A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS A STRUCTURED TUTORIAL PROGRAM HAS ON THE READING LEVELS OF LOW ACHIEVING READERS IN THE SIXTH GRADE

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

WILLIAM A. HALLS

1976

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS A STRUCTURED TUTORIAL PROGRAM HAS ON THE READING LEVELS OF LOW ACHIEVING READERS IN THE SIXTH GRADE

presented by

William A. Halls

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Administration & Higher Education

Major professor

Date February 27, 1976

O-7639

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS A STRUCTURED TUTORIAL PROGRAM HAS ON THE READING LEVELS OF LOW ACHIEVING READERS IN THE SIXTH GRADE

By

William A. Halls

The purpose of this study was to test the effect of a structured tutorial program on sixth grade low achievers who tutored second grade low achievers in reading.

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the effect of the Grant Von Harrison Law Tutor Program on sixth grade students who became tutors as well as on those who were tutored. Low achievers in reading who worked in the Grant Von Harrison Lay Tutor Program were compared with sixth graders not having the instructional opportunities offered by Von Harrison's program.

Selected Review of Literature

Controversy relating to the teaching of reading has always flourished in the field of education. The reading process, recognized as the heart of education, creates a necessity for expertise. Expertise in reading through research is one crucial element in education today. The effects of reading instruction, or the lack of reading instruction, is crucial in the lives of the students we

serve. This has necessitated the need for research and has spurred much controversy.

The review of literature examined the need and principles upon which present methods of teaching reading are based. The researcher then traced the origination of the American schools from the Quincy Grammar School of 1848 to the idea of a single-teacher-per-age graded group.

Recent attempts to improve reading instruction within this organization led to encourage other research in the history of tutorial programs. Finally, Von Harrison's structured tutorial program evolved from a combination of all three.

Three premises evolved from which tutorial programs should be based:

1. Many forms of individualized instruction are not in the best interest of low-achieving students.

2. Effective individualized instruction cannot be accomplished with machines or programmed materials exclusively.

3. Effective individualized instruction cannot be accomplished in a regular classroom setting.

The Von Harrison Approach to Structured Tutoring

Von Harrison has shown that efforts to individualize instruction for primary grade children or older students with limited reading ability are not effective unless certain structuring requirements are defined and

answered. Those requirements have been defined by previous research and include:

1. Pre-established instructional objectives.
2. Specified sequence of instructional objectives.
3. Valid means of assessing each student's mastery of the pre-established instructional objectives.
4. Instructional materials in harmony with the instructional objectives, and designed to strengthen the behaviour found by the pretest to be weak or missing from the student's repertoire.
5. Management procedures that include performance pretests and instructional prescriptions for individual students based on the pretest.
6. Management procedures which assure that individual students receive instructional prescriptions sequentially.
7. Management procedures that provide validated criteria tests, prepared in advance of instruction, for systematically checking each student's mastery of instructional criteria.
8. Management procedures that provide for modification of instructional procedures when a student does not master an instructional prescription.

Procedure

A print-out of the reading scores of the sixth graders at the experimental school, arranged in descending order, was provided by the principal. Starting at the bottom of the list every other student was placed in the experimental group and the others assigned to the control group. The

reading scores provided by the school had been taken from the Stanford Achievement Test routinely administered in 1973.

The students were then pre and post tested for reading, using the Von Harrison reading test. In addition, both groups were given the Mehl test to determine the Student Level of Confidence of Academic Ability.

For this study it was established that the level of significance was .005 using multi-variate ANOVA.

Findings

Results of the analysis showed that the mean difference of both the reading level and the level of confidence of academic ability of the experimental group did increase; and that the findings were significant at less than the .0001 level of significance. Further, the second grade tutees demonstrated reading gains significantly greater than the non-tutees.

Conclusions

1. A basic conclusion of this study was that involvement in the Von Harrison structural tutorial program was successful in improving the reading of readers of low achievement at the sixth grade level in the population studied.

2. A second basic conclusion was that involvement in the Von Harrison program also increased the level of confidence of academic ability as measured by the Mehl test of sixth grade students involved within the program.

3. In addition, those younger children who were tutored scored mean gains that indicated growth that gave further support for using a structured tutoring program.

A STUDY OF THE EFFECTS A STRUCTURED TUTORIAL PROGRAM HAS ON THE READING LEVELS OF LOW ACHIEVING READERS IN THE SIXTH GRADE

By
William A. Halls

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration
and Higher Education

1976

DEDICATION

This dissertation, its work, and effort are dedicated to my sons Bill and Brad. For it was their love that provided the motivation to finish this unimaginable task.

In an entirely different manner but with no less affection this work, and all that comes after it is dedicated to Dr. Peter L. Clancy. It was he who first suggested, then counseled and continually provided encouragement, guidance, and concern that sustained me to the finish.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many persons have helped to make this dissertation possible. Dr. Howard Hickey, my dissertation chairman, and friend, has provided the wise counsel and encouragement that played a large part in the finishing of this thesis. Dr. Archibald Shaw whose expertise in editing so greatly improved this work.

To Richard Zanas, Al Putnam, Eugene Grice, Glen Byers, and Jim Davidson whose friendship, concern and love were so appreciated through a long trying time.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES vi

Chapter

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 1

Introduction 1
The Problem. 3
Need for the Study 3
Hypotheses to be Tested. 4
Definition of Terms. 5
Limitations. 7
Organization of the Study. 8

II. SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE. 9

Introduction 9
Organization of the School 13
Recent Attempts to Improve Reading Instruction. 16
Findings from Tutorial Programs. 19
Structured Tutoring. 24
The Von Harrison Approach to Structured Tutoring. 25
Summary. 30

III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY. 31

The Site 31
Staffing Pattern of the School 32
Selection of the Sample. 32
Instrumentation. 34
Analysis of Data 35

IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA. 36

Introduction 36
Analysis of Results. 36
Null Hypothesis I. 39
Null Hypothesis II 39
Secondary Analysis 40
Findings 41
Summary. 42

Chapter Page

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 43

The Problem 43
The Sample. 44
Instruments Used to Collect the Data. 44
Data Analysis 44
Findings. 45
Conclusions 45
Discussion. 45
Recommendations 46
Recommendations for Further Study . . . 46

BIBLIOGRAPHY 47

APPENDICES 51

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Breakdown on the Racial Make-up of the Student Body	32
3.2	Reading Scores from Von Harrison Reading Test.	34
4.1	Mean Pre and Post Test Scores for the Von Harrison Reading Test . . .	37
4.2	Mean Scores of the Student Level of Confidence of Academic Ability of the Experimental and Control Groups as Measured by the Mehl Test . .	37
4.3	Standard Deviations for Pre and Post Reading Scores	38
4.4	Standard Deviations for Pre and Post Tests of the S.L.C.A.A.	38
4.5	Univariate Analysis of Variance in Reading Scores	39
4.6	Univariate Analysis of Variance in S.L.C.A.A. Scores.	39
4.7	Pre and Post Tests in Reading Achievement for the Tutees.	41

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

> "The most important responsibility of the elementary school, indeed, its most central and crucial responsibility--is to develop children's love of learning and to teach the skills that facilitate learning. Chief among those skills is reading, for reading is the key to the past as well as the present. To teach children to read is to start them on a lifetime of learning."[1]

James E. Allen, Jr., former U. S. Commissioner of Education, identified the inability to read effectively in this following light:

> "The inability to read efficiently, contaminating as it does every other dimension of education, is clearly one challenge deserving of our concentrated efforts. As we learn how to attack this deficiency cooperatively we not only will be getting at this foundation of learning, but will be gaining the strength and skills to meet many other educational problems."[2]

From a variety of statistical information accumulated by the U. S. Office of Education regarding deficiencies throughout the country, these shocking facts stand out:

---

[1]Jess M. Walker, A Comparative Study of Personalized Reading in an Open-Learning Environment, and Basal Text Reading in a Traditional Learning Environment through Early Elementary Pupil Achievement, (unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970).

[2]James E. Allen, Jr., "The Right to Read Target for the 1970's," The PTA Magazine LXIV (December, 1969): 6-7.

- One out of every four students nationwide has significant reading deficiencies.[3]

- In large city school systems up to one-half of the students read below expectation.[4]

- There are more than 3,000,000 illiterates in our adult population.[5]

- About one-half of our unemployed youth ages sixteen to twenty-one are functionally illiterate.[6]

- In recent U. S. Armed Forces program called Project 100,000, 68% of the young fell below grade seven in reading and academic ability.[7]

Lacy has put these insights to the relationship of learning and reading:

> "Perhaps the clearest requirement of the years ahead is that education must occupy a far larger part of our energies and resources dealing with a far more complex body of knowledge, extending at every level of a higher proportion of the population and continuing for longer periods as education occupies a more central role in our society. So inevitably will reading; it is a necessary accompaniment."[8]

---

[3]Stephen H. Portuges and Norma D. Feshback, "The Effects of Teachers' Reinforcement Style Upon Imitative Behaviour of Children," A.E.R.A. Paper Abstracts, ed. Henry Hausdorf (Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association, 1968), p. 268.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid, p. 270.

[6]Ibid, p. 271.

[7]Ibid, p. 281.

[8]Don Lacy,"Reading's Place in an Effective Society," International Reading Association Conference Proceedings, Scholastic Magazine (January, 1958): 20.

Mr. James E. Allen, former U. S. Commissioner of Education, has set forth a goal for all education in the 1970's:

> "We should immediately set for ourselves the goal of insuring that by the end of the 1970's the right to read shall be a reality for all; that no one shall leave our schools without the skill and the desire necessary to read to the full limits of his capability."[9]

One of our concerns as educators today must be to answer the question: Can we find more effective methods by which reading skills can be taught? It is clear that more research needs to be done.

The Problem

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the effect of the Grant Von Harrison Lay Tutor Program on sixth grade students who become tutors as well as on those who were tutored.[10] Low achievers in reading who have worked in the Grant Von Harrison Lay Tutor program will be compared with sixth graders not having the instructional opportunities offered by Von Harrison's program.

