INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

74-25,324

SENDLER, Simson, 1928-
READING COMPREHENSION ON TWO PARALLEL SETS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EXERCISES BY UPPER ELEMENTARY STUDENTS.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1974
Education, curriculum development

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

READING COMPREHENSION ON TWO PARALLEL SETS OF SOCIAL STUDIES EXERCISES BY UPPER ELEMENTARY STUDENTS

by

Simson Sendler

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Education)
in The University of Michigan
1974

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Findlay C. Penix, Chairman
Associate Professor Irene K. Heller
Professor Kenneth E. Vance
Assistant Professor Laura E. Williams

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the persons who made it possible for me to undertake and finish this study.

My wife, Sue, without whom I would not have undertaken this study nor been able to continue through many discouragements.

Professor Findlay C. Penix, Chairman, who has worked very patiently for several years and given much time to advise and assist me.

Associate Professor Irene K. Heller, Professor Kenneth E. Vance, and Assistant Professor Laura E. Williams, members of the committee. Their contribution to organizing and clarifying this study is appreciated.

Ms. Percy Porter and Mr. Eugene Gilmer, principals of the two schools in the study, who permitted me to work in their buildings.

Ms. Marilyn Cheff, who allowed me to conduct the study in her classroom, and Ms. Ruthie Johnson, who administered the exercises to her classes in a very competent and professional manner.

Laurie Sendler, who corrected the papers and also helped type.

Douglas, Brian, and Edward Sendler, who ran the computer and sometimes kept quiet.

I also wish to thank the Garrard Publishing Company, the Bobbs-Merrill Company, and the Houghton Mifflin Company for permission to use material from books published by their firms.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES. v

CHAPTER

I. BACKGROUND AND NATURE OF STUDY 1

Need for Study
General Area of Study
Specific Area of Study
Method of Study
Necessity for Ethnic Studies

II. REVIEW OF SELECTED RESEARCH 9

Language Development
Multi-Ethnic Readers
Reading Materials for the Disadvantaged
Interest
Identification
Self Concept
Black Studies
Textbooks
Summary

III. RESEARCH DESIGN, PROCEDURE, AND ANALYSIS OF DATA 18

Purpose of the Study
Hypotheses
Sample
Administration of Exercises
Construction of Exercises
Collection of Data
Analysis of Data

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY 38

Comparison of Mean Scores by Group - Black Students
Comparison of Mean Scores by Group - White Students
Comparison of Mean Scores by Sex
Comparison of Mean Scores by Reading Grade Level - First Comparison
Comparison of Mean Scores by Reading Grade Level - Second Comparison
Summary of Data - Black Students
Summary of Data - White Students

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 66

Summary
Conclusions - Black Students
Conclusions - White Students
Implications
Recommendations for Future Research

APPENDICES 81

BIBLIOGRAPHY 116

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Income Level of School One and School Two . . .	22
2.	Educational Characteristics of School One and School Two	23
3.	Construction of Parallel Stories - First Exercise - Attucks, Clark	30
4.	Comparison of Mean Scores by Group - Group A .	39
5.	Comparison of Mean Scores by Group - Group B .	41
6.	Comparison of Mean Scores by Group - Group C .	43
7.	Comparison of Mean Scores by Group - Group D .	45
8.	Comparison of Mean Scores by Group - Group E .	47
9.	Summary of Significant Differences as Reported in Tables 4, 5, 7, 8 for Groups A, B, D, E	52
10.	Comparison of Mean Scores by Sex - Groups A, B, D, E, Boys	54
11.	Comparison of Mean Scores by Sex - Groups A, B, D, E, Girls	55
12.	Comparison of Mean Scores by Reading Grade Level - First Comparison - Groups A and B	57
13.	Comparison of Mean Scores by Reading Grade Level - First Comparison - Groups D and E	58
14.	Comparison of Mean Scores with Reading Grade Level - Second Comparison - All Groups . .	60

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND NATURE OF STUDY

Need for Study

A major symbol of education for past generations was often the rod. When the popular song referred to subjects "Taught to the tune of a hickory stick," it summed up an attitude that corporal punishment was an inescapable part of learning. Medieval and renaissance accounts of schooling emphasize memorization and whipping as the chief tools of learning. In the nineteenth centure Horace Mann encountered strong opposition when he tried to mitigate the "cowhiding" of the Boston masters. There are few sources, from antiquity till modern times, which do not speak of the necessity of the rod.

If corporal punishment has now largely disappeared, one basic reason may be the widespread acceptance of the doctrine of interest. Education of the past presupposed a body of knowledge which the child must master. This might take the form of oral sagas, catechisms, or irregular Greek conjugations. In any case it was considered necessary for individual salvation or for social good, and few questioned that physical punishment was a legitimate means of impressing

the necessary knowledge on the child. When modern education turned away from the hickory stick, it could be ascribed in part to an acceptance of two concepts. First, the individuality of the child was recognized and the child's legitimate right to choose was acknowledged. Secondly, it was felt that given this choice the child would learn better. Thus, as an indication of the learner's selection, interest came to be a respected fundamental of modern education.

There are, however, two considerations here which may become confused. The recognition that the child is a person with the right to make educational choices is a valid philosophic position and, if accepted, needs no further justification. This must be separated from the conclusion that given this choice, the student will learn with greater efficiency. Several psychologists have emphasized that the basic laws of educational psychology have not been established with unquestioned certainty. One contribution of educational psychology to classroom teaching has been to provide insights and alternate strategies of action. In this regard the potential for improvement of instruction has hardly been approached; yet few would hold that the laws of learning have been established on the same foundation as the physical laws of behavior. In 1952 Deese said:

> There are large areas of the psychology of learning where we are simply lacking the basic facts.[1]

> Psychologists do not yet fully understand the nature of the principles underlying learning.[2]

And in 1968, Coladarci wrote:

> At present, while the school represents an enormously complex psychological arena, the science of psychology is still struggling with its basic concepts and laws.[3]

One of the major educational efforts of our times has been the attempt to raise the measured achievement of underprivileged children to nationally standardized levels. Much of the goal remains unattained, and some have uttered harsher judgments. Jenson said, "Compensatory education has been tried, and it apparently has failed."[4] Many of the compensatory education programs made the basic assumption that interest would necessarily increase learning, in the same way that the effects of a chemical catalyst may be expected. It is suggested that a more fundamental knowledge of the specific effects of interest on learning might avoid past errors. It is toward this end that the present study is directed.

---

[1]James Deese, The Psychology of Learning (New York: McGraw Hill, 1952), p. 2.

[2]Ibid., p. 357.

[3]Arthur P. Coladarci, "Educational Psychology," in International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (The MacMillan Company and the Free Press, 1968), Vol. 4, pp. 535-536.

[4]Arthur R. Jenson, "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review 39 (Winter 1969)

General Area of Study

One element in the compound or intermixture of interest is often thought to be identification of the reader with characters in the reading materials. Dewey presented the classic formulation of this concept:

> The genuine principle of interest is the principle of the recognized identity of the fact to be learned, or the action proposed with the growing self...Let this condition of identification once be secured, and we have neither to appeal to sheer strength of will, nor to occupy ourselves with making things interesting.
>
> Interest in persons is a strong, special interest...Small children's concern with persons is remarkably intense...It is through entering into the actions of others, directly and imaginatively, that he finds the most signficiant and the most rewarding of all his experiences.[5]

This insight has received wide acceptance in modern educational thought and practice. It is seen in its clearest form in those activities in which the children enter imaginatively into the life of the Indian, the ancient Romans, or the modern Japanese. When teachers apply this principle to more formal learning, and especially to sequential programs of reading, the application is not always so self evident. Two types of questions in particular require careful study.

Dewey spoke of securing the "condition of identification." It is first necessary to determine what

---

[5]John Dewey, Interest and Effort in Education (Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1913), pp. 13-14.

circumstances make for identification. One determinant often suggested is similarity of reader and character. However this cannot be automatically assumed. Interest surveys, for example, usually show that girls evince a strong interest in male adventure stories, and children normally identify with the most improbable knights and animals. Secondly, the effects of interest on reading skills must be considered, and certain questions examined in detail: Will increased interest improve comprehension of general ideas? Will it improve immediate retention or delayed retention? Will it improve the learning of vocabulary skills? The present study seeks to clarify some of the issues raised above. The general area of study is the effect of interest, assumed to be generated by identification, on reading.

Specific Area of Study

Lack of identification is a theory often advanced as an explanation of reading difficulty in culturally deprived children. In the literature it is many times held that they do not relate to the reading material. They are considered unable to recognize the situation because the characters are of a different race and they cannot identify with them. This blocks out the incoming stimuli and the children "tune it out." Furthermore, there is no drive, no fuel to stoke the learning engine, as this is conceptualized in various models of learning behavior.

The logical corollary to this theory is that when children read about persons of their own race they identify with them. This has the effect of allowing the stimuli to come through and causes the stimuli to react more powerfully on the higher learning centers. It can also be theorized that reading about persons with whom they feel a sense of identity heightens the drive. In any event greater reading efficiency is the expected result.

A causal chain is thus often conceived, consisting of three assumptions.

1. Children will identify with personalities of their own race in the reading texts.
2. Identification will cause higher interest.
3. Interest will lead to greater reading efficiency.

A question may then be stated: If children read about personalities of their own race, will they learn to read better? There are clearly theoretical grounds for assuming that this is so, but failure to test theoretical beliefs may have been a cause of previous disappointments. Chall stated this failure to test assumptions very plainly:

> At this moment (1967) many people are pinning their hopes for helping culturally disadvantaged children to read better on a change in content, rather than a change in method. They are assuming that these children do poorly in reading because they lack the necessary concepts, and cannot identify with the suburban, White, well-to-do children in their readers.

This assumption has gone untested.[6]

Method of Study

The research hypothesis was first formulated which stated that children would read about personalities of their own race with greater comprehension than they read about personalities of another race. The research hypothesis was then restated in terms of two experimental hypotheses and two null hypotheses. These are presented in Chapter III.

Two sets of reading materials were then prepared. One dealt with four Black personalities in American history. A second set matched each Black personality with a comparable White personality. The exercises for the matched personalities were written to be as equivalent as possible in level of reading difficulty and story content.

The experimental group consisted of 143 fifth and sixth grade students in two schools. They were in four classes. For purposes of study the scores were divided into five groups, four groups of Black students and one group of White students. The mean scores of each group on the tests were computed. The basic analysis was a comparison of the mean scores for each pair of personalities. Following this the scores were further analyzed by sex and by reading grade

---

[6]Jeanne S. Chall, Learning to Read: The Great Debate (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), p. 311.

level. The questions to be examined were, first, would any differences appear between the mean scores on the tests of the Black personalities and the mean scores on the tests of the White personalities? And secondly, what reasons could be postulated for either observed differences or lack of differences?

Necessity for Ethnic Studies

The present study centers on reading efficiency. It should be stated that there is an inherent reason for teaching Black studies, Irish studies, Swedish studies or other ethnic studies in all schools which has nothing to do with reading efficiency. The contribution of minority groups to world history and to American history is a legitimate and greatly neglected field of study. It is something all students should learn as a matter of course. It is necessary that this normal program be separated from the assumption that it will raise reading efficiency. Premature claims of reading gains can only cloud the need for a thorough, systematic program of ethnic studies at all levels.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED RESEARCH

The literature was surveyed to examine the evidence relating to the influence of interest on reading efficiency. The great bulk of the literature centers on attempts to ascertain what children's interests are. Only a small number of studies were found relating to the influence of interest on reading or on any types of learning.

Language Development

Language Development programs are based on a child's immediate experience. The child may be assumed to identify with the subject as it is from his own life. He may be further assumed to read with increased interest and thus to read better. Some studies have made a direct analysis of this assumption.

Bailey (1967) compared the reading achievement of five groups of disadvantaged first graders, matching a language development program with four other programs. She found no significant difference in achievement. The largest and most carefully controlled study of language development programs is that of Harris et al. (1966, 1967). In this study,

teachers of disadvantaged children were allowed to choose which type of program they preferred and teach their classes according to that method. Basal reader programs were compared with language experience type programs. At the end of the first year the basal reader groups scored slightly higher on the reading tests. By the second year there were no important differences consistently favoring either group. Harris concluded that differences between individual classes were much larger than differences between methods and approaches. Bergeman (1969) compared language experience programs with basal reader programs in the first grade. She also found no important differences. Thus, the assumption that children will read better because they can identify personally with the reading materials is not supported by these studies.

