

THE VALUE OF PUPIL SELF-EVALUATION
IN RELATION TO ACHIEVEMENT

BY

CHARLES E. BRYAN

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Education degree
in the Department of Education
Montana State College
July, 1962

P378
B84
cap. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	2
Procedures	2
Limitations	3
II. SURVEY OF LITERATURE	5
Role of Self-evaluation	5
Experiments in Self-evaluation	9
Self-evaluation of Language Arts Skills	12
III. EXPERIMENTATION IN SELF-EVALUATION	15
Homogeneous Class Groups	15
Methods of Instruction	16
Comparison of Achievement	20
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	24
Summary	24
Conclusions	26
Recommendations for Further Study	26
BIBLIOGRAPHY	27
APPENDIX	30
Appendix A: Record Forms	31
Appendix B: Checklists	38

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution of the IQ Scores of the Two Classes Involved in the Self-evaluation Experiment in Grade Five at Livingston, Montana, 1961-62 . . .	16
2. Mean Grade Level Scores on Stanford Achievement Tests Earned by Experimental and Control Groups When in the Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Grades	22

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Has much of the effort of teachers been nullified because they have imposed too much control upon the pupils?

Teachers often tell pupils what to do, how to do it, and, finally, how well they did it. During eleven years of elementary teaching, the writer arrived at the tentative conclusion that this procedure evoked an automatic resistance from the pupils which they have expressed as indifference, or sometimes as rebellion, and which resulted in less achievement.

Some authorities claim that the problem of pupil indifference can be solved by involving pupils in selecting subject matter, in planning procedures, and in evaluating their work. The writer was interested in one phase of pupil involvement, the phase of pupil self-evaluation.

Morgan believed that the democratic process called for self-evaluation, and he stated his view as follows:

Democratic principles imply that all persons involved in the evaluation process are affected by it and should share fully in it. Those affected by judgments or decisions should understand and participate in making them. Moreover, they should have a share in shaping the processes that will influence their development.¹

¹Morgan, H. Gerthson, "What Is Effective Evaluation?" National Education Association Journal, November, 1959, p. 16.

There is conflicting evidence as to the worth of pupil self-evaluation. After making a survey of pupil self-evaluation, Russell reported in 1953 that the "glib statement that self-evaluation is an important part of all evaluation programs would seem to need further investigation and extreme caution in its application."² Yet, a study of the effectiveness of self-evaluation in teaching electronic communication skills to Air Force men indicated a "highly significant difference in favor of the self-evaluating group."³ Since the value of pupil self-evaluation has not been firmly established, further studies are needed to clarify the issue.

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine whether use of instruments and techniques intended to promote pupil self-evaluation would result in higher achievement when applied to learning the language arts in grade five. It was the writer's belief that higher achievement would result.

Procedures

To carry out this investigation four steps were found

²Russell, David H., "What Does Research Say about Self-evaluation?" Journal of Educational Research, April, 1953, pp. 570-571.

³Duel, Henry J., "Effect of Periodical Self-evaluation on Student Achievement," The Journal of Educational Psychology, August, 1958, p. 199.

necessary:

1. Literature was surveyed to determine what instruments should be used and to discover helpful techniques.
2. Suitable self-evaluation instruments were built.
3. An experimental program was conducted in the classroom.
4. The program was evaluated by comparing achievement in the experimental group with that of a control group.

Limitations

The study was confined to the fifth grade class of the school where the writer taught in Livingston, Montana, and to the school year of 1961-1962. It was further limited to the language arts area. Not all the pupils in the class could be included in the study, because complete records of achievement test scores and intelligence quotients for each student were not always available.

In this study "self-evaluation" means the process of comparing one's own activities and accomplishments to those of a model or standard.

A review of literature was made at the Montana State College Library to determine appropriate and effective means of self-evaluation which could be used in experimentation. The findings of the review are presented in Chapter 2.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF LITERATURE

A survey of literature was made to discover what the role of pupil self-evaluation has been, what instruments and techniques have been used, and what skills in the language arts area should be evaluated. These facets are discussed in the following sections.

The Role of Self-evaluation

The goal of evaluation in schools has been commonly accepted as being to gain understanding of all factors acting upon pupils, so that these factors can be more wisely adjusted to accelerate the pupils' growth. At the beginning of the modern testing movement, attempts to understand these factors were usually fragmentary, dealing with isolated information, skills, and abilities. Recently, there has been considerable effort made toward a type of evaluation that considers the total development of the child, including physical, emotional, social, and intellectual aspects.

