Western Kentucky University
TopSCHOLAR®

Masters Theses & Specialist Projects | Graduate School

8-1944

A Study of the Effect of Growth in Reading Achievement Upon the Total Personality of the Child

Lillie Nix
Western Kentucky University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses

 Part of the Curriculum and Instruction Commons, Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons, Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons, Educational Psychology Commons, Elementary Education Commons, and the Reading and Language Commons

Recommended Citation
Nix, Lillie, "A Study of the Effect of Growth in Reading Achievement Upon the Total Personality of the Child" (1944). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects.* Paper 2702.
https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/2702

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

Nix,

Lillie

1944

A STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF GROWTH IN READING ACHIEVEMENT UPON THE TOTAL PERSONALITY OF THE CHILD

BY

LILLIE NIX

A THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

WESTERN KENTUCKY TEACHERS COLLEGE

AUGUST, 1944

Approved:-

Major Professor

Department of Education

Graduate Committee

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to Dr. C. H. Jaggers for his patient and able direction of this study. She is also indebted to Dr. Mabel Rudisill, Dr. Earl A. Moore and Dr. Lee Francis Jones for their critical appraisal of the manuscript. For their cooperation and assistance in conducting the investigation the writer also wishes to express appreciation to the following persons: Dr. Frank H. Gorman, Butler University, Indianapolis; Dr. H. L. Harshman, director of research, Indianapolis city schools; Mr. Elmer Norris, principal, school twelve, Indianapolis; Miss Belle Sense, Miss Beatrice Houze, Mrs. Mamie Smith, Mrs. Pearl Stokes, co-workers; and last but by no means least, the girls and boys, the cases for this study.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SET-UP AND EXPERIMENTAL TECHNIQUE	11
III.	ANALYSIS OF DATA	16
IV.	SUMMARY, LIMITATIONS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	25
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	30
	APPENDIX	32

TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Data Descriptive of Socio-Economic Background of Forty-seven Cases	13.
II	Summary of Results Obtained from Metropolitan Reading Tests and California Tests of Personality Administered in November and May	16
III	Data for Twenty-four Pupils Showing Gain in both Reading and Personality Scores between the November and the May Testing Programs	17
IV	Data for Ten Pupils Showing Gain in Reading Scores but Loss in Personality Scores between the November and the May Testing Programs	18
V	Data for Four Pupils Showing Gain in Personality Scores but Loss in Reading Scores between the November and the May Testing Programs	18
VI	Data for Six Pupils Showing Gain in Reading Scores with neither Gain nor Loss in Personality Scores or Gain in Personality Scores with neither Gain nor Loss in Reading Scores	19
VII	Data for Three Pupils Showing Loss in Reading Scores and neither Gain nor Loss in Personality Scores or Showing Loss in Personality Scores and neither Gain nor Loss in Reading Scores between the November and the May Testing Programs	20
VIII	Table Showing Median and Arithmetic Mean for Personality Scores Made by Three Groups: Twelve Who Ranked Highest in Reading Scores; Twelve Who Ranked Lowest in Reading Scores; and Twenty-three Who Comprise a Middle Group in Reading Scores	20
IX	Table Showing Median and Arithmetic Mean for Personality Scores Made by Three Groups: Twelve Who Ranked Highest; Twelve Who Ranked Lowest; and Twenty-three Comprising a Middle Group; in Intelligence as Rated by the Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability	21

TABLES (CONTINUED)

TABLE		PAGE
X	Table Showing Median and Arithmetic Mean Gain in Reading and Personality Scores for Three Groups: Those Showing Greatest Gain; Those Showing Average Gain; and Those Showing Least Gain in Reading	22
XI	Table Showing Median and Arithmetic Mean for Personality Scores Made by Three Groups: Fifteen Comprising an Under-age Group; Fifteen Comprising an Over-age Group; and the Remaining Seventeen Comprising an Average-age or Normal Group --- November Testing	24

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to determine the effect of reading achievement as measured by a standardized test of reading, upon the total personality of the child, as measured by a standardized test of personality.

To achieve this result, the investigation has been directed toward answers to the following questions:

1. Do children who make a phenomenal gain in reading achievement during a certain period of time reflect a feeling of success by a comparable advancement in personality?

2. Do children of above-median reading ability have a higher ranking in total personality?

3. Is there a direct relationship between intelligence and personality, as there is conceded to be between intelligence and reading?

4. Does the over-age child, retarded perhaps because of reading inability or disability, compare favorably in personality with the under-age child, advanced perhaps because of unusual reading ability, and with the average-age child, who has made normal progress?

A Definition of Personality

Before any study can be undertaken, there must be a common interpretation of terminology.

Allport tells us: "There is no single definition of personal-

ity: usage has sanctioned too many."[1] To most of us, the term has come, all too often, to mean only a polished exterior or the mere ability to get along well with our associates, regardless of the price one may pay for such adaptability. Breckenridge and Vincent in Child Development, under the heading: "What Personality Is", have this to say:

> The ordinary lay person's conception of personality as that which makes one popular with people is not the psychologist's conception. The psychologist thinks also of the dominating, destructive attitude of a gangster, or the blank emptiness of an idiot as making up part of the complex of feelings, attitudes and behavior which is personality.[2]

Many definitions of personality stated as such are found in writings published in the early part of the present century. Kempf (1918) defined personality as the "habitual mode of adjustment which the organism effects between its own egocentric drives and the exigencies of the environment."[3] Morton Prince (1924) says: "Personality is the sum total of all the biological innate dispositions, impulses, tendencies, appetites and instincts of the individual, and the acquired dispositions and tendencies."[4] Floyd Allport in the same year defines the term as "the individual's characteristic reactions to social stimuli and the quality

---

1. G. W. Allport, Personality: A Psychological Interpretation (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1937), p. 25.

2. Marian E. Breckenridge and E. Lee Vincent, Child Development (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1943), p.403.

3. The quotation is from Ross Stagner's Psychology of Personality, p. 2.

4. Ibid., p. 2

of his adaptation to the social features of his environment."[5] Symonds in 1928 says personality is "the portrait or landscape of the organism working together in all its phases,"[6] and May, (1929) interprets the word to mean "the social stimulant value of the individual."[7]

Writers of the last decade in the psychological field have been less willing, apparently, to give a concise definition of the term. They will describe the traits which go to make up the integrated personality or will tell us what personality is not. G. W. Allport, however, after tracing the word from its original use through forty-nine other interpretations, gives us as the fiftieth meaning of the term, a definition which the author of this paper wishes the reader to keep in mind.

