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Prospects for more reading and better reading proficiency among the elementary students in the nation are looking ever brighter, now that we have bridged some of our attitude gaps and semantic chasms. We refer specifically to the observable evidence that parents are accepting the idea of pre-school experience as the first step in reading training. We may further note the closer cooperation between parents and early elementary teachers in helping children build concepts, learn various shapes, time, distance, and other discriminatory skills.

Still another cheering fact is the way in which more and more elementary principals have educated themselves to build, evaluate, and guide reading programs in their buildings and systems. No longer are they finding themselves at the mercy of glib publishers’ representatives. No longer do principals call school-wide tests and a remedial room a reading program.

How did this measurable improvement come about? We believe one obstacle to progress which is rapidly disappearing is the barrier of semantics. Many parents used to think of sending their children “off to school” as if education were a different process than what had been going on at home. The idea of home-life as the reading readiness step did not exist. Thus, when teachers sought to build continuity between home experience and beginning literacy—the effort was seen as interference from school.

We feel a sense of gratitude for a new atmosphere that is building. Mothers of preschoolers are picking up materials made available to them at school, to better use games and activities that lay the foundation for ease in beginning reading. School boards have seen the wisdom of facilitating the printing and distribution of such materials. Enlightened principals have used their talents as coordinators instead of leaning on their authority. And we will all gain immeasurably as our children grow to maturity through reading.

Kenneth VanderMeulen
Editor
His name was Jimmy_. I remember my sense of apprehension when I saw that name included in my first-grade roster. It was not because he was older than the others, having spent two years in kindergarten, or that he was noticeably bigger. Jimmy was deaf. How, I wondered, could I help this child? How, indeed, could I cope with his handicap?

Because of recently enacted federal legislation which requires that children with handicapping conditions receive their education in the “least restrictive environment” more children like Jimmy will be found in regular classrooms. More teachers will be faced with the responsibility of teaching them. This does not mean wholesale abandonment of hearing-impaired and other handicapped children from the special resources available to them in the past. It does mean that such children will be spending more of their school time in regular classes. Here they will continue, in most cases, to receive direct assistance from specially trained persons on a part-time basis, or indirect assistance via the classroom teacher who, in turn, will receive instruction and help from the special teacher serving as a resource person. In any event, the regular classroom teacher will have an increased responsibility in the education of the hearing-impaired child.

Hearing-impaired is a generic designation indicating a continuum of hearing loss from mild to profound. The hearing loss is measured in decibels (dB) which is the unit used to measure the relative intensity of sound. Following are the categories of hearing-impairment: mild—loss of 27-40 dB; moderate—loss of 56-70 dB; severe—loss of 71-90 dB; and profound—loss of more than 90 dB. Possibly because of better nutrition and more effective treatment of infectious diseases, there are fewer deaf children today than in the past. There are also fewer so-called “normal deaf,” those without additional handicapping conditions. The rubella epidemic of several years ago produced children with various combinations of orthopedic, visual, auditory, and other categories of handicapping conditions. However, the single most serious impediment to successful school achievement in general and to learning to read in particular is the deaf child’s impaired language function.

**THE PROBLEM**

Studies of the academic achievement of the deaf invariably find a serious educational lag when compared to the hearing population. Dale (1974) estimates that normally hearing children may have a speaking vocabulary of some 2000 words by the time they enter kindergarten. The deaf may use only 250 words by the same age. The problem appears to
become accelerated with increasing age. Rosenstein and MacGinitie (1965) note that younger deaf children outperform older deaf children proportionately. Hargis (1970) reports a discrepancy of approximately eight years between the mean reading achievement of hearing and deaf children when the comparison is made after the completion of their regular educational programs. Wrightstone, Aranow, and Muskovitz (1962, 1963) used the Metropolitan Achievement Tests to study the performance of over 5,000 deaf children in 73 school programs of various kinds in Canada and the United States. They found that the children's average gain in reading achievement in the age span of 10 to 16 years was less than one year. The sixteen-year-olds were found to have an average reading achievement grade of 3.5. Hammermeister (1971) used the Stanford Reading Achievement Test to measure the performance of deaf adults who had completed their education at a residential school 7 to 13 years earlier. Significant gains were made on word meaning but not on the test of paragraph meaning.

That there was no improvement with age in the comprehension of meaning expressed in paragraphs is significant and central to the problem of language mastery by the deaf. As Goodman (1970) indicates, reading is a complex process which involves the reconstruction of meaning encoded in written language. Its purpose is the comprehension of meaning intended by the writer. Comprehension results from the reader's active sampling from and hypothesis-testing on the three categories of cue-systems which reside in English: grapho-phonemic cues arising from the relationship of sounds (phonemes) and their written symbols (graphemes); syntactic cues arising out of the arrangement or order of words; and semantic cues which reside in the meanings of the words in a passage. More proficient readers rely less on grapho-phonemic cues and more on syntactic and semantic cues than less proficient readers in extracting the meaning from written material. It is precisely in the areas of word meaning, particularly idiomatic, figurative and abstract meanings, and syntax that the deaf have been found to be deficient. For example, Quigley, et al. (1976) found that the syntactic rules of standard English were not well established even in eighteen-year-old subjects. Only simple transformations such as negation, question formation, and conjunction were mastered and then not completely so. Quigley, et al. speculate that the deaf may perceive English as a linear rather than as a hierarchial structure. For example, they may impose a subject-verb-object pattern on sentences in which this order does not apply, or they may connect the nearest noun and verb phrases. In any case, the deaf do not have access to syntactic and semantic cues to the degree that the hearing do. The deaf child, like the less proficient reader, has to rely on the less efficient grapho-phonemic cues. Hartung (1970) found no difference between deaf and hearing 7½-9 year olds in the kind of visual perception skill which is necessary for use of grapho-phonemic cues. More than fifty years ago, Gates and Chase (1926) found deaf children to be superior to hearing children in the word perception skills used in spelling. Yet, their relative inability to utilize semantic and syntactic cues may contribute to the low ceiling of about fourth-grade level obtained by so many deaf persons in reading achievement.
There are probably other contributing and confounding factors as well. For one thing, the impact of a deaf child in a hearing family (90% of deaf children are born with hearing parents) is great. The natural, spontaneous verbal interplay between mother or other caregiver and the infant and toddler is often sharply curtailed or absent altogether. Gross (1970) found that mothers of deaf children used less praise and more verbal antagonism than mothers of hearing children. Under such conditions the child is not stimulated to continue exploration with its vocal mechanism. Continued linguistic development may be impeded in a linguistically neutral or negative environment.

Traditional deaf education practices have been cited by Furth (1966) and Kohl (n.d.) as contributing to the retarded language development of deaf children. The oral method of teaching the deaf to speak emphasizes lipreading, learning sound elements and combinations, phonetic spelling, and reading of orthographic forms of English. This has been the predominant mode of teaching language to the deaf in the United States. It is hypothesized that its major appeal lies in the assumption that it can teach the deaf to speak. What has always stigmatized the deaf is not their inability to hear, but their inability to speak. To speak, to communicate in oral language is taken as a sign of human intelligence. Not to be able to speak is to be cast in with the lot of those who are less than human. Animals are called dumb because they cannot speak, so are the deaf who have not mastered oral communication. It is no coincidence that the deaf for many centuries were classed with the insane and retarded.

Despite many years of instruction in the oral method or some variation of it, however, a natural sign language persists as the most popular means of communication among the deaf themselves. Even in schools or programs where signing is expressly prohibited, one can observe children using this technique to communicate among themselves. Interestingly, an administrator in a special school for the deaf remarked that it was the most highly verbal children who were most resentful of being prevented from using sign language. Obviously, the deaf themselves find this their most effective means of communication. Furth (1966) recommends that parents use a discriminable sign language with their deaf children for the first three years. If parents made a discriminable sign for each word as they spoke it, Furth contends, the child would learn the natural language. The child would sign according to English syntax. The signs could be transliterated later to written form for the child to read.

The natural sign language used by the deaf does have some structure and consistency. Yet, it is so context-bound, dependent on paralinguistic cues, concrete, and subjective (Trevoort, 1961) that it can neither be as efficient nor sophisticated a mechanism for communication as a true linguistic system. However, the predominance of the oral method is diminishing with the concept that the deaf themselves or their guardians ought to be able to decide which system is used. A recent New York State law, for example, mandates that a school for the deaf offer more than one teaching methodology so that parents have the option of choice. Today,
most schools offer, in addition to the oral method, one called total communication which is a combination of the oral and manual (sign) language methods.

LEARNING TO READ

Basic Conditions

There are certain basic conditions which must be met in order to establish the most favorable environment for teaching the deaf child to read. First, the teacher must acknowledge honestly his or her own feelings about hearing-impairment in general, and about having a hearing-impaired child in class. It is better to acknowledge feelings even if they are negative, than to attempt to ignore or cover them up. Most teachers will respond to the idea of a deaf child in class with a good bit of anxiety—"Oh no, why me?" may be the response. The teacher, who is usually already burdened with many responsibilities, may find this just one too many, particularly if the teacher feels lacking in the necessary skills to work successfully with the hearing-impaired child. Knowledge is often the best antidote for fear. The teacher should seek out good references on teaching the hearing-impaired, visit a local school for the deaf, enroll in a college course that deals with educating the handicapped, and consult with specially trained personnel, if they are available.

Understanding his or her own feelings, the teacher will be in a better position to help the rest of the children in the class relate positively to their hearing-impaired classmate. The child’s hearing impairment should be acknowledged openly. It should be understood as simply one additional physical feature of the child. Children will be very curious about the child’s hearing aid. Its function should be explained simply. The teacher’s goal is to establish good peer relationships by removing any mystery which surrounds the hearing-impairment, and by dealing with it openly, honestly, and humanely. The teacher should become quite familiar with the hearing aid apparatus so as to be able to respond to signs of its malfunction. For example, the child’s inconsistent behavior might be caused by a problem with the hearing aid such as fluctuating amplification.

Finally, a child’s hearing impairment will necessitate certain simple physical accommodations which soon become quite habitual. For example, if the child relies primarily on lipreading, Northcott (1970) advises that you use a natural, clear voice accompanied by normal facial expression. In speaking to the child, face the light or window and stand at a distance of about three feet, positioned at the child’s eye level.

Vocabulary Development

The significance of oral language for learning to read which has been highlighted by psycholinguistic theory is as valid for the deaf as for the hearing child. However, the understanding vocabulary of several thousand words and the unconscious grasp of the syntactic features of English which we expect to be present in most native-speaking first-graders, cannot be taken for granted with the deaf child. While experiences to increase vocabulary are a part of all reading programs, they are at the very heart of
reading programs for the deaf. As Streng (1964) observes, language is the primary concern in teaching deaf children to read.

The development of vocabulary should be a central and continuing activity in each day's plan. Fitzgerald (1957) indicates that systematic and consistent training in vocabulary is necessary in each subject and in relation to every activity. The development of vocabulary is begun quite informally when the child first enters school and centers on the child's own personal being—his or her interests, needs, and activities. The Clarke School (1972) advises that formal vocabulary development begin when the child can use some spontaneous language. At this point, daily experiences which are repeated routinely are the ones to which vocabulary is related: recess, snacktime, lunch, library, etc. As the child's interests widen, so does the range of vocabulary development: television programs, vacations, trips, neighborhood, etc. Words are never presented or used in isolation. They are always used in meaningful contexts.

Vocabulary activities include: labeling, such as parts of the face, kinds of clothing, children's names; classifying and categorizing objects such as sorting plastic tableware by kind and color; pairing synonyms; linking appropriate adjectives with a given noun; classifying verbs according to action such as movement verbs, sound verbs, feeling verbs; and experiences with words of multiple meanings. For example, to help the child understand the different meanings of the word make there should be planned experiences of making foods, making presents, and making constructions out of various artistic media. Subsequently, as the speaking vocabulary begins to form the core of the reading vocabulary, charts are made to display, illustrate, classify, and categorize new words. In addition, the deaf child's vocabulary development will be facilitated by the presence of hearing peers whose spontaneous language models enrich the verbal milieu.

The significance of the parents' role in the child's language development should not be underestimated. The teacher will want to develop a cooperative relationship with the parents so that home and school can work together to build the child's language function. The Clarke School for the Deaf (1972) offers these suggestions to parents: talking with the child in complete sentences; making a conscious effort at adding new words and phrases; having a positive attitude toward the hearing aid, being certain that the child wears it all the time, and checking regularly to see if it is in working order; being a good listener, allowing the child to express him- or herself; telling and reading stories aloud; providing meaningful and enjoyable experiences such as cooking and taking trips; providing a positive atmosphere toward reading in the home—letting the child see reading being done regularly and routinely by all family members; and visiting the public library regularly.