Seemingly, evaluation that considers the total child has been difficult to attain. Megroth and Washburne believed a new approach to the problem was necessary to supplement what has been accomplished.¹ They have pointed out that the

¹Megroth, E. J., and Washburne, V. Z., "Teaching Evaluation," Journal of Educational Research, September, 1946, p. 63.

present technique of comparative testing has not been applicable to some very significant and large areas of the learning process, and that these areas can only be reached by the learner himself as is illustrated in this comment:

The relative positions therefore, of tester or teacher and student should probably be reversed. Where formerly the tester or teacher assumed the responsibility for uncovering and utilizing the data, it now appears that this primary responsibility must be left with the individual being tested. Where previously the tester or teacher conceived of his function as that of a judge, now it may be seen that the judgmental attitude must be eliminated before the students can assume complete responsibility, and before the data can be validly evaluated by the individual to whom they apply.²

According to this view, the primary function of the teacher has been to generate an atmosphere in which the student had no fear of being judged and could therefore accept the logical implications of the data about himself, could evaluate their significance, and could assume the responsibility for acting on their implications.³ Another function has been "to correct misinformation, miscalculation, misinterpretation, misconception, and the like."⁴ The authors recognized the lack of fully developed methods and instruments to carry out the kind of self-evaluation they envisioned, but they did maintain that scientific method was applicable

²Megroth and Washburne, op. cit., p. 68.

³Ibid., p. 69.

⁴Ibid., p. 66.

to the process.⁵

Allen said that examinations too often play the role of informer to tell the teacher the weakness or neglect of the pupil; therefore, they promote distrust, fear, and deceit rather than help the teacher serve the child.⁶ To avoid these outcomes and also to insure that the test promotes learning as it should, he suggested that tests be used diagnostically at the beginning of a course, that scores be used to raise a pupil's mark but not to lower it, and that in many tests no one but the pupil himself should know his score.⁷

Allen would have pupils correct their own tests and also would have the tester or teacher work with the class to set up a statistical analysis of their scores in order that each pupil could evaluate his own paper.⁸

Other educators, such as Montessori, Cousinet, and Cantor, have emphasized the importance of the pupil's role in his own education. For example, Cantor said to "help others in self guidance is the way to develop constructive personalities. The individual must be given opportunity to criticize himself by discovering his own weakness."⁹

⁵Ibid., p. 69.

⁶Allen, Richard D., Self-Measurement Projects in Group Guidance, Inor Publishing Co., 1934, p. 6.

⁷Ibid., pp. 6-7.

⁸Ibid., pp. 18-20.

⁹Cantor, Nathaniel, Dynamics of Learning, Foster and Stewart, 1946, p. 75.

Duel maintained that self-evaluation led to several worthy educational goals and offered the following list:

From our observations of the process it appears that self-evaluation helps to accomplish the following:

1. Students develop more sensitivity to desired outcomes.
2. Students achieve better understanding of how they measure up to established standards.
3. Students develop more awareness of requirements and expectations.
4. Students are motivated through a challenge to "beat themselves."
5. Students are orientated toward a look at "self" and a reliance on "self".
6. Some of the fear component of solely external evaluation is removed.
7. Students develop a clearer frame of reference upon which to base future actions.¹⁰

Allen has given a more lengthy but similar list.¹¹

In spite of the apparent advantages of self-evaluation Hagan and Thorndike remarked that there has been little empirical evidence given to demonstrate that better learning does result.¹² The weaknesses of the procedure were given as the pupil's probable lack of appraisal techniques, his lack of understanding of the objectives of the educational program, and his lack of a stable reference point by which to evaluate his own progress.¹³

¹⁰Duel, Henry J., "Help Your Students Help Themselves," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, October, 1959, pp. 53-54.

¹¹Allen, op. cit., pp. 12-13.

¹²Harris, Chester W., editor, Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Macmillan Co., 1960, p. 485.

¹³Ibid., p. 485.

In the following section are presented some of the instances in which self-evaluation has been a part of the educative procedure.

Experiments in Self-evaluation

It became evident from the survey of literature that pupil self-evaluation has usually been handled in two ways. One method was to share with the child evaluation data collected by the teacher. The other was to provide the child some sort of standard against which he could compare himself independently. The writer was more interested in the second method, since from a preliminary search it appeared that it has promoted greater participation by the pupil.

Marshall¹⁴ provided her seventh grade pupils with forms upon which they could judge themselves in composition, speech, grammar, spelling, social studies, mathematics, and science. Specific skills were not detailed for each subject; but papers, notebooks, and tests were kept upon which to base judgements. Her pupils used symbols for marking four levels of accomplishment: failure, poor, fair, good. She also marked each pupil's rating sheet and had a conference with each. Considerable agreement occurred between the pupils' marks and the teacher's marks, and increased motivation was

¹⁴Marshall, Mariann, "Self-evaluation in Seventh Grade," The Elementary School Journal, February, 1960, pp. 249-252.

felt to be the main advantage.¹⁵ As shown in the following statement, Ahmann and Glock supported Marshall's procedure in which the teacher and the pupils evaluated concurrently:

When both pupils and teacher use the same instruments to evaluate the same performance at the same time and the results are examined, the pupils gain a much better perspective of the important features of the performance and the teacher's standards concerning them.¹⁶

A guide sheet for pupils in an individualized third grade reading program conducted by Crossley and Kniley¹⁷ contained a section that gave a simple checklist for writing good book reports. Although this was primarily an assignment sheet, self-evaluation probably did result from the process of accumulating the reports as well as from the checklist. The authors reported that the pupils showed more than the usual gain in achievement.

