DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 540 CS 001 480

AUTHOR Schneider, Anita
TITLE Identification, Diagnostic and Remediation Procedures Used in Selected New Jersey Elementary Schools.
PUB DATE Jan 74
NOTE 118p.; M.Ed. Thesis, Rutgers University, The State University of New Jersey; Some pages have marginal reproducibility due to small type

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Assessment; Elementary Grades; Reading; Reading Instruction; Reading Programs; *Reading Research; Remedial Reading; *Remedial Reading Programs; *State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *New Jersey

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine what procedures were employed by the school districts in New Jersey to identify, diagnose, and service remedial readers. A random sample of 20 percent of the elementary schools in the state were sent a questionnaire to determine their reading practices for the academic year 1972-73. Responses to the questionnaire were tabulated by school, district, county, and county group. The data indicated that the procedures and criteria used in remedial reading programs in New Jersey are diverse. In most cases, the differences cut across county group, county, and district lines. However there were some areas of consensus: most of the schools select possible candidates for remedial reading instruction based on informal teacher conversations and on the results of a reading achievement test; most of the schools used as a selection criterion the fact that a student scored two or more years below grade level on a reading test; most of the schools assess a child's strengths and weaknesses in reading prior to the onset of remedial instruction; and most of the special reading classes tended to be small and generally lasted from 20 to 30 minutes per session. (WR)

IDENTIFICATION, DIAGNOSTIC AND REMEDIATION PROCEDURES USED IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

OF

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY

BY

ANITA SCHNEIDER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF

MASTER OF EDUCATION

NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY JANUARY, 1974

APPROVED: James Lyon
Phyllis Van Orden
Joseph Zelnick

DEAN:

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to give my sincerest thanks to Dr. James Swalm for the time and assistance which he has afforded me.

To my husband, Eugene Schneider, I owe a great deal of thanks for the support and encouragement that he gave me throughout the time I was working on this thesis.

Finally, to my children, Andra and Orren, I say, "Thank you" for graciously accepting many late meals while the computations and preliminary draft were being completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Background of the Problem

Every child has a right to read. This recent philosophical and educational goal has spurred federal, state, and local agencies to infuse substantial sums of money into New Jersey school districts for the improvement of the reading performance of its students.

Regardless of the quality of a school's developmental reading program, number and expertise of the staff, or socio-economic level of its pupils, some of its students will have difficulty in learning to read. Recognizing the importance of being a "reader" in today's society, educators, school administrators, teachers and parent groups have harnessed their available funds and energies into numerous and varied programs to help narrow the gap between a child's reading achievement and his capacity.

When one ponders the amount of economic and human resources involved, a basic question needs to be posed, and hopefully answered and evaluated: How are special reading programs structured?

The answer to this question, as will be shown, relates to the organization and procedures employed by the individual school districts. However, community wide factors--demographic and socio-economic may have a bearing as well on the organizational aspects of the program.

Statement of the Problem

What procedures are employed by the school districts in New Jersey to identify, diagnose and service remedial readers?

The Following Questions Were Asked

1. Among the school districts in New Jersey is there any difference in the procedures used to identify, diagnose and remediate students with reading problems?
2. Is there a relationship between the percentage of children serviced and the location of the district?
3. Is there a relationship between the percentage of children serviced and the socio-economic and demographic status of the district?
4. Among the school districts in New Jersey is there any difference in the percentage of schools offering remedial programs?

5. In New Jersey, are all children in need of remedial instruction receiving it, regardless of the community in which they reside?

Importance of the Study

The success of any program, whether massive or small in scale, cannot be assumed until it is evaluated. Evaluation involves knowledge and knowledge in turn involves information. There is a paucity of information concerning the organization of remedial reading programs in New Jersey. This report will attempt to provide some of this information.

Recent studies and reports have shown a positive correlation between the socio-economic level of a neighborhood and/or community and the school services offered its residents. It is imperative to see if this generalization holds true to the special reading programs in New Jersey.

Limitations of the Study

Studies based on questionnaire samplings share a common denominator--their limitations. There are several limiting factors common to all studies of this kind and a few which apply to this one in particular.

The accuracy of the responses will be taken at face value. Although the questionnaire is being sent to the school principal in many cases he will not be the respondent. Hopefully the person to whom it will be referred has the necessary information and will answer it correctly.

Another limiting factor is the respondent's mood and attitude. If he does not take adequate time to respond, or if he does not view the survey as important, the accuracy of his responses may suffer. Not being present, this writer will have no way of knowing how many, if any questionnaires fall into this category.

Length of the questionnaire may also have some bearing on the attitude of the respondent, thus possibly influencing his response. This study being part of a larger and more comprehensive questionnaire may suffer.

How general will the conclusions of this study be? Can the results of this study be generalized to other states? The answer, unfortunately, has to be in the negative. New Jersey is an atypical state--most densely populated state in the country; small area containing a relatively large population; high per

capita income; strong home rule; small amount of money (per student) supplied by the state for education--and any findings of this study can and should not be generalized to the rest of the country.

However, although the conclusions cannot apply outside of New Jersey, certainly the procedure of the study can be duplicated in other areas should the results warrant it.

Operational Definitions

For the purposes of this study these definitions will apply to the following terms.

Diagnosis refers to an analysis of the degree and nature of the problem with the aim of correcting or remedying the difficulty.

Identification is a process of screening, by the use of formal or informal testing and or observation, those children who may be remedial readers.

Procedures include testing, (formal or informal) observation, criteria and any other techniques used by the school district.

Remedial Reading refers to a program of techniques and procedures used in small groups outside of the regular classroom to help improve the reading

performance of those students designated as remedial readers. The maximum number of pupils per class is ten students and the minimum number of class meetings is twice weekly for the majority of the academic year.

Elementary School refers to a public school comprising grades K-8, or any part thereof, listed by the New Jersey School Directory 1972-73 as an elementary school.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

What constitutes a comprehensive, efficient, and effective remedial program? What components does it include? These questions do not lend themselves to numerous experimental studies. There is, however, a significant amount of literature on the subject, much of which has been written by noted persons in the field. With few experimental studies to substantiate their contentions these authors have instead relied on their years of experience of dealing with remedial readers--their successes and their failures.

Identification (Screening)

An important component of any effective program is the screening of all students. The White House Conference on Children (1970) recommends that each school district should screen all children to locate potential and already present reading difficulties.

Screening can be accomplished via different means. Dechant (1968) views the screening process as a means of separating students who are most likely to

need special reading instruction from those who are not likely to need it. Once the former group is identified they should be referred for further analysis.

The screening process begins with an evaluation of the reading achievement of the entire class, according to Bond and Tinker (1967). Assessment techniques and instruments at this level include formal reading tests--group standardized, end of basal reader; individual--informal reading measures and teacher observations.

Standardized group tests are the most commonly used technique to assess a child's achievement in comparison with the general norming population. Bond and Tinker (1967); Barrett (1967); and Trider (1971) advocate the use of survey tests to gauge the progress of groups or individuals; strengths and weaknesses; inconsistencies between ability and achievement scores that merit more intensive study and those children falling considerably below the average level who may be candidates for remedial instruction.

Proponents see this type of test as serving a valuable function. They are relatively inexpensive, easy to administer and can be given to large groups of children at a single sitting. In short--they are

efficient. They yield a maximum amount of information for a minimum amount of cost, effort and time and seem especially suited for large school districts.

There is a small but prolific group of professionals who favor the use of informal reading inventories as a method of assessment. In the forefront of these advocates are Johnson and Kress (1964) who claim that although they take longer to administer per child (at best they can only be given to small groups at a time) the results warrant this expenditure of time. Whereas users of standardized group tests argue about whether the grade levels achieved are the instructional or frustration level of the student; informal reading inventories yield three distinct reading levels--frustration, instructional, and independent--for each student. Rather than being based on norms they are based on criteria. Thus a student is ranked according to standards determined by test authors (many times teachers) rather than by how well the norming population performed.

A group of authors including Deighton (1971) and Bond and Tinker (1967) favor a combination of both standardized and informal methods of testing.

While many argue the merits of each or both, Buros (1972) contends that the selection of tests for purposes of identification is largely a matter of judgment--there being no evidence in the research showing the universal superiority of any one reading test for either group screening or individual diagnosis.

One point on which there is little disagreement is the use to which tests are put. Too many schools use the "test, score, and file" routine. As Smith (1969) succinctly states, "no test is worth anything if results are not evaluated and put to use." Finally, screening should be relatively simple, fast, inexpensive, valid, reliable and productive (Dechant, 1968).

Besides identifying those students performing below grade and or expectancy level, screening devices should also show the strengths and weaknesses of a school's developmental reading program. The quality of a school's reading program and staff will help limit the number of candidates for remedial reading, but despite this a number of youngsters will exhibit reading difficulties. Strang (1968) estimates this number to be between 10 and 25% of a school's population. Bond and Tinker (1967) cite a range of 10-18%; Harris (1970) states his figures at 12%; and Deighton (1971)

claims that 10-15% of the student population of a school have a reading disability of 1 year.

Diagnosis

Diagnosis has been defined as the "determining or analysis of the cause or nature of a problem or situation" (Random House Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged Ed., New York: Random House, 1966).

The immediate aim of diagnosis is the determination of the reading difficulty and if possible its cause. This process can be carried out to varying degrees of completeness by teachers, remedial specialists, special services teams, and clinical centers, depending on the complexity of the individual case, funds available and philosophy of the school. The core of this procedure is not just testing, but rather an intelligent and sensitive interpretation of the facts, and its natural outcome, a plan for treatment (Harris, 1970).

Whereas screening is a general assessment of the school body, diagnosis is an individual evaluation of a specific portion of the student population. It is intended only for those pupils who have been

identified as possible disabled and/or retarded readers (either reading below grade level or below expected capacity) (Money, 1961).

Harris (1953) presents the blueprint very succinctly. Diagnosis is a systematic exploration carried on by an individual who has the theoretical background and the practical experience to "1) know what questions to ask; 2) select procedures which supply the needed facts; 3) interpret the meaning of the findings correctly; and 4) comprehend the interrelationship of these facts and meanings so as to come out with a clear, correct and useful understanding of the problem situation."

What information is necessary to diagnose a child and how is it compiled? For without the necessary data there cannot be a proper evaluation. There is general agreement concerning the types of testing and information needed to evaluate a child's reading performance and hopefully find the cause of his disability, but not as to the weight that each of these factors play. These include a health examination--hearing, vision, speech, dominance; and standardized tests--individual intelligence, oral reading, silent reading,

and diagnostic. Kottmeyer (1959) also sees the need of a spelling diagnostic test.

