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It is not enough to expose future teachers and parents to good literature for children. It is important that they see young children reacting to books being read to them, an opportunity education majors get during preservice training. Non-education majors enrolled in my children's literature class were given, as an alternative to a traditional term paper, a chance to interact with preschoolers through the medium of books. Twenty-one students chose to participate in this project.

Local libraries and preschools are usually eager to have volunteer help for reading and telling stories to groups of children. Dr. Patricia Crook, of the University faculty, had long utilized them in conjunction with children's literature classes she teaches. In all, I found seven facilities willing to accommodate the needs of the project. Seven students were assigned to the University's Child Development Center, two students to the University's Speech and Hearing preschool, six students to three local libraries, and six students to two local preschools.

Each student's assignment included reading/telling stories to a group of children for a total of six sessions, spaced a week apart. Each student then submitted a written report to me, describing his or her experiences with the children. These reports provided the data for this article. All twenty-one students completed the assignment.

The Students

Students participating in the project were non-education majors. They attended different schools of the University including Arts and Sciences, Commerce, and Nursing. They were sophomores, juniors and seniors, and no one was planning a teaching career.

The Class

Students in this project attended weekly classes in children's literature. This contact was important for several reasons. It enabled the students to explore the many kinds of books for young children, ranging from Mother Goose rhymes to contemporary realistic fiction. In a class setting, these books were analyzed as to their literary quality, value orientation, and relevance for young children. Comparing books with similar themes, as sibling
rivalry or divorce, gave students a basis from which to select books to share with their young audiences.

The children's literature class also provided a chance for the students to meet and discuss common concerns about their reading experiences. For example, a student having difficulty with keeping children's attention had twenty other students' experience to draw upon in finding a solution.

The knowledge base of the course provided students with valuable information. A focus of the course is matching available books to the cognitive level of developing children. Such topics as egocentricity in preoperational children and evolving attention to print were explored in the course.

Perhaps the most important aspect of taking the course while participating in the project was that the importance of reading to children was constantly being reinforced. Discussions often focused on the value of having been read to in the students' own early lives in terms of concept development, development of a sense of story structure, familiarity with the unique prosody of the written word, and promoting a lifelong love of books. These understandings easily transferred to the reading experiences being shared with the children.

The Preschoolers

The children being read to ranged in age from two to six, with the majority preschoolers as well as a few kindergarteners and first graders who attended the libraries' story hour sessions. A cross-section of the community's children were represented in the reading groups. Children from two to six constituted the library story hour groups, while in the preschool settings, children of two and three were usually in a different group from that of the four year olds. Group size varied from about three to eight children. The preschool groups tended to remain constant over the weeks, while the library groups changed from week to week.

Lessons Learned

All students found their experiences rewarding, but most incurred some conflict or problem over the course of the sessions. The written reports demonstrated that many lessons were learned from reading to groups of children. Recommendations abounded concerning motivation, attention span, related activities, and kinds of books. These areas will be discussed in turn.

Motivation

Children naturally like being read to. At times it takes little else than just an announcement that a story is about to be read for children to flock around the reader. Yet, children involved in other play activities often need a more creative introduction to reading time than a mere call to gather. Most of the students reported that they just didn't start in with the story. A few of their successful motivating techniques follow:

1) The student sat in a chair and began to sing. A quiet, yet catchy tune initiates interest in the singer who soon becomes reader/teller.
2) The student entered the room quacking and waddling like a
duck, and proceeded to read a story about ducks. Assuming
a novel role adds excitement to reading time.

3) The student called each child to her, by name, one at a time.
This special touch makes the story hour warm and personal.

4) Once the student had the children in front of her, she learned
to direct their attention to her and the book she was about
to read. The student learned that the book must face the
children so that the illustrations could be seen by all.

Attention Span

Preschoolers have notoriously short attention spans. Students
who chose lengthy stories soon learned that they had lost their
audience. Following are some recommendations for maintaining atten­
tion to the reading activity:

1) The student selected more than one book to share during the
story hour. A rule of thumb is three or four short books
per half hour.

2) The student varied the types of books being shared. Rather
than reading three folktales, better to choose one folktale,
one concept book and some short narrative story.

3) The student involved the children in the stories through
vocal participation, questioning, and being responsive to
children's comments about the story. While a couple students
were annoyed by children's interruptions of the reading,
most observed that this verbal interaction is a positive
opportunity for oral language development.

4) The student rehearsed the book before sharing it with chil­
dren. This pre-reading gave the reader more confidence in
stressing key phrases and unique dialogue. When one reads
a book and really likes it, enthusiasm for the story is shared
along with the book itself.

5) The student learned to have respect for the audience, despite
their young years. Children have a genuine interest in listen­
ing to stories, and while some restlessness is natural for
young children, a rising volume of seat squirming is an indi­
cation that a particular book is not interesting. Not all
stories will appeal to all children, and some stories will
appeal to very few.

Related Activities

The use of books leads to other, related activities. Some
of the creative situations used by the students to hold and expand
the impact of stories and concept books follow:

1) The student drew pictures of characters as they appeared
in the story. This technique brings the story alive for many
children. It also proves useful to young children who have
difficulty holding all of the story's characters in their
minds.

2) The student dressed up stuffed animals to represent characters
in the story. A different child held each animal and raised it above his head when the character appeared in the story. This technique helps young children maintain an interest in the actions of a particular character.

3) The student had the children act out the actions of the story as she read it. Children must listen closely to a story when they are to represent it in movement.

4) The student, after reading the story, had the preschoolers dictate their reactions to the story. Children who have an opportunity to note that their reactions or feelings are being written down realize that their ideas are being valued and have a chance to gain a little more experience with the speech to print match.

5) The student used the book about feelings as a springboard for the children to discuss the variety of feelings they share. Books are wonderful motivators for children to open up and talk. They provide a focus for discussion.

6) The student told, rather than read, a story. The rich legacy of storytelling brings teller and audience closer as one medium, a book is removed from between them.

7) The student, after sharing a book, made it accessible to the children. Children will naturally pick up a book that has been read to them and "read" it themselves, remembering some passages, inventing some dialogue, and feeling successful at this pre-reading stage.

Kinds of Books

Picture books for young children abound. While the students found that most children enjoyed a variety of styles of books, they judged the book's illustrations to be a most important determinant of its appeal. Children responded best to books containing brightly colored yet simply drawn illustrations. One student reported that "the easier the pictures were to understand, the more the book was enjoyed." Following are some of the types and titles of books that were favorites of the preschoolers:

1) Books which promote the rhythm of language — Mother Goose books with their familiar rhymes allow children to join in the play of choral resitation. Similarly, Theodor Geisel's Dr. Seuss books make language fun to hear and say. Students read many of the Dr. Seuss titles, including Mr. Brown Can Moo, Can You?, Dr. Seuss' Sleep Book, and Green Eggs and Ham.

2) Wordless Picture Books — The use of these books helps preschoolers understand that books can tell a story and pre-readers themselves may make up a story line to accompany a wordless or nearly wordless book. Some of the books read by the students were Pat Hutchins' Rosie's Walk and Changes Changes, Mercer Mayer's One Frog Too Many, and Peter Spier's Caldecott winner, Noah's Ark.

3) Predictable Books — Pre-and beginning readers need books which are predictable in nature. As with other areas of experience,
reading is an anticipatory act wherein the reader or listener wants to verify his expectation of what is likely to happen in a story. Books which highlight this human predilection are both educationally valuable and fun. Sometimes the book capitalizes on repeated phrases, making the book most predictable as Margaret Wise Brown's Goodnight Moon and Maggie Dunn's Jonny and His Drum. Other books include events which trigger probable subsequent events as Beatrice Schenk de Regniers' May I Bring a Friend?

4) Animal Stories—Children love animals wild and ferocious and animals tame and adorable. Children's inquisitive minds and trusting natures make them responsive to both realistic and fanciful animal stories. Some of the animal stories shared with the preschoolers were Arnold Lobel's How the Rooster Saved the Day, James Marshall's Yummers, and Emily Hanlon's What If A Lion Eats Me and I Fall Into a Hippopotamus Mud Hole?

5) Participation Books—There are books which practically seduce the listener into repeating its phrases, oinking like its pigs, howling like its wolves, or quacking like its ducks. No group of preschoolers can resist joining in on "Hundreds of cats, thousands of cats, millions and billions and trillions of cats," from Wanda Gag's classic tale Millions of Cats. Other books shared which invited children's participation included Esphyr Slobodkina's Caps for Sale, Dr. Seuss' Mr. Brown Can Moo, Can You? and John Burningham's The Rabbit and The Dog.

6) Familiar Characters—How we love to follow the adventures of a favorite character! Children are as eager to hear new episodes of characters met in earlier read books. Many of the students read several books in a series. Among them are Russell Hoban's Frances, Martha Alexander's Blackboard Bear, Else Minarik's Little Bear, and E.A. Rey's Curious George.

The twenty-one students who participated in this reading project learned a great deal about the children and about sharing books with children. Certainly, they learned that reading to children involves a triad of elements: enthusiastic reader, actively involved listener, and meaningful book. On a human level, the book is probably less important than the interaction of reader and listener. As one student so aptly advised, "It's not the book you choose to read but how much of yourself you are willing to put into the children."
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Comprehension monitoring research has shown that younger-aged subjects and poor readers at all grade levels do not monitor their comprehension while reading text (Garner, 1981; Garner & Reis, 1981; Hare, 1981; Owings, Peterson, Bransford, Morris & Stein, 1980; Paris & Myers, 1981). Students do not know how to effectively summarize text, they do not know the difference between reader-based and text-based questions, and they often rate positive reading strategies as not being helpful. Researchers are now training subjects who are labeled as poor comprehenders or weak comprehension monitors to use effective text monitoring strategies. The results of these training studies are encouraging and hold great promise for the classroom teacher who is interested in helping students to better comprehend and remember text. As to the feasibility of incorporating monitoring instruction into the classroom curriculum, Pearson (1982) states "the systematic application of direct instructional approaches in the area of comprehension instruction has led to superior comprehension..." (p. 10).

Three comprehension monitoring strategies that seem viable for classroom instruction and application are: (1) summarization of text, (2) self-initiated questioning, and (3) differentiation of reader-based and text-based questions. Research supporting the instructional validity of each of these strategies will be discussed.

Brown, Campione and Day (1981) identified six basic rules essential to summarization. The six rules are (1) deleting unnecessary or trivial material, (2) deleting material that is important but redundant, (3) substituting a superordinate term for a list of items, (4) substituting a superordinate term for components of an action, (5) selecting a topic sentence, and (6) inventing a topic sentence when none is provided.

Day (1980) explored whether junior college aged subjects could be trained to use summarization rules. Subjects were divided into two groups: (1) average students with no reading or writing problems and (2) remedial students with normal reading ability but diagnosed as poor writers. Four instructional conditions were used which varied on a continuum from less explicit to most expli-
The major difference among the conditions was the amount of modeling done by the researcher. Results of Day's study indicated that the more mature students derive greater benefit from training and need less explicit instruction. The remedial students only fared well in the most explicit treatment conditions.

McNeil and Donant (1982) randomly assigned 23 fifth-grade pupils to one of three groups: (1) a summary rule training group, (2) a summary writing group, and (3) a non-instructional control group. Students in the rule training group were trained to use the six summary rules. The trained group out-performed the two control groups in writing post-test summaries.

A second monitoring strategy that appears to help students better remember and understand text relates to the training of students to ask themselves questions while reading text. Brown (1981) states "...by teaching students to generate self-questions we teach students metacognitive processes, such as (a) setting purposes for study, (b) identifying and underlining important segments of material, and (c) thinking of possible answers to questions. The self-questioning strategy leads the student to an active monitoring of the learning activity and to the engagement of strategic action" (p. 38).

