CHAPTER VI
CHAPTER VI
EFFECTIVENESS OF VARIOUS REMEDIAL STRATEGIES

The objectives set for this study influenced the formulation of various hypotheses and the data were analyzed keeping these hypotheses in view. The present study mainly being an experimental one aims at testing the effectiveness of different remedial strategies to reduce reading disability of dyslexic children. It purports to verify the following hypothesis formulated earlier in Chapter IV.

1. Various remedial strategies may be helpful in reducing reading difficulties of dyslexic children.

TESTING OF HYPOTHESIS

This hypothesis was tested with the help of results obtained from mean pre-test and post-test administered to all different EGs. Means, SDs, t-values and level of significance of oral reading and comprehension of different grades are presented in Tables 6.1 to 6.32.

Table 6.1 represents means, SDs and mean differentials (t-values) between pre- and post-test scores of oral reading of different EGs of LG1. The number of children in each group was 6. Mean pre- and post-test scores (M1 and M2) of EG1 were 69.50 and 95.00 respectively. Its SD1 and SD2 were 6.68 and 3.94 respectively and t-value between pre- and post-test scores of EG1 was recorded 8.4 (p<0.01). M1 and M2 of EG2 were 71.50 and 90.00 respectively and SD1 and SD2 were found to be 6.12 and 4.24 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 6.08 (p<0.01).
Table 6.1 further shows that $M_1$ and $M_2$, $SD_1$ and $SD_2$ of EG$_3$ were 71.50, 92.00; 6.12 and 5.58 respectively. Its t-value was 6.05 ($p<0.01$). $M_1$ and $M_2$, $SD_1$ and $SD_2$ of EG$_4$ were 67.50, 95.50; 6.22 and 3.50 respectively. Its t-value was found to be 9.60 which was significant much beyond 0.01 level of confidence. These significant t-values ($p<0.01$) of all EGs clearly indicate effectiveness of various remedial strategies in reducing oral reading difficulties at LG$_1$.

Figure 6.1 shows the mean differences between pre- and post-test results of oral reading for LG$_1$.

Table 6.2 represents means, SDs and t-values between pre- and post-test scores of different EGs of UG$_1$. $M_1$, $M_2$, $SD_1$ and $SD_2$ of EG$_1$ were 47.00, 63.00, 4.89 and 3.50 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 6.70 ($p<0.01$). $M_1$, $M_2$, $SD_1$ and $SD_2$ of EG$_2$ were 47.00, 60.00, 4.89 and 6.29 respectively. Its t-value was 3.99 ($p<0.01$). $M_1$, $M_2$, $SD_1$, $SD_2$ of EG$_3$ were 50.50, 66.00, 5.82 and 6.84 respectively. Its t-value was found to be 4.22 ($p<0.01$). $M_1$, $M_2$, $SD_1$, $SD_2$ of EG$_4$ were recorded 49.50, 71.00, 6.61 and 6.48 respectively. Its t-value was 6.14 ($p<0.01$).

These significant t-values clearly indicate the effectiveness of various remedial strategies in reducing oral reading difficulties at UG$_1$.

Figure 6.2 highlights the mean pre- and post-test results of different EGs of UG$_1$. 
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>M₁</th>
<th>M₂</th>
<th>SD₁</th>
<th>SD₂</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Tabulated t for 0.01 df(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG₁</td>
<td>69.50</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>8.04*</td>
<td>0.01 &lt; 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₂</td>
<td>71.50</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>6.08*</td>
<td>0.05 &lt; 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₃</td>
<td>71.50</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>6.05*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₄</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>95.50</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>9.60*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

LG₁ = Lower first grade

EGs = Experimental groups

M₁ = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs

M₂ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs

SD₁ = Pre-test

SD₂ = Post-test
Figure 6.1

Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs (LG)
Table 6.2
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs (UG₁)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>$M₁$</th>
<th>$M₂$</th>
<th>$SD₁$</th>
<th>$SD₂$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Tabulated t for 0.01 df(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EG₁$</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>6.70*</td>
<td>0.01 &lt; 3.17 0.05 &lt; 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG₂$</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>3.99*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG₃$</td>
<td>50.50</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>4.22*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG₄$</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>6.14*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* N.B. All the obtained t-values were significant at $p<0.01$.

UG₁ = Upper first grade
EGs = Experimental groups
$M₁$ = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs
$M₂$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
$SD₁$ = Pre-test
$SD₂$ = Post-test
Figure 6.2
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs (UG)

EG1 | EG2 | EG3 | EG4
---|---|---|---
47 | 47 | 50.5 | 49.5
63 | 60 | 66 | 71

EGs = Experiment Groups, UG = Upper First Grade
Table 6.3 represents means, SDs and t-values between pre- and post-test scores of oral reading of different EGs of LG\textsubscript{II}. M\textsubscript{1}, M\textsubscript{2}, SD\textsubscript{1} and SD\textsubscript{2} of EG\textsubscript{1} were 15.00, 29.50, 2.68 and 3.50 respectively. Its t-value was 8.04 (p<0.01). M\textsubscript{1}, M\textsubscript{2}, SD\textsubscript{1} and SD\textsubscript{2} of EG\textsubscript{2} were 13.50, 26.00, 3.14 and 4.09 respectively. Its t-value was 5.92 (p<0.01). M\textsubscript{1}, M\textsubscript{2}, SD\textsubscript{1} and SD\textsubscript{2} of EG\textsubscript{3} were recorded 17.00, 31.00, 3.09 and 4.09 respectively. Its t-value was found to be 6.67 (p<0.01). M\textsubscript{1}, M\textsubscript{2}, SD\textsubscript{1} and SD\textsubscript{2} of EG\textsubscript{4} were recorded 16.50, 36.50, 3.14 and 7.20 respectively. Its t-value was found to be 6.23 (p<0.01).

Figure 6.3 highlights the mean pre- and post-test results of different EGs of oral reading (LG\textsubscript{II}).