Factors Causing Reading Disabilities

In the past there was general agreement in the literature concerning the types of testing and other information needed to diagnose a child's reading performance and hopefully find the cause of his disability. These included health data--hearing, vision, general physical condition, severe illnesses--and academic data, consisting of general school performance and results of intelligence, oral and silent reading and diagnostic tests.

Several decades ago, the pendulum swung from the importance dominance (or lack of it) had on reading to the role played by intelligence. In the 1930's many "authorities" found a very high correlation between I.Q. and reading achievement. Malmquist (1960) in her search of the literature dealing with factors related to reading disabilities states that Theisen in 1921, Deputy in 1930, and Hayes in 1933 found correlations ranging from +0.40 to 0.60; Tinker in 1932 and Davidson in 1931 contending that I.Q. was the most important factor. It was Durrell in 1933, who gleaned

that the very high correlations were due in large measure to the fact that the I.Q. tests being administered in the above studies were in essence reading tests. It is now common practice to give non-verbal intelligence tests (at least during diagnosis). Malmquist in her study of over 10,000 students in Sweden found positive but not particularly high correlations between the results of intelligence and reading tests.

As the field of reading has become more of an interdisciplinary effort, the latest swing of the pendulum is away from the health and academic data as the major factor (but certainly not ignoring them) and emphasizing the role that social, emotional, economic and environmental conditions play in determining our academic achievement.

Dyer (1968) in summarizing three research studies, maintains that the correlation of socio-economic status with pupil achievement "generally runs high--so high indeed that it is difficult . . . how much impact the schools per se are having on pupils." He notes that a study undertaken by Goodman (Quality Measurement Project) for New York State Education

Department in 1957-58, found that the correlation of socio-economic status to achievement to be .61.

Concurring with this viewpoint is Patricia Sexton (1961). In a study of a mid-western city (she names it Big City) she found that reading ability as expressed by scores on the Iowa Achievement Test is closely associated with social class. For her study all of the schools were grouped by the average income level of the parents in the area. After looking at the average test scores of each school she concluded that achievement scores tended to go up as income tended to go up. The greatest difference in the scores was in the area of reading. In group 1 (schools where average parent income is under $3,000 per year) 96% of the schools were below grade level; whereas in group IV (average income being $9,000) 0% of the school scored below grade level.

Mayeski (1969) also recognizing this complexity contends that socio-economic and racial variables explain 70-80% of between-school variance on first grade test scores which he analyzed.

Money (1966) in comparing the percentage of children more than one year retarded in reading for his study, found that Metropolis had failure rates

two-thirds higher than Commuter County; three times higher than Suburbia; and more than fifty times higher than the independent schools. His results caused him to note that "motivation, like intelligence, is shaped by environment."

The effect of socio-economic status on general academic achievement in general, and reading achievement in particular, is not limited to the United States. Malmquist (1960) conducting her study in Sweden, found a significant relation between reading ability and parents' joint taxable income on the .01 level.

Wilson (1963) directed his study to include a new variable. Using 6th grade students in Berkeley, California as his population, he sought to analyze the effects of social stratification on the academic achievement of these children. The students were enrolled in fourteen different elementary schools. The author then divided the schools into three distinct social and geographical strata--following the lines of residential areas in the community. The strata included the Hills (occupied by the highest economic class); the Foothills (middle class); and the Flats (lowest economic class).

Wilson found a relationship between academic achievement based on reading, arithmetic scores and I.Q.'s and school strata. Students in the Hills were superior to those in the Foothills who were superior to those in the Flats. In reading, virtually all of the boys from the Hills were reading on grade level as opposed to one-half the boys in the Foothills, and two-fifths of those in the Flats.

The researcher noted that education, occupation and race are highly intercorrelated and help determine where a person resides. In a few cases where a family belonged to one social class but lived in a non-corresponding area, Wilson noted some cases where the boy's achievement corresponded not to his socio-economic class but to the area in which he lived and went to school. Sexton (1961) believes that class values influence the school curriculum, which may account for this finding by Wilson.

Whereas Wilson studied the effects of inter-community geographic areas on achievement, others have conducted studies of the relationship of geographic regions. The results of the Millenkoph-Melville study (reported in Dyer, 1962) showed high relationships between test scores and geographical location (south

vs. other regions); per-pupil expenditure; urbanism and number of specialists on the school staff. Klineberg (Ebel, 1969) confirms the Millenkopf-Melville findings. The results of his study showed that rural southern Negro children begin far behind urban southern Negroes. However, after a number of years of both groups living in New York City the difference disappears.

The federal government recognizing the close correlation between economic deprivation and education retardation enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. (United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966.) Title I of this act channels money into the local school system to "combat the education deprivation of disadvantaged youngsters whose specific needs have not been fulfilled by their regular school programs." As a result of this Act remedial reading programs have sprung up across the country.

Assessment of Remedial Readers

Regardless of the factors contributing to a child's reading disability, it is vital to pinpoint his reading level, strengths and weaknesses and preferred

mode of learning as accurately as possible. Bond and Tinker (1967) see as the first step in acquiring this information submitting the child to a series of standardized group tests to be supplemented by informal testing if warranted. These tests include: an individual intelligence test; diagnostic test; and an oral reading test. A good oral reading test and a proficient examiner should reveal the child's instructional reading level; relative rate of reading; fluency; phrasing; particular types of errors made--reversals, substitutions, omissions, general language development; enunciation; articulation; expression of thoughts and ideas; use of word attack skills; sight word recognition; level of comprehension--literal and inferential. The scores yielded on these tests will provide the quantitative evaluation. The examiner by careful observation and notations will provide the qualitative appraisal of the reading performance.

With testing and evaluation completed the specialist (reading or learning) is now ready to suggest a plan of instruction based on the causal factors of the difficulty and the instructional level and needs of the child. Answered will be such questions

as: What kind of training is necessary? Should remediation take place within or outside the regular classroom? How often should the child receive additional instruction? In short--what type of program can best serve the child's needs to result in efficient improvement in his reading performance.

Organization of Remedial Classes

At what age should remediation begin? The trend in current literature says "the earlier the better." Katrina de Hirsch (1966) contends after a study of pre-kindergarten children that by evaluating a child's perceptual, motor and language behavior at an early age one can predict academic success or failure for the youngster. This proponent of early diagnosis and treatment feels that since early prediction is possible, early treatment is necessary to head off emotional difficulties. In a more recent book written in conjunction with Jeannette Jansky (1972) their point of view is further emphasized. "We can no longer . . . wait until children are in trouble. If intervention is to be timely and effective, it is imperative to identify potentially failing readers at the earliest possible age [p. 1]."

This procedure showed positive results in Sweden where drastic reduction of reading disabilities were noted by Malmquist (Figuel, 1963) as a result of early identification and appropriate treatment.

The United States government also adopted this belief and revised their guidelines for Title I for the school year 1972-73 to cover those youngsters in grades K-3.

A primary grade student becomes a candidate for a remedial reading class when he is seriously below grade (or expectancy) level and requires specialized instruction in an individual or small group situation. Shiffman (1966) reports that in Baltimore County a child meets the criteria for remediation if his intelligence ranges from slightly below average to superior, and can comprehend material more difficult than that which he can read independently.

The size of the group for this type of program is discussed in the literature with no disagreement--groups should be small with a maximum of about 6. (Smith, 1969; Harris, 1970; Deighton, 1971) Johnson and Platts (1962) in a study conducted in England found no significant difference in gains between group and individual procedures. (Ebel, 1969) Keating (1962),

however, did find individual remediation significantly more effective. (Ebel, 1969)

After selecting the children and deciding upon the number in each "class" the next step is assigning the students to the various classes. This can be done by various common means--age, grade, sex, reading level, skill deficiency and needs. Smith (1969) reports that there is a difference of opinion on whether to group by age or sex, while Shiffman (1966), Bond and Tinker (1967), and Harris (1970) recommend grouping according to need. However grouped, the teaching should be geared to the individual child. (Deighton, 1971)

The question of duration and frequency of instruction of remedial class meetings depends on the workload of the reading specialist and/or the budget and philosophy of the school. Shiffman (1966) states that the children in his district attend the reading clinic from 9-11:40 daily. Deighton (1971) feels that the more severe cases should receive a minimum of three lessons weekly.

The more important question may be how long and intensive should treatment be. Barlow (1965) in a study conducted at the University of Minnesota reading clinic found that severe reading disability is not corrected by short-term intensive courses of treatment, although this treatment helps. The implication of this finding is that severe cases need long-term treatment. A study done by Lovell, Bryne and Richardson in Britain concluded similar findings. Their study consisted of 240 full-time remedial class pupils. After one year in this class they showed a 2 year gain and were returned to a regular classroom situation. Sixteen months later these children were re-tested. The results showed that the pupils had continued to improve, but at a slower rate; thus dropping farther behind their peers.

The type of instruction is still another factor worthy of consideration. The composite of opinions and suggestions is that instruction should be highly individualized catering to the child's needs and interests; it should use materials most used in the regular classroom; techniques should be varied; emphasis should be on success rather than errors; help improve the child's self image; and hopefully

instill an interest in reading. As Harris (1970) so aptly states, "I remain convinced that no . . . method or material provides a panacea for all."

Socio-Economic Influences on School Services

Although there have been many studies showing the relationship between race, socio-economic status, social mobility, home and parental influence and reading achievement (Ebel, 1969), this writer has only been able to find two studies dealing with the relationship of socio-economic factors and the reading services that a school provides.

Patricia Sexton (1961) in a study of a mid-western city found that those youngsters needing help the least (parents annual income was $7,000-$9,000) receive more service than those needing the service most--those in the lowest income schools. To document this contention she reports that 3.9% of all the schools in the lower income half of the community had a full time reading instructor, whereas 41.9% of schools in the upper-half had one.

The United States Senate, cognizant of this situation established a Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity on February 19, 1970. Its

task was "to study the effectiveness of existing laws and policies in assuring equality of educational opportunity . . . ." (Senate Resolution 359) On December 31, 1972 this Select Committee issued its final report.

In concluding their chapter on inequality in education, the Committee maintains that facilities and services in public schools are often distributed in inverse relation to need. This is the same conclusion that Patricia Sexton came to in her study of Big City. This condition results in the wealthiest communities who need it the least, getting the best services while the poor communities in great need of these services, receiving the least.

