relationship between success or successful completion of task, and reward versus failure to complete the task demanded and non-reward, will be established.

#### Teacher Training

The research design required that the Cynthia Buchanan Language Program be administered to all experimental groups, but with different

levels of teacher preparation and/or variations in the use of supplementary materials and reinforcement procedures. All experimental group teachers were given a half day orientation program for clarifying the Buchanan manual, by the Tulane University Evaluation and Research Center personnel. This minimal training period also included clarification of the Buchanan Supplement for teachers of experimental group 2 and the Swanson Supplement for teachers of experimental group 3. Teachers of experimental group 4 received a two-week comprehensive training program at the University of South Carolina. One week was given to the Buchanan Program and one week to the Swanson Supplement. Teachers of experimental group 5 received formal training at the University of South Carolina as follows: one week training on the Buchanan Program, one week training on the Swanson Supplement and one week training on the Reinstein Reinforcement Program.

Two teachers were trained from each sub-center in which a treatment was to be administered. After the training session terminated, the most proficient of the two was selected to participate in the investigation. In case of teacher attrition, the other trained teacher was available to take over the investigation.

Four monitors from the Tulane University Evaluation and Research Center participated in the University of South Carolina training sessions. Following the teacher training sessions the monitors received additional training in monitoring classes and administering tests. The monitor testers were certified at the University of South Carolina for having attained a pre-established level of proficiency before they were released from training.

#### General Design of the Research

The research was designed to assess the effectiveness of a "packaged" language development program, with different levels of teacher preparation

and/or variations in the use of packaged and non-packaged supplementary materials and reinforcement procedure upon the general cognitive, intellectual, and language development of pre-school children.

Thirteen classes were selected for the study. Six of these classes were located in the Harrison County, Mississippi Head Start Project and seven were located in the Mobile Community Action Head Start Project in Mobile, Alabama.

Treatment Administered:

1. Experimental Group 1 Treatment: The Buchanan Language Program and the teacher innovated supplement as suggested in the Buchanan manual were administered.
2. Experimental Group 2 Treatment: The orthodox Buchanan Language Program was administered with the Buchanan Supplement.
3. Experimental Group 3 Treatment: The Buchanan Language Program and the Swanson Supplement were administered.
4. Experimental Group 4 Treatment: The Buchanan Language Program and the Swanson Supplement administered by trained teachers.
5. Experimental Group 5 Treatment: The Buchanan Language Program, the Swanson Supplement and the Reinstein reinforcement material were administered by trained teachers.
6. Control Group 6: This group was composed of Head Start classes not using the Buchanan Program or any other "packaged" language development program. This group was not monitored, but was experimentally equivalent to the experimental groups in all cases.
7. Control Group 7: There was one class in Alabama, placed in this category. Control Group 7 differs from Control Group 6, in that it was monitored by personnel trained for the purpose, as was experimental groups 1 through 5.

In as much as each treatment was administered to two classes, the Tulane Evaluation and Research Center in effect replicated its work. However, to obtain children who had no previous Head Start experience, it was necessary to select children whose age ranged between  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to  $4\frac{1}{2}$  years old in Mississippi, while the children in Alabama ranged from  $4\frac{1}{2}$  to  $5\frac{1}{2}$  years of age. Due to this variable the data were analyzed separately for Mississippi and Alabama.

Schematic Design

	<u>Experimental Groups</u>					<u>Control Groups</u>	
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Replication I (Mississippi)	14	12	14	0	14	15	--
Replication II (Alabama)	15	7	10	10	16	13	12

N for each cell = one Head Start class.

Ns are posttest numbers; attrition was considerable.

Experimental classes differed in amount of training teachers received and materials used. (See Teacher Training).

Instruments Used to Measure

the Dependent Variables and Their Description

Pre-tests were administered before the intervention material was initiated. Posttests were administered to the children using the same test instruments to determine if there were significant differences in the language development of the children participating in the study.

A. Metropolitan Readiness Test:

Devised to measure the extent to which school beginners have developed in the several skills and abilities that contribute to readiness for first grade instruction.

1. Word Meaning--A 16 item picture vocabulary test.
2. Listening--A 16 item test of ability to comprehend phrases and sentences instead of individual words.
3. Matching--A 14 item test of visual perception involving the recognition of similarities.
4. Alphabet--A 16 item test of ability to recognize lower-case letters of the alphabet.
5. Numbers--A 26 item test of number knowledge.
6. Copying--A 14 item test which measures a combination of visual perception and motor control.

B. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests: Readiness Skills:

The test consists of eight subtests:

1. Listening Comprehension--measures the child's ability to understand the total thought of a single story.
2. Auditory Discrimination--measures the child's ability to distinguish between two words of similar sound.
3. Visual Discrimination--measures the ability to distinguish between the printed forms of two words.
4. Following Directions--measures the child's skill in following increasingly more complex directions.

5. **Letter Recognition**--measures the child's recognition of letters of the alphabet.
6. **Visual-Motor Coordination**--measures the child's skill in completing printed letters.
7. **Auditory Blending**--measures the child's ability to join parts of a word, presented orally, into a whole word.
8. **Word Recognition**--measures the child's ability to recognize whole words when presented in isolation.

C. **Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (I T P A):**

This instrument was developed because the author felt a need for a systematic, diagnostic device which would tap and differentiate various facets of cognitive ability. The object is to delineate specific abilities and disabilities in children in order that remediation may be undertaken when needed.

The psycholinguistic model on which the ITPA is based attempts to relate those functions whereby the intentions of one individual are transmitted (verbally or non-verbally) to another individual, and reciprocally, functions whereby environment or the intentions of another individual are received or interpreted.

**Description of the subtests:**

1. **Auditory Reception (auditory decoding)**--assesses the ability of a child to derive meaning from verbally presented material.



2. **Visual Reception (visual decoding)**--this is comparable to the Auditory Reception test but uses a different sense modality.
3. **Visual Sequential Memory**--evaluates the child's ability to reproduce sequences of non-meaningful figures from memory.
4. **Auditory Association**--this test taps the child's ability to relate concepts presented orally.
5. **Auditory Sequential Memory**--tests the child's ability to repeat increasingly longer sequences of digits presented at a uniform rate from memory.
6. **Visual-Motor Association**--a picture association test which assesses the child's ability to relate concepts presented visually.
7. **Visual Closure**--tests the child's ability to identify a common object from an incomplete visual presentation.
8. **Verbal Expression**--tests the child's ability to express his own concepts verbally.
9. **Grammatical Closure**--assesses the child's ability to make use of the redundancies of oral language in acquiring automatic habits for handling syntax and grammatical inflections.
10. **Manual Expression**--taps the child's ability to express ideas manually.



11. **Auditory Closure--assesses the child's ability to fill in missing parts which were deleted in auditory presentation and to produce a complete word.**

12. **Sound Blending--assesses the organizing process at the automatic level in the auditory-vocal channel.**

**D. Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale (Form L-M):**

**Like the I T P A, the Stanford-Binet was administered individually.**

Monitor Observation

Four monitors were employed and trained for the study. Two of the monitors were assigned to the Alabama study and two were assigned to the Mississippi project. The monitors used a Head Start Intervention Check List, which was especially designed for the study, for reporting observations. (See Appendix A). Each experimental class was observed by a monitor each week. The comments made by the monitors are quite revealing and two observations per month for each experimental group in the study are included:

E 1, January 15, 1969---Book 1, Lesson 7

I spoke with the teacher about the timing. I told her there should definitely be a 15 or 20 minute break in the middle and the Buchanan program should not last over 35 minutes, preferably 25, since her children are all four-year olds. The teacher had worked so hard on materials for the supplement that she was not as familiar with the Buchanan material as she should have been. She had to look at the book too often. She tended to call individual children to the book and discuss happenings with him too frequently; the others were restless while this was going on.

For the supplement, the teacher had covered a box with red paper (a square) and made a large green ball with paper. A table represented the black line in the middle. The children took turns being the lion and the tiger and acting out the activities in the book: going over the table, under the table, etc. Emphasis on right-left, red-green, square-circle, over-under, up-down, middle, roll-won't roll.

Bracelets had been made from colored macaroni--a green one tied around each right hand and a red one on the left.

The teacher is really very good with children, encouraging and giving praise. Her aide is new and doesn't know much about children.

