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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Reading, the crux of most learning, is indispensable in the modern era which depends on written communication for both personal growth and national survival. Reading has become a process of thought-getting, of language development, and of socialization rather than a mere subject. Instead of going to school to learn to read, children now go to school to read to learn. With an ever-increasing premium placed on high school and college achievement, education is mandatory. Today both laymen and professionals are concerned with the large numbers of children who, because of their difficulties in reading, cannot cope with schoolwork. Most educators agree that the number of children who read less effectively than they should is far too high. ¹

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

It is the purpose of this study to analyze and compare Des Moines Public Schools' remedial reading program to information obtained about remedial reading programs from elementary education directors of other cities with similar

population size. It is felt that all the remedial reading programs should consider the following four basic objectives for teaching slow readers:

1. Reading will make experiences richer.
2. Reading will develop right attitudes.
3. Reading will make interests broader.
4. Reading will help children have the ability to think.

After the investigation and analysis, it is hoped that the following questions can be answered:

1. How does Des Moines' program compare to the other cities' programs which were studied?
2. In what areas is Des Moines' program a strong one?
3. What recommendations can be given to Des Moines for the improvement of its program or what changes can be made?

II. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Reading is a very essential tool of learning. In modern life one needs to be able to read with a high degree of skill. The person who cannot read well is hopelessly handicapped by reading disability. Poor reading is now recognized as the most important single cause of retardation in the elementary school. One of the major goals in improving a remedial reading program is to increase its
effectiveness in terms of learning by the child. Realizing the tremendous importance of reading and its effect upon the child's life, it is the responsibility and obligation of the schools to help each child reach his maximum growth in reading. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to provide information for comparative analysis of Des Moines and other cities' remedial programs to discover if Des Moines should consider changes for the betterment of their programs and the children involved.

III. PROCEDURE

The survey method was the prime source of information for this study. However, there are factual materials provided supporting the opinions of the author. The following steps were followed in obtaining the necessary information:

1. Gather, organize and analyze all recent available material concerning the problem.

2. Gather all information about the present Des Moines Public Schools' remedial reading program.

3. Send out a questionnaire to Elementary Education Directors of the below listed cities in the United States to find out about their remedial reading programs.

Akron, Ohio

---

Albuquerque, New Mexico
Charlotte, North Carolina
Dayton, Ohio
El Paso, Texas
Grand Rapids, Michigan
Jacksonville, Florida
Jersey City, New Jersey
Miami, Florida
Mobile, Alabama
Richmond, Virginia
Sacramento, California
San Jose, California
Syracuse, New York
Tampa, Florida
Tucson, Arizona
Tulsa, Oklahoma
Wichita, Kansas
Yonkers, New York

4. Organize all information gathered from areas of investigation.

5. Tabulate and draw conclusions from the entire study.
IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The following factors were considered to be limitations in the study:

1. The small number of cities that were surveyed to obtain the information needed for the study.

2. The way each elementary director interpreted the questions and the way each question was interpreted.

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

Remedial reader. The term remedial reader was interpreted as meaning any child who has reading difficulties which keep him from reading up to the level of his ability or who shows weaknesses in mastering the specific skills and abilities of reading.

Remedial reading. The term remedial reading was interpreted as meaning the instruction reserved for seriously disabled readers who are operating on levels roughly two or more years below their capabilities.

Remedial reading class. A remedial reading class was interpreted as a class outside the regular classroom for children working below grade level, in which they received additional instruction in reading, and worked in small groups of children.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Recent experimental work in the field of reading, showing the relationships between reading disability, school failure, and behavior problems has done much to center the attention of educators upon the seriousness of reading failure. Many of the reading failures are unnecessary if adequate diagnosis and appropriate remedial work are given. The large number of children needing remedial reading, the hindrance to subsequent school progress by reading disabilities, the relationships between reading disabilities, personality and character, and a program that supplements in an essential and helpful way the regular reading instruction are justification, according to Monroe and Backus, to establish remedial reading programs in public schools today.1

While formulating a remedial reading program, however, Gates suggests that the following precautions should be observed:

1. Remedial instruction should not be substituted for enjoyable activities.
2. Remedial instruction should be managed so as not to classify the pupil in an embarrassing way.

