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CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Education has set its sights for its own "moon shot" in the '70's, according to James E. Allen, Jr., former United States Commissioner of Education. The target for the decade ahead is the national "Right to Read" crusade, a total commitment to end reading failures in the United States by 1980.

In presenting this challenge before a meeting of the State Boards of Education, Commissioner Allen quoted the following statistics:

One out of every four students nationwide has significant reading deficiencies. In large city school systems, up to 50% read below expectation. There are three million illiterates in our adult population. Seventy-five percent of juvenile offenders in New York City are two years or more retarded in reading. In a recent U. S. Armed Forces program, 68.2% of the young men fell below grade seven in reading and academic ability (3:6).

He stated further:

We should immediately set for ourselves the goal of ensuring that by the end of the 1970's the right to read shall be a reality for all; that no one shall leave our schools without the skill and the desire necessary to read to the full limits of his capability . . . . The challenge, then, is to all individuals and organizations that make up the total educational endeavor of our nation. Essential, too, of course, will be the intensive participation of the colleges and universities and their schools of teacher education (3:7).
Experts in the reading field have agreed that up-grading classroom instruction must begin with better reading preparation for teachers. Artley opined:

To improve pupil achievement in reading, one should look first at the teacher and his training. This, then, puts the responsibility squarely upon the shoulders of those who are engaged in teacher education, pre- and in-service—teachers of methods courses, supervisors of practice teaching, and school- and system-wide reading supervisors, both elementary and secondary (5:240).

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

How well prepared are the elementary grade teachers in classrooms today to answer this "Right to Read" challenge? Do they possess the knowledge of the reading act and of ways that children learn to achieve this goal? Have their college reading courses prepared them to teach reading successfully to all children? How do teachers rate their preparation in the light of day-by-day classroom needs? What are teachers doing to further their understanding and effective teaching of this vital skill? What suggestions might they offer to training institutions to improve reading preparation?

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the total preparation in reading of a group of elementary teachers, and the current reading requirements of Washington's four-year colleges and universities.
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The sample population was limited to elementary teachers who had received baccalaureate degrees in the past ten years. Some were new to the profession, and others were experienced. All were teaching in the current year in self-contained classrooms in the three largest districts of one county in the State of Washington.

All fifteen of the four-year colleges and universities in the state were asked for information regarding undergraduate course and content requirements for elementary trainees in the current year.

Questions asked both the colleges and the teachers corresponded in some areas. For the purpose of this study, no attempt was made to obtain information other than that pertaining to preparation for teaching reading, in itself a complex topic.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

The investigator initiated this survey on the premise that discrepancies exist between the ideal of every teacher being an effective teacher of reading and the actual classroom practices which result in many reading difficulties and outright failures.

It was recognized also that no matter what the extent of government research or dollar amount spent, the actual work involved in up-grading the teaching of reading must be done by the classroom teacher.
It was further supposed that the responsibility for effective training was no longer the exclusive province of the colleges, but lay in three areas: (1) pre-service requirements, (2) in-service opportunities, and (3) the professional obligation of the individual teacher to learn, grow, experiment, and create in the learning-to-read situation.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Words, phrases, and abbreviations peculiar to the study of reading will be explained in the text.

ORGANIZATION OF REMAINDER OF THE THESIS

Chapter II will review studies concerned with the status and evaluation of training programs.

Chapter III will disclose information obtained from the teachers surveyed regarding their educational backgrounds, attitudes, and opinions of training. Also included will be material from the colleges concerning their requirements.

Chapter IV will review briefly the problem and related literature. It will offer generalizations, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF LITERATURE

Chapter II will review recent literature pertinent to the training of elementary teachers in reading. It will explore pre-service training (that required in college courses), in-service training (opportunities for continued growth while employed as a teacher), and individual responsibility.

Because of the growing multiplicity of ideas and the acceleration of life and education in general, reading in the modern world becomes daily a more complex and demanding task. Mastering the mechanical skill is only the beginning phase; as it develops, so must the attendant reasoning abilities. Life today and tomorrow insists that the reader learn to evaluate, judge, interpret, seek intent, and draw together ideas in much that he reads.

According to the *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*,

The aims of reading instruction in America have in the broad sense reflected and interacted with the changing values of the times. In recent years the ultimate objectives of reading instructors have moved far beyond purely utilitarian concerns to an emphasis on the importance of reading as a continuing source of personal valuing and social understanding (14:1084).

Whether reading skills are simple or complex, the responsibility for teaching them belongs to the classroom teacher. What he
teaches and how he does it usually depend upon what he learned about reading during his college preparation for his classroom role.

**PRE-SERVICE TRAINING**

Pre-service training can be defined as college course work and activities which contribute to understanding the reading processes and effective ways to teach them.

**Harvard-Carnegie Study, Part 1**

The most comprehensive and definitive study of teacher preparation in reading in recent years was Part 1 of the Harvard-Carnegie study, under the direction of Austin and Morrison. Its two-fold purpose was (1) to learn how colleges and universities in the United States were preparing future teachers of reading, and (2) to suggest recommendations for improving that preparation. Reading departments in seventy-four colleges throughout the nation were questioned on current practices in undergraduate training. The results were published in 1961 under the title *The Torchlighters* (8:1, 15).

The authors concluded that teacher preparation was poor (7:7). This finding was based in part upon the following aspects of training.

**Course time, conduct, and content.** Too little course time was devoted to specific work in reading. Usually only one course was required, and frequently it was a combined Language Arts course. In
courses such as this, fewer than twelve class hours of instruction were allotted to the subject of reading. Instruction was based on lecture material and discussion of assigned reading. Little or no provision was given for working directly with children, and with the exception of student teaching, total observation time in classrooms averaged less than fifteen days in all.

Often the primary reading skills were emphasized and intermediate skills such as content and critical reading were slighted. Topics which should have received more attention were diagnosis and treatment of reading disabilities, differential materials to meet individual needs, and children's literature (8:Ch. III).

**Student teaching.** The time allotted to student teaching was usually nine weeks, full day, one level only. As it was generally scheduled for the last semester of the senior year, the student teacher was allowed no experience with grouping at the first of the year or with children's beginning reading levels. Seldom were the reading course and the student teaching offered concurrently; trainees could not practice teaching skills as they were learning them.

Colleges encountered problems getting superior cooperating teachers and had to rely mainly on volunteers. As a rule, the gap between the theory taught by the colleges and the methods practiced in the classroom was wide. Elementary supervisors were largely uninformed about reading.
Specific deficiencies in students' preparation were noted in the practice teaching room. Five common lacks were in (1) knowledge of phonic principles, (2) awareness of grouping techniques, (3) adjusting instruction to individual needs, (4) motivating the slow reader, and (5) developing independent instructional materials (8:Ch. V).

Recommendations. The Harvard-Carnegie report made the following recommendations, in part: (1) Colleges require at least three semester hours in reading, or the equivalent, whether taught as a separate course or integrated with Language Arts. (2) Professors take greater responsibility in making certain that students have mastered principles of phonetic and structural analysis. (3) Colleges offer a course or in-service training in reading instruction specifically designed for principals, supervisors, and cooperating teachers. (4) Colleges make more use of the case study or problem-centered approach in order to relate theory to a particular problem and to solve it, include more use of tapes and films, allow for more directed observation or closed-circuit television, and coordinate reading instruction with practice teaching. (5) All prospective teachers become acquainted with techniques, interpretation, and evaluation of current and past research and be introduced to professional reading journals (8:Ch. VIII).
Other Studies

Course time, conduct, and relevance have been the concern of others since the Harvard-Carnegie study. Durkin said of the single course requirement,

I cannot even begin to see how a course called "General Methods" or a course including all four of the Language Arts can ever hope to be successful in preparing students to teach reading (13:291).

Lecture was called "low-intensity activity" by Braam and Oliver (10:428), who with Gomberg (16) and Guszak (17) designed courses involving students actively with children. They cited both the benefits of making the students responsible for the children's reading needs and the direct relevance to on-going teaching of this kind of activity.

When preparing content for her own college courses, Durkin (13:291) found a remedy for student disinterest by requiring each to tutor a child while taking her class.

"Micro-teaching" for one hour a week in connection with a methods course revealed student problems in phonics, pupil management, and other areas, according to Olson (23:694).

Specific suggestions offered by Furr (15:286-287) for bringing to life the reading methods courses when work with children was not possible were (1) semi-laboratory experiences--those taken from real teacher-pupil reading instructional situations and brought into the room for analysis; (2) tape recorder--taped basal reading lessons showing
Sequential development of a lesson and variation in procedure such as in word study, setting of purposes, critical reading, and evaluative techniques; films, television, film strips, slides, role playing, and case conferences.

Summarized Furr:

(1) Actual laboratory experience should be an integral part of teacher training. (2) Semi-laboratory activities show superiority over the traditional-lecture methods of course presentation. (3) A student's performance in a teaching situation is perhaps the most effective evaluation of his knowledge of reading instruction (15:290).

Common practices in the student teaching situation have also come under scrutiny. Regarding amount of time, Stauffer observed:

It is true that some colleges are taking steps to upgrade their offerings, but in many colleges more laboratory time is devoted to the study of cattle or to physics or chemistry than is devoted to student teaching (25:405).

Aaron set down precepts for planners of student teaching experiences. Student teachers should (1) be placed in classrooms where good teaching is being done; (2) know that methods other than the ones he sees may also be effective; (3) observe more than one reading teacher; (4) feel secure in deviating from what the supervisory teacher does; (5) have a thorough course on teaching reading before student teaching; (6) have experience teaching developmental reading before trying remedial; (7) have experience with good, average, and poor readers; (8) prepare thoroughly before attempting to teach a reading lesson; (9) learn to deviate from the teacher's manual when
appropriate; (10) be familiar with basal series other than the one in use; and (11) be closely supervised (1:295-296).

Since 1963, the Washington Elementary School Principals' Association has conducted an on-going study of college preparatory programs in reading. During this time some changes have occurred. Although in most colleges in the state only one course is still required, total reading offerings have increased. A recommendation in April, 1968, was that two reading courses should be chief among the requirements for elementary trainees (28:1). See Appendix A for suggested course content.

IN-SERVICE TRAINING

In-service training can be defined as any of several ways to continue to grow professionally. Some sources are enrolling in graduate courses; participating in professional organizations; attending demonstrations, workshops, and national and local conferences; initiating action research; and reading professional journals.

Austin cited the "Herculean task" of meeting all reading needs, and added:

While we must look to the colleges to re-appraise and revise their present programs, we cannot expect them to shoulder the entire burden for the improvement of classroom reading instruction. Local school systems must assume at least a fair share of the responsibility through viable in-service activities (6:406).
Harvard-Carnegie Study, Part 2

The second part of the Harvard-Carnegie study investigated the actual conduct and content of reading programs in the elementary schools by means of questionnaires and two field studies. The questionnaires were returned by over one thousand school systems in all fifty states, and observations by the study staff were made in about 1800 classrooms. Results were published in 1963 in a volume titled *The First R* (7:247, 250).

