

**REACTION: A NATIONAL ASSESSMENT
OF UNDERGRADUATE SECONDARY CONTENT
AREA READING COURSES —
COMPONENTS AND CHARACTERISTICS**

RONA F. FLIPPO

University of Wisconsin—Parkside

This paper presents an interesting overview of the current "state of the art" of undergraduate secondary content reading education being taught in U.S. universities with graduate reading programs. The authors point out the difficulty in getting accurate information regarding state certification requirements and the need to do a survey of state departments of education requirements. A similar survey was done by Flippo and Hayes (1984), and information regarding state certification reading requirements is also available from the Interna-

tional Reading Association (1981). The authors might wish to check these sources and the questions used before developing their follow-up survey. It is this author's experience that information is often inconsistent because of the different specificity of requirements/course descriptions from state to state and university to university. For instance, in this paper the authors assessed the content of undergraduate courses in *secondary* content reading. Some state departments of education, and certainly some reading professors, might require/teach undergraduate courses in content reading or in developmental content reading. This difference in course descriptions can cause inconsistencies. For instance, I wonder how I would interpret such a survey when I teach content reading courses with a K-adult emphasis rather than a secondary emphasis? Or, how the state department of education certification clerk, filling out a form, would respond to the question "How many courses (or credit hours) does your state require for secondary content teachers?"; when in this hypothetical state, they require one for English teachers and none for science teachers and two for K-12 MR teachers? One question/direction/statement that might be addressed to faculty teaching content reading is "How many undergraduate content reading courses are taught at your institution? If more than one is taught, please differentiate titles/descriptions and content for each course separately."

The paper does present very informative and revealing information concerning the content of undergraduate secondary content reading courses. Of particular interest is the "Other" category. If a follow-up study is done by these authors it is recommended that they consider including their four major "emergent" categories (conveying knowledge about reading, motivating for content area reading, recognizing/meeting individual reading needs, practicum lessons/activities and material development) which resulted from their "Other" category, as additional major category choices on their new survey.

Additionally, even though there was no consistency in the "Other" citations in the "Improving Reading Efficiency of Prospective Secondary Teachers," it might be informative to see what was cited. Perhaps the authors would get more information, or additional information, if they called the category "Assessing Reading Efficiency of Prospective Secondary Teachers," or if they added that category in a follow-up study.

Finally, the authors do indicate that professors teaching the undergraduate content reading courses, at the surveyed institutions, appear to be very well informed regarding the latest literature and thinking in content reading. I agree, but of course, I'm not surprised. The survey data is very encouraging. Faculty teaching content reading at universities with graduate reading programs would be very likely to be well-informed. The authors did point out that a major limitation of their survey was that only programs listed in the IRA *Graduate Programs and Faculty in Reading* book (Blomenberg, 1981) were sampled. Obviously, this eliminates the vast number of teacher education programs without recognized graduate programs in reading. A study sampling these programs, that teach undergraduate reading, but do not necessarily have a graduate reading faculty might or might not yield very different results. Such a study would certainly be interesting and informative to pursue.

In summary, this is a good paper with very useful information. The authors seem to recognize most of their study's flaws. If a follow-up study is done, and the cited recommendations are considered, these authors will have additional and even more useful information to report in the future.

References

- Blomenberg, P. (1981). *Graduate programs and faculty in reading*. Newark: International Reading Association.
- Certification requirements in reading*. (3rd Ed.). Newark: International Reading Association.
- Flippo, R.F., & Hayes, D.A. (1984). Preparation in reading and educator certification: Requirements, needs, issues. In G. H. McNinch (Ed.) *Reading Teacher Education*, Fourth Yearbook of the American Reading Forum. Athens, Georgia: American Reading Forum.