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ABSTRACT

IMPROVING COMMUNICATION AND SERVICES
FOR VENTURA COUNTY SECONDARY
READING TEACHERS

by

Lenore Quinn Crowe

and

Geraldine Marie Ricci

Master of Arts in Education

June, 1974

A need for improved communication between the Director of
Secondary Education and secondary reading teachers in Ventura County
and inservice education which could be provided for them resulted in
this study.

A questionnaire was mailed to 57 reading teachers in 19
secondary schools in Ventura County to determine: (1) preservice
and inservice education, (2) professional development, (3) teachers'
reading programs, and (4) teachers' problems and needs.

The close-form and open-form questions were tabulated on a
categorical data chart.
The data revealed: (1) a majority of the respondents had taught reading for six years or less and had attended three or fewer inservice training sessions in the last three years, (2) few were members of professional reading organizations or read the journals of these organizations, (3) a majority indicated specific help was needed in methods and skill building but expressed willingness to attend workshops only on school-released time, and (4) answers to open-form questions reinforced the assumption that communication was needed with the Director and with other secondary reading teachers.

Based on the review of available, pertinent literature and on the responses to the questionnaires, recommendations were made in the areas of communication, inservice education, and professional growth.
CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

Introduction

As society has become more sophisticated, information processing technology also has become an important element in the society. Kerr reported, "The knowledge industry is the focal point for national growth in the second half of the 20th century, just as the auto was in the first half of the 20th century... (Stanford, 1968, p. 72)." The rapid proliferation of knowledge plus the increasing complexity of management activities in large organizations have placed ever greater demands upon the means of transmitting, processing, storing, and retrieving information. Sometimes these demands have been met by the development of new concepts, systems, models, and equipment, which, in turn, require the development of skill and understanding if they are to be used to good advantage. Business and government organizations have developed integrated information systems to serve their own activities.

The principles of information processing which have been applied to industry and to business organizations had their origins in science and mathematics. The same is true of education. Schools are introducing changes rapidly; however, frequently these innovations are introduced without adequate preparation for change (Taylor, 1971).
The problem of educational planning has been complicated by various views relative to the purposes of educational planning. These several views have been categorized as the humanistic or individual needs, the mechanistic or market needs, and the societal or national needs (McCracken, 1973). If the purpose of education is regarded as attaining a full life, then it must follow that decisions made regarding education must strongly emphasize human values. The humanistic view of education has placed greater emphasis on communication between individuals. However, because of the multiplicity of agencies involved in the educational scheme (e.g., state, county, district, building), the personal contact is frequently lost. Consequently the individual classroom teacher and these agencies must find an alternative means of communicating with one another.

Background and Significance

Questions regarding the communications system that existed between the Director of Secondary Education and secondary reading teachers in Ventura County were identified after the investigators' attendance at a preliminary reading framework workshop in which the primary emphasis was on the reading framework as it applied to the elementary schools. In this interview with Dr. Robert Ponce, who is the Director of Secondary Education, it was determined that the existing procedures for contacting and communicating with secondary reading teachers were inadequate and in need of improvement.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationships which existed between the Director of Secondary Education and the secondary reading teachers in Ventura County in the areas of communication and services provided. More specifically, the study sought answers to these questions:

1. What are the functions, responsibilities, and goals of the Director of Secondary Education as they pertain to secondary reading teachers?

2. What is the existing pattern of communication between the Director and the reading teachers?

3. What is the need for communication between the secondary reading teachers and the Director?

4. What is the need for reading teachers within the county to communicate with one another?

5. What recommendations can be made to improve communications?

6. What inservice education can the Director provide for reading teachers?

Assumptions

This study rests upon four assumptions:

1. Communication between the Director and the individual teacher is inadequate and can be improved.

2. The majority of the secondary reading teachers want inservice education and/or other services available through the
The Director is willing to provide the additional information or services needed by the teachers.

The teachers desire direct communication with other reading teachers in the county.

**Definitions of Terms**

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions apply:

**Communication** - The processing of information, feedback, and the exchange of information.

**Director of Secondary Education** - The coordinator of secondary education for the Ventura County Schools Office.

**Inservice education** - All efforts of administrators and supervisory officials to promote by any appropriate means the professional growth and development of educational workers (Hebert, 1973).

**Model** - A structure or pattern designed to accomplish a specified goal.

**Teacher** - Any teacher specifically teaching a course labeled reading development, improvement, or remediation.

**Secondary school** - Any school containing grades nine through twelve or grades ten through twelve and classified as a high school or senior high school.

**Delimitations**

The study is restricted to 57 identified reading teachers in secondary schools in Ventura County. This sample provided a
workable number for an initial study.

Limitations

This study has several limitations:

1. No attempt has been made to include private or parochial schools, even though one trend is toward greater cooperation between private and public education.

2. The scope of this study has not provided for actual testing of any recommendations.

3. Interviews provided some of the information used in this study. Interviews might have little academic significance but they provided information unavailable through more academic sources.

4. Respondents to the questionnaire sometimes gave contradictory responses which influenced the classification of the responses.

5. A description of the present structure and process of communication has been the subject of this investigation, not the personal characteristics of the people involved nor the County Schools Office.

Organization of the Remainder of the Study

The remainder of the study includes three chapters, a bibliography, and appendices.

Chapter II contains a review of the literature available and pertinent to the study. Selections are included only as they had direct relationship to the problem.
Chapter III contains a description of the preparation and distribution of the questionnaire and the classification of the responses on the questionnaire.

Chapter IV contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations based upon data collected in this investigation.

The bibliography and appendices follow Chapter IV.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A thorough review of the literature revealed that very little had been written which might apply directly to the problem. Therefore, this chapter will review only those sources which pertain to the study in the following general areas:

1. Rationale for improving communication
2. Selected models
3. Preservice and inservice education

**Rationale for Improving Communication**

Communication as defined in Chapter I has three aspects: (1) the dissemination, transmission, or delivery of information; (2) feedback, response, reaction, or evaluation; and (3) exchange. Information sources are myriad. For the purposes of this investigation, the content of the information processed is limited to that which the teacher receives through the County Schools Office, acting as an intermediate agency for the California State Department of Education.

All successful communication processes, systems, or channels rely on the same basic premises: (1) the information must be of importance to the receiver; (2) the language must be understood by the receiver; and (3) interruptions must be minimal. For two-way communication, the receiver must have access to the sender and the sender must act on this response.
One additional consideration of communication, according to Foley and Adams (1970) is:

Communication, then, is the making known, i.e., transmitting, of effect from one dynamic region to another. It assumes a source or sender of a message, a medium or channel for transmitting, and a destination or receiver of the message. Any difference between what is sent and what is received is defined as noise. One responsibility in a role relationship is to communicate in the context of the relationship in such a manner that noise is reduced. This usually takes the form of restating what has been received (in the form of a new communication) back to the source and is defined as feedback [p. 150].

