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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

American schools are generally successful at teaching the majority of students how to read, by one means or another. However, there remains an alarming number of particular students who continue to fail in their attempts to acquire literacy. Concern over these particular students has been recently underscored by the growing awareness of researchers and practitioners in the field of reading that most published reading programs often do not consider the information which has been identified about language and learning. It is these newer implications about language and learning which have recently provided additional and newer insights into the reading process and corresponding literacy practices. It appears that most recent theories of language and reading have not been effectively incorporated into instructional strategies and materials designed for use in the classroom reading programs.

According to Goodman (1969):

Theories in reading have been thinly built on partial views of the process of reading. Notably missing has been any awareness of the nature of language and language use.

COMMON APPROACHES TO READING INSTRUCTION

School settings generally make use of a basal reader approach to reading instruction. This basal approach includes one or more
instructional methodologies generally classified as phonics, and/or whole word emphasis, and/or the eclectic view.

Phonics programs teach the child various sound-to-letter relationships and the rules which govern their regularity. Exceptions to regularity are primarily left to memorization. Heavy emphasis is placed on the decoding of words. The reader is instructed to use rules, even state rules, to sound out unknown words in gaining meaning from a word.

Whole word, or look-say methods require beginning readers to develop a basic sight vocabulary. This vocabulary is introduced in simple word lists and through memorization of isolated words which have been grouped according to graded levels of difficulty.

Reading teachers have modified published programs to meet their perceived needs or the needs of children and according to their prescribed definition of reading. Consequently, few reading programs are exclusively one reading approach in terms of adhering to and supporting a particular consistent theoretical base. Most reading programs would better be described as eclectic, emphasizing mastery of rules as well as skills. Clearly, most all present popular approaches tend to stress rather absolute and tightly controlled vocabulary and story content in an attempt to approximate the varied backgrounds and interests of the reader.

According to Goodman, present day traditional approaches continue to view reading instruction as a passive, formal, structured and sequenced product, rather than how he feels it should be, an active,
developmental, selection process. Traditionally, Goodman states reading programs characteristically speak of reading as follows:

Reading is a precise process. It involves exact, detailed, sequential perception and identification of letters, words, spelling patterns and larger language units. (1967:126)

ALTERNATIVES TO COMMON APPROACHES TO READING INSTRUCTION

Kenneth Goodman (1969), Frank Smith (1971) and a growing number of other linguistic, psychological and reading researchers view the reading act today as an interaction of language and thought. This newer view is as much a result of historical researchers in language and psychology as it is of present linguists, sociolinguists and psycholinguists. Huey as early as 1908 began redirecting thinking about the structure and processes of language and its relationship to the acquisition of literacy.

Huey stated:

And so to completely analyze what we do when we read would almost be the acme of a psychologist's achievements, for it would be to describe very many of the most intricate workings of the human mind, as well as to unravel the tangled story of the most remarkable specific performance that civilization has learned in all its history. (1908:6)

Descriptions by Goodman and Smith relate heavily to Huey in that they today define reading as a psycholinguistic process. According to Goodman (1974), psycholinguistic research reveals reading primarily as a process of getting meaning from print. In essence, the reader is reconstructing the author's intended message on the basis of his
personal experiences and language. Reading is to be thought of as a communication process between the reader and the writer.

Goodman pointed out:

Reading is a selective process. It involves partial use of available minimal language cues selected from perceptual input on the basis of the reader's expectation. As this partial information is processed, tentative decisions are made, to be confirmed, rejected or refined as reading progresses. (1967:126)

This is obviously in contrast to the more traditional phonics and whole word positions which look at reading as a precise, sequential process of decoding letters, spelling patterns and words.

**ALTERNATIVE WHOLE LANGUAGE APPROACHES TO READING**

Compatible with the philosophies of historical and recent psycholinguistic views of reading are instructional techniques using the natural language and experiences of the learner as a base for the teaching of reading. Huey (1908) stated:

No trouble has been taken to write what the child would naturally say about the subject in hand, nor indeed, usually, to say anything connectedly and continuously as even an adult would naturally talk about the subject. The language used often shows a patronizing attempt to "get down to the child's level" and results in a mongrel combination of points of view and of expression that is natural neither to an adult nor to a child. (279)

An approach which does incorporate the natural language of the child is the Language Experience Approach (LEA). Popularized by Stauffer, and extended by Allen, the LEA facilitates the natural interaction between language and thought by encouraging the child to
dictate a story which reflects his natural language and experience. LEA seeks to broaden the learner's experiences, provide many opportunities for subjects to articulate their specific experiences, and develop expanded powers to communicate orally. LEA relegates the teaching of reading to no more or less importance than all other language arts skills. Children listen, speak, write and read about their personal experiences and ideas as a single communications act rather than separate skills. The child's speech determines the language patterns of language arts materials. His experiences determine the content.

LEA creates motivation naturally on the part of the student because of the self-directed relevance of the reading material. Reading is also facilitated by the normal language patterns of the text since the reader and speaker are one and the same. These factors are evidenced as powerful aids in assisting the reader in accomplishing the task of reconstructing meaning. In other words, the advantage of the LEA is that the language and thought of the reader and the writer of the text are practically identical.

More typical reading materials and instruction often reject and/or alter the child's natural language. Allen (1965) sees it as important to remember that each child has a respectable, grammatical natural language and that new language learnings must be related to it. In the instruction of reading and language, excessive correction of speech and writing may serve to block oral and written expression rather than to encourage it. Lefevre (1966) stated:
If teachers insist on instant correction, incessant correction, of every so-called mistake the child makes in speech, reading and writing, the child will close up like an oyster. He will hate to write and hate to recite in school. (128)

Acceptance of a child's natural language is essential to begin the LEA. Wilt (1959) stated that:

The teacher should accept enthusiastically and generously whatever personal expression the child dreams up. Regardless of the creative result, he must always realize that the process is of far more consequence than the product. (8)

Many, if not most, children with reading problems often exhibit a negative attitude toward school, self and others and reject typical remediation attempts which are more of the same type of instruction which was earlier unsuccessful. Attitude, success and motivation are equally important in working with students failing to gain literacy skills. For pupils who have a negative feeling about themselves as readers as a result of repeated frustration and failure, the use of personal stories has been successful in removing the fear of failure. The LEA seems to promote favorable attitudes toward reading and develops a high degree of personal involvement through intrinsic motivation as students experience success through the use of their own experiences and natural language.

Johnson (1966) stated five fundamental principles of learning which underlie working with readers and potential readers:

1. Learning begins with the known.
2. Learning proceeds from concrete to abstract.
3. Learning demands active participation.
4. Learning should be goal directed.
5. Learning is an individual matter. (14)
The language experience approach does begin with known material which is more easily understood, does provide concrete materials as the starting point, does actively involve the learner to be goal-directed, and does approach reading in an individual manner with concern for personal involvement in the reading situation.

The LEA has most commonly been used with kindergarten and primary grade (grades 1 through 3) children to develop the relationship between oral and written language which is the important step in beginning reading instruction. However, this instructional approach does not appear to be used widely with older children in reading instruction. There is no logic which should prohibit the use of LEA with older children who have yet to develop the relationship between oral and written language. Since motivation is a crucial factor in working with older children who for all practical purposes are beginning readers, the intrinsic motivation provided by LEA results in an ideal match. Language experience approach also helps to alleviate the difficulty of obtaining interesting reading material.

READING SELF-CONCEPT AND ATTITUDES TOWARD READING

Traditional reading approaches discussed here have seen both success and failure. Children of the failure category have possibly been stifled by the traditional methodologies since they appear to have developed poor concepts of themselves and negative attitudes toward reading.
When the child first encounters reading instruction, his self-concept as a reader is most pliable and it easily moves in a positive or negative direction (Kunz, 1968). Thus, the importance of the approach that is used in beginning reading instruction is very crucial for any child. Holmze (1962) described the process:

If a child is successful in extracting ideas from the printed page and he recognizes this, he will develop a concept of himself as a reader. As a result, he will attempt more difficult material, he will take more pleasure in reading, and he is more apt to read more widely. The wide reading makes the child a better reader; and the cycle is complete. However, if a child experiences little success in learning to read, he will develop a concept of himself as a "non-reader". His efforts to glean ideas from print are a struggle, so he does not like to read, or view himself as a reader. His lack of interest and effort make it difficult to experience success and improvement; the cycle is again complete. The role of self-concept in learning to read is, thus, vital and one of self-fulfilling prophecy. (211)

Damage resulting from a negative reading self-concept might be regarded less seriously if its effects were only short-range. However, Jaranko (1969) pointed out long-range effects that a "nonreader" self-concept can have upon an individual if the image and the corresponding low reading achievement are not countered. He claimed these patterns of failure and the resulting psychological problems often plague children throughout their lives.

Allen (1969) recognized the need for developing positive attitudes toward reading. He commented that the lack of desire to read on the part of the students is as great a failure as the lack of skill to read.
If, as some evidence seems to indicate, American schools are not successful at developing positive reading attitudes and habits in certain children, it is the responsibility of the system to develop instructional strategies which help children acquire the necessary attitudes toward as well as abilities in reading.

Clearly, numerous researchers and teacher counterparts recognize a relationship between self-concept and reading achievement, specifically Wiksell (1948), Russell (1948), Spache (1949), Bodwin (1958), Guilana (1967), Lamy (1963), Spicola (1960), Williams and Cole (1968) and Swartz (1972). In addition, many of these researchers see the relationship as a cycle in which one's image of himself as a reader is reinforced again and again through reading experiences that he can relate to.

Research has been directed toward the relationship of self-concept to general academic achievement. Other research has specifically explored the relationship of reading achievement to self-concept, with positive correlations having been found. All but few studies deal with the global self-concept rather than breaking it into sub-self-concept categories. Brookover (1962) felt that in addition to a global self-concept, a child appears to have subcategories of self-concept. He contends that an individual possesses any number of self-concepts. One of these specific self-concepts in our culture is an individual's perception of himself as a student. Furthermore, the role of student is composed of several self-concept subroles including those of academic achievement and ability. For
purposes of this study, then, it will be assumed that there exists a sub-category of student self-concept that could be termed "reading self-concept."

Research dealing with the reading self-concept is limited. Stillwell (1966) measured reading self-concept of sixth-grade subjects and found that it correlated positively with reading achievement. Sopis (1965) used a Colvin Silhouette Test technique to arrive at a reading self-concept. Quandt (1971) measured the effects of the self-concept and attitude toward reading prior to reading instruction for primary children, and found, through his attitude chart, that the reading self-image possessed by the individuals affected the reading ability development. However, they appear to be the only studies dealing with a specific reading self-concept. No research has been found that has investigated the effects of a particular instructional strategy and materials on the reading self-concept of a group of students. Seemingly, students who have been systematically identified as having low reading self-concept prior to this study previously have not been treated or assessed.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Can language experience based instructional strategies and materials improve student reading self-concept and reading performance.
PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

1. To see if reading ability of selected fifth-grade subjects, as measured by the Reading Miscue Inventory, can be increased using Language Experience Approach strategies.

2. To determine if the language experience based strategies has any effect on reading self-concept of students as measured by the semantic differential scale.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Natural Language: The language and idiolect of the subjects.

Language Experience Approach: A method which utilizes children's oral language and experiences as the basis for creating personal reading materials. The exception is, no strategies were based on isolating any of the children's language into smaller language units such as letters, letter patterns, or isolated words.

Reading Self-Concept: All the perceptions, ideas and attitudes that an individual develops about his own ability to read successfully, his own reading skill, or his potential ability to learn such reading skill. The operational definition consists of the outcomes of the self-concepts as measured by the semantic differential ratings.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. The Descriptive Design. The conclusions of the study are limited to those subjects of the study. The conclusions are idiosyncratic to the group of five students and techniques of the study.
2. **The Time-Span.** This study covers a period of approximately six weeks of thirty one-hour sessions.

