A NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN ENGLISH AND LANGUAGE ARTS

CONDUCTED FOR THE NATIVE INDIAN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

by

SALLY CLINTON

B.Ed., The University of British Columbia, 1975

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Department of Language Education)

We accept this thesis as conforming

to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

April 1981

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for an advanced degree at the University
of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make
it freely available for reference and study. I further
agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis
for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my
department or by his or her representatives. It is
understood that copying or publication of this thesis
for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written
permission.

Department of ___Language Education___

The University of British Columbia
2075 Wesbrook Place
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1W5

Date ___April 30, 1981.___

A NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN ENGLISH AND LANGUAGE ARTS CONDUCTED CONDUCTED FOR

THE NATIVE INDIAN TEACHED EDUCATION PROGRAM AT THE

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to identify educational needs of students in the NITEP program with particular regard for English and language arts. The study was designed to involve college and university instructors, sponsor teachers, and senior and junior students in assessing students' needs on instruments specifically designed for this purpose. Respondents were asked to rank order their perceptions of NITEP students' capability in skills of oral and written expression as demonstrated in academic coursework and student teaching. Items describing teaching competencies in the language arts were included in the student teaching questionnaire.

The responses to the questionnaire concerning language competency in university coursework indicated that although instructors identified more skills needing improvement than did students, for the most part the two groups perceived similar needs. In particular, the skills required for argumentive and expository essay writing were seen as needing improvement. In responding to the questionnaire concerning English and language arts in student teaching, sponsor teachers perceived needs in the quality and use of voice which were not perceived by the students.

Students and sponsor teachers both, however, saw needs for improvement in general knowledge of children's literature and early language background.

Some of the recommendations put forward in light of this needs assessment are the following: 1. Students who may need extra help in English should be identified on admission and instructors alerted to their needs. 2. Whenever possible such students should be counselled to take English improvement courses at colleges or through agencies such as the Open Learning Institute before admission. 3. NITEP should ask the English Department to offer a NITEP English 100 section whenever feasible. 4. Academic English courses should be scheduled in the day-time, and students' attendance and participation in them given high priority in NITEP scheduling of courses and teaching practica. 5. Language arts and reading methodology courses should be offered concurrently, rather than consecutively, and include more children's literature and native Indian content. 6. The program staff, advisors, and instructors in Speech Arts, should meet to consider the question of quality and use of voice with respect to student teaching. 7. Speech Arts should be offered at the beginning of Year One in the program. 8. More opportunities for all instructors and program staff to meet together should be provided. 9. Study skills should be taught by individual NITEP instructors for their own courses. 10. English tutoring programs should be expanded when necessary to respond to students' specific problems with language. 11. An assessment of students' English competency should be an ongoing process in NITEP. Since there are new NITEP students every year, and the program is frequently offered at new sites, the students' needs with regard to English and language arts may differ from year to year.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE (Cont.)

LIST OF FIGURES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

To my husband, Alf.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

> We cannot escape the need for special attention to English
> capability. It illustrates the special 'something' that
> Indian students need. (Benham, 1975, p. 2)

> The education of an Indian student depends to a very great
> extent on how efficiently he is taught English and how well
> he is able to learn it. Higher education will be available
> to him only through the medium of English, and most of the
> careers open to him are dependent very largely on his
> ability to communicate in English. (Radulovich, 1974, p. 19)

Native Indian educators, however much concerned about the quality

of English instruction for native Indian students, are even more concerned

about the quality of Indianness--a strong sense of cultural identity--

which they see as an integral part of the kind of education they envisage

for their people (National Indian Brotherhood, 1972, pp. 1-2). One way

of engendering this Indianness is to have native Indian people involved

at every level of the school system, particularly where there are a

number of native people in the community (NIB, 1972, p. 28). Native

teachers would seem to be crucial in such a plan, and if they are to be

charged with providing "special attention to English capability", they

must themselves be very capable. The purpose of this study is to

utilize the process of needs assessment in considering English competency

and the potential for its development in a teacher training program for

native Indian students at the University of British Columbia.

This program, the Native Indian Teacher Education Program (hereafter identified as NITEP), undertakes to produce elementary school teachers certified to teach anywhere in British Columbia. In many respects the NITEP compares closely to the regular elementary program, and certainly the demands concerning English are the same. Students in NITEP are required to meet all the regular academic requirements for education students including English 100 and English 200 as part of their under-graduate program. In addition, like their counterparts in the regular program of the Faculty of Education, students receive evaluations in oral and written language use, voice quality, projection and fluency as part of the practicum, or student teaching experience (Faculty of Education, For 323, 1979).

However, there are certain features of the NITEP which differ from the regular undergraduate program. For example, the first two years are held at an off-campus site; methodology courses and intensive student teaching practice are included in year one and two; the majority of academic courses are scheduled into year three and four; some courses are taken at community colleges; and a range of support services including tutoring and counselling are provided for students (More & Wallis, 1979, p. 41).

Several of these program differences have implications for the whole question of the NITEP students' competency in English, as well as the English and language arts components of their program. For example, both non-credit and academic English courses must often be taken at community colleges in classes which may be geared to the interests and needs of students from other cultures. Further, during practicums sponsor teachers may have expectations of English competency and/or teaching capability

in language arts which do not allow for the fact that the students are
registered in first or second year; not in third or fifth year as are most
student teachers. Senior students shifting from NITEP centers and
community colleges may find third and fourth year courses formal and
intimidating and may not perform as well as they are able in oral and
written expression. These and other such matters typical of NITEP, but
not of other programs in the Faculty of Education, require special study.

Need for the Study

In Return home, watch your family, a 1977 study evaluating NITEP,
the researchers reported that it was "generally recognized among students
and staff alike, that deficiencies in language skills present the greatest
problem which must be overcome by the NITEP students" (Thomas & McIntosh,
1977, p. 50). Given the importance of English in the academic life of
university students (U.B.C. Calendar, 1980-81), as well as its importance
in the professional life of student teachers (Report, 1979, Rec. 7), any
reported "deficiency in language skills" requires examination.

It is, however, important to remember that this concern about
language is not restricted to NITEP. The popular press features articles
decrying the state of literacy at this province's major educational
institutions quite regularly. One such article, written by a member of
the University of British Columbia's English Department, spoke of
university students as the "new illiterates" (Beavis, Province Magazine,
1979, p. 12). The recent President's Review Committee on the Faculty of
Education recommended that "the faculty tighten its English proficiency
requirements," and in addition, reinstate a senior course in basic

composition for all elementary undergraduates (Report, 1979, Rec. 7). Such a recommendation implies that students other than those in NITEP are seen to be performing unsatisfactorily in English.

Concern about language skills has also surfaced at the national level. A study undertaken in 1975 by the ACUTE Commission on Undergraduate Studies in English found that chairmen of English departments, responding to a questionnaire, reported being at best "somewhat dissatisfied" with "the abilities and preparation in language and composition" of students being admitted to the university Committee (CCTE, 1976, p. 45). Obviously, had Thomas and McIntosh studied other university programs developed to educate elementary school teachers, they might have found a concern for "deficiency in language skills" in them as well. It is likely that the question of university students' English competency will be addressed in many studies in the near future.

However, since NITEP is a special program with a precise mandate (Proposal, 1974), it seems important to consider separately, within the context of the program, this general concern about university students' language competency and to consider ways and means of approaching the problem. The author's experience as a language arts instructor in the program suggested that such a study would be appropriate at this time. Because there is an annual intake of new students, the NITEP population has changed considerably since 1977, and therefore, the present group of students may be quite different in terms of language background than those interviewed by Thomas and McIntosh (1977).

Significance of the Study

During the past decade almost a score of teacher training programs designed for native Indian students have appeared on the Canadian scene (More, 1981). These programs are in direct response to demands outlined in the 1972 manifesto on education, Indian control of Indian education, wherein it states, "Native teachers and counsellors who have an intimate understanding of Indian traditions, psychology, way of life and language are best able to create the learning environment suited to the habits and interests of the Indian child" (NIB, p. 75). Faced with "the failure of the Canadian educational enterprise, at all levels, in its service to the Indian peoples" (McIntosh, 1979, p. 22), it is not surprising that institutions of higher learning have been persuaded to make an effort to improve this situation by encouraging and supporting these innovative teacher training programs.

The establishment of programs to train native Indian teachers, chiefly in university settings, has not been achieved without difficulty. Since fewer than 10% of native students graduate from high school, and almost none from academic programs (More, 1979, p. 2), it has been necessary to use "mature and special admission categories" in order to gain admittance for many NITEP students (More, 1979, p. 5). It is therefore fair to assume that a number of these students may lack facility in English--certainly at the level of performance expected in the university-- and have serious gaps in their general academic backgrounds. More, suggesting this, and criticizing some programs for having failed to come to terms with this matter, says:

> In some programs standards are lower in academic background
> and facility in English. It is laudable to admit to teacher
> education programs students who show potential but who have
> large gaps in their academic background. It is indefensible
> to graduate such students without them having taken a single
> college level English course or adequately filled in their
> academic gaps. (1979, p. 8)

Certainly teachers capable of providing the calibre of education envisioned

by the National Indian Brotherhood for their people will not come from

watered-down programs such as described by More. Quality education for

native children requires teachers as highly competent in English as in any

other subject. Consequently, this aspect of the native Indian teacher

preparation programs deserves special attention. This study uses an

adaptation of the needs assessment process as a technique for considering

the question of English competency and the potential for its development in

such a program.

Assumptions

This study is based on the following assumptions:

1. That it is possible to identify and describe oral and written

English as satisfactory or unsatisfactory for students of the teaching

profession.

2. That it is possible to identify and describe oral and written

English as satisfactory or unsatisfactory for the academic work expected

of university students.

3. That it is possible to identify and describe specific competencies

in teacher performance which relate primarily to successfully teaching

the language arts.

Research Questions

This study attempts to find:

1. Which aspects of oral expression do instructors and students identify as concerns in the university coursework of NITEP students?

2. Which aspects of written expression do instructors and students identify as concerns in the university coursework of NITEP students?

3. Which aspects of oral expression do sponsor teachers and students identify as concerns in the student teaching of NITEP students?

4. Which aspects of written expression do sponsor teachers and students identify as concerns in the student teaching of NITEP students?

5. Which of the specific teaching competencies related to the teaching of the language arts do sponsor teachers and students identify as needing improvement?

Scope of the Study

This study will concentrate on the NITEP as it has been structured since 1977. The target population for the study consists of persons who have participated in the program as sponsor teachers, college and university instructors, students and program staff. The data used in the study comes from instruments designed for the study.

Limitations

Practicality and feasibility dictated several compromises with preferred procedure in this study. The study was limited in several ways:

1. The general limitations of an instrument designed to collect assessments of respondents' perceptions rather than direct observations were present in the questionnaire.

2. The recognized limitations of collecting responses by mail such as non-response, bias and the inability to check responses were present in this study.

Definitions of Terms

A number of terms used in this study are subject to a variety of interpretations. The selected definitions are given below.

Native Indian. The terms native Indian, native or Indian refer to any person who can trace a part of his or her ancestry to the original inhabitants of North America.

Student teachers. University students, registered in the Faculty of Education, who have a practice teaching component in their program are referred to as student teachers.

Sponsor teachers. Classroom teachers who provide classes and supervision for the practice teaching component in teacher training are called sponsor teachers.

Instructor. For the purpose of this study, the term instructor will include anyone with teaching responsibility at a community college or at the university.

Program staff. The program staff refers to the coordinators and counsellors of NITEP.

English. English, in the context of this study, refers to the language of instruction in British Columbia schools; courses in composi-

tion, literature or language at the university; one of two official
languages in Canada.

Language arts. The English language curriculum for elementary
schools in British Columbia is called language arts. It includes listen-
ing, oral expression, reading, written expression, study skills, children's
literature and language study.

English competency. For the purposes of this study, English com-
petency is defined as the degree of language sufficient for one's needs
in the academic and professional community as represented by the
educational establishment in British Columbia.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 has stated the purpose, need for, and significance of this
study. In addition, it has dealt with assumptions, research questions,
and limitations as well as giving definitions for relevant terms. In
Chapter 2, the literature pertinent to the study will be reviewed in
three sections: the teaching and learning of English and language arts
in native Indian education; the special nature of teacher training programs
for native Indian people; the needs assessment process as a technique for
developing and improving educational programs.

Chapter 3 outlines the development of the instruments and the
procedure used to gather data for the assessment from instructors, sponsor
teachers, and students. The results of the data collection are presented
in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 includes a general discussion of the findings, a
summary of the study and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of literature relevant to this study includes (a) an appraisal of the place of English and language arts in native Indian education; (b) an examination of the special nature of native Indian teacher education with particular regard to English and language arts; and (c) a survey of writings concerning needs assessment as a process suitable for reviewing specific components in a teacher education program.

The Place of English and Language Arts in Native Education

The historical setting. Canadian education has never successfully met the needs of its native population. A record of attempts to provide education for Indian people is outlined in Ashworth's recent book The forces which shaped them (1979). She points out that since contact with Europeans had destroyed much of the stability of Indian society, the missionaries saw an opportunity (and probably a duty) to establish a Victorian-type Christian society in the new world. Believing, as they did, that schooling would be the most effective way to implement the kind of change they envisioned, early missionaries first established village schools (pp. 3-10), and then residential training schools for native students (pp. 10-35). These schools operated until the early 1950s when government policy changed and integration--wherein native children were encouraged to attend provincial schools--became the new hope for Indian education (Kirkness, 1980, p. 14).

The change from residential schools to provincial schools was well intended, according to Kirkness (p. 14) but since "no genuine preparation was made for the change" (p. 14), and there was no real consideration of the implications of such change, the new policy failed in its attempt to "bring Indians into the mainstream of Canadian life" (p. 14).

Unfortunately, the integration policy did little to improve depressing statistics concerning school drop-out, age-grade retardation and unemployment amongst native people (Stanbury, 1975). Kirkness (1980) sums up the history of Indian education:

> Indian people have been the victims of an educational system that was foreign to them. This system has been allowed to continue from the 17th century to the present day. It is only during the last ten years that Indian people have made strong demands for change. (p. 15)

The historical perspective on language. The English language has long figured as a factor in native Indian education, but, for the most part, in a very negative way. Although a few of the earliest missionaries used the language of the particular tribe they were teaching (Ashworth, 1979, p. 9), the majority adopted a program of English language instruction combined with native language suppression. This policy, and the attitudes toward native language which it represented, characterized Indian education for a long period of time (pp. 25-35). Students in residential schools were required to speak English at all times, often being severely punished for speaking their native tongues (Ashworth, p. 29). Brown, writing of non-Anglo children in British Columbia, says:

> For some the scars go so deep that one despairs of their ever being erased; the Native Indians, for example, here long before white people came, suffered the gravest insult and humiliation to their language and their culture and their pain can still be heard in the bitter words, recorded herein, of a citizenship judge speaking about her experiences as a pupil at a residential school. (Brown, 1979, p. iii)

The total rejection of the native languages and the enforced use of

English, particularly in residential schooling, led to children suffering

"a profound sense of alienation from their parents" (Canadian Council,

1978, p. 137), and threatened the very existence of native family life,

the heart of Indian society. This sorry history must be taken into

consideration in any discussion of language in native Indian education.

Native Languages in Native Indian Education

Given the historical background wherein English was imposed and

native languages suppressed (Ashworth, 1979, pp. 25-33), it is not

surprising that native leaders assign high priority to the reclamation

and teaching of native languages (NIB, 1972, p. 15). The call for

bilingualism and biculturalism in native Indian education is strong.

Native language programs such as those at New Aiyansh or Mount Currie

in British Columbia (Spears, 1974; Wyatt, 1977b), are becoming increasingly

commonplace in North America (Andersson & Boyer, 1978).

Riffell (1975) suggests, however, that parents often find themselves

in a "language dilemma" when faced with these programs (p. 27). Some

are concerned that learning a native language will interfere with 'real'

education (Smith, 1980, p. 15; Wyatt, 1977a, p. 407), while others may

question the validity of such programs with an argument similar to that

expressed by Epstein (1977):

> After nearly nine years and more than half a billion dollars
> in federal funds, however, the government U.S. has not demon-
> strated whether such instruction makes much difference in the
> students' achievement, in their acquisition of English, or in
> their attitudes toward school. (p. 1)

Smith (1980), writing in a recent edition of the Journal of American

Indian Education, actually condemns bilingual education for native students.

She supports her contention that it will exacerbate the problem of age-

grade retardation by referring to the work of Macnamara (1966).

> After reviewing more than 75 independent studies on bilingual-
> ism and second language teaching, Macnamara concluded, "All
> in all, we may tentatively conclude that monolinguals - those
> people speaking only one language - are superior to bilinguals
> in all linguistic skill enumerated." (Smith, 1980, p. 15)

Regardless of the controversy that exists concerning the benefits

of bilingual education, it is nevertheless evident that native parents

and educators are very concerned about their children's development of

proficiency in English (Radulovich, 1974; Foerster & Little Soldier,

1980). For example, in a large scale needs assessment addressed to the

issue of improving education for native students, eight of ten participant

groups (N=1618) chose the development of English skills as the most

important goal in education (Oklahoma, 1976).

Since native people do value English competency as an educational

goal, the fact that English is still singled out as the chief cause of

native children's failure in the school system, is a serious indictment

of our educational practices in this regard (Reid, 1974).

English as a Factor in Native Indian Education

The teaching and learning of English, identified as a significant

and troublesome factor in the education of Canadian native Indian

students, is discussed by Bowd (1977), Brooks (1978), and Clifton (1977).

In their reviews of the psychological studies undertaken in this century,

they have indicated that studies before the late 1960s were chiefly

concerned with comparing the scholastic aptitudes of native and non-
native children, and attributing the substantially lower aptitude of the
native children to environmental factors (Brooks, 1978, p. 59). Although
recommendations concerning the teaching of language were common in these
reports, they rarely went further than recommending increased oral
practice (Brooks, p. 61) or remedial attention to reading skills (Bowd,
pp. 336-339). This researcher has failed to find any reports that claim
improved English competency as a result of implementing these two
additions or changes.

The Hawthorn Study (1967) documented the failure of most educational
practices then being used in native education, including those to do
with the teaching and learning of English (Bowd, 1977, pp. 332-335).
Its authors, in suggesting that many problems in native education were
the result of expecting native Indian children to respond to schooling
in exactly the same way as white middle-class children, reflected the
thinking that was then beginning to appear in psychological studies
(Brooks, 1978, p. 59).

Recent Psychological Studies in Native Indian Education

As studies shifted from measuring intelligence and cognition with
verbal tests to measuring them with non-verbal tests, some clues concern-
ing the mismatch between common educational practices and the problems
in learning for native children began to emerge (Brooks, p. 62). It
became clear that while verbal communication dominated their instruction,
native children were much stronger in non-verbal and spatial skills than
they were in verbal skills, and could use their spatial abilities in

problem solving (p. 62). Although it has not been possible to build a

theory of native education methodology based on these or other findings

(p. 67), nevertheless, some recommendations which apply to English

teaching and learning have been forthcoming. Brooks, in reviewing the

work of Bowd (1972), Kleinfeld (1970), and McArthur (1978), summed up

their recommendations for changing instructional practice in the follow-

ing statement:

> School learning would be improved by the use of teaching
> aids such as charts, diagrams, maps and concrete objects.
> Venn diagrams and symbolic pictorial aids have been
> recommended for use in teaching abstractions, even language
> concepts. (p. 65)

Such a recommendation speaks to English curriculum preparation and

instructional methodology.

Additional research which provides useful direction for those

involved in the teaching and learning of English for native students

comes from more recent work by Kleinfeld (1975). She observed classes

in two native and five integrated schools with the intention of studying

the effects of different teaching styles on the verbal participation

of native students. The criteria she used to judge verbal participation

had to do with the quantity and quality of students' oral and written

contributions in specified classes. She found that students responded

best to teachers who, while expressing personal warmth to students,

actively demanded good quality work from them. Since teachers of English

have consistently complained about shy, withdrawn, nonverbal native

students (Dumont, Jr., 1972), it may be that preconceived notions of

behavior have resulted in unnecessary problems for teachers and students.

In Kleinfeld's most recent work, for example, she contrasts the "self-

confident and verbal" English language performance of a group of Eskimo

students attending a school without any special language programs, with

the "traditional" behavior of native and Eskimo students in schools of

any kind (1979, p. 2). The students who so impressed Kleinfeld were

attending a school which had sent an inordinate number of students to

the University of Alaska and thus become the focus of an ethnographic

study of successful bicultural education. Insofar as there were no

special programs for language development in the school (p. 14), and the

students when entering the school scored significantly lower on language

measures than did control groups, their success in English is interesting.

Kleinfeld observes that teachers demonstrated interest in the Eskimo

language while encouraging the use of English as an integrative force

in community life, and taught English skills and abilities in such a way

as to be in harmony with Eskimo values and ideals (pp. 129-130).

In any review of studies relating to the teaching and learning of

English in native Indian education, it is important to acknowledge a

recommendation which has been a part of almost every study and report

written since the 1940s. A typical recommendation reads:

> The weaknesses in verbal ability must be redressed by a
> greater use of English as a Second Language programs in
> the junior elementary schools and by continuing them
> throughout the child's schooling. (Brooks, 1978, p. 66)

English as a second language methodology is presently included in several

of the native teacher training programs (More and Wallis, 1979) but no

definitive studies demonstrating effectiveness of this approach to

English in Indian education have come to the attention of this writer.

A recent refinement in this area, the study of methodology for the teach-

ing of a second dialect of English (Johnson, 1976, pp. 255-271), may prove

to be more effective in Indian education. This should be a productive

area of study and research.

Recent Linguistic Studies in Native Indian Education

Considering the concern with language that has characterized the psychological studies in native Indian education, it is surprising that so few linguistic studies have been published in this area. Dale (1975) suggests that concern with the problems of black Americans has led to a dearth of information about other minority peoples (p. 282). He points out that "on the whole, people who have been interested in language and the American Indian child have focused on English as a second language" (p. 283) but since he earlier stated that "we do not know how many speakers there are for each Indian language, how many speakers are mono-lingual or bilingual in English as well, and how many no longer speak the Indian languages at all" (p. 283), this focus may be somewhat questionable. In fact, Dale leaves this topic and moves on to discuss the best known linguistic study in native education, Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom (Philips, 1972).

Philips documented what many earlier studies had merely suggested: the ways in which native children learn and are taught at home are in direct contrast to the way in which they learn and are taught at school. She found that the following observations held true:

1. Indian pupils did not understand the role of the teacher since there was no comparable adult role in the Indian community.

2. Indian pupils were used to learning primarily through observation of older relatives.

3. Indian pupils were reluctant to verbally respond to the teacher in front of a class for fear of making mistakes.

4.   Indian students were used to learning tasks at home in segmented sequences with self-testing for proficiency.

5.   Indian students did not share certain sociolinguistic assumptions with non-natives or with the teacher. For example, native students did not necessarily recognize the assumption that a question requires an answer.

6.   Indian students worked happily, producing and using effective language when they worked on group projects which were not teacher directed.

Work such as Philips' is important in raising the consciousness of educators responsible for native children, and has been influential in British Columbia (Wyatt, 1978). As Klesner (1980) points out, educational practices such as family grouping, individualized study, learning centres, student tutoring and project work "closely match the in-home learning styles" (p. 15) described by Philips. Furthermore, such practices will not accommodate the students' learning styles at the expense of eventual adaptation to a majority dominated educational setting, a mistake that teachers have made in the name of "helping" their native Indian students (Philips, p. 383).

Although linguistics has not heretofore been a bountiful source of useful studies for native education with regard to learning and teaching English, it is to be hoped that with the growth of Indian education, more research will be forthcoming from this discipline.