While teaching children to judge the quality of their literature, Root found that by "keeping simple records of the modifications through which their criteria go, children will be able to more completely evaluate their own growth."¹⁸

¹⁵Ibid., p. 251.

¹⁶Ahmann, J. Stanley, and Glock, Marvin D., Evaluating Pupil Growth, Allyn and Bacon, 1958, p. 342.

¹⁷Crossley, Ruth, and Kniley, Mildred, "An Individualized Reading Program," Elementary English, January, 1959, pp. 16-20.

¹⁸Root, Shelton L., "Evaluating Children's Awareness of Literature," The Reading Teacher, February, 1956, p. 152.

He also believed that children profited most when the criteria for evaluation were evolved by the class.¹⁹

Duel conducted an experiment with adults who were studying electronic communication.²⁰ The student made an estimate of his skill or knowledge by marking a graduated scale for each item being judged. The instrument was used at the beginning, during, and following the course. The experimental groups did significantly better on achievement tests than the control groups did.²¹

Cantor tried to develop the implications of psychiatry, mental hygiene, and social case work to the teaching of two college courses, "Culture and Human Relations" and "Crime in Society". He held that every individual is in a constant battle with himself, maintaining that "Every individual seeks security and dependence, but he also wants to assert himself, to be independent, to express himself in accordance with his own peculiar temperament."²² Cantor made use of this inner conflict to bring change in his students. He refused to give them security by praising or blaming with the result that the students could not passively accept the instructor's word as authority, rather they were forced to make their own evaluations.²³ He insisted they develop and use their own values

¹⁹Ibid., p. 152.

²⁰Duel, Henry J., "Effect of Periodical Self-evaluation on Student Achievement," The Journal of Educational Psychology, August, 1958, pp. 197-199.

²¹Ibid., p. 199.

²²Cantor, op. cit., p. 59.

²³Ibid., pp. 74-76.

upon which to base judgments.²⁴ No objective data was used in the study to support the contention that superior learning resulted from the technique, but he used many quotes from his students as evidence that this was the case.²⁵

The survey of literature has shown that experimentation has been diverse but not frequent in the area of self-evaluation. The following section is devoted to the survey of literature by which the writer determined the basic language skills at the fifth grade level and techniques by which they may be evaluated.

Self-evaluation of Language Arts Skills

It was necessary to discover which are the language arts skills that fifth graders could be expected to evaluate. There was rather common agreement that the language arts can be divided into the areas of listening, speaking, reading, writing, spelling, and handwriting; however, the skills in one of these areas are often the same as or related to skills in another area.²⁶ For this reason, a basic list of language skills was not difficult to deduce, even though they were

²⁴Ibid., pp. 234-235.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 253-267.

²⁶Hatchett, Ethel L., and Hughes, Donald H., Teaching Language Arts in Elementary Schools, Ronald Press, 1956, p. 14.

found to be organized in various ways.²⁷ Usually evaluation instruments shown were made for use by the teacher only.

Ritter and Shepard gave instruments by which to evaluate letter content, letter form, speaking, and capitalization and punctuation.²⁸ These were principally in the form of checklists or score sheets.

Two authors suggested either giving children listed standards for their language arts work or else helping the class develop such lists cooperatively.²⁹ Usually the self-evaluation was thought to occur during class discussion of such standards. Hatchett and Hughes stressed the importance of oral evaluation day-by-day.³⁰

Textbooks often suggested that each child have a notebook or folder in which to record progress or keep samples of work. Dawson recommended that the teacher should keep such a folder for each child.³¹

²⁷Ibid., pp. 356-358, 370; Lee, J. Murray, and Lee, Dorris May, The Child and His Curriculum, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1950, pp. 433-438; Dawson, Mildred A., Miller, Jonnie M., and Zollinger, Marian, Language for Daily Use, Grade 5, Teacher's Edition, World Book Co., 1959, pp. 12, 57, 83, 162.

²⁸Ritter, E. L., and Shepherd, L. A., Methods of Teaching in Town and Rural Schools, Dryden Press, Inc., 1944. pp. 142-173.

²⁹Hatchett and Hughes, op. cit., pp. 368-369; Ritter and Shepherd, op. cit., p. 142.

³⁰Hatchett and Hughes, op. cit., p. 369.