Word Recognition

The first printed words presented to the child should be highly familiar ones which have distinct physical or configuration features. The child should be taught an awareness and recognition of his or her name first as it
appears on personal possessions such as a lunchbox or cubby hole, and later as it appears in a sentence that is meaningful to the child. When a child has mastered its own name, awareness and recognition of classmates' names should be taught. Then the child is introduced to names of others such as pets and family members. From this point the child is introduced to connected language in meaningful contexts. On completion of an activity the teacher discusses it and writes a simple descriptive sentence. The child then illustrates the sentence. Familiar words are noted and identified in different settings such as books and filmstrips. Activities to give practice in noticing similarities and differences in visual patterns are begun: matching identical pictures; matching identical letter forms; selecting a word which differs from the others; matching words; associating printed words with pictures; associating printed sentences with illustrations. Words that are mastered should be printed on one inch cards which the child keeps and reviews. These word cards are also used by the child to construct sentences. The manipulation of words as sentence segments into proper positions helps to give the child a visual representation of language structure. As the child gains proficiency in perceiving specific characteristics of printed material, the teacher introduces additional word recognition techniques such as phonics, structural analysis, and phonetic respelling.

Comprehension

Practice in comprehension of spoken language will naturally precede activities designed to improve reading comprehension. For example, the teacher makes an oral command, statement, or question to which the child responds. Later the child's response will be to a written command, statement or question. The child will work with picture stories, first single and subsequently two-or-three sentence stories. The child selects which picture is illustrative of the story. Or, the child physically enacts or dramatizes the meaning of the story. Or, the child physically enacts or dramatizes the meaning of first a single sentence story, and later two-to-three sentence stories. To build sentence memory the child responds to simple commands written and shown on flash cards. To give practice in recalling story sequence, the child rearranges a series of simple illustrations to conform to the correct sequence of events. Or, an experience chart can be composed on sentence strips which are scrambled. The child then rearranges them in the order that the events actually occurred in the experience.

After the child has acquired some skill in literal comprehension of written material, practice at the interpretation level is begun. For example, in order to teach the child to recognize a passage's main idea a sequence of activities such as the following may be used: the teacher asks specific questions which the child answers and from this the teacher formulates the main idea; then the teacher asks specific questions which the child answers, but in this activity the child formulates the main idea; then the child both asks the questions and formulates the main idea; finally, the child formulates the main idea immediately after reading the story. Variations on this sequence involve having the child read a paragraph and then select or write a title for it. Or, give the child a title and have the child compose a story for it.
Problems in comprehension usually arise for the deaf child with the use of more complex reading material which is marked by idiomatic and figurative language, and sophisticated syntax. As noted earlier, it is precisely in these domains where the deaf child's language is deficient. Some believe as Streng (1964) does, that mastery of reading material at the intermediate level and above by the deaf child requires a planned, systematic program of instruction in the basic structures of English. In any case, the teacher must preview selected reading material very carefully for potential causes of difficulty such as colloquial, metaphoric, and figurative language and then provide the child with direct instruction on these points. The teacher will stress the importance of the verb as the word that directs the action of the sentence. The child will be taught to find the verb in complex sentences or those with unusual word order. The teacher will instruct the child to locate the subject and verb and then think the meaning of the sentence through. It is essential to relate the more complex meanings encountered in intermediate level and above reading material to actual experiences the child can understand. If the child, for example, has difficulty understanding the conditional, the teacher might say, "Remember Jimmy, we said that if it doesn't rain, then the class can go outside after lunch." Then this is related back to the written sentence in question.

Reading Materials

Quill (1959) cites the following as prerequisites to introducing the deaf child to reading from books: an understanding vocabulary of at least 500 words; a grasp of connected language with some skill in using it; sentence memory; skill in the mechanics of reading such as left-to-right eye progression; and a desire to read. Actually, the teacher will create much of the child's beginning reading material primarily in the form of experience charts and individual booklets. These begin with a single line which is accompanied by an illustration. Gradually, these charts grow to two and more simple sentences which are also illustrated. Most of the early charts will illustrate a single verb, such as

- We see stores.
- We see houses.

Then charts will incorporate sentences with two or more different verbs:

- We went to the zoo.
- We saw animals.

Later, the charts will begin to incorporate a beginning notion of the paragraph. Even though sentences are still written on separate lines, they now begin to show a clearer relation to each other. For example,

- Mary has a new dress.
- It is pink and white.
- Her new dress is pretty.

Thus, in a rather carefully programmed manner, the deaf child is gradually introduced to language of increasing semantic and syntactic complexity.

Because of the deaf child's limited grasp of the semantic and syntactic features of English, reading from books often presents numerous difficulties. The so-called Sanders Reader was prepared by Alexander Graham
Bell in 1873 for use by a six-year-old deaf child because other suitable printed material was not available. There is still a good deal of dissatisfaction with current reading material primarily because of its uncontrolled presentation of syntactic structures. For example, Hargis et al. (1973) tested the hypothesis that the direct discourse format, which is frequently found in beginning basal reading series, contributes to the reading difficulty experienced by hearing-impaired children at the first-grade reading level. To test the hypothesis they selected randomly stories of about 500 words long—conversational and nonconversational—from a popular reading series. Students from the Tennessee School for the Deaf who were reading at first-grade level were selected randomly and then randomly assigned to the conversational and non-conversational stories. Results revealed a statistically significant difference in achievement favoring the group using the nonconversational stories. Hargis (1970) believes the solution may lie in the use of specially prepared readers which control syntactical structures, and idiomatic and figurative elements as well as vocabulary. N. and J. Peters (1973) have compiled an annotated listing of materials in reading and other curriculum areas which were selected for their relative ease. The teacher may also find an earlier compilation of Spache (1960) to be helpful in locating suitable printed material.

The natural language competence which we rightfully ascribe to most native-speaking children cannot be assumed present in the hearing-impaired child. Instead, the hearing-impaired child usually arrives at school with a serious language deficit. A slow, deliberate and carefully designed instructional program can help to reduce this language deficiency. A reading plan for the deaf is distinguished from a regular teaching program not by qualitative differences, but by quantitative ones. It is characterized by small, systematic and carefully planned increments in instruction, much review and reinforcement, and the use of materials which control the semantic and syntactic features of the language. But, like any good reading program, it is based on the child’s oral language, it uses the child’s interests as a source of material, it teaches skills functionally and in context, and it sees comprehension of meaning as the primary function of reading. The hearing-impaired child can learn to read along side the rest of the class.
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ORAL READING: CONSIDERATIONS BEFORE UTILIZATION

L. D. Briggs
PROFESSOR OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION, EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

One of the most revealing diagnostic devices used in the elementary school is oral reading. By using oral reading the teacher can evaluate the child's ability to respond to punctuation marks, to apply phonics, to recognize basic sight words, to phrase correctly, and to apply other reading skills. The child's strengths and weaknesses can easily be determined through the use of oral reading, and an individual improvement program can be based on an evaluation of reading skills as reflected by oral reading. Without question, oral reading is an essential activity for effective teaching.

Oral reading, however, is not an extensively used activity. Oral reading is not often utilized outside the classroom. Most reading is silent, and, even in the classroom, silent reading is used more often than oral reading.

Oral Reading in the Classroom

The purpose of oral reading is to share with others. This sharing may range from reading to the teacher for diagnostic purposes to reading to the whole class for skill-development, information, or recreation (Smith & Johnson, 1976).

Practice in oral reading can make some enduring positive contributions to the child's growth. When reading orally, the child can develop poise, social status, self-confidence, a feeling of success and belonging, a good speaking voice, the ability to read while having eye contact with the audience, and a positive self-image.

A good oral reader can give the listener a reading pattern to emulate. Also, the reader who correctly applies reading skills can give the listener a feeling for language. Just as an artist can paint a picture using oils and a brush, an author can create characters, scenes, and plots through lines of print; and a good reader can bring these lines to life.

On the other hand, while the child is reading orally, the peers may perceive him or her as a poor reader who unwittingly mispronounces words and changes perfectly readable print into an enigma by ignoring punctuation marks and by misapplying word attack skills. Therefore, an oral reading performance could result in the reader's loss of poise, social status, and confidence.

Oral reading is used in three settings in the elementary classroom. One setting is the teacher-pupil conference where the child reads to the teacher in a one-to-one relationship. This conference should be "as private as possible; ideally, with only the teacher listening" (Durkin, 1970). This is an excellent diagnostic technique for making an assessment of the child's growth in reading skills and comprehension.
Oral reading is also used in small subgroups where children have been placed according to need, interest, or achievement. The teacher is better able to meet the individual needs of the children by using this homogeneous grouping. When reading orally in this situation, the child will read to a limited number of peers who have comparable ability and achievement.

At other times, the whole class may constitute the reading group. In this situation, the child will read orally to all members of the class. This activity tends to be competitive and unfair to the less capable children unless the reading material is on a very low level, or the slow readers have had an opportunity to read the material orally with teacher assistance prior to the reading period. In addition, the teacher's disciplinary control is spread thin in this situation, and children are more prone to make derogatory remarks about poor readers. This would constitute "an undesirable audience situation" (Dallman, et al., 1974).

The possession of the necessary skills for oral reading should not be the only criterion used for selecting a child to read. The child should also be emotionally, socially, and physically ready. All of these areas must be considered before a child is called on to read orally in a group situation with an audience. Of course, the same rule applies to other academic activities as well.

Restricting Oral Reading

Too often, teachers perform acts in teaching that are not only non-productive but are detrimental to learning and the child. Obviously, no injurious act should be performed in the classroom. There are times, however, when oral reading can hurt the child.

Perhaps the teacher-pupil oral reading conference presents the least threat to the child because it excluded a peer audience. Small group and whole class reading sessions can be threatening, and, in these situations, the teacher must decide whether to involve the child in oral reading. The decision must be made with consideration being given to all aspects of the child's development and achievement.

When specific conditions exist, the teacher should be very concerned about requiring the child to read orally:
1. The child has distracting mannerisms. It is especially harmful if other members of the class point out and laugh at a child's mannerisms.
2. The child stutters under stress or strain. Reading problems produce stress and strain, and stress and strain produce stuttering. The child's stuttering causes problems in reading, and the cycle repeats itself.
3. The child does not have the vocabulary or reading skills necessary to cope successfully with the reading material.
4. The child has some distracting injury which is readily noticed by other children in the class. Children naturally become curious and distracted. These injuries are often seen in school: a black eye, a cut on the face, or a cut or bandage on the head.
5. The child has recently had a traumatic experience. These are very emotional experiences for children: a death of a parent, death of a
brother or sister or some other close family member, or some other catastrophic happening.

6. The child has some permanent disability which has resulted in emotional trauma, extreme self-consciousness, or introversion.

7. The child has a temporary dental problem. After losing some front teeth, the child must learn to compensate for this loss before he or she can be understood by others.

These conditions, which are representative, do not have the same impact on every child. Some children having one or more of these problems should be kept from reading orally because of possible injurious effects; whereas, other more emotionally secure, self-confident children with the same problems can be actively involved in oral reading activities without repercussions.

Children at different ages have diverse attitudes toward reading and reading problems. Younger children tend to be less conscious of mispronunciations and other errors made during oral reading. But as they grow in age and sophistication, the children become more perceptive of the lack of good reading skills. As they progress through the various grades, the children's range of achievement and the number and complexity of their reading problems increase; and the children become more acutely aware of their reading problems and those of others.

Oral reading is more demanding on the child than silent reading. Since oral reading is a demanding activity, the classroom teacher should consider more than basic skills when calling on a child to read aloud. The teacher should consider the child's social, emotional, and physical levels of maturation. When reading silently, the child has the opportunity to mispronounce words, skip words, and ignore punctuation without the loss of social status or self-confidence.

Every child is unique; therefore, each individual reacts differently to personal and academic problems. The teacher must judge each case to determine if oral reading in front of peers should be curtailed, and if so, for how long. The teacher must be cognizant of the problems that confront pupils, and he or she must make judgments accordingly. Oral reading is an excellent teaching device, but there are times when it can be counterproductive, and even detrimental.
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Teachers do not listen to children’s strategies for interacting with their language, often preferring to dominate the lesson with questions of factual recall (Guszak, 1967). To make matters worse, when asking recall questions they tend to give good readers more time than poor readers to formulate answers (Sucher, 1967). Teachers react in this manner even though many of them instinctively know that children need to interact with language in order to clarify cognitive structure. They do this, according to Frank Smith (1975), by constantly creating new categories of learning and/or redefining learned categories. Smith calls language the major medium through which children learn of the existence of new categories of learning (p. 127). He further states that children learn of categories through an elaborate yet innate scheme of hypothesis testing which children will take part in intuitively if given the right opportunity. With this theory in mind, a technique has been developed called the Interactive Cloze Procedure. The authors feel the technique gives students the all-important time they need to explore language in its rich and varied forms, make hypotheses concerning why certain words are chosen by authors to create images in the mind of the reader, and interact with peers and the teacher about words and the categories those words represent. The paper will give the background research concerning cloze techniques, detail the steps teachers would follow to use Interactive Cloze, report behavioral observations within the classroom setting, and indicate direction for research into the efficacy of this procedure.

Background

The cloze procedure (Taylor, 1953) is recognized as a means of determining level of comprehension and readability. Research efforts, however, have not consistently supported the cloze as an effective instructional procedure for facilitating comprehension of prose material (Jongsma, 1971). As early as 1962, Blommer used the cloze as a remedial teaching technique for students enrolled in a college reading program. Although cloze exercises were concluded to have a positive effect on comprehension and college grade point average, faulty experimental designs and threats to internal validity rendered the results tentative at best. The point must be made that the “teacher” served only as a record-keeper
and made no effort to interact with students. Martin (1968), however, asked students in a class setting to verbalize reasons for deletion responses. Both experimental groups (instruction in the cloze strategy and transformational grammar) scored statistically significant differences over the control group. The cloze group made significant gains in word meaning, paragraph comprehension, and selection of key words.