> Personality _is_ something and _does_ something. It is not synonymous with behavior or activity; least of all is it merely the impression that this activity makes on others. It is what lies _behind_ specific acts and _within_ the individual. The systems that constitute personality are in every sense _determining tendencies_, and when aroused by suitable stimuli provoke those adjustive and expressive acts by which the personality comes to be known.[8]

Reading and Personality

The belief that some subtle relationship exists between the wholesome integrated personality and ability to read well is perhaps as old as the art of printing itself. Repeatedly, men and women who have achieved renown have been pointed out as being

---

5. _Ibid._, p. 2.
6. _Ibid._, p. 3.
7. _Ibid._, p. 3.
8. Allport, _op. cit._, p. 48.

great lovers of worth-while literature and avid readers, and just as the ability to read well and the enjoyment of reading are assumed to have been a major contributory factor to their success, so has the inability to read well been blamed for many of life's failures.

Educational and psychological literature of the present day abounds with opinions that much of our maladjustment in personality problems is to be laid at the door of the lack of reading ability. In Youth and the Future, the report of the American Youth Commission, we read: "Defective reading ability is a major handicap to citizenship and personal success throughout life."[9]

Ryan, in his Mental Health through Education, referring to Moodie's studies at the London Child Guidance Clinic, says: "These, and many other studies, have shown reading disabilities and failures generally, in school subjects are responsible for a heavy proportion of the emotional disturbances in cases referred from the school to the clinics."[10]

Strang says: "Ideally, reading is a thought process which makes a natural contribution to the personality development as well as to the intellectual growth of individuals."[11]

Baker tells us:

When the child finds stories or books that satisfy

---

9. Youth and the Future: The General Report of the American Youth Commission, p. 134. Compiled by the American Council on Education. Washington, D. C. 1942.

10. Will Carson Ryan, Mental Health through Education (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1938), p. 209.

11. Ruth Strang, Problems in the Improvement of Reading in High Schools and Colleges (Lancaster, Pennsylvania: The Science Press Printing Co., 1940) p.60.

his personal interests or his emotional drive, he reads with greater intensity of effort and tends to form a permanent liking for reading. As he reads, new interests and drives develop, and these may be translated into action, leading to the formation of worth-while purposes toward which he will work with enthusiasm. Thus the integrated personality develops.

Wholesome attitudes cannot be developed through reading, however, unless the child acquires the fundamental habits and skills essential to successful achievement. The boy or girl who reads with extreme hesitation not only will fail to develop pleasure in reading but may acquire feelings of inferiority that will lead to various behavior difficulties. Attitudes of fear, anxiety, defeat, aversion to books and to school-- all are unhealthy personality traits frequently noted in poor readers.[12]

McCallister in quoting Phyllis Blanchard says: "Blanchard has shown that reading disability, if uncorrected, may result in personality as well as educational maladjustments."[13]

In Remedial Reading, by Monroe and Backus, we find: "The relation between reading disabilities, personality and character justifies remedial reading programs in the public schools,"[14] and again: "Reading disabilities contribute attitudes in many cases which result in anti-social and delinquent behavior."[15]

It is unusual to find such statements as the following, a statement, in sharp contrast to the opinion of the writers quoted above:

Children whose social contacts are too long delayed, probably do not suffer too much when they make their initial contacts with other children whose social skills are as inadequate as their own. There is no sense of stigma

---

12. Reading and Pupil Development. Compiled and edited by William S. Gray. Supplementary Educational Monograph, Published in conjunction with the School Review and the Elementary School Journal. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940), p. 25.

13. James M. McCallister, Remedial and Corrective Instruction in Reading (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936), p. 11.

14. Marion Monroe and Bertie Backus, Remedial Reading (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1937), p. 4.

15. Ibid., p. 8

> and everybody can be awkward together. When, however, the initial contacts come at the age of strong awareness of other children's reactions (six or seven years up,) children are very likely to develop a sense of inferiority and a feeling of discouragement at ever being able to accomplish the necessary learning. Their awkwardness and their mistakes stand out in sharp contrast to the smoothness of the other children. Instead of quickly progressing through the first unskilled stages, they often withdraw, tending to develop the "sour grapes" attitudes that they don't really want to be sociable anyway. Such children may retreat into the world of reading if their reading skills are good enough or into solitary fantasies where they find themselves more successful than in the world of reality.[16]

Experimentation

There seem to have been very few experiments made to determine the effect of reading achievement on the personality of the child. Buswell is one among many educators to write of the lack of experimentation along this line. He says: "There is at the present time, a very considerable body of literature relating to personality. ... But the number of experiments in the literature which deal with the personality in school situations make up a very minor part of the total."[17]

Preston of the School of Medicine, Stanford University, reports an experiment where a group of non-reading cases referred from thirty-two schools, evidently of the traditional type, were placed in a school where "skillful techniques in beginning reading"[18] were used, and reports that "satisfactory readers were made of 78 per cent of them and fair readers of 13 per cent."[19]

---

16. Breckenridge and Vincent, op. cit., p. 415.

17. Guy T. Buswell, "Experimentation and Personality Development," Elementary School Journal, XLIII (1943), p. 393.

18. Mary I. Preston, "The School Looks at the Non-reader," Elementary School Journal, XL (1940), p. 458.

19. Ibid., p. 458.

As a result, these pupils who before this help was given, had been considered failures, were enabled to overcome the maladjustment which had arisen from the reading inability.

> Reading success was not the whole of the story. As school security improved and the victim of reading failure could hold up his head as an equal of his classmates, the previous suspicious, resentful, and revengeful misbehavior dropped off, including even stealing and truancy, and better social relations ensued at school; social security improved along with school security. Moreover, when the family discovered that it was not being disgraced by subnormal school actions, the child was reinstated as a normal member, pressure was removed, reproaches and revilings gave way to approval and praise, and the home security of the child was raised to a comforting degree. Thus correction of the reading inability raised not only the school security but the social and the very important home security as well.[20]

The entire study is based on subjectivity of judgment with little objectivity of experimentation. The reader is hesitant to accept the many generalities given, as proofs, chief among them the conclusion that poor teaching was in the majority of the schools the determining factor in the low reading ability of the cases.