Table 6.4 represents means, SDs and t-values between pre- and post-test scores of oral reading of different EGs of UG\textsubscript{II}. M\textsubscript{1}, M\textsubscript{2}, SD\textsubscript{1} and SD\textsubscript{2} of EG\textsubscript{1} were 9.50, 23.50, 3.98 and 3.98 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 6.08. M\textsubscript{1}, M\textsubscript{2}, SD\textsubscript{1} and SD\textsubscript{2} of EG\textsubscript{2} were 10.00, 22.00, 1.54 and 3.09 respectively. Its t-value was 8.48. M\textsubscript{1}, M\textsubscript{2}, SD\textsubscript{1} and SD\textsubscript{2} of EG\textsubscript{3} were 10.00, 23.00, 3.09 and 4.09 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 6.19 (p<0.01). M\textsubscript{1}, M\textsubscript{2}, SD\textsubscript{1} and SD\textsubscript{2} of EG\textsubscript{4} were 10.50, 28.50, 3.14 and 8.43 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 4.89. All obtained t-values were significant at 0.01 level of confidence. Figure 6.4 has been prepared to highlight the differentials in the pre- and post-test results of different EGs (UG\textsubscript{II}).
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Table 6.3
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs (LG\textsubscript{II})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>(M_1)</th>
<th>(M_2)</th>
<th>(SD_1)</th>
<th>(SD_2)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Tabulated t for 0.01 df(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(EG_1)</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>8.04*</td>
<td>0.01 &lt; 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EG_2)</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>5.92*</td>
<td>0.05 &lt; 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EG_3)</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>6.67*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EG_4)</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>6.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

LG\textsubscript{II} = Lower second grade
EGs = Experimental groups
\(M_1\) = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs
\(M_2\) = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
\(SD_1\) = Pre-test
\(SD_2\) = Post-test
Figure 6.3

Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs (LGII)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EG</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EGs = Experimental Groups, LGII = Lower Second Grade
Table 6.4
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs (UG_{II})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>$M_1$</th>
<th>$M_2$</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Tabulated t for 0.01 df(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EG_1$</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>6.08*</td>
<td>0.01 &lt; 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_2$</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>8.48*</td>
<td>0.05 &lt; 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_3$</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>6.19*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_4$</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>4.89*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

$UG_{II}$ = Upper second grade

EGs = Experimental groups

$M_1$ = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs

$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs

$SD_1$ = Pre-test

$SD_2$ = Post-test
Figure 6.4

Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs (UGII)

EGs = Experimental Groups, UGII = Upper Second Grade
Table 6.5 represents means, SDs and t-values of different EGs of LG\_j. M\_1, M\_2, SD\_1 and SD\_2 of EG\_1 were 5.50, 17.50, 3.98 and 5.50 respectively. Its t-value was 4.32. M\_1, M\_2, SD\_1 and SD\_2 of EG\_2 were 3.50, 13.00, 1.22 and 1.54 respectively. Its t-value was 11.78. M\_1, M\_2, SD\_1 and SD\_2 of EG\_3 were 5.00, 15.50, 2.44 and 4.80 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 4.76 (p<0.01). M\_1, M\_2, SD\_1 and SD\_2 of EG\_4 were 5.00, 20.50, 2.44 and 7.91 respectively. Its t-value was found to be 4.58. All obtained t-values were significant at 0.01 level of confidence. The differences between pre- and post-test results of oral reading have also been presented in Figure 6.5.

Table 6.6 represents means, SDs and t-values of different EGs on oral reading for UG\_j. M\_1, M\_2, SD\_1, SD\_2 of EG\_1 were 4.00, 13.00, 3.09, and 5.89 respectively and t-values recorded was 3.30. M\_1, M\_2, SD\_1 and SD\_2 of EG\_2 were 1.00, 8.00, 1.54 and 2.44 respectively. Its t-value was 5.91. M\_1, M\_2, SD\_1 and SD\_2 of EG\_3 were 2.00, 9.50, 1.54 and 4.41 respectively. Its t-value was 3.92. M\_1, M\_2, SD\_1 and SD\_2 of EG\_4 were 3.00, 16.00, 1.89 and 8.19 respectively. Its t-value was found to be 3.78. All obtained t-values were significant at 0.01 level of confidence.

Figure 6.6 has been prepared to highlight the differentials in the pre- and post-test results of different EGs (UG\_j).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>$M_1$</th>
<th>$M_2$</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Tabulated t for 0.01 df(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EG_1$</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.32*</td>
<td>0.01 &lt; 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_2$</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>11.78*</td>
<td>0.05 &lt; 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_3$</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.76*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_4$</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>4.58*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

$LG_{III}$ = Lower third grade

EGs = Experimental groups

$M_1$ = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs

$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs

$SD_1$ = Pre-test

$SD_2$ = Post-test
Figure 6.5

Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs (LGIII)

EGs = Experimental Groups, LG = Lower Third Grade
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>$M_1$</th>
<th>$M_2$</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Tabulated t for 0.01 df(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EG_1$</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>3.30*</td>
<td>0.01 &lt; 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_2$</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>5.91*</td>
<td>0.05 &lt; 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_3$</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.92*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_4$</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>3.78*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

$UG_{III}$ = Upper third grade

EGs = Experimental groups

$M_1$ = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs

$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs

$SD_1$ = Pre-test

$SD_2$ = Post-test
Figure 6.6

Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs (UG_{III})

EGs = Experimental Groups, UG_{III} = Upper Third Grade
Table 6.7 represents means, SDs mean differentials (t-values) between pre- and post-test overall scores of oral reading of different EGs. \( M_1, M_2, SD_1 \) and \( SD_2 \) of EG\(_1\) were 150.00, 246.16, 20.47 and 20.32 respectively. Its t-value was 8.12. \( M_1, M_2, SD_1 \) and \( SD_2 \) of EG\(_2\) were 146.50, 220.50, 11.13 and 5.61 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 14.54. \( M_1, M_2, SD_1 \) and \( SD_2 \) of EG\(_3\) were 156.00, 235.16, 16.75 and 20.75 respectively. Its t-value was 7.27. \( M_1, M_2, SD_1 \) and \( SD_2 \) of EG\(_4\) were 152.00, 261.83, 20.31 and 36.95 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 6.37. All obtained t-values were much beyond 0.01 level of confidence. These significant t-values of all EGs clearly show the efficacy of various remedial strategies in reducing reading difficulties of all EGs. Figure 6.7 has been prepared to show the overall differences between mean pre- and post-test results of different EGs.

Means, SDs, t-values and level of significance of reading comprehension of different grades and of total are presented in Tables 6.8 to 6.16.

Table 6.8 represents means, SDs and mean differentials (t-values) between pre- and post-test scores of reading comprehension of different EGs of primary level. \( M_1, M_2 \) of EG\(_1\) were 55.00 and 83.33 respectively. Its SD\(_1\) and SD\(_2\) were 10.48 and 8.16 respectively and t-value between pre- and post-test scores was recorded 5.22 \( (p<0.01) \). \( M_1, \)
Table 6.7
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores
with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs
(Total Scores of all Grades)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>$M_1$ (N=24)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=24)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Tabulated t for 0.01 df (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG1</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>246.16</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>8.12*</td>
<td>0.01 &lt; 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG2</td>
<td>146.50</td>
<td>220.50</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>14.54*</td>
<td>0.05 &lt; 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG3</td>
<td>156.00</td>
<td>235.16</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>7.27*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG4</td>
<td>152.00</td>
<td>261.83</td>
<td>20.31</td>
<td>36.95</td>
<td>6.37*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups
$M_1$ = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs
$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
$SD_1$ = Pre-test
$SD_2$ = Post-test
Figure 6.7
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores
with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs
(Total Scores of all Grades)

