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A New Beginning

This summer issue of READING HORIZONS represents a hallmark in both the history of the journal and the career of its editor, Dr. Dorothy J. McGinnis. Dr. McGinnis has recently accepted the opportunity to resume a full schedule of teaching as a professor of education at Western Michigan University.

Her full and varied career has included 8 years as Associate Editor of READING HORIZONS and 7 years as its Editor. Dr. McGinnis has served as Director of the Reading Center and Clinic for 11 years. Along with Homer L. J. Carter, she established one of the first college-adult reading programs in the State of Michigan, and the longest continuous adult program in the nation. Her many books and articles have become standard references in the field of reading.

The HORIZONS staff is appreciative of the direction and achievement Dr. McGinnis has given the journal and will miss her positive and constructive influence in our efforts. We are sorry to lose her but are aware that many future students of reading will benefit from the opportunity to learn from this outstanding educator.

The Staff of
READING HORIZONS
NEW EDITORIAL BOARD APPOINTED

READING HORIZONS is pleased to announce the appointment of a new editorial board whose members will serve a three-year period. HORIZONS welcomes these distinguished scholars to the staff of the journal.

DR. LORRAINE BEITLER is Coordinator of the Allied Health Learning Center of the New York City Community College of the City University of New York. She has served as co-director and consultant for various committees of the International Reading Association, National Reading Conference and College Reading Association as well as for the City University of New York. Dr. Beitler has had extensive experience with reading and reading programs at the community college level.

DR. HAP GILLILAND, director of the Eastern Montana College Reading Center, also serves as Montana State Coordinator for the International Reading Association and Executive Director of the Rocky Mountain Reading Specialists Association. Dr. Gilliland, known for his contributions in the field of reading disabilities, has published two books in that area.

DR. LAWRENCE E. HAFNER, a Research Professor of Reading and Language Arts at Florida State University, is the author of many articles dealing with the problems of reading in the secondary area as well as the author of three books. Dr. Hafner has served as editor of the Journal of Reading Behavior since 1968.

BETTY L. HAGBERG, an assistant professor at Western Michigan University's Reading Center and Clinic, has authored several articles and is a regular contributor to READING HORIZONS. Mrs. Hagberg has specialized in the field of reading and reading disabilities in the elementary areas. She currently is serving as president of the Homer L. J. Carter Reading Association, Southwestern Michigan.
READING PROGRAMS AT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEVEL

In recent years the educational institution which has experienced the most rapid growth is the community college. One of the distinguishing features of the community college is its open-door policy. The open-door policy means that any student with a high school diploma can enter college, usually without regard to level of achievement or age. Because of its open-door policy, the community college, in general, has a higher proportion of marginal and high-risk students than four-year colleges and universities. Community colleges have recognized this fact and have developed reading improvement classes for these students, but too often such classes are remedial in nature and isolated from the academic life of the campus. As a result of the emphasis on remediation, administrators, faculty members, and students often regard the reading program as a “refuge for the stupid.” Consequently, many of the students who need help are reluctant to participate because of the program’s reputation. Many of the more able students who could profit from guidance in learning how to learn refuse to take part for the same reason. Therefore, it seems obvious that to be truly effective the purpose of the reading program should be re-examined.

A good college reading program SHOULD assist the poorly prepared student, but its purpose should be broader than this. The reading program at a community college should provide service to ALL its students and should be more than a facility for teaching reading skills. It should not be just a place to practice reading-study skills but a facility where the student can get help with his learning problems. It should be a center which fosters the concepts of self-learning. It should involve students, administrators, and content area teachers as well as learning center staff. The reading-learning center should be the heart of the community college and should serve as a support system for the institution’s total academic program.

Dorothy J. McGinnis
Editor
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF
ATTITUDES OF FIRST GRADE CHILDREN
IN TWO READING PROGRAMS—
INDIVIDUALIZED AND BASAL

Ann Warren & E. Coston Frederick
BOISE STATE COLLEGE

Background of Problem

Many studies have been done comparing individualized and basal reading programs, but few have employed a valid attitude scale to evaluate attitudes toward reading at the primary level.

Adams (1962), while comparing individualized reading with basal oriented reading, failed to use an attitude scale in his test data, yet concluded that a more favorable attitude toward reading was found in the individualized reading program. Duker's study (1957) suggested that his individualized group evidenced larger vocabulary, read more books, and enjoyed reading more. Again, no scale was used to measure attitudes. Acinapuro's study (1959) of upper elementary children found that an individualized program created more positive attitudes, as measured on an attitude scale.

Since more favorable attitudes had been alluded to in some primary studies which used no attitude scale, and other studies used scales but were concerned with a higher grade level, perhaps studies need to be done on the first grade level also using an attitude scale.

Statement of Problem

Will children at the first grade level show a more favorable attitude toward reading in an individualized reading program, as measured by an attitude scale, compared to children in a basal oriented program?

Population

Ninety-eight first grade children from seven classrooms were involved in the research project. Fifty-three children were systematically sampled from three classrooms employing an individualized reading program and were assigned to the experimental group. Forty-five were
systematically sampled from children involved in a basal-oriented reading program and assigned to the control group.

Selection of Groups

The classrooms were selected by the reading technique used. Professors who had visited the classrooms reported teachers who employed techniques favoring individualized reading or basal oriented reading. The teachers selected for the individualized group had to be employing the principles of seeking, self-selection, and pacing. Individual conferences between the teacher and child, held one or more times a week, were also necessary for a classroom to be included in the individualized group. No provision was made to control the teacher variable except that they were considered outstanding by a professor or by the teacher's principal.

The basal oriented group, the control, was also selected by recommendation of the teacher's principal or a professor who had visited the class. These teachers were also reported to be outstanding. The basal group had to be using ability grouping for reading and also a basal series. When a reading group had completed one book in the series, the children would go on to the next book in the series.

Measurement Instrument

The most intriguing aspect of the study was finding a measurement instrument which would effectively reflect young children's attitudes. None of the usual manifest attitude tests were appropriate for first grade children.

The semantic differential was selected for this study for three reasons: validity has been supported (Osgood, et. al., 1957), reliability has been established (Osgood, et. al., 1957), and the test could be adapted to young children.

The semantic differential is an instrument normally involving twelve opposite adjectives on bipolar scales. The subject places an "X" on a seven-point scale representing how he feels about a particular concept, within the limitation of the opposite adjectives. For example:


The twelve opposite adjectives represent three factors of any concept, identified by Osgood (1957) as evaluative, potency and activity. The adjectives used in this study resulted from a large scale, trans culture, trans language study by Miron and Osgood (1966) to identify the twelve "purest" adjectives.
The evaluative factor is the descriptive attribute of a concept reflected by adjectives such as “nice/awful.”

The potency factor is the power attribute reflected by adjectives such as “old/young.”

The activity factor is the movement attribute reflected by adjectives such as “fast/slow.”

Because primary aged children were used in the study, a simplified form of the semantic differential was used. It was felt that first grade children might have had difficulty with semantic space represented by a continuum, so a presentation different from the usual was employed. First, the seven-point scale was reduced to three. The three-point scale was then represented by three clowns, each holding his hands at different widths.

The clown with the widest hands represented a positive reaction and the number three was assigned to it. The middle clown was number two, and the clown with the narrowest hands was considered negative and assigned the number one. Thus, a child could be asked, How well do you like spinach? The expected answer would be number one. Ice cream would be more likely to gain a “three” response.

The concept chosen for the present experiment was: How does reading make me feel? Instead of presenting both of the opposite adjectives for each scale, the tester used only the positive adjective in the sentence, How..............does reading make me feel? Each child was asked: How Big does reading make me feel? How Helpful does reading make me feel? How Old does reading make me feel? and so on. The child then indicated his answer by pointing to the clown which represented the degree to which he related to the adjective. The total list of adjectives are as follows: big, helpful, old, strong, powerful, deep, nice, fast, sweet, alive, good, quiet.

The tester then made a check on a three-division scale to indicate which degree the child pointed to. At the completion of the test, the tester grouped the scales according to factors and tallied the results for each factor—evaluative, potency, and activity.
Design and Statistical Analysis

The post-test only control group design was used in the experiment. It was assumed that the children entered first grade with randomized attitudes concerning reading.

The children were tested individually by the tester in May of the school year. The clown's order was reversed twice during the test in order to prevent response sets.

Raw score means were obtained for each of the three factors—evaluative, potency, and activity—for the concept: How does reading make me feel? The difference between the means was determined, the standard error for each set of means was calculated, and the one-tailed t test was applied.

Alpha was set at .05.

Hypothesis and Analysis

Hypothesis Number 1:

There will be no significant difference in the evaluative factor on a semantic differential at the first grade level between children in an individualized reading program and children in a basal oriented program on the concept: How does reading make me feel?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Basal</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2.255</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Individualized</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.372</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>1.170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant difference appeared between the basal group and the individualized group on the evaluative factor. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis Number 2:

There will be no significant difference in the potency factor on a semantic differential at the first grade level between children in an individualized reading program and children in a basal oriented program on the concept: How does reading make me feel?
TABLE II

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN SCORES ON THE POTENCY FACTOR FOR THE BOYS AND GIRLS ON THE CONCEPT: HOW DOES READING MAKE ME FEEL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Basal</th>
<th>Total Individualized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>2.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.196*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = significant at the .05 level.

A significant difference appeared between the basal group and the individualized group on the potency factor in favor of the experimental group. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis Number 3:

There will be no significant difference in the activity factor on a semantic differential at the first grade level between children in an individualized reading program and children in a basal oriented program on the concept: How does reading make me feel?