Andre and Anderson (1978-9) trained high-school students to generate self-questions about important points while reading narrative prose. The self-questioning procedure was modeled by the researchers. Results of this study showed that generating self-questions facilitated better learning than did rereading or making up questions without regard to important points.

Using schema theory as a framework, Singer and Donlan (1982) taught eleventh-grade students to generate self-questions by teaching that many short stories contain a problem-solving type of schema. In conjunction with this problem-solving schema, students were taught to generate schema-general and story-specific questions. This study indicated that trained subjects asked themselves more questions about important information than did control subjects.

Garner and Kraus (1981-2) suggest that poor comprehenders are not aware that not all information that is read can be stored in one's memory. Students need to be taught corrective strategies that could be used when their comprehension begins to falter.

Sixth and seventh grade students were taught to use a lookback strategy by Garner (1982). They were taught that if text-based questions required multiple pieces of information, they should refer to text for answers. Students were also taught that the answering of reader-based questions required the integration of information that was read with one's prior-knowledge information. Garner found that with training, good comprehenders at both levels were more likely to use text lookbacks effectively. She also found that training and practice improved performance for all groups and this improved performance maintained over time.

Raphael and Pearson (1982) trained fourth, sixth, and eighth grade average readers in the use of three question types and their implied question-answer relationships. The three question-answer
relationships were: (1) text explicit (information used to create the question and to form the appropriate response is located within a single sentence in the text), (2) text implicit (information used to create the question and to form the response was found in the text but answers integrated information across sentences, paragraphs and pages), and (3) script implicit (based on information in the passage but required readers to search their own knowledge base for answers). Results of this extensive study demonstrated that trained subjects did better on the question-answer relationships than did their control peers.

Most of these studies incorporated three essential learning ingredients in their training methodology. These three ingredients were (1) modeling, (2) practice, and (3) feedback. If we as teachers also incorporate these ingredients in their monitoring lessons, students can be trained to successfully monitor their reading and comprehension of text.

Before a teacher does any monitoring instruction in his/her classroom, s/he may want to determine whether his/her students do or do not monitor their comprehension. An easy way to obtain this information is by administering a comprehension monitoring questionnaire. Paris and Myers (1981) gave a reading strategy questionnaire to fourth-grade good and poor comprehenders. The questionnaire consisted on 25 reading strategies: 10 positive reading strategies, 10 negative reading strategies and five neutral reading strategies. Students individually rated each of the strategies according to a nine-point scale. Questionnaire results indicated that poor readers were less aware of detrimental influences of negative factors on comprehension than good readers, while their ratings of positive and neutral factors were equal. Readers who were low in comprehension also showed more reversals of ratings—they rated negative strategies as positive and vice versa.

As part of a dissertation study (Hahn, 1983), a modified form of the Paris and Myers questionnaire was used in order to identify "weak" comprehension monitors. One hundred and nine sixth-graders were given the questionnaire, which consisted of five positive and five negative reading strategies. Each statement was read aloud to a total sixth-grade class. Students rated each statement on a four-point scale. The rating scale was explained to the students as follows: if a strategy is used all of the time, mark it always; if used most of the time, mark it almost always; if used only now and then, mark it almost never; and if never used, mark it never.

Table 1 - Questionnaire

Does it help to understand a story if you...

1. Think about something else while you are reading?

   ____ always   ____ almost always   ____ almost never   ____ never

2. Write it down in your own words?

   ____ always   ____ almost always   ____ almost never   ____ never

3. Underline important parts of the story?

   ____ always   ____ almost always   ____ almost never   ____ never
4. Ask yourself questions about the ideas in the story?
___ always ___ almost always ___ almost never ___ never

5. Write down every single word in the story?
___ always ___ almost always ___ almost never ___ never

6. Check through the story to see if you remember all of it?
___ always ___ almost always ___ almost never ___ never

7. Skip the parts you don't understand in the story?
___ always ___ almost always ___ almost never ___ never

8. Read the story as fast as you can?
___ always ___ almost always ___ almost never ___ never

9. Say every word over and over?
___ always ___ almost always ___ almost never ___ never

10. Ask questions about parts of the story that you don't understand?
___ always ___ almost always ___ almost never ___ never

Positive strategies (Questions 2, 3, 4, 6 and 10) were scored as follows: +2 for always; +1 for almost always; -1 for almost never; -2 for never. Negative strategies (Questions 1, 5, 7, 8 and 9) were scored just the reverse of the positive strategy scoring. Each student's monitoring score was determined by first adding the plus scores and then adding the negative scores. The difference between these two sums was then calculated. Scores may range from a +20 to a -20. In the dissertation study, students who received a score below the mean (X = 3.4) were labeled as "weak" monitors. Although this group of students was heterogeneous in reading ability, Paris and Myers' (1981) findings were replicated. Many of the students labeled as "weak" monitors rated positive strategies as not being very helpful. These two pieces of research evidence suggest that the questionnaire could be of assistance to the classroom teacher in identifying subjects who could benefit from monitoring training.

Such a modified questionnaire could be a helpful monitoring assessment instrument for classroom teachers in grades four through twelve. Teachers could give the questionnaire to their entire class in a matter of 15 to 20 minutes. In assessing each student's monitoring attitude, teachers may want to analyze only the positive strategy statements. Students who rate these positive strategies as not being very helpful may benefit from some monitoring training in those strategies. Teachers could also tally the total questionnaire. Students who receive a low positive score (-4 or below) or a negative score would be candidates for monitoring training.
Training Students to Use Strategic Behavior

When training students to use monitoring strategies, expository text should be used for two reasons: (1) expository text is more difficult to read because of informational density and difficult vocabulary and (2) it becomes very important to school learning after the primary grades. Let me now suggest two monitoring strategies that could be taught to students. Teachers are often frustrated when they ask students to summarize what they have read. In many instances, students copy verbatim the text they have read. Such students are good candidates for effective summarizing instruction. Before summarizing instruction is begun, the teacher should go through the expository text to be used and s/he should identify the important pieces of information in that passage. It is often helpful to do this task with another teacher. If both teachers identify the same pieces of information, one can assume that the most important pieces of information have been selected. If there are any major discrepancies, both teachers will need to discuss their choices and come to an agreement. Once this step is accomplished and appropriate information has been selected, teachers can begin their summarization instruction.

Begin the instruction by having students read a short expository passage (about 200 words). Following the reading of the passage, have the students write down what they consider to be the important points from the story. After this is completed, have the students draw a line under their important points and proceed by summarizing the important information in as few words as possible. When this activity is completed, have each student

---

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Strategies</th>
<th>Strong Monitors Helps</th>
<th>Strong Monitors Doesn't Help</th>
<th>Weak Monitors Helps</th>
<th>Weak Monitors Doesn't Help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 2</td>
<td>60% (18)</td>
<td>40% (12)</td>
<td>16% (5)</td>
<td>84% (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 3</td>
<td>36% (11)</td>
<td>64% (19)</td>
<td>6% (2)</td>
<td>94% (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 4</td>
<td>66% (20)</td>
<td>34% (10)</td>
<td>13% (4)</td>
<td>87% (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 6</td>
<td>80% (24)</td>
<td>20% (6)</td>
<td>16% (5)</td>
<td>84% (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 10</td>
<td>100% (30)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>10% (3)</td>
<td>90% (27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 60
conduct an "efficiency rating," (an idea that originated in the research literature—Garner, 1982).

An "efficiency rating" is obtained by dividing the number of important points each student wrote down by the number of words in the written summary. For example, suppose students were given a passage that contained eight important pieces of information. Student X wrote down five important points and his/her summary contained 30 words. Student X's efficiency rating would be 5/30 or .16. An efficiency rating of .16 is considered very weak, and ratings of .26 or more are considered good.

Students should then be told why their efficiency ratings are weak. They should be made aware that it is important to identify all the important information in the story and to summarize this information in as few words as possible. With practice and teacher feedback, students can be taught to more efficient in summarizing.

Another monitoring strategy that could be taught to students is asking self-questions about the main idea in a story (Andre & Anderson, 1978-79; Hahn, 1983). Using expository text, teachers should model this process for the students. The process involves locating the main ideas in a passage and asking one's self-questions concerning those main ideas. The teacher demonstrates the way this questioning encourages the identification of supportive information for the main idea. The first couple of times that the students use this process, they should be encouraged to write their self-questions down on paper. This will allow teachers to help students evaluate whether or not their questions are indeed main idea questions. Once students have mastered the skill of locating the main idea and asking a self-question about it, they need no longer be required to write their questions on the paper.

Teaching students to ask themselves questions about the main ideas in stories demonstrates for students the purpose of superordinate and subordinate information in text. Answering their main idea questions gets students to mentally rehearse important information. As a result, student retention of relevant information should increase.

One final suggestion would be to discuss with the students why the negative strategies (Ques. 1, 5, 7, 8, & 9) are not helpful for effectively studying and remembering text. To make a point, teachers might encourage students to read a passage as fast as they can. Following this rapid reading, they should be asked to retell everything they remember. The retellings usually contain minimal information. Students could then discuss why this strategy is not good. Only by making students aware of the effects in this manner can we convince them that such strategies are futile.

Thus, through assessing students' monitoring attitudes, teaching students to use effective monitoring strategies, and discussing why negative strategies hinder their comprehension processes, teachers can help students not only become aware of effective learning strategies but actually begin to use them. The end results of this monitoring instruction should be improved comprehension of text!
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COMPETENCY MODEL FOR PRESERVICE TEACHERS IN A BASIC SKILLS COURSE

Mary Sue Eckert
OHIO UNIVERSITY

John Wollenberg
MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

A theoretical competency based model was established in this study incorporating academic achievement, aptitude, and attitudinal variables related to performance on criterion-referenced tests in reading. The model utilized the predictor variables for performance on criterion-referenced tests. The predictor variables consisted of high school grade point average, ACT composite score, vocabulary score, reading comprehension score, major, and attitude toward reading. A review of the literature indicated a lack of studies dealing with the utilization of predictor variables for preservice teacher reading competency models in a basic skills course in the teaching of reading.

Specific features of the theoretical competency based model include cognitive learning through instruction as measured by performance on four criterion-referenced tests in the basic course mentioned. The four criterion-referenced tests operating as assessment instruments in the teaching of reading concentrate on the theoretical criteria of linguistic-cognitive models, reading readiness, approaches to the teaching of reading, word recognition skills, comprehension skills, and research and study skills (Artley 1978; Burns & Roe, 1980). These four tests for measuring performance and the six selected predictor variables are represented graphically (Eckert, 1983), on the following page.

The predictor model serves as a primary means of educational evaluation of foundation courses. Educational evaluation for program planning and counseling requires the accurate assessment of student achievement, aptitude, and attitude (Wallace & Larsen, 1979). This model was developed for counseling preservice teachers and altering foundation courses to meet the individual needs of a heterogeneous collegiate student body.

METHODS

The subjects for this study were 61 prospective teachers who were majoring in elementary and special education. These subjects registered for and completed the basic skills course in the teaching of reading at a land-grant university in Mississippi in the spring and fall semesters of 1982. It was anticipated that all subjects would be elementary and special education majors. However, seven of the 61 subjects had other majors.
The research design was a correlative and descriptive ex post facto study. The variables selected were each subject's high school GPA, composite score on the ACT, attitude toward reading as measured by the five subscales of the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment, declared major (elementary and special education), vocabulary score and reading comprehension score as measured by The Nelson-Denny Reading Test, Form C (1973), and score achieved independently and summatively on each of the four criterion-referenced reading tests.

The statistical techniques utilized were the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient and analysis of variance. A one-tailed test was used for finding the simple correlations among the selected variables of high school grade point average, ACT composite score, attitude toward reading, vocabulary score, and reading comprehension score with achievement scores from individual and total scores on the four criterion-referenced tests. Major
was tested using a two-tailed test due to the lack of evidence for a positive correlation in the literature. A relationship was considered significant at the .05 level.

