

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL ALIENATION IN UPPER
ELEMENTARY STUDENTS RECEIVING READING INSTRUCTION
IN FIVE TYPES OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS

APPROVED:

Graduate Committee:

A. Daniel
Committee Chairman

J. Marguerite
Committee Member

Fred W. Janner
Committee Member

Swane Tengery
Dean of the College of Education

Robert B. Toulouse
Dean of the Graduate School

Robinson, Frances Olvis, A Comparative Analysis of Social Alienation in Upper Elementary Students Receiving Reading Instruction in Five Types of Environmental Settings. Doctor of Education (Elementary Education), August, 1971, 132 pp., 32 tables, bibliography, 54 titles.

The problem of this study is concerned with a comparison of social alienation in upper elementary students receiving reading instruction in five types of environmental settings: (1) regular classroom with pupils who read at their grade level, above, or not as much as a year below their grade level, (2) regular classroom with pupils at least one grade level behind in reading, (3) large, special class, (4) small group instruction with a special teacher, and (5) a clinical setting located in a central area available to many schools. With the exception of (1) above, the students were at least one grade level behind in their reading.

The pupils in the five environmental settings resided in a southwestern state in or near a large metropolitan area. Twenty-five students were selected for testing from each of the five environmental settings previously described.

A semantic differential entitled "When at School I Feel" was constructed to ascertain the attitude of the students in regard to their feelings about school. The bipolar words regarding feelings toward school were selected in a

pilot study by typical children of similar age as those who were tested later.

"Attitude Toward School" is a scale recently developed to assess responses to forty-six questions as suggested by the title. With the establishment of both content validity and construct validity for the "Attitude Toward School" instrument, the attempt was made to establish concurrent validity for the semantic differential entitled "When at School I Feel." This was done by a Pearson correlation with the "Attitude Toward School" instrument as a criterion. The correlation was .73.

To test the hypotheses, an analysis of covariance was used with I.Q. scores as the control variable. A significant difference between the five groups of .0001 on the total scores of both instruments was found. Finding a significant difference in the F ratio, the Scheffé test was used comparing groups from regular and segregated settings. A difference beyond the .01 level was indicated by the Scheffé test. Tukey's test was used for a multiple comparison of pairs. Pupils in regular classroom settings showed a significant difference beyond the .05 level when paired and compared with pupils in segregated settings.

Conclusions

1. Pupils in different environmental settings have different attitudes toward school.

2. In general, the difference in pupil attitudes about school tends to reflect a predominant pattern, with children in regular classrooms feeling alike and somewhat more negative than children in segregated settings, who feel alike and have more positive feelings regarding school.

3. Generally, pupils in a homogeneous setting occupied a middle position, as to degree of alienation, between the more negative attitudes of pupils in a regular classroom and the more positive feelings of children in segregated settings.

4. Clinical and small class settings are characterized by smaller teacher-pupil ratios, more individualized instructional procedures, and the most positive pupil attitudes about school. These characteristics, in turn, may interact to create an atmosphere of better mental health for teachers and pupils.

5. Pupils who do not make normal progress in a regular classroom have the same attitudes about school as pupils in a regular classroom who progress at a normal rate or better. In the formation of attitudes, this suggests that the peer group influence is a more important factor than degree of achievement.

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL ALIENATION IN UPPER
ELEMENTARY STUDENTS RECEIVING READING INSTRUCTION
IN FIVE TYPES OF ENVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

By

Frances Olvis Robinson, B.M., M.M.

Denton, Texas

August, 1971

Copyright by
Frances Olvis Robinson
1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	
Purposes of the Study	
Hypotheses	
Background and Significance	
Definition of Terms	
Limitations	
Basic Assumption	
Instruments	
Procedures for Collecting Data	
Procedures for Analysis of Data	
II. RELATED LITERATURE	24
Alienation in General	
Alienation in the Elementary School	
Alienation in the Reading Environment	
III. COLLECTION OF DATA	51
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	59
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS	110
Findings	
Conclusions	
Implications	
Suggestions for Further Study	
APPENDIX	118
BIBLIOGRAPHY	128

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Attitude Toward School, Powerlessness	62
II. Attitude Toward School, Role Estrangement	63
III. Attitude Toward School, Meaninglessness	65
IV. Attitude Toward School, Guidelessness	67
V. Attitude Toward School, Cultural Estrangement	69
VI. Attitude Toward School, Total Score	70
VII. When at School I Feel, Good-Bad	73
VIII. When at School I Feel, Excited-Not Excited	74
IX. When at School I Feel, Awake-Asleep	76
X. When at School I Feel, Free-Trapped	77
XI. When at School I Feel, Glad-Sad	79
XII. When at School I Feel, Great-Terrible	81
XIII. When at School I Feel, Not Angry-Angry	82
XIV. When at School I Feel, Rested-Tired	84
XV. When at School I Feel, Friendly-Unfriendly	86
XVI. When at School I Feel, Calm-Nervous	87
XVII. When at School I Feel, Total Score	89
XVIII. Tukey Comparison of Means, R-AV, S-CLIN	91
XIX. Tukey Comparison of Means, R-BAV, S-SCLIT	93
XX. Tukey Comparison of Means, R-BAV, S-LSPCL	95
XXI. Tukey Comparison of Means, S-CLIN, S-SCLIT	97

Table	Page
XXII. Tukey Comparison of Means, S-CLIN, S-LSPCL . . .	99
XXIII. Tukey Comparison of Means, S-LSPCL, S-SCLIT . . .	100
XXIV. Tukey Comparison of Means, R-AV, R-BAV	102
XXV. Tukey Comparison of Means, R-AV, S-SCLIT	104
XXVI. Tukey Comparison of Means, R-AV, S-LSPCL	106
XXVII. Tukey Comparison of Means, R-AV, S-CLIN	108
XXVIII. Individual Scores, R-AV	118
XXIX. Individual Scores, R-BAV	119
XXX. Individual Scores, S-LSPCL	120
XXXI. Individual Scores, S-SCLIT	121
XXXII. Individual Scores, S-CLIN	122

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The reading difficulties of children are a particular problem of the public schools in the United States. The responsibility for resolving this problem is primarily, if not solely, within the scope of elementary education. The ability to read is a crucial factor for success in a technological, literate society. The ability to read is also a crucial factor for success in school. Therefore, a child who cannot read faces the first of a long series of problems, frustrations, failures, and possible social alienation in his school career.

The possibilities for the solution of this problem appear to fall within two main lines of thought. One type of solution would favor special instruction within the framework of the regular school environment. The other type of solution would involve segregation, in some manner, of children with reading difficulties from the regular school environment in order to give them special instruction. Segregation from one's peers is most often apparent (1) in a special class placement; (2) in a small group of one to three or more, instructed by a special teacher; (3) in a clinical setting located in a central area accessible to many schools.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to compare the social alienation of upper elementary students receiving reading instruction in five types of environmental settings.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were (1) to compare the extent of social alienation in those students who have reading instruction in different settings, (2) to analyze the implications of this social alienation for counselors, teachers, and others who are interested in their social adjustment.

Hypotheses

To carry out the purposes of this study, the following null hypotheses were formulated:

I. There is no significant difference in the degree of social alienation between students who receive reading instruction in a regular classroom and students who receive reading instruction in a segregated setting.

II. There is no significant difference in the degree of social alienation between students at least one year behind in reading who receive reading instruction in a regular classroom and students at least one year behind in reading who receive reading instruction (1) in a large, special class, (2) in a small group with an itinerant teachers, (3) in a clinical setting.

III. There is no significant difference in the degree of social alienation between students at least one grade level behind in reading in a clinical setting when compared with students at least one grade level behind in reading who receive reading instruction in a regular classroom.

IV. There is no significant difference in the degree of social alienation between students at least one grade level behind in reading taught by an itinerant teacher in a small group or on an individual basis when compared with students at least one grade level behind in reading who receive reading instruction in a regular classroom.

V. There is no significant difference in the degree of social alienation between students at least one grade level behind in reading taught in a large, special class when compared with students at least one grade level behind in reading who receive reading instruction in a regular classroom.

VI. There is no significant difference in the degree of social alienation between students at least one grade level behind in reading in a clinical setting when compared with students at least one grade level behind in reading who receive reading instruction from an itinerant teacher in a small group or on an individual basis.

VII. There is no significant difference in the degree of social alienation between students at least one grade level behind in reading in a clinical setting when compared

with students at least one grade level behind in reading who receive reading instruction in a large, special class.

VIII. There is no significant difference in the degree of social alienation between students at least one grade level behind in reading in a large, special class when compared with students at least one grade level behind in reading who receive reading instruction by an itinerant teacher in a small group or on an individual basis.

IX. There is no significant difference in the degree of social alienation between students in a regular classroom who are not at least one grade level behind when compared with students at least one grade level behind in reading who receive reading instruction in a regular classroom.

X. There is no significant difference in the degree of social alienation between students in a regular classroom who are not at least one grade level behind when compared with students at least one grade level behind in reading who receive instruction from an itinerant teacher in a small group or on an individual basis.

XI. There is no significant difference in the degree of social alienation between students in a regular classroom who are not at least one grade level behind when compared with students who are at least one grade level behind in reading and receive reading instruction in a large, special class.

XII. There is no significant difference in the degree of social alienation between students in a regular classroom who are not at least one grade level behind when compared with students at least one grade level behind in reading who receive reading instruction in a clinical setting.

Background and Significance

The significance of social alienation is apparent in diverse fields of endeavor. The fine arts reflect this quality. Also, philosophy is concerned with alienation, particularly the existential philosophers. Fromm and Maslow are psychologists who have considered alienation specifically in their personality theories. In addition, educators have made socialization a major goal. Educators, especially experts in reading, have argued for and against various organizational plans that might increase or decrease social alienation among elementary students. It was from these areas that a background for the present study was first considered.

Social Alienation and the Fine Arts

Many writers have characterized this century in modern times as the age of anxiety. Among its chief components have been violence, despair, and depersonalization. The humanities approach has yielded evidence in music, literature, and art of the traits of guilt, alienation, suffering, and abandonment (22, p. 413). Consider, for example, the

dissonance in modern musical expression or the stark coldness of skyscrapers. Or again, more specific examples might be The Waste Land by the poet T. S. Eliot, who identifies "the hollow men"; the suffering of war as expressed in the painting, Guernica, by Pablo Picasso; or the almost faceless sculptural forms of the family by Henry Moore.

Social Alienation in Philosophy

In philosophy, existential anxiety signifies social alienation not merely from one's fellow human beings but from the world. It is not characterized by hysteria but by a "warped rapport with one's fellowman . . . a low-order problem of being out of adjustment with one's social environment" (19, p. 25). It is the uneasy feeling of being an alien in a strange land.

Morris further states that the motivation for all humanistic thought is the irreplaceability of the individual. A socio-psychic need is the need for a "sense of belonging-in-the-world."

Morris says,

We want to know that in some genuine sense, we belong to and in the groups and activities with which we associate. This need is so powerful, as we all know, that if it is frustrated or unfulfilled for any length of time severe neurosis can result. Such understandings are now commonplace in psychological circles (19, pp. 32-33).

Social Alienation in Psychology

Maslow considers that his position falls within the broad province of humanistic psychology which he has characterized as a "third force" in American psychology, the other two being behaviorism and psychoanalysis (13, p. 325).

Maslow distinguished between basic needs and metaneeds. In his levels of motivation the basic needs of survival (such as food and shelter), safety, belonging, and esteem had to be met before intellectual growth and self-actualization could take place. These basic needs were defined as deficiency needs. He considered metaneeds, such as justice, beauty, goodness, order, and unity to be growth needs and equally potent rather than existing in a hierarchical order as the basic needs. "Metopathologies consist of such states as alienation, anguish, apathy, and cynicism" (13, pp. 327-328).

Erich Fromm is an example of a psychoanalyst who has shown concern for the aspect of humanization in a technological society. In his view "the alienated bureaucratic method" by which society conducts its affairs results in a pathological state of man in which he is a passive human being rather than an active participant in the centralized enterprises of government. He characterizes "the alienated bureaucratic method" as a one-way system in the manner of a pyramid with orders and planning directed from the top to the bottom.

Fromm observes,

Persons are "cases," whether welfare cases or medical cases, or whatever the frame of reference is, cases which can all be put down on a computer card without those individual features which designate the difference between a "person" and a "case." Our bureaucratic method is irresponsible, in the sense that it does not "respond" to the needs, views, requirements of an individual. This irresponsibility is closely related to the case-character of the person who becomes an "object" of the bureaucracy. One cannot respond to a case but one can respond to a person (10, p. 104).

The Educators' View of Social Alienation

In the transfer of this view of society to the specific area of education, theories of learning are found to have a similar psychological basis in that students are considered to be active or passive in relation to their learning environment. The alternative outlook would disregard the dichotomy of this type of dualism. Learning, to Gestalt-field theorists, would be interactive, rather than active or reactive. According to Bigge "there is a conviction that the concepts person, psychological environment, and interaction are highly advantageous for teachers in describing learning processes" (1, p. 10).

Cameron has quoted Ashley Montagu regarding the most important skill to be learned, this being the ability "to relate oneself warmly, cooperatively, and creatively to other human beings" (7, p. 48). Mikelson and Hanson have stated the goals in elementary education to be the preservation of the social heritage of society, the development of.

the individual, and experiences in group living. They say "a child who has not learned to get along with others and to behave intelligently and effectively as a group member is simply not educated" (17, pp. 6-8). Bradley and Earp have quoted objectives in elementary education compiled by Kearney in nine areas which included individual social and emotional development, social relations, and the social world as well as physical development, health, and body care, ethical behavior, the natural environment, aesthetic development, communication, and quantitative relationships (5, p. 3).

In writing of the disadvantaged, Noar has pointed to "the institutions of discrimination which continue to restrict and limit their experience and keep them out of the mainstream of American life" (20, p. 10). She states also that while remedial reading classes and clinics are most helpful to some children, the most severely retarded are often not reached (20, p. 28).

Moffett has written that "as much as possible, poor readers should not be segregated. Part of the snowballing effect of reading failure stems from this segregation and its consequent effect on self-esteem." Moffett thinks that broader ways should be found to handle learning problems "for the whole human being must be considered" (18, p. 112).

Strang has given attention to children retarded in reading in her endeavors to help children develop their potentialities:

Strang says,

It does not seem wise to put underachievers in separate classes; they are likely to reinforce one another's negative attitudes. It is more effective (a) to help them establish a personal relation with a teacher who consistently accepts them as persons with potentialities, and (b) to give them effective instruction in reading, arithmetic, and other learning skills that they have failed to acquire (23, p. 123).

A private company might be contracted to teach reading in a segregated school. If it does not teach reading, the company will lose money. Behavioral Research Laboratories (BRL) of Palo Alto, California is an example of such a private firm. Speaking of this program, Robert L. Thornberry, executive director of the Indiana Federation of Teachers, said it "threatens to break teacher-school board contracts, substitute corporate for public policy, introduces a strong element of vested interest in the use of corporate products in public schools, and ignores the 'Hawthorne effect'" (9, p. 6).

The prevalence of reading difficulties has been reported by Bond and Tinker in an overview of reading disability. They estimate that "the percentage of seriously retarded readers ranges from about ten to twenty-five percent" (2, p. 9). They cite surveys on reading status by Betts, Durrell, Monroe, Gates, McCallister, Witty, Lazar, and the more recent figures reported by Austin, Bush, and Huebner to validate this statement.

There is evidence to show remedial instruction in reading will produce gratifying results. An example of a study cited by Bond and Tinker was one by Monroe at the Institute of Juvenile Research. It was reported that those with higher I.Q.'s of 90 to 109 gained 1.55 reading grades (2, p. 13).

Bond and Tinker quote a report by Lazar on the administrative problem concerning retarded readers. "In ninety-six per cent of the schools it was felt that special teachers should be provided to instruct retarded readers outside the regular classroom" (2, pp. 11-12).

In summary, the prevalence of social alienation has been noted as well as the desirability of educative goals toward socialization. Whether the goals of socialization can be met by means of some form of segregation in reading instruction is a question that deserves further consideration. This study was an attempt in that direction.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study the following definitions were formulated:

Social alienation: the process of estrangement whereby an individual does not feel that he belongs to a group. Closely related to the estrangement from others is the diminution or elimination of self-awareness in the individual along with a lack of responsibility for intellectual, emotional, or even physical activity as stated by Kaplan and

Singer in their study of sensory alienation. They say "alienated man is said to lose his sense of being 'subject' and to become more and more 'object' in his own eyes" (15, p. 486). However, for the present study, alienation was considered primarily as it related to estrangement or isolation from others and absence of the feeling of belonging to the group.

Mackey has delineated five sub-categories of alienation. (1) "Powerlessness over the environment" is the category in which learning is inhibited when the individual thinks his performance makes no difference in the outcome and that goals are determined by social institutions and unrecognizable forces. (2) "Role-estrangement" criticizes the schools in that they foster estrangement by instrumentalization in which others are manipulated as commodities or through inauthentic experiences that pretend to be goal-oriented. (3) "Meaninglessness of life alternatives" is the category in which the individual feels unable to cope with his complex life situation. In this state, there is a tendency to romanticize the past. (4) "Guidelessness" is the inclusion of conflicting norms in the same personality. (5) "Cultural estrangement" marks an attitude in which the individual voluntarily separates himself from the social and cultural norms that prevail (16, p. 85). Although these categories are often typical of adults, and young adults especially, it

is becoming apparent that such feelings exist at an earlier stage of social alienation in elementary school years.

Upper elementary students: students in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades or the middle school grouping of fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. The ages involved were not younger than nine nor older than fifteen. The extended upper age limit was deemed necessary in that some of the students tested may have been retained and would therefore be older than the expected age.