EGs = Experimental Groups
Note: The origin on Y-Axis is not starting from 0
Table 6.8
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (primary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>(M_1)</th>
<th>(M_2)</th>
<th>(SD_1)</th>
<th>(SD_2)</th>
<th>(t)-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BG1</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>5.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG2</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>3.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG3</td>
<td>56.66</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>4.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG4</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>88.33</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>7.25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups

\(M_1\) = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs

\(M_2\) = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs

\(SD_1\) = Pre-test

\(SD_2\) = Post-test
Figure 6.8
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (Primary)

EGs = Experimental Groups
Note: The origin on Y-Axis is not starting from 0
M₂, SD₁ and SD₂ of EG₂ were recorded 55.00, 73.33, 10.48 and 8.16 respectively and t-value was 3.37 (p<0.01). M₁, M₂, SD₁ and SD₂ of EG₃ were 56.66, 80.00, 10.32 and 8.94 respectively. Its t-value between pre- and post-test scores was 4.18 (p<0.01). M₁, M₂, SD₁ and SD₂ of EG₄ were 55.00, 83.33, 10.48 and 4.08 respectively. Its t-value was 7.25 which was significant beyond 0.01 level. Results are represented in Figure 6.8 of reading comprehension of different EGs at primary level.

Table 6.9 represents means, SDs and mean differentials (t-values) between pre- and post-test scores of reading comprehension of different EGs of LG₁. M₁, M₂, SD₁ and SD₂ of EG₁ were 41.66, 66.66, 9.83 and 10.32 respectively. Its t-value was 4.29 (p<0.01). M₁, M₂, SD₁ and SD₂ of EG₂ were 35.00, 53.33, 5.47 and 5.16 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 5.96 (p<0.01). M₁, M₂, SD₁ and SD₂ of EG₃ were 41.66, 63.33, 9.83 and 13.66 respectively. Its t-value was 3.15 (p<0.05). M₁, M₂, SD₁ and SD₂ of EG₄ were 41.66, 71.66, 7.52 and 7.52 respectively. Its t-value was 6.90 which was significant beyond 0.01 level. Figure 6.9 has been prepared to highlight the differences between mean pre- and post-test scores of different EGs at LG₁.

Table 6.10 represents means, SDs and mean differentials (t-values) between pre- and post-test scores...
### Table 6.9

Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (LG<sub>1</sub>)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>M&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>M&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>SD&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>SD&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Tabulated t for 0.01 df(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>4.29*</td>
<td>0.01 &lt; 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.96*</td>
<td>0.05 &lt; 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>63.33</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>3.15**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>71.66</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>6.90*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence  
** Significant at 0.05 level of confidence

LG<sub>1</sub> = Lower first grade  
EGs = Experimental groups  
M<sub>1</sub> = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs  
M<sub>2</sub> = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs  
SD<sub>1</sub> = Pre-test  
SD<sub>2</sub> = Post-test
Figure 6.9
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (LG1)

EGs = Experimental Groups, LG1 = Lower First Grade
Note: The origin on Y-axis is not starting from zero.
Table 6.10
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (UG₁)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>M₁</th>
<th>M₂</th>
<th>SD₁</th>
<th>SD₂</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG₁</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>51.66</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>7.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₂</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>4.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₃</td>
<td>31.66</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>3.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₄</td>
<td>31.66</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>5.07*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence
** Significant at 0.05 level of confidence

UG₁ = Upper first grade
EGs = Experimental groups
M₁ = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs
M₂ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
SD₁ = Pre-test
SD₂ = Post-test
Figure 6.10

Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (UG)

EGs = Experimental Groups, UG = Upper First Grade

Note: The origin on Y-axis is not starting from 0
of reading comprehension of different EGs of UG I. The number of students in each group was 6. Table 6.10 shows that \( M_1, M_2, SD_1 \) and \( SD_2 \) of EG1 were 25.00, 51.66, 5.47 and 7.52 respectively. Its t-value was 7.01 (\( p<0.01 \)). \( M_1, M_2, SD_1 \) and \( SD_2 \) of EG2 were 25.00, 40.00, 5.47 and 6.32 respectively. Its t-value was found 4.39 (\( p<0.01 \)). \( M_1, M_2, SD_1 \) and \( SD_2 \) of EG3 were 31.66, 50.00, 9.83 and 10.95 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 3.05 (\( p<0.05 \)). \( M_1, M_2, SD_1 \) and \( SD_2 \) of EG4 were recorded 31.66, 60.00, 7.52 and 11.40 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 5.07 which was significant beyond 0.01 level. Figure 6.10 corresponding to table 6.10 highlights the mean differentials of pre- and post-test results of different EGs.

Table 6.11 represents mean, SDs, and mean differentials (t-values) between pre- and post-test scores of LGIII. \( M_1, M_2, SD_1 \) and \( SD_2 \) of EG1 were 13.33, 33.33, 5.16 and 8.16 respectively. Its t-value was 5.07 (\( p<0.01 \)). \( M_1, M_2, SD_1 \) and \( SD_2 \) of EG2 were 16.66, 31.66, 5.16 and 7.52 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 4.02 (\( p<0.01 \)). \( M_1, M_2, SD_1 \) and \( SD_2 \) of EG3 were 16.66, 35.00, 5.16 and 8.36 respectively. Its t-value was 4.56 which was beyond 0.01 level. \( M_1, M_2, SD_1 \) and \( SD_2 \) of EG4 were 20.00, 46.66, 6.32 and 12.11 respectively. Its t-value was 4.78 which was significant beyond 0.01 level of confidence.

Figure 6.11 has been prepared to highlight the differences between mean scores of pre- and post-test results of different EGs of LGIII.
### Table 6.11

Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (LG\textsubscript{II})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>M\textsubscript{1}</th>
<th>M\textsubscript{2}</th>
<th>SD\textsubscript{1}</th>
<th>SD\textsubscript{2}</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Tabulated t for 0.01 df(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG\textsubscript{1}</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>5.07*</td>
<td>0.01 &lt; 3.17 0.05 &lt; 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>31.66</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>4.02*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG\textsubscript{3}</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>4.56*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG\textsubscript{4}</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>46.66</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>4.78*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

LG\textsubscript{II} = Lower second grade
EGs = Experimental groups
M\textsubscript{1} = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs
M\textsubscript{2} = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
SD\textsubscript{1} = Pre-test
SD\textsubscript{2} = Post-test
Table 6.12 represents means, SDs and mean differentials (t-values) between pre- and post-test scores of reading comprehension of different EGs of UG_II. The number of students in each group was 6. Table 6.12 shows that $M_1$, $M_2$, $SD_1$ and $SD_2$ of EG_1 were 10.00, 26.66, 0.00 and 5.16 respectively. Its t-value was 7.90 (p<0.01). $M_1$, $M_2$, $SD_1$ and $SD_2$ of EG_2 were 8.33, 20.00, 4.08 and 7.07 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 3.50 (p<0.01). $M_1$, $M_2$, $SD_1$ and $SD_2$ of EG_3 were 8.33, 23.33, 4.08 and 10.32 respectively. Its t-value was 3.30 (p<0.01). $M_1$, $M_2$, $SD_1$ and $SD_2$ of EG_4 were recorded 10.00, 31.66, 0.00 and 9.83 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 5.39 which was significant beyond 0.01 level of confidence. Figure 6.12 corresponding to Table 6.12 highlights the mean pre- and post-test results of different EGs of UG_II.