3. **The Sample Size.** The subjects are limited to five pupils in the fifth grade, selected from Green Valley Elementary School in a middle-class, suburban neighborhood in southwestern Virginia. The low number of subjects is necessary for this study because of the complex nature of the analysis given to the Reading Miscue Inventory.

4. **Semantic Differential Scale Reliability.** No reliability was established for the semantic differential scale.

**SUMMARY**

Because of the fact that learners are sometimes unable to deal effectively with the traditional methodology in learning to read, this study was designed to assess the efficacy of Language Experience Approach based instructional strategies presented to a selected group of fifth-grade subjects.

At the start of this study, a semantic differential scale was used to determine the subjects' reading self-concept. The Reading Miscue Inventory was given to determine their reading ability. At the conclusion of the six-week treatment period, the same semantic differential scale and RMI instruments were re-administered, and the results were analyzed.
ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1 has presented a brief introduction to the research and a statement concerning the purposes of the study. Also included are the definition of terms and the limitations of the study. Chapter 2 presents a review of the related literature and research with emphasis on the history and research of self-concept, mentioning other miscue research that has been done. In Chapter 3, the research methods and procedures are outlined. Chapter 4 contains a description of the treatment, and a comparison of the Reading Miscue Inventory and semantic differential scales, both pre- and post-. Chapter 5 deals with a summarization of the study, its conclusions and recommendations.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

This review of literature looks at the notion of self-concept including (a) the self, (b) self-concept and overall achievement, and (c) self-concept and reading. The chapter provides an overview of the research base dealing with self-concept in order to help establish the need for more research in the area of reading self-concept. Also, a base will be established for previous research in the Language Experience Approach (LEA) reading instruction. This helps to explain LEA in relation to this study. The Reading Miscue Inventory (RMI) research has not had studies connected with it in the area of self-concept. The Review of Literature verifies other variables with which the RMI has been combined, and how they relate to this study.

THE SELF

William James (1890) in his Principles of Psychology, brought the topic of self to the attention of American social scientists. He considered ego the individual's sense of identity. In addition to this global concept, he felt that the self included spiritual, material, and social aspects. Mental faculties and inclinations comprised the spiritual self. Material possessions constituted the material self. The esteem and regard that a person perceives others have for him
formed the social self. From James, then, came a view of self which incorporated feelings and attitudes along with a principle of causality.

Allport (1937) pointed out the interrelatedness of the self as both object and process. He calls the ego, or self, functions that propitiate functions of the personality. Freud (1943) gives the ego a central place in his theory of personality structure. In counter-distinction to James and Allport, Freud pays little attention to the self-image. Rather, for him the ego is a functional agent or executive of the personality structure which makes rational choices and controls actions in the healthy person by keeping a "psychic balance" between the demands of the moral arm of the personality and the natural impulses of the person.

As Wylie (1961) points out, during the 1920's through the 1940's, the self received scant attention from the behavior-oriented psychologists who dominated American psychology. Watson (1925), the most vocal of the behaviorists, argued persuasively that consciousness was neither observable nor measurable, and therefore was inappropriate for psychological study. At that time in American psychology, few self-respecting psychologists would treat self as a topic for serious experimental study.

There were a few exceptions to this general neglect. George H. Mead (1934) made the concept of self a major part of his theoretical writing on the philosophy of society and described in detail how the self is developed through transactions with the environment. Lewin (1935) viewed the self as a central and relatively permanent
organization which gave consistency to the entire personality. Goldstein (1939) analyzed the processes of self-actualization, as contrasted with those of the sick organism which must constantly worry about bodily preservation. This was a forerunner of the comprehensive work of Maslow (1954, 1956) who has written so powerfully on self-actualization. Prescott Lecky (1945) contributed the notion of self-consistency as a primary motivating force in human behavior. Bertocci (1945) emphasized the two aspects of the self, distinguishing between the self as object and the self as subject. Murphy (1947) discussed the origins and modes of self-enhancement and how the self is related to the social group. Taify (1948) introduced measures of self-concept in counseling interviews and argued that psychotherapy is a process of changing the self-concept.

Among those most consistent in objecting to behaviorism were the clinical psychologists who found the tenets of behaviorism too narrow and passive to account for most human behavior. One of the most eloquent and significant voices was that of Carl Rogers. In several of his books, Carl Rogers (1951; 1954; 1959a, b; 1969) presented a system of psychotherapy called "nondirective" which was built around the importance of the self in human adjustment. Rogers believed that the self is the central aspect of personality and that in every human being there is a tendency toward self-actualization and growth as long as this is permitted by the environment.

Another influence in reintroducing the concept of the self into psychology and education was the writing of Combs and Snygg (1959).
They proposed that the basic drive of the individual is the maintenance and enhancement of the self, and that all behavior, without exception, is dependent upon the individual's frame of reference. Thus, behavior is determined by the totality of experience of which the individual is aware at an instant of action, his "phenomenal field", an idea which is compatible with the language experience, psycholinguistic, and Reading Miscue Inventory philosophies.

In the last few years there has been an enthusiastic rebirth of interest in internal and intrinsic motivating forces and cognitive and symbolic processes, particularly in reference to the dynamic importance of the self. The research and writing of Brockover (1959, 1962, 1964, 1965, 1967), Reider (1958), Patterson (1959, 1961), Combs (1965, 1969), Diggory (1966), and Coopersmith (1967); along with Myers (1969), Shaw (1931), Yamamoto (1972), LaBenne (1969), and Moustakas (1967, 1973, 1974), among others, have given us a deeper understanding of the dynamics of the self in determining behavior.

SELF-CONCEPT AND OVERALL ACHIEVEMENT

Empirical and experimental data has been gathered from studies which explored the relationship of self-concept and achievement in school. Lecky (1945) was one of the first investigators to demonstrate that low academic achievement was often due to a child's definition of himself as a nonlearner. Brookover, Thomas, and Patterson (1964) found a statistically significant positive correlation between self-concept and perceived evaluations of significant others,
general performance in academic subjects, and achievement in specific subject-matter fields.

Many researchers (Bruck, 1959; Paris, 1967; Farquhar, 1968; Gill, 1969; Paschal, 1968; Reeder, 1955) have substantiated the significant relationship between self-concept and school achievement of elementary and secondary students. Among the college-age population, similar findings (Gowan, 1960; Irwin, 1968; Roth, 1959) demonstrated that students who do achieve are characterized by self-acceptance and a positive self-concept.

It seems that the self and its influence has no boundaries regarding race, class or giftedness. Barrett (1957) studied underachieving gifted children and concluded that they were underachieving because they could not adequately utilize their inner resources. In a study of Negro students, Caplin (1966) found that those children who professed more positive self-concepts tended to have higher academic achievement. Davidson and Greenberg (1967) found that high achievers among a group of lower class children rated themselves significantly better than low achievers on personal, academic and social competence.

The relationship between self-concept and success in school appears clearer for boys than for girls. Both Campbell (1965) and Bledsoe (1967), using self-report inventories, found a stronger relationship between the self-concept and achievement in boys than in girls. Shaw, Edson and Bell (1960) conducted a study to determine differences between achievers' and underachievers' perceptions of themselves. Their study discovered that male achievers are more
positive about themselves than male underachievers, but that the same could not be said about the girls.

Most studies dealing with the unsuccessful students have focused on the problem of underachievement, the underachiever being one whose classroom performance tends to be lower than his demonstrated aptitudes as measured by mental ability tests. Fewer studies have considered the "nonachiever," the one who lacks the ability to meet the demands of school. It would seem from the studies performed, however, that unsuccessful students in either group perceive themselves and their relationships to the world around them differently from those who succeed. Goldberg (1960) found underachievers to perceive themselves as less ambitious and able as well as less confident. Shaw (1961) and Bruck and Bodwin (1962) reported a tendency toward immature self-concepts on the part of underachievers. One study, that of Holland (1959), did not confirm the general theory that unsuccessful students give themselves a negative self-evaluation.

The number of studies reported in the literature relating global or academic self-concept to general academic achievement indicates that the field is extremely vast and difficult to report in its entirety within this chapter. For example, Purkey (1970), limiting himself to published research, found thirty-four studies relating some measure of self-concept to some form of academic achievement between 1960 and 1970 alone. Wylie (1961) also found large numbers of studies relating these two variables prior to 1960. The research designs, the self-concept instruments, and even the value
of the studies varied over a wide spectrum. The evidence from the research, as demonstrated by the examples above, however, seems to indicate that there is a substantial positive relationship between an individual's global self-concept and his achievement in school. However, it cannot be assumed from these studies that either the self-concept determines scholastic performance or that scholastic performance shapes the self-concept. It may be that the relationship between the two is caused by some other factor yet to be determined. The evidence suggests that it is a possible two-way street and that there is a continuous interaction between the self and academic achievement and that each influences the other.

Being there seems to be a strong relationship between an individual's academic achievement and his self-concept, it would seem logical to expect self-concept to be related to reading achievement and ability as well. The degree to which this expectation is met will next be demonstrated.

SELF-CONCEPT AND READING

As a brief historical base, it would be safe to say that many studies were found in the field or reading related to a feeling of adequacy. Although the conceptual scheme of the self-concept as defined by educational psychologists had not been publicized widely prior to the 1950's, specialists in the field of reading recognized self-esteem, self-confidence, and emotional adjustment as important factors in learning to read as early as the 1930's. While the
literature of this period reveals lack of agreement as to which came first; failure to learn to read causing emotional maladjustment or emotional maladjustment resulting in failure to learn to read; there is, nevertheless, agreement that there is a relationship.

Witty and Kopal (1939) found that in the Northwestern University Reading Clinic, 50 percent of the retarded readers were characterized by fears and anxieties. These students could not succeed in reading until their self-confidence was reestablished. Fernald (1943) found a much higher percentage of her pupils in the reading clinic entered school with no history of emotional instability, but after having unhappy experiences with reading in school, learned to hate or fear the reading situation and everything connected with it.

On the other hand, Gates (1941) found that 75 percent of pupils with reading problems had emotional problems previously. He believed that those emotional problems prevented the pupils from learning to read. Robinson (1946) in an investigation to determine why pupils fail in reading found that 43 percent of one group of seriously retarded readers had emotional difficulties.

Russell (1948) reviewed approximately one hundred studies from 1920-1940 in the general field of reading disabilities and personality maladjustment. With a few exceptions, he found that the studies agree that there is a close relationship between reading difficulties and personality difficulties. In her study, Blanchard (1928) found that the basis of emotional difficulties was found to be in the emotional experiences of the child during his first attempts to learn to read.
This suggests that instead of poor reading causing emotional maladjustment or emotional difficulty causing poor reading, the two develop simultaneously.

Wiksell (1948), in a study of college students with reading difficulties, found that part of the explanation for their difficulties was in fact, in their twelve years of schooling they had had feelings of frustration and inferiority because of their inability to read satisfactorily. In his study, Sherman (1939) brought out the fact that the feelings of insecurity are more serious in reading than in other subjects. He found that any type of deficiency tends to create a feeling of inferiority and inadequacy. A person tends at first to rationalize, but the poor reader has more difficulty in rationalizing because every phase of his academic career and his other adjustment is affected by his defective learning (reading) ability.

Spache (1949) in his earlier studies of the relationship of the learner and his self-concept found that the first step to understanding the learner is to discover what his concept is of himself and his concept of himself as a reader. He believes that the important thing is to help the learner to recognize the inconsistencies and rationalizations that are present.

In order to lend a degree of organization to the remainder of the reports of the literature in this section, the studies were divided into five groups. The first four groups were divided on the basis of the research design used. The first group of studies related self-concept to reading achievement within one group of subjects at one
given time; the second group of studies compared the self-concept of two groups of readers; the investigators in the third group examined reading and/or self-concept gain scores; and the studies in the fourth group explored the predictive ability of self-concept. The fifth group of studies was separated from the others because they deal with a specific reading self-concept.