Need for the Study

Von Harrison has stated:

> "That for some reason we are not sure of, no one program (reading) works for all children. We have seen children receive instruction in four

---

[9]Allen, op. cit., p. 7.

[10]Grant Von Harrison, Beginning Reading I: A Professional Guide for the Lay Tutor (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 1972), p. 25.

> or five reading programs over a three year period and be unsuccessful in their attempts to learn to read. Then in a fourth year they begin to learn to read on their own."[11]

This study recognizes the need for continual research in reading instruction. It explores specifically the effects of a procedure that gives low-achieving readers in the sixth grade a special challenge and staisfaction: special in the sense that they are genuinely needed to help the teacher teach some younger students. Their being needed and the tutoring itself, it is hoped, will allow them to see themselves and their reading abilities in a new light and will have a positive effect on their own reading achievement.

Hypotheses to be Tested

The following are the hypotheses which offered and provided direction to the study:

Null Hypothesis I - There will be no significant difference in gain scores in reading achievement between experimental and control groups of tutors as measured by the Von Harrison Reading Test.

Null Hypothesis II - there will be no significant difference in gain scores in student level of confidence in their academic ability between experimental and control

---

[11]Grant Von Harrison, Interview Sheet, November, 15, 1973.

groups of tutors as measured by the Mehl test of Student Level of Confidence in Academic Ability.[12]

Definition of Terms

The following is a list of definitions of key concepts as they are used in this study.

Structured Turoring - an approach to the teaching of reading aimed at the systematic development of reading ability and is distinguished by the care and process in training the tutors. (See Appendix A for description of the Von Harrison model.)[13]

Von Harrison Guide for Lay Tutors - a guide outlining a step by step program for trainer, tutor, and tutee.[14]

Trainer - a professional teacher who has been trained to work with tutors.[15]

Tutor - an upper elementary student who undergoes a training program by the trainer to work with the tutee.[16]

Tutee - the recipient of the teaching being done by the tutor.[17]

---

[12]John Walter Mehl, Parental Attitudes Toward the School, Student Confidence, Level of Academic Ability, Selected Indices of Student Achievement, A Comparative Study of Relationships (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972).

[13]Von Harrison, op. cit., p. 22.

[14]Ibid, p. 25.

[15]Ibid, p. 26.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Ibid, p. 27.

Controlled Vocabulary - "vocabulary selected and spaced in a basal reader or other textbook so as to control the number of new words to be learned by the child per unit of reading matter."[18]

Individual Reading Instruction - "differentiation of instruction in reading according to individual difference in pupils."[19]

Veatch offers a more detailed description of the features of an individualized reading program:

> "It is an attempt on the part of the teacher to manage the classroom so each child is safeguarded. The child's purpose and plans are thus intimately involved in establishing the thresholds of his own learning. Instruction is paced to the individual needs, concerns, likes, and aspirations. The selection of reading material and resources is a matter of the particular child's recognition that 'this is what I really want to read'."[20]

Personalized Reading Program - a personalized reading program encompasses individualization of reading instruction and personalization of reading content.

Trade Book - a "book designed for the general bookstore and library market rather than text use."[21]

---

[18]Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education, Second Edition (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), p. 602.

[19]Ibid, p. 690.

[20]Jeannette Veatch, Individualizing Your Reading Program (New York: G.P. Putnam and Sons, 1959), p. 8.

[21]Ibid, p. 12.

Reading Achievement - the status of the student's ability to read as measured by standardized reading tests. The Von Harrison reading test was used in this study to measure reading achievement.

Reading Level - the form used to express the relationship between a child's reading achievement as compared to reading achievement of other children with the same degree of experience in education. Reading level is expressed in grade equivalents derived from the Von Harrison test.[22]

Mean Gain in Reading Achievement - the difference between the average of the reading scores obtained by a group prior to the application of the program, and the average of the reading scores obtained by the same group after completion of the program.[23]

Basal Reading Text - a book or series of books uniform throughout any given school district, as the principal or only textbook in reading.

Limitations

This research is affected by the larger question of mental health and its relation to reading and that affect is not dealt with in this study.

---

[22]Good, op. cit., p. 68.

[23]Stephan Michael and William Issac, Handbook in Research and Evaluation (San Diego: Robert P. Knapp Publisher, 1971), p. 8.

The researcher runs the risk, as do all researchers, of not knowing exactly how much of the effect shown can be attributed to the Hawthorne effect.[24]

The population studied is in one school and one study. Therefore, the findings are limited to this particular population.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I has stated the problem to be studied. Included are the introduction, the problem, the hypotheses to be tested, definition of terms, and the limitations of the study.

A selected review of related literature is presented in Chapter II. A brief history of the Von Harrison tutorial instruction and a description of the classroom conditions under which it can be used is included.

Chapter III has a description of the tutorial projects, selection of experimental and control groups, selection of trainer, methods and procedures, techniques and instruments used to collect data. Analysis of the data will be presented in Chapter IV. The summary, conclusions, and recommendations will be presented in Chapter V.

---

[24] Veatch, op. cit., p. 15

CHAPTER II

SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Controversy relating to the teaching of reading has always flourished in the field of education. The reading process, recognized as the heart of education, creates a necessity for expertise. Expertise in reading through research is one crucial element in education today. The effects of reading instruction, or the lack of reading instruction, is crucial in the lives of the students we serve. This has necessitated the need for research and has spurred much controversy.

There are differing points of view representing the many varying opinions from authorities in the field of reading. Gerald A. Yoakam stated: "There must be a well planned, systematic program of reading development for all children. Such a program is properly called basal reading instruction."[1]

It is with need for something to be done for the non-reading or slow reading upper elementary students that this study was initiated. It is the hope of this researcher

---

[1]Gerald A. Yoakam, Basal Reading Instruction (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955), p. 10.

that this study will suggest additional studies which will have impact upon reading instruction. Jeannette Veatch stated:

> "Although reading achievement is improving in this country, it is not improving enough; and the blame for this too meager growth rests on those who, perhaps knowing no better, have led children to read books and other materials which are remote from their purpose. A new and different method of teaching reading is needed to replace the outmoded basic reading program now in vogue in American schools."[2]

Smith points out:

> "A lack of books was a major problem in American education as early as the Colonial Period; and because of this many people never learned to read. Children's literature was also scarce; so textbook publishers, including Lindlay Murry, Lyman Cobb, and others began to compile series of school readers. The outgrowth of their work was the modern basal textbook, the use of which has dominated reading instruction for over 100 years."[3]

During the Colonial Period, when children were taught to read, more often than not the family Bible was the only book to be taught by.

As education became more prevalent, with it grew the need for books and instruction in how to use them correctly. Little help was available and the only guidance to be found was in the teacher's manual which accompanied the textbook readers.

---

[2]Jeannette Veatch, "Individualized Reading for Success in the Classroom," The Educational Trend (April, 1954): p. 82.

[3]Nila Barton Smith, Historical Analysis of American Reading Instruction (New York: Silver Burdett Company, 1934), pp. 51-72.

An American grade school began to be developed in the early eighteen forties and with it came graded reading material. Instruction books of this type usually consisted of a primer and a succession of books graded one through eight. William McGuffey popularized this pattern. Between 1836 and 1844, because of the universality of McGuffey's books on the frontiers of America, he is given credit by Smith and others for having authored the first series of readers in this country. Two important concepts having to do with reading were introduced by McGuffey:

> "On each page a number of new words were introduced. These words were then offered for repetitive learning on succeeding pages. These two ideas are at the heart of all basal readers today; that of a controlled vocabulary."[4]

Many sets of graded basal readers were produced between 1880 and 1925. These textbooks manifested improvements in terms of better mechanical make-up including the use of colored pictures, provision for gradual introduction of words, with a significant reduction in the number of different words used, and inclusion of more variety in story content.[5]

Enforcement of the compulsory education laws by 1921 was keeping more children in school longer. This influx in the classroom load made it apparent to teachers that they

---

[4] Ibid, pp. 105-106.

[5] Paul Witty, Reading in Modern Education (Boston: D.C. Heath and Company, 1949), p. 4.

needed more than one book per grade level. Three ability levels gradually evolved and were used for instruction. Smaller groups were structured within the classroom in order to bring together children of similar reading levels so that the instruction could be geared to each particular group. Common today in many elementary classrooms in America are these three ability groups: above grade level, grade level, and below grade level. This ability grouping plan has proven to be much more effective than the single presentation practices.[6]

Preprimers for use in the first grade reading program were added to the basal reader series around 1927.[7] It is interesting to note that additional materials became supplemental basal texts. Teachers' manuals, flash cards for word drill, practice exercises, and tests were also introduced at that time.

During the thirties Smith began a continuing analysis of the vocabulary contained in primary levels of basal readers. Smith's analysis of sixteen series produced three conclusions: (1) standard word lists, rather than author judgement, were used as the basis for vocabulary selection; (2) the number of new words, or vocabulary load,

---

[6]Don Dawson, "Some Issues in Groups for Reading," National Department of Elementary School Principals 34th Yearbook of the National Education Association (Washington, D.C.: 1955), pp. 48-52.

[7]Gertrude Hildreth, Teaching Reading (New York: Henry Hoct and Company, 1958), p. 225.

for primers had decreased, and (3) the average number of repetitions per word had increased.[8]

In 1941 Spache reported three new trends in pre-primers, first and second grade readers: (1) extensive use of color, and pictures; (2) lowering of the vocabulary and (3) greater integration and carry-over of the vocabulary to successive reader levels.[9]

Perhaps the best of the Post World War II trends can be found in Walker. Walker reported:

> Today, basal text reading instruction refers to a procedure in which children are grouped on the basis of reading proficiency. Each group meets with the teacher for a daily reading lession from a basal text, the context of which has been geared to current knowledge of the interest and abilities of children at various stages of development. Generally, the groups remain the same throughout the year.[10]

Organization of the School

The idea of a single-teacher-per-age-graded-group is an invented concept that developed over a long period of time. It represents an evolutionary continuum of organizational development for schools in the absence of any rigorous research or data-gathering activities. Although the Quincy Grammar School of 1848 is usually cited

---

[8]Smith, op. cit., pp. 200-210.