Table 6.13 represents means, SDs and mean differentials (t-values) between pre- and post-test scores of reading comprehension of its different EGs of LG_III. The number of students in each group was 6. Table 6.13 shows that $M_1$, $M_2$, $SD_1$ and $SD_2$ of EG_1 were 6.66, 21.66, 5.16 and 4.08 respectively. Its t-value was 5.58 (p<0.01). $M_1$, $M_2$, $SD_1$ and $SD_2$ of EG_2 were 6.66, 16.66, 5.16 and 5.16 respectively. Its t-value was 3.35 (p<0.01). $M_1$, $M_2$, $SD_1$ and $SD_2$ of EG_3 were 6.66, 21.66, 5.16 and 9.83 respectively. Its t-value was 3.30 (p<0.01). $M_1$, $M_2$, $SD_1$ and $SD_2$ of EG_4
Table 6.12
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores
with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (UG_{II})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>$M_1$</th>
<th>$M_2$</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG_1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>7.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG_2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>3.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG_3</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>3.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG_4</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>31.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>5.39*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

UG_{II} = Upper second grade

EGs = Experimental groups

$M_1$ = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs

$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs

$SD_1$ = Pre-test

$SD_2$ = Post-test
Figure 6.12
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (UGII)

EGs = Experimental Groups, UGII = Upper second grade
**Table 6.13**

Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (LGIII)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>$M_1$</th>
<th>$M_2$</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Tabulated t for 0.01 df(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG1</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>5.58*</td>
<td>0.01 &lt; 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG2</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>3.35*</td>
<td>0.05 &lt; 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG3</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>3.30*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG4</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>7.05*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

LGIII = Lower third grade

EGs = Experimental groups

$M_1$ = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs

$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs

$SD_1$ = Pre-test

$SD_2$ = Post-test
Figure 6.13
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (LGm)

EG1 = Experimental Groups, LGm = Lower third grade
were 8.33, 30.00, 4.08 and 6.32 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 7.05 which was significant beyond 0.01 level of confidence. Figure 6.13 has been prepared to show the differences between mean pre- and post-test results of different EGs at LGIII.

Table 6.14 represents means, SDs and mean differentials (t-values) between pre- and post-test scores of reading comprehension of its different EGs of UGIII. The number of students in each group was 6. M1, M2, SD1 and SD2 of EG1 were 5.00, 16.66, 5.47 and 8.16 respectively. Its t-value was 2.90 (p<0.05). M1, M2, SD1 and SD2 of EG2 were 5.00, 15.00, 5.47 and 5.47 respectively. Its t-value was 3.16 (p<0.05). M1, M2, SD1 and SD2 of EG3 were 6.66, 18.33, 5.16 and 4.08 respectively. Its t-value was 4.34 (p<0.01). M1, M2, SD1 and SD2 of EG4 were 5.00, 26.66, 5.47 and 12.11 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 3.99 which was significant at 0.01 level. Figure 6.14 has been prepared to show the differences between mean pre- and post-test results of different EGs of UGIII.

Table 6.15 represents means, SDs and mean differentials (t-values) between pre- and post-test overall scores of reading comprehension of its different EGs of total scores of different grades of reading comprehension. The number of students in each group was 6. M1, M2, SD1 and SD2 of EG1 were 156.66, 285.00, 36.69 and 41.35 respectively. Its t-value was recorded 5.68 (p<0.01). M1,
Table 6.14
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores 
with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (UG_{III})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>$M_1$</th>
<th>$M_2$</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Tabulated t for 0.01 df(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EG_1$</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>2.90**</td>
<td>0.01 &lt; 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_2$</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>3.16**</td>
<td>0.05 &lt; 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_3$</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.34*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_4$</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>3.99*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence
* Significant at 0.05 level of confidence

UG_{III} = Upper third grade
EGs = Experimental groups
$M_1$ = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs
$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
$SD_1$ = Pre-test
$SD_2$ = Post-test
Figure 6.14

Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (UG_{III})

EGs = Experimental Groups, UG_{III} = Upper third grade
Table 6.15
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (Total Scores of all Grades)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>$M_1$</th>
<th>$M_2$</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Tabulated t for 0.01 df (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EG_1$</td>
<td>156.66</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>36.69</td>
<td>41.35</td>
<td>5.68*</td>
<td>0.01 &lt; 3.17 0.05 &lt; 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_2$</td>
<td>151.66</td>
<td>245.83</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>6.44*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_3$</td>
<td>168.33</td>
<td>290.00</td>
<td>38.16</td>
<td>38.98</td>
<td>5.46*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_4$</td>
<td>171.66</td>
<td>356.66</td>
<td>34.88</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>7.84*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups

$M_1$ = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs

$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs

$SD_1$ = Pre-test

$SD_2$ = Post-test
Figure 6.15
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Comprehension of Different EGs (Total Scores of all Grades)

EGs = Experimental Groups
Note: The origin on Y-Axis is not starting from 0
M₂, SDₓ, and SD₂ of EG₂ were 151.66, 245.83, 27.86 and 22.45 respectively. Its t-value was 6.44 (p<0.01). M₁, M₂, SD₁ and SD₂ of EG₃ were 168.33, 290.00, 38.16 and 38.98 respectively. Its t-value was 5.46 (p<0.01). M₁, M₂, SD₁ and SD₂ of EG₄ were 171.66, 356.66, 34.88 and 46.00 respectively. The t-value of EG₄ was 7.84 which was significant beyond 0.01 level. Figure 6.15 has been prepared to highlight the overall differences between pre- and post-test scores of different EGs.