Multi-Ethnic Readers

Multi-Ethnic Readers contain characters of different minority groups and are expressly intended to stimulate identification. Blom et al. (1965) and Collier (1967) evaluated present multi-ethnic readers and found them wanting in several respects. As Whipple said, "We cannot assume that a child looking at stylized pictures will identify

himself, his family, and his neighborhood."[1]

An experiment reported in 1963 was based on a direct comparison of basal readers with a multi-ethnic series. Whipple compared 12 classes of first graders who alternately used the pre-primers of a standard series and then the City Schools Series (Follett Readers). She concluded:

> With the total group of pupils, the City School Series is significantly more effective than the standard series in promoting word recognition.
>
> In oral reading, although the differences between the averages for the two series were slight, the difference consistently favored the City Series.
>
> With boys, the City Series was much more successful than the standard series in promoting verbal ability.
>
> The most striking increase in verbal ability through the use of the City School Series is that for the Negro group.[2]

Reading Materials for the Disadvantaged

Criscuolo (1968) found satisfactory results by using standard basal readers intensively with disadvantaged children and concluded "Since the content of the Basal Readers

---

[1]Gertrude Whipple, "Issues Relating to Basic Instruction in Reading," in Reading: Seventy-Five Years of Progress, edited by Alan Robinson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 53.

[2]Gertrude Whipple, Appraisal of the City Schools Reading Program (Detroit: Detroit Public Schools, Language Education Department, 1963), p. 30.

used in this study was not multi-ethnic as such, it is suggested that the criticism of basal readers for use with culturally disadvantaged children is not completely justified."[3]

Hogue (1965) reported on the Button Family Adventures, a series written for "children from families of low socio-economic circumstances." When used with such children in Louisiana he found no improvement in reading ability. A more hopeful study was presented by Edgar (1965). His participants were Negro and Puerto Rican children who developed fictional and biographical material that integrated a limited number of Social Studies concepts with other subjects. Over a three-year period the experimental group gained more on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale than the control group. The project had clear goals and a simple teaching methodology.

Interest

Only one report of actual research investigating the effects of interest on reading efficiency has thus far been discovered in the literature. Schnayer (1968) had children read stories at two grade levels above their tested reading

---

[3]Nicholas P. Criscuolo, "How Effective are Basal Readers with Culturally Disadvantaged Children?" Elementary English XLV (March, 1968), pp. 364-365.

level. They rated the stories as to interest and answered questions measuring different types of comprehension. Schnayer concluded:

1. Reading interest, as a factor of reading comprehension, may enable most students to read beyond their measured reading ability.

2. High ability students are less affected by interest than low ability students.

3. Reading interest is significant to students with reading abilities two years below grade level to one year above grade level.

4. For readers at or below grade level, there is reason to believe that low interest has a cumulatively negative effect.[4]

Schnayer's conclusions are relevant to the present study. If low ability students read better when interest is high then we should expect that disadvantaged Black students will read better when the subject is one in which they may be assumed to have high interest.

Identification

One component of interest is assumed in this study to be identification of the reader with the subject. Ellison and Williams (1971) examined the assumption that working class children will identify with books and select books

---

[4]Sidney William Schnayer, "Some Relationships Between Reading Interests and Comprehension," Dissertation Abstracts 28 (January, 1968): 2606A.

more consonant with their own background than is usually contained in basic readers. They found no difference in the children's selection and concluded that value as literature and attractiveness were more important. The assumption that identification heightens interest was not supported.

Self Concept

Assuming that identification is present raises a question. Is it valid to conclude that children will respond favorably? The Asubels (1963) speak of "negative self esteem...in regard to himself and his family." Bottsdorf (1967) concludes that a majority of lower class Negro and White children dislike the word "black." The Clarks (1939) found that Negro five year olds realize that black equals inferior status and reject it. These may be deep emotional feelings. But on a higher, conscious level Rowland and Hill (1965) found a greater portion of Black children chose Black illustrated material for reading. Poulos (1966) found Black adults showed high approval of positive Black historical characters but tended to reject pictures of slave labor, slums, plantation workers, etc. Baughman and Dahlstrom (1968) concluded that "The self esteem of Negro children appears to be appreciably less

negative than is customarily presented to be true in the literature."[5]

Black Studies

An area of interest on which this study focuses is Black studies and their effect on learning. Roth (1969) studied an "integral curriculum," which was defined as a curriculum that includes materials about Blacks and information about historic Blacks. He found it did improve the self concept of Black students. Frerichs (1971) in turn concluded that the self concept of the disadvantaged had a positive relationship to school success.

Rist (1971) described a program utilizing Black studies materials with Black students. One college student tutored two seventh graders in a non-directive approach. He reported a very high reading growth with his experimental group of three years, four months. However, other variables were involved and no valid conclusions can be drawn.

Textbooks

Guthrie (1972) found students will learn better if readability of the text is improved. Peterson demonstrated

---

[5]Earl E. Baughman and Grant W. Dahlstrom, Negro and White Children (New York: Academic Press, 1968), p. 466.

that high school students will learn better when textbooks material is rewritten to be more interesting and gave several suggestions on how this be done. As with Krug (1967), she emphasized the use of personalities to make concepts clear. This is suggestive of what can be done and emphasizes the point made by Getzels: "Recent studies of culturally deprived children show that a crucial characteristic of these children is this: Their capacity to be interested has been impaired."[6]

Summary

Few studies deal directly with interest as a factor in reading efficiency. There are hopeful indications in the studies of Schnayer and Peterson that interest may have a genuinely positive effect. Particularly interesting is the conclusion of Schnayer that interest has its maximum effect on poor readers. Whipple gave evidence that a multi-ethnic reader improved initial reading skills. In the specific area of Black studies Roth found that an integral curriculum improved self concept. Rist reported good results with a program of Black studies. On the other hand, Ellison and Williams questioned whether identification has an effect on interest. All reports of language experience

---

[6]J. W. Getzels, "The Problem of Interest: A Reconsideration," in Reading: Seventy-Five Years of Progress, edited by H. Alan Robinson (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), p. 102.

programs find no advantage over standard reading programs; nor has any extra benefit been found in materials designed expressly for disadvantaged children.

This survey reveals that one basic assumption of modern education has not been examined in a thorough way. There may be studies which this survey of the literature has failed to reveal. However it seems clear that the effects of interest on learning have been subjected to little critical thought.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN, PROCEDURE, AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Purpose of the Study

Three assumptions were stated in chapter I which are often made about interest and the reading process:

1. Children will identify with characters of their own race in the reading texts.
2. Identification will lead to higher interest.
3. Interest will cause the student to read with greater efficiency.

The purpose of the study was to examine these assumptions. The question was, will students read materials dealing with personalities of their own race with greater efficiency than they read materials dealing with personalities of another race?

Hypotheses

The question was first stated in terms of the research hypothesis:

Research Hypothesis:

Black and White students who read materials on both Black and White personalities will score

higher on comprehension tests on the materials about the persons of their own racial group than on materials about persons of the other racial group.

The assumption is made that identification with personalities of their own racial group is the intervening variable which elicits heightened interest and therefore, greater achievement when reading materials about personalities of their own racial group than about another racial group.

For purposes of analysis the research hypothesis was stated in terms of two experimental hypotheses:

Experimental Hypothesis I:

The mean scores on tests of Black historical personalities taken by Black students will be significantly greater than on tests of White historical personalities.

$$H_1: \quad M_{bb} > M_{bw}$$

Experimental Hypothesis II:

The difference between the mean for Black students reading about Black personalities and the mean for Black students reading about White personalities will be greater than the difference between the mean for White students reading about Black personalities and the mean for White students reading about White personalities.

$$H_2: \quad M_{bb} - M_{bw} > M_{wb} - M_{ww}$$

The research hypothesis was then restated in terms of two null hypotheses:

Null Hypothesis I:

There will be no difference between the mean scores of tests on Black and White historical personalities for Black students.

$$H_o: \quad M_{bb} - M_{bw} = 0$$

Null Hypothesis II:

There will be no difference between the mean scores of tests on Black and White historical personalities for White students.

$$H_o: \quad M_{wb} - M_{ww} = 0$$

Sample

The experimental group consisted of 143 students from two schools.

Two fifth grade classes were from School One. There were 35 students in one class and 36 students in the other class. The racial composition of both classes was sixty percent Black and forty percent White. The exercises were given to one entire class at a time, and all students in the class completed the exercises together. After the tests were checked and the scores compiled, the scores of the

White students in the both classes were placed together and analyzed separately. It should be emphasized that all students in a class, Black and White, did the exercises together. It is only the scores which were extracted and treated separately. These two classes thus made three groups. They are designated:

Group A - Black students from the first class. N = 22

Group B - Black students from the second class. N = 22

Group C - White students from both classes. N = 22

Two sixth grade classes were from School Two. The racial composition of these classes was entirely Black. They are designated:

Group D - Black students from first class. N = 36

Group E - Black students from second class. N = 38

Gates - MacGinitie Reading Tests were administered to the fifth grades in September, 1971, and to the sixth grades in September, 1972. The scores are presented in appendix A.

Information relating to the income levels of the areas in which the schools are located is given in table 1. Table 2 shows comparative educational achievement. It will be seen that the students come from two separate socio-economic areas.

TABLE 1

INCOME LEVEL OF SCHOOL ONE AND SCHOOL TWO

	Median Income All Families in Dollars	Mean Income All Families in Dollars	Percent of Families with Income below Poverty Level
School One			
Tract A	20,697	24,787	4.3
Tract B	36,647	46,992	0.9
Tract C	13,878	14,446	3.5
School Two			
Tract A	9,824	9,705	12.4
Tract B	10,364	11,102	6.6

SOURCE: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Census of Population and Housing: 1970, Census Tracts, Final Report PHC (1) - 58 Detroit, Michigan, SMSA (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), pp. 263, 264, 265.

TABLE 2

EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOL ONE AND SCHOOL TWO

	Mean Scores - Iowa Test, April, 1972				
	Fifth Grade Reading	Fifth Grade Math	Sixth Grade Reading	Sixth Grade Math	Percent of Students Eligible for State Chapter 3 Aid
School One	5.7	6.1	6.5	7.0	14
School Two	4.2	4.4	5.1	5.1	45

SOURCE: Detroit Public Schools, Department of Research and Development, Summary of Achievement Test Scores - 1972 (Detroit: Detroit Public Schools, 1972), pp. 31, 35.

Administration of Exercises

Background

The research proposal was presented to the Research Department of the Detroit Board of Education and approved. (Approval: Research Study No. 71050, September 2, 1971.)

The investigator was employed at School One in the fall of 1971. Permission was secured from the principal to conduct the study in a fifth grade homeroom with both morning and afternoon sections. The investigator

administered the exercises personally. Three of the four series were completed by these classes. The investigator was transferred at the end of the first semester and was unable to complete the last series. The teacher offered to give the last series but it was felt that another administrator would introduce another variable and cloud the results.

Permission was secured from the principal of School Two in the fall of 1972 to administer the exercises to two sixth grade classes. The investigator was not employed in this school. A teacher was recommended by the principal. The project was carefully explained to the teacher with all the necessary procedures and controls and the teacher agreed to carry out the work. The investigator often discussed the progress of the work with the teacher. To the best of the investigator's knowledge, all procedures described were observed with care.

Subject Matter of the Exercises

Eight famous persons from American history were studied. They were persons with adventurous lives. Four were Black and four were White. Each Black personality was paired with a comparable White personality.

Published biographies were selected for each pair. These were books written for children and from reputable

publishers. Permission was secured from the publishers to use the passages necessary for the study. Letters of permission are reproduced in appendix B. The pairs and the publishers are given below. Also included is a range of Dale - Chall readability scores.

Garrard Press	
Frederick Douglass	4.24 - 4.56
Paul Revere	4.40 - 4.51
Bobbs Merrill	
Crispus Attucks	4.66 - 5.39
George Rogers Clark	4.61 - 5.17
Houghton Mifflin	
Matthew Henson	4.70 - 5.12
Dan Beard	4.40 - 5.55
Houghton Mifflin	
Harriet Tubman	4.61 - 5.64
Amelia Earhart	4.87 - 5.24

Two selections were taken from each book. The first was from the childhood or youth of the personality and the second was from later life. The first selections for each pair were rewritten to be as nearly identical as possible in level of reading difficulty, and the same was done with the second selections. Questions were prepared for each selection. The questions on the first selection of one

personality were written to be as similar as possible to the questions on the first selection of the paired personality, and the same was done with the second tests. There were twenty-four questions in each test, with a total of forty-eight questions on each personality. For example:

Henson (first reading selection) = Beard (first reading selection)

Henson (first test, twenty-four questions) = Beard (first test, twenty-four questions)

Henson (second reading selection) = Beard (second reading selection)

Henson (second test, twenty-four questions) = Beard (second test, twenty-four questions)

The basic intent was to approximate as closely as possible the alternate forms of standardized reading tests, with the race of the personality as the only variable.

Students read the first selection on Tuesday and the second selection on Thursday. For example:

Tuesday, first week Tubman, first selection, twenty-four questions

Thursday, first week Tubman, second selection, twenty-four questions

Tuesday, second week Earhart, first selection, twenty-four questions

Thursday, second week Earhart, second selection, twenty-four questions.

A complete series thus consists of four tests, two on each personality. The method by which the selections and questions were equated is explained in detail later in the chapter.

Method of Administration

Before beginning work it was explained to the students that they would start a new Social Studies project. The purpose of this project was to teach them about famous persons in American history and also assist them to become better readers. The students cooperated well in all phases of the work and no problems arose in the course of the study.