RESULTS

Table 1 displays the simple correlation coefficients between all independent variables paired with each dependent variable. Significant correlations with Test I were ACT composite score (r=.57), vocabulary score (r=.52), high school grade point average (r=.50), comprehension score (r=.40), and major (r=.31). The significant correlations with Test II were ACT composite score (r=.64), vocabulary score (r=.58), high school grade point average (r=.54), comprehension score (r=.54), major (r=.37), and attitude toward general reading (r=.24). The significant correlations with Test III were ACT composite score (r=.59), vocabulary score (r=.53), high school grade point average (r=.47), comprehension score (r=.42), major (r=.28), and attitude toward reading in the library (r=.25). The significant correlations with Test IV were ACT composite score (r=.58), high school grade point average (r=.49), comprehension score (r=.36), major (r=.26), and attitude toward reading in the library (r=.21). The significant correlations with the Total Score were ACT Composite score (r=.66), vocabulary score (r=.60), high school grade point average (r=.56), comprehension score (r=.48), and major (r=.34). ACT composite score, vocabulary score, high school grade point average, comprehension score, and major consistently were significant with the dependent variables. From Table 2 it can be concluded that the negative relationship between major and achievement found on Table 1 was a result of the high coding for elementary majors who consistently had the lowest mean scores (X) for achievement on all five test scores in a basic skills course in the teaching of reading. Other majors achieved higher mean scores on four of the five test scores. The highest mean score on Test IV was made by special education majors. The Scheffe test, however, revealed that the only statistically significant difference between mean scores was on Test II in which elementary majors had a lower mean score than other majors. The significant correlation of these predictor variables with the dependent variables indicated that these variables may be important when investigating the models for the prediction of performance on each dependent variable. (Tables 1 and 2 on following page.)

CONCLUSIONS

As concluded through analysis of the data, significant correlations existed among achievement on individual and total scores from the four criterion-referenced tests in a basic skills course in the teaching of reading for preservice teachers with the predictor variables of ACT composite score, vocabulary score, high school grade point average, and comprehension score. A significant negative correlation existed between achievement on criterion-reference tests and the predictor variables of major and attitudes toward reading in the library and general reading.

Major was a predictor variable that was significant in the general correlation and the literature (Barter, 1974). A negative
Table 1
Results of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (r) Relating Predictor Variables to Achievement Associated with Understanding of a Basic Skills Course in the Teaching of Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Test I</th>
<th>Test II</th>
<th>Test III</th>
<th>Test IV</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite Score</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/School Related Reading</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Reading in the Library</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Reading in the Home</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/Other Rec. Reading</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude/General Reading</td>
<td>50.57</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Score</td>
<td>27.70</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension Score</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at .05 level ** Significant at .01 level

Table 2
Means (X) and Standard Deviations (S.D.) for Elementary, Special Education, and Other Majors on Five Achievement Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Test Scores</th>
<th>Elementary (E)</th>
<th>Special Education (SE)</th>
<th>Other (O)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test I</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63.23</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test II*</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76.56</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test III</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>75.77</td>
<td>10.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test IV</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76.58</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>307.95</td>
<td>30.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant differences at .05 level (O > E).
relationship existed, however, because the vast number of elementary majors consistently have the lowest scores in achievement and the highest code number among three classifications of majors (48 elementary majors, 6 special education majors, and 7 other majors).

A review of these variables implied a theoretical competency model for achievement on criterion-referenced tests in a basic skills course in the teaching of reading. From this theoretical model and study, additional research should be generated in order to develop prediction equations for achievement in the course mentioned.
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Frequently I observe early childhood education majors who are enrolled in a field-based reading course attempt to help young children learn to infer by the "testing-not-teaching" method. Though well meaning, these soon-to-be teachers are operating under the false assumption that merely asking children enough inference-type questions will eventually result in their ability to infer (cf. Herber & Nelson, 1975). The fallacy of this assumption soon begins to take its toll—both on the teacher intern and on the children. The frustration that ensues is predictable.

On more than one such occasion I have intervened by introducing a listening comprehension guide during our next seminar back on campus. Using a listening comprehension guide to help children learn to make inferences is effective and makes good sense for a couple of reasons:

1) Showing children how to interact with text for the purpose of inferring meaning from it makes more sense than expecting them to improve simply by practicing a skill they've never been taught.

2) "If," as Pearson and Fielding (1982, p. 626) have noted, "we take construction models of language comprehension seriously, then we have to provide children with many opportunities to 'negotiate' a model of meaning for text with the author of that text. Such practice can proceed just as well in a listening as it can in a reading mode."

What follows, then, is a listening procedure for helping even very young children learn how to "negotiate" meaning from an author's implied statements. Before describing this procedure, however, the rationale for selecting listening rather than reading as the preferred mode of instruction is discussed briefly.

Why Listening?

The fact that only a limited number of listening curricula exist in our schools, despite the relatively large amount of time children spend listening, has prompted Pearson and Fielding (1982) to suggest that we consider giving more emphasis to listening activities. Although this is certainly a reasonable suggestion, it was not the primary reason for choosing listening over reading as an instructional mode for teaching young children how to infer.
Rather, it was the preferred language art in this instance because listening comprehension is thought to develop quite naturally in most youngsters (Kean, 1982). Unhindered by the need to concentrate on decoding written text, children who engage in listening activities are free to devote their attention to the inference-making aspects of the comprehension process.

Another reason for choosing listening over reading as a means for helping young children learn to infer is the fact that teachers have the opportunity to select instructional materials without regard for the readability of those materials. This makes it possible to use the many fine trade books written for children, as well as any recordings of those books.

Finally, much of the research on story comprehension (Mandler, 1978; Nezworski, Stein, and Trabasso, 1982) has been conducted with children using a predominantly listening mode. This fact also supports the feasibility of choosing listening over reading as a means of introducing youngsters to the inference-making process.

Getting Started

The first step in planning a listening comprehension guide is to set the purpose for using one. In this instance it will be to involve children in inference-making through a teacher-led discussion. Secondly, it helps to choose instructional materials that lend themselves to the process being taught. Since this article will describe a procedure for helping young children learn to infer, Ezra Jack Keats' The Snowy Day (1962) is especially appropriate.

This well known children's book tells of how Peter awakens one morning to find that a heavy blanket of snow has covered everything while he slept. He goes for a walk by himself and has great fun making tracks in the snow. At one point Peter notices a group of older youngsters who are engaged in a snowball fight. Momentarily, he even considers joining them, but then, sensing that he's not quite old enough, Peter goes off by himself to make a snowman and angels in the snow. He even pretends that he is a mountain climber! Finally, just before entering his warm house, Peter packs a large snowball and puts it in his pocket for tomorrow. Once inside, he tells his mother all about his adventures as she removes his wet clothing. Toward bedtime Peter checks his pocket for the snowball, but his pocket is empty. Sadly, Peter climbs into bed and dreams that the sun has melted all the snow. But the next morning when Peter awakens, he finds that the snow is still everywhere. In fact, new snow is falling! After breakfast Peter calls to his friend across the hall, and together they go out to play.

The Listening Guide

After setting the purpose and choosing the appropriate material, construction of the listening comprehension guide itself can begin. Drawing upon Herber's (1978) concept of the three levels of comprehension, the following guide was constructed to help children identify the necessary information for making an infer-
ence. Although The Snowy Day contains several story segments in which children would be expected to make inferences in order to understand fully the author's intent, only one is illustrated in the guide below. Consequently, only a limited number of statements appear in each of the three levels of comprehension. A good rule of thumb, in fact, is to keep the listening comprehension guide simple, at least initially.

Directions for the teacher "The book that I am going to read to you today is called The Snowy Day. The person who wrote this book is named Ezra Jack Keats. Mr. Keats is an author who likes to write stories for boys and girls your age. Here are some things he might tell you about Peter, the boy in this book."

(Read aloud to the children the three literal level statements below.)

1. Peter took his dog for a walk in the snow. (the distractor sentence)
2. Peter made a snowball and put it in his pocket.
3. Peter went inside his warm house.

"Now, please listen while I read The Snowy Day. As soon as I come to a part that says Peter took his dog for a walk in the snow, or Peter made a snowball and put it in his pocket, or Peter went inside his warm house, raise your hand. Are there any questions about what you are to do?" (Read the entire story without showing the pictures, as they provide too many cues. At some later time, of course, children should be given an opportunity to enjoy the colorful illustrations that accompany this text.)

Commentary. Typically, some children will raise their hands to signify that the author said Peter took his dog for a walk in the snow when in reality, no mention was made of a dog, although Peter did go for a walk by himself. If this misunderstanding occurs it may be helpful to stop reading and briefly discuss what it was that led to the confusion.

A few children may quickly infer (and state orally) that the snowball will melt when Peter puts it in his pocket and then goes inside the warm house. If this occurs, that's fine. It is a natural lead-in to the interpretive level of the guide which is described below. If no such response is forthcoming, the teacher should proceed with the next set of directions.

Directions. "You have done very well to listen for what the author said about Peter. Now, I would like you to pretend that you are detectives. Your job is to figure out what really happened to the snowball that Peter put in his pocket. The author doesn't say, but he gave you some good clues. Tell me what you think the author wanted you to believe happened to the snowball." (Accept all responses; do not indicate your agreement or lack of agreement with any of them at this time. If the following inferences have not been offered after a reasonable length of time, suggest them as possibilities.)
1. Peter's mother found the snowball and put it back outside.
2. The snowball melted in Peter's pocket.

"Good detectives can always describe what clues they have used to solve a mystery. Tell me what clues you used from the story to figure out what happened to Peter's snowball."

Commentary. This section of the listening comprehension guide is responsible for actively involving children in the process of inferring. As they cite evidence from the story and use their past experiences to support either their own hunches or those supplied by the teacher, children are engaged in pulling together valuable pieces of information. For example, children who know that Peter put a snowball in his pocket and also that he entered a warm house shortly thereafter have two pieces of information which, if combined with an appropriate background of experiences, should lead to the correct inference.

The process just described may not occur in some children for any number of reasons. Children, obviously, who lack prior knowledge of the effect of heat on snow will have difficulty making the connection between literal level statements #2 and #3 in the listening comprehension guide.

On the other hand, children who have the appropriate prior knowledge may fail to note the most relevant text data. For example, if the fact that Peter's mother removed his wet clothing had been the focus of these children's attention, it would be reasonable to expect that they might select inference #1 as opposed to #2. According to Nicholson and Imlach's (1981) study of a group of 8-year-olds' ability to infer, "When children do not give the answers teachers expect, it is probably because (some) explicit text data are not as 'competitive' as other, more powerful inferences, suggested by the text" (p. 127).

Directions. "So far you have learned two things to do when you listen to a story. First, you learned to listen carefully to what the author of The Snowy Day really said. Secondly, you learned that sometimes it is necessary to put pieces of information together in order to understand what the author wanted you to know even though he didn't come right out and say it. Now, you will discover how you can use something you already know about to help yourself understand what happened to Peter's snowball. Listen as I read the following sentence."

--Snowcones disappear quickly on a warm summer day.--

"Think about a time when you had a snowcone." (Encourage children to share their experiences. If they don't volunteer information related to the melting and dripping of snowcones exposed to the warm air, bring it up as a topic of conversation.) "Now, tell me how the disappearance of Peter's snowball was like the disappearance of your snowcone. Also, how are the two different?"
Commentary. It is at this third level of comprehension that children are helped to perceive the relevance of what they have inferred from the text. For instance, in the example above the children's knowledge of a common outside-of-school experience was applied to what they had just inferred about Peter's disappearing snowball. Since children rarely relate what they experience on the "outside" to what they learn in school, Herber (1978, p.47) believes that "one value of instruction at this level is that it provides students with a systematic way to incorporate their own experiences and ideas from other sources into what they are learning in school."