E 1, January 30, 1969--Book 1, Lesson 17

The teacher had prepared carefully and the session went well except for the all-too-frequent threatening, scolding voice of the aide. She does not know how to talk with children. Here are a few of the admonitions (during the Big Book discussion and the Supplement), "A, put your shoes on; B, keep your hands to yourself, I don't think it's funny; I am not going to tell you again; I don't want to see you do that again; Don't stamp your feet; C, we are not playing with that now; What were you told to do on this paper, you were not told to do that; You better remember that; Be quiet and listen to the teacher, L, M, N; A, please behave like you are supposed to; Is that a C, J?; Listen, you're not stupid; Look at that book; Is that an A?; Just a minute D, No, etc, etc."

E 1, February 3, 1969---Book 2, Lesson 2

The teacher was well prepared, although the children were restless during the period. Four children were not participating. There was not nearly as much interference on the part of the aide this morning as there was the last time I observed.

I did not stay for the supplement as Mrs. Duffy and Dr. Jones from New Orleans, and Dr. Justison from Washington, D. C., were observing the class and we left to observe other centers.

E 1, February 25, 1969---Book 2, Lesson 16

Two of the best students were absent today. There are about three who know very few letters--low IQ. Others do fairly well. Six of the children went to the chart and pointed to each letter and called it by name (with the help of the teacher). The teacher said there would be time for only one more and while that child was at the chart, the other children started moving their chairs over to the tables, making a lot of noise, and the aide just sat there.

The teacher pronounced the letter "r" as having two syllables, as ah'ra. I told her afterwards this was incorrect. She seemed so surprised, almost unbelieving. She said, "Everyone around here says ah'ra. No one ever told me it was wrong." She asked me if she pronounced the other letters right and I said yes. She was grateful that I corrected her. She's a lovely person.

E 1, March 12 1969---Book 3, Lesson 9

The Buchanan lesson went very well. This is an interesting story sequence (birds stealing the letters) and the children are excited about it. The aide did not interrupt as much as usual and the teacher did a good job. She still pronounced "r" incorrectly (ah'ra) and I told her after class. She said she forgets and she will have to practice it. The children say "ah'ra" too. I think perhaps the teacher thinks her pronunciation is correct and that I am wrong. The other monitor says she will reinforce the correct pronunciation the next time she is there.

E 1, March 24, 1969---Book 4, Lesson 1

This is the first time I have seen the teacher teach from notes, not using her manual. She had better eye contact with the children and the Buchanan lesson went very well. There were three children not involved---the same three who rarely listen.

The aide in this class is new, today is her first day. The transfer was made earlier but she had been sick and was back today for the first time. She had time to discuss procedures and the "how" of assisting the sample class. I have no doubt they will work well together.

The teacher pronounced the letter "r" correctly. However, on the cover picture she called the pan, a skillet.

Supplement--chairs in circle around flannel board. Teacher put a circle on the flannel board and asked what letters looked as though they were made from a circle. Children named O and Q and the teacher said perhaps C and G could be included as they were part of a circle. Then she placed a triangle on the board and asked the same question. The children named V,W,X; the teacher added A,Y, and M. A square was next. This was a stretch of the imagination, but the teacher pointed out H,E, and one child added F.

Then each child was given a piece of newsprint with three rows of letters written with crayons. There were four letters in a row, three alike. The children were asked to circle the one that is different. Some of them had difficulty understanding what she meant. There was no demonstration for the class; the teacher and aide had to explain to each child as they walked around and helped. After class, I told the teacher that if she did this again, have them mark with an X the letter that is different.

E 1, April 2, 1969---Book 4, Lesson 6

The teacher reviewed the sounds of a,n,p, and introduced the sound of t. Her sounds for a,p, and t were correct but she was sounding "n" as nuh, just as puh and tuh. (The p and t sounds were given in the manual). During the break I told her how to make the "n" sound and she corrected it during the supplement and also had the children change the sound.

On the last page of the lesson the teacher called individual children to the Big Book and asked each one to match a picture on the page with each of the letter sounds p,t,n,a. Hardly any of the other children were paying any attention while a child was "up front".

On the page with pictures of objects ending in "t" (hat, net, rat), the teacher called the rat a mouse and said that it did not end with a t sound.

E 1, April 10, 1969---Book 4, Lesson 10

The class follows the usual pattern--children sitting about the room where chairs were placed, some listening and others not. Some attention getting device should have been used at the beginning, but the teacher only said (twice), "Children, this is listening time."

The teacher was prepared. By this time the class is fairly well determined. There are five who are doing well enough, one exceptionally well. The others are either not ready or don't have it.

For the supplement the teacher continued an alphabet book project, one for each child. This was evidently started a while back. The children are pasting a small letter and its capital on a page of heavy paper. When they finish, the pages will be fastened together at the left side and they will take them home. As the children are pasting, the teacher and the aide talk with them about the letters.

E 2, January 1969--Book 1, Lesson 4

The teacher had failed to understand the manual. The first section has to do with coloring books which are to be used beginning with lesson 9. The second section deals with cards which are used in lesson 1. She had not read this far. I showed her the manual and explained it. She said she would use the cards for review of these four lessons she has missed--the supplement, that is.

For the Buchanan lesson the teacher was prepared well enough but could not hold the attention of the children. They were noisy and she had to stop and call them down several times even though the aide was doing the best she could with them. She failed to call on the children individually and they all answered in chorus. The room is not large enough and the children were in two rows and I am sure some could not see.

For the supplement the teacher prepared an art activity which was unrelated to the Buchanan lesson.

E 2, January 24, 1969--Book 1, Lesson 14

Read directly from manual. On page 60, read aloud Instruction to the Teacher, by mistake: "point to the horse's hoofs." Pronounced "orange", "errch". Children were extremely restless and noisy after the first 15 minutes. The teacher's technique is to shout above them. They did know their colors and all seemed to enjoy the coloring books very much and again demonstrated their ability to distinguish colors. (No white crayons available to mix lighter shades).

She went 38 minutes on the Buchanan--then with no break went into the Buchanan supplement coloring books for 50 minutes. The children were finally allowed a 12 minute break between coloring books and cards; although I should point out they seemed to love the coloring books and considered that recreation.

E 2, February 21, 1969--Book 2, Lesson 15

Reads directly from manual. The teacher asked for a purple letter. When they named "g", which was purple, she said no, "f". Attention was better than usual, but class was smaller than usual. In looking at a,b,c, and d, the teacher asked, "Which letter has a curved line?" and only accepted "c" as correct.



E 2, February 28, 1969--Book 3, Lesson 3

Buchanan supplement--reviewed small letter cards, then capital letter cards. In exercise with cards did not have children say "capital" before naming capital letters.

Even though the class was very small and the children quite attentive, the teacher still used too loud a voice. I always find many small things to criticize here; but in spite of some very poor teaching techniques, the children are learning something. The aide spent the whole lesson time hanging pictures and cleaning the room. During the supplement lesson, she tried to watch the children but was immediately discouraged by the teacher's command, "Miss Aide, please leave her be!" She went back to cleaning. During the supplement lesson, she showed a child the capital E and the small "e" and said, "See? These are both the same only this one's big and this one's little". After 25 minutes with the letter cards the children had lost interest but she kept going for seven more minutes.

E 2, March 10, 1969--Book 3, Lesson 8

The teacher was prepared as well as usual and the class proceeded as usual, except the children seemed to behave a little better, particularly during the last part, perhaps because Mrs. Duffy was visiting then. The aide stayed with the group the whole time, right on through the coloring book. During the Buchanan lesson the teacher tried to out-shout the children. A lot of time was spent on the two alphabet charts and the children are learning rather well.

E 2, March 12, 1969--Book 3, Lesson 10

Arranged children in semi-circle for first time. Allowed her aide to assist with children (in directing their attention to lesson, etc.). She tried to limit recitation to one child at a time. was consistent in referring to capital letters as such and in seeing that children also did.



Very much improved and I complimented her on this.

E 2, April 18, 1969--Book 4, Lesson 15

Quite good. Children were very eager and responsive for first 20 minutes or so--then became very restless. (Teacher never seems aware of this). The supplement (word cards and charts) became very tiresome for each child as soon as his turn was over. The teacher said, "You all done real well."

E 2, April 28, 1969--Book 4, Lesson 21

Recently there has been great improvement in the deportment of this class. I can't believe it's the same class. True, several were absent today, but there were no behavior problems even when the supplement dragged on and on for an hour!

Three children did most of the responding. The others were not really involved. The three were competing to see which could answer first. The teacher seldom called on an individual child during the Buchanan lesson.

I was annoyed by the way she made the n sound and m sound. She said, "nuh" and "muh" (also "kuh") in the same way that she said "tuh" and "puh". In giving the beginning sounds of words, she would say, "nuh-ap" (nap), "muh-at" (mat), etc. Also there was no difference between pin and pen.