Summary

The majority of native parents want quality education--which they
see as including English proficiency--for their children. Although
biculturalism, and in many cases, bilingualism, are seen as essentials
in native Indian education, there is no suggestion that parents or
educators are willing to sacrifice other educational components for them.

There is considerable support in the literature for the identifica-
tion of English as a significant factor in the academic achievement of
native students. Unfortunately there is a tendency to recommend the
establishment of bilingual or English as a second language programs as
the answers to educational difficulties without considering all the
implications of such programming. Such recommendations, for example, do
not allow for the many native students and their families who speak only
dialects of English. It seems apparent there is a need for language
development programs which accept students' dialects while providing for
the learning of a second dialect--school English--which they need for
academic success. Increased research in the teaching and learning of
dialects should eventually prove useful to those working in native
Indian education.

Psychological and linguistic studies provide considerable evidence
that native children learn differently from non-native children.
Unfortunately, there is insufficient evidence to suggest that these
findings can safely be generalized to all native children. The majority
of practices recommended in the studies can be described as pedagogically
sound, however, so there appears to be sufficient justification for
including study of these practices in English/language arts methodology

courses for those who plan to teach native Indian children.

Overall, there are several implications for this study. Wherever possible, the issue of English as a second language, or English as a second dialect should be addressed. Consideration of the findings regarding the learning styles of children should be incorporated into any course regarding the teaching of language arts. The literature supports the basic assumption of this study that the English and language arts components of teacher training programs for native Indians deserve attention.

The second section of this review of the literature pertinent to the development of this study has to do with the native Indian teacher preparation programs.

An Examination of the Special Nature of

Native Indian Teacher Preparation Programs

With Particular Regard to English and Language Arts

Introduction

> Some students did indicate that they might like to be teachers
> but hastened to add that they could never achieve such a
> goal because they would probably not complete high school
> and would never get to university. (Hawthorn, 1967, p. 124)

In 1967 Indian students had little hope of becoming teachers; the fact that in 1980 they can do so marks a significant development in Indian education. During the past decade, more than a score of university programs for training native Indian teachers, designed to include those students who may not have had the opportunity to complete secondary

school, have been established in Canada (More & Wallis, 1979). Similar

programs have been established in the United States (Mathieson, 1974).

Background

These programs have developed, at least in part, as a response to

the well documented "failure of the Canadian educational enterprise, at

all levels, in its service to the Indian peoples" (McIntosh, 1979, p. 22).

They reflect a sincere conviction on the part of those involved that

"more Indian people in the teaching profession and the emergence of an

even more effective Indian leadership in education" (More, p. 12) will

redress the failure, at least in part. They are based on the assumption

that Indianness--a quality which native Indian leaders see as essential

but frequently missing from Indian education programs--will primarily

come from the presence of native Indian teachers, especially in classrooms

where there are numbers of native students. "The best way to begin to

Indianize the schools is to penetrate them with qualified teachers"

(Kaltsounis, 1972, p. 292).

A review of the literature concerning native Indian teacher prepara-

tion programs reveals that little of an analytic or evaluative nature is

available in published form. This may be explained by Barnett's (1974)

suggestion that "superficial analysis by external evaluators unfamiliar

with philosophical assumptions and objectives underlying the programs"

(p. 29) can undermine these hard-won alternatives to regular teacher

training. On the other hand, the lack of evaluative studies may reflect

an understandable fear that such reports will be incorrectly used as

evidence "that costs are too high or that the program strays from original guidelines" (Sterling, 1975, p. 14), leading to a bureaucratic decision to cancel the program in question.

Whatever the reasons, few studies concerning native Indian teacher education programs have been published. Most of the available material tends to be descriptive and anecdotal, and programs are discussed in general terms. Notwithstanding the dearth of research of critical studies, recent monographs such as Native teacher education (More & Wallis, 1979; More, 1981) provide a useful overview relevant to this study.

Current Situation

It is undoubtedly true that although native Indian teacher education "programs are beginning to demonstrate their effectiveness" (More, 1979), they are not without problems. In addition to the issues which may arise in any teacher education program--such as a concern about the length of practica--there are special problems, or special aspects of the usual teacher education problems which may be unique to native programs.

More outlines the special problems in a paper presented to the Canadian Education Association Conference in September, 1979. Since some of the problems identified by More are relevant to the concerns of this study, they will be discussed in terms of native Indian teacher education programs in general, and in terms of NITEP.

Problems in Native Teacher Education

The question of standards in the programs. More suggests that the
basic problems with standards "arises from a misunderstanding of equiva-
lent standards and from an actual--but exaggerated--lowering of standards"
(p. 7) in some programs. The admission criteria which permit mature
students to enter the university without secondary school graduation or
academic background, or the acceptance of native languages in fulfillment
of language requirements are confused with lowering program standards.

Given the importance of English in academic studies, it is not
surprising that English figures prominently in this issue of standards.
More admits that "some" programs have succumbed to "the fadishness
(unfortunately) of Indian education, the urgent need for more Indian
teachers, political pressures and the fuzzy thinking of the so-called
'bleeding hearts'," and have allowed students to graduate without taking
or completing one college level English course or otherwise having come
to terms with academic deficiencies. However well intentioned such
practices, they succeed only in maintaining the idea of the "red pass"
or the "watered-down program" (p. 7), which are unfair assumptions "about
recent Indian education programs in general" (More, 1979, p. 7).

NITEP, like other programs in native Indian teacher training, admits
students who have not completed secondary school and who may have
deficiencies in their academic background. Unlike some of these other
programs, NITEP demands that students fulfill the same English require-
ments as all other education students. A 1975 external evaluation of
NITEP, part of an evaluation of all alternative programs in the Faculty
of Education at the University of British Columbia, was completed in

1975 by Worthen, Owens and Anderson. Using questionnaires and interviews, they surveyed school superintendents, sponsor teachers, principals, faculty students and program staff concerned with the various programs. They found the NITEP had high standards and that faculty and program staff had high expectations of the students. NITEP was commended for providing students with tutorial help in written English, recommended that this practice continue and that a course in study skills be added to the program (Worthen et al., 1975).

Thomas and McIntosh (1977) reported that nine out of ten students in their sample of 90 students responded affirmatively to the statement, "I had difficulty in writing the quality of papers which my instructors expected from me" (Appendix C). Half of those responding affirmatively indicated that this matter was of serious concern to them.

In addition to administering the student questionnaire, Thomas and McIntosh interviewed some instructors teaching in the program at that time, and reported that these instructors seemed to agree that "for most NITEP students, as for most beginning U.B.C. students irrespective of program, writing is a problem" (p. 46). Overall, however the report states:

> It is generally recognized, among students and staff alike, that deficiencies in language skills present the greatest problem which must be overcome by the NITEP students. (p. 50)

The special status of the programs. The fact that programs are restricted to native people in order to meet their "common need" is misunderstood by some in the majority culture. (More (1979) points out that "fortunately most educators long ago left the dream world of trying to treat students equally, and entered the real world of trying to treat individuals according to their needs" (p. 9).

This matter of resistance on the part of some members of the majority culture to special programs directed to native people does not appear to be at issue in NITEP, or in British Columbia at this time. Several very supportive articles such as Ohm's "Not a Red Pass," and two external evaluations suggest that the program is held in high repute (Thomas & McIntosh, 1977; Worthen et al., 1975).

Since the English and language arts requirements are at least as rigorous in NITEP as in the regular elementary program, and native languages are not presently included in the curriculum, there is little with regard to language that makes NITEP different from the regular elementary program.

Control of the programs. The various groups involved in the native Indian teacher education programs want more say in the development of those programs. Thomas and McIntosh (1977) discuss the difficulties in this area pointing to the autonomy which exists in the university and the reluctance of the university community to share control in such areas as course planning. Interestingly, their example has to do with English.

> We surmise that a good deal of friction would be generated
> if, say the (Advisory) Committee were to provide guidelines
> for the English 100 course taught to NITEP students. This
> would be an incursion on territory which is jealously
> defended by academies. (p. 88)

Fortunately, the general support for NITEP in the university community suggests that the Advisory Committee, or program supervisor, could approach the English department and ask for special consideration in meeting the needs of NITEP students.

Nature of the programs. This issue has to do with whether or not programs are assimilative or integrative: whether or not they are Indian enough. English and language arts curricula, for example, may be a part

of this problem since they may be seen to represent the values and attitudes of the majority culture to the exclusion of the native Indian culture. The question of Indianness, and provisions for it within those parts of a program concerned with English, language arts, and related courses, has been discussed in reports but rarely studied in any formal way. Wyatt (1977a; 1977b; 1978), in writing about the Mount Currie program of Simon Fraser University, alludes to using books by and about native writers as course content in English literature as well as an emphasis on Indian curriculum and teaching methodology development in their program. In addition, this program included native language study. It may be assumed that such a program guarantees a high degree of Indianness, but McIntosh (1979) in analyzing and comparing three programs representative of the three models of native Indian teacher training programs currently being used in Canada (More, 1979), found this not to be so. McIntosh suggests that there is considerable "uncertainty as to what is appropriate for cultural content in these special programs" (McIntosh, 1979).

One question concerning the programs which include native languages and a high degree of Indian content, not answered in any published studies, has to do with the fact that students are granted provincial teaching certificates (Wyatt, 1977b) and may teach anywhere in the educational system. If a significant amount of time has been given over to purely native concerns, what, if anything, has been eliminated from these programs? Given the fact that increasing numbers of native people have moved off-reserve, usually to the cities (McKay, 1977) or that on-reserve parents may choose to send their children to public schools, not all graduates of the special programs are likely to be teaching only

native children.   Obviously graduates of these programs need to be

equipped to teach all children, in addition to being equipped to meet

the special needs of their people.

The question of Indianness, probably the most important question

in Indian education (More, 1981, p. 71), is a dominant concern in NITEP.

"The necessity to 'Indianize' the program without compromising the rigor

and standards of achievement required by the institution for awarding

the B.Ed. (Elementary) degree" (Cook, 1980, p. 9.4), has implications

for this study in English and language arts.   Since English is the

majority language, and has often historically been, at least in the view

of some Indian activists "basic to white supremacy" (Adams, 1975, p. 155),

any study relating to English in native Indian education needs to reflect

an awareness of the native Indian education literature and a sensitivity

to the needs in Indian education as stated by native people.

An emphasis on student teaching in the programs.   Native Indian

(and Inuit) teacher education programs tend to emphasize earlier and

longer periods of student teaching (More, 1979).   There are several

ramifications for programs and their curriculum in terms of English and

language arts.   For example, the amount of time given to teaching method-

ology, and the order in which the courses are given, may be seen to be

important in terms of student teaching.   An internal evaluation done in

Brandon University's IMPACTE program found that faculty, cooperating

teachers and students were all in agreement that student teaching should

not be undertaken until a language arts methodology course had been com-

pleted (Loughton, 1974).

The problems regarding student teaching are particularly relevant

to the NITEP which includes extended periods of classroom teaching in

the first two years, as well as one practica in each of the final years
of the program.

One problem in NITEP has to do with the order in which student
teachers take reading and language arts methodology, one in each of the
first two years. Since sponsor teachers often assign reading and
language arts teaching units for practice teaching in first year, under
the present arrangement they will find that if the students are prepared
to teach reading they are less well prepared to teach language arts and
vice versa. Sponsor teachers may find this unsatisfactory.

Another area of concern in practice teaching that concerns language
arts and reading has to do with the student teacher's language background.
A number of NITEP students are likely to have attended schools where they
were not exposed to a rich program of language development and consequently
consider themselves deficient in such areas as children's literature,
particularly when they are practice teaching in schools where the children
have had a wide breadth of experience.

Although the Thomas and McIntosh study did not make any recommendations
concerning English and/or language arts in student teaching, the 1975
evaluation (Worthen et al.) found that students and sponsor teachers indi-
cated concern about the speech and oral skills of NITEP students. Presum-
ably, the areas normally addressed in the Faculty of Education student
teaching reports--appropriateness or oral English, quality of voice,
fluency and ability to project--were areas which led to this concern
(Faculty of Education, Form 323, 1979). How much of this concern had to
do with the fact that speech patterns and behaviors were different from
those of the teachers and students belonging to the majority culture, and
how much had to do with actual problems in this area would be difficult
to ascertain. Nevertheless, NITEP presently includes a credit speech arts

course for first or second year students in its program.

Summary

Given the demand for native Indian education which will support
native people in their cultural identity, while preparing them intellectu-
ally to make a free choice "to assimilate, integrate or segregate if they
choose" (Sterling, 1975, p. 12), the planning and development of native
Indian teacher education programs is understandably complex and
challenging.

The literature of native Indian teacher education programs, although
generally limited to descriptive, subjective reports, and giving little
information about the teaching and learning of English and language arts,
supports a need for analytical studies and ongoing evaluation. Since
the programs are relatively new, understandably sensitive to external
criticism, with problems sometimes quite different from the main-stream
programs of teacher education, this researcher sees needs assessment as
a valuable tool for studying the program from the point of view of
teaching and learning English and language arts. Needs assessment with
its concern for the learner and all other participants in the educational
process, seems philosophically attuned to the significant problems
outlined in this survey of the literature, at the same time enabling the
specific consideration of English and language arts in the program.

The last section of this review of the literature deals with the
process of needs assessment, and its applicability to the consideration
of English and language arts in the NITEP program.

Needs Assessment: An Investigative Technique for

Considering English and Language Arts in NITEP

Introduction

> Needs assessment is a humanizing process to help make sure
> that we are using our time and the learner's time in the
> most effective and efficient manner possible. (Kaufman &
> English, 1979, p. 31)

This definition of needs assessment must hold great promise for

educators who are trying to improve, plan, change or evaluate their

educational undertakings (Kaufman & English, 1979, p. 31). Some may be

attracted-to this particular process by the claim for efficiency which

is said to result from being able to deploy resources to identified

critical needs, rather than scattering resources throughout a program

(McNeil, 1977, p. 74). Others may be attracted by the humanistic aspect

of needs assessment, particularly those who are concerned with efforts

to improve education for members of minority groups (p. 74). It is not

surprising that educators have been enthusiastic about the technique,

whether they are involved in curriculum planning (p. 90), or in program

development (Bell, Lin & Warthein, 1977, p. 3).

The Process of Needs Assessment

Although needs assessment is frequently used to consider societal

problems on a large scale (Bell et al., p. 22), it is an adaptable process

which can be used in planning for individual programs, or courses (McNeil

& Laosa, 1975, p. 26). Regardless of the size of the problem to be

considered, there appears to be a basic structure to needs assessment.
While the number and description of steps in the process vary widely
(Bell et al., 1977; Coffing, 1977; Kaufman & English, 1979; McNeil, 1977),
an overview of articles by these proponents suggests the following steps:

1. The decision to conduct the needs assessment

2. Identification of participants

3. Generation or elucidation of goals and their priorities

4. Definition of needs

5. Measurement of priorities

6. Interpreting and reporting the results

7. Implementation of recommendations and solutions

The criteria for success in needs assessment (Coffing, 1977) relate
to the above and can include:

1. Commitment to the process on the part of those involved

2. Identity of participants and their degree of involvement in the
process

3. Reliability, validity and utility of assessment of needs

4. The degree to which the findings, recommendations and suggested
solutions are implemented (Coffing, 1977; Kaufman & English, 1979).

One reminder that runs through needs assessment literature is that
it is meant to be "ongoing and continuous" ("Taking a new look," 1977,
p. 7), justifying the time, attention and expense that it involves.
Since the participants, goals, needs or the priorities assigned to them
are subject to many external and internal influences and consequently,
continuous change, assessment must be ongoing.

Difficulties in Needs Assessment

While there has been a "widespread adoption of needs assessment

strategies and techniques over the past decade" (Kimpston & Stockton,

1979, p. 16), there are many unresolved issues currently being debated

in the literature and in practice (Monette, 1977, p. 116). In view of

the fact that needs assessment did not appear as a topic in the

Thesaurus of ERIC descriptors until 1977, it is not surprising that

there is little sense of a firm theoretical foundation or strong

methodology in the literature (Monette, 1977; Griffiths, 1978). Further-

more, there is a philosophical debate centering on what is for some, an

irreconcilable incongruence between the technological and the "social

reconstructionist" aspects of needs assessment (McNeil, 1977, p. 90).

Certainly, the newness and questions concerning theory and

application would explain the findings of Chow (1976), in his study of

the use of needs assessment in higher education. He found that

instructional development agencies used informal, rather than formal

and systematic needs assessment, because they were unable to overcome

the obstacles of cost and client reluctance. He recommended future

studies which would explore the usefulness of needs assessment data

relative to the cost of obtaining same, as well as studies which would

demonstrate simplified needs assessment. Chow's work would seem to

support a study which would adopt the needs assessment for use in

program development in higher education.

Adaptation of Needs Assessment

One of the ongoing discussions in needs assessment literature has

to do with the concept of need. Although the discrepancy model of need--

being the discrepancy between the ideal and the status quo--is widely

used, some critics are very skeptical about needs assessment built on

this model. Monette (1977) speaks for them when he writes:

> The term need ... always implies, more or less directly,
> some standard or valued state of affairs or certain social
> norms against which need is measured. Such standards
> are generally taken for granted and left unchallenged by
> need assessment procedures. Needs assessment basically
> favors 'adjustment'. (p. 125)

In Monette's view, needs assessment which does not question basic

assumptions is an unacceptable procedure. He argues that the too ready

acceptance of standards or norms prevents the uncovering of real needs.

Interestingly, Kaufman and English, foremost of the writers supporting

needs assessment as a technological tool, agree that the truest form of

needs assessment "accepts few givens" and "no sacred cows in terms of

personnel, history - or even existing laws" (p. 56), starting without

any pre-conceived notions.

Cross (1979), on the other hand, has suggested that needs assess-

ments can be very useful in closed systems where there is a problem

which may be interfering with the learner's intention. He sees the

"search for program components that will meet the needs of identified

target groups" (p. 19) as a fully justified use of needs assessment.

Kaufman and English also recognize that pragmatic considerations

frequently require needs assessments which do not question "rules,

policies, goals and objectives of the organization" (p. 60) with which

the learners are involved, but rather, set out to ascertain specified

needs which are deemed necessary to "attain learner growth" (p. 238).
This is the version of needs assessment which they call the Beta-type
needs assessment.

Although Kaufman and English repeatedly stress the narrowness of
the Beta-type assessment, they nevertheless claim some special values
for it (p. 221). For example, they see the process as one which provides
an unusual opportunity for participants in an educational program to
focus on planning. In addition, they suggest that the exercise of
taking part in a Beta-type assessment can result in the development of
group cohesiveness among participants.

The Beta-type needs assessment (Kaufman, 1977, p. 60) lends itself
to this study because it is "focusing exercise for a more rational
approach to planning" which promotes the development of "a conscious and
collective group identity" (Kaufman & English, 1979, p. 221).

Since "program-as-community" is valued in the NITEP (Ohm, 1978, p. 13),
it seems appropriate to use a process such as the Beta-type needs assess-
ment in considering the problem of English and the potential for its
development within the program. Cross (1979) points out that needs
assessments that are designed to solve problems, "moving toward the
search for program components that will meet the needs of identified
target groups," may prove in the long run to "make more significant
contributions to education (p. 19) than other more ambitious forms of
needs assessment described in the literature. Accordingly, this study's
focus on English competency and the program components related to its
development is not too narrow and should prove informative and useful.
Utility is recognized as the final test of successful needs assessment
(Coffing, 1977, p. 183; Kaufman & English, 1979, pp. 4, 88). If the

needs assessment results are useful to the decision makers, the needs assessment is considered worthwhile.

Summary

Needs assessment, best known as a useful technique in large scale, long term educational planning, can play an effective role in considering specific concerns such as the English and language arts components in an ongoing program such as NITEP. The basic technique, as outlined in the literature, is adaptable for use in a variety of educational situations providing that it meets certain criteria, particularly that of utility.

Because needs assessment is relatively new, and increasingly popular, several issues concerning its theory and application exist. This means that there is no firm direction for those adopting this method of studying an educational problem. Despite this, the Beta-type needs assessment, a form of needs assessment especially adapted to be used in ongoing programs, provides a model which gives sufficient direction to ensure credibility in a study such as this.

Chapter 3 will describe the design and methodology of a Beta-type needs assessment used to consider program components in NITEP with particular regard to English competency and the potential for its development.

CHAPTER 3

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The needs assessment process to be utilized in this study is a
synthesis of the directions provided in two models from the literature
(Coffing, 1977, pp. 189-190; Kaufman & English, 1979, pp. 202-203).
The process includes the following five stages:

1. Decision and planning

2. Identification of participants

3. Defining the needs

4. Measuring the priorities of needs

5. Interpreting and reporting the information

Decision and Planning

The initial proposal to conduct a needs assessment within NITEP was
sent to the program's Advisory Committee in November, 1979 (Appendix A).
The proposal was discussed at some length and then approved by the
Committee. Since the Committee included students, native community members,
instructors, and teachers as well as decision making university personnel,
their acceptance was critical in fulfilling initial criteria for successful
needs assessment. These criteria include: (a) the acceptance of the basic
premise by representatives of the participant groups, (b) the acceptance
of the basic premise by representatives of the decision makers, and (c)
acceptance of the needs assessor in that role (Coffing, 1977, pp. 186-187).
The approval of the Advisory Committee provided the necessary acceptance.

Identification of Participants
_____

The target population for a needs assessment includes those

identified as partners in the educational enterprise under study:

learners, educators, and community members (Kaufman & English, p. 187).

Although the initial proprosal for this study (Appendix A) envisioned

a somewhat broader population, including members of the greater native

Indian educational community, time and financial constraints made it

necessary to restrict the population to those groups most directly

involved with the program: sponsor teachers, college and university

instructors, students and program staff. The Advisory Committee

continued to be involved in the process through those members of the

partner groups who served on the Committee, and through progress reports

which were called for periodically (see Appendix B for an example).

Once the partner groups had been identified, it became "important

to be very clear about whose needs were of concern" (Lenning, 1978, p. 7).

In his work developing a conceptual framework for needs assessment,

Lenning makes the point that "the tendency of needs assessors has been

not to be specific enough about whose needs are being identified and

analyzed, and to not separately consider the needs of specific subgroups"

(p. 7).

For the purpose of this study, needs to be considered were those

of the NITEP students. Since the structure of the program divides

students into two subgroups, those first and second year students involved

in an extensive student teaching process, and the third and fourth year

students who are primarily concerned with academic work, it became

apparent that the needs of the two groups would lend themselves to being

considered separately. This is not to suggest that junior students are not concerned about academic matters, nor is it to suggest that senior students are not concerned with student teaching. It merely represents an arbitrary division based on the present structure of the NITEP program. Furthermore, since it is possible that other significant but unrecognized subgroups in the program exists --for example, students having English as a second language--it would be necessary to gather as much relevant personal background information as possible in order to subsequently identify other subgroups.

Defining the Needs

The primary task in needs assessment is the identification of need, or the development of a need model (Bell, Lin & Warheit, 1977, p. 4). Accepting the premise that an educational need is the discrepancy between _what is_ and _what ought to be_ (Knowles, 1977, p. 86; McNeil, 1977, p. 74), this researcher undertook a series of unstructured interviews with members of the partner groups in order to gather their views. It was generally suggested by the majority of those interviewed that what 'ought to be' was that students should exhibit the level of facility in oral and written English 'normally' expected at the university level and in the teaching profession. Most of those interviewed, including students, stressed that 'lower' or 'different' standards would be unacceptable.