---

1Marion Monroe and Bertie Backus, Remedial Reading (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1937), pp. 3-10.
3. Time allowance for remedial work should be generous.
4. The teacher should have sufficient time to arrange and supervise the remedial work.
5. Remedial work may be either individual or cooperative.
6. Remedial work should be begun at a favorable time.
7. Successes should be emphasized in remedial work.
8. Improvement should be measured and the record shown.
9. The competitive impulse should be enlisted.
10. The pupil's particular errors and successes should be detected.
11. The teacher's attitude should be optimistic and encouraging.
12. Practice should be so distributed as to avoid fatigue and boredom.
13. A variety of exercises and activities should be provided.
14. A plan should be dropped when it fails to produce results after a fair trial.
15. Individual supervision should be continued until the pupil has his improved techniques well habituated.1

It can easily be seen why it is necessary to have a properly formulated program. One of the most serious defects of much remedial work is to be found in the lack of a proper program. When remedial instruction is offered a bit now and a bit then at odd moments, it can hardly be highly effective.2 Remedial reading must be included as part of the total reading program. It cannot be separate.

The process of learning to read is unique in each individual. Individuals vary in the time they take to master

2Ibid., p. 29.
the reading techniques. Therefore, remedial reading instruction by and large should be designed to provide a higher degree of adjustment to individual differences and needs than developmental reading instruction normally provides. Moreover, it is concerned with pupils who from the standpoint of intelligence and other learning potential fail to make satisfactory progress in reading. The individual child who is slow in learning to read should not be forced into a different quality of process because of his slower development. Effort should be spent instead in providing for the child a greater variety of interesting materials over a longer period of time.¹

There are seemingly many factors which cause children to have reading disabilities, but Monroe and Veach categorize these causative factors into five major areas including:

1. Constitutional Factors--visual, auditory or motor defects and debilitating physical conditions.
2. Intellectual Factors--verbal disabilities and peculiarities in modes of thought.
3. Emotional Factors--those directly responsible for the reading failure and those which further impede progress but which result from the reading difficulty.
4. Educational Factors--deficiencies in readiness, poor adjustment of materials and methods to the pupil's needs, lack of interest in reading and inadequate provision or attention to pupils who are encountering difficulty.

5. Environmental Factors—very little, if any, relationship between parents and child, frequent moving, and distracting environmental conditions.\footnote{Monroe and Backus, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 17.}

One soon realizes that reading problems cannot be considered in isolation. The pupils with reading problems must be regarded as a whole person and the multiple nature of the causes of reading failure must always be kept in mind.\footnote{Warren G. Cutts, \textit{Modern Reading Instruction} (Washington: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1964), p. 87.}

One concludes from this that remedial reading work should stress relieving the obvious difficulties in reading, but it must be within a framework of understanding and permissiveness that does not focus unwarranted attention upon a child's shortcomings and deficiencies. Remedial reading experiences are one then that should have personal value to each child as he learns to recognize, adjust to, and overcome his difficulties.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 89-90.}

A discrepancy between the child's reading skill and his mental ability and a demonstration of inability by the child to learn to read from reading instruction provided in his classroom are considered by the authorities MacCampbell and Peck to be important factors in choosing children for...
remedial reading instruction. However, Pohl suggests that candidates should be selected on the basis of their disability in relation to their own classmates. and Monroe and Backus feel that teacher judgment, informal testing, and standardized tests are the most important factors for the selection of children for remedial work. Whatever factors are employed in choosing children for remedial reading instruction, it is apparent that some basis must be established within the school system itself. Through this special instruction the child, by learning to read, will be spared the emotional strain which accompanies the failure in achievement.