E 3, January 10, 1969--Book 1, Lesson 5

This was a very good session by a teacher with no special training. She had prepared adequately (except for making of bead patterns for them to follow; her instructions re colors were verbal) and the lesson went smoothly. However, she failed to follow the order of lesson-break-supplement. She simply followed the lesson with the supplement and then let

them go outside. Naturally, they got restless before the supplement was over. I told her afterwards that she should always have the break in the middle. (She had been told this during the briefing but either forgot it or chose to change the procedure). Perhaps there was not enough individual participation during the Big Book period. Questions just thrown out to the group. This teacher has a very good aide.

E 3, January 29, 1969--Book 1, Lesson--Review

Apparently no preparation. The teacher finished Book 1 yesterday and materials for Swanson Supplement, Book 2, have not yet arrived. I told her yesterday to review today and I'm sure she didn't expect me back. The review from the book went fairly well. The children know the material--most of them--but there is so much noise with the teacher trying to talk above it. The aide is a big, motherly person, who has ten children and she can handle these children better than the teacher can.

There was not enough variety in the supplementary activities. They sat around tables the whole time and kept drawing lines until I wanted to scream. The children were restless and the boys began hitting each other and talking and not paying any attention to the teacher, who didn't know herself what she wanted to do next!

E 3, February 6, 1969--Book 2, Lesson 4

Utter chaos. The teacher had been absent for two days, the routine had been broken, and the aide was absent today! The teacher began in a loud voice; the children were fighting and crying and screaming. Mostly, they were paying no attention to the book. One child went to the other side of the room and played with blocks and later went into the room next door and stayed until the end of the class.

It was raining and the children could not go outside for their break. The teacher attempted to lead in some singing games. Not very successful.

Part of the trouble was the teacher's lack of preparation. She rarely uses her manual while teaching the Buchanan material--as some of the teachers do. She sees what is on a page of the big book and more or less talks about it in her own way. When she came to the supplement, not one item was carried out specifically as instructions set forth:

1) She had one ball which did not have enough air in it. She threw it to a child and that child threw it to the child next to him and on around the circle. Next, the teacher bounced the ball to a child and said "once" and the child was to bounce it back to the teacher and say "twice".

2) In addition to the duck walk and rabbit hop, she had the children do the crab walk and elephant walk. And none of them was done correctly.

3) Floor chart. She made up her own directions to the children--such as, "skip around the chart twice and jump on the yellow cross." The underlined words in the manual were not emphasized.

4) Alphabet cups. Only about seven minutes left for this activity. The teacher said, "Cecil, find a g and put it in the cup with a g on it, as the directions state.

After class I told the teacher that she must pay closer attention to the directions in the supplement and as nearly as possible, carry them out as written. The teacher cannot handle these children; the aide does fairly well.

E 3, February 20, 1969--Book 2, Lesson 13

Good student response. The teacher seemed well prepared and student attention was fairly good. I think today's lesson went better than usual for her.

E 3, March 6, 1969--Book 3, Lesson 6

No preparation by either the teacher or the aide. The teacher explained that she had to take her grandchild to the hospital last night. She had.

read the Buchanan material over just before class and this part of the lesson went very well. It was raining and only six children were present. (The rowdy ones were absent!)

During the break the children played with trucks and the aide and I turned a jump rope and tried to teach the children to jump over as the rope came around.

Lack of preparation really showed up in the supplement. Instructions as detailed as these cannot be read at the last minute and executed properly. The matching of letters at the flannel board proceeded OK. (They've done this so many times before). Then came "listening time." Not enough time was devoted to simply listening for ordinary sound, such as a bird, voices, airplane, etc. And the teacher had not had time or imagination enough to assemble objects to make specific sounds to be identified. So this phase was unsatisfactory.

As for the worksheets--they put out sheets of newsprint for each child and the teacher went to the chalk board and started drawing a right angle, telling the children to watch and draw just what she did. I interrupted to say there were prepared worksheets for this activity and all the children had to do was stay within the lines. The teacher went over to a box and found the worksheets but she was so flustered she failed to demonstrate on the board what the children were to do. Instead she and the aide went from child to child and sort of told each one and some children went ahead before the teacher got to them and, all in all, it was a flop. The aide took one child's hand and guided it between the lines. She started to do this with another child and I told her to let him do it by himself.

E 3, March 21, 1969--Book 4, Lesson 1

This lesson went very well; there was the usual boistrousness of the children, and shrill voice of the teacher but learning took place. There

are two boys and one girl in this class who are older than the others and know a lot more. They anticipate what the teacher is going to say with such remarks as: "The pan is sitting on a mat", "The cover is red", "They are holding the small alphabet", (cat, can), "That girl's name is Ann", "There's that line in the middle of the page; it came back in". The teacher says, "We are coming to that, wait a minute; I haven't got to that yet, you try to get ahead of me--now wait and listen."

E 3, April 7, 1969---Book 4, Lesson 5

Apparently, the teacher had only a vague idea of what phonetics is all about. In previous lessons she should have taught the sounds of a and n, and today's lesson introduced the sound of p. She was not having the children make the sounds at all. They would spell the words, then she would say, "The word pin starts with a p sound." She did not give the sound of p as "puh". Nor did they know the sound of a as /ae/, or n. She simply referred to the n sound and the a sound.

The teacher and her aide have come a long way in controlling these boistrous youngsters and in the poorest of physical settings, creating something of a learning atmosphere. They do better all the time.

E 3, April 24, 1969---Book 4, Lesson 18

There was little opportunity during the whole procedure for the children to answer on their own. Mostly the teacher spelled all the words and the children said the letters after her. However, in finding the missing letters there were at least three who know the letter every time.

On the page with the dog and the letters "Pe\_", the teacher started talking about the dog as a pet. One boy said, "That is a capital P." That sort of threw her but she recovered and went on to say that this was the dog's name.

Teacher pronounced "pen" the same as "pin". Teacher did not have the

children say "capital" when they should--only occasionally did she say it. Only about half the children participated orally, but all seemed to be paying attention. I think the children were better behaved than I have ever seen them.

Supplement: each time letters had to be changed on the flannel board the teacher took too long to get them up there. In the first activity the teacher failed to have the children point to the letter with which each group of words start. In the next activity the teacher had two capital letters mixed in with small letters on the flannel board, as e M e. She had individual children come up and point to the letter that is different, but did not have the children name the letters. When the teacher put up the letters for the last activity she said, "This is harder. These letters sound alike but are different", (rather than look much alike). The teacher called off the letters and asked the children which one was different. Naturally, after she said e e c, they could say c is different. This was one of the teacher's off-days but the children were "with it."

E 4, January 6, 1969--Book 1, Lesson 3

Well prepared--well presented. Maintained children's interest throughout (with the exception of two very young ones).

E 4, January 23, 1969--Book 1, Lesson 13

Buchanan lesson--well prepared. Children interested and responsive. And most of them know the material they have covered. (There was a new aide in this class today--very efficient and effective).

E 4, February 5, 1969--Book 2, Lesson 5

Today the teacher had brought candy mints as a "surprise" for the children who paid attention and looked at the Big Book! After a good individual performance she gave the child a mint. Once in the middle of the lesson she stopped and gave each of them one.



Afterwards I asked her how she happened to bring the candy (she said she had done it once before) and she said she had heard some of the teachers in South Carolina talking about it, and her little boy who is in first grade gets candy from his teacher. I told her not to do it again as this is not part of her phase of the research. She agreed not to do it.

Twice, the teacher used the word "alphabets" for letters: "That is one of the alphabets," "We are going to see some new alphabets on the next page." I forgot to tell her of this error but I shall tell her next time I am here.

There is a boy who has been in the class about two weeks who is not a sample child. It seems that the teacher can do more with him than anyone else so he was put in her class. He causes a lot of trouble--wants to fight and doesn't pay much attention to the book. The teacher was prepared well enough but the children were inattentive in spite of the candy.

E 4, February 27, 1969--Book 2, Lesson 15

The teacher began her lesson with a review of the letters a through x, which she had lettered herself on the blackboard. (The a, c, g, j, o, p, and q were improperly formed--some of them looking like capital letters). The children did not know their letters. She then had a review of page 60 before going on. It was obvious that she had not read the lesson because she thought the lion had awakened from his dream on page 64. On this page (64) she had the children identify the letters by color only--never describing them by shape. She pronounced "r", "ara"; and in speaking of the letters, said "All these are called alphabets". She turned to page 65, the last page of the lesson, but did not cover it; instead she said, "We'll take this page tomorrow". (Actually, her lesson had already run out so she had no alternative). After the lesson, I pointed out the malformed letters, and corrected her pronunciation of "r".