**In-service findings.** In one section of the report, Austin and Morrison found that although two-thirds of the responding systems claimed to have some kind of in-service activity in reading, these programs usually fell far short of success. Needs of teachers were not taken into account nor were they asked to help plan. Sessions were often scheduled for after school or Saturday on the teachers' own time. Leadership was poor (7:Ch. VI).

**Recommendations.** The study recommended that in-service education programs (1) be designed to increase the knowledge and to improve the performance of teachers within the school; (2) be continuous, year-to-year efforts; (3) provide released time for teachers to attend meetings; (4) allow participants to play a more active role in planning content; (5) be limited in enrollment to permit active participation of those in attendance; (6) make use of television, audio-visual aids,
and case studies for the purpose of developing theoretical concepts in realistic situations (7:237).

Other Studies

A USOE monograph distributed to school districts in the state by the Research Office of the Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction suggested that in-service training was "probably the most neglected technique for attacking problems" (24:11).

Successful in-service offerings by school systems were described by several authors. Witmer (29) wrote of an on-going program prepared on video tapes and based upon all aspects of reading—philosophy, readiness, disabilities, diagnosis, phonics, and others.

A study in Florida was made by Adams of teachers' instructional needs. It revealed that 90 percent of the 268 teachers surveyed wanted help in learning about corrective or remedial reading, diagnosis and treatment of problems, and ways to meet individual differences and needs (2:261).

Reported by DeCarlo and Cleland was an experimental program for intermediate grade teachers which consisted of a week's training before school began, regular visits by a reading consultant, and twice-weekly seminars. They concluded that in-service programs geared to the teachers' needs can result in beneficial changes in the effectiveness of their teaching (12:164, 168).
Heilman built an intensive in-service program around the goals that teachers (1) become conversant with significant research in beginning reading, (2) read widely in professional literature, (3) share teaching techniques, (4) modify and/or extend concepts of reading instruction (19:624).

Less formal approaches than classes or workshops listed in part by Crowley were (1) bulletins for departmental sharing, (2) a professional library provided by the school system, (3) displays of new materials and discussions about them with the consultant, and (4) subsidized attendance at conferences (11:304).

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY

No matter what curriculum strides teacher-training colleges may accomplish in the present and future, or to what extent school systems assume the obligation for making available continuous education, the end responsibility for improving reading belongs to the individual teacher. It is his awareness of needs and his determination to meet them that will bring about change.

The Teacher Variable

In this "age of media" some insist that improved materials will take over the job of teaching every child to read. Harris declared:

There are those who have discarded the notion that teacher effectiveness can be greatly improved through better teacher training and supervision. Their solution is to produce equipment
which will teach in a way that is invulnerable to teacher incompetence or inefficiency. In other words, they want teacher-proof education (18:195).

He pointed out that recent research shows differences in teachers are more important than differences among methods and materials (18:203).

Bond and Dykstra backed up this statement with conclusion nine of the Cooperative Research Program in First Grade Reading:

Future research might well center on teacher and learning situation characteristics rather than methods and materials . . . . To improve reading instruction, it is necessary to train better teachers of reading than to expect a panacea in the form of materials (9:123).

Strickland referred also to this study, made by the United States Office of Education at a cost of more than $1 million. Seeking to find out which were most successful, the study compared methods of teaching reading. Two generalizations emerged: (1) It is impossible to meet the needs of all children by any one method. (2) The most important element in any reading program is the teacher. It is the teacher, not the method, that makes the difference (27:96).

Strickland urged that teachers divorce themselves from loyalty to a system and concentrate on opening themselves to individual needs, move away from reading as a separate discipline instead of as a part of the language constellation, expand their knowledge of child development and methods of learning and using language, understand thoroughly the psychology of learning, and acquaint themselves with
books, materials, and methods which can be adapted to the needs of children as they learn to read.

"Such a plan of freeing teachers to teach children to read rather than teaching a system of reading might bring the millenium," she concluded (27:109-110).

Professional Goals

The National Education Association has suggested ways of improving on-going education. In part, they advocated the following goals:

(1) Continuing education is a career-long process of professional growth. (2) The primary responsibility for continuing development rests with the individual teacher. (3) Continuing education is planned on an individual basis. (4) Professional growth is achieved in a variety of ways, including, but not limited to, formal study (22:17).

The International Reading Association (21) has suggested minimum standards for professional preparation in reading. See Appendix B for their recommendations.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY OF LITERATURE

Chapter II has reviewed the current literature regarding pre-service courses, in-service training, and individual responsibility for improving practices in reading.

The demands made of reading in the modern world are increasing, and teaching them well places a large responsibility on the
classroom teacher. In attempting to meet needs, he in turn can usually draw only from what he has learned in his college reading preparation.

Part 1 of the Harvard-Carnegie study revealed that teachers had poor preparation. Too little course time was devoted to reading, phonic principles and intermediate skills were slighted, and students seldom worked directly with children. Poor practices in student teaching were the scheduling, the quality of cooperating teachers, and the discrepancies between theory taught at the college and actual classroom practices. The study concluded with five recommendations for improving student teaching experiences.

Other studies by Durkin, Braam and Oliver, Gomberg, Guszak, Olson, Furr, and Aaron reinforced the Harvard-Carnegie findings and suggested additional ways to up-grade college reading courses.

The Washington Elementary School Principals' Association study recommended a required two courses in reading for elementary teacher trainees.

In-service training was defined. The results of the second part of the Harvard-Carnegie study revealed that in-service programs for the most part suffered from poor planning, leadership, and scheduling. Six ways to remedy shortcomings were offered.

Successful in-service approaches were described by Witmer, Adams, DeCarlo and Cleland, and Heilman.
No matter what the instructional opportunities or improved materials made available, the final responsibility for bettering the teaching of reading rests with the classroom teacher. Studies by Harris, Bond and Dykstra, and remarks by Strickland pointed out that the personal and professional qualities of the teacher were usually the deciding factors in a child's success or failure in reading.

The chapter concluded with goals for professional preparation by both the National Education Association and the International Reading Association.

Chapter III will disclose details of reading preparation as volunteered by more than one hundred elementary grade teachers and all of the Washington four-year colleges. Pertinent tables will be presented and appendices cited.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

DESIGN OF THE INVESTIGATION

In order to ascertain the status of teacher preparation in reading, two sources were utilized. A group of practicing elementary teachers and the Washington colleges and universities were questioned regarding course titles, course content, student teaching activities, and other areas which revealed reading foundations.

QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE TEACHERS

A questionnaire was distributed on March 2, 1970, to 128 teachers of regular, self-contained classrooms, grades one through six, in the three largest districts in Thurston County—Olympia, North Thurston, and Tumwater.

Principals of the twenty elementary schools supplied the names of teachers who had obtained Bachelor of Education degrees in 1960 or since. The sample population chosen was limited to these years to reflect current college requirements in reading, a span of teaching experience broad enough to give a measured opinion on training and practice, and the presumably open-minded interest of the younger teacher in new trends in education.
The month of March was chosen because the major part of the school year was past and reflection on and evaluation of the reading program could then most reasonably be made.

The first deadline of March 10, 1970, elicited sixty-nine responses, or about 54 percent return. A second letter was sent out March 13, 1970, with a due date of March 16, 1970. By the end of that week, which also marked the start of spring vacation, 105 questionnaires had been returned, a response of 82 percent. On these 105 returns this study was based.

Designed to look into the total picture of preparing to teach reading, the questionnaire was divided informally into three sections, which might be described as past preparation, a brief look at practices in the classroom, and teachers' present and future interests.

The first portion asked for factual and biographical information, seeking to establish general educational background of respondents. Specific questions followed on reading courses and pre-teaching experience. The purpose of this section (through question 10) was primarily to establish the basis on which teachers' opinions of the worth of their training and practices might be evaluated.

The second part (through question 14) inquired into respondents' opinions of their total training in reading in relationship to present classroom practices. The purpose of this part was to
determine the effectiveness of background preparation in the light of
day-by-day uses.

Section three (questions 15 through 17) sought to find out in
what new directions teachers' interests might lie, and asked in conclu-
sion for suggestions for improving the total college preparation for
teaching reading to elementary grade children. (See Appendices C and
D for the letter to the teachers and the teachers' questionnaire.)

Results of the Questionnaire

Question 1: Name of school, sex of respondent? The names
of the schools were necessary to determine which persons had
responded. No resume of them appears in this study. As might be
expected in an all-elementary group, most respondents were female.
Answering were 80 women and 25 men. (See Table 1.)

Table 1
Respondents by Grade and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22-1/2<em>13-1/2</em></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Combined second and third grade room
Question 2: Grade now teaching? Replying to the questionnaire were 21 first grade teachers, 22-1/2 second, 14-1/2 third, 12 fourth, 17 fifth, and 18 sixth. (One teacher had a class of both second and third graders.) (See Table 1.)

Question 3: How many years have you taught this grade?
Most were fairly new to teaching. Thirty-two (29.5%) respondents stated they were in their first year in this grade. Twenty-two were in their second, and 10 had taught three years. Another 10 had taught four years, 5 were in their fifth year of experience, 4 in their sixth, and another 4 in their seventh. Nine teachers had had eight years in their grade, 3 had had nine, and 3 had had ten.

Four persons who had taught on sub-standard certification and obtained degrees in the 1960's claimed more than ten years' experience. Information about grades taught at other times was not relevant to this study. (See Table 2.)

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4: What is the highest degree you hold? The majority (62.8%) were teaching with a four-year degree. Fifty-nine marked BA as their highest degree, while 7 claimed a BS. Thirty-four had completed a fifth year of study, and 5 held a Master's degree. No one marked the category "Less than BA." (See Table 3.)

Table 3
Type of Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than BA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>BA + 5th year</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5: In what year did you receive your Bachelor's Degree? Years in which respondents received degrees were as follows: 1960--6; 1961--7; 1962--8; 1963--8; 1964--5; 1965--14; 1966--9; 1967--15; 1968--16; 1969--17. (See Table 4.)

Table 4
Year of Bachelor's Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Granted</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Year Granted</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 6: Did you graduate from a college or university in this state? Most of this group—85, or about 8 out of 10—had had their undergraduate work in Washington State. Twenty had finished in out-of-state institutions.

Question 7: At what grade level(s) did you student teach? Student teaching was done in all grades—kindergarten through grade twelve—and in special education. Seventy-three persons had had student teaching on one level. Primary only was listed by 39 respondents; 25 had taught in intermediate only, and 3 in junior high only. Six had had their one experience in high school. Of those who listed high school only, all excepting one were men, and all held Washington degrees. Aside from these few, the majority of the sample had had student teaching experience either on the present grade level taught or quite close to it. (See Table 5.)

Table 5

One Level of Student Teaching Experience, By Grade Currently Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Student Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student teaching experience on two levels was reported by 32 respondents. (See Table 6.)