Reading instruction: the teaching of reading as it meets the deficiency needs in reading of individual pupils.

Itinerant teacher: a resource person who is not a regular classroom teacher, but one who teaches selected students at intervals apart from the regular classroom situation.

Environmental setting: the situation in which a student receives reading instruction as it relates to the presence or absence of his classroom peers.

Designation of instructional settings and groups: five environmental settings were designated for the supposed degree of alienation that might be evidenced.

(1) R-AV (Regular Classroom-Average Reading Ability). In a regular classroom, usually referred to as a self-contained classroom, a group with average ability would be the most predominant environmental setting to be found. By average ability is meant those children who, as a group,

read at their grade level, above their grade level, or less than a year below their grade level. Generally, one teacher works with the same group of children throughout the day or most of the day as in modified forms of the plan. There are social advantages to this plan in that the teacher and pupils can know each other more intimately. Emotional security is promoted because children are treated as individuals at the same time they identify with a group.

(2) R-BAV (Regular Classroom-Below Average Reading Ability). This setting is identical to the setting previously described. However, the pupils in this setting are at least one grade level behind in reading. For this reason, these pupils may have feelings of alienation that the average group would not have. Their feelings could be attributed to organization within the classroom. Much depends on the way grouping is done in the class.

Bradley and Earp state,

. . . for most classes it is necessary to have two types of reading groups. On the one hand, one has the several "skill groups" which includes those children who need special help with a particular skill, while on the other the best readers may be separated from the average group, and the like (5, p. 113).

(3) S-LSPCL (Segregated-Large Special Class). An increased degree of alienation would be suggested in this setting in that pupils have been separated from the heterogeneous, regular classrooms into classes constructed according to ability. These homogeneous groupings are often called

the Joplin Plan because such groupings were developed in the Joplin, Missouri schools. The basic advantage of the plan, according to Jenson and others, is "that each teacher would have a group of children to teach that represented a small spread in reading achievement" (14, p. 94). This type of grouping is more permanent than the temporary groupings in a heterogeneous regular class. And in the case of "low ability" groups, the permanence would heighten the labeling effect.

(4) S-SCLIT (Segregated-Small Class, Itinerant Teacher). This setting separates pupils from their peers in an even greater degree than the other settings reviewed. Not only are children in this group labeled according to their lack of reading ability, but the room in which the reading instruction is most often done is a small room away from the regular classrooms. The teacher in this situation usually will have special training in remedial reading. The instruction of one to several children is more individualized according to a particular pupil's needs. In some cases these sessions are in addition to, rather than in place of, regular classroom reading instruction.

(5) S-CLIN (Segregated-Clinical). In this environment, pupils are separated from their peers for a portion of the day, or every day, in a central location away from their particular school. Children from many different schools will attend the clinical reading sessions. Often the reading

is given along with speech therapy or play therapy if a need is evidenced in these areas also. Emphasis is placed on proper diagnosis so that much testing and interviewing is done in addition to reading instruction. Usually children who have the most severe problems are those in these reading groups. The reading groups are small, however, and there is some use of a one-to-one relationship between teacher and pupil.

Limitations

This research was limited to a comparison of alienation as it exists in five groups of elementary school children. This study was further limited to a comparison of five groups, each about twenty-five, three groups receiving instruction in special settings and two in a normal, classroom setting. Children who were emotionally disturbed were excluded from the study. The assessment of alienation was limited to two instruments: (1) the "Attitude Toward School" scale and the (2) "When at School I Feel" semantic differential. Finally, the assessment and comparison of alienation was made by the use of a posttest only.

Basic Assumption

A basic assumption which seemed necessary to make was that pupils who are poor readers have a low sociometric rating by their peers and therefore experience social alienation. From their study, Grossman and Wrighter say,.

"the children with low reading ability also had low selection-rejection scores" (12, p. 354). They concluded that children who are rejected by their peers "are, by and large, more susceptible to nervous symptoms than the selected children. Their lack of a feeling of belonging is a true reflection of their status in the group" (12, p. 355). Bonney found that the high group of pupils in sociometric status rating were much more involved in verbal behavior and group activities than the low group (4, p. 493). In a similar comparison, Comross confirmed "the uncertainty of isolated children in regard to the reactions of others and their inhibition in verbal communication" (8, pp. 41-42). Gronlund found that there was a general tendency for teachers "to least prefer those pupils that receive relatively few choices on a sociometric test" (11, p. 149).

Instruments

A semantic differential entitled "When at School I Feel" was constructed to ascertain the attitude of the students in regard to their feelings about school. This information was indicative of the students' sense of belonging if it is agreed that reasonable satisfaction and happiness accompanies the sense of belonging among one's peers. Conversely, when the subjects responded with feelings indicative of unhappiness and dissatisfaction with school, the evidence would suggest either a degree of alienation or a

greater confidence in expressing the feelings of which they were aware. The bipolar words regarding feelings toward school were selected in a pilot study by typical children of similar age as those who were tested later.

"Attitude Toward School" is a scale recently developed to assess responses to forty-six questions as suggested by the title. Attempting measurement along a continuum ranging from "nearly always" to "sometimes" through "seldom" and finally "never," the subjects selected their answer. The number of selections in each of the four categories was then tallied for the derivation of a mean from the scores.

Although the instrument mentioned in the preceding paragraph is not listed in a book such as Buros' Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook, its use by Bonney in a study of 320 sixth-graders was documented in The Journal of Educational Research of April, 1971 (3). During the time span of one week, test data and retest data of the three classes involved in the study obtained reliability coefficients of .74, .86, and .89. Of the 320 sixth-grade pupils, the upper and lower quartiles were discriminated by an item analysis at the .01 level with the exception of two items.

Bonney designed the "Attitude Toward School" scale as an instrument to measure that dimension. Empirical relationships were hypothesized based on this construct and investigated in the previously mentioned study. The investigator's conclusions were borne out by research as was printed in

The Journal of Educational Research, April, 1971 (3). This lends, according to Roscoe, "support to both the validity of the instrument and the theory of the investigator" (21, p. 108). The analysis of test items was applied to the problem of content validity, the content validity discriminating at the .01 level.

With the establishment of both content validity and construct validity for the "Attitude Toward School" instrument, the attempt was made to establish concurrent validity for the semantic differential entitled "When at School I Feel." This was done by correlation with the "Attitude Toward School" instrument as a criterion. The correlation was .73.

Procedures for Collecting Data

After permission was secured from personnel in the school settings involved, the collection of data began. Twenty-five students were selected from testing in each of the five environmental settings previously described. The average group (R-AV) was selected randomly and tested orally in a group. Since the remaining students tested were poor readers, it seemed advisable to give the "Attitude Toward School" and the "When at School I Feel" instrument either orally or orally and individually so that the subjects could respond in a more meaningful manner for them.

Achievement test results not more than one year old and I.Q. tests were reported from school records. The names of these tests were reported also (6).

Data were then coded and punched into cards. Automatic data processing completed the process.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

For the first hypothesis an analysis of covariance was used. Since research studies give evidence that there is a relation between I.Q. and sociometric status, I.Q. scores were used as a covariant.

Roscoe says,

The use of analysis of covariance ordinarily involves a pretest (the variable to be controlled) and a posttest (the criterion) that are known to be correlated. I.Q. scores, achievement test scores, and previous course grades are often used as pretest measures in educational research (21, pp. 254-255).

Finding a significant difference in the F ratio, the Scheffé test was used comparing the two groups in the regular classroom setting (R-AV and R-BAV) with each of the three groups in segregated situations (S-LSPCL, S-SCLIT, and S-CLIN).

For the second hypothesis, an analysis of covariance was used to test the groups at least one grade level behind in reading in four environmental settings. Finding a significant difference in the F ratio, the Scheffé test was used comparing one group in the regular classroom setting (R-BAV) with each of the three groups in segregated situations (S-LSPCL, S-SCLIT, and S-CLIN).

Finding a significant F ratio in the analysis of covariance, Tukey's test for multiple comparisons of pairs was used to test Hypotheses III through XII. Tukey's test is a

more powerful test for these comparisons than some other statistical tests that might have been employed. Since one of the groups tested was not at least one year behind in reading, it was deemed advisable to use a more powerful test, such as Tukey's, in order to lessen the chance of a type II error. The .05 level of significance was necessary for the twelve null hypotheses to be rejected.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bigge, Morris L., Learning Theories for Teachers, New York, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964.
2. Bond, Guy L. and Miles A. Tinker, Reading Difficulties: Their Diagnosis and Correction, 2nd ed., New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
3. Bonney, Merl E., "Assessment of Efforts to Aid Socially Isolated Elementary School Pupils," Journal of Educational Research, 64 (April, 1971), 359-364.
4. _____, "Social Behavior Differences Between Second-Grade Children of High and Low Sociometric Status," Journal of Educational Research, 48 (March, 1955), 481-495.
5. Bradley, R. C. and N. Wesley Earp, Exemplars of the Teacher's Cognitive Domain, Dubuque, Iowa, William C. Brown Book Company, 1967.
6. Buros, Oscar Krisen, The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, The Gryphon Press, 1965.
7. Cameron, Jack R., "Public Education and the Retreat from Culture," Journal of Educational Thought, 3 (April, 1969), 41-48.
8. Comross, H. H., "Some Characteristics Related to Social Isolation of Second Grade Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, 53 (1962), 38-42.
9. Denton Record-Chronicle, December 13, 1970.
10. Fromm, Erich, The Revolution of Hope Toward a Humanized Technology, Bantam Edition, New York, Harper & Row, 1968.
11. Gronlund, Norman E., "Relationship Between the Sociometric Status of Pupils and Teachers' Preferences for or Against Having Them in Class," Sociometry, 16 (May, 1953), 142-149.

12. Grossmann, Beverly and Joyce Wrighter, "The Relationship Between Selection-Rejection and Intelligence, Social Status, and Personality Amongst Sixth Grade Children," Sociometry, 11 (November, 1948), 346-355.
13. Hall, Calvin S. and Gardner Lindzey, Theories of Personality, 2nd ed., New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1970.
14. Jensen, Theodore and others, Elementary School Administration, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1967.
15. Kaplan, Martin F. and Erwin Singer, "Dogmatism and Sensory Alienation: An Empirical Investigation," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 27 (1963), 486-491.
16. Mackey, James A., "The Dimensions of Adolescent Alienation," The High School Journal, 54 (November, 1970), 84-94.
17. Mikelson, Peter Palmer and Kenneth H. Hanson, Elementary School Administration, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957.
18. Moffett, James, A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, Grades K-13: A Handbook for Teachers, Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1968.
19. Morris, Van Cleve, Existentialism in Education: What It Means, New York, Harper & Row, 1966.
20. Noar, Gertrude, Teaching the Disadvantaged, Washington, D.C., National Education Association, 1967.
21. Roscoe, John T., Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
22. Satin, Joseph, The Humanities Handbook, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
23. Strang, Ruth, Helping Your Child Develop His Potentialities, New York, Award Books, 1970.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

In a search for related literature concerning the concepts of this study, three areas were particularly considered. These areas were alienation in general, alienation in the elementary school, and alienation in the reading environment. In this chapter on related literature, the selection of studies was made to emphasize the latest findings and some of the older research studies that seemed most pertinent.

Alienation in General

In a study to determine teachers' sense of alienation, Hearn found that no relationship between teachers' sense of alienation and school system structure existed after test results were computed of 658 elementary teachers employed in 27 school systems near the greater Cleveland area. Organizational bureaucratization, including specialization, centralization, and standardization, was not found to be incompatible with structural professionalism. Fifteen percent of the sample were men and they were found to be more alienated than females. Also teachers with lower social status backgrounds were significantly more alienated than teachers with professional and business backgrounds. Those teachers who had taught longer in a system were more alienated than those

teachers who had taught in several systems. The age of teachers did not seem to be related to alienation (21).

Some causes and cures of alienation were the concern of Moellenberg. The role of institutions has changed from the small school, church, and college in a small community, where the individual felt significant, to the large institutions in metropolitan situations where the individual impact is not so apparent. Moellenberg cites a famous study to suggest that dependence upon authority in teaching does not develop the needed habits of independent inquiry while it does stress passive acceptance of authority whether book, teacher, or minister. The study to which Moellenberg refers is by Lippitt and White regarding leadership and group life. Democratic, authoritarian, and laissez-faire were the three variations in adult leadership studied in four clubs of eleven-year-old children. In the authoritarian atmosphere the members were more dependent upon the leader than in the other two situations. There was a reduced range of individuality in the authoritarian situations. Rebellion against the leader and cooperation in out-group aggression were characteristic of the aggressive autocracy while submissiveness and lack of incentive were characteristic in the apathetic autocracy (19). Hence, Moellenberg suggests better communication between opposing groups in society and the more active participation of students in the decision-making processes of our institutions. In this situation the

student would be more active and the teacher's role would facilitate learning. As the students' role becomes more active, their sense of alienation should decrease, even in a large community (27).

Armer studied the effects of formal Western education (Western-style primary and secondary) in producing a sense of alienation in individuals of developing societies. Structured interviews of 591 young men in Kano, Nigeria cast doubt on the widespread belief regarding the damaging psychological effects of formal education in emergent societies. The effect of education on alienation depends upon the traditional or modern value orientations of individuals. It is less likely that individuals with modern value orientations will experience alienation. For them, education will tend to be conducive to their goals (4).

The study by Kaplan and Singer was designed to investigate dogmatism and sensory alienation. Dogmatism was measured by Rokeach's scale and thirteen dogmatic and thirteen non-dogmatic individuals served as populations. Sensory discrimination was determined by requiring the subjects to differentiate and/or match stimuli in five tasks. The five task areas were olfactory, gustatory, tactile, auditory, and visual. The results of the experiment showed that the highly dogmatic group did exhibit lower sensory acuity as compared with the group who were not considered to be dogmatic. This was particularly true in the olfactory,

gustatory, tactile, and auditory tasks. Although the visual task did not show a significant difference, the evidence, however, was in the same direction as the other tasks (24).

Bickford and Neal studied alienation in a population of students in a vocational training program in Canada. Sixty percent of the subjects were in the sixteen to twenty-one age category. The majority of these unskilled, jobless subjects were young, unmarried, childless, and from families of low socioeconomic status. Alienation scales were utilized to measure powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, and social isolation. Satisfaction measures about the training center and learning measures were also used. The results of the data analysis showed that the alienation variable affected learning and highly alienated subjects were more discontented with the program. Alienation per se was the cause rather than social background factors according to the data.

Bickford and Neal conclude,

If continued support for the relevance of alienation variables for education is obtained, the implications are clear. To produce effective learning situations it is first necessary to direct attention toward reducing kinds and degrees of alienation (6, p. 152).

The aspect of powerlessness in alienation is investigated by Seeman in a reformatory setting. There were three kinds of information presented to the prisoners. These included the immediate reformatory situation, long range

prospects for a non-criminal career, and the prospects for achieving parole. An alienation measure and a measure for social desirability were also given. These distributions were dichotomized at the median. The significant difference was between those high and low in alienation regarding the parole information. The data indicate that this could not be attributable to criminal history or I.Q. Seeman discusses the informal roles of inmates often called "Square John" and "Real Con," the former oriented to the rehabilitation situation and the latter oriented to the culture of the criminal.

Seeman states,

Motivation to learn is seen as being dependent not only upon expectancies for control of one's outcomes, but also upon the value one places upon the outcomes to which the learning is relevant (33, p. 284).

Coleman reacted to Seeman's "Alienation and Social Learning in a Reformatory" research by drawing a parallel to the mobility of people who adapt to urban living. He felt that those who adapt most readily are more individualistic than paternalistic. In regard to the paternalistic background of the southern Negro in the city, he observes that powerlessness often becomes apparent in a lack of ability to learn and become self-sufficient in the urban situation (11).

Another study by Seeman on alienation and learning was conducted in Sweden. The main idea of this research was to

see if the alienation-learning hypothesis was applicable cross-culturally.

Seeman says,

The thesis is that an individual's generalized expectancy for control of his outcomes (i.e., his sense of powerlessness) governs his attention to, and acquisition of, information available in the environment (34, p. 105).

There is a connection between learning theory and the mass theory which asserts that alienation is a development of modern aspects of living such as mobility, technology, and bureaucratization. A powerlessness scale and knowledge tests concerned with nuclear knowledge and cultural knowledge were given by mail questionnaires and interviews with students.

Correlations between powerlessness and knowledge supported the prediction including the idea that powerlessness is not "a global variable that has a negative correlation with all kinds of information." For example, the results showed that high powerlessness goes with low political awareness in the case of women. It was predicted that those high in powerlessness would delay returning the nuclear test, if at all, but that this would not happen in the case of the cultural test. However, the predicted behavior avoidance pattern was not supported by the statistics (34).

In a small, southern city, Middleton measured 256 randomly-selected residents to see if the different types of

alienation as suggested by Seeman correlated with each other. Seeman's interpretation of the construct of alienation included powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, isolation, and self-estrangement. The findings revealed that estrangement from work correlated most highly with the other types of alienation. The percentage of Negroes who felt alienated was much higher than the percentage of whites for every type of alienation. Those with more education felt less alienated than those with less education (26).

Aiken and Hage explored the relationship between alienation from work and alienation from expressive relations. Two structural properties of organizations, formalization and centralization, were compared in sixteen welfare organizations. Ten of these organizations were private and six of them were public.

Aiken and Hage aver,

Alienation from work reflects a feeling of disappointment with career and professional development. . . . Alienation from expressive relations reflects dissatisfaction in social relations with supervisors and fellow workers (2, p. 498).

The degree that members participate in decision-making is the meaning of centralization. By formalization, standardization is applied and the amount of deviation allowed is implied.