After the establishment of a formula for choosing the children for the remedial reading program, consideration must be made in choosing good personnel for the remedial reading program. The authorities, Austin and Morrison, feel that good classroom teachers do not necessarily make good remedial reading teachers. However, it seems that reading personnel


3 Monroe and Backus, op. cit., p. 36.
are usually spread too thin. Lack of funds, lack of trained personnel, and lack of adequate space to "house" a special reading program seem to be obvious reasons for not having more personnel.¹

Teachers employed in remedial reading programs should have certain basic characteristics. One authority suggests the following:

1. Remedial reading teachers should have adequate special training and experience in teaching.
2. Remedial teachers should be interested in remedial teaching.
3. Remedial teachers should possess a genuine and deep-seated love for children, unusually sensitive to their hopes, fears, ambitions, moods and inhibitions.
4. Remedial teachers should have time, energy, interest and ingenuity to help each child develop confidence and a sense of security, and to help him overcome a variety of emotional blocks and antagonistic attitudes.
5. Remedial teachers should possess well above average physical and mental health.
6. Remedial teachers should have exceptional ability to get along with parents and colleagues, to exercise leadership, and to co-ordinate the work of several persons.²

The teacher has the sole responsibility of establishing a proper atmosphere in which a child can readily learn. The


atmosphere must be one in which the child can learn from his daily experiences that he is competent to do good work and is responsible for maintaining high standards. Remedial pupils who have long experienced failure in learning to read will not meet another teacher with hope and a new determination to learn. Some pupils will be suspicious and not cooperative, some will be discouraged and unwilling to try again and others will be sullen or even aggressive. The biggest existing problem for teachers then is motivation—the child too must want to learn to read.¹

Some learning will take place almost without planning, but the teacher who stands in the best position to do an effective instructional job is the teacher who knows the range of activities she may use, knows the pupils and their limitations as well as their abilities, knows the basic attitudes, habits, and skills that are crucial in learning to read, knows what activities and what games are useful for building which skills, knows how growth takes place in relation to the methods she uses and most especially knows how to choose and order the many possible classroom procedures that will enable her to provide for maximum growth for each individual child.² No small child should ever

¹Ibid., p. 110.

feel compelled to achieve at a level beyond his own maturity. Once learning begins to take place the teacher must then encourage the child to use his newly acquired skills outside the classroom. The child must become an image of a new self.

Kottmeyer sums up remedial reading teachers by stating:

Most important is that common characteristic of all superior teachers—an impelling and driving zeal to give another human being that indispensable tool of learning which makes the wisdom of the ages accessible to him. The good remedial teacher must be endlessly patient with slow, bungling learning, with sullen and listless pupils. He must somehow communicate his confidence, interest, and sympathy to his pupil. When the child perceives this earnestness of purpose, his own attitude toward learning begins to change. The dullest of learners unfailingly recognizes and responds to sincerity and instinctively knows when it is feigned. If a teacher has this drive to help others, remedial teaching can become the most rewarding of all work; without it, it is tedious drudgery. The teacher who once sees a discouraged and spiritless pupil slowly transformed into a confident, eager learner as a result of his efforts alone will never forget the experience. It is a humbling and wonderful adventure.\(^1\)

The organization and administration of a remedial reading program must be a highly specialized one. Its requirements are demanding in order for the program to be most effective. However, it seems that all of the organizational and administrative devices only set the stage. The

\(^1\)Kottmeyer, op. cit., p. 112.
purpose for which all the preplanning exists is the daily instructional program, created by the genius of the teacher, based on her knowledge of her materials and her methods and on her understanding of children.  

In the instructional process, it is important for remedial reading teachers to be extremely flexible in their approach, being prepared at all times to shift quickly from an unfruitful approach to one that produces results. Not only is flexibility in the instructional process a demanding characteristic, but also one sees the necessity to involve a multiple approach to reading problems including the group approach as well as individual guidance.

Method too becomes important. Authorities say that method is an essential ingredient in every discourse designed for the instruction of mankind. Whether it be in regular classroom teaching or in remedial reading classes, it is a known fact that instruction must vary with each child and that there is no comprehensive method that is suitable to all children.

Gates feels that school systems should consider carefully the choice of materials employed for remedial work.

---

1 Monroe and Rogers, op. cit., p. 206.
The following are criteria which Gates deems important:

1. The materials should be highly interesting to the pupils.
2. The materials should be of proper difficulty.
3. The materials should be of various types.
4. An abundance of easy reading should be provided as a substitute for review.