Discussion concerning what is--the general level of competence in English displayed by NITEP students--uncovered far less concensus among the participants. Although no one claimed that all NITEP students were

at a satisfactory level of competency, some instructors interviewed suggested that in this respect the NITEP students did not differ from other students they had taught in college and university programs. Others expressed the belief that some NITEP students had more deep seated and serious deficiencies in their English background than would normally by expected of university students. The concerns mentioned--a whole range of language competencies--included vocabulary development, voice quality and projection, essay writing and many other aspects of oral and written language. In addition, some of those interviewed raised the question of a few students whose difficulties might have more to do with inadequate concept development and background for abstract thought. Since the question falls outside the parameters of the proposed needs assessment, this area of concern was not actively pursued by this researcher.

As a result of the interviews with participants, the problem became to describe the recommended level of competency in sufficient detail to encompass those areas identified as concerns, and then to ensure that all participants would have an opportunity to express themselves in a way which could be quantified and discussed.

Planning the instruments. Consideration was given at this time to using standardized tests to gather data concerning students' competency in English. Kaufman (1979) points out that such data would improve the validity of a program needs assessment (pp. 295-304). Unfortunately, the limitations of such testing, such as the difficulties of finding the right tests (N.C.T.E., 1976, p. 27), and constraints imposed by time and cost, did not permit this kind of measurement.

Eventually, since the participants in NITEP would be spread through-out the province during the time allowed for the study, the decision was taken to use a mailed questionnaire for data collection. Although there can be serious problems with a mailed questionnaire--chiefly related to non-response leading to biased samples, and to a lesser degree, the inability to check responses (Kerlinger, 1966, p. 397)--Best points out, it can be a "most appropriate and useful data gathering device" (1977, p. 158).

The first issue, non-response, is discussed by Orlich (1978). He reports that there is support in the research literature for the notion that populations with a common group identity, such as the participant groups in the NITEP program, will demonstrate minimal "response differences between respondents, non-respondents and late respondents" (1978, p. 99). He further states that if response is expected to be rather low, having more than one group and then comparing the intensity of responses of representative groups for convergence of opinion, will, if convergence exists, allow "a higher probability of making conclusions which tend to be supported." The natural dichotomies in the NITEP partner groups--sponsor teachers from two school districts; college and university instructors; junior students and senior students--allow for comparisons between two groups in any one category. For example, if sponsor teachers from one district had a very high response rate and sponsor teachers from a second district had a very low response rate, it would be possible to make conclusions with high probability if their compared responses were similar.

Devising the instruments. The decision to collect data through a mailed questionnaire necessitated further consideration of this study's

objectives. To answer the research questions regarding concerns about students' language use and teaching competencies, and to collect data regarding the program's potential for developing English competency, implied a lengthy and detailed questionnaire. Because lengthy and detailed questionnaires "frequently find their way into the wastebasket" (Best, 1977, p. 166), brevity and conciseness became important.

Using the criteria of brevity and conciseness, different models of English competency were examined and assessed as to their appropriateness and suitability.

For example, a fairly typical curricular model developed by a public school system for a language improvement program listed six major aspects of language breaking down into 185 skills (BUILD, 1977), hardly a manageable number. Another model developed by Petty, Petty, Newman and Skeen (1977), appeared brief and concise but in fact listed competencies so complex that considerable analysis would have been necessary to reach the stage of specificity necessary for questionnaire development. The problem of describing English competency—what ought to be, in the needs assessment process—was addressed in a more concise manner by the researchers responsible for the British Columbia assessment of written expression (Conry & Rodgers, 1978). Their research team analyzed seventy-four forms of writing "likely to be met by average adults who have completed grade twelve" (Summary, 1978, p. 13), and then isolated forty-three skill areas which grouped into six "component abilities in competent writing" (Summary, 1978, p. 16).

Since this model of language description reflected the competencies in written language expected of grade twelve graduates, it seemed to provide a suitable baseline for describing the competencies in written

expression expected of university undergraduates. Furthermore, its brevity and conciseness, and the fact that it described language behavior in behavioral terms, adds to its usefulness.

Validity is present in needs assessment when those identified as decision makers are able to evaluate the information and the process by which it was gathered, and then use it to implement necessary change (Coffing, 1977). According to Coffing, the opportunity for validity is greatly improved when the participants are able to identify their needs in behavioral terms and there is little chance for "loss of meaning in the transmission of needs" between the participant groups and the decision makers (1977, p. 188).

Further consideration suggested that the model provided in the Conry and Rodgers study could be adapted to describe not only the competency expected of university students in the area of written language, but also to describe aspects of competency in written language expected of student teachers. It soon became apparent to this researcher that the Conry and Rodgers model could also be useful in creating a description of competency in oral language for both groups. A review of other assessments which included an oral language component such as Assessing pupil progress (1976); and Language, B.C. (1976); as well as study of a model developed by Petty, Petty, Newman and Skeen (1977), provided further direction. The guide, A statement on the preparation of teachers (N.C.T.E., 1976), was also helpful in this development. The resulting aspects of oral and written language competency selected for inclusion in the questionnaire are shown in Tables 1 and 2. Items describing the various aspects of oral and written expression were prepared for the questionnaires (see Figures 1, 2, 3 and 4).

Table 1

Aspects of Language Related to the

Academic Student Role

Oral language	Written Language
a. Quality and use of voice	a. Conventions of format
b. Interpersonal communication behavior	b. Basic description and recording
	c. Sensitivity to words and word sequences
c. Sensitivity to words and arrangements of words	d. Response to experience
d. Appropriate usage and dialect	e. Achieving the writer's purpose: exposition and argument
e. Listening capabilities	
f. Achieving speaker's purpose	f. Achieving the writer's purpose narration and characterization

Table 2

Aspects of Language Related to

Student Teaching Performance

Oral language	Written Language
a. Quality and use of voice	a. Conventions of format
b. Interpersonal communication behavior	b. Basic description and recording
	c. Sensitivity to words and word sequences
c. Sensitivity to words and arrangements of words	
d. Appropriate usage and dialect	
e. Listening capabilities	
f. Achieving speaker's purpose	

A. Quality and use of
   voice

1. Speaks distinctly, articulates sound clearly

2. Projects voice effectively relative to audience size

3. Speaks without undue extraneous expressions such a 'uh' and 'er'

B. Interpersonal
   communication
   behavior

4. Takes responsibility as a member of group discussion

5. Uses conventional nonverbal behavior

6. Confidently expresses divergent opinion

C. Sensitivity to words
   and arrangements
   of words

7. Uses wide ranging vocabulary

8. Shows awareness of fine distinctions in meaning

9. Uses effective imagery

D. Appropriate usage
   and dialect

10. Demonstrates control of standard English usage

11. Uses level of language appropriate to situation; e.g., report giving, discussing, debating

---

E. Listening
   capabilities

12. Listens attentively with comprehension

13. Questions perceptively in order to understand

F. Achieves speaker's
   purpose

14. Expresses and supports opinions reasonably

15. Reports main ideas with sufficient detail

16. Organizes ideas in a coherent manner

Figure 1. Aspects of oral expression related to student performance in university coursework.

A. Conventions of format

1. Spells, punctuates, capitalizes correctly
2. Uses quotation marks and associated punctuation correctly
3. Proofreads effectively
4. Uses correct mechanics of bibliographies, citations and footnotes

B. Basic description and recording

5. Gives basic information clearly, e.g., answering questions, brief reports
6. Describes people, things with sufficient detail

C. Sensitivity to words

7. Uses variety in sentence length
8. Uses imagery effectively
9. Selects words to reinforce a specific mood or impression
10. Shows awareness of fine distinctions in word meanings
11. Understands and uses grammatical terms in discussing writing

D. Response to experience

12. Expresses own voice effectively
13. Shows fluency in ideas and associations
14. Responds to readings with perception

E. Achieving the writer's purpose: exposition and argument

15. Distinguishes between essential and peripheral detail
16. Focuses on one topic or event
17. Adjusts tone to audience
18. Elaborates an opinion, makes a judgment
19. Selects detail to support a viewpoint
20. Summarizes and paraphrases
21. Organizes complex essays/reports; uses connectives, transitions

F. Achieving the writer's purpose: narration and characterization

22. Displays coherence and unity of tone and impression
23. Organizes events in a plausible sequence
24. Conveys personality through selected detail

Figure 2. Aspects of written expression related to student performance in university coursework (Adapted from British Columbia assessment of written expression by R. Conry and D. Rodgers, 1978).

A. Quality and use of voice	1.	Speaks distinctly, articulates sounds clearly
	2.	Projects voice sufficiently for classroom needs
	3.	Uses voice effectively in various situations such as story telling, giving directions, etc.
B. Interpersonal communication behavior	4.	Uses conventional nonverbal behavior effectively
	5.	Recognizes need of all children to be heard; modesl respect for others' ideas
	6.	Uses language with confidence
C. Sensitivty to use of words, and arrangement of words	7.	Uses interesting, varied vocabulary
	8.	Rephrases information in variety of ways whenever necessary
	9.	Demonstrates control of rhythm and rhyme; e.g., poetry, rhyming exercises, etc.
D. Appropriate usage and dialect	10.	Demonstrates adequate control of standard English usage
	11.	Recognizes dialectal differences in others' language; e.g., understands childrens' language use
	12.	Chooses level of language appropriate to situation
E. Listening capabilities	13.	Identifies and discriminates all speech sounds (as in phonics)
	14.	Listens attentively, responds appropriately
F. Achieving speaker's purpose	15.	Uses language to set a scene, create a mood
	16.	Uses language effectively to maximize positive interaction with the pupils

Figure 3. Aspects of oral expression related to student teaching performance.

A. Conventions of format   1. Spells correctly

2. Uses correct punctuation and capitalization

3. Proofreads effectively

4. Uses common abbreviations correctly

B. Basic description and recording   5. Gives simple directions clearly

6. Uses terse, telegraphic style effectively for chalkboard notes where suitable

C. Sensitivity to words and word sequences   7. Shows awareness of fine distinctions in word meanings

8. Uses grammatical terms appropriately in talking about writing

Figure 4. Aspects of written expression related to student teaching performance.

Measuring the Priorities of Needs

An important characteristic of good questionnaire design is the ease with which it can be completed by the respondent and tabulated by the researcher (Best, 1977, pp. 166-167). One way to accomplish this is to have respondents assess needs and assign priorities to them in one step. Therefore, a summated three point rating scale was adopted. It was postulated that such a scale would be acceptable since items were being treated as though of equal value, and that sufficient diversity of opinion was permitted with the following categories: satisfactory or better; needs some improvement; needs considerable improvement. Given the necessary features of items being treated as of equal value, and allowance for diversity of opinion, Kerlinger says that the summated rating scale is "the most useful in behavioral research" (1966, p. 487). In order to overcome the error of central tendency which typically appears when raters are not familiar with the subject under study, he recommends allowing for greater variance in response than sometimes allowed in questionnaires. However, in this study, the degree to which raters know the subject should overcome any such tendency (Kerlinger, 1966, p. 517).

To accommodate the various aspects of language involved in the two major areas of student life, student teaching and academic coursework, different versions of two questionnaires were prepared. The first, written in the first person for senior students, was rewritten in the third person for instructors and program staff. The second, written in the first person for junior students, was rewritten in the third person for sponsor teachers. Instructions for each section of the questionnaires,

invitations to make comments, and ample space to do so, as well as the
questions needed to ascertain demographic, professional and personal
information, were added. Care was taken, through the provision of an
introduction to each section, to develop a context within which partici-
pants could respond to the various questions. Following review of the
questionnaires by English education faculty members, graduate students
and two first year Arts students, minor modifications were made in the
terms. Most commonly this was the addition of a few more words of
description. The final copies were typed and the materials photocopied
prior to mailing. The questionnaires can be seen in Appendix C.

Administering the instruments. Since the letter of transmittal may
be the "most important single factor in determining the percentage of
responses" to a mailed questionnaire (Borg & Gall, 1979, p. 302), each
was carefully designed to explain the purpose and importance of the study,
the need for the respondent's participation, and the time constraints.
The letters were typed on university letterhead and included the name of
a faculty member (Appendix D). Prior to any mailings, letters and
materials were sent to the school superintendents of the two school
districts connected with the program requesting permission for their
teachers to participate in the study (Appendix E).

The original mailings to all participants in the middle of June,
included stamped return addressed envelopes, a procedure often cited as
an important factor in gaining response to a mailed questionnaire (Borg
& Gall, 1979, p. 303; Best, 1977, p. 168). Approximately ten days after
the first mailing, follow-up post cards requesting the return of those
questionnaires not yet received were sent to instructors and students
(Appendix D). Since sponsor teachers were no longer available at their

schools, and home addresses were unknown, nothing further could be done
to obtain their participation. In mid-July the needs assessor was
notified that certain students had moved and had not received question-
naires. Duplicate materials were sent to those students for whom new
addresses were available.

Further discussion, specific to measuring the priorities of needs
in the NITEP, will appear in Chapter.4.

Interpreting and Reporting the Information

The four instruments were coded in order that the data could be
transcribed onto cards for processing in the Michigan Terminal System at
the University of British Columbia computing centre. Since the number
and kind of responses to individual items and the priority of those items
would be the important analysis, the consultant statistician recommended
the Statistical package for social sciences (Kita, 1978) as the basic
source for programming. Programs were devised which would produce fre-
quencies, relative frequencies, adjusted frequencies, cumulative frequen-
cies, arithmetic means and standard deviations for all items on the
questionnaires. In addition, since it was likely that not all respondents
would be able to respond to every item, it was necessary to devise a
program which would allow for all computations to be based only on the
actual number of coded responses for each item. Interpretation and
reporting of the needs assessment data will occur in Chapter 5.

Chapter 3 has described the design and methodology required to set
the needs assessment process in motion. The development of the study's
instruments, their administration, and the plans for data analysis have

been described. Criteria for monitoring the needs assessment process have also been discussed. Chapter 4 will present the treatment and analysis of the data, or, in needs assessment terminology, will describe the needs and discuss the priorities of those needs.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this study was to consider English competency and
the potential for its development in NITEP, through the use of the needs
assessment process. As part of this process, questionnaires were developed
and mailed to people who had been identified as participants in the program
in any year since 1977. The participant groups in the survey included:
sponsor teachers from two school districts where NITEP centers had been
established; college and university instructors or program staff who had
taught students; and senior and junior students who were registered in the
program in September, 1980.

In this chapter the data from the mail questionnaires are presented
following the sequence of the research questions which they were designed
to address. In addition to the data, tables outlining the aspects of
language involved in each question, and descriptions of the participant
groups who responded to the questionnaires, are provided.

Treatment of the Questionnaires

Returned questionnaires were marked with the date of delivery in case
it became necessary to study late respondents as a separate group. They
were then coded and the information transferred to data processing cards
and computer files. Computer programs were run to establish frequency
counts, number of responses, means and standard deviations for each item.

Secondary programs were run on the student data in order to consider the

English as a second language variable.

Response to the Questionnaires

The use of mailed questionnaires raised the issue of acceptable rates

of return. Although Borg and Gall (1979, p. 377) argue that an 80% return

is necessary for validity when using a mailed questionnaire, Curtis (1978),

reporting on a survey of the literature relevant to the issue, wrote:

> There would appear to be no concensus among those who have
> discussed mail survey in the literature about what percent-
> age of returns are necessary for a valid analysis. (p. 369)

He points out that several published studies have ranged well below 50%,

going as low as 9.65%, and cites a variety of studies including both

Phillips (1941) and Babbie (1973) who argue that 50% return is sufficient

for generalizing about a population.

As previously discussed in Chapter 3, other researchers have found

that when participant groups have a common purpose or some kind of commit-

ment to an undertaking, no significant differences are found between

respondents, non-respondents or late respondents (Orlich, 1978). Since

participants in NITEP would seem to have such a common purpose and commit-

ment--Thomas and McIntosh alluded to this in their 1977 study--it could

be argued that a response falling below the ideal of 80% or better would

be acceptable.

The overall response rate in this study was 69.3%, with no group

falling below a 50% return (see Table E, Appendix F). It is interesting

to note that the figures move from a low of 53% for one group of sponsor

teachers who did not receive the questionnaire until the middle of June,

and who could not be contacted thereafter, to a high of 90% for a group of students to whom follow-up post cards could be sent.

University Coursework Questionnaire

Characteristics of instructors responding to the questionnaire. Questionnaires were sent to all instructors whose names appeared on staff lists covering the period September, 1977 to September, 1979. Twenty-seven college and university instructors returned usable questionnaires.

Eight questions asked for information concerning the nature of the instructor's involvement with NITEP (Table A, Appendix F).

The first two questions asked instructors to respond to three options describing the courses which they had taught to NITEP students. Five instructors indicated that they had taught more than one kind of course to NITEP students. Four of the instructors responding to the question had taught non-credit courses in addition to education courses, while one instructor had taught an arts course as well as a non-credit course.

Questions three, four, five and eight had to do with the kind and amount of experience that instructors had had with the NITEP. Questions six and seven were intended to identify those instructors who might, by reason of their teaching assignment or professional background, be particularly interested in English. The majority of instructors respond-ing to the questionnaire characterized their courses as being demanding in oral. and written English; only four instructors described their courses as not particularly demanding in oral or written English. The majority of instructors identified their professional responsibility as

including the teaching of English or as having, in the past, included the teaching of English.

Characteristics of senior students responding to the questionnaire. Questions to elicit professional and personal information from both junior and senior students were placed at the beginning of their respective questionnaires (Appendix C). The data collected in response to those questions appear in Table B, Appendix F.

Of thirteen senior students for whom addresses were available and to whom questionnaires were mailed, eight returned usable forms for analysis. Seven of the eight respondents identified themselves as having been registered in fourth year during 1979, and there was one third year student in the group.

Four of the eight students claimed English as their first language, while the remaining four had spoken a native Indian language before learning English. It appeared that two of the four students had not learned English until they attended school, since they did not learn the language until they were seven or eight years of age.

Insofar as their families were concerned, five of the eight students indicated that their families spoke an Indian language at least some of the time, while six of the eight students reported that the people in their home communities spoke a native tongue at least part of the time.

Oral Expression in the Academic Student Role:

Research Question One

The first research question in this study asks: Which aspects of
oral expression do instructors and students identify as concerns in the
university coursework of NITEP students? Participants were asked to
respond to 16 items concerning oral expression on a scale which included
three options: satisfactory or better; needs some improvement; needs
considerable improvement. Instructors were asked to reflect on their
assessment of oral language competence of all students, and then, consider-
ing the NITEP students whom they had taught since 1977, to respond to the
descriptions of oral language behavior using the scale provided. Students
were asked to consider their own use of oral language in their academic
classes and to evaluate themselves accordingly.

The aspects of oral language which were considered, and descriptors
which led to the actual items on the questionnaires, are shown in Table 4.
The questionnaires sent to instructors and senior students appear in
Appendix C.

Oral Expression in University Coursework

as Perceived by Instructors

The data collected from the instructor group in response to the 16
items regarding oral expression in academic coursework are presented in
Table 3. The table lists the items ranked in order of priority as estab-
lished by means and standard deviations obtained from summing all
responses. It also reports the actual responses to each item including

the number of respondents who did not answer. The total number of respon-

dents to the questionnaire is also included.

Because the ranking of items was ascertained by the means and

standard deviations based on the total response to each item, the figures

representing frequency of response may not follow one another in the

expected order. For example, in Table 3, 24 instructors expressed concern

about item 8, the ability to make fine distinctions in word meanings.

Since this item was accorded the highest mean rating of all items in oral

expression, 2.39, it ranked first as a matter of concern, even though

item 7, demonstration of a wide ranging vocabulary, was identified as a

concern by 25 of the instructors responding. The reason for this apparent

discrepancy is that 12 instructors chose the needs considerable improve-

ment response to item 8 while only nine of the instructors responding to

item 7 chose that response. Item 15, the ability to report main ideas

with sufficient detail, ranked third, and was a matter of concern to 21

of the responding instructors with a mean response of 2.08. The fourth

ranked concern, item 13, the ability to question perceptively, was identi-

fied as a matter of concern by 20 of the instructors responding and given

a mean response of 2.08. Twenty-one of the instructors answering the

questionnaire expressed concern about some students' control of standard

English and item 10 was accorded a mean response of 2.04, and ranked

fifth. Twenty-six of the instructors assigned the same mean to item 14,

the ability to express and support opinions, ranking it in sixth place,

while the seventh ranking concern, item 16, the ability to organize ideas

coherently, was identified as being of some concern to 19 of the respon-

dents but given a slightly lower mean response of 2.00 by 26 of them.

Table 3

Items in Oral Expression Ranked as Perceived Concerns by Instructors

N = 27

Item Number	Language descriptor	Responses[a]					X	S	Rank Order
		1	2	3	NA	Total			
8	Made fine distinctions in vocabulary	2	12	12	1	27	2.39	.63	1
7	Showed breadth of vocabulary	1	16	9	1	27	2.31	.55	2
15	Reported main ideas	4	15	6	2	27	2.08	.64	3
13	Asked useful questions	5	13	7	2	27	2.08	.70	4
10	Controlled standard English	5	15	6	1	27	2.04	.66	5
14	Supported opinions	7	11	8	1	27	2.04	.77	6
16	Organized ideas coherently	6	14	6	1	27	2.00	.69	7
2	Projected voice adequately	8	11	7	1	27	1.96	.77	8
11	Chose appropriate levels of language	5	18	3	1	27	1.92	.56	9
12	Listened and comprehended	7	14	4	2	27	1.88	.67	10
9	Used effective imagery	7	13	4	3	27	1.88	.67	10
4	Actively participated in discussion	9	13	4	1	27	1.81	.69	12
6	Confidently expressed divergent opinions	9	11	3	4	27	1.74	.69	13
1	Demonstrated correct articulation and projection	10	13	3	1	27	1.73	.67	14
3	Spoke fluently	8	16	1	2	27	1.72	.54	15
5	Used conventional nonverbal	15	6	1	5	27	1.36	.58	16

[a] 1 = satisfactory or better
2 = needed improvement
3 = needed considerable improvement

Overall, seven items were accorded a mean response of 2.00 or greater by the instructors responding to the items. Since a response between 2.00 and 3.00 had been established as indicating a need for improvement on the questionnaire, these seven items deserve particular attention.

Five of the seven items with a mean response of 2.00 or greater represent concerns about only two aspects of oral expression: sensitivity to words and arrangements of words, and achieving the speaker's purpose. In addition to these two aspects of oral expression, two others were represented by one item each: appropriate usage and dialect, and listening capabilities. It is interesting to note that other items descriptive of oral expression were identified as being of some concern to more than 60% of the participating instructors without registering the mean response indicating that the item is perceived as a need.

Item 2, projected voice effectively; item 11, chose appropriate levels of language; item 12, listened and comprehended; item 9, used effective imagery; item 4, actively participated in discussion; and item 3, spoke fluently, had mean responses of 1.96, 1.92, 1.88, 1.88, 1.81, and 1.72 respectively, but were perceived as being of some concern to at least 60% of the instructors responding to the questionnaire.

Oral Expression in University Coursework
as Perceived by Senior Students

The data collected from the questionnaires sent to senior students are reported in Table 4. They were rank ordered by summing the number of 1, 2, and 3 responses to each item. Item 9, the use of effective

Table 4

Items in Oral Expression Ranked as

Perceived Concerns by Senior Students

N = 8

Item no.	Language descriptor	Responses [a]					Rank order
		1	2	3	N/A	Total	
9	Used effective imagery	2	4	2	-	8	1
10	Controlled standard English	3	2	3	-	8	2
7	Showed breadth of vocabulary	2	5	1	-	8	3
8	Made fine distinctions in vocabulary	3	3	2	-	8	4
3	Spoke fluently	3	4	1	-	8	5
11	Chose appropriate levels of language	3	4	1	-	8	5
13	Asked useful questions	3	4	1	-	8	5
16	Organized ideas coherently	3	4	1	-	8	5
5	Used conventional nonverbal behavior	3	5	-	-	8	9
12	Listened and comprehended	3	5	-	-	8	9
1	Used correct articulation	3	4	-	1	8	11
2	Projected voice adequately	5	2	1	-	8	12
14	Supported opinions	5	2	1	-	8	12
4	Actively participated in discussion	5	3	-	-	8	14
6	Confidently expressed divergent opinions	5	3	-	-	8	14
15	Reported main ideas	5	3	-	-	8	14

[a] 1 = Satisfactory or better; 2 = Needed improvement; 3 = Needed considerable improvement.

imagery, was identified as needing improvement by six of the eight students responding and was the first ranked concern. Five students identified item 10, the control of standard English, as being of some concern and ranked it second. Item 7, the ability to use a breadth of vocabulary, was identified as being of some concern to six of the eight students, but ranked third. Similarly, item 8, the ability to make fine distinctions in vocabularly, was identified as being an area of concern to five out of eight students and ranked fourth.