In an effort to extend Martin's verbalization strategy into a structured teaching paradigm, the Interactive Cloze Procedure has been developed. The procedure is designed to 1) promote close attention to the structure and patterns of print resulting in increased comprehension, 2) enable students to effectively use context clues and grammatical syntax to ascertain the appropriateness of a response, 3) provide a setting for positive interaction among students concerning material read, and 4) encourage students to become active rather than passive participants in classroom reading activities.

The following steps make up the Interactive Cloze Procedure teaching paradigm:

1) Select a 100-500 word passage from a textbook. The passage should be one that students have had difficulty comprehending or one that the instructor feels is important for them to fully understand.

2) Make appropriate lexical deletions of nouns, verbs, adjectives, and/or adverbs accordingly. The form of, and number of speech deletions can be varied according to purpose of teaching.

3) Ask students to complete the cloze passage individually, filling in as many blanks as possible. The teacher can decide appropriate time limits for the task depending on the difficulty level of the passage.

4) Divide students into small groups, three to four students per group. Instruct them to compare answers and come to a joint decision as to the best response for each blank.

5) Reassemble into a large group setting. The instructor reads the selection intact from the text. Students are given opportunity to express opinions as to the suitability of the author's choice of terms as compared to their choices.

6) Test over cloze passage to strengthen short-term recall.

Recognizing that use of imagery in prose writing is difficult for the novice as well as the experienced English student to fully comprehend, the paradigm has been incorporated into an instructional model for developing awareness and understanding of imagery in a literature selection. The technique, however, can be adapted to any content or reading selection.

In an effort to observe the effect of the Interactive Cloze Procedure the authors field-tested the strategy in two eighth grade English classes. The selection chosen to be read was that of Truman Capote's "A Christmas Memory." The class received pre-reading activities focusing on the definition of "imagery" as a concrete detail that appeals to the senses. They were also told that by using specific images, an author establishes mood and arouses emotion in readers.

Students were then given a 250 word cloze passage utilizing an every
fifth-adjective lexical deletion strategy. The Interactive Cloze Procedure teaching paradigm was then followed.

Behavioral observations reported lend credence to the paradigm in an instructional setting.

While the students were in groups they justified their choice of words in a positive way, using grammatical elements to support their choice of response. Comments were noted such as:

- "You can't use that word."
- "It isn't an adjective and it HAS to be an adjective."
- "You can't use the same word twice."
- "That's too simple."
- "The author meant it different than that."

Additionally, students used the Thesaurus and oral reading to stress their points. When interacting in the large group setting, students challenged the appropriateness of usage, and on occasion, felt their choice constituted a more visual or sophisticated use of imagery than that of the author.

Students were asked to rate how much they enjoyed reading the story on a three-point scale. Ninety percent (90%) of the cloze experimental group indicated they liked the story; 6% thought it was average and 4% did not like it. In contrast, from the group who had not used the cloze, 73% liked the story, 15% thought it average and 12% disliked it.

**Conclusion**

On the simplest level, the Interactive Cloze Procedure appears to be an easy discussion motivator. In addition, the authors feel that the strategy possesses a more heuristic value in that it requires close attention to print, promotes verbalization of the reading act, and in some instances, expands word-recognition and knowledge of vocabulary. Most important, students seem to enjoy the technique more than traditional methods of teaching reading in content areas.

In interviews with poor readers, Penty (1959) found a significant amount of negativism toward textbooks with feelings of hostility and defeat generalizing to the courses in which textbooks and teacher lecture were central features. New techniques like the Interactive Cloze Procedure must be used by teachers to overcome textbook hostility and improve student attitude. Empirical research should be conducted to substantiate this belief.

It is also felt that the Interactive Cloze Procedure should not be limited in content usage. Because the teaching paradigm was originally devised to be used with college freshmen having difficulty comprehending material in a biology text, research is being conducted with college reading classes not only to substantiate an intuitive belief in the efficacy of the procedure, but to examine the effect of the Interactive Cloze on different levels of readers. Additional empirical research, however, should not be limited to the cognitive domain. A study needs to be undertaken to determine if use of the Interactive Cloze Procedure significantly changes students' attitude toward
reading in general and the study of language in particular. The authors are engaged in such a study and would welcome the research of others interested in this area of investigation.
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A MINI LOOK AT SOME MAXI IDEAS

Prof. Heath Lowry and Barbara Waters
UNIVERSITY OF PACIFIC, STOCKTON, CA

Time and again I have listened to busy teachers complaining that they don’t have time to read the many current articles on IQ, open classrooms, class organization, learning theory, motivation, and use of traditional material which appear in professional literature. Therefore, I would like to consolidate many of these sources into one article which will give the reader some indication of the trends which seem to be taking place concerning these things.

Teaching methods, values, and organization which supports each of these are in a state of flux. As our society moves forward, the needs of the people change, no matter what their age, and so the goals of education. Teaching techniques must reflect the new knowledge about how children learn, but most important is the fact that all this information and change is arid unless what we produce is to the advantage of the learner.

The following recent (’73-’74) professional journal publications have been selected and reviewed in succinct form to aid the busy teacher in “keeping current” on recent ideas and innovative practices.

"A MINI-LOOK AT SOME MAXI-IDEAS FROM RECENT PUBLICATIONS —’72-’74”

Annotated Bibliography of Pertinent Items To Be Considered When Teaching Reading

1. Bereiter, Carl, “Education: An Affront to Personal Liberty?”

   Needs determine interest in forms of education. Children should have the right to choose to be educated and to direct their growth in terms of needs. Compulsory education denies this personal liberty.

2. Dillon, Stephen-Franks, David “Why Open Classrooms Close Down”

   Failure of open classrooms may be due to one or more of six reasons. 1. The teacher is an insecure person. 2. The teacher does not accept basic values of open education and the fact that learning must be the emphasis, not the teaching. 3. A teacher must set clear limits for students. 4. A teacher refuses to yield her position based teacher power. The students share the power of office. 5. The provisions for learning are inadequate. There is a need for considerable more planning. 6. The classroom was “opened” too suddenly without preparing students for the freedom they will have. It involves a re-socialization process.

Piaget believes some aptitude is innate and experience helps to develop it. Psychological aspect is only one part of what the instructor must know. He must also be concerned with teaching methods, and must know the many facets of children.


This documented article deals with the idea that quality teachers are trained not born. While this training may begin at birth, an important contribution may be the kind of learning opportunities that are provided for the teachers. Chall and Feldman (1966) identified most effective those teachers who used a thinking approach to learning, a sound symbol emphasis and appropriate level of a lesson. Harris and Serwer (1966) study showed that time spent directly on reading, irrespective of time spent on reading related activities, was positively correlated with reading achievement.


Deals with the idea that teaching and learning are not synonymous terms. One needs insight into human relations, and teaching must flow out of interests of the child. Children who don't learn may be pointing to the fact that teachers need to do more learning in order to teach well.


A documented article which states that an experienced reading child often recognizes sight words with a single eye fixation, but as early as Buswell (1922) studies showed that beginning readers make eye fixations that could not be interpreted as seeing whole words. Olson (1958) concluded that sight words need not be taught before word analysis. Muehl (1961) found that beginning and ending letters seem to give the greatest aid in early readers' attack on similar words. Marchbanks and Levin (1965) concluded from their study that the weakest cue was shape.

The value of perceptual training has not been clearly established. But studies over the past ten years indicate that the practice of providing perceptual-motor training to all school children in the name of readiness is not an accurate assumption.


PAT stands for Problem, Attack and Taste of Success. Workbooks should be a practice of previously acquired skills which the teacher has taught, and should bring the taste of success. Too often they are used as a teaching tool, thus creating frustration.


Good motivational techniques are simple. One of the best is to ask "What are your goals for the time you spend here?" Goals should be set so they can be changed if needed. Motivation is a bundle of emotional forces that compel an individual toward action.


Author compared 14 word lists to derive his own list. Narrowed his list down to four compiled from 1936 through 1969 collections. He raises the idea that perhaps there should be a basic list for children and one for adults. He found that Thorndike's list seemed to suffer omissions. The author feels that the Dolch list need not be condemned, but he feels his list is more appropriate to present material now being offered to children.

11. Hood, Joyce, "Why We Burned Our Sight Vocabulary Cards" Reading Teacher, Vol. 27, No. 6, March 1974, pp. 579-582.

Dolch or basic words are better learned in phrases. The teacher should develop a dead pan expression and teach the child to analyze as to whether the word he called did make sense. A list of words is a better basic technique for testing.


Practice must be given with knowledge on the part of the
teacher. It should be brief and the meaning of the term, brief, will vary with the child involved in the task. New learning should be reinforced with frequent practice and the learner should see the purpose for his work.


Emphasizes that there is a third factor IQ other than genetic and environmental factors and that is that which occurs during the third and fourth month of fetal life as evidenced by such a difference as fingerprints (ridgecount) in identical twins.


Perhaps courses designed as college preparation should be combined for the sake of time, such courses as literature, history and philosophy. In the time which is saved, we could offer instruction in fields which make a difference in survival, as human relations, environment, leadership, health, child rearing, home management and others.


Deals with the idea that children are not born at age 5, and should have opportunity for many developmental learning experiences and individualized attention along with corrective procedures before this time.


Paraprofessionals give added hands to spread the child adult ratio. Flexible and differentiated staffing must be determined by the needs of the children they serve. Teachers should learn from one another.


Gives reasons for delaying the forcing of formal structured learning at an early age. The author believes that research points to the fact that this early education may hinder rather than aid later learning.

Advocates that meeting individual needs includes special children. The author feels it is advantageous to keep a child in the main stream rather than special classes, but until provisions are made to relieve regular teachers of their increasing burdens, indiscriminate placement of students with special needs in regular classes is not the answer.


It is nearly impossible to compare reading failures between countries. Reading symbols and structure are different; problems of multiple phonemes for a given grapheme; the problem of countries' expectations for girls and boys; a need for a universal definition of reading failure; the question of ability to decode and its relationship to meaning; the problem of a non-standard dialect all add to the confusion.


Does a child always read from left to right? Considering the total phrase or sentence perhaps, but many an experienced reader will attack a new word from a familiar recognizable part which may not be at the beginning of a word. Such as a child's first attack on the word "vacillating." The *ill* or *ing* might be the natural focal points even though they don't appear at the beginning.


The prime purpose of language is communication. Reading should be an integrated part of all communication which calls for it to be found in all subjects. Children should learn that the written form of communication is lasting.


Reading is not a subject, but an integral part of an active seeker of knowledge. It is a vehicle for the intellectual life of the class. Skills should be learned with the expectation of application.

A student teacher discovers that teaching is drawing the child out rather than preaching. A child’s attention or awareness is the key to initiative and spontaneity. Open education is to observe what the child is attending and help him to deepen the focus and concentration.


Reading should be a process of deriving meaning. A child should develop a wide repertoire of word attack strategies to help him understand and not be dependent solely on “sounding out.” Goodman sees reading as a psycholinguistic guessing game. Moffett stresses the structure of language and sees it inextricably bound up with thinking. Omissions and insertions become unimportant in Holistic approach if meaning is there.


Terms used by teachers must be related to words that are in the child’s experience and understanding. Transference of learning in another area may not take place, and teachers should be aware of variables so accepted as integral to a process by adults that they overlook them as a possible source of confusion in the child’s learning.


Describes a six-year program in Chicago dealing with early childhood education, Child Parent Center, CPC. The success was based on early involvement of children in the program, consistency of the program, heavy parent involvement, and structured language skills.


The author wants more in the way of multivariate analysis and measurement. Criterion reference tests seem more valid than
normed reference tests as they measure individual growth. The most fundamental weakness is that all behavioral objectives are not necessarily related to the skill of reading and time might better be applied to the more closely related skills.


Before tests are given, find out how students think they will perform. Help teach the children to know themselves better through such things as Glasser suggests. Let the child be involved in his own evaluation.


Some believe that the open classroom was adopted from the British infant school, but the author believes it is uniquely American. British style is more laissez-faire, and our schools provide much direct instruction along with open ended activities.


Author gives many examples of how movement relates to skill in vocabulary, space relationships, math values, and concepts of personal worth. During the early years of living, the quality of movement experience determines the quality of his total learning.


Benet developed his test to locate retarded children in the population, not to measure innate ability. A culture free test has been developed by John Eftl using brain response to light. It is not at present useful to the teacher. IQ tests should be used not to separate the bright from the dull but to help us better prepare curriculum according to development of the child.
Before the days of community-supported schools, parents were the primary reading teachers of their children. This was, of course, if the parents could read themselves. Once schools became established, parents generally relinquished the responsibility for teaching their children to read to the schools. Despite the fact that today most parents know how to read, too often they take a very inactive role in their children’s reading development.

The important influence of parents and the home environment on the developing child provides educators with a resource to insure children’s successful growth in reading. It seems that the responsibility for children’s reading development lies neither solely on the parents nor the schools, but rather must be shared by both. The preschool years, in which the parents play the largest role in the child’s life, is the time when parents can help establish a foundation for learning to read once school starts. Thus, public education should be available to parents to provide them with the opportunity to develop their children’s learning potential during the preschool years.