[9]George Spache, "New Trends in Primary-Grade Readers," Elementary School Journal XLII (December, 1941), p. 283.

[10]Walker, op. cit., p. 21.

as the beginning of the current definition, the roots of the idea can be found in the work of the German educator Johann Sturm (1507-1589) when he founded the gymnasium in Strassburg. Cubberly[11] notes that Sturm probably adopted his idea from the French colleges. Sturm organized the gymnasium into ten classes, one for each year the pupil was in school and provided each class with a teacher. Sturm's gymnasium was visited by scholars and educators from all over Europe and the structure spread very rapidly, having been adopted by the Jesuits. The significant difference between Sturm's gymnasium and the Quincy Grammar School was that in the latter, pupils were sorted and assigned to teachers within specialized subjects, whereas in the gymnasium although teachers had been "differentiated" by subject or skill areas, students had remained in a heterogeneous group. Cubberly observed how in the elementary schools the subjects of instruction were divided among the teachers rather than the children. A common division was between the teacher who taught writing and arithmetic. Writing being considered a difficult art, was taught by a separate teacher, who often included the ability to teach arithmetic also among accomplishments.[12]

---

[11] Fenewich H. English, and Donald K. Sharpes, Strategies for Differentiated Staffing (Berkely: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1970), p. 9.

[12] Ibid, p. 10.

In the Lancastrian schools, which later came to dominate eastern and southern school systems in the United States, children were advanced individually and by subjects as their progress warranted, "until they had progressed as far as the instruction went, or the teacher could teach."[13]

The "modern" elementary school is the product of several organizational changes that began by having three separate schools coming together under one roof.

The next step was the division of each school into classes. This began by the employment of assistant teachers, in England and America known as "ushers," to help the "master," and the provision of small recitation rooms, off the main large schoolroom, to which the usher could take his class to hear recitations. The third and final step came with the erection of a new type of school building, with smaller and individual schoolrooms. It was then possible to assign a teacher to each classroom, sort and grade the pupils by ages and advancements, outline the instruction by years, and the modern graded elementary school was at hand.[14]

Thus, the current definition of the role of classroom teacher was born, and with it were created a host of problems that have yet to be solved.

---

[13] Ibid, p. 11.

[14] Von Harrison, op. cit., pp. 1-4.

Since the fifties virtually every school system in the United States had adopted basal texts for their district. The same judgement can be made for the graded structure of the schools within these districts. It is safe to say that during the late fifties and continuing to date experimental programs sometimes resulted in approved supplemental programs. The increased dissatisfaction with traditional schemes of staffing, organization, and texts, led Grant Von Harrison to develop both a rationale and program of study for those children not learning to read using what was developed in the traditional methods.

Recent Attempts to Improve Reading Instruction

In his guide Von Harrison summarizes and critizes many attempts to improve reading instruction.

Von Harrison says:

> Many students do not do well in reading, and for many reasons. Some important reasons include lack of adequate individualized help at home, limited ability to work independently, reluctance to request individual help, insecurities because of repeated failure, tendency to respond impulsively to questions, unusual need for more clarification, more than average need for practice with a task, and need for systematic instruction in small increments.[15]

Von Harrison points out:

> No matter how conscientious a classroom teacher is, it is humanly impossible for him to conduct effective individual

---

[15]Grant Von Harrison, Beginning Reading I: A Professional Guide for the Lay Tutor (Provo: Brigham Young University Press, 1972), p. 29.

> instruction for every student. Because of time restraints and the wide range of student abilities, it is almost impossible to identify the precise learning needs of every student every day. In a regular classroom setting it is extremely difficult to provide additional clarification regarding procedures to individual students even if they request it. In many instances, though they do not understand, they will not say so.[16]

In addition, Von Harrison says:

> Even if a teacher wanted to, there is no way he could monitor each student during various learning activities. Of necessity, teachers gear their instruction for the majority, and in so doing find it extremely difficult to individualize the amount of time students spend on a particular objective. To provide individual students with additional appropriate practice when necessary is equally difficult. There is a limit to the amount of specific feedback and reinforcement a teacher can give individual students.[17]

These reasons are only representative of the host of reasons why classroom teachers cannot realistically be expected to individualize instruction for every student.

Currently, he says, various forms of instruction in the public schools are erroneously called individualized instruction. For example, the engagement of students in a variety of learning activities is not of itself a true form of individualized instruction. The possibility remains that the student's activity will not fill his own specific needs. Some educators let individual students select their

---

[16] Ibid, p. 35.

[17] Ibid.

own learning activities to achieve individualization, but some research has shown that children are prone to select learning activities involving their strong subjects while they avoid areas where they are deficient.[18]

A closely related fallacy would allow each student to progress at a rate which the student controls. Again, much research[19] has shown that children do not have the ability to select an appropriate rate of learning for themselves.

In his view, the most common form of inappropriate individualized instruction is the use of programmed texts or workbooks. It has been found that, for a variety of reasons (e.g., limited reading ability and poor notivation), programmed texts or workbooks are not effective for those students most in need of help.[20]

Probably the most serious fallacy regarding individualized instruction is the idea that students should work independently. Again, those students who have the most serious difficulties are least likely to utilize independent study time effectively.[21]

---

[18] Ibid, p. 48.

[19] Ibid, p. 50.

[20] Ibid, p. 4.

[21] Ibid.

He urges that anyone attempting to individualize instruction for primary grade children or older students with limited reading ability keep the following in mind:

1. Many forms of individualized instruction are not in the best interest of low-achieving students.
2. Effective individualized instruction cannot be accomplished with machines or programmed materials exclusively.
3. Effective individualized instruction cannot be accomplished in a regular classroom setting.[22]

Out of these problems was conceived the idea of structured tutoring.

Findings from Tutorial Programs

Little research has been undertaken in the area of tutorial programs. As late as 1967 James Noce commented in a publication prepared by the Tutorial Assistance Center, "Very little careful and responsible tutorial research and evaluation has been performed anywhere nationally to date."[23] Yet, a number of studies have been reported which have incorporated statistical designs that attempt to measure change in pupil self-concept, achievement and intelligence.

In Winnetka, Illinois, Freund[24] reported the progress of the Project for Academic Motivation. This

---

[22] Ibid.

[23] James Noce, Research and Evaluation in Tutorial Programs (Washington, D.C.: Tutorial Assistance Center, 1967), p. 1.

[24] Janet Freund, "Time and Knowledge to Share," Elementary School Journal (February, 1965), pp. 351-358.

project was originally conceived as an inquiry into academic under-achievement, especially among elementary school males. The project was financed by a Wieboldt Foundation grant and used knowledgeable volunteers in an effort to improve the under-achievers' classroom performances and to provide them with much needed recognition.

The projects on which the volunteers and children worked were coordinated with the curriculum, and the pupils shared their experiences with their classes. The instruction provided by the volunteers was not tutorial or remedial, but rather enriching in nature.

Controlled evaluation was a part of the design. Children were drawn from the third, fourth, and fifth grades of the two participating schools. Premeasures and postmeasures were administered to the 64 under-achieving children who had been randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups. Measures were taken for attendance; for growth in reading, arithmetic, language, and spelling; for attitudinal development and for self-esteem. The analysis of these data showed that the experimental group improved significantly in attitudes toward reading, in confidence in applying such skills as use of the dictionary and reference books, in school attendance and in enjoyment of school life. The author concluded that while there was no evidence to indicate that the experimental group improved more than the control group in terms of academic achievement,

it was possible that improved school attendance and improved attitudes toward school and school tasks might result in improved academic achievement.[25]

Baun[26] reported a tutorial project involving 85 college volunteers who tutored 250 Negro secondary school pupils in basic science, remedial reading and arithmetic in after-school situations. Tutoring was supplemented by cultural and informative field trips. School personnel gave basic methods of teaching to the volunteers prior to their undertaking the tutorial relationship. Evaluation of the program was primarily based on comments of the faculty, the tutored pupils and their parents. Teachers stated that the major advantage of the tutorial program was an increased level of academic motivation which was leading to a higher quality of classroom work. Tutored pupils and their parents expressed positive comments about the program. In the spring, the American Reading Achievement Test was administered to the seventh-grade class which included 22 of the tutored pupils. The test results indicated a significant difference in reading achievement favoring the tutored group. They showed an average gain of nine months in comparison to a 4.6 month gain for the untotored group over a period of six months.

---

[25] Ibid.

[26] Eugene Baun, "The Washington University Campus Y Tutoring Project," Peabody Journal of Education, (1965), pp. 161-168.

A tutorial project reported by Gordon, Curran, and Avila[27] was designed to improve pupils' attitudes toward school and to improve the self-concepts of pupils. As a part of their educational course work, college sophomores were assigned to tutor pupils who had or were having learning difficulties. The tutored sample consisted of 20 pupils each from two elementary schools and one junior high school. They were matched by age, sex, and enrollment in the same classes with a control group in each of the schools. Tutor-pupil pairs worked in the tutorial relationship for one hour per week over a period of twenty weeks.

In an effort to measure behaviour change, teachers completed a pupil behaviour instrument, the Behaviour Description Chart, for each child at the beginning and the end of the project. Gordon's How I See Myself self-concept instrument was administered in January and May. Tests failed to exhibit significant differences for the tutored group on the aspects of leadership, aggressiveness, and withdrawal as measured by the Behaviour Description Chart. Likewise, there were no significant differences between the pretest and posttest scores of the experimental group with relation to self concept.[28]

---

[27] Ira J. Gordon, Robert L. Curran and Donald L. Avila, An Inter-Disciplinary Approach to Improving the Development of Culturally Disadvantaged Children (Gainesville, Florida: College of Education, University of Florida, 1966).