Betts reports a scientifically conducted experiment in which seventy-eight fifth grade pupils in a public school in State College, Pennsylvania, were tested to determine the relation of a group of factors, among which were those of reading achievement and personality growth.[21]

The Brown Personality Inventory for Children was administered on two successive days. Neither the teachers nor the pupils knew

---

20. Ibid., p. 457.

21. Emmett A. Betts, "Reading Problems at the Intermediate Grade Level," Elementary School Journal, XL (1940), p. 742.

of the plan of administering the test a second time. This established the correlation coefficient of .919±.0122 between the scores on the first testing and the retesting.

The author of the personality test gives 17.20 as the average score. Betts tells us: "The average score for the good readers was 16.93; for the poor readers 20.06. There was no statistically significant difference in the social-adjustment scores made by thirty pupils who scored highest and thirty who scored lowest on the Durrell-Sullivan Reading Achievement Test."[22]

Vaughn, of the University of Arizona, reports a study "designed to ascertain what disturbing classroom reaction might be attributed to the attempt to teach reading and related subjects to illiterate, defective adolescent boys."[23]

Twenty-eight boys with average chronological age of 13.8 years, intelligence quotient of sixty-four and reading grade of 2.2 comprise a control group. The group used for comparable study had an average chronological age of 13.9 years, intelligence quotient of sixty-four, and a reading grade of 4.2.

A comparison of the adjustment of the groups was made in two classroom situations: one, in "academic" rooms; the other, in "handwork" rooms.

The Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedules were used to measure adjustment, and the author of the study tells us:

The poor readers, (that is those with an average reading

---

22. Betts, op. cit., p.742.

23. Charles L. Vaughn, "Classroom Behavior Problems Encountered in Attempting to Teach Illiterate, Defective Boys How to Read," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXII (1941), p. 339.

grade of 2.2) showed significantly more disinterest in school work, marked over-activity, temper outbursts, and speech difficulties in the academic rooms than did the good readers, (that is, those cases with an average reading grade of 4.2). The poor readers tended to bully other children more and to be more defiant of discipline. The backward readers were also more poorly adjusted in academic rooms than in handwork rooms in terms of these same problems, whereas the good readers were not. The same situation holds likewise for attentiveness and the total of intellectual traits on Division 1 of Schedule B, of the Haggerty-Olson-Wickman Behavior Rating Schedules."[24]

The study concludes that problem behavior as symptomatic of personality maladjustment is encountered in the "academic" classroom "when an attempt is made to teach reading and related subjects to illiterate, defective adolescent boys."[25]

The study, while hardly characteristic of an ordinary classroom situation, due to the type of cases used, is pertinent in that almost any "normal" classroom situation has at least two or three such cases. While in the usual group they constitute a decided minority, yet they often make their presence felt to such an extent that they are the major factor, many times, in causing the teacher to seek remedial measures.

If personality is taken to include maladjustment as well as adjustment, as G. W. Allport tells us that it must be, [26] and Breckenridge and Vincent interpret it to mean, [27] then an investigation such as the following, made by Healy and Bronner is also meaningful. In their book, New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment, we read:

---

24. Ibid., p. 349.

25. Ibid., p. 350.

26. Allport, op. cit., p. 49.

27. Breckenridge and Vincent, op. cit., p. 403.

Our investigation of reading interest gave surprising returns as we compared the delinquents and controls. Evidently considerably more of the delinquents were fond of reading and were even said to be greater readers.[28]

---

28. William Healy and Augusta Bronner, New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936), p. 72.

CHAPTER II

SET-UP AND EXPERIMENTAL TECHNIQUE

The Scope of the Study

The subjects for this study were regularly enrolled pupils of School Twelve of the Indianapolis Public School System for the scholastic year, 1943-44. When they were first tested in November, 1943, they were classified on 4B, 4A and 5B levels, and were drawn from three rooms. When the final testing was made in May, 1944, they were with one exception, classified on 4A, 5B and 5A levels and were drawn from four rooms.

The exception noted above, was one boy who for various reasons was retained in 4B, and whose case history appears in the Appendix to this study. Two children had been withdrawn from regular classrooms and entered in a fresh-air room making the final number of rooms four instead of the original three.

Fifty-eight children were given at least two of the three tests administered in November, 1943. Records were completed, however, for only forty-seven of these cases. This was due to several causes. Four subjects moved from the district. Three were eliminated after the first testing because of physical defects serious enough to be considered probable cause for a feeling of inferiority and therefore an invalidation of the test results in personality. One child was eliminated because her reading was so superior to the group and so far in advance of her chronological age and grade placement, as compared with the group, that it was feared that the averaging of the results with

her score counted in, would seem to give an unfair picture of the whole group. Two were not given the second test because of prolonged absence between the two testing periods, and one child was eliminated because all three tests given in November showed patterned responses.

The children chosen for this study come from a community whose homes scarcely deserve the dignity of such a title. The term, "hovel", would more appropriately describe most of them. In looking over the list of cases chosen for this study, however, the writer realizes that although the selection was made somewhat at random, yet the group as a whole, scarcely represents a true cross-section of the school's population. They are of the upper socio-economic strata of the district, even though this would probably rank low in comparison with the usual school community. The only reason the author of this study can suggest for this fact is that when the investigation was being planned, it was the intention to select only children whose intelligence quotient was ninety or above, the range usually designated as "normal".

This idea was abandoned later, however, when it became apparent that it would be impossible to obtain enough pupils of this intelligence classification for a fair sampling and keep the cases to be studied on a fourth and fifth grade level. This above explanation assumes that children of high intelligence as shown on intelligence test ratings, are products of parents of the same or somewhat the same intellectual levels, who because of this fact are able to solve life's social and economic problems more satisfactorily than their fellowmen who have been less abundantly en-

dowed.

In Table I, an attempt has been made to give a compostie picture of the socio-economic background of the group. The information recorded therein was obtained from a questionnaire administered to the forty-seven cases whose testing records were completed; from interviews with the children and their parents; and from information received from the school principal, teachers and other school employees who had served in the district over a long period of time.