Table 6

Two Levels of Student Teaching Experience,
By Grade Currently Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Student Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten &amp; Primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/2*</td>
<td>1/2*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary &amp; Intermediate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary &amp; Junior High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary &amp; High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate &amp; Junior High</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate &amp; High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate &amp; Special Ed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Combined second and third grade room

Question 8: At the time you began teaching, had you taken any college course(s) specifically for the teaching of reading? Eighty-six persons (81.9%) said that they had had some training in reading by the time they started teaching. However, 19 teachers (18.1%) had never had a reading course before teaching. Included in this group were 2 first grade, 3 second grade, 3 fourth grade, 1 fifth grade, and 10 sixth grade teachers. Four had trained in other states; the remaining 15 were graduates of local institutions. Ten of those who had not had any reading courses and graduated in Washington were teaching sixth grade at the time of the survey. Their years of graduation were 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967.
It was evident, therefore, that as recently as 1967, graduates of state teacher-training programs entered elementary classrooms with the task of teaching all phases and levels of reading instruction without having had any course preparation in it. Out of the ten, nine had also had no student teaching experience in reading. (See Table 7.)

Table 7

Undergraduate Reading Course(s) Taken, By Grade Currently Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had course(s)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19 1/2</td>
<td>14 1/2*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had no course(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Combined second and third grade room

Question 8, continued: If yes, list title(s) of course(s) as well as you can recall. Circle number of credits and check type of hours. One undergraduate course in reading was listed by 35 respondents, or one-third of the sample. A variety of course titles was given, most referring to what was assumed to be a basic reading class. The most common title listed was The Teaching of Reading, and the usual amount of credit was two semester hours or three quarter hours. As course titles varied among the fifteen four-year colleges in the state, as names of classes from out-of-state colleges were also given, and
as memories fail, little significance was attached to exact titles and credit in this study. (See Table 8 and Appendix E.)

Table 8

Number of Undergraduate Reading Courses Taken, By Grade Currently Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Courses Taken</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 1/2*</td>
<td>1 1/2*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Combined second and third grade room

As shown in Table 8, 35, or another one-third of the sample, listed two undergraduate classes in reading methods. Most often named were a basic course probably titled The Teaching of Reading, and a second class, Children's Literature. Again, the usual amount of credits was two semester or three quarter hours.

Ten teachers (9.5%) claimed to have had three courses in the field of reading as an undergraduate. Of these teachers, 7 were teaching grades one, two, and three at the time of the survey. Methods for Language Arts was the most common third title, carrying two semester or three quarter hours.

Listing a total of four undergraduate reading classes were 5 teachers (4.8%).
Question 9: Did you personally teach reading to a child or group of children in any undergraduate course, including student teaching? Of the 105 teachers replying to the questionnaire, 83 (79%) indicated that they had had experience before graduation in the teaching of reading; 21 persons (20%) answered "No"; 1 declined to answer.

Question 9, continued: If "yes," name course and describe the situation briefly. Of the 83 who had had experience, 81 persons described it. The most listed (74 times) types of experience were connected with some phase of student teaching. Other opportunities were tutoring for the YWCA, helping a Japanese girl learn to read English, and some incidences in other courses before student teaching.

A wide range of time on task, depth, and width was revealed in the details given of the student teaching experience in reading. Opportunities varied from situations which allowed a token amount of time and student initiative to what was considered in-depth teaching. One person described her sole exposure as being one of a group of five student teachers who assisted a room teacher for one-half hour a day. Other short-term apprenticeships were "three groups daily for two weeks," "conducted two or three reading classes," tutoring one child, and teaching one group. In contrast, several persons said they had taught reading for a full semester, or for several months. One said she had been "in complete charge of the classroom from August to December full day, all three reading groups after first three weeks." (See Appendix F.)
Question 10: Have you taken any college reading course(s) since you completed your initial teacher training? This question was asked to ascertain whether teachers had found it helpful or necessary to take additional reading work as a postgraduate, and to complete the picture of college preparation. Of the 35 teachers who said they had had one undergraduate course, 24 of them have had no additional courses at all. An exception was a first-year teacher who claimed 30-1/2 semester hours in seven reading courses since her 1969 BA degree.

The postgraduate course most often named was Remedial Reading. Others frequently chosen were Children's Literature, Language Arts, and Teaching Primary Reading. (See Table 9 and Appendix G.)

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Postgraduate Courses Taken</th>
<th>No. of Undergraduate Courses Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total--104. (One respondent did not give course titles)

*Claimed seven courses, 30-1/2 semester hours in clinic/workshop.
The total number of courses taken, both undergraduate and postgraduate, is presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Total Number of Reading Courses, Pre- and Postgraduate, By Grade Currently Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Courses Taken</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Grade 4</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 1/2*</td>
<td>3 1/2*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average No. of Classes 2.48 2.4 2.4 2.33 1.8** 1.5

*Combined second and third grade room

**The eight classes taken by one fifth grade teacher, BA 1969, were not included, as it was felt that the addition of this figure would distort true preparation.

Question 11: In your opinion, have the course(s) that you have taken, if any, prepared you adequately for effective teaching of reading at this time? This query introduced the second part of the study: evaluation according to present needs and practices.

Of those responding, 35 teachers, one-third of the total sample, adjudged their preparation in reading to be adequate. The number of courses taken by this group varied from one to eight. The
most common number was two, and the next most common was four.

All grades were represented. (See Table 11.)

All ten BA years were also represented. The distribution of respondents is as follows: 1960--3; 1961--4; 1962--2; 1963--3; 1964--1; 1965--7; 1966--2; 1967--4; 1968--4; 1969--5.

Table 11

Teachers Who Judged Their Training As Adequate, Listed by Grade and Number of Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Courses Taken</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average No. of Classes: 2.97

Nearly the same number of persons did not feel well prepared to teach classroom reading. Of the respondents, 33 (31.4%) answered "No" to question 11. The majority of dissatisfied respondents were those in grades five and six. Eight in each of these grades expressed a feeling of lack, while only 3 in first grade and 3 in third felt the same. Of those answering negatively, 4 had had no reading courses, 12 had had one course, and 9 had had two, which was the average number taken by the whole sample. One person who declared five
reading courses still felt dissatisfied with the adequacy of his training. (See Table 12.)

While all BA years were represented, the largest number of persons who felt training was insufficient were 1969 graduates, in their first year of teaching. This feeling of inadequacy may reflect to some extent the limited amount of experience and the lack of opportunity as yet to take additional reading work. The distribution of respondents is as follows: 1960--2; 1961--3; 1962--4; 1963--2; 1964--1; 1965--2; 1966--4; 1967--3; 1968--5; 1969--7.

Table 12

Teachers Who Judged Their Training As Inadequate, Listed By Grade and Number of Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Courses Taken</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average No. of Classes: 1.7

A third optional answer to the question of adequacy of preparation was "Not sure." Eighteen people gave this reply. The largest number of doubters (6) were first grade teachers. Of the respondents in this category, 9 had had one reading course, 4 had had four
courses, and 1 had had five. One second grade teacher who had had seven reading courses labeled them "background only."

One respondent marked both "Yes" and "No," and another chose "Yes" and "Not sure." Both were counted among the "Not sure" for a total of 20 undecided. (See Table 13.)

The BA years of most indecision were 1967 and 1968. The distribution of respondents is as follows: 1960--0; 1961--0; 1962--1; 1963--0; 1964--2; 1965--1; 1966--2; 1967--6; 1968--6; 1969--2.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Courses Taken</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/2*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average No. of Classes: 2.45

*Combined second and third grade room

A fourth provision for reply to this question was labeled "Other." Ten persons commented rather than choose a definite answer. Two of them suggested that experience was the most help. One who had had no reading work declined to answer on that account. The other
seven indicated that classes had been some degree of help. "The beginning course has proved a good basis," one remarked. Another said that the courses "... did introduce problems I would be confronted with." (See Appendix H.)

Seven persons did not answer question 11. Since three had had no reading courses, this lack was assumed to be the reason they did not answer. Of the other four, one person had had one class and three had had two courses.

Summarizing responses to the part of question 11 concerned with adequate preparation, one-third of the sample felt secure in their training while more than half (54.8%) expressed partial or full doubt about its effectiveness. Those who felt most confident were primary grade teachers; a total of 22 of the 35 who answered "Yes" taught grades one, two, and three. (Primary teachers totaled 55.3 percent of the total respondents and 62.8 percent of the total "Yes" answers.)

First grade teachers felt better prepared than did second grade teachers. Eleven of the 21 first grade teachers answered "Yes," while only 5 of the total of 17-1/2 second grade teachers gave affirmative replies. This doubt may reflect children's rapid growth and fast-widening spread in second grade reading. It may also be explained in part by the fact that a large number of second grade teachers in this sample were fairly new to teaching.
Respondents in the intermediate grades numbered 47 persons, or 44.7 percent of the total. Thirteen answered "Yes" to question 11 and 19 answered "No." The remaining 15 replied in other ways or did not answer. Fourth grade teachers were more confident of effectiveness than were either the fifth or the sixth grade teachers. Five of the 12 fourth grade teachers answered "Yes," while only 4 of the 17 fifth grade and 4 of the 18 sixth grade teachers did the same. This small proportion of favorable replies was probably due in part to the male fifth and sixth grade teachers who had had little or no reading background.

Among the "Yes" answers, there were no respondents who had had no courses. Four had had one course, 14 had had two, 5 had had three, and 8 had had four. Among the "No's," 4 teachers had taken no courses, 21 listed one, 12 had had two, 6 had completed three, and 6 named four courses.

Some relationship appeared to show between number of classes taken and degree of feeling of adequacy. Those answering "Yes" averaged 2.97 classes, while those responding "No" averaged 1.72 classes. However, the average of classes taken for those who were "Not sure" (2.45) was not far behind the "Yes" people.

Although all BA years were represented in both "Yes" and "No" answers to the question concerning adequacy of preparation, no trend was clear. Years on both answers were quite evenly distributed.
However, 17 of the 20 "Not sure" answers were concentrated into the most recent five of the BA years. From this, it would seem that the more experienced teachers were as doubtful as were the relative newcomers. All classes in reading—undergraduate and postgraduate—were considered together as total preparation.

**Question 11, continued:** What aspects of your training in reading proved most helpful? Eighty-seven teachers answered; 18 did not. Remarks ranged from the highly affirmative, such as, "Courses explained very clearly what skills were needed and what difficulties children can have in reading," to the extremely negative, such as, "I must say none. I felt when I graduated, as I do now, almost unskilled in reading."

As might be expected, the greatest number of positive comments came from those who had evaluated their training as effective. This group was largely primary-based teachers. Of the 18 who did not answer this question, the majority were fifth and sixth grade teachers, although all grade levels were represented.

Comments offered varied a great deal and reflected many areas of skills development, practices, and introduction of materials. The dominant theme of most remarks was that the strengths of reading courses were closely connected with the opportunities that teachers-in-training were given to apply what they were learning in immediate, practical situations, such as direct classroom observation of master
teachers at work and direct teaching experience with children. (See Appendix I.)