Summary

Although students did not register the same degree of concern as instructors about items relating to sensitivity to words and word sequences, the ranking of items suggested more similarity in their perception of concerns about this aspect of oral expression than might appear to be the case. Two of the three items ranked similarly. Item 8, made fine distinctions in vocabulary, and item 7, displayed a breadth of vocabulary, were ranked first and second by instructors and fourth and third by students. There is considerable difference, however, in the ranking of the third item in this category. Item 9, used effective imagery, was ranked first by students and eleventh by instructors.

Another difference between the two groups emerged from their response to two of the items representing that aspect of oral expression called achieving the speaker's purpose. Item 15, the ability to report main ideas with sufficient detail to be comprehensible and interesting, was ranked third by instructors and sixteenth by students, while item 14, the ability to support opinions, was ranked sixth by instructors and

twelfth by students. Instructors and students appeared to be much closer to one another in their perception of the students' ability to organize ideas coherently. Item 16 was ranked seventh by instructors and fifth by students.

With the further exception of item 3, spoke fluently without using extraneous expressions unduly, which was ranked fifteenth by instructors and fifth by students, and item 5, used conventional nonverbal behavior, ranked sixteenth by instructors but ninth by students, the remaining items showed minor differences in the rankings, suggesting that overall, with the exceptions already noted, instructors and students were relatively similar in their perceptions considering NITEP students' oral English competency in university coursework.

Oral expression in university coursework as perceived by senior students with English as a second language. When the computer program was run to analyze the oral language data dependent on whether students had English as a first or second language, four of eight senior students were in each group: $English_1$ and $English_2$. Although the sample is small, the results are included here and will be discussed briefly in Chapter 5.

In Table 4, senior students ranked only two items, numbers 9, use of effective imagery, and 10, control of standard English, as matters of concern. When the data were analyzed with particular attention to $English_1$ students, only one of those items, number 9, the use of effective imagery, was identified as a concern. The senior students for whom English was a second language, however, responded quite differently from those who had spoken English as their first language (Table 5).

Senior students for whom English was a second language identified concerns in five different aspects of oral language, all but listening

Table 5

Items in Oral Expression Ranked as

Perceived Concerns by English$_2$ Senior Students

Item no.	Language descriptor	Responses[a]					Rank order
		1	2	3	N/A	Total	
3	Spoke fluently	-	3	1	-	4	1
7	Showed breadth of vocabulary	-	3	1	-	4	1
10	Controlled standard English	1	1	2	-	4	3
5	Used conventional nonverbal behavior	-	4	-	-	4	4
8	Made fine distinctions in vocabulary	1	2	1	-	4	5
16	Organized ideas coherently	1	2	1	-	4	5

[a] 1 = Satisfactory or better; 2 = Needed improvement; 3 = Needed considerable improvement.

capabilities. The first ranked concerns, item 3, the ability to speak fluently, and item 7, control of a breadth of vocabulary, were identified as needing improvement by all four students. The third ranked item, the control of standard English, was identified as being of concern to only three of the four students. All four students identified item 5, the use of conventional nonverbal behavior, as needing some improvement and ranked it fourth. The same item had been ranked ninth by the responses of all the senior students and sixteenth by the instructors' responses (Tables 3 and 4). English$_2$ students and instructors were in accord with respect to concerns about vocabulary, organizing ideas, and the students' use of standard English.

Written Expression in the Academic Student Role:

Research Question Two

The second research question in this study asks: Which aspects of

written expression do instructors and students identify as concerns in

the university coursework of NITEP students? Since written expression

tends to be an important factor in the evaluation of college and univer-

sity students, 24 items were chosen to represent six aspects of language

related to written expression (Figure 2, p. 45). These items appeared in

Part 3 of the instructor and senior student questionnaires (see Appendix

C). The responses were calculated and are reproduced in the same format

as the tables dealing with oral expression in academic coursework.

Because of the number of concerns identified in written expression,

responses to the items are discussed in the context of the six aspects

of language pertinent to written expression as detailed in Table 2 (p. 43).

Written Expression in University Coursework

as Perceived by Instructors

A. Conventions of format. All items used to describe this aspect

of written language were identified as being of some concern to the

majority of instructors responding to the questionnaire (Table 6). Items

describing the conventions of format included: the third ranked item 3,

effective proofreading, seen as a concern by 23 of the respondents, and

given a mean rating of 2.42; the fifth ranked concern, item 4, correct

use of the mechanics of scholarship, identified as a concern by 22 of

participating instructors and rated 2.38; item 1, the ability to spell,

Table 6

Items in Written Expression Ranked as

Perceived Concerns by Instructors

N = 27

Item number	Language descriptor	Responses[a]							Rank order
		1	2	3	N/A	Total	x̄	S	
21	Organized essays effectively	0	11	12	4	27	2.52	.51	1
11	Used grammatical terms correctly	2	8	12	5	27	2.46	.67	2
3	Proofread effectively	1	12	11	3	27	2.42	.58	3
10	Made distinctions in vocabulary	1	12	11	3	27	2.42	.58	3
4	Used mechanics correctly	2	11	11	3	27	2.38	.65	5
22	Showed coherence and unity	2	10	9	6	27	2.38	.66	6
9	Created moods, impressions	2	14	7	4	27	2.22	.60	7
13	Displayed fluency	2	14	7	4	27	2.22	.60	7
14	Responded to readings	2	15	7	3	27	2.21	.58	9
1	Spelled, punctuated correctly	3	13	8	3	27	2.21	.66	10
2	Controlled mechanics of quotation	2	16	6	3	27	2.17	.57	11
17	Adjusted tone for audience	1	14	4	8	27	2.16	.50	12
7	Varied sentence length	4	13	7	3	27	2.13	.68	13
15	Selected details for emphasis	4	14	6	3	27	2.08	.65	14
20	Summarized and paraphrased readings	6	8	7	6	27	2.05	.81	15
5	Gave basic information clearly	4	15	4	4	27	2.00	.60	16
19	Supported viewpoint with details	5	11	5	6	27	2.00	.71	17
8	Used imagery in description	5	13	4	5	27	1.96	.65	18
24	Conveyed personalities	6	9	4	8	27	1.90	.74	19
16	Focused on single/topic event	7	12	4	4	27	1.87	.69	20
6	Described with sufficient detail	6	13	3	5	27	1.86	.64	21
18	Elaborated when necessary	8	11	4	4	27	1.83	.72	22
23	Sequenced events plausibly	8	11	3	5	27	1.77	.69	23
12	Expressed self	9	10	3	5	27	1.73	.70	24

[a] 1 = Satisfactory or better
2 = Needed improvement
3 = Needed considerable improvement

capitalize, and punctuate correctly, identified by 21 of the respondents as a concern and rated 2.21; and the eleventh ranked item 2, control of the mechanics of quotation, seen as being of some concern to 22 of the instructors but rating a mean response of 2.17.

B. Basic description and recording. One of the two items in this category registered a mean response of 2.00. Item 5, the ability to give basic information clearly as required for answering questions or writing brief reports, was accorded a mean response of 2.00, and identified as a concern by 19 of the instructors responding. Since it was one of two items describing basic description and recording in written expression, the second of which ranked twenty-first in the ranking, this aspect of written expression does not appear to be a matter of particular concern.

C. Sensitivity to words and word sequences. Four out of five items relating to this aspect of written expression, sensitivity to words and word sequences, were identified by a majority of the instructors as being of some concern. Item 11, the ability to use grammatical terms correctly in discussing writing, although identified as a concern by only 20 of the instructors, was the second highest ranked item because of its mean response of 2.46.

Item 10, the ability to make fine distinctions in vocabulary, ranking third, was identified as being of some concern by 23 of the instructors but only to the degree represented by a mean response of 2.42. Other concerns relating to the category of words and sequences of words, were registered with the seventh ranking of item 9, the ability to select words to reinforce a specific mood or impression, and the thirteenth ranking of item 7, the ability to use variety in sentence length, with means of 2.22 and 2.13 respectively.

D. Response to experience. In this category, a pair of descriptors, item 13, displays fluency, and item 14, perceptive response to reading, ranked seventh and ninth in priority based on mean responses of 2.22 and 2.21 respectively. Twenty-one instructors saw item 13 as needing improvement while 22 instructors saw item 14 as needing improvement.

E. Achieving the writer's purpose: exposition and argument. Of the 24 items listed as descriptors of written expression in academic coursework, 17 items were identified by some instructors as being of concern (Table 6). The first ranked item, identified as a concern by all of the instructors responding to the item, and given a mean rating of 2.52, was item 21, the ability to organize essays effectively. Four other items, relating as does item 21 to the aspect of language described as achieving the writer's purpose in exposition and argument, were identified as being of at least some concern to the majority of responding instructors.

Item 17, the ability to adjust tone of writing for a specific audience, was identified as a concern by 18 respondents and assigned a mean rating of 2.16, thus ranking twelfth. The fourteenth ranked item, number 15, the ability to select details for emphasis, was given a mean response of 2.08 and identified as a concern by 20 of the 24 instructors responding to the item.

Item 20, the ability to summarize and paraphrase readings, although identified as being of concern by only 15 of the instructors answering the questionnaire, was accorded a mean response of 2.05, thus ranking fifteenth, two rankings ahead of item 19, the ability to support viewpoint with details, with its mean response of 2.00. Overall, five of the seven items representing the aspect of written expression relating to achieving the writer's purpose in exposition and argument were identified

as being of some concern to more than half the instructors responding to the questionnaire.

F. Achieving the writer's purpose: narration and characterization. One item descriptive of this aspect of written expression, item 22, the ability to display coherence and unity of tone, was rated 2.33 and ranked sixth by the instructors. It was seen as a matter of concern to 19 of 21 instructors responding to the item.

With the exception of two single items, numbers 5 and 22, all other items with a mean response of 2.00 or greater, tended to cluster into four aspects of written expression. Conventions of format, sensitivity to words and word sequences, response to experience and achieving the writer's purpose: exposition and argument, were the aspects of written expression about which instructors had the most concern with regard to their NITEP students.

It should be noted, however, that although the remaining seven items in Table 6 were accorded means of less than 2.00, they were identified as being of some concern to at least half of the instructors responding to the given items. The items which fell into this category were: item 8, uses imagery in description; item 24, conveys personality through selected details; item 16, focuses on single topic/event; item 6, describes with sufficient detail; item 18, elaborates an opinion; item 23, sequences ideas plausibly; and item 12, expresses own voice effectively.

Written Expression in Coursework as

Perceived by Senior Students

Table 7 shows several items as being of some concern to at least half

of the eight students who responded to the questionnaire. Since the

instructors' concerns were discussed in the order of the six aspects of

language to which they referred (Figure 2, p. 45), the student response will

be discussed in the same order.

Only one item categorized as a convention of format was seen as a

matter of concern by the senior students. Item 3, the ability to proof-

read effectively, was identified as a concern to six students and ranked

second.

Five students were concerned about item 6, the ability to describe

people and things with sufficient detail, and ranked the item sixth on

their list. The other item categorized as basic description and recording,

item 5, the ability to give basic information clearly when answering

questions or writing reports, was seen as a matter of some concern to

half the students but ranked fifteenth.

When considering the aspect of written expression called sensitivity

to words and word sequences, item 11, using grammatical terms correctly

in discussing writing, was seen as a matter of some concern by six of the

responding students and ranked second. Item 9, selecting words to reinforce

a specific mood or impression, was seen as a concern by five students and

ranked sixth. One other item in this category perceived as a concern by

half the students responding to the questionnaire was item 10, the ability

to make fine distinctions using vocabulary, which ranked ninth. Similarly,

item 12, the expression of self in writing, and item 13, demonstration of

Table 7

Items in Written Expression Ranked as

Perceived Concerns by Senior Students

Item no.	Language descriptor	Responses [a]					Rank order
		1	2	3	N/A	Total	
15	Selected essential detail	1	6	1	-	8	1
3	Proofread effectively	2	5	1	-	8	2
11	Used grammatical terms correctly	2	5	1	-	8	2
21	Organized essays effectively	2	6	-	-	8	4
23	Sequenced ideas plausibly	3	4	1	-	8	5
6	Described with sufficient detail	3	5	-	-	8	6
9	Created moods, impressions	3	5	-	-	8	6
24	Conveyed personalities	3	5	-	-	8	6
10	Made distinctions in vocabulary	4	3	1	-	8	9
12	Expressed self	4	3	1	-	8	9
13	Displayed fluency	4	3	1	-	8	9
16	Focused on single topic/event	4	3	1	-	8	9
22	Showed coherence and unity	4	3	1	-	8	9
4	Used mechanics correctly	5	1	2	-	8	14
5	Gave basic information clearly	4	4	-	-	8	15
17	Adjusted tone for audience	4	4	-	-	8	15
18	Elaborated when necessary	4	4	-	-	8	15
14	Responded to readings	5	2	1	-	8	18
20	Summarized and paraphrased readings	5	2	1	-	8	18
1	Spelled, punctuated correctly	5	3	-	-	8	20
8	Used imagery in description	5	3	-	-	8	20
19	Supported viewpoint with details	5	3	-	-	8	20
7	Varied sentence length	6	1	1	-	8	23
2	Controlled mechanics of quotation	7	1	-	-	8	24

[a] 1 = Satisfactory or better
2 = Needed improvement
3 = Needed considerable improvement

fluency in ideas and associations, ranked ninth, identified as concerns

by half the students responding.

Five of the seven items describing skills used in writing exposition

and argument were singled out as being of some concern to at least half

the senior students responding to the questionnaire. Item 15, the ability

to select essential from peripheral detail, was identified as a concern

by all but one of the senior students and ranked first. Item 21, the

ability to organize essays effectively, was seen as a matter of concern to

six of eight students and therefore ranked fourth. Half the students

indicated some concern about item 16, focusing on a single topic or event;

item 17, the ability to adjust tone for an audience; and item 18, the

ability to elaborate an opinion or make a judgment.

Academic students responded to all three items describing skills in

writing narration with some indication of concern. Item 23, organizing

events in plausible sequence; item 24, conveying personality through

selected details; and item 22, displaying coherence and unity of tone and

impression, ranked fifth, sixth and ninth respectively, and were identi-

fied as needing improvement by at least half of the students.

Of the twenty-four items, the two items ranked last and presumably

of little or no concern to students, were item 7, the ability to vary

sentence length, and item 2, the ability to control the mechanics of

quotation. Since these two items were ranked thirteenth and eleventh

respectively by instructors, there is some indication here that instruc-

tors and senior students differ with regard to NITEP students' competency

in these items.

Summary

Table 8 summarizes Tables 6 and 7 and lists the highest ranking concerns in written expression as identified by instructors and senior students. It suggests that students and instructors perceive student competency in written expression somewhat differently, at least in the number of items identified as needing improvement. Instructors identified 17 items as needing improvement while half or more of the senior students expressed concern regarding only eight items.

The most obvious difference between the two groups, as shown in Table 8, has to do with that aspect of written expression often called the mechanics of writing. Referred to in this study as conventions of format, this aspect of written expression was represented by four items on the questionnaire. Half or more of the instructors participating identified the four items as concerns, and all four items had a mean response of 2.17 or greater. Students identified only one item in this category, item 3, effective proofreading, as being of some concern and ranked it second.

Instructors and students appear to be closer together when responding to the aspects of written expression called basic description and recording, and sensitivity to words and sequences of words. The two groups do not seem to differ markedly in their perception of students' competency in these two categories of written expression, with the exception of one item in the former, item 6, the ability to describe with sufficient detail, ranked twenty-first by instructors but sixth by students; and two items in the latter, item 7, the ability to vary sentence length, ranked thirteenth by instructors and twenty-third by senior students; and item 10,

Table 8

Summary of Tables 6 and 7 Showing Comparison of Items

Identified as Concerns by Both Instructors and Senior Students

	Items ranked as concerns[a]	
Aspects of written expression	Instructors	Seniors
A. Conventions of format	1, 2, 3, 4	3
B. Basic description and recording	5	6
C. Sensitivity to words and word sequences	7, 9, 10, 11	9, 11
D. Response to experience	13, 14	-
E. Achieving the writer's purpose: exposition and argument	15, 17, 19 20, 21	15, 21
F. Achieving the writer's purpose: narration and characterization	22	23, 24

[a] Item numbers only.

the ability to make fine distinctions in vocabulary, ranked third by

instructors but ninth by senior students.

With regard to response to experience, the fourth aspect of written

expression represented in the questionnaire, there were two items to which

instructors and students responded quite differently. Item 12, expresses

own voice effectively, was ranked twenty-fourth by instructors but ninth

by students, while item 14, responds to readings effectively, was ranked

ninth by instructors and eighteenth by students.

The fifth aspect of written expression included in the questionnaire,

achieving the writer's purpose: exposition and argument, included three

items on which students and instructors varied considerably in their

rankings of the items even though half the students identified them as needing improvement. Item 15, distinguishing between essential and peripheral detail, was ranked fourteenth by the instructors' responses but first by the students' responses. Item 18, elaborates an opinion, was ranked twenty-second by instructors and fifteenth by students. Item 16, focuses on single topic/event, was ranked twentieth by instructors and ninth by students. Other items in this aspect of written expression were ranked similarly by both groups.

The last aspect of written expression considered was described as achieving the writer's purpose: narration and characterization. Two of the three items in this category displayed considerable variance between the two groups' perception of competency. Item 23, sequences ideas plausibly, ranked twenty-third on the instructors' list but fifth on the students' list. Item 24, conveys personalities through selected details, was ranked nineteenth by instructors and sixth by students.

It would appear that, overall, instructors and students differ most in the areas of conventions of format, response to experience, and achieving the writer's purpose: narration and characterization. In the other three aspects of written expression, basic description and recording, sensitivity to words and word sequences and achieving the writer's purpose: exposition and argument, there appear to be more similarities than differences in responses to items by the two groups.

Written expression in university coursework as perceived by students with English as a second language. When the data concerning written expression were analyzed with regard to English as a second language, the English$_1$ students identified only one item as a matter of concern. They ranked item 19, the ability to proofread assignments effectively, as their primary concern amongst the items offered. In contrast, the four English$_2$

students' responses to items of written expression identified seven items
about which at least three out of the four students were concerned.
Table 9 contains the data concerning the seven items in question. At
least three of the four senior students who spoke English as a second
language expressed a need for some improvement in seven items descriptive
of aspects of written expression. Given the small sample, the results
are of limited value insofar as the study is concerned. Nevertheless,
as indicators of what may be a significant factor in NITEP planning, they
are discussed briefly here.

Table 9

Items in Written Expression Ranked as

Perceived Concerns by English$_2$ Senior Students

N = 4

| Item no. | Language descriptor | Responses[a] | | | | | Rank order |
		1	2	3	N/A	Total	
15	Selected details for emphasis	-	3	1	-	4	1
10	Made fine distinctions in vocabulary	1	2	1	-	4	2
11	Used grammatical terms correctly	1	2	1	-	4	2
20	Summarized and paraphrased readings	1	2	1	-	4	2
22	Showed coherence and unity	1	2	1	-	4	2
23	Sequenced ideas plausibly	1	2	1	-	4	2
4	Used mechanics of scholarship	2	-	2	-	4	7

[a] 1 = Satisfactory of better; 2 = Needed improvement; 3 = Needed considerable improvement.

It is interesting to note that the English$_2$ students expressed
concerns with regard to seven items, and six of those items were those
identified by instructors as shown in Table 6. In particular, item 11,
the ability to use grammatical terms in discussing writing; item 10, the
ability to make fine distinctions in vocabulary; item 4, the ability to
use the mechanics of scholarship; and item 22, the ability to write with
coherence and unity of tone and impression, were seen as items of concern
to both groups.

Student Teaching Questionnaire

Questions three, four and five were designed to consider student
language performance in the student teaching situation with some particu-
lar reference to the teaching of language arts. The data were collected
from groups described as sponsor teachers and junior students.

Characteristics of sponsor teachers responding to the questionnaire.
In order to establish a background against which to view the data concern-
ing student teaching, demographic, professional and personal information
was collected and collated (Tables C and D, Appendix F). Questionnaires
were sent to sponsor teachers whose names appeared on program lists
covering the period September 1977 to September 1979. Sixty-three
teachers, slightly more than sixty percent of those to whom questionnaires
were sent, returned usable questionnaires. They answered ten questions
concerning their teaching backgrounds, assignments and experiences with
student teachers (Table C, Appendix F).

The sponsor teachers involved in this study came from two British Columbia school districts currently providing practice teaching opportunities and supervision for NITEP students. Of the sixty-three teachers responding to the questionnaire, thirty-one were teaching primary grades and thirty were teaching at the intermediate level. Two were undesignated. More than two thirds of the group held professional teaching certificates and with one exception, the minimum amount of teaching experience was five years. The majority of respondents had from five to 15 years teaching experience. Over half the respondents had taken general education courses for their professional concentration. Many of the respondents did not identify an academic concentration, but of those who did, 16 indicated that English was their major area of study. Given a list of professional memberships, 24 teachers indicated that they belonged to the British Columbia Primary Teachers' Association. None of the responding teachers indicated memberships in groups primarily concerned with the teaching of English, language arts or reading.

When asked, the majority of teachers indicated that they had supervised only one NITEP student while twenty-nine respondents had supervised two or more. Fifteen teachers indicated that they had been involved with NITEP in 1977 or before, while three times as many indicated that they had worked with the program since 1978. Since the responses circled in answer to question eight did not always balance with the responses to question nine, concerning year(s) of involvement with the program, it may be that one or either of the questions was ambiguous or misleading. In addition, a few teachers indicated by comments or question marks that they could not remember the pertinent dates.

The last question had to do with experience in supervising non-NITEP student teachers, and while 20 teachers indicated that they had frequently supervised student teachers outside NITEP, the majority, 35 teachers, had occasionally supervised other student teachers.

Characteristics of junior students responding to the questionnaire. Questionnaires were sent to all junior students registered in the program as of May, 1979. Twenty usable questionnaires were returned giving a return of 84%. Junior students were asked for the same information as senior students. These data are presented in Table D, Appendix F. Of the twenty students responding to the questionnaire, ten were in first year, nine in second year and one was unclassified. Several students did not respond to the questions concerning academic and professional concentrations indicating that they had not yet made their choice. More than half the students were interested in teaching in the primary grades.

Questions regarding first language, family language and community language were answered by all the junior students responding to the questionnaire. Thirteen students had English as their first language while seven students spoke a native language first. Half the students indicated that their families spoke English all the time, while nine of twenty students indicated that their families spoke English only some of the time. One student indicated that his or her family rarely or never spoke English. Slightly more than half the students identified their home communities as speaking English only some of the time while the remainder identified their home communities as English-speaking.