TABLE III

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN SCORES ON THE ACTIVITY FACTOR FOR THE BOYS AND GIRLS ON THE CONCEPT: HOW DOES READING MAKE ME FEEL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Basal</th>
<th>Total Individualized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.161</td>
<td>2.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.832*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = significant at the .05 level.

A significant difference appeared between the basal group and the individualized group on the activity factor. The null hypothesis was rejected.

Comparison of Mean Scores for Girls

After closer investigation of the data, the tester felt it valuable to compare the girls involved in basal reading with the girls involved in individualized reading on the three factors: evaluative, potency, and activity.
TABLE IV

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN SCORES ON THE EVALUATIVE FACTOR FOR THE GIRLS ON THE CONCEPT: HOW DOES READING MAKE ME FEEL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls Basal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.354</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Individualized</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.348</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant difference appeared between the girls in the basal group and the girls in the individualized group on the evaluative factor.

TABLE V

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN SCORES ON THE POTENCY FACTOR FOR THE GIRLS ON THE CONCEPT: HOW DOES READING MAKE ME FEEL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls Basal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.208</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>1.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Individualized</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.337</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant difference appeared between the girls in the basal group and the girls in the individualized group on the potency factor.

TABLE VI

A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN SCORES ON THE ACTIVITY FACTOR FOR THE GIRLS ON THE CONCEPT: HOW DOES READING MAKE ME FEEL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls Basal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.146</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>1.788*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Individualized</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.391</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = significant at the .05 level.

A significant difference appeared between the girls in the basal group and the girls in the individualized group on the activity factor in favor of the individualized group.
Comparison of Mean Scores for Boys

It was also felt to be of value to compare the boys involved in basal reading with the boys involved in individualized reading on the three factors: evaluative, potency, and activity.

TABLE VII
A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN SCORES ON THE EVALUATIVE FACTOR FOR THE BOYS ON THE CONCEPT: HOW DOES READING MAKE ME FEEL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys Basal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.172</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>1.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Individualized</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.398</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant difference appeared between the boys in the basal group and the boys in the individualized group on the evaluative factor.

TABLE VIII
A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN SCORES ON THE POTENCY FACTOR FOR THE BOYS ON THE CONCEPT: HOW DOES READING MAKE ME FEEL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys Basal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.284</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>1.830*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Individualized</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = significant at the .05 level.

A significant difference appeared between the boys in the basal group and the boys in the individualized group on the potency factor in favor of the individualized group.

TABLE IX
A COMPARISON OF THE MEAN SCORES ON THE ACTIVITY FACTOR FOR THE BOYS ON THE CONCEPT: HOW DOES READING MAKE ME FEEL?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boys Basal</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.181</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Individualized</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.284</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No significant difference appeared between the boys in the basal group and the boys in the individualized group on the activity factor.

**Conclusions and Discussion**

The evaluative factor in the semantic differential reflects somewhat of a cognitive response. As such, the children may have been responding to what they had been taught about reading—that reading is *nice, sweet, and good.* Very few children in either the experimental or control group responded negatively.

Unlike the evaluative factor, however, children are not told that reading will make them feel *big, old, strong, or powerful*—the adjectives used for the potency factor. If children respond to these scales favorably, they are reflecting how they *feel* about the concept rather than what they have been told. The significant difference in favor of the experimental group apparently indicates that when children select their own books and read without being compared to other children that they feel more positively about reading. It would appear that the individualized reading program provided more support through self-selection and success so that the children in that program felt bigger, older, stronger, and more powerful than the children in the basal program.

The activity scales (*helpful, fast, alive, and quiet*), like the potency factor, are not learned. Basal reading programs are often characterized by immobility of the children. That is, the physical orientation of the reading group precludes much movement away from the reading circle. The books are often on the table when the children arrive for reading groups. When they return to their desks, they become occupied with various worksheets. Little opportunity is available for children to share their books or carry out book activities. Thus, children in an individualized reading program possibly feel more active about reading than those in a basal program.

There is a further possibility that children in an individualized reading program simply read much more than basal children, and therefore reflect a greater change in attitude.

It is interesting to note that boys in the individualized reading program seemed to reflect more positive potency attitudes toward reading than boys in the basal programs. There has been much discussion concerning the possible female orientation of early school reading programs. Perhaps further research will throw more light on individualized reading as one method to re-orient the personal responses to reading.
Further research is needed on the adaptation of the semantic differential to first grade children. It is an intriguing concept of measurement, and seems to represent the personalized goals of reading more realistically than the usual standardized instruments.

**SUMMARY**

First grade children in an individualized reading program reflected more positive attitudes on the potency and activity factors of a semantic differential than children in a basal reading program on the concept: How does reading make me feel?

No differences occurred on the evaluative factors.

First grade boys in an individualized reading program reflected a more positive potency attitude than boys in a basal program.

First grade girls in an individualized reading program reflected a more positive feeling of activity than girls in a basal program.

**REFERENCES**


DISRUPTIVE EFFECT: A PHENOMENON IN ORAL READING

John W. Miller
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

PURPOSE

The major purpose of the present study is to examine the effect that an unknown word has on the oral reading of second grade children. Specifically, the study is concerned with the possible increased probability of error on words that are in close proximity to an unknown word. Additionally, the study examines the degree of disruptiveness created by unknown words in different grammatical positions, and the degree of disruptiveness of various types of unknown words.

SIGNIFICANCE

Observation of oral reading reveals that many children tend to produce errors in clusters. It seems possible that one unknown word may produce an environment in which errors occur on surrounding known words. In effect, one error may produce a triggering of other errors that would not have occurred had the original unknown word not been present. The ramifications of this suggested phenomenon may result in artificially depressed scores on such oral reading measures as informal reading inventories, standardized oral reading tests, and portions of diagnostic reading instruments. In effect measures of oral reading that rely on surviving oral reading errors to produce a “score” may be developing a distorted view of a reader’s actual ability.

In addition to significance at the applied level, the present study also may have heuristic significance to researchers examining the processing of written language. Support for the existence of disruptive effect may lead to new directions using degree of disruption as a dependent variable in examining such factors as the relationship of syntactic structures to readability or the relationship of semantic categorization to children’s reading ability.

SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Four questions are examined in the present study. The first two are addressed to the establishment of disruptive effect as an existent or non-existent phenomenon. Questions three and four are concerned
with the ramifications of disruptive effect, and need be examined only
if significant findings can be reported with regard to the first two
questions. The four questions are stated as follows:

1. Is there a difference in the number of errors on the four words
before and after an unknown word and the number of errors on
all other words (not surrounding an unknown word) in a story
read orally by second grade children?

2. Is there a difference in the number of errors on the four words
before and after an unknown word and the number of errors on
the same words when the unknown word is not present in a story
read orally by second grade children?

3. Is there a difference in the number of errors four words before and
after unknown nouns, verbs, or modifiers?

4. Is there a difference in the number of errors four words before and
four words after different types of unknown words?

**RELATED LITERATURE**

Three specific areas in the literature are of importance to the
development of this study: 1. Methods of examination in oral reading,
2. Use of nonsense items as “words” in oral language and reading re-
search, 3. Relationships of cloze technique research and the present
study.

Traditionally, examination of oral reading skills has centered on
the sum of a student’s errors as a product for quantitative inspection.
The familiar Gray Oral Reading Test (1963), the Gilmore Oral Read-
ing Test (1951), the oral reading sections of such diagnostic instru-
ments as Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty (1955), the Gates-
McKillop Reading Diagnostic Test (1962), and the traditional in-
formal reading inventories all derive their basic word accuracy scores
by summing insertions, substitutions, omissions, etc. Unfortunately,
quantitative analysis lends little insight to the ongoing psychological
and linguistic processes of the readers.

Robinson (1973) has called for a new era in test construction. One
that will measure oral reading as a qualitative function of processes
rather than a quantitative sum of errors. *The Reading Miscue Inven-
tory* (Goodman and Burke, 1972) may be the first instrument to
emerge from the psycholinguistic research into oral reading behaviors.
With a trend developing towards the examination of oral reading as a
qualitative process, definitive knowledge about the nature of the pro-
cess is required. If the questions surrounding oral reading analysis are
to undergo a change in nature from "How many"? to "Why"?, extensive input from reading specialists, linguists, and learning psychologists is mandatory.

Researchers in the areas of language development and language pathology have frequently made use of nonsense items to isolate specific linguistic variables for analysis. Arnold, Bower, and Bobrow (1972) used nonsense disyllables in semantically compatible and incompatible sentence frameworks to support the hypotheses that comprehensibility affects association formation. Marwit, Marwit, and Boswell (1971) examined the ability of black and white children to derive present, plural, possessive, and time extension forms of nonsense syllables. Krossner (1971) used CVC pattern nonsense syllables in analysis of associative value in class membership statements. The use of nonsense items in examining syntax is listed as one of the six most used methods by Slobin (1967).

Researchers in reading have generally utilized nonsense items in a different manner. Combining letters to form familiar spelling patterns without meaning has been done to examine word attack skills (Gates-McKillop Reading Diagnostic Test, 1962). While this utilization of nonsense items is justified, there are numerous untouched applications for the use of nonsense words to examine oral reading abilities in reading meaningful context.

The use of Cloze procedure indicates that there are linguistic constraints operating both within and between sentences in oral and written language that enable a reader to supply a missing word by use of surrounding contextual clues (MacGinitie, 1961, Ramanskus, 1972). However, there is no definitive information indicating what effect a missing word or an unknown word in written language will have on the known words in the surrounding context.

Obviously, if an unknown word has a detrimental effect on the recognition of surrounding known words, re-examination of traditional quantitative oral reading analysis is necessary.