Instructional Features

As mentioned earlier, this procedure for teaching early childhood education majors how to help young children learn to infer continues to be effective. In fact, The Snowy Day example provided in this article has been used successfully by undergraduate teacher interns with children as young as kindergarteners. Instructional features that appear to be contributing at least partially to its success are the following three: 1) the flexibility of a listening guide, 2) the substitution of declarative statement for question, and 3) the direct teaching of a listening strategy which actively involves youngsters. A discussion of each of these features, along with some cautionary pointers, is included below.

Flexibility of a guide. As Herber has noted (1978), students' responses to the second level of a comprehension guide—the inferential level—may vary considerably depending on their prior experiences. Because it is neither possible nor desirable to eliminate the influence of prior experiences on the inferences students make, a teacher who is uncomfortable in allowing children to find meanings which differ from his or her own may not benefit from the procedure suggested here. Also, even though the listening guide is divided into three distinct sections, each with its implied order, teachers need to bear in mind that this represents instructional preferences rather than any general principle in cognitive processing. For some teachers' and students' learning styles, for example, starting at the third (applied) level and then moving to the first (literal) and second (interpretive) levels may make more sense (Herber, 1978).

Declarative statements. The reason for using only declarative statements in the listening comprehension guide is based on the notion that it is easier to recognize than recall information. However, as Herber and Nelson (1975) have noted, the use of declarative statements to guide students' comprehension processes initially does not mean that questions should be eliminated once and for all. On the contrary, teachers need to work toward eliminating the need for statements! This can be accomplished over a period of time (differing for the age and ability level of children) by teachers who are sensitive to their students' growth in developing independence.

A final precaution related to using declarative statements is that it is imperative that teachers read the statements to the children prior to reading them the story. To ask students
to react to the statements after listening is to defeat the purpose of a guide. Keeping in mind that the purpose is to help children learn how to infer on their own will help teachers remember that students must be "partners" in the reading/listening process. Sharing with them the reason for using a guide is highly recommended.

Direct teaching. Based on an updating of the research on listening comprehension (Pearson and Fielding, 1982), the direct teaching of listening strategies apparently tends to improve children's listening comprehension. This is particularly true if the children are taught the same skills as those found in the reading curriculum; if they are involved in activities following listening; and if literature is the material of choice. Although no empirical data exist as to its effectiveness, the listening guide described in this article appears to meet all three of the above criteria. That is, the guide was constructed for the purpose of helping children learn to infer, typically a skill taught in the reading comprehension curriculum; it engaged them in active verbal response following listening; and The Snowy Day was a popular piece of children's literature.

Although one might be tempted to conclude that teaching children how to infer through a listening comprehension guide is a skill that will transfer to reading, there is simply no evidence to support such a claim at this time. The jury is still out. However, one can support the use of a listening guide if viewed within the context of one of Pearson and Fielding's (1982, pp. 625-626) recommendations for careful consideration:

We would like to see more emphasis given to listening comprehension as an entity in its own right. We do not think that what is done ought to be very different from good reading comprehension instruction...; but we do think it ought to be done more often as a listening activity. Furthermore, if teachers did this, they would be able to work in more advanced content and skills at an earlier age than they can with reading.
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Since the 1920's, a wealth of data has accumulated on the subject of reversals. In this vast array of studies, such symbol reversal errors as b - d, M - W, 6 - 9, have been the focus of a wide and diverse variety of investigations. Many teachers and researchers have developed programs to remediate reversals (Pollway and Pollway, 1980; Kirshner, 1977; Bracey and Ward, 1980; Harman, 1982; Bannatyne, 1973; Stromer, 1977). These programs utilized a wide range of techniques and methods. The author conducted the following study to investigate the effectiveness of a visual-motor training program for the remediation of symbol reversals.

The program used in this study was an adaptation of the Kirshner Program (1977) for the remediation of symbol reversals. Symbol reversals referred to the misperception of single letters and numbers presented in a correct or left-right reversed spatial orientation as measured by the Jordan Left-Right Reversal Test Level 1 (1974).

Methods and Procedures

Thirty eight first grade students who demonstrated four or more symbol reversal errors (mean score 10.06) on the Jordan Left-Right Reversal Test Level 1 (1974) comprised the sample. These students were taken from seven different classes in two schools in a city. The students were given a series of remedial symbol training lessons by their teachers, 20 minutes per session, three sessions per weeks for eight weeks. They were then posttested at the end of eight weeks with the Jordan Left-Right Reversal Test Level 1 (1974) and the results analyzed.

Treatment

The author expanded the Kirshner Program (1977) to provide remediation for both uppercase and lowercase letters and also to include all the letters that could potentially be perceptually reversed. The following steps for the remediation of symbol reversals were then implemented:

1. The student used the 'magic ruler' of the Kirshner program (1977) modified, to get practice in making the reversed symbol (letter or number) in its correct orientation (Fig.1).

2. The student traced over the correct shape of a large form of the letter or number with his index finger several times,
articulating the letter or number as he traced.

3. The student practiced filling in the large shape of the symbol with smaller versions, without using the 'magic ruler'.

4. The student colored the large symbol after it had been filled in with the smaller versions.

5. The student filled in a sheet containing blank squares with the appropriate symbol in its correct orientation without having access to the symbol, i.e., from memory.

6. In this step which is the criterion or mastery test, the student circled the correct form of the symbol which had been mixed in with an array of jumbled letters or numbers in various orientations.

7. If the student failed at Step 6, he was retaught the process and practiced from step 1 through to step 6 again.

The remedial program is thus based on the principle of providing a visual-motor directional pattern that is error free, right from the start. It is a task-analyzed procedure which gives students practice in recognizing and making the correct form of the symbol. The student is remediated for specific diagnosed symbol reversal errors, and only one error is remediated at a time.

Figure 1  Use of 'Magic Ruler'
Results

The data presented in Table 1 showed the means and differences for pretests and posttests in symbol reversals on the Jordan Left-Right Reversal Test Level 1 (1974).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest Means</th>
<th>Posttest Means</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treated Symbol</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reversers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results thus showed that there was a mean reduction of 3.09 in symbol reversal errors after 8 weeks of training.

In addition to examining the mean difference, a specific contrast was used to explore whether the difference in symbol reversals observed within the group was significant from pretest to posttest. Toward this end, an analysis of variance with repeated measures on the factor (time) was utilized. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contrast</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( T_2 - T_1 /G_1 )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>194.05</td>
<td>26.90</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level

\( G_1 \) = Treated Symbol Reversers  \( T_1 \) = Pretest  \( T_2 \) = Posttest

The above results showed that there was a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence in the reduction of symbol reversals for students in a treated remedial program.

Discussion

The results of the above study seem to indicate that a visual-motor training program which incorporated multisensory techniques is useful in the remediation of symbol reversals in first grade children. However, the teachers in the study reported that students seemed to have also shown a marked improvement in handwriting skills. The possibility for transfer to handwriting and eye-hand coordination skills could be a topic for further investigation.

A visual inspection of the students' test papers indicated that many students corrected the symbol reversals that they had been trained to correct but made a few new reversal errors on
the posttest. This observation seems to imply that the tendency of strong symbol reversers to continue to make symbol reverse errors is persistent. We might in turn infer the possibility of underlying factors such as maturation and cerebral organization at work.

Several teachers also reported that even though some students may have corrected their visual perceptual reversal errors in recognition, they may continue to make written reversals of the same letters or numbers. Thus we may also consider the possibility of a difference between visual perceptual reversals (decoding) and written reversals (encoding).

Conclusions

The results of this study showed that symbol reversals can be remediated with a visual motor training program. However, there is a need to investigate the effects of symbol reversal training programs on other aspects of language arts such as handwriting and reading. The effects of maturational and neurological factors on symbol reversals need to be investigated and also the differences that may exist between decoding and encoding reversals. The results of such investigations may throw some new light on the ubiquitous phenomenon of reversals.
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IS THE INFLUENCE OF
PSYCHOLINGUISTIC RESEARCH
EVIDENT IN PRESERVICE TEACHERS' VIEWS OF THE READING PROCESS?

Mary Jane Gray
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Psycholinguistic research which has been conducted for about twenty years has been persuasive enough to challenge some of the traditional beliefs teachers held about reading instruction. Holdaway (1979) tells us:

Essentially, the psycholinguists insist that reading is not a matter of perceiving or recognizing words first and then getting to meaning but rather that meaning guides and facilitates perception. The influence of meaning in reducing uncertainty greatly limits the amount of visual detail which must be processed and in so doing makes perception more rapid and efficient, while at the same time allowing the greater part of attention to be directed toward comprehending. (p.87)

Goodman (1974), Smith (1975), Clark (1976), Artley (1975) and a number of other investigators have provided sufficient evidence to cause educators to question some traditional methods used in the teaching of reading.

The overall aim of this investigation was to attempt to determine whether the psycholinguistic view of the reading process was being reflected in the views of preservice teachers.

Subject Selection and Procedure

The subjects consisted of two groups of preservice teachers who were preparing to teach elementary school children in regular classrooms or in special education programs, specifically those children with behavior disorders. The students were enrolled in an urban university during the spring semester of the 1981-82 academic year. Their beliefs about reading were checked by asking them to respond to a self-rating scale which was developed by R. D. Robinson, E. J. Goodacre, and M. C. McKenna for their study entitled "Psycholinguistic Beliefs and a Cross-Cultural Study of Teacher Practice." (1978) The scale was based on a verbatim list of statements introduced by F. Smith (1973). T. Bean (1980)

(Author's Note—I wish to acknowledge the contribution of Suganda Tapaneeyangkul, a recent Ed.D. graduate of Loyola University, in helping me to carry out this research project.)
also used this scale for his study entitled, "Can We Update Experienced Teachers' Beliefs and Practices in Reading?"

Table 1
Robinson et al. Rating Scale (1978)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Emphasis</th>
<th>Slight Emphasis</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Moderate Emphasis</th>
<th>Heavy Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Aim for early mastery of rules of reading.

2. Ensure that phonic skills are learned and used.

3. Teach letters or words one at a time, making sure each new letter or word is learned before moving on.

4. Make word-perfect reading the prime objective.

5. Discourage guessing; be sure children read carefully.

6. Encourage the avoidance of errors.

7. Provide immediate feedback.

8. Detect and correct inappropriate eye movements.

9. Identify and give special attention to problem readers as soon as possible.

10. Make sure children understand the importance of reading and the seriousness of falling behind.

11. Take opportunity during reading instruction to improve spelling and written expression and also insist on the best possible spoken English.

12. If the method you are using is unsatisfactory, try another. Always be alert for new materials and techniques.
A teacher holding a psycholinguistic view of the reading process would be expected to respond negatively to the twelve items on the scale. It was hypothesized that the newly prepared teachers would not hold beliefs which show the influence of the psycholinguistic view. It was also hypothesized that there would be no difference in the responses of the elementary teachers and those of the special education teachers.

For the first hypothesis, the categories were arranged in two segments as follows: The No Emphasis/Slight Emphasis was one segment, and the Moderate Emphasis Heavy Emphasis was the other. The uncertain responses were not included. The criterion for evidencing the influence of psycholinguistic research was a mean score of 49% or less Moderate Emphasis/Heavy Emphasis on the scale.

For the second hypothesis a t-test was run to statistically compare the ratings in each of the twelve categories of those preparing to be elementary teachers with those preparing to be special education teachers.

Results

The rating scale was sent to eighty-eight elementary education majors and to forty-nine special education majors. Thirty-seven or 42% of the elementary education majors returned the scale, and twenty-three or 47% of the special education majors returned theirs.