The finding is upheld by Guthrie et al. in their report on Schools and Inequality (1969). The authors, in a concentrated study, examined the relationships between pupil socio-economic status, the quality of available school services, pupil achievement and student post-school performance. For their domain, this group surveyed a number of varied school districts in Michigan--large cities, suburbs, and rural areas with low population densities. The findings agreed with those of the Senate Select Committee; namely,

high quality school services are provided to children of wealthy homes, with children from poor homes receiving poorer quality school services.

The authors found that among school districts in Michigan those with higher percentages of students from affluent families had more administrative services, curricular offerings, and special education services for the handicapped. Low socio-economic status schools were more crowded, less well equipped, had fewer library books per 1,000 students, were less likely to have remedial educational services, services for speech correction for students deficient in English, for students with physical handicaps, or for students with behavior and adjustment problems. In summary, the authors found that "socio economic status is an excellent predictor of available school services."

Summary

The success of a remedial reading program depends, in part, upon its having an overall structure based on four stages--identification of possible candidates through broad screening; individual diagnosis and assessment; and remediation, with the

goal of alleviating the disability so that the child can function adequately in a normal classroom situation.

A review of the literature finds no disagreement concerning these schema. Differing viewpoints and contentions emerge in the implementation of this broad blueprint. Whereas everyone agrees to the value of testing, there are those favoring group standardized tests while others see more value in informal testing. A third group recommends the use of both types of testing.

In the area of diagnosis the apparent consensus is that it is vital to remediation. Since this process can be costly (because of the many specialists involved), the prevailing viewpoint is that the intensity of diagnosis should be commensurate with the severity of the individual disability.

The value of remediation is broadly accepted. Points of contention arise over how to make remediation more efficient and effective. Various recommendations have been made concerning the optimum size of the group; method of grouping; and length and intensity of the program.

The inclusion of remedial reading within a general schoolwide educational program is an accepted fact today. Professional literature suggests that in the future we will probably continue to read many more ideas and suggestions about how it can best be implemented and meet the needs of the children it involves.

While much of the literature deals with the structure of special reading programs, a crop of current studies deal with factors relating to reading achievement and general school services. The themes of these studies, which were conducted in many and varied sections of the country, are: children of the low socio-economic strata exhibit lower reading achievement than middle class children; the reading ability of children residing in cities and rural areas is below that of suburban children; services of a school generally reflect the financial resources of its population. Wealthier school districts tend to provide more services than poorer districts.

The impact of these findings have had substantial political repercussions. They have resulted in state and federal aid to help offset

this imbalance, a number of well publicized court cases, and continuing Congressional hearings.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

To obtain information concerning reading practices in New Jersey public schools, a questionnaire was sent to 20% of the schools in the state. This writer concerned only with remedial reading programs on the elementary level dealt with the elementary schools in the sample. This chapter contains descriptions of the population, the questionnaire, its coding and distribution, and the treatment of the data.

Population

To ascertain the number of children involved in remedial reading programs and practices employed in these programs during the 1972-73 school year, 447 elementary schools in New Jersey were sampled. Every fifth school from the New Jersey School Directory 1972-73 was chosen making for a random sample. The selection was administered by the Division of Research and Planning of the Department of Education, and then forwarded to the Division of Curriculum and

Instruction. The selected schools constituted the sample population. Responses were received from 386 of these schools.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire was prepared and distributed by the State Department of Education to obtain information about current reading practices. To determine the content of the questionnaire, a list of topics suggested by the literature was drawn up. These were then submitted to a committee of the New Jersey Reading Teachers Association and a separate committee of County Helping Teachers for comments and evaluation. A final list of topics was then compiled by the reading staff of the Department and forwarded to the Division of Research and Planning.

The topics were written into questionnaires. Three forms were developed: one to be submitted to all district central offices in the state; an elementary school form to be sent to principals in those schools designated as elementary by the New Jersey School Directory and chosen as sample schools; and a secondary school form to be sent to those secondary schools included in the sample population.

County departments of education aided in the distribution, completion (by answering any questions) and collection of the questionnaires from the selected schools within their jurisdiction.

Although the total questionnaire was relatively lengthy, great care was taken to make the questions as clear and brief as possible without sacrificing the needed information.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted in three counties, namely, Somerset, Monmouth and Middlesex. Within these counties the questionnaire was given to ten reading specialists representing large and average cities, and elementary and K-12 school districts. They were instructed to read and comment on the clarity, degree of difficulty to answer the questions and the length of the questionnaire. Although most comments were favorable, some recommendations were accepted and changes made accordingly, especially in the wording of the responses.

Treatment of the Data

Completed responses to the questionnaire in Appendix B were tabulated and coded by county, district and school. Each county was numbered (1-21) by alphabetical order. Each district within the county having a school sampled was numbered, and each school sampled was designated by letter. Some districts had more than 1 school in the sample population.

Schools were credited with having a remedial/supplemental program if their program met the following criteria: remedial/supplemental classes had a maximum of 10 students; met a minimum of 2 times weekly for most of the academic year; and instruction by a certified teacher took place outside of the regular classroom. All schools not offering a program and/or not meeting this criteria were classified as "no program" schools. Of the schools sampled 43 offered no program and 22 schools offered programs not meeting the criteria of this study.

This writer was concerned with 13 questions in the questionnaire dealing with remedial reading practices (see Appendix B). By scoring each part of each answer separately 27 responses were scored and tabulated for each school.

The data was compiled into county totals. The counties were then grouped according to a typology prepared for a report, "Classification of Municipalities" written by the New Jersey County and Municipal Government Study Commission in 1973. The counties fall into seven categories:

Group 1 - rural northwestern; consisting of Warren, Hunterdon, and Sussex

Group 2a - suburban New York; including Middlesex, Monmouth, Mercer, and Passaic

Group 2b - suburban Philadelphia; including Burlington, Camden, and Gloucester

Group 3 - affluent suburban New York; comprising Morris, Bergen, Union, and Somerset

Group 4 - undeveloped Atlantic Coast, comprising Atlantic, Cape May, and Ocean

Group 5 - rural southwest; consisting of Cumberland and Salem

Group 6 - highly urban; including Essex and Hudson

To arrive at a county group profile of remedial reading practices, this writer selected those procedures and criteria which at least 50% of the schools in a county group responded that they used on a regular basis. (In this questionnaire those responses in the "always" or "very important" columns.)

In addition data from three questions--percent of children serviced, number of schools offering no remedial or supplemental program, and the frequency of class meetings was compiled and grouped by community type. The sampled schools and their communities were divided into six classes based on common characteristics. These classes included: central cities; stable suburbs; affluent suburbs; developing suburbs; average suburban communities; and outlying rural communities. The report "Classification of Municipalities" supplied the typology for the grouping of the districts.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As noted earlier, responses were received from 386 of the 447 elementary schools sampled. This chapter, dealing with the tabulated data derived from the questionnaires, examines the results utilizing county group profiles of remedial reading practices, and discusses the findings in comparison with the literature. In addition, selected data dealing with remedial services is analyzed by community type.

Results

The results of this study show that procedures used in remedial reading programs in New Jersey are diverse. In most cases this disparity cuts across county group, county and district lines. There are, however, some areas of consensus.

The overwhelming majority of schools identify possible candidates for remedial reading instruction based upon informal teacher conversation and or the results of a reading achievement test. These results are shown in Table 1 (see p. 39). Table 2 (see p. 41)

indicates that a majority of schools offer individual diagnosis "in all cases."

In the selection process the criteria selected by most schools showing the greatest agreement were: scoring 2 or more years below grade level on a reading test (Table 13); the use of teacher recommendation in selecting students (Table 18); potential to benefit from instruction (Table 15); and the results of diagnostic testing (Table 17). (These tables are found on pp. 54-61.)

Prior to the start of instruction, diagnosis of a pupil's strengths and weaknesses was achieved in most schools by teacher observation and reading diagnostic test in six of the seven county groups. (See Tables 18-22 on pp. 61-65.)

Remedial reading classes generally consisted of fewer than 6 students (Table 3, p. 42) who were grouped in a majority of the schools on a basis of reading level, skill deficiency and a combination of the two. These findings are borne out in Tables 6-8 (see pp. 45-47).

Questions

1. Among the school districts in New Jersey is there any difference in the procedures used to identify, diagnose and remediate students with reading problems?

The results of this study (Table 1) reveal that elementary schools in the state employ varied screening procedures to identify remedial readers. Whereas there is virtual unanimity in the use of informal teacher conversations and reading achievement tests, the variance in the use of end of basal tests runs from a low of 27.0% to a high of 75% and testing by Special Services varies from 0-33%. All county groups used intelligence tests to some degree with the range from 41.6% to 63.3%. Informal testing was done in only 4 of the 7 county groups and in these by a relatively small number of schools.

All children identified as possible candidates for remedial instruction were diagnosed in 60% of the schools in county group 2b (minimum) while in county group 1 all candidates were diagnosed in 83.3% of the schools. Although a majority of the schools in all groups diagnosed all candidates, nonetheless as

TABLE 1

SCREENING PROCEDURES PRACTICED BY SELECTED
NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	Informal Teacher Conversation	Reading Achievement Test	End of Basal Test	Intelligence Test	Special Services Testing	Informal Test
1	91.6	100	67	41.6	33	0
2a	96.8	94.6	29.7	58.5	11.7	9.5
2b	95.4	95.4	75.0	61.3	0	0
3	94.2	93.1	39.0	63.2	18.3	12.6
4	89.4	100	73.6	52.6	21.0	5.2
5	100	100	63.3	63.3	9.0	0
6	97.2	97.2	27.0	45.9	0	5.4

seem in Table 2 a gap of 23.3% existed between the counties.

All county groups offered remedial instruction but procedures varied regarding frequency, size and duration of class meetings; as well as criteria used for grouping the students in these classes (see Tables 3-10). Tables 3 and 4 illustrate that most schools held daily classes and that classes meeting 4 times a week were the least preferred. Most classes throughout the state were small (fewer than 6). In one county group (1) there was unanimity with all schools having fewer than 6 students in their remedial classes. County group 6 exhibited the smallest percentage with 61.7% of its schools having small classes.

Duration of class meetings showed great variation within each county group with the exception of group 5 where all classes met for between 20 and 30 minutes per session.