PROCEDURES

Sample

Forty second grade children were drawn from two classrooms in two lower-middle class, semi-rural schools. The total population of these two classrooms was forty-six; however, six students who were essentially nonreaders were dropped from the sample. The remaining forty children were randomly assigned to the standardization group
rh—201

(SG) or the experimental group (EG). The EG and SG were both comprised of twenty students.

**Materials**

Two versions of the story "Plant Doctor" (Early et. al., 1970) were reproduced with permission from Harcourt, Brace and World. "Plant Doctor" was selected as stimulus materials because of its middle second grade difficulty level as ascertained by the Fry Readability Graph (1968) and the Spache readability formula (1953), and because of the appeal it appeared to hold for rural and semi-rural children. Version one, the unmodified version (UV), was retyped with a primary typewriter exactly as it appeared in the basal reader. Version two, the modified version (MV), contained largely the same text, but with approximately five percent of the words changed. (On the average, about one word in twenty was altered.) These modifications became the unknown “words.” Beginning with the fourth sentence, and in every other sentence from that point on, selected words in the UV were replaced with specifically designed unknown “words.” This version of the story became the MV.

Each version had the same number of words. Every word was assigned a numerical position, except the modified words in the modified version of the story and those words in the unmodified version that were later replaced in the modified version. The word modifications were made on two bases: 1. type of modification, and 2. grammatical position of the modification. The replaced words were modified by type in four ways. The passage contained six of each of the following types of modified words:

1. Real words of a difficulty level considered more than second grade (e.g., companions)
2. Nonsense words that are phonologically possible in English but which do not occur, and are without meaning marker (e.g., proy)
3. Nonsense roots that are phonologically possible in English but which do not occur and have a meaning marker (e.g., spacks)
4. Nonsense words which are not phonologically possible in English (e.g., ndalq).

These modified words were then assigned to one of three grammatical positions in the MV: nouns, verbs, or modifiers. There were eight words holding each of these positions in the MV.

**Administration and Scoring**

The story was individually administered to every subject (S) in a
quiet testing area. The story was read orally and was tape recorded for later verification of scoring procedures. A total of three judges scored each protocol. Discrepancies were resolved by consensus.

The SG read only the UV of the story. The data for this group were used to establish a criterion for oral reading performance on the story. Therefore, the SG was tested on only one occasion.

The EG was divided into two groups of 10. $\text{EG}_1$ read the original version of the text and then after a one week delay, read the modified version. $\text{EG}_2$ read the two texts in inverted order. This procedure was done to counterbalance the effect of learning.

Errors in oral reading were classified into the following four categories:

1. Omissions: Only whole word omissions were scored and assigned positions.
2. Additions: Whole word additions were scored and assigned the numerical position of the immediately preceding word.
3. Substitutions: Any pronunciation error was scored as a whole word substitution and assigned the numerical position of the actual word in the text.
4. Repetitions: Repetitions were considered an error regardless of the number of words repeated. Repetitions involving spontaneous self corrections were not considered errors. A repetition was assigned the numerical position of the first word repeated.

Errors such as hesitations or punctuation were not considered in this study.

Errors from each protocol were entered onto data cards by numerical position for analysis purposes. A composite tally of errors by word position for each group (SG, $\text{EG}_1$ and $\text{EG}_2$) was calculated. The composite print-outs for each group served as the data for analysis.

**Research Hypotheses**

The first hypothesis tested was: Is there a significant difference $(\alpha = .01)$ between the number of errors surrounding a specific unknown word and the number of errors in those positions throughout the story which are not surrounding unknown words? For this purpose the EG's reading of the modified version of the story was compared to the SG's reading of the unmodified version. A two by two Chi square analysis was used to test the hypothesis.

The second hypothesis was: Within the EG is there a significant difference $(\alpha = .01)$ between the number of errors made in the posi-
tions surrounding the unknown words in the modified version of the story and the equivalent positions in the unmodified version of the story? A two by eight Chi square analysis was used.

The third hypothesis was: Is there a significant difference (α = .01) in the number of errors surrounding unknown nouns, verbs, or modifiers in the reading of the modified version by the EG? A one way analysis of variance was used with grammatical position as the independent variable and number of surrounding errors as the dependent variable.

The fourth hypothesis was: Is there a significant difference (α = .01) in the number of errors surrounding difficult words, phonologically possible nonsense words, phonologically possible nonsense roots with meaningful markers, and phonologically impossible words? A one way analysis of variance was used to test the hypothesis with type of modification as the independent variable and number of surrounding errors as the dependent variables.

**FINDINGS**

Hypothesis one, the crucial hypothesis of the study because of the dependency of the remaining hypotheses, concerns the locations of errors throughout the passage. As can be seen in Table 1 the errors made by the EG on surrounding positions accounted for over 50% (260/501) of the total errors, while for the SG the errors in the surrounding positions accounted for less than 33% (267/806) of the total errors. The

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRIBUTION OF ERRORS BETWEEN SURROUNDING AND NON-SURROUNDING POSITIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Surrounding</th>
<th>Not Surrounding</th>
<th>N = 11140</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>errors</strong></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>non-errors</strong></td>
<td>3580</td>
<td>7059</td>
<td>10639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3840</td>
<td>7300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from EG's reading of modified version
difference was significant at the .01 level. A significantly greater proportion of errors were made by the experimental group than the SG in the positions surrounding unknown words.

Hypothesis two is connected with the reading by the experimental group of both versions of the story. As can be seen in Table 2 more errors were made on the modified text than the unmodified text. The difference was significant at the .01 level. Not only was the total number of errors greater, but the errors for each surrounding position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrounding Word Positions</th>
<th>Errors</th>
<th>Non-Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data from EG's reading of modified text

\[ \chi^2 = 98.55368 \]

\[ \text{sig.} > .01 \]

Data from EG's reading of unmodified text

\[ \chi^2 = 178.08892 \]

\[ \text{sig.} > .01 \]
were greater for the modified text. The greatest number of errors were in the + 1 positions.

In relation to hypothesis three significant differences in the number of errors surrounding unknown nouns, verbs, and modifiers were not observed. The observed F value (.23) indicated that there were essentially no differences in the effects of various levels of grammatical positions on the number of surrounding errors.

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>18.0334</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.0167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>823.2500</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39.20238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>841.2834</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F .95 (2.21) = 3.47

**F .99 (2.21) = 5.78

In relation to hypothesis four, no significant differences in the number of errors surrounding unknown words of the various types were observed. The observed F value (.6556) indicated that there was very little difference in the effects of various levels or type of modification on the number of surrounding errors.

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>42.8429</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.2809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>609.8750</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.78125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>652.7179</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F .95 (3.28) = 2.95

**F .99 (3.28) = 4.57

In relation to hypothesis four, no significant differences in the number of errors surrounding unknown words of the various types were observed. The observed F Value (.6556) indicated that there was very little difference in the effects of various levels or type of modification on the number of surrounding errors.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The data from this study support the notion that a higher incidence of oral reading errors is associated with close proximity to unknown words. This would suggest the need for qualitative analysis of oral reading errors, particularly if they are made in clusters. The child who errs on “easy” words such as and, said, etc. may not have produced this error because he did not know the word, but because of
its close proximity to an unknown word. He may have had his attention diverted from the "easy" word to the more difficult one. Unknown words can be disruptive in terms of oral reading. Those assessing oral reading behavior should be aware of this phenomenon.

This conclusion is further strengthened by the rejection of hypothesis two. The same children, reading the same words on two different occasions, erred more frequently when the words were in close proximity to unknown words in the modified version; they made fewer errors on the identical words when the unknown word was not present.

The disruptive effect in oral reading is most apparent in the word immediately preceding and the word immediately following the +1 position surrounding an unknown word than on the same word position without the presence of the unknown word. While the disruptive effect was observed in all eight surrounding positions, it was most evident in the immediately adjacent positions.

While hypotheses three and four of this study were accepted, the data indicated trends that might be borne out in further study with samples across grade levels. It was hypothesized that unknown words in verb positions would be more disruptive than unknown words in modifier positions and that they, in turn, would be more disruptive than unknown words in noun positions. Though not statistically significant, the rankings obtained were as hypothesized. Similarly, it was hypothesized that phonologically impossible modified words would create the most disruptive effect and that nonsense roots with meaningful markers would be least disruptive. Once again the rankings were as hypothesized, although not statistically significant.

The technique used in the study to assess disruptive effect in oral reading appears to be promising. The rejection of hypotheses one and two suggests a degree of validity in the research technique. The trends observed in hypotheses three and four suggest potential for further investigation.
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THE MYTHOLOGY OF READING:
I—SIGHT WORDS

Patrick Groff
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY

It is significant to note that the teaching of "sight" words was not one of the "persistent questions on beginning reading" which a carefully-selected group of experts recently chose to discuss (1). Indeed, from what one knows of this topic it would have been surprising to find the notion that young children should be first taught words as "wholes" being given critical examination in any such discussion. This is because the validity of instruction in "sight" words is accepted without question by almost all of today's experts in reading instruction. That is, there is widespread support among them for Durkin's recommendation "that reading instruction begin with what is generally referred to as a whole-word approach. This simply means that entire words are taught at the start rather than, for example, letter sounds.

Sometimes this approach is referred to as a 'sight method' because the expectation is that children will recognize words on sight rather than through a letter-by-letter analysis. And sometimes it is called a 'look-say method' because the assumption is that a child will look at a word and be able to say what it is without going through the more careful analysis" (3).