**Question 11, continued:** What were the obvious lacks? The number replying was 83, with no answer from 22 persons. Remarks ranged from "I can think of no lacks," and "I felt well prepared," to "Training lacked everything." Insufficient practical experience with children placed first. Listed next was too few practical, concrete materials, ideas, and suggestions. Additional criticisms were that courses did not offer phonics training and helps for remedials, that instructors were out of touch with the classroom, and that too much emphasis was put on philosophy and theory. (See Appendix J.)

**Question 12:** Have you ever taken any in-service course or workshop specifically for the reading method you now teach? This was asked to find out what opportunities were offered to acquaint a teacher with the reading system he would be teaching and to give him guidance in how to teach it. Of the respondents, 31 teachers answered "Yes," and 72 replied "No"; 2 did not answer.

By grade taught, 10 first grade teachers, 8 second grade, 5 third, 6 fifth, and 2 sixth grade teachers said they had had in-service training. However, remarks volunteered indicated that there was some confusion about the meaning of in-service training. One teacher who answered "Yes" added, "Just the IRI" (informal reading inventory.) Another who answered "No" added "Only IRI."
Other comments were, "A four-hour demonstration," and "W.O.R.D. (Washington Organization for Reading Development) conferences."
(See Table 14.)

Table 14

In-Service Training Taken, by Grade Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Responding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 13: What do you feel are the strengths of your reading program this year? One hundred teachers answered this question, while 5 did not. A variety of high points was suggested which encompassed many skills, materials, and approaches. Most mentioned as a strength was the phonics program, followed next by individualizing reading. In third place were both ability grouping and SRA programs. One fifth grade instructor counted the use of MacBeth and other plays of Shakespeare as his program's greatest strength. Four fifth and sixth persons said they could name no strengths at all.

Lest phonics should appear to be the over-all most important aspect in reading programs, let the reader be reminded that nearly two-thirds (64%) of the respondents were teaching primary grades,
the years in which the greatest emphasis is usually given to phonics and like decoding skills. (See Appendix K.)

Cross-grading or ability grouping was practiced mostly in the intermediate grades, although one use of it in a third grade was noted. Teachers in all six grades were experimenting with individualizing their reading instruction. SRA was mentioned as being used in grades three, four, five, and six. Only one respondent above primary named her background in phonics as her greatest help. She described her class as the lowest in fourth grade ability grouping.

**Question 13, continued:** What area, if any, needs greater emphasis? Responding were 82, while 23 (12 primary and 11 intermediate) did not comment. Again, dozens of skills, materials, and methods were named, with the most concern on all grades being shown for more emphasis on individualizing reading. In the primary grades, the area slighted was felt to be comprehension. In the upper grades, teachers felt that too little attention was given to word attack skill instruction and to helps for the below-grade reader.

Three persons said they did not see any weaknesses in their programs. Such an answer was given by a teacher with four years' experience in first grade who observed, "The program we have is very thorough." Her background training included no reading courses and no student teaching experience in reading. (See Appendix L.)
Question 14: What do you do to further your own professional growth in reading? The question was purposely phrased in a non-directed manner so as to elicit a breadth of responses based on the individual's personal needs and quests for help. Ninety-seven replied, while 8 did not. By far the most repeated answer was "Read!" Sixty-three persons said they read, and the material most often read was articles in teachers' magazines. Next most named was exchanging ideas with other teachers. Almost as many said they planned to take more course work. A fifth grade teacher answered with, "Over twenty years of military experience." While 10 persons specifically named W.O.R.D., only 2 listed membership in I.R.A. (International Reading Association). (See Appendix M.)

This question ended the section of the study having to do with present reading activities. The questions concluding the survey asked about teachers' interests in new ideas in reading, the content they might wish to find in future reading courses, and a summary of opinions on what might constitute better reading preparation for teachers.

Question 15: Which of the following might you want to know more about? Of the respondents, 103 teachers marked one or more areas of interest on an eighteen-itemed check list. The most frequently selected category was "Helping the non-reader," with "Individualizing reading" a close second. "Physical, mental, and emotional problems," "Remedial reading," and "Reading diagnosis"
ranked next in number of choices. The least interest was shown in "Words in Color." (See Table 15.)

Table 15
Interests of Teachers in New Areas in Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.t.a.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Team teaching</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words in color</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Team learning</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized reading</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Kinesthetic</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed reading</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Reading diagnosis</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Physical, mental,</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading machines</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>emotional problems</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial reading</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Observing and interpreting</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping techniques</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>behavior</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading clubs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Integrated day</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping the non-reader</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>*Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other: "Purpose of each grade in sequence of reading curriculum."
"Ratings of major reading series according to what is taught in each book, so as to show which would best suit needs of child's background."
"SRA lab."

Question 16: Are you planning to take additional course work in this field? In response to this question, 86 (81.5%) answered "Yes," 9 answered "No," 6 did not respond, and 4 indicated that they were undecided.

Question 16, continued: If yes, what class(es) would interest you, or what content would you desire? Commenting were 88 teachers; no answer was given by 17. Although many respondents referred to the check list in question 15, numerous other facets of reading instruction
were suggested. The most interest was shown, as before, in individualizing. Next was remedial, with concern for the non-reader ranking third. Some revealing remarks were, "Not show and tell"; "I need to start from scratch." (See Appendix N.)

**Question 17:** To sum up your thinking on college requirements in the teaching of reading as related to actual classroom practices, what courses, training, and/or experience do you think the teacher-training institutions of this state should provide for beginning elementary grade teachers? Twelve respondents did not answer the last question in the survey. The other 98 (93.3%) offered definite ideas as to what should be included in a well-rounded, practical program of training for teaching reading to youngsters. More than fifty categories of major and minor relevance were named.

In spite of such diversity, the one recommendation most repeated was that of more practical experience—a suggestion made by more than one-third of those answering this question. The next most common idea was that of more exposure to varied methods, basal series, materials and ideas for use, and the opportunity to try them out personally.

Eleven persons said they would like to see more emphasis given to helps in grouping and classroom organization. Nine teachers felt that much benefit would be derived from experience with remedial readers, slow learners, and children with special problems. (See Appendix O.)
By a wide margin, teachers in elementary classrooms in Thurston County at the time of this survey stressed the felt need for the practical approach in effective preparation to teach reading. They emphasized getting to know children, materials, and methods, and gaining experience in using the knowledge. The more abstract facets of reading, such as theory, psychology, and philosophy, were seldom mentioned, and then only by those whose experience and training appeared to be beyond that of the average teacher.

Composite of the Average Respondent

The average respondent in this study was female, was teaching second grade for the first year, and had received a BA in 1969 from a college in Washington State. Her reading training had consisted of two courses—the Teaching of Reading and either Children's Literature or Language Arts. Her student teaching experience was on one level, probably primary, and during it she had taught reading to three groups. Although she had not yet had additional courses in reading, she planned to take more work.

Attempting to judge the quality of her reading preparation, she was undecided about its effectiveness. The most helpful part, she felt, was the experience she had gained while student teaching. A drawback was not having had classroom experience at the same time she was learning to teach reading skills.
This teacher had had no in-service training in the reading method she used in her second grade. Her phonics program was strong, but she felt she would like to individualize to a greater extent. To improve her knowledge of the reading process she read professional magazine articles and exchanged ideas with other teachers.

This teacher wanted to know more about individualizing techniques and ways to help the remedial or problem reader. She felt that more practical classroom experience coupled with more opportunities to observe varied methods and materials in use would improve the college teacher-training program.

QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE COLLEGES

The second questionnaire was sent on May 29, 1970, to the education departments of each of the fifteen four-year colleges and universities in Washington State. Five questions were asked regarding current undergraduate requirements and activities in reading for elementary trainees. The purpose of the inquiry was to establish the extent of preparation prescribed for prospective teachers by state institutions. All fifteen replied. (See Appendices P and Q for copies of the letter to the colleges and questionnaire.)

Results of the Questionnaire

Question 1: What undergraduate courses in the teaching of reading do you require at this time of all students in elementary
education, grades one through six? Fourteen of the colleges required one course, and the fifteenth required two. From the titles, it appeared that eleven of the courses were devoted primarily to reading, while four combined reading with language arts. The sixteenth, titled Elementary Education I, seemed to indicate a broad methods course. It carried six semester hours, while credits for the others varied from two semester or three quarter hours to four semester hours. (See Appendix R.)

**Question 2:** In student teaching, do you require that your elementary education students personally teach reading to a child or group of children? Twelve schools answered "Yes"; three said "No." Added to one negative answer was the comment, "But almost all do teach reading."

**Question 2, continued:** If yes, list approximate amount of time in weeks spent in teaching reading to children. A varied amount of time was allotted to reading activity in student teaching by the twelve colleges which required it. The least period was "Two weeks minimum," and the most, fourteen weeks. Four schools listed six weeks, one eight weeks, one nine weeks, one ten weeks; two said, "Varies," and one answer looked like "125 min."

**Question 2, again continued:** If yes, describe the usual types of student-taught reading activities. Six of the twelve replied that their students taught small groups, four said individuals, and two said one group. Three schools answered that their students did
classroom teaching under supervision. Three emphasized teaching from basals; one did remediation. A school which required one of the longer terms of teaching reading listed activities such as basal instruction, skills in content reading, library recreational program, and reference skills. Others made mention of specific programs, such as programmed reading and i.t.a. (Initial Teaching Alphabet).

**Question 3:** Do your course requirements for primary (grades 1, 2, 3) differ from those required for intermediate (grades 4, 5, 6)? If yes, list primary courses and hours, intermediate courses and hours. Thirteen schools answered "No" and two answered "Yes." The latter two did not list different course titles, but explained that they sectioned their classes according to grade level preference. The same claim was made by two which answered "No." One replied with neither answer, but commented, "Slightly—-in performance, not in content." (See Appendix R.)

**Question 4:** In your fifth year program, do you require any additional classes in the teaching of reading? If yes, list course titles and hours. Affirmative answers numbered four; negative totaled nine. One school marked both "Yes" and "No," and one did not answer. Two having this requirement named course titles: Teaching of Reading, five quarter credits, and Teaching of Remedial Reading, no credits noted. The third "Yes" had the added remark, "Varies with the individual." The fourth explained that although they did have this requirement in
their program, they "did not offer course." Two of the "No" responses also had the comment that they strongly recommended more work in reading to their fifth year students. (See Appendix R.)

**Question 5:** Do you have any comments on your reading requirements that might aid this study? Seven of the fifteen offered comments, three of which had to do with a desire to up-grade their requirements. Two remarked that they required secondary trainees to take a reading course. Two others said that they felt methods classes should be taken at the same time as classroom practice. One college described an in-school aide program mandatory in the sophomore year. (See Appendix R.)
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY OF THE PROBLEM, LIMITATIONS, AND BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

The goal of the national "Right to Read" crusade initiated in 1969 by James E. Allen, Jr., former United States Commissioner of Education, was that every child learn to read to the extent of his capacity. Allen called for intensive participation by all responsible for education, especially those who train teachers.