[28] Ibid, pp. 15-25.

Cloward[29] has reported an extensive evaluation program for the Mobilization for Youth tutorial program in New York City. In each of 11 centers, tenth and eleventh grade high school students tutored fourth and fifth grade pupils under the supervision of certified teachers. All of the tutees were reading below grade level according to tests administered by the schools. An experimental group of 410 pupils and a control group of 185 pupils were randomly selected. Among those assigned to tutoring sessions, some were tutored for four hours per week, some for only two hours. Each of the pupils was tutored in reading.

On comparing reading scores on pretests and post-tests after a five-month period, it was found that tutees who received four hours of tutoring per week showed an increase in reading ability which was significantly greater than the control group. This did not hold true for the group which received only two hours of help per week. Further analysis of data indicated that the tutorial services did not produce in the tutees a measurable change in school marks, school behavior ratings or pupil attitudes and aspirations.[30]

---

[29]Robert D. Cloward, "The Nonprofessional in Education: Mobilization of Youth's Tutorial Project," Educational Leadership (1967), pp. 604-606.

[30]Ibid.

In Columbus, Ohio, the Teen Tutorial Program[31] was designed as a strategy for breaking the cycle of succeeding generations of children educationally deprived during their critical pre-school years. The tutorial program involved 40 boys and girls in one junior high school in tutorial relationships with members of two kindergarten classes from a nearby school. One measure, I.Q., was reported for the kindergarteners during the period of the pilot study. The results from pretests and posttests indicated gains in I.Q. of 3.11 points for the kindergarteners in the experimental group and .47 points for the control group. A level of significance was not reported.

Structured Tutoring

Structured tutoring seems to emanate from Von Harrison. A Reading Guide Search, a Dissertation Abstract Search and an ERIC Search failed to reveal any instances of structured tutoring. In 1968 at the University of Chicago a Conference on Tutoring was held. Eleven reports were presented which dealt with specific tutoring programs. However, a review of that conference report indicates a non-structured tutorial emphasis. It indicates eleven different instances of upper elementary students and junior high students who all were achievers being placed for as

---

[31]Gene Telego, "A Teen Tutorial Program," Pacereport (Lexington, Kentucky: A publication of the College of Education, University of Kentucky, May-June, 1968), pp. 15-17.

little as one hour a week and as much as four hours a week with a non-achieving first and second grader. Universally these reports did not relate to a structured approach to tutoring.[32]

The Von Harrison Approach to Structured Tutoring

Von Harrison [33] has shown that efforts to individualize instruction for primary grade children or older students with limited reading ability are not effective unless certain structuring requirements are defined and answered. Those requirements have been defined by previous research and include:

1. Pre-established instructional objectives.
2. Specified sequence of instructional objectives.
3. Valid means of assessing each student's mastery of the pre-established instructional objectives.
4. Instructional materials in harmony with the instructional objectives, and designed to strengthen the behaviour found by the pretest to be weak or missing from the students' repertoire.
5. Management procedures that include performance pretests and instructional prescriptions for individual students based on the pretest.
6. Management procedures which assure that individual students receive instructional prescriptions sequentially.

---

[32]Grant Von Harrison, Telephone Conversation, (Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, February 12, 1974).

[33]Von Harrison, op. cit., pp. 1-4.

7. Management procedures that provide validated criteria tests, prepared in advance of instruction, for systematically checking each student's mastery of instructional criteria.

8. Management procedures that provide for modification of instructional procedures when a student does not master an instructional prescription.[34]

Because of the complexity in the reading process, Von Harrison feels that many students do not learn to read from regular classroom instruction. Consequently, reading--more than any other subject--requires legitimate individualized instruction to insure that every student learns to read adequately.

He points out that structured tutoring opens several new dimensions of instruction:

- It is the first form of individualized instruction that truly monitors oral response.

- It is the first form of individualized instruction that monitors the student's behaviour while he attempts to solve a problem.

- It provides a degree of flexibility with instruction that cannot be duplicated with computers.

- It implements identified tutoring techniques and procedures which allow for maximum sensitivity to the individual learning characteristics of the student so as to maximize learning.[35]

---

[34] Ibid, p. 5.

[35] Ibid, p. 6.

According to Von Harrison structured turoring is a teaching technique rather than a set of material; thus, the subject matter taught can be determined entirely by the curricular requirements of the school system in which it is used. His preliminary research and experience indicate that this type of tutoring has great potential for individualizing instruction at the primary grade level, and that it could provide an answer to the problem of effectively adapting primary instruction to individual differences.

Von Harrison's extensive practice has demonstrated that the classroom teacher need not spend his valuable time tutoring. An adult with normal reading skills who follows the procedures and techniques specified in a book based on the structured tutoring model can successfully teach a student such difficult academic skills as reading.

The process of reading is complicated by the numerous sub-skills required, any one of which can become a major stumbling block for a student. Many writers assume that identification skills are important aspects of reading mastery. For example, in a summary of reading success studies, Durell (1958) indicated that:

> ...most reading difficulties can be prevented by instructional programs which provide early instruction in letter names and sounds, followed by applied phonics and accompanied by suitable practice in meaningful sight vocabulary and aids to attentive silent reading.[36]

---

[36]D. D. Durell, "First Grade Reading Success," Journal of Education, No. 3 (1969), p. 2.

Each of these specified competencies (naming, sounding, blending, and sight words) requires drill and practice for acquisition, especially for the student who does not find reading easy. Because of the time restraints on classroom teachers, it is not always possible for a teacher to provide the extensive individual drill and practice that a particular student may need. Consequently, many students are deprived of the skills of blending and decoding sounds and of other prerequisite skills.

> "Generally, there are students in every elementary school classroom who have not mastered basic skills. In some schools, testing has shown that as many as 35 percent of the children in the third grade do not know the sounds of consonants, vowels, and diagraphs."[37]

Very basic to the complex process of reading is the process of blending sounds that make up a given word. This process is extremely difficult for a child if the word is a new one. The process of reading a new word is generally called "sounding out a word." If a student can successfully sound out a new word, we say he has "attack skills."[38] Unfortunately, many children do not acquire basic attack skills and later experience a great deal of frustration and embarrassment when required to read aloud.

Some words cannot be read phonetically and students must learn to read them by sight. "The total number of sight

---

[37] Ibid, p. 3.

[38] Ibid.

words primary grade children are expected to know ranges from 100 to 200, depending on the particular reading series being used."[39]

Hence, the inability to read a word results from one or more of the following conditions: (1) the student does not know or is uncertain of the sounds of the letters in the word, (2) the student has not had ample drill and practice in blending individual sounds into words, (3) the word requires knowledge of a specific phonetic rule the student has not learned, and (4) the word is a sight word the student does not know.[40]

Von Harrison developed a guide for structured reading which is designed to show a paraprofessional or nonprofessional how to: (1) teach a student basic attack skills, and (2) teach a student to read sight words that are encountered frequently.

The guide assumes that if a student is proficient at sounding out new words and can read the majority of the sight words he encounters, he will not become anxious when he reads out loud. Half the battle in learning to read is won if the student is relaxed and unthreatened by the process.

Similarly if a student knows how to decode (sound out) words, he will usually enjoy reading. While in contrast,

---

[39] Ibid, p. 4.

[40] Ibid, p. 6.

if a student does not know how to decode words, he will not ordinarily enjoy reading.

Even though only about 200 sight words are frequently encountered, approximately 50 percent of the words on any printed page are sight words.[41] In many instances a student's failure in learning to read key sight words is the crux of his reading problem. Consequently, he must learn to read frequently-encountered key sight words, as well as to decode (sound out) new words that can be read phonetically.

So as the controversy continues, this study recognized the need for a well planned systematic approach to reading. At the same time it is directed toward the non-reading or the slow reading student.

Summary

Recently those concerned with the slow readers in upper elementary school are increasingly given to say that the lower the teacher-pupil ratio, the better chance the student has. A structured tutoring program indirectly does just that.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The Site

Data used in this study were gathered in an elementary school located in a midwestern metropolitan community with a population of about one hundred and fifty thousand. The community in which the school is located is a combination of residential and commercial properties. A large industrial plant, while not lying within the elementary school attendance area, is just outside its boundary. The housing pattern in the attendance area is a combination of multiple and single family dwellings. Located in an older part of the city there is an absence of new apartment complexes. However, there are several large older homes that have been reconstructed for the purpose of multiple family housing. Within the elementary boundaries are a number of neighborhood grocery stores, gas stations, and dry cleaners that supply the needs of the people residing there. As of January, 1974, the principal of that school noted that a high percentage of the school constituents were experiencing economical difficulties. This was due to the poor financial conditions of the city as a whole. In particular, 80% of the community depended upon the

adjoining industrial complexes for their income. Lay-offs, permanent and temporary, account in part for the high mobility rates for about 20% of the student body. At the time that these data were gathered, the school housed 468 students, not including those in kindergarten or the special education programs.

A breakdown on the racial make-up of the student body may be found in Table 3.1.

TABLE 3.1 -- Breakdown on the racial make-up of the student body.

Race	Total Number Enrolled	Percent of Total Students
White	183	39%
Non-White	285	61%
Totals	468	100%

Staffing Pattern of the School

Its staff includes some teachers who are organized in a "differentiated staffing" pattern and others whose role is more traditional. In addition to the teachers, the staff includes coordinators, teaching aides, a community school coordinator and a principal.

Selection of the Sample

The purpose of this study was to test the effects of the Von Harrison Tutorial Reading Program on sixth grade students reading below grade level.

The principal was contacted by Dr. William Hoffman of Michigan State University. Discussion then followed with the principal, central office personnel, and the teachers involved. Permission was granted to do the study.

A list was compiled of the reading scores of the forty sixth graders who scored lowest among the sixth graders in order of their scores. Every second person was assigned to the experimental group, the alternate ones making up the control group. The reading scores provided by the school had been taken from the Stanford Achievement Test routinely administered in 1973.