Hypothesis 1: Newly prepared teachers will not hold beliefs about reading which show the influence of recent psycholinguistic research.

As stated previously, the criterion for evidencing the influence of this research was a mean score of 49% or less Moderate Emphasis/Heavy Emphasis on the rating scale. The score for the preservice group as a whole was 70% Moderate Emphasis/Heavy Emphasis thus leading to an acceptance of the hypothesis. This indicates that these students were strongly influenced by traditional views of the reading process.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no difference in the response of the preservice elementary education students and those of the preservice special education students.

There were only three categories in which there was a difference which was significant in the ratings of the elementary education students and those of the special education students.

The first of these was the first category on the scale: "Aim for the early mastery of the rules of reading."

Although both groups of preservice students placed considerable emphasis on this as being important, the mean rating of the elementary students was Heavy Emphasis, while the mean rating of the special education students was Moderate Emphasis. Both of these would be in contradiction with the psycholinguistic principles of reading instruction. The difference was significant at the .01 level.
Table II

"Aim for early mastery of the rules of reading."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>4.2174</td>
<td>-2.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>4.8108</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.015 level

The second category on the rating scale was also one in which the difference was significant at the .01 level.

"Ensure that phonic skills are learned and used."

Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>3.8696</td>
<td>-2.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>4.5135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.010 level

Once again the elementary rating was Heavy Emphasis while the special education rating was Moderate Emphasis. This, too, was in contradiction with psycholinguistic principles.

The third category in which the ratings were different was Number 4 on the scale - "Make word-perfect reading the prime objective."

Table IV

"Make word-perfect reading the prime objective."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>2.2609</td>
<td>-2.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>3.1081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.008 level

The special education rating was Slight Emphasis on this with the elementary rating slightly higher, but below Moderate Emphasis. The difference was significant at the .008 level. Those favoring psycholinguistic principles of reading would place no emphasis on this.

The three categories in which the combined group of preservice
teachers showed greatest agreement with psycholinguistic principles were Numbers 4, 5, and 6 on the scale. They are:

"Make word-perfect reading the prime objective."

"Discourage guessing; be sure children read carefully."

"Encourage the avoidance of errors."

Discussion

It was surprising to note that the teachers still in preparation were the ones who appeared to cling very closely to traditional beliefs about the teaching of reading. This was unexpected since their preparation should reflect the influence of recent psycholinguistic research. Several assumptions might be made as to why this occurred.

1. Preservice students' beliefs are heavily influenced by supervising teachers who may hold to the more traditional beliefs about reading.

2. These preservice students may not have been introduced to psycholinguistic principles in their undergraduate preparation.

3. The preservice students may have leaned heavily on the remembrance of their own reading instruction in the elementary school which was likely traditional in nature.

Number 1 above would not be unusual as it has been pointed out by Austin and Morrison (1963) that the person most heavily influencing preservice teachers is the supervising teacher during the student teaching period.

Number 2 seems highly unlikely since university faculty generally are informed on current research and help their students to become familiar with this research. Certainly reading teachers should know about the psycholinguistic research which has been conducted. Even if university faculty did not familiarize their students with this, there would be few texts for reading methods courses which would not include the psycholinguistic research and the application to reading instruction.

For Number 3, Lortie (1966) has indicated that teaching is the only profession in which an entering individual has had experience observing what it is that members of that profession do. This is true since each individual experiences the influence of teachers for each year that s/he attends school. No one has to imagine what it is that teachers do, all students receive direct exposure to what it is they do. It may or may not be what should be done, but without a doubt, that exposure has an influence on the beliefs and practices of any beginning teacher.

Limitations of Study

Since this study was conducted in one setting, the findings cannot be generalized beyond that setting or beyond the group of individuals responding. It is possible, if a wider sample of students from several universities were asked to complete the survey, that the results would be quite different. It would be well to include a larger sample drawn from more than one teacher
preparation program in future research.

Summary

While it is true that the influence of psycholinguistics is only one influence that has been dominant in recent years, it is a most important one which future teachers should be aware of. Clearly this should be felt in teacher preparation programs. The fact that even this small group of students tended to hold more closely to traditional views of reading should encourage teacher educators to re-examine their preparation programs. Without this background, there is less likelihood of any modifications being made in the instructional programs in reading in our elementary schools. Without a clear view of what the reading process requires a varying levels, modifications cannot be made to meet the needs of children who are learning to read. While every teacher cannot be expected to view reading from the psycholinguistic point of view, every teacher should be aware of and informed about this way of perceiving the act of reading.
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BEYOND BOOK JACKETS: CREATIVE BULLETIN BOARDS TO ENCOURAGE READING

Alan Frager and Janet Valentour
HEIDELBERG COLLEGE, TIFFIN, OHIO

The use of bulletin boards by teachers and librarians for the purpose of motivating students to read is a time-honored and widespread practice. The wisdom of this convention is that the jackets of books displayed on a bulletin board will encourage students to seek out and read the books depicted by the display. Examples of this approach, which can be seen in nearly every North American school and library, owe their effectiveness to the way the book jackets project images of activities that engage young people's interest.

By using techniques that employ these motivating factors in addition to student interest, teachers and librarians can create many new types of bulletin boards which also effectively encourage reading. The additional motivational elements are self-concept, attitude toward reading, and peer influence. The rationale and application of each factor is illustrated through three general bulletin board types.

Interactive Bulletin Boards

The links between positive self-concept and increased motivation to read, and suggestions for improving self-concept through reading, have been described often in the professional literature. Fredericks (1982) included self-concept as an important factor in reading because it helps provide the desire and a will to read. Alexander and Filler (1979) stressed the importance of feedback over a period of time in developing the kind of self-concept which has a positive influence on students' reading. Quick (1973) has explained how success and achievement are related to self-concept development and reading improvement. To the many lists of suggestions for helping students develop and maintain positive self-concept, interactive bulletin boards should be added.

Bulletin boards for which students' reading behaviors over a period of time are accompanied by changes in the display may be called interactive. An example is Color Your Life With Books. The display consists of a collection of crayon boxes each bearing the name of a student, and a category marked "key", which shows different cutout and colored crayons for different book categories (red for romance, blue for biography, etc.). When students finish reading a book, they write the name of the book on an appropriately colored crayon and put it in their crayon box.
A variation of this type of bulletin board is Reading Opens Many Doors, a display consisting of cutout doors, each corresponding to a different book category. Students read books, they write the name of their book and their own name inside the appropriate door, or make a new door when a new category is needed.

Interactive bulletin boards contribute to developing positive student self-concept in several ways. First, student names are displayed on the bulletin board, promoting the students' sense of belonging in the class. Second, students' names are displayed in a positive way, i.e., in association with books. Additionally, as the students finish books and interact with the display, the bulletin board provides constant feedback related to the students' achievement.

Integrative Bulletin Boards

Displays in which books and reading are integrated into conventional bulletin board themes may be called integrative bulletin boards. The value of these bulletin boards is their potential to build positive attitudes toward reading, motivating children to read. This potential is illustrated by three different integrative bulletin boards each relating to one of the three dimensions of reading attitude as identified by Teale (1981).

Displays which integrate books and reading into the conventional "proverbial message" bulletin board are allied with the individual development dimension of students' attitude toward reading, which Teale defines as "the value placed on reading as a means of gaining insight into self, others, and/or life in general." An example is It's What's Inside That Counts, an integrative bulletin board that illustrates the title by depicting a shy but thoughtful child in patched clothes reading a book whose tattered pages have seen better days. The child's expression of intelligence and reserve carries the double message that people and books are worth "getting into".

An integration of reading and books into conventional subject area "informational" bulletin boards helps to develop the reading attitude dimension which Teale has described as utilitarian, or "the value placed on the role of reading for attaining educational or vocational success... ." To create this type of integrative bulletin board teachers and librarians first need to identify reading resources (such as books, newspaper and magazine articles, reference materials) which are related to the topic of the informational bulletin board. Then these resources in the form of lists, book jackets, magazine covers, newspaper articles, or whatever are incorporated into the display. An example is a geography bulletin board that incorporates references to informational books on a shelf below with a map display of the regions of the Southern Hemisphere.

To foster the enjoyment of reading, which is Teale's third dimension of reading attitude, reading and books can be integrated into bulletin boards which have "holiday" themes. Both Thanksgiving and Christmas bulletin boards could read Wish For a Book with only slight changes in the display.
The considerable power of peer influence is the operative factor in encouraging reading by means of bulletin boards which display student reading choices. To make effective use of the finding of Anderson and Lawson (1981), that children are more likely to influence the reading choices of other children than either librarians or teachers, bulletin board displays could highlight in clear and large print the names of the books children are reading or have read. Such a display should be placed at the students' eye level in a conspicuous part of the classroom. One example of a student display bulletin board is The Reader rea u e, a dinosaur whose scales are construction paper strips on which are written in dark, large letters the name of a student and the book s/he has read.

Another example is The Sky Is the Limit in Reading, in which a blue sky bordered by a rainbow is filled with fluffy white clouds and airplanes, each displaying the name of a student and the book read.

The description of the three types of bulletin boards above is not to suggest that displays incorporating two or even all three of the motivating factors cannot be created. In fact, they can and should be. In utilizing the ideas presented in this article, teachers and librarians should feel encouraged to go beyond book jackets and create original bulletin boards which employ many motivational factors that encourage reading.
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"What kind of person do you think this character is?" A familiar question which, more than occasionally, results in answers such as, "nice, happy, mean, good, etc." Discussion with many teachers indicate that such superficial responses persist through the grades with some children, especially those who encounter problems when reading.

Understanding the problem

Herber & Nelson (1970) wrote that questioning, in general, does not inherently help children develop comprehension skills. For example, if a child cannot answer a question to show that s/he has some insight into a character's behavior, the question does not give clues on how to gain such insight. Durkin (1977) describes such questioning as assessment since it really tells a teacher whether or not a skill implied by a question was mastered previously. Her research suggests that these types of questioning sessions occur regularly in elementary classrooms.

Bloom (1976) feels that new learning cannot take place unless the child has the necessary prerequisite knowledge, and just as important, that this prerequisite knowledge is available "at the time it is required in the specific new learning task." (p. 33) For Bloom availability essentially means that children can remember and use applicable prior learning. To move beyond questioning strategies perhaps we need to identify, in a more systematic manner, the prerequisite knowledge a child will need to answer specific questions. In the case of understanding characters, it seems reasonable that this knowledge would include that of the vocabulary used to describe behavior and emotions along with some appropriate response models for answering teacher questions.