2. Is there any relationship between the percentage of children serviced and the location of the district?

As was previously mentioned the county groups were determined largely by geographic and demographic

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY OF DIAGNOSIS IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	In All Cases	In Most Cases	In Some Cases	Only in Severe Cases
1	83.3	16.6	0	0
2a	75.2	13.4	10.3	1.0
2b	60.0	17.7	13.3	8.8
3	82.9	11.0	2.2	3.3
4	77.2	13.6	9.0	0
5	68.4	15.2	15.2	0
6	65.0	17.5	10.0	7.5

TABLE 3

SIZE AND LENGTH OF CLASSES IN SELECTED
NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

County Group	Percentage of Classes With		Percentage of Classes Meeting	
	1-5 Pupils	6-10 Pupils	20-30 Minutes	35 or More Minutes
1	100	0	69.2	30.8
2a	77.2	22.8	57.7	42.3
2b	69.0	31.0	58.6	41.4
3	81.1	18.9	69.6	30.4
4	72.4	27.6	31.8	68.2
5	79.9	20.1	100	0
6	61.7	38.3	46.2	53.8

TABLE 4

FREQUENCY OF CLASS MEETINGS IN SELECTED
NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

County Group	Percentage of Classes Meeting			
	2 Times Weekly	3 Times Weekly	4 Times Weekly	Daily
1	21.6	54.1	5.8	18.3
2a	21.0	21.0	10.8	47.4
2b	32.6	20.3	13.7	32.4
3	37.6	23.9	10.1	27.0
4	21.1	16.4	18.2	44.1
5	7.7	14.4	5.6	72.1
6	31.2	16.0	15.2	37.5

TABLE 5

USE OF AGE AS A BASIS FOR GROUPING IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	14.2	14.2	14.2	14.2	42.8
2a	15.5	24.6	24.6	22.0	12.9
2b	19.0	28.5	23.8	21.4	7.1
3	17.5	29.7	25.6	17.5	9.4
4	0	35.0	15.0	40.0	10.0
5	20.0	20.0	10.0	50.0	0
6	9.0	30.3	21.2	24.2	15.1

TABLE 6

USE OF GRADE AS A BASIS FOR GROUPING IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	28.4	14.2	28.4	14.2	14.2
2a	26.7	46.5	19.7	5.8	1.1
2b	27.2	36.3	25.0	6.8	4.5
3	37.9	30.3	17.7	8.8	5.0
4	31.5	26.3	31.5	0	10.5
5	18.1	36.2	18.0	27.1	0
6	34.2	39.4	18.4	7.8	0

TABLE 7

USE OF READING LEVEL AS A BASIS FOR GROUPING IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	50.0	12.5	12.5	25.0	0
2a	63.5	25.6	8.2	1.1	1.1
2b	77.7	20.0	2.3	0	0
3	61.2	25.0	8.7	3.7	1.2
4	68.4	26.3	5.2	0	0
5	90.8	0	0	9.0	0
6	55.2	23.6	15.7	5.2	0

TABLE 8

USE OF SKILL DEFICIENCIES AS A BASIS FOR GROUPING IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	50.0	50.0	0	0	0
2a	65.5	29.8	3.4	0	1.1
2b	77.2	18.1	4.5	0	0
3	60.4	32.0	4.9	1.2	1.2
4	73.6	15.7	10.5	0	0
5	81.3	9.0	0	9.0	0
6	64.7	11.7	11.7	11.7	0

TABLE 9

USE OF READING LEVEL AND SKILLS AS A BASIS FOR GROUPING
IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	50.0	50.0	0	0	0
2a	69.5	25.6	3.6	1.2	0
2b	84.7	10.8	2.1	2.1	0
3	65.8	22.7	8.8	1.2	1.2
4	70.0	15.0	15.0	0	0
5	81.3	9.0	0	9.0	0
6	68.4	15.7	7.8	7.8	0

TABLE 10

USE OF INTERESTS AS A BASIS FOR GROUPING IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	0	28.5	0	42.8	28.5
2a	5.3	18.6	28.0	37.3	10.6
2b	6.9	18.6	34.8	32.5	6.9
3	8.1	28.3	12.1	40.5	10.8
4	5.0	10.0	15.0	50.0	20.0
5	0	44.4	33.3	22.2	0
6	3.0	33.3	18.1	30.3	15.1

factors. As seen in Table 11 the schools in the rural northwestern counties (group 1) serviced 5.1% of its school population (the lowest of any group), whereas the suburban northcentral counties serviced more of their students than any group by remediating 11.0% of their school population.

3. Is there any relationship between the percentage of children serviced and the socio-economic and demographic status of the district?

Table 12 illustrates that a smaller percentage of children from the affluent suburbs (6.9%) received remedial instruction than did those children residing in central cities (11.6%). Other community types serviced a percentage of their students ranging between these two figures.

4. Among the school districts in New Jersey is there any difference in the percentage of schools offering remedial programs?

Regardless of whether the school districts are grouped by county or community type (see Tables 11 and 12) districts located in the rural areas of New Jersey offered fewer remedial programs than did

TABLE 11

MEAN DATA CONCERNING CHILDREN RECEIVING REMEDIAL READING INSTRUCTION AND SCHOOLS NOT OFFERING ANY PROGRAM IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

County Groups	% Children Serviced	% Schools With No Program	N Respondents	Total Enrollment Sampled Schools
1	5.1	42.1	19	13,434
2a	11.0	8.8	79	34,090
2b	7.8	20.0	55	20,861
3	8.8	13.0	92	37,271
4	8.8	28.6	28	10,204
5	10.9	31.2	16	5,282
6	8.7	31.3	42	23,663

TABLE 12

PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN RECEIVING REMEDIAL READING INSTRUCTION IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS BY COMMUNITY TYPE

Class	Community Type	% Students Serviced	% Schools With No Program	Total Enrollment	N
1	Central City	11.6	15.4	26,252	45
2	Stable Community	10.9	13.0	16,863	43
3	Affluent Suburb	6.9	16.7	23,079	54
4	Developing Suburb	7.1	17.1	18,710	35
5	Average Suburban Community	11.3	12.0	29,333	81
6	Outlying Rural Community	7.3	50.0	5,897	18

districts in other areas of the state. County groups 1 and 5 had 42.1% and 31.2% of their schools respectively offering "no programs." When grouped by community type the disparity is even more glaring. Whereas Classes 1-5 vary from 12.0% to 17.1%; 50% of the schools in Class 6 do not offer any remedial programs.

5. In New Jersey all children in need of remedial instruction can receive it, regardless of the community in which they reside.

A disabled or retarded reader did not receive remedial reading instruction if he attended a school not offering a remedial program (Tables 11 and 12). Even children attending schools which offered programs may have been denied instruction if he scored less than 2 years below grade level on a reading test (see Tables 13 and 14).

The results of this study indicate that questions 1-4 can be answered affirmatively, whereas the response to question 5 is a negative one.

TABLE 13

CRITERION FOR SELECTION OF STUDENTS IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: SCORING TWO OR MORE YEARS BELOW GRADE LEVEL ON A READING TEST

County Groups	Percentage Deeming It				
	Very Important	Important	Average Importance	Slight Importance	Not Important
1	75.0	25.0	0	0	0
2a	60.0	30.5	5.8	2.3	1.1
2b	68.1	20.4	0	4.5	6.8
3	71.9	13.2	6.0	1.2	1.2
4	80.9	19.0	0	0	0
5	100	0	0	0	0
6	69.4	22.2	5.5	2.7	0

TABLE 14

CRITERION FOR SELECTION OF STUDENTS IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: SCORING ONE YEAR BELOW GRADE LEVEL ON A READING TEST

County Groups	Percentage Deeming It				
	Very Important	Important	Average Importance	Slight Importance	Not Important
1	8.3	50.0	25.0	8.3	8.3
2a	28.4	39.7	18.1	7.9	5.6
2b	35.0	42.5	10.0	5.0	7.5
3	36.8	39.0	13.3	4.6	0
4	35.0	35.0	20.0	0	10.0
5	88.9	11.1	0	0	0
6	33.3	43.5	15.3	5.1	2.5

Results of County Group Practices

This section will contain county group profiles of mean remedial reading programs based on data compiled from the questionnaire.

County Group 1 comprises the rural northwestern counties of Warren, Hunterdon, and Sussex. Responses were received from 19 schools in this region. Of their total enrollment (grades 1-8) 5.1% of their pupils received remedial reading instruction. This is the lowest percentage serviced by any county group as is seen in Table 11 (see p. 51). This Table also shows that this group had a considerably higher percentage of "no program" schools than any group and significantly more than the statewide mean.

In screening potential candidates for remedial instruction the rural northwestern schools conformed to the overall state pattern by utilizing informal teacher conversations and reading achievement tests. A majority of the schools also employed the end of basal reader test. Although all groups tended to individually diagnose all potential candidates, more schools in this region performed this service than elsewhere (see Table 2, p. 41).

This group of rural northwestern counties select their students on much the same bases as other county groups, namely; the children will generally be 2 or more years below grade level (based on a reading test); and exhibit the potential to benefit from the additional instruction and be recommended by a teacher. Results of their diagnostic testing also had a determining factor in their selection (see Tables 13-17).

In diagnosing pupil's skills and needs prior to instruction, the group adhered to the general statewide practice of relying heavily on teacher observation (Table 18). Table 19 points out that achievement tests were used by only 25% of the schools all of the time and diagnostic tests in 36.3% (Table 20), being the only group where fewer than the majority of schools used them in "all cases." The results of standardized oral and intelligence tests were used less by these respondents than by those in other groups. (Refer to Tables 21 and 22.)