The purpose of this study was to investigate total reading preparation of a group of elementary teachers and to ask their opinions of its quality and relevance to actual classroom demands. The study was limited to teachers of self-contained classrooms, with baccalaureate degrees within the past ten years, who were teaching in three school districts in one county in the state. Information was also solicited from the fifteen Washington four-year colleges and universities.

The researcher considered "total preparation" to consist of pre-service training, in-service work, and whatever the teachers surveyed had done personally to increase their knowledge in the field.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Living effectively today calls for sophisticated reading skills. Teaching them demands much of the teacher, who usually has to look to his college training in reading for guidance.

The purpose of the Harvard-Carnegie study, part 1, was to find out how teachers were prepared, and to recommend improvements in training. The study concluded that training was poor and cited contributing factors of not enough time allowed, little or no work with children offered, and certain skills and techniques not taught. Student teaching was poorly scheduled and was not concurrent with course work. Cooperating teachers were of mediocre quality, supervisors were uninformed, and theory differed widely from practice. Recommendations were that more class hours be required, phonics and structural analysis be taught, and a course be offered for supervisors. Other suggestions were that course content be problem-centered, opportunity to work actively with children be provided, audiovisual aids be used, the course be offered at the same time as student teaching, and students be trained to read research and professional journals.

Other studies reinforced the Harvard-Carnegie findings and recommendations. Durkin, Braam and Oliver, Gomberg, and others described courses built around student involvement with children. Approaches included "micro-teaching," taped basal lessons, and
tutoring. Furr emphasized that a major part of training should be work experiences with children, that even semi-laboratory experiences were better than lecture, and that a good way to judge a student's knowledge of reading was to watch him teach it. Guidelines were proposed by Aaron for setting up valuable student teaching activities. All supported more time given to the subject, including the Washington Elementary Principals Association, which recommended two reading courses as requirements.

"In-service" was defined as a variety of ways to further one's knowledge, coursework being only one. School systems were challenged to take on the responsibility of providing in-service helps for their teachers.

Part 2 of the Harvard-Carnegie study reported that although two-thirds of the systems surveyed claimed in-service programs, lacks in relevance, leadership, and scheduling rendered these attempts unsuccessful. It was recommended that schools plan programs around existing needs, continue on year by year, release teachers to attend, keep groups small, and relate theory to practice.

Studies quoted by Witmer, Adams, DeCarlo and Cleland, Heilman, and others pointed out ways to design successful in-service programs. Two approaches were the taping of segments covering many areas of reading, and a project made up of workshop, classroom visits by a consultant, and seminars. Less formal ideas were the distribution of bulletins, a school-maintained professional library, displays, and subsidies for conference attendance.
Pre-service and in-service training can contribute much to effective teaching of reading. However, even if colleges improve courses and school systems offer on-going helps, the task and the commitment for teaching reading still belong to the individual teacher. He must become aware of needs and be determined to meet them.

Materials will not do the job for him, although efforts are being made to develop materials to teach children to read practically without the presence of a teacher. However, the teacher cannot be discounted; he is the all-important variable in success or failure. Bond and Dykstra found in their extensive study of beginning readers that the teacher makes the difference, not the methods or materials.

Strickland challenged teachers to take themselves out of compartmentalized methods of teaching reading and to approach it from the view of the needs and learning patterns of children. The NEA pointed out the continuous, individual obligation for professional growth.

**SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF DATA**

**Teachers**

One hundred five teachers in self-contained elementary classrooms in three districts in Thurston County answered questions about preparation, practices, and interests in reading. They summarized their answers and opinions with suggestions for improving undergraduate training.
Most of the respondents (80%) were female, more than one-half taught in primary grades, and one-third of the one-half were new to the profession. Nearly two-thirds of the whole sample held four-year degrees, and eight out of ten had trained in the state. The majority had had student teaching on one level and were at the time of the study employed in a grade close to that level.

Slightly more than eight out of ten had had a college reading course; the remainder had had none. Most of those without reading training were men teaching fifth and sixth grades, although some primary teachers had never had a course. The number of courses taken varied from none to eight. One-third had had one course, probably three quarter hours of Teaching of Reading. Another one-third had had two, with Children's Literature the probable second title. Ten teachers had had three courses; five had had four.

Slightly fewer than eight out of ten respondents had taught reading in student teaching. The remainder had not. Activities such as tutoring were named in connection with other classes.

A variety of activities and time allotted in student teaching was described. Experiences ranged from a room crowded with six student teachers in a short term summer class to a full quarter or semester handling the whole classroom.

Regarding postgraduate reading courses, nearly two-thirds of those who had had only one course had not taken more. One possible
reason was that many of the first-year teachers had not yet had the opportunity. If an additional course was taken, the one most often selected was Remedial Reading.

One-third judged that they were adequately prepared to teach reading effectively. Of this group, most had had two courses. Nearly as many said they were not adequately prepared. Most of these were upper intermediate teachers, and some had had no reading courses. Better than half of the entire sample expressed partial or full doubt about the adequacy of their training. The largest number dissatisfied were in their first year of teaching. First grade teachers felt more secure than did second. More intermediate teachers answered "No" to adequacy than answered "Yes." Some relationship was evident between the number of classes taken and the type of answer, although experienced teachers were as doubtful as newer ones were.

The majority of the teachers said that the most helpful aspects of their reading courses were those connected with practical application, such as directed observation and working with children. Criticisms were that courses spent too much time on theory and not enough on practical experience and instruction in areas such as phonics and remediation.

Doubt of what constituted "in-service" training was evident from answers volunteered. In all, in-service opportunities were scant.
Phonics, individualizing, and ability grouping were named as strong points of classroom programs. Too little individualizing was listed by others as a weakness of their programs. Primary teachers thought comprehension was slighted, and intermediate teachers named word attack and remedial work as deficiencies.

To further their own professional growth, more than half of the respondents said they read in professional magazines. Almost as many exchanged ideas with other teachers. Topics to be explored at some future time differed, but most persons expressed interest in learning more about helping the non-reader or the remedial reader, in individualizing, and in problems and diagnosis. More than eight out of ten said they planned to take additional course work.

In recommending improvements in preparation, teachers asked for more practical experience, more methods, more knowledge of basal series and materials, and the opportunity to learn to use them while students.

A composite picture of the average respondent was compiled. She was female, teaching second grade for the first year, and had received her BA degree in 1969 from a Washington college. She had had two undergraduate reading courses, had student taught on one level, and had taught reading to three groups in the classroom. Although she had not yet had additional courses in reading, she was planning to do so. Asked to judge the effectiveness of her college training in reading,
she was uncertain. The most helpful part, she felt, was the experience gained while student teaching. The greatest lack was not having had practical experience at the same time she was learning about teaching reading.

This teacher had had no in-service training in the reading method she was using in her second grade. Although she thought that her phonics program was strong, she felt that she ought to individualize more. Sources of upgrading her own knowledge were reading professional magazine articles and exchanging ideas with other teachers. She wanted to know more about individualizing techniques and ways to help the problem reader. More practical classroom experience would improve the teacher-training program, she felt, along with more opportunities to observe many methods and materials in use.

**Colleges**

The questionnaire answered by the fifteen Washington teacher-training institutions revealed that all required one course in reading, and one college required two. Most courses included the word "reading" in the title. Only one appeared to be an all-purpose methods course. Either three or five quarter credits was the usual amount.

Twelve colleges said that they required their elementary trainees to teach reading in student teaching. The amount of time varied from two weeks to fourteen, with six weeks the most common.
diversity of reading activities was listed, with most students teaching small groups.

Two colleges of the fifteen claimed that their course requirements differed for students in primary and intermediate. The other thirteen had no differing requirements, except for some adjustments in course requisites. Four colleges stated they required their fifth year students to take an additional reading course, while eleven did not have this rule. Detailed comments are provided in Appendix R.

GENERALIZATIONS FROM THE STUDY

Six generalizations were drawn from this study:

1. Total training: Total training of elementary teachers in the sample appeared to show some improvement over that disclosed nationwide by the Harvard-Carnegie study of ten years ago. An average of two courses per person had been taken, and many individuals exhibited broader knowledge, concern, and confidence about the reading task. However, there were a number of teachers who were teaching reading with little or no formal background in it.

2. Pre-service courses: In Washington colleges, diversities rather than similarities seemed to be the rule in course content and requirements. Seemingly, more time was being allotted to reading and related activities by more colleges. According to teacher respondents, however, many schools still offered minimal time and content. Some
colleges made direct contact with children available in course work other than student teaching. Others appeared to provide little.

Strengths and weaknesses of training paralleled those revealed in the Harvard-Carnegie study. Significant factors were work with children, knowledge of materials, methods, grouping, remedial techniques, and specific skills.

Dissatisfaction of intermediate teachers may also have echoed the Harvard-Carnegie findings that primary skills were given priority. Perhaps because of lack of awareness, intermediate respondents showed little concern about critical reading skills or content reading.

3. Student teaching: The literature stressed that the influence made by the student teaching experience was frequently stronger than that of course work. Comments from both the teachers and the colleges indicated that student teaching tasks were often chosen at the discretion of the supervising teacher, resulting at times in a lack of varied opportunities for the student. In general, most respondents had taught some reading in student teaching. Of those who had not, the majority had trained in other states. As suggested in the literature, breaches between theory in course work and practice in the classroom were revealed.

4. In-service opportunities: In the county in which this survey was made, system-sponsored in-service help was either practically non-existent or teachers did not take advantage of what was
offered. No mention was made by respondents of the sort of on-the-job training described in the literature. It is possible that although teachers may have availed themselves of some aids, they did not recognize them as "in-service."

Queried about personal pursuits in reading, almost two-thirds of the teachers answered that they read. However, the highly professional sources of information about reading were not the publications that were named. Consulting with other teachers, the second most listed practice, may be very often beneficial; however, it may also be a matter of "the blind leading the blind." Although a number of teachers said they planned to take more courses, intent does not always become fact. Supervisors were seldom sought out; only two persons mentioned talking to a consultant, and one seeking help from a principal.

5. Classroom programs: A summary of teachers' opinions of their own classroom programs hinted that although many expressed an interest in individualizing, in practice they relied strongly on organized methods, materials, and groupings, such as phonics, cross-grading, and SRA. Only a few revealed their own contributions as creative teachers; most seemed inclined to "teach the system."

6. Professionalism: In responding to this survey, some individuals communicated the desire to increase their knowledge and professionalism, and to employ scientific and objective procedures in
their teaching. However, the majority did not. It may be true that a substantial number of children learn to read effectively through their own efforts and in spite of their teachers.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Although preparation for teaching reading has improved, it has further to go. Particularly revealing was the fact that many first year teachers, fresh from training, expressed dissatisfaction and bewilderment about their reading preparation. Eight conclusions and recommendations seemed evident from the results of this study.