Aiken and Hage conclude,

Alienation from work and alienation from expressive relations were found to be more

prominent in highly centralized and highly formalized organizations (2, p. 497).

Clark was interested in developing a tool for the measurement of alienation. He interviewed members of a milk cooperative. He found the more powerless that members of an organization feel, the more dissatisfied they are with its operations (10).

Even though the preceding studies have been concerned with alienation in general, the findings in these studies suggest applications that might be transferred to research in the elementary schools. One of the central ideas to emerge is the aspect of powerlessness as it involves authority figures, such as the teacher, in the child's environment. If the teacher is either alienated or authoritarian, the evidence would indicate that powerlessness on the student's part would be a manifestation. Conversely, with student-teacher planning, the pupil's feelings would receive consideration and apathy might be reduced or avoided. Further, the study in Sweden by Seeman suggests one way that might reveal alienation as it relates to a lack of concern about current events on the part of alienated individuals.

Guidelessness, or the presence of conflicting norms, was apparent in Seeman's study in a reformatory setting. Supposedly, if the students had a more active role in planning their school work, the outcomes would be more relevant for them and therefore conflict with teacher norms would be reduced at the same time that meaningfulness would increase.

Finally, these studies show a relationship between the presence of alienation and the inability to learn. If sensory alienation is part of the total alienation pattern, as the evidence suggests, then the aspect of word-blindness in reading, for example, is better understood.

Alienation in the Elementary School

Relationships between sociometric status and reading achievement have been the concern of many research studies. Bloomer provides some insights in a study of 450 children in grades one through six in two suburban schools. The children were given a sociometric device of four questions. After determining differences between groups, the data from reading achievement tests were analyzed and compared. Bloomer found that the rejected child had lower reading scores than the accepted, isolate, or high-impact child. Although tests showed no significant difference between sociometric groups for the memorization of materials, the rejected group was inferior to the other groups when conceptual learning was involved (35).

Calder evaluates self-directing reading materials in a series of studies. These materials involved tasks of a manipulative nature with written instructions and illustrations. In a study of sixty-two fifth-grade children, statistically significant differences appeared in those using self-directing booklets. Reading achievement, the ability

to follow written directions, and attitudinal growth were noted in relation to rejected and anxious children. Self-directing materials seemed to help these children overcome some of their frustrations caused by failures (35).

Commiss studied social isolation of second-grade children based on the theories of Sullivan. Sullivan emphasized the early school years as the time for becoming social and the handicapping effect of social isolation at this time. Due to fear of ridicule, the child may fail to expose himself to new learning or corrective learning. A comparison of some twenty children scoring in the highest quarter of their classes on a sociometric test with twenty children in the lowest quarter confirmed Sullivan's theories in that isolated children were uncertain in relation to others and inhibited in verbal communication. A positive relationship between social status and eye-hand coordination was found in the group studied also (12).

In another study of second-grade children of high and low sociometric status, Bonney found that high pupils were more involved in verbal behavior and that their high peer status was more related to the possession of positive traits than to the absence of negative traits. Some of the positive traits were that the high children participated in group activities of all kinds and appeared to be in good humor and happy most of the time. These children were not only cooperative and friendly, but they were reasonably aggressive,

showing greater personality balance. Although they were sociable and communicative, they were able to occupy themselves when alone (9).

Gronlund gave a sociometric test to forty sixth-grade classes. Each teacher of the classes was asked to select the three boys and the three girls most and least preferred by her. In general, teachers most preferred students who were highly chosen on a sociometric test and to least prefer those students who had few choices. This indicates that certain behavior characteristics of pupils low on the sociometric test influence their acceptance both with peers and teachers (17).

Sixth-grade children were studied by Grossmann and Wrighter for the relationships between selection-rejection scores and intelligence, personality, and social status. Generally, the children who had high selection-rejection scores had the higher ratings on personality, social status, and intelligence. However, it appeared that intelligence made a difference only to the point of being normal. In regard to reading ability, this did not seem to be a factor once average reading ability was achieved. The children of high and low selection-rejection scores were differentiated most often in the area of personality adjustment. The children with low scores were more susceptible to nervous symptoms and to feelings of not belonging to the group (18).

In Britain, Pumfrey and Elliot were interested in reading achievement and social adjustment in relation to the use of play therapy. Eight boys from two schools were randomly allocated to control and experimental groups. The experimental group was given play therapy. At the end of the experiment different rates of reading progress were found between the control and experimental groups, but the differences were not significant. There were also nonsignificant differences between the group mean scores on each reading test even though large differences in initial adjustment scores were evident. Since the results of this study did not agree with some similar studies, the authors attributed the difference to the small number of children that they used in their research (31).

Bills has based his study on the self-consistency theory of Lecky who thought that poor reading resulted from inconsistencies in the self-concept of the child who perceived himself as a poor reader rather than the concept of self as a good reader. Supposedly, reading ability will improve when the inconsistencies within the value-systems of pupils are resolved through non-directive play therapy. It was suggested that a change of self-concept was the result of non-directive play therapy experience and that these techniques are adaptable to the classroom (7).

The eight retarded readers tested were observed during three periods of thirty days each. The first period measured

the reading gains previous to play therapy experience. During the second period of thirty days, therapy was given. The third period measured gains after therapy. Bills concludes that significant changes resulted in reading ability after a therapy experience (7).

In a similar study, also by Bills, of well-adjusted retarded readers, it was found that the well-adjusted readers did not make significant gains in reading therapy.

Bills concludes,

The gains in subject matter ability are directly proportional to the amount of emotional maladjustment present in the child (8, p. 249).

Hughes was concerned in his study with delayed auditory feedback as it related to reading achievement particularly. Reading tests were given to fifty-one randomly-selected sixth-grade students from five elementary schools. The reading tests were repeated under conditions of delayed auditory feedback and their reading coping strength and comprehension coping strength were noted under conditions of distraction. Scores from The Children's Manifest Anxiety Scale, the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale, and midterm grades were considered for relationships. The children had previously been selected for an I.Q. range confined to 89 to 112.

The results of the Hughes study indicated that children with a higher I.Q. and a higher self-concept tended to earn higher grades. There was a significant difference in reading

coping strength and comprehension coping strength in that children with I.Q.'s above the mean in this study made a lower number of errors on the reading tests. Although reading coping strength did not vary significantly between girls and boys, coping strength of Negro pupils was superior statistically (22).

Graubard conducted an experiment utilizing the group in teaching disturbed delinquents in which the dependent variables were reading achievement and appropriate behavior. The group of eight boys were taught under three different conditions. Under the first condition, a group consensus determined the reinforcers such as kite, goldfish, shirt, etc. If the class did not behave, the teacher was tolerant, but the boys would not receive their reinforcers. Reminders that inappropriate behavior affected all usually came from children who scored highest on a class sociometric device. The same academic routine was followed under the second condition, but points were given in the early morning period and did not depend on the behavior of the boys. The teachers praised, graded, and intervened when there was misbehavior. After this, group and individual contingencies were initiated. The results included reading gains of two levels on the SRA materials and when the peer group sanctioned learning, there was a sudden, positive shift in behavior (15).

McElhinney and others studied alienation in elementary school pupils in grades four through six. Six thousand

students were given a seventy-two item questionnaire in which eleven of the items were suggestive of alienation. This study showed that the amount of alienation depends on the particular school environment as unique patterns of response appeared on the eleven items. From these data, it was found that more than half of the students felt that school experiences were contradictory to life outside of school. However, twice as many students would prefer to escape school by becoming older rather than younger. The conclusion reached by one in twenty fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-graders was to the effect that they would not succeed as adults. Of the items that define alienation, McElhinney lists

. . . absence of control over own life, unequal chance to succeed, absence of pride in accomplishments, school content as irrelevant to their lives outside school, willful school absence, absence of an understanding teacher, withdrawing when things go wrong at school, absence of parental verbal interest in school, parental avoidance of visiting school, and degree to which pupils saw adults as verbally undependable (25).

In this section of studies on alienation in the elementary school, the study by McElhinney is most like the research of the present study as it attempts to tap various manifestations of alienation such as role estrangement, cultural estrangement, and meaninglessness. The pupils of McElhinney's study showed a preference for becoming older as an escape from school rather than showing a tendency to romanticize the past as might be expected with older individuals exhibiting meaninglessness.

Some of the other studies were concerned with the self-concept. In the McElhinney research pupils in elementary school felt that they would not succeed as adults. Play therapy was shown as beneficial to the self-concept when used with poorly adjusted pupils especially. Evidence suggested also that the teacher's role could be a more positive one for social acceptance of all pupils. Several of the studies indicated the importance of verbal communication in relation to social acceptance and as a prerequisite to reading progress.

The connection between sensory and social alienation was again apparent in the Hughes study. The auditory sense was investigated and the relationship with reading achievement was evident.

Alienation and the Reading Environment

Zotos conducted a six-month study using tape-teaching with 200 primary children. Two treatment groups were formed by the random selection of 100 children. One group received individual and small group instruction through tape-teaching. The other group received the same instruction independently or in teacher-led groups, but without the utilization of tape-teaching. The report found only a small difference between the two groups in reading achievement. However, the slight difference favored the tape-teaching group (35).

Johnson found evidence of social maladjustment in a reading clinic. Of the thirty-four children involved, over 80 percent showed one or more of the following: withdrawal from group activities, prolonged lack of leadership, inability to cooperate with peers, avoidance of peers by seeking adult society, and attempts to dominate younger children (23).

Goldman and Wolff made a study of the effectiveness of a demonstration reading school. This study concerned seven heterogeneous classes of children from kindergarten through grade six. They were from a cross-section of socioeconomic levels both urban and rural. They, with their teachers, were bussed to the demonstration reading school for instruction by experts. The teachers were given intensive training. It was found that there was a significant improvement of reading school pupils beyond that of control pupils for a majority of classes. There was also a significant improvement in ability to teach reading for teachers at the reading school (14).

Hart compared the pupil achievement in reading, under a grouping by ability, with pupil achievement in reading under the regular program, in which the pupils were heterogeneously grouped. The reading achievement of pupils who were homogeneously grouped was significantly greater than those in the regular group (20).

Oliver surveyed numerous research studies that compared intraclass organization for reading instruction with interclass organization for reading instruction and homogeneous with heterogeneous ability groupings. Oliver analyzed the Hart study and thought that factors other than organization might account for the results.

Oliver says,

The children in the cross-class homogeneous groups had been given informal reading inventories. . . . Had informal reading inventories been given to the pupils in the regular classroom group, they might have shown more gain in reading (30, p. 98).

Morgan and Stucker compared the Joplin Plan of reading instruction with the traditional method. In an experiment that lasted for one year, children in the upper elementary grades of a rural elementary school were matched according to reading ability and other variables. They were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups after they had been designated as fast or slow achievers. The teachers were also randomly assigned to the groups. The students in the experimental group received their reading instruction according to the Joplin Plan. The control group received reading instruction in a traditional self-contained classroom. The results indicated that the Joplin Plan was effective for those pupils leaving their homerooms for reading instruction in that their reading scores were higher than the control group.

Morgan and Stucker state,

It was suggested that the obtained superiority might be due to the lowered variance of the experimental group, which allowed . . . the slow student to function in a nonthreatening atmosphere which maximized positive feedback from readable materials (28, p. 73).

Regarding the reduction of the range of ability or achievement in a group as advocated by the Joplin Plan, Nichols asks,

Should administrative arrangements for grouping children be offered as a substitute for efforts at upgrading teacher competency (29, p. 588)?

Of three groups of students compared, two groups were heterogeneously grouped and one group had been divided for purposes of reading into three ability sub-groups. The achievement differences were "overwhelmingly" in favor of pupils randomly assigned and receiving instruction in a self-contained classroom. Their achievement was equal to the homogeneous group of superior children who had reading in the school with interclass ability grouping (29).

An experimental program was devised by Balow for a 50 percent reduction of class size. This was accomplished by having half of each class involved come to school an hour earlier for their reading while the remaining half received their reading instruction after the early group had left in the afternoon. Interpretation of the results of this study showed that the experimental group had increased reading achievement over the control group.

Balow says,

This finding suggests that the influence of the program was cumulative and adds statistical weight to the belief that the first grade is the critical year in reading instruction (5, p. 186).

Balow thought that third-grade achievement patterns were stabilized to the extent that smaller class size did not change these patterns (5).

Anastasiow defined ungraded reading instruction as a practice of the teacher which placed the individual child in an instructional group near his grade-level of achievement. The study was conducted in two elementary schools of similar socioeconomic profiles and mean reading achievement. In one school the children were grouped across grades four through six according to their level of achievement. In the other school the children remained in self-contained classrooms for reading instruction. All children were grouped by achievement. The results indicated that there were no significant differences between the two schools in achievement. Both schools made significant gains, however (3).

Schrank conducted two similar experiments regarding ability grouping. In the first experiment the labeling effect was definitely found to exist. In the second experiment it was not found to exist. The difference in the two experiments had to do with the expectations of the teacher. In the first experiment the teachers did not know that the grouping was random. In the second experiment the teachers

knew that the students had not been grouped according to ability but that ability grouping was only simulated.

Schrank says,

This indicates that a primary factor in the production of the labeling effect is the teacher's own reaction to his perception of pupil ability rather than the pupil's reaction to teacher expectation (32, p. 358).

In a study by Meyerowitz on the effect of special class placement upon young retardates, these children were found to be more derogatory of themselves than children in regular classes. After the first year of placement in the special class, Meyerowitz concludes,

. . . children of this study developed a more negative self-concept than they would have if left in their regular classes (16, p. 208).

This conclusion was reached because retardates in regular grades were not more derogatory of themselves than retardates in special classes. This finding was opposite to the predicted direction of the hypothesis (16).

Delacato and Delacato were the researchers in a study that reported a reading gain of one grade during a six-weeks session with poor readers in a total environment that was permissive and a social studies program about "People, How and Why They Act as They Do." The same study with similar boys produced the same favorable results when it was repeated at a later time. The authors indicate that this approach to remedial reading can be successfully used in a classroom.

Delacato and Delacato say,

Such group remedial instruction given within the framework of the classroom organization can embrace the value of remedial instruction which in many instances has lost some of its effectiveness because it is isolated from the classroom lives of the children (13, p. 33).

Adelman expresses a molar viewpoint by directing attention to the learner and the learning environment. It is not reading per se that he is interested in, but the process of learning to read in the classroom. This idea was tested in seven classrooms of three "disadvantaged" schools. Each of the classrooms contained thirty to forty-two pupils whose reading ability ranged from a few who were reading a little above grade level to many who were reading below grade level. The classroom facilities and activities were changed so that there was an increase in approach and a decrease in avoidance tendencies on the part of the student and teacher. There were a variety of "centers" to stimulate learning, boring activities were eliminated to be replaced by activities that derived from the students' interest, and each child had an individually designed reading program. In six of the seven classrooms there was not a single pupil found to be unable to read or make progress. There were no major behavioral problems in any of these rooms during the reading program (1).

This experiment was chosen to be the concluding study because the molar distinction made by Adelman summarizes the

principal views regarding reading instruction. Those who emphasize reading per se see no disservice to pupils when separated from their peers for instruction. Those who stress the view expressed in the phrase reading in the classroom consider socialization goals as important as well as necessary prerequisites for reading achievement in a continuing process.

The research by Balow lends support to the study by Comross in the previous section. Both studies confirm Sullivan's theories that stressed the importance of the early school years and what might be termed prevention in the primary grades as opposed to the necessity, too often, of reading remediation in the upper elementary grades.

Alienation as related to environmental setting is yet very little studied. The studies in this section are typical of most studies regarding setting in that they are a comparison of reading achievement gains between pupils grouped according to ability and pupils in a heterogeneous grouping. Most studies of a clinical setting have been of a descriptive type, the Johnson study being an example of this type of study. The results in reading achievement have varied, but the latest research indicates that significant teaching makes the regular classroom setting the most favorable one, both for gains in reading and for the attainment of a positive self-concept.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adelman, Howard S., "Learning to Read in the Classroom," The Reading Teacher, 24 (December, 1970), 257-260.
2. Aiken, Michael and Jerald Hage, "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis," American Sociological Review, 31 (August, 1966), 497-507.
3. Anastasiow, Nicholas J., "A Comparison of Two Approaches in Ungraded Reading Instruction," Elementary English, 45 (April, 1968), 495-499.
4. Armér, Michael, "Formal Education and Psychological Malaise in an African Society," Sociology of Education, 43 (Spring, 1970), 143-159.
5. Balow, Irving H., "A Longitudinal Evaluation of Reading Achievement in Small Classes," Elementary English, 46 (February, 1969), 184-187.
6. Bickford, Hugh L. and Arthur G. Neal, "Alienation and Social Learning: A Study of Students in a Vocational Training Center," Sociology of Education, 42 (Spring, 1969), 141-153.
7. Bills, Robert E., "Nondirective Play Therapy with Retarded Readers," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14 (1950), 140-149.
8. _____, "Play Therapy with Well-Adjusted Retarded Readers," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14 (1950), 246-249.
9. Bonney, Merl E., "Social Behavior Differences Between Second-Grade Children of High and Low Sociometric Status," Journal of Educational Research, 48 (March, 1955), 481-495.
10. Clark, John P., "Measuring Alienation within a Social System," American Sociological Review, 24 (December, 1959), 849-852.
11. Coleman, James S., "Implications of the Findings on Alienation," The American Journal of Sociology, 70 (July, 1964), 76-78.