All remedial reading classes in Group 1 are small (fewer than 6) as is seen in Table 3 (p. 42). Most classes met three times a week with class periods generally running 20-30 minutes. The class groupings

TABLE 15

CRITERION FOR SELECTION IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: POTENTIAL TO BENEFIT FROM EXTRA INSTRUCTION

County Groups	Percentage Deeming It				
	Very Important	Important	Average Importance	Slight Importance	Not Important
1	50.0	41.6	8.3	0	0
2a	63.0	29.3	4.3	1.0	2.1
2b	60.4	31.2	0	2.0	6.0
3	58.1	31.9	5.5	2.2	3.3
4	57.1	28.5	14.2	0	0
5	82.0	9.0	9.0	0	0
6	57.5	32.5	5.0	2.5	2.5

TABLE 16

CRITERION FOR SELECTION IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: USE OF TEACHER RECOMMENDATION

County Groups	Percentage Deeming It				
	Very Important	Important	Average Importance	Slight Importance	Not Important
1	75.0	25.0	0	0	0
2a	63.5	33.3	2.0	1.0	0
2b	53.0	34.6	12.2	0	0
3	68.1	25.3	5.5	1.1	0
4	59.0	40.9	0	0	0
5	58.4	16.6	25.0	0	0
6	60.8	30.8	7.7	0	0

TABLE 17

CRITERION FOR SELECTION IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: RESULTS FROM DIAGNOSTIC TEST

County Groups	Percentage Deeming It				
	Very Important	Important	Average Importance	Slight Importance	Not Important
1	67.0	16.6	0	16.6	0
2a	50.5	33.3	10.7	3.2	1.0
2b	50.0	34.7	8.6	2.1	4.3
3	52.2	29.8	12.2	1.1	1.1
4	71.4	19.0	9.5	0	0
5	50.0	41.9	8.1	0	0
6	48.5	42.8	8.5	0	0

TABLE 18

FREQUENCY OF TEACHER OBSERVATION IN DIAGNOSIS PRECEDING REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	91.6	8.3	0	0	0
2a	81.2	13.5	0	1.0	0
2b	84.0	8.0	2.0	4.0	2.0
3	93.6	3.5	0	0	1.0
4	90.9	4.5	4.5	0	0
5	66.6	33.3	0	0	0
6	69.0	21.4	9.5	0	0

TABLE 19

FREQUENCY OF READING ACHIEVMENT TESTS IN DIAGNOSIS PRECEDING REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	25.0	50.0	16.6	0	8.3
2a	53.7	33.3	8.6	1.0	1.0
2b	53.0	20.4	18.3	4.0	4.0
3	55.3	24.5	11.7	4.2	3.2
4	45.4	22.7	22.7	9.0	0
5	41.6	41.6	16.8	0	0
6	63.4	21.9	14.6	2.4	0

TABLE 20

FREQUENCY OF USE OF READING DIAGNOSTIC TEST IN DIAGNOSIS PRECEDING REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	36.3	36.3	0	18.1	9.0
2a	66.3	24.2	5.2	3.1	1.0
2b	68.0	14.8	6.3	8.5	2.1
3	68.7	18.1	3.2	3.2	1.1
4	52.3	28.5	4.7	14.2	0
5	66.6	8.4	16.8	8.4	0
6	56.0	21.9	48.0	14.6	4.8

TABLE 21

USE OF STANDARDIZED ORAL READING TEST IN DIAGNOSIS PRECEDING REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	18.1	9.0	0	36.3	36.3
2a	16.4	35.2	12.9	25.8	9.4
2b	20.4	15.9	11.3	27.2	25.0
3	32.9	17.0	19.3	21.6	9.1
4	26.3	15.7	15.7	36.8	5.2
5	33.3	33.3	0	25.0	8.4
6	28.9	13.1	13.1	16.2	18.4

TABLE 22

USE OF INTELLIGENCE TESTS IN DIAGNOSIS PRECEDING REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	27.2	9.0	0	36.3	27.2
2a	38.2	19.1	17.9	17.9	6.7
2b	34.0	17.0	19.1	23.4	6.3
3	42.2	14.4	20.0	16.6	6.6
4	18.1	9.0	36.2	31.8	4.5
5	36.2	9.0	18.1	27.1	9.0
6	18.4	18.4	26.3	26.3	10.5

were based on skill deficiency and a combination of reading level and skills. This, too, is a practice common to the rest of the state.

County Group 2a represents the suburban north-central counties and comprise Middlesex, Monmouth, Mercer, and Passaic. Seventy-nine schools were sampled in this group with a total school enrollment of 34,090. Seven schools did not offer any remedial program (8.8%). This percentage is considerably lower than any other county group. Table 11 (p. 51) shows that 11% of the elementary school children in this group were offered remedial instruction, the highest percentage of any group.

In screening potential candidates almost all schools followed the state norm using informal teacher conversations and reading achievement tests with a slight majority also using intelligence tests. Individual diagnostic procedures were practiced by three-quarters of the schools in "all cases." Children were selected to receive remedial instruction on the same bases as children in other areas--2 years below grade level; recommendation by a teacher; warranted as a result of a diagnostic test. In diagnosing a child's skills and needs, schools in County Group 2a used the

same tools employed in other areas. In addition 44% of the schools also used the informal reading inventory, representing the largest percentage of any group (see Table 23).

Remedial reading classes tended to be small with 47% of them meeting daily. Most classes met for a period of 20-30 minutes. The grouping of classes concurred with the criteria relied on in other areas of the state.

County Group 2b includes the suburban Philadelphia counties of Burlington, Camden, and Gloucester. Fifty-five schools responded to the questionnaire with 11 offering no remedial program. The schools with a total enrollment of 20,861 provided additional reading instruction to 1,632 or 7.8% of its students.

Children were selected for additional reading instruction based on the same criteria as in other areas. An inventory of their skills and needs also followed the statewide pattern. Classes tended to be small. The frequency of class meetings varied from 2-5 times weekly and their duration was generally from 20-30 minutes. Children were grouped into classes on a basis of common reading level, skill deficiency or a combination of the two in more than three-quarters

TABLE 23

USE OF INFORMAL READING INVENTORIES IN DIAGNOSIS PRECEDING REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	33.0	16.6	8.3	33.0	8.3
2a	44.1	31.3	9.3	11.6	3.4
2b	41.6	27.0	14.5	12.5	4.1
3	43.9	28.6	13.2	12.1	3.3
4	40.9	31.8	9.0	18.0	0
5	27.1	36.2	18.1	18.1	0
6	35.8	20.5	30.7	7.6	5.1

of the schools.

County Group 3 consists of the affluent suburban New Jersey counties of Bergen, Morris, Union, and Somerset. The 92 respondent schools had a total enrollment of 37,271. Twelve schools did not offer any remedial reading program for a percentage of 13. 8.8% of the children in these counties received remedial instruction.

To screen potential candidates the methods most commonly used were similar to others already mentioned--informal teacher conversations and reading achievement tests. In addition, a majority of the schools also administered intelligence tests to the children. In determining which candidates to select and in evaluating their skills and needs, County Group 3 followed the practices commonly employed elsewhere in the state. The small remedial reading classes usually met 2 or 3 times a week for a period lasting 20-30 minutes.

County Group 4 includes the Atlantic coastal counties of Atlantic, Cape May, and Ocean. The respondents totaled 28 schools with a total enrollment of 10,204. Serviced were 8.8% of these pupils. Eight

schools did not offer any remedial reading program (28.6%).

In addition to the common practices followed in the screening procedure, most of the schools in this group also used the end of basal reader test.

Individual diagnosis generally took place in all cases, following the state norm, as did their practices in diagnosing the child's skills and needs prior to the start of remedial instruction.

In selecting students this tri-county area made use of the same criteria as most other schools in the state. In addition, half of the schools also used an informal reading test (see Table 24).

More than one-half of the classes of 5 or less met either 4 or 5 times weekly. Most classes met for longer than 30 minutes exceeding other county groups in this practice. Criteria for class groupings did not deviate from those previously mentioned.

County Group 5 comprises the two rural south-western counties of Salem and Cumberland. The 16 schools included in this study had a total enrollment of 5,282. Remedial reading instruction was provided for 10.9% of the students. Schools in the "no program"

TABLE 24

CRITERION FOR SELECTION IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: USE OF INFORMAL READING TEST

County Groups	Percentage Deeming It				
	Very Important	Important	Average Importance	Slight Importance	Not Important
1	27.2	27.2	18.1	21.2	0
2a	30.6	35.2	21.5	6.8	5.6
2b	34.0	34.0	19.1	6.3	6.3
3	43.7	31.0	18.4	2.3	4.6
4	50.0	36.3	13.6	0	0
5	45.2	27.1	27.1	0	0
6	35.2	48.6	13.5	2.7	0

category numbered 5 for a percentage of 31.3.

The most common tools used in screening potential remedial students were teacher conversation and reading achievement tests. A majority of schools, however, also used the results of end of basal reader and intelligence tests.

The frequency of individual diagnosis and the practices used in determining a child's skill and need inventory did not deviate from the statewide pattern. This group did differ from other county groups in its selection process. It was the only group in which a majority deemed 1 year below grade level as "very important." (See Table 14, p. 55.)

An overwhelming majority of the remedial reading met daily for 20-30 minutes. These class groupings were based on the same criteria used by other county groups.

County Group 6 consists of the highly urban counties of Essex and Hudson. Forty-two schools with a total enrollment of 23,663 responded to the questionnaire. These schools provided remedial services to 8.7% of their students. A high one-third (14 schools) of the schools in this area did not provide any viable

remedial reading program. This is higher than the state-wide norm.

Similar screening procedures were employed by these two counties as in other areas. In addition, 46% of the schools also used intelligence test results.

Similarly, all candidates for additional reading instruction tended to receive individual diagnosis, were selected and had their skills and needs analyzed in the same manner as children in other areas of the state.

Remedial reading classes were small and over one-half met 4 or 5 times weekly. Most classroom instruction lasted for longer than 30 minutes. The criteria for grouping the children into classes did not deviate from those employed in other county groups.

Thus, with few exceptions, schools regardless of which county or county groups they belong to tend to rely on certain favored practices and tools in the organization and operation of their remedial reading programs. The one organizational practice where there did not seem to be a pattern was in the frequency of class meetings. This variation shows itself within and between county group lines. (See Table 4, p. 43.)

Comparison of Selected Practices by Community Type

Based on a typology developed by the New Jersey County and Municipal Study Commission, the 567 municipalities of the state fall into six categories. These include the following: city; stable community; affluent suburb; developing suburb; "average" suburban; and outlying rural communities.

Dividing the school districts sampled into these groupings, data from three questions have been gathered and analyzed, namely, the percentage of children serviced, the number of schools not offering a remedial reading program, and the frequency of class meetings. These questions were selected as they were the only ones in the questionnaire which lent themselves to quantification.

Class 1 communities comprise the central cities of New Jersey. Responses were received from 11 districts. Table 12 (see p. 52) shows the results of 10 of the districts. One community skewed the data and was therefore excluded. As noted in Table 12, taken as a group the central cities provided a higher percentage of remedial reading programs for its students than any other community type. It is noteworthy

that this is a considerably higher percentage than that of the affluent suburbs (Class 3).

When the results of Table 25 are considered, not only did the affluent suburbs (as a group) remediate a smaller percentage of students but provided these pupils with fewer daily class meetings than any other community type.

Only two of the six community types had a majority of their classes meeting daily; the central cities and the outlying rural communities. This latter group shows a rather inconsistent pattern. A large portion of its classes met daily, yet one-half of the responding schools did not offer remedial reading instruction last year. This figure contrasts sharply with the other percentages which range from 12.0-17.1.