The method of administration was as follows. Exercises and test papers were passed out. The children were instructed not to begin until told. When attention was secured, the administrator showed the children a picture of the person who was the subject of the day's lesson. A short description was then read.

The description told a little of the person's life up to the point where the exercise commenced. The descriptions for the parallel personalities were written to be as similar as possible. The main difference was that in the case of the Black personality the fact that the subject was Black was brought out and repeated. There is no doubt in

the investigator's mind that the children understood this basic fact clearly before beginning to read.

After the introduction was completed the children began reading the exercise. It was emphasized that there was no time limit. The children were encouraged to read carefully and to finish all items. A special effort was made to avoid tension or a test-like atmosphere. It was explained to the children before they started reading and continually repeated that they could look back in the exercise to find the answer. This was intended as a measure of comprehension and not recall.

Rotation of Exercises

If a class read about a Black personality first in one set, they would begin the second set by reading about a White personality. There was also a difference in the morning and afternoon classes. If the morning class began by reading about a Black personality, the afternoon class began by reading about the matched White personality. This alternation was followed through in all classes and in all sets. For example:

Group D

Week	Tuesday	Thursday	
first	Douglass (B)	Douglass (B)	first series
second	Revere (W)	Revere (W)	
third	Clark (W)	Clark (W)	second series
fourth	Attucks (B)	Attucks (B)	

Group E

Week	Tuesday	Thursday	
first	Revere (W)	Revere (W)	first series
second	Douglass (B)	Douglass (B)	
third	Attucks (B)	Attucks (B)	second series
fourth	Clark (W)	Clark (W)	

Construction of Exercises

In order to test the research hypothesis it was necessary to construct stories and questions so nearly parallel that the only variable would be the identity of the personalities. To illustrate how this was done a detailed explanation is presented, showing how the first exercise for Attucks and Clark was constructed. The method described below for these exercises was used in all particulars for the other exercises.

Stories

1. Two comparable episodes were selected from the personalities' youth. For Attucks the episode described how he harpooned his first whale. For Clark it described how he shot his first deer.
2. The selections were taken basically from the book. However whole selections were not simply lifted out. Paragraphs or portions

were taken from the chapter and put together to form one continuous narrative.

3. The word count for each selection was made the same, and the number of sentences was also made equal.

4. The reading selections were then divided into two parts, part A and part B. An example of how the words and sentences were divided between part A and part B is given in table 3.

TABLE 3

CONSTRUCTION OF PARALLEL STORIES - FIRST EXERCISE ATTUCKS - CLARK

	Attucks	Clark
Words - total	945	937
Sentences - total	116	116
Average sentence length	8.2	8.1
Words - part A	502	496
Words - part B	443	441
Sentences - part A	58	59
Sentences - part B	58	57

5. For each part, A and B, the words in the text not included on the Dale-Chall Word List were noted. Then the text was changed so that the

parallel parts had nearly the same number of non-listed words. This was done by removing words or by substituting synonyms on the list. Below are given the non-listed words for each of the parallel parts.

Part A

Attucks	Clark
steersman, vessel, lookout, starboard, oarsmen, sped, harpoon shaft, tangle, lowered ceased, steady, indicate gripped, hurl, strength barb, activity, surface spray, furious	probable, motioned, gasped sniffed, stag, clumsy trembling, target, bruise scented, alert, trigger realize, butt, wisps gunpowder, training disappeared, exclaimed grin, thrill

Part B

Attucks	Clark
crippled, captured, calm harpoon, steady, thrashed strained, lashed, surface distance, flattened, instant, struggled, behold relief, recover, signal wearily, harpooner, bunk immediately, challenge, runaway	perfect, buckwheat, spotless hastily, primed, cocked scent, tremble, relax steadily, trigger, gunsight tensed, bound, heavily cautiously, plunged, beckoned, antlers, trickle seriously, respect, sheath

6. After the stories were typed, the text was inspected to insure that both selections were visually similar. Both were altered, if necessary, to insure that they contained the same number of paragraphs and approximately the same number of lines.

Questions

Twelve questions were prepared for each part, A and B, making a total of 24 questions on the first selection. The following principles were used in construction of the questions.

1. Questions one - nine, eleven and twelve were questions of simple fact. Numbers nine and ten tested inference comprehension.
2. There were no "catch" questions. The tests were intended to measure comprehension of fact or inference and nothing else.
3. Both questions and answers were phrased as simply as possible. Every attempt was made to keep them within the vocabulary of the Dale-Chall list.
4. The answer used a synonym for a word in the text or an equivalent phrase. The exact language of the text was avoided.
5. The questions were equated so that a question on Attucks was paralleled as closely as possible by a question on Clark. Examples of some of the most closely coincident questions are given below.

Part A

A. The whale was first spotted by _____.

C. They found the deer near _____.

A. When Chris came near the whale he probably _____.

C. When George came near the deer, he probably _____.

Part B

A. Jansen told Chris he had done _____.

C. His father told George that he had done _____.

A. Chris would have liked other men to _____.

C. George would have liked other hunters to _____.

All questions could not, of course, coincide so closely. To maintain the parallel structure it was insured that the following criteria were met:

a. Parallel questions were approximately the same length.

b. The answers each called for a word or a phrase.

Collection of Data

Method of Collection

There are four tests in a series and many students were absent for one or more tests. In these cases all the students' scores were rejected. The only scores included

in the computation are those of students who completed all four tests in a series.

Test Labels

The tests are referred to in the following code:

	1st test	2nd test	total scores
Douglass	1B1	1B2	1B1B2
Revere	1W1	1W2	1W1W2
Attucks	2B1	2B2	2B1B2
Clark	2W1	2W2	2W1W2
Henson	3B1	3B2	3B1B2
Beard	3W1	3W2	3W1W2
Tubman	4B1	4B2	4B1B2
Earhart	4W1	4W2	4W1W2

Analysis of Data

An I.B.M. card was prepared for each student in the experiment. The following data were recorded on the cards: Test scores (where all four tests in a series had been completed), sex, and reading grade level. The data were analyzed by computer. Four types of comparisons were made.

1. Comparison of Mean Scores by Group, tables 4-8

The basic analysis of this study was a comparison of group mean scores. The mean scores of each group (A, B, C, D, E) on the Black personality were compared to the mean scores on the paired White personality. A two by two analysis of variance was

made of the first tests, the second tests, and the total scores in each series. For example:

Group B

Douglass (first test) v. Revere (first test)

Douglass (second test) v. Revere (second test)

Douglass (total) v. Revere (total)

The difference between the mean scores was analyzed by a t-test to determine the level of significance. The .05 level and beyond was selected as indicating a significant difference.

The following data are provided in this analysis for each group:

mean score of each test

standard deviation

standard error of the mean

difference between mean scores of paired personalities

t-statistic

significance of difference

2. Comparison of Mean Scores by Sex, tables 10-11.

The purpose of this comparison was to determine if the observed differences in mean scores in the Comparison of Mean Scores by Group could be attributed mainly to either sex.

The scores of the White students, Group C, were removed from this computation. Two sections were

thus formed, the Black boys and the Black girls. The tables show the mean scores of each section on the tests and the difference between the mean scores of the paired personalities. No analysis for significance of difference was made, as the only purpose was to find out whether a preference for personalities of either race would be characteristic of one sex, or of both sexes.

3. Comparison of Mean Scores by Reading Grade Level - First Comparison, tables 12-13.

The purpose of this analysis was twofold. First, it was to determine if the observed differences in mean scores in the Comparison of Mean Scores by Group could be attributed to students reading at any particular reading grade level. Secondly, it was to determine whether there would be any difference in mean scores between students who had the same tested reading grade level but came from two different socio-economic areas.

a. The scores of the Black students in School One (Groups A and B) were placed in one section (table 12), and the scores of the Black students in School Two (Groups D and E) were placed in a second section (table 13).

b. Reading scores were grouped in .05 grade level intervals. For example: 2.0 - 2.5, 2.6 - 3.0, etc.

c. Tables 12 and 13 give the difference between the mean scores of the tests of the paired personalities at each reading grade level interval. The mean difference is given for the first tests and the second tests in each series. The mean score on the total (test one and test two) is also given for both personalities.

4. Comparison of Mean Scores by Reading Grade Level - Second Comparison, table 14.

To refine the first analysis by reading grade level a second comparison was made.

a. The .05 reading grade level interval was again used.

b. The scores of all the students, including the White students, were combined together.

c. For each series the mean scores are first presented at each reading grade level interval. The differences between the mean scores of the first tests and the differences between the mean scores of the second tests are then given.

The purpose of this comparison was again to determine whether the observed differences could be attributed to students reading at any particular reading grade level.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Four comparisons were made. They are presented in the following tables:

1. Comparison of Mean Scores by Group - tables 4-8
2. Comparison of Mean Scores by Sex - tables 10-11
3. Comparison of Mean Scores by Reading Grade Level - First Comparison - tables 12-13
4. Comparison of Mean Scores by Reading Grade Level - Second Comparison - table 14

Each comparison is followed by an analysis of the data contained in the appropriate tables. A summary of the analyses is presented at the end of the chapter.

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES BY GROUP

GROUP A

Test	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Difference of Means	t	Significance of Difference
1B1	19	16.47	4.66	1.07	0.58	0.50	.66
1W1	19	15.89	4.84	1.11			
1B2	19	15.89	3.54	0.81	1.84	2.57	.02 *
1W2	19	14.05	2.99	0.69			
1B1B2	19	32.37	7.25	1.66	2.42	1.79	.09
1W1W2	19	29.94	6.57	1.51			
2B1	16	14.56	3.88	0.97	1.38	1.65	.12
2W1	16	15.94	3.61	0.90			
2B2	16	15.00	2.76	0.69	2.56	2.68	.02 *
2W2	16	12.44	5.19	1.30			
2B1B2	16	29.56	5.73	1.43	1.19	1.31	.20
2W1W2	16	28.38	7.92	1.98			

* Difference significant at .05 level or beyond

TABLE 4 - Continued

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES BY GROUP

GROUP A

Test	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Difference of Means	t	Significance of Difference
3B1	17	15.12	4.51	1.09			
3W1	17	16.35	4.72	1.14	1.23	1.01	.33
3B2	17	17.94	4.91	1.19			
3W2	17	13.41	5.03	1.22	4.53	3.65	.002 *
3B1B2	17	33.06	8.31	2.02			
3W1W2	17	29.77	8.59	2.08	3.29	2.07	.05 *

* Difference significant at .05 level or beyond

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES BY GROUP

GROUP B

Test	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Difference of Means	t	Significance of Difference
1B1	17	17.32	3.55	0.86			
1W1	17	16.53	5.81	1.41	0.83	1.06	.29
2B1	17	15.06	4.21	1.02			
2W1	17	12.18	4.77	1.16	2.88	3.45	.003 *
1B1B2	17	32.41	7.31	1.77			
1W1W2	17	28.71	9.13	2.21	3.70	3.81	.002 *
2B1	18	15.39	5.77	1.36			
2W1	18	12.67	5.85	1.38	2.72	2.86	.01 *
2B2	18	14.22	5.80	1.37			
2W2	18	13.06	5.57	1.31	1.17	0.90	.38
2B1B2	18	29.61	10.33	2.44			
2W1W2	18	25.72	10.78	2.54	3.89	2.73	.01 *

* Difference significant at .05 level or beyond

TABLE 5 - Continued

Test	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Difference of Means	t	Significance of Difference
3B1	19	16.11	6.21	1.42			
3W1	19	14.47	6.76	1.55	1.63	1.85	.08
3B2	19	15.95	6.17	1.41			
3W2	19	14.32	6.09	1.40	1.63	2.07	.05 *
3B1B2	19	32.05	12.10	2.78			
3W1W2	19	28.79	12.11	2.78	3.26	2.71	.01 *

* Difference significant at .05 level or beyond

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES BY GROUP

GROUP C

Test	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Difference of Means	t	Significance of Difference
1B1	18	19.17	4.74	1.12			
1W1	18	20.28	2.76	0.65	1.10	1.41	.19
1B2	18	18.50	3.50	0.83			
1W2	18	16.61	3.57	0.84	1.89	2.39	.03 *
1B1B2	18	37.67	7.51	1.77			
1W1W2	18	36.89	5.67	1.34	0.78	0.55	.59
2B1	21	18.95	3.79	0.83			
2W1	21	18.29	2.94	0.64	0.67	1.06	.30
2B2	21	17.95	4.70	1.02			
2W2	21	18.29	4.30	0.94	0.33	0.48	.63
2B1B2	21	36.91	8.17	1.78			
2W1W2	21	36.57	6.82	1.49	0.33	0.30	.77

* Difference significant at .05 level or beyond

TABLE 6 - Continued

Test	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Difference of Means	t	Significance of Difference
3B1	18	18.89	4.44	1.05			
3W1	18	19.06	3.72	0.88	0.17	0.30	.77
3B2	18	19.89	4.14	0.98			
3W2	18	19.06	4.53	1.07	0.83	1.30	.21
3B1B2	18	38.78	8.26	1.95			
3W1W2	18	38.11	8.02	1.89	0.67	0.81	.43