³¹Dawson, Miller, and Zollinger, op. cit., p. 33T.

According to Tyler³² there are several ways to evaluate that are little used, such as records of activities in which pupils participate, questionnaires, checklists, anecdotal records, and interviews. Of the items mentioned by Tyler, the writer found the checklist and the record of activities most suited to pupil use. Since many of the instruments and techniques given in the foregoing references were oriented toward teacher evaluation of pupils, they had to be adapted by the writer to agree with the purpose of this study. As a guide for making the adaptation the following points were developed and used:

1. It should be simple enough for the pupil to understand easily and to do quickly.
2. It should accumulate evidence upon which to base judgements.
3. It should increase the pupil's awareness of the accepted level of achievement.
4. It should clarify to the pupil the skills he is attempting to master.
5. It should be inexpensive and readily available.

These instruments are discussed and how they were used is explained in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III

EXPERIMENTATION IN SELF-EVALUATION

Having established ways of encouraging pupils to make self-evaluations, as shown in the preceding chapter, the writer conducted an experiment using these ways in teaching the language arts to one fifth grade class. For comparison a control group was taught by another teacher who did not emphasize self-evaluation. The experiment was conducted at East Side School in Livingston, Montana, during the school year of 1961-62. This chapter deals with the homogeneity of the class groups, the methods of instruction, and a comparison of the achievement of the two classes.

Homogeneous Class Groups

The two classes seemed to be homogeneous in regard to mental ability¹ as evidenced by IQ scores. The range of IQ scores was from 84 to 114 for the experimental group and from 77 to 114 for the control group. The experimental group had seven more points than the control group on the lower end of the range, but the upper extremity was the same for both groups. The median IQ score was 101 for the experimental group and 99 for the control group, giving a difference of 2 points. The mean score was 99.7 for the experimental class

¹Kuhlmann-Anderson Intelligence Tests, Sixth Edition, Booklet K, Personnel Press, Inc., 1952.

and 98.4 for the control class, a difference of 1.3 points. A distribution showing the number of pupils in each group who received IQ scores at different levels is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1. DISTRIBUTION OF THE IQ SCORES OF THE TWO CLASSES INVOLVED IN THE SELF-EVALUATION EXPERIMENT IN GRADE FIVE AT LIVINGSTON, MONTANA, 1961-62

IQ Scores	Experimental Group	Control Group
111-115	2	3
106-110	4	3
101-105	4	3
96-100	3	6
91-95	1	4
86-90	3	1
81-85	1	2
76-80	0	1
Total Number	18	23
Mean IQ	99.7	98.4

The classes also seemed homogeneous in some other respects. The mean age of the control group was 11 years and one month, and that of the experimental group was one month greater. Both groups came from the same neighborhood and appeared to share similar home backgrounds.

Methods of Instruction

The two groups used the same textbooks, and the teacher of each group used the same study guides, except that the

experimental group used the SRA Reading Laboratory² for three months of the school year. The chief deliberate difference in the method of instruction was the experimental group's use of instruments and techniques intended to stimulate the pupils to evaluate themselves. These included lists of standards, checklists, progress charts, records of activities, individual conferences, and class discussions.

In the experimental group each pupil kept a folder in which he placed finished work and forms for recording language arts activities. These forms are shown in Appendix A. Checklists used for self-evaluation of language arts skills are found in Appendix B.

Reading. To complement the usual reading program, pupils in the experimental group kept a continuous record of library reading on a form that is shown in Appendix A on page 32. On it the pupil showed the amount of reading done and the type of material read. Also, it caused the pupil to express an opinion about the content of the story as well as his opinion about the difficulty of the material. Approximately every six weeks these records were checked by the teacher, who pointed out to the pupil his reading trends.

Other kinds of self-evaluation were done while using the SRA Reading Laboratory--an individualized reading program which called for the pupil to grade his own written work,

²Parker, Don H., SRA Reading Laboratory, IIb, Science Research Associates, Inc., 1960.

keep progress charts, correct his error, and decide how he could improve his work.

English. In English the children were encouraged frequently to do original written compositions. Usually a list of standards were developed by the class and put on the chalkboard to be used by the pupils while proofreading their compositions. After receiving the corrected paper back from the teacher, each pupil entered the errors he made on a form in his folder. This form is shown in Appendix A on page 33. The outline, shown on pages 34-36, was also included in the folder. Its purpose was to assist the pupil in analyzing errors and in phrasing his record of them. Periodically the pupil was asked to look over the list of errors and to mark "OK" those that he believed he had mastered.

To further increase skill in proofreading, the teacher occasionally placed a short composition on the chalkboard and asked the class to correct the errors in it. The errors contained in the composition were those recently made by the class. This process probably helped the children see their abilities in the light of a standard, also.

To encourage critical thinking, the class was often asked to discuss the good points of oral reports or talks made by class members.