Oral Expression In Student Teaching:

Research Question Three

The third research question in this study asks: Which aspects of oral expression do sponsor teachers and students identify as concerns in the student teaching of NITEP students? Because oral language plays such an important part in the performance of the teaching role, sixteen items concerned with oral expression were included in the sponsor teacher and student teacher questionnaires. Sponsor teachers were asked to respond to the questionnaire in terms of the NITEP student or students whom they had supervised and student teachers were asked to think about their own oral language behavior, remembering any comments they might have received from those supervising them.

The aspects of oral language which were considered, and descriptors which became the items on the questionnaire, are shown in Figure 3 (p. 46). The actual questionnaires sent to sponsor teachers and junior students appear in Appendix C.

The degree of concern for each item was established using the same process as that used for the instructor questionnaires; that is, calculating numerical means and standard deviations from the sum of all responses to any given item. The resulting figures were used to assign priority ranking to each item. The response columns in the table show the responses to each item and include a no answer category. Because the ranking of items is controlled first by the means and, in the event of a tie, by the standard deviations, the response figures may not always follow in the expected sequence.

Oral Expression in Student Teaching as

Perceived by Sponsor Teachers

Sixteen items having to do with oral expression in student teaching were included in the sponsor teacher and student teacher questionnaires. The items were designed to gather data from which to answer the third research question: Which aspects of oral expression do sponsor teachers and students identify as concerns in the student teaching of NITEP students?

The items related to oral language in student teaching were ranked using the same procedures as had been used in analyzing the data for research questions one and two. Accordingly, the responses were listed in rank order of concern as perceived by the respondent group (Table 10).

Fifty-one of the 63 sponsor teachers responding to the questionnaire identified item 2, projected voice sufficiently for classroom needs, as being of concern. Its mean rating of 2.08 established it as the first ranking concern of the sponsor teachers. Item 1, spoke distinctly and articulated sounds clearly, ranked second with a mean response of 2.05. These two items, combined with item 3, used voice effectively in various situations such as story telling and giving directions, which ranked eighth and was seen as being of some concern by 44 of the respondents, combine to make up the aspect of oral expression called quality and use of voice.

The third and fourth ranked items of concern to responding sponsor teachers were from the aspects of language having to do with interpersonal communication behavior and appropriate usage and dialect. Item 6, spoke with confidence, and item 10, controlled informal standard English, had

Table 10

Items in Oral Expression Ranked as

Perceived Concerns by Sponsor Teachers

N = 63

Item No.	Language descriptor	Responses [a]							Rank order
		1	2	3	N/A	Total	X	S	
2	Projected voice sufficiently	12	34	17	-	63	2.08	.68	1
1	Spoke distinctly, articulated clearly	15	30	18	-	63	2.05	.73	2
6	Spoke with confidence	15	31	16	1	63	2.02	.71	3
10	Controlled informal standard English	15	31	15	2	63	2.00	.71	4
9	Demonstrated control of rhyme	13	33	12	5	63	1.98	.66	5
8	Rephrased information when necessary	16	33	14	-	63	1.97	.70	6
7	Showed breadth of vocabulary	17	33	13	-	63	1.94	.69	7
3	Used voice effectively	19	29	15	-	63	1.94	.74	8
15	Created scenes, moods	18	32	10	3	63	1.87	.68	9
13	Controlled all speech sounds	17	31	8	7	63	1.84	.65	10
16	Used language effectively	21	34	8	-	63	1.79	.65	11
4	Used appropriate nonverbal language	25	28	6	4	63	1.68	.66	12
12	Chose appropriate level of language	31	28	4	-	63	1.57	.62	13
11	Recognized dialectal differences	37	18	4	4	63	1.44	.62	14
5	Modelled good listening	42	19	1	1	63	1.34	.51	15
14	Listened and responded	49	13	-	1	63	1.21	.41	16

[a] 1 = Satisfactory or better
2 = Needed improvement
3 = Needed considerable improvement

mean responses of 2.02 and 2.00. The other items which describe these two aspects of language, however, ranked no higher than twelfth.

An aspect of oral expression which more than 70% of the responding sponsor teachers indicated was of some concern was sensitivity to words and arrangement of words. Item 9, demonstrated control of rhyme and rhythm, item 8, rephrased information, and item 7, showed breadth of vocabulary, ranked fifth, sixth and seventh even though their mean responses were 1.98, 1.97 and 1.94 respectively.

Oral Expression in Student Teaching as
Perceived by Junior Students

Junior students, those primarily concerned with student teaching, did not identify any items of oral expression with a mean ranking of greater than 1.95 (Table 11). The items ranked first and second were number 7, the use of interesting and varied vocabulary, and number 9, the ability to control rhythm and rhyme as in poetry and rhyming exercises. These items were perceived as needing improvement by 17 and 15 of the responding students respectively.

Summary

The items in oral expression identified as being of most concern to sponsor teachers were not identified as concerns by the majority of students responding to the student teaching questionnaire. Items 1 and 2, the items concerning quality and use of voice, and of prime concern to the sponsor teachers, were ranked tenth and fourteenth on the student

Table 11

Items in Oral Expression Ranked as

Perceived Concerns by Junior Students

N = 20

Item no.	Language descriptor	1	2	3	N/A	Total	X	S	Rank order
7	Showed breadth of vocabulary	3	15	2	-	20	1.95	.51	1
9	Demonstrated control of rhyme and rhythm	5	12	3	-	20	1.90	.64	2
13	Controlled speech sounds	6	11	3	-	20	1.85	.67	3
10	Controlled informal standard English	6	12	2	-	20	1.80	.62	4
6	Spoke with confidence	7	10	3	-	20	1.80	.70	5
16	Used language effectively in interaction	9	10	1	-	20	1.60	.60	6
4	Used appropriate nonverbal language	3	11	-	1	20	1.58	.51	7
3	Used voice effectively	10	10	-	-	20	1.50	.51	8
15	Created scenes, moods	10	10	-	-	20	1.50	.51	8
1	Spoke distinctly	11	8	1	-	20	1.50	.61	10
8	Rephrased information when necessary	11	8	1	-	20	1.50	.61	10
5	Modelled good listening	14	4	2	-	20	1.40	.68	12
11	Understood dialectal differences	13	7	-	-	20	1.35	.49	13
2	Projected voice suffiently	14	5	1	-	20	1.35	.59	14
12	Chose appropriate level of language	14	5	1	-	20	1.35	.59	14
14	Listened and responded appropriately	16	2	1	1	20	1.21	.54	16

[a]1 = Satisfactory or better
2 = Needed improvement
3 = Needed considerable improvement

list and identified as needing improvement by only nine and six of the twenty students respectively. Obviously, there were considerable differences in the perceptions of the two groups with regard to items 1 and 2.

Two items about which sponsor teachers and student teachers appeared to hold similar rather than different perceptions were item 10, the control of standard English, ranked fourth by approximately 70% of both groups, and item 6, the ability to speak with confidence, ranked third by 75% of the sponsor teachers responding to the questionnaire and fifth by 65% of the junior students responding.

Agreement between sponsor teachers and student teachers was also evident in those items ranked lowest by both groups. Two of the items, numbers 11 and 12, related to appropriate usage and dialect. Item 11, the ability to recognize dialectal differences in others' language, was ranked fourteenth by sponsor teachers and thirteenth by students. Item 12, the ability to choose the level of language appropriate to a situation, was ranked thirteenth by sponsor teachers and fourteenth by students. A third item, listening attentively and responding appropriately, was identified with a mean response of 1.21 by both groups.

Inasmuch as the data suggest that sponsor teachers of NITEP students and NITEP students are frequently in agreement regarding the students' use of oral expression in the teaching situation, those aspects of language about which their perceptions of need differ take on an added significance. The sponsor teachers' evident concern regarding the students' quality and use of voice in the classroom, and the students' lack of concern about this matter, are in direct contrast. It is interesting to note that while the students' perception of need regarding vocabulary is not seen as a prime need by sponsor teachers, sponsor teacher response supports the

students' perception that there is some need of improvement in this aspect of oral expression.

Oral expression in student teaching as perceived by students with English as a second language. When the data from the junior student questionnaires were analyzed taking first language into account, it was found that students with English as a first language identified item 13, control of speech sounds as necessary for a phonics program, as needing improvement. Item 7, uses interesting, varied vocabulary, and item 9, demonstrates control of rhythm and rhyme as in poetry and rhyming exercises, were identified as needing improvement by six of the seven $English_2$ students responding to the junior student questionnaire.

It is interesting that the responses from the $English_2$ students in the junior student group differed so little from those of the $English_1$ students, especially in light of the marked differences between $English_1$ and $English_2$ senior students with regard to oral expression in academic coursework.

Written Expression in Student Teaching:
Research Question Four

The fourth research question in this study asked: Which aspects of written expression do sponsor teachers and students identify as concerns in the student teaching of NITEP students? Since opportunities for student teachers to demonstrate capabilities in written expression may be limited by factors such as grade level, shortage of blackboard space, or the use of commercially-prepared materials, only eight items relating to written expression were included on the student teaching version of the

questionnaire (Appendix C). The aspects of written expression and the descriptive items for written expression in student teaching appear in Figure 4, p. 47.

Written Expression in Student Teaching
as Perceived by Sponsor Teachers

In response to eight items describing written expression in student teaching, sponsor teachers accorded mean ratings of no higher than 1.88 to any item (Table 12). Since this is somewhat lower than the 2.00 which has generally been adopted as an indicator of need in this study, it would appear that written expression in NITEP student teaching is not a matter of concern to sponsor teachers. However, it should be noted that item 8, the ability to use grammatical terms appropriately in talking about writing, and item 7, the ability to make fine distinctions in vocabulary, were identified as being of some concern to more than 60% of the teachers responding to the questionnaire. Mean responses of 1.88 and 1.85 suggest that these items are not seen as matters of particular concern at this time.

Written Expression in Student Teaching
as Perceived by Junior Students

Junior students, those NITEP students presumably most concerned with student teaching since they spend a large proportion of their time in teaching practica, identified one item of written expression as a matter of concern (Table 13). This item, number 8, the ability to use grammatical

Table 12

Items in Written Expression Ranked as

Perceived Concerns by Sponsor Teachers

N = 63

Item no.	Language descriptor	Responses[a]					$\bar{x}$	S	Rank order
		1	2	3	N/A	Total			
8	Used grammatical terms appropriately	18	29	11	5	63	1.88	.70	1
7	Made fine distinctions in vocabulary	17	33	8	5	63	1.85	.64	2
6	Used style appropriate to note making	18	24	6	15	63	1.75	.67	3
4	Used common abbreviations correctly	25	25	5	8	63	1.73	.72	4
5	Gave simple directions clearly	25	29	6	3	63	1.68	.65	5
2	Punctuated and capitalized correctly	31	25	6	1	63	1.60	.66	6
1	Spelled correctly	31	27	5	-	63	1.59	.64	7
3	Proofread materials	38	17	9	4	63	1.31	.47	8

[a]1 = Satisfactory or better; 2 = Needed improvement; 3 = Needed considerable improvement

Table 13

Items in Written Expression Ranked as

Perceived Concerns by Junior Students

N = 20

Item no.	Language descriptor	Responses[a]					$\bar{x}$	S	Rank order
		1	2	3	N/A	Total			
8	Used grammatical terms appropriately	2	16	2	-	20	2.00	.46	1
7	Made fine distinctions in vocabulary	7	11	2	-	20	1.75	.64	2
3	Proofread materials	8	12	-	-	20	1.60	.50	3
6	Used style appropriate to note making	9	9	1	1	20	1.58	.61	4
2	Punctuated and capitalized correctly	14	3	3	-	20	1.45	.76	5
4	Used common abbreviations correctly	14	4	2	-	20	1.40	.68	6
1	Spelled correctly	14	5	1	-	20	1.35	.59	7
5	Gave simple directions clearly	16	4	-	-	20	1.20	.41	8

[a]1 = Satisfactory or better; 2 = Needed improvement; 3 = Needed considerable improvement

terms appropriately, was identified as a concern by 18 of the 20 students responding to the questionnaire. Other items which were identified as being of some concern to more than half the students but which did not have a mean rating of 2.00 or greater, were item 7, the ability to make fine distinctions in vocabulary, and item 3, the ability to proofread materials effectively.

Summary

Although NITEP students' written expression in the teaching situation does not appear to be a matter of prime concern at this time, it should not be overlooked that both sponsor teachers and student teachers ranked item 8, the ability to use grammatical terms appropriately and item 7, the ability to make fine distinctions in vocabulary, first and second.

Analysis of the data concerning written expression from the perspective of English as a first or second language revealed no differences in the junior students' perceptions of their performance in written expression.

Selected Competencies in Teaching Language Arts:
Research Question Five

Because student teaching is a major emphasis in the first two years of NITEP, and language arts dominates the elementary school curriculum, the decision was made to include items concerning language arts teaching competencies in the questionnaires developed to consider student teaching (Appendix C). Sixteen items representing specific teaching competencies

were designed to answer the fifth research question: What specific competencies in teaching language arts do sponsor teachers and student teachers identify as needing improvement? The data were treated exactly the same as the data collected from those parts of the questionnaire having to do with oral and written expression. Teaching competencies were ranked in order of perceived concern derived from the mean response and standard deviation calculated for each item. In addition to the rankings, the numerical means and the standard deviations, the tables include a breakdown of the total responses to each item including a no-answer column (Tables 14 and 15).

Language Arts Teaching Competencies in Student
Teaching as Perceived by Sponsor Teachers

Seventy percent or more of the responding sponsor teachers identified five teaching competencies as being of some concern, assigning a mean response of 2.00 or greater to three of them (Table 14). The first ranked concern, identified as such by 49 of the 63 respondents, had to do with the student teacher's familiarity with children's literature. This item had a mean response of 2.08. The second ranked item, the ability to model correct pronunciation and speech patterns was identified as a concern by more sponsor teachers, 51 of those responding, but received a mean rating of 2.05. Item 5, the competency having to do with questioning skills, was ranked third because of a mean rating of 2.00. The fourth and fifth ranked items, demonstrating familiarity with children's language background, and the ability to give clear, sequenced instructions, received lower means of 1.95 and 1.92 respectively. They were identified as matters of concern,

Table 14

Teaching Competencies Ranked as Concerns by Sponsor Teachers

N = 63

Item number	Descriptor	Responses[a]							Rank order
		1	2	3	N/A	Total	$\bar{x}$	S	
4	Demonstrates familiarity with children's literature	11	33	16	3	63	2.08	.67	1
6	Models correct pronunciation and speech patterns	12	36	15	-	63	2.05	.66	2
5	Shows ability to use different levels of questions	15	32	15	1	63	2.00	.70	3
7	Demonstrates familiarity with children's language background	16	31	13	3	63	1.95	.70	4
2	Gave clear, sequenced instructions	14	40	9	-	63	1.92	.60	5
16	Designs and moderates group or class discussion	23	28	11	1	63	1.81	.72	6
3	Reads aloud with expression and enjoyment	25	27	11	-	63	1.78	.73	7
13	Demonstrates ability to assess and evaluate student's progress	23	29	9	2	63	1.77	.69	8
15	Involves children in activities showing interrelatedness of language arts usage	21	35	4	3	63	1.72	.59	9
12	Constructs useful charts and other learning aids	27	28	7	1	63	1.68	.67	10
11	Uses media such as photographs, models, films, etc.	29	26	4	2	63	1.39	.62	11
14	Demonstrates ability to incorporate children's interests in lessons	30	25	4	4	63	1.56	.62	12
9	Understands and uses teaching manuals	36	23	3	1	63	1.47	.59	13
10	Demonstrates knowledge of, and ability to use the library or resource center	37	21	4	1	63	1.47	.62	14
1	Prints and writes adequately on chalk board	42	21	-	-	63	1.33	.48	15
8	Models good listening behavior	48	12	2	1	63	1.26	.51	16

[a] 1 = Satisfactory or better; 2 = Needed improvement; 3 = Needed considerable improvement

Table 15

Teaching Competencies Ranked as Concerns by Junior Students

N = 20

Item number	Descriptor	Responses[a]							Rank order
		1	2	3	N/A	Total	$\bar{x}$	S	
7	Demonstrates familiarity with children's language background	2	13	5	-	20	2.15	.59	1
4	Demonstrates familiarity with children's literature	3	15	2	-	20	1.95	.51	2
13	Demonstrates ability to assess and evaluate student progress	6	13	1	-	20	1.75	.55	3
11	Uses media such as photographs, models, films, etc.	9	8	3	-	20	1.70	.73	4
15	Involves children in activities showing interrelatedness of language arts	8	11	1	-	20	1.65	.59	5
12	Constructs useful charts and other learning aids	9	9	2	-	20	1.65	.67	6
5	Shows ability to use different levels of questions	9	11	-	-	20	1.56	.51	7
10	Demonstrates knowledge of, and ability to use the library or resource center	10	10	-	-	20	1.50	.51	8
14	Demonstrates ability to incorporate children's interest in lessons	11	8	1	-	20	1.50	.61	9
6	Models correct pronunciation and speech patterns	11	9	-	-	20	1.45	.51	10
2	Gave clear, sequenced instructions	11	9	-	-	20	1.45	.51	10
16	Designs and moderates group or class discussion	12	7	1	-	20	1.45	.61	12
1	Prints and writes adequately on chalk board	13	6	1	-	20	1.40	.60	13
3	Reads aloud with expression and enjoyment	14	6	-	-	20	1.30	.47	14
9	Understands and uses teaching manuals appropriately	15	4	1	-	20	1.30	.51	15
8	Models good listening behavior	18	2	-	-	20	1.10	.31	16

[a]1 = Satisfactory or better; 2 = Needed improvement; 3 = Needed considerable improvement

however, to 44 and 49 of those responding.

Language Arts Teaching Competencies in Student
Teaching as Perceived by Junior Students

Junior students, those students in the NITEP most concerned with

student teaching, assigned only the first ranked teaching competency a

mean rating over 2.00 (Table 15); that is, ninety percent of the respond-

ing students registered concern about item 7, demonstrating familiarity

with children's language background. Moreover, it had a mean rating of

2.15. The second ranked item, according to responses from junior students,

was number 4, demonstrating familiarity with children's literature.

Eighty-five percent of the students identified the item as being of

concern, although the item had a mean response of only 1.95. Item 13,

the ability to assess and evaluate student progress, was identified as a

concern by seventy percent of the respondents but received a mean rating

of 1.75. Four other teaching competencies were identified as causing

concern by more than half the responding students, but the degree of

concern, as indicated by the mean response of the junior students respond-

ing to the questionnaire, did not exceed a mean response of 1.70. These

items had to do with abilities in the following: use of media such as

photographs, models, films; involving children in activities showing

interrelatedness of language arts; construction of useful charts and

other learning aids; questioning skills.

Certain teaching competencies were identified as being of concern

to fewer than one third of the responding students. Item 3, reads aloud

with expression and enjoyment, item 9, understands and uses teaching

manuals appropriately, and item 8, models good listening behavior, ranked fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth respectively. The last mentioned, item 8, was identified as a matter of concern by only 2 of the students responding to the teaching competencies.

Summary

Sponsor teachers and junior students appeared to be in accord with regard to concerns about the NITEP student teachers' familiarity with children's language background and children's literature. Item 4, demonstrating familiarity with children's literature, was ranked first by sponsor teachers and second by junior students. Item 7, demonstrates familiarity with children's language background, was ranked first by junior students and fourth by sponsor teachers.

It would appear, however, that sponsor teachers and junior students did not hold similar opinions about other items describing specific teaching competencies. For example, sponsor teachers ranked item 6, models correct pronunciation and speech patterns, second on the list of sixteen competencies while junior students ranked the same item tenth. Other items about which they did not seem to be in agreement were the ability to give clear, sequenced instructions, ranked fifth by teachers and tenth by students, the ability to design and moderate class discussion, ranked sixth by teachers and twelfth by students, and the ability to read aloud with expression and enjoyment, ranked sixth by sponsor teachers and fourteenth by student teachers.

Items which seemed to concern junior students more than sponsor teachers, at least in terms of the rankings, were items 11, the ability

to use media, and item 10, knowledgeability about the library or resource center.

Items about which sponsor teachers and junior students seemed to hold similar views were item 5, shows ability to use different levels of questions, item 13, demonstrates ability to assess and evaluate students' progress, and item 8, models good listening behavior. The first two items were ranked, in order, third and eighth by sponsor teachers, and seventh and third by junior students. The third item, modelling good listening behavior was ranked last by both groups.

Teaching competencies in student teaching of language arts as perceived by junior students with English as a second language. The analysis of data concerning specific teaching competencies in language arts considering the first language variable resulted in little new information. Responses from those students identifying themselves as speakers of English as a first language paralleled those reported in Table 20, differing only in the size of the mean responses. For example, the first ranked item 7, familiarity with children's language background, registered a mean response of 2.00 instead of 2.15, while item 4, familiarity with children's literature had a mean response of 1.92 for English as a first language speakers as compared with 1.95 for those who spoke English as a second language.

All students for whom English was a second language identified item 7, demonstrates familiarity with children's language background, as being of concern. In addition, they responded to item 4, familiarity with children's literature by assigning it a mean response of 2.00. It would appear that the first language variable is not a factor which obviously differentiates between English$_1$ and English$_2$ junior students

when they are doing their student teaching.

Comments from the Questionnaires

Several opportunities were included in the questionnaires for
participants to elaborate on their responses to specific items or to
make general comments. Comments from the questionnaires considered
particularly relevant to an interpretation of the data, or the ensuing
discussion will be cited in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5 will contain a summary of the findings of this study,
together with conclusions on the basis of the information and data
presented. In addition, recommendations for further study will be
presented.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was designed to consider the questions of English competency
and the potential for its development within NITEP, the Native Indian
Teacher Education Program in the Faculty of Education, University of
British Columbia. Since student competency in English has ranked as a
matter of concern throughout university communities increasingly during
recent years, and internal and external evaluations of NITEP have singled
out certain problems in the program related to English, a review of the
present situation regarding English and language arts in NITEP seemed
timely and worthwhile.

Needs assessment, a process which can be adapted to focus on one
aspect of a program in order to locate specific areas of concern, seemed
to offer a rational approach to the problem. The intent of this process
is to identify learners' needs--discrepancies between the ideal and the
status quo learning situation--and to establish priority amongst the
revealed needs, involving as many relevant persons as possible.

Because there was little usable data available from which to draw
conclusions concerning NITEP students' competency, and testing was
impractical at this time, an alternative was sought. This researcher
believed that program participants in NITEP would have fairly firm
perceptions of NITEP students' English competency and an adequate sampling
of these perceptions would be useful in determining the needs of students.
The decision was taken to design a questionnaire which would encourage

participants to indicate their perception of NITEP students' English competency in such a way that the data could be quantified and ranked in priority of perceived need.

Covering letters, questionnaires and stamped addressed envelopes were sent to people who had been involved with the program since 1977 and for whom addresses were available. Returns representing 69% of the total sample to whom questionnaires were mailed were subsequently analyzed.

The questionnaire results were presented in text and tables in Chapter 4 of this study. The interpretation, implications and recommendations arising from the data are presented here within the context of the research questions which were addressed by this needs assessment.

Findings of the Research Questions

The needs assessment process in this study addressed five research questions through two questionnaires: one concerned with NITEP students primarily involved with university coursework, and the second concerned with NITEP students who are primarily involved in student teaching. Items designed to elicit data for the purpose of answering Research Questions One and Two were asked of college and university instructors who were presently teaching or had taught in NITEP, and senior students in the third and fourth year of the program. Similarly, items were designed to collect answers to Research Questions Three, Four and Five from sponsor teachers now or recently involved in the supervision of NITEP students, and from junior students in the first or second year of the program.

Responses to Research Questions One and Two indicated that although instructors identified more skills in oral and written expression which needed improvement than did students, for the most part the two groups' perceptions of needs appeared to be similar.