Developing the vocabulary and making it available

Most children have some vocabulary which they use to discuss story characters. To gather a master list of vocabulary words, teachers in each classroom of an elementary school can be asked to conduct brainstorming sessions. During these sessions, children try to think of as many words as possible that can be used to describe how characters behave in stories. Teachers accept and record all responses and they can add words of their own. These class lists are combined and edited, and all the words are subjectively grouped to facilitate their use. This same process can
Character Traits List—Example 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fun</th>
<th>sad</th>
<th>scary</th>
<th>selfish</th>
<th>cranky</th>
<th>weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>playful</td>
<td>happy</td>
<td>friendly</td>
<td>frightened</td>
<td>unselfish</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>unfriendly</td>
<td>gentle</td>
<td>sneaky</td>
<td>clumsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>unkind</td>
<td>sweet</td>
<td>jealous</td>
<td>nosy</td>
<td>greedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bossy</td>
<td>nice</td>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td>foolish</td>
<td>lucky</td>
<td>grumpy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tidy</td>
<td>funny</td>
<td>honest</td>
<td>clever</td>
<td>polite</td>
<td>jolly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sloppy</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>helpless</td>
<td>bashful</td>
<td>lazy</td>
<td>grouchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>messy</td>
<td>shy</td>
<td>loving</td>
<td>curious</td>
<td>quiet</td>
<td>bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silly</td>
<td>odd</td>
<td>brave</td>
<td>merry</td>
<td>noisy</td>
<td>careless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>smart</td>
<td>proud</td>
<td>cheerful</td>
<td>lonely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caring</td>
<td>strict</td>
<td>patient</td>
<td>gossip</td>
<td>lenient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thoughtful</td>
<td>stubborn</td>
<td>mannerly</td>
<td>lively</td>
<td>boisterous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thoughtless</td>
<td>loyal</td>
<td>humble</td>
<td>daring</td>
<td>creative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likable</td>
<td>popular</td>
<td>dull</td>
<td>bold</td>
<td>vain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generous</td>
<td>mischievous</td>
<td>sincere</td>
<td>mulish</td>
<td>heartless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naughty</td>
<td>terrible</td>
<td>cowardly</td>
<td>mysterious</td>
<td>meek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gabby</td>
<td>horrible</td>
<td>cowardly</td>
<td>mysterious</td>
<td>meek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cruel</td>
<td>grateful</td>
<td>lovable</td>
<td>hateful</td>
<td>spiteful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasty</td>
<td>worried</td>
<td>wild</td>
<td>understanding</td>
<td>inquisitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rude</td>
<td>trusting</td>
<td>forgetful</td>
<td>responsible</td>
<td>stern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impolite</td>
<td>eager</td>
<td>nervous</td>
<td>organized</td>
<td>studious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strange</td>
<td>obedient</td>
<td>talented</td>
<td>graceful</td>
<td>prejudiced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weird</td>
<td>considerate</td>
<td>witty</td>
<td>responsible</td>
<td>anxious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>decent</td>
<td>conceited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moody</td>
<td>joyful</td>
<td>boastful</td>
<td>sensible</td>
<td>casual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emotions List—Example 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>scared</th>
<th>cheery</th>
<th>thankful</th>
<th>puzzled</th>
<th>puzzled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sad</td>
<td>surprised</td>
<td>amazed</td>
<td>ashamed</td>
<td>disappointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glad</td>
<td>pleased</td>
<td>excited</td>
<td>horrified</td>
<td>concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mad</td>
<td>dumb</td>
<td>eager</td>
<td>furious</td>
<td>glum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td>playful</td>
<td>confused</td>
<td>shocked</td>
<td>calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silly</td>
<td>homesick</td>
<td>upset</td>
<td>embarrassed</td>
<td>guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>angry</td>
<td>unhappy</td>
<td>impatient</td>
<td>delighted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind</td>
<td>jolly</td>
<td>jealous</td>
<td>discouraged</td>
<td>dejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lucky</td>
<td>proud</td>
<td>bored</td>
<td>heart broken</td>
<td>startled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disgusted</td>
<td>annoyed</td>
<td>envious</td>
<td>exasperated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tense</td>
<td>dumbfounded</td>
<td>outraged</td>
<td>disoriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depressed</td>
<td>nauseated</td>
<td>overwhelmed</td>
<td>shattered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>astonished</td>
<td>inspired</td>
<td>petulant</td>
<td>distraught</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

be used to gather words that describe how characters might feel.

Once classrooms receive copies of these master lists, teachers can begin to make them accessible through the use of charts, word banks, individual copies, and so forth.

Providing appropriate response models

Knowing how to respond to a question is not always clear to a child even when s/he has some of the information needed for the answer. Using the schoolwide vocabulary lists, a teacher can
begin building personal vocabularies. Children learn to match vocabulary words from the lists with specific behaviors, etc. Discussions of fairytales and other familiar stories can be helpful when used in conjunction with these matching activities. Next, children can match vocabulary words with characters from stories they are currently reading, justifying their choices by describing appropriate character behaviors.

As children become comfortable finding and isolating the specific actions of characters that give clues to traits and emotions, more general comprehension strategies can be utilized. Those strategies that children can eventually learn to use on their own are especially useful. Some suggested strategies are as follows:

1. **Think Links/Semantic Webbing (Wilson 1981)** This strategy shows children how to gather and organize their ideas on paper. It facilitates easy self-evaluation and revision as information is processed. It can be used at all levels.

2. **Personal Outlining Strategy (Wilson 1981)** This strategy requires children to decide what is most important about a topic and find evidence to support their choices. It is especially effective in grades four and above.

3. **Story Frame Approach (Fowler 1982)** Using the structure of a paragraph, children gather information that could make sense with the story frame model. This model remains constant so that children can use it repeatedly with new stories. It can be used at all levels.

**Summary**

Analyzing story characters can be a difficult task, especially for children who encounter problems when reading. By providing a systematic study of characters that goes beyond individual stories, teachers can help children develop skills that may be prerequisites for the task. Schoolwide participation in activities such as developing vocabulary banks and teaching general comprehension strategies are some of the ways that this goal may be accomplished.
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A WORKSHOP TO INCORPORATE LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT IN TEACHING READING

Dixie D. Sanger and Sheldon L. Stick
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA, LINCOLN

Speech-language pathologists and educators in Elementary Education are becoming increasingly aware of the need to include specific speech and language activities as a part of regular classroom instruction (Andrews & Brabson, 1977; England, 1973; Jones, 1972; Pickering & Kaelber, 1978; Simon, 1975). This increased interest is related to: (1) the relationship between language and reading skills (Mattingly, 1972; Smith, 1975; Snyder, 1981; Stark, 1975; Stark & Wallach, 1981; Wiig & Semel, 1976); (2) the relationship between language development and academic success (Carlson, Gruenwald, & Myberg, 1981; England, 1973; Nelson, 1981); (3) the relationship between reading skills and cognitive development (Gallagher & Quandt, 1981; Jenkins & Heliotis, 1981; Sawyer and Lipa, 1981); and, (4) the documentation that phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics are integral components to a reading program (Anastasiow, 1970; Goodman, 1974; Magee & Newcome, 1978; McDonnel, 1975; Monroe & Rogers, 1964; Smith, 1975; Snyder, 1980; Vogel, 1977; Wiig & Semel, 1976).

It is the purpose of this paper to describe a workshop designed to teach elementary school teachers how to incorporate language development activities during reading instruction, particularly with children who have language-based reading difficulties. This integrative reading-language program is carried out in a regular classroom setting and illustrates how teachers can help students improve their language skills and concomitantly gain more meaning from their printed texts by improving the use of predicting, confirming, and integrating strategies during reading instruction. The main themes of the workshop are: a rationale for the relationship between reading and language; the integrative language activities; general guidelines for implementing the integrative reading-language approach; and a workshop evaluation.

A Rationale for the Integrative Language-Reading Approach

Many students have reading problems because of covert associated or primary language deficiencies despite an apparent ability to communicate with peers and family members. Such children might not understand how given lexical units can be used and combined in multiple linguistic contexts, and therefore be unfamiliar with the vocabulary and the complexity of the syntax in their reading books even though they can read words and use them in restricted contexts. The result is a failure to understand the printed text
Despite relatively good communication ability. Such language problems may interfere with the intake of information, the development of propositions, utilization of given and new information, matching the new information with the given information in long-term memory storage, and subsequently storing the new information in memory (Clark & Clark, 1977).

Illustrations of the importance of language in the reading process are the following statements which appear in children's textbooks: (1) "John went to the circus with his sister and father; there he saw elephants and clowns"; (2) "How do you think Betty and Tom feel about what father is doing for Susan?"; (3) "We are going to pick a card from each set and write a number sentence to tell the number of circles on the cards we have chosen." These three sentences involve concepts of space, time, classification, seriation, number, social knowledge, and physical knowledge. Additionally, the syntax is complex and tends to be confusing, because of abstract concepts such as: think, feel, about. Examples of other abstract concepts which frequently appear in children's reading texts include before, below, between, bottom, closed, fewer, fifth, inside, longer, last, more, smaller, top, up, and zero. Children with language problems might experience varying degrees of frustration and/or failure with reading because of unfamiliarity with some words, or because of confusion or inability to comprehend the underlying meaning of phrases and/or sentences.

The relationship between language and reading becomes more evident as one examines some of the correlates of reading. Correlates are not synonymous with causes but rather are conditions which often accompany an inability to read. They can be grouped into three broad categories: physical, environmental, and psychological, and include visual processing and sensory deficits, poor school experiences, cultural differences, language differences or disorders, emotional and social problems, and auditory processing and sensory deficits (Kirk, Kleibhan, & Lerner, 1978).

It is also interesting to note that many factors important for reading readiness are important for normal language development (mental maturity, visual and auditory abilities, thinking skills, social and emotional group, and interest and motivation). Menyuk (1973) states that language is the foundation for reading and there is a similarity in the acquisition of both abilities. To normally acquire spoken language, children must have the capacity for perceiving, storing, and retrieving information which then is arranged into a system of verbally articulated symbols. The ability to process auditory perceptions meaningfully is dependent upon the conventional knowledge of lexicon and sentence formation rules. Becoming a proficient reader requires a similar process but uses the visual modality.

Professionals need to recognize that the processes involved in reading include a number of skills, and many of them are influenced by a child's development of language. Children with adequate or better language abilities usually become good readers through subconscious applications of language strategies, and they can benefit from teaching approaches that do not maximize
the consistent use of selected language activities. However, for children with speech and language deficiencies or differences, a deliberate effort to interweave language activities oftentimes is needed to teach reading skills. Such children might have different learning strategies, variable rates of linguistic development because of inconsistent cognitive maturation, or be at a disadvantage because of acquired attitudinal and/or environmental factors. A program which provides for dynamic interactive growth in language must attempt to integrate, not separate reading lessons and language development (Squire, 1972).

Professionals studying the reading process have advocated a need for adopting innovative language and reading enrichment programs which help strengthen children's thinking and verbal language skills (Athey, 1971; Kirkland, 1978; Rakes & Canter, 1974; Smith, 1975), but literature references to such programs are scarce. Simpson-Tyson (1978) reported on the earlier research of Francis, Loban, Labov, Hall, Turner, & Chomsky who all urged professionals to consider the benefits of oral language activities when planning elementary curricula. Other authors (Schneyer, 1970) urged that children be afforded opportunities to expand their cognitive and linguistic skills when learning to read, while Kirk, et. al. (1978) stressed that educators be concerned with the variables of motivation and interest; factors that are difficult to manipulate but that can be addressed by involving children in oral language activities during reading instruction.

Integrative Language Activities

"An Integrative Approach to Reading, Incorporating Language Spelling and Math", developed and implemented by Sanger and Doyle (1976) was described during the workshop. The approach illustrated how the following language activities could be incorporated systematically into reading instruction: following directions, practice speaking in sentences, using correct grammatical structures, increasing vocabulary development, identifying nonsense statements, recognizing cause and effect, problem solving, dramatization, categorization and interpreting action in pictures. The activities were designed to be suggestive rather than prescriptive. Speech-language clinicians and other professionals were encouraged to creatively modify them to meet their children's needs.

Based upon the Sanger & Doyle (1976) initial work, and several subsequent applied modifications, the protocol and materials for the current workshop were developed. It focused on integrating four language activities into children's reading lessons by using the stories and information from their reading texts. Following Verbal Directions was defined as listening and following the verbal message given by a teacher. Describing Objects or Pictures was defined as looking at selected pictures from a reading lesson and providing a verbal description. Defining Words included telling what designated words meant. Emphasis was on describing function, shape, size, color, composition, synonyms, naming parts, comparison and categorization. Retelling Stories required a child to listen to or read a story and retell it to a teacher. Based upon an evaluation (Sanger, 1981) of the techniques recommended by Sanger and Doyle (1976), the above four activities were found to be most
successful for providing teachers with a means for simultaneously stimulating language development while teaching reading.