TABLE I

DATA DESCRIPTIVE OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF FORTY-SEVEN CASES

	Yes	No	Unanswered or "Don't Know"
1. Do your parents own your home?	12	32	3
2. Is your mother living?	44	3	
3. Is your father living?	45	2	
4. Are your parents separated?	12	35	
5. Did father attend high school?	5	5	37
6. Did mother attend high school?	7	2	38
7. Did father attend college?	2	7	38
8. Did mother attend college?	3	3	41
9. Do you live with someone other than your parents?	5	42	
10. Do you have a stepfather?	5	42	
11. Do you have a stepmother?	2	45	
12. Do you have stepbrothers and/or stepsisters?	9	30	8
13. Does your father work?	34	4	9
14. Does your mother work?	20	27	
15. Do you study school subjects at home?	15	32	
16. Do you read library books at home?	13	34	
17. Do you read library magazines at home?	1	46	
18. Do you read drug store magazines at home?	20	27	
19. Have you a radio at home?	20	27	
20. Do you play with other children?	18	11	18
21. Do you work?	30	17	
22. Do you attend Sunday school or church regularly?	22	25	

TABLE I (CONTINUED)
DATA DESCRIPTIVE OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF FORTY-SEVEN CASES

	Range	Group Average
23. How many times have you moved?	From "never" to ten	4+
24. How many schools have you attended?	From one to six	2+
25. How many brothers and/or sisters have you?	From none to ten	4
26. About how many shows do you attend in a month?	From none to twenty	5
27. How many parties did you attend the last year?	From none to six	1+
28. How many books do you have at home that belong to you or that you can read?	From none to "about ten"	2+

Technique

On November 18, 1943, the Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability was administered to the entire group. Four days later, sufficient time having elapsed to enable the examiner to check the results obtained from this test with tests of mental ability previously given, the Metropolitan Achievement Test in Reading - Intermediate Level -Form A was administered, followed the next day, November 23, by the California Test of Personality - Elementary Level - Form B, designed for grades four to nine.

To eliminate the possibility that the personality test would become just another test of reading performance, the author of this study, who performed the entire testing, anticipated words which might possibly offer difficulties and for several weeks preceding the testing period studied them with the group, both for word recognition and interpretation of meaning.

To further eliminate the possibility of a reading hazard in the results of the personality test, the children were tested in

small enough groups to give individual help on any word whose meaning was not clear to the child.

The atmosphere of the testing room was made as informal as possible during the administering of the personality test, and the children, forty-nine of whom were either at that time in the writer's classroom, or had been within the two preceding semesters, were directed to freely ask any questions concerning word meanings which they desired to have answered. The author, knowing the children as she does, has every reason to believe that the questions of the personality test were clearly comprehended by the children and were answered to the best of their ability. Even though the test is designed so that all questions are answered by encircling "yes" or "no", many of the children not only encircled one of these answers, but wrote notes in the margin which showed their complete comprehension and appreciation of many of the questions. Not only was this true of the best readers in the group, but also of those whose reading scores ranked among the lowest.

On May 23, 1944, the Metropolitan Achievement Test of Reading Ability, Form B, Intermediate Level, and on May 25, the California Test of Personality, Elementary, Form A were given. The same procedure of anticipating difficulties, giving preliminary study, and help during the testing period was employed, great care being exercised to make the amount of time spent in the preliminary study the same as had been given before the first test.

The purpose of this second testing was to determine the amount of gain or loss that had occurred in reading and in personality since the November testing.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data here interpreted are the results of the Metropolitan Reading Test and the California Test of Personality administered in November, 1943, and in May, 1944. The resultant scores of the personality tests are given in percentile norms, and the scores of the reading tests are given in terms of school months, ten months constituting a school year.

In Table II, the entire group of forty-seven completed cases is divided into the seven classifications according to the results of the previously mentioned tests.

TABLE II

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OBTAINED FROM METROPOLITAN READING TESTS AND CALIFORNIA TESTS OF PERSONALITY ADMINISTERED IN NOVEMBER AND MAY

Description of Group	Number in Group
1. Number showing gain in both personality and reading scores	24
2. Number showing gain in reading score but loss in personality score	10
3. Number showing gain in personality score but loss in reading score	4
4. Number showing gain in reading and neither gain nor loss in personality	3
5. Number showing gain in personality and neither gain nor loss in reading	3
6. Number showing loss in reading and neither gain nor loss in personality	2
7. Number showing loss in personality and neither gain nor loss in reading	1
Total number of cases	47

It will be noted from this table that slightly more than 50 per cent of the entire group showed gain both in reading and in personality scores.

Table III gives data for the members of this first group men-

tioned in Table II, the number showing gain in both personality and reading scores. An interesting item to be noted in this table is that while four pupils having an I. Q. rating of above one hundred made only normal progress in reading, six months, that being the approximate time which elapsed between the two testing periods, three of the four highest-ranking in reading gains had I. Q. ratings of only seventy, eighty-four, and seventy-four, respectively.

TABLE III

DATA FOR TWENTY-FOUR PUPILS SHOWING GAIN IN BOTH READING AND PERSONALITY SCORES BETWEEN THE NOVEMBER AND THE MAY TESTING PROGRAMS

Pupil	I.Q.	Personality		Reading		Personality Gain	Reading Gain
		Nov.	May	Nov.	May		
1	73	45	75	44	45	30	1
2	86	45	70	40	41	25	1
3	68	10	15	44	46	5	2
4	80	15	30	39	41	15	2
5	86	30	35	34	36	5	2
6	95	20	45	45	47	25	2
7	99	35	85	44	46	50	2
8	80	55	60	45	48	5	3
9	93	30	40	35	38	10	3
10	84	35	60	48	52	25	4
11	91	10	20	28	32	10	4
12	98	25	45	42	46	20	4
13	74	40	75	37	43	35	6
14	103	20	30	40	46	10	6
15	104	55	70	43	49	15	6
16	110	45	80	44	50	35	6
17	111	10	35	45	51	25	6
18	95	70	75	44	51	5	7
19	97	50	85	43	50	35	7
20	97	20	60	41	48	40	7
21	74	10	20	20	28	10	8
22	96	55	85	42	53	30	11
23	84	10	25	28	42	15	14
24	70	20	40	28	42	20	14

Personality scores given in terms of percentile norms.
Reading scores given in terms of school months; ten months constituting a school year.

Table IV gives the data pertaining to the ten cases who though making gain in reading scores between the two testing program periods showed loss in personality scores in that same time. It

is to be noted, however, that in six of the ten cases, the loss is slight, being only five points (considering percentile norms as points).