To promote more self-evaluation the pupils were asked to mark the checklists shown in Appendix B on pages 39-41.

Speaking and listening traits were listed in these instruments. They were marked during the first, third, and sixth six-week periods. The first time this was done with discussion and explanation of each item on the checklists. The checklists were used following a situation in which the class had been speaking or listening, so that marking tended to be based upon real behavior. The pupils were told this did not affect their grades except as it helped them to improve their work, and the teacher collected and kept the checklists to prevent comparison among pupils which might lead to unrealistic marking due to competition.

Students kept all of their compositions in their folders until the end of each grading period when they took them home for inspection by the parents. This activity was intended to help pupils to notice changes in their work.

Spelling. In spelling, self-evaluation was promoted in an organized way. On Monday of each week the students followed the steps for the study of the wordlist given in the textbook.³ The resulting study paper was marked by the teacher in a way to show the kind of error, such as prefix or suffix, confusion of sounds, syllabication, and handwriting. The pupils were then expected to correct the errors and to practice the words missed.

³Billington, Lillian E., Using Words with Meaning, Silver Burdett Co., N. Y., 1950, p. 1.

After the weekly test, words missed were recorded on a form in the pupil's folder. The form is shown in Appendix A on page 37. At the end of each six-week period, the teacher tested each pupil on the words missed and also discussed with each his peculiar spelling habits and difficulties. The number of words recorded on the form served as a progress chart, for the student could quickly see whether his list was decreasing in size.

Handwriting. In teaching handwriting, the checklist given in Appendix B on page 42 was used three times during the year to assist the pupils in judging their skill. In addition they evaluated some of their other papers for "smoothness," "shape," "size," "spacing," "slant," and "alignment" by marking each of these items as "poor," "fair," or "good".

Comparison of Achievement

At the end of the eighth month of instruction both classes took the Stanford Achievement Test.⁴ The mean grade placement scores of the experimental class were compared to those of the control class in the light of similar comparisons made of scores for the same pupils on tests taken one year, two years, and three years earlier.

⁴Stanford Achievement Test, World Book Co., Yonkers, N. Y., 1953.

According to the battery medians, the groups were equal in general achievement at the end of the second grade, the achievement level being 3.3 years for both. Thereafter the experimental group ranked lower on the median score, as shown in Table 2, having in grade five a mean battery median score of 5.7 while the control group had a score of 6.0. However, in the earlier grades the experimental group consistently scored lower in the language arts section of the Stanford Achievement Test. This trend was partially reversed in the fifth grade when the experimental group scored at 6.2 years in the Paragraph Meaning Test to the control group's 6.1 years. In former grades the experimental group had scored .2 to .4 of a year lower than the control group.

The experimental group did less well in two tests. In the test for Word Meaning the experimental group stood at 5.4 years and the control group at 5.8 years, a difference of .4, whereas in earlier grades the control group was only .1 of a year ahead. The same trend was evident in Spelling in which the experimental group scored 5.4 years to the control group's 5.8, favoring the latter by .4 of a year while formerly the difference in favor of the control group had been only .1 or .2 of a year.

There was a small improvement in Language by the experimental group as compared to the control group. The scores were 5.3 and 5.6 respectively, show a superiority of .3 of a

TABLE 2. MEAN GRADE LEVEL SCORES ON STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST EARNED BY EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS WHEN IN THE SECOND, THIRD, FOURTH, AND FIFTH GRADES*

Grade	Paragraph Meaning		Word Meaning		Spelling		Language		Battery	
	Experimental Group	Control Group	Experimental Group	Control Group	Experimental Group	Control Group	Experimental Group	Control Group	Experimental Group	Control Group
Second	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	**	**	3.3	3.3
Third	4.2	4.6	4.1	4.2	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.8	4.3	4.4
Fourth	5.1	5.5	4.8	4.9	5.2	5.4	4.8	5.4	5.0	5.3
Fifth	6.2	6.1	5.4	5.8	5.4	5.8	5.3	5.6	5.7	6.0

*The test scores for subjects other than in the language arts area are omitted from this table.

**There was no test for Language in the second grade test battery.

year for the control group where previously it had excelled from .3 to .6 of a year.

A summary of this self-evaluation study, conclusions, and recommendations for further research are presented in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has been concerned with the organization and appraisal of a program of pupil self-evaluation of the language arts skills in grade five. It has been suggested by the writer that leading children to evaluate their own skills will yield better achievement than exclusive reliance upon traditional teacher evaluation of the pupils' work.

Summary

A survey of literature concerning self-evaluation was made to reveal what had been done in this area. It was found that there was a difference of opinion about the value of pupil self-evaluation and that little has been done in building self-evaluation instruments for use by the pupils.