It is generally assumed, as well, that this "sight" word instruction should be continued on into the middle grades. For example, Smith and Barrett believe that one way words are "learned [is] through application of a variety of word identification skills" (8). But "additionally," they insist, "there are times when words are taught as sight words." These sight words are "potentially troublesome words," they go on, which do not "lend themselves to identification by means of other skills" (the above "variety of word identification skills"). These writers contend therefore, as does Durkin, that it is necessary for children to learn to recognize some words "without going through any types of analyses" (4). Accordingly, "most middle grades teachers will experience the need to teach some sight words nearly every day" (8).

Since almost all writers of reading methodology to the present agree with these conclusions, one would assume that reading whole words by "sight" would be a practice firmly supported by the experimental evidence as to how children first perceive words. Much to one's consternation, however, no such evidence is demanded by the
advocates of "sight" words. Rather, the values of "sight" words are thought by them as self-evident. Unfortunately for the teacher of reading, in passing along the descriptions of "sight" words in reading methods texts over the years these writers have failed to indicate these descriptions were based on hearsay, rumor or speculation. That is, on anything but an accurate reading of the matter, as this would be done from the published research.

For the research here as to how children recognize words, as Chall (2) was able to give due publicity, offers little corroboration to the supposition that the easiest, therefore most-used cue to word recognition by the beginning reader is an image of the contour, outline or configuration of a "whole" word. This template conception of word recognition, Chall noted, was discredited handily by the research up to the time of her intensive review in 1967.

An even more exhaustive critique of the research on word recognition since Chall's confirms her earlier conclusions (5). It has been demonstrated here that without exception the research on how young children perceive or identify words indicates "the shape of a word is the least-used cue to its recognition." After a reading of Gibson's report of her research on how children recognize letters one cannot be too astonished at this finding. Gibson explains that children do not recognize even a letter by its general configuration or shape (6). Taking Gibson's research as his guide, Frank Smith has described further that if children use the separate features of letters (whether a letter is open, intersected, horizontal, has symmetry) as cues to recognize letters, they hardly could recognize words as wholes, or by "sight." He asks of the problem, in a pertinent way: "If words are recognized 'as wholes,' how are the wholes recognized?" (7).

Quite apparently, this is a question the proponents of sight words over the years have failed to consider, for some undisclosed reason. By not facing up to the facts about sight words, vis a vis the research on word recognition, the writings on sight words have evolved into strange-appearing phenomena. The current descriptions of "sight" words are highly irregular, to say the least. For example, there are several unfounded claims made for "sight" words, e.g., they lengthen the reader's eye span or they are necessary to know before one teaches children to discriminate letters, or before phonics can be successfully learned. As expected, what a "sight" word is has numerous and often contradictory definitions, from one advocate to the next. Supposedly, they are "unphonetic," yet commonly-used, high-frequency words. How a word that does not conform to English phonology could be
commonly used is never explained, of course. These words are said to have high emotional content, in one opinion of them, and yet must only be free morphemes, or function words, in the views of other writers. There are many other, equally disconcerting remarks that surround the mysterious "sight" word.

In spite of the state of affairs of "sight" words briefly given here, it is not too late for writers to begin to reform what they have to say about this troubled proceeding. Nonetheless, to regain our confidence in the integrity of the advice given teachers as to teaching reading to beginning readers, the proponents of "sight" words must take a painful step. This is to ask themselves if what they have said about "sight" words does not in fact constitute wrongful advice—in light of the research. And thus, whether this advice has not led teachers into wasteful and ineffectual practices. If the present advocates of sight words believe that teachers are best served by advice based on research rather than rumor, they must inevitably come to this rejudgment of their opinions of "sight" words.

This change in attitude among the opinion-makers of reading instruction, while admittedly an unpleasant chore, will have bounteous effects. Among these will be the stimulation to teachers to help children take advantage of their inherent perceptual abilities by directing them to a more proficient use of letter cues to word recognition. The likelihood of attaining fluency in word recognition in children will be much more enhanced by this instruction than by instruction in "sight" words.
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Teachers in general are well aware of the appalling reading deficiencies that many students bring to the classroom. This is true at the elementary, the secondary, and the college level. In many cases, however, teachers of subject matter tend to refuse to accept responsibility for helping students to overcome their reading problems. Such an attitude is, of course, understandable, as the limited time that students spend in any particular class is barely sufficient to “teach” them the subject itself. The additional responsibility of teaching reading may seem to many educators not only an unfair imposition, but an impossible task to handle.

There is some justification for the unspoken fear of not knowing just how to cope with the problems of reading retardation. Some teachers are, unfortunately, deficient in the necessary skills of reading, and therefore find it impossible to help their students acquire those skills themselves. Other teachers simply feel inadequately prepared to do the job, although they themselves are skillful readers. Reading skills, often accidentally acquired, may be taken for granted, and the teachers, not being fully certain of the process by which their knowledge was acquired, feel unable to transmit it.

While it is true that serious cases of reading retardation need the corrective guidance of a specially trained reading specialist, it is also true that the regular classroom teacher, at every educational level, has much to offer his or her students in helping them to become better readers. In a sense, then, every teacher—regardless of the content area in which he or she operates—should be a teacher of reading. Should the subject taught be social studies, mathematics, natural sciences, or a foreign language, who knows better than the teacher in charge of the class what the students should look for in the textbook assigned, in the reference materials to be used, in the examinations given? And who should be better prepared to guide the students in the search?
The near impossibility of teaching the many facets of the reading process along with the subject matter can and does discourage the best-intentioned teacher, however. And the suggestion presented here is not meant to imply that every classroom teacher must become a reading specialist overnight. The suggestion is meant as a strong recommendation for teachers to make a conscious effort to improve their students' reading skills as they teach them specific subjects that on the surface might appear to be unrelated to the one of reading. Reading and practically every discipline are not only related, but are interdependent as well. Moreover, success in the latter is often based on proficiency in the former. And as a final consideration for the argument, there is the fact that the skill acquired in the reading process will, in all probability, be retained longer than any other subject learned. This being, perhaps, partially due to the fact that the opportunities to put reading to use will be many and continuous—at least for as long as the individual attends school.

Another vital reason why reading skills are retained when properly acquired is rooted in the very nature of the reading process: reading is thinking. In educating our young people we often lose sight of what should be the ideal in education: to teach individuals to think. Only too often do we emphasize memorization and assimilation of facts and dates that the students are required to give back at exam time. Yet, it is the ability to think, to organize and categorize ideas, to generalize and conceptualize that constitute the very core of human intelligence.

Teachers, instructors, professors, every individual involved in the business of education, therefore, has the sacred obligation to promote the process of learning to think. And insofar as reading is an integral part of that process, a part of the classroom curriculum should be instruction in reading, if not in general terms, definitely as it applies to the subject being taught.

It is not within the scope of this article to itemize and delineate a subject by subject, step by step procedure for all teachers to follow while teaching the materials for which they are officially responsible. The aim of this author is to encourage and also to share with the readers some of her experiences with simultaneous dual teaching of her two fields of interest: Spanish and reading.

The teaching of a foreign language offers special challenges in our one-language (English)-oriented culture, and new methods and techniques of teaching foreign languages spring up with the same frequency and offering the same magic results as do the many approaches to the teaching of reading. In the final analysis, though,
just as it is in reading, it is the eclectic approach that produces the best results. And it is the instructor who combines the best features of every approach, method and technique, who is the most successful.

Among other things, the students are taught quite early the sounds of the Spanish letters alone and in combinations. Syllabication is explained, and so is sentence structure. The alert instructor, the one who wishes to stress reading along with the foreign language, will take advantage of every opportunity to establish comparison between the foreign language and the mother tongue. Making students aware of the differences between Spanish and English serves to reinforce or review rules learned long ago on English syllabication and sounds of diphthongs and consonant clusters. Exercises in Spanish sentence structure can be used to reinforce the basic idea of the required subject and verb agreement that exists in both languages. And as students progress from simple to complex sentences guidance on how to rely on context clues to make sense of specific sentences can prove invaluable to the students, especially when they are reminded that this is a helpful tool to use on their own native English.

Helping students establish associations between sentences and between paragraphs, helping them find subjects or implied subjects in sentences, or topic sentences in paragraphs can also be used as ways to teach reading along with the subject of Spanish. The old traditional method of emphasizing translation and grammar in the teaching of a foreign language has given way, in many instances, to more realistic and palatable techniques such as stressing that the students make every effort to think in the foreign language. Grammatical points are more effectively explained in context rather than in isolation, and mainly as it becomes necessary in their relevance to the written or spoken lesson.

Although some institutions subscribe to the practice of “immersion” in the foreign language, with all English left out, in the majority of the institutions of higher learning and in the high schools also much of the first year as well as some of the second year of a foreign language instruction is conducted in a bilingual fashion, which gives the teacher the opportunity to explain fully, and to everyone’s understanding, important points in the language. This custom also proves advantageous to those who strongly believe in the importance and the value of possessing reading skills and who strive to teach them along with the foreign language.

Combining the teaching of these two subjects obviously demands suitable techniques. Combining the teaching of reading with other
subjects will require other approaches tailored to each particular case. Needless to say, this type of dual teaching will demand additional preparation, effort, and dedication from the teacher. In turn, his or her rewards will come mainly from the satisfaction of having helped students acquire or improve the valuable tools of reading skills. Such tools they will continue to need and use long after the cobwebs of time have covered much of whatever else they learned along with the magic process of reading well.
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Using Visual Highlighting to Teach Discriminations and Patterns

Richard Allington
State University of New York at Albany

Every day in classrooms throughout the country one can find children experiencing visual discrimination problems. One can also find a massive amount of teaching effort directed towards correcting those same problems, too often with limited success. Recent research has raised many questions about the usefulness of the most popular commercially available training materials (i.e. Frostig, Kephart, Michigan Tracking). However, research has also identified useful techniques that classroom teachers might employ.