TABLE IV

DATA FOR TEN PUPILS SHOWING GAIN IN READING SCORES BUT LOSS IN PERSONALITY SCORES BETWEEN THE NOVEMBER AND THE MAY TESTING PROGRAMS

Pupil	I.Q.	Personality		Reading		Personality	Reading
		Nov.	May	Nov.	May	Loss	Gain
1	84	15	10	37	38	5	1
2	99	40	30	39	41	10	2
3	87	35	30	42	45	5	3
4	87	60	15	43	47	45	4
5	91	60	45	42	47	15	5
6	84	45	30	36	43	5	7
7	76	25	20	33	40	5	7
8	84	40	35	41	49	5	8
9	72	20	15	28	39	5	11
10	127	30	5	51	63	25	12

Personality scores given in terms of percentile norms.
Reading scores given in terms of school months; ten months constituting a school year.

In Table V data are recorded for four cases who though having lost points in reading (theoretically speaking), yet made decided gains in personality scores.

TABLE V

DATA FOR FOUR PUPILS SHOWING GAIN IN PERSONALITY SCORES BUT LOSS IN READING SCORES BETWEEN THE NOVEMBER AND THE MAY TESTING PROGRAMS

Pupil	I.Q.	Personality		Reading		Personality	Reading
		Nov.	May	Nov.	May	Gain	Loss
1	69	25	65	32	28	40	4
2	95	20	60	43	40	40	3
3	87	65	85	45	43	20	2
4	81	5	30	38	37	25	1

Personality scores given in terms of percentile norms.
Reading scores given in terms of school months; ten months constituting a school year.

Table VI gives the data for the six pupils, three of whom show gain in reading and neither gain nor loss in personality scores,

and three of whom show gain in personality and neither gain nor loss in reading scores. The reading gains shown in this table are unusually high and for this reason constitute data contrary to the theory that unusual progress in reading should affect the personality of the child.

TABLE VI

DATA FOR SIX PUPILS SHOWING GAIN IN READING SCORES WITH NEITHER GAIN NOR LOSS IN PERSONALITY SCORES OR GAIN IN PERSONALITY SCORES WITH NEITHER GAIN NOR LOSS IN READING SCORES BETWEEN THE NOVEMBER AND THE MAY TESTING PROGRAMS

Pupil	I.Q.	Personality Nov.	Personality May	Reading. Nov.	Reading. May	Personality Gain	Reading Gain
1	67	40	40	23	36	0	13
2	65	15	15	27	40	0	13
3	87	15	15	20	38	0	18
4	67	25	30	32	32	5	0
5	84	40	50	39	39	10	0
6	101	25	40	46	46	15	0

Personality scores given in terms of percentile norms.
Reading scores given in terms of school months; ten months constituting a school year.

In Table VII data are recorded for the three pupils two of whom showed loss in reading with neither gain nor loss in personality, and one of whom showed loss in personality with neither gain nor loss in reading. These three cases are challenging, especially in view of the fact that the I. Q. ratings of the three are ninety-eight, eighty-seven, and eighty-three, respectively.

Table VIII gives the median and arithmetic mean of the personality scores made on the two tests. The entire group of forty-seven cases has been divided into three sub-groups. The first group is composed of the twelve who ranked highest in reading, group three of the twelve who ranked lowest, leaving twenty-three subjects to form an average or middle group.

The mean of the highest-ranking group in both test performances is more than twice that of the lowest-ranking group. While the difference between the highest-ranking and middle groups as a result of the November testing is only 7.32; the acceleration of the cases in Group I in personality is such that the difference after the May testing is 16.18. The difference in mean of Groups II and III after the May testing is 14.24.

TABLE VII

DATA FOR THREE PUPILS SHOWING LOSS IN READING SCORES AND NEITHER GAIN NOR LOSS IN PERSONALITY SCORES OR SHOWING LOSS IN PERSONALITY SCORES AND NEITHER GAIN NOR LOSS IN READING SCORES BETWEEN THE NOVEMBER AND THE MAY TESTING PROGRAMS

Pupil	I.Q.	Personality Nov.	Personality May	Reading Nov.	Reading May	Personality Loss	Reading Loss
1	83	10	10	37	35	0	2
2	87	15	15	38	36	0	2
3	98	40	35	41	41	5	0

Personality scores given in terms of percentile norms.
Reading scores given in terms of school months; ten months constituting a school year.

TABLE VIII

TABLE SHOWING MEDIAN AND ARITHMETIC MEAN FOR PERSONALITY SOCRES MADE BY THREE GROUPS: TWELVE WHO RANKED HIGHEST IN READING SCORES; TWELVE WHO RANKED LOWEST IN READING SCORES; AND TWENTY-THREE WHO COMPRISE A MIDDLE GROUP IN READING SCORES IN BOTH TESTING PROGRAMS

	Group I Highest		Group II Middle		Group III Lowest	
November	Median	40	Median	40	Median	20
	Mean	41.67	Mean	34.35	Mean	20.83
May	Median	60	Median	35	Median	25
	Mean	57. 92	Mean	41.74	Mean	27.50

Median and arithmetic mean given in terms of percentile norms.

The data of Table IX are recorded to show the effect of intelligence upon the personality of the child as it appears in this study. Again the entire group has been divided into quartiles, roughly speaking, the highest and the lowest being composed of twelve pupils each, and the twenty-three remaining cases comprising a middle group.

While there is a difference of only .51 in the arithmetic mean of the personality scores made in November between Groups I and II, yet the advance of the first group in personality rating is such that a difference of 10.22 percentile norms exists between the means of Groups I and II after the May test performance. Between the middle and the lowest groups the mean difference is 4.89 after the November testing, while in May, the advance in personality of the third group makes this difference only .61. The difference between the personality means of the first and the third groups is 5.40 in November and 10.83 after the May testing.

TABLE IX

TABLE SHOWING MEDIAN AND ARITHMETIC MEAN FOR PERSONALITY SCORES MADE BY THREE GROUPS: TWELVE WHO RANKED HIGHEST; TWELVE WHO RANKED LOWEST; AND TWENTY-THREE COMPRISING A MIDDLE GROUP IN INTELLIGENCE AS RATED BY THE HENMON-NELSON TEST OF MENTAL ABILITY

	Group I Highest		Group II Middle		Group III Lowest	
November	Median	32.50	Median	30	Median	25
	Mean	32.90	Mean	32.39	Mean	27.50
May	Median	42.50	Median	35	Median	35
	Mean	50	Mean	39.78	Mean	39.17

Median and arithmetic mean given in terms of percentile norms.

In Table X the fifteen pupils making above-average gain (seven months or more) in reading comprise Group I; nineteen pupils making the least gain (two months or less, counting seeming losses in reading also) comprise Group III; while the remaining pupils, those making an assumed average or normal gain of from three to six months, comprise Group II.