1. Two pre-service reading courses should be required—a basic foundations class and a second one geared to the preferred grade level of the trainee. Every effort should be expended to offer practical, laboratory-type experiences. Specific skills should be taught according to need. Course concentration should be placed on concrete materials and methods that can answer the cry of the beginning teacher, "But what shall I do?"

2. A third, postgraduate reading course should be mandatory for fifth-year students. Content would be directed to the needs of the experienced teacher, now more aware of the complexities of reading and more open to the subtler aspects, such as psychology, diagnosis, and remediation.
3. Every prospective teacher should have basic reading courses and experience in reading in student teaching. The study revealed that some secondary people eventually teach in elementary grades.

4. Reading courses should be scheduled concurrently with student teaching of reading. Students will become more cognizant of children's needs, of inconsistencies between theory and practice, and of poor classroom methods if they are learning about reading as reading demands are made of them. If concurrent scheduling is not possible, courses should immediately precede student teaching and check-up seminars be arranged during it.

5. Student teachers should be placed with cooperating teachers who exhibit good teaching of reading. Students should be given latitude, varied experiences, and close supervision by the college.

6. The area of in-service education needs an inspired boost and promotion job. Schools must find ways to accomplish on-going training, perhaps more effective than pre-service because of its relevance to immediate needs. A team feeling must be fostered; asking for help must become professionally acceptable. Supervisory personnel should be knowledgeable in reading; well-informed reading consultants should be readily available.
7. Prospective teachers must be educated into attitudes of objectivity, creativity, and professionalism. During the college years, instructors must seek to instill in students the idea of career-long learning. A dynamic attitude can be fostered by introducing the reading of professional journals, teaching objective ways to evaluate information gathered, and encouraging creative classroom experimentation based on solid educational knowledge of learning styles and needs.

8. Preparation cannot be judged by counting courses. Qualitative rather than quantitative criteria should be employed. The content of a class, its presentation and relevance, and the attitude of the enrollee all have a part in determining worth.

Meeting the challenge of teaching every child to read demands the self-examination, desire, and determination of a great many persons in diverse places in education. A tiny step by each may combine in a giant step forward to attain the unattainable.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This inquiry into teachers' preparation in reading has touched upon only a portion of the interrelationships which contribute to effective classroom teaching and learning. A suggestion for further study is the expansion of this pilot work into a state-wide survey of preparation and practices.

Profitable research can be made in areas such as the
promotion and utilization of in-service offerings, the role of the principal in the reading program, and the conduct and content of reading programs in student-teaching classrooms.
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Course 1--Introductory Course

Course 1 should be taught in a lab situation using films, tapes, video tapes, observations, etc.

I. Background
   A. Understanding of what constitutes reading
   B. Human growth and development as it effects reading
      1. Sociological and psychological factors effect on a child's reading.
      2. Motivation and interest

II. Scope and Sequence of Reading
   A. Word attack skills
   B. Comprehension skills
   C. Reading in content fields
   D. Skills of critical reading
   E. Vocabulary development

III. Sources of Help to Teachers
   A. Journals, manuals, etc.

IV. Varying Approaches to Reading Instruction

V. How to Plan, Teach, and Evaluate a Lesson

Course 11--Divided into primary and intermediate sections, if possible, with a strong emphasis on methods, materials, and informal diagnostic techniques.

I. Primary Section
   A. Readiness
   B. Word recognition, comprehension
   C. Provisions for wide reading
      1. Use of library
      2. Reading for pleasure
D. Approaches to teaching beginning reading
E. Research on the teaching of reading
F. Planning for reading instruction, grouping, etc.
G. Evaluation, use of both formal and informal techniques and instruments

II. Intermediate Section
A. Word attack skills, comprehension, wide reading, vocabulary, and other aspects of a developmental reading program are reinforced, maintained, and extended.
B. Reading in content fields
C. Creative or critical reading
D. Adjusting rate to purpose
E. Evaluation, use of both formal and informal techniques and instruments
APPENDIX B

MINIMUM STANDARDS SUGGESTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION FOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION IN READING (ELEMENTARY)

I. A Bachelor's degree, including courses in child development, educational psychology, educational measurement, and children's literature.

II. A minimum of six semester hours, or the equivalent, in an accredited reading course or courses.

A. One or more courses for elementary teachers covering each of the following areas:

General Background
   The nature of language
   Psychology of the reading process
   Interrelationship of activities and outcomes in the four language arts
   Nature and scope of the reading program

Reading Skills and Abilities
   Pre-reading readiness abilities
   Readiness for reading at any level
   Word recognition skills (including word analysis)
   Vocabulary development
   Reading comprehension abilities, including critical reading
   Interpretive oral reading

Diagnosis and Remedial Teaching
   Techniques for evaluation of progress
   Difficulties frequently experienced by children in learning to read
   Diagnostic techniques that can be used by the classroom teacher
   Differentiation of instruction to fit individual capabilities
   Corrective methods for use in the classroom
Organization of the Reading Program
Classroom organization for reading
Varied approaches to reading instruction
Planning a reading lesson

Materials
Knowledge and use of basic and supplementary materials of instruction
Selection of suitable reading materials
Knowledge of children's literature

Application of Reading Skills
Skills needed for reading in content fields
Qualities to be appreciated in literature
Fostering lifetime use of reading

B. It is recommended that the course or courses ... include direct observation and participation experiences in appropriate ... classrooms, where the student in education grapples with real problems children experience in learning to read effectively. When circumstances prevent firsthand laboratory experiences, the use of taped or filmed observations and problem situations may be substituted.

III. Student teaching experiences in reading.

Colleges should make every effort to place student teachers with cooperating teachers who demonstrate a good knowledge of the teaching of reading. In some instances, it may be necessary to prepare cooperating teachers in the use of good reading techniques.

IV. In those states or areas where teachers are required to have additional preparation for permanent certification as a classroom teacher, it is recommended that this preparation include a graduate course in reading as part of the requirements. This course should include, among other topics, the following:

Significant research findings that influence decisions about reading instruction
Advanced information on the psychology of reading
Current issues and methods of teaching reading
Extension of skills taught at the undergraduate level
Dear Teacher:

Remember your first days in the classroom? You probably were unsure of yourself in some areas, as we all were to begin with. How about in the teaching of reading? Did you feel confident that your college classes had given you the tools and understanding that you needed? Or did you find to your dismay that teaching reading was "something else" altogether?

Central Washington State College is anxious to know just how well colleges today are preparing teachers for actual day-by-day classroom reading instruction. As part of the requirements for a Master's degree in reading, I am making a thesis study of this very question—an important one, I think you'll agree. Now is your chance to make known your opinions on this question, based on your own experience. May I ask you to help by completing the attached questionnaire, which asks primarily about your background training and present interest in reading. Your thoughtful answers could help bring about significant changes in college courses, thus benefiting teachers of tomorrow and their students.

Be assured that your responses are completely confidential; information given will be used in a statistical manner only. Your signature is optional.

Please complete and return the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope by March 10, 1970. Thank you for participating.

Yours truly,

/s/ Joan Drittenbas

Joan B. Drittenbas

The Elementary Department of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction endorses this study on reading. We feel that it will
provide information that will be helpful in our contribution to the national "Right to Read" crusade, launched last September by U. S. Commissioner James Allen.

/s/ Robert Groeschell

Robert Groeschell
Director of Elementary Education
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE
TEACHER PREPARATION IN READING

FOREWARD: The questions included herein are of great importance to elementary grade teachers of reading and to those who train aspiring teachers. Please feel free to express your opinions fully, with the assurance of complete anonymity, guaranteed by the questioner.

1. Name of school __________________ Sex of respondent:  M  F

2. Grade now teaching: (circle) 1 2 3 4 5 6

If you received your Bachelor's Degree before 1960, if you do not teach in grades one through six, or if you do not teach reading at all, please disregard the remainder of the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. Thank you.

3. How many years have you taught this grade? _______ years

4. What is the highest degree you hold? (circle)
   Less than BA  BA  BS  BA+5th year  MA  EdD  Other_______

5. In what year did you receive your Bachelor's Degree? _____ (year)

6. Did you graduate from a college or university in this state?
   (circle) Yes  No

7. At what grade level(s) did you student teach? (circle)
   Kindergarten  Primary  Intermediate  Junior High  High

8. At the time you began teaching, had you taken any college course(s) specifically for the teaching of reading? (circle) Yes  No

   If yes, list title(s) of course(s) as well as you can recall. Circle number of credits and check type of hours. (If you wish to refer to it, the bottom of page 3 lists typical titles.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title(s)</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Sem.</th>
<th>Qtr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Did you personally teach reading to a child or group of children in any undergraduate course, including student teaching?
   (circle) Yes  No
If Yes, name course and describe the situation briefly:


10. Have you taken any college reading course(s) since you completed your initial teacher training? (circle) Yes  No

If yes, list title(s), circle credits and check type of hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title(s)</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Sem. Qtr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. In your opinion, have the course(s) that you have taken, if any, prepared you adequately for effective teaching of reading at this time? (circle) Yes  No  Not sure  Other

What aspects of your training in reading proved most helpful?

What were the obvious lacks?

12. Have you ever taken any inservice course or workshop specifically for the reading method you now teach? (circle) Yes  No

13. What do you feel are the strengths of your reading program this year?

What area, if any, needs greater emphasis?

14. What do you do to further your own professional growth in the field of reading?
15. Which of the following might you want to know more about? (Check those in which you are interested.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i.t.a.</th>
<th>Team teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words in color</td>
<td>Team learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized reading</td>
<td>Kinesthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed reading</td>
<td>Reading diagnosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>Physical, mental, emotional problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading machines</td>
<td>Observing and interpreting behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial reading</td>
<td>Integrated day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping techniques</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading clubs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping the non-reader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Are you planning to take additional course work in this field? (circle) Yes  No

If yes, what class(es) would interest you, or what content would you desire?  __________________________________________________________________________

17. To sum up your thinking on college requirements in the teaching of reading as related to actual classroom practices, what courses, training, and/or experiences do you think the teacher-training institutions of this state should provide for beginning elementary grade teachers?  __________________________________________________________________________

Signature (optional)  ________________

Some reading course titles:

- The Teaching of Reading
- Developmental Reading
- Reading Readiness
- Primary Reading
- Intermediate Reading
- Secondary Reading
- Reading in Content Fields
- Psychology of Reading
- Remedial Reading
- Diagnostic Reading
- Tests and Measurements
- Advanced Course in Reading
- Language Arts
- Programmed Learning
- Children's Literature
- Individualizing Instruction
- Linguistics
- Clinical Experience
- Reading Machines
APPENDIX E

UNDERGRADUATE COURSE TITLES

Undergraduate course titles given in order of frequency by those who had taken one course.