The theoretical base for the methods discussed herein is a process called visual search. When attempting to discriminate visually between two objects a search for the differences between the items occurs. For example, when attempting to identify a police vehicle, many people look for one of the many distinctive features that can be used (e.g. the colored warning on the roof; the distinctive color or markings). These gross featural differences make identification quite easy. However, if one is attempting to identify an unmarked police vehicle the task is more difficult. In other words, finer discriminations are required. The lack of success in this discrimination can often be proven on the nation’s highways. The point is, whenever one attempts to differentiate between the objects, distinctive features play an important role.

Research has demonstrated that there are differences between the search processes employed by good and poor readers. The primary finding being that good readers know how and where to focus attention, while poor readers apparently do not. That is, poor readers use ineffective cues such as initial letter; word shape; or word length when attempting to identify isolated words. Good readers search out the effective cues and employ them in making discriminations. Thus, research has identified what many teachers have long known; poor readers mix up familiar words which are highly similar. For example, they mix up such words as (went—want, what—that, where—there, was-saw).
The strategy for correcting these errors must be one that assists the poor reader in doing what seemingly comes naturally for good readers: identification of distinguishing or distinctive features. A promising strategy for accomplishing this is the use of color cues. Several research studies have demonstrated the usefulness of using a single color to highlight or emphasize those features to which the learner must attend. Either a technique of underlining or printing the distinctive features in the color chosen seem to benefit the learner by focusing attention where it is most useful. Whether the object to be discriminated is a letter, word, or shape this type of assistance facilitates learning.

In daily classroom practice, the teacher may want to provide these contrasts when introducing new words to eliminate errors from the outset. The teacher might also employ this strategy to correct errors as they occur in reading situations. In either case several rules of thumb are wise to follow.

First, make sure you have identified the features that are relevant to the task. Color highlighting can be used to identify similarities as well as differences. Whether one wants the learner to notice that *want* and *went* differ in the second letter, or that *hat*, *cat* and *fat* each end in the same pattern, color cues will facilitate focusing student attention.

Second, pairing words or letters with separate colors may be detrimental to learning. That is, the child may learn to identify the stimulus on the basis of color alone without identifying the desired features. Training programs which provide multiple color cues have generally been ineffective. The learners respond to the color rather than the letter or word.

Third, color cues can facilitate identification of distinctive features and discriminations, but not all students who mix up similar words need this type of training. Many learners can discriminate *went/want* but still confuse them when reading. Thus, the basic task here is teaching the child to associate the correct verbal response with the visual symbol. A teacher who is confused as to which problem a student may have can use this simple test. Provide the learner with a string of the two letters or words to be discriminated. Generally, three of one and one of the other such as *want went want want*. Now ask the child to mark the one that is different. If this task is completed correctly, the teacher can assume the child can discriminate between the stimuli but has not developed the correct verbal associations for each. Tasks which require the child to mark either a symbol representing a spoken stimulus or to name or read a stimulus are association
tests not tests of visual discrimination. Similarly, discrimination training is useless for those children who can discriminate but cannot associate the correct verbal response.

**SUMMARY**

Color cues can be used to facilitate visual discriminations. However, caution must be taken when supplying these cues. The teacher must also identify whether a discrimination error is the source of the problem. Further, color cues can be used to facilitate identification of patterns in words. For the teacher attempting to teach word patterns, color cues can assist the student in identification of the necessary features.
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Illustrative uses of color cues in discrimination training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>went</th>
<th>w[e]nt</th>
<th>went</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>want</td>
<td>w[a]nt</td>
<td>want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was</td>
<td>[w]as</td>
<td>was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saw</td>
<td>[s]aw</td>
<td>saw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there</td>
<td>th[ere]</td>
<td>there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>th[ree]</td>
<td>three</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illustrative uses of color in identifying patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pat</th>
<th>r[ing]</th>
<th>land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hat</td>
<td>th[ing]</td>
<td>band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cat</td>
<td>w[ing]</td>
<td>hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rate</td>
<td>[m]ouse</td>
<td>swing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fate</td>
<td>[m]an</td>
<td>sweet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late</td>
<td>[m]arble</td>
<td>swim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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More children are experiencing difficulty in reading than in any other subject area in the elementary classroom. There are various degrees of a reading disability. A reading disability can range from a reader who is a grade or two below the level of his peers to a child who is a complete non-reader. In most cases, the concern of the elementary classroom teacher of reading is to see to it that the children are able to read well enough to perform the work of the specific class-level and to receive some enjoyment from their reading. If an ordinary classroom teacher is confronted with a child who is a complete non-reader, the usual procedure is to refer the child to a qualified reading specialist who is equipped to deal directly with the serious reading handicaps in a more specific manner than would be possible in a classroom situation. Then the classroom teacher would stand ready to follow the recommendations of the reading specialist in regard to help for a non-reader.

However, if competent remedial reading assistance is not readily available, or is only available on a very limited basis, then it is the responsibility of the regular classroom teacher to find ways of providing assistance to the non-reader in the regular classroom. In any case, the help given to the non-reader must be provided on an individual basis whenever a break in the schedule permits. But at no time should the non-reader be restricted in other activities that the other children are free to enjoy in order to work on his reading problems. If the child with a reading handicap is denied his free time, he will soon learn to regard the individual assistance offered in the classroom as a form of punishment.

An evaluation of the child’s readiness for learning to read is the initial step in helping the non-reader. The readiness takes the form of determining if the child has the basic physical, emotional, intellectual, and experiential readiness needed to begin the reading process.

Physical readiness could involve adequate vision on the part of the non-reader. The non-reader may be hiding the fact that he wears corrective lens. If this is the case, then the child should be encouraged to wear the eyeglasses when he needs them.

Emotional readiness involves creating a desire within the child to learn to read. The classroom teacher can help by attempting to moti-
vate the non-reader by the use of any positive means available. See that
the child experiences as much success as possible with his initial read-
ing efforts. A wise teacher will build upon success.

Intellectual readiness can be determined by the use of a good in-
telligence test. Once a valid intelligence test determines the child’s
mental age, the teacher can determine his potential reading ability and
should not attempt to push the child beyond his potential reading level.

The child’s background of experience, both direct and vicarious,
will have a great deal of bearing on the child’s progress in reading.
The classroom teacher should provide many direct and vicarious ex-
periences for the non-reader and provide opportunities for the child
to verbalize these experiences.

In any case, remedial assistance should not begin until the teacher
has evaluated all the areas of readiness and can make some decisions
regarding what the child can realistically be expected to achieve. If
the child seems ready to begin to read, then the teacher can take the
steps outlined here to help the child overcome his reading problems.

**First-Aid Techniques**

Begin the reading instruction at the point where the child presently
is. The most efficient way to determine this is to attempt a very in-
formal type of reading inventory or survey. Ask the child to read books
that seem to be of an easy nature. If he experiences difficulty reading
an easy book, try a book that is even easier. Repeat this process until
the child can read from a book without a great deal of difficulty. Ask
a few simple questions to make a decision about his family to compre-
hend what he has read. When the child can read with relative ease
and can answer comprehension questions without losing the main
idea of the content, the reading level to begin the instruction will
have been discovered.

Begin the second step with work to increase the child’s sight
vocabulary. Since a child learns many words by their shape and size,
the teacher can utilize many games and devices to assist the child in
developing an adequate sight vocabulary. Pictures or actual objects
that represent the word to be learned can be used to give the child
more than a vague understanding of the words they hear and see.
In this manner, the child can increase his sight vocabulary so he is
able to read more difficult material.

The third step would involve the child’s own ability to discover
new words through use of the various word attack skills that are avail-
able. Context clues, structural analysis, phonetic analysis, word-form
clues, or picture clues can be attempted by the child with assistance from the teacher. Whatever word attack technique that is attempted will still depend upon how well the child has developed his sight vocabulary. Use whatever technique works the best for the individual child. In some cases, the child can use a combination of one or more of the word attack techniques to attack a word he has never before seen in print.

Developing good comprehension is the next task for the classroom teacher concerned with the non-reader. The child must learn to remember what he reads. A teacher cannot increase a child’s innate ability to remember, but the child can be helped to use his memory to its greatest potential. There are many games available to use with children to increase memory. In addition, if the child is permitted to verbalize freely what he has read, comprehension will be strengthened.

Finally, the child should be given the opportunity for wide reading experiences that bring him into contact with many books, magazines, and newspapers. As long as the material the child is reading is at his present level of competence the child should experience little frustration in his reading. The key factor remaining is that the child is encouraged to read and the reading habit becomes a part of his life.
A federal grant from the Teacher Corps Office of the United States Office of Education has been awarded to Western Michigan University's Teacher Education Department. The Teacher Corps project will be a cooperative effort between Western Michigan University's Teacher Education Department and the Grand Rapids Schools. The purpose of this project will be to develop a training complex to redesign graduate teacher education. The program will be housed and the activities will be held primarily at the Alexander Elementary School in Grand Rapids. The project will involve a team consisting of four Teacher Corps interns, a team leader, and the 26 permanent staff members at Alexander School. Dr. Jess Walker will be the project director. This project presents the Department of Teacher Education with an opportunity to implement a field base for the development of In-Service programs. The funding for the initial year will be $315,000. Starting date was May 20, 1975. For further information, you may contact Dr. Jess Walker, Department of Teacher Education, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008.
Together, the readers and authors of *The Language Experience* join in a search for the nature of language—for pleasure, for intellectual stimulation, and for humanistic self-revelation. Written from a literary and humanly philosophic point of view, rather than a strictly linguistic and scientific bias, the selections are based on the thesis that "exploration of one's own language—personal idiolect as well as native tongue—can help one discover his essence as a human being."