The median and mean gain, both in reading and in personality growth, are given for each group. While the mean gain in reading for Group III is only .05 month, the mean gain in personality is 14.73 percentile norms. Group II, having a mean gain in reading of 4.62 months, has a mean gain in personality of 9.62 percentile norms. Group I, having a mean gain in reading of 10.47 months, has a mean gain in personality of only 7.67 percentile norms. The mean gain in personality decreases, as the mean gain in reading for the three groups, rises.

TABLE X

TABLE SHOWING MEDIAN AND ARITHMETIC MEAN GAIN IN READING AND PERSONALITY SCORES FOR THREE GROUPS: THOSE SHOWING GREATEST GAIN; THOSE SHOWING AVERAGE GAIN; AND THOSE SHOWING LEAST GAIN IN READING

	Group I Above-average	Group II Average	Group III Below-average
Reading Gain	Median 11	Median 4	Median 0
	Mean 10.47	Mean 4.62	Mean .05
Personality Gain	Median 0	Median 10	Median 15
	Mean 7.67	Mean 9.62	Mean 14.73

Median and mean gain in reading given in terms of months.
Median and mean gain in personality given in terms of percentile norms.

To test the theory that reading inability is usually the chief cause of pupil retardation through the elementary school, and the theory held by many educators and psychologists that such retardation affects the total personality of the child, the data in Table XI are given.

The group of forty-seven has been further subdivided into three groups; the under-age group composed of fifteen pupils whose ages at the time of the November testing were nine years, five months or less; the over-age group, fifteen pupils whose ages were ten years, eight months or more; and the middle group composed of the remaining seventeen pupils whose ages at the time of the November testing fell between the two age limits. While the author of this study realizes that the first-named group could scarcely be called an under-age group in some situations, yet, in this particular school it was decidedly so.

The variation of the mean in the three groups is slight, the personality mean of the first or under-age group being highest. The difference in the mean of this group and the average group is 4.00 in favor of the under-age group. It is interesting to note that the difference in means of this under-age group and of the average group is even greater than the difference between the under-age and over-age groups.

The gains in personality for the under-age group during the year are evidently such that after the May testing the differences appear still greater. This group has a difference in mean of 4.78 points more than the average-age group and 5.39 points more than the over-age group, while there is a small difference of

.61 between the average-age and the over-age groups, as a result of the May testing.

TABLE XI

TABLE SHOWING MEDIAN AND ARITHMETIC MEAN FOR PERSONALITY SCORES MADE BY THREE GROUPS: FIFTEEN COMPRISING AN OVER-AGE GROUP; FIFTEEN COMPRISING AN UNDER-AGE GROUP; AND THE REMAINING SEVENTEEN COMPRISING AN AVERAGE-AGE OR NORMAL GROUP— NOVEMBER TESTING

	Group I Under-age	Group II Average-age	Group III Over-age
November	Median 35	Median 30	Median 25
	Mean 34.23	Mean 30.23	Mean 31.53
May	Median 40	Median 35	Median 40
	Mean 46.92	Mean 42.14	Mean 41.53

Median and mean scores given in terms of percentile norms.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, LIMITATIONS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this thesis was to test the effect of progress in reading upon the growth in personality of elementary school children of the fourth and fifth grade levels as measured by standardized tests, both of reading and of personality.

As an aid to the study of this major problem the three following comparisons were made:

1. The relation between reading ability and personality;
2. The relation between intelligence rating and personality;
3. The effect of age-grade placement on the total personality.

While the California Test of Personality is made up of twelve very clearly-defined personality traits, a definite effort was made not to give any direct training in these traits to any of the children used as cases for this study. Thirty-two of these as 4A and 4B pupils were in the writer's classroom and under her direction for only three weeks after the November testing. Seven were under her direction during the second semester. In the rooms where the forty remaining cases were enrolled, the teachers knew nothing concerning the investigation, except that an investigation was being made. These teachers had no access to the records of the November testing results, and it is believed made no more definite attempt at personality development than is made in the usual classroom, wherein no individual guidance records are kept.

The reading program carried on, was the usual one employed for

any average group of children with the habitual "scatter" of abilities and interests.

While only twenty-four of the group of forty-seven showed gain both in reading and in personality, as is shown in Table II, yet the fact that the performance of this group is a consistent one, while that of the other twenty-three subjects is highly inconsistent, as is shown by Tables IV, V, VI and VII, would indicate that there is a relation between gain in reading achievement and growth in personality.

Table X shows, however, the improbability of establishing an expectancy of results. There would seem from this table to be little comparability between the "amount" of reading gain and the "amount" in personality growth.

Tables VIII and IX establish for this study the fact that there is a direct relation between personality scores and reading ability scores, and between personality scores and intelligence quotients. It appears also from these Tables, VIII and IX, that at least as far as the performance of the group as a whole is concerned, the fact can be established for this study that there is a higher relation between reading achievement and personality adjustment than between personality adjustment and intelligence.

While the difference between the three age-groups is slight, it would seem that the youngest children in a grade make the most satisfactory personality adjustment of the three; and while the over-age make the poorest personality adjustment, seemingly, the difference between this group and the average-age group is so slight

as to cause us to expect about the same personality adjustment from the two.

Limitations

The study has recognized limitations:

1. A greater number of cases would have made statistical analysis worth while, whereas the small number tested rendered such interpretation ineffectual.

2. To eliminate the element of reading ability entirely from a group performance test in personality where reading is involved, is difficult. The question presented is: Did the premeditated drill given to clarify the meaning of the personality test also result in greater reading skill and comprehension of this particular material?

3. The inability to control the out-of-school reading of the child always presents a problem in a study of this kind. Would personality growth be influenced by the type of literature read?

Conclusions

1. While the study seems to establish no relation whatever between the amount of reading gain and the amount of personality growth, as measured by the standardized tests used, there are certain factors to be kept in mind in making this conclusion. The total personality consists of fundamental traits, traits too fundamental, in fact, to be cast off easily and at will, like some worn-out garment. Even though a child should make a phenomenal gain of fourteen or even eighteen months, in a six-months' period, as was done in this study, yet it may take some time for him to realize the measure of his success or to see the effect of this success upon himself and his environment.

2. While personality, "the state of being a person",[29] is so highly individualistic as to almost defy group performance and analysis, yet results yield information sufficient to warrant an attempt at adjustment where seeming maladjustment would appear.