Through the methods, techniques and materials which are utilized in the program, it is realized that remedial reading is a highly adaptive experience. Not only then should remedial reading instruction begin when it is first needed and continued as long as the child has definite reading needs but also a child should return to his regular classroom as soon as he is emotionally ready and has sufficient reading facility to profit from regular instruction and self-help. Reasons are then formulated to create a desire for individual as well as total program evaluation.

Woolf and Woolf indicate that remedial reading programs should be evaluated for the following reasons:

1. Teachers learn which objectives have been reached and where they need to improve.
2. Evidence of improvement serves as a reward for teachers.
3. Results can be used to inform the public and staff.
4. Interest in the program is stimulated.

5. Results of the evaluation can be used in defending the program and justifying expenditures.\(^1\)

It is important to include an appraisal of the total growth of the program. However, it is more necessary for the child himself to be making a continual self-evaluation so the individual is aware of the amount of progress he is making in overcoming his problem. The remedial reading experience is one which must have personal value to each child as he begins to recognize his advancements.\(^2\)

Every remedial program should set up realistic goals for which they should strive to achieve. Improvement in reading plus improvement in behavior and personality-rating scales indicating favorable changes in attitudes are two important goals that Monroe and Backus think should be realized in all remedial reading programs.\(^3\) If the goals are to be attained, then it is important for the program to be evaluated frequently so that a loss of the set goals does not appear.

Ours is a society based on the written word. The school that fails to make a reader of a child who has the native ability fails that child. It is easy to see that the


\(^2\)Marjorie Seddon Johnson, "Reading Instruction in the Clinic," *The Reading Teacher*, XV (May, 1962), 416.

\(^3\)Monroe and Backus, *op. cit.*, p. 152.
teaching of reading takes precedence over all other school responsibilities. Educators who are reluctant to give wholehearted support to reading programs, however meager their budgets, are most lax in their thinking. Their frugality then approaches gross negligence. It has been proven that remedial reading programs are necessary and play a very intricate part in the total educational system of the schools today.

1Pohl, op. cit., p. 289.
CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

An investigation was made to compare and analyze Des Moines and other cities' remedial programs to discover if Des Moines should consider changes for the betterment of their program and the children involved. In order to obtain this information to fulfill the purpose of the study a questionnaire was sent to nineteen cities in the United States with return replies from sixteen out of nineteen of the cities. Four of the sixteen cities refused information for the study because the questionnaire did not fit their program and three sent no reply at all. Each section of the questionnaire was processed on a different sheet of colored paper which, when returned, provided ease in analyzation and calculation. The information herein presented represents the results of the survey.

Table I reveals two important facts. Firstly, that the percentage of children in remedial reading programs is relatively low with the percentages ranging from 2 per cent to 7 per cent but it still seemed to denote a definite need for the program. Secondly, the program is relatively a new one in most of the school systems. Four of the systems began their programs earlier than ten years ago, but three-fourths of them are only five years or less in their
### TABLE I

The Initiation Year of the Remedial Reading Program and the Percentage of Children Enrolled During the 1967-1968 School Year for Des Moines and Cities of Similar Population Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Total Schools in the System</th>
<th>Children in Grades K-8</th>
<th>Remedial Reading Programs Involved in the Schools</th>
<th>Percentage of Children in Remedial Program</th>
<th>Year the Program Was Started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, North Carolina</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>2½%</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, Texas</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2½%</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29,741</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2½%</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>87,365</td>
<td>3,170</td>
<td>3½%</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City, New Jersey</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE I (continued),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number of Schools in the System</th>
<th>Number of Children in Grades K-8</th>
<th>Children Involved in Remedial Reading in School and Year the Program Was Started</th>
<th>Percentage of Children in School and Year the Program Was Started</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, New York</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25,829</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>55,846</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, Kansas</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development. Des Moines has the oldest program which was
begun thirty years ago and Jersey City had the youngest
program which was begun in 1967.