On the other hand, the results of the questionnaire directed to answering Research Question Three found that sponsor teachers and junior students differed considerably in their perception of an important aspect of the student teachers' performance in oral expression. Sponsor teachers perceived a real need in the area of quality and use of voice while student teachers registered little concern about this aspect of oral expression.

Research Question Four, designed to consider written expression in student teaching practice, revealed that both sponsor teachers and junior students were in agreement that written expression presented no real concerns.

Research Question Five found that sponsor teachers and student teachers identified some important common concerns about problems related to the teaching of language arts but once again differed in their perception concerning teaching competencies involving the quality and use of voice.

Summary of the Findings and Their Implications
Research Question One

Which aspects of oral expression do instructors and students identify as concerns in the university coursework of university students?

Eight items describing aspects of oral expression were identified by instructors and senior students as concerns. Three of the items represent

a concern common to instructors and students, four of the items were only

identified by instructors and one item was seen as a concern only by

students (Tables 16 and 17).

Table 16

Summary of Items in Oral Expression Identified as Needing Improvements by

Both Instructors and Senior Students Based on Tables 3 and 4.

Item	Descriptor
8.	Showed awareness of fine distinctions in vocabulary
7.	Showed breadth of vocabulary
10.	Controlled standard English

[a]Needing improvement represents a mean response of 2.00 or greater on the part of the instructors and a majority of responses indicating a need for improvement on the part of the students.

In viewing expressed needs of third and fourth year students it is

important to remember that few opportunities exist for NITEP planners or

directors to influence or control the educational experiences of third

and fourth year NITEP students. At the present time, only the first two

years of NITEP lend themselves to change because the present structure of

the program integrates third and fourth year students into the main-stream

of the university and away from direct involvement with NITEP. Therefore,

the chief value of these findings is in the implications they present with

regard to first and second year students. For example, it should be

possible to establish whether or not there are courses or support services

in first or second year which might address deficiencies such as those

identified in Table 16. Since both instructors and students share the same

concerns, such a process should not be difficult. It might be more

difficult to interest students in concerning themselves with skills

identified as concerns only by instructors such as those listed in Table 17.

Table 17

Summary of Items in Oral Expression Identified as Needing Improvement[a] by Instructors Only Based on Tables 3 and 4.

Item	Descriptor
15.	Controlled main ideas
13.	Asked useful questions
14.	Supported opinions
15.	Organized ideas coherently

[a]Needing improvement represents a mean response of 2.00 or greater on the part of the instructors.

Reviewing the NITEP program from the point of view of student opportunities to learn and practice the skills of oral composition raises some interesting questions. Do college and university instructors accept the stereotype of quiet, shy native students and therefore not press these student to perform well in oral expression? Do students reinforce the stereotype by not putting themselves forward in class and avoiding oral assignments? One senior student reported that her oral expression was difficult to assess since her "oral contribution in class was minimal".

Also, if instructors find their students inadequate in some areas of oral expression, are they likely to give the time necessary for the instruction required to improve the situation? Are they not more likely to simply change their instructional strategies to avoid the areas in which the students are not contributing at the expected level? One instructor commented on the questionnaire that small discussion groups were not successful, while another reported that neither debates nor simulation

games worked well. It may not be unreasonable to assume that such activities were abandoned rather than giving class time for instruction which might make them work.

Only one item, the use of effective imagery, was identified as needing improvement by students and not by instructors. In the view of this researcher, the wording of this item may have dictated the response, and since the item was related to the generally accepted concern about vocabulary, the concern will be included in that discussion.

Research Question Two

Which aspects of written expression do instructors and students identify as concerns in the university coursework of NITEP students?

Research Question Two established that although senior students did not perceive as many needs in written expression, they seemed to agree with the instructors that written expression is an area of NITEP student performance which needs improvement. The concerns about which instructors and students shared similar perceptions are shown in Table 18.

Three of the items about which both instructors and senior students were concerned, numbers 21, 3 and 15, relate to essay writing. These findings concerning written expression suggest that both students and instructors recognize that developing and improving skills in essay writing would be worthwhile. The program cannot do much to improve the situation for the senior students but can make significant change insofar as junior students are concerned. It might be worthwhile to provide

Table 18

Summary of items in Written Expression identified as Needing Improvement[a]

by both instructors and Senior Students Based on Tables 6 and 7.

Item	Descriptor
21.	Organized essays effectively
11.	Used grammatical terms correctly
3.	Proofread effectively
9.	Created moods, impressions with words
15.	Selected essential details

[a]Needing improvement represents a mean response of 2.00 or greater on the part of the instructors and a majority of responses indicating a need on the part of the students.

opportunities for senior students to share with junior students the need

to prepare themselves for the rigours of academic coursework, particularly

essay writing. Opportunities for such communication might come about

during the annual "Orientation" visit to campus or through the regular

exchange of newsletters from center to center. Although instructors may

repeatedly point out the need for improving one's essay writing skills,

the advice of other students is more likely to be heeded, and to provide

the motivation needed to tackle the number of skills required for

effective essay writing. Since senior students appear to have a fairly

realistic idea of their need for improvement in written expression, it

seems reasonable to assume that in the "community" spirit of NITEP they

would be willing to share their perceptions and observations.

Although senior students and instructors shared a general perception

of need in written expression, instructors alone identified several skills

that needed improvement. These skills are listed in Table 19.

Table 19

Summary of Items in Written Expression Identified as Needing Improvement[a]

by Instructors Only Based on Tables 6 and 7.

Item	Descriptor
10.	Made fine distinctions in vocabulary
4.	Used mechanics of scholarship
22.	Showed coherence and unity of ideas
13.	Displayed fluency in ideas
14.	Responded to readings perceptively
1.	Spelled, capitalized, punctuated correctly
2.	Controlled mechanics of quotation
17.	Adjusted tone for audience
7.	Varied sentence length
20.	Summarized and paraphrased readings
5.	Gave basic information clearly
19.	Supported viewpoint with details

[a]Needs improvement represents a mean response of 2.00 or greater on the part of the instructors.

The concerns identified by instructors only appeared to center almost entirely on the skills necessary for successful expository essay writing. Since this is not only the primary mode of written expression in university classes but is probably also one of the important vehicles for student evaluation, it is not surprising that instructors would be most concerned about this particular form of written expression. The concerns apparent in the response patterns of the instructors implied insufficient control of the conventions of format, an inadequate vocabulary, a weakness in

internalizing and expressing new ideas, and recognizable difficulties in the composing of exposition and argument. Since these skills are requisite in essay writing, and, as pointed out by Conry and Rodgers (1978), the secondary schools have not always provided the necessary instruction to enable most students to master these skills, what can NITEP do to provide its students with this capability?

Again, remembering that few opportunities exist to change the third and fourth years of NITEP, and that general university policy does not support the teaching of remedial English as a recognized part of a university education, the problem for program planners in NITEP becomes twofold. Firstly, they must ensure early identification and help for those students who meet the criteria for acceptance into the program but are deficient in English. Secondly, they must determine ways in which to ensure that provisions are made to help all students who want to improve in such skills in using the mechanics of scholarship or summarizing and paraphrasing readings. Conry and Rodgers (1978) suggested, after finding serious weaknesses in twelfth grade writing in their province-wide assessment of written expression, that nothing would change unless students received instruction in particular skills and then had opportunities to write in situations geared to improve writing. They further suggested that students would benefit from teaching strategies such as pre-writing and student editing groups. These suggestions have interesting implications for the NITEP program since it is entirely possible that some of those 1978 grade twelve students are presently in NITEP.

One interesting sidelight on the data regarding oral and written expression in university coursework came from analyzing the responses of those students who identified themselves as speakers of English as a second language. Unfortunately the size of the sample is too small to

support generalizations, but a few observations appear to be in order.

Compared with the student group as a whole, English$_2$ students indicated

more concern about aspects of their English competency than did English$_1$

students. In several cases the English$_2$ students echoed the responses

of the instructors. Since NITEP is opening a more northerly center next

year, this question of English as a second language may be important and

should be addressed in the planning.

Research Question Three

Which aspects of oral expression do sponsor

teachers and students identify as concerns in

the student teaching of NITEP students?

Responses gathered to answer Research Question Three found that sponsor

teachers and junior students perceived a different priority of needs with

regard to NITEP students performing in their role as student teachers.

The sponsor teachers who responded to the questionnaires saw the quality

and use of voice as the prime aspect of oral expression requiring improvement,

whereas junior students were concerned about needs in the areas of vocabulary

development and the control of rhyme and rhythm in speech (Table 20 and 21).

Since the effective and appropriate use of the voice can be an

important factor in successful teaching, the fact that sponsor teachers

ranked this aspect of oral expression as their prime concern while student

teachers did not, cannot be ignored. If NITEP students perceive their use

and quality of voice as satisfactory, it may be difficult for instructors in

student teaching seminars or in speech arts classes to motivate students to

Table 20

Summary of Items in Oral Expression Identified as Needing Improvement[a]

by Sponsor Teachers Only Based on Tables 10 and 11.

Item	Descriptor
2.	Projected voice sufficiently
1.	Spoke distinctly, articulated clearly

[a]Needs improvement represents a mean response of 2.00 or greater on the part of the instructors.

Table 21

Summary of Items in Oral Expression Identified as Needing Improvement[a]

by Junior Students Only Based on Tables 10 and 11.

Item	Descriptor
7.	Showed breadth of vocabulary
9.	Demonstrated control of rhyme and rhythm

[a]Although items 7 and 9 were not accorded means of 2.00 or greater by the students, they are listed here because 15 of the 20 students indicated a need for improvement in these areas.

improve these skills. Since real improvement in projection and articulation relies on considerable practice, lack of strong motivation could be an important block to constructive change.

Factors which might be at work in this question of quality and use of voice include the previously discussed matter of the teacher's perception that a majority culture voice is best for the classroom. On the other hand, it may reflect a general acceptance of the stereotypical idea that, in the words of one teacher responding to the questionnaire, "By nature most

Natives are quite shy and quiet". In addition, there is a possibility

that sponsor teachers are being overly protective of the feelings of their

native Indian student teachers, and are therefore reluctant to comment

freely on such personal matters as voice projection and articulation.

If this is so it would not be the first time that members of a minority

group have been impeded by good intentions. On the other hand, it may be

that student teachers have not realized the potential benefits of a good

voice in terms of classroom management and instruction and are not therefore

moved to acquire these benefits for themselves.

It is interesting to note in Table 21 that junior students share a

concern of their senior counterparts concerning the need for development

of a broader vocabulary. Although sponsor teachers did not share this

concern, or a concern about the control of rhyme and rhythm in oral

expression, they did share similar perceptions with students about need

with regard to two other items from the student teaching questionnaire.

These items appear in Table 22.

Table 22

Summary of Items in Oral Expression Identified as Needing Improvement[a]

by Both Sponsor Teachers and Junior Students Based on Tables 10 and 11.

Item	Descriptor
10.	Controlled informal standard English
6.	Spoke with confidence

[a]Needs improvement represents a mean response of 2.00 or greater on the part
of the instructors. Although items 10 and 6 were not accorded means of 2.00
or greater by the students, they are included here because 14 of the 20
students indicated a need for improvement in these areas.

It seems possible that if students are concerned about their use of

informal standard English this may be one factor reflected in an inability

to speak with confidence. Since both teachers and students are concerned

about these aspects of oral expression in the classroom, it should not be

difficult to make provisions in student teaching and related situations

for encouraging improvement in these areas. As open discussion about

these aspects of language behavior in the Sponsor Teacher Workshops

preceding student teaching could enable students to ask for help during

practica and teachers to give it.

Research Question Four

Which aspects of written expression do sponsor teachers and students identify as concerns in the student teaching of NITEP students?

Responses collected to answer Research Question Four did not reveal

any aspects of written expression in the student teaching situation which

translated into a need requiring special attention or change in NITEP. It

would appear at this time that the program is providing the students with

whatever is needed for them to function reasonably well in this area. This

reseacher has observed that the program staff places considerable emphasis

on written lesson plans during the student teaching years, and had frequently

noted during the May 1980 practicum the kind of response indicated by one

teacher who wrote on the questionnaire, "... written plans were detailed and

very thorough."

In their comments on written expression most sponsor teachers reiterated

previously stated concerns about oral language and general satisfaction

concerning written expression. For example, one teacher said, "All my students needed a great deal of work with spoken English--written was mainly satisfactory." Another stated, "Written English much more fluent than oral English." On the other hand, one teacher commented that "They (NITEP students) should have more facility with the written language," while another commented on language and spelling skills as the "biggest downfall." Obviously, some teachers did have concerns about written language, but overall the sponsor teacher responses on the student teaching questionnaires suggest that aspects of oral expression are viewed as concerns more often than aspects of written expression.

Research Question Five

Which of the specific teaching competencies related to the teaching of language arts do sponsor teachers and students identify as needing improvement?

Reseach Question Five found that sponsor teachers and junior students were concerned about deficiencies in the student teachers' knowledge of children's language background and their knowledge of children's literature (Table 23).

Since these concerns about a lack of knowledge of children's literature and children's language background were perceived by both groups as inadequacies needing improvement, it appears that present course content in language arts methodology is not providing what some students require in this area. It seems that the regular content of language arts -- as suggested by

Table 23

Summary of Teaching Competencies Identified as Needing Improvement[a] by Both

Sponsor Teachers and Junior Students Based on Tables 14 and 15.

Item	Descriptor
4.	Demonstrates familiarity with children's literature
7.	Demonstrates familiarity with children's language background

[a]Although item 4 was not accorded a mean response of 2.00 or greater by the students, it was identified as needing improvement by 17 of 20 students. Similarly, item 7 was not accorded a mean response of 2.00 or greater by sponsor teachers but was identified as needing improvement by 44 out of 60 sponsor teachers.

course outlines and student teachers language arts methodology texts --

assumes that student teachers come to teacher education with a knowledge of

children's books and the content of a "typical" white middle-class child's

language background as a direct result of their own upbringing and education.

Considering the ever growing numbers of non-majority culture students

enrolled in teacher education, this seems to be a fallacious assumption of

which the full implications have not been considered. This certainly appears

to be the case for native Indian students.

It seems quite unreasonable to expect that native Indian students will

arrive at the university equipped with a strong background in children's

book and language experiences such as nursery rhymes and games. Questions

concerning their need for such a background and the opportunities for

acquiring it need to be addressed by those involved in the presentation of

reading and language arts methodology. It is also possible that other course

in the program directly related to the student teaching component of NITEP

could assume some responsibility in this area.

It was interesting to note that only two teaching competencies, modelling correct pronunciation and the ability to use different levels of questions in language arts instruction, were singled out by sponsor teachers but not by junior students. Since one of these items seems to be related to the sponsor teachers' general perception about quality and use of voice, it would appear that the singling out of this item simply reiterates the degree to which sponsor teachers' hold this perception.

Recommendations Arising from the Findings and Implications

The following recommendations are based upon the data drawn by the needs assessment and the resulting conclusions and implications that have just been discussed. The recommendations are organized into categories relating to various administrative aspects of the NITEP program: Admission; Academic Component; Education Component; and Support Services.

Admission. It is recommended that early identification of those students who may be less proficient in English, and the transmission of this information to those instructors and/or program staff who are in a position to assist these students, should be a specific responsibility of those who do the screening interviews prior to students' acceptance into the program. Since the program is expanding to a northern community this year, it may be that there will be an increase in the number of students who speak English as a second language, or a non-standard dialect, and early indentification of these students would expedite attending to any special needs.

It is recommended that if any student's English background appears to

warrant such intervention, interviewers should consider counselling students to take speaking, writing and/or reading improvement courses prior to entry into the program. Since such courses are often offered at community colleges and through the Open Learning Institute and are therefore available to most students, this might provide opportunities for strengthening their language skills and thus upgrading ease the students' entry into the program. The NITEP Advisory Committee might undertake to investigate possible sources of funding for pre-NITEP education such as this as another way of ensuring that students are encouraged to take such courses.

Academic component. It is recommended that NITEP make every effort to gain permission and approval to enable the program to offer English 100 or an equivalent course within the program whenever enrollment justifies this action. Such a course would facilitate ongoing instruction not only in such areas as expository essay writing but in other language skills within a context which could capitalize on the students' common backgrounds and interests while attending to their identified needs. Adherence to regular examination standards and other procedures should ensure acceptance of such a course in terms of the university and English department regulations.

It is further recommended that no effort be spared to facilitate the students' opportunities for success in English 100 or 200. The acknowledged heavy demands of student teaching and other special aspects of the program must not be allowed to interfere with the students' English studies as they presently do. Every effort should be made to find ways in which these courses can be scheduled during the day, perhaps at NITEP centers, and be free from interruptions due to NITEP obligations. Having to attend English classes at night, after attending NITEP classes or practice teaching all day, places an unfortunate strain on students, one that is recognized by instructors. For example, one wrote, "One group (of NITEP students), I

recall, did not have time to eat dinner before arriving at the College.
They were very, very tired and were physically and mentally at a very low
ebb".

Education component. It is recommended that Education 304, Curriculum
and Instruction in the Language Arts, and Education 305, Curriculum and
Instruction in Developmental Reading in the Elementary School, be offered
as two one and one-half unit courses during each of the first two years in
NITEP, rather than consecutively and for three units each in first or
second year as is presently the case. Since language arts dominates the
curriculum of the elementary school, it is not surprising that student
teachers are expected to teach language arts, a good deal of which includes
reading, in their earliest practicum. To send them out without any
preparation in either area is unreasonable.

A recent melding of the two faculty of education departments of English
Education and Reading into one Department of Language Education should
facilitate at least a reorganization if not an integration of the reading
and language arts methodology courses. Such development would be in keeping
with the expressed philosophy of the new provincial curriculum guide (B.C.,
1978).

It is recommeded that instructors of Education 304 and 305 be asked to
provide more than the usual opportunities for NITEP students to become
familiar with children's books, poems, word games, finger plays, and all the
myriad of experiences with which an effective teacher of English language
arts should be familiar. In addition, it is recommended that such instructors
be asked to incorporate information and teaching materials relating to the
special needs of native Indian children in English language arts, paying
particular attention to the new Language arts guide for native children

(Klesner, 1979).

It is recommended that Education 216, Speech Education (1½ units), be offered at the beginning of first year, and that the instructor be apprised of the pertinent results of this needs assessment. Consultation with native Indian program staff and advisors regarding the whole question of voice, and how much change may be desirable or necessary, should be helpful in planning this course. Since speech arts courses are provided through the Department of Language Education, opportunities for incorporating some aspects of children's literature and children's early language background into this course could be considered by the appropriate instructors.

It is recommended that the program extend its recognized concept of "a NITEP community" to include instructors and sponsor teachers to a greater degree. Both these groups might benefit from an increased sense of belonging to the program and to expect as a part of their involvement to meet for an exchange of views and information.

NITEP sponsor teachers presently attend occasional workshops. It seems that an extension of these workshops might provide opportunities to explore the possibilities inherent in student teaching supervision for improving student teacher performance in those areas that have been identified by the assessment as needing improvement. Problems such as those arising from teachers' reluctance to expect enough of the student teachers through misguided kindness could be addressed in such meetings.

Instructors certainly should be encouraged to meet together regularly as a part of their commitment to NITEP. This is not an unusual expectation since faculty participating in other alternate programs presently do so. Among other things such regular and ongoing contact between instructors and program staff would facilitate a concern for English across the curriculum

and enable the development of English profiles for each students. Three

such meetings have been held in North Vancouver this year and program

staff and instructors have been very positive in their comments about

this experiment.

Because NITEP espouses principles of community, it is also important that

every effort be made to have representation from students at such meetings.

For example, in North Vancouver this year, students drafted lists of "things they

needed to know" after the first practicum and these were issued to instructors.

Such communication reportedly proved useful to instructors.

Support services. It is recommended that the present arrangement which

provides junior students with a study skills course for at least one week

in September be discontinued. Although the basic premise of equipping

students with specific skills in reading texts, taking tests and other such

skills is a good one, some data from the needs assessment suggest that

the effectiveness of the present practice is questionable. Many of the needs

perceived by instructors and senior students could be more effectively

addressed by NITEP instructors given extra time to teach specific study

skills related to their own course content and teaching style. In addition

to apportioning the time made available by such a move, it is recommended

that the program decision makers consider using some of the funds spent

purchasing a general study skills course from a community college to provide

in-service for NITEP instructors on effective methods for teaching their

own study skills.

It is recommended that some form of English and language arts needs

assessment be an ongoing process in NITEP. With an annual intake of

students and regular changes to the program, it may be expected that

students' needs will change considerably. The following comment from a

sponsor teacher supports the contention of this researcher that focusing

the attention of program participants on English can in and of itself be

a worthwhile endeavor. In the words of the teacher, "These areas we are asked to evaluate have always been a definite problem with almost all my NITEP students -- I'm glad to be able to respond to a survey such as this -- as I feel that if people are aware of these deficiencies, they will be improved upon."

Although this research's experience in NITEP has not led her to the conclusion that "almost all" NITEP students have problems in language -- it is important to realize that if people have such perceptions concerning NITEP students' competency, these perceptions will influence their relationship with the program and with the students. There is no question that some NITEP students have had serious problems with the English language. One senior student expressed her personal frustrations with English when she wrote, "English also is not clear, has many twisted sounds and is confusing. After four years, I haven't gotten far." It is interesting that the same needs assessment produced a sponsor teacher who said, "I have been very fortunate in having such students -- their standards have been very high." The value of a needs assessment such as this one is that it provides an opportunity for everyone to be "listened to" and to affect the development of a program. Such procedures offer program participants a degree of control which they value (More, 1979, p. 10).

It is recommended that remedial English instruction, including reading, be available for students who are permitted to enter the program and then found to have significant gaps in their English background. An assessment of the most effective way in which to provide such instruction should be undertaken by an appropriate person or agency under the supervision of the NITEP Advisory Committee. Because English tutoring has been provided at various times and in various ways in an attempt to improve students' writing, it should probably be included in such an assessment. Since English tutoring

as it has been provided has not included a concern for oral English but has concentrated on writing, it may be that such a service is too limited to meet the needs of students as identified by the program participants reported in this study.

Problems and Suggestions for Change
in Any Future Needs Assessment

The problems encountered in this needs assessment were linked with the timing of the survey and weaknesses in the instruments. Doing the needs assessment in June necessitated sending questionnaires to teachers at what may be the busiest time of the year for them. In addition, it meant that students and instructors were frequently not at their respective institutions and were difficult to contact.

March and April would seem to be better months in which to collect data for such a needs assessment. The February practicum would be finished but teachers would still be in school and available for follow-up of any kind while instructors and students could be interviewed or be included in data-producing situations by the needs assessor just prior to the conclusion of their courses. Such procedures would almost guarantee an improved sampling of the population. Subsequently it should also be possible to broaden the sample base to include native Indian teachers and other native educators.

Increased reliability and validity of the questionnaires should increase the usefulness of the needs assessment data. The inclusion of student test results in a needs assessment such as this should improve validity while extensive pre-testing of questionnaire items and instructions should improve

reliability. In addition, random arrangement of items on the questionnaire and subsequent analysis to check internal validity would be worthwhile, as follow-up interviews of randomly selected participants. Finally, doing a similar study in another native Indian teacher education program would be a good measure of utility of the instruments and the entire needs assessment.

Suggestions for Further Research

1. A review of recent research into the teaching of academic writing to those sometimes referred to as "basic" writers and a subsequent study to measure the effectiveness of the most promising techniques.

2. A study to measure the effectiveness of speech arts training in improving student performance in student teaching.

3. A comparison of the English and language arts components in NITEP and in the other native Indian and Inuit teacher preparation programs in Canada.

4. A needs assessment study in English and language arts in an alternate program other than NITEP.

5. An examination of reading competencies of NITEP students with particular regard for those students who may not be performing at the level generally accepted as necessary for success in a university.