The success of past parent education programs and home intervention projects in helping parents to develop their child's reading potential, points to the need for programs and projects on a wider scale. In order for these programs to develop effectively, it will be necessary for educators to assess and to gain insight from the literature in setting up their parent education programs.

Although most children do actually learn to read in school, research has shown the importance of the preschool years in laying the foundation for learning to read. The influence of the parents during these years on their child’s intellectual development, in general, and reading readiness development, in particular, is well-documented. The purpose of this paper is to review the pertinent research to provide educators with the background for developing programs in which parents can be instructed in ways to insure their children’s progress in learning to read.

Schaefer (1972) reviews a wide variety of research on parents as educators of their children from birth. He maintains that parents have great influence on children’s intellectual and academic achievement. He further suggests that programs to educate parents in developing their children intellectually would serve as effective supplements or alternatives for pre-school education. DeFranco (1973) emphasizes the necessity of establishing a solid base in reading readiness before the child starts school in preventing later reading problems. She points out that readiness techniques...
used with children from infancy on have shown positive effects and that adult education in the use of these techniques would serve to help parents in developing children's reading potential.

AREAS OF PARENT INFLUENCE

The interaction between the parent and child from birth entails a complexity of behaviors, attitudes, and feelings which can either foster or obstruct learning. As Margaret Weiser (1974) states, "We are finally becoming convinced that children learn long before they go to school; in fact, learning may be said to begin the moment a child is born." (p. 226) Some of the areas of preschool learning which impinge directly on the ability to read are: language development, experiential background, auditory and visual perception and discrimination ability, and interest in reading. In each of these areas parents play a major role as teachers and developers.

In their research and writings, Goodman (1968), Smith (1971), Weiser (1974), and Rupley (1975), have established that language is the basis of reading. In order to be able to associate verbal symbols with a meaningful referent, a child must have a well-developed skill in language. Language develops through listening and responding and being responded to from birth. If a child has not been encouraged to attend to and try to imitate the elements of language, he will not have the facility with language necessary to provide a firm base for reading development. The amount and quality of language used in the home will determine the language skill the child will have when he begins school. Children need parents to talk to them and to listen to what they have to say.

Milner (1951) studied the relationship between reading and parent-child interaction. She found that children who scored higher on reading and language tests came from a richer verbal family environment. She concluded that children who scored lower as compared to those who scored higher lacked an extensive opportunity to interact verbally with adults of high personal value who possess adequate speech patterns.

Like language, the experiential background of the child is an important factor in reading. As Carl Smith (1971) explains, "An adequate supply of concepts gained from experience and the manipulation of language constitute a basic ingredient for the eventual comprehension of what is read." (p. 14) Besides giving the child a background from which to bring meaning to printed symbols in reading, experience helps to develop the skills, concepts, and feelings which enhance the act of reading. Ward (1970) maintains that the role parents play in arranging experiences in the child's preschool years is so vital that parents should be considered the first teacher of reading.

Some of the experiences a child has in his preschool years can help to develop the auditory and visual perception and discrimination abilities necessary for reading development. Unless a child is capable of perceiving and discriminating between the letter sounds and symbols, he will not be capable of reading. By providing children with experiences which stimulate
and develop their sensory equipment, parents are helping to develop the audio-visual abilities necessary for reading. Smith (1971) demonstrates parents' role in developing sensory capabilities in their child. He describes the situation of an infant who is given the minimal amount of attention from his parents and/or caretakers and who receives little auditory and visual stimulation. Smith concludes:

This kind of deprivation may have long-lasting effects on the reading and learning performance of the child. There are implications, too, for the effect of sensory stimulation on the decoding operation and on perception. For the eyes and ears must report accurately for decoding and perception to take place." (p. 13)

A child's interest in reading is another important factor in learning to read. Parents and the home environment figure heavily in whether or not this interest is developed. The availability of reading material in the home is certainly a necessity in developing a child's interest in books and reading. Sheldon and Carrillo (1952) investigated the relation of parents and the home environment and certain developmental characteristics to children's reading ability. One significant finding of their study was the relationship between availability of books in the home and reading achievement. It was determined that as the number of books in the home increased, the percent of good readers increased.

However, as Weiser (1974) claims, being surrounded by books is not enough to fully develop a child's interest in books. The child needs the attention and positive attitudes of an adult who interacts with him using books. By reading to the child, answering his questions, asking him questions, interpreting the author's message, pointing out important elements of the stories and pictures; parents are helping to develop the child's love of books and reading which is so important in motivation to learn how to read. In addition, by reading books themselves, parents provide the child with a reader model. This type of preschool experience with books serves to enhance a child's opportunity to be successful with reading.

PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Many parents are interested in helping their preschool child get ready to read. However, they do not know what they can do to help. Programs and studies have been conducted which support the efficacy of instructing parents in how to develop their children's reading potential.

Frank Freshour (1972) describes a parent education program designed to improve parents' and children's attitudes towards school. It was felt that by instructing parents in the factors involved in learning to read and by offering them specific suggestions in helping their children, the children would be positively influenced once school began. The author enumerates the aspects of physical, speech, and attitudinal development to which parents were directed to give their attention. The program was successful in improving children's preparation for school and in helping parents to become aware of how they could function in a supportive role.
Levenstein (1970) conducted a study to investigate the effects of helping low income families develop cognitive growth in children through verbal interaction. Two groups of children were initially given an intelligence and vocabulary test. The subjects in the experimental group were visited by a social worker who brought toys and books. In the presence of the mother, the social worker interacted with the child using the toys and books, thus acting as a model for the mother and presenting possible verbal categories for mother-child communication. In the control group, subjects were visited and given toys and books but no verbal stimulation. After a seven month period, the groups were retested. The experimental group scored significantly higher than the control group on the IQ and vocabulary tests given. Thus, the author concluded that cognitive learning "... can take place in the home, with major involvement of the mother, even when the mother has limited mastery of symbolic modes of representation and is harried by the problems of large family and small income." (p. 431)

Another program still in progress is the Brookline Early Education Project (BEEP) in Brookline, Massachusetts (Pierson, 1974). This program was designed to insure early detection of any educational or physical handicap in the children involved. Parents of various ethnic backgrounds were initiated into the program a few months before the birth of their child. A center was organized to which parents could take their child for free health and developmental exams. There was also a resource area with information to increase the parent's understanding and influence on their child's development. Each family was assigned a teacher, who had background in child development and was a parent as well, to act as a liaison between the center and the family. Although no concrete indications of the effects of BEEP are yet available, the program has been favorably received by those involved and, also, provides an interesting model of parental involvement in preschool development of children.

CONCLUSION

It is clear that parents do play an important role in their children's progress in learning to read. Particularly during the preschool years parents have a strong effect on the child's growth and development in terms of factors involved in the reading process. Educators have not tapped parents as a resource in insuring children's successful growth in reading. What is called for is a stronger relationship between schools and parents working together to prepare children for learning to read. The programs cited in this paper serve as a guide for what can be done. Each school system needs to design and implement a program appropriate for its community. Children can only stand to benefit by such programs and, feasibly, many of the reading programs schools are faced with will be minimized.
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FACTORS AFFECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LISTENING AND READING

Shirley Olejnik
HUNTLEY MIDDLE SCHOOL, DEKALB, ILLINOIS

In a chapter devoted to the topic of integrating reading with the other language arts, Otto and Smith (1970) state that "reading is a language process and as such it is properly placed within the total language arts curriculum with writing, speaking, and listening." (p. 93).

Although it is important to look at the relationships between all of the language arts, the purpose of this paper is to focus on the relationship between reading and listening. There are several practical reasons for focusing on these perceptive skills. With the myriad of listening/reading materials published today, reading teachers must be ready to evaluate the effectiveness of such materials. In addition, they should be armed with knowledge about the utility of using training in specific and general listening skills as a method of improving reading skills. And, finally, they should have some ideas as to how to incorporate listening activities into a reading program.

Similarities Between Listening and Reading

In the past fifty years there has been much discussion on the similarities and differences between listening and reading. In a review of the research, Bracken (1970) described both listening and reading as demanding "thinking in the sound-symbol-understanding process." (p. 37) Otto and Smith (1970) also noted that both involve similar mental processes triggered by visual and auditory stimuli. In a recent study, Walker (1975) stated that a review of the research in this area revealed that there was "wide agreement on two principles of information processing that operated in both reading and listening: cue sampling and message reconstruction." (p. 255) In general, most authors seem to concur that listening and reading are similar in that they are receptive processes and involve information processing.

Differences Between Listening and Reading

While there are general similarities between listening and reading, it is in exploring the differences that some insight can be gained into how best to use listening in a reading program. Moffett and Wagner (1976) note that "what is unique about reading is not the intellectual part, the comprehending, which characterizes listening also, but the translating of print into speech, the literacy part." (p. 112) This and other differences have been discussed by several investigators (Cunningham, 1975; Mart, 1971;
Factors Affecting the Relationship

Despite the differences, reading and listening seem to be related skills, and numerous studies correlating tests of listening and reading tend to support this relationship. Researchers have also shown that there are other factors which confound the relationship between listening and reading; moreover, these factors should be taken into account if one is to use listening activities in a reading program. Grade level, intelligence, degree of reading disability, socio-economic status, and factors related to the message itself (e.g. difficulty, familiarity, organizational structure, etc.) all may influence the transferability of listening training to reading.

In studying the relationship between listening and reading, grade level seems to be an important factor. Most authors seem to agree that listening comprehension surpasses reading comprehension in the early grades but that in the intermediate and upper grades reading comprehension becomes superior. This appears to be a function of vocabulary development. Durrell (1969) explained that in the lower grades listening vocabulary is superior to reading vocabulary but that they grow to be equal by about the eighth grade. It has been demonstrated that as one advances in reading and especially into the content areas, words and their meanings which are recognizable in print may not be in the listening vocabulary of a student. This has important implications for teaching listening in the upper grades. Swalm (1974) indicated that "listening is generally better for learning purposes in the primary grades and that reading is more effective for learning in the upper grades." (p. 1110) He concluded that both listening and reading need to be emphasized in the lower grades. This does not mean that educators should eliminate the teaching of listening at the secondary
level, but it does suggest that using listening training to improve reading at this level may not be very effective for most students.

The second factor which may affect the transferability of listening training to reading is intelligence. In general, Reeves (1968), Brassard (1970), and Duker (1971) have found that the more intelligent students seem to be the best listeners and that students with high I.Q. scores had the least discrepancy between reading and listening comprehension. Likewise, those with lower I.Q.'s tended to score lower on listening comprehension tests.

A third factor which may confound the relationship between listening and reading is the degree of reading disability. In considering good versus poor readers, researchers tend to agree that the good reader is likely to be a good listener; and, similarly, the poor reader is likely to be a poor listener, but that the listening level of a poor reader is usually much higher than his reading level. (Duker, 1971; Markert, 1974) Because the listening ability of a poor reader is generally much greater than his reading ability, one might conclude that a poor reader would benefit more from listening training than a good reader and that this growth in listening might affect his growth in reading. Indeed, researchers have found support for this conclusion. Reddin (1971), Heckler (1975), Swalm (1972), and Taylor (1972) noted that poor readers are more likely to improve in both listening and reading comprehension when given training in listening than are good readers.

A fourth factor which seems to make a difference in the effectiveness of listening training as it affects reading is socio-economic status. Van Valkenburg (1968) found that low socio-economic status students profited more from listening training than high or middle socio-economic status students. Similarly, Dewar (1972) concluded that a listening program in the third grade was particularly effective for lower and middle class students.

The fifth and final factor which seems to affect the relationship between listening and reading are variables within the message itself. Although a few studies (Siegel, 1974 and Sticht, 1971) have taken into account such factors as difficulty and type of material used in listening training, Reddin (1971) points out that more studies are needed of the nature of the material being heard.

What implications does the above research have for reading teachers? Although the studies are not extensive, one could tentatively conclude that training in listening would be a viable method of increasing reading achievement for students in the lower grades, for poor readers, and for students from lower socio-economic areas. Although emphasis upon listening is important for all students, the brighter student who is reading up to grade level or expectancy level is not as likely to benefit from listening skills training as the poor reader. Since the research has focused on the primary and intermediate grade levels, generalizations cannot be applied to the secondary level. Although students in a secondary school reading at a primary level might benefit from listening training, little research has been done in this area.
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READING DEFICIENCY AND BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS: A STUDY

Neil T. Glazer
PRINCIPAL, QUABOAG REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL, WARREN MASSACHUSETTS

Early in the 1973 school year, original research was conducted in a New England public school concerning the relationship between reading deficiency and disciplinary problems. A description of the research design and the results of the project were published in the Journal of the New England Reading Association. Since that time further studies have been conducted using a more sophisticated research plan and an expanded statistical analysis of the results. Even more significant than the continued research in the relationship between reading and behavior is longitudinal aspects of the study; the students that participated in the original 1973 study are now eligible for high school graduation. The follow-up on their progress is significant in light of the work done to remediate their learning deficiency and help them become better adjusted to school.