Presented in Table II are data designating how school
systems chose their personnel for the remedial reading pro-
grams. Special reading training and classroom experience
proved to be the most popular characteristics. The personal-
ality of the teacher, however, seemed to be an important
factor to some systems and authorities are in agreement
that this is of vital importance in selecting remedial
reading teachers. Only four schools required their teachers
to have a Masters Degree as a necessary characteristic. Four
of the school systems that were surveyed pay their remedial
reading teachers a higher salary. More college training,
longer working days, and extra compensation to all special
teachers were reasons given for the various increases in pay
given to these teachers.

The distribution between men and women teachers in
the remedial reading program was unbalanced. This informa-
tion is shown in Table III. Eight and one-half per cent of
all teachers in the programs were men and four systems
employed no men. Miami, however, employed twenty-one men
in their schools. The total amount of teachers in the pro-
gram ranged from six teachers in Jersey City to sixty-six
teachers in Wichita. The information presented indicated a
TABLE II

RESULTS INDICATING HOW TEACHERS ARE CHOSEN FOR REMEDIAL READING PROGRAMS
FOR DES MOINES AND CITIES OF SIMILAR POPULATION SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Personality</th>
<th>Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, Texas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>Special Reading Training</td>
<td>Classroom Experience</td>
<td>Personality of Teacher</td>
<td>Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, New York</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>Teachers Program</td>
<td>Total Number of Teachers in the Program</td>
<td>Women</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, North Carolina</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, Texas</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City, New Jersey</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, New York</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, Kansas</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
definite contrast in program size when the number of teachers involved was studied.

Table IV implies that all but one of the school systems studied chose children for their programs through recommendation by the teacher. Second in importance was the reading level of the child. The minimum intelligence quotient was also used as a guideline for choosing children in the remedial program. However, there were differences indicated in the study as to what minimum score should be employed. Only one school system used the scores 80-84 as their basis and only one system used scores of 95-99 as their starting point. All of the other systems surveyed used the scores 85-94 as one of the factors important in implementing the remedial reading program.

In Table V various aspects of implementing the program are shown. Age seven seemed to be the most popular age that children were accepted into the program. Three schools used age six as a starting age and two schools used age eight. El Paso was the only school that started children in the program at the age of nine. Ten schools involved four, five or six children in each class period with four schools involving seven, eight or nine children in each class period. Only Syracuse involved ten, eleven or twelve children in a class and Miami involved thirteen, fourteen or fifteen children.

The small class sizes typified that small group instruction seemed to be an effective instructional method and that
## TABLE IV

RESULTS SHOWING HOW CHILDREN ARE CHOSEN FOR THE REMEDIAL READING PROGRAMS FOR DES MOINES AND CITIES OF SIMILAR POPULATION SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Intelligence Quotient: Minimum:30-34:35-39:40-44:45-99:</th>
<th>Recommendation by Teacher:</th>
<th>Reading Level of the Child:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, North Carolina</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, Texas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>Intelligence Quotient</td>
<td>Recommendation by Teacher</td>
<td>Reading Level of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, New York</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, Kansas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>Ages</td>
<td>Program Start/End</td>
<td>Hours Each Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, IA</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6:7-9:10 AM</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, OH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6:7-9:10 AM</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6:7-9:10 AM</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6:7-9:10 AM</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6:7-9:10 AM</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids, MI</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6:7-9:10 AM</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, FL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6:7-9:10 AM</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City, NY</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>6:7-9:10 AM</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>Ages</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, New York</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, Kansas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE V (continued)**

**Age Children Are Involved in Each Class Period:**

**Time Spent:**
- Each Week: in the Program
- Each Child:
- Stay for Each Child

**Average Length of Program:**
- Ages:
- Number:
- Hours:
- Semester:
- Years:

**Total**:
- 3 6 3 1 0 10 4 1 1 6 6 1 3 3 5 1
individual instruction was most likely being engaged.

The time spent in classes weekly varied from two to five hours. Only one school system involved the children in the remedial program six to eight hours weekly. A few of the schools did not have children spend time daily in remedial classes. These programs were planned so that the children spent longer time periods in class on certain days of the week. One and one half years was indicated by five systems as the average length of stay for each child in the program. Akron, Dayton and Tulsa kept the children on the average of one semester and Charlotte, El Paso and Miami show that one year is the average length of stay for their programs. One interesting fact was that Jacksonville, Florida had the children spend more time in classes weekly than any other school system studied and the average length of stay for each child was two years.