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES BY GROUP

GROUP D

Test	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Difference of Means	t	Significance of Difference
1B1	28	16.43	5.20	0.98			
1W1	28	14.93	5.30	1.00	1.50	2.38	.03 *
1B2	28	12.79	4.95	0.93			
1W2	28	10.18	4.27	0.81	2.61	3.61	.0001*
1B1B2	28	29.21	9.53	1.80			
1W1W2	28	25.11	8.86	1.67	4.11	4.33	.0002*
2B1	22	12.36	4.30	0.91			
2W1	22	14.64	4.24	0.90	2.27	3.21	.004 *
2B2	22	13.36	3.20	0.68			
2W2	22	11.14	4.36	0.93	2.23	2.76	.01 *
2B1B2	22	25.73	6.60	1.41			
2W1W2	22	25.77	7.94	1.69	0.04	0.04	.97

* Difference significant at .05 level or beyond

TABLE 7 - Continued

Test	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Difference of Means	t	Significance of Difference
3B1	25	13.88	4.68	0.94			
3W1	25	13.96	4.08	0.82	0.08	0.13	.90
3B2	25	14.12	4.37	0.87			
3W2	25	11.08	4.44	0.89	3.04	3.51	.0002*
3B1B2	25	28.00	8.29	1.66			
3W1W2	25	25.04	7.69	1.54	2.96	2.26	.03 *
4B1	25	13.28	6.08	1.22			
4W1	25	12.12	4.59	0.92	1.16	1.11	.28
4B2	25	11.68	5.58	1.12			
4W2	25	10.76	4.71	0.94	0.92	0.88	.39
4B1B2	25	24.96	11.18	2.24			
4W1W2	25	22.88	8.82	1.76	2.08	1.07	.29

* Difference significant at .05 level or beyond

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES BY GROUP

GROUP E

Test	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Difference of Means	t	Significance of Difference
2B1	26	11.39	4.89	0.96			
2W1	26	10.88	4.77	0.94	0.50	0.54	.60
2B2	26	10.69	4.18	0.82			
2W2	26	8.12	4.61	0.90	2.58	3.56	.002 *
2B1B2	26	22.08	7.64	1.50			
2W1W2	26	19.00	8.68	1.70	3.08	3.21	.004 *
3B1	26	12.42	5.28	1.04			
3W1	26	11.39	4.03	0.79	1.04	1.21	.24
3B2	26	12.96	5.12	1.00			
3W2	26	10.04	4.62	0.91	2.92	3.30	.003 *
3B1B2	26	25.39	9.77	1.92			
3W1W2	26	21.42	7.81	1.53	3.96	2.82	.009 *

* Difference significant at .05 level or beyond

TABLE 8 - Continued

Test	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Difference of Means	t	Significance of Difference
4B1	30	13.00	4.89	0.89			
4W1	30	9.24	3.99	0.74	3.76	4.40	.0001 *
4B2	30	10.80	4.79	0.87			
4W2	30	9.10	4.95	0.90	1.70	1.93	.06
4B1B2	30	23.90	8.90	1.63			
4W1W2	30	18.03	8.74	1.59	5.87	3.71	.0009 *

TABLE 8 - Continued

Test	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	Difference of Means	t	Significance of Difference
1B1	27	12.81	4.81	0.93			
1W1	27	13.41	5.63	1.08	0.59	0.50	.55
1B2	12	10.75	3.70	1.07			
1W2	12	7.67			3.08	5.60	.0001 *
1W2	27	8.41	4.07	0.78			

NOTE: Only 12 students completed the 1B2 test. This series is therefore not included in the analysis of results. The scores are presented for inspection only. The 12 students who completed the 1B2 test are compared with the same students' scores on the 1W2 test. The total 1W2 score is also included.

Comparison of Mean Scores by Group

Black Students

Experimental Hypothesis I stated:

> The mean scores on tests of Black historical personalities taken by Black students will be significantly greater than on tests of White historical personalities.

The results of tables 4, 5, 7, and 8 for groups of Black students A, B, D, and E are summarized in table 9.

In the comparison of the first tests the hypothesis was accepted in 23.08 percent of the cases.

In the comparison of the second tests the hypothesis was accepted in 76.92 percent of the cases.

In the comparison of the total scores the hypothesis was accepted in 69.23 percent of the cases.

The experimental hypothesis was thus rejected in approximately three-fourths of the first tests and was accepted in approximately three-fourths of the second tests. It was accepted in a little over two-thirds of the total scores.

Null Hypothesis I stated:

> There will be no difference between the mean scores of tests on Black and White historical personalities for Black students.

The null hypothesis was rejected. There were a total of thirty-nine comparisons made for the groups of Black students. Of these 89.75 percent had a difference in favor of the Black personality. At the .05 level or beyond 56.41 percent of the differences were significant.

Inspection of the scores reveals that the major cause of the differences in mean scores in favor of the Black personality on the second tests is a decline in the mean scores on the second tests of the White personality. The mean scores on the second tests of the Black personality are, in most cases, almost equivalent to the mean scores on the first test, or even above the mean scores of the first test.

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AS REPORTED IN TABLES 4, 5, 7, 8 FOR GROUPS A, B, D, E

First Test Significance of Difference	Second Test Significance of Difference	Total Significance of Difference
,68	.02 *	.09
.12 (W)	.02 *	.20
.33 (W)	.002 *	.05 *
.29	.003 *	.002 *
.01 *	.38	.01 *
.08	.05 *	.01 *
.03 *	.001 *	.0002 *
.004 * (W)	.01 *	.97 (W)
.90 (W)	.002 *	.03 *
.28	.39	.29
.60	.002 *	.004 *
.24	.003 *	.009 *
.001 *	.06	.0009 *
Significant Difference in Favor of Black Personality		
Number 3	10	9
Percent of All Tests 23.08	75.92	69.23

Differences in favor of the White personality are denoted by (W). Differences significant at the .05 level and beyond are denoted by (*).

Comparison of Mean Scores by Group

White Students

Experimental Hypothesis II stated:

> The difference between the mean for Black students reading about Black personalities and the mean for Black students reading about White personalities will be greater than the difference between the mean for White students reading about Black personalities and the mean for White students reading about White personalities.

Table 6 contains the comparison of mean scores of the White students (Group C). The mean differences between the Black and White personalities are much smaller than these of the Black students. Experimental Hypothesis Two was accepted.

Null Hypothesis II stated:

> There will be no difference between the mean scores of tests on Black and White historical personalities for White students.

Only one test in the three series showed a difference in mean scores significant at the .05 level or beyond. The other tests reveal differences so small that they may be chance relationships. The average significance of difference was .49. The null hypothesis was accepted.

The mean scores are much higher than for the other groups. The mean reading score of these students was 6.2 on a standardized reading test (see appendix A).

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES BY SEX

GROUPS A, B, D, E

BOYS

Series	Mean Score First Test Black	White	Mean Score Second Test Black	White	Difference 1st Test	Difference 2nd Test
1st	15.06	14.53			0.53	
			12.97	10.79		2.18
2nd	12.81	12.75			0.06	
			13.22	11.37		1.85
3rd	14.25	14.00			0.25	
			15.19	11.72		3.47
4th	13.47	9.50			3.97	
			11.35	6.82		4.53

TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES BY SEX

GROUPS A, B, D, E

GIRLS

Series	Mean Score First Test Black	Mean Score First Test White	Mean Score Second Test Black	Mean Score Second Test White	Difference 1st Test	Difference 2nd Test
1st	15.82	15.24			0.58	
			14.23	10.86		3.37
2nd	13.36	13.60			0.24 +	
			12.90	10.52		2.38
3rd	14.12	13.60			0.52	
			14.72	12.08		2.62
4th	13.05	11.03			2.03	
			11.13	11.21		0.08 +

\+ Difference in favor of White personality

Comparison of Mean Scores by Sex

A pattern can be noted in the Comparison of Mean Scores by Group of the scores of the Black students in tables 4, 5, 7, and 8. The first tests show a small difference in mean scores, mainly in favor of the Black personality. The second tests show a much larger difference in mean scores, all comparisons favoring the Black personality. The purpose of this comparison was to determine if the pattern was caused mainly by students of either sex.

Tables 10 and 11 summarize the mean differences of the four groups of Black students. Both boys and girls show the same pattern in the first three series. There are small differences in mean scores in favor of the Black personality in the comparisons of the first tests. The second tests show much larger differences in mean scores, also in favor of the Black personality.

In the comparison of Harriet Tubman and Amelia Earhart the boys showed strong preference for Tubman on both tests. On the second test the girls were almost evenly divided between Tubman and Earhart.

TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES WITH READING GRADE LEVEL

FIRST COMPARISON

GROUPS A AND B - SCHOOL ONE

Reading Grade Level	First Test Black Personality	First Test White Personality	Second Test Black Personality	Second Test White Personality	Difference of Means First Test	Difference of Means Second Test
2.0-2.5	10.00	8.20	8.40	6.80	1.80	1.60
2.6-3.0	9.25	12.50	12.00	9.38	3.25 #	2.62
3.1-3.5	12.08	10.50	10.50	8.33	1.58	2.17
3.6-4.0	16.00	14.12	13.35	11.62	1.88	1.73
4.1-4.5	16.92	16.42	15.08	13.68	0.50	1.40
4.6-5.0	18.08	16.39	17.35	14.62	1.69	2.73
*5.1-5.5	--	--	--	--	--	--
5.6-6.0	17.22	18.44	20.22	17.22	1.22 #	3.0
6.0-9.9	21.12	21.25	20.75	20.62	0.13 #	0.13

* Insufficient scores

Difference in favor of White personality

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES WITH READING GRADE LEVEL

FIRST COMPARISON

GROUPS D AND E - SCHOOL TWO

Reading Grade Level	First Test Black Personality	First Test White Personality	Second Test Black Personality	Second Test White Personality	Difference of Means First Test	Difference of Means Second Test
2.0-2.5	9.55	9.09	8.18	5.45	0.46	2.73
2.6-3.0	10.33	9.66	9.50	7.73	0.67	1.77
3.1-3.5	12.13	11.10	11.00	8.85	1.03	2.15
3.6-4.0	13.51	12.44	12.87	9.82	1.07	3.05
4.1-4.5	16.56	15.35	15.31	12.53	1.21	2.78
4.6-5.0	15.75	15.08	16.75	14.84	0.67	1.91

Comparison of Mean Scores by Reading Grade Level

First Comparison

The purpose of this comparison was to determine:

1. If the pattern noted in the previous comparisons held true for students reading at all grade levels, as determined by standardized reading tests.
2. If there would be any difference in mean scores between groups of students of the same tested reading ability who came from two different socio-economic areas.

Tables 12 and 13 summarize differences in mean scores on the first and second tests of Black students from School One and School Two. Inspection of mean differences reveals that the same pattern occurs at almost all reading grade levels in both schools. On the first tests most comparisons show a small difference in mean scores in favor of the Black personality. The second tests show a larger difference in mean scores in favor of the Black personality.