Discussion

The results of the practices employed by the county groups generally adhered to the literature. They followed many of the recommendations made by the various authors cited earlier in this paper. On the screening level, teacher recommendations and reading achievement tests were very widely used.

TABLE 25

FREQUENCY OF REMEDIAL CLASS MEETINGS IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS BY COMMUNITY TYPE

Class	Community Type	Total N Remedial Classes	% Meeting 2 Times Weekly	% Meeting 3 Times Weekly	% Meeting 4 Times Weekly	% Meeting Daily
1	Central City	409	19.8	15.4	13.7	51.1
2	Stable Suburb	428	37.2	17.8	12.6	32.9
3	Affluent Suburb	406	26.6	31.8	8.9	32.7
4	Developing Suburb	308	35.9	16.8	9.4	37.9
5	Average Suburban Community	809	30.6	22.3	6.8	40.4
6	Outlying Rural Community	110	11.8	21.8	2.7	63.6

In the area of diagnosing and assessing a child's skills and needs, New Jersey schools did not meet all of the standards set forth by Bond and Tinker (1967). These authors recommended the use of an individual intelligence test, diagnostic test, and oral reading test. Our elementary schools tended to use the diagnostic test, teacher observations, and reading achievement tests as tools in this procedure. Informal reading inventories were administered more often than standardized oral tests, but not by a majority of the schools in any group.

The average size of remedial classes (under 6) corresponds with that advocated by Deighton (1971) et al.; however, the percentage of children serviced falls short (in some groups) of the estimates made by several noted authors which range from 10-25% of the school population. Table 1 (see p. 39) shows that New Jersey schools divided by county groups serviced between 5.1% and 11.0%. When averaged by community type (Table 25) the percentages range from 6.8 to 11.6. This difference may be attributed to one and/or several factors: the estimates in the literature are too high; a shortage of qualified personnel existed; an

insufficiency of funds for additional remedial classes; and some children in need of service did not receive it.

Children in remedial classes in New Jersey in 1972-73 were grouped by level and need. This agrees with the recommendations of Shiffman (1966) and Bond and Tinker (1967). The frequency of class meetings meet the minimum standards advocated by Deighton (1971). In all groups (see Table 4, p. 43 and Table 25, p. 76) most classes met from 3 to 5 times weekly.

Overall, most schools offering remedial programs followed the recommendations set forth by the literature for effective, efficient, and comprehensive organizational plan for remedial reading programs.

Regarding socio-economic influences on school services, the results of this study differ sharply with the literature reviewed earlier in this paper. It has been reported by Guthrie (1969), the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity (1970), and Sexton (1961) that children in the wealthiest communities with the least need receive the best services while those residents of poor communities in greater need of these services, receive the least.

Data from the questionnaire under discussion shows conclusively that the reverse holds true in New Jersey. (See Table 12, p. 52 and Table 25, p. 76.) The central cities provided remedial reading services to a higher percentage of its elementary school population than did the affluent suburbs, had a lower percentage of "no program" schools, and had a substantially larger proportion of its classes meeting on a daily basis. There are several possibilities for this glaring discrepancy. New Jersey may be atypical; location may play a factor. (Both Sexton's and Guthrie's studies took place in the midwest.) Another more reasonable explanation is that in the years between the two mentioned studies and this writer's, considerable funds under Title I and III have been expended, especially in the central cities and the poorer rural areas of New Jersey. This observation may also help account for the differences in Table 11 (see p. 51) between county group 1's percentage of services children and that of county group 5. This latter group includes many communities eligible for federal educational funds which are not available to group 1.

Thus, as manifested in New Jersey for 1972-73, socio-economic status is no longer an excellent predictor of the availability of remedial reading services.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Based on a survey of remedial reading practices in 1972-73, the elementary schools in New Jersey use varied procedures to identify, diagnose, and remediate those pupils in need of this service. Of the many practices and instruments available, fewer than half were used consistently by a majority of the schools. Those procedures favored by one county group (used by more than 50% of the schools) tended to be utilized by most schools in the remaining counties indicating a pattern of practices for the state as a whole.

During the screening process most schools used informal teacher conversations and achievement test results to identify those children who might be in need of additional reading instruction. All children selected as potential candidates were then individually diagnosed.

Students were selected to participate in remedial reading classes if they showed the potential to benefit,

were recommended by their teacher, were 2 or more years below grade level, and if results of diagnostic testing indicated need of such instruction.

Common practices for evaluating a remedial reader's skills and needs included teacher observation and administering a reading diagnostic test.

Most remedial classes contained 5 or fewer students grouped according to a common reading level and skill deficiencies. Many other acceptable procedures and tools were used in varying degrees by the individual schools, but not by a majority of the schools in all county groups.

Since most county groups are heterogeneous in nature, data from three questions were analyzed by community type to determine if size, location (rural vs. urban), socio-economic factors, or stage of development played a role in the percentage of children serviced by remedial reading programs, the number of schools not offering a program, and/or the frequency of class meetings.

Results showed, contrary to studies in the literature, that the central cities serviced a higher percentage of its elementary school population than other community types. Conversely, the affluent

suburbs serviced a substantially lower percentage and provided then with fewer daily remedial reading classes.[1]

Conclusions

Results of this survey provide information that heretofore has not been available on a statewide level. The data indicates that there are differences in the procedures used to identify, diagnose, and remediate students with reading problems. Although patterns appeared in the frequency of use of some practices, there is no practice that was used by all of the schools all of the time.

Location was a factor in the results of the percentages of children serviced and in the number of schools offering remedial reading programs.

When grouped homogeneously by common socio-economic and demographic factors, differences also appeared in the percentage of children serviced indicating variation between the various community types. Substantial variation also appeared between the districts, community types, and county groups in the percentage of schools offering remedial reading programs. Location seemed to be a significant factor, with rural communities and counties having a substantially larger percentage of "no program" schools.

[1]This finding does not account for the probability that central city schools have a higher total percentage of students reading significantly below grade level.

Due to this disparity all children in need of remedial instruction did not receive it. In many instances the question of whether or not a child with reading difficulties received remedial instruction depended not only on the county or community he resided in but the school he attended. The school he attended also largely determines how many hours of weekly remedial instruction he received. The data on this question fluctuated with no clear pattern emerging.

Suggestions for Further Research

The finding manifesting sharpest disagreement with the literature warrants further investigation. What factors account for the central cities in New Jersey servicing a larger percentage of their students than other types of communities? The literature cited gives evidence of just the reverse. A study conducted on the amounts of Title I aid channeled to various communities and its impact on the quantity of instruction offered might help explain the discrepancy in findings between this study and previous ones cited.

Another question worthy of further study is whether the number of children serviced is dependent on the number of remedial readers and the degree of

retardation; the availability of federal and/or state funds; the availability of qualified personnel; personal education philosophy differences or other factors.

Perhaps the most important question, not within the realm of this paper, but justifying further research, is one of output. Whereas this study deals with input and quantity--organization and procedures--in remedial programs, no attempt was made to analyze the quality or effectiveness of these programs as evidenced by children's reading achievement. The crux of the question is: do remedial reading programs in New Jersey help in narrowing the gap between a remedial reader's ability and his achievement?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barlow, B. Long term effect of remedial reading instruction. Reading Teacher, 1965, 18, 581-586.

Barrett, T. C. (Ed.) The evaluation of children's reading achievement. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association, 1971.

Bond, G. L., and Tinker, M. A. Reading difficulties: Their diagnosis and correction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Chandler, T. Reading disability and socio-economic status. Journal of Reading, 1966, 10, 5-21.

Dechant, E. Diagnosis and remediation of reading disability. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Co., 1968.

Deighton, L. C. The encyclopedia of education. New York: Macmillan Co. and Free Press, Vol. 7, 1971.

de Hirsch, K., et al. Predicting reading failure. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Dyer, H. S. Research issues on equality of educational opportunity: School factors. Harvard Educational Review, 1962, 38, 38-56.

Ebel, R. L. (Ed.) Encyclopedia of educational research. (4th ed.) London: Macmillan Co., 1969, 1069-1104.

Guthrie, et al. Schools and Inequality. New York: Urban Coalition, 1969.

Harris, A. J. How to increase reading ability. New York: McKay Co., Inc., 1970.

Harris, A. J. Diagnosis and correction of reading disabilities, corrective reading in classrooms and clinic. Supplementary Education Monographs, University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Jansky, J., and de Hirsch, K. Preventing reading failure. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Johnson, M., and Dress, R. Individual reading inventories. Sociological and Psychological Factors in Reading. 21st Annual Reading Institute, Temple University, 1964, 48-60.

Kottmeyer, W. Teachers guide for remedial reading. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1959.

Malmquist, E. Factors related to reading disabilities in the first grade of the elementary school. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wilsell, 1960.

Mayeski, et al. A study of our nations schools. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1969.

Money, J. (Ed.) The disabled reader. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

Shiffman, G. Program administration within a school system. In J. Money (Ed.), The disabled reader. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1966, 241-259.

Sexton, P. C. Education and income. New York: Viking Press, 1961.

Smith, C. B. Treating reading disabilities: The specialists role. Bloomington, Ind.: International Reading Association, 1969.

Strang, R. Diagnostic teaching of reading. (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.

Tridler, M. S. The right to read and standardized testing: A necessary dimension. Reading Teacher, 1971, 24, 320-330.

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Guidelines: Special programs for educationally deprived children. Washington, D.C.: 1966.

White House Conference on Children 1970. Report on Forum 7. The right to read. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Senate. Toward equal educational opportunity. The Report of the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Report No. 92-000. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, December 31, 1972.

Wilson, A. B. Social stratification and academic achievement. In A. Passow (Ed.), Education in depressed areas. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963, 190-216.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

225 WEST STATE STREET

P O BOX 2019

TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625

May 1, 1973

TO: Principal

Let me take this opportunity to thank you for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire. It is intended to collect information about current reading practices from a 20 percent statewide sample of elementary and secondary schools and from all the schools in one county. Your school was selected as one of the sample. The information collected will be used to furnish baseline data for the Right to Read Program and to plan more effectively for reading consultant services at the local, county and state levels.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire for the grades included in your building. We suggest that you designate the person most knowledgeable of your school's reading practices to complete the questionnaire. A set of definitions and directions has been included to help when completing this form. The questionnaire should be returned through you and your Superintendent, to the Office of the County Superintendent of Schools no later than Friday, May 18, 1973. We expect to share some of the information collected by the questionnaires with you in the fall.