3. Reading achievement appears to be an effective means of aiding in the adjustment of maladjusted personalities.

4. While all persons, "the gangster and the idiot",[30] do have personality (being persons), yet the most satisfactory social and personal adjustment can still be expected from persons of intelligence and apparently the greater the intelligence, the greater the personality adjustment to be expected. Where a great variation to this generality occurs, that fact should present itself to the teacher as a danger signal that the child needs psychological or even psychiatric help.

Recommendations

According to the data presented as a result of this investigation, teachers should realize more than ever the importance of the reading program.

Many investigations are needed along this same line, investigations carried on in different parts of the country, whose subjects would represent a variety of cultural and geographic backgrounds.

A study of the effect of arithmetic progress, spelling progress or progress in any other school subject upon the total personality

---

29. Floyd C. Dockeray, Psychology (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1942), p. 420.

30. Breckenridge and Vincent, op. cit., p. 403.

of the child would be enlightening. A study such as this would answer the question: Is it merely a feeling of success which the child needs, to become a more adjusted personality, or does the particular school subject per se have a unique value toward adjusting the total personality of the child?

The present study carried out with different age and grade levels, especially with pupils of the junior and senior high schools would be interesting.

The present study carried out with subjects drawn from institutions for the adjustment of juvenile delinquencies might throw much-needed light upon this ever-present problem. It might at least relieve the schools of a feeling of undue responsibility and guilt for such maladjustments, or might even give them a greater feeling of responsibility. It might furnish them such definite conclusions from which to work, that such a study might enable them to re-educate and re-adjust many of these cases who would otherwise remain social losses.

A study where controlled out-of-school reading is possible, would be of great help both to teachers and librarians, in guiding the reading interests of the child.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, G. W. Personality: A Psychological Interpretation. Henry Holt & Co., 1937.

Breckenridge, Marian E. and Vincent, E. Lee. Child Development. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Co., 1943.

Buswell, Guy T. "Experimentation and Personality Development," Elementary School Journal, XLIII (March, 1943), 393-397.

_____. "The Function of Subject Matter in Relation to Personality," Arithmetic in General Education, Sixteenth Yearbook, The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1941.

Clark, Willis W. "Measurement in Personality," Education, LXI (June, 1941), 620-622.

Davis, Frederick B. "Two New Measures of Reading Ability," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXIII (May, 1942) 365-372.

Dockeray, Floyd C. Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1942.

Elsbree, Willard S. "School Practices that Help and Hurt Personality," Teachers College Record, XLIII (October, 1941), 24-34.

Feder, D. D. and Baer, L. Opal. "A Comparison of Test Records and Clinical Evaluation of Personality Adjustment," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXII (February, 1941), 133-144.

Frank, L. K. "The Basic Needs of the Child," Mental Health in the Classroom, Thirteenth Yearbook, The Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction, Washington: National Education Association, 1940.

Gilkinson, Howard and Knower, Franklin H. "A Study of Standardized Personality Tests and Skill in Speech," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXII (March, 1941), 161-175.

Gray, William S. (ed.). Reading and Pupil Development. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940.

Harris, Elizabeth H. "The Guidance Approach to Problems of Remedial Teaching," Elementary School Journal, XLIII (February, 1943), 347-352.

Healy, William and Bronner, A. F. New Light on Delinquency and Its Treatment, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

Katz, Barney. "What Teachers Should Know About Personality Disorders," Education, LXI (June, 1941), 598-601.

McCall, William A. and Herring, John P. "Measuring and Promoting Growth in Personality," Teachers College Record, XLII (April, 1941), 612-618.

McCallister, James M. Remedial and Corrective Instruction in Reading. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936.

Monroe, Marion and Backus, Bertie. Remedial Reading. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1937.

Olson, Willard C. and Davis, Sarita I. "The Adaptation of Instruction in Reading to the Growth of Children," Educational Method, XX (November, 1940), 71-79.

Preston, Mary I. "The School Looks at the Non-reader," Elementary School Journal, XL (February, 1940), 450-458.

Ryan, Will Carson. Mental Health through Education. New York: The Commonwealth Fund, 1938.

Stagner, Ross. Psychology of Personality. Philadelphia: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1937.

Strang, Ruth. Problems in the Improvement of Reading in High School and College. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: The Science Press Printing Co., 1940.

Tiegs, Ernest W. "Personality: Education's Greatest Adventure," Education, LXI (June, 1941), 577-578.

Vaughn, Charles L. "Classroom Behavior Problems Encountered in Attempting to Teach Illiterate, Defective Boys How to Read," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXII (May, 1941), 339-350.

Witty, Paul. "Personality Hazards in Our Schools," Education, LXI (June, 1941), 607-612.

Witty, Paul, Skinner, Charles E., et al. Mental Hygiene in Modern Education. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1939.

Zachry, Caroline B. "Personality Growth," Journal of Educational Sociology, XVII (October, 1943), 84-89.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

Case Histories

The following case histories are given in an attempt to explain the relationship between the reading and the personality scores for four children whose reading gains were twelve months or more.

J. is pupil 10 in Table V. With an I.Q. of 127, a reading grade one year and eight months in advance of her grade placement (May test), she is not a leader in the room in any way.

In September, 1942, she was enrolled in the room of the author of this study. At that time she was extremely self-conscious and avoided both the teacher and the children. It was impossible to get her to respond in any class situation, or to cooperate with a group in any of the room activities. When chosen or appointed leader, she would refuse to accept the responsibility.

When singled out for praise, she would cover her face with her hands, a book or a paper. The action gave the impression, not so much of self-consciousness arising from timidity as from a sense of guilt. The same attitude of guilt was apparent, also, after the temper tantrums which she frequently had with little or no provocation.

The mother was soon invited "to visit the room", and almost the first question she asked was one concerning J's temper tantrums. She added that the father and she had tried, since the child was quite small, to "crack that temper", and that they were going to keep on until they succeeded.

The mother was an educated woman, far superior to most of the mothers of the district, and the teacher decided to talk the case over fully, trying to explain that she was afraid that they were treating only a symptom instead of the casue, and that their manner of dealing with the situation was giving J. an undue feeling of guilt.

The mother was not without knowledge of modern methods of handling children. She explained to the teacher that she subscribed regularly to several magazines which carried articles about child-training, and read a daily column in a local paper to this effect, also. She added, however, that she did not believe in all that nonsense, and that in dealing with J. she and the father had found that corporal punishment was the most effective.