Table 6.16 represents means, SDs and mean differentials (t-values) between pre- and post-test scores of word reading age of different EGs. M₁, M₂, SD₁ and SD₂ of EG₁ were 77.17, 87.00, 5.00 and 4.65 respectively. Its t-value was 3.53. It was significant at 0.01 level of confidence. M₁, M₂, SD₁ and SD₂ of EG₂ were 77.83, 84.83, 4.79 and 3.19 respectively. Its t-value was 2.98 which is significant at 0.05 level of confidence. M₁, M₂, SD₁ and SD₂ of EG₃ were 77.00, 85.83, 4.15 and 2.32 respectively. Its t-value was 4.55 which is found to be significant at 0.01 level of confidence. M₁, M₂, SD₁ and SD₂ of EG₄ were 78.67, 88.17, 4.80 and 5.27 respectively. Its t-value was 3.26 which was found to be significant beyond 0.01 level of confidence. Figure 6.16 has been prepared to show the differences of mean pre- and post-test results of different EGs of word reading.
Table 6.16

Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Word Reading of Different EGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EGs</th>
<th>$M_1$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Tabulated t for 0.01 df(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG₁</td>
<td>77.17</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.53*</td>
<td>0.01 &lt; 3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₂</td>
<td>77.83</td>
<td>84.83</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.98**</td>
<td>0.05 &lt; 2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₃</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>85.83</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>4.55*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₄</td>
<td>78.67</td>
<td>88.17</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>3.26*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence
** Significant at 0.05 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups

$M_1$ = Mean of pre-test scores of different EGs

$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs

$SD_1$ = Pre-test

$SD_2$ = Post-test
Figure 6.16
Mean Differentials between Pre- and Post-test Scores with regard to Word Reading of Different EGs

EGs = Experimental Groups
Note: The origin on Y-Axis is not starting from 0
Entries in Table 6.17 represent means, SDs and mean differentials (t-value) between post-test scores of different EGs of LG1 for oral reading.

Entries in Table 6.17 show that means (M1) of EG1, EG2, EG3 and EG4 were 95.00, 90.00, 92.00, 95.50 respectively. Mean (M2) of control group (CG) was found to be 70.00. Likewise, SDs (SD1) of EG1, EG2, EG3 and EG4 were 3.94, 4.24, 5.58 and 3.50 respectively. SD of control group (SD2) was 7.74. t-values of EG1-CG, EG2-CG, EG3-CG and EG4-CG were found to be 7.04, 5.54, 5.64 and 7.34 respectively. All the obtained t-values were significant much beyond 0.01 level of confidence. In Figure 6.17 differences could be seen in oral reading in different EGs (trained with different remedial strategies) and CG (no training was provided).

Entries in Table 6.18 show that means (M1) of EG1, EG2, EG3 and EG4 were were 63.00, 60.00, 66.00 and 71.00 respectively. Mean (M2) of control group (CG) was found to be 48.50. Likewise SDs (SD1) of EG1, EG2, EG3 and EG4 were 3.50, 6.29, 6.84 and 6.48 respectively. SD of control group (SD2) was 7.68. t-values of EG1-CG, EG2-CG, EG3-CG and EG4-CG were found to be 4.34, 2.83, 4.16 and 5.48 respectively. t-value of EG2 was significant at 0.05 level but all other three group i.e., EG1, EG3 and EG4, the t-values were significant at 0.01 level of confidence.

Figure 6.18 has been prepared to highlight the post-test mean differences between different EGs and UG1.
Table 6.17
Mean Differentials between Post-Test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Oral Reading (LG1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>$M_1$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG1-CG</td>
<td>95.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>7.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG2-CG</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>5.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG3-CG</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>5.64*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG4-CG</td>
<td>95.50</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>7.34*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

LG1 = Lower first grade
CG = Control Group
EGs = Experimental groups
$M_1$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.17

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs & CG (LG1)

EGs = Experimental Groups, CG = Control Group, LG1 = Lower First Grade
### Table 6.18

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Oral Reading (UG₁)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>$M_1$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=5)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG₁-CG</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>4.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₂-CG</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>2.83**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₃-CG</td>
<td>66.00</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>4.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₄-CG</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>48.50</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>5.48*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence
** Significant at 0.05 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups
CG = Control group
UG₁ = Upper first grade

$M_1$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.18
Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs & CG (UG1)

EGs = Experimental Groups, CG = Control Groups, UG1 = Upper First Grade
Entries in Table 6.19 show that means ($M_1$) of EG$_1$, EG$_2$, EG$_3$ and EG$_4$ were 29.50, 26.00, 31.00 and 36.50 respectively. Mean ($M_2$) of control group (CG) was found to be 16.50. Likewise SDs ($SD_1$) of EG$_1$, EG$_2$, EG$_3$ and EG$_4$ were 3.50, 4.09, 4.09 and 7.20 respectively. SD of control group ($SD_2$) was 3.16. t-values of EG$_1$-CG, EG$_2$-CG, EG$_3$-CG and EG$_4$-CG were found 6.75, 4.50, 6.87 and 6.23 respectively. All the obtained t-values were significant beyond 0.01 level of confidence. Figure 6.19 shows significant reduction in oral reading problems of lower second grade children belonging to different experimental groups and control group.

Entries in Table 6.20 show that means ($M_1$) of EG$_1$, EG$_2$, EG$_3$ and EG$_4$ were 23.50, 22.00, 23.00 and 28.50 respectively. Mean ($M_2$) of control group (CG) was found to be 11.50. Likewise SDs ($SD_1$) of EG$_1$, EG$_2$, EG$_3$ and EG$_4$ were 3.98, 3.09, 4.09 and 8.43 respectively, SD of control group ($SD_2$) was 2.25. t-values of EG$_1$-CG, EG$_2$-CG, EG$_3$-CG and EG$_4$-CG were found 6.41, 6.70, 6.01 and 4.77 respectively. All the obtained t-values were significant beyond 0.01 level of confidence. Significant reduction in oral reading problems of dyslexic children at upper second grade belonging to different experimental groups and CG has been shown graphically in Figure 6.20.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Compared</th>
<th>$M_1$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG₁-CG</td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>6.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₂-CG</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>4.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₃-CG</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>6.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₄-CG</td>
<td>36.50</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>6.23*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

LG_{II} = Lower second grade
EGs = Experimental groups
CG = Control group
$M_1$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.19

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores with regard to Oral Reading of Different EGs & CG (LGi)

EGs = Experimental Groups, CG = Control Groups, LGi = Lower Second Grade
Table 6.20
Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Oral Reading (UG\textsubscript{II})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>$M_1$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG\textsubscript{1} - CG</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>6.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG\textsubscript{2} - CG</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>6.70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG\textsubscript{3} - CG</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>6.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG\textsubscript{4} - CG</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.77*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups
CG = Control group
UG\textsubscript{II} = Upper second grade
$M_1$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.20
Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Oral Reading (UGII)

Post-test of EG 23.5
Post-test of EG 22
Post-test of CG 11.5
Post-test of CG 11.5

EG1-CG
EG2-CG

Post-test of EG 23
Post-test of EG 28.5
Post-test of CG 11.5
Post-test of CG 11.5

EG3-CG
EG4-CG

Post-test of EGs
Post-test of CG

EG = Experimental Group, CG = Control Group, UGII = Upper second grade
Entries in Table 6.21 show that means ($M_1$) of EG$_1$, EG$_2$, EG$_3$ and EG$_4$ were 17.50, 13.00, 15.50 and 20.50 respectively. Mean ($M_2$) of control group (CG) was found to be 3.00. Likewise, SDs ($SD_1$) of EG$_1$, EG$_2$, EG$_3$ and EG$_4$ were 5.50, 1.54, 4.80 and 7.91 respectively. SD ($SD_2$) of control group (CG) was 3.51. t-values of EG$_1$-CG, EG$_2$-CG, EG$_3$-CG and EG$_4$-CG were found to be 5.80, 7.91, 5.56 and 5.13 respectively. The obtained t-values of all EGs were found significant at 0.01 level of confidence. Significant differences were recorded in the post-differentials of different EGs but not in CG which is shown through Figure 6.21 also.