Most of the school systems did not have remedial reading centers in each building, however, Jersey City and Syracuse maintained centers in each building. For those children who did not go to remedial reading centers, it was indicated that the regular classroom teacher involved herself in the special instruction. However, in some instances parents provided the transportation to the centers or in one situation, a special teacher visited different schools at regular times. One way Des Moines
handles this situation was by having some children become transfer students at schools where there was a center located. For the most part, the schools surveyed denoted that most of the program was continued during the summer. The terminal point of the remedial program varied. Six school systems continued their program through the junior high level whereas four school systems ended the program at the elementary level. Charlotte, North Carolina continued their program on the high school level.

Data relating the types of instructional materials used for the remedial reading programs are shown in Table VI. Des Moines and El Paso were the only schools that used all the methods suggested on the questionnaire. However, seven of the school systems employed all of the instructional methods but four or less. Syracuse and Wichita utilized the fewest number of methods using four and seven, respectively. Games used as motivational devices, the overhead projector, tapes and tape recorders were employed by twelve schools and filmstrips, records and record players were utilized by eleven of the schools. Ten of the schools studied used pictures, the SRA reading method and programmed reading whereas nine systems used films, film projectors, linguistics, and concentrated instruction. Of all the school systems surveyed Syracuse was the only one of them that used a specific reading series and that series
## TABLE VI

**TYPES OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR THE REMEDIAL READING PROGRAMS EMPLOYED BY DES MOINES AND CITIES OF SIMILAR POPULATION SIZE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Films</th>
<th>Tapes</th>
<th>Records</th>
<th>Overhead Strips</th>
<th>Projectors</th>
<th>Recorders</th>
<th>Players</th>
<th>Projector</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Readers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, Texas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City, New Jersey</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, Kansas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** 11 9 12 11 12 10 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Craig</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Tach-X</th>
<th>S.R.A.</th>
<th>Reading;Pictures</th>
<th>Motivational</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Concentrated</th>
<th>Devices</th>
<th>Games as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, North</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, New York</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, Kansas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Totals                 | 4     | 9       | 6      | 10     | 10                | 12           | 12          | 9            |         |           |
was only utilized at certain times during the program. The results shown in this table are more similar in data than any other findings presented in this report.

Table VII reveals the annual per pupil cost for the materials used in the remedial reading program. As shown in the table five of the schools surveyed indicated no response as there was a variance from year to year and it seemingly could not be answered accurately. However, six to ten dollars was the annual per pupil cost for five of the systems. Charlotte indicated a cost of one to five dollars and Jacksonville and Jersey City utilized sixteen to twenty dollars annually. Every school system showed an interest in maintaining remedial reading centers in all schools if the finances were available. Grand Rapids, Charlotte, and Jersey City were the only school systems who did not receive special government aid for support of their programs.

Evaluation seemed to be an intricate part of the total program. Grand Rapids and Miami revised their programs in 1966 and 1967, respectively. Four of the school systems stated that 1965 had been their last revision date and five systems indicated continuous and constant evaluation at all times specifying no exact date. The interest in revision and evaluation seemed to prove that all the systems surveyed desired an up-to-date program.
TABLE VII

ANNUAL PER PUPIL COST FOR MATERIALS USED BY DES MOINES AND CITIES OF SIMILAR POPULATION SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-40</th>
<th>41-45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines, Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akron, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte, North Carolina</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso, Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Rapids, Michigan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jersey City, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa, Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita, Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 1 5 0 2 0
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to provide information for comparative analysis of Des Moines and other cities' remedial reading programs to find out if Des Moines should consider changes for the enrichment of their program and the benefit of the children involved and to make recommendations for implementing the program in the future.