When asked if she could suggest some cause of the temper, she replied that J. inherited it from her paternal grandfather, that he had "vicious tantrums, also".

In the two rooms where J. has been enrolled this past year, the teachers report that she responds to classroom situations, "fairly well". It has been noted, however, that she goes alone most of the time. Her posture, as well as her facial expression, denotes hopelessness and resentment. She, however, does not have the temper tantrums as she did.

One of the teachers reports that she reads a great deal. This is obvious in her marked improvement between the November and May tests. Her personality score, however fell from the thirtieth norm to the fifth. Her personality test booklet in November showed a great many more notes in the margin than that of any other child,

and in May she put almost twice as many as she had done in November. These were chiefly notes of dissatisfaction against home conditions with, however, a few about school and the community in general.

Here is a child who, obviously unhappy, is seeking refuge and release in reading.

V is pupil 23 in Table III. With an I. Q. of 84 and a reading grade approximately two years below her grade placement after the November test, she nevertheless made such gain in reading that after the May test her reading grade and grade placement showed a difference of only approximately four months.

The father and mother are separated but not divorced and V. seems to be constantly torn between the conflicting possibility that they will obtain a divorce or that the father will return to make their home, his. She sometimes wishes that he will return and sometimes hopes that he never will. These attitudes evidently reflect the current attitude expressed by the mother.

V. is evidently considered the "black sheep" of the family, although the siblings are, judging from their school records, no more intelligent and no more capable than is V. They, however, do not exhibit the nervousness that she does. She has a facial tic, talks constantly, and at times shows decided lack of muscular coordination. These nervous symptoms would seem to be the result of too much nagging and pressure put on by the family group.

She doesn't like her family; has a decided attitude of resentment toward them. She wishes often that she could be the only child. When asked by the teacher what she wanted done with her brothers

and sisters in order to bring such a condition about, she said, "I don't want anything to happen to them; I just want to be the only child in another family, somewhere."

Shortly after the November testing the mother asked V.'s teacher concerning her progress. The teacher, realizing that the child's home environment was not a happy one, and fearing to bring more family disapproval upon her, decided to give a good report of the child, regardless of the actual conditions. She told the mother that V. was more interested in her school work than ever, and that she was doing quite well.

The mother said that she wished she could learn to read better, and the teacher replied that she was sure that she would see improvement by the end of the year, although she was not confident of this herself.

The next day, when the children were leaving the room for lunch, V. left the group and catching the teacher's hand in both of hers, said, "Oh thank you so much for what you told Mother yesterday.

The next day she asked the teacher if she would listen to her read a book, adding, "I believe I can read it almost through." The book was only a primer, but she read it enthusiastically, and the teacher praised her effort. This was the first time the girl had exhibited any interest in reading. After that there was hardly a day that passed that she did not ask whether she might do some special bit of reading to the teacher, even remaining after school hours to do so.

With a gain of fourteen months in reading, she made a gain of

fifteen percentile norms in personality between the November and the May tests. Here, evidently, is a child to whom success in reading meant greater prestige, either actually or in her own opinion, in the family group, and for that reason a greater feeling of security.

H. is pupil 24 on Table III. With an I.Q. of 70 and the attendant difficulty in the learning situation which such a low I. Q. would suggest, the girl had developed a defense mechanism to such perfection that it was for a long time difficult to detect. It was observed over a long period of time, however, that whenever she was given a task too difficult for her, she would soon begin to sneeze and cough and would in a short time manifest every symptom of a severe cold. She would remain at home for a day or two thereafter, saying that she was too ill to come to school.

Her attendance from the first year she had entered school had been very poor, and this, of course, had not helped the situation. One day, when the mother accompanied the girl to school and explained what an ordeal it had been to get the girl to come that day, the teacher explained the situation in part, to the mother, and asked her cooperation in seeing that H. was in school each day, regardless of her apparent colds.

The mother, like V.'s mother, said if only H. could learn to read, she thought school would be more interesting to her. The teacher suggested that she be allowed to have a few story books of her own, that she be given the privilege of selecting them, and suggested that the small books so often seen on ten cent store counters would be colorful and also easy to handle. She

asked the mother to suggest to the girl that when she had learned to read one, she should bring it to school and read it to the class and the teacher.

The teacher then talked the "defense mechanism" over with the girl, and promised her that from that day she would never expect her to do any task which H. considered too difficult for her. H. was to be the judge of this, and when an assignment was made, if she considered it too difficult, she was to tell the teacher so, and an easier one would be substituted. The teacher then assured her that she knew that H. could learn to read well, if she wished to do so, and that the teacher was there to help her in any way that H. wished.

The girl's improvement in reading and in personality began from that day, an improvement so marked that it seems strange to think that the mere twenty percentile norms indicating the amount of gain in personality should be symbolical of such progress. She was absent only one half-day during the remaining part of the semester, where before that time there had been scarcely a week in which she had not missed two or three whole days. Evidently the fear of being unable to learn to read had been the cause of the girl's lack of self-confidence and evasion of school and social responsibility.

R. is pupil 3 in Table VI. The teacher had always felt that R's. reading difficulty was a disability rather than an inability. Even though his I. Q. of 87 fell only in the dull normal group there were days when his speech and evidently his thinking were almost incoherent. He often spoke and wrote groups of four and five words reversed.

One day when asked to give a sentence with the word "bottom", he said, "I can spin my top", and even though what he had done was explained to him several times, he never seemed to fully comprehend.

Like many children of this and lower intelligence groups he does not respond as usual to any attempt to arouse his interest. Even though the room was filled with such things as games, a tool chest, weaving frames, painting and sketching materials, clay for modeling, and although the children were given complete freedom in the use of these, he seldom manifested any interest in them. In spite of many suggestions by the teacher as to the use of all these materials, he spent most of his day just watching the other children.

Finally, one day, the teacher, desperate in the face of such inactivity, suggested that he sit with L., a boy who read as poorly as R., and that they read to one another. Thereafter, he spent the greater part of each day sitting from desk to desk, either reading or being read to. At first, even though the teacher realized that he spent more time in conversation than he did in reading, she refused to be discouraged or dismayed.

It would seem that just the social aspect of the situation would have caused a rise in personality score, but this was not the case. Although R. made an improvement of eighteen months in reading in the six-months' period his personality score remained the same; fifteen percentile norms.