6. A study to determine what would constitute an adequate knowledge of child language and children's literature for an effective language arts teacher.

7. An alpha-type needs assessment focusing on native Indian teacher preparation.

8. An examination and subsequent listing of materials relating to the improvement of teaching and learning for native Indian students.

9. The development of NITEP student profiles in order that students' progress may be followed and evaluated continuously.

10. An examination of English as a second language as a factor in post-secondary education for native Indian students in British Columbia.

Conclusion

This needs assessment has concerned itself with reviewing the English and language arts components of NITEP in order to ensure that the program is providing maximum opportunities for NITEP students to develop and strengthen English competency. Fairly wide-ranging suggestions for change in many areas of the program have been recommended. Such extensive change is rarely easy, but the strong sense of purpose and commitment that runs through NITEP should enable the program to assess the value of these changes and to incorporate those that appear to be warranted.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, H. Prison of grass. Toronto: New Press, 1975.

Aldous, M., Barnett, D., & King, C. (Eds.). Teacher education programs for native people. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan, College of Education Research Resources Centre, 1974.

Andersson, T. & Boyer, M. Bilingual schooling in the United States (2nd ed.). Austin, Texas: National Educational Laboratory Publishers, Inc., 1978.

Ashworth, M. The forces which shaped them. Vancouver: New Star Books, 1979.

Ashworth, M. Language development and the Ahousaht Children. In G.H. Cannon (Ed.). The Ahousaht education study. North Vancouver: Clare Educational Development Inc., 1980.

Assessing pupil progress in English. Towson, Maryland: Board of Education of Baltimore County, 1976.

Aurbach, H.A. and Fuchs, E. The status of American Indian education. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State, 1970.

Bamberg, B. Composition instruction does make a difference: A comparison of the high school preparation of college freshmen in regular and remedial English classes. Research in the Teaching of English, 1978, 12 (1), 47-59.

Barnett, D.C. Principles and issues underlying the Indian teacher education program at the University of Saskatchewan. Monograph No. 4 Indian and Northern Education Program. Saskatoon: Saskatchewan University Indian and Northern Curriculum Resources Centre, 1975.

Beavis, R. "The new illiterates ... can they be cured?" Magazine, Sunday Province, October 14, 1979, pp. 12-13.

Bell, R.A., Lin, E. & Warheit, J.J. Issues in need assessment data collection strategies. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 149 208)

Benham, W.J. A philosophy of Indian education. Journal of American Indian Education, 1975, 15 (1) 1-3.

Bergman, R. et al. Problems of cross-cultural education research and evaluation: the Rough Rock Demonstration School. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1969.

Berwick, R.F. Assessing needs in ethnic communities and planning for specific purpose instruction. Unpublished graduating essay, Univeristy of British Columbia, 1977.

Best, J.W. Research in education (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentic-Hall, Inc., 1977.

Blanchard, J.D. & Reedy, R. The relationship of a test of English as a second language to measures of achievement and self concept in a sample of American Indian students. Paper presented at American Psychological Association Convention, Miami Beach, Florida, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 147 090)

Borg, W. & Gall, M.D. Educational research: An introduction (3rd ed.). New York: David McKay, 1979.

Bowd, A.D. Ten years after the Hawthorn report: changing psychological implications for the education of Canadian native peoples. Canadian Psychological Review, 1977, 18 (4), 332-345.

Braithwaite, R.L. Increasing minority participation in research and development through survey research methodology. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Pre-Session, Toronto, 1978.

Brooks, I.R. Native education in Canada and the United States: a bibliography. Calgary: Office of Educational Development, Indian Students University Program Services, University of Calgary, 1976.

Brooks, I.R. Teaching native children: lessons from cognitive psychology. Journal of Educational Thought, 1978, 12 (1), 56-67.

Brown, R. Introduction to M. Ashworth's The forces which shaped them. Vancouver: New Star Books, 1979.

Bringing unity into language development, Report 3. Vancouver: Vancouver School Board, 1977.

Burnaby, B. Languages and their roles in educating native children. Informal Series 116. Toronto, Ontario: Institute for Studies in Education, 1980.

Canadian Council of Children and Youth. Admittance restricted: the child as citizen in Canada. Toronto: Canadian Council of Children and Youth, 1978.

Canine, J.K. The American Indian and the community college. (Doctoral dissertation, Teachers' College, Columbia University, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 39, 39/12A. (University Microfilms No. 79-13187)

Cannon, G.H. The Ahousaht education study. North Vanouver, B.C.: Clare Educational Development Inc., 1980.

Cardinal, D. "Educators ... your systems have failed." Education Canada, 1970, 40, 21-22.

Cardinal, H., The rebirth of Canada's Indians. Edmonton: Hurtig, 1977.

Cavender, C. Suggested educational programs for teachers and parents of urban Indian youth. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1971. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 052 969)

Cazden, C. et al. Functions of language. New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, 1972.

Chow, C.H.M. An investigation of the concept of needs assessment and its role in three instructional development agencies in higher education. (Doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37:8 6921-A. (University Microfilm No. 77-9846)

Clifton, R.A. Factors which affect the education of Canadian Indian students. In R.A. Carlton, L.A. Colley & N.J. MacKinnon (Eds.), Education, Change and Society. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing, 1977.

Coffing, R.T. Client need assessing. In G. Zaltman, D. Florio & L. Silorski (Eds.), Dynamic educational change. New York: The Free Press, 1977.

Coffing, R.T. & Hutchison, T.E. Needs analysis methodology: A prescriptive set of rules and procedures for identifying, defining and measuring needs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 095 654)

Committee of the Canadian Council of Teachers of English. Report on English language education in Canada. St. John, New Brunswick: 1976.

Common sense and testing in English. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1975.

Conry, R. & Rodgers, D. British Columbia Assessment of written expression: Summary report. A report to the Ministry of Education, Province of British Columbia, 1978.

Cook, T. 1979-1980 Annual report presented to the NITEP Advisory Committee, University of British Columbia, 1980.

Cross, P.K. The state of the art in needs assessment. Paper presented at the Conference on Lifelong Learning. Akron, Ohio: 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 181 032)

Curtis, C.K. Contemporary community problems in citizenship education for slow-learning secondary students (Vols. 1 & 2). (Doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39, 2864. (University Microfilms No. 78-21119)

Dale, P. Language development: structure and function (2nd ed.). Holt, Rinehart and Winston Co., 1975.

Decker, D. Indian outreach program needs assessment survey. Prescott, Arizona: Yavapai College, 1979. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 176 919)

Deever, R.M., Abraham, W., Gill, G.A., Sundwall, H.W. & Gianopulos, P.G. (Eds.). American Indian education. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State University, 1974.

Department of Indian affairs and northern development. 5,000 little Indians went to school. Ottawa: Canadian Education Branch, 1971, 43-45.

Derrick, J. Language needs of minority group children. Windsor, Berks: NFER Pub. Co. Ltd., 1977.

Dick, W. & Carey, L.M. Needs assessment and instructional design. Educational Technology, 1977, 17 (11), 53-59.

Dumont, F.J. Report of an assessment of educational needs of Northern Albertans. Alberta Educational Planning and Research Branch, 1978.

Dumont, R.V. Jr. Learning English and how to be silent: Studies in Sioux and Cherokee classrooms. In C. Cazden et al. (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers' College Press, 1972.

Educational technology: Definition and glossary of terms. Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1977.

Elementary Language Arts Curriculum Guide. Victoria, B.C.: Province of British Columbia, Ministry of Education, 1978.

Elementary language arts - kindergarten. A teacher questionnaire. Victoria, B.C.: Department of Education, 1975.

English, F.W. & Kaufman, R.A. Needs assessment: a focus for curriculum development. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975.

Epstein, N. Language, ethnicity and the schools. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, The George Washington University, 1977.

Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia. Form 323, Rev. 1979.

Favel, F. Integration or assimilation. B.C. School Trustee, 1970, 26 (2), 18.

Foerster, L.M. & Little Soldier, D. Classroom communication and the Indian child. Language Arts, 1980, 57 (1), 45-49.

Fox, R.P. Essays on teaching English as a second language and as a second dialect. Urbana, Ill.: NCTE Committee on Publications, 1973.

Fuchs, E. & Havighurst, R.J. To live on this earth: American Indian education. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1972.

Gillam, M.R. American Indians as student teachers. Paper presented to National Council for the Social Studies, San Francisco, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 092 298)

Gillie, B.C. A possible solution for some of the difficulties faced by Indian and Eskimo people. Learn Newsletter, 1974, 6 (3), 5-7.

Goodson, W.D. The effect of a five-week pre-college orientation program for Indian students. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University, 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 063 991)

Grambs, J.D. Multicultural education: Issues without answers. Education Digest, 1979, 45 (4) 45-47.

Griffith, W.S. Educational needs: definition, assessment and utilization. School Review, 1978, 86, 382-39.

Hawthorn, H.B. A survey of the contemporary Indians of Canada. Vol. II. Ott.: Indian Affairs, 1967.

Head, C.V. Jr. Academic achievement in English of junior college transfer students and native students at the University of Mississippi. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 34, 3720. (University Microfilms No. 72-3925)

Hook, J.N., Jacobs, P.H. & Crisp, R.D. What every English teacher should know. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1970.

Hopkins, T.R. Teaching English to American Indians. English Record, 1971, 21 (4), 24-31. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 053 603)

Hunter, W.A. Multicultural education through competency based teacher education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of College Teacher Education, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 120 173)

Indian and Northern education program. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan, 1974.

Indian education: an era of change. Canadian Association in Support of Native Peoples Bulletin, 1975, 16 (2) 4-7.

Indian teachers to teach Indians. B.C. Teacher, 1976, 55 (4), 135.

Jackson, C.E. Identification of unique features in education at American Indian Schools. San Francisco: R & E Research Assoc., 1974.

Jensen, K.D. & Jensen, S. Factors in college education for Indian students. Improving College and University Teaching, 1970, 18, 52-54.

John, V.P. Styles of learning - styles of teaching: reflections on the education of Navajo children. In C. Cazden et al. (Eds.), <u>Functions of language in the classroom</u>. New York: Teachers' College Press, 1972.

Jones, V. Training teachers of English for Alaska's Native children. <u>Elementary English</u>, 1971, <u>48</u>, 198-202.

Johnson, N.A. <u>Current topics in language</u>. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop Publishers, Inc., 1976.

Kaegi, Gerda. <u>A comprehensive view of Indian education</u>. Toronto: Can. Assoc. in Support of Native Peoples, 1974.

Kaltsounis, T. The need to Indianize Indian schools. <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, 1972, <u>53</u> (5), 291-293.

Kaufman, R. A possible taxonomy of needs assessment. <u>Educational Technology</u>, 1977, <u>27</u> (11), 60-64.

Kaufman, R.A. <u>Educational system planning</u>. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Kaufman, R. & English, F.W. <u>Needs assessment: concept and application</u>. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1979.

Kerlinger, F.N. <u>Foundations of behavioral research</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Kimpston, R.D. & Stockton, W.S. Needs assessment: a problem of priorities. Educational Technology, 1979, <u>19</u> (6), 16-21.

King, A.R. Indian education. <u>Canadian Journal of Native Education</u>, 1979, <u>6</u> (4), 8-11.

Kirkness, V.J. Change is a long time coming. <u>Canada and the World</u>, March 1980, 14-15.

Kita, S. <u>UBC SPSS: statistical package for the social sciences version 7.01 (under MTS)</u>. Vancouver, B.C.: Computing Centre, University of British Columbia, 1978.

Kleinfeld, J. <u>Eskimo school on the Andreafsy: a study of effective bicultural education</u>. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1979.

Kleinfeld, J. Effective teachers of Eskimo and Indian children. <u>School Review</u>, 1975, <u>83</u>, 301-344.

Kleinfeld, J. Positive stereotyping: the cultural relativist in the classroom. <u>Northian</u>, 1976, <u>12</u> (1), 20-25.

Kleinfeld, J. & Kohout, K.L. Increasing the college success of Alaska natives. <u>Journal of American Indian Education</u>, 1974, <u>13</u> (3), 26-31.

Klesner, M.A. Listen to what I really say! (A practical guide to the teaching of language arts to native Indian students K-7). Draft No. V. Victoria, B.C.: Ministry of Education, 1979.

Knowles, M.S. The modern practice of adult education (2nd ed.). New York: Association Press, 1977.

Koenig, D.M. Northern people and higher education: realities and possibilities. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1975.

Lane, B. Five years later. B.C. School Trustee, 1970, 26 (2), 13-14.

Language B.C.: An assessment in the English language arts. The Department of Education, Province of British Columbia, 1976.

La Roque, E. Defeathering the Indian. Agincourt, Ont.: The Book Society of Canada Ltd., 1975.

Lenning, O.T. A conceptual framework for identifying and assessing needs in post secondary education. A paper presented at the Annual Association for Institutional Research Forum at Houston, Texas, May, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 161 341)

Locke, P. Higher education: background and implications for American Indians. Boulder, Colo: Western Insterstate Commission for Higher Education, 1973. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 085 160)

Loughton, A.J. Indian Metis project for careers in teacher education (I.M.P.A.C.T.E.) An internal evaluation. Manitoba: Brandon University, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 139 562)

MacLean, H. A review of Indian education in North America (Rev. ed.). Toronto: Ontario Teachers' Federation, 1973.

Macnamara, J. Bilingualism and primary education. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1966.

Martin, I. Facing the real problems of native language education. Canadian Association for Support of Native Peoples, 1975, 16 (2), 10-11.

Mathieson, M.B. A brief bibliography on teacher education and American Indians. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1974.

McArthur, R.S. Ecology, culture and cognitive development: Canadian native youth. In L. Driedger (ed.), The Canadian Ethnic Mosaic. Toronto: McLelland and Stewart, 1978.

McIntosh, G. Teacher education for Native Indians. Challenge in Educational Administration, 1979, 18, 21-31.

McKay, A.A. Meeting the needs of the native Indian student. Paper presented at Education of the Urban and Migrating Indian conference, Vancouver, 1977.

McNeil, J.D. Curriculum: a comprehensive introduction. Toronto: Little, Brown & Co., 1977.

McNeil, J.D. & Laosa, L. Needs assessment and cultural pluralism in schools. Educational Technology, 1975, 25 (12), 25-28.

Mitchell, Marjorie. The message of silence: language and the Indian child. B.C. Teacher, 1974, 53 (5), 163-166.

Monette, M.L. Needs assessment: a critique of philosophical assumptions. Adult Education, 1979, 29 (2), 83-95.

Monette, M.L. The concept of educational need: an analysis of selected literature. Adult Education, 1977, 27 (2), 116-127.

Monette, M.L. Paulo Friere and other unheard voices. Religious Education, 1979, 74, 543-554.

More, A.J. Indian teacher education in Canada. Paper presented at the meeting of the Canadian Education Association, Winnipeg, 1979.

More, A.J. Native teacher education: A survey of native Indian and Inuit teacher education projects in Canada. Vancouver: Canadian Indian Teacher Education Projects (CITEP) Conference, February, 1981.

More, A.J. & Wallis, J.W. Native teacher education: a survey of native Indian teacher education projects in Canada. Vancouver, B.C.: Canadian Indian Teacher Education Projects (CITEP) Conference, 1979.

Morgan, L. & Feldman, D. Needs assessment in higher education: the Mott Foundation Community College model. Educational Technology, 27 (11), 48-52.

Morse, J.L. The drop-out, the school, and the community. English Journal, 1972, 61 (8), 1232-1238.

Murphy, D.M. Opinionnaire: selected teacher corps programs. Anchorage, Alaska: 1973.

NCTE Standing Committee on Teacher Preparation and Certification. A statement on the preparation of teachers of English and the language arts. Urbana, Ill.: 1976.

Native education in the province of Alberta. Alberta Government, 1972.

National Indian Brotherhood. Indian control of Indian education. Ottawa: The Brotherhood, 1972.

Nisyok, Jean. I would like to become a teacher: Indian Education Newsletter. 1979, 3 (10), 9.

Ohannessian, S. The study of the problems of teaching English to American Indians. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1967.

Ohm, V. NITEP: Not a red pass but a red passageway. U.B.C. Alumni Chronicle. Summer, 1978, 12-16.

Oklahoma Indian education needs assessment project. Vol. IV. Appendixes. Stillwater, Okla.: Oklahoma State University, 1976.

Overturf, L.L., et al. Problems faced in higher education by American Indians. College and University, 1972, 47, 316-318.

Oppenheim, A.N. Questionnaire design and attitude measure. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1966.

Orlich, D.C. Designing Sensible Surveys. Pleasantville, N.Y.: Redgrove Pub. Co., 1978.

Parnell, Ted. Barriers to education. Yukon Assoc. of Non-Status Indians. Whitehorse: 1976.

Petty, W.T., Petty, D.C., Newman, A.P. & Skeen, E.M. Language competencies essential for coping in our society. In J.R. Squire (Ed.), The teaching of English. The seventy-sixth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: 1977, 66-95.

Philips, S.U. Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Springs children in community and classroom. In C. Cazden et al. (Eds.), Functions of language in the classroom. New York: Teachers' College Press, 1972.

Policy statement on Indian education. Schools Department Circular. Victoria, B.C.: Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, October, 1979.

Pooley, R.C. The teaching of English usage. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974.

Powell, J.W. Indian linguistic families of America North of Mexico. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.

Proposal presented to University of British Columbia Senate, for native Indian teacher education program, 1974.

Radulovich, M.L. Teaching English to Indian children. T.E.S.L. Talk, 1974, 5, 14-19.

Reid, G. Indian education as I see it. Speech to Kitimat District Teachers and Education 479 class. Reprinted in Indian Education, 1974, 4 (6 & 7), 11-14.

Report of the President's review committee on the faculty of education. The University of British Columbia, February, 1979.

Richburg, J.R. & Rice, M.J. Accountability in minority teacher training: University of Georgia Indian Teacher Training Program. Paper presented to the C.U.F.A. section, Annual Meeting of the National Council for Social Studies, Boston, Mass., 1972. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 076 466)

Riffel, J.A. Education for the people: towards a systematic approach to assessing the educational needs of Indian communities. Northian, 1975, 11 (1) 26-31.

Roberts, W.K., Daubek, K.M. & Johnston, J.C. The use of needs assessment techniques for establishing training programs responsive to the U.S. Army's role. Educational Technology, 1977, 17 (11), 41-42.

Robinson, H.A. & Burrows, A.T. Teacher effectiveness in elementary language arts: a progress report. Urbana, Ill.: National Conference on Research in English, 1974.

Rubidge, N.A. The effects of learning and instructional style congruence in an adult education learning environment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia, 1979.

Ryberg, R.F. & Belock, M.V. Exploration in the history and sociology of American Indian education. Meerut, India: Sadha Prakashan, 1973.

Sandstrom, R.H. Clash of cultures: a report of the institute on the American Indian student in higher education. Canton, N.Y.: St. Lawrence University, 1972.

Saville, M.R. First-language influences on ethnic dialects: Spanish and Navajo. In N. Johnson (Ed.), Current topics in language. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop Publishers, Inc., 1976, 157-163.

Sawyer, D. Schools have treated Indian students shamefully. B.C. Teacher, 1976, 56 (2), 42-45.

Scoon, A.R. Affective influences on English language learning among Indian students. TESOL Quarterly, 1971, 5 (4) 285-291.

Sealey, D.B. "The Métis: schools, identity and conflict." In A. Chaiton & N. McDonald (Eds.), Canadian Schools and Canadian Identity. Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing Ltd., 1977.

Selections from Distinguished Speaker Series for the NITEP Think-in/Workshop. Native Indian Teacher Education Program, Faculty of Education, The University of British Columbia, 1980.

Shaw, M.E. & Wright, J.M. From scales for the measurement of attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Shrestha, G.M. An institutional needs assessment approach to teacher education programs with special reference to Nepal. (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38, 7127-7128A. (University Microfilms No. 78 08424)

Simon, R.I., Shebib, F., Little Bear, L. & Shewan, K. Impacte: a description report and evaluation of the first 18 months: Indian and Metis project for careers through teacher education. Ottawa: Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, 1973.

Smith, J.C. When is a disadvantage a handicap? Journal of American Indian Education, 1980, 19 (2) 13-17.

Spears, J. Learning in Nishga. The Province, October 26, 1974, p. 5.

Stanbury, W.T. Comparison of on-and-off reserve educational achievements. Journal of American Indian Education, 1973, 12 (3), 24-33.

Stanbury, W.T. Success and failure: Indians in urban society. U.B.C. Press, 1975.

Sterling, R. Native Indian education in British Columbia. Canadian Association for Support of Native Peoples, 1975, 16 (2), 12-14

Summary report of the task force on the educational needs of native peoples of Ontario. Toronto: 1976.

Szasz, M.C. Education and the American Indian (2nd ed.). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1974.

Taking a new look at ... needs assessment. The Practitioner. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1977, 4 (2), 1-11.

Taking the University to the reserve. Northian News, 1974, 40: 4-6.

Thompson, T.A. American Indian teacher training: teacher corps model. Journal of Teacher Education, 1975, 26 (2) 123-4.

Thomas, W.G. & McIntosh, R.G. Return home, watch your family. Edmonton: Department of Indian Affairs, 1977.

Touchie, B. Linguistics and education: a native student's perspective. Canadian Journal of Indian Education, 1979, 6 (4), 14-17.

Travers, R.M.W. An introduction to educational research (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan Pub. Co. Inc., 1978.

Undergraduate handbook, education. Vancouver, B.C.: Faculty of Education, University of British Columbia, 1980-81.

University of British Columbia calendar 1980-81. Vancouver, B.C.: University of British Columbia.

Williams, A.M. An assessment of the educational needs of minority students as perceived by parents, students, and staff. (Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37: 2043A-2044A. (University Microfilms No. 76-21 404)

Williams, T.R. Leadership issues for Canadian education. Toronto: Canadian Education Association, 1979.

Wise, J.E. Nordberg, R.B. & Reitz, D.J. Methods of research in education. Boston: Heath & Co., 1967.

Worthen, B.R., Owens, T.R. & Anderson, B. Native Indian teacher education program evaluation. In Evaluation of the alternative teacher education programs of the University of British Columbia, 1975. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 60-94.

Wyatt, J.D. Native involvement in curriculum development: the native teacher as cultural broker. In M.L. Kovacs (Ed.) Ethnic Canadians: culture and education. Regina: Canadian Plains Research Centre, 1978.

Wyatt, J.D. Self-determination through education: a Canadian Indian example. Phi Delta Kappan, 1977a, 58, 405-408; 423.

Wyatt, J.D. Native teacher education in a community setting: the Mount Currie program. Canadian Journal of Education, 1977b, 2 (3), 1-14.

Zielinski, W.G. Achievement of Grade VII compound and coordinate Cree as English-speaking bilinguals in Northland School Division No. 61. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Montana, 1971). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 33, 132A. (University Microfilms No. 72-19974)

APPENDIX A

ORIGINAL PROPOSAL PRESENTED TO THE

NITEP ADIVSORY COMMITTEE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE STUDY

Approval necessary to comply with the U.B.C. Policy for Research on Human Subjects.

1. Access to student records in order to determine:

    a. English Placement results

    b. Grade 11 and 12 course work

    c. Post secondary course work

2. Permission to test students for:

    a. Reading competence

    b. Language fluency, oral and written

3. Since we will be viewed as representing NITEP, we request permission to approach the following groups for possible data collection as related to this study:

    a. Present and past NITEP students

    b. Teachers - practicum sponsors, Native Indian teachers, teachers in schools predominantly Native Indian in population

    c. English/Language Arts supervisors in school districts or in the Ministry

    d. University teachers, counsellors, college instructors, counsellors

    e. Other Native Indian individuals or groups as appropriate

4. Access to reports, records etc.

APPENDIX B

PROGRESS REPORT PRESENTED

TO THE NITEP ADVISORY COMMITTEE

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRES SENT TO

INSTRUCTORS, SENIOR STUDENTS,

SPONSOR TEACHERS, JUNIOR STUDENTS

University Coursework Questionnaire

Instructor's Version

Part 1. BACKGROUND AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Please choose your answer and put the corresponding letter in the space provided.