E 4, March 6, 1969--Book 3, Lesson 3

The children were interested, attentive, and participated well, but many made the mistake of calling the b and d, "p". They were corrected for this by the teacher. As it was raining, a 15 minute break was held inside. Unfortunately, free drawing was the activity--too similar to supplement lesson.

E 4, March 13, 1969--Book 3, Lesson 8

This was a very good lesson. The children were very responsive. The teacher relied too heavily on the manual, following in the exact sequence of questions and comments. For example, when she turned one page, a child exclaimed about the predicament of the lion and she said, "Let's talk about Pat first."

Supplement: everything was carried out as it should have been.

This class has lost four sample children during the last week. The children moved away. So, today four children from the alternate class, which was getting too large, were moved into this one. (There was already one who is not a sample child in this class). The children moved into the class are older than those who dropped out and class performance is much improved.

As I was leaving the center, the director told me of the very favorable reaction of some of the parents to the use of the Buchanan materials. He said that some came to the monthly parents' meetings now who never came before, especially white parents. They are so pleased with the change in their children and the fact that they are being taught something.

E 4, April 2, 1969---Book 4, Lesson 4

Did well on sounds for a and n. Rather awkward by page 11 with such questions as: "Where did you hear the "the" sound?", without identifying sound they were to listen for. Asked "Do pig and pie sound alike?"



Half the children said "No", as this was the same way she had phrased the question to determine rhyming words. Some faults in usage and pronunciation: "mill" for middle; "Does these words sound alike?", "Lissing very good"; "Lissing careful", "Lissing at it"; "Can'l = candle; "Lissing to pig and monkey; which one begins with a sound?"

E 4, April 29, 1969---Book 4, Lesson 21

Not prepared. Thought she was through on page 61, then discovered there was one more page. Attention fair. High noise level in center.

E 5, January 14, 1969---Book 1, Lesson 6

This was an excellent session. Teacher well prepared and the children with her all the way. She has two very good aides. The only flaw I could mention (and it didn't seem to matter) was that the teacher had not memorized the "Parts of Your Body" and "Touching".

This whole procedure was handled very smoothly. For the testing there were three tables; even so, some of the children looked at other's papers, but that couldn't be helped. Yesterday was the first time any of the children had received prizes. Today two or three others were eligible. The aide handling the prizes and records did not clearly understand the procedure and gave prizes again to those who received them yesterday. They couldn't be taken back so it was decided to start over again tomorrow.

E 5, January 21, 1969---Book 1, Lesson 11

The teacher was very well prepared and maintained high interest throughout. Had mounted some pictures of red objects other than those pictured in the book. Good class participation.

The reinforcement went smoothly. Six children needed the second test picture; one child needed the third.

E 5, February 14, 1969---Book 2, Lesson 12

It would indeed be difficult to match this performance anywhere. From start to finish it was a joy to behold. All fifteen children were present; they know what they had been over; they are eager and excited; they don't just answer questions but make interesting comments about the pictures or something about themselves they are reminded of. The teacher listens to each contribution and comments. When individual children are going to the table, the others look and listen. They sit on the edges of their chairs and there is not a child who is not involved. I am thrilled with what is being accomplished in this class.

E 5, February 28, 1969---Book 3, Lesson 4

Excellent. A technique which involved the children was relating the capital letters studied, to their first names. A-Andrew and Albert, etc. A boy could hardly wait to get to the G because he knew his name started with that letter. When the page was turned to the G, the teacher asked, "What is Pat doing?", he replied, "He is writing my name!" And later when the lion pulled off the straight line from the G, he said, "He is breaking my name."

Another technique which the teacher used: when she turns to a new page she gives the children time to look at it and make any comments they want to make before she picks up things they have said and adds whatever should be added. These comments were made by children on seeing a new page: "They took them down." (The tiger and lion took down A and B); "The C fell on the tiger's head"; "The lion and tiger are happy."

On one wall of the room the teacher had placed capital and small letters from A through H.

During the supplement only the A was passed around and felt by the children.

The teacher held the other letters up and traced her finger around them showing how they were made. She said there wasn't time to pass them around. (Later I suggested that one of the aides might help and two letters could be going around at the same time).

E 5, March 4, 1969---Book 3, Lesson 6

Very good as always. This class has very good attendance. All were present. However, three were absent yesterday and the teacher told these children especially to pay attention so they could catch up. She gave them a little extra attention during the session.

The children were noisy today and the teacher had some difficulty getting them settled down.

Again, the capital letters were associated with the first letter of the children's names, and each child knew not only his own first letter but that of several other children.

Also, several times the class talked about b-a-d and s-a-d--both in connection with the lion and tiger as well as themselves. The children are really learning and the teacher is doing an excellent job. She is always prepared, never uses the manual, and shows genuine interest in each child.

Two children failed to get the first test right, but passed the second. Choices were: blocks (4), puzzles (4), music corner (6), and housekeeping (1). The children look forward to this free choice of activity and they play in earnest without any quibbling. Also they never seem to try to change from one activity to another.

E 5, March 27, 1969---Book 4, Lesson 5

Well prepared and taught. The children know that now they are learning the sounds of letters, that letters have sounds as well as names.

They reviewed the sounds for a and n and added p today. They sounded the letters for p-a-n and n-a-p and were told that they are now reading the words, not simply spelling them.

When the children are answering as a group and some are not participating, as today, she stopped and said, "I didn't hear everybody; I didn't hear (calls a name), etc." Then if they get too loud she says, "Let me hear the softness of your voices". She also keeps them looking ahead to some new "fun things" we are going to do today (in the supplement activities). (She brainwashes them--they really think it's fun!)

When they were making the p sound, one boy said, "I have a brother named Paul!" And one of the figures she drew on the board for them to copy was a right angle; one child said immediately, "That's a capital L."

I was amused by what occurred during the break. The two aides took the children outside. Sometimes I go out and sometimes I don't. Today I went out after about ten minutes had elapsed and the two aides were drilling the children on the sounds of a, n, and p. Evidently, they thought some of them were not getting it as well as they should. The aides are both very capable. When they saw me they immediately started a game of ball.

In the supplement the children identified the picture by saying "left" or "right". Then they repeated the word and sounded the beginning letter. They answered as a group.

In the second activity the teacher did not pronounce the d on the end of and and hand so that it could be distinguished. Otherwise, they had no trouble determining whether words were the "same" or "different".

They drew the figures OK, traced the square template and went around the square on the worksheet. They are getting quite good at this.

Three children failed the first test but passed the second.

They like the "jump rope" prize and some of the boys are sporting police badges. Free play choices were: Lego-3 children; books-1; clay-4; peg boards-5, (they made capital letters on the peg board).

E 5, April 14, 1969--Book 4, Lesson 14

A very fine session in spite of the noise all around. I have never been in this center when there was so much noise from other classrooms-- records playing, drums and cymbals, children going to the bathroom.

The children certainly are learning a lot.

Once today, when the teacher turned to a new page with the words tap, nap and map on it, a boy said, "3 p's on the right, 3 a's in the middle, t, n, m, at the front".

Every day they read the words they have learned thus far from a chart on the wall, without the pictures.

Supplement---all according to directions.

All passed the first test except one, and he took all three.

E 5, April 16, 1969---Book 4, Lesson 16

Lesson excellent, as usual. During supplement the teacher held up pictures of egg, elf, etc. and said, "This is a egg, a elf, a elephant, etc. (I corrected her on this by holding up a card that only she could see. She corrected herself and went on).

All but three got first test picture correct (two had circled the right word but in the wrong color), one missed second test--this was an intelligent girl who seemed to be testing the teacher.

Table 1 provides means for Alabama children at pre-and posttesting on the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities and on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale, (Form L-M). On the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, Experimental Class 2 had the lowest pre-test Total Score mean (101.85) and Control Class 6 had the highest (132.73). Experimental Class 2 obtained the lowest posttest mean (117.85) and Control Group 6 the highest (159.86). Experimental Class 4 clearly showed the most gain, 45 points, between pre-and posttesting, which is 16 points more than any other group.

The Alabama children scored very low in comparison to national norms on the Stanford-Binet, with group means running from a low of 75.43 to a high of 80.60. IQ gains varied from 1.56 points for Experimental Class 2 to 11.64 points for Experimental Class 5. Control Group 7 had the lowest pre-and posttest means and Control Group 6 had the highest pre-and posttest mean scores.