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES WITH READING GRADE LEVEL

ALL GROUPS - SECOND COMPARISON

Reading Grade Level	MEAN SCORES First Test Black Personality	First Test White Personality	Second Test Black Personality	Second Test White Personality	Difference First Test	Difference Second Test	
2.0-2.4	10.25	9.50	6.75	6.50	0.75	0.25	1st Series
2.5-2.9	9.70	10.20	10.71	6.80	0.50 #	3.91	
3.0-3.4	13.80	13.05	12.07	8.70	0.75	3.37	
3.5-3.9	15.42	14.64	12.33	9.57	0.78	2.76	
4.0-4.4	17.61	15.77	14.06	11.78	1.84	2.28	
4.5-4.9	18.55	18.55	16.30	13.82	0.00	2.48	
5.0-5.4	17.75	18.38	16.37	14.50	0.63 #	1.87	
5.5-5.9	20.00	19.33	19.00	16.00	0.67	3.00	
6.0-9.9	20.33	21.33	20.67	18.67	1.00 #	2.00	
2.5-2.9	8.00	7.56	9.44	6.11	0.44	3.33	2nd Series
3.0-3.4	10.17	10.95	10.78	7.56	0.78 #	3.22	
3.5-3.9	12.69	14.00	12.23	10.69	1.31 #	1.54	
4.0-4.4	15.53	15.33	14.07	13.53	0.20	0.54	
4.5-4.9	15.43	15.54	15.73	12.91	0.09	2,82	
5.0-5.4	19.80	17.80	17.40	15.40	2.00	2.00	
5.5-5.9	19.33	18.67	17.00	17.33	0.66	0.33 #	
6.0-9.9	21.50	18.50	20.00	22.00	3.00	2.00 #	

# Indicates difference favors White personality

TABLE 14 - Continued

Reading Grade Level	Mean Scores 1st Test Black Personality	1st Test White Personality	2nd Test Black Personality	2nd Test White Personality	Difference 1st Test	Difference 2nd Test	
2.0-2.4	11.33	7.00	13.00	9.33	4.33	3.67	3rd Series
2.5-2.9	8.00	11.62	10.87	7.37	3.62 #	4.16	
3.0-3.4	12.21	11.10	11.63	9.37	1.11	2.26	
3.5-3.9	13.19	12.44	14.38	11.25	0.75	3.13	
4.0-4.4	15.39	13.83	15.17	13.06	1.56	2.11	
4.5-4.9	17.11	18.44	17.00	14.67	1.33 #	2.33	
5.0-5.4	18.75	17.00	21.12	15.50	1.75	5.62	
5.5-5.9	15.33	19.33	19.33	12.33	4.00 #	7.00	
6.0-9.9	21.67	21.67	21.67	21.67	0.00	0.00	
2.0-2.4	6.66	5.66	5.33	4.66	1.00	0.67	4th Series
2.5-2.9	8.00	11.62	10.87	7.37	3.62 #	3.50	
3.0-3.4	12.21	11.10	11.63	9.39	1.11	2.24	
3.5-3.9	13.19	12.44	14.37	11.25	0.75	3.12	
4.0-4.4	15.39	13.83	15.17	13.06	1.56	2.11	
4.5-4.9	18.25	12.00	14.75	11.50	6.25	3.25	

# Indicates difference favors White personality.

Comparison of Mean Scores by Reading Grade Level - Second Comparison

The mean scores of all the students in the experiment were grouped together. The mean scores of students at each reading grade level were compared for each series. Table 14 shows that in the main the pattern noted in the previous comparisons did hold true. The majority of mean scores at all reading levels in all series reveal small differences on the first tests in favor of the Black personality, with larger differences in mean scores on the second tests.

Summary of Data - Black Students

Experimental Hypothesis I stated:

> The mean scores on tests of Black historical personalities taken by Black students will be significantly greater than on tests of White historical personalities.

A difference was defined as significant if it reached the .05 level or beyond. Experimental Hypothesis I was accepted in:

23.08 percent of the comparisons of the first tests
76.92 percent of the comparisons of the second tests
69.23 percent of the comparisons of the total scores

Null Hypothesis I stated:

> There will be no difference between the mean scores of tests on Black and White historical personalities for Black students.

The Null Hypothesis was rejected. There were a total of thirty-nine comparisons made in the Comparison of Mean Scores by Group. In these comparisons 89.75 percent had a difference in mean scores in favor of the Black personality, with 56.41 percent of the differences significant at the .05 level or beyond.

A pattern was noted in the Comparison of Mean Scores by Group of the Black students. In the comparisons of the first tests most cases showed a small difference in mean scores in favor of the Black personality. In the comparisons of the second tests there was a much larger difference in mean scores in favor of the Black personality. The scores were further inspected to determine whether a particular group of students contributed more or failed to contribute to this pattern. There were three analyses:

1. The data were analyzed by separating the mean scores of the boys and the girls.
2. The Black students of School One and School Two were placed in two sections. The mean scores of each section were analyzed by reading grade level.

3. The mean scores of all the students were grouped together and analyzed by reading grade level.

.In these comparisons no analysis was made for significance of difference. The mean scores of the first tests on the Black and the White personalities were computed and the differences between them noted. The same was done in the comparisons of the second tests. The differences were inspected to determine if they fell into the pattern described above.

It was found that with few exceptions, the pattern was characteristic of both sexes and of students at all tested reading grade levels.

It was noted that the mean scores on the second tests of the Black personality were close to the mean scores on the first tests. The mean scores on the second tests of the White personality showed a decline from the mean scores on the first tests. This was the major reason for the larger difference in mean scores in the comparisons of the second tests.

Summary of Data - White Students

Experimental Hypothesis II stated:

> The difference between the mean for Black students reading about Black personalities and the mean for Black students reading about White

personalities will be greater than the difference between the mean for White students reading about Black personalities and the mean for White students reading about White personalities.

The mean differences noted on table 6, which gave the scores on the White students, are smaller than the difference noted for the Black students. Experimental Hypothesis II was accepted.

Null Hypothesis II stated:

There will be no differences between the mean scores of tests on Black and White historical personalities for White students.

The differences noted did not, with one exception, reach the level of significance. They were therefore considered unimportant and the Null Hypothesis was accepted.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The study was an investigation into the effect of interest on reading efficiency. It was hypothesized that one element in interest is identification of the reader with the subject of the reading material. From this it followed that students reading about personalities of their own race should identify with them and have more interest in the reading materials. The purpose of the study was to find out what effect this assumed interest would have on reading efficiency.

Four series of exercises were prepared. Each series compared a Black and a White historical personality. There were two exercises on each personality, an exercise consisting of a story and questions based on it. Students did the first exercise for a personality on Tuesday and the second exercise for that personality on Thursday. The next week they did the same for the matched personality. The order of presentation was rotated, so that if a group began by reading about a Black personality in one series they read

about a White personality first in the next series. The reading exercises for the matched personalities were written to be as similar as possible in terms of reading level, difficulty, and interest. The tests were also written to be as comparable as possible. The objective was to approximate as closely as possible the alternate forms of standardized reading tests, with race of the main personalities as the only variable.

The research hypothesis stated that students would read materials dealing with personalities of their own race with greater efficiency than materials dealing with personalities of another race. This was stated in terms of an experimental hypothesis, and then further expanded:

1. The mean scores on tests of Black historical personalities taken by Black students will be significantly greater than on tests of White historical personalities.
2. The difference between the mean for Black students reading about Black personalities and the mean for Black students reading about White personalities will be greater than the difference between the mean for White students reading about Black personalities and the mean for White students reading about White personalities.

The research hypothesis was then restated in terms of two null hypotheses, which held that no difference between the mean scores on the two types of tests would be found for either Black or White students.

The experimental group consisted of four classes, two fifth grades and two sixth grades, with a total of 143 students. The fifth grades from School One were approximately sixty percent Black and forty percent White. The sixth grades from School Two were entirely Black. School One was located in an area with a higher average income than the area of School Two, and the standardized achievement test scores of School One were also higher than School Two.

After the students in the fifth grade classes had completed the exercises in their classes, the scores of the White students in both classes were placed together in a separate group. Five groups were thus formed for analysis:

Group A - Fifth grade (Black students)

Group B - fifth grade (Black students)

Group C - fifth grade (White students)

Group D - sixth grade (Black students)

Group E - sixth grade (Black students)

Four types of analysis were made:

1. Comparison of Mean Scores by Group. Differences in mean scores between the parallel tests of the Black and White personalities were analyzed

for significance of difference. The .05 level and beyond was selected as indicating a significant difference.

2. Comparison of Mean Scores by Sex.
3. Comparison of Mean Scores by Reading Grade Level - First Comparison.
4. Comparison of Mean Scores by Reading Grade Level - Second Comparison.

Comparisons two, three, and four were for the purpose of discovering if the pattern noted in the comparison by group could be attributed to students of either sex or students reading at any particular grade level, as determined by standardized test scores. Therefore, these analyses inspected only differences between mean scores and no analysis was made of these scores for significance of difference. Comparisons three and four analyzed mean scores by reading grade level in two different ways.

Conclusions - Black Students

The null hypothesis was rejected. A large majority of all differences in mean scores favored the Black personality, with over half of the differences significant at the .05 level or beyond.

The experimental hypothesis formed a useful focus about which to group the data, but the results are too

complex to conclude with a simple acceptance or rejection. A close examination of the data shows that two basic patterns are discernable and may be summarized as follows:

1. A majority of the comparisons of both the first and second tests show a difference in mean scores in favor of the Black personality.
2. The difference in mean scores in favor of the Black personality is much larger on the second test.

In the Comparison of Mean Scores by Group it was found that approximately one-fourth of the differences in mean scores in the comparisons of the first tests favored the Black personality at the .05 level or beyond (23.08 percent). Three-fourths of the differences in mean scores in the comparisons of the second tests favored the Black personality at the .05 level or beyond (76.92 percent). This pattern also holds true when the scores are analyzed by sex and by reading grade level.

Before inferring any conclusions it is in order to state certain facts about the study design. When the present study was prepared it was decided to have two tests on each personality. The sole reason for this was to have a total score of forty-eight items rather than twenty-four, a procedure which might normally be expected to increase test reliability. At no point in any of the research proposals was it suggested that an analysis be made of the

differences between the first and the second tests. The entire analysis and interpretation of results was conceived to result from the differences noted between the total scores. The final research proposal speculated on several possible outcomes and what conclusions might be derived from each. A difference between the first and second tests was not one of the alternatives. The results of this study would seem to indicate that the most significant conclusions are to be drawn from these differences. This was unexpected and necessitated a rethinking of the conclusions.

The pattern noted in the scores may be stated as follows: On Tuesday of two consecutive weeks the students read stories about a Black and a White person respectively (or in reversed order). When they took tests on these stories the differences in mean scores in favor of the Black personality were not large. Two days later the students read an additional exercise about each personality. At this time the differences in mean scores in favor of the Black personality were much larger. The question is, what caused this larger differences in mean scores on the second tests? A tentative explanation may be advanced to account for the observed facts:

1. Black students identified with the Black personalities and therefore had more interest in them.

2. Interest kept the student's attention focused on the Black personality over a period of two days, while the attention given to the White personality dropped.
3. Because their attention was fixed on the Black personality the second day their reading scores did not drop or even increase. Because they did not have the same degree of interest in the White personality the attention they gave to the exercises wavered, and thus the reading scores dropped.
4. The main cause of the larger differences in mean scores on the second tests is thus identified as a lengthened attention span, resulting from the increased interest the Black students showed in the Black personalities.

The explanation given above represents what, to the investigator, is the most reasonable cause of the difference in mean scores. The mean scores of the first and second tests were very close on the B tests (Black personality). The difference was caused mainly by a drop in the W scores (White personality). Stated another way it can be said that the students did not comprehend the B material any better, but that the increased attention span kept them from comprehending any worse. The neurological factors involved in the term "attention span" are far beyond the

bounds of this study. But whatever its biologic nature, an extended attention span is advanced as an explanation for the fact that the students showed equal or even superior comprehension on the second test of the Black person to the first, while causing a drop in the score of the White person.

To the extent that generalization is justified, this conclusion may be restated in broader terms. In a one time experience interest may cause a small difference in reading comprehension. It will not, however, make a major or vital difference. The student will tend to comprehend substantially in accord with his or her tested reading ability. When the time factor is increased, interest does make a stronger difference. Students will focus on personalities or subjects in whom they have interest and show more comprehension, over a period of time, than they will with personalities or subjects in whom they have less interest.

Conclusions - White Students

The experimental hypothesis was accepted. The differences between mean scores for the tests of the Black personalities and the tests of the White personalities were much smaller than the differences in mean scores of the Black students.

The null hypothesis was also accepted. The differences noted were considered as possessing very little significance.

Most of these students were reading at a higher level than the level at which the exercises were written. Therefore their scores on both sets of tests were very high and very little discrimination was possible. No conclusions are possible for this group.

Implications

The basic implications of the conclusions relate to classroom learning. The important question is, if greater interest is present will the student's learning ability be enhanced? To examine this question the two terms, "learning" and "interest value," must be carefully defined and related to the present study.

Learning is defined as a demonstrable change or modification of behavior. Normal types of school learning are memory or recollection of facts, improvement of reading skills, or change in attitude and beliefs. The present study did not include any measures to determine what facts the students remembered after the course of study, what improvements took place in reading skills, or whether there was any change in attitude. The only measure used was one of direct comprehension of fact and implied conclusions.

This did not, under the definition given above, provide any information on learning.

The term "interest value" also requires understanding. A basic doctrine of modern education is that every child has basic needs and that interest is an outward manifestation of these inner imperatives. It is thus necessary to make a clear distinction between materials which respond to a true need and materials which have only a superficial and ephemeral appeal. It may be postulated that Black studies do respond to a true need of Black students. But this cannot be generalized to anything that captures a child's attention. A child may certainly be held for a time by Donald Duck or Superman. This does not necessarily correspond to a true need, and it is not proper to speak of interest in Superman and interest in Black studies in the same way.

The basic implications of the study may then be stated as follows: Higher interest allows the opportunity for effective teaching to cause better achievement.

This implication may be restated and clarified. Reading materials by themselves do not necessarily teach and a child does not necessarily learn from them. The more deficient a student is in reading skills the less he or she learns from reading alone, and the greater is the need for systematic instruction. Learning is more likely to occur when a teacher uses reading materials in an

organized, planned way to effect specific changes in behavior. Therefore a teacher should not expect any type of reading material by itself to lead to higher learning. However the teacher may use material of genuine high interest to teach a lesson more effectively because there is a lengthened attention span. For example, the desired modification of behavior may be to improve skill in predicting outcomes. The teacher will present a skill lesson based on the reading material. Because the children have a lengthened attention span, more achievement may be expected in the acquisition of this skill.