Entries in Table 6.22 show that means ($M_1$) of EG$_1$, EG$_2$, EG$_3$ and EG$_4$ were 13.00, 8.00, 9.05 and 16.00 respectively. Mean ($M_2$) of control group was found to be 3.50. Likewise SDs ($SD_1$) of EG$_1$, EG$_2$, EG$_3$ and EG$_4$ were 5.89, 2.44, 4.41 and 8.19 respectively. SD of ($SD_2$) of control group was 3.51. t-values of EG$_1$-CG, EG$_2$-CG, EG$_3$-CG and EG$_4$-CG were found to be 3.39 (p<0.01), 2.58 (p<0.05), 2.61 (p<0.05) and 3.43 (p<0.01) respectively. All the obtained t-values were significant. Figure 6.22 has shown graphically the post-mean differentials of different EGs and CG at upper third grade.
Table 6.21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>$M_1$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EG_1$-CG</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>5.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_2$-CG</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>7.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_3$-CG</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>5.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_4$-CG</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>5.13*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups

CG = Control group

LG$_{III}$ = Lower third grade

$M_1$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs

$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.21

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Oral Reading (LGIII)

EG1-CG
Post-test of EG 17.5
Post-test of EG 13
Post-test of CG 3

EG2-CG
Post-test of EG 15.5
Post-test of EG 20.5
Post-test of CG 3

EG3-CG
Post-test of EG 15.5
Post-test of CG 3

EG4-CG
Post-test of EG 20.5
Post-test of CG 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-test of EGs</th>
<th>Post-test of CG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

EGs = Experimental Groups, CG = Control Group, LGIII = Lower third grade
Table 6.22

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Oral Reading (UGIII)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>( M_1 ) (n=6)</th>
<th>( M_2 ) (n=6)</th>
<th>( SD_1 )</th>
<th>( SD_2 )</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( EG_1 )-CG</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( EG_2 )-CG</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.58**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( EG_3 )-CG</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( EG_4 )-CG</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.43*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence
** Significant at 0.05 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups
CG = Control group
UGIII = Upper third grade

\( M_1 \) = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
\( M_2 \) = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.22

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Oral Reading (UGⅢ)

EGs = Experimental Groups, CG = Control Group, UGⅢ = Upper third grade
Entries in Table 6.23 show that means ($M_1$) of EG1, EG2, EG3 and EG4 were 246.16, 220.50, 235.16 and 261.83 respectively. Mean ($M_2$) of control group (CG) was found to be 155.00. Likewise, SDs ($SD_1$) of EG1, EG2, EG3 and EG4 were 20.32, 5.61, 20.75 and 36.95 respectively. SD ($SD_2$) of control group was 19.13. t-values of EG1-CG, EG2-CG, EG3-CG and EG4-CG were found to be 8.00, 8.04, 6.95 and 6.28 respectively. All the obtained t-values were significant much beyond 0.01 level of confidence. These results indicate the significant overall reduction in oral reading problems of all grades of the subjects belonging to different experimental groups and CG. In Figure 6.23, difference could be seen in overall gains of all the groups in oral reading of different EGs but not in CG.

Entries in Table 6.24 show that means ($M_1$) of EG1, EG2, EG3 and EG4 were 83.33, 73.33, 80.00 and 88.33 respectively. Mean ($M_2$) of the control group was found to be 55.00. Likewise SDs ($SD_1$) of EG1, EG2, EG3 and EG4 were 8.16, 8.16, 8.94 and 4.08 respectively. SD ($SD_2$) of control group was 10.48. t-values of EG1-CG, EG2-CG, EG3-CG and EG4-CG were found to be 5.22, 3.37, 4.44 and 7.25 respectively. All the obtained t-values were significant beyond 0.01 level of confidence. These significant post-test differentials of subjects belonging to different experimental groups and CG are shown in Figure 6.24.
Table 6.23

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Oral Reading (Total Score of all Grades)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>$M_1$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG1-CG</td>
<td>246.16</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>8.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG2-CG</td>
<td>220.50</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>8.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG3-CG</td>
<td>235.16</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>6.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG4-CG</td>
<td>261.83</td>
<td>155.00</td>
<td>36.95</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>6.28*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups

CG = Control group

$M_1$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs

$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.23
Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Oral Reading (Total Score of all Grades)

EGs = Experimental Groups, CG = Control Group
Note: The origin on Y-Axis is not starting from 0
Table 6.24

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (primary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>$M_1$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG₁-CG</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>5.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₂-CG</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>3.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₃-CG</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>4.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₄-CG</td>
<td>88.33</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>7.25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups
CG = Control group

$M_1$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
**Figure 6.24**

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (Primary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EG1-CG</th>
<th>EG2-CG</th>
<th>EG3-CG</th>
<th>EG4-CG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>73.33</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-test of EGs

Post-test of CG

EGs = Experimental Groups. CG = Control Group.
Entries in Table 6.25 show that means ($M_1$) of $EG_1$, $EG_2$, $EG_3$ and $EG_4$ were 66.66, 53.33, 63.33 and 71.66 respectively. Mean ($M_2$) of control group was found to be 42.50. Likewise SDs ($SD_1$) of $EG_1$, $EG_2$, $EG_3$ and $EG_4$ were 10.32, 5.16, 13.66 and 7.52 respectively. SD ($SD_2$) of control group was 10.83. t-values of $EG_1$-$CG$, $EG_2$-$CG$, $EG_3$-$CG$ and $EG_4$-$CG$ were found to be 3.95, 2.23, 2.92 and 5.41 respectively. The obtained t-values for $EG_1$-$CG$ and $EG_4$-$CG$ were significant beyond 0.01 level of confidence and t-values for $EG_2$-$CG$ and $EG_3$-$CG$ were significant at 0.05 level of confidence. Figure 6.25 shows the significant reduction in reading comprehension problems of subjects belonging to different experimental groups at lower first grade.