**Single Group Studies.** Nearly all of the investigators who explored relationships of self-concept and reading achievement using a single group so subjects at one given time did so through the use of a correlation. Factor analysis or nonstatistical procedures were used by the other researchers.

Various instruments to measure self-concept were employed by many researchers (Bodwin, 1958; Guilian, 1967; Lamy, 1963; Moffett, 1962; Spicola, 1960; Swartz, 1972; Williams and Cole, 1968) who all found a significant positive correlation between self-concept and reading achievement levels. In contrast, only three other studies (Carter, 1957; Swartz, 1972; Williams, 1973) demonstrated no significant relationship between total scores of self-concept and reading achievement.

One particularly interesting study was that of Pollock (1972) who examined the self-concepts of a selected group of elementary school children and the relationship of these self-concepts to intelligence and to reading achievement. Six subhypotheses were formulated to test relationships among IQ, global self-concept, specific role self-concept, teachers' evaluation of the child's self-concept, and reading
achievement. In her findings, it was evident that specific role, or school, self-concept and the teacher's evaluation of the child's self-concept are related to reading achievement.

The research in the first group of studies clearly points in one direction. While they are not completely consistent and while they do not offer overwhelming evidence, the results of these studies appear to indicate that a positive relationship exists between self-concept and reading achievement and ability. The cumulative evidence is quite strong.

**Group Comparison Studies.** The studies in this group also investigated the relationships between self-concept and reading achievement but did so by comparing groups of subjects.

Overachievers and underachievers in reading were matched on numerous variables in several studies (Bricklin, 1965; Lumpkin, 1959; Toller, 1967) and their self-concepts were compared. Results were that the overachievers revealed significantly more positive self-concepts.

Zimmerman and Allebrand (1956) compared underachieving readers to "normal" readers and found significant differences between the groups on a self-concept test. Krim (1969) made a similar comparison but found that underachieving readers from lower socio-economic levels reported more positive self-concepts than many underachieving subjects at higher socio-economic levels.

Reading achievers and nonachievers were compared across several personality traits, including self-esteem, by Henderson, et al. (1965).
No significant difference was found between the two groups on a self-concept measure.

Walton (1970) compared self-concept of subjects removed from their classrooms for corrective instruction with those not removed. The findings indicated that students in a conventional classroom tend to reflect a higher self-concept than students placed in special reading classes.

Thus, the researchers whose studies were placed into this group compared the self-concepts of subjects whose reading achievement could be categorized into two, or in one case, three levels or of subjects who were receiving differing reading instruction. The instruments used to measure self-concept in these studies included the California Test of Personality, a Q-sort, a semantic differential technique, the Reading Apperception Test, the Bledsoe Self-Concept Scale, and a variety of instruments devised by the investigators. The number of different instruments used in these studies again demonstrated a variety of self-concept definitions upon which the research was based. The results of the studies, however, were quite uniform.

The research in this category points in the same direction as that reported in the first category. The more positive self-concepts found among the better readers in the majority of these studies tends to show a relationship between reading and self-concept. This evidence supports the positive correlations between self-concept and reading achievement that were reported earlier.
Gain Score Studies. A number of investigators have not been interested in the relationships between self-concept and reading achievement but rather in the relationships of gains in self-concept and gains in reading achievement. The results of their research have been inconclusive. One study (Carlson, 1964) resulted in a significant positive correlation between progress in reading and self-concept levels. The other studies (Bradford, 1972; Carlton and Moore, 1965; Padelford, 1970; Seay, 1961) did not find that the correlation between gains in reading achievement and in self-concept reached significance. The observations that were made in the previous sections regarding the lack of uniformity in self-concept definitions can also be applied to the studies in this group. However, the outcomes of the studies in this group are somewhat different than those previously reported because no apparent conclusion can be drawn from them.

Self-Concept as a Reading Predictor. In what is perhaps the most well-known study of reading and self-concept, Wattenberg and Clifford (1962) compared the predictive ability of an intelligence test and a measure of self-concept. The measure of self-concept, which consisted of a quantified analysis of tape recorded conversational speech and of teacher ratings, was administered to 128 subjects when they were in kindergarten and again in second grade. In addition, a dichotomized measure of reading achievement (at grade level; below grade level) was made as well as a rank order correlation between several variables and the reading book being used by the child. In general, the measures of self-concept made at the beginning of
kindergarten proved to be somewhat more predictive of reading achievement two and one-half years later than the measure of intelligence. The correlation between the measures of reading achievement and changes in self-concept, however, proved to be slight and inconsistent in direction.

Dowd (1969) tested various combinations of initial reading success predictors in order to find the best combination for different groups of children. The predictors tested were two readiness tests, a verbal mental ability test, and a measure of self-concept, the U-Scale. The subjects of the study were 232 children, one-third of whom were blacks, and who were followed from kindergarten into first grade. Upon applying multiple regression techniques, the investigator found no combination of predictors which was best across both sexes and both ethnic groups. However, in three of the four groups self-concept scores added significantly to the predictability and the validity of the best single predictor. In another aspect of the study pre- and post-test self-concept measure of 309 first graders, when compared to reading achievement test scores, led the investigator to conclude that self-concept stands in a causal relationship to reading success.

These two studies, again differing in self-concept definitions from those described in connection with the other groups of studies, do not provide sufficient evidence by themselves to draw any conclusions. They do add some support, however, to the evidence established with the first two groups of studies.
Reading Self-Concept Studies. Finally, three studies have been located which have explored a specific self-concept which could be termed reading self-concept. One of the investigators used reading self-concept as a tool to measure another factor. Another investigator studied the relationship between reading self-concept and reading achievement. The other studied the effect of a child's concept of himself as a potential reader (reading self-concept) upon his ability to learn to read.

Boys and girls in grades two through five were given the Colvin Silhouette Test by Sopis (1965) in order to locate subjects with high, average, or low self-images as a reader, physical education student, music student, or a smart independent child. Subjects of high, average, or low levels of reading self-concept were assigned to a group in which they had also a high self-image as a physical education student, a music student, or a smart independent child. They were motivated to perform on a reading task by being told the task dealt with their non-reading area of high self-image. Boys with a high self-concept as readers performed better across all motivational states than boys with average or low reading self-concepts. With the girls, however, no significant differences between groups were found.

Stillwell (1966) tested all sixth grade children from two schools for mental maturity, for achievement, and for four types of self-concept using a semantic differential technique. Pearson r correlations were calculated and t-tests for significance of differences between correlations were computed. Global self-concepts showed no
relationship with achievement for either sex. When reading self-concept was compared with reading achievement, however, a significant relationship was found.

Quandt (1972) examined the relationship between reading self-concept at the beginning of first grade and measured reading achievement at the middle of first grade, and to discover the relationships between change in first grade reading self-concept and patterns of observed successes in reading. He used a reading self-concept scale that he devised. After one semester, a post-test of the same scale was administered. It was found that, while no trends toward increase or decrease of successes in reading could be observed which differentiated any of the reading self-concept change groups from any of the others, several indications were found that subjects whose reading self-concept changed negatively experienced fewer successes in reading than subjects whose reading self-concept either changed positively or did not change. In the other aspect of his study, it appeared that through a correlation of .22, which was not significant at the .05 level, the pre-reading instruction reading self-concept was not connected with the reading achievement at the middle of the first grade.

The studies involving a reading self-concept, then, like the studies in group four, have weaknesses and do not provide enough evidence by themselves to draw any conclusions. However, they add weight to the other evidence which has been described and which provides some indication that a relationship exists between self-concept and reading ability.
In summary, the nature and the limitations of the research of this section do not allow any conclusions regarding the relationships between self-concept and reading achievement to be drawn with certainty. The design used would not allow broad generalizations to be made. The lack of random selection in obtaining subjects for the studies was limiting. A variety of self-concept definitions and instruments were used. Finally, it must be remembered that none of the studies that have been reported has shown a cause and effect relationship between self-concept and reading achievement. The statistical designs used would not allow such generalizations.

In spite of such limitations, however, the fact that such a large majority of the studies indicated a positive relationship between self-concept and reading achievement cannot be ignored. It appears safe to conclude that at least this related research appears to indicate the following:

1. There is a positive relationship between self-concept and reading achievement, although the strength and the causes of this relationship are not known.

2. Academic self-concept is more closely related to reading achievement than global self-concept.

3. Possibly reading self-concept is at least as closely related to reading achievement as is the more general academic self-concept, but the evidence is so limited that this conclusion is uncertain.
Research in the area of the Language Experience Approach to reading in any form is scarce. The paucity of the literature in this area might be due to the lack of usage of the program in the schools, experimentally or regularly.

DeLawter (1970) conducted a study which focused on the oral reading errors in relation to early reading instruction. It also investigated the relationship of oral reading errors to the meaningfulness of reading material. The two instructional methods studies were the Allen linguistic approach and the Chandler language experience-basal approach. It was expected that subjects from both instructional groups would make fewer errors on words presented in context than on those same words in isolation. On words in isolation subjects taught by the linguistic method were expected to make fewer errors than those taught by the language experience-basal approach. On the other hand, on words in context, the language-experience-basal group was expected to make fewer errors than the linguistic group. It was found that both instructional groups made fewer errors on words presented in context than on those same words in isolation. Further, children taught by the linguistic method were not handicapped in reading meaningful passages. In fact, they scored higher than the subjects taught by the language-experience-basal method. The study found that the linguistic approach was more effective than the language-experience-basal method for subjects who began schooling with limited reading-related skills. It was also found that certain patterns of oral reading errors are
related to instructional method. Children taught by the language-experience-basal method seemed to make a majority of errors which were sensible, real words. Children taught by the linguistic method used word analysis skills with more frequency and facility but tended to offer a majority of nonsense responses.

Knight (1971) investigated a comparison of the influence of four different reading programs on children's expressed attitudes toward reading. The study was to determine what difference in expressed attitude toward reading, if any, existed after one school year's instruction in each of four different beginning reading programs. An attitude-toward-reading inventory was developed by the investigator and was administered to a random sampling. Mean attitude scores from all second grade groups were higher than mean attitude scores from their first grade counterparts. Reading Achievement scores favored the Basal Reader Group. The Language-Experience was not mentioned in any of the results.

READING MISCUE INVENTORY

In her study, Goodman (1967) described the observed development of oral reading phenomena in selected beginning readers, based on the assumption that reading is a psycholinguistic process. Six beginning readers were used. Each miscue was coded according to a taxonomy which examined the miscues in terms of (1) levels of cue systems within the language, (2) how the children handled the miscue once it was produced; and, (3) types of miscues. The corrections and
regressions were also analyzed. This study was a description of what
was found, giving several hypotheses that were found as a result of
the study. Some of the more noted of these are: (1) Basal reading
materials do not consistently increase in difficulty in successive
books. (2) Dialect miscues do not affect the reading comprehension or
reading proficiency of the beginning reader. (3) All beginning
readers make miscues in reading which are corrected by the children
through the phenomena of regressions. The majority of these regres-
sions produce responses which conform to the expected response to the
print.

Allen (1969) used fifteen subjects, randomly selected, to perform
a study of the psycholinguistic analysis of the substitution miscues of
selected oral readers in grades two, four, and six, and the relation-
ship of these miscues to the reading process. He concluded that the
reading process consists of two operational levels, operations on the
surface structure and operations on the deep structure. In relation
to the subject of self-concept, his study, he felt, showed when a
miscue has semantic and syntactic acceptability, there seems to be
little need or reason on the part of the teacher to correct the miscue,
or to even call the reader's attention to it. This may affect the
attitude toward reading on the part of the learner.