The fundamental implication of this study is thus hardly new or revolutionary but may be worth stating again. A sensitive teacher will seek out material which corresponds to a true life need of the student and to which the student will respond with sincerity. Using this material the teacher must impart skills thoroughly and completely. The study suggests that for Black children, Black studies material can be such a resource.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. The White students in the study showed very small differences in mean scores. One reason was that their average reading level was considerably above the level of difficulty at which these exercises were written.

It is recommended that the study be replicated with other groups of White students, using materials closer to their tested reading ability.

2. While the research hypothesis held that students would identify with personalities of their own race, the present study dealt mainly with Black children. It is possible that the results found in this study are characteristic only of this group and cannot be generalized. It is therefore recommended that the study be replicated with other ethnic groups.

3. Small groups of children were involved in the present study. Investigations should be made using larger groups of children at all grade levels. It is especially important to extend this type of study to the junior high level and discover whether the pattern found here would hold true for adolescent students.

4. An area which is now receiving widespread attention is the place of Black studies in the schools. It should first be reiterated that the justification for any type of ethnic studies in the schools does not depend on their contribution to the improvement of reading skills. The question may be asked, however, how ethnic studies and in particular Black studies can aid in the acquisition of reading skills. An implication of this study was that the use of Black studies materials could lengthen the attention

span of the students and thus allow a teacher to present skills more effectively. It is suggested that action research at the school or classroom level could effectively study how Black studies can contribute to skill development. For example, a group of teachers could present a lesson from a basal reader and later a lesson based on a Black personality. They could evaluate which was more effective in developing one of the following types of comprehension skills:

interpreting pictures
identifying main ideas
finding specific ideas
recalling details
following a sequence of ideas
considering ideas in the light of personal experience
predicting outcomes

The same type of study could be made in relation to vocabulary skills, as use of context clues.

5. It was concluded from the Review of Selected Research, chapter 2, that little basic research had been done to study the effect of interest on learning. It is suggested that research proceed along two lines:

a. What constitutes true interest? The majority of the research on interest consists of some type of questionnaire. The findings uniformly discover that the students are interested in

exactly what they are expected to be interested in. The result is that instead of providing positive leadership the profession appeals to the most transitory of interests. What is needed is to take the studies which have been made of genuine needs and determine the true interests arising from them.

b. Research is needed to analyze what types of learning are affected by interest. At the high school level a distinction is commonly made between fields where interest is considered to be a factor and fields where it is not. We speak of an "aptitude" for science and math, but reserve interest for more literary fields. Is there any basis for this distinction? Are both areas affected by interest or is it possible that neither is affected? It might be concluded that self-selection of literature is as unnecessary as self selection of physics texts.

.c. At a primary level it is necessary to determine what reading skills are affected by interest and how effective teaching can be used to produce the desired modification of behavior in the necessary areas. It is

insufficient to say that boys like sea stories. It must be determined how the skills of inference and context vocabulary can be improved through the use of sea stories, if it has been discovered that in fact they do so.

6. It is suggested that future research not be bound to mean scores and that one student is a proper subject. Research should attempt to penetrate into the inherent structure of the student, determine what this particular student's interests are, why he or she has these interests, and what materials or techniques may utilize these interests most effectively.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Reading Scores

Gates MacGinitie Reading Test

Level D

READING SCORES - GROUPS A, B, C, D, E

GATES - MACGINITIE READING TEXT, LEVEL D

Group A		Group B		Group C	
Student	Score	Student	Score	Student	Score
1 -	5.2	1 -	5.6	1 -	8.1
2 -	6.8	2 -	2.9	2 -	5.0
3 -	5.0	3 -	5.2	3 -	5.5
4 -	5.6	4 -	8.1	4 -	4.0
5 -	2.7	5 -	3.9	5 -	6.0
6 -	2.9	6 -	3.4	6 -	6.2
7 -	5.0	7 -	4.6	7 -	3.3
8 -	4.0	8 -	3.2	8 -	9.9
9 -	5.0	9 -	4.4	9 -	4.5
10 -	3.8	10 -	3.4	10 -	9.3
11 -	4.1	11 -	2.1	11 -	5.5
12 -	3.2	12 -	4.2	12 -	6.2
13 -	3.0	13 -	4.0	13 -	4.2
14 -	5.0	14 -	5.8	14 -	3.8
15 -	3.2	15 -	3.2	15 -	9.9
16 -	4.2	16 -	2.2	16 -	3.9
17 -	5.0	17 -	4.7	17 -	4.2
18 -	3.8	18 -	4.2	18 -	4.4
19 -	4.6	19 -	4.7	19 -	7.6
20 -	4.6	20 -	4.2	20 -	5.8
21 -	9.3	21 -	5.0	21 -	7.2
22 -	2.7	22 -	4.0	22 -	9.9
				23 -	5.3
				24 -	6.0
				25 -	5.5
				26 -	7.7

GROUP D

Student	Score	Student	Score	Student	Score
1	3.4	13	4.8	25	3.8
2	4.2	14	4.0	26	3.8
3	4.4	15	3.2	27	3.8
4	3.8	16	4.2	28	3.2
5	4.1	17	3.9	29	3.6
6	2.5	18	4.8	30	2.1
7	3.3	19	3.9	31	3.0
8	4.1	20	3.6	32	3.8
9	4.1	21	3.2	33	3.3
10	4.6	22	4.2	34	2.3
11	4.0	23	3.3	35	4.0
12	4.7	24	4.8	36	3.2

GROUP E

Student	Score	Student	Score	Student	Score
1	3.2	13	2.8	25	4.1
2	4.3	14	3.1	26	2.0
3	4.1	15	3.1	27	2.9
4	3.3	16	2.8	28	3.0
5	2.6	17	3.4	29	4.5
6	4.0	18	2.8	30	3.7
7	3.5	19	4.6	31	3.1
8	2.8	20	3.6	32	3.6
9	3.2	21	3.2	33	2.5
10	3.2	22	3.3	34	2.9
11	2.6	23	3.3	35	3.5
12	4.0	24	3.5		

APPENDIX B

Letters of Permission

The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
A Publishing Service of ITT

Trade Division

4300 West 62nd Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46268
Tel. (317) 291-3100

August 5, 1970

Mr. Simson Sendler
20296 Blackstone
Detroit, Michigan 48219

Dear Mr. Sendler:

Thank you for your letter of the 3rd, giving me the additional information for which I had asked.

We are pleased to give you permission to use material from CHRISPUS ATTUCKS and ANTHONY WAYNE in the doctoral study which you are preparing, with the customary citation to titles, authors, publisher and copyrights.

This permission also extends to the one-time classroom use you outline.

We wish you luck with the project.

Sincerely yours,

Lois Stewart

S

Lois Stewart
Rights and Permissions

GARRARD PUBLISHING COMPANY

1607 North Market Street Champaign, Illinois 61820 Phone A.C. 217 352-7685

August 7, 1970

Mr. Simson Sendler
20296 Blackstone
Detroit, Michigan 48219

Dear Mr. Sendler:

There will be no objection to your reproducing forty copies of Chapters One and Four from Frederick Douglass and Paul Revere for use on the basis outlined in your letter of August 3, 1970.

On the copies you reproduce full credit must be given indicating the source of this material by listing the title, the author, the publisher's name, and the publisher's city and state address.

Sincerely,

GARRARD PUBLISHING COMPANY

R. J. Garrard
President

RJG:es

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
2 PARK STREET BOSTON 02107
TELEPHONE: 423-5725

August 10, 1970

Simson Sendler
20296 Blackstone
Detroit, Michigan 48219

Dear Mr. Sendler:

We have your letter of August 3 and would have no objection to your using approximately 6 pages from each of the 2 or 3 chapters you have requested from HARRIET TUBMAN, SACAJAWEA, MATTHEW HENSON and PONTIAC in your doctoral study.

No fee is involved for the use of up to 40 copies of the above material in your 4 fifth grade classes, but full credit should be given to authors, titles and to us as the publisher.

When your study is complete, all copies are to be destroyed, except for a sample to be included in your thesis.

Sincerely yours,

Barbara E. Amidon

(Mrs.) Barbara E. Amidon
Permissions Department

BEA:gew

APPENDIX C

Sample Exercises

Appendix C

Sample Exercises

The exercises on Frederick Douglass and Paul Revere are presented as samples of the exercises used in the study. The other three series follow this form in all details.

The investigator will be pleased to furnish copies of any exercises to interested persons.

FREDERICK DOUGLASS

These stories are taken from the book FREDERICK DOUGLASS, by Lillie Patterson, Garrard Publishing Company, Champaign, Illinois. Copyright 1965.

Frederick Douglass

"Step lively, Fred! Work faster!"

Fred heard this from dawn to dusk. He was now sixteen and had a new owner. Fred belonged to Thomas Auld. Thomas Auld was mean to his slaves. He never gave them enough to eat. He did not like Fred because Fred was not afraid to speak his mind.

"City life has spoiled you," Thomas Auld told Fred. "I'll have to send you to a slave-breaker."

Masters often sent troublesome slaves to slave-breakers. These men worked and whipped the slaves. They did this until the slaves became easier to handle. So Fred went to the farm of Edward Covey.

Fred had never been a field slave. He did not know how to handle farm tools and animals. The first week Covey said, "Go get a load of wood. Take the cart and the two oxen. Hurry!"

Fred finally got the load of wood. But the oxen ran away with the cart. Fred did not know how to stop them. Crash! They ran into the gate, breaking cart and gate.

Covey dashed over to a tree and cut three long switches. "Take your clothes off," he ordered Fred.

Fred stood stubbornly, not moving.

Covey ripped Fred's clothes off. The switches made long red marks across Fred's skin. He clenched his teeth together. He would not cry out or beg Covey to stop.

1. Fred was put to work in a
   a. farm b. factory c. bakery d. desk e. oxen
2. Fred worked
   a. all night b. part time c. all day d. very slowly
   e. in the city
3. Thomas Auld treated his slaves
   a. with respect b. without food c. very hard
   d. very well e. better
4. A slave breaker
   a. broke slaves in two b. helped them escape
   c. treated them with respect d. caught runaway slaves
   e. made slaves easier to order about
5. The oxen ran away because Fred didn't know about
   a. Covey b. animals c. Thomas Auld
   d. slave breakers e. carts
6. When Fred was whipped he was
   a. tied b. noisy c. laying down d. silent
   e. crying
7. Thomas Auld was Fred's
   a. old owner b. slave breaker c. oxen
   d. new owner e. leader
8. Covey beat Fred with a
   a. club b. branch c. whip d. pole e. cord
9. Before coming to the farm, Fred had probably
   a. raised sheep b. plowed fields c. done housework
   d. weeded gardens e. raised corn
10. When the oxen ran away, Covey thought Fred had
    a. done it on purpose b. done it by mistake
    c. been sorry d. not meant to do it
    e. wanted to get hit
11. After Covey was done, Fred's skin was
    a. marked b. smooth c. even d. never e. white
12. Covey had sent Fred to get some
    a. corn b. whips c. logs d. switches
    e. Thomas Auld

Frederick Douglass

Over the next six months Covey whipped Fred at least once every week. Fred worked until he nearly dropped. He worked in rain, snow, hail and heat. He grew silent. He never smiled.

Covey laughed. "At last I've broken him."

Early one morning Fred went to the barn to feed the horses. Covey sneaked up behind him with a long rope. Suddenly Fred's eyes flashed. Then he doubled his fist. He was seventeen now, tall and powerful.

"Are you going to resist me?" Covey asked.

"Yes, sir. I don't want to fight you, Mr. Covey. But I won't let you whip me this time."

Covey leaped at Fred like a tiger. But Fred was like a lion. He held Covey in his strong hands. The two began to give blow for blow. They rolled out of the barn door onto the floor. Covey finally gave up.

"I am a man," Fred told himself. "No master will ever whip me again."

On this farm Fred made close friends with other slaves. Fred and five slaves decided to run away. "We'll borrow a canoe and row up Chesapeake Bay," Fred planned. "Then we'll go northward on foot. The night before Easter will be a good time."

"How will we know where we're going?" one slave asked.

"We'll follow the North Star. It will guide us to the free states."

1. Fred and the other slaves decided to
   a. agree b. escape c. surrender d. revolt e. fight
2. Covey whipped Fred
   a. for being lazy b. often c. seldom d. in town
   e. lightly
3. Covey thought that Fred would never
   a. be broken b. work c. help him d. give up
   e. fight
4. Covey came on Fred while he was
   a. feeding animals b. plowing c. digging ditches
   d. resisting e. praying
5. After the fight, Fred decided he would never be
   a. escaped b. worked c. lazy d. beaten e. true
6. Covey and Fred fought
   a. at daybreak b. at noon c. at evening d. always
   e. North Star
7. Fred fought because he
   a. had to b. wanted to c. escaped d. worked
   e. was silent
8. Fred and the other slaves thought they would get away by
   a. forest b. water c. horseback d. camp e. road
9. After the fight, Covey probably felt
   a. stronger b. lazy c. ashamed d. happy e. brave
10. Fred and the other slaves chose the night before Easter because people might be more
    a. hungry b. careless c. angry d. watchful
    e. eager
11. The fight began when
    a. Fred attacked Covey b. Covey attacked Fred
    c. both attacked d. Fred escaped e. no one saw
12. When Covey worked Fred hard, Fred became
    a. loud b. slow c. quiet d. pleased e. resist

"I was too late to get one, sir. I'll pay for it now."