The program of self-evaluation was organized by choosing and adapting those techniques and instruments which seemed most suited to carry out the experimentation of this study. Five guides were developed and used by the writer in making these choices and adaptations.

An experiment was conducted using lists of standards, checklists, progress charts, records of activities, individual conferences, and class discussions to implement a self-evaluation program in one fifth grade class while another class continued to be evaluated by only the teacher, except

for incidental self-evaluation by the pupils. The experimental self-evaluation activities were supplementary to the usual teacher evaluation.

It was postulated on the basis of IQ tests, age similarities, and common home background that the two classes were homogeneous in nature.

The method of using the various self-evaluation techniques and instruments was explained.

A comparison of the experimental group with the control group was made to discover what effect the experimental program had had on achievement. As a measure of achievement, scores on Stanford Achievement Tests were used. Starting in the second grade the tests had been given annually to the two groups.

It was found that the experimental group had made lower scores in the language arts tests during all of the three years preceding the beginning of this study. After one school year under the self-evaluation program the experimental class surpassed the control group in the Paragraph Meaning test by a score of 6.2 years to 6.1 years and had improved in the Language test with a score of 5.3 to 5.6 for the control class, cutting the difference to .3 of a year whereas it had been .6 in the preceding grade. These gains were countered by losses in the Word Meaning and Spelling tests. In earlier grades the experimental class had scored about .1 of a year lower in these two tests, but in the fifth grade the class

scored .4 of a year lower in both tests, the scores in each of the two tests being 5.4 for the experimental group to 5.8 for the control group.

Conclusions

The evidence accumulated in this study is contradictory. It appeared that the self-evaluation program increased achievement in some areas and decreased it in others, therefore it is not possible to make any definite conclusions about the value of pupil self-evaluation on the basis of this study. It may be that fifth grade pupils lack the maturity necessary to carry on effective self-evaluation on the level tried in this experiment.

Recommendations for Further Study

The results of this investigation suggest that the following questions would be worthy of further study:

1. What would the results be of a study of this type when done in a departmentalized school where the same teacher could instruct both the experimental and the control groups?
2. What would the results be if additional or better ways were found to encourage pupil self-evaluation?
3. Would better results occur with more mature pupils?
4. Would a larger sampling show better results?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmann, J. Stanley, and Glock, Marvin D., Evaluating Pupil Growth, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1958, 605 pp.
- Allen, Richard D., Self-Measurement Projects in Group Guidance, Inor Publishing Co., New York, 1934, 274 pp.
- Beery, George S., "An Experiment in Self-Analysis," The Journal of Educational Psychology, 37:111-124, February, 1946.
- Billington, Lillian E., Using Words with Meaning, Silver Burdett Co., New York, 1950, 158 pp.
- Cantor, Nathaniel, Dynamics of Learning, Foster and Stewart, Buffalo, N. Y., 1946, 282 pp.
- Crossley, Ruth, and Kniley, Mildred, "An Individualized Reading Program," Elementary English, 36:16-20, January, 1959.
- Dawson, Mildred A., Miller, Jonnie Mashburn, and Zollinger, Marian, Language for Daily Use, Grade 5, Teacher's Edition, World Book Co., Tarrytown-on-Hudson, N. Y., 1959, 302 pp.
- Duel, Henry J., "Effect of Periodical Self-evaluation on Student Achievement," The Journal of Educational Psychology, 49:197-199, August, 1958.
- "Help Your Students Help Themselves," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 43:52-54, October, 1959.
- Hamalainen, Arthur E., "Existing Practices in the Evaluation of Pupil Growth in the Elementary School," Elementary School Journal, 42:175-183, November, 1941.
- Harris, Chester W., editor, Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Macmillan Co., New York, 1960, 1564 pp.
- Hatchett, Ethel L., and Hughes, Donald H., Teaching Language Arts in Elementary Schools, Ronald Press, New York, 1956, 426 pp.
- Hyde, Harold E., "A College Tries to Implement Student Self-evaluation," Educational Research Bulletin, 34:41-44, February, 1955.

Kuhlmann-Anderson Intelligence Tests, Sixth Edition, Booklet K, Personnel Press, Inc., Princeton, N. J., 1953.

Lee, J. Murray, and Lee, Dorris May, The Child and His Curriculum, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York, 1950, 710 pp.

Marshall, Mariann, "Self-evaluation in Seventh Grade," Elementary School Journal, 60:249-252, February, 1960.

Megroth, E. J., and Washburne, V. Z., "Teaching Evaluation," Journal of Educational Research, 40:63-69, September, 1946.

Meyer, Adolph E., Modern European Educators and Their Work, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1934, 236 pp.

Morgan, H. Gerthson, "What Is Effective Evaluation?" National Education Association Journal, 48:15-17, November, 1959.

Nance, Afton, "How Can Teachers Know What Children Are Learning?" Childhood Education, 36:21-26, September, 1959.