Romatkowski (1972) used three bi-lingual subjects to examine
and describe the oral reading performance of themselves. Her study
was a psycholinguistic description of miscues generated by selected
subjects during the oral reading material as presented in Polish
Readers and in English Basal Readers. Many conclusions were drawn from the study, some of the most notable being:

1. The Goodman Taxonomy of Reading Miscues was effective in dealing with the miscues generated during the reading of the Polish story.

2. Subjects tended to leave uncorrected those miscues which were semantically and syntactically acceptable. This occurred more frequently in the English story.

Cambrell (1972) made an in-depth study of teachers' analyses of the oral reading performance of a group of linguistically different fourth grade students. The central purpose was to find out how teachers of grades four, five and six analyze oral reading miscues of fourth grade children in the same school. The findings in general were that teachers do not agree on their identification and classification of words considered miscues. Teachers did not agree on their recommendations for remediation, and they were not consistent in their assessment of the students' oral language. She also found that a high incidence of the most frequently occurring miscues were in non-content words.

Young (1973) analyzed the oral reading miscues of Hawaiian Islands dialect speakers in grades one through six. He tried to identify dialect features in the oral reading of the Hawaiian Islands dialect speakers in the grades, and also wished to infer the strategies employed in word recognition by Hawaiian Islands dialect speakers in those grades. The conclusions drawn from the study were that the
Hawaiian Islands Dialect did not appear to influence the oral reading of the subjects. That graphic clues appeared to strongly influence the word recognition strategies of the subjects. Also, that the subjects have not developed the habit of demanding meaning from what they read. However, the subjects generally displayed a growing tendency to employ context clues in their word recognition strategies.

In her study, Anderson (1974) used the natural language of the subjects as a base for reading activities. Before and after a treatment period, the miscues of all the subjects were analyzed to determine if the use of the individual's natural language in the instructional process had any effect on the quality or the quantity of the subjects' miscues. Also looked for was whether or not the use of natural language in reading activities allows the reader to read with more comprehension. The study found that the five treatment group subjects had made the greatest gains in comprehension and were focusing their reading on comprehension and meaning. Her study in all the review of literature came closest to the conclusions that the value of the child's natural language gave him the greatest chance of reading achievement success, rather than the phonics rules and mastery of words lists. Her study seemed to show that comprehension occurred to a greater degree as a result of the natural language approach.
SUMMARY

On the basis of a review of the literature, several generalizations applicable to the proposed study were formulated:

1. Research dealing with self-concept and achievement supports a correlation between the two.

2. There is a instrument available with which to examine reading in terms of the process and product.

3. Research exists which has utilized language based activities to a partial degree in the studies.
Chapter 3

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to utilize the natural language of the subjects as represented by the Language Experience Approach in reading instruction. The following procedures were implemented to facilitate this investigation. The first task was the lesson strategy construction. It was necessary to develop and administer the particular program, using the subjects' natural language as a base for the activities. Secondly, the selection of the subjects occurred. This entailed the administration of a reading self-concept semantic differential scale. The teachers rated the population as to their perception of the students' concepts of themselves as readers. The semantic differential was then administered to the students. In task three, the subjects were administered the Goodman and Burke Reading Miscue Inventory and an analysis was made of the subjects' oral reading miscues. The following, and fourth task, was the re-administering of the Reading Miscue Inventory as a tool to analyze the second oral reading by the subjects. This was done after the treatment period of the lesson strategies. Fifth, the same semantic differential scale that had been used to establish who the subjects were, was administered again. The sixth task was the comparison of the pre- and post-miscues of the subjects to see if any changes occurred in the miscue patterns. Finally, the seventh task was the comparison of the pre- and post-
semantic differential scales to see if changes occurred in reading self-concept.

The key for selecting the subjects for this study was the use of a semantic differential scale developed for the study (Appendix A).

**Description of the Instrument Used**

Using suggestions by Osgood in developing semantic differential scales (SD), the semantic differential for this study measured a set of six concepts on five polar adjectival scales. For each concept the adjectival contrast pairs were randomly assigned positions and right or left positive valence. The test directions asked that each item be considered as an independent judgment. Although there may be other factors involved in the quantitative measurement of connotative meaning for a particular concept, Osgood et al. (1957) stated that the primary factors involved in meaning are the evaluative dimension, the potency dimension and the activity dimension. His research showed that the evaluative is the most important of these dimensions and that, as connotative meaning for a concept changes, at least half of this change is accounted for by the evaluative dimension. Osgood et al. recommended choosing from one to three scales to represent each factor, these being maximally loaded on that factor and minimally loaded on others. Following his recommendations, three were chosen for this study for the evaluative dimension: good/bad, happy/sad, valuable/worthless; one from the potency dimension: strong/weak; and one from the activity dimension: fast/slow.
Administration of the Instrument

The semantic differential scale developed for this study was administered to one hundred students. The group was heterogeneous with respect to socio-economic status. The teachers were asked to divide the students into three categories according to what they observed as the students' view of themselves as readers: high, average and low. The results on the semantic differential scale were divided into three groups according to their feelings about themselves as readers, either high, average or low. The results fell into three relatively delineated groups naturally. There were 78 percent of the students' responses that agreed with the observed reading self-concept assigned by the teacher.

Selection of the Subjects

The selection of the subjects was then done in two stages. The initial group was the fifth grade in its entirety, sixty-eight students, at Green Valley Elementary School in Roanoke, Virginia. After a short training period by the investigator in which a discussion with the fifth grade teachers covered: definitions of terms and basic reading methodologies, discussion of what to look for in identifying reading self-concept, and discussion of the language experience reading approach, the teachers then identified the subjects in their respective rooms as to their observed reading self-concepts. They were categorized into the three groups: high, average and low.
A block of time was then given to administer the reading self-concept instrument. The reading self-concept instrument is a six item semantic differential scale and was given to all sixty-eight students. These were rated as to reveal the subjects' feelings about themselves as readers.

At this time, using the above information, the second stage of subject selection occurred. The initial group of subjects was narrowed to a group of five, on the following basis. Those subjects who had rated themselves so as to score with an apparent low reading self-concept in relation to the other students were identified. If the teacher's observed rating was low, and the subject's own reading self-concept rating was low, that subject was selected as a possibility for the five final subjects. The subjects exceeded the number five, at this point, so the final selection process was assigning each student's name a number and the numbers were drawn at random. There were three males and two females.

The Reading Miscue Inventory

The instrument that was used to study the subjects' oral reading miscues was the Reading Miscue Inventory (Goodman and Burke, 1972). The inventory is based on the assumption that reading is a psycholinguistic process. The RMI was selected as the research instrument because of its total view of the reading process.

The RMI was initiated by a taping session for each subject. Prior to the taping sessions, the subjects met with the researcher to help all acquaint themselves with each other and to put all
subjects involved at ease. Another facet of meeting together was to become acquainted with the interests and experiences of the individual subjects.

When the taping sessions began, the individual subjects were worked with in a small, private area. The subject was then asked to read a particular basal reader story selection. No assistance was given to the subject in any way, and he was made aware of this prior to the taping. It was explained to the subject he or she needed to work out any unfamiliar words or problems in reading to the best of his or her ability. While the subject read, the tape recorder picked up all that was said. This was kept and used for a more accurate analysis of the oral reading at a later time, by the researcher.

While the subject read, the researcher recorded the miscues that were the easiest to initially note. He used a previously typewritten form of the story to do his recording of the oral miscues and deviations. The selections were chosen from texts that were suggested as being appropriate for the fifth grade. The level of material was selected to create some reading difficulty, but not cause frustration on the part of the reader. The text in both instances was unfamiliar to the subjects and was not in use in the school.

**Coding the Miscues**

The format that was suggested by Goodman and Burke was used to record the miscues. This was set forth in the *Reading Miscue Inventory* manual. The variations that were recorded were omission, substitution,
repetition, reversal and insertion. The miscues were any deviations from the printed page.

A coding inventory sheet was used to record the miscues. When the pre- and post-miscues were coded, they were recorded on the inventory sheet. According to the Reading Miscue Inventory, the researcher then asked nine questions concerning each miscue. These questions were intended to measure the effects of all aspects of language within the reading process. Below are the questions.

1. **Dialect.** Is a dialect variation involved in the miscue?

2. **Intonation.** Is a shift in intonation involved in the miscue?

3. **Graphic Similarity.** How much does the miscue look like what was expected?

4. **Sound Similarity.** How much does the miscue sound like what was expected?

5. **Grammatical Function.** Is the grammatical function of the miscue the same as the grammatical function of the word in the text?

6. **Correction.** Is the miscue corrected?

7. **Grammatical Acceptability.** Does the miscue occur in a structure which is grammatically acceptable?

8. **Semantic Acceptability.** Does the miscue occur in a structure which is semantically acceptable?

9. **Meaning Change.** Does the miscue result in a change of meaning?

   (Goodman and Burke, 1972)
The School Reading Programs

While the researcher worked with the subjects, the regular classroom activities continued the remainder of the school days in the week. All five subjects regularly spent about one hour and a half per day, five times a week, in their school reading program. The subjects had their full one hour and a half for the treatment. The school reading program centered around the use of a basal text, its accompanying workbook, and some supplemental readers. The approach adopted by the teachers incorporated the use of word lists, typical of the isolated word approach of the basal program, and relied heavily on the use of word-attack skills based on sound-letter relationships. There was no use of the readers' natural language integrated into the school reading program.

The Language Experience Approach and Treatment Period

There is no psycholinguistic method of teaching reading. Rather, psycholinguistics provides the information which may suggest some instructional strategies that will allow teachers to give the reader the information he needs to become a proficient reader. The acceptability of the language that the reader derives from the material will ultimately result in the reader gaining his meaning.

Meaning is both input and output in reading. Any selection will be understood only to the extent that the reader brings to it the prerequisite concepts and experiences. Even in learning to read, the new concepts can only be slightly beyond the reader's prior attainments and he must be able to relate vicarious experiences to real experiences in order to make any use of it. (Goodman, 1972:158-159)
Children's language can be expected to vary as a result of their unique experiences with language in a particular environment, but that will not affect the universal developmental features of his language abilities. In presenting written materials to readers, the closer the material parallels the language experiences of the reader, the greater the chance for successful reading and comprehension of the message. Unfortunately, writers of texts cannot provide for every individual's experiences within their work. The author best able to do that is the reader himself.

This study utilized the natural language of the subjects in a series of language activities designed to focus on meeting success, ultimately, with the printed page, and increasing the subjects' reading self-concepts. The specific activities which the subjects participated in appear in Appendix B of this research.

**The Setting**

The language activity sessions were held in a conference room, in a multi-purpose room, or outdoors. The working areas changed, depending on the activity. These included tables and chairs, the floor, counters and desks. The activity sessions were in the mornings.

**The Activity Sessions**

The five subjects met with the researcher thirty occasions, each lasting one hour. The main point of these meetings was to provide activities to elicit the natural language of the subjects. This natural language was then used as a basis for the activities that
required active participation in the reading process, and encouraged an increase in subjects' willingness to take risks in their reading attempts. An atmosphere was provided by the investigator that put the subjects at ease in their attempts at meeting success with the printed page, and provided a trust factor in their own language as being appropriate and important to the activities. In the activity sessions, subjects were encouraged to take risks with their reading attempts. In addition to the natural language and risk-taking activities, the investigator frequently read to the subjects. At times, the subjects attempted reading books of their own choosing, without regard for the level of difficulty of their contents.

The sessions were each built upon work from the previous sessions. The language that was used was from the subjects themselves. There was no list of words given as a basis for learning nor a look-say approach. Phonics rules, as typified in modern linguistic approaches, were not introduced in any sessions. The researcher did not interfere with the subjects' language structures in the prescribed language activities.