The Original Study

Accurate records were kept of all students sent to the Office for Disciplinary Infractions, problems ranged from simple truancy to the more severe problems of delinquency. Each student was given the Gates-MacGinitie Test and the results recorded. At the end of the semester one hundred students had been referred to the office. The vast majority of the students scored well below grade placement in reading. Eighty-nine of the one hundred were performing below grade placement with the mean reading 2.2 years behind. Only eleven of the students performed at or above grade placement on the Gates MacGinitie.

The students were randomly divided into control and experimental groups. The experimental group received individual and small group instruction in reading a minimum of twice a week with either a member of the professional staff or a university tutor. The control group continued in regular classes without special help in reading.

At the same time a rating scale was developed to measure and classify the different types of behavior problems in the school; the behavior could then be quantitatively measured for students in both the experimental and the control groups. During the experimental period accurate records were kept on both the behavior of each child and the progress made in reading. At the conclusion of the research project, a complete statistical analysis was made for the behavior and reading achievement for individuals in both the experimental and control groups.

Statistically, it was indicated that the experimental group improved in reading. This was established by administering the Gates-MacGinitie as the post test and comparing reading scores. At the same time, those students in
the experimental group experienced a greatly diminished misbehavior pattern. Only a small number of the students were referred to the office, and those who were sent for discipline were referred for violations considered less severe. The control group was post tested using the Gates-MagGinitie and their behavior statistically examined. It is interesting to note that their reading did not improve and at the same time, the behavior of the students continued to be disruptive despite the traditional efforts to remediate the misbehavior. The research indicates that there is a relationship between reading and discipline problems in the school, and that when the reading deficiency is remediated, it has a direct effect on the behavior of the student.

In conclusion it was felt that schools should follow the example set by the medical profession in dealing with health problems. Certainly, little progress would be made if physicians would treat only the symptom of the disease and show no concern for the cause. Educators are concerned with the increase in discipline problems in the public school, the last two Gallup polls of concerns in education clearly indicate the national problem in controlling students. The poll listed discipline as the number one concern. Educators are attempting to deal with the symptom of the problem but few have given serious thought to the cause. If we are to ever improve public education we must examine and remediate the cause of misbehavior.

Longitudinal Aspects of the Study:

The majority of the students who participated in the original study are now eligible for high school graduation. It is of great interest and importance to follow these students through their educational career. If the original study is to have an impact on schools, it must be shown that students who tend to read at or above grade level and are well adjusted in their behavior will be more successful and eventually graduate. The following is the statistical breakdown of the progress made by students from the original study. It should be noted that those in the original control and experimental groups did not receive special attention in reading after the conclusion of the research project. The original random sample of students was used as a means of comparing the reading and behavior of the total school population to the group referred to the office.

From the data, it is apparent that educators can make some rather accurate prognoses concerning students early in the student's school career. The research for this project involved students in grades seven and eight, from the results of the longitudinal study it is apparent that those students who experienced difficulty in both reading and behavior in the early years of junior high did not graduate from high school and conversely, those who were not referred to the school disciplinarian and were reading at or above grade level were successful in completing high school. Of the students in the original 1973 study, 54% of the children identified as having disciplinary and reading problems did not graduate while only 13% of the random sample of students from the same school did not graduate.

This type of information is extremely important for everyone involved in
education. If indeed, we can accurately diagnose problems early in a child's career, then we should be able to remediate the causes and help students to remain in school. Naturally we as educators can not remediate all of the problems relating to poor reading and behavior, there are many socio-economic and personal problems which go beyond the school; however, this research clearly indicates an area where we do have the expertise and manpower to make significant changes. What then is the prognosis for students with reading and behavior problems? The data is explicit in predicting the future of the student with the above problems; they will drop out of school long before graduation time. If we can predict the future success or failure of the individual, then we must be capable of changing the future for those headed towards failure. What we need is a concentrated effort in reading for all students and particularly those who are in secondary schools and still having difficulty with reading and behavior.
The purpose of a readability formula is to produce a number or number range which approximates the achievement level required of a reader in order to comprehend a written passage. A useful formula, especially to the classroom teacher, is one which is easily computed and which accurately predicts the needed reading ability. Two formulas which have appeared in recent years, the Fog Index and the SMOG Grade, are easily applied. But are they accurate?

Robert Gunning's Fog Index, while more complicated than the SMOG to compute, is nevertheless relatively easy. It has three basic steps. 1) Select a set of consecutive sentences ending with the complete sentence nearest 100 words and compute the average number of words per sentence to the nearest tenth. 2) Compute the percentage of "hard words," i.e., words of three or more syllables excluding proper nouns and proper adjectives, compounds made from short, easy words and verb forms made three syllables by adding -ed or -es. 3) Add the average number of words per sentence to the percentage of "hard words" and multiply that sum by .4. One study of the index reported high correlation to the Flesch formula. Correlations, however, do not seem to be the appropriate statistics for judging a formula's accuracy. Rather, simple description reveals the frequency with which one formula produces the same readability level as another formula.

The major appeal of the SMOG Grade lies in its simplicity. One can literally compute it mentally. Three ten-sentence passages are selected, each from the beginning, middle and end of a book. All words of three or more syllables, as read orally in context, are counted. The nearest square root of the polysyllabic word count is added to the constant 3 and the resulting figure is a grade level designation. The formula is unique in that it abandons the traditional syllable count, a factor employed by most formulas to represent complexity. Instead, it substitutes a mathematical manipulation—the square root. Its originator, McLaughlin, fails to explain...
TABLE 1
GRADE LEVELS OF TWELVE INTERMEDIATE BOOKS
BY SIX READABILITY FORMULAS OR VARIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Intended Grade Level</th>
<th>Dale-Chall</th>
<th>Fog</th>
<th>SMOG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Times in agreement with Dale-Chall

3 0 5 10 7

Underlined scores are in exact agreement with Dale-Chall.

why a reader's ability to comprehend polysyllabic words increases geometrically.4

SMOG tends to inflate the readability of a selection when compared to the level generated by other formulas. Miller and Legerski found that it overestimated the mean score of five formulas about half of the time.5 In defense of SMOG, McLaughlin argues that it reflects the level at which one

4 According to the formula, a fourth grade reader can handle only 1 polysyllabic word in 30 sentences. a fifth grader - 4 polysyllabic words. a sixth grader - 9. a seventh grader - 16. and so on until a twelfth grader can manage 81 polysyllabic words.

can read a passage with "total comprehension." He cites other formulas as predicting "suitability" or the level at which one can "read with understanding," but not with total comprehension.  

Dr. McLaughlin is a professor of journalism. Perhaps reading educators ought to concern themselves with total comprehension. But, since formulas based on "suitability" and "understanding" are functional for classroom use, another alternative is to modify the SMOG formula so that it computes a reading level comparable to that generated by other formulas. Colleagues have suggested informally adjusting SMOG by using the constant 2 instead of the constant 3. This study compares the original SMOG formula and three variations, each using decreasing constants -2, 1, and 0.

The basic question of the study is: are Fog, SMOG, or any variations of SMOG accurate predictors of readability? Comparison was made to the Dale-Chall, a formula commonly used in readability research. Each formula was applied to selections from twelve books commonly used with children in the intermediate grades. The formulas were computed independently by the author and by a graduate assistant, Cameron Lind, for accuracy. Table 1 reports the results of the five formulas.

The Fog Index produced a level equal to the Dale-Chall in three of twelve cases. The original SMOG exceeded the Dale-Chall in all instances. SMOG + 2 was an accurate predictor five of twelve times; SMOG + 1 predicted accurately ten times in twelve; and SMOG + 0 predicted the Dale-Chall in seven of twelve cases.

The most likely predictor appears to be the SMOG variation which substitutes the constant 1 in place of the original constant 3. That variant, when applied to Miller and Legerski's data, supports the same ratio. It produced the same grade level as Dale-Chall in five of six cases.

Precision is important in formal research but less significant in informal situations. Neither the Fog Index nor the original SMOG Grade, when compared to the Dale-Chall, appear to be sufficient for either purpose. The SMOG variation which substitutes the constant 1, however, may prove to be useful to teachers, particularly when informally assessing readability of library books for individualized reading or when analyzing the difficulty of one's own written material—tests, worksheets, learning center directions, and the like.
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DEVELOPING FLUENCY IN WORD-BY-WORD READERS

Patrecia A. Ross
MONGUAGOU MIDDLE SCHOOL, TRENTON, MICHIGAN

What can be done to nudge word-by-word readers from their halting habits into the fluency which characterizes good reading? Not only is the slow reader discouraged by the tedium of his word reading, he is unlikely to get much meaning from the print because the short-term memory becomes overloaded and he cannot process ideas efficiently.6

A look at what good readers do will provide clues as to how reading teachers may approach the problem. Skilled readers do not identify letters en route to words because word identification is too fast for letter-by-letter analysis. Fast readers scan for meaning; they do not read all of the words, but rather sample meaning information from most words. At least one study suggests that good readers do not pay much attention to vowels, pulling meaning instead from the consonants as primary visual cues.2

Pedantic readers need to shift their focus from the individual word to connected discourse and to integrate their fragmented responses. Slow readers, having been drilled in phonics year after year, have become too bogged down in letters and words. It is little wonder that they need help in seeing the larger picture—the sweeping line, the flowing idea—and in learning to attend to the semantics and syntax instead of plodding along word-by-word.

Carol Chomsky increased the fluency of slow readers by having them listen to tape-recorded books until they could read along with the book. For some children, this meant playing the tape as many as twenty times! And although this may appear to have been an artificially induced fluency, it nonetheless jolted these readers out of their ruts and into the desired behavior. One extra benefit of this experiment was that these readers discovered to their joy that they, too, were capable of reading along like everyone else. The self-confidence they gained from the experience broke them free from their previous conceptions of themselves as failures and generated new and successful attempts at reading.1

Another method of turning hapless readers into happy readers is by using poetry in the classroom. Even children who think they do not like reading will find reading poetry irresistible when their active participation is rewarding. Children who seldom volunteer to read will do so when increased fluency enables them to do so comfortably.

Poems with regular rhythms seem to capture children the most. To use any poem with slow readers, I read the poem first as the children followed along on their papers. Having the teacher read the selection first is a critical step as it provided the first acquaintance with words which might be unknown and with the intonation that carries the meaning.
Fluent reading is a highly complex synthesis of all the reading skills the student has acquired—word identification and meaning, sentence meaning as it affects intonation, and speech production. The student must repeat a selection until fragmentation becomes integration.

The student has acquired —word identification and meaning, sentence meaning until fragmentation becomes integration.

Language series. There is no limit to the ways of developing fluency selections. In fact, developing fluency in slow readers requires it. Linguist Charles Fries reminds reading teachers that to read effectively, one must as it affects intonation, and speech production. The student must repeat a

Hands went up as different students asked to read the poem alone; several did so, with obvious delight. By the time it was apparent that some children were able to say the poem from memory, instead of by reading it, we moved on to another poem. Eyes had read it, mouths had read it, minds had read it. And most importantly of all, slow readers had read it as well as anybody else, which is, after all, their great goal whether articulated or not!

The same repetitious procedure can be used with any short stories or poems. Perhaps everyone's favorite books are Bill Martin, Jr.'s Sound of Language series. There is no limit to the ways of developing fluency through oral reading. A few are:

1. Teacher begins a story, setting the mood. Students who wish to read orally raise hands and read until they wish to stop or must be stopped.
2. Teacher reads the story, leaving out certain key words either within sentences or at the ends of sentences. This speeds up the eye movements of slow readers, forcing them ahead. Children consider this a game and relish the challenge of being able to supply the missing words.
3. Students choose partners, sit in various corners or crannies in the classroom to read to each other. They beg to read the “Bill and Noodles” dialogue from the Sounds of Language series.
4. Teacher reads the entire story the first time, explaining any new or difficult words. Students read round robin the second time.
5. Teacher reads the story. Students read with her as they are inclined. It works well for the teacher to begin at a slower pace, increasing gradually to a normal speaking rate.
6. Sometimes a student will ask to read the entire selection, especially if it reflects a particular interest. In this case the student reads it to himself first before reading to the class.
7. Choral reading can be adapted to many short stories or poems, dividing the class into groups by various ways: by rows, by girls and boys, blue-eyes and brown-eyed, right- and left-handers, talls and shorts, etc. This device lends a gamelike atmosphere to the activity.

It must be emphasized that there is nothing wrong with repeating selections. In fact, developing fluency in slow readers requires it. Linguist Charles Fries reminds reading teachers that to read effectively, one must develop high speed recognition responses to the graphic signs. While good readers may be able to do this on sight, slower readers require much practice to do so.