12. Comross, H. H., "Some Characteristics Related to Social Isolation of Second Grade Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, 53 (1962), 38-42.
13. Delacato, Janice F. and Carl H. Delacato, "A Group Approach to Remedial Reading," Elementary English, 30 (January, 1953), 31-33.
14. Goldman, Bert and Helen D. Wolff, "Effectiveness of a Demonstration Reading School," The Reading Teacher, 24 (November, 1970), 106-111.
15. Graubard, Paul S., "Utilizing the Group in Teaching Disturbed Delinquents to Learn," Exceptional Children, 36 (December, 1969), 267-272.
16. Gordon, Ira J., Human Development Readings in Research, Glenview, Illinois, Scott, Foresman and Company, 1965.
17. Gronlund, Norman E., "Relationship Between the Sociometric Status of Pupils and Teachers' Preferences for or against Having Them in Class," Sociometry, 16 (May, 1953), 142-149.
18. Grossmann, Beverly and Joyce Wrighter, "The Relationship Between Selection-Rejection and Intelligence, Social Status, and Personality Amongst Sixth Grade Children," Sociometry, 11 (November, 1948), 346-355.
19. Haimowitz, Morris L. and Natalie Reader Haimowitz, Human Development, Selected Readings: Second Edition, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1966.
20. Hart, Richard, "The Effectiveness of an Approach to the Problem of Varying Abilities in Teaching Reading," Journal of Educational Research, 52 (February, 1959), 228-231.
21. Hearn, James J., "Teachers' Sense of Alienation with Respect to School System Structure," Phi Delta Kappan, 52 (January, 1971), 312.
22. Hughes, Thomas M., "The Relationship of Coping Strength to Self-Concept, School Achievement and General Anxiety Level in Sixth Grade Pupils," Journal of Experimental Education, 37 (Winter, 1968), 59-64.

23. Johnson, Marjorie Seddon, "A Study of Diagnostic and Remedial Procedures in a Reading Clinic Laboratory School," Journal of Educational Research, 48 (March, 1955), 565-578.
24. Kaplan, Martin F. and Erwin Singer, "Dogmatism and Sensory Alienation: An Empirical Investigation," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 27 (1963), 486-491.
25. McElhinney, James H. and others, Evidence of School Related Alienation in Elementary School Pupils, Washington, D.C., American Educational Research Association, 1970.
26. Middleton, Russell, "Alienation, Race, and Education," American Sociological Review, 28 (December, 1963), 973-976.
27. Moellenberg, Wayne, "Alienation: Some Causes and Cures," Contemporary Education, 42 (October, 1970), 21-25.
28. Morgan, Elmer F. and Gerald R. Stucker, "The Joplin Plan of Reading Vs. a Traditional Method," Journal of Educational Psychology, 51 (April, 1960), 69-73.
29. Nichols, Nancy J., "Interclass Grouping for Reading Instruction: Who Makes the Decision and Why?" Educational Leadership, 26 (March, 1969), 588-592.
30. Oliver, Marvin E., "Organizing for Reading Instruction," The Elementary School Journal, 71 (November, 1970), 97-104.
31. Pumfrey, P. D. and C. D. Elliot, "Play Therapy, Social Adjustment and Reading Attainment," Educational Research, 12 (June, 1970), 183-193.
32. Schrank, Wilbur R., "A Further Study of the Labeling Effect of Ability Grouping," Journal of Educational Research, 63 (April, 1970), 358-360.
33. Seeman, Melvin, "Alienation and Social Learning in a Reformatory," American Journal of Sociology, 69 (November, 1969), 270-285.
34. _____, "Powerlessness and Knowledge: A Comparative Study of Alienation and Learning," Sociometry, 30 (June, 1967), 105-123.

35. Wylie, Richard E., "Research in Reading: The Child, A Method and a Technique," Childhood Education, (December, 1970), 173-175.

CHAPTER III

COLLECTION OF DATA

The pupils in the five environmental settings reside in a southwestern state in or near a metropolitan area. All except one of the environmental settings are located in two schools of a school system composed of children from two adjacent towns of approximately 15,000 and 20,000 population. These towns are about 20 miles from a metropolitan area. The primary clinical setting is in a town approximately 40 miles from the same metropolitan area. The clinic is connected with one of two universities located in the same town. The other clinical setting is in a metropolitan area, also approximately 40 miles from the primary clinical setting. From a socioeconomic view, the children of this study did not represent extremes of wealth or poverty, but would be considered middle-class in general.

School A provided the data for the settings of R-AV (Regular Classroom-Average Reading Ability) and R-BAV (Regular Classroom-Below Average Reading Ability). School A was a one-story construction with several wings. The classrooms were organized in a self-contained plan. It was not thought desirable to separate the children in this school

for testing. Therefore, the entire sixth grade was given the two instruments in one test session in the cafeteria.

The semantic differential was explained to the pupils first. Examples of where to check along the continuum from one to seven were given to illustrate certain feelings about school. Then the students were asked to give responses to some further examples. Next the students read together orally the bipolar words on the semantic differential. Finally, they made their checks individually.

Regarding the "Attitude Toward School" scale, the meanings of the words in the continuum of "nearly always," "sometimes," "seldom," and "never" were discussed and illustrated as to degree. Each question was read orally and response was made at the same time by the group. Although the pupils were encouraged to ask questions about any of the questions on the instrument that they did not understand, the pupils did not seem to have any particular problems.

From approximately 115 sixth-graders, the tests of those children who were at least one year behind in reading were removed for the R-BAV group for a total of 25. A number was chosen at random from a table of random numbers. The number was six. File cards on the children for the R-AV group were arranged alphabetically and beginning with the sixth card, every fifth card was drawn from the remaining cards of approximately 90 until a group of 25 students was selected for the R-AV agroup. In a few cases, adequate

records of reading achievement or I.Q. scores were not available. In this event, the student on the next fifth card was selected.

School B provided the data for the S-LSPCL (Segregated-Large Special Class) group and most of the data for the S-SCLIT (Segregated-Small Class, Itinerant Teacher) group. Over 1,000 students were enrolled in this elementary school. The school building itself is of a one-story brick construction. Children were grouped into classes for reading instruction, according to ability.

The children in one, large, special class were at least one year behind in reading. Nineteen students were selected from this fifth-grade class. Another fifth-grade class was tested in which most of the students were behind in their reading but not as much as one year. However, six students in this class who were at least one grade level behind in reading were added to the other nineteen for a total of twenty-five.

These fifth-graders were tested as a group, but each class at a different time. An opaque projector was utilized to project cards illustrating words from the semantic differential. These cards were placed above a numbered continuum from the semantic differential after procedures for checking and examples had been discussed. Each set of words was read aloud. The cards were changed as each scale was checked.

Questions from the "Attitude Toward School" scale were read orally and checked. Some time was given to the discussion of the meaning of terms to be checked such as "nearly always," "sometimes," "seldom," and "never." The students were encouraged to ask about questions they did not understand.

Sixteen children from school B were tested in the small group setting (S-SCLIT). The teacher of these children had graduate training in remedial reading.

The room for the setting was located in the primary section in an opposite wing from the fifth-grade rooms. The size of the room was approximately twelve feet by twenty-four feet. The room contained one window. A blackboard, movable bulletin board, mirror for speech training, a large bookcase, listening stations, and metal file cabinet for records were in the room. A record player, tape recorder, and control reader were available too. Other materials were the Webster word wheels, SRA kit, Flash X, phonetic drill cards, games, echo records, and linguistic blocks. Each child had a folder for individual work, although some time for group work with several children was often the first activity during a period.

Since the students in the S-SCLIT situation were poor readers, it seemed advisable to give the "Attitude Toward School" instrument and the "When at School I Feel" instrument

both orally and individually so that the subjects could participate in a more meaningful manner for them.

For the semantic differential, the two words used as polarities were illustrated with pictures as well as with the printed word and placed at either end of a type of Q-sort. Cubicles corresponding to the seven degrees of the semantic differential were explained to each child. After the words were identified, the child placed a blank card along the continuum between bipolar words to indicate his feelings. Then his sort was recorded as a check on the semantic differential.

For the "Attitude Toward School" scale, the cubicles were turned to the back side and four cubicles were labeled "nearly always," "sometimes," "seldom," and "never." These terms were explained before the child placed blank cards in piles according to their answer. The questions were read orally and explained when the child did not understand the meaning of a word. When the questions were completed, the number of cards in each pile or sort were tallied for the pupil's score on the "Attitude Toward School" instrument. The results of the individual questions were recorded on a test sheet at the time the questions were asked.

Nine students from school A who had small group instruction (S-SCLIT) were tested also to make a total of twenty-five pupils in this setting. The room in school A in the S-SCLIT setting was approximately nine feet by twelve

feet at the end of a hallway. There was not a window in this room. Many of the same materials were evident in this setting as in school B. A typewriter was an additional item noted. The special teacher in school A also had graduate training in remedial reading.

The children were tested in the same manner as the students from school B in the S-SCLIT setting. The students from both school A and school B were in the fourth, fifth, or sixth grades and at least one year behind in their reading. Children from both schools had been screened for emotional disturbance before being included in the small-group instruction.

Pupils in a S-CLIN (Segregated-Clinical) group were tested individually and orally in a similar manner to the pupils in the small group situations (S-SCLIT). The primary clinical setting for this study was located on the campus of a university. The clientele served by the primary clinical setting included students in thirteen public school systems and one private school from one county. A frame house was remodeled to include a reception room, kitchen, baths, and office space. There was an added wing that included a hallway leading into four rooms approximately nine feet by six feet with three adjacent smaller rooms containing chairs, earphones, tape recorders, and one-way mirrors for observation. The reading room had a window and a door that opened on the outside. Materials for reading were

similar to those in the S-SCLIT situation previously described. A room for play therapy was next to the reading room. The other two rooms did not have windows and were used primarily for testing or individual instruction. Although speech therapy was part of the organizational structure of this clinic, the speech therapy was given in another building.

Over twenty students were enrolled for the reading program. Fifteen of these students were selected for testing in this study. Some students were eliminated because they were not nine years old and some students were not tested because they were considered to be primarily emotionally disturbed. With the exception of two students who were fifteen years old, the students tested were nine to thirteen years of age.

Twelve students from a private school for children with learning disabilities were tested to secure the remaining ten students for the clinical setting (S-CLIN). One child tested was not used in the study because his I.Q. was below seventy-five. Another child tested had no problems in reading and was not the required year behind in reading. Of the remaining ten, each child tested was reading at a primary level, even though each would have been upper elementary students in a public school situation. Therefore, the instruments were given to each pupil individually and orally in the manner described in the first S-SCLIT setting.

This private school provides special education for children with learning disabilities from preschool to high school level. These children have normal intelligence and their training is designed to provide therapy in reading so that they can reach their full academic potential. Adequate psychological tests are required before admittance is made. There were approximately 100 students enrolled. Some of the children receive state aid, some receive military aid, and some parents provide the tuition. The students are predominantly from a large, metropolitan school district that contracts with the private school for instruction for certain pupils. Other students come from nearby, smaller towns. Some students are brought to the school by bus while other students are brought by their parents.

The requirements for the teachers are the same as in the metropolitan school system. The director of the school and many of the teaching staff have additional training in special education. There is a teacher-pupil ratio of six to one. Specialists on the staff include a speech therapist, a physical development director, a music director, and a registered nurse. The school is nongraded and the students work at their own individual levels.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Two analyses of covariance were used as the principal means for the computation of data with I.Q. as the control variable. One analysis of covariance was a five-group comparison and the other was a comparison of four groups from the same population of readers at least one grade level behind in reading. There were two total scores in each analysis, one for the "Attitude Toward School" scale and one for the semantic differential, "When at School I Feel."

In the five-group comparison, between the groups previously designated as R-AV, R-BAV, S-LSPCL, S-SCLIT, and S-CLIN, the total score on the "Attitude Toward School" scale was significant at the level of .0001. On the semantic differential, "When at School I Feel," a significant difference between groups was found at the level of .0001. Finding a significant difference, the Scheffé test for group comparisons was used for the two total test scores. The formula in this case was

F =

$$F = \frac{.5(M_{R-AV}) + .5(M_{R-BAV}) - .3333(M_{S-LSPCL}) - .3333(M_{S-SCLIT}) - .3333(M_{S-CLIN})}{MS_E \left(\frac{1/2^2}{25} + \frac{1/2^2}{25} + \frac{1/3^2}{25} + \frac{1/3^2}{25} + \frac{1/3^2}{25} (k-1) \right)}$$

when

$$MS_E = MS \text{ adj. } \left(1 - \frac{B_{xx}/k-1}{S_{xx}} \right)$$

with B_{xx} --among groups

S_{xx} --within groups.

The level for significance of F was 2.29 at the .05 level and 3.48 at the .01 level. The F for the total score on the "Attitude Toward School" scale comparing children in the regular classroom setting with children in the segregated settings, was 5.82. With the same comparison using the total score on the semantic differential, "When at School I Feel," the F was 6.46.

In the four-group comparison between groups reading behind at least one grade level and designated as R-BAV, S-LSPCL, S-SCLIT, and S-CLIN, the total score on the "Attitude Toward School" scale was significant at the level of .0001. On the semantic differential, "When at School I Feel," a significant difference between groups was found at the level of .0003. Finding a significant difference, the Scheffé test for group comparisons was used for the two total test scores. The formula in this case was

F =

$$\frac{1(M_{R-BAV}) - .3333(M_{S-LSPCL}) - .3333(M_{S-SCLIT}) - .3333(M_{S-CLIN})}{MS_E \left(\frac{1^2}{25} + \frac{1/3^2}{25} + \frac{1/3^2}{25} + \frac{1/3^2}{25} \right) (k-1)}$$

The level for significance of F was 2.45 at the .05 level and 3.95 at the .01 level. The F for the total scores

on the "Attitude Toward School" scale comparing children at least one grade level behind in reading in a regular classroom with those in segregated settings was 8.57. With the same comparison on the semantic differential, "When at School I Feel," the F was 8.68.

Five subtests were computed using the "Attitude Toward School" instrument in addition to the total test score. These subtests were selected to correspond with the subcategories of alienation as outlined under the definition of alienation found in the first chapter. The subtests were (1) "Powerlessness"--"When a student doesn't like something in this school there is someone who will listen to him"; (2) "Role Estrangement"--"A student in this class can be different from others in some ways and not be made fun of or avoided"; (3) "Meaninglessness"--"My class work is interesting"; (4) "Guidelessness"--"When a problem comes up in our school groups, we discuss with the teacher how best to deal with it"; and (5) "Cultural Estrangement"--"During school hours, I would rather be in school than anywhere else." Tables I through VI will show the statistical results of the subtests and total test for the "Attitude Toward School" instrument. Table I shows data for "Powerlessness," Table II for "Role Estrangement," Table III for "Meaninglessness," Table IV for "Guidelessness," Table V for "Cultural Estrangement," and Table VI shows data for the total test comprised of forty-six questions.

The five subtest scores ranged from one to four with one being the most positive score and four the most negative score possible. The one score was interpreted as showing the least alienation and a score of four was interpreted as showing the most alienation in regard to feelings about school. Also the scores one to four corresponded to the continuum checked on the test of one as "nearly always," two meaning "sometimes," three as "seldom," and four meaning "never."

The item in Table I indicating a feeling of powerlessness showed no significant difference between groups. The

TABLE I
ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL
POWERLESSNESS

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	2.5600	1.1210	2.5534
R-BAV	2.1600	1.0677	2.1644
S-LSPCL	2.3600	0.9522	2.3592
S-SCLIT	2.2800	0.8907	2.2802
S-CLIN	2.3200	1.2152	2.3228
Total	2.3360	1.0468

$F = 0.3333$; $P = 0.8557$.

scores ranged from one to four. A score of 2.33 showed that pupils felt that someone would listen to them only sometimes.

A score of 2.33 would be on the positive side and show little evidence of alienation on the part of any of the groups tested. The fact that the "Powerlessness" test placed a strong emphasis on the teacher-pupil relationship lends itself to two possible interpretations. The majority of the students tested were preteens and it would be expected that their relations with adults at school would be more harmonious than at a later teen-age stage. The other interpretation would suggest that the teachers and other adults associated with the particular groups tested were understanding and willing to listen to the students at least some of the time.

The subtest of "Role Estrangement" found in Table II proved to be one of the most interesting tests in regard to

TABLE II
ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL
ROLE ESTRANGEMENT

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	2.7200	0.7371	2.6818
R-BAV	2.2400	0.7789	2.2653
S-LSPCL	1.9600	0.5385	1.9555
S-SCLIT	2.1200	0.8327	2.1211
S-CLIN	2.1600	0.9866	2.1763
Total	2.2400	0.8172

$F = 2.6329$; $P = 0.0370$.

the responses made of any of the subtests. It will be recalled that this test tried to tap the feelings of pupils about their peers who were considered different in some manner from them. This subtest could have racial implications as well as feelings in regard to the handicapped or to a child with some outstanding physical feature. Also, a child who was extremely smart, possibly creative in some way, or a child who was retarded might be considered different from the majority. It would not be surprising to find that an unusual or funny name or initials would place a child into the category of being different and at least being made fun of, if not avoided.

A significant difference in the groups at the .03 level was found in this subtest. The homogeneous group of S-LSPCL pupils was more inclined to think that a different student would not be avoided. It is interesting that S-LSPCL was grouped by ability.

That children in a homogeneous setting would have the lowest and therefore most positive score of least alienation is not surprising when it is considered that they have the more narrow range of ability. As might be expected, pupils in a regular classroom of heterogeneous ability would have more reason to notice differences in ability because the range of ability would be very wide. The R-AV group had the most negative score of 2.72, with the R-BAV group showing the next most negative score of 2.24. It was between the

R-AV and R-BAV groups that the most difference was shown also. It might be that pupils who make normal progress or better are more conscious of having avoided their below-average peers, whereas other children who might be avoided have become insensitive, to a degree, of this avoidance. However it is interpreted, the subtest of "Role Estrangement" indicates some reactions in the peer relationships.