After all thirty language experience activities were completed, the subjects were asked to read another basal reader story and miscues were then analyzed again using the same 

Reading Miscue Inventory. The coding and recording of the coding was the same as the initial analysis. The new story was selected so that the subjects did not have any previous experience with the words or subject matter.
Analysis of Data

The pre-and post-Reading Miscue Inventories of each subject were analyzed and compared descriptively to determine if there were qualitative or quantitative changes in the miscues. Similarly, the pre- and post-reading self-concept semantic differential scale scores were descriptively compared.

SUMMARY

In summary, this chapter has discussed the selection of the subjects in this study, and use and rationale of the semantic differential scale. It also gave brief descriptions of the Reading Miscue Inventory, the school reading program, the Language Experience Approach, the treatment and its setting.
Chapter 4

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

This study asked the question, "Can language experience based instructional strategies and materials improve student reading self-concept and reading performance?"

Five subjects were identified as having low reading self-concept. A pre-reading self-concept semantic differential scale had been administered to determine how they viewed themselves as readers; a pre-Reading Miscue Inventory was also administered. Following this, thirty language experience lesson strategies incorporating the subjects' personal language and thought were administered to the subjects. The lesson strategies were given over a period of six school weeks, once a day, one hour each day. After this treatment period, a post-reading self-concept semantic differential scale and a post-Reading Miscue Inventory were administered to each of the subjects.

This chapter presents the data that resulted from the two main aspects of the study:

1. The five subjects' pre- and post-oral reading miscue analyses using the Goodman and Burke Reading Miscue Inventory, and

2. The pre- and post-reading self-concept semantic differential scales of the subjects.

The discussion of the reading miscue analyses includes all examination of dialect, intonation, graphic similarity, sound similarity, grammatical function, correction, grammatical acceptability,
meaning change, comprehension, grammatical relationships, retelling scores and miscues per hundred words (MPHW).

The discussion of the reading self-concept semantic differential includes a comparison of each subjects' pre- and post-responses of each concept that is listed: How I feel when I read for my parents; for my teacher; for my classmates; for myself; when I read when and what I want to; and when I read when and what I have to.

THE MISCUE ANALYSIS

The five subjects were assigned letter names in order to facilitate discussing the overall results, as well as comparing the individual miscue analyses. The group was thusly subjects A, B, C, D and E.

A pre- and post-miscue analysis was given to all five subjects. The miscues that were generated by the subjects were analyzed using the Reading Miscue Inventory (Goodman and Burke, 1972).

The term miscue is used instead of error or mistake, to avoid any negative connotation or association. A miscue is a deviation from the printed matter resulting from an alternative cue or cues used by the reader that cause degrees of deviation from the graphic display.

Each subject was presented two basal reader selections. The first selection was designated by the publisher as being appropriate for use in the first half of the fifth year. The second selection was designed for use in the second half of grade five.
The individual subjects' readings were tape recorded. The miscues that were produced by each subject were identified by listening and re-listening to the recordings and marking a typed script of the story. The miscues were then transferred to the Reading Miscue Inventory coding sheet to be analyzed according to appropriate categories for each miscue. A discussion and the comparison of the results of each of these categories is shown by the following tables and explanations. If changes occurred between 0 and 10 percent, it was considered a slight change; between 11 and 30 percent was a moderate change; and 31 percent and above was considered a sharp change.

The results of this study will first be discussed in terms of group differences, then in terms of individual differences.

Dialect and Intonation

The first questions asked by the RMI are concerned with the dialect and intonation of the observed responses, or miscues. Does the subject's dialect have anything to do with the type of miscue that was made? Did the subject's intonation with a certain word determine a change in the meaning or grammatical function? In this study, there were very few instances which evidence this. Out of a total of over four hundred miscues, there were only six cases where dialect was a factor, and five where intonation was involved in the miscue.

Graphic Similarity

When a subject substituted another word or set of letters for the expected response, the substitutions were compared to the expected
response in terms of graphic similarity; how similar was the miscue graphically to the expected response? Using the beginning, middle and end of the response, the RMI categorizes the graphic similarity of the miscue to the expected response in one of three categories: high degree of similarity (meaning two of the three parts were correct); partial degree of similarity (meaning one of the three parts was correct); and no graphic similarity (meaning none of the three parts was correct).

On the pre-RMI, the five subjects' responses were generally within the partial degree of similarity category, meaning that one of the three graphic parts of each miscue was correct, with a group total percentage of 32 percent of the miscues falling into that category. The post-RMI shows a general shift toward the responses falling into the category of high graphic similarity, showing that two of the three graphic parts of each miscue were correct, with a group total of 46 percent.

Table 1 conveys the pre- and post-RMI percentages. The results are discussed in terms of the categories that the subjects' percentages fell into, and the changes that occurred from the pre- to the post-RMI's. Subject A remained relatively consistent across the three categories. He increased 6 percent in the category of high graphic similarity and decreased 5 percent in no graphic similarity. Subject B's results were interesting, with a decrease in the categories of high and partial graphic similarity, with 2 and 12 percent, respectively, and an increase in no graphic similarity of 14 percent. Subject C clearly made a change in high graphic similarity, with a
Table 1

Percentages of Graphically Similar Miscues for Pre- and Post-RMI's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total X</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23 percent increase, a 26 percent decrease in partial, and a slight increase of 3 percent in no graphic similarity. Subject D also increased in quality of miscues, with a moderate 7 percent increase in high similarity, 23 percent in partial and 30 percent in no graphic similarity. Subject E demonstrates a sharp increase in miscues in the high category, showing a 37 percent increase. He showed a small decrease of 5 percent in partial and a sharp decrease in no graphic similarity of 42 percent.

**Sound Similarity**

The sound relationship between the observed response and the expected response is shown in Table 2. The same comparison procedure was used for sound similarity as that for graphic similarity.

Similar to graphic similarity, comparing pre- and post-RMI's for the subjects' miscues in sound similarity showed an overall increase in quality of miscues. The group percents for the pre-RMI were 29 percent of the miscues in the category showing a high degree of sound similarity, 42 percent in the partial category, and 28 percent in the category showing no sound similarity. In contrast, the post-RMI conveys a 17 percent increase in the group percentages that fall into the high category. There is a small decrease for each of the other categories, with 9 percent in the partial and 4 percent in the category of no sound similarity.

Table 2 demonstrates the changes that occurred for each subject on the pre- and post-RMI's. Subjects A and 3 showed a small degree of change in all categories. Subject A made a slight
Table 2
Percentages of Sound Similarity Miscues for Pre- and Post-RMT's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
increase in the first two categories, a 2 and 10 percent change, respectively. His miscues decreased 14 percent in no sound similarity. Subject B also showed a 2 percent increase in high sound similarity and a 5 percent increase in partial. He showed a 7 percent decrease in no sound similarity. Subjects C, D and E all showed sharp increases in sound similarity. Subject C changed sharply with a 30 percent increase in high sound similarity, leaving a 30 percent decrease in partial, and remained stable in no sound similarity. Subject D showed a 38 percent increase in the high category. He decreased in both partial and no sound similarity by 27 and 11 percent, respectively. Subject E increased in sound similarity by 30 percent in high, decreasing in partial by 20 percent and increasing slightly by 5 percent in no sound similarity.

**Grammatical Function**

In the RMI the question is asked, does the miscue retain the same grammatical function as the expected response? Table 3 shows a comparison of the grammatical function of the subjects' substitution miscues for the first and second RMI. The miscues were in either of two possible areas in relation to the grammatical function, as either having the same grammatical function or as having a different grammatical function.

As can be seen in Table 3, the five subjects increased in their ability to use their cueing systems to assist them in making a higher quality of miscues after the treatment was given. The group showed an overall group percentage in the category of grammatical function of 39 percent on the pre-RMI, and a post-RMI group percentage of 72 percent.
Table 3
Percentages of Grammatical Function Miscues for Pre- and Post-FMT's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th></th>
<th>Different</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a sharp increase of 33 percent. An analysis of the group percentage in the category of the miscues in the different grammatical function shows a pre-RMI percentage of 61 percent, decreasing to 28 percent on the post-RMI, a change of 33 percent.

Table 3 indicates that Subject A shows a relatively sharp change in his pre- and post-RMI responses falling into the same grammatical function category, with a 25 percent increase. He decreased by 35 percent in the category of different grammatical function. Subject B remained fairly constant, with a 7 percent increase in the first category and a 7 percent decrease in the second. Subjects C, D and E all showed sharp improvement in quality of miscues with 50, 46 and 35 percent increases, respectively, in the category of same grammatical function.

**Corrections of Miscues**

Table 4 points out the percentage of miscue correction in its three categories. The question asked is, is the miscue corrected? The miscue would have fallen within one of these three categories: Y, meaning yes, the miscue had been corrected; P, meaning partially, there has been an unsuccessful attempt at correction; and N, meaning no, there has been no attempt at correction of the miscue. The process of correction in oral reading was taken as evidence that the reader was dissatisfied with his original response.

As the table indicates, the group increased in their ability to effectively correct their miscues. Those in the category of Y, meaning their miscues had been corrected, increased moderately by 28 percent.
### Table 4

Percentages of Corrections of Miscues for Pre- and Post-RMT's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Total $\bar{X}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Y = corrected  P = unsuccessfully corrected  N = uncorrected*
The partially corrected miscues in group percentage decreased 28 percent, and the number of miscues that were uncorrected, those in category N, decreased moderately in the group percentages by 22 percent.

In analyzing the individual differences, the P category was almost negligible in four of the five subjects. Subject A made a sharp increase of 35 percent in the Y category. He decreased 30 percent in the N category. Subjects B, C and D also changed substantially in their miscue corrections, with 25, 40 and 29 percent increases, respectively. They decreased in the category showing no correction by 25, 40 and 29 percent, respectively. Subject E is interesting, making a moderate change of a 10 percent increase in his miscue corrections, a 23 percent decrease in the area of partial correction, with a 13 percent increase in his miscues that were not corrected.

**Grammatical Acceptability**

Grammatical acceptability focuses on how successfully the reader copes with the structure of the sentences in the story. In Table 5, the question is asked, does the miscue occur in a structure which is grammatically acceptable to the story?

The table displays the grammatical acceptability of the miscues for the five subjects' pre- and post-RMI's. The categories that are measured are for those miscues that resulted in the high degree of grammatical acceptability, meaning the response occurs in a sentence which is grammatically acceptable and is acceptable in relation to prior and subsequent sentences in the text. The partial category, signifies either the miscue occurs in a sentence which is grammatically
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>High</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total X</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
acceptable but is not acceptable in relation to prior and subsequent sentences in the text, or, the miscue is grammatically acceptable only with the sentence portion that comes before or after it. When the miscue is in the category of no grammatical acceptability, it means that it occurs in a sentence that is not grammatically acceptable, as compared to the expected response.

The group percentages for each category are displayed in Table 5. The responses that fell into the category of high degree of grammatical acceptability made a sharp increase of 40 percent. Those in the category of partial degree decreased by 12 percent. The miscues that had no grammatical acceptability on the group percentages decreased by 28 percent. It is apparent that the quality of the miscues increased in Table 5 after the treatment period.

An analysis of the individual differences, revealed that Subject A had a sharp percentage difference, showing a 53 percent increase in his pre- and post-RMI's in the high category, and a 39 percent decrease in the no category. Subject B is interesting, with a small decrease of 2 percent in the high category, 4 percent decrease in partial and a 6 percent increase in the category showing no grammatical acceptability. Subjects C and D made sharp increases that showed their responses had higher grammatical acceptability, with increases of 50 and 39 percent, respectively. Subject E shows the greatest change, having a 62 percent increase in high grammatical acceptability, a 32 percent decrease in partial and a 30 percent decrease in no grammatical acceptability.
Semantic Acceptability

The semantic acceptability question focuses on the success with which the reader is producing understandable structures. The question that is asked is, is the whole sentence meaningful within the dialect of the subject? The comparison procedure for semantic acceptability closely approximates that used for grammatical acceptability (high, partial and no).