Orata, Pedro F., "Evaluating Evaluation," Journal of Educational Research, 33:641-661, May, 1940.

Parker, Don H., SRA Reading Laboratory, IIB, Science Research Associates, Chicago, 1960.

Ritter, E. L., and Shepherd, L. A., Methods of Teaching in Town and Rural Schools, Dryden Press, Inc., New York, 1944, 492 pp.

Root, Shelton L., "Evaluating Children's Awareness of Literature," Reading Teacher, 9:149-154, February, 1956.

Russell, David H., "What Does Research Say about Self-evaluation?" Journal of Educational Research, 46: 563-571, April, 1953.

Safford, Alton L., "Evaluation of an Individualized Reading Program," Reading Teacher, 13:266-270, April, 1960.

Stanford Achievement Test, World Book Co., Yonkers, N. Y., 1953.

Tinker, Miles A., "Appraisal of Growth in Reading," Reading Teacher, 8:35-38, October, 1954.

Tyler, Ralph W., "The Place of Evaluation in Modern Education," Elementary School Journal, 41:19-27, September, 1940.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A
RECORD FORMS

RECORD OF LANGUAGE USE

1. Write the wrong and the right way for items which give you trouble when you are writing or speaking.
2. As soon as you have overcome the error so that you do not make the mistake any more, write "OK" in the last column.
3. Two examples are given to show you how.
4. You may use this record to help in proofreading the new work you do. That way you may avoid making the same mistakes again.

[illegible]

LANGUAGE SKILLS

I. Sentences

- A. Avoid short, choppy sentences.
- B. Avoid boring sentences. Arrange the words in various ways.
- C. Avoid tying them together with "and", and "then", so that they run on and on.
- D. Be sure it is a complete thought.

II. Paragraphs

- A. Indent the first line.
- B. Make the ideas follow a logical order.
- C. Keep to ideas that are about only one topic.

III. Punctuation

- A. Use a period
 - 1. After a statement or a command that does not exclaim.
 - 2. After an initial or an abbreviation.
 - 3. After a numeral or a letter in an outline.
- B. Use a question mark after a question.
- C. Use an exclamation point after a statement or command that shows strong feeling.
- D. Use a comma
 - 1. To separate names of city and state.
 - 2. To separate day of month and year.
 - 3. After greeting of a friendly letter.
 - 4. After closing of a letter.
 - 5. To separate exact words of a speaker from the rest of a sentence in direct quotations.
 - 6. To separate the items in a series.
 - 7. After words like "yes", "no", and "oh".
 - 8. To set off the name of a person spoken to.
 - 9. After a person's last name when it is placed before his first name.
- E. Use an apostrophe
 - 1. To show omitted letters in contractions.
 - 2. To show possession.
- F. Use quotation marks around the exact words of a speaker.
- G. Use underlining for titles of books.

- H. Use a colon
 1. After the greeting of a business letter.
 2. In writing time, as in "10:30".
 3. To introduce a list.
- I. Use a hyphen to divide syllables of a word that is broken at the end of a line.

IV. Capitalization is used for:

- A. Names of persons and pets.
- B. Names of days, holidays, and special days.
- C. Names of months.
- D. Names of schools and buildings.
- E. Names of towns, cities, and states.
- F. Names of countries: Mexico.
- G. Names of nationalities: Mexicans.
- H. Names special groups: Pilgrims, Boy Scouts, Methodists.
- I. Names of streets, avenues, and rural routes.
- J. Names of companies and stores.
- K. Names of rivers, creeks, oceans, and mountains.
- L. Family names like "Mother", "Father", "Aunt" when they are used in place of real names.
- M. Initials.
- N. Titles of persons: Miss, Mr., Mrs., Dr.
- O. These abbreviations: Mr., P.O., R.R., and C.O.D.
- P. First word of a sentence.
- Q. First word and important words in greeting of a letter.
- R. First word in the closing of a letter.
- S. First word of each line of a poem.
- T. First, last, and important words in titles of books, stories, poems, songs, and reports.
- U. In written conversation, the first word of the speaker.
- V. The word "I".
- W. In outlines, to begin main headings and subheadings.

V. Word usage.

- A. These words require helpers:

1. eaten	7. drunk	13. run	19. taken
2. begun	8. driven	14. rung	20. torn
3. blown	9. gone	15. sung	21. worn
4. broken	10. given	16. seen	22. written
5. come	11. grown	17. spoken	
6. done	12. known		
- B. "A" and "An"
 1. Use "a" before a word that starts with a consonant sound.