Entries in Table 6.26 show that means ($M_1$) of $EG_1$, $EG_2$, $EG_3$ and $EG_4$ were 51.66, 40.00, 50.00 and 60.00 respectively. Mean ($M_2$) of control group was found to be 21.66. Likewise the SDs ($SD_1$) of $EG_1$, $EG_2$, $EG_3$ and $EG_4$ were 7.52, 6.32, 10.95 and 11.40 respectively. SD of control group ($SD_2$) was 7.52, t-values of $EG_1$-$CG$, $EG_2$-$CG$, $EG_3$-$CG$ and $EG_4$-$CG$ were found to be 6.90, 4.56, 5.22 and 6.87 respectively. All the obtained t-values were significant beyond the 0.01 level of confidence. Figure 6.26 shows the post-mean differentials of different EGs and CG of comprehension of upper first grade children.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>$M_1$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG₁-CG</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>3.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₂-CG</td>
<td>53.33</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>2.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₃-CG</td>
<td>63.33</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>2.92**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₄-CG</td>
<td>71.66</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>5.41*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence
** Significant at 0.05 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups
CG = Control group
LG₁ = Lower first grade
$M_1$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.25
Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (LG1)

EGs = Experimental Groups, CG = Control Group, LG1 = Lower first grade
Note: The origin on Y-Axis is not starting from 0
**Table 6.26**

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (UG₁)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>M₁ (n=6)</th>
<th>M₂ (n=6)</th>
<th>SD₁</th>
<th>SD₂</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG₁-CG</td>
<td>51.66</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>6.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₂-CG</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>4.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₃-CG</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>5.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₄-CG</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>6.87*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups
CG = Control group
UG₁ = Upper first grade
M₁ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
M₂ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.26

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (UG₁)

EGs = Experimental Groups, CG = Control Group, UG₁ = Upper first grade
Entries in Table 6.27 show that means (\(M_i\)) of EG_1, EG_2, EG_3 and EG_4 were 33.33, 31.66, 35.00 and 46.66 respectively. Mean of control group (\(M_2\)) was found to be 15.00. Likewise, the SDs (\(SD_i\)) of EG_1, EG_2, EG_3 and EG_4 were 8.16, 7.52, 8.36 and 12.11 respectively. SD of control group (\(SD_2\)) was 5.47. t-values of EG_1, EG_2, EG_3 and EG_4 were found to be 4.56, 4.38, 4.89 and 5.83 respectively. All the obtained t-values were significant beyond 0.01 level of confidence. Figure 6.27 has been prepared to highlight the differences between post-test scores of different EG with CG at lower second grade.

Table 6.28 shows that means (\(M_i\)) of EG_1, EG_2, EG_3 and EG_4 were 26.66, 20.00, 23.33 and 31.66 respectively. Mean of control group (\(M_2\)) was 8.33. Likewise SDs (\(SD_i\)) of EG_1, EG_2, EG_3 and EG_4 were 5.16, 7.07, 10.32 and 9.38 respectively. SD of control group (\(SD_2\)) was 7.52. t-values of EG_1-CG, EG_2-CG, EG_3-CG and EG_4-CG were found to be 4.91, 2.76, 2.87, 4.61 respectively. t-values of EG_2-CG and EG_4-CG were significant beyond 0.01 level of confidence and t-values of EG_2-CG and EG_3-CG were significant at 0.05 level of confidence. These results were shown in Figure 6.28 which indicates significant reduction in reading comprehension problems of subjects belonging to different EGs of upper second grade.
Table 6.27
Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (LG_{II})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>$M_1$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG_{1} - CG</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>4.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG_{2} - CG</td>
<td>31.66</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>4.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG_{3} - CG</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>4.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG_{4} - CG</td>
<td>46.66</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.83*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups
CG = Control group
LG_{II} = Lower second grade
$M_1$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.27
Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (LGII)

EGs = Experimental Groups, CG = Control Group, LGII = Lower second grade
Table 6.28
Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (UG_{II})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>M₁</th>
<th>M₂</th>
<th>SD₁</th>
<th>SD₂</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG₁-CG</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>4.91*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₂-CG</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>2.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₃-CG</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>2.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG₄-CG</td>
<td>31.66</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>4.61*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence
** Significant at 0.05 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups
CG = Control group
UG_{II} = Upper second grade
M₁ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
M₂ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.28

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (UGII)

EGs = Experimental Groups, CG = Control Group, UGII = Upper second grade
Entries in Table 6.29 show that means ($M_1$) of $EG_1$, $EG_2$, $EG_3$ and $EG_4$ were 21.66, 16.66, 21.66 and 30.00 respectively. Mean of control group was 6.66. Likewise SDs ($SD_1$) of $EG_1$, $EG_2$, $EG_3$ and $EG_4$ were 4.08, 5.16, 9.83 and 6.32 respectively. SD of control group ($SD_2$) was 5.16. t-values of $EG_1$-CG, $EG_2$-CG, $EG_3$-CG and $EG_4$-CG were 5.58, 3.35, 3.30 and 7.00 respectively. All the obtained t-values were significant beyond 0.01 level of confidence. Significant reduction in reading comprehension problems of subjects belonging to different EGs of lower third grade are highlighted in Figure 6.29.

Entries in Table 6.30 show that means ($M_2$) of $EG_1$, $EG_2$, $EG_3$ and $EG_4$ were found to be 20.00, 18.33, 18.33 and 26.66 respectively. Mean of control group ($M_2$) was found to be 5.83. Likewise SDs ($SD_1$) of $EG_1$, $EG_2$, $EG_3$ and $EG_4$ were found to be 6.32, 7.53, 4.08 and 12.11 respectively. SD of control group was ($SD_2$) 4.92. t-values of $EG_1$-CG, $EG_2$-CG, $EG_3$-CG and $EG_4$-CG were found to be 4.33, 3.41, 4.79 and 3.90 respectively. The t-values of $EG_1$-CG, $EG_2$-CG, $EG_3$-CG and $EG_4$-CG were significant at 0.01 level of confidence. Post test scores of reading comprehension have been shown in Figure 6.30 of all EGs and CG at upper third grade.
Table 6.29

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (LG_{III})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>( M_1 ) (n=6)</th>
<th>( M_2 ) (n=6)</th>
<th>SD_1</th>
<th>SD_2</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG_1-CG</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG_2-CG</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>3.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG_3-CG</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>3.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG_4-CG</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>7.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups
CG = Control group
LG_{III} = Lower third grade
\( M_1 \) = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
\( M_2 \) = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.29
Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (LGIII)

EG1-CG
Post-test of EG 21.66
Post-test of CG 6.66

EG2-CG
Post-test of EG 16.66
Post-test of CG 6.66

EG3-CG
Post-test of EG 21.66
Post-test of CG 30

EG4-CG
Post-test of EG 21.66
Post-test of CG 6.66

Post-test of EGs  Post-test of CG

EGs = Experimental Groups, CG = Control Group, LGIII = Lower third grade
Table 6.30