General Guidelines for Implementation

Several types of training activities were utilized to help the workshop participants understand and apply the integrative reading-language approach. First, background literature illustrating the relationships between language and reading was reviewed. Second, definitions of the four language behaviors and examples of how they could be integrated with curriculum texts were distributed. Third, the participants used their school's reading texts and practiced developing activities for each language behavior. Initially they wrote their ideas. Later, they orally described how they could incorporate the activities into the children's reading lessons and practiced by role-playing. Fourth, using transparencies the participants were afforded many opportunities to identify activities. Following this exercise they were tested on their knowledge of the material presented during the workshop. Participants were given examples of language behavior and were asked to identify whether the activities were examples of following directions, describing pictures or objects, defining words, or retelling stories. At the conclusion of the workshop each participant was provided with a document containing descriptions of all materials covered during the workshop including a review of literature, definitions of the four language behaviors and examples of how to incorporate them into a reading lesson, sample lesson plans, and guidelines for implementing the approach which included:

1. Use of simplified instructions which the children could understand;
2. Use of visual cues coupled with the verbal counterpart;
3. Opportunities and time for verbal responses;
4. Use of moral support and verbal cues whenever necessary;
5. Initial acceptance of short or concrete answers from the children;
6. Rephrasing the children's responses into concise and descriptive words through the use of modeling;
7. Providing the children with opportunities for achieving success rather than having them participate in activities that would result in failure (Sanger & Doyle, 1976).

Evaluation of the Workshop

On two separate occasions quasi-experimentally designed studies have been conducted with teachers who implemented the integrative reading-language approach described in the 90-minute workshop. The subjects included a total of 43 second and third grade low-reading students who were instructed with the integrative reading-language approach, and 39 children who served as the controls. These two studies involved participation from five elementary schools each having an experimental and control subgroup
from different classrooms. Each experimental and control subgroup had been instructed by a different teacher resulting in five experimental and five control teachers. During both experiments the treatment in the experimental subgroups was implemented over a fourteen week period.

Observational findings, descriptive and inferential statistics, and informal interviews have provided supportive evidence that the workshop has been successful. Charted data collected on fixed-interval schedules for both experimental and control teachers revealed that the teachers who participated in the workshop initiated more than twice as many language behavior opportunities during reading instruction as their control counterparts. Interestingly, the primary activity the control teachers implemented, despite the fact they had not received the training, was following directions. Also of interest was that the control teachers frequently used the teacher manual that accompanied a reading text, and gave directions to the children that often contained lengthy and complex syntax in addition to many abstract concepts.

Analyses of covariance have revealed that statistically significant differences existed between the experimental and control subgroups for subtests measuring vocabulary development, syntactic skills, reading directions of schoolwork, and retelling stories. However, in several instances statistically significant interactions occurred between the experimental and control subgroups. These findings suggested that the relative degree of success or non-success of the workshop was accounted for by a teacher variable. Furthermore, observational recordings suggested that the positive results with the integrative reading-language model was related to the extent and amount of treatment provided throughout the duration of a study. (See Table, next page)

Based upon information obtained during informal interviews conducted with the experimental teachers after the studies, and a number of others who did not participate in controlled studies, the following conclusions have been drawn. The workshop was instrumental in heightening their awareness to the importance of language development in teaching reading. Second, the language behavior activities were developed readily by the teachers and incorporated into the reading lessons. Third, retelling of stories was viewed as the most beneficial language behavior for improving reading skills. Fourth, the teachers reported that children who received the instruction demonstrated the greatest improvement in their attending, listening, and verbal skills.

Summary

Controlled research supporting the approach described in this paper is in an incipient stage, and the results are encouraging. The approach illustrates compliance with the legislative act PL 95-561; Title II; The Basic Skills Improvement Act which advocates that efforts be made to facilitate the development of the basic reading, mathematics, and oral and written communication into an academic curriculum. The approach allows children who are low readers to use their existing language and develop meaning from what is heard or read during their reading lessons. Further-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Following Verbal Directions</th>
<th>Understanding Action in Pictures</th>
<th>Describe Objects or Pictures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Event observation recordings of the behavioral language responses from 45 third grade and 39 second grade subjects who were low readers—Recorded 9-16-80 to 11-25-80 and 1-27-80 to 4-14-82.
the approach encourages teachers to develop students' existing language potential, to monitor their logical thinking, and improve their sequential memory skills through the retelling of stories. Finally, by providing opportunities for participation and use of existing language, children tend to become more motivated toward the reading experience. This reading instruction model allows teachers to use any reading text and create many opportunities for language-based low readers to improve their reading skills while building vocabulary and understand content through exposure to a variety of listening, thinking, and communicative situations. It is believed that implementation of the information in the workshop could lead to the creation of more dynamic teaching with more actively involved learners.
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...There stood Peter and Edmund and all the rest of Aslan's army fighting desperately against the crowd of horrible creatures whom she had seen last night; ...in the daylight, they looked even stranger and more evil and deformed...

(p. 173)

Thus, author C. S. Lewis, in The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe (1970), depicts the evil characters by ascribing to them physical disabilities. In doing so, Lewis perpetuates the negative portrayals of the disabled that exist in much of children's and adolescent and even adult literature—both classical and contemporary.

This article will aversions toward the disabled that still prevail and reasons why they exist. Surveyed literature will show where negative stereotypes of disabled appear, and literature in which characters are realistically portrayed. We will examine the efforts of basal publishers to adequately represent the disabled. The conclusion will present criteria for selecting reading materials in which non-stereotyped characters are depicted. Names of books about characters with impairments are not included because comprehensive annotated bibliographies like Notes from a Different Drummer (Baskin & Harris, 1977) and The Bookfinder (Dreyer, 1977, 1981) are available.

Aversions Toward the Disabled

Authors and readers alike—unless they have been exposed to disabling conditions—tend to use the terms "disability" and "handicap" as synonyms. However, "disability" refers to a medical condition whereas "handicap" implies a barrier. "Handicap" is thought to have been derived from the time when people who were disabled had no choice but to beg in the streets, cap in hand. And, in doing so, they were avoided by the nondisabled (Interracial Books for Children Bulletin, 1977).

Avoidance of the disabled still exists. Studies (Roessler and Bolton, 1978, p. 12) indicate the reasons:

...1) non-disabled persons are fearful of disablement, dis-
figurement, loss of sensory capacity, loss of self-control, etc.; 2) therefore, contact with afflicted persons causes intense discomfort and arouses anxiety; and 3) hence, disabled persons are avoided and efforts are made to segregate them and isolate them.

Or, as Cohen (1977) writes, the nondisabled fear "handicap germs." Such aversions signify "handicappism."

Another reason the disabled are frequently targets of "handicappism," just as many of us experience the negative results of "ageism" and "sexism," is that as readers—whether as children, adolescents, or adults—we read books in which the disabled often are depicted in certain categories (Moore, 1983):

As evil, sinister, and perpetrators of insidious acts; as the brunts of cruel actions by the unthinking; and/or as passive, always cheerful, and dependent.

According to Cohen (1977, p. 151), such "...presentations [of characters] ...foster negative beliefs, feelings, and/or behavioral tendencies toward the disabled." In addition, many such character portrayals suggest "...wicked things to be shunned or banished" (Reynales, 1976, p. 16). Shurtleff and Monson (1978), confirming the effects of negative characterizations, found that younger children associated the prosthesis used by Captain Hook in Peter Pan (Barrie, 1950) with the sinister character of Hook. And we readers accept, consciously or unconsciously, the exclusionary attitudes conveyed in this literature.

Stereotypical Characters

Some literature reveals the stereotypical portrayals of characters with disabilities. Shakespeare conveys King Richard's evilness through his deformed figure. The Grimm brothers collected folk tales that contain grim-visaged, deformed witches with poor eyesight who commit insidious acts upon innocent children. Charles Dickens' Tiny Tim—unwaveringly kind, considerate and passive—declares his wish that the churchgoers see him because he is crippled. Born one-eyed, humpbacked, and lame, Quasimodo, in Victor Hugo's The Hunchback of Notre Dame is an object who is rejected by society because of his hideousness. In the book, Heidi (Spyri, 1980, p. 73), Klara, Heidi's best friend, is referred to as an "...invalid who never goes out [but who is] seldom impatient..." Stevenson, in Treasure Island, depicts the one-legged Long John Silver and the blind beggars as symbols of evil and, subliminally perhaps, suggests that the disabled should be avoided and not trusted.

Tales of the past reflect "...an association between beauty and value..." (Cohen, 1977, p. 151). The stories also imply that the disabled "...are different...apart [from society]...and that disablements are "...punishments we bring upon ourselves by our sinful behavior" (p. 152).

Handicappist stereotypes appear in some contemporary literature in which are found disabled characters. Neufield, in his book Twink (1970), dehumanizes Twink and her friend who have cere-
bral palsy. They are described as "...twisted...scarecrow figures ...[who make] chortles...almost happy sounds" (p. 5). Neufield’s picture of Twink—blind, severely disabled, but extremely intelligent—is unrealistic and maudlin. In The Pirate Who Tried To Capture the Moon (Haseley, 1983), the sinister nature of the pirate is depicted through his eyepatch, thereby associating blindness and evilness, a recurrent theme in literature.

Realistic Portrayals

Although the majority of the examples of disabled characters in contemporary literature "...are bad" (Cohen, 1977, p. 151), some fiction contains positive descriptions of characters with disabilities. The authors of the latter make no attempts to hide the characters' weaknesses, but, concurrently, their strengths are revealed as they successfully cope. These characters do not symbolize evil; they are active and independent, and, as in real life, not always cheerful. Nor are they always completely accepted by the non-disabled—as in real life.

In Winning (Brancato, 1977), Gary Madden, paralyzed in a football accident, experiences many negative emotions about his future. His friends, when they visit him and uncertain of what to do, joke with one another and ignore Gary. Such experiences illustrate the indications of the Roessler and Bolton study (1978) mentioned above. Fourteen-year-old Margaret, in A Dance to Still Music (Corcoran, 1974), encounters the isolation often imposed by deafness. Angered by the insensitivity of school friends and her mother, Margaret retorts that others are blind, physically disabled, but, eventually, are accepted, thereby indicating her fight for acceptance. Ron Jones, author of The Acorn People (1976), in an account of his experiences as a counselor at a camp for the disabled, admits thinking that his close association with these disabled campers could poison him—a further validation of the Roessler and Bolton study. He vacillates as he considers quitting his job but finally determines to remain; happy that he stays, he recounts his final day with "The Acorn People" whom he describes as "...mountain climbers" (p. 78).

Basal Publishers

Publishers of basal readers, used in about 95 per cent of the schools in this country, have done little to represent the disabled in basal literature. A recent study (Hopkins, 1982, p. 31) indicates that of 4,656 selections appearing in the most recent editions of 12 major basals, "...only 39 stories dealt with any types of handicapping conditions." Because of the dearth of stories about characters with disabilities, it is "...possible that a child might be exposed to only one story about a handicapped person in six years of school" (p. 31). Blindness was the most commonly represented disability in the 39 stories. Yet, according to the Digest of Education Statistics: 1977–78, the blind comprise less than 0.05 per cent of the total school population.

Among the findings of Hopkins' study was the revelation that certain publishers "...will depict more handicapped characters making positive contributions to society." One such publisher,
simply to meet California requirements, has altered the illustrations in its current series: A hearing aid is depicted on a boy, a leg brace on a girl. Other changes include a girl with metal support crutches, a rocking chair changed to a wheelchair, a boy with a leg brace making a list at a table.

The impact on the portrayal of the disabled through such cosmetic changes as the aforementioned and the inclusion of only 39 stories about the disabled is questionable. The real impact on the attitudes of the non-disabled toward the disabled can occur only when readers are exposed to literature—in books and basals—in which the areas of life that are difficult are understood, and in which characters with disabilities "...represent individuals who cope with real feelings and frustrations" (Huck, 1979, p.421).