Table 6 conveys the group percentage differences. In the high degree of semantic acceptability category, the subjects increased by 25 percent. They decreased both in partial semantic acceptability and no semantic acceptability at differences of 17 and 22 percent, respectively.

In discussing individual differences, subject A increased in the high category by 26 percent, decreased in partial by 15 percent and decreased in the no category by 11 percent. Subject B showed very little change in the high, partial and no categories, with differences of 6, 6 and 12 percent, respectively. Subject C made a moderate increase of 14 percent in the high, a 14 percent increase in partial and a 28 percent decrease in no semantic acceptability. The sharpest increase in this table was made by subject D, with a 46 percent increase in the category of high semantic acceptability, a 10 percent decrease in partial and a 22 percent decrease in no semantic acceptability. Subject E increased 32 percent in high semantic acceptability, decreased 10 percent in partial and decreased 22 percent in no semantic acceptability.
Table 6
Percentages of Semantically Acceptable Miscues for Pre- and Post-RMI's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>High Pre</th>
<th>High Post</th>
<th>Partial Pre</th>
<th>Partial Post</th>
<th>No Pre</th>
<th>No Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total X</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meaning Change

This category asks the question, does the miscue that has occurred result in an alteration of the intended meaning of the print? This is a crucial category, because it is concerned with the area of gaining the intended message of the writer. This question is independent of the grammatical or semantic acceptability of the miscue because it is possible for the reader to achieve the intended meaning from unacceptable semantic and grammatical structures. This section of the RMI also has three categories that the responses fall into: Y, meaning an extensive change in meaning is involved; P, meaning a minimal change in meaning is involved; and N, meaning no change in meaning is involved.

Table 7 yields the group percentages for the three categories. There was an increase of 27 percent in the N category, showing an improvement in the subjects' ability to produce miscues that resulted in no meaning change. A decrease of 17 percent is evident in the category that showed a high degree of meaning change. There is a decrease of 10 percent in partial meaning change. Overall, the group improved in its ability to give responses that resulted in no change in the intended meaning of the writer.

In analyzing the individual differences, Subject A increased in no meaning change by 34 percent. He decreased by 30 percent in the Y category and by 4 percent decreased in partial meaning change. He decreased by 6 percent in the category of high meaning change. Subjects C and D made sharp increases in the category of no meaning change, with
Table 7

Percentages of Meaning Change in Miscues for Pre- and Post-EMI's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Y Pre</th>
<th>Y Post</th>
<th>P Pre</th>
<th>P Post</th>
<th>N Pre</th>
<th>N Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Total X: 43 26 29 19 28 55

Y = extensive change    P = minimal change    N = no change
differences of 30 and 34 percent, respectively. They both decreased in the category showing a high amount of meaning change by 14 and 16 percent, respectively. Subject E increased by 26 percent in the category of no meaning change, and decreased in the partial and high category by 8 and 18 percent, respectively.

Comprehending Pattern

The comprehending pattern is a process concerned with the interrelatedness of correction, semantic acceptability and meaning change. It is concerned with the use of the individual's language in connection with these areas. The three areas produce a pattern which gives insight into whether there has been a meaning loss. There are twenty-seven possible combinations produced by interrelating these three questions. These combinations indicate whether the miscues have resulted in no loss of comprehension, partial loss of comprehension, or loss of comprehension.

Table 8 indicates the pre- and post-analyses of the overall comprehending pattern of the responses in any of three categories: no loss, partial loss, or loss. When the miscue is in the category of no loss of comprehension, the reader's patterns have shown no loss of meaning as a result of the miscue. When the miscue is in the category of partial loss of comprehension, although meaning is changed, it is likely that the reader does gain some meaning from the sentence. If the miscue is in the category of loss of comprehension, the miscue has produced a structure from which the reader apparently gained no meaning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No Loss</th>
<th>Partial Loss</th>
<th>Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 conveys the miscue percentages in the three categories. It is evident that the overall responses resulting in no comprehension loss increased. The difference between the pre- and post-RMI in this category is 27 percent, which substantiates this statement. The category of partial loss is negligible. The group percentage decreased by 25 percent in the loss of comprehension category.

Subject A's pre- and post-RMI percentages indicate a sharp increase of 49 percent in the no loss category. He decreased 44 percent in the loss category. Subject B once again appears interesting, having decreased in the quality of miscues by 6 percent, and increased in loss of comprehension by 6 percent. Subjects C and D both indicated a sharp increase in their no loss percentages, with 37 and 35 percent increases, respectively. Their decreases in the loss category were 34 and 35 percent differences between the pre- and post-RMI, respectively. Subject E showed a moderate increase of 20 percent in the no loss category and a 20 percent decrease in the category of comprehension loss, indicating a general improvement in the quality of his miscues.

Grammatical Relationships

This segment of the RMI deals with the interrelatedness of correction, grammatical acceptability, and semantic acceptability, and how these three categories combine to produce patterns which give insight into how concerned the reader is that his oral reading sounds like language. Eighteen combinations are possible when utilizing the above three categories. These combinations have been categorized
according to the degree which they indicate the reader's strength in using the grammatical system, and are designated by the headings of same, partial, no and overcorrection (all referring to grammatical relationship). The reader that uses appropriate correction strategies uses both grammatical and semantic cueing systems effectively.

Table 9 shows the pre- and post-RMI analysis of the overall grammatical relationship of the responses in any of the four categories mentioned before. When the miscue is in the category of the same grammatical relationship, the reader has used grammatical and meaning cueing systems effectively and makes appropriate use of correction strategies. When the miscue is in the partial category, the reader has used the grammatical cueing system to the exclusion of meaning cues and does not make the appropriate use of correction strategies. If the miscue is in the category of no grammatical relationship, the reader has not used grammatical cues, meaning cues, or appropriate correction strategies, the reader used correction strategies when it was inefficient to do so.

As is evident in Table 9, there was an increase in the responses that were in the category of same grammatical relationship. The table demonstrates the group percentage differences in the four categories. There was a sharp group increase of 53 percent in the category of same grammatical relationship indicating a clear improvement in the subjects' cueing systems. The partial category was almost negligible, with an increase from 4 to 8 percent.
Table 9
Percentages of Grammatical Relationships for Pre- and Post-RMI's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Same Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Partial Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>No Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Over-correction Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Total $\bar{x}$: 24 77 5 3 67 12 4 8
The table provides an itemization of increases and decreases of the individual subjects. Subject A changed substantially with a 68 percent increase in the same grammatical relationship category and showed a 67 percent decrease in the no grammatical relationship category. Subject B again remained stable, with a minimal change of four percent in the category of same grammatical relationship. Subjects C, D and E all increased sharply in the category of same grammatical relationship with increases of 58, 58 and 76 percent, respectively. They decreased in the category of no grammatical relationship by 74, 52 and 75 percent, respectively.

Retelling

The retelling segment of the RMI is a measurement of the ability of the subject to restate what happened in the story that he read. Certain points are given for certain areas that have been effectively retold about the story. These categories are: character analysis, theme, plot, events, specifics and generalizations.

Table 10 displays the points that were earned by the five subjects on their pre- and post-RMI's. The group scores show increases in points ranging from subject A's four point increase, to subject E's 27 point increase, with subjects B, C and D falling between, scoring 5.5, 8.5 and 17 point increases, respectively.

Summary Comparison of
Pre- and Post-RMI's

Figure 1 displays the interrelationship between, and the averages for all five subjects' total pre- and post-miscues in the
Table 10

Pre- and Post-RMI Retelling Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Pre-RMI</th>
<th>Post-RMI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Averages</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Averages of Post-RMI Categories

Figure 1
high category of the seven following RMI questions: graphic similarity, sound similarity, grammatical function, correction, grammatical acceptability, semantic acceptability, and meaning change.

As the graph indicates, a clear increase is evident in the comparison of the pre- and post-RMI's. The greatest increases are in the areas of grammatical acceptability and grammatical function. The areas showing the least amount of increase are graphic similarity and sound similarity.

The area of graphic similarity shows 31.8 percent on the pre-RMI, as compared to 46.0 percent on the post-RMI; an increase of 14.2 percent in quality of miscues.

Sound similarity showed an increase of 16.6 percent in the quality of miscues. The pre-RMI averages were 29.2 percent, and the post-RMI averages were 45.8 percent.

The scores of the miscues in the category of grammatical function indicated an increase of 32.6 percent, with the pre-RMI showing 39.0 percent, and the post-RMI showing 71.6 percent.

The category concerned with correction shows the pre-RMI to be 14.0 percent, and the post-RMI average at 41.8 percent, an increase of 27.8 percent.

Figure 1 points out an increase in quality in the category of grammatical acceptability for all five subjects' pre- and post-RMI's. The pre-RMI indicates a scoring of 27.6 percent, while the post-RMI shows 68.0 percent. This indicates an increase of 40.4 percent in this category.
The area of semantic acceptability shows the pre-RMI to be 32.0 percent, with the post-RMI indicating 56.8 percent; this is an increase of 24.8 percent in this category.

Finally, the category concerned with meaning change shows the pre-RMI at 28.4 percent, and the post-RMI at 55.2 percent, indicating an increase of 26.8 percent in this category.

While differential in its magnitude, the treatment apparently had effect on the overall quality of the miscues of the five subjects.

READING SELF-CONCEPT SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Table 11 is a summation of the initial responses and the changes made by all five subjects on their pre- and post-semantic differential scales. The scoring system indicates the magnitude of the change. A plus number represents a positive change. A minus number represents a negative change, and a zero represents no change. A total of each subject's scores was established by adding all the assigned numbers, signifying the changes that he made on his pre- and post-semantic differential scale in all five polar adjectival scales. An example of the assigned positive and negative scoring is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>Bad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11
Summary of Pre- and Post-Semantic Differential Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Concepts*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#5</td>
<td>#6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = When I read for my parents, I feel:
2 = When I read for my teacher, I feel:
3 = When I read for my classmates, I feel:
4 = When I read for myself, I feel:
5 = When I read what and when I want to, I feel:
6 = When I read what and when I have to, I feel:
An example of the scoring system is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>valuable/worthless</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast/slow</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad/good</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy/sad</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak/strong</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, using subject A as an example, he scored a total of 4 in the overall column for concept number one. The possible scale range for each concept is from -10 to +10.

While Table II indicates that the subjects viewed themselves more positively in all six concepts, it is apparent that the overall group of five subjects totaled a greater degree of change in the first three concepts. For concept one, "When I read for my parents, I feel:", the total of thirty-five space changes occurred. On concept two, "When I read for my teacher, I feel:", the total group changes were thirty-five. Concept three, "When I read for my classmates, I feel:", witnessed the highest degree of change, with an increase of forty-four.

In the concepts four, five and six, substantially less change occurred. The subjects apparently viewed themselves as changing less in the categories that dealt with reading for themselves, and their feelings about themselves, as compared to those concerned with reading for others. In concept four, "When I read for myself, I feel:", the
group's total increase is twenty. For concept number five, "When I read what and when I want to, I feel:", a total of nineteen changes occurred. This concept showed the least change of any of the six concepts. Concept six, "When I read what and when I have to, I feel:", showed a group total change of twenty-five.

In analyzing Table 11, it is evident that there are two categories of concepts, those dealing with externals (parents, teachers and classmates) and those dealing with the personal (myself, what I want to read and what I have to read). It is clear that the greatest changes occurred in the category dealing with the external concepts. Apparently, the subjects viewed themselves as having improved in their reading in the eyes of their parents, teachers and classmates, while their feeling about themselves and reading was more resistant to change in the way they viewed themselves as readers. This result was examined for a ceiling effect which might have been caused by the instrumentation. However, no ceiling effect was revealed as the mean test scores were significant in range.