Fluent reading is a highly complex synthesis of all the reading skills the student has acquired — word identification and meaning, sentence meaning as it affects intonation, and speech production. The student must repeat a selection until fragmentation becomes integration.
Margaret Mead reminds us that we don't object to skaters' or pianists' or hockey players' practicing incessantly. Why should we call all practice of basic skills such as reading or writing "dull drill" and throw it out? While the vogue for inductive teaching and learning is appropriate in some areas, it cannot supplant repetition and drill in skill areas. Surely children have as much right to gain proficiency in a basic skill such as reading fluency as they do in learning a sport. Reading teachers will keep this in mind as they insist upon oral practice for developing fluency in word-by-word readers.
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DIVORCE—READING STYLE

Nicholas P. Criscuolo, Ph.D.
SUPERVISOR OF READING, NEW HAVEN, CONN., PUBLIC SCHOOLS

What is one of the biggest problems in the teaching of reading today? It is curriculum isolationism which results in treating reading as a separate entity rather than as part of the language arts. Teachers spend vast amounts of time teaching reading skills as outlined in basal readers while virtually ignoring the opportunities for children to listen, speak and write. This divorce creates a sterile reading program whereas a marriage of reading with other communication skills results in an effective and healthy reading program.

In too many classrooms, reading instruction consists of using a reading text, workbook and barrels of ditto sheets. Although suggestions are offered in teachers' guides for integrating the program, many teachers prefer to rush through basals so that a certain number can be covered per year. Facets of language arts are ignored which could effectively reinforce reading skills and enhance the entire reading program.

Let's illustrate this point by taking a mythical story “Mr. Floyd's Dilemma” from a mythical basal text *Bold Horizons*. This story is about two children, Margo and Tommy, who help a blind man solve a problem. Reading group members have just read the story and have done their workbook assignment. Ms. Zachary, their teacher, has followed the manual and taught the skill outlined in Step 3: using the consonant clusters *cl* and *bl*.

For some teachers, the end would be there. But not in this classroom. For a listening activity, a paragraph from the story is read to the children. After the paragraph is read, Ms. Zachary asks the children a question on it and reads the answer using three different kinds of expression. Was the character sad? angry? excited? By listening to the paragraph read, children must sense its mood and tone and supply the appropriate response.

Grammar is covered by putting sentences directly from the story and asking children to punctuate each sentence. Oral language is stressed by having children recount, in their own words, experiences they have had which parallel those of the central characters in the story. A related activity would be to give one sentence from the story and each child in turn adds one sentence to it. An oral summary emerges. This type of activity reinforces both oral language and summarization skills.

Creative writing is easier when it's related to specific topics which evolve from one's reading. The nature of the story can change to develop invented circumstances surrounding the major characters. “What if Mr. Floyd were not blind, would the problems he experienced be the same? Would Tommy and Margo have reacted differently?”

Children can be asked to deal with these invented circumstances through writing. Primary children with limited spelling skills can write...
rebus stories using pictures either cut from magazines or drawn by themselves to complete these stories.

Since "Mr. Floyd's Dilemma" deals with a blind person, creative dramatics can take place by blindfolding a child and then asking him or her to do "simple" tasks which could become quite difficult with sight.

A good activity in drama can also occur by asking children to imagine that they are going to produce a play on this story. The following format will be helpful:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Main Street</td>
<td>Tommy Margo Mr. Floyd</td>
<td>Tommy and Margo see Mr. Floyd at a curb with a white cane. They help him cross the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Living room of Mr. Floyd's home</td>
<td>Mr. Floyd Mrs. Floyd Margo Tommy</td>
<td>Mrs. Floyd is pouring lemonade into four glasses. She asks the children if they could do something for her and her husband.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart is completed by the children as a group process. Parts are then assigned to individual children who can then either write out dialogue for each scene or pantomime it.

The process of integrating the language arts does not stop here. The whole room atmosphere can indicate that the reading program in essence is a language development program. Time spent independently on seatwork and projects can also reflect this commitment. For example, some teachers have gotten usable typewriters for children to type out original stories. This spot is known as the Peck Deck. They have secured a small table with a lamp on it for kids to write out their impressions and reactions to their reading. This spot is known as the Jot Spot. Tagged items are placed on a table to stimulate children to do some independent research. This spot is the Label Table. All sorts of spots can be found in a typical classroom which will help children use a variety of language art skills to acquire information and find reading both useful and appealing.

As illustrated in this article, so much can be done with one story to integrate the reading program. When listening, speaking and writing skills are used to reinforce reading skills, a marriage takes place which makes for a much more comprehensive program. A fully integrated program produces not only more efficient readers but motivated ones as well.
FALSE PREREQUISITES IN LEARNING TO READ

Marie Carducci-Bolchazy
READING CONSULTANT, HARVEY, ILLINOIS

Reading management systems, designed to facilitate planning and monitoring of individualized instruction, are based on the concept of prerequisite skills. For this investigation specific skills from the word-attack component of the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development have been selected in order to investigate whether these skills are indeed prerequisite skills for competence in reading. If these skills are prerequisite skills, one should not find competent readers who lack them. (It is important to caution, however, that even if competent readers have certain skills, these skills are not necessarily prerequisite to reading competence. It is possible that competent readers acquired these skills after or as a concomitant to learning to read.)

Review of the Literature

Some of the tests on the Wisconsin Design—Word Attack (level C) are: Consonants and Their Variant Sounds, Two Vowels Together, and Final Vowel. Some of the tests at the D level are: Three Letter Consonant Blends, Syllabication, and Accent. The testing procedure for word attack skills makes extensive use of nonsense words or syllables.

The literature dealing with a specific skill such as consonants and their variant sounds or three letter consonant blends is sparse, but investigations regarding the teaching of grapheme-phoneme correspondences or the teaching of phonics are relevant. Research is generally supportive of the view that the teaching of grapheme-phoneme correspondences is valuable (Bishop, 1964; Chall, 1967; Diack, 1965; Gibson, Pick, & Osser, 1963; Mathews, 1966; Nevins, 1973; Samuels & Jeffrey, 1966; Towner & Dykstra, 1974). By extension, it can be concluded that the literature is generally supportive of the teaching of consonants and their variant sounds and of the teaching of three letter consonant blends.

In regard to the two vowels together generalization and the final vowel generalization, studies on the utility of phonic generalizations (Bailey, 1967; Clymer, 1963; Emans, 1967) should be considered. For the two vowels together generalization, the percent of utility reported was as follows: Bailey, 76%; Clymer, 74%; Emans, 33%. The findings of the utility studies suggest that the two vowels together generalization should not be taught, and that the teaching of the final vowel generalization should be questioned.

The literature on syllabication generally supports the view that the teaching of syllabication (i.e., rules for dividing between syllables) is not valuable. The teaching of syllabication has been questioned by Glass
The teaching of accenting has a little support in the literature (Winkley, 1965), but this evidence is far too scant to suggest that the skill to recognize and place accent marks is essential for reading competence.

In regard to the use of nonsense words or syllables on tests of word-attack skills, investigations have shown that some children who could pronounce real words still had difficulty pronouncing nonsense words (Vellutino, Steger, & Kandel, 1972; Walmsley, 1975). These findings suggest that the scores on tests employing nonsense words should be interpreted with caution.

The question of false prerequisites in the teaching of reading has been investigated by McNeill (1974), who found the following skills to be false prerequisites: selecting words with affixes, distinguishing meaning of homographs, selecting similar sounds of r-controlled vowels, and possibly, selecting pairs of consonant variables. McNeill suggested that since his investigation treated only 15 of the "skills which a consensus regards as essential . . . it is likely that many more non-essentials are being taught in skill development programs" (p. 426).

Investigated in this paper is the validity of skills other than those treated by McNeill (1974).

Method I

Sample. The sample consisted of 25 eighth-grade students who had scored at or above the 50th percentile on a standardized reading achievement test. These students attended an inner-city school located in an area of low socioeconomic level in Lancaster, a small city in southern Pennsylvania. The racial composition of the sample was mixed. Sample selection was done by the school principal, and all of the subjects were enrolled in a foreign language class, either Spanish or French.

Procedure. The students were tested by this investigator on five components of the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development—Word Attack, levels C (approximately second grade level) and D (approximately third grade level). In this order, the students were administered the following tests: Three Letter Consonant Blends, Two Vowels Together, Final Vowel, Accent, and Syllabication. Tests were administered according to directions given in the manual.

The Three Letter Consonant Blends Test uses the following procedure:

1. The student is shown four combinations of letters, e.g., sce, spr, scr, and scl. (2) The test administrator pronounces twice a nonsense word like screp, which must be pronounced to rhyme with the real word pep. (3) The student selects the combination of letters that correspond to the first three letters in the nonsense word.

The two Vowels Together Test uses two procedures. For the first procedure: (1) The student is shown a nonsense word as moav. (2) The test
whether the word was pronounced correctly. (3) The student then decides whether the nonsense word is pronounced "as the rule says it should be pronounced." For the second procedure: (1) The student is shown a real word such as because. (2) The test administrator pronounces a word that may or may not be the word because. (3) The student decides whether the word was pronounced correctly.

The Final Vowel Test also uses two procedures. For the first procedure: (1) The student is shown a nonsense word like vo. (2) The test administrator pronounces the nonsense word to rhyme with the real word to. (3) The student then decides whether the nonsense word was pronounced as the rule says it should be pronounced. For the second procedure: (1) The student is shown a real word such as go. (2) The test administrator pronounces a word that may or may not be the word go. (3) The student then decides whether the word was pronounced correctly.

For the Accent Test, students were shown a word which was accented in two or three different ways (but only one way was correct), e.g., bum' ble bee, bum ble' bee, bum ble bee'. The students were directed to select the alternative they thought was right.

For the Syllabication Test students were shown a word which was syllabicated in several different ways (but only one way was correct). The students were directed to select the alternative they thought was right.

Results on the Three Letter Consonant Blends Test, all the students passed the criterion of 80%, with the mean score being 90%. This finding does not contradict the view that skill with three letter consonant blends is prerequisite to reading competence. (It should be remembered that the literature generally supports the teaching of grapheme-phoneme correspondences, and by extension, the teaching of three letter consonant blends.)

On the Two Vowels Together Test, all but one of the students passed the criterion of 80%; even though the directions for this test were somewhat misleading. This finding does not contradict the view that skill with the two vowels together generalization is prerequisite to reading competence. (It should be remembered, however, that the utility of phonic generalization studies suggest that this generalization should not be taught.)

On the Final Vowel Test, 60% of the students failed to meet the criterion of 80%, the mean being 74%. Furthermore, if the last third of the test, which uses real words, were omitted, 72% of the students would have failed to make the criterion passing score. In analyzing the data on the Final Vowel Test, it became apparent that most of the students made responses keyed as incorrect as a result of their experiences with real words. For example, many of the students decided that pronouncing vo to rhyme with the real word to was correct; yet, according to the answer key, that pronunciation was incorrect. These data provide some evidence that skill with the final vowel generalization, at least as tested by the Wisconsin Design, is not prerequisite to reading competence. (It should be remembered that the utility of phonic generalization studies suggest that the teaching of the final vowel generalization should be questioned.)
On the Accent Test, a surprising 68% of the students failed to meet the criterion of 80%, the mean score being 61%. These data suggest that skill in selecting correctly-accented words is not prerequisite to reading competence. (It should be remembered that the literature in this area is scant.)

On the Syllabication Test, all but one of the students passed the criterion of 80%, the mean score being 89%. These data do not contradict the view that skill in syllabication is prerequisite to reading competence. (However, the literature suggests that the teaching of syllabication [i.e., rules for dividing between syllables] is not of value.)

Method II

Sample. Two school districts that have been using the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development—Word Attack Skills participated in a survey of the subskills in the Wisconsin model. Completed survey forms were received from 8 third-grade teachers, 7 fourth-grade teachers, and 6 fifth-grade teachers, a total of 21 teachers.

Procedure. Teachers were asked a number of questions about the children in their class who are competent readers (i.e., those children who would be able to score at approximately the 70th percentile or better on a standardized reading test). Eight subtests from levels C and D of the Word Attack Component of the Wisconsin Design were listed, and teachers were asked what per cent of their competent readers could pass each subtest. (See appendix for further details.)

Results. In Table I are reported the results of the survey of the 21 teachers regarding the ability of their competent readers to pass certain level C Word Attack Tests on the Wisconsin Design. Since level C skills are approximately second grade level skills, then third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade competent readers should have mastered these skills. Given testing error, one might expect 90-95% of these students to pass tests of level C skills. Considering the fact that a number of the teachers stated that their estimates were approximate, perhaps 85% would be an acceptable average for each grade level. Then, using an 85% criterion, too many third-graders, (but not fourth- or fifth-graders), failed the following tests: Long Vowel Sounds, Two Vowels, and Final Vowel. These data give a little support to the view that these skills may not be prerequisite to reading competence.

In Table 2 are reported the results of the survey of the 21 teachers regarding the ability of their competent readers to pass certain level D Word Attack Tests on the Wisconsin Design. Since level D skills are approximately third-grade level skills, then most of the third-grade, and all of the fourth-, and fifth-grade competent readers should have mastered these skills. Perhaps a criterion of 80% might be used for the third grade, and a criterion of 85% for fourth and fifth grades. Then, on the Three Letter Consonant Blends Test, the averages for all three grades were acceptable. On the Syllabication Test, the fifth-grade average was acceptable, but the third- and fourth-grade averages were not. On the Accent Test, none of the averages were acceptable. These data thus give some support to the view
that skill with three letter consonant blends may be prerequisite to reading competence. These data also contradict the view that skill in dividing words into syllables and in selecting correctly-accented words probably are prerequisite to reading competence.