"I suppose you have your free papers with you?"

Fred spoke boldly. "Well, sir, I have a paper with an American eagle on it. That will carry me anywheres."

The conductor looked quickly at the paper and gave it back.

Fred was still not safe. Every time the train stopped for more passengers he held his breath. At one station he looked up and his heart jumped. A German blacksmith who knew Fred well came aboard. The two looked into each other's eyes for a long moment. Then the blacksmith went on to the next car.

"He knows I'm running away," Fred thought, "and he's letting me go."

The train soon reached Wilmington, Delaware. This was a danger spot for Fred. Passengers had to leave the train and take a steamboat for Philadelphia. Wilmington was on the border between slave states and free states. The slave catchers were all about. These spies searched for runaway slaves. Masters paid them for each slave caught.

But Fred's luck held. He reached Philadelphia and took another train. The next morning he was in New York.

He had escaped. Fred later wrote, "A new world had opened upon me." But where could he go? Fred walked the

streets until night. Then he crept behind some barrels on the waterfront. He slept soundly, the sweet sleep of freedom.

Once again a friendly sailor helped Fred. The sailor took him to the home of David Ruggles, a young Negro.

Ruggles listened to Fred's story. "You'll have to hide," he said. "There are some slave catchers even in the North. I'll hide you here while we send for Anna."

"But we are strangers," Fred said. "Why are you helping us?"

Ruggles smiled. "I am free and well educated. So I work to help others get their rights and freedom."

Anna came and she and Fred were married. Ruggles told them his plans. "I'll send you to a friend in New Bedford, Massachusetts. That's a busy seaport and Fred can find work."

Fred and Anna rented a small house. Then Fred went to the shipyard. "I am a first class shipworker," he told the owner. "I see you need help."

"I'm sorry," the owner answered him. "The workers won't let us hire Negroes."

Fred was stunned. "I'll show them," he told Anna. "I'm young, I'm strong, and I'm my own master. Nothing can stop me now."

Fred dug cellars, swept chimneys and loaded ships. No job was too hard. Later, he got work in a factory.

1. On the train, Fred was helped by a
   a. worker b. sailor c. slave d. conductor
   e. Negro
2. Fred was kept from working in the shipyard by the
   a. owner b. conductor c. Negroes d. sailors
   e. workers
3. A very dangerous part of the escape was when Fred had to go by
   a. road b. water c. cart d. horse e. tunnel
4. David Ruggles wanted Fred to get a job
   a. in a factory b. building boats c. digging cellars d. sweeping chimneys e. on a train
5. Slave catchers took slaves they captured to
   a. jail b. freedom c. their masters
   d. their wives e. Wilmington, Delaware
6. Fred went to New Bedford because
   a. he had to run away b. his wife was there
   c. he had friends d. he hoped to get work there
   e. the slave catchers found him
7. On the train, the conductor
   a. searched him b. forgot him c. overlooked him
   d. helped him escape e. checked his papers
8. David Ruggles helped slaves to
   a. escape b. fight c. battle d. protest
   e. give up
9. When Fred said, "A new world had opened on me," he meant
   a. a door was opening b. he discovered a new country
   c. he didn't have to work d. he was with free people
   e. the ground opened up
10. The German blacksmith probably
    a. owned slaves b. liked slavery c. thought slavery was good d. couldn't see e. didn't like slavery

11. David Ruggles kept Fred in his
    a. train b. tunnel c. shipyard d. house
    e. waterfront
12. Fred bought his train ticket
    a. before leaving b. on the train c. in town
    d. at the station e. in Wilmington

Fred went to work in a Baltimore shipyard. He learned quickly and soon became a skillful worker.

Every week Fred got paid. He could not spend the money though. A slave's earnings belonged to his owner.

It was at the shipyard that Fred met Stanley, the sailor. Stanley was a free Negro. All Negroes in the South were not slaves. Some were born free. Some were freed by kind masters. Some worked long years to buy their freedom.

"Every Sunday night the free Negroes get together," Stanley told Fred. "We teach each other what we know. I'll take you to one of our meetings."

Fred went. Everyone liked him. He studied with the group each week. And he began walking home with one of the girls after the meetings. She was Anna Murray. Her calm face and long black hair made Fred think of an Indian princess.

One night Fred whispered, "I'll be free soon, Anna."

"How, Fred?"

"I have a plan. If you miss me, don't worry."

"Be careful, Fred. They'll kill you if you're caught."

Fred planned carefully, step by step.

First he needed money. He got Auld to let him "hire out" his time. Owners sometimes let slaves pay them a sum each week, and keep for themselves any money left over. Fred worked early and late, Sundays and holidays.

One night Anna surprised him. She put some money in his hand. "Take it, Fred. I've been saving too. You find freedom. Then send for me."

Next Fred needed "free papers." Free Negroes had to carry papers to prove their freedom. Stanley had the answer. He offered Fred his "sailor's protection." "This paper protects Negro sailors anywhere," Stanley told Fred. "I'll lend you my sailor's suit and hat too. You can mail everything back to me."

One Monday morning in 1838, Fred left home early. He did not go to work though. He went to Stanley's room. When he came out, he was a handsome sailor, ready for travel.

Fred knew that Negroes were checked carefully at train stations. He timed his arrival for the last minute. The engine chugged. Fred dashed up and jumped on the train as it began to move.

"So far, so good," Fred told himself.

He knew the dangers ahead, though. Suppose someone on the train knew him? Suppose the conductor saw that the description on Stanley's paper did not match him?

Luckily the train was crowded. The conductor had to work fast. "Where is your ticket?" he asked Fred.

1. The money Fred got at the shipyard went to his
   a. escape b. friends c. wife d. plans e. master
2. At the train station, they checked _____ very carefully.
   a. women b. soldiers c. Blacks d. Whites e. sailors
3. Fred began working at a place that made
   a. cannon b. trains c. cotton d. boats e. escapes
4. Fred told the conductor he hadn't bought a ticket because he didn't have
   a. a friend b. enough money c. enough time
   d. the fare e. a conductor
5. Fred got his sailor's papers from
   a. his master b. Anna Murray c. Thomas Auld
   d. the conductor e. a friend
6. _____ let Fred do extra work to get money
   a. his master b. Anna Murray c. Stanley
   d. the conductor e. a friend
7. Anna said that if Fred were caught he might be
   a. whipped b. beaten c. dead d. starved e. unhappy
8. Anna helped Fred by
   a. giving him money b. giving him papers c. giving him advice d. sending for him e. running away
9. If Fred had been caught, he might have brought trouble to
   a. Thomas Auld b. the conductor c. his owner
   d. Stanley e. the shipyard
10. His master probably thought Fred wanted more money
    a. to buy his freedom b. to escape from the South
    c. to help someone escape d. to become a sailor
    e. for pleasure
11. The free Negroes met together to
    a. fight b. argue c. escape d. work e. learn
12. When Fred got ready to escape, he
    a. changed his address b. called Anna Murray
    c. changed his looks d. tried to forget
    e. went to the shipyard

PAUL REVERE

These stories are taken from the book PAUL REVERE, by Charles P. Graves, Garrard Publishing Company, Champaign, Illinois. Copyright 1964.

Paul Revere

"Down with the King!" Paul heard a speaker say.

A roar rose from the crowd of listeners. "Down with the King and his taxes," Paul shouted. "We want a place in the government."

One day Paul heard that the King was sending some soldiers to Boston. The soldiers were going to force the people to respect the King.

"We'll never do that," Paul thought. "Not unless the King shows respect for us."

Paul watched the King's soldiers get off their ships. He saw them march through the streets. Their drums were beating. Each red-coated soldier carried a gun.

"It would be all right if they had come to protect us," Paul said to a friend. "But they have come to make us obey a bad king. That is wrong."

A crowd gathered to watch the soldiers.

"Go back to England!" Paul heard a boy yell.

"They look like lobsters," a girl shouted.

"Let's boil them!" a man said.

It was plain that the people of Boston did not like the English soldiers. Paul felt sure there would be serious trouble.

One night Paul was working late. The ground outside was covered with snow. Paul was making an iron pot. No

one could afford silver now. Paul had to use cheaper metals.

Suddenly Paul heard bells ringing. There was shouting in the streets. Paul knew the noise meant trouble.

1. Soldiers were sent to make the people
   a. work b. fight c. obey d. slaves e. less able
2. Paul made
   a. cooking things b. silver things c. gold things
   d. pictures e. guns
3. The crowd thought the King was
   a. helping them b. not fair c. too good
   d. not strong e. in prison
4. Ringing bells and yelling meant
   a. the King had come b. taxes were higher
   c. lots of fun d. something bad might happen
   e. it was winter time
5. When the soldiers came, they were all ready to
   a. assist b. fight c. boil d. help e. respect
6. Paul thought that the King was
   a. helpful b. wise c. too brave d. a lobster
   e. not good
7. Paul heard the bells when it was
   a. at dawn b. before dark c. after dark
   d. storming e. very cheap
8. Paul said that the King had to
   a. forget b. give c. march d. fight for respect
   e. demand
9. When the English soldiers saw the people of Boston, they
   a. liked them b. joined them c. helped them
   d. were worried e. were pleased
10. The people of Boston thought that the soldiers
    a. were friendly b. wanted to harm them c. would help
    them d. were useful e. were sorry
11. Someone said that the soldiers looked like
    a. sailors b. pioneers c. sea animals d. ladies
    e. Paul
12. When Paul heard the bells, it was in
    a. winter b. summer c. spring d. fall e. daylight

He grabbed his coat and rushed out of the shop.

A crowd was running toward the State House. Paul followed them.

King Street was jammed with people. Men were throwing snowballs and shells at a group of English soldiers.

"Why are the people so angry?" Paul asked a man nearby.

"Because the English soldiers knocked a boy down," the man answered.

"Bloody backs!" the people shouted, pointing to the soldier's red coats.

"Let's pull the lobster's claws!"

The crowd moved closer to the soldiers. An English officer raised his gun. "Keep back," he warned. "Keep back or we'll shoot."

The crowd kept coming. "Stop or you'll be killed!" a redcoat cried.

"We're not afraid of your guns," a man near Paul shouted.

"Kill the redcoats," another man screamed.

Then someone shouted "Fire!" Paul didn't know who gave the order. He heard the English guns go off. Smoke rose from the guns. There was a smell of burning powder.

Paul saw some of the Americans fall into the snow - dead. Blood flowed from their wounds. The snow turned red.

Tears filled Paul's eyes as he realized what the English had done. Hatred burned in his heart. He wanted to fight the English.

Just then he heard a roll of drums. The drums were calling other English soldiers. Hundreds came marching up the street. Paul moved away, as there was nothing else he could do.

1. When the soldiers fired, many people were
   a. angry b. killed c. chased. d. taxed e. sorry
2. Some people were _____ at the soldiers
   a. firing guns b. spitting c. throwing things
   d. shooting e. thankful
3. The soldiers told the people to
   a. attack b. get shells c. go back d. fire
   e. get lobsters
4. When Paul saw what the soldiers did, he was very
   a. pleased b. friendly c. angry d. frightened
   e. ashamed
5. When the soldiers warned the crowd, the people
   a. came closer b. moved back c. ran away
   d. stayed still e. shot guns
6. Paul left the fight because he
   a. was afraid b. saw blood c. heard guns
   d. had to e. wanted to work
7. The man who told the soldiers to fire was
   a. the English officer b. Paul Revere c. not known
   d. an American e. the King
8. The crowd thought the soldiers had
   a. taken prisoners b. retreated back c. hurt some
   girls d. hurt a boy e. charged ahead
9. When the soldiers saw the crowd, they probably felt
   a. afraid b. stronger c. cowardly d. sleepy
   e. hungry
10. When people said, "Let's pull the lobster's claws,"
    they meant
    a. eat the soldiers b. boil the soldiers c. take
    their claws d. take their guns e. have fun
11. The drums Paul heard were to
    a. warn people b. bring men c. scare people
    d. get Indians e. make music
12. When Paul saw a crowd running, he
    a. led b. joined c. escaped d. charged e. argued

Paul Revere

Paul and two friends stole down to the riverbank where they had hidden the boat. Paul got in the bow. His friends started rowing. They had wrapped the oars in cloth to deaden the noise.

Paul saw a big English warship anchored in the river. "If a lookout sees us," Paul thought, "the ship's cannon will blow us to pieces."

Slowly and quietly Paul's friends rowed the small boat. As they passed the warship, Paul's heart pounded. He felt sure a lookout would see them. But no one saw the little boat glide by.