The information was obtained by sending a questionnaire to cities in the United States with similar population size. Once the information was collected, the investigator analyzed pertinent data and formulated a presentation of the data. The information received from the school systems revealed a variety of programs.

II. CONCLUSIONS

Through the analysis of the data acquired, a number of basic conclusions could be established. With a few exceptions, the investigator found the remedial reading program to be a new one in most of the school systems and that the percentage of children in the remedial programs indicated a need for the program.
All of the schools studied used classroom experiences as their basic characteristic for choosing teachers for the program. However, special reading training was used by eleven schools and eight schools considered the personality of the teacher as an important factor. Few men were involved as teachers in the remedial programs. Many systems did not employ men at all. Recommendation by the teacher, the reading level of the child, and a minimum intelligence quotient were the guidelines utilized in choosing children for participation in the program.

Six, seven, eight or nine were the ages used in first accepting children into the program. The number of children in each class period varied from four to fifteen, however, four, five or six children seemed to be the most popular class size. This data revealed to the investigator that the school systems recognized the apparent need for more individualized instruction and so provided the small class sizes to meet the needs.

The time spent in classes each week by the children ranged from two hours to eight hours weekly. However, two to five hours weekly proved to be the most popular ranges of time. One semester to two years were indicated as average lengths of stay for children in the remedial program. One and one half years in the program was most readily indicated as the average length of stay.
Most of the cities employed a variety of instructional materials for their programs. This data proved almost all of the systems displayed an interest in providing as many different instructional methods and materials as school budgets made available. Few of the systems surveyed operated remedial reading centers in all of the schools, but summer programs were a means used by which children could take advantage of the proper instruction and more children could receive the services provided by the centers. However, it was implied that if finances were available that the centers would be provided in all schools which showed a definite interest to continue with the remedial program. All but three of the schools did receive federal aid for their programs and most likely more federal aid could be obtained if the programs in these cities continued to grow and expand.

The annual per pupil cost for the materials used in the programs varied greatly. Five schools did not indicate at all a per pupil cost since it changed from year to year. Six to ten dollars was the most popular figure with one system only spending one to five dollars and two systems spending sixteen to twenty dollars. Evaluation was deemed as most important in keeping the programs appropriately implemented.
III. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the results reported, the investigator would make the following recommendations for the enrichment of Des Moines' remedial reading program:

1. That further attention be given to the development and expansion of the remedial reading program for succeeding years.

2. That more specialized personnel be included to carry out the expanding program.

3. That the program begin at the earliest possible age so that the reading problems could be eliminated before they became too severe.

4. That the remedial program be furthered to include a language arts program on the high school level.

5. That the program continue to be enriched through the purchase and use of the most effective and current instructional materials and methods.
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APPENDIXES
1517 Henderson Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa
May 25, 1968

Director of Elementary Education
Albuquerque Public Schools
721 Maple Street
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Dear Director:

Please find attached a questionnaire which is the first step in writing my thesis entitled "A Comparative Survey of the Remedial Reading Program of Des Moines, Iowa, As Compared to Remedial Reading Programs of Cities in the United States with Approximately the Same Population Size."

Since your school system is within the realm of my study, I am calling upon you for your help and cooperation. I am sure that you are aware that the success of my study will depend upon your participation in this project.

I would appreciate it if you would give the attached questionnaire your immediate and prompt attention and return it to me at your earliest convenience in the self-addressed envelope provided. I am grateful for your help and sincerely want you to know that I appreciate your interest.

Sincerely yours,

Sally Jo Lieschty
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

BACKGROUND AND SCHOOL POPULATION

1. How many schools are there in your system? _________

2. Approximately how many children are there in your school system in grades K-8? _________

3. Approximately how many children are involved in your total Remedial Reading Program? _________

4. In what year was your Remedial Reading Program started? _________
1. How many teachers are involved in the total Remedial Reading Program? ________
   a. How many are men? ________
   b. How many are women? ________

2. How are the teachers chosen for this program? (Mark all that apply.)
   ________ Masters Degree
   ________ Special Reading Training
   ________ Experience
   ________ Personality of Teacher
   ________ Other-(Explain)

3. Because it is a special program, are the Remedial Reading teachers paid a higher salary?
   ________ Yes
   ________ No

   If answered yes, approximately how much more money does each teacher receive? ________

4. If your teachers receive more salary for their work in the program, briefly explain why you think these teachers deserve more?
3. Do your teachers always stay in one building or do they serve more than one building?