SUMMARY

In summary, this chapter explained qualitative and quantitative differences. It showed an overall increase in the quality of miscues, a decrease in the quantity of the subjects' miscues, and a concomitant increase in the reading self-concept of the subjects, especially with respect to reading for others.
Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes a summary of the study, the conclusions drawn from the research, and recommendations. There is also a discussion of the results in terms of specific analyses explaining the reasons for the changes that were evidenced by the data.

SUMMARY

A literature survey was conducted which discussed and supported the high correlation between school achievement and self-concept. In particular, the existence of sub-categories of self-concept such as reading self-concept were cited in the literature. The need for programs that gave support to the child with low reading self-concept was discussed.

A group of five fifth-grade subjects were identified as having low reading self-concept through the reading self-concept semantic differential scale that was devised for this study. The Reading Miscue Inventory (RMI) was administered as a pre-diagnostic test to assess the quality and quantity of the subjects' miscues. A series of language experience reading strategies were developed for this study. The strategies were then presented to the subjects for six weeks, one hour each day. After this treatment period, a post-reading self-concept semantic differential scale and RMI were again administered, and a comparison was made between the pre- and post-measures.
The results of the pre- and post-RMI's and pre- and post-
reading self-concept semantic differential scales were compiled and
analyzed descriptively. The analysis supported a reading strategy
approach that is suggested for students with low reading self-concept.

Reading Ability and Language
Experience Based Strategies

In analyzing the results of this study, it is evident that
there is a differential, but consistent overall increase in the quality
of miscues made by the subjects as measured by the RMI. This study
provided support that this overall improvement was in part because
of the treatment period and possibly to a greater extent, because
of the type of reading strategies that were utilized during the six
week period.

The reading lessons were planned reading situations in which
the availability and use of selected reading strategies are high-
lighted. These reading materials and the reading situations were
arranged to encourage the reader's conscious use of the selected
instructional strategies without interfering with the natural and
constant interaction among the three language systems involved in
reading. These strategies were designed to address the characteristics,
needs and interests of fifth-grade subjects with low reading self-
concept. The strategies were planned anticipating their weaknesses.
These weaknesses have been found to be often a result of typical
remedial instruction which is inappropriate to the interest and the
language of the student in terms of reading as a process of the
interaction of the thought and language of the student. The author created thirty strategy lessons designed to respect and encourage the subjects' own language as a legitimate base for instruction. The subjects' use of cue systems changed during and after the treatment which accounts for the production of clear increases in the quality of miscues.

In an attempt to explain the causes of the changes that occurred after the treatment period, a discussion of the findings related to the seven categories of the RMI areas which make up the cueing systems will follow.

The growth that occurred in categories one and two, graphic and sound similarity, was slight in comparison to the other two categories. One would not expect to see great increase in these categories. The previous instruction of the subjects had likely emphasized graphic/sound relationships, as is typical of remedial instruction in schools. This cueing system received the least attention of the three with respect to the reading strategy lessons. However, the reading strategy lessons likely accounted for the increase by helping the subject discover for himself the relationship between the sound and its corresponding written symbol. The strategies employed natural sentence structures which reflected the interests and linguistic maturity of the reader. When graphic/sound confusion was observed, the most subsequent common strategy was a story of lesson which emphasized the specific confusion in a very predictable language context.
The third category, grammatical function, revealed a sharp increase after the treatment. The increase may have been because of the subjects' ability to prove to themselves that they could anticipate and then complete grammatical structures. They were apparently helping establish the relationship between their oral and written language. It is important to note that the strategies were not intended to teach grammar to the student. Rather, they were responsible for encouraging the student to apply his implicit knowledge of the syntactic structure of oral language to the processing of written language. The lesson strategies which seemed to have had effect on the increase were those which dealt with constructing partial sentences that could be completed by using any number of words or phrases, and required the subjects anticipating, or predicting, the remainder and completing it. The partial structures were always part of a larger text with the completed sentences which provided the needed context and redundancy to support the reader's effective use of implicit knowledge of grammar.

The correction category conveys a moderate increase in the subjects' ability to effectively correct their miscues after they made themselves aware that they occurred. Here again, their prediction improved because they were using language more effectively, thus eliminating many miscues that would normally have had to be corrected. The lesson strategies that were the most likely to have helped the subjects in this area were those lessons which repeatedly contained misprints or anomalous information. Other strategies included stories
that had added lines which contained obvious misinformation. The reader's strategy first was to read, then to correct those elements which were disruptive to meaning.

The greatest percentage gains were made by the subjects in the category of grammatical acceptability. The subjects seemed to benefit from the prediction lesson strategies. These strategies encouraged prediction based on the student's implicit knowledge of the structure of language. The prediction strategies taught the subjects to transfer their knowledge of oral language, applying it to knowledge of written language. Particular skills might have been developed from the lesson strategies using misplaced parts of sentences that were totally unacceptable in relation to prior and subsequent sentences in the text. The basic improvement was in the subjects' ability to know or monitor whether or not their miscues sounded like language.

The fifth area, semantic acceptability, showed a moderate increase in the quality of the subjects' miscues. The subjects' miscues were at times in structures which were grammatically acceptable but lacked acceptable meaning. The increase in the quality of miscues might be in part due to the lesson strategies wherein the subjects wrote an interesting passage containing a significant noun or verb that repeated. The word selected was then replaced with a non-word. The subject was required to use the meaning system to predict an appropriate real word. In essence, he was asking himself the very basic question for this category, does this make sense?
The sixth category, meaning change, also indicated moderate increase in quality. The miscues resulted in less meaning change after the treatment period. The subjects had been encouraged to explore how sentences could be grammatically restructured while the meaning was retained.

The seventh segment of the RMI dealt with the retelling of the stories. This segment showed an improvement in the comprehending process and one would then expect a concomitant increase in the product, which was seen in most cases. One would expect the process scores to correlate with the product scores. This was not always true, but was generally so. It would seem that the emphasis of the strategy lessons on making sense directed or at least redirected the reader's attention to the meaning aspect of the reading process. That is, he became more concerned with the message than the individual words which formed the message.

Reading Self-Concept and Language Experience Strategies

The segment of this study having to do with the pre- and post-measurement of the subjects' reading self-concept indicates that after the treatment, a positive increase was observed in their feelings about themselves as readers.

One of the basic premises of language experience strategies is the individualization that it provides in terms of the language and thought of the reader. The respect which these strategies convey to the reader about his language and his thoughts could very well
account for the improvement of one's concept of himself as a reader. In addition, the redundancy that is provided by using the student's natural language in the lesson strategies helps make reading easier, which in turn would make one feel better about himself as a reader.

Interestingly, this improvement was differential. The students seem to feel better about themselves when reading for others, such as parents, teachers and classmates. However, when reading for themselves, their feelings were not as positive. Perhaps the improvement in reading ability, which has been documented in this study, provided the basis for them to feel better about themselves as readers in the eyes of others. Yet, the short duration of treatment in this study was not influential enough to overcome the previous years of personal frustration and failure that accompanied the learning to read and reading process.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Reading ability of fifth-grade students with low reading self-concept was generally improved in process and product as measured by the Reading Miscue Inventory after receiving instruction using language experience based strategies.

2. The reading self-concept of selected fifth-grade students can be positively affected by using language experience based instructional strategies.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The present study seems to indicate that the Reading Miscue Inventory is an instrument that is sensitive enough to show substantive differences in quality and quantity of responses in the subjects of this study, using the lesson strategies and technique. It appears that it is sensitive enough to use in methodological research in reading. In most methodological studies, only a quantitative diagnostic instrument is used which is frequently insensitive to the changes in the reading behavior of the students. The qualitative aspect of this diagnostic instrument clearly differentiates it from the quantitative diagnostic instruments.

2. Data should be gathered which substantiates the reliability of the semantic differential scale.

3. The present study should be cast in the form of an experimental design.

4. The present study should be replicated, using a different socio-economic level of subjects, different locale and different grade levels.
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APPENDIX A

Semantic Differential (Osgood, 1952)
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL (OSGOOD, 1952)

INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this study is to measure the meanings of certain phrases to different people by having them rate these things on a number of scales. IN TAKING THIS TEST, PLEASE MAKE YOUR JUDGMENTS ON THE BASIS OF WHAT THESE PHRASES MEAN TO YOU. On each page you will find a different word to be judged and beneath the phrase a set of scales. You are to rate the phrase at the top of the page on each of these scales in order.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the phrase at the top of the page rates very close to one end of the scale, you should place your check mark as follows:

Fast        X
Very       Somewhat    OR       Somewhat    Very

Fast
Very       Somewhat    OR       Somewhat    X

If you feel that the phrase at the top of the page rates somewhat closer to one end of the scale, you should place your check mark as follows:

Strong
Very       Somewhat    OR       X       Very

Strong
Very       Somewhat    OR       Somewhat    Very
If you feel that the phrase at the top of the page is just as close to one end of the scale as the other, or if the phrase doesn't make sense on that scale, you should place your check mark in the middle space:

Sad  ______  _______  X  _______  _______  Happy

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seems to best fit your meaning for the phrase at the top of the page, and the way you feel about the phrase.

IMPORTANT

1. Be sure that check marks are in the middle of the spaces.
2. Check every scale on each page.
3. Put only one check mark on each scale.

Sometimes you may feel as though you have had the same item before on the test. This will not be the case, so do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the test. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at a fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your impressions, your first feelings about the item, that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we want your true impressions.

---

When I read for my parents, I feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th></th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valuable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worthless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When I read for my teacher, I feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Happy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Worthless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Worthless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When I am reading for myself, I feel:

- Relaxed
- Worthless
- Happy
- Fast
- Bad
When reading what and when I **want** to, I feel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slow</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>______</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Fast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worthless</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Valuable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When reading what and when I **have to**, I feel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th></th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Sad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Sommerat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sommerat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Sommerat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sommerat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Sommerat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sommerat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Worthless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Sommerat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sommerat</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Language Experience Activities
LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE ACTIVITIES

Session 1. During this initial session, the group primarily worked on activities to familiarize themselves with each other and the researcher. We began by discussing feelings about anything that interested them, and progressed onto their feelings about themselves as readers and what they viewed as being ways to improve those feelings. The researcher integrated these clues into the activities that followed in the treatment. There was also a discussion of prediction and taking risks in reading, what they meant, and that we were going to utilize these in our activities. The researcher wrote on the blackboard their own terminology for all that was discussed.

Session 2. The students were provided newspapers and comic books. They were asked to cut out five cartoon series. They mounted each series on a plain sheet of paper, and covered the "blurbs" with blank paper. On these blank blurbs, they created the plots in their own language for each series. (The researcher had a duplicate of each of the cartoon series that he handed out.) The student used the cartoon characters' positions and animation as a base to predict what they might be saying. The students exchanged their completed cartoons and read one another's. They were enthused, involved, and often in a state of uproarious laughter over the other's language choices. They were anxious to finish those they had not completed. They continued to work on these in any free time during the week.

Session 3. Today, the students cut out three more series of cartoons apiece and mounted them as before. They then cut out only letters from the blurbs of the characters. Sometimes they cut out only one letter, sometimes two and three per word. They chose partners, I was one of them, and read one another's scripts to the other using prediction solely as a base for reading and predicting what they thought might have been the missing letters. Thusly, they made sense of the words and the language from the writer's message.

Session 4. This session utilized the cartoons from the previous two sessions. The opaque projector was used to show the group what was actually said in the original cartoon blurbs. They compared their own language that they had chosen for the cartoon characters with that of the original artist's. They felt that they had predicted what the artist had intended; in some cases they felt the artist's blurbs were a little better, but in many incidences, they felt their own were better! They were beginning to show signs of faith in their own language and reading ability.
Session 5. The group was encouraged to create their own cartoon series, with a main plot, theme, and original set of characters. I was involved in the brainstorming that initiated the activity. The entire series contained three separate sections with a continuing theme. The students were excited to learn of their ability to be authors and artists in such an advanced sense. A common remark from the group was that they didn't know their own language and ideas could be as "cool" as those people in the newspaper.