Of the generalities about communication methods which Rubin (1973) lists, two are pertinent to the understanding of communication:

1. Successful communication, at least for the purposes of educational improvement, is communication that evokes sufficiently sustained action to implement beneficial change [p. 1].
2. It is exceedingly difficult to transmit information to a disinterested audience; the relevance of the message, therefore, is crucial [p. 2].

A multiplicity of demands on the Director's time requires an efficient and effective communication process. It is unrealistic to assume that he can individually contact 57 teachers. Consequently, he needs an efficient, functioning communication system for reaching this segment of the teaching population.

As demands become more complex and the number of involved persons and institutions increases, the administrator finds the methods of the past are not always adequate for solving contemporary problems. Therefore, there is an increasing need for new techniques.
and methods of communication that will effectively deal with present
demands (Spillman, 1969).

In suggesting criteria for change, Spillman stresses:

People who play different roles in
education—teachers, administrators, and
researchers, for example—generally do not
have their work adequately linked together
by institutional means or procedures. Each
can, and often does, conduct his work in
isolation from the knowledge and specialized
competencies of the other. More effective
communication would produce a more efficient
organization in which talents and work could
be shared rather than duplicated or distribu-
ted unevenly [p. 331].

Selected Models

In assessing models for introducing change, Taylor (1971)
states that changes involving human social relations are most
effective when those involved have a part in bringing about the
change. Where a deliberate attempt for planned change is made, it
can be charted, analyzed, and evaluated.

Taylor describes three effective models:

1. The social-interaction type of model
introduces innovation to a population whose
needs are determined by the initiator. If
the receiver reacts positively to innovation,
this starts a series of stages of acceptance
or rejection ...[p. 451].

2. The research, development, and diffusion
type of model concentrates on change process
from the perspective of the originator of
innovation who formulated his original
problem on the basis of receiver needs.
Models like this present change as an orderly
sequence which begins with the identification
of a problem, proceeds through activities
directed toward finding solutions to the
problem, and ends with the diffusion of the
solution to a target group. The initiative in these activities is taken by those other than the receiver who remains passive ...[p. 451].

3. The problem-solver type of model is directed toward this involvement of the receiver in solving his own problems. Although the receiver may be able to create or find suitable solutions to his problem himself, problem-solver models are primarily concerned with those cases in which outside sources are utilized ...[p. 451].

Crowner (1973), Horne (1972), and Trull (1971) formulated models based on statewide dissemination of information. Each is concerned with alternatives providing for more flexibility and a greater range of services. The geographic regions included in their studies were large and sparsely populated.

Crowner's three phase operational framework summarizes the approaches taken by the three authors:

1. The analysis phase includes consideration of the environment, the organization, the decision making, and the alternate choices.
2. The design phase includes decision alternatives, the decision situation, the authority and responsibility for making decisions, rules for selecting alternatives, and criteria for assessing alternatives.
3. The operational details - includes school selection, pilot study implementation, evaluation program, and cost-effectiveness determination [p. 2].

Instead of proposing a model, Darcy (1973) employs a syncytial model, an analogy drawn from biology, to describe roles played in developing policy formation. The most important advantage of this model is that:

...it allowed the researcher to seek out and describe the actual structure and process for policy formation without being unduly restricted
by statements of formal relationships or procedures. The most important features selected from the biological syncytial model were its structure, its metabolism, and its capacity for growth and change [p. 180].

Additionally, another variation on planning was called backcasting. Instead of starting with programs or systems and projecting forward toward possible outcomes, backcasting began with the desired outcome and worked backward to existing programs or structures.

Stanford (1968), like Darcy, applies scientific principles for the formulation of his model. Stanford believes this communication model has specific application to the academic environment. In defining how communication models differ from mathematical ones, he states:

Communication models are descriptive, not predictive. They generally take the form of a diagram to sort relevant information, to suggest analogies and similarities among various kinds of organizations, and to suggest, for testing, solutions to organizational problems. Models are not expected to handle all aspects of a situation, but they can help improve our grasp of the essentials [p. 77].

Stanford quotes Barnard who describes the elements of an organization as: (1) communication, (2) willingness to serve, and (3) common purpose. Stanford further states that "communication is necessary to translate purpose into terms of the concrete action required to effect it [p. 14]."

Stanford reviews four types of organizational structures proposed by Argyris:
1. pyramidal
2. Likert's modified structure of overlapping, participative groups
3. a structure in which each individual is given power as a function of his potential contribution to the problem
4. a structure in which each individual has equal power and responsibility, which he may not relinquish [p. 72].

Stanford employs the cybernetic intelligence model developed by Professor William E. Thomas as the source of his basic conceptual scheme:

The cybernetic concept of feedback and control as developed from and applied to the control systems of other goal-seeking, adaptive enterprises, can prove a basis for the relationship of departmental elements in an information system model which will suggest insights, techniques, and systems useful to academic departments and institutions [p. 107].

McCracken (1973) and Roberts (1968) investigated methods of disseminating occupational-vocational information to classroom teachers. McCracken stated the value of his study could be determined only through use on a longitudinal basis. The scope of this investigation does not provide for the testing of a model on such a longitudinal basis. Roberts study was directed more to the improvement of the teacher's role through group interaction. Some of his principles are applicable and are considered in Chapter IV.

Preservice and Inservice Education

Several studies (Hebert, 1973; Pine and Neill, 1970; Rubin, 1973) have surveyed the limitations inherent in preservice education and the specific techniques required by the teacher in the classroom. Reducing the discrepancy between these two is the primary
function of inservice education. The effectiveness of any inservice activity depends on the teacher's particular needs. Unless a functioning communication system exists between those planning the inservice education, i.e., the Director of Secondary Education, and the target group, i.e., secondary reading teachers, the program tends to be unsystematic, poorly focused, and largely ineffectual (Otto and Erickson, 1973). Rubin (1973) expands on the necessity for directing communication to a specific audience when he states:

1. Few dissemination messages have relevance for all educational practitioners. Generally, practitioners believe that the information they most need is rarely available in a convenient, easily understood format. The targeting of specific messages for particular professional groups, in the style most appropriate for the intended audience, is therefore of considerable value [p. 12].

2. In communications campaigns aimed at constructive educational change, it is helpful to organize follow-up activities, within the target audience, which necessitate group discussion of message content. These follow-up activities help the communicator to become more sensitive to people's reactions, to become aware of misconceptions and misinterpretations, and to sense inherent dissatisfaction with the message. These insights are helpful in improving subsequent communications activities [p. 12].