All forty, both control and experimental were then given the Von Harrison Reading Test.

TABLE 3.2 -- Reading scores from Von Harrison Reading Test

Experimental		Control	
Student		Student	
1 - 2.3	11 - 3.0	1 - 2.3	11 - 3.0
2 - 2.4	12 - 3.0	2 - 2.4	12 - 3.0
3 - 2.5	13 - 3.1	3 - 2.5	13 - 3.1
4 - 2.6	14 - 3.2	4 - 2.6	14 - 3.2
5 - 2.6	15 - 3.2	5 - 2.6	15 - 3.2
6 - 2.6	16 - 3.4	6 - 2.6	16 - 3.4
7 - 2.6	17 - 3.5	7 - 2.6	17 - 3.5
8 - 2.7	18 - 3.5	8 - 2.7	18 - 3.5
9 - 3.0	19 - 3.6	9 - 3.0	19 - 3.6
10 - 3.0	20 - 3.6	10 - 3.0	20 - 3.6

Instrumentation

The Von Harrison reading test was administered by the teacher in charge of the project at the school. (See Appendix B for grade equivalent scores.)

Mehl recommends that his student level of confidence of academic ability form (S.L.C.A.A.) not be administered by teachers, since some of the items reflect the student's perceptions of their teachers' evaluation of their work.[1] Therefore, this study, as did Mehl's study, used Michigan State University students who were enrolled in Education 482 (The Urban Tutorial Program) at Michigan State University to administer the S.L.C.A.A. A training session for them was held prior to the administration of the S.L.C.A.A. form.

The student level of confidence of academic ability was determined by the previously outlined procedures. The scale for this test was developed by Mehl after "a careful examination of the literature of Brookover and others."[2]

An interview technique was used to accommodate students whose reading level might be too low, as well as to insure reliability of administration.

---

[1]John W. Mehl, Parental Attitude Toward the School, Student Confidence Level of Academic Ability, Selected Indices of Student Achievement: A Comparative Study of Relationships (unpublished Ph.D. Disseration, Michigan State University, 1972).

[2]Ibid, p. 47.

Each item is scaled on a five point Likert-type continuum with a letter (a) given a value of five (5) points, (b) four (4) points, and on to (e) one (1) point. A high score on the S.L.C.A.A. form indicated a low level of confidence. The reliability of this instrument was measured by the Hoyt test and showed a reliability (V) of .70.[3]

The Von Harrison Reading Test was developed by Dr. Grant Von Harrison while on the staff of the Research Department of the University of Southern California.

It is a three part reading test given to the students individually. The test not only shows the level of ability in reading, but in addition shows diagnostically, problem areas for each student, such as naming letters, producing sounds, and reading sight words, blending the sounds and decoding.

Analysis of Data

Multi-Variate ANOVA tests were used to analyze the data. For this study the level of significance was established as .005.

It has been the purpose of this chapter to describe the procedures used in both the data gathering and the analysis of the data.

---

[3] Ibid, pp. 47-48.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of the study is to find out if sixth graders who have been reading below grade level will improve their own reading level while acting as tutors, and whether their tutoring helps raise reading achievement in those being tutored.

Forty sixth graders reading below grade level were systematically divided into two groups. One group was designated as experimental group, the other as control. The experimental group after receiving appropriate training acted as tutors for 20 students defined as "needing help" by their teachers.

Analysis of Results

The primary analysis of the basic data is presented in this section.

Tables 4.1, 4.3, and 4.5 deal with the analysis of data for Null Hypothesis I.

Tables 4.2, 4.4, and 4.6 deal with the analysis of data for Null Hypothesis II.

Table 4.1 lists the mean pre and post test scores made by the tutors and the control group in the Von Harrison reading test.

TABLE 4.1 -- Mean pre and post test scores for the Von Harrison reading test

	Control	Experimental
Pre Test	3.000	3.000
Post Test	3.000	4.000

Table 4.1 indicates that the mean score of the experimental group rose one grade level in reading while the mean score of the control group remained the same.

Table 4.2 shows the mean scores of the same experimental and control groups as measured by the Mehl test (Student Level of Confidence of Academic Ability) S.L.C.A.A.

Table 4.2 -- Mean scores of the Student Level of Confidence of Academic Ability of the experimental and control groups as measured by the Mehl test.

	Control	Experimental
Pre Test	3.295	3.270
Post Test	3.315	2.855

The figures indicate a decrease of the mean of the experimental group. On a Likert type scale a lower number indicates more growth.

Table 4.3 tests the standard deviations for pre and post reading scores.

TABLE 4.3 -- Standard deviations for pre and post reading scores.

	Control	Experimental
Pre Test	.4034	.4156
Post Test	.4909	.7174

Table 4.4 lists the standard deviations for pre and post tests of the S.L.C.A.A. (Mehl tests).

TABLE 4.4 -- Standard deviations for pre and post tests of the S.L.C.A.A.

	Control	Experimental
Pre Test	.2502	.2230
Post Test	.1689	.2089

Both tables 4.3 and 4.4 confirm the results of tables 4.1 and 4.2. There is a wider distribution of scores for the experimental group than for the control group in each of the post tests.

The next step in the analysis was to determine if the data thus far presented related to the two hypotheses in question.

Table 4.5 presents the results of the univariate anova test of the data as it relates to null hypothesis I.

Null Hypothesis I

There will be no significant difference in gain scores in reading achievement between experimental and control groups of tutors as measured by the Von Harrison Reading Test.

TABLE 4.5 -- Univariate Analysis of Variance in Reading Scores

Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	Multivariate F	P Less Than
1228.4503	1.37	43.1206	.0001

The results indicate P less than .0001, thus there are significant differences between the mean of experimental and control groups on the pre and post Von Harrison test, in favor of the experimental group.

Null Hypothesis II

There will be no significant difference in gain scores in student level of confidence in their academic ability between experimental and control groups of tutors as measured by the Mehl test of Student Level of Confidence in Academic Ability.

TABLE 4.6 -- Univariate Analysis of Variance in S.L.C.A.A. Scores

Mean Square	Degrees of Freedom	Multivariate F	P Less Than
1.7307	1.37	47.035	.0001

The results again show P less than .0001, and indicate that there are significant differences between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups of the Mehl test, in favor of the experimental group.

The results of the data support rejection of both of the null hypotheses of the study.

Secondary Analysis

While the primary purpose of this study was to see if sixth graders reading below grade level could be helped to make progress in their reading ability, additional data were gathered.

Involved in any tutor relationship is the tutee. The reading progress of the tutees was also charted. The tutees were pre and post tested, using the Von Harrison reading tests. The tutees were not selected by a specific statistical sampling method. Forty second grade students were identified as "needing help in reading" by their teachers. All names were alphabetized and every other name was selected for the experimental group to be tutored by the sixth grade tutors. The control group received no tutoring.

Table 4.7 provided the means of the results of the pre and post tests for the tutees.

TABLE 4.7 -- Pre and post tests in reading achievement for the tutees.

	Pre Reading	Post Reading	Mean Difference
Experimental	1.59	3.42	+1.83

The mean difference for the tutees involved suggests that the Von Harrison reading program does what it was designed to do. (See Appendix C for grade equivalent scores.) Von Harrison's intent was to take low-achieving tutors and train them to tutor low-achieving tutees. The implications of this research are mentioned in Chapter V.

Findings

There were significant differences reported between the experimental and control groups on reading achievement as measured by the Von Harrison reading test. The experimental group, the sixth graders who tutored low achieving second graders, made more reading gains than did their counterparts in the control group.

There were significant differences reported between the experimental and control groups on the student level of self confidence in academic ability as measured by the Mehl test. Students in the experimental group scored lower which means they had a higher level of self confidence of academic ability.

The secondary analysis indicates that the tutees in the experimental group made significant gains in reading

achievement as measured by the Von Harrison reading test over the control group who received no tutoring.

Summary

This chapter reported the analysis of the data and listed the findings of the study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Problem

It was the intent of this study to find the effect of participation in a structured tutorial program on a group of low achieving readers at the sixth grade level. A control group was identified and exposed to the traditional reading programs his or her school was currently offering. The experimental group, located at the same school, received indoctrination, testing, and instruction, and then acted as tutors to a group of second graders who were identified as "needing help in reading" by their teacher.

It was expected that two things would happen to the experimental group.

1. The mean reading level of the experimental group would increase at a faster level than the control group.
2. The experimental group's rating on the Mehl self confidence of academic ability would show an increase in their self confidence of academic ability.

The research questions were stated in the null hypothesis form and were tested statistically by examining

the difference between the experimental and control groups using a multivariate analysis.

The results of the study indicated that both of the null hypotheses were rejected with P less than .0001.

The Sample

The population from which the sample of tutors was drawn was the sixth grade of the Willow Street School in Lansing, Michigan. The research design was drawn up with the cooperation of the Research Department of the College of Education, Michigan State University.

Instruments Used to Collect the Data

The Von Harrison reading test was selected to pre and post test all subjects.

The Mehl test for the student level of confidence of academic ability was used to pre and post test all tutor clients in the program.

Data Analysis

The test program was intended to identify whether or not the treatment of the experimental and control groups produced a mean difference in reading achievement in reading level, and level of confidence of self concept of academic ability. The data were collected, mean scores were found and the mean scores were compared.

Findings

Results of the analysis showed that the mean difference of both the reading level and the level of confidence of academic ability of the experimental group did increase; and that the findings were significant at less than the .0001 level of significance. Further, the second grade tutees demonstrated reading gains significantly greater than the non-tutees.

Conclusions

1. A basic conclusion of this study is that involvement in the Von Harrison structural tutorial program was successful in improving the reading of readers of low achievement at the sixth grade level in the population studied.

2. A second basic conclusion is that involvement in the Von Harrison program also increased the level of confidence of academic ability as measured by the Mehl test of sixth grade students involved within the program.