TABLE 1

Means on I T P A and Stanford-Binet  
at Pre- and Posttesting  
Experimentals & Controls

ALABAMA

E 1                      E 2                      E 3                      E 4                      E 5                      Control 6                      Control 7

I T P A

Total Raw Score

-36-

	N's	13	7	16	14	14	15	16
Post Mean		136.07	117.05	143.37	151.35	139.64	159.66	129.43
Pre Mean		107.53	101.35	114.06	105.57	116.75	132.73	103.06
Gain (or loss)		28.54	16.00	29.31	45.78	20.86	27.13	26.37
Group Means		121.50	109.85	123.71	128.46	129.21	146.29	116.24

Stanford-Binet

I Q

	N's	15	7	17	16	15	13	14
Post Mean		84.00	77.29	85.35	84.71	82.21	91.20	80.44
Pre Mean		76.77	75.43	76.47	77.29	70.57	80.60	74.19
Gain (or Loss)		7.23	1.86	8.88	7.42	11.64	10.60	6.25
Group Means		80.38	76.36	80.91	81.00	76.39	85.90	77.31

TABLE 2

Means on Metropolitan Test

at Pre-and Posttesting  
Experimentals and Controls

ALABAMA

E 1      E 2      E 3      E 4      E 5      Control 6      Control 7

Word Meaning

N's	10	7	11	12	16	14	15
Post Mean	5.30	5.29	5.27	5.33	5.44	5.21	5.53
Pre Mean	4.80	6.29	4.82	5.25	4.94	5.29	5.33
Gain (or loss)	.50	(1.00)	.45	.08	.50	(.08)	.20
Group Means	5.05	5.79	5.05	5.29	5.19	5.25	5.43

Listening

Post Mean	7.70	7.71	8.36	9.00	7.44	8.21	8.27
Pre Mean	7.10	9.86	8.64	8.83	8.19	8.36	6.73
Gain (or loss)	.60	(2.15)	(.28)	.17	(.75)	(.15)	1.54
Group Means	7.40	8.79	8.50	8.92	7.82	8.29	7.50

Matching

Post Mean	4.90	2.86	4.45	4.33	4.81	4.36	5.20
Pre Mean	3.80	2.43	2.73	3.25	2.88	2.64	2.27
Gain (or loss)	1.10	.43	1.72	1.08	1.93	1.72	2.93
Group Means	4.35	2.65	3.59	3.79	3.85	3.50	3.74



TABLE 2 (continued)

Means on Metropolitan Test  
at Pre-and Posttesting  
Experimentals and Controls

ALABAMA

E 1                      E 2                      E 3                      E 4                      E 5                      Control 6                      Control 7

Alphabet

	N's	10	7	11	12	16	14	15
Post Mean		6.00	3.57	7.64	12.63	7.25	10.57	10.33
Pre Mean		4.30	3.14	3.16	3.50	3.31	3.26	2.00
Gain (or loss)		1.70	5.43	4.46	9.33	3.94	6.71	8.33
Group Means		5.15	5.36	5.41	6.17	5.20	7.22	6.17

Numbers

Post Mean		7.30	5.71	6.27	8.67	6.94	8.14	7.60
Pre Mean		6.50	4.71	4.36	5.00	5.25	3.93	4.73
Gain (or loss)		.80	1.00	1.91	3.67	1.69	4.21	3.07
Group Means		6.90	5.21	5.32	6.34	6.10	6.04	6.27

Copying

Post Mean		3.70	.29	3.64	2.06	1.31	3.26	3.20
Pre Mean		1.70	.29	.45	.50	.31	1.29	1.07
Gain (or loss)		2.00	.00	3.19	1.56	1.00	2.57	2.13
Group Means		2.70	.29	2.05	1.29	1.06	2.55	2.14

Table 2 presents means for Alabama children on Metropolitan Readiness test at pre-and posttesting. Control Class 7 had the lowest Total Score mean (21.30) on the pre-test and Experimental Class 1 the highest (28.20). Experimental Class 2 had the lowest Total Score mean (29.14) on the posttest and Experimental Class 4 the highest (39.75). Control Class 7 made the most gain in Total Score (17.87 points) while Experimental Class 2 produced the least gain (2.43 points).



TABLE 3

Means on Gates-MacGinitie Tests

at Pre-and Posttesting  
Experimentals and Controls

ALABAMA

E 1      E 2      E 3      E 4      E 5      Control 6      Control 7

N's      11      7      13      13      15      12      15

Listening Comprehension

Post Mean	5.36	11.43	10.31	9.54	6.07	9.75	5.47
Pre Mean	6.82	9.71	7.46	9.69	5.33	9.17	6.67
Gain (or loss)	1.54	1.72	2.85	(.15)	2.74	.58	1.30
Group Means	7.59	10.57	8.89	9.62	6.70	9.46	7.57

Auditory Discrimination

Post Mean	11.00	13.57	15.39	13.39	13.50	14.42	14.40
Pre Mean	11.55	12.29	11.08	10.82	8.33	11.17	9.27
Gain (or loss)	(.55)	1.28	4.31	2.77	5.47	3.25	5.13
Group Means	11.28	12.93	13.24	12.01	11.07	12.50	11.34

Visual Discrimination

Post Mean	5.36	4.71	10.46	6.54	7.30	5.25	8.13
Pre Mean	.91	3.71	2.54	4.15	.80	5.33	3.00
Gain (or loss)	4.45	1.00	7.92	2.39	7.00	(.50)	5.13
Group Means	3.14	4.21	6.50	5.35	4.30	5.54	5.57

TABLE 3 (continue:)

Means on Gates-MacGinitie Tests  
at Pre-and Posttesting  
Experimentals and Controls

ALABAMA

	E 1	E 2	E 3	E 4	E 5	Control 6	Control 7
N's	11	7	13	13	15	12	15
	Following Directions						
Post Mean	3.73	5.57	7.69	9.15	6.20	7.50	7.53
Pre Mean	3.91	2.36	5.03	5.35	3.53	5.03	3.53
Gain (or loss)	(.18)	2.71	2.61	3.30	2.67	1.67	4.00
Group Means	3.92	4.27	6.39	7.50	4.57	6.67	5.54
	Letter Recognition						
Post Mean	5.09	9.43	10.39	12.31	7.53	10.50	11.67
Pre Mean	2.18	4.29	.46	2.15	.67	6.42	4.40
Gain (or loss)	2.91	5.14	9.93	10.16	6.86	4.08	7.27
Group Means	3.64	6.36	5.43	7.73	4.05	5.46	5.09
	Visual-Motor Coordination						
Post Mean	3.82	2.00	6.54	4.54	4.00	6.00	5.33
Pre Mean	1.36	1.71	2.23	1.46	1.53	5.56	2.00
Gain (or loss)	2.46	.29	4.31	3.05	2.47	.42	3.33
Group Means	2.59	1.86	4.39	3.00	2.77	5.79	3.67

Table 3 presents the Total Score mean on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests at pre-and posttesting for Alabama classes. Experimental Class 5 had the lowest Total Score mean (26.25) at pre-testing and Control Class 6 the highest (56.50). At post-testing, Experimental Class 1 had the lowest Total Score mean (51.18) and Experimental Class 3 the highest (77.67). Experimental Class 3 provided the greatest gain (42.5 points) while Control 6 gained the least (11.50 points).





Table 4 presents Total Score means on Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities and Stanford-Binet at pre-and post-testing for children tested in Mississippi. Experimental Class 5 scored lowest (106.14) on the pre-test and Experimental Class 2 the highest (142.75) on the pre-test, on the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. Experimental Class 1 scored the lowest (108.28) on the posttest, with Experimental Class 2 again scoring highest (151.50). Experimental Class 4 showed the most gain (41.37 points) between pre-and posttest scores, while Experimental Class 1 showed a loss of 1.5 points.

The scores on the Stanford-Binet were low, but not as low as the scores made by children in Alabama on the same instrument. The pre-test scores ranged from 75.07 to 39.00 with only one group, Experimental Class 3, having a mean below 30. Experimental Class 3 scored lowest on the pre-test (75.07) and Control Group 6 the highest (89.00). Experimental Class 3 was lowest (35.93) on the posttest and Experimental Class 2, the highest (95.83). Experimental Class 3 showed the most gain (10.86 points) while Control 6 had the least IQ gain (3.59 points), of the Mississippi groups.