The subtest of Table III entitled "Meaninglessness" was concerned with the aspect of classwork and its relevance for

TABLE III
ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL
MEANINGLESSNESS

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	2.8000	0.8660	2.6408
R-BAV	2.9600	0.8406	3.0654
S-LSPCL	2.3200	0.8021	2.3011
S-SCLIT	1.8000	0.8165	1.8047
S-CLIN	1.6000	0.7638	1.6680
Total	2.2960	0.9674

$F = 12.8395$; $P = .0001$.

the individual student rather than an appraisal of relationships between peers or teacher-pupil relationships. This subtest showed a significant difference in the feelings between the groups at the level of .0001. The children in a

small class situation and a clinical setting had the most positive scores of 1.80 and 1.60 respectively and therefore showed the least alienation in regard to interest in classwork. These children also had more individualized instruction adapted to their needs.

A very significant difference in feelings about classwork is indicated between groups, especially in regard to pupils in a regular classroom setting who were behind in reading. They felt that classwork was seldom interesting, as a three score suggests.

The score of three made by the R-BAV group was the adjusted mean and indicates that this group had the most negative feelings about classwork and were hence the most alienated on this matter. This suggests that in a regular classroom there is less effort expended on individual needs. It is probable that much of their classwork was beyond their reading level and that this might have accounted for their lack of interest. Conversely, those pupils who were above the average in reading ability might not be challenged or interested in readings at their grade level. Their resultant lack of interest, then, might be a reason for the R-AV group scoring the second highest score in a negative direction indicative of alienated feelings.

In Table IV, the subtest regarding "Guidelessness" was similar to the subtest of "Powerlessness" in that the teacher-pupil relationships were explored. In the

TABLE IV
ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL
GUIDELESSNESS

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	2.0400	0.9345	1.7084
R-BAV	1.6800	0.9883	1.8996
S-LSPCL	1.9600	1.0198	1.9206
S-SCLIT	1.7600	0.7789	1.7699
S-CLIN	1.8800	0.8327	2.0216
Total	1.8640	0.9100

$F = 0.4356$; $P = 0.7850$.

"Guidelessness" subtest, teacher norms were tested against peer group standards. If, in solving problems, the teacher's help was sought rather than not sought the prevalence of teacher norms would be the case. At a later teen-age stage, it might be expected that students would be less inclined to seek the teacher's help. The relatively harmonious relationship between teachers and pupils of elementary students is reflected in the most positive of the subtest scores regarding "Guidelessness." This suggests less alienation in teacher-pupil relationships than in other areas explored.

Pupils felt more alike on this subtest. A score of one to two is the most positive score also. It suggests that pupils of this age seek the teacher's help in solving problems.

A high score would suggest conflict between teacher and pupil norms.

Of the five groups tested for "Guidelessness," the R-AV group had the highest score, suggesting their self-reliance in problem-solving and their alienation from teacher norms of behavior. However, when the adjusted mean scores were considered, the situation was reversed and the R-AV group had the lowest score and the least alienation expressed. In the adjusted mean scores it was the clinical group of students who had the highest score of 2.02 and exhibited the most alienation from teacher norms. Generally, the adjusted mean scores do not produce such dramatic shifts. The reason that pupils in a clinical situation might show more independence could be attributable to their play therapy experience that often accompanies a clinical reading setting.

Table V concerns the area of "Cultural Estrangement" and in this case leanings toward truancy. If school is considered to be the culture of elementary pupils, then more negative feelings of "Cultural Estrangement" were exhibited in this test than on any of the other subtests. A total score of 2.43 was the highest total score and hence showed the strongest feelings of alienation in this area. It could be possible the test question regarding the desirability of being in school during school hours reflected some interpretation regarding holidays or the summer vacation. However,

TABLE V
ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL
CULTURAL ESTRANGEMENT

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	3.0800	0.8622	2.8883
R-BAV	3.0000	0.8660	3.1269
S-LSPCL	2.1600	0.6880	2.1372
S-SCLIT	2.1200	0.7810	2.1257
S-CLIN	1.8000	0.8660	1.8819
Total	2.4320	0.9532

$F = 11.3969$; $P = 0.0001$.

the question was carefully worded to include the terminology of school hours.

The data in Table V produced the most negative results of the subtests using this instrument. Pupils with the lowest achievement had the most positive desire to be in school. Pupils of the R-BAV group had the greatest desire to be out of school.

Pupils in the R-BAV group had a mean score of 3.00 and an adjusted mean score of 3.12, showing the most alienation in a negative direction. If the individual scores are checked in the Appendix for this group it can be seen on comparing their reading achievement and I.Q. as a group with the total five-group comparison that they had a higher achievement and lower I.Q. than the other groups behind in

reading. The fact that the R-BAV group achieved more with less intelligence points to the good influence of a regular classroom setting. Their negative score and the extremely positive score of children in a clinical setting presumably accounts for significant difference between groups of .0001 on this subtest. Again, the play therapy experience in conjunction with the clinical reading experience might be a factor in the positive attitude of clinical children.

In Table VI the total score of the "Attitude Toward School" instrument represents forty-six questions instead of

TABLE VI
ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL
TOTAL SCORE

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	130.4400	15.7536	133.7329
R-BAV	130.0800	20.8266	128.2272
S-LSPCL	139.2400	19.0029	139.5726
S-SCLIT	151.8000	12.9617	151.7168
S-CLIN	149.9200	17.2311	148.7248
Total	140.2960	19.4440

$F = 8.3137$; $P = 0.0001$.

only one question as was the case in the subtests. In addition, the scoring represents an opposite direction from the subtests on the "Attitude Toward School" scale. This is

due to the fact that weights of four, three, two, and one were applied to the number of checks along the continuum of "nearly always," "sometimes," "seldom," and "never," respectively. Hence, forty-six multiplied by four would be the highest score possible suggesting the least alienation; forty-six multiplied by one would be the lowest score possible for an individual and would represent the most alienation.

One hundred eighty-four was the highest total score possible with "always," "sometimes," "seldom," and "never" weighted four, three, two, and one, respectively. While the S-SCLIT group did not account for differences in the subtests, the total was significant.

A significant difference between the five groups of .0001 on the total score of the "Attitude Toward School" scale was one of the most important statistical findings of the study. The S-SCLIT group had the highest score of 151.8 and were therefore the least alienated of the five groups. This is an interesting finding in that the S-SCLIT group was not the group that had a score to make an outstanding difference on the subtests. The children in the R-BAV group had the most negative score of 130 and an adjusted mean score of 128.2, indicating the most alienation to be found in this group. Perhaps even more important than these extreme scores between R-BAV and S-SCLIT was the similarity of feeling between children in the R-AV group with children in the R-BAV group each

having a mean score of 130. Students in the S-CLIN setting had very similar positive scores as the students in the S-SCLIT setting. The S-CLIN was 149. This type of grouping seemed to be the predominant pattern in most of the tests with the S-LSPCL scores ranging between the regular classroom groups and the clinical and small class settings.

Word polarities comprised the ten scales of the semantic differential, "When at School I Feel." The statistical results of the data for these ten scales, in addition to the total test score, are presented in Tables VII through XVII. Table XVII is the total test result of the semantic differential. A score of one shows the least alienation; a score of seven the most alienation. One to seven is the possible range of a score scale.

The scores on scales of the semantic differential ranged from one as the most positive score to seven as the most negative. Children in a regular classroom setting had similar feelings about school. Their score of four was midpoint on the continuum in the "Good-Bad" scale of Table VII.

The "Good-Bad" scale of the semantic differential, "When at School I Feel," had one of the most significant F values, that of .0001. Therefore, there was a very significant difference in feelings between groups for this scale. The R-AV group and R-BAV group had the highest scores of 4.03 and 4.24, respectively. This would indicate that these two groups had the strongest feelings of alienation, as

TABLE VII
WHEN AT SCHOOL I FEEL
GOOD-BAD

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	4.0800	1.2884	4.0122
R-BAV	4.2400	1.5885	4.2849
S-LSPCL	3.2000	1.4434	3.1919
S-SCLIT	2.9200	1.2220	2.9220
S-CLIN	2.2000	1.6073	2.2290
Total	3.3280	1.6053

F = 8.1879; P = 0.0001.

compared to S-SCLIT and S-CLIN who had more positive scores suggestive of less alienation. The lowest and most positive score was registered by the S-CLIN group at 2.20, with the S-SCLIT group scoring a 2.92. It will be noticed that the predominant pattern set earlier is again manifest on this test, with the S-LSPCL group scoring 3.20 between the regular classroom groups, who were most alienated, and the pupils in a clinical or small class setting who showed the least alienation.

Table VIII explores feelings of enthusiasm and excitement regarding school as opposed to feelings of lethargy and apathy regarding school. Although the P value of this test was somewhat less than some of the tests, a very significant difference in feelings about school was indicated between

TABLE VIII
WHEN AT SCHOOL I FEEL
EXCITED-NOT EXCITED

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	4.6800	1.5470	4.5568
R-BAV	4.4000	1.9791	4.4815
S-LSPCL	3.5600	1.7814	3.5454
S-SCLIT	2.7200	1.5416	2.7237
S-CLIN	2.7200	1.9044	2.7726
Total	3.6160	1.9168

F = 6.1248; P = 0.0003.

groups. The P value was .0003. An immediate glance at Table VIII will show the same pattern forming again that was noted earlier. The regular classroom groups tended to feel alike and more negative or alienated than the segregated groups of S-SCLIT and S-CLIN, with S-LSPCL scoring between the two extremes.

Although the significance was not as large as the "Good-Bad" scale, the children in a regular setting registered the same feelings, while pupils in the S-SCLIT and S-CLIN groups felt alike and more excited about school.

It might be that children would be more hesitant to admit to being excited about school than to a somewhat general terminology like good or bad. Whether this was the reason or not, the total score of 3.61 was higher and showed

more alienation than the total score of the preceding scale of "Good-Bad" at 3.32. The R-AV group and R-BAV groups showed the highest and therefore the most negative scores of 4.68 and 4.40, respectively. The mean scores of the S-SCLIT and S-CLIN settings showed an unusual arrangement of exactly identical scores of 2.72. However, the adjusted mean scores gave the lowest and hence least alienated rating to the S-SCLIT group by retaining the 2.72 score, while the adjusted mean score of the S-CLIN group was increased to 2.77. Following the predicted pattern, the S-LSPCL group was between the regular classroom groups and clinical or small class settings, with a mean score of 3.56 and an adjusted mean score of 3.54. This showed that they were somewhat more alienated than the S-SCLIT and S-CLIN groups and somewhat less alienated than the R-AV and R-BAV groups.

Table IX represents the "Awake-Asleep" feelings of children at school. It will be recalled that a pilot study was conducted with two groups of children in order to arrive at the scales used for the semantic differential. Feelings of being tired or sleepiness were mentioned rather quickly by both groups. Therefore, they were included to see what patterns might be projected, relating to alienation. It will be noticed that a different pattern is formed about feelings regarding the "Awake-Asleep" scale.

On the basis of these data, children in a class grouped according to ability felt more wide-awake than others.

TABLE IX
WHEN AT SCHOOL I FEEL
AWAKE-ASLEEP

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	4.2800	1.6961	4.1605
R-BAV	3.5600	2.1032	3.6391
S-LSPCL	2.6000	1.8930	2.5858
S-SCLIT	3.1200	1.9218	3.1236
S-CLIN	3.0800	1.6052	3.1311
Total	3.3280	1.9083

$F = 2.4497; P = 0.0491.$

However, the P value of .0491 did not show as large a significant difference as the P value of the other subtests.

Although the R-AV group again had the highest score and therefore the most negative and alienated score of 4.28, children of the R-BAV group were closest to this score with a 3.56. At this point the usual pattern changes and the S-SCLIT group and the S-CLIN group have scores in the middle range of 3.12 and 3.08, with the lowest and least alienated score being that of the S-LSPCL, with a more positive score of 2.60. It might be noted however that feelings in general were fairly negative on this scale as well as being similar almost to the point of no significant difference. The high value of this test was significant at the .04 level, which

would indicate that there was not as much difference in feelings on the "Awake-Asleep" scale as on some of the other scales.

Table X of the "When at School I Feel" semantic differential was concerned with free or trapped feelings about

TABLE X
WHEN AT SCHOOL I FEEL
FREE-TRAPPED

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	5.1600	1.6753	4.7011
R-BAV	4.4800	1.9604	4.7838
S-LSPCL	4.4000	2.4833	4.3455
S-SCLIT	3.8800	2.1856	3.8936
S-CLIN	2.9600	2.1502	3.1560
Total	4.1760	2.1999

$F = 2.5169$; $P = 0.0442$.

school. It tends to correspond with the "Cultural Estrangement" subtest of the "Attitude Toward School" instrument. The question of the "Cultural Estrangement" subtest stated, "During school hours, I would rather be in school than anywhere else." The results of this subtest in Table V show a very significant difference in feelings between groups of .0001 in the P value. Hence it might be expected that feelings about being trapped or free might have the same

significant difference. This was not the case however as the P value of the "Free-Trapped" scale was .04. While significant beyond the .05 level, it was not as much as the .0001 P value in Table V.

In this subtest pupils in a regular classroom setting as well as pupils in a large special class felt more trapped than children in the S-CLIT and S-CLIN groups. One of the more negative five scores was recorded by the R-AV group.

In general, scores of four or less on the semantic differential would not indicate a very negative attitude nor would they be indicative of a very high degree of alienation. Practically all of the test scores on both instruments fall within this positive range and comparisons as to degree fall within the generally favorable scores. Therefore, it is especially noteworthy to have a score of 5.16 for the R-AV group in a negative, alienated direction on the "Free-Trapped" scale. However, adjusted mean scores reduce the score of 5.16 to 4.70 and give the higher, negative score of alienation to the R-BAV group instead. Children in a clinical setting received the most positive score of 3.15 showing the least alienation in relation to feeling trapped in school.

Table XI of the semantic differential explores the area regarding feelings of being glad or sad at school. Although in the pilot study pupils in both groups rather quickly produced the terminology of "Glad-Sad," it might be that in a

TABLE XI
WHEN AT SCHOOL I FEEL
GLAD-SAD

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	3.8000	1.0801	3.4845
R-BAV	3.6800	1.6763	3.8889
S-LSPCL	3.1600	1.5727	3.1225
S-SCLIT	2.4000	1.4142	2.4094
S-CLIN	2.4400	1.6852	2.5748
Total	3.0960	1.5935

$F = 4.3354; P = 0.0030.$

personal response situation there might be more hesitancy in admitting sadness with its relation to crying. Whether this was the case or not, the total test score of 3.09 would suggest a fairly positive or glad feeling as compared to some other scales with a four score. None of the mean scores nor the adjusted mean scores recorded a score of four on the "Glad-Sad" scale.

The "Glad-Sad" scale is typical of the results found in other tests. The pattern indicates again that pupils in a regular classroom tend to express the same feelings and pupils in the S-CLIN and S-SCLIT groups have similar feelings.

The R-AV group showed the most negative and alienated score in the direction of sadness about school, with the R-BAV group having the next highest score of 3.68. However,

when the means were adjusted, the most alienation was evidenced by the R-BAV children with an adjusted mean score of 3.88. The R-AV group score of 3.80 was adjusted, then, to 3.48 for the second highest score. Even though the placement between groups was reversed in the R-AV and R-BAV groups, the similarity of feelings between the two groups as compared to children in a segregated setting is the more important observation. Additionally, the usual pattern is again evidenced in the very least alienated and most positive scores being the S-SCLIT scores of 2.40 and the S-CLIN scores of 2.44, with S-LSPCL taking a middle position of 3.16 between the positive and negative scores. The P value of this test was .0030.

Table XII was indicative of rather extreme or heightened emotional feelings as the terms of "Great-Terrible" would suggest. Much the same meanings might be given to the scale entitled "Good-Bad." However, it might also be considered that "Great" would register a stronger feeling than "Good" and in a similar manner, "Terrible" would indicate a more extreme feeling than "Bad." It is not surprising, then, that the P value showed a significant difference between groups at the .0001 level on the "Good-Bad" scale and a significant difference between groups of .0001 on the "Great-Terrible" scale.

This subtest was more like the "Good-Bad" scale than the other scales. The difference was that "Great-Terrible"

TABLE XII
WHEN AT SCHOOL I FEEL
GREAT-TERRIBLE

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	4.6800	1.4640	4.5810
R-BAV	4.3200	1.8646	4.3855
S-LSPCL	3.4800	1.3577	3.4682
S-SCLIT	2.8400	1.4911	2.8429
S-CLIN	2.6000	1.7078	2.6423
Total	3.5840	1.7606

$F = 7.2764$; $P = 0.0001$.

would indicate a more extreme feeling. The P values for these two scales were the largest of the scales.

In the "Great-Terrible" scale the predominant pattern of response was again evident. The R-AV group had the most negative and alienated score of 4.68, with the R-BAV group having the next highest and most alienated score of 4.32. The children in the S-CLIN setting had the most positive and least alienated score of 2.60, with the S-SCLIT group registering the next most positive score of 2.84. In the usual middle place between the regular groups and segregated groups were pupils in S-LSPCL, with a score of 3.48. The adjusted mean scores did not alter the preceding pattern as the numerical changes were slight. These scores were significantly different with a P value of .0001. The total

mean score for the "Great-Terrible" scale was fairly negative at 3.58.