10 Teaching of Reading
5 Elementary Reading Methods
4 Teaching of Reading in the Elementary School
3 Primary Reading
2 Language Arts
1 Reading
1 Methods of Teaching Reading
1 Techniques of Reading Instruction
1 Teaching Methods
1 Methods and Materials in Reading
1 Methods of Reading Instruction
1 Reading for Elementary Students
1 Developmental Reading
1 Children's Literature
1 Innovations of Reading
1 Block Methods Course

Undergraduate course titles given in order of frequency by those who had taken two courses.

13 Children's Literature
12 Teaching of Reading
10 Reading in the Elementary School
10 Language Arts
3 Introduction to Teaching Reading
3 Remedial Reading
3 Foundations of Reading Instruction
3 Tests and Measurements
3 Developmental Reading
2 Methods of Basal Reading Instruction
2 Primary Reading Instruction
1 Reading Methods
1 Concepts in Reading
1 Reading Materials in Elementary Grades
1 Intermediate Reading
1 Improvement of Reading Instruction
1 Preparation for Student Teaching
Undergraduate course titles by those who had taken three courses.

6  Children's Literature
6  Teaching of Reading
5  Methods for Language Arts
4  Modern Reading Program--Primary
3  Tests and Measurements
2  Reading in Elementary School
2  Modern Reading Program--Intermediate
1  Studies and Problems in Reading
1  Laboratory Workshop

Undergraduate course titles by those who had taken four courses.

4  Language Arts
3  Teaching of Reading
3  Children's Literature
2  Remedial Reading
2  Tests and Measurements
1  Teaching Reading--Primary
1  Foundations of Reading
1  Reading in the Elementary School
1  Individualizing Instruction
1  Secondary Reading and Literature
1  Advanced Language Arts
Experiences in teaching reading to child or group of children, listed in order of frequency.

74  Student teaching of reading
18  Three groups of reading
  9  One group
  9  Whole class
  4  One group for a semester
  4  Remedial groups, grades 4, 5, 6
  2  Three groups daily for two weeks
  2  Three groups daily for three weeks
  2  Tutored remedials
  2  First grade
  2  Third grade
  1  One group each, grades 3, 4, 5
  1  Remedial high school juniors
  1  Two or three reading classes
  1  SRA
  1  Second grade
  1  Summer school student teaching
  1  Joplin

Selected comments:

"Student taught in summer reading program in Seattle--five student teachers in one room assisted teacher about one-half hour a day."

"In charge of all reading groups (primary) with no direction and no understanding of what to do."

"Second grade--95% Negro children."

"Not enough experience handling several groups."

"From August through December full day, all three reading groups after first three weeks."

"Two experiences: one group of thirteen for nine weeks; another last six weeks of twenty-eight."
Experiences other than in student teaching, in connection with course work:

Tutoring remedials

Reading story to group and discussion

Helped Japanese girl read English

One reading group each Friday for four weeks

Demonstration with small group of children developing experience chart

Laboratory workshop, grade three children

Worked with one child three times in school library to find interests and evaluate reading capabilities
APPENDIX G

POSTGRADUATE COURSE TITLES

Titles of postgraduate courses taken by all respondents listed in order of frequency.

9 Remedial Reading
7 Children's Literature
6 Language Arts
5 Tests and Measurements
5 Teaching Primary Reading
4 Improvement of Reading Instruction
4 Teaching Reading or Techniques of Teaching Reading
3 Advanced Teaching of Reading
3 Diagnosis of Problems
3 Reading in the Elementary School
3 Intermediate Reading
2 No title given
2 Reading Readiness
2 Reading Workshop
2 Developmental Reading
2 Reading Methods
1 Reading in the Curriculum
1 Practice Teaching in Remedial
1 Reading Clinic
1 Speech and Hearing as it Applies to Reading
1 Speech and Hearing Laboratory Courses
1 Workshop in Machine and Programmed Techniques
1 Teaching Trends in Reading
1 Corrective Reading

Classes listed by one 1969 graduate as postgraduate courses were:
  Interdisciplinary Institute in Reading, Reading and Conference,
  Psychology of Reading, Reading Disabilities, Verbal Learning,
  Literature for Young People, and Children's Literature.
APPENDIX H

COMMENTS ON ADEQUACY OF PREPARATION

Comments volunteered on adequacy of preparation.

Yes

"Experience in classroom probably did me more good."
"Don't make use of all I learned."
"Adequately prepared, but not as well as I would like to be."
"Part, but not fully."
"Except for children 1-1/2 or more years below grade level."

No

"Have gained much more from experience than from reading classes."
"Need more phonetic training."
"I needed more help."
"Correspondence course."

Not Sure

"Courses were background."
"Background plus experience produce effective teaching."
"My first year of teaching experience was as important as actual classes."
"It was a beginning but I could use more help."
"I'm open minded about trying other methods."

Other

"The beginning course has proved a good basis."
"Not completely, but they did introduce problems I would be confronted with."
"Fair."
"Yes, in connection with library books; no, in connection with reading series."
"Actual experience was best help."
"Actually I feel the involvement in the classroom rather than 'book learning' is best."
Helpful aspects of training in reading, listed in order of frequency named.

32   Student teaching, actual working with children
20   Knowledge and evaluation of basals, texts, methods, techniques,  
     ideas, and materials
   6  Observation in classes of master teachers
   6  Diagnostic tools and testing
   6  No helpful aspects
   5  Working under master (or training) teacher
   5  IRI techniques
   5  Remedial course, working with problem readers
   4  Phonics or phonetics course
   4  Courses in speech, hearing, listening skills
   3  Awareness of fundamental skills needed
   3  Grouping techniques
   2  Reasons for problems other than physical
   2  Motivation for reading enjoyment
   2  Children's literature; reviewing children's books
   2  Experience working with whole class
   2  Enthusiastic, practical-minded instructor
   2  Lesson planning
   2  What to expect from certain age levels
   1  Psychological and counseling services available
   1  New emphases, new programs
   1  Working with reading specialist
   1  Individualizing
   1  How to attack beginning reading
   1  Tutoring
   1  Clinical experience
   1  Laboratory workshop
   1  Economy Co. materials

Selected comments on helpful aspects of reading training:

"The outside reading that I did!"

"Getting into the practical situation even before student teaching helped me see the wide differences and the need to be flexible and try different things for different children."
"Actually teaching a reading group is 100 times as helpful as taking a course."

"The extreme value of my reading courses was due to the professor who was an enthusiastic instructor willing to share limitless ideas. Our assignments, which were long and difficult, were all useful and well worth the sweat and tears."

"These courses explained very clearly what skills were needed for children and what difficulties they frequently have in reading."

"I was introduced to the value of books on the teaching of reading."

"Very little, because most of the work done was research or outside reading. When you go to college you go to learn the practical things . . . but some teachers feel busy work is more important . . . !"

"Going back to a class specifically in reading (workshop) after I'd had experience and knew where my problems were."

"I felt that when I graduated, as I do now, almost unskilled in reading."

"The student teaching experience was the only thing that was worthwhile."
APPENDIX J

DEFICIENCIES OF TRAINING

Lacks in preparation for teaching reading, listed in order of frequency named.

15 Lack of actual practical experience teaching children while learning reading skills
10 Too few practical, concrete materials and suggestions on "how-to-do-it"
  9 Lack of phonics training and how to teach phonics
  8 No techniques for helping poor readers
  7 Classes inadequate, didn't deal with teaching reading
  5 Too much philosophy and theory
  5 Instructors out of touch with the elementary classroom
  5 No help in testing and diagnosis
  4 No help in motivating the good reader
  4 Didn't deal with specific, individual reading problems
  4 Not enough course time; too much material presented in too little time
  3 No lacks
  2 Student teaching classes too large to apply specific techniques learned
  2 Too little observation of various basal methods in use
  2 No review of basals and methods for use
  2 Course too general, not specific enough
  2 Not enough observation of master teachers, followed by discussion
  2 No help in creating materials
  1 Too much technical knowledge
  1 No help in how to obtain interesting material at individual reading levels
  1 Not enough background
  1 Training impractical and unrelated to real class situation
  1 Assumed materials were always available
  1 No warning of span of ability in a classroom
  1 No supervised training
  1 Should teach reading first, then have reading classes
  1 Working under only one critic teacher
  1 No inservice training and observation
  1 No work with children at first of year
  1 Not enough observation on various levels
  1 Too idealistic--few children, many materials
  1 Had no idea how to move from readiness to reading
Selected comments:

"My background in phonics is poor, and now I must teach it. Though I'm not sure how I like the program, I should know how to teach it better."

"Training for teaching first grade reading needs to be quite different from that for third grade, and yet it was all combined in courses."

"Seventy-year-old lady teacher hadn't been in an elementary classroom since Wilson died."

"Total picture of reading training and each grade's function in curriculum was lacking."
APPENDIX K

STRENGTHS OF READING PROGRAMS

Strengths of classroom reading programs, listed in order of frequency named.

37 Phonics program
17 Individualization
13 SRA
10 Ability grouping
  6 Comprehension
  6 Variety of approaches and materials
  6 Classroom grouping
  5 Motivation
  5 Vocabulary study
  4 Specific program named (Lippincott, Open Court, Phonetic Keys, Economy)
  3 Creative writing
  3 Use of library
  3 Total language arts
  3 Visual aids
  2 Good manuals
  2 Main ideas
  2 Getting meaning from context
  2 Materials
  2 Oral reading
  2 Teacher's own experience
  2 Practical workbook
  2 Sequence of skills, testing child for next step
  2 No strengths
  2 Reading independently
  2 Programmed reading
  1 Writing and researching a subject paper
  1 Something for all
  1 Listening skills
  1 Open-ended program
  1 Readiness
  1 Firm discipline
  1 Using novels for style, characterization, plot, setting
  1 MacBeth and other Shakespeare
  1 Choral reading
  1 Teacher's own materials
  1 Resource person
  1 Over-all approach
  1 Not satisfied
  1 Weak program
WEAKNESSES OF READING PROGRAMS

Weaknesses of classroom reading programs, listed in order of frequency named.

16. Not enough individualization
15. Phonics and word attack
11. Comprehension
  9. Varied, multi-leveled materials
  8. Increase in rate, fluency and expression
  5. Helping remedial
  4. Diagnosis and evaluation
  3. No weaknesses
  3. Fostering enjoyment, motivation
  3. Reasoning and critical thinking
  3. Grouping
  2. Materials for slow learners
  2. Oral practice
  2. Using context
  2. Physical defects, learning disabilities
  2. Listening skills
  2. Discussion of character, plot
  2. Vocabulary building
  2. Not enough preparation time
  2. Main ideas
  2. Author's meaning
  1. Not enough knowledge of available programs
  1. Sight words
  1. Use of library
  1. Not enough teachers for problem groups
  1. Not enough help in administering IRI
  1. Exposure, rather than mastery
  1. Class too large
  1. All of it is weak
APPENDIX M

PERSONAL GROWTH IN READING

Personal growth in reading, listed in order of frequency suggested.