It is generally accepted that one of the unique qualities of humans is the creative power of that language. Researchers have devoted years to the study of the nature of language; much more research is currently in progress. Implications of such studies have raised some intriguing questions and invigorated renewed dialogue among interested educators and experimentors. Does the world shape language, or does language shape the world? Is silence a language also, and can it, then, be made to speak? Just how does language influence the total psychological makeup of man? Can language serve to disguise as well as to clarify thought? Do the limitations of language make it an inadequate medium of expression, or do they become a challenge and the means of self-discipline? Has the transition from "Oldspeak" to "Newspeak" been progressing inexorably toward the completion date of 2050?1 Are the fears and passionate upheavals that accompany new social, economic, and political conceptions inevitable because there is no language to express genuinely new ideas? These, and related mysteries of language, are probed in the first section of the book, "Language as Epistemology."

One of these areas becomes the central focus of the second section, "Language as Politics." Writers in this section are concerned with how language shapes, or misshapes, the world. Here, they discuss dangers inherent in language that does not do its work properly. The human mind, with its potentialities for reaching out to an awareness of things beyond its practical environment can become over-preoccupied with symbols and images. Rather than mediating between events and re-

---

sponsive actions, it transforms or, possibly, distorts events into images for retention and contemplation. One’s “stream of thought,” or envis­
agement, then becomes a seat of weakness or peril to oneself and to
others. A recent, very painful realization is the disastrous effect that
political language can have upon the national scene. As cited in “Words
from Watergate,” the following abuses of language have become fami­
liar to all frequent users of mass media: quibbling over nuances;
vagueness; power not from persons, but from real estate; euphemisms
to separate words from truth; and private jargon meant to mystify the
outsider. Similarly difficult and distressful to face is the acknowledge­
ment that the language of racism and sexism, and the acts of racism
and sexism, are one and the same. Prejudicial terms, phrases, and
clichés must be discarded before prejudicial acts can be eradicated.
Educatorese is also included in the indicted forms of language used as
agencies for gamesmanship or, perhaps, even elitism.

The main theme of the third section, “Language as Experience,”
is the nature of language from the perspective of the literary a:rtist.
In it, some writers depict reverse social and existential snobbery. Others
illustrate the complexity of the disciplines of language. Another upholds
the theory that “total human experience is informed and structured by
language.” In some measure, they are all experimenting with the ver­
satility and plasticity of “words, their sounds, their logic, their syntax,
their rhythms, and, ultimately, their silence.”

In this volume, some well-known writers in the field of education
provide a critical rationale for its use. Neil Postman says:

The strongest defense any of us has against making idiots
of ourselves is our knowledge of how language works . . . I
recommend it not only to college teachers but to all those in­
terested in shoring up their intellectual defenses.

Ronald and Beatrice Gross add this comment:

Innovative professors will find it a seed store of ideas for cultivating
language-awareness and language-delight.

For any serious reader, “language-experiencing” with this text can be
thought-provoking, profoundly shocking, or just pure fun!
It is almost a sure bet that when someone graduates from a college or university with a number of credit hours in the teaching of reading, the hiring institution will attempt to employ this person as a remedial reading instructor. It is secondly a sure bet that the personnel director will recommend this graduate to a principal who has been beset by complaints about reading problems in all the content area classes. And, according to the typical history, the teachers in that high school will refer to the new reading teacher those students who are deep in academic difficulties.

The story does not have a happy ending; the new reading teacher is kept so busy learning which students are attitudinal problems, which are slow learners, and which are merely corrective problems in certain reading skills—that she cannot take the time to establish necessary rapport with content course teachers. Furthermore, because of the lack of administrative foresight, the reading teacher is too occupied with the work of setting up a referral system and means of reporting to do anything of a positive or constructive nature. Being new, she probably doesn't know how to protest this Frankenstinian reading "program" which is burgeoning in reverse. It is doomed to limp along, with no one in the classroom any wiser, with none of the teachers any better off, and the reading teacher never given the opportunity to show leadership or imagination.

Who is responsible for this miscarriage of education? According to the charts showing chain of authority and division of duties, the leader and exemplar of quality education should be the principal. While we do not wish to inveigh against administration, we must say, the support and encouragement that an imaginative and progressive reading program requires have to come from the department chairmen and principals. No real reading program can logically result when a person trained to teach reading improvement is put on the endless cycle of seeing five to ten disabled readers an hour, five days a week. What
compounds the problem is that subject matter teachers have stereo-
typed the so-called remedial reading teacher as someone who offers
sympathy and academic pablum to potential “flunk-outs.” Of
course, this kind of thinking constitutes a major obstacle to open commu-
ication, and precludes any use of the trained reading person as a resource
for all-school in-service programs, or as consultant, or advisor on
reading problems.

Somewhere, between the dismal picture of the reading teacher
bogged down in a frustrating routine that is out of touch with the rest
of the school, and the ideal all-school reading program painted for us
by the experts who see total cooperation and positive enthusiasm in all
staff members as requisite—there must be a way to use personnel and
talent to build for measurable success in a reasonable amount of time.
Setting realistic goals, using staff members wisely, and keeping the lines
of communications open; these are the responsibilities of the adminis-
trator. One other responsibility the principal should accept is to let
himself or herself be convinced that hiring a reading resource person
would be infinitely wiser than naming the person “remedial” reading
teacher.

Defining the role and duties of a reading resource person requires
at least a brief look at the genesis of the term itself. Historically, accord-
ing to Nila Banton Smith, the growth of the movement to hire persons
for supervising the teaching of reading took place in the 1930’s. (Amer-
ican Reading Instruction, I. R. A., 1965, pp. 305-6.) In this context,
the terms reading supervisor, reading coordinator, and special super-
visor of reading were used interchangeably and without distinction.
The typical emergence of the reading supervisor may be described as
one who was “moved up” from the position of English teacher because
of her enthusiasm for or concern about the need for teaching reading.
However, emotional fervor does not always result in expertness in the
teaching of reading, just as moving someone to a position of reading
supervisor does not automatically make one a leader of teachers in the
field.

Some of the texts and manuals in the area employ the term consul-
tant, the definition of which may include a range of ideas in applica-
tion, but none that rule out the use of such a person for workshops,
in-service, or related capacities of a more or less permanent nature.
In recent years, the term consultant has been narrowed down in mean-
ing; the concept now generally carries the stipulation that it is a posi-
tion freed of all classes, or as the person who will direct the organiza-
tion and running of a reading center, or even as the person to serve as liaison between the school and the community.

It is noteworthy that the term *supervisor* was more or less purposely lost in the job descriptions between the original concept in the thirties and the more recent discussions of the need for personnel trained in reading at the secondary level. It is entirely reasonable. We suggest that the word *remedial* follow the same route to oblivion. What is essential to the improvement of reading at the junior and senior high school level is an awareness of the nature of the process. A teacher, working side by side with other teachers, can demonstrate and analyze the process, to the benefit of everyone concerned.

The cause of reading must permeate the entire high school atmosphere, and only adequate discussion among equal colleagues can bring about the attainment of this goal. If a reading teacher can help the biology teacher make pages 78-89 of the text into a direct reading activity, the students will gain new insight into the skills they may apply in all other science reading, and the teacher of biology may see ways to make his classroom technique a bit more effective. If a coach can be convinced to recommend a sports biography to a student (perhaps a reluctant reader who admires the coach), a further step toward the true all-school reading program will be taken. The principal too, might be persuaded to look for ways in which he could foster the triple causes—reading to learn, reading for recreation, reading for personal development.

Suppose we describe the reading resource person, as a position, in some detail. As preparation and background for the secondary work, this teacher should have some years of experience as a subject matter teacher. Courses in reading which would help provide the technical expertise might be testing, diagnosis, reading therapy, adolescent literature, and administration of reading programs. (We are assuming that all teaching certificates will include the basic requirement of at least six semester hours in the teaching of reading.)

Job specifications for a *reading resource person* at the secondary level might be as follows:

a) administers, scores, and interprets standardized survey reading tests
   (What seems like dull clerical work here is an important opportunity for the reading resource person to help acquaint teachers with both national and local norms, and to distinguish between rate, vocabulary, and comprehension performances.)

b) reports to teachers on student reading records
   (Again, a means of showing that reading is a complex set of skills
and attitudes. It also allows the content course teachers an opportunity to ask questions without deigning to ask a remedial reading teacher, nor, on the other hand, ask questions of one who casts himself in the role of administrator.)

c) keeps students informed of their needs for reading practice
(No more challenging situation can be presented to a student than the information that his mental abilities are four or three grades ahead of his reading performance. The reading resource person can compute the reading expectancy of students who are merely drifting, and use the information to appeal to the students' sense of self-competition. The results are quite dramatic, and serve as examples to the less talented, who may then come in for instructional assistance.)

d) finds and distributes materials related to reading
(It is incumbent on the reading resource person to find and read the latest materials on research in the area. By paraphrasing and adapting, he can offer quite practical and helpful ideas to content course teachers who feel the need for such aid.)

e) tests incoming individual students as requested by counseling department
(It is inevitable that during the year, in this mobile society, a few students show up at the school with almost no records for placement. It is a valuable service, if the reading resource person can apply a few brief tests such as word, sentence, and paragraph comprehension, to describe a range of reading level and offer some observation of reading difficulties, if any.)

f) provides materials and organizes reading development programs for students who wish to work in the reading center
(Naturally, this would require some acquaintance with the machinery and kits extant in the field at the pertaining levels. A board of education would most respect a reading resource person who reflected a philosophy of frugality toward gadgets and gimmicks.)