The "Angry-Not Angry" scale on the semantic differential was a test that produced interesting results as Table XIII shows. The fact that this scale along with the "Friendly-Unfriendly" scale and the "Calm-Nervous" scale produced the

TABLE XIII
WHEN AT SCHOOL I FEEL
ANGRY-NOT ANGRY

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	2.6400	1.4107	2.2482
R-BAV	3.4000	2.0207	3.6594
S-LSPCL	2.6000	1.7321	2.5534
S-SCLIT	2.2400	1.0116	2.2516
S-CLIN	2.8800	1.5089	3.0473
Total	2.7520	1.5946

$F = 3.1220$; $P = 0.0174$.

most positive scores in the direction of least alienation is noteworthy. Most of the total test scores registered in the range of three or four, but the three scales previously mentioned had total test scores at the level of two. The total score for the "Angry-Not Angry" scale was 2.75. There was a significant difference between groups on this scale at the .01 level, indicating another important characteristic of this scale.

The scores of the "Angry-Not Angry" represent a unique pattern among the subtests. Pupils in a regular class who were behind their grade level in reading were more angry than other groups. Their standard deviation indicates a wider dispersion of scores also.

The most negative and alienated score on the "Angry-Not Angry" scale was displayed by the R-BAV group with the only three mean score of 3.40. A different pattern is presented in this scale, with the children in a clinical setting having the next most negative score of alienation at 2.88, adjusted to 3.04. Why these two groups would indicate more angry feelings is not clear. It can be noted by their individual scores in the Appendix that this group had the highest reading achievement of the population of readers who were at least one grade level behind in reading, that of 3.9. At the same time, of the same four groups of retarded readers, the R-BAV group had the lowest mean I.Q. of 91.9. Since the S-CLIN group had the lowest reading achievement as a group of 2.4 with a higher I.Q. of 94.6, another reason for their expression of angry feelings must be valid. It is possible that play therapy experiences in conjunction with the reading therapy might account for the clinical group's willingness to express angry feelings. Children in the S-SCLIT setting had the least angry feelings at 2.24 with the S-LSPCL group and R-AV group registering a middle score.

Table XIV introduces the "Rested-Tired" scale which is similar to the "Awake-Asleep" scale. However, the total score was one of the most negative scores of 4.15 on the "Rested-Tired" scale, being surpassed by the "Free-Trapped" scale at 4.17.

TABLE XIV
WHEN AT SCHOOL I FEEL
RESTED-TIRED

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	4.9200	1.8239	4.7979
R-BAV	5.1600	1.8637	5.2408
S-LSPCL	3.8000	1.9579	3.7855
S-SCLIT	3.5200	1.9816	3.5236
S-CLIN	3.3600	1.7767	3.4121
Total	4.1520	1.9962

$F = 4.6886$; $P = 0.0018$.

Since the S-LSPCL group felt the most awake of the groups, it was expected that they would be the most rested. However, pupils in segregated settings felt more rested than pupils in a regular classroom, especially those in the R-BAV group.

The highest and most negative score on the semantic differential was recorded by the R-BAV group on the "Rested-Tired" scale. The mean score for the R-BAV group was 5.16

and the adjusted mean score was even higher at 5.24. As was discussed in the preceding table, the same reasons that accounted for the R-BAV group's angry feelings might also account for their excessive tiredness as compared with the other groups. The next most negative score was accounted for by the feelings of the R-AV group who possibly equated feelings of boredom with tiredness. Children in a clinical setting were the most rested as indicated by their most positive score of 3.36. Scoring in the middle range were children in S-SCLIT group and the S-LSPCL group with scores of 3.52 and 3.80, respectively. Even though all of these scores were fairly high, there was a significant difference between groups at the .0018 level, which in itself is an important distinction.

Table XV introduces the "Friendly-Unfriendly" scale of the semantic differential. This scale has the unique attribute of having the most positive scores of any of the scales in the semantic differential, "When at School I Feel." The other unique characteristic of the "Friendly-Unfriendly" scale was the fact that the P value of .0590 was slightly short of significance between groups at the .05 level. This was the only scale on the semantic differential that did not register a significant difference between groups.

There was not quite a significant difference between groups in their feelings of "Friendly-Unfriendly" designation. The total score on this scale was the most positive

TABLE XV
WHEN AT SCHOOL I FEEL
FRIENDLY-UNFRIENDLY

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	2.4000	1.1902	2.3487
R-BAV	2.5200	1.8055	2.5540
S-LSPCL	1.7200	1.1372	1.7139
S-SCLIT	1.6000	1.1180	1.6015
S-CLIN	1.8800	1.3329	1.9019
Total	2.0240	1.3706

$F = 2.3308$; $P = 0.0590$.

of the ten scales. Pupils in segregated settings had the most friendly feelings.

The group with the most negative score in the direction of alienation was the R-BAV group. However, their high score in a negative direction was, on an overall basis, a positive one of 2.52, adjusted to 2.55. As usually occurred, pupils in the R-AV setting had the closest agreement with the R-BAV group with a score of 2.40 adjusted to 2.34. Varying the predominant pattern on this scale, the S-SCLIT group showed the least alienation with the most positive score of 1.60. Children in S-LSPCL had the next most positive score of 1.72, adjusted to 1.71. Usually the S-LSPCL occupied the middle value among scores, but on the "Friendly-Unfriendly" scale, the middle score was held by the S-CLIN

group at 1.88. The total score was 2.02, reflecting a basically positive view of friendliness for the entire group.

The last scale on the semantic differential was the "Calm-Nervous" scale and the results are shown in Table XVI.

TABLE XVI
WHEN AT SCHOOL I FEEL
CALM-NERVOUS

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	3.3200	1.9088	3.3788
R-BAV	3.2000	1.9579	3.1611
S-LSPCL	2.6400	1.6803	2.6470
S-SCLIT	1.9600	1.6452	1.9583
S-CLIN	2.2000	1.7078	2.1749
Total	2.6640	1.8358

$F = 2.7834; P = 0.0293.$

The "Calm-Nervous" scale as compared with other scales on the semantic differential had one of the more positive total scores registering in the two range at 2.66. This positive score might be in the nature of the assessment in that it might be difficult for children to admit to nervous feelings. Many children have tranquilizers prescribed also and this might account for some additional positive scores. Most positive scores are probably accurate appraisals with nervousness basically considered to be for adults.

In the scale, "Calm-Nervous," students in a regular classroom setting expressed similar feelings. This suggests that these pupils actually were more nervous or that they were more inclined to admit their nervous feelings.

It was interesting to note that children who were making normal progress in school or better were the most inclined to admit to nervous feelings. Children in the R-AV group had the highest score of 3.32, adjusted to 3.37, in a negative or alienated direction. The R-BAV group had the most similar negative feelings as the R-AV group with a score of 3.20, adjusted to 3.16. Children in the S-SCLIT setting felt the least alienated or calm and positive about the scale as their score of 1.96, adjusted to 1.95, indicates. The next most positive score was that of the S-CLIN group with 2.20 adjusted to 2.17. The S-LSPCL group often reflects a middle score and this scale was no exception as their score, 2.64, reveals. It is interesting that the S-LSPCL score is quite close to the total score of 2.66. A significant difference between groups was recorded at the .02 level.

Of the entire tests reviewed, the tests reflecting total scores are the most important. Table VI represented the total scores for the "Attitude Toward School" scale and the following Table XVII represents the total scores for the semantic differential, "When at School I Feel." The lowest score possible was 10, with 70 being the highest score possible. The P value was significant at the .0001 level. The

TABLE XVII
WHEN AT SCHOOL I FEEL
TOTAL SCORES

Environmental Setting	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Adjusted Mean
R-AV	39.800	10.595	38.094
R-BAV	38.960	13.798	40.090
S-LSPCL	31.160	11.368	30.957
S-SCLIT	27.240	7.224	27.291
S-CLIN	26.320	11.161	27.049
Total	32.696	12.270

$F = 7.6105; P = 0.0001.$

most predominant pattern of scores was evidenced with the R-AV group having the most negative alienated score of 39.8 as a mean score. However, the adjusted mean gave the R-BAV group the most negative score of 40. S-CLIN and S-SCLIT scores were least alienated at 26.3 and 27.2, respectively. S-LSPCL had the middle score of 31.1.

The total scores on the semantic differential show a very significant difference in regard to feelings about school. The predominant pattern evidenced in the scales is reflected in the total scores with pupils in a regular classroom expressing similar feelings and pupils in S-SCLIT and S-CLIN feeling alike.

In Tables I through XVII, the analysis of covariance was used for a comparison of five groups. The analysis of covariance with four groups reading at least one grade level behind yielded similar data. However, in the "Attitude Toward School" instrument, the subtest for "Role Estrangement" produced very different data. In the four-group comparison the results were not significant at the level of .7130 even though the results were significant at the .03 level when the R-AV group was included. Therefore, this suggests that "Role Estrangement" was experienced by pupils with higher I.Q.'s and reading achievement who were possibly being shaped into an average mold.

The semantic differential comparing four groups of the same population was similar to the five-group comparison. In the five-group comparison the "Friendly-Unfriendly" scale was the only scale that did not show a significant difference in feeling between groups. However, in the comparison of four groups, the "Awake-Asleep" scale, "Free-Trapped" scale, and "Calm-Nervous" scale did not show a significant difference in addition to the "Friendly-Unfriendly" scale. This indicates that pupils with higher I.Q.'s and achievement felt more asleep, trapped, and nervous, thereby accounting for the significant difference in the five-group comparison shown in Tables I through XVII.

Tables XVIII through XXVII represent a comparison of means paired according to Hypotheses III through XII. The

Tukey test was significant at the level of 3.92. The test numbers correspond to the table numbers I through XVII.

In Table XVIII, based on total scores of both instruments, it can be surmised that there was a significant

TABLE XVIII
TUKEY COMPARISON OF MEANS
R-BAV, S-CLIN

Test	Score
1. Powerlessness	0.7118
2. Role Estrangement	0.5359
3. Meaninglessness	8.2283***
4. Guidelessness	0.6703
5. Cultural Estrangement	7.4126***
*6. Total Score	5.6598***
7. Good-Bad	6.7860***
8. Excited-Not Excited	4.6150***
9. Awake-Asleep	1.3033
10. Free-Trapped	3.7374
11. Glad-Sad	4.2264***
12. Great-Terrible	5.2162***
13. Angry-Not Angry	1.8951
14. Rested-Tired	4.6158***
15. Friendly-Unfriendly	2.3070
16. Calm-Nervous	2.6222
17. Total Score	5.6631*

*Total "Attitude Toward School."

**Total "When at School I Feel."

***Significant beyond the .05 level.

difference between the feelings of these two groups. The highest score was by the R-BAV group who did not feel that their class work was interesting.

It will be recalled that the total test scores for the two instruments were recorded as test 6 and test 17, being

reflected in Table VI and Table XVII also. The significance of subtest scores, while noted, were not considered in the decision as to whether a particular hypothesis was accepted or rejected in the comparison of means. With one exception, the comparison between R-BAV and S-LSPCL groups, if there was significance in one total test score there was significance in the total test score for the other instrument. Table XVIII is a comparison between R-BAV and S-CLIN. Using a Tukey test, test 6 and test 17 showed a significant difference between these two groups beyond the .05 level. By utilizing the interpretations presented in Table VI and Table XVII, it may be further stated that the direction of least alienation was the S-CLIN group and the most alienation was by the R-BAV group. The greatest degree of significant difference between the R-BAV group and the S-CLIN was 8.22 on the "Meaninglessness" subtest of the "Attitude Toward School" scale in which, according to the assessment of Table III, it showed that the R-BAV group had the most negative, alienated feelings about the interest value of classwork. The S-CLIN group had very positive feelings about their classwork as their small score indicated.

Table XIX shows a comparison on the seventeen tests between the R-BAV group and the S-SCLIT group. These comparisons are quite similar to the R-BAV comparison with S-CLIN. This is not surprising because S-CLIN and S-SCLIT often produced similar scores on the seventeen tests reviewed.

TABLE XIX
 TUKEY COMPARISON OF MEANS
 R-BAV, S-SCLIT

Test	Score
1. Powerlessness	0.5204
2. Role Estrangement	0.8682
3. Meaninglessness	7.4232***
4. Guidelessness	0.7121
5. Cultural Estrangement	5.9610***
*6. Total Score	6.4860***
7. Good-Bad	4.4985***
8. Excited-Not Excited	4.7472***
9. Awake-Asleep	1.3226
10. Free-Trapped	2.0438
11. Glad-Sad	4.7583***
12. Great-Terrible	4.6158***
13. Angry-Not Angry	4.3588***
14. Rested-Tired	4.3344***
15. Friendly-Unfriendly	3.3697
16. Calm-Nervous	3.1982
17. Total Score	5.5580*

*Total "Attitude Toward School."

**Total "When at School I Feel."

***Significant beyond the .05 level.

Total scores indicate a significant difference between the feelings of R-BAV and S-SCLIT groups. The differences were the same as R-BAV and S-CLIN with the exception of test 13, the "Angry-Not Angry" test. Pupils in the S-SCLIT group did not feel as angry as pupils in the R-BAV group.

By looking at the entire set of Tukey comparisons between possible pairs, it may be ascertained, by counting the number of tests where a significant difference was indicated, the pair with the most difference. The comparison of R-BAV with S-SCLIT indicates that ten out of a possible

seventeen tests showed a significant difference beyond the .05 level. Hence, the results of Table XIV show R-BAV compared with S-SCLIT were the most different with R-BAV compared with S-CLIN having the next highest difference with significance shown in nine of the tests. It can be noted by a review of test 13, the "Angry-Not Angry" scale, that the R-BAV group and the S-CLIN group expressed similar high feelings of alienation, while the S-SCLIT had the least angry feelings and alienation of the five groups, thus accounting for the significant difference. Other than test 13, the significant differences were registered in the same nine tests. These tests were test 3, "Meaninglessness"; test 5, "Cultural Estrangement"; test 6, "Total Score" ("Attitude Toward School"); test 7, "Good-Bad"; test 8, "Excited-Not Excited"; test 11, "Glad-Sad"; test 12, "Great-Terrible"; test 17, "Total Score" ("When at School I Feel"). In each of these nine tests the R-BAV group had the highest, most negative, alienated score and the S-CLIN group and the S-SCLIT group had the least alienated, positive scores.

Table XX compares R-BAV with S-LSPCL. A quick appraisal of Table XX will show that there was much less difference between these two groups, with only three tests showing significance.

A comparison of the R-BAV group with the S-LSPCL group shows a significant difference, but only of slight degree. Two of the subtests on the "Attitude Toward School" instrument

TABLE XX

TUKEY COMPARISON OF MEANS
R-BAV, S-LSPCL

Test	Score
1. Powerlessness	0.8754
2. Role Estrangement	1.8661
3. Meaninglessness	4.5007***
4. Guidelessness	0.1154
5. Cultural Estrangement	5.8925***
*6. Total Score	3.1327
7. Good-Bad	3.6076
8. Excited-Not Excited	2.5281
9. Awake-Asleep	2.7020
10. Free-Trapped	1.0064
11. Glad-Sad	2.4649
12. Great-Terrible	2.7448
13. Angry-Not Angry	3.4244
14. Rested-Tired	3.6734
15. Friendly-Unfriendly	2.9721
16. Calm-Nervous	1.3669
17. Total Score	3.9658*

*Total "Attitude Toward School."

**Total "When at School I Feel."

***Significant beyond the .05 level.

were significantly different. The total score on the semantic differential was significant.

In interpreting Table XX as to whether there was a significant difference between R-BAV as compared to S-LSPCL in the fifth hypothesis, a decision had to be made on the basis of one significant test score. As was pointed out earlier, in all other comparisons where significance was obtained, both total scores had been significant. Although test 6 was almost significant at the .05 level with a score of 3.13, only test 17 reached significance with a score of 3.96.

Since test 17 was significant, it could not be said that there was no significant difference between the two groups. In addition, two subtests on the "Attitude Toward School" scale showed a significant difference. These two tests were test 3, "Meaninglessness" and test 5, "Cultural Estrangement" at 4.50 and 5.89, respectively. The direction of tests 3 and 5, as well as test 17 were identical in that the R-BAV group had the most negative and alienated score with the S-LSPCL group showing less alienation at a level of significance.

Table XXI compares children in the setting designated as S-SCLIT with children in a clinical setting called S-CLIN. The most important observation to be made about this comparison has been to point out that there is no significant difference between the two groups on any one of the seventeen tests administered. In fact, the total scores reveal the least significance between these two groups of any of the ten comparisons.

Although none of the tests yielded significant evidence of a difference in the feelings of pupils in the S-CLIN and S-SCLIT settings, the most significant score was the "Not Angry-Angry" scale. This suggests that pupils in a clinical setting were more angry or that they expressed their anger more freely.

The total score for the "Attitude Toward School" instrument was 0.8262 and the total score of the semantic

TABLE XXI
 TUKEY COMPARISON OF MEANS
 S-CLIN, S-SCLIT

Test	Score
1. Powerlessness	0.1915
2. Role Estrangement	0.3323
3. Meaninglessness	0.8050
4. Guidelessness	1.3824
5. Cultural Estrangement	1.4516
*6. Total Score	0.8262
7. Good-Bad	2.2876
8. Excited-Not Excited	0.1322
9. Awake-Asleep	0.0192
10. Free-Trapped	1.6936
11. Glad-Sad	0.5319
12. Great-Terrible	0.6005
13. Angry-Not Angry	2.4637
14. Rested-Tired	0.2814
15. Friendly-Unfriendly	1.0628
16. Calm-Nervous	0.5760
**17. Total Score	0.1051

*Total "Attitude Toward School."