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (UG_{III})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>$M_1$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG_1-CG</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG_2-CG</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>3.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG_3-CG</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG_4-CG</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>3.90*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups
CG = Control group
UG_{III} = Upper third grade
$M_1$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.30

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (UGm)

EGs = Experimental Groups. CG = Control Group. UGm = Upper third grade
Table 6.31
Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (Total Scores of all Grades)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>$M_1$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EG_1$ - CG</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>41.35</td>
<td>36.68</td>
<td>5.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_2$ - CG</td>
<td>245.83</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>36.68</td>
<td>5.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_3$ - CG</td>
<td>290.00</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>38.98</td>
<td>36.68</td>
<td>6.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_4$ - CG</td>
<td>356.66</td>
<td>158.00</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>36.68</td>
<td>8.26*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups
CG = Control group
$M_1$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.31
Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Comprehension (Total Score of all Grades)

EGs = Experimental Groups, CG = Control Group.
Note: The origin on Y-Axis is not starting from 0.
Table 6.32

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Word Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>$M_1$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$M_2$ (n=6)</th>
<th>$SD_1$</th>
<th>$SD_2$</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$EG_1$ - CG</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>77.66</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>3.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_2$ - CG</td>
<td>84.83</td>
<td>77.66</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>2.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_3$ - CG</td>
<td>85.83</td>
<td>77.66</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>3.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$EG_4$ - CG</td>
<td>88.17</td>
<td>77.66</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>3.32*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.01 level of confidence
** Significant at 0.05 level of confidence

EGs = Experimental groups
CG = Control group
$M_1$ = Mean of post-test scores of different EGs
$M_2$ = Mean of post-test scores of control group
Figure 6.32

Mean Differentials between Post-test Scores of different EGs and CG with regard to Word Reading.

EGs = Experimental Groups, CG = Control Group.
Discussion of Results

Results obtained from Tables 6.1 to 6.7 show mean differentials (t-values) of oral reading between pre- and post-test scores with regard to different EGs and different grades of oral reading i.e., LGI to UGIII and overall scores of all grades. All mean differentials (t-values) between pre- and post-test scores of all EGs were large enough to be significant at 0.01 level. Thus, this substantial reduction in the oral reading problems can be attributed to the efficacy of different remedial strategies. These results support the findings of Pavchinski, Peter, Evans, Joseph and Bostow and Darrel (1989).

Referring to Tables 6.8 to 6.15, reading comprehension of dyslexic children trained through different remedial strategies was significantly improved. All the obtained t-values of all EGs at different grades were significant at 0.01 level. These findings verify the findings of Lahey, McNees and Brown (1973a).

Table 6.16 shows that mean differentials (t-values) of word reading between pre- and post-test of EG₁, EG₃ and EG₄ were large enough to be significant at 0.01 level. Mean differentials of word reading between pre- and post-test scores of EG₂ were found significant at 0.05 level. This indicates that word reading (reading age) was improved significantly through different strategies. These findings verify the findings of Fry (1973).
Tables 6.17 to 6.23 refer to mean differentials (t-values) between post-test scores of different EGs and control group for oral reading of different grades i.e., LG_I to UG_III and total scores of all grades. Table 6.17 shows that all mean differentials between the post-test scores of different EGs and control group were found to be significant at 0.01 level at LG_I. The t-values of UG_I recorded between the post-test scores of all EGs and control group were significant at 0.01 level except EG_2 (trained through Alphabetic phonic method) which was significant at 0.05 level (Table 6.18).

Further Tables 6.19 and 6.20 show that mean differentials of oral reading between post-test scores of all EGs and control group were recorded significant at 0.01 level at LG_II and UG_II. The t-values (Table 6.21) between post-test scores of all EGs and control group were significant at 0.01 level. It indicates that all strategies were successful in reducing oral reading problems of dyslexic children at LG_III. Further Table 6.22 shows that all mean differentials (t-values) between post-test scores of EG_1 and EG_4 and control group were significant at 0.01 level but post-test scores of EG_2 and EG_3 and control group were significant at 0.05 level at UG_III. It shows that subjects could gain substantially significantly at LG_III and UG_III. Table 6.23 shows that all mean differentials (t-
values) between post-test scores of different EGs and control group with regard to total scores of all grades of oral reading were significant at 0.01 level. It verifies the results of Malamuth (1979), Rose and Sherry (1984), Rose (1985), Bereiter and Scardamalia (1989).

Again mean differentials (t-values) of reading comprehension at primary level presented in Table 6.24 between post-test scores of different EGs and control group were found large enough to be significant at 0.01 level. Table 6.25 shows that mean differential of EG₁ (trained through MSLM) and EG₄ (trained through ECM) were significant at 0.01 level. The t-values of EG₂ (trained through APM) and EG₃ (trained through BM) were also significant at 0.05 level.

Mean differentials (t-values) presented in Tables 6.26 and 6.27 between post-test scores of all EGs (trained through different remedial strategies) and control group (with no intervention) were found large enough to be significant at 0.01 level of confidence for reading comprehension at UGᵢ and LGᵢᵢ. Table 6.28 shows that t-values between EG₁-CG and EG₄-CG were significant at 0.01 level but t-values of EG₂-CG and EG₃-CG were significant at 0.05 level. Table 6.29 shows that the t-values between post-test scores of different EGs and control group were recorded significant at 0.01 level of confidence of reading comprehension at LGᵢᵢᵢ.
Again Table 6.30 shows that mean differentials of post-test scores of all EGs with control group were significant at 0.01 level. Table 6.31 shows that all t-values of post-test scores between different EGs (trained through different remedial strategies) and control group (with no intervention) were significant at 0.01 level. It shows that subjects gained substantially in reading comprehension as t-values of overall scores were large enough to be significant at 0.01 level. It verifies the results of Swason (1981a,b).

The mean differentials (t-values) of the post-test scores between different EGs and control group with regard to word reading of the subjects (Table 6.32) show that mean differentials of post-test scores between EG$_1$ (trained through MSLm) and CG were large enough to be significant at 0.01 level. The t-values between post-test scores of EG$_2$ (trained through APm) and CG was significant at 0.05 level of confidence whereas the t-values between post-test scores of EG$_3$ (trained through BMm) and CG, EG$_4$ (trained through ECM) and CG were significant at 0.01 level.

It is clear from the above discussion that mean scores in oral reading, reading comprehension and word reading improved significantly over baseline mean scores by providing different remedial strategies to different EGs. But there was no significant difference in pre and post mean scores of
CG which was provided with no intervention. Thus, it begins to appear that various remedial strategies employed in the present study were effective in reducing reading disability of dyslexic primary school children. Thus, the hypothesis that "Various remedial strategies would be effective in reducing or eliminating reading disability of dyslexic primary school children", stands verified.