_________ Stay in one building

_________ Serve more than one building
IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAM

1. How are the children chosen for your program? (Mark all that apply.)

___ Minimum Intelligence Quotient to qualify

___ 30-34
___ 35-39
___ 40-44
___ 45-49
___ 50-54
___ 55-59
___ 60-64
___ 65-69
___ 70-74
___ 75-79
___ 80-84
___ 85-89
___ 90-94
___ 95-99
___ 100-104
___ 105-109
___ Recommendation by teacher
___ Reading level of the child
___ Other—(Explain)

2. At what age are children first accepted into the program?

___ 6 years old
___ 7 years old
___ 8 years old
___ 9 years old
___ 10 years old
___ 11 years old
___ 12 years old

3. How much time is spent in Remedial Reading classes each week by the children?

___ 2-3 hours
___ 4-5 hours
___ 6-8 hours
4. Does each child spend time daily in the Remedial Reading Program?
   
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

   If no, explain briefly. (For example: ½ hour three times a week)

5. Do you have a Remedial Reading Center in each school?
   
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

   If no, how many centers do you have in your school system? _____

6. Approximately how many children are involved in each class period?

   _____ 1-3 children       _____ 10-12 children
   _____ 4-6 children       _____ 13-15 children
   _____ 7-9 children

7. How do you take care of the children who do not attend a school with a Remedial Reading Center?

   _____ Bus them to a Center.
   _____ Have a teacher visit the school at regular times.
   _____ Parents provide transportation for children to the Centers.
   _____ Remedial Reading instruction is taken care of by the regular classroom teacher.
8. Do you find that most of your program is carried on in the lower economic areas of your city?

_________ Yes

_________ No

9. What is the average length of stay for each child in the program?

_________ 1 semester

_________ 1 year

_________ 1½ years

_________ 2 years

_________ More

10. Does your system use a specific reading series for the Remedial Reading Program?

_________ Yes

_________ No

If yes, what series is used? __________

11. If a specific reading series is not used, is a multimedia type of instruction implemented? (Mark all that apply.)

_________ Filmstrips

_________ Films and Film Projectors

_________ Tapes and Tape Recorders

_________ Craig Readers

_________ Linguistics

_________ Tach-X

_________ SRA Reading Method
Records and Record Players        Pictures

Overhead Projector        Games as Motivational Devices

Programmed Reading        Concentrated Instruction

Controlled Readers        Other-(Explain)

12. Is your nine-month school program continued during the summer?

Yes
No

13. What is the terminal point of the Remedial Reading Program?

Ends at the Elementary Level
Continues through the Junior High Level
FINANCES

1. If finances were available, would you maintain Remedial Reading Centers in all schools?
   __________ Yes
   __________ No

2. Do you have a special government aid specifically appropriated to the system for your program?
   __________ Yes
   __________ No

3. What is the per pupil cost for materials of the Remedial Reading Program?
   __________ $1-$5
   __________ $6-$10
   __________ $11-$15
   __________ $16-$20
   __________ $21-$25
   __________ $26-$30
   __________ $31-$35
   __________ $36-plus
EVALUATION

1. When was the last time your Remedial Reading Program was revised? 

2. Would you like the results of this survey? 
   
   Yes 
   No 

3. If you have any other comments you would like to make about your program, please write them below.
On May 25, 1968 you were sent a letter and questionnaire from me to be filled out by you as the preliminary step in writing my thesis. The response that I have received thus far has been very good. As of this writing I have not received my reply from the Albuquerque Public Schools and I am in dire need of your questionnaire in order that I might complete my survey. I realize that this is the summer and vacation season, but I did try to make my questionnaire simple for ease of completion. May I please receive this by return mail in the very near and immediate future? Thanking you again for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Sally Jo Liechty