Surveying and describing preservice education and inservice education among elementary teachers is the subject of Hebert's (1973) study. Although Hebert is concerned with elementary teachers and reading, he cites surveys which showed that "Regular classroom teachers even at elementary levels, possessed few of the skills needed to effectively teach reading [p. 1]."
He further states that:

Some new teachers were beginning their careers unsuitably prepared to teach reading at any grade. Some more experienced teachers had stalled into teaching habits that were so engrained that they could not get a view of the new and interesting reading practices going on around them [p. 26].

One of Hebert’s purposes was to make comparisons of the manner in which eight dichotomous groups of respondents to a questionnaire ranked stated needs and problems in teaching reading. The responses to the question, "What is your total number of semester hours in reading courses?" are significant to this study. Of 786 respondents indicating undergraduate semester hours, 66 respondents indicated "None"; 170 indicated "1-3"; 219 indicated "4-6"; 143 indicated "7-9"; 100 indicated "10-12"; and 86 indicated "over 12." Of 683 respondents indicating graduate semester hours, 348 indicated "None"; 99 indicated "1-3"; 67 indicated "4-6"; 32 indicated "7-9"; 19 indicated "10-12"; and 18 indicated "over 12" [p. 197]."

Grayson (1973) specially designed her study to test an inservice procedure based on simulation games. She stresses the importance of inservice education and the need for its constant renewal as concerns repeatedly expressed by authors in the field. She quotes Childress, Moffitt, and Rubin on the importance of continuous programs for updating teachers' knowledge and skill. In Chapter III of her study, Grayson presents a detailed plan for organizing inservice education using simulation games. Her suggestions are considered in Chapter IV of this study.
Summary

A review of the literature revealed that successful communication was the key to effective and positive professional relationships. Of particular significance is the principle that the interpersonal channels of face-to-face communication are more lasting and effective because they provide for a two-way flow of information to initiate feedback (Ponce, 1972).

All of the models introduced in this review involve these steps:

1. Identify target population
2. Assess the needs
3. Analyze the data received
4. Plan activities
5. Evaluate

Two additional steps proposed by others are revision and retrial followed by evaluation.

Regardless of the complexity, the scope, or the length of time required to establish a working communication model, these variables apply:

1. Size of target population
2. Geographical area
3. Money
4. Willingness and eagerness to participate in programs
5. Preparedness of the individuals to cope with the tasks being asked of them
6. Cooperation between individuals involved.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND CLASSIFICATION OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship which now exists between the Director of Secondary Education and the secondary reading teachers in Ventura County in the area of communication and services provided. There were additional questions to be answered: (1) the specific job description of the Director, (2) the existing pattern of communication between the Director and secondary reading teachers, (3) the need for communication between the teachers and the Director, and (4) the need for reading teachers within the county to communicate with each other. The study made possible recommendations for improving communications between the Director and the reading teacher, as well as making recommendations for inservice education.

This chapter presents methods, materials, and results of a questionnaire sent to 57 teachers labeled reading teachers by the secondary principals in Ventura County. It includes an account of the questionnaire which encompassed teachers' preservice and inservice education, professional development, reading programs, and problems and needs. In this questionnaire, teachers were also requested to make any additional comments they considered important. The remainder of the chapter includes the classification of the data.
Development of the Instrument

In the second interview with the Director of Secondary Education (interview with Dr. Robert Ponce, Director of Secondary Education, Ventura County Schools Office, October 15, 1973), he identified the existing method for disseminating information. (For a model of the existing communications structure, see Figure 1.)

The communications dissemination pattern described in Figure 1 was not pursued below the district office level because it would be beyond the scope of this study to do so.

The Director expressed a desire for better communication with teachers and a willingness to provide inservice education when their needs could be assessed. It was determined that a direct-mail questionnaire be employed to discover these needs because research indicated that a descriptive survey instrument was the most efficient and expedient method for collecting this data (Best, 1970).

Pattern for the Construction of the Questionnaire

The form of the questions on the instrument used both closed-form and open-form. The closed-form questions provided control by limiting the choice of responses and facilitating tabulation (Best). The majority of questions followed the closed-form pattern. Several questions were open-form, allowing the respondents the opportunity to express themselves more fully while still conforming to the general direction of the questionnaire (Best).

The following criteria (Best, 1970; Travers, 1969) were used for construction of the questionnaire:
Figure 1. Communications Structure
1. Only those questions pertinent to the purpose of the study should be included.

2. The wording should be understandable to ensure comprehension of the questions.

3. Each question should be limited to one concept.

4. The questions should follow natural sequence.

5. Each question should be constructed so that the answer to it will not be affected by previous questions.

6. The questions should be asked in such a way that they are not embarrassing or too personal for the respondent.

7. The physical format of the questions should be brief and attractive enough to elicit responses.

These criteria were applied to the formulation of this questionnaire to ensure clarity and ease of classification of responses.

An essential element in the construction of this questionnaire was the practice of pretesting (Best, 1970). This enabled the investigators to evaluate the accuracy of the instrument. Eight people were used to pretest the questionnaire: two administrators, two content area teachers with experience in the construction of questionnaires, and four reading teachers. The pretesting was done on a personal interview basis so that the investigators could note questions people had difficulty interpreting. The personal interview format allowed for discussion of the questionnaire to identify any ambiguities or weaknesses (Best). Two recommendations on question content and two recommendations on format were made by members of the pretest group. These recommendations were incorporated in the
Revision of the questionnaire.

**Description of the Population**

In an interview with the Director (interview with Dr. Robert Ponce, Director of Secondary Education, Ventura County Schools Office, October 1, 1973), it was determined that the population for the questionnaire should be reading teachers in secondary schools as defined in Chapter I. As identified by the Director, the population group consisted of 57 individuals in 19 schools representing seven school districts. There are 20 high schools in the county, but it was determined before the questionnaires were mailed that one school did not have a reading program, and therefore this school was eliminated from the mailing.

**Distribution of the Questionnaire**

After the questionnaire was revised and the population identified, the distribution procedure was formulated. The Director wrote a cover letter to each principal introducing the investigators, explaining the purpose of the questionnaire, and endorsing the study as one of significance for Ventura County. The investigators composed a cover letter for the questionnaire explaining the purpose of the questionnaire and asking for the cooperation of the teachers.