If you have any questions, please call Dr. James Swalm, Supervising Consultant in Reading at 609-292-4009.

Thank you.

James Swalm
Supervising Consultant in Reading
Division of Curriculum and Instruction

JS/bc/W18

Enclosures

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE ELEMENTARY QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire has been kept as brief and simple as possible. Most of the questions can be answered by checking a response or filling in a blank. However, should any questions arise, contact Dr. James Swalm at (609) 292-4009 for clarification.

Please complete the questionnaire for all grades in your school. All elementary and most middle schools should use this form. However, if seventh or eighth is your lowest grade, please use the secondary school form of the questionnaire when reporting. Copies of the secondary form may be obtained from your County Superintendent's Office.

Grade levels have been included as a category in many questions. If your school is wholly or partially non-graded, answer the questions requiring grade data by substituting the number of years the pupil has been in school, excluding kindergarten. Place such figures in the appropriate grade level categories and note on the margin next to the question that your school is not graded. This will help us better interpret your response.

Two copies of the questionnaire have been included. One is for your files; the other is to be returned through your Superintendent to the office of the County Superintendent of Schools no later than Friday, May 18, 1973.

Special Instructions for Selected Questions

Question 5 - In Question 5 you are asked to write the number of classrooms using different organizational patterns in reading. Because many classrooms use more than one pattern of organization for reading instruction during the year, you are asked to determine which pattern is the principal one used in the classroom. Do this by considering only the time when reading instruction is provided to the pupils directly by the teacher; do not consider seat work or similar type activities when answering. Whichever pattern is used 70 percent or more of the time in that classroom, is the one to be reported on the questionnaire. Indicate only one pattern per classroom.

Question 6 - When marking the amount of time devoted to reading instruction per week, include all reading instruction activities.

Question 7 - Question 7 is directed toward finding what methods are used to teach reading in your school. Because teachers use a variety of means to teach reading within a given year, you are asked to designate which one is the principal one used in the classroom. Again this is done by considering only the time when reading instruction is provided directly by the teacher; do not consider seat work or similar type activities when answering. Whichever pattern is used 70 percent or more of the time in that classroom, is the one to be marked on the questionnaire. Only one means of instruction should be listed per classroom.

Question 12 - In question 12, please do not list any new reading books or basals as programs unless they have resulted in a different approach to teaching reading in the classroom.

DEFINITIONS

Respondents are asked to review the following definitions carefully before completing the questionnaire for the elementary school.

DEVELOPMENTAL READING - Developmental reading is classified as reading activities in the classroom designed to increase reading power, refine reading and study habits, develop vocabulary and create interest in reading. This reading instruction is provided by the classroom teacher.

REMEDIAL READING - Remedial reading is classified as concentrated reading instruction directed towards specific skill deficiencies. Students receiving this instruction are deficient in reading skills and do not progress satisfactorily in a regular classroom. Remedial reading is characterized by small group (3-7), or individual instruction based upon a diagnosis of the student's reading disability. This instruction is done by a special reading teacher. Some schools may refer to the reading defined here as corrective-remedial reading instruction. Corrective reading based upon a careful diagnosis and provided in small groups by special reading teachers should be classified under remedial reading.

SUPPLEMENTAL (SUPPORTIVE) INSTRUCTION - This term is not to be confused with supplemental instruction as applied to children under the provisions of Title 18A, Chapter 46. For this questionnaire supplemental is classified as extra reading instruction that follows the same basic pattern and sequence of skill development as provided in classroom (developmental) reading lessons. This instruction is offered as extra help to selected students in small group situations (5-10 students) either outside of the classroom or by a teacher who comes in specifically to reinforce the reading lessons taught by the regular reading teacher. Supplemental instruction as defined here is not provided by the student's regular classroom teacher.

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE - A number of questions ask for the 'relative importance' of the listed alternatives during classroom instruction, or when working with students in special reading classes. When completing such questions, check the scale point that most nearly describes the normal importance of the practice in your school. Several alternatives within the same question may be rated with equal importance.

FREQUENCY OF USE - Noting the 'frequency of use' of different practices is requested in several questions. When completing such questions, check the scale point that most nearly describes the normal frequency of use in your school. Again, several alternatives within the same question may be rated with equal frequencies.

NJDE 7300 T-60E (4/73)
(Elementary)

STATE OF NEW JERSEY - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
Office of Curriculum Services

SURVEY OF READING PRACTICES - NEW JERSEY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS 1972-73
Elementary School Questionnaire

County _____ District _____ School _____

Reply Submitted by _____ Title _____ Telephone _____ Date _____

1. SCHOOL DATA

	Grade	Total Classrooms	Total Pupils Enrolled	Number of Pupils in Special Reading Classes: Remedial	Supplemental
a.	Kindergarten				
b.	One				
c.	Two				
d.	Three				
e.	Four				
f.	Five				
g.	Six				
h.	Seven				
i.	Eight				
j.	Other (Specify)				
k.	Grand Total				

2. KINDERGARTENS
Mark with (x) to show the relative importance of each of the listed skills in your kindergarten readiness program.

	Skills	Very Import.	Import.	Avg. Import.	Slightly Import.	Not Import.
a.	Rhymes, rhyming words					
b.	Similarities and differences in speech sounds					
c.	Visual discrimination of letters					
d.	Recognition of sound-symbol relationships					
e.	Discrimination of initial middle and final sounds in words					
f.	Visual recognition of phonograms					
g.	Use of oral language					
h.	Listening					
i.	Other (Specify)					

3.
Mark with (x) to show the relative importance of each of the criteria you use in determining readiness for formal reading.

	Criteria	Very Import.	Import.	Avg. Import.	Slightly Import.	Not Import.
a.	Observation and teacher judgment					
b.	Check list and rating scales					
c.	Readiness test					
d.	Auditory test					
e.	Vision test					
f.	Other (Specify)					

4.
Indicate the total number of Kindergarten pupils who read:

a. Commercial pre-primer type books _____

b. Materials developed through a language experience approach _____

5. ELEMENTARY GRADES 1-8
Indicate the number of classrooms using the listed patterns as the principal means of organizing reading instruction at each grade level. (Interpret PRINCIPAL to mean more than 70 percent of the time.)

	Organizational pattern	Number of classrooms using pattern in grade: 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
a.	Grouping within classroom								
b.	Grouping between classes								
c.	Ungraded								
d.	Individualized								
e.	Departmentalized								
f.	Homogeneous grouping by grade								
g.	Multi-age								
h.	Other (Specify)								

6. Mark with (x) the approximate hours per week devoted to reading instruction in each grade of your school.

	Grade	Hours Per Week					
		Fewer than 2	2-3	4-6	9-12	13-15	More than 15
a.	Kindergarten						
b.	One						
c.	Two						
d.	Three						
e.	Four						
f.	Five						
g.	Six						
h.	Seven						
i.	Eight						
j.	Other (Specify)						

7. Indicate the number of classrooms using the listed systems as the principal means for reading instruction. (Interpret PRINCIPAL to mean more than 70 percent of the time.)

	Principal means of instruction	Number of classrooms using method in grade							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
a.	One basal series								
b.	Co-basal program								
c.	Tri-basal program								
d.	Programmed reading								
e.	Linguistic materials								
f.	Language experience								
g.	Phonics series								
h.	Multi-text								
i.	Other (Specify)								

8. Indicate the number of classrooms in the school in which the listed supplementary reading materials are found regularly.

	Supplementary Materials	Number of Classrooms
a.	Additional basal text	
b.	Additional workbook and/or sheets	
c.	Laboratory kits	
d.	Reading machines	
e.	Trade books (hard cover or paper backs)	
f.	Reading games	
g.	Film strips	
h.	Tapes or cassettes of stories	
i.	Overhead transparencies	
j.	Learning Centers in reading and/or language arts	
k.	Commercial materials designed to improve visual perceptions	
l.	Literature series for reading	
m.	Other (Specify)	

9. For each grade span in your school, mark with (x) the one statement which best describes the extent of instruction in reading skills as a regular part of content subject classes.

	Statement	Best Description	
		Grades 4-6	Grades 7-8
a.	Reading skills are taught in content subjects as part of the prescribed curriculum.		
b.	Reading skills are taught in content subjects as need arises.		
c.	Teachers are encouraged to incorporate reading skills in content subjects.		
d.	Little emphasis is placed on incorporating reading skills in content subjects.		
e.	Other (Specify)		

10. For each grade span listed, mark with (x) the one statement that best describes the schools standardized testing program in reading.

	Statement	Best Description: Grades 1-3	Grades 4-6	Grades 7-8
a.	Tests from the same publisher are administered in each grade once a year.			
b.	Tests from different publishers are administered in each grade once a year.			
c.	Tests are administered whenever teachers consider it necessary.			
d.	No standardized tests are administered as a part of the reading curriculum.			
e.	Other (Specify)			

11. For each grade span listed, mark with (x) the one statement that best describes the use made of your standardized reading test information.

	Statement	Best Description: Grades 1-3	Grades 4-6	Grades 7-8
a.	The scores are used to group pupils in classes.			
b.	The scores are part of the information used to group pupils in classes.			
c.	Teachers are given the test scores and encouraged to use the results in planning instruction.			
d.	Test scores are retained in centrally located folders and used in specific instances.			
e.	Other (Specify)			

12. List any new reading programs that have been initiated in the school during the last two years. (Examples: I/T/A, IPI, EWRL, Wisconsin, etc.) Include grades involved.

a.

b.

c.

d.

e.

13. SPECIAL READING SERVICES-GRADES 1-8
Mark with (x) all methods that are important in the screening process used to identify pupils in need of remedial or supplemental instruction.

	Method	Important in screening for: Remedial Instruction	Supplemental Instruction
a.	Informal teacher conversations		
b.	Reading achievement test		
c.	End of basal reader test		
d.	Intelligence test		
e.	Other (Specify)		

14. Mark with (x) to indicate the frequency with which candidates for remedial and supplemental reading services receive individual diagnosis.

	Frequency	Remedial	Supplemental
a.	In all cases		
b.	In most cases		
c.	In some cases		
d.	Only in severe cases		

15. Mark with (x) to indicate the relative importance of the criteria you use in selecting pupils for remedial reading programs.

	Criteria	Very Import.	Import.	Avg. Import.	Slightly Import.	Not Import.
a.	Scoring one or more years below grade on reading test					
b.	Scoring two or more years below grade on reading test					
c.	Potential to benefit from extra instruction					
d.	Result from diagnostic test					
e.	Informal reading test					
f.	Teacher recommendations					
g.	Academic records					
h.	Other (Specify)					

16. Mark with (x) to indicate the relative importance of the criteria you use in selecting pupils for supplemental reading programs.