Criteria for Selecting Literature

Readers should be exposed to literature in books and basals in which there appear disabled characters. But these readers must possess the ability to distinguish between literature in which the disabled symbolize stereotypes and the literature in which characters with disabilities are portrayed realistically (Raskin and Harris, 1977). Exposure to accurate portrayals may best be achieved through the use of certain criteria for selecting appropriate literature.

The following criteria are taken from guidelines formulated by the National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped (1977, n.p.):

1. Characters with disabilities should be depicted as participants in diverse but integrated activities rather than in isolated activities that evolve from the disabilities. In real life, persons with disabilities are rapidly mainstreaming themselves. Readers should seek literature in which the disabled are presented in mainstreamed situations.

2. Characters with disabilities should not be described in terms that could be construed as discriminatory. Words such as "lame," "mute," "pathetic" (when it refers to a disabled character), and figurative expressions such as "blind as a bat," "deaf as a doornail," and "crazy as a loon" would be considered discriminatory. And the character portrayals probably would be inaccurate.

3. The literature should depict non-disabled and disabled characters in mutually beneficial interaction. Characters with disabilities should not always be illustrated as the recipients of charitable acts by the non-disabled.

4. The literature should provide role models for the disabled who read the material. It should also enable both the disabled and the non-disabled to read about characters who cope with disabilities realistically.

5. The literature should not emphasize any difference between those with disabilities and those without. Such differences could be noted only if necessary.
Other criteria that will provide readers with the ability to differentiate between literature in which the characters are stereotyped and that in which they are not include the following (Moore, 1979, n.p.):

1. The specialized terminology in the literature must be accurate. Materials in which only vague words describe disabling conditions may indicate that the authors lack the credentials essential for conveying accurate messages.

2. The literature must not imply maudlinism, pity, nor other negative sentiments.

Conclusion

The potential for affecting change in avoidance of the disabled by the non-disabled lies in books and basals dealing with disablement. Ranging from picture books to adult fiction, literature can be utilized in altering attitudes. Such literature, however, must not contain stereotypical characters who convey negative images that only foster handicappism. Literature must accurately portray the disabled.

REFERENCES


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ISSUE NUMBER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Application of Culturally Relevant Factors to Literacy Programs in Appalachia (Marcia Baghban, W.V.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing and Extending Comprehension: Monitoring Strategies in the Classroom (Amos H. Hahn, MD)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Reading: More Than Talk Written Down (Janice A. Dole, Colo.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Book Jackets: Creative Bulletin Boards to Encourage Reading (Alan Frager and Janet Valentour, Ohio)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking the Emotional Barrier Through the Bibliotherapeutic Process (Dan T. Ouzts, SC)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Linguistic Insight: What We Think We Know (Camille Blachowicz, Ill.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Students Reading to Preschoolers (David Hayes, Va.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Comparative Study of Educators' Perceptions and Use of Mandated Reading Assessments (Charles K. Kinzer and Ruth J. Stone, TN)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Comparison of Children's Ability to Define and Apply Phonics Terms (Lynn J. Moore and John H. Litcher, N.C.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Model for Preservice Teachers in a Basic Skills Course in Reading (Mary Sue Eckert, OH, and John Wollenberg, MS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispelling the Mystery About Comprehension: Kintsch's Model and Implications (Donald J. Richgels, LSU)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Issue Number</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Effectiveness of SSR: An Overview of the Research</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(K.D. Wiesendanger, Alfred Univ., and Elled D. Birlem, Knoxville, TN)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Effects of a Visual-Motor Training Program on the Symbol Reversal Errors of First Grade Children (Bernard L. Heydorn, Univ. of West Indies, Trinidad)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing Independent Vocabulary Growth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dixie Lee Spiegel, Univ. of Nor. Car.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Children Develop Reading Competency for the Twenty-First Century (Donald C. Cushenbery, Univ. of Nebr.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Inquiry Into Summer Loss in Reading: Grades 1–7 (Jerry Johns, Nor. Ill., Richard T. Vacca, Kent State, OH)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Motivation and Feelings of College Students in the Developmental Program (Anne M. Ferguson, Joe Bitner, Southeastern Louisiana Univ., Hammond)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the Influence of Psycholinguist Research Evident in Preservice Teachers' Views of the Reading Process? (Mary Jane Gray, Loyola of Chicago)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Phonics Naturally: A Model for Instruction (Barbara Johnson, Nat. College of Educ, Ill., Linda Lehnert, Widener Univ. Chester, PA)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Look at the Future: Teachers in Non-Traditional Adult Reading Programs (Thomas R. Schnell &amp; Richard W. Burnett, Univ. of Missouri, St. Louis)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Reading Development and the Evaluative process: A Call to Action (Nicholas P. Criscuolo, New Haven, CT)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Identifying With Characters for Motivation in Reading Stories (Samuel A. Perez, Univ. of TX, Arlington)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Language and Reading Development for Two Vietnamese Children (Diane J. Sawyer, Syracuse Univ., Brenda Weaver, Little Falls, New York)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>ISSUE NUMBER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Aloud to Preschoolers Age 3-6: A Review of the Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sandra McCormick, Ohio State Univ.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read First, Test Later: Meeting the Needs of the 'Overskilled' Reader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Karen D. Wood, Univ. of North Carolina)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dixie Lee Spiegel, Univ. of Nor. Car.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Reading Readiness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Beverly B. Swanson, East Carolina Univ.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Gains in a College Reading Laboratory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Charles E. Heerman, Kansas State Univ.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Interests of Gifted Children</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sue Hawkins, Trinity Univ., San Antonio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Program Evaluation: A Plan for</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Implementation (Richard D. Robinson, Univ. of MO, and Joyce Hulett, Columbia, MO, Public Schools)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Schoolwide Program to Help Children</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze Story Characters (Gerald L. Fowler, Dir. of Rdg, Carlisle, Penna.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Simplified Miscue Analysis for Classroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Clinic (James Cunningham, Univ of NC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Thoughts on Systematic Reading Readiness Instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(J. Michael Palardy, University of Alabama)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR, Accountability, and Effective Reading Instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Mark C. Sadoski, Texas A&amp;M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR — What to Do When the Interest is Gone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Patricia K. Smith, West Virginia Univ.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching the Process of Inferring Through a Listening Guide</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Donna E. Alvermann, University of Georgia, Athens)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Use of Teletherapy in the Mainstreaming Era</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(William S. O'Bruba, Mary D. Sanford, and Donald A. Camplese, Bloomsburg State College, Bloomsburg, Penna.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a Modified SMOG in Primary and Intermediate Grades</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lawrence L. Smith, Univ. of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>ISSUE NUMBER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a Thematic Pre-Organizer and Guided Instruction As Aids to Concept Learning (Marino C. Alvarez, TN State)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Scavenger Hunts: A Scheme for Schema Development (Pat Cunningham, Wake Forest, Sharon Crawley, Augusta College, Lee Mountain, Univ. of Houston)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wordless Books for All Ages (Karla Hawkins Wendelin, Univ. of Nebr., Lincoln)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Workshop to Incorporate Language Development in Teaching Reading (Dixie D. Sanger, and Sheldon L. Stick, Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing for Reading (Robert Karlin, Queens College, and Andrea C. Karlin, Lamar University, Beaumont, Texas)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AUTHOR INDEX VOLUME 24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AFFILIATION</th>
<th>ISSUE NUMBER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvarez, Marino C.</td>
<td>(Tenn. State University)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvermann, Donna E.</td>
<td>(Univ. of Georgia, Athens)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghban, Marcia</td>
<td>(College of Grad. Studies, W.V.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birlem, Ellen D.</td>
<td>(Rdg. Consultant, Knoxville, TN)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitner, Joe</td>
<td>(Southeastern Louisiana Univ., Hammond)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blachowicz, Camille</td>
<td>(National College of Education, Evanston, IL)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnett, Richard W.</td>
<td>(Univ. of Missouri, St. Louis)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camplese, Donald A.</td>
<td>(Bloomsburg State College, PA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawley, Sharon</td>
<td>(Augusta College, Augusta, N. C.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criscuolo, Nicholas P.</td>
<td>(Supervisor of Reading, New Haven, Connecticut)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham, James</td>
<td>(University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td>ISSUE NUMBER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cunningham, Patricia</td>
<td>(Wake Forest University)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cushenbery, Donald C.</td>
<td>(University of Nebraska, Omaha)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dole, Janice A.</td>
<td>(University of Denver, Colo.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckert, Mary Sue</td>
<td>(Athens, Ohio)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson, Anne M.</td>
<td>(Southeastern Louisiana Univ., Hammond)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowler, Gerald L.</td>
<td>(Dir. of Reading, Carlisle, PA)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frager, Alan</td>
<td>(Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray, Mary Jane</td>
<td>(Loyola Univ. of Chicago, Ill.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahn, Amos H.</td>
<td>(University of Maryland)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins, Sue</td>
<td>(Trinity University, San Antonio)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes, David</td>
<td>(Univ. of Virginia, Charlottesville)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heerman, Charles E.</td>
<td>(Kansas State University, Manhattan)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heydorn, Bernard L.</td>
<td>(University of West Indies, Trinidad)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hulett, Joycelin</td>
<td>(Columbia Publ. Schs., MO)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns, Jerry L.</td>
<td>(Northern Illinois University)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Barbara</td>
<td>(National College of Education)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlin, Andrea C.</td>
<td>(Lamar University, Beaumont, Texas)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlin, Robert</td>
<td>(Queens College, Flushing, NY)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinzer, Charles K.</td>
<td>(Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehnert, Linda</td>
<td>(Widener Univ., Chester, PA)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litcher, John H.</td>
<td>(Wake Forest University)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick, Sandra</td>
<td>(Ohio State Univ., Columbus)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, Lynn J.</td>
<td>(Forsyth County Schs., Winston-Salem, North Carolina)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td>ISSUE</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain, Lee</td>
<td>(University of Houston, Texas)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Bruba, William S.</td>
<td>(Bloomsburg State College, Bloomsburg, Penna.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouzts, Dan T.</td>
<td>(The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palardy, J. Michael</td>
<td>(The University of Alabama)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez, Samuel A.</td>
<td>(The University of Texas, Arlington)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richgels, Donald J.</td>
<td>(Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Richard D.</td>
<td>(University of Missouri)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadoski, Mark C.</td>
<td>(Texas A&amp;M University)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford, Mary D.</td>
<td>(Bloomsburg State College, Penna.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanger, Dixie D.</td>
<td>(University of Nebraska, Lincoln)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyer, Diane J.</td>
<td>(Syracuse University, New York)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnell, Thomas R.</td>
<td>(University of Missouri)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Lawrence L.</td>
<td>(University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Patricia K.</td>
<td>(West Virginia University, Morgantown)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiegel, Dixie Lee</td>
<td>(University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stick, Sheldon L.</td>
<td>(University of Nebraska, Lincoln)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone, Ruth J.</td>
<td>(Vanderbilt University, Nashville)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanson, Beverly B.</td>
<td>(East Carolina University, Greenville, Nor. Car.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacca, Richard T.</td>
<td>(Kent State University, Kent, OH)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentour, Janet</td>
<td>(Heidelberg College, Tinnin, OH)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver, Brenda</td>
<td>(Consultant, Little Falls, New York)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendelin, Karla Hawkins</td>
<td>(Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>AFFILIATION</td>
<td>ISSUE NUMBER</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine D. Wiesendanger</td>
<td>Alfred University, Alfred, New York</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollenberg, John</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood, Karen D.</td>
<td>University of North Carolina, Charlotte</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>