The Director provided the investigators with the names of the principals and the address of each school represented in the survey. A coding system was devised to facilitate a follow-up procedure (Best). The coding was accomplished by assigning a separate postage stamp design to each school.
On November 12, 1973, the letter of endorsement and the required number of cover letters, questionnaires, and stamped, self-addressed envelopes for return were sent to each principal to be distributed to the reading teachers in his school. The letters and the questionnaires were professionally printed (Best). Letters were received from the principals of three high schools indicating that they did not have a reading program or reading teachers. These letters accounted for five potential respondents. A fourth principal to whom six questionnaires had been sent also responded that his school did not have a reading program. He further stated that he gave one of the six questionnaires to a teacher who included reading comprehension as part of an English Class. These ten questionnaires were subtracted from the original 57.

Four questionnaires were returned from one school to which two questionnaires had been sent originally. The third and fourth questionnaires returned were dittoed copies of the original. The dittoed copies were included in the total number received.

By January 1, 1974, 33 responses had been received for a 72% return. In order to make the survey as thorough as possible, a follow-up procedure was implemented on January 8, 1974, by a new letter to the principals and a new letter to the teachers, written by the investigators, asking for completion of the questionnaires. This effort increased the final total to 39 questionnaires returned for an 83% return. A copy of each letter and a copy of the questionnaire are included in the appendix.
Classification of Data

After studying several methods of classifying data recorded on questionnaires (Best, 1970; Burroughs, 1972; Travers, 1969), the investigators decided to use a categorical data chart to tabulate the responses. This arrangement offered the investigators a method for recording the responses in the form of a large wall chart.

Fifteen questions were the closed-form type to facilitate recording. These responses are presented in this section in tabular form. Five questions followed the open-form type. These responses are presented in lists under general headings. The responses to the two types of questions are explicated in Chapter IV.

The questions on the questionnaire had been grouped into four main categories to assist the Director in planning inservice education. These categories were:

1. Preservice and inservice education
2. Professional development
3. Teachers' reading programs
4. Teachers' problems and needs

In the remainder of Chapter III, the questions are placed in tables under these categories.

As the questionnaires were returned, the responses were entered on the chart. When it was apparent that no more questionnaires would be received after the follow-up, the responses were tabulated. There are discrepancies in the tables because not all respondents answered all the questions, some respondents gave more than one
answer to a question, and some respondents did not answer according to the directions for the question.

Preservice and Inservice Education

Question 1

The first five questions related to the preservice and inservice education of the respondents. The first question asked for the number of years the respondent had been teaching reading. This is shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING READING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One respondent indicated he taught reading as a specific class in one summer session. The same respondent indicated he taught reading as part of a regular English class. A second respondent qualified his answer by stating he had taught reading for 7-9 years "as English 9B teacher."

Question 2

The second question asked for the number of quarter unit or semester unit courses in reading the respondent had taken. This information is shown in Table 2.
### TABLE 2

NUMBER OF QUARTER AND SEMESTER UNIT COURSES IN READING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>4-6</th>
<th>7-9</th>
<th>9 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter Units</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester Units</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 3 and 4.

The third question asked whether the level of the reading courses the respondent had taken was undergraduate or graduate. The fourth question asked whether the reading classes taken were oriented toward the elementary level or the secondary level. The information from these two questions is shown in Table 3.

### TABLE 3

LEVEL AND TYPE OF READING CLASSES TAKEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For these questions, respondents added comments to their answers. Six respondents checked both columns for undergraduate and graduate study. One respondent stated he had taken "both elementary and secondary classes, but the emphasis was on elementary." Another respondent stated, "Both at the clinic." One respondent wrote, "Some of each but most aimed at elementary."

**Question 5**

The fifth question asked for the number of workshops or inservice training sessions of one day's duration or more the respondent had attended in the last three years. This information is shown in Table 4.

**TABLE 4**

WORKSHOPS OR INSERVICE TRAINING SESSIONS ATTENDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of sessions attended</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One respondent who checked one workshop attended indicated it was at "reading clinic in Ventura." One respondent who checked five workshops attended indicated, "I'm counting conferences." Two respondents did not answer.
The sixth question asked for the organizations to which the respondents currently belong. The investigators provided the names of five organizations. Space was included for the respondents to list other organizations to which they belong. This information is shown in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**

**PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Organization</th>
<th>NCTE</th>
<th>CATE</th>
<th>IRA</th>
<th>CRA</th>
<th>VCIRA</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Other Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SRCLA</td>
<td>None-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASCA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CTA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CADA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCSS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kappa Delta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pi Lambda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The investigators identified SRCLA as Secondary Reading Council of Los Angeles, CTA as California Teachers Association, and CCSS as California Council of Social Studies. The remaining organizations listed under "Other" could not be identified. Eighteen respondents did not check any of the organizations listed, nor did they list any organizations in the column marked "Others."
Question 7

Question 7, "List the journals you regularly read," was intentionally left open-form by the investigators to avoid suggestion of answers and to secure honesty by the respondents. The journals listed and their frequency were:

- NOTE 5
- CATE 1
- Journal of Reading 6
- Reading Teacher 3
- CTA 1
- CCSS 1
- NCTE Journal 2
- Kappan 1
- Educational Forum 1
- Journal of Developmental Reading 1
- Psychology of Learning 1
- Scholastic Teacher 1
- Psychology Today 1
- Intellectual Digest 1

In addition, the following comments appeared:

"No reading journals"
"Nothing having to do with reading"
"Few. They're not worth a damn."
"Scan professional ones and generally find them useless."
"Sometimes IRA and SRA publications"
"Eclectic and cumulative"

One respondent indicated, "Psychological journals," but gave no titles. Two respondents indicated, "None." Fourteen made no reply at all.

Teachers' Reading Programs

Question 8

The eighth question asked for the average size of reading classes. This information is shown in Table 6.
TABLE 6
AVERAGE SIZE OF READING CLASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of classes</th>
<th>under 15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>over 30</th>
<th>Other Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>None-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One respondent checked "26-30" and "over 30" and indicated "classes vary by semester." One respondent did not answer this question.

Question 9

The ninth question asked the respondents to check the materials available to their students. There were four categories included on the questionnaire. This information is shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7
MATERIALS AVAILABLE TO YOUR STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check mark</th>
<th>Programmed Materials</th>
<th>Workbooks</th>
<th>Machines</th>
<th>Teacher-created Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One respondent divided the "Programmed Materials" column
in half and inserted "paperbacks." One respondent altered the wording of "Teacher-created materials" to "Teacher-adapted Materials."

Question 10

The tenth question asked the respondent to number from one to four the materials used most often in order of preference. This information is shown in Table 8.