**Total "When at School I Feel."

***Significant beyond the .05 level.

differential was 0.1051. Of the ten comparisons, only the R-AV and R-BAV comparison approached this sort of similarity with a test 6 score of 1.38 and a test 17 score of 0.8666. That there was such a high degree of similarity in the feelings of the S-SCLIT group and the S-CLIN group is even more remarkable when it is considered that the test data came from four different schools. And, in addition, in the clinical settings the pupils had come from many different public schools. So that it would seem improbable that the extreme similarity of feelings had derived from schools

per se, but would more likely be related to fairly stable personality responses of these children. For purposes of comparison, it will be remembered that pupils in the R-AV setting and the R-BAV setting were from one particular school. It will be recalled also that children in R-AV and R-BAV settings had the more negative alienated attitudes while children in the S-CLIN and S-SCLIT settings had the more positive and least alienated attitudes toward school.

Table XXII is a comparison of children in the S-CLIN setting with children in the S-LSPCL setting. Again the most important observation to be made about this comparison would be that there is no significant difference between the two groups on any one of the seventeen tests. However, many of the scores are higher and approach significance. So there is more difference between clinical children and S-LSPCL than S-SCLIT.

There was no significant difference in the feelings about school between the S-CLIN group and the S-LSPCL group. There was almost a significant difference in test 3. The pupils of the S-LSPCL did not think their classwork was interesting compared to children in a clinical setting.

The S-CLIN group and the S-LSPCL group of children expressed similar feelings about school in the direction that was least alienated. However, some of the seventeen tests revealed scores that showed tendencies in the direction of a significant difference between the two groups. Test 3 was

TABLE XXII
 TUKEY COMPARISON OF MEANS
 S-CLIN, S-LSPCL

Test	Score
1. Powerlessness	0.1635
2. Role Estrangement	1.3302
3. Meaninglessness	3.7276
4. Guidelessness	0.5548
5. Cultural Estrangement	1.5201
*6. Total Score	2.5271
7. Good-Bad	3.1785
8. Excited-Not Excited	2.0868
9. Awake-Asleep	1.3987
10. Free-Trapped	2.7309
11. Glad-Sad	1.7615
12. Great-Terrible	2.4715
13. Angry-Not Angry	1.5293
14. Rested-Tired	0.9424
15. Friendly-Unfriendly	0.6652
16. Calm-Nervous	1.2553
**17. Total Score	1.6973

*Total "Attitude Toward School."

**Total "When at School I Feel."

the closest to significance with 3.72. Test 3 was the "Meaninglessness" test and it will be recalled that children in a clinical setting had very positive feelings about the interest value of their classwork, whereas the other groups, including S-LSPCL, thought the classwork was much less interesting. Test 7 showed the next highest tendency toward a significant difference. This was the "Good-Bad" scale of the semantic differential with children in a clinical setting feeling more positive and children in the S-LSPCL group moving in the direction of bad feelings about school. Other tests showing a tendency toward a significant difference

between the two groups were the total score on the "Attitude Toward School" instrument, the "Excited-Not Excited" scale, the "Free-Trapped" scale, and the "Great-Terrible" scale.

Table XXIII is a comparison of children in the S-LSPCL setting with children in the S-SCLIT setting. The most

TABLE XXIII
TUKEY COMPARISON OF MEANS
S-LSPCL, S-SCLIT

Test	Score
1. Powerlessness	0.3550
2. Role Estrangement	0.9979
3. Meaninglessness	2.9226
4. Guidelessness	0.8276
5. Cultural Estrangement	0.0685
*6. Total Score	3.3533
7. Good-Bad	0.8909
8. Excited-Not Excited	2.2190
9. Awake-Asleep	1.3794
10. Free-Trapped	1.0373
11. Glad-Sad	2.2935
12. Great-Terrible	1.8710
13. Angry-Not Angry	0.9344
14. Rested-Tired	0.6610
15. Friendly-Unfriendly	0.3976
16. Calm-Nervous	1.8313
**17. Total Score	1.5922

*Total "Attitude Toward School."

**Total "When at School I Feel."

important observation to be made about this comparison would be that there is no significant difference between the two groups as to their feelings about school and as recorded on any one of the seventeen tests. Some of the scores approach significance, but there are fewer tests like this between

S-LSPCL and S-SCLIT than was evidenced in the S-LSPCL and S-CLIN comparison.

There was no significant difference between the feelings of children in a large, special class and children who received reading instruction in a small group with a special teacher. The total score of the "Attitude Toward School" instrument approached significance, however.

The S-SCLIT group and the S-LSPCL group of children expressed similar feelings about school in the direction that was least alienated. The total score of the "Attitude Toward School" instrument showed the strongest tendency toward a significant difference between the two groups of any of the seventeen tests. Test 3, the "Meaninglessness" test, had a score of 2.92 for the next strongest tendency as compared to the test 6 or total score of 3.35. In both cases, the S-SCLIT group tended toward the more positive or least alienated score rather than the S-LSPCL group of children. Other tests which were fairly high were test 8, the "Excited-Not Excited" scale and test 11, the "Glad-Sad" scale with children in the S-SCLIT setting indicating the more positive feelings about school.

Table XXIV is a comparison of children in the R-AV group with children in the R-BAV group. From total test scores on the "Attitude Toward School" instrument and the "When at School I Feel" semantic differential it may be ascertained that there is no significant difference between

TABLE XXIV
 TUKEY COMPARISON OF MEANS
 R-AV, R-BAV

Test	Score
1. Powerlessness	1.7478
2. Role Estrangement	2.5087
3. Meaninglessness	2.5005
4. Guidelessness	1.0497
5. Cultural Estrangement	1.4210
*6. Total Score	1.3837
7. Good-Bad	0.9002
8. Excited-Not Excited	0.2034
9. Awake-Asleep	1.3373
10. Free-Trapped	0.1899
11. Glad-Sad	1.3008
12. Great-Terrible	0.5850
13. Angry-Not Angry	4.3695***
14. Rested-Tired	1.1180
15. Friendly-Unfriendly	0.7262
16. Calm-Nervous	0.5790
**17. Total Score	0.8666

*Total "Attitude Toward School."

**Total "When at School I Feel."

***Significant beyond the .05 level.

R-AV and R-BAV. This is the most important statement to be made about these two groups. However, it is also true that one of the subtests on the semantic differential, test 13 or the "Angry-Not Angry" scale, showed a significant difference between the two groups of 4.36. By checking the table for this test it can be noted that the R-AV group of children had the more positive and least alienated score when comparing R-AV with R-BAV.

The total scores on the "Attitude Toward School" scale and the semantic differential indicate that pupils in a

regular classroom setting have very similar feelings about school even though they differ in achievement and I.Q. The only difference of significance was the "Angry-Not Angry" scale.

A further look at the table recording data of the "Angry-Not Angry" scale will emphasize the fact that the R-BAV group was the most negative and angry of the five groups compared. Test 3, the "Meaninglessness" subtest and test 2, the "Role Estrangement" subtest showed the next strongest tendencies for a significant difference between groups, each registering a score of 2.50. In the "Meaninglessness" test, the R-BAV group had the more negative score indicating that they did not classify classwork as very interesting. However, on the "Role Estrangement," it was the R-AV group that accounted for the more negative, alienated feelings in a R-AV and R-BAV comparison. This coincides with the analysis of covariance for four groups and as discussed on page 90 in which there was no significant difference in feelings of role estrangement between children who were at least a grade level behind in reading regardless of whether they were in a regular classroom setting or some type of segregated setting. However, when the R-AV group was added to the four groups, there was a significant difference in the feelings about role estrangement between groups, indicating that the R-AV group accounted for the difference.

Table XXV is a comparison between children in the R-AV setting and pupils in the S-SCLIT setting. There were many significant differences between these two groups in regard to their attitude about school.

TABLE XXV
TUKEY COMPARISON OF MEANS
R-AV, S-SCLIT

Test	Score
1. Powerlessness	1.2274
2. Role Estrangement	3.3770
3. Meaninglessness	4.9227***
4. Guidelessness	0.3375
5. Cultural Estrangement	4.5400***
*6. Total Score	5.1023***
7. Good-Bad	3.5983
8. Excited-Not Excited	4.9505***
9. Awake-Asleep	2.6599
10. Free-Trapped	1.8539
11. Glad-Sad	3.4576
12. Great-Terrible	5.2008***
13. Angry-Not Angry	0.0107
14. Rested-Tired	3.2164
15. Friendly-Unfriendly	2.6435
16. Calm-Nervous	3.7773
17. Total Score	4.6914*

*Total "Attitude Toward School."

**Total "When at School I Feel."

***Significant beyond the .05 level.

Total scores reveal a significant difference between feelings of the R-AV group and the S-SCLIT group. The "Angry-Not Angry" test was the least significant of the scores although this test had been significant in other comparisons.

The total test score of the "Attitude Toward School" instrument was 5.10 and the "Great-Terrible" scale was 5.20, indicating the highest significant difference between R-AV and S-SCLIT. In both test scores, the S-SCLIT group showed the least alienation and the R-AV group had the more negative scores. Other test scores which showed a significant difference were test 3, the "Meaninglessness" test; test 5, "Cultural Estrangement"; test 8, the "Excited-Not Excited" scale; and test 17, the "Total Score" of the semantic differential. In these tests, also, the R-AV pupils had the more negative alienated scores when compared with S-SCLIT children. With six out of a possible seventeen tests showing a significant difference between R-AV and S-SCLIT, it is noteworthy that test 13, the "Angry-Not Angry" test, indicated such a similarity of feelings between the two groups. Another test, the "Guidelessness," test 4, indicated very similar feelings in their acceptance of teacher help in solving problems.

Table XXVI is a comparison of means between R-AV and S-LSPCL. The hypothesis, which was XI, stating no significant difference between the two groups was interpreted in the light of total test scores rather than any subtest or subtests. Even though three of the subtests showed a significant difference between R-AV and S-LSPCL, in general, there was no significant difference. Where there was a significant difference, the tests were not the ones that usually showed a difference in other comparisons.

TABLE XXVI
 TUKEY COMPARISON OF MEANS
 R-AV, S-LSPCL

Test	Score
1. Powerlessness	0.8724
2. Role Estrangement	4.3748***
3. Meaninglessness	2.0001
4. Guidelessness	1.1651
5. Cultural Estrangement	4.4715***
*6. Total Score	1.7490
7. Good-Bad	2.7074
8. Excited-Not Excited	2.7315
9. Awake-Asleep	4.0393***
10. Free-Trapped	0.8166
11. Glad-Sad	1.1641
12. Great-Terrible	3.3297
13. Angry-Not Angry	0.9451
14. Rested-Tired	2.5555
15. Friendly-Unfriendly	2.2459
16. Calm-Nervous	1.9459
**17. Total Score	3.0992

*Total "Attitude Toward School."

**Total "When at School I Feel."

***Significant beyond the .05 level.

Total test scores revealed no significant difference in the feelings about school between the R-AV group and the S-LSPCL group. On test 2 pupils grouped by ability felt that a pupil could be different and not be avoided, whereas the R-AV had more negative feelings accounting for the difference in five groups.

The tests that showed a significant difference in a comparison of R-AV and S-LSPCL were test 2, "Role Estrangement" and test 5, "Cultural Estrangement." of the "Attitude Toward School." instrument, as well as test 9, the "Awake-

"Asleep" scale of the semantic differential. In all three of these tests, the R-AV group had the most negative, alienated score and the S-LSPCL group had the more positive score. In the five-group comparisons of "Role Estrangement" and "Awake-Asleep," it was these two group differences of R-AV and S-LSPCL that accounted for the highest and lowest scores.

Table XXVII is a comparison of means between R-AV and S-CLIN. There was a significant difference between these two groups as can be judged by the total test scores of the two instruments. The total score of the "Attitude Toward School" instrument was 4.27 and the total score of the semantic differential was 4.79. Some other tests showed a significant difference in addition. These tests were test 3, the "Meaninglessness" test; test 5, "Cultural Estrangement"; test 7, the "Good-Bad" scale; test 8, the "Excited-Not Excited" scale; and test 12, the "Great-Terrible" test. In all of these tests, it was the R-AV group who had the most negative, alienated score and the clinical pupils who indicated the least alienation with their positive feelings about school. Of the seven tests out of seventeen that showed a significant difference, test 5, regarding a desire to attend school, showed that they differed the most. The clinical children wanted to attend school much more than the R-AV group who experienced more success.

Total test scores showed that there was a significant difference in feelings about school between the R-AV group

TABLE XXVII
 TUKEY COMPARISON OF MEANS
 R-AV, S-CLIN

Test	Score
1. Powerlessness	1.0359
2. Role Estrangement	3.0446
3. Meaninglessness	5.7277***
4. Guidelessness	1.7200
5. Cultural Estrangement	5.9916***
*6. Total Score	4.2761***
7. Good-Bad	5.8859***
8. Excited-Not Excited	4.8184***
9. Awake-Asleep	2.6406
10. Free-Trapped	3.5475
11. Glad-Sad	2.9256
12. Great-Terrible	5.8012***
13. Angry-Not Angry	2.4744
14. Rested-Tired	3.4978
15. Friendly-Unfriendly	1.5808
16. Calm-Nervous	3.2012
17. Total Score	4.7965*

*Total "Attitude Toward School."

**Total "When at School I Feel."

***Significant beyond the .05 level.

and the S-CLIN group. When the R-BAV group was compared with those in a clinical setting, tests 11 and 14 were significant also.

Tables XXVIII through XXXII are included in the Appendix and give individual reading achievement scores and I.Q. scores. Children who read at least one grade level behind had I.Q. group means of 91 to 100. Pupils who were not a grade level behind in reading had a mean I.Q. of 111.

Reading achievement was not used as a covariant because the pupils of this study were from different grade levels.

and the pupils were different ages within the span of nine to fifteen years of age. R-AV and R-BAV groups were students from the sixth grade and their mean reading achievement was 6.3 and 3.9, respectively. The S-LSPCL group was composed of students in the fifth grade and their mean reading achievement score was 3.4. Pupils in the S-SCLIT setting had a reading achievement score of 3.0 and were from the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades. Pupils in a clinical setting were from different grades also and these children had the lowest reading achievement mean score of 2.44.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Findings

From the analysis of the statistical data, the following findings are apparent:

1. There was a significant difference in feelings about school between pupils in a regular classroom setting and pupils in a segregated setting beyond the level of .01 using a Scheffé comparison of five groups, with segregated groups the least alienated.

2. There was a significant difference in feelings about school between pupils in a regular classroom setting and pupils in a segregated setting beyond the level of .01 using a Scheffé comparison of four groups at least one grade level behind in reading, with segregated groups the least alienated.

3. There was a significant difference in feelings about school between pupils in a regular classroom setting at least one grade level behind in reading (R-BAV) and pupils in a clinical setting (S-CLIN) beyond the .05 level using the Tukey test for the comparison of means, S-CLIN being the least alienated.

4. There was a significant difference in feelings about school between pupils in a regular classroom setting

at least one grade level behind in reading (R-BAV) and pupils in a small class with an itinerant teacher (S-SCLIT) beyond the .05 level using the Tukey test for a comparison of means, with S-SCLIT the least alienated.

5. There was a significant difference in feelings about school between pupils in a regular classroom setting at least one grade level behind in reading (R-BAV) and pupils in a large, special class (S-LSPCL) beyond the .05 level using the Tukey test for a comparison of means, S-LSPCL the least alienated.

6. There was not a significant difference in feelings about school between pupils in a clinical setting (S-CLIN) and pupils in a small class with an itinerant teacher (S-SCLIT) using the Tukey test for a comparison of means.

7. There was not a significant difference in feelings about school between pupils in a clinical setting (S-CLIN) and pupils in a large special class using the Tukey test for a comparison of means.

8. There was not a significant difference in feelings about school between pupils in a large, special class (S-LSPCL) and pupils in a small class with an itinerant teacher (S-SCLIT) using a Tukey test for a comparison of means.

9. There was not a significant difference in feelings about school between pupils in a regular classroom setting who are not behind in reading (R-AV) and pupils in a regular

classroom setting at least one grade level behind (R-BAV) using the Tukey test for a comparison of means.

10. There was a significant difference in feelings about school between pupils in a regular classroom setting who are not behind in reading (R-AV) and pupils in a small class with an itinerant teacher (S-SCLIT) beyond the .05 level using the Tukey test for a comparison of means, with S-SCLIT the least alienated.

11. There was not a significant difference in feelings about school between pupils in a regular classroom setting who are not behind in reading (R-AV) and pupils in a large, special class (S-LSPCL) using the Tukey test for a comparison of means.

12. There was a significant difference in feelings about school between pupils in a regular classroom setting who are not behind in reading (R-AV) and pupils in a clinical setting (S-CLIN) beyond the .05 level using the Tukey test for a comparison of means, with S-CLIN the least alienated.

Conclusions

The preceding findings make the following conclusions tenable:

1. Pupils in different environmental settings have different attitudes toward school.

2. In general, the difference in pupil attitudes about school tends to reflect a predominant pattern, with children

in regular classrooms feeling alike and somewhat more negative than children in segregated settings who feel alike and have more positive feelings regarding school.

3. Generally, pupils in a homogeneous setting occupied a middle position, as to degree of alienation, between the more negative attitudes of pupils in a regular classroom and the more positive feelings of children in segregated settings.

4. Clinical and small class settings are characterized by smaller teacher-pupil ratios, more individualized instructional procedures, and the most positive pupil attitudes about school. These characteristics, in turn, may interact to create an atmosphere of better mental health for teachers and pupils.

5. Pupils who do not make normal progress in a regular classroom have the same attitudes about school as pupils in a regular classroom who progress at a normal rate or better. In the formation of attitudes, this suggests that the peer group influence is a more important factor than degree of achievement.

Implications

As the test scores were interpreted, children in segregated settings showed the least alienation. The implication suggested here is the importance of favorable human relationships and significant teaching regarding a positive attitude toward school. A teacher's mental health is important.