	Criteria	Very Import.	Import.	Avg. Import.	Slightly Import.	Not Import.
a.	Scoring one or more years below grade on reading test					
b.	Scoring two or more years below grade on reading test					
c.	Potential to benefit from extra instruction					
d.	Results from diagnostic test					
e.	Informal reading test					
f.	Teacher recommendations					
g.	Academic records					
h.	Other (Specify)					

17. Mark with (x) to show the frequency of use of the listed procedures in diagnosing pupils' skills and needs before remedial reading instruction is provided.

	Procedure	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
a.	Teacher observations					
b.	Reading achievement test					
c.	Reading diagnostic test					
d.	Standardized oral test					
e.	Informal reading inventories					
f.	Intelligence test					
g.	Psychological evaluation					
h.	Interest inventories					
i.	Health and social evaluation					
j.	Other (Specify)					

18. Mark with (x) to show the frequency of use of the listed procedures in diagnosing pupils skills and needs before supplemental reading instruction is provided.

	Procedure	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
a.	Teacher observations					
b.	Reading achievement test					
c.	Reading diagnostic test					
d.	Standardized oral test					
e.	Informal reading inventories					
f.	Intelligence test					
g.	Psychological evaluation					
h.	Interest inventories					
i.	Health and Social evaluation					
j.	Other (Specify)					

19. Enter the number of remedial reading classes, the number of pupils enrolled in each, and the length of class periods.

	Class Meetings	Number of classes	Average pupil enrollment	Minutes per class
a.	Twice per week			
b.	Three times per week			
c.	Four times per week			
d.	Daily			
e.	Other (Specify)			

20. Enter the number of supplemental reading classes, the average number of pupils enrolled in each, and the length of class periods.

	Class Meetings	Number of classes	Average pupil enrollment	Minutes per class
a.	Twice per week			
b.	Three times per week			
c.	Four times per week			
d.	Daily			
e.	Other (Specify)			

21. Indicate the frequency of use of each of the listed bases for grouping pupils for remedial reading instruction.

	Bases for grouping	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
a.	Age					
b.	Grade					
c.	Reading level					
d.	Skill deficiencies					
e.	Reading level & skills					
f.	Interests					
g.	Other (Specify)					

22. Indicate the frequency of use of the listed bases for grouping pupils for supplemental reading instruction.

	Bases for grouping	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
a.	Age					
b.	Grade					
c.	Reading level					
d.	Skill deficiencies					
e.	Reading level & skills					
f.	Interests					
g.	Other (Specify)					

23. Mark with (x) those techniques used to coordinate remedial and supplemental reading programs with classroom reading instruction.

	Technique	Technique used with: Remedial instruction	Technique used with: Supplemental instruction
a.	Regularly scheduled conferences between teachers		
b.	Teachers are encouraged to exchange information		
c.	Special reading teachers suggest materials for classroom teachers		
d.	Classroom teachers adjust teaching materials to special reading pupil needs		
e.	No opportunity is provided for coordinating such activity		
f.	Other (Specify)		

24. Mark with (x) all materials that are important, and used regularly, for instruction in remedial and supplemental reading classes.

	Materials	Used regularly for instruction: Remedial Classes	Used regularly for instruction: Supplemental Instruction
a.	Basal text and materials		
b.	Supplementary phonics books		
c.	Supplementary comprehension materials		
d.	Teacher made drill sheets		
e.	Commercially made drill sheets		
f.	Trade books		
g.	Audio-visual materials		
h.	Reading games		
i.	High interest-low reading books		
j.	Other (Specify)		

25. Mark with (x) to show the predominant location of remedial and supplemental reading instruction in your school.

	Location	Program type: Remedial	Program type: Supplemental
a.	In the classroom		
b.	Outside the classroom		
c.	Other (Specify)		

Please return completed questionnaire to your County Superintendent of Schools, no later than May 18, 1973.

APPENDIX C

ADDITIONAL DATA

TABLE 1

USE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION IN DIAGNOSIS
PRECEDING REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	33.0	8.3	16.6	41.6	0
2a	15.7	13.4	22.4	44.8	3.3
2b	11.3	20.4	18.1	45.4	4.5
3	17.2	11.5	10.7	42.5	8.0
4	13.6	13.6	18.0	45.4	9.0
5	18.1	36.2	0	36.2	9.
6	16.2	10.8	21.6	43.2	8.1

TABLE 2

USE OF INTEREST INVENTORIES IN DIAGNOSIS
PRECEDING REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	9.0	18.1	36.3	18.1	18.1
2a	10.4	22.0	29.0	29.0	9.3
2b	6.5	13.0	17.3	36.9	23.9
3	15.1	14.0	20.9	26.7	23.2
4	13.6	18.0	9.0	36.2	22.7
5	0	27.1	18.1	45.2	9.0
6	10.8	5.4	40.5	21.6	21.6

TABLE 3

USE OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL EVALUATION IN DIAGNOSIS
PRECEDING REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION
(in percentages)

County Groups	Always	Frequently	Usually	Seldom	Never
1	27.2	9.0	45.4	9.0	9.0
2a	27.5	22.5	23.7	20.0	6.2
2b	22.2	13.3	24.4	33.0	6.6
3	36.4	21.6	22.7	16.0	3.3
4	15.0	15.0	20.0	35.0	15.0
5	16.6	41.8	16.6	25.0	0
6	26.3	23.6	15.7	26.3	7.8

VITA

Name: Anita M. Schneider

Address: 44 Stonicker Dr., Trenton, N.J. 08638

Telephone: (609) 882-7648

Educational Background:

High School:	High School of Performing Arts New York, New York June 1951
College:	Brooklyn College Brooklyn, New York 1951-1955 B.A. 1955
Graduate School:	Trenton State College Trenton, New Jersey 1968-1970

Professional Experience:

1973-	Supplemental Instructor Kreps School East Windsor, New Jersey
1971-1973	Title I Instructor Kreps School East Windsor, New Jersey
1968-1971	Supplemental Instructor Dutch Neck School West Windsor, New Jersey
1962-1964	Elementary Teacher Grades 5-8 Trenton Hebrew Academy Trenton, New Jersey
1956-1957	Elementary Teacher (Permanent Substitute) 5th Grade Cremp School Phil delphia, Pennsylvania

COURSE WORK FOR MASTER'S DEGREE IN READING

Fall, 1970-1971		**Instructor**
299:561	Foundations of Reading Instruction	Dr. Fry Dr. Mountain
Spring, 1971		
299:564	Remedial Reading	Dr. Fry
299:565	Laboratory in Remedial Reading	Dr. Kimberly
Fall, 1971-1972		
290:513	Introduction to Early and Middle Years	Dr. Arnold
610:521	Materials for Children	Dr. Van Orton
Spring, 1972		
290:501	Introduction to Tests and Measurements	Dr. Geyer
Spring, 1973		
290:525	Psychology of the Exceptional Child	Dr. Holowinsky
290:599	Master Thesis Research	Dr. Swalm

IDENTIFICATION, DIAGNOSTIC AND REMEDIATION PROCEDURES USED IN SELECTED NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

AN ABSTRACT OF A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

OF

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY

BY

ANITA SCHNEIDER

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF

MASTER OF EDUCATION

NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY JANUARY, 1974

Every child has a right to read! This philosophy provides the goal for various district, state and federal programs designed to improve the reading level of youngsters who are experiencing difficulties in this area. Although large sums of effort and money have been expended on these programs there is a paucity of information concerning their organization and structure.

To compile and analyze the needed information a questionnaire was formulated and distributed by the New Jersey Department of Education concerning reading practices employed by elementary schools in New Jersey for the academic year 1972-73. A random sampling of 20% of the schools in the state was undertaken. To date, responses have been received from 386 of the 447 elementary schools selected.

This thesis concerns itself with that section of the questionnaire relating to the reading practices employed in remedial and/or supplemental elementary school programs. Responses to the following questions were compiled and analyzed:

What was the total enrollment of the school in 1972-73?

How many children received remedial instruction?

Which procedures were followed in screening the general population for potential remedial reading candidates?

How many of these children received individual diagnosis?

On what criteria were children selected to receive extra instruction?

How were the pupil's reading level and needs determined?

How often did the classes meet?

What was the average enrollment and duration of each class?

On what basis were the children grouped in remedial classes?

Responses to these questions were tabulated by school, district, county and county group. The counties were divided into seven groups. These included: the rural northwestern counties of Warren, Sussex and Hunterdon; the suburban New York counties of Mercer, Middlesex, Monmouth and Passaic; the suburban Philadelphia counties of Camden, Burlington and Gloucester; the Atlantic coastal counties of Atlantic, Cape May and Ocean; the rural southwestern counties of Salem and Cumberland; the highly urban counties of Essex and

Hudson; and, the suburban counties of Morris, Bergen, Union and Somerset. By grouping the data in this manner a profile of practices employed by each county group was developed.

In addition, data from three questions which lent themselves to quantification was tabulated and analyzed by community type.

The data emanating from this study show that procedures and criteria used in remedial reading programs in New Jersey are diverse. In most cases this disparity cuts across county group, county and district lines. There are, however, some areas of consensus.

The overwhelming majority of schools select possible candidates for remedial reading instruction based upon informal teacher conversations and on the results of a reading achievement test. These candidates are next diagnosed individually by most of the schools.

In the selection process the criteria selected by most schools as being "very important" are: scoring 2 or more years below grade level on a reading test; teacher recommendation; potential to benefit from instruction; and the results of diagnostic testing.

After the students are selected and prior to the onset of remedial instruction an assessment of the

child's strengths and weaknesses was determined. Schools relied upon teacher observation in all county groups, and a reading diagnostic test in all but one.

Special reading classes tended to be small (fewer than 6 students) and generally lasted from 20-30 minutes per session. The pupils were grouped on the basis of reading level, skill deficiency or a combination of the two.

The one organizational practice lacking a clear pattern was in the frequency of class meetings. This variation showed itself within and between county group lines.

As noted earlier, three questions were analyzed and grouped by "community type," namely, the percentage of children serviced, the number of schools not offering a remedial reading program and the frequency of class meetings.

The central cities, as a group, provided a higher percentage of children with remedial instruction than any other community type. Conversely the "affluent suburbs" remediated a smaller percentage than any other community type and provided these students with fewer daily class meetings.