g) consults with teachers in all content areas on matters of reading
(A reading resource person would have considerable access to the latest ideas on how to teach vocabulary in all subjects, how to use the textbook for small reading drills, and how to vary the lesson to meet the needs of all students. While there is always the chance that philosophies may differ, the reading resource person is hopeful that teachers generally see high school as a place where students are becoming acquainted with their own strengths and weaknesses—not to be mere receptacles of informative data.)
h) provides information on reading levels of textbooks considered for use or adoption
   (The reading resource person would need to be well acquainted with readability formulas, and the developments in this area. He might try the Fry, the Cloze, and make comparisons.)

i) works with librarian in obtaining materials relative to reading improvement for library (and professional) shelves
   (Popular books about how to study or how to read faster are easy to find. More important are a few books of a more technical nature for teachers—the psychology of teaching reading—how to identify the creative student, etc.)

j) demonstrates the teaching of reading to new teachers, shows materials, discusses reading skills, etc.

k) experiments with materials, surveys student reading habits and makes reports on results obtained

l) coordinates efforts with teachers on reading research projects in the classroom

m) prepares and submits regular progress reports to administration
   (This is a last-but-not-least item. It comes under the heading of tying up the loose ends, and letting the administration see that a viable program is under way. Preparing an accurate and comprehensive report is the most effective way of educating administrators regarding the work being accomplished and the needs for the future. The report is, finally, the means of motivating the rest of the faculty, just as we teach students to look at their progress now and then—it helps to build success.)
Round Robin is a forum intended for our readers' use to express or comment on any topical subject affecting the field of reading. Send your letters or comments to Dorothy E. Smith, Round Robin Editor.

Dorothy E. Smith, Editor

Dear Mrs. Smith:

In an earlier issue Reading Horizons cited the major concerns, questions, and suggestions practitioners have regarding the preparation in reading received by students at Western Michigan University. The list, while not exhaustive, did reflect perceptions shared by many individuals both in the schools and in teacher education institutions.

We at Western welcome the suggestions made in the interest of improving ultimately the experiences of boys and girls in our schools. It seems appropriate therefore to share some of the steps currently underway to improve preparation in reading not only in pre-service but also as they apply to in-service and/or graduate programs.

We have long been concerned that the reading component of pre-service programs was inadequate. As of the current academic year that component will change from one course to two courses in developmental reading.

During the past academic year the Reading Unit within the Department of Teacher Education has re-examined each of the courses in the Reading Program. Course descriptions have been revised to accurately represent the content of the course and to distinguish it from all other courses.

The question of the interdisciplinary nature of teaching versus the specialty focus of reading degree programs is another area of concern. Once again our Reading Unit has attempted to meet the problem head on by identifying several program variations based on the role the student hopes to play in the school. Thus, individuals who aspire
to be clinicians or diagnosticians will have options in the area of tests and measurements beyond those required of individuals planning to continue to be classroom teachers.

We are constantly searching for ways to make our experiences more relevant. Most often this means getting closer to children. Thus within our various programs we continue to search for on-site, clinical, internship, etc., experiences. These have been built into our pre-service programs and may be seen in attempts to move courses traditionally taught exclusively "on-campus" off campus.

The question of the relationship a new teacher has to the system is always difficult to deal with. The variables to be considered are as many and varied as the districts themselves. However, through earlier and more varied laboratory experiences we are attempting to acquaint teachers with the services available to support instruction within the school and the community.

We have also worked to expose students to the wide variety of techniques and materials favored, recommended and/or used by school districts to help students learn to read. Ultimately, however, we must face the fact that we cannot complete the job in four years let alone in six or eight hours of a 120 hour program. Recognizing this we must accept the fact that professional growth in teaching is a continuous process which begins when individuals make a commitment to teaching and continues throughout their entire professional career.

Our commitment must be to continue to provide options and alternatives to meet the obvious need educators have to improve experiences leading to the full development of each child's languaging ability.

Thomas Ryan, Chairman
Department of Teacher Education
Western Michigan University
"Digressions, incontestably, are the sunshine; they are the life, the soul of reading; take them out of this book for instance, you might as well take the book along with them."

Laurence Sterne


Abrams indicates that in the past several decades there have been intriguing professional shifts of opinion regarding the etiology of reading disabilities. There have been so many diagnostic labels used that educators have become antagonistic toward them. He recognizes that the term "dyslexia" has become a "wastebasket" label which teachers hide behind in order to conceal their inadequacies. However, he contends that there are valid cases of dyslexia. He suggests that there are three types of dyslexia and that their incidence is rare—less than 1% of the total population of disabled readers. The author briefly describes the three types and concludes by stating, "The child born with dyslexic tendencies will then develop dyslexia only if the initial teaching to which he is exposed is not sufficiently effective . . . ."


In the past decade teachers have been inundated with new educational terminology such as hyperactive, brain damaged, learning disabled, maturational lag, dyslexic, perceptually handicapped, minimal brain damage, and others. Allington emphasizes that this "labeling" phenomena is professionally unsound and educationally unwise. Few of the labels have a single commonly accepted definition, they do not communicate useful information, and the use of a label shifts the burden of failure to the child. The author suggests that educators begin
the remedial process by providing instruction on the task identified as yet unmastered by the student rather than attempting to explain why he is not achieving academically.


The main idea is still the central feature of reading comprehension. Axelrod’s article presents some techniques on the improvement of teaching this most important comprehension skill by offering multiple choice main idea reading exercises. He stresses that students should understand the question and that they should learn the meanings of differences in main idea, best title, and moral of a story. He provides explanations and examples throughout the article.


Barr presents and discusses her investigation of the influence of homogeneous and differential pacing of classes on basal word learning and mastery, and the effect of basal word learning on general reading achievement. It is an intriguing study which could open up a whole new area of reading research.


Berg specifies that while the attention currently accorded Black English is intended as a positive step toward improving literacy in innercity schools, it is concerned principally with language and the cognitive dimensions of learning as opposed to the affective domain—such as self-concept and the role of teacher expectations. This emphasis is not entirely unexpected considering the injection of linguistics and psycholinguistics into the field of reading. The overriding issues remain those of interpersonal relationships and quality teaching with all that the latter implies. If the teacher cannot accord her students the respect and dignity due them as fellow human beings, her efforts to innovate, linguistically or otherwise, will not succeed.

In this article Betts discusses the contributions the field of linguistics has made to reading instruction. He points out that one, but only one, of the prerequisites to understanding word perception in reading is a “working knowledge of phonemics and grammar.” Betts states that a streamlined course in phonemics relevant to the needs of teachers provides an understanding of speech sounds related to spellings and syllable stress. It also builds an awareness and respect for different dialects as well as a working knowledge of grammar. Betts remarks that linguistics, psychology, and sociology all offer guidelines to the escalation of reading instruction.


The author indicates that this introduction to materials evaluation is intended to stimulate the educator to learn to ask the right questions before purchasing materials. He reminds his readers that teachers are less and less dispensers of narrow areas of knowledge, and more and more managers of materials and systems created by technicians and specialists. Evaluation of materials can be on a subjective personal level, or objective measurable standards can be defined. Bleil examines both the subjective and objective approach. He outlines certain qualities to look for and certain pitfalls to avoid.

Boy Scouts of America, *Family Living Skill Book*, (BSA #6587), and *First Aid Skill Book*, (BSA #6588), Supply Division BSA, North Brunswick, N.J. 08902.

These two books are designed for use with children reading on a third or fourth grade level. They are aimed at children from low and moderate income families or children in remedial reading programs anywhere. They are suitable for classroom use. *Family Living Skill Book* will help children better understand child care, family responsibilities, home safety, family recreation, and family problems. *First Aid Book* helps children learn how to respond to common medical emergencies. Sample copies of the two books are 30c each and teachers’ guides are also available.

Carver carefully describes and discusses the differences between psychometric and edumetric tests. He indicates that, when a measure of individual differences is desired, a "psychometric" test which measures an individual in relation to a normative group should be used. Similarly when a measure of within-individual gain or growth is desired, an "edumetric" test is desirable. Teacher-made tests and criterion-referenced tests are edumetric in design. The thrust of Carver's article is to point out that there is room for both tests that focus on stable between-individual differences and those that measure progressive within-individual gains. He stated that a test may be evaluated with respect to both psychometric and edumetric dimensions. However, Carver indicates clearly that the edumetric dimension of tests has been neglected by psychologists involved in testing and he expressed the hope that future tests will be developed and evaluated with an appreciation of both dimensions.


If teachers are to guide students in systematically attacking printed material, they must construct methods which guide the process as the student is simultaneously involved in that process. It becomes the teacher's task to create a step-by-step format for modeling their own appropriate reading behaviors. In attempting to help fellow teachers develop such a format, the authors have developed a workable guidance technique: the "Selective Reading Guide-O-Rama." One teacher who has used this technique stated, "This idea comes as close as I can to standing by my student with my hand on his shoulder while he reads the assignment."


The article presents the highlights of the Silberbergs book,
Who Speaks For The Child? The book offers advice for teachers and parents and is unique in its reliance on common sense. It presents iconoclasms concerning perceptual-motor training, cheating, poor handwriting, homework, IQ tests and intelligence, learning disabilities, hyperactivity, and normalcy. The Silberbergs emphasize that people must stop assigning blame and start dealing with realities. Children cannot be fitted into neat categories.


The author offers a set of twelve guidelines for viable in-service activities to improve classroom reading instruction. These general guidelines express a specific point of view which emphasizes the importance of teacher initiation. The in-service facilitator must interpret the guidelines and determine the extent to which he will use them. Draba suggests that this point of view is one of several concerning the way to achieve productive in-service instruction.