**TABLE 8**

MATERIALS USED IN ORDER OF PREFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st choice</th>
<th>2nd choice</th>
<th>3rd choice</th>
<th>4th choice</th>
<th>Other Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workbooks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machines</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-created Materials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents who indicated their preference by check marks rather than numerical preference as instructed in the directions for answering question ten are included in Table 8 in "Other Responses."

The same respondent who divided the "Programmed Materials" column in question nine and inserted "paperbacks" divided the "Programmed Materials" column in question ten. The respondent assigned first choice to "Paperbacks" and third choice to "Programmed
Materials." He assigned preference five to "Machines." This is not included in Table 8.

**Question 11**

The eleventh question asked the respondents to number from one to four the materials they found most beneficial for their students. This information is shown in Table 9.

**TABLE 9**

**MATERIALS MOST BENEFICIAL IN ORDER OF PREFERENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st choice</th>
<th>2nd choice</th>
<th>3rd choice</th>
<th>4th choice</th>
<th>Other Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workbooks</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-created</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents who indicated their preference by check marks rather than numerical preferences as instructed in the directions for answering question 11 are included in Table 9 in "Other Responses."

The same respondent who divided the "Programmed Materials" column in half in questions nine and ten divided the "Programmed Materials" column in question 11. He again indicated first choice
for "paperbacks" and third choice for "Programmed Materials." He assigned preference five to "Machines." This is not included in Table 9.

One respondent wrote a "?" in the "Programmed Materials" column. One respondent used preference numbering. He wrote, "All are useful for certain students — no one thing cures all illnesses."

Question 12

Question 12 asked, "Other than those listed under #9, which materials would you like to have available?" The investigators made this question open-form, and they included five spaces for possible answers. This question was answered by 22 respondents: 8 listed one item, 6 listed two items, and 8 listed 3 or more. No items were listed by 18 of the respondents. The items listed were grouped into four categories:

1. Publications
   - books
   - paperbacks
   - workbooks
   - magazines
   - newspapers

2. Test materials
   - pre- and posttest
   - updated diagnostic materials

3. Equipment
   - tape recorders
   - tapes
   - film strips
   - tachistoscopes
   - machines
   - reading machines
   - reading lab
   - room for machines
4. Miscellaneous

all
anything
updated materials
more variety of remedial materials
systems, sets, materials, etc.
program [sic] materials geared to needs of
class
subject materials on many grade levels
history and science in short, easy reading
pieces

More respondents listed publications than they did any
other category. Many respondents indicated the materials should be
"more current," "topical," "contemporary," "high interest, contem-
porary, ethnic," "short, easy, high-interest," and "wide range."

Question 13

The 13th question asked the respondents if they had facil-
ities set up as a reading lab. The second part of the question asked
if they did not have one would they want one.

TABLE 10
READING LAB FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>No facilities, but would like them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Responses  | 2                                |
Four respondents who indicated "yes" also made comments. One indicated the equipment was not functioning. The second respondent indicated the "facilities are not complete." The third indicated, "Facilities between yes and no." The fourth indicated that the facilities are "in between." One respondent who indicated "No" said that the facilities are "not as expected."

One of the respondents who indicated a question mark wrote, "What is a reading lab?"

One respondent who indicated he did not have facilities and did not want them commented, "Reading lab is a waste of money for remedials."

**Question 14**

The 14th question asked the respondents to indicate the diagnostic procedures they use. The investigators provided the names of five diagnostic techniques. The investigators included space for other diagnostic techniques. This information is shown in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Nelson</th>
<th>Otis</th>
<th>Gilmore</th>
<th>Informal Inventory</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Other Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>WRAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CTBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>Otis</td>
<td>Gilmore</td>
<td>Informal Inventory</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Other Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Test 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RFU 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tests 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gray 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calif. Edg.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test, Jr. &amp; Adv.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cloze 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follett Reading Survey 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frostig 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gates-McGinitie 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gefman 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monroe-Sherman Coop.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rdg. Test 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Readers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Digest 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego DRI 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slauson 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Visual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Screening, eye-hand dom.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tests available 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher-created 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workbook reading tests 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One respondent listed a test name that could not be deciphered by the investigators.
Question 15

The 15th question asked the respondents to indicate if they used teacher aides. This information is shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12
USE OF TEACHER AIDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of the respondents who answered "no" made comments. One indicated "school had none." The second respondent indicated "student aides." The third respondent indicated "but I'd like to."

Question 16

The 16th question asked the respondents to indicate the person to whom they would go if they needed help.

TABLE 13
PEOPLE FROM WHOM ASSISTANCE IS SOUGHT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Another Teacher</th>
<th>Department Chairman</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three respondents wrote in the "Another Teacher" category that they would seek help from the "reading lab teacher," "reading teacher," and "reading." One of the respondents wrote in the "Other" category "reading lab teacher." Another respondent wrote "no one."

Teachers' Problems and Needs

Question 17

Question 17 asked, "What kinds of assistance do you seek?"
The investigators made this question open-form. This question was answered by 33 respondents: 19 had one response, eight had two responses, and six had three or more responses. The items listed were grouped into nine categories:

1. Materials
   - additional
   - new
   - appropriate
   - more varied
   - games
   - to reproduce
   - sharing

2. Ideas
   - additional
   - motivational
   - new

3. Class size
   - reducing
   - lower
   - scheduling

4. Instruction
   - how to teach reading
help with materials and tests
methods of teaching high school nonreaders to read
sitting and reading with students
"drilling" games
assessment of past and present techniques

5. Students

information about particular students
correlation of mutual student behavior
specific information on students

6. Diagnostic needs

someone trained to give tests
some tests
class on diagnostic testing for secondary

7. Medical

eye doctor to work with students
advice on motor-sensory or neurological disability from psychologist

8. Teacher reinforcement

reassurance
a strong shoulder

9. Miscellaneous

from another colleague
personal library of reading materials
former or present reading teacher
UCSB Reading Clinic
project development
(Title I)

money

Many of the items were duplicated. In order to avoid repetition, similar items were represented by a single entry.
Question 18

The 18th question asked the respondents to indicate in order of preference the time when they would be willing to attend an inservice workshop in reading.