**TABLE 4**  
**Means on I T P A and Stanford-Binet**  
**at Pre-and Posttesting**

**Experimentals and Control**

**MISSISSIPPI**

	E 1	E 2	E 3	E 4	E 5	Control 6
<b>I T P A</b>						
	<b>Total Raw Score</b>					
N's	14	12	14	8	14	15
Post Mean	103.28	151.50	136.50	143.12	144.57	129.53
Pre Mean	109.73	142.75	106.71	106.25	106.14	109.93
Gain (or loss)	(1.50)	8.83	29.79	41.27	38.43	19.60
Group Means	109.03	147.16	121.60	127.16	125.35	119.73
<b>Stanford-Binet</b>						
	<b>I Q</b>					
N's	12	12	14	8	13	12
Post Mean	91.56	95.03	85.93	95.00	90.69	92.67
Pre Mean	85.33	*	75.07	85.82	80.92	89.06
Gain (or loss)	6.25		10.86	9.36	9.77	3.59
Group Means	88.45		85.50	90.31	85.80	90.87

\*Pre-tests administered and lost.

TABLE 5

Means on Metropolitan Test  
at Pre-and Posttesting  
Experimentals and Control

MISSISSIPPI

E 1 E 2 E 3 E 4 E 5 Control 6

N's

14 12 14 14 14 15

Word Meaning

Post Mean  
Pre Mean  
Gain (or loss)  
Group Means

4.21  
4.21  
--  
4.21

5.33  
4.67  
.66  
5.00

4.00  
4.71  
(.71)  
4.35

5.36  
5.25  
.13  
5.31

4.71  
4.71  
--  
4.71

4.20  
2.60  
1.60  
3.40

-47-

Listening

Post Mean  
Pre Mean  
Gain (or loss)  
Group Means

5.71  
5.36  
.35  
5.53

8.33  
7.75  
.58  
3.04

5.64  
5.79  
(.15)  
5.71

7.63  
4.63  
3.10  
6.13

7.93  
6.36  
1.57  
7.14

7.47  
4.87  
2.60  
6.17

Matching

Post Mean  
Pre Mean  
Gain (or loss)  
Group Means

2.64  
1.21  
1.43  
1.92

5.67  
2.06  
3.59  
3.67

3.79  
1.06  
1.93  
2.82

5.13  
.75  
4.36  
2.94

5.57  
3.21  
2.36  
4.39

5.20  
.87  
4.33  
3.03

TABLE 5 (continued)

Means on Metropolitan Test  
at Pre-and Posttesting  
Experimentals and Control

MISSISSIPPI

E 1                      E 2                      E 3                      E 4                      E 5                      Control 6

Alphabet

	N's	14	12	14	6	14	15
Post Mean		3.14	10.50	5.93	6.30	5.57	3.60
Pre Mean		1.07	2.75	1.50	3.13	2.07	1.13
Gain (or loss)		2.07	7.75	4.43	5.25	6.50	2.47
Group Means		2.10	6.62	3.71	5.75	5.32	2.36

Numbers

Post Mean		4.21	6.92	5.36	7.75	6.14	6.07
Pre Mean		4.36	5.75	2.50	4.13	4.50	2.93
Gain (or loss)		(.15)	1.17	2.86	3.62	1.64	3.14
Group Means		4.33	6.33	3.93	5.94	5.32	4.50

Copying

Post Mean		1.07	3.92	2.36	2.13	3.79	1.07
Pre Mean		0.00	2.42	1.07	2.63	1.00	.53
Gain (or loss)		1.07	1.50	1.29	(.50)	2.79	.54
Group Means		.53	3.17	1.71	2.56	2.39	.00

Table 5 presents means on the Metropolitan Reading Test at pre-and posttesting for Mississippi children. Control Class 6 had the lowest Total Score mean (12.93) at pre-testing and Experimental Class 2, the highest (25.42). Experimental Class 2 was highest (40.67) at posttesting and Experimental Class 1 the lowest (21.00). Experimental Class 4 had the most increase in Total Score (15.60 points) and Experimental Class 1 the least (4.79 points).

TABLE 5 (continued)

Means on Metropolitan Test  
at Pre-and Posttesting  
Experimentals and Control

MISSISSIPPI

E 1                      E 2                      E 3                      E 4                      E 5                      Control 6

METROPOLITAN TOTAL SCORES

	N's	14	12	14	8	14	15
Post: Mean		21.00	40.67	27.07	36.32	36.71	27.50
Pre Mean		16.21	25.42	17.43	20.50	21.66	12.93
Gain (cr loss)		4.79	15.25	9.64	15.82	14.55	14.67
Group Means		18.60	33.04	22.25	28.44	29.26	20.26

TABLE 6

Means on Gates-MacGinitie Tests  
at Pre-and Posttesting  
Experimentals and Control  
MISSISSIPPI

	E 1	E 2	E 3	E 4	E 5	Control 6
	N's	12	12	13	14	13
		GATES-MACGINITIE				
		Listening Comprehension				
Post Mean	6.00	10.67	8.50	11.50	6.21	7.31
Pre Mean	5.15	6.42	5.67	5.63	6.93	4.15
Gain (or loss)	.85	4.25	2.83	5.87	1.28	3.16
Group Means	5.57	6.54	7.06	6.56	7.57	5.73
		Auditory Discrimination				
Post Mean	9.85	14.50	<del>13.92</del> 13.92	15.75	14.43	11.15
Pre Mean	7.00	11.58	6.33	6.86	10.93	3.62
Gain (or loss)	2.85	2.92	7.59	8.87	3.50	2.53
Group Means	6.42	13.04	10.12	11.31	12.68	9.83
		Visual Discrimination				
Post Mean	5.08	6.92	6.25	6.63	6.21	4.46
Pre Mean	1.31	3.42	1.92	2.25	4.29	1.23
Gain (or loss)	3.77	5.50	4.33	4.38	1.92	3.23
Group Means	3.19	6.17	4.08	5.44	5.25	2.84



TABLE 6 (continued)  
Means on Gates-MacGinitie Tests  
at Pre-and Posttesting  
Experimentals and Control

MISSISSIPPI

	E 1	E 2	E 3	E 4	E 5	Control
N's	13	12	12	14	13	13
Following Directions						
Post Mean*	2.77	7.75	4.92	6.80	4.71	5.54
Pre Mean	2.46	4.75	2.00	1.00	4.07	2.23
Gain (or loss)	.31	3.00	2.94	5.00	.64	3.31
Group Means	2.61	6.25	3.50	4.30	4.39	3.50
Letter Recognition						
Post Mean	5.77	12.75	9.00	11.13	11.29	6.46
Pre Mean	2.23	3.25	1.50	3.13	3.43	1.00
Gain (or loss)	3.54	9.50	7.50	8.00	7.86	5.30
Group Means	4.00	3.00	5.29	7.13	7.50	3.77
Visual-Motor Coordination						
Post Mean	2.46	6.50	5.00	6.13	6.14	3.51
Pre Mean	.65	1.17	1.00	2.30	2.64	.30
Gain (or loss)	1.61	5.41	4.00	3.75	3.50	2.93
Group Means	1.65	3.37	3.00	4.25	4.39	1.54

Table 6 presents means for Gates Mac-Ginitie Reading Tests at pre-and posttesting for Mississippi children. Experimental Class 3 scored lowest (31.42) at pre-testing and Experimental Class 5, highest (40.36) on Total Score mean. On the posttest Experimental Class 1 had the lowest Total Score mean (37.31) and Experimental Class 2, the highest (77.67).

TABLE C (continued)

Means on Gates-MacGinitie Tests  
at Pre-and Posttesting  
Experimentals and Control

MISSISSIPPI

E 1                      E 2                      E 3                      E 4                      E 5                      Control 6

N's                      13                      12                      12                      9                      14                      13

Auditory Blending

Post Mean  
Pre Mean  
Gain (or loss)  
Group Means

2.36  
3.46  
(1.06)  
2.92

3.53  
4.17  
4.41  
6.37

4.42  
1.33  
2.59  
3.12

6.75  
3.50  
3.25  
5.12

4.29  
3.00  
1.29  
3.64

5.00  
1.62  
3.33  
3.31

Word Recognition

Post Mean  
Pre Mean  
Gain (or loss)  
Group Means

3.00  
4.00  
(1.00)  
3.50

7.92  
3.17  
4.75  
5.59

6.53  
1.00  
5.53  
3.79

7.36  
2.63  
4.75  
5.00

7.64  
5.07  
2.57  
6.35

5.46  
3.06  
2.36  
4.27

GATES-MACGINITIE TOTAL SCORES

Post Mean  
Pre Mean  
Gain (or loss)  
Group Means

37.31  
26.46  
10.85  
21.33

77.67  
37.92  
39.75  
57.79

53.75  
21.42  
37.33  
40.03

74.13  
20.25  
45.88  
51.19

62.93  
40.36  
22.57  
51.64

46.69  
22.38  
26.31  
35.53

Because of the large differences among pre-test means, these data were evaluated by analysis of covariance. The purpose of the covariance analyses was to compensate posttest means for pre-test differences. Tables 7 and 8 show adjusted means for those tests which resulted in significance at the 5% level when analyzed by analysis of covariance. From Alabama, those tests were:

Stanford-Binet, Total Score

Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, Total Score

Metropolitan Reading Test, Subtest 4, Alphabet

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, Total Score

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, Subtest 2,  
Auditory Discrimination

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, Subtest 3,  
Visual Discrimination

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, Subtest 4,  
Following Directions

From Mississippi, those tests were:

Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, Total Score

Metropolitan Reading Test, Total Score

Metropolitan Reading Test, Subtest 2, Listening

Metropolitan Reading Test, Subtest 3, Matching

Metropolitan Reading Test, Subtest 4, Alphabet

Metropolitan Reading Test, Subtest 6, Copying

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, Subtest 1,  
Listening Comprehension

Adjusted means for those tests, from Mississippi, which resulted in significance at the 5% level when analyzed by analysis of covariance: (continued)

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, Subtest 2,  
Auditory Discrimination

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, Subtest 4,  
Following Directions

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, Subtest 7,  
Auditory Blending

Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, Subtest 8,  
Word Recognition

As those covariance adjusted means shown in Table 7 and 8 resulted in significance at the 5% level, the adjusted means were subjected to further analyses. The purpose of this additional treatment is to determine the nature of significant differences within the groups of adjusted means. Tables 9 and 10 present the results of these significance tests within the sets of covariance adjusted means.

The significance tests of differences among covariance adjusted means for Alabama, Table 9, show Experimental Class 2 significantly lower on the Stanford-Binet than groups 6, 5, and 3. This difference in Stanford-Binet scores is primarily attributable to the fact Experimental Class 2 gained only 1.86 IQ points during the course of this research, while the other classes in Alabama gained from 6 to 12 points. On the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, Total Score, Experimental Class 4 is significantly higher than the other classes. On the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, Total Score, Experimental Class 3 is significantly higher than all classes other than Experimental Class 5.

The significance tests of differences among covariance adjusted means for Mississippi, Table 10, in general show a great deal of overlap within the groups. On the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities Total Score, Experimental Class 1 is significantly lower than all other classes. Experimental Classes 4 and 5 are significantly higher than all other classes but Experimental Class 3, on the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities.

On the Metropolitan Readiness, Total Score, Experimental Class 1 is significantly lower than all classes except Experimental Class 3, excluding Experimental Class 1, there are no significant differences on the Metropolitan, Total Score. On the Gates-MacGinitie, Total Score, Experimental Class 1 is significantly lower than all classes except Experimental Class 5. Experimental Classes 4 and 2, though not significantly different from each other, are significantly higher than all other groups with the exception of Experimental Class 3.

In terms of interstate comparison the similarities are less than obvious. Experimental Class 4, which is clearly a high performing group in Mississippi, does not rank as high in Alabama. Experimental Class 2 which is also a high performer in Mississippi, appears to be near the bottom in Alabama. Experimental Class 1, which has a tendency to be low on all the tests in Mississippi does not adhere to the same tendency in Alabama.

TABLE 7

Posttest Means Adjusted for Pre-test Differences  
by Analysis of Covariance

ALABAMA

TEST Subtest:	ADJUSTED MEANS for Groups:						
	E1	E 2	E 3	E 4	E 5	C 6	C 7
Stanford-Binet Total Score	83.27	77.65	85.71	83.57	86.52	87.36	81.81
I T P A Total Score	140.59	127.23	142.30	157.55	134.53	142.82	137.78
Metropolitan 4--Alphabet	5.46	3.65	7.69	12.72	7.23	10.27	11.01
Gates-MacGinitie Total Score	58.05	53.23	83.05	64.07	75.52	52.79	68.05
Gates-MacGinitie 2--Auditory Discrimination	10.50	12.76	15.09	13.29	14.68	14.08	14.38
Gates-MacGinitie 3--Visual Discrimination	6.22	4.37	10.62	6.01	3.70	4.00	3.09
Gates-MacGinitie 4--Following Directions	4.03	6.48	7.32	8.33	6.72	6.69	8.05



TABLE 8

Posttest Means Adjusted for Pre-test Differences  
by Analysis of Covariance

MISSISSIPPI

TEST	ADJUSTED MEANS for Groups:					
	E 1	E 2	E 3	E 4	E 5	C 6
<b>I T P A</b>						
<b>Total Score</b>	110.87	130.39	141.30	153.26	149.78	132.01
<b>Metropolitan</b>						
<b>Total Score</b>	23.42	34.12	28.21	34.62	33.64	33.22
<b>Metropolitan</b>						
<b>2--Listening</b>	5.93	7.42	5.66	8.19	7.67	7.92
<b>Metropolitan</b>						
<b>3--Matching</b>	2.84	5.52	3.73	5.51	4.98	5.53
<b>Metropolitan</b>						
<b>4--Alphabet</b>	3.88	9.58	6.24	7.08	8.32	4.28
<b>Metropolitan</b>						
<b>6--Copying</b>	2.24	2.59	2.42	0.58	3.92	1.68

TABLE 8 (continued)

Posttest Means Adjusted for Pre-test Differences  
by Analysis of Covariance

MISSISSIPPI

TEST Subtest:	ADJUSTED MEANS for Groups:					
	E 1	E 2	E 3	E 4	E 5	C 6
Gates-MacGinitie Total Score	40.43	69.73	66.74	75.52	52.63	55.75
Gates-MacGinitie 1--Listening Comprehension	6.23	10.33	8.50	11.52	7.66	7.98
Gates-MacGinitie 2--Auditory Discrimination	10.58	13.26	14.93	16.53	13.47	11.19
Gates-MacGinitie 4--Following Directions	3.15	6.48	5.57	7.67	3.93	6.08
Gates-MacGinitie 7--Auditory Blending	2.09	7.93	4.96	6.44	4.23	5.66
Gates-MacGinitie 8--Word Recognition	2.78	7.94	7.23	7.56	7.12	5.51

TABLE 9

Significance Tests of Differences Among Sets  
of Adjusted Means from Covariance Analyses \*

ALABAMA

<u>Test:</u>	Rank Ordered Treatment: (High to Low)						
Stanford-Binet, Total Scores	6	5	3	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>
I T P A, Total Scores	4	6	3	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>
Metropolitan, Subtest 4--Alphabet	4	7	6	<u>2</u>	3	5	1
Gates-MacGinitie, Total Scores	3	5	<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	6
Gates-MacGinitie, Subtest 2-- Auditory Discrimination	3	7	5	6	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
Gates-MacGinitie, Subtest 3-- Visual Discrimination	3	<u>5</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	6
Gates-MacGinitie, Subtest 4-- Following Directions	4	7	3	5	6	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>

Means underlined by the same line are not significantly different at the 5% level of confidence.

\*The method is an F test described by B.J. Winer, STATISTICAL PRINCIPLES IN EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN, page 592.

TABLE 10

Significance Tests of Differences Among Sets  
of Adjusted Means from Covariance Analyses \*

MISSISSIPPI

<u>Test :</u>	<u>Rank Ordered Treatment :</u> <u>(High to Low)</u>					
I T P A, Total Scores	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>
Metropolitan, Total Scores	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
Metropolitan, Subtest 2--Listening	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>
Metropolitan, Subtest 3--Matching	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
Metropolitan, Subtest 4--Alphabet	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>
Metropolitan, Subtest 6--Copying	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
Gates-MacGinitie, Total Scores	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>
Gates-MacGinitie, Subtest 1-- Listening Comprehension	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>
Gates-MacGinitie, Subtest 2-- Auditory Discrimination	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1</u>

TABLE 10 (continued)

Significance Tests of Differences Among Sets  
of Adjusted Means from Covariance Analyses \*

MISSISSIPPI

<u>Test:</u>	<u>Rank Ordered Treatment:</u> (High to Low)					
Gates-MacGinitie, Subtest 4-- Following Directions	4	2	6	3	5	1
	<hr/>		<hr/>			
Gates-MacGinitie, Subtest 7-- Auditory Blending	2	4	6	3	5	1
	<hr/>		<hr/>			
Gates-MacGinitie, Subtest 8-- Word Recognition	2	4	3	5	6	1
	<hr/>					

Means underlined by the same line are not significantly different at the 5% level of confidence.

---

\*The method is an F test described by B.J. Winer, STATISTICAL PRINCIPLES IN EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN, page 592.