Durkin’s study reports the reading achievement during grades 1-4 of children who participated in a two year, pre-first grade language arts program. It also compares their achievement with that of classmates who did not participate in the program. Those who were not in the program attended kindergartens in which some attention was given to numeral and letter naming and also to the building of a small reading vocabulary. The reading achievement of the experimental subjects exceeded that of the control group each of the 4 years. In the interesting discussion of her study Durkin points out its limitations and offers tentative conclusions.


From regular visitations to elementary classrooms the author pinpoints several examples of the indefensible goals of “abiding
by tradition," "abiding by the calendar," and "abiding by the
basal reader." Durkin's classroom observations also revealed in-
struction that appeared not to have a goal—at least not any that
related to reading. She outlines various illustrations which dem-
strate the urgent need for teachers to ask themselves repeat-
edly, "Why am I doing this?" The author also indicated that
while the details of superior instructional programs vary, visits
to schools make it very clear that all of them are characterized
by daily efforts to match instruction to what children need to
learn in order to become better readers. And, isn't that what
individualized instruction is all about?

Ennis, Carolyn G., "The Reading Alibi—A Major School Problem,"

The author designs a revealing skit to emphasize the negative
attitudes of teachers and parents toward students who are poor
readers. Reading and discussion of the skit may help teachers
become aware of alternative solutions. She concludes that faith,
positive reinforcement, time, and a pupil who is taught to read
in grades K-12 is the solution to this major school problem.

Erickson, Lawrence and Wayne Otto, In-service Education to Improve
Reading Instruction. International Reading Association, Newark,

The authors present the need for and benefits of in-service
education. While giving enthusiastic encouragement to in-service
programs, they suggest areas of caution in planning and im-
plementing successful workshops. It is indicated that a pur-
pose for in-service must be clearly established and roles and
responsibilities of personnel in implementing the program must
be properly defined. Suggested models and formats of in-
service reading programs are presented. This small booklet is
a valuable tool for administrators, curriculum directors, or com-
mittees concerned with reading improvement.

Garzone, Tullio, "Is Reading for Meaning a Teachable Skill for the
Beginning Reader?", Reading World, (October, 1974), 14:25-36.

The author explores and discusses the meanings of "Mean-
ing" as it pertains to the teacher of beginning reading. The
two-fold instructional goal for the teacher of beginning reading is decoding and meaning. Regardless of which program is used, the teacher quickly discerns the teachable, concretized, symbolization of decoding. Comprehension, understanding, assimilation, in short “meaning” is, to say the least, less teachable, less concrete, less symbolic. Garzone goes on to delineate the meanings of “meaning” and to probe it as a teachable skill for beginning readers. He cites and describes four meanings of “meaning” and offers a clearer perception of the concept of comprehension. For the teacher of beginning reading the major task seems to address itself to the kinds of questions and exercises that will result in the grasp of the four meanings of “meaning” delineated by Garzone.


The author presents a ten-step program for teachers in dealing with classroom discipline. While he does not ignore feelings, he emphasizes behavior through a sequence of responses designed to incorporate success experiences—no matter how small—for the teacher as well as student. This program is now in use and works well. However, he affirms that more feedback is needed to work out various contingencies; and he would like very much to hear from any elementary teacher who tries this plan for at least four weeks. Glasser favors clear firm plans for changing behavior.


The authors view reading as claiming self and present implications of this concept for teachers, parents, and children. Learning to read is not an end in itself. Reading is a means of seeking information, of seeking enjoyment, of seeking understanding; in short, of seeking self. This enables us to see it as a process. Green and Way carefully explain how reading is a claiming of self. The self merges the subjective and objective. The reader reaches out to the world and takes it in. One reads to become one.

Iles, Betty, “The Effects of T.O. and i.t.a. on Reading and Spelling

The purpose of this study was to gain information as to whether the medium of reading instruction had any measurable effect on the reading and spelling skills of elementary school children. The sample studied consisted of two groups, one of which had learned to read using T.O. (traditional orthography) while the other group had been taught with an augmented alphabet, namely Pitman's i.t.a. (Initial Teaching Alphabet). The group scores from a standardized reading test and two standardized spelling tests were compared to each other and to national norms. Comparisons were made by grade level and for the total group. Spelling errors were classified by type and also compared. According to this study, the i.t.a. group had significantly better reading and spelling scores. The conclusion is that i.t.a. appears to be an effective medium for teaching reading to first graders.


The author discusses briefly LaPray and Ross' word lists (1969) and also the list of Harris and Jacobsen (1972). Johns presents a core list of 10 words at each level and suggests that teachers can use the lists to estimate a student's reading level and get some idea of a student's strengths and weaknesses in word attack. Provided are the directions for administering the word lists as well as guidelines for assessing the independent, instructional, and frustrational reading levels. However, the author cautions teachers about the limitations of using an isolated word list in assessing reading strengths and weaknesses.


The author reviews formulas and related predictive devices since 1960. He presents four categories: 1) revisions of existing formulas, 2) new formulas, 3) application aids for both manual and machine use, and 4) predictions of readability for foreign languages. Klare concludes his study with suggestions for choos-
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ing a formula based on the following: 1) special versus general needs, 2) manual versus machine application, 3) simple versus complex formulas, and 4) sentence length versus sentence complexity. The author stresses that formulas provide good indices of difficulty but they do not indicate the causes of difficulty or suggest how to write more readable materials.


Mavrogenes describes the use of a wide variety of cues which can improve secondary reading and offers ways to increase students’ awareness of them. Any reader, in order to comprehend, uses any and all cues available to him, so it becomes clear that no cue system can be neglected in the teaching of reading. The author reiterates that reading is a complex process and many factors contribute to reading ability. She emphasizes that in the end it is the teacher who makes the difference. He must understand the learner, the nature of reading, and the procedures of teaching and must apply that knowledge.


Peltz re-wrote tenth grade studies materials using the language patterns found in the students' own writing. Performance using the students' style of writing was compared with performance when the original version was read. A single multiple choice test revealed that while there was no significant difference in the number of correct responses to the multiple choice questions, the results showed significantly more correct responses to cloze items based upon the students' style of written passages. Continued efforts are needed in the development of materials more easily comprehended by readers of all ages.

Pflaum, Susanna F., “The Development of Language and Reading In the Young Child,” Charles E. Merrill, Columbus, Ohio, 1972.

The author divides her book into two parts. Part I deals with language development and its significance for intellectual and academic progress. She discusses language deficit and language
difference. In Part II Pflaum discusses the transition from oral language to reading, the needed reading readiness skills, and also suggests materials for beginning reading. She emphasizes individualizing instruction and provides checklists and diagnostic instruments to aid teachers in planning effective programs for the acquisition of language and reading skills.


Pikulski reviews the general concept of “criterion referenced testing” and discusses its possible implications for clinical evaluation. He points out that the distinction between diagnostic tests and criterion referenced or norm referenced measures is largely a matter of emphasis. Diagnostic tests are concerned with definition of disability and emphasizes the etiology of problems. Criterion referenced tests establish the score necessary for “passing” ahead of time without reference to scores usually obtained by others taking that test. Pikulski discusses five characteristics of criterion referenced tests and then goes on to consider the concept of criterion referenced testing to clinical evaluation in a somewhat directed manner. He points out that criterion referenced testing can be fully used only if clinical programs provide instruction following the diagnosis of a reading problem. He presents five areas of caution in using criterion referenced measurements and concludes that with the small number of students that are typically part of clinical instruction, individualization of instruction and goals should be possible. Criterion referenced measures are simple ways of determining whether goals have or have not been met.


Pryor gives a striking account of “George,” a disabled reader, and reminds readers that how students feel about themselves is a strong factor in the success of anything they do. A student who has a positive concept of self will usually learn faster regardless of mental ability than a child who lacks self-esteem. Bolstering a pupil’s feelings about himself is perhaps the first step toward
improving academic problems. If the teacher cannot accord students the respect and dignity due them as fellow human beings, her efforts to innovate, linguistically or otherwise, will not succeed.


Rauch reminds his readers that the longest running topic on the education scene is "Why Johnny Can't Read." He also points out that the study, "National Search for Exemplary Reading Programs" suggests four factors that are responsible for reading success or failure. Two of these factors are school leadership and in-service teacher training. The author presents eight workable recommendations to administrators for providing effective in-service teacher training programs in reading.


Siler's research investigates an aspect of the relationship between oral and written language. His study is concerned with the effects of syntactic and/or semantic violations on the oral reading performance of second and fourth graders. Findings indicated that sentences violated syntactically were also violated semantically. Siler concluded that syntax appeared to have a greater effect than semantics on oral reading performance.


Many educators are excited by the challenge and interest sparked by the learning center approach. A learning center is a recent innovation and there are many types and many ways to produce a learning center atmosphere. The learning center idea produces eager, aggressive learners rather than passive students. Students develop certain behaviors within an atmosphere of freedom. Pupils work at a pace they choose with materials suited for them. The teacher aids the student by providing opportunities
for self-pacing and independence in planning. The basic structure of the reading center is complete when the furniture, equipment and materials are arranged. The most important step is to design activities for students to learn the reading skills. The authors give suggestions for selecting materials, scheduling time, and evaluating students' progress.


There are two popular approaches to reading in the literary world. The first approach is suggested as being impersonal, rigorously formal, text-centered, and detached. The second approach suggests that reading and education consist of understanding one's own experiences and becoming aware of what one thinks, feels, and values. The two approaches reflect De Quincey's thinking on the two functions of literature; the one teaches us and the other moves us. Yoder recommends that teachers of literature draw from both approaches rather than supporting one over the other. He suggests a two step method of drawing from both approaches.
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