TABLE 14

WILLINGNESS TO ATTEND INSERVICE WORKSHOPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>1st choice</th>
<th>2nd choice</th>
<th>3rd choice</th>
<th>4th choice</th>
<th>Other Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School-released</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the six respondents who answered "Other" for "After school," four indicated with a check mark, one wrote "no," and one wrote "maybe." Of the two respondents who answered "other" for evening, one indicated with a check mark, and one wrote "maybe." Of the five respondents who answered "Other" for "Saturday," four indicated with a check mark and one wrote "no." Two respondents did not answer this question. Eight respondents checked one category with a check mark.
Question 19

The 19th question asked, "If inservice workshops were held, what should be offered?" The investigators made this question open-form. This question was answered by 13 respondents. The items were grouped into four categories:

1. Materials

- programs of new materials
- materials available, work packets, etc.
- machines
- materials available
- remedial materials in high school content areas
- good materials interesting for students

2. Programs

- comparable programs in other schools
- information from other secondary reading teachers
- record-keeping systems
- methods other teachers find successful
- resource ideas and people available
- Hooked on Books [sic]
- psychological approach

3. Methods and skills

- use of newer equipment and materials
- methods of reading
- ways to teach content teachers to be reading teachers
- methods of teaching basic skills to high school nonreaders without insulting age group
- diagnostic testing
- techniques to motivate remedial students
- stress work with minority students—bilingual and bicultural
- small group teaching techniques
- individualizing
- motivating intelligent but severely disabled reader
- how to teach skills needed as prerequisites
- how to detect problems (perceptual, dyslexia)
how to guide student as he progresses through different levels
diagnosis and correction of reading difficulties
open classroom techniques for secondary reading games
vocabulary building techniques
speed building
"techniques in affective domain"
approaches and materials to teach the skill of reading
phonics - generalized review
comprehension

4. Miscellaneous

convincing school personnel of seriousness of reading problems (administration)
right now CTA conferences and research filling needs
I need smaller classes and teacher aid
identify reading: what it is and why different approaches and materials to teach the skill of reading
the newest in everything
see question 17

Question 20

The 20th question requested the respondents to list any significant resource people, models, materials, and/or techniques that the respondents believed would be beneficial to reading teachers in Ventura County. This question was answered by 25 respondents. The items were grouped into four categories:

1. Resource people

   Gary Davis, Oxnard High School
   Santa Barbara Jr. High School Reading Clinic,
   Dorothy Ross, Dir.
   Dr. John Hayden, CSUN
   Dr. Chris Smith, CSUN
   Dorothy Coanichi, CSUN
   reading clinic "traveling specialist" available in work with kids or give advice
county-based resources if district can't afford it
Dorothy Dillon, Royal High School
Fran Harris, Royal High School
Me! I learned it all the hard way.

2. Models

Fountain Valley or similar materials
San Diego City Schools
CSUN Reading and Self-Help services as presented in curriculum day in Simi Valley Unified this year

3. Materials

new, better films
more money
more presentations by publishers of available materials
game project creations
money - good programs cost!
bookfair where can order free exam copies

4. Techniques

assistance in setting up labs
unipack materials and learning packs
courses in how to teach reading are needed by secondary credential candidates regardless of subject area
open classroom sources and Kohl ideas of Holt, Kohl, and Fader

On the bottom of the questionnaire, the investigators asked the respondents to make additional comments on the back of the questionnaire. Nine respondents did. Because these respondents showed this interest in the questionnaire, their comments are quoted:

1. Any interchange of ideas from reading teacher to reading teacher would be beneficial. I support both of you in your project to bring about some badly needed communication between every person and every office connected with reading. It is my considered opinion that a flow of information, readily accessible, and
disseminated in some timely way, would be a valuable service. As it is, we as Reading Teachers are relatively incommunicado with one another and certainly not privy to whatever information the Director of Secondary Education has regarding Reading programs, etc. At any rate, the line of communication should be more direct. Keep up the good work.

2. I teach reading but am not a reading teacher. I would appreciate any help or information that better communication will bring. Thanks for your effort and extra work.

3. Exactly this - "communications" among secondary teachers of reading.

4. My experience has been that most workshops [sic], college classes, etc., offer methods that apply to elementary children. Also, most courses offer bits and pieces of information. I've never seen a full scale plan offered. Naturally, such a plan would have to be modified to meet the needs of certain school situations, but it would be nice to have a model instead of bumbling along trying to make do with inadequate materials and inadequate knowledge (this is true in spite of reading courses taken in the past).

   I don't mind searching for and creating materials if I have a set goal to follow.

5. Teachers should meet periodically, visit other schools, have guest speakers, etc. Workshops are usually orientated towards elementary school age students. In fact, most of my graduate work was done with elementary students although I received the degree in Secondary Education. We need materials, ideas—anything to show progress—with high school students. I sometimes feel my students walk out the door after a school year with me not really having progressed in reading or writing.

6. I have answered the questionnaire but feel you should know that I am not a reading teacher, as such.

   My emphasis was in speech pathology.
Chapter III has presented methods, materials, and results of a questionnaire sent to 57 teachers labeled reading teachers by the principals of their schools in Ventura County. The responses to the questionnaire were grouped and tabulated in four categories: preservice and inservice education, professional development, reading programs, and problems and needs.
CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was initiated by the investigators at the request of the Director of Secondary Education of Ventura County. The purpose of the study was twofold: (1) to determine the communications pattern which existed between the Director of Secondary Education and secondary reading teachers, and (2) to determine the services he and the county office could provide in effective inservice education.

The review of literature reinforced the investigators' assumption that successful communication is mandatory in achieving effective and positive professional relationships in contemporary education. Several specific models were studied, but it was determined by the investigators that no single model or adaptation of one was applicable for the purposes of this study. One study reviewed stressed the importance of the continuation of inservice education after preservice education. One study provided insight into one successful method of inservice education.

Before an effective inservice program could be formulated for Ventura County, the needs of the teachers had to be assessed. With the cooperation of the Director of Secondary Education, the investigators conducted a survey, using the questionnaire method. A categorical data chart was used to record the responses. The tabu-
lation of data revealed that a majority of teachers wanted inservice education and communication with other reading teachers in the county.

Conclusions

Communications

The primary function of the Director of Secondary Education in Ventura County is to serve as coordinator of secondary education in Ventura County schools through cooperative curriculum development. Additionally, he is assigned overall responsibility in the specific areas of career education, cultural awareness, foreign languages, mentally gifted minors, Mexican-American school relations, and guidance and counseling services. He is also the liaison officer between the county office and the State Education Committees and Commissions. A further responsibility is to accomplish other activities as required by the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of instruction (interview with Dr. Robert Ponce, Director of Secondary Education, Ventura County Schools Office, March 8, 1974).

Before he can provide the services of his office, he must know the needs of the reading teachers in the county. The existing pattern is not adequate. The following example will serve to illustrate this inadequacy.

In January, the Director was given prior notification of a language arts conference to be held in May. The communication he received indicated further information would follow. On April 4, 1974, he received a detailed notification of the conference. The bulletin was relayed to him from the County Superintendent of School,
and the Director in turn gave the investigators a copy. In order to assist the investigators in this study, he called the sponsor of the conference to find out who would receive notification. He learned that the bulletin had been sent to every county superintendent, district superintendent, and every junior high and senior high school principal in the state. One week after receipt of the bulletin, the investigators attempted telephone contact with reading teachers in ten of the 20 secondary schools in the county.