37  Read professional magazines*
18  Share and exchange ideas with other teachers, ask them questions
17  Plan to take reading courses
15  Read
14  Experiment with new ideas in class
11  Read professional books and publications
11  Attend workshops
10  Attend WORD and reading conferences
  5  Review various reading programs and their methods
  5  Keep an open mind to new materials
  5  Study teacher's manual of my basal reading series
  3  Attend demonstrations of reading methods
  3  Look for a class that will really help me
  2  Study curriculum guide
  2  IRA membership
  2  Talk to reading consultant
  1  Use reading aids and their instruction booklets
  1  Discuss problems with principal
  1  Read children's and young people's books
  1  Read research
  1  Take courses in related fields (group techniques, psychology)
  1  Inservice training from Economy Co.
  1  Working on M.Ed.
  1  Read newspaper articles
  1  Over 20 years of military experience

*Specific periodicals named were: 7-Grade Teacher; 4-The Instructor;
  2-The Reading Teacher; 1-Highlights; 1-Elementary English
APPENDIX N

DESIRED CONTENT OF FUTURE CLASSES

Content desired in further reading classes, listed in order of frequency.

29 Individualizing reading
23 Helping the remedial or problem reader
15 The non-reader
14 Diagnosis and specific treatment
11 Physical and emotional problems
10 Effective grouping
10 Programmed reading
  8 Newest reading programs, materials, and techniques
  8 Reading machines
  6 Observing and interpreting behavior
  5 Linguistics
  3 Children's literature
  3 Team teaching
  3 Intermediate reading
  3 Basic course
  2 Reading clubs
  2 Motivation
  2 Primary reading
  2 Content reading
  2 Tests and measurements
  1 Language arts
  1 Pre-first grade
  1 Reading readiness
  1 Identifying problems or potential problems for beginning readers
  1 Integrated day
  1 Integrating reading skill development with other subject areas
  1 Teaching the slow learner to associate letters and sounds
  1 Kinesthetic
  1 Team learning
  1 Laboratory experience and observation
  1 Motivating the gifted reader
  1 Counseling
  1 Child psychology
  1 Learning styles
  1 Dyslexia
  1 General advanced course
  1 Enrichment for regular reading classes
  1 Setting up a reading program
  1 Problems of immaturity
1 Independent reading
1 Anything to qualify as a reading specialist
1 Any class available
1 Not sure

Selected comments:

"Not show and tell. I want to hear and see people explain a teaching technique and then show it to me with children and all the props."

"A class that would teach me to teach reading--phonics, blends, etc. Actually, I need to start from scratch."

"Helping the average reader improve through use of better-prepared materials."

"A course based more on practical application in classroom and less on theory."

"Anything I haven't had yet--just to broaden my scope."

"Any reading class possible because I feel reading is the 'key subject' and it demands a lot of skill and variety and creative thinking on the part of the teacher."
APPENDIX O

SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE TRAINING

Summary of suggestions for training to teach reading, listed in order of frequency.

35 More practical experience under supervision while learning skills
14 More exposure to a variety of methods, techniques, and materials
11 Grouping and classroom organization
 9 Practical experience with remedials and problem readers
 9 Practical ideas in courses rather than theory
 8 Survey of commonly used basals, series, and their methods
 7 Observations of master teachers using basals, approaches, followed by discussions
 7 Diagnosis, testing, and treatment of reading problems
 5 More observations on all levels, starting earlier in college years
 5 Practical experience in teaching reading before student teaching
 5 More variety in available college courses
 4 Workshops or seminars with experienced teachers on your grade level
 4 Realistic rather than ideal situations presented
 4 Phonics instruction
 4 More required under-graduate courses
 4 More student teaching time in the classroom
 4 Work with students on all levels of ability
 3 Better instructors with recent classroom experience
 3 How to teach skills, rather than enrichment
 3 Student teaching in your grade, one above, and one below
 3 Required graduate courses
 3 Tutoring experience
 2 Overview of total sequential development of children in reading
 2 Motivating the good reader
 2 Objective discussion of basal series by instructor rather than salesman
 2 More courses required for primary
 2 Reading as part of the language arts
 1 Perceptual difficulties of beginning readers
 1 More experience in planning reading programs with children
 1 How to add variety to classroom program
 1 Earlier student teaching
 1 Laboratory-type experiences
 1 Behavior of children
 1 Team teaching
 1 How to use IRI
Selected comments:

"More time in a classroom. Why not two or three quarters instead of so much theory?"

"More than one reading course should be mandatory even if it is merely a lecture course to make the future teachers aware of the real importance of reading."

"There should be sufficient lab type experiences where students can observe well run programs on their chosen grade level."

"Listening to children read--both those who read easily and those who have trouble."

"There should be more actual observation of presentation of reading from first day of school in a classroom of ordinary children from the lower economic scale--not professors' children."

"More experiences with actually working with individuals and groups is needed. I didn't really understand how children begin to read until I was the teacher."

"I think teaching for reading proficiency should be stressed at the expense of all other academic areas. Without that skill a child becomes lost in the system as it presently mostly functions."

"Choose a good method and stay with it. I believe that too much changing and experimenting wastes everyone's time and produces poor results."
"I do not like to teach 'reading' as we now do. I do not have any better method or I would employ it."

"1. Fundamentals of Reading—to all levels
2. Reading Problem Diagnosis
3. Remedial Reading
4. Recreational Reading Motivation"

"1. Begin with available programs or methods in reading
2. Develop basic teaching technique
3. Apply to classroom
4. Be very thorough. It seems college courses only scratch the surface of reading"

"Reading Readiness, The Teaching of Reading, Diagnostic Reading, and Student Teaching. During the reading courses the class members should work with individual students and with an entire class in student teaching."

"Teaching of Reading, Reading Readiness, Children's Literature, Teaching Language Arts, Individualizing Instruction, Current Reading Program (as a study of i.t.a., Words in Color, Ginn, Lippincott, etc.)."

"A primary background increases ability to recognize reading problems in later years."

"A two-hour basic course in primary reading, then depending on level, more primary or intermediate. If intermediate stress diagnostic reading and development of program depending on the test results—preferably an individualizing program."

"I think one of the greatest barriers to learning and teaching is the behavior of children. Any techniques for group handling is a Godsend in the classroom and as important as anything else you can learn in teaching reading. Most of the problem readers have problems of inattention, preoccupation, and general non-performance."

"It's not the course but what the teacher of that course is doing. I think instructors need to be improved if you want to improve courses."

"What is needed in reading is the same as all of the other content areas, the material taught in the college should relate to what the teacher is doing in the class room."
Route 7 Box 477E
Olympia, Wash.
May 29, 1970

TO: Dean of School of Education

RE: Requirements in the Teaching of Reading for Elementary Teachers

Dear Sir:

As a Master's candidate at Central Washington State College, I am presently researching a thesis study in the teaching of reading. I have questioned more than one hundred elementary teachers in my area regarding their college preparation in reading and their opinions of its relevancy to actual classroom needs. My study has the endorsement of Mr. Robert Groeschell, State Superintendent of Elementary Instruction.

You can aid my research greatly by supplying answers to the following five questions about your institution's requirements in this field.

Please return this information promptly in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. Thank you for your help.

Yours truly,

/s/ Joan Drittenbas

(Mrs.) Joan Drittenbas
APPENDIX Q

QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE COLLEGES

QUESTIONNAIRE ON READING REQUIREMENTS

1. What undergraduate courses in the teaching of reading do you require at this time of all students in elementary education, grades one through six?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title(s)</th>
<th>Number sem. hrs. (or) qtr. hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In student teaching, do you require that your elementary education students personally teach reading to a child or group of children?

Yes  No

If yes, list approximate amount of time in weeks spent in teaching reading to children. _______ weeks.

If yes, describe the usual types of student-taught reading activities:

3. Do your course requirements for primary (grades 1, 2, 3) differ from those required for intermediate (grades 4, 5, 6)?

Yes  No

If yes, list primary undergraduate reading course(s) and hours:

Intermediate course(s) and hours:

4. In your fifth year program, do you require any additional classes in the teaching of reading?

Yes  No

If yes, list course title(s) and hours:

5. Do you have any comments on your reading requirements that might aid this study?

===================================================================

Name of Institution
APPENDIX R

RESPONSES BY COLLEGES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ON READING REQUIREMENTS

Question 1: Course titles and amount of credit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Titles</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of Reading Instruction (Elementary)</td>
<td>5 qtr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of Reading in Elementary School</td>
<td>3 qtr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Language Arts</td>
<td>5 qtr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Reading in the Elementary School</td>
<td>3 qtr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Other Language Arts in Elementary School</td>
<td>5 qtr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading-Language Arts Methods</td>
<td>3 qtr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching of Reading</td>
<td>3 qtr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Teaching of Reading</td>
<td>3 sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching of Reading in Elementary</td>
<td>4 sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education I</td>
<td>6 sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction in Elementary Reading</td>
<td>2 sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Language Arts</td>
<td>4 sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading in Elementary Grades</td>
<td>3 sem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Reading</td>
<td>5 qtr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Foundations of Reading Instruction</td>
<td>2 qtr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Basal Reading Instruction</td>
<td>3 qtr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Both courses were one school's requirement

Question 3: Differing requirements for primary and intermediate:

"Same course, but a focus on primary or intermediate."

"Lab experience and final project is concentrated in level (primary-intermediate) for which student is preparing."

"Except in electives under advisement."

"Our course requirements in reading do not differ."

"However, we section the above course at the two levels."

"Primary and intermediate in different sections."

"Slightly--in performance, not content."
"Our students receive degrees in Liberal Arts and so take their methods courses in about seven weeks before they do their student teaching. During this time they have the reading course four hours a week. Two of the hours are in a large group class that covers material pertinent to all levels (1-6). The other two hours the group divides (1-3, 4-6) and instruction is directed to those group levels."

Question 4: Additional reading courses in fifth year program:

Yes and No: "Highly recommend courses in diagnosis and/or reading in content areas."

Yes: Teaching of Reading, 5 quarter credits

Yes: "Very strongly urged." Teaching of Remedial Reading

Yes: "Varies with the individual."

Yes: "It is noted for each person certified to teach that for their fifth year, they are to take one additional course in reading. Cannot give title since Gonzaga does not offer course."

No: "But we encourage more."

No: "We do encourage additional courses."

No: "But most take work under advisement."

No answer: "We have none."

Question 5: Comments

Central Washington: "We need more reading. Methods should be taught simultaneously with classroom experience. At present trying to change to five hour course."

Eastern Washington: "We have been trying to establish additional reading courses as requirements but have been unable to obtain total college approval."

Gonzaga: "Since we are able to supervise our student teachers after the methods block, we are able to pick up feedback from them, the cooperating teachers, and our own observations of their teaching the students. Generally, we feel the students have a good foundation based upon our information we obtain."