2. Use "an" before a word that begins with a vowel sound.
- C. Words whose meanings are confused:
1. can--able to
may--allowed to
 2. good--used to describe a person, place, or thing
well--used to tell how something is done
well--used to describe one's health
 3. learn--to find out about something
teach--to show how
 4. let--to allow
leave--to go away; to go away from
 5. sit--to take a seat; to rest
set--to put something in position
 6. their--shows possession (ownership)
there--shows place
they're--they are
 7. to--shows motion toward; used with verbs
two--2
too--also; more than enough
- D. Verbs should agree with subjects.
1. Use "is", "isn't", "was", "wasn't", and "am" when talking about one (singular).
 2. Use "are", "aren't", "were", "weren't", when talking about more than one (plural).
 3. Use "doesn't" (does not) with words that mean one.
 4. Use "don't (do not) with more than one except with "I" and with "you".
- E. Possessive nouns
1. A singular noun is made to show possession by adding an apostrophe and the letter "s".
 2. Plural nouns that end in "s" are made possessive by adding an apostrophe.
 3. Plural nouns that do not end in "s" are made possessive by adding an apostrophe and an "s".
- F. Making nouns plural
1. Add "s" to most nouns.
 2. If the noun ends in "ch", "sh", "x", or "s" add "es".
 3. If the noun ends in "y" and has a vowel before the "y" add "s".
 4. If the noun ends in "y" and has a consonant before the "y" change the "y" to "i" and add "es".
 5. Some nouns ending in "f" or "fe" are made plural by changing the "f" or "fe" to "v" and adding "es".
- G. Use only one negative word (such as "no", "not", "doesn't", or "never").

APPENDIX B**CHECKLISTS**

HOW WELL DO I SPEAK ?

Name _____ Date _____

Directions:

1. Decide how well you do each thing listed below. To help you decide try to think back to things you have done recently.
2. Check the proper column to show how well you did.
3. On the blank after "Comment" explain what you can do to become a better speaker.

I. Voice

- A. Loudness
- B. Pitch (or tone).
- C. Expression (variety for meaning)
- D. Clearness.
- E. Speed.

Good	Needs Im- provement

Comment: _____

II. Adjustment Habits

Do I show I have good speaking habits by:

- A. standing or sitting straight while talking?
- B. looking at the person or the audience?
- C. feeling at ease (not nervous)?
- D. avoiding long pauses or time-killing noises?

Yes	Usually	Seldom

Comment: _____

III. Ideas

Do I:

- A. suggest answers to problems? . . .
- B. add information
- C. summarize ideas for the group .
- D. choose exact and colorful words?
- E. make comparisons in order to explain a thing?
- F. tell things in reasonable order?
- G. stick to the subject?
- H. think carefully before speaking?

Usually	Seldom

Comment: _____

IV. Courtesy

Do I:

- A. take turns talking and avoid interrupting?
- B. show appreciation when someone gives valuable information?
- C. disagree respectfully?
- D. encourage those not talking to take part?
- E. refrain from making noise until the speaker is through?
- F. answer when spoken to?
- G. avoid saying things just to "show-off"?
- H. make and appreciate humor? . . .
- I. greet people pleasantly?
- J. introduce people who aren't acquainted and do it well? . . .
- K. follow the rules for using the telephone?

Yes	Usually	Seldom

Comment: _____

HOW WELL DO I LISTEN

Name _____

Date _____

Directions: To help you judge how well you are learning through listening, check yourself on these items.

Do I:

	Yes	Usually	Sometimes
A. look at the speaker?			
B. make pictures in my mind of what I am hearing			
C. think how this which I am hearing is related to something else I know?			
D. ask the speaker to explain something I didn't understand?			
E. try to separate the speaker's opinions from the facts?			
F. listen to understand the speaker's feelings?			
G. keep my body quiet and attentive?			
H. refuse to answer if someone speaks to me while another is talking?			

Comment: _____

HOW WELL DO I WRITE ?

Name _____ Date _____

1. Judge your writing for each of the items below, and check each as satisfactory or unsatisfactory.
2. Use red pencil or red ball point pen for grading.
3. Write the number of any item that is unsatisfactory beside the error on your paper.
4. Clip or staple this sheet to your paper.

Satisfactory	✓	✓	Unsatisfactory
1. <i>Smoothness</i>			<i>Smoothness</i>
2. Shape			
a. <i>a o</i>			<i>o o a</i>
b. <i>e i</i>			<i>e i u</i>
c. <i>d</i>			<i>d</i>
d. <i>b f</i>			<i>b f f</i>
e. Other			
3. <i>size</i>			a. <i>size</i>
			b. <i>size</i>
			c. <i>size</i>
4. <i>spacing</i>			a. <i>spacing</i>
			b. <i>spacing</i>
			c. <i>spacing</i>
			d. Margin (too wide or narrow or uneven)
5. <i>Slant</i>			a. <i>Slant</i>
<i>Slant</i>			b. <i>Slant</i>
6. <i>Alignment</i>			a. <i>alignment</i>
			b. <i>alignment</i>