Conclusions

The hypothesis that the achievement of Experimental Classes using the selected basic language program and the supplementary materials and the reinforcement procedure would show more improvement than the Control Classes, as measured by selected language development tests, was not completely upheld in the final analysis.

The Head Start Intervention Check Lists, completed by the monitors, although not treated statistically, revealed many important observations which may have had direct affect on the outcome of the intervention program.

- 1) Pupil and teacher enthusiasm for the material remained high from the beginning to the termination of the program. (This was not formally measured, but may be considered an important by-product).
- 2) Parent interest and approval was noted.
- 3) Most of the children were learning.
- 4) The teachers lacked formal training in pre-school education. (Of the 15 teachers included in the study, one teacher of an experimental class had a college degree; the remainder were high school graduates.)
- 5) The teacher variable appeared to be a more important source of variance than the differences in instructional procedure.
- 6) The aides lacked training. (The aides generally considered themselves as domestics and spent most of their time cleaning and not working with the teacher and children.)

- 7) Teachers who lack professional pre-school education training can unknowingly sabotage any instructional program, whether it be structured or unstructured.
- 8) The intervention study did not continue long enough to permit completion. (Due to internal problems, neither the Mississippi nor the Alabama Head Start Centers opened on schedule.) (The author of the basic program has stated the program must be completed before significant achievement results can be expected on standardized tests, such as were administered in this study.)



Recommendations

- 1) Professionally certified pre-school educators, who have demonstrated their teaching abilities, should be employed to teach Head Start children.
  - a. It may not be necessary to have every teacher certified, but there must be a continuous in-service training and supervision program for those who are certified, as well as for para-professionals. (Money spent for employing teachers is wasted if they have no knowledge of phonics, teaching techniques, etc.)
- 2) Head Start teaching aides should be trained to obtain a certain proficiency level before they are placed in the classroom.
- 3) To secure and insure parent and community support, parents should be involved in the planning, classroom, and evaluation of any curricular intervention program.
- 4) Curricular intervention studies should be designed as longitudinal studies. It is necessary to follow these children for more than one year to determine if the intervention has produced change and if it has carry-over value.

Appendix A

HEAD START INTERVENTION CHECK LIST

Region \_\_\_\_\_ Treatment \_\_\_\_\_  
 Center \_\_\_\_\_ Book \_\_\_\_\_ Lesson \_\_\_\_\_  
 Teacher \_\_\_\_\_ Time: from \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_  
 Monitor \_\_\_\_\_ Number of Children \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date \_\_\_\_\_ Number of Aides \_\_\_\_\_

1. Adheres to 30-minutes specified time period per Buchanan lesson. (If less than 25 minutes or more than 35 minutes, write amount of time in NO column.)
2. Adheres to specification of one Buchanan lesson per day.
3. Adheres to correct sequencing of Buchanan lesson followed by supplement.
4. Adheres to specified 20-minutes break following Buchanan lesson. (If less than 15 minutes or more than 25 minutes, write time in NO column.)
5. Adheres to allotted 30-minute time period for supplement lesson. (If less than 25 minutes or more than 35 minutes, write time in NO column.)
6. Teaching was begun within 10 minutes of scheduled time. If not, include explanation given by teacher for deviation from scheduled time in the COMMENTS section.
7. Indicate which objectives of Buchanan lesson were covered by teacher and which were omitted. (Write in number of page corresponding to relevant objective.)

YES	NO

COVERED \_\_\_\_\_ OMITTED \_\_\_\_\_

8. If applicable, indicate which activities of Swanson Supplement were covered by teacher. Which were omitted? If not applicable, check box to right.

NOT APPLICABLE

COVERED \_\_\_\_\_

OMITTED \_\_\_\_\_

9. COMMENTS ON PREPARATION AND ADMINISTRATION: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_



APPENDIX B

1963-69 Monitors

The monitors administered:

1. O S C I
2. Animal House-PSI
3. Gumpgookies
4. Sociometric Play Situation
5. Metropolitan
6. Post Observation with Teacher
7. Gates-MacGinitie
8. Class Facilities Inventory
9. Teaching Staff Characteristics
10. Post Program Interview with Teacher
11. Checklist of Administrative Variables

All monitors attended the Intervention Training Program at the University of South Carolina, and the OSCI training session at Tulane University, conducted by UCLA.

**Harrison County, Mississippi:**

Virginia Sicotte--University of Minnesota. Eight weeks--  
University of Alabama Child Development  
training session.

Juanita Quimby--M.A. Northwestern University,  
Evanston, Illinois.

**Mobile County, Alabama:**

Patricia Feldhaus--B.A. Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.  
Community and fraternal organizations.  
1967-68 E & R Center monitor for  
Mobile, Alabama study.

Linda N. Anderson--B.A. Elementary Education.

Appendix B

Stanford-Binet Examiners:

(Including Brich Response Style and Factors Affecting Test Performance)

Donald C. Paup--Psychometry Credential California State College at Long Beach; Ph. D. candidate at Tulane University in psychology. Pre and Post Mississippi and Alabama, Stanford-Binet and I T P A.

Bruno Preilowski--Ph. D. candidate at Tulane University in psychology. Pre and Post Alabama and Mississippi, Stanford-Binet and I T P A.

Lindsey L. Keys--Ph. D candidate at Tulane University in psychology. Pre and Post Alabama and Mississippi, Stanford-Binet and I T P A.

Ann M. Kenney--Ph. D. candidate at Tulane University. Pre and Post Alabama and Mississippi, Stanford-Binet and I T P A.

Helen S. Paup--B.A. California State College at Long Beach. Post Alabama, Stanford-Binet.

Virginia M. Simmons--Ph. D. candidate 1½ years at Tulane University. Pre and Post Alabama, Stanford-Binet.

Joseph Tremonti, C.S.V., Ed.D.--Stanford-Binet and I T P A, Mississippi Pre.

Family Interviewers:

Margaret L. Clair--Post Mississippi. Two years college; volunteer Head Start teacher's aide; welfare committee.

Ruby N. Hanshaw--Pre Mississippi. High School; Head Start volunteer worker.

John Kovace--Pre and Post Mississippi. B.A.; social work; civic and business affiliations.

Carol Smith--Pre and Post Alabama. Half year college courses. 1967-68 Tulane University E & R Center pre-and-post Family Interviewer.

## RESUME

### A. PERSONAL:

Dr. Shuell H. Jones  
Director  
Evaluation & Research Center  
Head Start E & R Center  
Tulane University  
6823 St. Charles Avenue  
New Orleans, Louisiana 70113

Date of birth: September 20, 1917

Marital Status: Married  
Two children

Residence: 5830 Albany Court  
New Orleans, Louisiana  
70114  
504---367-5718

Area Code 504  
865-7711 Ext. 236

### B. EDUCATION:

William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa; B.A., 1941

State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; M.A., 1949  
Major: Educational Administration

State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; Six-year specialist  
in Educational Administration, Certificate, 1952

University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota; Ed.D., 1960  
Major: Educational Administration

Dissertation: "A Survey of the Training of Public School Superinten-  
dents of Iowa and North Dakota with a Proposed Program  
for the Sixth-Year Specialist Certificate at the  
University of North Dakota"

### C. EXPERIENCE:

1941 - 42

Public Schools, Bridgewater, Iowa, High School teacher

1942 - 45

U.S. Navy Lieutenant

1946 - 48

Public Schools, St. Ansgar, Iowa, High School teacher

1949 - 51

Public Schools, Winfield, Iowa, Superintendent

1952 - 61

Public Schools, State Center, Iowa, Superintendent

RESUME

-2-

Shuell H. Jones

1961 - 63

Public Schools, St. Louis County, Missouri, Jennings  
Senior High School, Principal

1963 - 66

Public Schools, Cook County, Illinois, Brookfield and  
LaGrange Parls., Superintendent

1965 - 66

Visiting Professor, North Central College, Naperville, Ill.

1966 - 69

Director, Evaluation & Research Center, Center for Teacher  
Education, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana

D. PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS:

PHI DELTA KAPPA

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

LOUISIANA EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

E. PUBLICATIONS:

"A Problem Solving Approach to Remedial Reading", Louisiana Schools,  
Volume XLIV, April, 1967, pp. 24-28

"Programmed Reading Report: So Far, So Good", Nation's Schools,  
Volume 78, Number 1, July, 1966, pp. 39-40

"Programmed Reading in the First Grade", Cook County Educational  
Digest, Volume 28, January, 1965, pp. 3-5

"Programmed Reading", Journal of Programmed Reading, Issue Number 3,  
June, 1965, pp. 10-16