Contact was made with eight of the teachers with the following results: two teachers received the bulletin directly from their principals, two received the bulletin from their department chairman, and four had not received the bulletin. While not included in the survey, the investigators, both employed in the same school, received no notification except through the Director. This is but one example of the existing communication pattern which reinforced the investigators' assumption that communications are inadequate.

Inservice Education

As identified in the beginning of Chapter IV, one of the twofold purposes of the study was to assess the needs of the reading teacher to determine the content for inservice education. The results of the survey indicated the following:

1. Thirty-five of the 40 respondents had taught reading for six years or less.

2. Ten respondents had taken no reading courses, and 13 respondents had taken six units or less.
3. Twenty-six respondents had taken courses in reading at the secondary level, but 16 indicated they needed assistance in a variety of areas. Three of the 26 made specific comments that secondary courses placed more emphasis on the elementary level.

4. Twenty-eight of 38 respondents had attended three or fewer inservice training sessions in the last three years.

5. Twelve of the 40 teachers indicated membership in IRA. Thirteen indicated membership in CRA. Eleven indicated membership in VCIRA.

6. Thirty-two respondents indicated that they read no professional journals. Five indicated membership in IRA, but they did not list the journal. (The investigators find this significant since these are professional organizations representing reading.)

7. Twenty-two of 40 respondents indicated that they have reading lab facilities. Sixteen respondents who did not have them expressed a desire for such facilities.

8. Twenty-nine respondents requested assistance.

9. Thirty-four respondents expressed willingness to attend inservice workshops on school-released time. No respondents indicated they would be willing to attend a workshop on Saturday as their first choice.

10. Thirty of the 40 respondents made suggestions for the content of inservice education. The majority of suggestions were in the category of methods and skill building.

11. Only 16 respondents were able to offer specific resource people, models, materials or techniques that would be of benefit to
12. Ten respondents made additional comments on the questionnaire that reinforced the need for reading teachers in Ventura County to communicate with each other and to participate in inservice education.

**Recommendations**

**Communication**

After studying and testing the communication pattern that presently exists between the Director of Secondary Education and the secondary reading teachers, these recommendations are made:

1. A coordinator for the reading department or an individual willing to assume this responsibility should be identified in each of the 20 schools to serve as a direct contact with the Director of Secondary Education.

2. A specific individual should be identified in each of the seven school district offices to function as the liaison between the Director and the district.

3. The Director should implement a colored paper coding system by subject area for the information he must send to the schools. This should expedite the receipt of important information by the school principal.

4. The Director should condense to one page longer communications received from the State Education Department before dissemination to individual schools or teachers.
5. The Director should continue to explore alternate channels of communication to maintain effectiveness.

**Inservice Education**

The necessity for inservice education has been proven by this study. To continue the learning process that is the purpose of inservice education (Hebert, 1973), these recommendations are made:

1. Inservice education programs, preferably on school-released time (Hebert), should be instituted by the Director following the requests and recommendations of the respondents to the questionnaire. The Director should seek the cooperation of the districts to provide funds for these programs.

2. The investigators recommend that the initial inservice program focus on providing assistance for those needs which the respondents have indicated are most immediate (Hebert).

3. Additional inservice programs should be planned to treat specifically reading and the affective domain (Framework in Reading, 1973), reading in the content areas (Otto and Erickson, 1973), and the use of tutors in the reading program (Pine and Neill, 1970).

4. The teachers involved must play a decisive role in the planning of the inservice programs, and the programs should "encourage the teachers to be self-evolving (Grayson, 1973, p. 22)."

5. A potential goal of inservice education should be the establishment of a data bank (Nay, 1972) or exchange center for materials, ideas, programs, etc., for use by all reading teachers in the
county. Maintained at a simple level (Darcy, 1973), each teacher could make contributions and affect the efforts of others in reading (May, 1972).

Professional Growth

One of the difficulties in the dissemination of information stems from the fact that teachers are sometimes inadequately trained for the roles they must assume (Roberts, 1968). For teachers to be able to realize their own potential, these recommendations are made:

1. Reading teachers should become members of the professional organizations directly related to the field of reading (Hebert, 1973).

2. The teachers should become members of the VCIRA in order to involve themselves at the local level and to communicate with other teachers.

3. The teachers should maintain awareness of changes within the field of reading by additional coursework.

4. Teachers should actively work to convince their school administrators of the seriousness of reading problems.

5. Teachers should pursue personal growth as teachers. According to the Framework in Reading (1973), "As the teaching of reading grows better, the range in achievement will become greater, not less. Responsiveness to human potential is, after all, a prime characteristic of good education [p. 35]."
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APPENDIX A

LETTER SENT TO PRINCIPALS
The Master's Thesis proposed by Mrs. Lenore Crowe and Mrs. Geraldine Ricci has been endorsed by the Graduate Committee of San Fernando University at Northridge. I feel that their study, "A Communications Model for Secondary Reading Teachers in Ventura County," will provide meaningful research which will be of benefit not only to all school administrators in Ventura County, but to the County Schools Office as well.

The data to be compiled from information received on the enclosed questionnaire will lead to the implementation of this model within the county. Therefore, your cooperation in encouraging your reading teachers in completing and returning the questionnaire at their earliest convenience will be appreciated.

Thank you for your help and consideration in this very important matter.

Sincerely,

Robert Ponce, D.E.
Director of Secondary Education

RP:rb
Enclosure
APPENDIX B

LETTER SENT TO READING TEACHERS
Copy of Letter Sent to Reading Teachers

Dear Colleague:

"Communications" is a word we hear used many ways and on many occasions. We would like to ask your cooperation in making "communication" among secondary teachers of reading in Ventura County more than just a word. Dr. Robert Ponce, Ventura County Director of Secondary Education, has offered the services of his office in setting up workshops and/or meetings for the purpose of better communications among reading teachers. This questionnaire is a first step. We would appreciate your completing it and returning it to us as soon as possible. Please make any additional comments or suggestions you believe to be pertinent.

We are asking 57 teachers to complete this questionnaire. A stamped, addressed envelope is provided for your convenience. The address is that of Ventura High School where the results will be tabulated.

The sharing of your experiences is vital to the success of this survey. You may be sure that the anonymity of all respondents will be preserved.