**Concluding Remarks**

This paper presented evidence that at least some of the skills listed in the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development—Word Attack Skills are probably not prerequisite skills for reading competence. Specifically, both the data from the study with eighth-graders and the survey of teachers suggest that skill with the final vowel generalization and with selecting correctly-accented words are not prerequisite skills. Additionally, the survey results provide a little evidence that some other skills may not be prerequisite to reading competence, namely the skills assessed by the following tests: Long Vowel Sounds, Two Vowels Together, and Silent Letters. The data from this investigation do not contradict the view that skill with consonants and their variant sounds and with three letter consonant blends may be prerequisite to reading competence.

The purpose of this paper has been to investigate the validity of the assumption that prerequisite skills to reading competence have been identified. Conclusions drawn here concern the Wisconsin model but probably will generalize to most other management systems. Since management systems have already been published and disseminated and are not likely to be extensively revised in the near future, school districts employing such systems will need to make some decisions regarding the validity of the various components. This paper offers some evidence to aid school districts to make some of these decisions.
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APPENDIX

SURVEY ON THE SUB-SKILLS OF THE:

WISCONSIN DESIGN FOR READING SKILL DEVELOPMENT

WORD ATTACK SKILLS — LEVELS C AND D

Name: _________________________________ School: _______________________

Grade(s) You Teach: ____________________________
(If you are not a teacher, please indicate your title. ______________________)

Did you use the Wisconsin Design for Reading Skill Development last year? yes no

When answering the following questions, please consider ONLY those children who are competent readers. (Children classified as competent readers should be able to score at approximately the 70th percentile or better on a standardized reading test).

What % of the competent readers in your class could pass the following sub-test?

(1) Level C-Test 2 Consonants and Their Variant Sounds, fewer than 75%_ 75-84%_ 85-89%_ 90-94%_ 95-97%_ 98-100%

(2) Level C-Test 4 Long Vowel Sounds, fewer than 75%_ 75-84%_ 85-89%_ 90-94%_ 95-97%_ 98-100%

(3) Level C-Test 10 Two Vowels Together, fewer than 75%_ 75-84%_ 85-89%_ 90-94%_ 95-97%_ 98-100%

(4) Level C-Test 11 Final Vowel, fewer than 75%_ 75-84%_ 85-89%_ 90-94%_ 95-97%_ 98-100%

(5) Level D-Test 2 Three Letter Consonant Blends, fewer than 75%_ 75-84%_ 85-89%_ 90-94%_ 95-97%_ 98-100%

(6) Level D-Test 3 Silent Letters, fewer than 75%_ 75-84%_ 85-89%_ 90-94%_ 95-97%_ 98-100%

(7) Level D-Test 4 Syllabication, fewer than 75%_ 75-84%_ 85-89%_ 90-94%_ 95-97%_ 98-100%

(8) Level D-Test 5 Accent, fewer than 75%_ 75-84%_ 85-89%_ 90-94%_ 95-97%_ 98-100%

Would you like the results of this survey sent to you? yes no

USE REVERSE SIDE OF PAPER FOR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS.
Table 1

Results of Survey of 21 Teachers Regarding the Ability of Their Competent Readers to Pass Certain C-Level Word Attack Tests on the Wisconsin Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Taught by Teacher</th>
<th>3 (n = 8)</th>
<th>4 (n = 7)</th>
<th>5 (n = 6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Cent of Students Who Could Pass Test</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 75%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-97%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consonants and Their Variant Sounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Vowel Sounds</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-97%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two Vowels Together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Vowel</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 75%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-97%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There were 2 third-, 3 fourth-, and 2 fifth-grade teachers who stated that their estimates were approximate.

**In averaging the scores, the category "Less than 75%" counted as 70%.
Table 2
Results of Survey of 21 Teachers Regarding the Ability of Their Competent Readers to Pass Certain D-Level Word Attack Tests on the Wisconsin Design

| Grade Taught by Teacher | *Per Cent of Students Who Could Pass Test | \n|------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 3 (n = 8)              | 4 (n = 7)                                | 5 (n = 6)                                |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three Letter Consonant Blends</th>
<th>3rd-grade average=87.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less than 75%</strong></td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84%</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89%</td>
<td>2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94%</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-97%</td>
<td>2 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-100%</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silent Letters</th>
<th>3rd-grade average=78.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 75%</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84%</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89%</td>
<td>1 4 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94%</td>
<td>1 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-97%</td>
<td>0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-100%</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllabication</th>
<th>3rd-grade average=74.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 75%</td>
<td>5 4 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84%</td>
<td>2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89%</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94%</td>
<td>0 0 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-97%</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-100%</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accent</th>
<th>3rd-grade average=73.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 75%</td>
<td>5 5 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-84%</td>
<td>3 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89%</td>
<td>0 0 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-94%</td>
<td>0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95-97%</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-100%</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There were 2 third-, 3 fourth-, and 2 fifth-grade teachers who stated that their estimates were approximate.

**In averaging the scores, the category “Less than 75%” counted as 70%.”
How can teachers measure the untapped resources of a child's oral language? What tool can the teacher use to observe language patterns that may enhance or retard the student's reading achievement? Questions as these are asked, studied, and the results observed. The tests devised to answer these questions have led to one definitive statement: In terms of specific behavior, reading achievement and subsequent learnings are determined by the effect of a language pattern influenced by appropriate or inappropriate cognitive thought.

The various cognitive levels of oral language production have been examined and it has been found that the construction and formation of word associations gauge development and facility. The language development of children denotes a sequential pattern of word association developing from unrelated, to divergent (syntagmatic), to convergent (paradigmatic) responses. The possible effect of a child's language pattern on his reading achievement is not equivocally known; however, it may ultimately enhance or retard learning performance. Deficits in prior experience or prior learning can handicap a child in developing oral responses needed in language development.

The teacher must keep in mind the possibility that it may be the child's background experiences, physiological development, or other factors hindering the development of language, and not the child's innate cognitive ability.

Development from the concrete level of cognitive thought to the abstract level is that process which enables the child to successfully process information through language levels and thus facilitate achievement in reading.

It has long been this educator's thought that there must be an informal test instrument that could help the teacher determine a student's level of language development. In this way, the teacher would be assisted in teaching to those deficits in a particular child's language production.

A tool to aid the teacher in determining students' level of language development is presented here. An example of a teacher-made test using the four levels of cognitive (paradigmatic) language responses to aid in reading achievement are as follows:

The first level of language responses involves the relation of contrast: hot-cold; up-down.

The second level of responses to be evaluated is the relation of whole-part: hand-finger; head-eye.
Relations are used to evaluate the responses which are used to produce an observable product of the intellect. Does the child respond to a stimulus word from experience (in - the kitchen) or from the language level (in - out)?

The third level of language responses is the coordinate class: car truck; cat-dog. The coordinate class of responses are units of language that have been compared and found to have observable similarities, i.e., car-truck are vehicles.

The fourth and highest level of responses is that of super-ordinate responses: morning-time; oak-tree. The super-ordinate system of responses tie together several classes because of a broader relation.

These four level of products of the intellect enable the child to successfully perform on tests measuring reading achievement.

The preliminary studies conducted using this Oral Language Inventory indicates that those children with achievement scores on or above grade level also exhibit appropriate language level scores. Conversely, those students with predominantly syntagmatic responses had below grade level achievement test scores.

The results of this preliminary study indicate positive correlation between achievement test scores and oral language production. It is felt that scores obtained on the Oral Language Inventory can provide the classroom and special reading teacher with an instrument for more accurate evaluation of oral language production. Thus, the teacher can provide more effective instruction in reading skills.

This observation began with two questions: How and with what can the teacher measure a child's oral language? The Oral Language Inventory is proffered here as an aid for the classroom teacher in an attempt to answer these questions.
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REQUIRED PREPARATION IN READING FOR SECONDARY TEACHERS

Walter J. Lamberg
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

Introduction

In Fall, 1977, a survey was conducted on requirements for secondary teachers in the area of reading instruction. Information from state certifying agencies show a majority of states have some requirements. The results of the survey, when compared to results of two earlier surveys, show increasing interest in secondary reading.

The Survey

As the Undergraduate Adviser for Secondary English and Reading, I was interested in the nature and extent of required preparation in instruction in reading. Officials responsible for teacher certification in all states and the District of Columbia were sent a questionnaire. The following information was requested: (1) whether or not there were requirements, (2) the number of required hours of course work, (3) the "content" of required courses, and (4) whether or not there was a move to establish requirements, in the event no requirements were in effect. All agencies responded. Six substituted or added statements from their offices which detailed requirements; the rest returned the completed questionnaire.

Results

Of the 51 agencies, 30 had some kind of requirement, as reported in Table I. Twenty-three required 3 or more hours of course work. Three hours were the minimum required (by 15 states); 12 was the maximum. Seven agencies had an unspecified number of hours. Two agencies required a demonstration of knowledge or competence, but did not require course work.

Twenty-one agencies had requirements for all secondary teachers. Five had requirements only for secondary English teachers; 3, only for Secondary Reading teachers. One state indicated that only some (unspecified) teacher education programs had requirements.

Agencies were asked to indicate which of the following areas of reading were required: (1) content-area (i.e., reading directly related to subject-areas, such as English, Social Studies, Science, and Mathematics); (2) developmental reading (development of general areas of comprehension, vocabulary, and flexibility; not necessarily directly related to subjects); (3) remedial (for students with reading difficulties); and (4) beginning (for students unable to read). Four agencies required coursework which covered all four areas of reading. One state required the first three areas. Four required content-area and developmental reading. Eight required only
content-area reading; one agency, only developmental. Eleven states did not indicate the area of reading.

Twenty-one states had no requirements. Of those, 12 indicated that there was presently a consideration of the possibility of establishing requirements.

Conclusions

A study by Estes and Piercey, in 1973, found 17 percent of the states had requirements in reading instruction for secondary teachers. A study by Bader, in 1975, found 35 percent. The present study found 59 percent. The study by Bader found that 55 percent either had, or were considering having, requirements. The present study found that 82 percent had, or were considering having, requirements.

The majority of states with requirements had them for all secondary teachers. A minority limited requirements to secondary English and Reading teachers. The emphasis in course work was on content-area reading.

The results of three surveys show that secondary teachers are expected to be knowledgeable of reading instruction and to apply that knowledge in the context of content-area or subject-matter instruction. During the 1970's increasingly more states have established requirements.
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Table 1
Secondary Reading Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Unspecified hours</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Or by examination</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Unspecified hours</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Unspecified hours</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>One or more courses</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unspecified hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Quarter Hours:</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sec. Eng. only</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Some programs</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sec. Eng. only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sec. Eng. only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sec. Eng. only</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>Competency required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sec. Rdg. Tch. only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sec. Reading Teachers</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sec. Rdg. Tch. only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>only</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sec. Eng. only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many persons have developed the understanding that the evaluation of a given student's reading ability must take the form of the administration of a commercial, standardized reading test. Though the results of a standardized test can be valuable, secondary teachers need to develop an evaluation model which encompasses a number of factors. These aspects would include commercial tests, informal techniques, observational devices, and the study of past reading performance data accrued by a reader.

In many ways, informal reading tests may be more useful and practical than the typical standardized reading achievement test. In the first place, the validity and reliability of such instruments vary considerably. Second, since they are norm-referenced with a large general population they are unlikely to measure those exact skills and competencies which have been promoted by a particular content teacher. Third, there are many aspects of reading skill development which cannot be evaluated by a timed, pencil-and-paper test that is not related to current class materials.

Because of these inherent limitations, all secondary teachers should be aware of the role and nature of various informal reading techniques and devices for the purpose of collecting pertinent data which will serve as a basis for formulating appropriate teaching strategies. The purpose of this article is to describe the procedures for constructing and administering informal measures. Attendant explanations relating to the proper analysis of the test results and how this information may be used for improving reading instruction are included.

The Oral Reading Test

After determining the grade level difficulty of a given text or article being used by the class, ask each student to read orally from the material. Each student should be asked to read a 200-word passage. During the oral reading exercise the teacher should make a careful analysis of all oral reading errors (omissions, substitutions, or refusals) committed during the reading exercise. If he/she makes more than ten errors, the reading material may be at frustration level for the student and should not be used for that student. If the reader makes fewer than four oral reading mistakes, the printed matter may be too easy.

A Sight Word Test

Using the same material alluded to in the previous section, a formal sight vocabulary test can be constructed. By the use of a systemized sam-
pling technique, a collection of 30 sight words can be employed. These words can be selected by listing every eighth word in a typical 250 word passage of the book or article. This technique should prove to be a good sampling device since both simple as well as more complex words will be chosen. Each word selected can be printed on three by five inch pieces of white cardboard and flashed, one at a time, for one to two seconds for each word. The student who is reading at the readability level of the book should be able to pronounce correctly at least 23 of the 25 words which are flashed. Those who cannot demonstrate competency at this level should use easier books.

**The Cloze Procedure**

One of the most efficient methods of evaluating the vocabulary and concept formation of students is to administer a cloze test. The following steps should be observed in developing the test:

1. Select a 425-word passage from a book or article which has been determined to be at grade level difficulty.
2. Duplicate the passage leaving the first sentence intact. Beginning with the second sentence, leave every eighth word blank until there are fifty blanks in evidence. (The only exceptions to this practice would be first and last words of sentences and proper nouns.)
3. Ask each student to complete the test, writing the most appropriate word for each of the blanks on the test. Only answers which correspond exactly with the words from the original source should be counted.
4. The following standard should be used in evaluating test performance:

   - 0-18 correct — book or article is too difficult for the student.
   - 19-25 correct — book is proper for the reader.
   - 26-50 correct — material is too easy for the student.