3. In addition, those younger children who were tutored scored mean gains that indicate a growth that gives further support for using a structured tutoring program.

Discussion

For many years educators have tried to come up with "a program" or "a system" that would satisfy the learning needs of all the students. The Von Harrison structured tutorial program as used here, proved to be a promising tool to increase the reading level of tutors and tutees alike.

It is not, however, to be concluded from this study that this is "the system" or "the program." Rather it is a diagnostic, prescriptive program that proved here to lend itself inexpensively to the needs of some students.

Recommendations

This investigation was undertaken to test the realtionship between the use of the Von Harrison Tutorial Reading Program as a means of increasing reading levels and its effect on the clients level of confidence of academic ability.

As a result of this study it is recommended that educators give serious consideration to the use of structured tutorial programs. This recommendation would apply to its use for achieving students and non-achieving students alike. The research regarding tutorial programs should not be confused with structured tutorial programs. The key seems to be that a structured program offered on a one-to-one basis produces gain scores not realized by non-structured tutoring programs.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. This test be replicated with a different population to see if results are the same.
2. That the prescription be given for a full academic year to reduce the Hawthorne effect and to see if gains are substantial.
3. Test the same group a year later to see if mean gain scores hold over time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, James E., Jr. "The Right to Read Target for the 1970's," The PTA Magazine, LXIV (December, 1969): 6-7.

Barbe, Walter B. Educators Guide to Personalized Reading Instruction. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1961.

Baun, Eugene. "The Washington University Campus Y Tutoring Project," Peabody Journal of Education (1965), pp. 161-168.

Beck, Carlton E., and others. Education for Relevance. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Brogan, Peggy and Lorene Fox. Helping Children Learn. New York: World Bood Company, 1955.

Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Incorporated, 1960.

Bush, Clifford L., and Mildred H. Huebner. Strategies for Reading in the Elementary School. London: MacMillan Company, 1970.

Chasnoff, Robert E. Elementary Curriculum. New York: Pitman Publishing Company, 1964.

Cloward, Robert D. "The Nonprofessional in Education: Mobilization of Youth's Tutorial Project," Educational Leadership (1967), pp. 604-606.

Cohen, S. Alan. Teach Them All to Read. New York: Random House, 1969.

Combs, Arthur W. The Professional Education of Teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1965.

Daniels, Steve. How 2 Gerbils, 20 Goldfish, 200 Games, 2,000 Books, and I Taught Them How To Read. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1969.

Dawson, Don. "Some Issues in Groups for Reading," National Department of Elementary School Principals 34th Yearbook of the International Education Association, (Washington, D.C.: 1955).

BIBLIOGRAPHY (continued)

Dawson, Mildred A. and Frieda Hayes Dingee. Children Learn the Language Arts. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1959.

Duker, Sam. Individualized Reading: An Annotated Bibliography. Metchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1968.

Durell, D. D. "First Grade Reading Success," Journal of Education, No. 3 (1969).

Fader, Daniel W. and Elton B. McNeil. Hooked on Books: Program and Proof. New York: A Berkley Medallion Book, 1970.

Fantini, Mario D. and Gerald Weinstein. The Disadvantaged Challenge to Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Fenewich, H. English and Donald K. Sharpes. Strategies for Differentiated Staffing. Berkley: McCutchan Publishing Company, 1970.

Freund, Janet. "Time and Knowledge to Share," Elementary School Journal, (February, 1965) pp. 351-358.

Fromm, Erich. The Art of Loving. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Glasser, William. Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

Gordon, Ira J., Robert L. Curran, and Donald L. Avila. An Inter-Disciplinary Approach to Improving the Development of Culturally Disadvantaged Children. Gainesville, Florida: College of Education, University of Florida, 1966.

Goslin, David A. The School In Contemporary Society. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1965.

Heilman, Arthur W. Phonics in Proper Perspective. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1964.

Hildreth, Gertrude. Teaching Reading. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1958.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (continued)

Holt, John. How Children Fail. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1964.

_____. How Children Learn. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1967.

Kearney, Nolan C. "An Analysis of the Vocabulary of First Grade Reading Materials," Journal of Educational Research, Volume XLIII, March, 1950.

Lacy, Don. "Readings Place in an Effective Society," International Reading Association Conference Proceedings, Scholastic Magazine, (January, 1958): 20.

Lee, D. M. and R. VanAllen. Learning to Read Through Experience (revised edition). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Incorporated, 1963.

Mehl, John Walter. Parental Attitudes Toward the School, Student Confidence, Level of Academic Ability, Selected Indices of Student Achievement, A Comparative Study of Relationships. (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1972).

Michael, Stephan, and William Issac. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego: Robert P. Knapp Publisher, 1971.

Noce, James. Research and Evaluation in Tutorial Programs. Washington, D.C.: Tutorial Assistance Center, 1967.

Portuges, Stephan H. and Norma D. Feshback. "The Effects of Teachers' Reinforcement Style Upon Imitative Behavior of Children," A.E.R.A. Paper Abstracts, ed. Henry Hausdorf (Washington, D.C.: American Educational Resdarch Association, 1968), p. 268.

Rogers, Vincent R. Teaching in The British Primary School. London: MacMillan Company, 1970.

Ryan, Kevin and James M. Cooper. Those Who Can, Teach. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972.

Schatz, Esther. Exploring Elementary Reading in the Elementary Classroom. The Ohio State University, 1960.

Schwebel, Milton. Who Can Be Educated? New York: Grove Press, Incorporated, 1968.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (continued)

Smith, Nila Barton. Historical Analysis of American Reading Instruction. New York: Silver Burdett, Company, 1934.

Spache, George. "New Trends in Primary-Grade Readers," Elementary School Journal, XLII, December, 1941.

Telego, Gene. "A Teen Tutorial Program," Pacereport, Lexington, Kentucky: A publication of the College of Education, University of Kentucky, May-June, 1968.

Veatch, Jeanette. "Individualized Reading for Success in the Classroom," The Educational Trend, April, 1954.

_____. Individualizing Your Reading Program. New York: G. P. Putnam and Sons, 1959.

_____. Reading in the Elementary Schools. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1966.

Von Harrison, Grant. Beginning Reading I: A Professional Guide for the Lay Tutor. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1972, p. 25.

Walker, Jess M. A Comparative Study of Personalized Reading in an Open-Learning Environment, and Basal Text Reading in a Traditional Learning Environment through Early Elementary Pupil Achievement. (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970).

Witty, Paul. Reading in Modern Education. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1949.

Yoakam, Gerald A. Basal Reading Instruction. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Incorporated, 1955.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Instructor's Guide to Tutorial Reading Program[1]

Chapter 3

TRAINING GUIDE

INTRODUCTION

The following materials will assist the supervisor in training the tutors. The training schedule suggests seven training sessions; however, the time required to train tutors will vary. If it is possible to schedule training sessions for one hour instead of one-half hour, the training can be completed in four sessions.

On the other hand if the tutors being trained are lax in reading the Home Study Materials, it will take more time. Also, if low achievers are selected as tutors, it may take more time to train them. For example, if the tutors do not know the sounds of certain letters, it will be necessary to teach them these sounds in addition to the specified tutoring techniques and procedures.

The school's reading specialist can prepare a tape of appropriate sound models for the tutors to listen to. The Sound Guide is adequate for answering any questions regarding the specific sounds of any of the individual letters or combinations of letters.

The supervisor should read carefully the Tutor Home Study Materials (Chapter 4) and the Training Guide very carefully before he conducts the training sessions. It is

---

[1]Used by permission of the author, Grant Von Harrison.

absolutely essential that he demonstrate the various tutoring techniques and procedures before he has the tutors practice them by roleplaying. This necessitates that the trainer be highly conversant with all aspects of the training.

Before he meets with the tutors, the supervisor must make arrangements with their teachers for them to be released from class at designated times. It is also necessary that the supervisor allow one week between the third and fourth training sessions for each tutor to begin working with a student who needs help with names of letters, sounds, or sight words before introducing the tutors to the tutoring procedures covered in the third, fourth, and fifth sets of the Home Study Materials.

At the conclusion of the training, the tutors should be able to handle any one of the following instructional prescriptions: naming letters, producing sounds of letters and letter combinations, blending sounds, decoding words, reading sight words, and reading orally.

ORIENTATION SESSION

Materials

- A copy of the Home Study Materials for each tutor being trained.
- A copy of the schedule of the training sessions.

Equipment

- A chair for each tutor being trained.

Procedures

- Cover the prescribed dialogue and instructions.
- Answer any questions the students have regarding their roles as tutors.

Dialogue and Instructions

Congratulations. You have been selected to be a tutor. A tutor is a special kind of teacher who teaches one person at a time.

Before being assigned to tutor a younger student, you will be taught how to tutor.

Review the schedule of the training sessions with the tutors.

Today you will be given some home study materials which will explain what you do the first time you meet a student.

In the training sessions you will practice how to tutor a student by means of role-playing.

Define role-playing.

After you have completed your training, you will be assigned to tutor a younger student who needs special help with his school work.

Conclusion

- Answer any questions the tutors may have.
- Give each tutor the Home Study Materials and a copy of the training schedule.
- Stress how important it is that each tutor study the first set of the Home Study Materials very carefully before the first training session.
- Explain that in the first training session each of them will practice meeting with a student for the first time.
- Praise the tutors for accepting the responsibility to be tutors.
- Tell them where and when the next training sessions will be held.

TRAINING SESSION ONE

Note: The trainer should review the first set of the Home Study Materials very carefully before conducting the first training session.

Materials

- A set of flash cards for each pair of tutors.
- A Contingency Record.
- The first set of the Home Study Materials.

Equipment

- A table and two chairs for each pair of tutors being trained.

Procedure

- Begin the prescribed dialogue.
- Follow the instructions on how to conduct various phases of the training session.
- Have only one tutor respond when a response from the tutors is requested.
- If the response is adequate, praise the tutor and restate the answer.
- Example:

  Trainer: "Why is it important to ask the student friendly questions?"