Session 6. This week was devoted to the use of game-type exercises emphasizing the use of prediction, always encouraging the subjects to take a risk rather than sit back. It was apparent at first that they had been conditioned to fearing a "wrong" answer. It took patience to show them a low-risk atmosphere prevailed.

This particular session encouraged one particular game and was continued throughout the entire hour. They paired off and each made lists of one half of possible compound or hyphenated words (i.e., ____ way). They exchanged papers and the other person listed as many possibilities that could be filled in to complete the word as he could think of.

At the end of the session they all listed them on sheets of paper so that they could be placed into a notebook they were creating. They also did some speed drills with each other, with one giving the part of the word and the other naming all the possibilities he could in one minute. This seemed to encourage confidence in their prediction ability.

Session 7. The students were given small cards with beginning or ending letters of words and asked to list as quickly as possible what letters could go after or before those on the card to make sense as words (i.e., sta____, sta___, ___ore). They then made up their own cards and gave them to one another. They again progressed into this exercise giving themselves time limits, and making listings for their notebooks. They exchanged papers and checked each other's to see which were correct.

Session 8. This session involved all the possible ways a sentence might be begun or completed when having previously been given a partial sentence (i.e., I went to the ____ to ____ and it was _____, or ____ shot _____, then the ____ tiger _____.) They enjoyed these and wrote literally dozens of them for one another to complete. When checking each other's work, I noticed an increasing understanding of their ability to make sense from language.

They were encouraged to use large words that they knew were appropriate. If they misspelled them, it was considered unimportant.
Session 9. We played "I Know A Word" for this session orally. For example the caller said "I know a word that begins with 'st', ends with 'p' and has one, two, or three letters in between." This word progress around the group and the variations were recorded on the chalkboard, and later in the notebook. The remainder of this session was used to work on the notebooks and edit them.

Session 10. During this session, the students were encouraged to create and put into operation their own prediction word games. Their games were creative and clever. They recorded them in their notebooks.

Session 11. This session began the third week and the students were informed that they must read one book with a minimum of 50 pages, for the next four weeks. They each will discuss the book with me, and their group, or write something about the book. They also were given a cassette tape each and were assigned a five minute discussion each night into a tape recorder (that was assigned) about their feelings about language and reading, the areas they feel good and bad about. They then chose teams and went to the library. Each team got a short, but difficult book. We then utilized the opaque projector, and the students drew numbers to determine who began and who continued to read the books on the screen. When the student currently reading could not continue, the next person started. Sometimes a stopwatch was used to give fair amounts of reading time. This continued until each team's book was read from.

Session 12. The use of library books was necessary for this session. The opaque projector showed the text, and the same format was utilized, however, purposeful errors were made by the student reading to get a correction response from the other four. Scoring was used to determine which students created their own story, using as many difficult as they could think of that were appropriate. I helped them create their stories (which ended up being masterpieces) by writing them as the students dictated them. They were placed on the screen and the other students read them.

Session 13. During this session, we reread the language from Session 12 and the students identified the words they recognized from the previous session. They recorded these words in their notebooks. Partial sentences using these words or phrases were completed by the students using any number of words to do so. These partial structures were part of a larger text (the complete story), so that the completed sentences surrounding them provided the context to support the readers.
Session 14. Each student created his own story deliberately misplacing parts of sentences so that they were totally unacceptable in relation to prior and subsequent sentences in the text. The students then exchanged stories, and enjoyed rewriting them so that the language made sense to them. They went back over these revisions with the original author, pointing out why they made the changes that they did. Some debate ensued at times, but in a healthy manner.

Session 15. In this session, the subjects wrote interesting passages containing a significant noun and verb that was used several times throughout the passages.

This particular word was then replaced by a non-word using similar prefixes and suffixes to the real word. Another significant verb was chosen and an additional non-word was employed. This was continued for most all significant nouns and verbs, and the papers exchanged. (The researcher was involved as an equal for all of the activities.) The passages were then read orally by the partner, and an attempt at interpreting what the meaning might be ensued. The partner then tried to predict what the original nouns and verbs might have been, and put the story back together in its original sense as much as possible.

Session 16. Directed reading thinking activities were utilized in this session. The researcher read a partial sentence from any page of any book. When he stopped, the students predicted the next word or the possibilities, and listed them on their own paper. This continued, letting the students do the reading and stopping by taking turns. A contest followed by giving special jobs to the ones who wrote down the correct word to follow the partial sentence. They progressed to giving partial sentences and predicting the remainder of the sentences.

Session 17. Magazines were provided for this session. Each student cut out five pictures from the magazines that showed action, and involved people or animals. They numbered them in a sequence that they felt told a story. They then wrote a complete story about the sequence of five, and traded pictures and stories. It was interesting to note that the students corrected each other's grammatical or spelling errors voluntarily and subtly.

Session 18. The new words that were used and new language patterns that were learned from Session 17 were recorded in the student's notebooks. Several pictures were cut out and placed on a table prior to the session. The students then chose a new sequence of three action pictures from their own magazines. They wrote the beginning of a story from the three pictures then went to the table and chose another from a choice of three that was used to complete the story. This required innovation and imagination. They included these stories with their others in their notebooks and shared them with the group.
Session 19. This session used a stopwatch. The researcher distributed two pictures from magazines and timed the students for five minutes. As the students wrote their stories, two more pictures were prepared for distribution at the end of the five minutes. The next two pictures were given out and an additional five minutes were given. The stories that were created were then shared with the group via the opaque projector and enjoyed. Often, the students would correct their errors in grammar and terminology themselves. Their creations were praised by the researcher and other subjects alike. A discussion followed. The students were expressing their newfound belief in their ability to write, read and generally make sense of language. They were quick to say they never thought that they'd be able to do this sort of thing saying, "that is what the 'smart' kids did, not them."

Session 20. Several joke books were brought to the group (expendable) or jokes had been dittoed. Initially, the punch lines to the jokes had been cut out, and the students wrote in their own punch lines. When one student was finished writing his own punch line, he passed that joke to his neighbor and the same thing was done, with a new punch line. Every joke was written then on a larger poster board and each student wrote his own punch line below the joke. They all shared laughs and chances to read what the others wrote. They were then provided the original punch lines for each joke and compared. In general, they were more pleased with the new lines than the original. They completed an amazing total of 47 jokes before the poster board was complete. These were kept with their notebooks.

Session 21. This week's sessions all began with fifteen minutes of uninterrupted sustained silent reading. The subjects were allowed to ask someone else a word if they didn't know it. The subjects were reporting by now that they were reading much more at school and home. Parent reports verified this. The students went to the library during this session and located books that they felt they would have thought too difficult for them to read a month ago. They read to their partners, helping one another with difficult words, and listing these words on a sheet of paper. After their reading, they all went over their lists and met general success with pronouncing and defining the words.
Session 22. Today, the students were involved in an activity involving
a paper bag filled with objects that suggested action. Then included:
a book, pencil, razor, perfume, a dishrag, pencil sharpener, and
funny hat. A story was started by the researcher and the bag was then
opened for the next student in the circle to feel for an object to
pull out. That object then determined some action and some of the
plot of the story. It was stressed that the story must make sense
and have continuity. The entire circle participated. While the story
programmed, a cassette recorder recorded all the wording. The story
was played back and the students wrote it on their own papers. It
was encouraging to see how their willingness to take risks in spelling
and attempting to write words had improved. They re-read the stories
to the researchers at the end and were spelling and reading words
they'd never attempted.

Session 23. Old textbooks and children's magazines were provided for
this session. The students chose their own stories, and cut out the
pronouns, verbs and nouns. They traded stories and completed the
stories by filling in the words. This necessitated looking ahead
in the sentences and the story in order to choose appropriate words
that made sense.

Session 24. Session 23 was reviewed and discussed and a new approach
was used in this session. A new story was chosen by each student.
Every eighth word was cut out, regardless of what importance it might
have had for the story. The stories were traded and completed. The
students were very capable of making coherent, well-chosen word
replacements, and proudly read them to the partners. They then chose
to cut out every fourth word for an extra challenge.

Session 25. In this session, the group wrote exciting announcements
and messages to one another using only the consonants. The group
translated these messages and predicted what they said. A notebook
was made from them, and they proudly shared them with their regular
classes.

Session 26. Every student was given a small object and was told to go
onto the school grounds and bury or hide it. They then developed a
map with in-depth written instructions guiding their chosen partner
to the treasure. The instructions leading to the treasure could only
include consonants. This was so enthusiastically received, the
students wanted to do it again, using non-words. They did it even
a third time, deleting the nouns, forcing them to look at the context
of the sentence to determine their next move.
Session 27. The students each cut out several pictures from a magazine. They co-operated by combining their pictures so as to produce a large collage that they felt told a story agreed on by all. They dictated the story, one sentence per child at a time, while I wrote it exactly as it was dictated on the board. It was a very advanced, sophisticated example of language usage.

Session 28. This session involved the students' names. Each letter of their names prompted four adjectives describing that person. They were all listed on the board. These adjectives were combined and used to write a story about how they viewed themselves at this point. A large story was done on poster board and put with the notebooks.

Session 29. Mother Goose rhymes were read initially, then the teams changed the words so as to make them either nonsensical or more humorous. The same beats and patterns for each poem had to remain the same. They illustrated and framed their poems in cardboard.

Session 30. This was the final session.

The students used what we termed as the "compliment whip." They wrote a succession of words about every other member of the group, particularly pointing out the person's growth as a reader. They then wrote words describing themselves as readers. It was very evident that they had developed a real interest in words and language, and were in a state of disbelief as to their ability as readers and the changes of only six weeks.
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A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE BASED
LESSON STRATEGIES ON THE READING SELF-CONCEPT AND READING
PERFORMANCE OF SELECTED FIFTH GRADE STUDENTS

by
George Gordon Getz

(ABSTRACT)

It was the purpose of this study to examine the use of the
natural language of the five subjects identified as having low reading
self-concept as the basis for reading instruction, and to analyze,
before and after the treatment period, the miscues of the subjects
to determine if the use of the language experience lesson strategies
had any effect on the quality or the quantity of the subjects' miscues.
Further, the reading self-concepts of the subjects were analyzed before
and after the treatment period to determine if there was a change.

The data for this research were obtained by analyzing the oral
reading miscues of the five subjects using the Reading Miscue Inventory
(RMI) (Goodman and Burke, 1972). A miscue is a deviation between the
reader's oral response and the printed material. In analyzing a reader's
miscues it is possible to measure the variables surrounding the miscues
both quantitatively and qualitatively.

A review of the literature provided background into the area of
the self, self-concept and overall achievement, self-concept and
reading, language experience approach to reading and the Reading Miscue Inventory.

Upon completion of the treatment period and the analysis of the pre- and post-RMI's, it was found that the five subjects had made gains in their ability to utilize the three cueing systems facilitating an increase in the quality of miscues, and decreasing the quantity of miscues. Concomitantly, the data reflected an increase in the subjects' reading self-concept, especially with respect to reading in the presence of and for others.

It was concluded that the study provides an alternative approach to reading instruction that utilizes the inherent language of the subject and that reading programs for the upper elementary student with a poor reading self-concept need not be presented as a skill-oriented process along, but dealt with as a meaning-based, interactive language and thought process. The study also provided evidence that the reading self-concept semantic differential scale created for this study can be utilized as an effective tool in classrooms to measure children's reading self-concept as a tool in program assessment from the affective standpoint.

It is recommended that this study, using the RMI as a diagnostic reading instrument and the reading self-concept semantic differential scale might be extended, using different locale, socio-economic and grade-level populations. It is recommended that the study be carried out in an experimental design.