   It is important to employ the results of the cloze test with the data derived from other evaluative techniques before decisions are made concerning a student's reading ability.

**Group Informal Reading Inventory**

A quick assessment of a given student's ability to read and comprehend classroom reading matter involves the selection of four to five pages of material to be read silently by all class members. A ten-question test should be constructed and administered. Questions used for checking comprehension should include literal and interpretative type items. All students who score at a level of at least 80 percent on the test can probably use that reading book or article for everyday assignments. Any student who scores below 70 percent might possess serious reading problems and may have great difficulty in "handling" the books or other materials from which the test was taken. These readers will need several types of differentiated reading aids if assignments are to be completed successfully.

**Functional Reading Test**

One of the best methods of determining the ability of a learner to use a content textbook is to construct an examination which requires him/her to
locate data of a precise nature. Approximately ten questions which are similar to the following may be constructed:
1. On what page(s) would you find information about Sterling J. Morton?
2. On what page does Chapter 3 of Part III begin?
3. Examine the map on page 287. Which city in Brazil has the largest population?
4. Look at the graph on page 49. In what year did Nebraska have the most confirmed tornadoes?
5. How many chapters does this book contain?

Any student who misses more than two items on the ten-question test may need corrective reading instruction with respect to certain aspects of functional reading skill development.

Summary

Reading evaluation for secondary students must be broader in scope than the use of one or more commercial standardized instruments. The informal reading tests which have been described in this article will provide all content teachers with valuable tools for evaluating such important aspects as a learner's instructional reading level, vocabulary proficiency, and comprehension abilities. The data from these techniques should be used with results obtained from other evaluative devices to help each teacher develop appropriate lesson plans for every student.
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Contact is the basic word in education. It means that the teacher must relate himself to his students not as one brain to other brains—a well-developed brain to still undeveloped ones—but as one being to other beings; . . . . What is required is not merely a search for information from below and a handing down of information from above, nor a mere interchange of questions and answers, but a genuine dialogue into which the teacher must enter directly and unselfconsciously . . . .

If ever there were a teaching method tailor-made for "genuine dialogue" between and among teachers and learners, it is epitomized by instructional procedures of the language-experience approach. As reported in this publication, action research in this area demonstrates this repeatedly. In the first section of the volume, Stauffer discusses the dimensions of a sound reading program leading to high competencies in responsible choices for "freedoms of self, of a scholar, of a citizen and of mankind." Here, he advances certain convictions about the characteristics of the reading process, and practices which further its effective development, mastery, and utilization. Over and over again, through such phrases as "evaluate process," "active searching and decision making," "continuous reciprocity of language and thought," and "functional contexts" of concept and language learning, he emphasizes that acquiring the cognitive skills necessary to attain the versatile reading achievements of a scholar requires competent instruction, constant interaction, and conscientious, intentional study. Everywhere, today, teachers are faced with more and greater pressures to push, for completion of schedules; to produce, for compilation of scores; to perform, for competitive scrutiny; and to prove that standard curriculum by fiat produces popular scholarship. To help their students achieve high competencies, reading teachers must be able to distinguish between methods based upon sound, compatible pedagogy and philosophy, and those dictated by the time-consuming trivialities of many of the newer, basal "delivery and management systems." This author provides good direction for determining where/how to delegate priorities of teaching time and energy so that these two precious elements will be conserved and enhanced, not wasted nor diminished, and so that the mind-nourishing, thinking process of reading may not be sacrificed upon the altar of

---

ephemeral success in completion of the next level text/workbook. To this end, Stauffer sets forth certain convictions:

1. The reading process is akin to the thinking process. Cognitive actions required in the fruitful search for meaning constitute the most striking features of the process;
2. Command of the reading-thinking process is developed best in the dynamics of a group situation. Actions involving searching and decision making are focused on cognitive enrichment, with resulting development of processes of thinking and logical methods of inquiry;
3. Group directed reading-thinking activities provide the group with useful ways of behaving, helping the individual members to know themselves and their limitations, and to be self-generative in their learning;
4. Utilizing the principles and practices associated with the structured, multivariety and adaptive language-experience approach is the best way to take advantage of the linguistic, experiential and cognitive maturity that children possess. Through these functional strategies children acquire word recognition and comprehension power; they also learn to transfer these powers successfully to many printed sources;
5. The school library, together with public libraries and classroom libraries, must provide the hub of a sound reading instruction program. These multi-media centers have the potential to capture interest and to promote a taste for the desire to read;
6. To read is to comprehend and to manipulate concepts; therefore, concept development is of primary importance in reading instruction. Concepts are not acquired by explanations and memorization, but through experiencing them in their functional contexts; and
7. The efficient reader is the versatile reader. Sound and thorough reading instruction, with purposes for reading as the principal determiners, will demand decisions on adjustment of rate; rate of comprehension becomes more important than rate of reading.

Recognition of the foregoing components and provision for their inclusion/facilitation in the reading program, not on a short term basis, but across the years, will help children acquire and refine their cognitive skills. Thus, may their minds grow to the "disciplined and dignified, competent and productive, vigilant and independent." In such an instructional setting, much is required of teachers in terms of time, competencies, personal involvement, confidence, and energy spent on improvement of classroom learning, which, in itself, is a just reward.

To be effective, teachers and others interested in improving classroom instruction in the reading-thinking processes must work through first-hand
classroom experiences—examining, altering, and refining the dynamics of instruction. It is that kind of action research, carried on by teachers in the field, in actual schools and classrooms throughout the country that are reported in this volume. Other teachers may find these descriptions helpful and stimulating, even desirable for replication. Instructors in reading clinics/teacher-training institutions should find many ideas here to discuss and explore.

The author and compiler of this text admits that research reported here represents functional, rather than final, truths. Nevertheless, he maintains that certain trends established in some of the studies have important implications; at the same time, he suggests that what is needed are more and varied studies in many of these same areas. Perhaps, there are even larger goals at stake than heretofore realized, or even suspected. One of the most intriguing bits in the whole text is the short report of the C. vanEyk Grobler study regarding channeling of aggression. It arouses speculation as to what other areas of social thinking/behavior might be influenced by the L.E.A. approach, implemented through Directed Reading-Thinking Activity procedures. How is freedom of critical thinking that involves active participation of the thinking subject related to social thinking and social reality? The one crucial variable in all the important reading research burgeoning out of the federal grants to education in the sixties and early seventies was a human factor, the teacher. It may be that the most significant result of teaching cognitive skills for independent, disciplined decision-making is to make it possible for masses of people to live on this earth and enjoy life together as fully valued human beings.

... our intellect is not meant to stop working when it comes to social relations ... an intellectual development that stops short of the social reality is bound to be experienced today as incomplete and irrelevant.

Education for thinking, therefore, has as its most important indirect goal helping individuals to take an active, intelligent part in shaping the life of society, from personal relations within a family to attitudes toward people living in other countries and under different social systems. As with other activities, the age range of the elementary school period is a most necessary and at the same time a most promising period for laying the foundation of social thinking.²

---

Barron, Roderick W., Linnea C. Ehri, and Jeffrey M. Feldman, *The Recognition of Words.* International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Road, P.O. Box 8139, Newark, Delaware 19711.

*The Recognition of Words* by Barron, Ehri, and Feldman is the third title in an IRA series on "The Development of the Reading Process."

The series is organized around the notion that the child's reading behavior, among other things, is a developmental phenomenon. In *The Recognition of Words,* Linnea Ehri proposes a general model for the recognition of words which requires that various aspects of words must be amalgamated and assimilated into the child's previously constructed linguistic systems.


The authors stress the millions of dollars lost each year because of poor listening habits, together with the emotional distress and anguish caused in part by our not listening to the needs of ourselves and others. They feel teachers must learn and teach better listening. With this in mind, they present fifteen classroom activities which can be used as presented, or in modified version, for children of all ages and backgrounds. Also, they laud the steady increase in listening research in the past twenty-five years.

Cleary, Donna McKee, *Thinking Thursdays: Language Arts in the Reading Lab.* International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Road, P.O. Box 8139, Newark, Delaware 19711.

This 87-page book reveals a creative and humanistic method for approaching reading problems of the secondary student.

Author Donna Cleary feels thinking is what reading and learning is all about and that students experiencing difficulty need warmth, love and success in their reading program.


Through extensive experimentation in the Detroit Public Schools Citron has drawn the conclusion that the success rate for spelling is significantly higher when a phonic system of teaching is employed.
While there are many proposals and ideas for changing our present system, Citron suggests one similar to that chosen by the Australian Teachers Federation where one change to bring the phonemic system back in line to an alphabetic one is made every four years. This would allow for necessary changes and adjustments over a long period of time.

Examples of advantages and research experience are provided to support the proposal.


The relationship between spelling and reading has long been debated. While there are definite commonalities between the poor speller and poor reader, the relationship between the good reader-poor speller and good speller-poor reader is less understood.

Most problems stem from English spelling inconsistencies and teaching techniques. Teachers are cautioned to take both into account but to avoid confusing the important differences in the encoding and decoding processes involved in spelling and reading respectively.


Sure to provoke controversy, this timely article deals with the current neglected state of writing in American schools today.

Donald Graves emphasizes the importance of writing as a complex discipline that develops a person's intelligence and ability to analyze and synthesize many levels of thinking. Unfortunately, due to a myriad of reasons, writing is rarely taught or even valued in education according to the author.

The mutually beneficial relationship between reading and writing is explored. However, Graves feels that the concern with reading is a "national neurosis" and has directly contributed to the decline of teaching writing.

A lucid and well thought out "process-conference approach" to the teaching of writing is defined that would eliminate many of the traditional pitfalls of teaching writing.

Harper, Robert J., and Gary Kilarr, eds., *Reading and the Law*, International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Road, P.O. Box 8139, Newark, Delaware 19711.

Will minimal literacy standards for graduation and funding turn into maximum standards? What kind of reading will the law prescribe? Are the Basic assumptions that underlie the present
relationship between law and reading accurate?

These and similar questions are raised in *Reading and the Law*, edited by Robert J. Harper II, Lawyer’s Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, and Gary Kilarr, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, a joint publication by the International Reading Association and the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills. A compilation of the writings of various authors, this text raises provocative questions in order to provide information and to encourage the awareness of a very complex problem—that posed by the relationship between law and reading.


Jamestown publishers have presented a series of high interest low level reading booklets that are both well constructed and beautifully illustrated.

The grade 2-3 reading level booklets are the “branching” story variety where a student chooses the outcome from among 3 possibilities. Author Lee Mountain has written exciting sequences and follows up each “trip” with a unique system of pressure sensitive picture stickers the student places on worksheets in the back. The pupil then answers appropriate questions designed to improve his attention and concentration.

The series all involve trips with varying outcomes. Students are motivated through the exciting, well written material to explore all the possibilities available. While these are most suitable for grades 6-12, adult learners and capable upper elementary students would find them of value also.


Five tried and proven means for effective teaching of writing are explained. These methods: the models approach, the steps approach, the sentence-combining approach, the relationships approach and the theory-of-the-world approach are not necessarily new or gimmicky but are based on past practice and research.

Confusion in the field of teaching writing has resulted in some chaos regarding techniques but author Miles Myers believes that the above, in combination or isolation depending on individual needs, still are the best means for providing a sound approach to writing.

An interesting solution to the management of individualized reading instruction. A great deal of summertime work turned out to result in a successful reading skills program. This may give you an idea about how you can spend your summer profitably. Utilizes existing materials in a functional manner.


*Nonsense Word Stories* from *Thinkerthings* (duplicating masters published by Addison Wesley). Uses nonsense words in logical context. Could be used as model for similar activities. Should be stimulating and challenging for all levels.


Osburn and McDonell feel that if reading skills are to be improved, classroom teachers must become aware of the interrelatedness of reading to language processes so that instruction may be geared toward activities which reinforce all communication skills. With this in mind, they have designed a series of workshops to be used by primary, upper elementary, or secondary school teachers, and describe them in detail. These workshops have been designed to develop teachers' understanding of the systems which underlie language and the language process, and to provide model activities which will support and build on the language competencies.


Readers of *Learning* share some innovative approaches and alternatives to the typical book report.

Included are such suggestions as secret student pen pals sharing ideas about books, activity cards placed in book pockets, pictorial book reporting, letter correspondence between students in different classes about books, creating art type "quilt" of books read by students with appropriate data, and collecting various items related to a book in a brown bag to share with other classmates. All ideas presented move away from the structured report form.

Readers are asked to remember that not every book needs reporting of any type; free reading should be free.

This 16-page booklet offers simple and practical advice to parents who wish to help their children achieve a good experience with reading. A 50-point checklist for parents is provided to see how the home reading program measures up to the ideal. Suggestions that could interfere with the actual teaching experience are not made.

In addition, common questions that parents might have regarding today's teaching of reading, techniques, and materials are answered. Cooperation and communication between the school and home is stressed as essential.
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