There is another factor to be considered in this interpretation of test scores. Since the instruments used were informal rather than standardized on many groups of children, specific guidelines as to the interpretation of scores were lacking. While the tests themselves produced rather spectacular results in the collection of pertinent data; and while some safeguards were used to insure the understanding of poor readers, the weakness of the instruments became evident in an attempt to interpret the scores.

It is generally accepted in psychological circles that a certain balance of personality is desirable and that extremes tend to indicate imbalance. Ginott in his recent book, Between Parent and Child, points to the bad effects of repressed anger, for example (1).

It is conceivable also that alienation patterns formed in the elementary grades might later consist of two types: (1) passive alienation as indicated by withdrawal, repression, acquiescence, or addiction of some sort and (2) active alienation that might manifest as militancy, aggression, promiscuity, or destructiveness. If this is the case, the test scores of the two instruments would be interpreted differently in that extreme scores, whether positive or negative, would be indicative of a tendency toward imbalance in the personality. The middle scores, then, would show better adjustment and be the more positive and least alienated. In this event children in a regular classroom would be the

least alienated according to the data collected for this study. That children making normal progress in school, both from a mental and social standpoint, are a very good influence on their peers who are slower mentally can be seen by the similarity of feelings between the R-AV group and R-BAV group.

Which interpretation is the correct one cannot be stated scientifically without standardized scoring procedures. However, it can be stated that either or both interpretations point to the importance of human relationships in any consideration of social alienation.

Suggestions for Further Study

The following suggestions are made for additional research:

1. A replication of the present study that would include a pretest should be made in order to gauge the degree of alienation over a period of time.
2. A replication of the present study that would include a measurement of sensory alienation in addition to the two instruments measuring social alienation should be made.
3. A replication should be made of the present study with all of the pupils from the same grade, using reading achievement as a covariant.
4. Research should be undertaken regarding alienation in relation to teacher personality as authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire.

5. Research on alienation related to a parental background of rejection should be undertaken.
6. Research on alienation in relation to poor nutrition and general health should be undertaken.
7. Research should be undertaken regarding alienation related to methods of teaching reading.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ginott, Haim C., Between Parent and Child, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1965.

APPENDIX A

TABLE XXVIII

INDIVIDUAL SCORES
R-AV

Subject	Reading Achievement*	I.Q.**
1	5.7	106
2	5.3	102
3	7.4	114
4	6.0	105
5	7.1	120
6	5.7	107
7	6.2	116
8	9.0	125
9	5.4	104
10	5.5	116
11	5.1	107
12	6.1	107
13	5.2	89
14	5.1	109
15	5.5	107
16	7.4	107
17	6.5	104
18	6.3	111
19	7.1	117
20	6.6	106
21	6.8	116
22	5.9	103
23	8.5	132
24	8.0	132
25	5.9	117
Total Mean (5-Group)	3.8	99.5
Mean (R-AV)	6.3	111.1

*Stanford Achievement Test.

**Otis-Lennon Mental Ability Test.

TABLE XXIX
 INDIVIDUAL SCORES
 R-BAV

Subject	Reading Achievement*	I.Q.**
26	3.4	75
27	4.2	90
28	4.2	82
29	3.7	91
30	2.7	77
31	4.5	100
32	4.2	96
33	4.7	102
34	4.5	80
35	4.1	99
36	4.5	96
37	3.7	78
38	3.9	94
39	4.9	111
40	3.3	102
41	3.9	92
42	4.4	112
43	4.1	91
44	4.2	90
45	4.2	92
46	4.5	95
47	4.3	91
48	4.1	82
49	1.2	82
50	3.2	98
Total Mean (5-Group)	3.8	99.5
Mean (R-BAV)	3.9	91.9

*Stanford Achievement Test.

**Otis-Lennon Mental Ability Test.

TABLE XXX
 INDIVIDUAL SCORES
 S-LSPCL

Subject	Reading Achievement ^a	I.Q. ^b
51	3.5	103
52	3.8	91
53	3.3	98
54	2.9 ^d	93 ^c
55	2.8	95
56	3.3	99
57	3.7	122
58	3.2	92 ^c
59	3.0	90
60	2.0	126
61	3.9	97
62	3.0	113
63	3.8	106
64	3.9	99
65	3.7	95
66	3.7	81 ^c
67	3.2	111 ^c
68	2.8	117 ^c
69	3.6	91
70	3.7	101
71	3.8	113
72	3.1	102
73	4.0	101
74	3.4	91 ^e
75	4.0	97
Total Mean (S-Group)	3.8	99.5
Mean (S-LSPCL)	3.4	100.9

^aStanford Achievement Test.

^bCalifornia Test of Mental Maturity (Short).

^cWISC.

^dWide Range Achievement Test.

^eOtis-Lennon Mental Ability Test.

TABLE XXXI
 INDIVIDUAL SCORES
 S-SCLIT

Subject	Reading Achievement ^a	I.Q. ^b
76	3.3	93
77	5.0 ^c	92 ^d
78	3.0	104
79	2.2	85
80	3.3	101
81	3.3	106 ^e
82	2.6 ^c	104
83	3.7 ^c	95
84	4.4 ^c	115
85	2.9 ^c	106
86	2.9 ^c	85
87	3.0 ^c	122
88	3.3	103
89	2.9 ^c	114
90	2.8 ^c	101 ^f
91	2.9 ^c	92
92	2.8 ^c	108 ^f
93	2.3 ^c	90
94	2.4 ^c	91
95	3.4 ^c	86
96	2.8	103
97	3.3	93
98	2.2 ^c	100 ^f
99	3.4 ^c	101
100	3.0	91
Total Mean (5-Group)	3.8	99.5
Mean (S-SCLIT)	3.0	99.2

^aDurrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty.

^bWechsler Intelligence Scale for Children.

^cStanford Diagnostic Reading Test.

^dStanford-Binet.

^eCalifornia Test of Mental Maturity.

^fOtis-Lennon Mental Ability Test.

TABLE XXXII
INDIVIDUAL SCORES
S-CLIN

Subject	Reading Achievement ^a	I.Q. ^b
101	4.5 ^c	92
102	3.0	92
103	1.7 ^d	99
104	1.5	93
105	2.5 ^d	107
106	1.7 ^d	77
107	2.5	96
108	3.3 ^c	87
109	2.9 ^d	80
110	2.6 ^d	76
111	1.0	119
112	2.4 ^d	86
113	2.3 ^d	80 ^e
114	3.7	95
115	3.5	117
116	2.0	98
117	2.2	95
118	2.5 ^d	101
119	3.0	104
120	3.0 ^c	120
121	2.6 ^d	90
122	1.0	93
123	1.6	86
124	2.5	106
125	1.5 ^d	77
Total Mean (5-Group)	3.8	99.5
Mean (S-CLIN)	2.4	94.6

^aDurrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty.

^bWechsler Intelligence Scale for Children.

^cDiagnostic Reading Scales (Spache).

^dStanford Achievement Test.

^eStanford-Binet.

APPENDIX B

ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL

Your Name _____ Date _____

I.D. Number _____ School _____

Directions: Please answer each of the questions below by putting a check mark (X) under one of the four headings given in the columns to the right of the questions.

These four columns are:

(1) Nearly Always or Most of the time (2) Sometimes (3) Seldom (4) Never

	1 Nearly Always	2 Some- times	3 Seldom	4 Never
1. During school hours, I would rather be in school than anywhere else.				
2. Whenever I find or make something which I think the other students and the teacher will like, I bring it to school.				
3. Whenever I make something like a booklet, or a picture, or write a story, or have a good test paper, I take it home.				
4. During play periods everyone has a fair chance to play and do well.				
5. My abilities are recognized and given a fair place in this school.				
6. When a student doesn't like something in this school there is someone who will listen to him.				
7. When I see a way that I can help out another student, I try to do it.				
8. I believe my school work is fairly judged or graded by my teachers.				
9. My teachers are eager for me to learn new things.				
10. My teachers expect me to do my best in all of my school work.				

2

	1 Nearly Always	2 Some- times	3 Seldom	4 Never
11. When a problem comes up in our school groups, we discuss with the teacher how best to deal with it.				
12. I like to go to school.				
13. I feel free to ask my teachers anything I want to.				
14. I get along O.K. with boys. (girls only)				
15. I get along O.K. with girls. (boys only)				
16. I am glad to see other students do well in their school work.				
17. I feel that my teachers like me.				
18. My parents are pleased with my school work.				
19. I feel that I am succeeding in school.				
20. I like my teachers.				
21. My teachers seem cheerful and happy.				
22. I feel free to get up out of my seat without asking permission of the teacher, to talk to another child about school work, or to borrow a pencil, a book, or something.				
23. Most other students that I know in this school like me.				
24. In class discussions I raise my hand to volunteer information.				

	1 Nearly Always	2 Some- times	3 Seldom	4 Never
25. I am encouraged to work on topics or projects of special interest to me.				
26. I feel free to speak out in class and tell other students what I think of things they have said or done.				
27. Most of the other students like to see me do well in school.				
28. My teachers do all they can to help me understand what I am supposed to learn.				
29. Our required home-work is about right.				
30. When I break a school or group rule, spill or break something, I feel free to admit it to my teachers.				
31. When I need to, I can work quietly in this class without being disturbed.				
32. I hope I can go to school for many more years.				
33. I am proud of my school.				
34. I enjoy our play periods.				
35. My teachers understand how I feel about things.				
36. I have sat near or worked with other students whom I wanted to be with.				

	1 Nearly Always	2 Some- times	3 Seldom	4 Never
37. A student in this class can be different from others in some ways and not be made fun of or avoided.				
38. When a student annoys others, or interferes with what the group is trying to do, he is controlled or punished.				
39. A student who has a sense of humor is really appreciated in this class.				
40. A smart student who is very good in his school work is admired in this class.				
41. In this classroom I have felt relaxed and at ease.				
42. My class work is interesting.				
43. The rules of this school are enforced with fairness for everyone.				
44. When it comes to being strict, the teacher of this class is about right.				
45. There are plenty of books for our needs in the school library.				
46. I feel that what I am learning in school will be valuable to me in later life.				
47. I try hard to make a good record in all of my school subjects.				

APPENDIX C

WHEN AT SCHOOL I FEEL

Good _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Bad

Excited _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Not Excited

Asleep _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Awake

Trapped _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Free

Sad _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Glad

Great _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Terrible

Angry _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Not Angry

Rested _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Tired

Friendly _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Unfriendly

Nervous _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Calm

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Bigge, Morris L., Learning Theories for Teachers, New York, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1964.
- Bond, Guy L. and Miles A. Tinker, Reading Difficulties: Their Diagnosis and Correction, 2nd ed., New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
- Bradley, R. C. and N. Wesley Earp, Exemplars of the Teacher's Cognitive Domain, Dubuque, Iowa, William C. Brown Book Company, 1967.
- Buros, Oscar Krisen, The Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook, Highland Park, New Jersey, The Gryphon Press, 1965.
- Fromm, Erich, The Revolution of Hope Toward a Humanized Technology, Bantam Edition, New York, Harper & Row, 1968.
- Ginott, Haim C., Between Parent and Child, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1965.
- Gordon, Ira J., Human Development Readings in Research, Glenview, Illinois, Scott, Foresman and Company, 1965.
- Hall, Calvin S. and Gardner Lindzey, Theories of Personality, 2nd ed., New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1970.
- Haimowitz, Morris L. and Natalie Reader Haimowitz, Human Development, Selected Readings: Second Edition, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1966.
- Jensen, Theodore and others, Elementary School Administration, Boston, Allyn & Bacon, 1967.
- Mikelson, Peter Palmer and Kenneth H. Hanson, Elementary School Administration, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957.
- Moffett, James, A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, Grades K-13: A Handbook for Teachers, Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1968.

- Morris, Van Cleve, Existentialism in Education: What It Means, New York, Harper & Row, 1966.
- Roscoe, John T., Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Satin, Joseph, The Humanities Handbook, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Strang, Ruth, Helping Your Child Develop His Potentialities, New York, Award Books, 1970.

Articles

- Adelman, Howard S., "Learning to Read in the Classroom," The Reading Teacher, 24 (December, 1970), 257-260.
- Aiken, Michael and Jerald Hage, "Organizational Alienation: A Comparative Analysis," American Sociological Review, 31 (August, 1966), 497-507.
- Anastasiow, Nicholas J., "A Comparison of Two Approaches in Ungraded Reading Instruction," Elementary English, 45 (April, 1968), 495-499.
- Armer, Michael, "Formal Education and Psychological Malaise in an African Society," Sociology of Education, 43 (Spring, 1970), 143-159.
- Balow, Irving H., "A Longitudinal Evaluation of Reading Achievement in Small Classes," Elementary English, 46 (February, 1969), 104-187.
- Bickford, Hugh L. and Arthur G. Neal, "Alienation and Social Learning: A Study of Students in a Vocational Training Center," Sociology of Education, 42 (Spring, 1969), 141-153.
- Bills, Robert E., "Nondirective Play Therapy with Retarded Reader," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14 (1950), 140-149.
- _____, "Play Therapy with Well-Adjusted Retarded Readers," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14 (1950), 246-249.
- Bonney, Merl E., "Assessment of Efforts to Aid Socially Isolated Elementary School Pupils," Journal of Educational Research, 64 (April, 1971), 359-364.

- Bonney, Merl E., "Social Behavior Differences Between Second-Grade Children of High and Low Sociometric Status," Journal of Educational Research, 48 (March, 1955), 481-495.
- Cameron, Jack R., "Public Education and the Retreat from Culture," Journal of Educational Thought, 3 (April, 1969), 41-48.
- Clark, John P., "Measuring Alienation Within a Social System," American Sociological Review, 24 (December, 1959), 849-852.
- Coleman, James S., "Implications of the Findings on Alienation," The American Journal of Sociology, 70 (July, 1964), 76-78.
- Comoss, H. H., "Some Characteristics Related to Social Isolation of Second Grade Children," Journal of Educational Psychology, 53 (February, 1962), 38-42.
- Delacato, Janice F. and Carl H. Delacato, "A Group Approach to Remedial Reading," Elementary English, 30 (January, 1953), 31-33.
- Goldman, Bert and Helen D. Wolff, "Effectiveness of a Demonstration Reading School," The Reading Teacher, 24 (November, 1970), 106-111.
- Graubard, Paul S., "Utilizing the Group in Teaching Disturbed Delinquents to Learn," Exceptional Children, 36 (December, 1969), 267-272.
- Gronlund, Norman E., "Relationship Between the Sociometric Status of Pupils and Teachers' Preferences for or against Having Them in Class," Sociometry, 16 (May, 1953), 142-149.
- Grossmann, Beverly and Joyce Wrighter, "The Relationship Between Selection-Rejection and Intelligence, Social Status, and Personality Amongst Sixth Grade Children," Sociometry, 11 (November, 1948), 346-355.
- Hart, Richard, "The Effectiveness of an Approach to the Problem of Varying Abilities in Teaching Reading," Journal of Educational Research, 52 (February, 1959), 228-231.
- Hearn, James J., "Teachers' Sense of Alienation with Respect to School System Structure," Phi Delta Kappan, 52 (January, 1971), 312.

- Hughes, Thomas M., "The Relationship of Coping Strength to Self-Concept, School Achievement and General Anxiety Level in Sixth Grade Pupils," Journal of Experimental Education, 37 (Winter, 1968), 59-64.
- Johnson, Marjorie Seddon, "A Study of Diagnostic and Remedial Procedures in a Reading Clinic Laboratory School," Journal of Educational Research, 48 (March, 1955), 565-578.
- Kaplan, Martin F. and Erwin Singer, "Dogmatism and Sensory Alienation: An Empirical Investigation," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 27 (December, 1963), 486-491.
- Mackey, James A., "The Dimensions of Adolescent Alienation," The High School Journal, 54 (November, 1970), 84-94.
- Middleton, Russell, "Alienation, Race, and Education," American Sociological Review, 28 (December, 1963), 973-976.
- Moellenberg, Wayne, "Alienation: Some Causes and Cures," Contemporary Education, 42 (October, 1970), 21-25.
- Morgan, Elmer F. and Gerald R. Stucker, "The Joplin Plan of Reading Vs. a Traditional Method," Journal of Educational Psychology, 51 (April, 1960), 69-73.
- Nichols, Nancy J., "Interclass Grouping for Reading Instruction: Who Makes the Decision and Why?" Educational Leadership, 26 (March, 1969), 588-592.
- Oliver, Marvin E., "Organizing for Reading Instruction," The Elementary School Journal, 71 (November, 1970), 97-104.
- Pumfrey, P. D. and C. D. Elliot, "Play Therapy, Social Adjustment and Reading Attainment," Educational Research, 12 (June, 1970), 183-193.
- Schrank, Wilbur R., "A Further Study of the Labeling Effect of Ability Grouping," Journal of Educational Research, 63 (April, 1970), 358-360.
- Seeman, Melvin, "Alienation and Social Learning in a Reformatory," American Journal of Sociology, 69 (November, 1969), 270-285.
- _____, "Powerlessness and Knowledge: A Comparative Study of Alienation and Learning," Sociometry, 30 (June, 1967), 105-123.

Wylie, Richard E., "Research in Reading: The Child, a Method and a Technique," Childhood Education (December, 1970), 173-175.

Publications of Learned Organizations

McElhinney, James H. and others, Evidence of School Related Alienation in Elementary School Pupils, Washington, D.C., American Educational Research Association, 1970.

Noar, Gertrude, Teaching the Disadvantaged, Washington, D.C., National Education Association, 1967.

Newspaper

Denton Record-Chronicle, December 13, 1970.