Sincerely,

Lenore Crowe

Jerry Ricci
APPENDIX C

VENTURA COUNTY READING TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE
1. How many years have you been teaching reading?
   0-1 □ 1-3 □ 4-6 □ 7-9 □ 10 or more □

2. How many quarter unit courses or semester unit courses in reading have you had?
   Quarter: 0 □ 1-3 □ 4-6 □ 7-8 □ 9 or more □
   Semester: 0 □ 1-3 □ 4-6 □ 7-8 □ 9 or more □

3. Were your reading classes undergraduate □ or graduate □?

4. Were your reading classes oriented towards elementary □
   or secondary □

5. How many workshops or inservice training sessions in reading of one day's duration or more have you attended in the last 3 years?
   0 □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ or more □

6. To what organization(s) do you currently belong?
   NCTE □ CATE □ IRA □ CRA □ VCIRA □
   Others ____________________________________________

7. List the journals you regularly read. ________________________________

8. Average size of reading classes: under 15 □ 16-20 □ 21-25 □
   26-30 □ over 30 □

9. Check the materials available to your students: (answer in block #9 below.)
   10. Which do you use most often? (Answer in order of preference in block #10 below.)
   11. Which do you find most beneficial for your students? (answer in order of preference in block #11 below.)

   Programmed materials □ 10 □ 11 □
workbooks
machines
teacher-created materials

12. Other than those listed under #9, which materials would you like to have available?

13. Do you have facilities set up as a reading lab? Yes/ No
    If not, do you want one? Yes/ No

14. What diagnostic techniques do you use?
    Stanford
    Nelson
    Otis
    Gilmore
    Informal inventory
    Other

15. Do you use teacher aides? Yes/ No

16. If you need help, to whom do you do? Another teacher
    Dept. Chmn./ princ./ other

17. What kinds of assistance do you seek?

18. When would you be willing to attend an inservice workshop in reading? (In order of preference)
    School-released time/ after school/ evening/
    Saturday

19. If inservice workshops were held, what should be offered?

20. Please list any significant resource people, models, materials, and/or techniques that you believe would be beneficial to reading teachers in Ventura county.

Please make additional comments on the back of this questionnaire. Thank you.
APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER SENT TO PRINCIPALS
Copy of Follow-up Letter Sent to Principals

In November, we sent you a questionnaire to be distributed to your reading teachers. These were accompanied by a letter from Dr. Robert Ponce. We thank you for cooperating in the distribution. We were pleased by the number of questionnaires which were returned.

Lest those who cared enough to respond feel that nothing is being done, we again ask your cooperation in distributing the enclosed letters to your reading teachers.

In the event that there may be teachers who did not respond, we are also enclosing extra questionnaires. Would you please make these available to teachers who need them.

We are currently working with Dr. Ponce to evaluate the responses we have received and to plan a system of inservice programs for Ventura County secondary reading teachers. We believe these will be of benefit to students, teachers, and the schools they represent.

Sincerely,

Lenore Crowe

Jerry Ricci
APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP LETTER SENT TO READING TEACHERS
Copy of Follow-up Letter Sent to Reading Teachers

Dear Colleague:

In November we asked your cooperation in completing a reading teacher's questionnaire. The return was quite good and we wish to thank those of you who responded. (If you did not complete the questionnaire, your principal had additional copies. We would still like to hear from you.)

We have been collating the responses and working with Dr. Robert Ponce to plan inservice programs that will be in answer to your needs. Although we cannot give you specific dates for these programs now, we would like to alert you to a Right to Read In-Service Training Program and Conference in Language Arts and Reading in the Secondary School. The conference is planned for May 6, 7, and 8 in Santa Barbara. Your principal will be receiving more information as it becomes available.

Again we express our appreciation for your time and interest.

Sincerely,

Lenore Crowe

Jerry Ricci
APPENDIX F

LANGUAGE ARTS CONFERENCE LETTER
March 19, 1974

TO: California Language Arts Personnel  
FROM: Leslie A. Pacheco  
California Right to Read/Reading Task Force  
SUBJECT: Language Arts Conference - Secondary Level - READING IN THE CONTENT AREA

As the California Right to Read unit has worked with schools throughout the state, we have identified a common staff need. This need is READING IN THE CONTENT AREAS. In responding to this, R2R has scheduled a conference to bring together recognized authorities in the area of Reading in the Content Areas.

The California Right to Read Unit will conduct a Language Arts Conference May 6, 7 & 8, 1974 at the Francisco Torres in Goleta (near Santa Barbara, California). Registration will be from 8:00 to 10:00 a.m., Monday, May 6, 1974; sign-out is scheduled from 12 noon to 3 p.m., Wednesday, May 8, 1974.

Individuals who have agreed to participate as general session speakers and workshop participants are:

- Dr. Henry A. Bauman - "What is 'Reading in the Content Areas'?'"
- Mr. Nobuo (Bob) Watanabe - "Enabling Behaviors"
- Dr. Luis Hernandez - "The Mexican-American Student"
- Dr. Ken Johnson - "The Black Student"
- Dr. Walter Loban - "The Total Language Arts Program in the Content Areas"
- Dr. Robert Edwards - "Content Area Reading - Practical Approaches and Ideas"
- Mrs. Charlie Knight - "The Right to Read Procedure in Strengthening Reading in the Content Areas"
- Dr. Sue Wasserman - "State Framework in Reading - How it Ties Reading into Content Areas"

The above speakers will be present the entire 2½ days. In addition to a general session address, they will each be available for various workshop sessions.

To round out the conference the final speaker will be Dr. S. I. Hayakawa addressing a general session of all conference participants.

California Right to Read believes this will be a fantastic conference with tremendous interchange of ideas. But - - - we need one more element to make this conference a roaring success. We need you!
Who may attend?

1. Right to Read Local Education Agency Directors
2. Senior high and junior high level faculty, especially:
   a. Language Arts Instructors and Department Chairman
   b. Deans of Students
   c. Principals and Vice Principals
   d. Counselors

3. County Personnel

The conference will be limited to 400 participants. Please return the attached registration form as soon as possible. The deadline for accepting registrations is April 19, 1974.

The registration fee includes room, meals, and necessary materials for the conference from 8:00 a.m., Monday, May 6, 1974 to 1:00 p.m., Wednesday, May 8, 1974. Fees are:

- $42.00 for a single room, shared bath
- $37.00 for a double room, shared bath

We certainly hope you can attend and bring fellow educators with you.

LAP:jf

SCHOOL OR DISTRICT

Those who will be attending May 6, 7 & 8, 1974 conference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION/GRADE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mail To:

M. Bruce Hagen
Right to Read
Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

Attending at $37

Attending at $43

TOTAL

Make Checks Payable to: Leslie A. Pacheco & M. Bruce Hagen