  Tutor: "So he will like us and not be afraid."

  Trainer: "Very good. If you don't ask the student friendly questions he might be frightened."

- Praise the tutors consistently after they practice the various tutoring techniques.

Dialogue and Instructions

What should you remember to do when you are speaking to the student? (Smile, speak in a friendly voice, speak

slowly and clearly. Briefly discuss the why for each point.)

What should you remember to never say when a student makes a mistake? ("No that is wrong" or "That isn't right")

How does it make a student fell if you tell him no or that an answer is wrong? (Bad.)

What do you do before you meet with a student for the first time? (Pick up your tutoring assignment sheets from your supervisor so that you will know what you will be teaching the student and also obtain the instructional materials you will need, e.g. flash cards, decoding exercises, storybooks.)

What are the questions you ask the student to put him at ease? (What is your name? Do you have pets? Do you like to play games?)

Play the role of the tutor and have one of the student tutors play the role of the student in order to demonstrate asking the designed questions.

Next, divide the tutors into pairs and instruct them to take turns playing the role of student. Have each tutor go once through the questions which are designed to put the student at ease.

Also instruct the tutors to always sit on either side of the child, never across from him, and to hold the flash cards in their left hands. After each tutor has gone

once through the questions which are designed to put the student at ease, select one tutor to demonstrate asking the questions in front of the entire group and another to play the role of the student. Then critique the tutor's performance in front of the group.

Did he remember to smile?

Did he speak in a friendly voice?

Did he ask all of the questions?

Did he say something each time the student answered a question before asking another question?

If you were assigned to teach the child the names of letters l, t, p, c, and b, what instructional materials would you pick up before you meet with the student? (Three flash cards for each letter.)

How many flash cards for each letter do you place in your stack to start with? (One.)

What do you do after you explain what the flash cards gave on them? (Hold up one flash card at a time, tell the student the correct answer, and have him repeat the correct answer.)

What do you say each time the student repeats the answer correctly? ("That is right" or "Very good.")

Why is it important to praise the student every time he is correct? (It provides encouragement, makes him feel good, motivates him.)

What don't you do if a student repeats the answer incorrectly? (Say no.)

What do you do if a student repeats the answer incorrectly? (Tell him the correct answer.)

What do you do if the student mumbles or does not speak clearly? (Encourage him to speak clearly.)

What do you do if the student speaks softly? (Ask him to speak louder.)

How long do you go through the stack of flash cards? (Approximately fifteen minutes.)

Play the role of the tutor and demonstrate having the student (played by the tutor) repeat the correct answer to the stimuli in the flash cards.

Provide each pair of tutors with a set of flash cards (one flash card for six different stimuli), and instruct the tutors to take turns playing the role of the student. They are to repeat the answer incorrectly twice and whisper answers correctly twice when they play the role of the student.

While the tutors are practicing, watch for the following:

. Do the tutors consistently praise the student for repeating the answer correctly?

. Do the tutors avoid saying no if the student repeats the answer incorrectly?

. Do the tutors ask the student to speak louder if he whispers?

. Do the tutors playing the role of the student repeat the answer incorrectly twice?

. Do the tutors playing the role of the student whisper the correct answer twice?

If necessary the tutors are to be reminded of the above points.

Did anyone forget to praise the student when he repeated the answer correctly?

Did anyone say no when the student repeated the answer incorrect?

Did anyone forget to have the student speak louder when he whispered?

What do you say and do before you send the student back to class?

Say things that will let the student know he has done well: for example, "You really have done well today. When I see your teacher I am going to tell her how well you did." When the student learns what I am assigned to teach him, I report to my supervisor. If the student passes a mastery test, I help place a star on his record.

Next, show the tutors the Contingency Record and explain how it is maintained.

What do you do after the student has returned to class? (Fill out the Tutor Log.)

What information do you record on your Tutor Log? (The date, the number of the instructional prescription, comments about how the student reacted and what he learned.) The supervisor should decide in advance what information he wants the tutors to record.

How long do you continue to have the student repeat the correct answers when you work with him? (Until he has learned to say at least two of the new correct answers without help.)

Conclusion

- Answer any questions the tutors may have.
- Stress how important it is that each tutor go over the second set of the Home Study Materials before the next session.

TRAINING SESSION TWO

Note: The trainer should review the second set of the Home Study Materials very carefully before conducting the second training session.

Materials

- A set of flash cards for each pair of tutors (three copies of at least six different stimuli in file boxes of packets).
- A Tutor Log for each tutor.
- The second set of Home Study Materials.

Equipment

- A table and two chairs for each pair of tutors.

Procedures

- Begin the prescribed dialogue.
- Follow the instructions on how to conduct various phases of the training session.
- Have only one tutor respond when a response from the tutors is requested.

Dialogue and Instructions

What are the things you should remember when you are speaking to the child? (Smile, speak in a friendly voice, speak slowly and clearly.)

How do you check to see if the child has learned some of the correct answers? (Ask him to tell you the answer for each flash card and keep track of those he is able to answer correctly.)

Play the role of the tutor and demonstrate checking to see if the student has learned some of the answers. Have the tutor playing the role of the student answer correctly to three of the flash cards. Demonstrate recording on the Tutor Log the answers the student has learned. Provide each pair of tutors a set of flash cards and two tutor logs. Instruct each pair to take out of the box one flash card for six different answers. Have the tutors practice checking to see if the student has learned at least two answers and then record the results on the Tutor Log.

Instruct the tutors to do the following when they play the role of the student:

. Get two answers correct.

. Hesitate in some answers.

. Answer incorrectly.

While the tutors are role-playing, watch for the following:

. Did the tutors remember not to tell the student the correct answers?

. Did the tutors remember not to tell the student whether or not his answer was correct?

. Did the tutor remember to go to the next card if the student hesitated in answering?

. Did the tutor remember to keep track of the cards for which the student knew the answers?

If necessary, remind the tutors of these points, and be sure to have them fill out the Tutor Log.

If the child has learned at least two answers from repeating the answers, what do you do? (Start to teach one new answer.)

If the child has not learned at least two answers from repeating the answers, what do you do? (Continue to have the child repeat the correct answer until he has learned at least two answers.)

Have the tutors practice, by means of role-playing, everything that has been covered thus far in the training sessions:

. Putting the student at ease.

. Having the student repeat the correct answers.

. Checking to see if the student has learned at least two answers.

. Making entries in the Tutor Log.

. Concluding a session.

Stress to the student that they must be able to remember to practice these techniques.

Each time you work with the child, say things that will make him enjoy being tutored.

At the conclusion of the student's tutoring session, make an entry in your Tutor Log.

Conclusion

- Answer any questions the tutors may have.
- Tell the tutors to study very carefully steps 3 through 9 in the second set of the Home Study Materials before the next training session.
- Explain that in the next training session, they will practice teaching new answers, using the flash cards.
- Praise the tutors.
- Tell them where and when the next training session will be held.

TRAINING SESSION THREE

Note: Review steps 3 through 9 in the second set of the Home Study Materials very carefully before conducting the third training session.

Materials

- A set of flash cards for each set of tutors being trained.
- A Tutor Log for each tutor being trained.

Equipment

- A table and two chairs for each pair of tutors.

Procedures

- Begin the prescribed dialogue.
- Follow the instructions on how to conduct various phases of the training session.
- Have only one tutor respond when a response from the tutors is requested.

Dialogue and Instructions

What do you do before you meet with the student to start to teach him a new answer? (Prepare a stack of flash cards made up of all the answers the student knows, plue the three flash cards for one of the answers he does not know; shuffle the stack.)

Demonstrate preparing a stack of flash cards to teach the student an answer he does not know (e.g., when tested, the student knew hypothetically in the previous session, and tell him one new answer to teach.)

Then check for the following:

. Does the stack contain one flash card for each answer the student knows?

. Does the stack contain three flash cards for one new answer?

. Did the tutor mix up the flash cards?

. Is the first card in the stack one of the flash cards for which the student knows the answer?

When you start to teach a new answer, do you tell the student the correct answer? (No, I ask the student to tell me the answer.)

What do you do if the student answers correctly? ("That is right" or "Very good.")

What do you do if the student is slow to answer or says he does not know the correct answer? (Tell him the correct answer and have him repeat it.)

What do you do if the student answers incorrectly? (Do not say no or that is wrong; simply tell the child the correct answer and have him repeat it.)

How long do you drill the student with flash cards? (Approximately five minutes.)

Demonstrate teaching the student a new answer. Instruct the tutor who plays the role of the student to miss the new letter the first few times it comes up.

Give each set of tutors a set of flash cards and have them practice teaching the student a new answer. Instruct them when they play the role of the student to miss the new answer at least four times and to hesitate at least five times.

Check for the following:

. Did the tutor consistently praise the student?

. Did the tutor tell the student the correct answer if he hesitated?

. Did the tutor refrain from saying no when the student answered incorrectly?

Have the tutors practice concluding a session and making an entry in the Tutor Log.

What do you do in the next session if the student learned the new answer? (Start to teach him one more new answer.)

What do you do in the next session if the student did not learn the new answer? (Continue to drill the student on the same answer until he learns it.)

What flash cards do you put in the stack after the student learns the new answer? (Put one flash card for every answer the student learned from repeating the correct answers, two flash cards with the answer taught in the last session, one flash card for each answer taught before the last session, three flash cards with the new answer that is going to be taught.)

Demonstrate preparing the stack of flash cards for a later session (e.g., the student knows a, m, and n when checked after he has repeated the correct answers; f and i have been taught in previous sessions; s was taught in the last session; and t will be taught in the next session.)

Have the tutors practice preparing the stack of flash cards for a later session. Tell them which answers the student learned from repeating the correct answers, which answers have been taught, which new answer was taught in the last session, and what new answer is to be taught in the next session.

What do you do if the student forgets an answer which he has known previously? (Keep going through the stack until the child is able to answer correctly for each flash card.)