The boat reached the Charlestown shore. Paul leaped out. His Charlestown friends had seen the lanterns. They had a horse ready for him. Paul swung into the saddle.

"Be careful, Paul," a friend said. "If the English catch you, they may hang you."

"If I don't warn the minutemen, we may all be hanged!" Paul replied.

After he had gone a short distance, he saw two men on horseback straight ahead. They were blocking the road.

Paul pulled hard on his horse's reins. The moonlight shone on the men's uniforms. They were English soldiers.

One of them started toward Paul. Paul dug his spurs into his horse's flanks. He turned off the road. He galloped across the field as fast as he could go. The English soldier was close behind.

Paul saw a pond ahead. He rode straight for it. When he was a few feet from the pond, he turned sharply to the left.

As Paul had hoped, the English soldier didn't see the pond. Then it was too late. He couldn't turn his horse. He slid down the bank into some mud. By the time he got his horse out of the mud, Paul was gone.

Paul found another road that led to Lexington. At every farm and village Paul warned the minutemen.

"The redcoats are coming!" he shouted. "Wake up! Get ready! The redcoats are coming tonight."

Windows flew up. People leaned out.

"How's that?" they questioned. "The redcoats are coming?"

"Yes!" cried Paul Revere. "Tonight! The redcoats are coming tonight."

Men dressed and grabbed their guns. They got ready to fight.

Paul rode on. At Lexington he met Billy Dawes. They started for Concord together. Another Son of Liberty, Dr. Samuel Prescott, joined them. He helped them warn people who lived near the road.

1. Paul said that if he didn't warn the minutemen, they might all be
   a. captured b. gone c. dead d. surprised e. ready
2. Paul warned the people that the _____ were coming.
   a. minutemen b. warships c. horses d. Americans e. English
3. Paul and his friends started out by
   a. horse b. water c. road d. warship e. Sons of Liberty
4. Paul escaped because the English soldier was going
   a. too slow b. up the hill c. in the forest d. to Lexington e. too fast
5. Paul got a horse from
   a. some Americans b. the English c. Lexington d. Billy Dawes e. Dr. Samuel Prescott
6. _____ also rode with Paul to tell others.
   a. two men b. the English c. the minutemen d. three men e. one man
7. When they first started out, they were afraid of being seen by an English
   a. horseman b. troop c. cannon d. boat e. friend
8. When the English soldier chased him, Paul
   a. swam a river b. rode across country c. jumped in a boat d. met Billy Dawes e. found another road
9. If Paul had been captured, he probably would have
   a. told everything b. gone home c. kept quiet d. found minutemen e. explained everything
10. The English General knew that people
    a. were being warned b. didn't know his plans c. liked him d. didn't believe Paul e. wouldn't fight
11. They wrapped their oars in order to
    a. go faster b. be quiet c. be longer d. be larger e. turn faster
12. When Paul told the people what was happening, they
    a. ignored him b. didn't believe it c. stopped fighting d. ran away e. prepared to fight

Paul Revere

Dr. Prescott and Billy Dawes turned in at a dark farmhouse. They wanted to wake up the owner. Paul rode slowly ahead. As he rounded a curve he saw two redcoats on horseback.

Paul shouted for help from Billy and Dr. Prescott. Surely the three of them could beat two redcoats. But just then four other redcoats appeared. One of them pointed his pistol at Paul. Billy and Dr. Prescott rode up. As they did Paul tried to break through the group of redcoats.

"Obey me or I'll blow your brains out!" one of the Englishmen shouted. He waved his pistol. All the redcoats were watching Paul. This was a good chance for Dr. Prescott to get away. He jumped his horse over a stone wall and escaped. Billy also got away shortly afterwards.

Paul was not so lucky. One of the redcoats grabbed the reins of his horse. Another held a pistol against his chest. Paul could not escape. The English made Paul ride along with them.

Suddenly, bells started ringing and drums beating. The English knew the minutemen were getting ready to fight.

"We must hurry and join our company," one of the redcoats said.

"I can't," another said. "My horse is worn out."

"Well, take the prisoner's horse."

The redcoat made Paul dismount. Then he got on Paul's horse. He cut the bridle and saddle of his own

horse so Paul couldn't ride it. The English galloped off. Paul was free.

Paul hurried to Lexington on foot. He knew that the important leaders of the Sons of Liberty were hiding there. They were Sam Adams and John Hancock. If they stayed in Lexington, the English might capture them. Paul helped them get away.

Hancock had a clerk named John Lowell. He asked Paul to help him. They had to move a trunk out of a tavern in Lexington and hide it.

The trunk held secret papers belonging to the Sons of Liberty. If the English found the papers, they might hang Adams and Hancock.

Paul and John Lowell carried the trunk out of the tavern. They saw a line of redcoats marching up. The soldiers came to a company of minutemen standing on Lexington Green.

Paul and John couldn't stay to see what happened. They had to get the trunk to a safe place. They hurried across the green and got away. When they were out of sight, they heard gunfire.

Paul could hardly wait to learn what happened. Later he saw one of the minutemen who had been there.

"The redcoats marched up to us," the minuteman told Paul. "An English major said, 'Out of the way, you rebels! Out of the way! Lay down your arms!'"

1. Paul was captured by
   a. two soldiers b. four soldiers c. six soldiers
   d. the Americans e. Dr. Prescott
2. Paul helped Sam Adams and John Hancock
   a. fight b. march c. prepare d. escape e. stay
3. When the soldiers heard bells and drums, they knew it meant
   a. sailing b. marching c. fighting d. preparing
   e. escaping
4. Paul got away because the English
   a. liked him b. needed his horse c. were afraid
   d. trusted him e. held the reins
5. When Paul was captured, he was
   a. with a friend b. by himself c. with a troop
   d. in a boat e. with two friends
6. Paul and John didn't stay at Lexington because
   a. they had to warn others b. they were afraid
   c. they had to save the papers d. they wanted to fight e. the English made them move
7. When Paul was captured, the English made him
   a. get off his horse b. tell them everything
   c. follow them d. climb a tree e. ride with them
8. The English major told the Americans to
   a. fight b. battle c. defend themselves d. protest
   e. give up
9. In Lexington, the most important Paul had to do was
   a. fight the English b. save the papers c. get to a tavern d. sink the warship e. get to more towns
10. Paul tried to break through the group of redcoats in order to
    a. get away b. fight the soldiers c. sink the warships
    d. let others escape e. get the secret papers
11. The English soldier took Paul's horse because his was
    a. shot b. tired c. old d. sick e. excellent
12. Paul learned about the battle
    a. after it was over b. by watching it c. immediately
    d. in jail e. by fighting

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Asubel, David and Asubel, Pearl. "Ego Development among Segregated Negro Children." Education in Depressed Areas. Edited by H. Passow. New York: Teachers College, 1963.

Bailey, Francis Carolyn. "A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Two Reading Programs and a Language Development Program with Culturally Disadvantaged Children." Dissertation Abstracts 28 (May 1967): 3767A.

Baughman, Earl E. and Dahlstrom, Grant W. Negro and White Children. New York: Academic Press, 1968.

Bergemann, Verna E. "A Modified Language Experience Approach versus a Basal Reader Approach to Reading with First Grade Children." Dissertation Abstracts 30 (November - December 1969): 1740A.

Blom, Gaston E.; Waite, Richard R.; and Zimet, Sarah. "Ethnic Integration and Urbanization of a First Grade Reading Textbook." Psychology in the Schools IV (April 1967): 176-181.

Bottoroff, Norman E. "The Reaction of Third Grade Low and Middle Class Children to Selected Social Studies Words." Dissertation Abstracts 27 (March 1967): 2932A.

Chall, Jeanne. Learning to Read: The Great Debate. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.

Clark, Kenneth B. and Clark, Maimie.K. "Emotional Factors in Racial Identification and Preference in Negro Children." Journal of Negro Education 19 (1950): 341-350.

Clark, Kenneth B. and Clark, Maimie K. "The Development of Consciousness of Self and the Emergence of Racial Identification in Negro Pre-School Children." Journal of Social Psychology 10 (1939): 591-599.

Collier, Marilyn. "An Evaluation of Multi-Ethnic Readers." Elementary English XLIV (February 1967): 152-157.

Criscuolo, Nicholas P. "How Effective are Basal Readers with Culturally Disadvantaged Children?" Elementary English XLV (March 1968): 364-365.

Davis, Allison. "Teaching English and Reading to Disadvantaged Negro Children." Elementary English 42 (November 1965): 791-797.

Deese, James. The Psychology of Learning. New York: McGraw Hill, 1952.

Detroit Public Schools. Department of Research and Development. Summary of Achievement Test Scores, 1972. Detroit: Detroit Public Schools, 1972.

Dewey, John. Interest and Effort in Education. Cambridge, Mass.: Riverside Press, 1913.

Edgar, Robert W. "History, Reading, and Human Relations: An Integrated Approach." Social Education 29 (1965): 155-158.

Ellison, Tom and Williams, Gerald. "Social Class and Children's Reading Preferences." Reading 5 (June 1971): 3-8.

Fenton, E. "Crispus Attucks is not Enough. The Social Studies and Black Americans." Social Education 33 (April 1969): 396-399.

Frerichs, A. H. "Relationship of Self Esteem of the Disadvantaged to School Success." Journal of Negro Education 40 (Spring 1971): 117-120.

Getzels, J. W. "The Problem of Interests: A Reconsideration." Reading, Seventy-Five Years of Progress. Edited by H. Alan Robinson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Guthrie, John T. "Learnability versus Readability of Texts." Journal of Educational Psychology 65 (February 1972): 162-165.

Harris, Albert and Serwer, Blanche L. "Comparing Reading Approaches in First Grade Teaching with Disadvantaged Children." The Reading Teacher 19 (May 1966): 631-635.

Harris, Albert and Gould, Lawrence. "Comparing Reading Approaches in First Grade Teaching with Disadvantaged Children - Extended into Second Grade." Reading Teacher 20 (May 1967): 698-703.

Hogue, Bradley. "Some Effects of a Reader Written for Children from Families of Low Socio-Economic Circumstances." Dissertation Abstracts XXV (February 1965): 4576.

International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. 1968 ed. "Educational Psychology," by Arthur P. Coladarci.

Jensen, Arthur R. "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review 39 (Winter 1969).

Jersild, Arthur T. Children's Interests and What They Suggest for Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Press, 1949.

Krug, Mark. History and the Social Studies. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell, 1967.

Lichter, John H. and Johnson, David. "Changes in Attitude toward Negroes of White Elementary School Students After Use of Multi-Ethnic Readers." Journal of Educational Psychology 60 (1969): 148-152.

McNinch, George. "Determining the Reading Preferences of Third, Fourth, and Fifth Grade Disadvantaged Pupils." Journal of Reading Behavior 3 (No. 2, 1970-1971): 32-38.

Neyland, Leedell W. "Why Negro History in the Junior and Senior High Schools." Social Studies LVIII (December 1967): 315.

Peterson, Eleanor. Aspects of Readability in the Social Studies. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Press, 1954.

Poulos, Nicholas. "Negro Attitudes toward Pictures for Junior High School Social Studies Textbooks," Dissertation Abstracts 27 (August 1966): 332-333A.

Price, R. D. and Spencer, T. L. "Elementary Social Studies Textbooks and their Relevance to the Negro Child." Social Studies 61 (April 1970): 168-173.

Rist, R. C. "Black Studies and Paraprofessionals - A Prescription for Ailing Reading Programs in Urban Black Schools." Journal of Reading 14 (1971): 525-530.

Roth, R. W. "Effect of Black Studies on Negro Fifth Grade Students." Journal of Negro Education 38 (Fall 1969): 435-439.

Rowland, Monroe and Hill, Patricia. "Race, Illustration, and Interest in Materials for Reading and Creative Writing." Journal of Negro Education XXXIV (Winter 1965): 84-87.

Schnayer, Sidney W. "Some Relationships Between Reading Interests and Reading Comprehension." Dissertation Abstracts 38 (January 1968): 2606A.

U. S. Department of Commerce. U. S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Population and Housing: 1970. CENSUS TRACTS. Final Report PHC (1) - 58 Detroit, Michigan SMSA. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.

Waite, Richard R. "Further Attempts to Integrate and Urbanize First Grade Reading Textbooks: A Research Study." Journal of Negro Education 37 (1968): 62-69.

Whipple, Gertrude. Appraisal of the City Schools Reading Program. Detroit: Detroit Public Schools, Division for the Improvement of Instruction, Language Education Department, 1963.

Whipple, Gertrude. "The Culturally and Socially Deprived Reader." Education of the Disadvantaged. Edited by Harry Passow. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Whipple, Gertrude. "Issues Related to Basic Instruction in Reading." Reading: Seventy-Five Years of Progress. Edited by H. Alan Robinson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Wilkerson, Doxey A. "Prevailing and Needed Emphasis in Research on the Education of Disadvantaged Children and Youths." Journal of Negro Education XXXIII (1964): 346-357.