What should you do if the student consistently has trouble remembering an answer that has been taught? (Do not put a new answer in the stack until the student is able to answer correctly for each flash card already in the stack.)

What do you do when the student learns the correct answer for each flash card? (Report to the supervisor.)

Conclusion

- Answer any questions the tutors may have.
- Explain that in the next session, which is to be the last training session of the first phase of their training, the tutors will practice everything that have learned.
- Tell them to review completely the second set of the Home Study Materials.
- Tell the tutors that if they do well in the next training session, they will be assigned to tutor a student.
- Praise the tutors.
- Tell them where and when the next training session will be held.

TRAINING SESSION FOUR

Materials

- A set of flash cards for each set of tutors being trained.
- A Tutor Log for each tutor.
- A copy of the specific procedures the tutors are to follow (e.g., going to and from class, picking up materials, reporting the student's progress to the supervisor.)
- A copy of the Instructional Sequence for each tutor.

- The tutor assignment sheets filled out (if possible) for each tutor, assigning him to help a studnet with an instructional prescription which requires the use of the flash cards (those containing letter names, letter sounds, and so forth.)

Equipment

- A table and two chairs for each pair of tutors.

Procedures

- Begin the prescribed dialogue.
- Follow the instructions on how to conduct various phases of the training session.
- Have only one tutor respond when a response from the tutors is requested.

Dialogue and Instructions

Today we are going to pretend that you have just been assigned to tutor a student and that you will be meeting with him several different times on different days.

Give each tutor a copy of the tutor assignment sheets and a copy of the Instructional Sequence. The tutor assignment sheets should contain the student's name and room number and assign the tutor to help the student with the fourteenth instructional prescription.

Show the tutors how to use the Instructional Sequence to determine what specific letter names, letter sounds, or sight words are in a particular instructional prescription.

Now take turns pretending you are meeting with the student for the first time.

Ask him questions to put him at ease.

Get one flash card for each answer you are assigned to teach him.

Have the student repeat the correct answers three times. If you were actually tutoring a student you would have him repeat the correct answers for ten minutes.

Conclude the session.

Make an entry on your Tutor Log.

After each tutor has practiced conducting the first session, have him pretend it is the next day and instruct him to check to see if the student has learned at least two answers. Tell the tutor to answer correctly for only two flash cards when he plays the role of the student.

Remind him to conclude the session and then make an entry in his Tutor Log.

Next, have the tutors practice preparing their flash cards for the next session in which they will be teaching the first new answer. Then have them pretend they are meeting with the student for the third time. Remind the tutors to make an entry in their tutor logs after they conclude the session.

Have the tutors practice preparing their flash cards for a later session in which they will be teaching the student the last new answer they were assigned to teach him. Remind the tutors again, if necessary, to make an entry in their tutor logs after they conclude the session.

Direct the rest of the session, and if necessary an additional session, to the specific procedures the tutors are to follow (e.g., picking up and returning flash cards, returning to class). These should be written out in detail and duplicated for each tutor.

Conclusion

- Give the tutors their first assignments at this time if at all possible. If this is not possible, let them know when they will receive their first assignment.
- Explain that the next training session will be scheduled after this group of tutors has had the opportunity to tutor students using the flash cards for approximately one week.
- Do not assign a tutor to tutor a student if for some reason he has not mastered the specified tutoring techniques.
- Praise the tutors.

TRAINING SESSION FIVE

Note: The fifth training session should not be conducted until each student tutor has had an opportunity to tutor a student using flashcard drills for approximately one week.

The trainer should review the third set of the Home Study Materials very carefully before conducting the fifth training session.

Materials

- One blending exercise for each pair of tutors.
- A Contingency Record.
- A Tutor Log for each tutor.

Equipment

. A table and two chairs for each pair of tutors being trained.

Procedures

. Follow the instructions on how to conduct various phases of the training session.

. Have only one tutor respond when a response from the tutors is requested.

Conducting Instructions

. Review and discuss with the tutors the study questions for the third set of the Home Study Materials.

. Demonstrate the procedures the tutors should follow when they are working with the blending exercises.

. Have the tutors practice the procedures by means of role playing.

. Critique the performance of the tutors. Remember that it is imperative that they they learn the specific techniques for teaching the blending of sounds and that they follow them precisely; otherwise they will be almost totally ineffective in teaching students to blend the sounds of letters.

. Have the tutors practice concluding a session and filling out their tutor logs.

. Discuss the procedures the tutors should follow in reporting to their supervisor when the student is able to blend the sounds on a blending exercise. Discuss also the procedures they should follow in marking the Contingency Record.

Conclusion

- Praise the tutors.
- Tell the tutors to carefully study the fourth set of the Home Study Materials.
- Tell the tutors where and when the next training session will be held.

TRAINING SESSION SIX

Note: The trainer should carefully review the fourth set of the Home Study Materials before conducting the sixth training session.

Materials

- One decoding exercise for each pair of tutors being trained.
- A Contingency Record for each tutor.
- A Tutor Log for each tutor.

Equipment

- A table and two chairs for each pair of tutors being trained.

Procedures

- Follow the instructions on how to conduct various phase of the training session.
- Have only one tutor respond when a response from the tutors is requested.

Conducting Instructions

- Review and discuss with the tutors the study questions for the fourth set of the Home Study Materials.
- Demonstrate the procedures the tutors should follow when they are working with one of the decoding exercises.

. Have the tutors practice the procedures by means of role playing.

. Have the tutors practice concluding a session and filling out their Tutor Logs.

. Discuss the procedures the tutors should follow in reporting to their supervisor when the student is able to blend the sounds on a blending exercise. Discuss also the procedures they should follow in marking the Contingency Record.

Conclusion

. Praise the tutors.

. Tell the tutors to carefully study the fifth set of the Home Study Materials.

. Tell the tutors where and when the next training session will be held.

TRAINING SESSION SEVEN

Note: The trainer should carefully review the fifth set of the Home Study Materials before conducting the seventh training session.

Materials

. One storybook for each pair of tutors.

. A Contingency Record for each tutor.

. Several copies of the Individual Student Progress Report.

. A Tutor Log for each tutor.

. The tutor assignment sheets (filled out) for each pair of tutors if they have not been assigned to tutor a child previously.

Equipment

. A table and two chairs for each pair of tutors being trained.

Procedures

. Follow the instructions on how to conduct various phases of the training.

. Have only one tutor respond when a response from the tutors is requested.

Conducting Instructions

. Review and discuss with the tutors the study questions for the fifth set of the Home Study Materials.

. Demonstrate the procedures the tutors should follow when the student is reading an exercise or a story-book orally.

. Have the tutors practice the procedures by role playing. So that the tutor will have a change to practice the specific tutoring techniques he has learned, instruct the tutor playing the role of the student to hesitate on some words and to read some words incorrectly.

. Have the tutors practice filling out their tutor logs.

. Discuss the procedures the tutors should follow in reporting to their supervisor when a student is able to read a storybook. Discuss also the procedures they should follow in marking the Contingency Record.

. Tell the tutors where the following materials are filed: blending exercises, decoding exercises, reading exercises, and storybooks. Discuss the procedures the tutors should follow in picking up and returning their materials.

. If the tutors have not previously been assigned to tutor students, give them their first assignment.

. Show the tutors how to fill out the Individual Student Progress Report.

Conclusion

. Answer any questions the tutors may have.

. Praise the tutors.

APPENDIX B

PRE & POST TEST SCORES FOR TUTORS

Experimental Group

Pre Test		Post Test	
Student Number	Grade Equivalent Score	Student Number	Grade Equivalent Score
1.	2.3	1.	4.1
2.	2.4	2.	4.4
3.	2.5	3.	4.0
4.	2.6	4.	3.8
5.	2.6	5.	5.1
6.	2.6	6.	3.8
7.	2.6	7.	4.2
8.	2.7	8.	2.9
9.	3.0	9.	3.9
10.	3.0	10.	4.0
11.	3.0	11.	3.1
12.	3.0	12.	5.4
13.	3.1	13.	5.2
14.	3.2	14.	4.8
15.	3.2	15.	4.6
16.	3.4	16.	4.2
17.	3.5	17.	4.2
18.	3.5	18.	3.6
19.	3.6	19.	4.2
20.	3.6	20.	5.1

Control Group

Pre Test		Post Test	
Student Number	Grade Equivalent Score	Student Number	Grade Equivalent Score
1.	2.3	1.	2.3
2.	2.4	2.	2.3
3.	2.5	3.	2.5
4.	2.6	4.	2.6
5.	2.6	5.	2.7
6.	2.6	6.	2.6
7.	2.6	7.	2.6
8.	2.7	8.	2.8
9.	3.0	9.	2.5
10.	3.0	10.	2.9
11.	3.0	11.	3.0
12.	3.0	12.	3.1
13.	3.1	13.	3.0
14.	3.2	14.	3.2

Appendix B (continued)

15.	3.2	15.	3.4
16.	3.4	16.	3.8
17.	3.5	17.	3.4
18.	3.5	18.	3.7
19.	3.6	19.	3.7
20.	3.6	20.	3.7

APPENDIX C

PRE & POST TEST SCORES FOR TUTEES

Pre Test		Post Test	
Student Number	Grade Equivalent Score	Student Number	Grade Equivalent Score
1.	1.2	1.	2.5
2.	1.4	2.	2.7
3.	1.5	3.	3.2
4.	1.0	4.	2.4
5.	1.7	5.	3.0
6.	1.8	6.	3.9
7.	2.1	7.	4.2
8.	2.2	8.	3.6
9.	2.3	9.	3.4
10.	1.3	10.	3.4
11.	1.4	11.	3.7
12.	1.3	12.	3.7
13.	1.1	13.	3.2
14.	1.8	14.	2.3
15.	2.4	15.	4.1
16.	3.1	16.	4.4
17.	1.6	17.	3.9
18.	1.1	18.	3.7
19.	1.2	19.	3.8
20.	1.4	20.	3.4