1. I instructed NITEP students in (a)an ARTS course; (b)an EDUCATION course; (c)a non-credit course. _____
2. I taught the students at (a)a community college; (b)the university; (c)an off-campus site. _____
3. My class (a) was restricted to NITEP students; (b)included other students. _____
4. The length of the course was (a)one semester or less;(b)two semesters. _____
5. I have instructed a course that included NITEP students (a)once;(b)twice;(c)more than twice. _____
6. I consider that my course (a)made heavy demands in oral English;(b)made heavy demands in written English;(c)made heavy demands in oral and written English;(d)was not particularly demanding in oral and written English. _____
7. My professional responsibility(a)includes teaching English;(b)does not now, but once did include teaching English;(c)has never included teaching English. _____
8. I have taught(a)fewer than 5 NITEP students; (b)5-15 NITEP students;(c)16-25 NITEP students; (d)more than 25 NITEP students. _____

Part 2. ORAL EXPRESSION

During class discussions, question and answer periods, interviews, report giving and other oral activities, you undoubtedly assess the oral language competence of all your students. At this time we would like you to consider the NITEP students that you have taught during or since the academic year 1977-1978, and to respond to the list of oral language competencies, using the following scale.

1 = Satisfactory or better

2 = Needed improvement

3 = Needed considerable improvement

In their oral expression the NITEP students:

1.	Spoke distinctly, articulated sounds clearly.	1 2 3
2.	Projected voices adequately for intended audiences	1 2 3
3.	Spoke without undue use of extraneous expressions such as "uh" and "er".	1 2 3
4.	Took part responsibly in discussion groups.	1 2 3
5.	Used conventional nonverbal language.	1 2 3
6.	Confidently expressed divergent opinions.	1 2 3
7.	Used wide ranging vocabulary.	1 2 3
8.	Showed awareness of fine distinctions in meaning.	1 2 3
9.	Used effective imagery in description.	1 2 3
10.	Demonstrated control of standard English.	1 2 3
11.	Used a level of language appropriate to the situation; e.g. reporting, conversation, debate.	1 2 3
12.	Listened attentively with comprehension.	1 2 3
13.	Questioned perceptively in order to understand.	1 2 3
14.	Supported opinions reasonably well.	1 2 3
15.	Reported main ideas with sufficient detail to be comprehensible and interesting.	1 2 3
16.	Organized ideas in a coherent manner.	1 2 3

The quality of student writing is of some concern in B.C. colleges and universities. No doubt you assess the writing competencies of your students as you read their essays, reports, examinations and other written assignments. In this part of the questionnaire we would like you to consider all of the NITEP students that you have taught during and since the academic year 1977-1978, and to respond to the list of writing competencies using the scale provided.

Assessing <u>all the NITEP students as a group</u>, I would evaluate the following aspects of WRITTEN EXPRESSION as:

> 1 = Satisfactory or better
>
> 2 = Of some concern
>
> 3 = Of serious concern

Please circle the number which represents your assessment of the students' performance of the competency described.

In their <u>written expression</u>, the NITEP students:

1.	Spelled, punctuated and capitalized correctly.	1	2	3
2.	Used quotation marks and associated punctuation correctly.	1	2	3
3.	Proofread written assignments effectively.	1	2	3
4.	Used correct mechanics of bibliographies, citations and footnotes.	1	2	3
5.	Gave basic information clearly; e.g. answering questions, reports.	1	2	3
6.	Described people and/or objects with sufficient detail.	1	2	3
7.	Used variety in sentence length.	1	2	3
8.	Used imagery effectively.	1	2	3
9.	Selected words to reinforce a specific mood or impression.	1	2	3
10.	Showed awareness of fine distinctions in word meanings.	1	2	3
11.	Understood and used grammatical terms in discussing writing.	1	2	3
12.	Expressed self in writing style.	1	2	3
13.	Showed fluency in ideas and associations.	1	2	3
14.	Responded to readings with perception and judgement.	1	2	3
15.	Distinguished between essential and peripheral detail.	1	2	3
16.	Focused on one topic or event if necessary.	1	2	3
17.	Adjusted tone of writing to specific audience.	1	2	3
18.	Elaborated on an opinion, made a judgement.	1	2	3
19.	Selected detail to support a viewpoint.	1	2	3
20.	Summarized and paraphrased when indicated.	1	2	3
21.	Organized complex essays/reports using connectives and transitions.	1	2	3
22.	Displayed coherence and unity of tone and impression.	1	2	3
23.	Organized events in plausible sequence.	1	2	3
24.	Conveyed personalities through selected details.	1	2	3

IF YOU WISH TO ELABORATE ON ANY ITEM, OR TO MAKE COMMENTS ABOUT ORAL OR WRITTEN EXPRESSION, PLEASE DO SO HERE OR ON THE BACK OF THE PAGE.

You may have found that certain class activities resulted in improved oral language performance. Please rank the following situations as to their potential for improved performance, using number 1 to represent most effective, number 2 as next most effective etc.

    a. small discussion groups   _____

    b. question and answer periods _____

    c. oral reports   _____

    d. panel discussions   _____

    e. role playing   _____

    f. reading aloud   _____

    g. general class discussion   _____

There are many oral activities not listed here. Please list any that you may have found effective in working with NITEP students.

_____

_____

_____

You may have found that written performance improved in certain situations or with certain teaching strategies. Please rank the following as you did the above.

    a. extended discussion of topics before
       writing   _____

    b. frequent, short papers instead of one
       or two lengthy ones   _____

    c. revising and editing of papers in groups _____

    d. writing exercises such as sentence
       combining or expanding   _____

    e. responding to audio-visual stimuli _____

    f. seeing examples of writing expected _____

    g. class discussion of writing errors _____

There will be several situations or strategies not listed here which you may find effective in improving writing. Please list them here.

_____

_____

_____

During the first two years of NITEP, students presently take a number of classes and courses which might be construed as being helpful in improving English. Please rank the following as to your perception of how helpful they might be.

    Reading and study skills course _____

    English(non-credit preparatory) _____

    Speech Arts   _____

    English (1st yr. credit)   _____

    English (2nd yr. credit)   _____

    Language Arts methods   _____

    Reading methods   _____

    English tutoring (weekly group) _____

Perhaps you have some ideas about the kinds of things which would be really helpful to those NITEP students who are experiencing some difficulty at university related to language use, oral or written. We would very much appreciate your taking the time to write out your ideas in the space provided or on the back of this page.

_____

_____

_____

_____

University Coursework Questionnaire

Senior Student's Version

Date:_____

Year in the program: 1   2   3   4   5
(Please circle the number of the year you enrolled for in Sept. '79).

Teaching concentration:_____

Academic concentration:_____

What grade or grades are you most interested in teaching?
Please circle: K   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Secondary school

Was English your first language? Please circle: YES   NO

If English was NOT your first language, please name the language

you first spoke._____

If English was NOT your first language at what age did you begin

to speak English?_____

Do your family speak English: (a) all of the time, (b) some of the

time, or (c) rarely or never? Please indicate your answer by circling

a, b, or c.

Do the people in your home community speak English: (a) all of the

time, (b) some of the time, or (c) rarely or never. Please indicate

your answer by circling a, b, or c

COMMENTS_____

_____

_____

Part 2. LANGUAGE ARTS CURRICULUM

In this part of the questionnaire we would like you to think
about which aspects of the language arts curriculum you feel most
ready to teach. Please rank the following list by number with
number 1 meaning "I feel most ready to teach", number 2, "I feel
next most ready to teach" etc.

LISTENING   _____

ORAL EXPRESSION   _____

READING   _____

WRITTEN EXPRESSION   _____

STUDY SKILLS   _____

CHILDREN'S LITERATURE   _____

LANGUAGE STUDY   _____

Part 2. ORAL EXPRESSION

In your university coursework you may have had to take part in class discussions, make oral reports, read aloud, debate or give speeches. In this part of the questionnaire we would like you to consider your use of oral language in those classes, remembering the response you received from instructors or others, and then to evaluate yourself in oral language, using the following numbers, and their definitions.

1 = I was satisfactory or better
2 = I needed some improvement
3 = I needed considerable improvement

In my ORAL EXPRESSION, I:

1. Spoke distinctly, pronouncing all words correctly.   1 2 3

2. Projected my voice effectively according to the audience.   1 2 3

3. Spoke without using too many expressions such as
   'uh' and 'er' and without too many hesitations.   1 2 3

4. Took responsibility as a member of group discussion;
   participated sufficiently, listened carefully, helped
   to keep on topic.   1 2 3

5. Used nonverbal language when necessary to make
   myself understood.   1 2 3

6. Felt confident in expressing an opinion that differed
   from those of other people.   1 2 3

7. Used a wide ranging, well developed oral vocabulary.   1 2 3

8. Used the most appropriate words; e.g. was able to find
   the best words to express my ideas.   1 2 3

9. Used effective imagery that helped people to see
   what I meant.   1 2 3

10. Demonstrated my control of standard English usage;
    e.g. rarely made "grammatical" errors.   1 2 3

11. Used levels of language appropriate to situations;
    formal reports, taking part in informal discussions.   1 2 3

12. Listened attentively, understanding most of what I heard.   1 2 3

13. Asked sensible questions which resulted in other
    people clarifying their meaning.   1 2 3

14. Expressed my opinions and supported them with good reasons.   1 2 3

15. Reported main ideas with sufficient detail so that
    people understood and were interested.   1 2 3

16. Organized my ideas in a coherent manner; e.g.
    connected my ideas logically and reasonably,
    so that people could follow my thinking.   1 2 3

IF YOU WISH TO COMMENT ABOUT ORAL LANGUAGE PLEASE FEEL FREE
TO USE THE BACK OF THIS PAGE

Part 3. WRITTEN EXPRESSION

You have undoubtedly spent a good deal of your time in NITEP writing essays, reports, exams, and other assignments. In this part of the questionnaire we would like you to think about all the written work you have done, the kind of response you may have received from instructors or advisors, and then to evaluate yourself, choosing the phrase which best describes your writing.

> 1 = I was satisfactory or better
>
> 2 = I needed some improvement
>
> 3 = I needed considerable improvement

Please circle the number which best describes your writing.
In my WRITTEN EXPRESSION, I:

1. Spelled, punctuated and capitalized correctly.   1   2   3

2. Used quotation marks and associated punctuation correctly.   1   2   3

3. Proofread my written assignments effectively.   1   2   3

4. Used correct mechanics for bibliographies, identifying sources and making proper footnotes.   1   2   3

5. Gave basic information clearly; e.g. in answering written questions and reports.   1   2   3

6. Described people and/or objects with sufficient detail.   1   2   3

7. Used variety in the length of my sentences.   1   2   3

8. Used imagery when trying to describe something clearly.   1   2   3

9. Selected special words to reinforce a specific mood or to create an impression.   1   2   3

10. Sensed fine distinctions in word meanings, e.g. tried to find the best possible word.   1   2   3

11. Understood and used grammatical terms when necessary to discuss writing; e.g. clauses, conjunctions etc.   1   2   3

12. Expressed my personality in writing style.   1   2   3

13. Moved easily from one idea to another in writing.   1   2   3

14. Understood what I read and could discuss in writing the author's point of view, attitudes, purpose or style.   1   2   3

15. Selected the most important details for emphasis.   1   2   3

16. Limited myself to one topic or event when necessary.   1   2   3

17. Adjusted the tone of my writing to specific audiences; e.g. teacher, children, other students.   1   2   3

18. Developed and supported my opinion, explaining my reasons for agreeing or disagreeing.   1   2   3

19. Selected details to support my viewpoint.   1   2   3

20. Summarized or paraphrased material from books or articles clearly and concisely.   1   2   3

21. Organized complex essays/reports using transition words such as furthermore, on the other hand, therefore, and moving smoothly from one paragraph to the next.   1   2   3

22. Wrote coherently so that everything seemed to fit together and the tone was consistent throughout.   1   2   3

23. Organized events in reasonable sequence; e.g. was able to avoid jumping around in my writing.   1   2   3

24. Selected details that brought personalities to life in my writing.   1   2   3

IF YOU WISH TO COMMENT ABOUT WRITING PLEASE FEEL FREE TO USE THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

You may have found that certain class activities improved your <u>oral language performance</u>. Please rank the following situations as to their effectiveness for you. Rank using number 1 as most effective, number 2 as next most effective etc.

       a. small discussion groups   _____
       b. question and answer periods   _____
       c. oral reports   _____
       d. panel discussions   _____
       e. role playing   _____
       f. reading aloud   _____
       g. general class discussion   _____

There are many oral activities not listed here. Please list any others that may have been helpful to you.

_____

_____

_____

You may also have found that your <u>written performance</u> improved in certain situations or following certain activities. Please rank the following as you did the above.

       a. extended discussion of topics
           before writing   _____
       b. frequent, short papers instead
           of one or two lengthy ones   _____
       c. revising and editing your
           work in a group   _____
       d. writing exercises such as
           sentence combining or expanding _____
       e. responding to pictures or
           movies   _____
       f. seeing examples of the kind
           of writing expected   _____
       g. class discussion of writing
           errors   _____

There may have been several situations or activities not listed which were helpful to you. Please list them here.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Since entering NITEP, you have taken several courses and participated in classes which may have helped you improve your oral and written English. Please rank the following list of courses and classes as to their helpfulness in developing language skills and abilities, using number 1 as most helpful etc.

       Reading and study skills course   _____
       English (non-credit)   _____
       Speech Arts   _____
       English (1st yr. credit)   _____
       English (2nd yr. credit)   _____
       Language Arts methods   _____
       Reading methods   _____
       English tutoring   _____

There may have been other things that have been helpful to you. For example, you may have learned a study technique during another course, or have had help from a coordinator or counsellor. Please tell us about anything that you think may have helped to improve your oral and/or written expression.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Student Teaching Questionnaire

Sponsor Teacher's Version

Part 1. BACKGROUND AND GENERAL INFORMATION

Please choose the answer that represents your situation in
'79-'80.

1. Location: a. North Vancouver   b. Vancouver   c. Kamloops

        d. Other _____

2. Teaching assignment: K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Other_____

3. Teaching certificate: Professional ____   Standard ____

                License ____

Please complete each item.

4. Teaching experience (including '79-'80) ____ _____ years.

5. Professional concentration in teacher training _____

6. Academic major or concentration in training _____

7. Professional memberships: B.C. Primary Teachers_____;

    I.R.A._____; Provincial Intermediate Assoc. _____;

    C.C.T.E._____; N.C.T.E._____; Other_____

Please circle the answer that applies to you.

8. Number of NITEP students supervised including '79-'80:

    1   2   3   4   5   More than 5

9. The years in which I supervised NITEP students included:

    '74-'75 '75-'76 '76-'77 '77-'78 '78-'79 '79-'80

10. Have you supervised other student teachers?

    a. Frequently ___   b. Occasionally ___   c. Never ___

_____

Part 2. LANGUAGE ARTS METHODOLOGY REQUIREMENTS

    Since NITEP students, unlike their counterparts in the other

U.B.C. Education programs, practice teach from the beginning of

their first year, it would be useful for us to know in what order

you think methodology regarding the various aspects of the language

arts should be introduced. Would you please rank the following

list in the order which you think methodology would benefit a

NITEP student teacher in your classroom. Please rank using number

1 as most helpful, 2 as next most helpful etc.

                LISTENING   ____
                ORAL EXPRESSION   ____
                READING   ____
                WRITTEN EXPRESSION   ____
                STUDY SKILLS   ____
                CHILDRENS' LITERATURE ____
                LANGUAGE STUDY   ____

COMMENTS:_____

_____

Part 3. ORAL AND WRITTEN EXPRESSION

In the regular, written evaluation of student teachers, you take into consideration their use of oral and written language in the classroom. In this part of the questionnaire we are interested in your assessment of the oral and written language of all the NITEP students you may have supervised. We would like you to consider the following list of oral and written language competencies and to respond, using the scale provided, by circling the number which best represents your opinion.

In assessing my NITEP student(s), I would evaluate the following aspects of their <u>oral expression</u> as:

       1 = Satisfactory or better
       2 = Need(s) some improvement
       3 = Need(s) considerable improvement

When using ORAL LANGUAGE in the classroom, the NITEP student(s):

1. Spoke distinctly, articulated sounds clearly.   1   2   3

2. Projected voices sufficiently for given audience.   1   2   3

3. Used voices effectively for story telling, giving
    dictation, introducing a topic, encouraging students.   1   2   3

4. Used conventional nonverbal behaviour effectively.   1   2   3

5. Recognized need of all children to be heard; modelled
    respect for others' ideas.   1   2   3

6. Used language with confidence; spoke with ease.   1   2   3

7. Used interesting, varied vocabulary.   1   2   3

8. Rephrased information in a variety of ways when necessary.   1   2   3

9. Demonstrated control of rhyme and rhythm in language;
    e.g. reading and writing poetry.   1   2   3

10. Demonstrated adequate control over informal standard
    English (recognized and corrected occasional errors in
    usage).   1   2   3

11. Recognized dialectal differences in childrens' language;
    e.g. was able to understand them.   1   2   3

12. Chose level of language appropriate to situation;
    e.g. instruction, formal speech, conversation with pupils.
    (did not overuse colloquialisms)   1   2   3

13. Identified and discriminated all speech sounds; e.g. as
    required in a phonics program.   1   2   3

14. Listened attentively, responded appropriately to the
    children.   1   2   3

15. Used language to set a scene, create a mood.   1   2   3

16. Used language effectively to increase positive interaction
    with the class.   1   2   3

When using WRITTEN LANGUAGE the NITEP student(s):

1. Spelled correctly.   1   2   3

2. Used correct punctuation and capitalization.   1   2   3

3. Proofread materials carefully before distribution.   1   2   3

4. Used common abbreviations correctly.   1   2   3

5. Gave simple directions clearly.   1   2   3

6. Used telegraphic style effectively in making
    blackboard notes.   1   2   3

7. Showed awareness of fine distinctions in word meanings.   1   2   3

8. Used grammatical terms appropriately in discussing
    writing.   1   2   3

IF YOU WISH TO ELABORATE ON ANY ITEM, OR TO MAKE ADDITIONAL
COMMENTS ABOUT ORAL OR WRITTEN EXPRESSION, PLEASE FEEL FREE
TO USE THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

Part 4. LANGUAGE ARTS TEACHING

When teaching the language arts, student teachers need to develop any number of teaching competencies. Please consider the following list of selected teaching competencies and respond in terms of the NITEP student(s) you have supervised, by circling the number which best represents your assessment.

In assessing the NITEP student(s) I have supervised I would evaluate the following teaching competencies as:

> 1 = Satisfactory or better
>
> 2 = Needs) some improvement
>
> 3 = Need(s) considerable improvement

When <u>teaching language arts</u>, the NITEP student(s) I sponsored:

1. Printed and/or wrote on the chalkboard with reasonable speed and legibility.   1 2 3

2. Gave clear, well sequenced instructions for oral and written activities.   1 2 3

3. Read aloud to children with expression and enjoyment. 1 2 3

4. Demonstrated familiarity with childrens' literature.   1 2 3

5. Showed ability to use different levels of questions; e.g. recall, explanation, prediction, judgement.   1 2 3

6. Modelled correct pronunciation and speech patterns.   1 2 3

7. Demonstrated familiarity with childrens' language background such as songs, games, verses.   1 2 3

8. Modelled good listening behaviour.   1 2 3

9. Understood and used teaching manuals appropriately.   1 2 3

10. Demonstrated knowledge of, and ability to use, the library or resource centre.   1 2 3

11. Used media such as photographs, models, film strips and tape recorders with some ease.   1 2 3

12. Constructed useful charts and other learning aids.   1 2 3

13. Demonstrated ability to assess and evaluate students' progress.   1 2 3

14. Demonstrated ability to recognize childrens' interests and concerns and incorporate them into language arts lessons or units.   1 2 3

15. Involved children in activities that show the interrelatedness of the language arts; writing and listening, reading and dramatizing.   1 2 3

16. Designed and moderated group or class discussion effectively.   1 2 3

IF YOU WISH TO ELABORATE ON ANY ITEM, OR TO MAKE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT TEACHING COMPETENCIES IN LANGUAGE ARTS, PLEASE FEEL FREE TO USE THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

Student Teaching Questionnaire

Junior Student's Version

Date:_____

Year in the program: 1   2   3   4   5
(Please circle the number of the year you enrolled for in Sept. '79).

Teaching concentration:_____

Academic concentration:_____

What grade or grades are you most interested in teaching?
Please circle: K   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Secondary school

Was English your first language? Please circle: YES   NO

If English was NOT your first language, please name the language

you first spoke._____

If English was NOT your first language at what age did you begin

to speak English?_____

Do your family speak English: (a) all of the time, (b) some of the

time, or (c) rarely or never? Please indicate your answer by circling

a, b, or c.

Do the people in your home community speak English: (a) all of the

time, (b) some of the time, or (c) rarely or never. Please indicate

your answer by circling a, b, or c

COMMENTS_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Part 2. LANGUAGE ARTS CURRICULUM

In this part of the questionnaire we would like you to think
about which aspects of the language arts curriculum you feel most
ready to teach. Please rank the following list by number with
number 1 meaning "I feel most ready to teach", number 2, "I feel
next most ready to teach" etc.

LISTENING   _____

ORAL EXPRESSION   _____

READING   _____

WRITTEN EXPRESSION   _____

STUDY SKILLS   _____

CHILDREN'S LITERATURE _____

LANGUAGE STUDY   _____

Part 3. ORAL AND WRITTEN EXPRESSION

During your practice teaching, you have no doubt become aware of the importance of language in the classroom. In this part of the questionnaire we would like you to think about your own oral and written language, remembering any comments or suggestions that you may have had about your use of language, and to evaluate yourself, using the following scale.

1 = I was satisfactory or better

2 = I needed some improvement

3 = I needed considerable improvement

When using ORAL LANGUAGE in the classroom, I:

1. Spoke distinctly, articulated all sounds clearly.   1 2 3
2. Projected my voice sufficiently for my intended audience.   1 2 3
3. Used my voice effectively for story telling, giving
   dictation, introducing a topic, encouraging students.   1 2 3
4. Used nonverbal behaviour that everyone understood.   1 2 3
5. Recognized need of all children to be heard; modelled
   respect for others' ideas.   1 2 3
6. Used language with confidence; spoke with ease.   1 2 3
7. Used interesting, varied vocabulary.   1 2 3
8. Rephrased information in a variety of ways when necessary
   so that children might understand.   1 2 3
9. Demonstrated understanding and ability to use rhyme and
   rhythm in language; e.g. reading and writing poetry.   1 2 3
10. Demonstrated adequate control over informal standard
    English. (recognized and corrected occasional "grammatical
    errors").   1 2 3
11. Recognized dialectal differences in children's language; e.g.
    was able to understand the children's speech.   1 2 3
12. Chose level of language appropriate to situation; e.g.
    instruction, formal speech, conversation with pupils,
    (did not overuse colloquialisms or slang).   1 2 3
13. Identified and discriminated all speech sounds; e.g. as
    required in a phonics program.   1 2 3
14. Listened attentively, responded appropriately to the
    children.   1 2 3
15. Used language to set a scene, create a mood.   1 2 3
16. Used language effectively to increase positive interaction
    with the class; conveyed my interest in the children   1 2 3
    through language.

When using WRITTEN LANGUAGE, I

1. Spelled correctly.   1 2 3
2. Used correct punctuation and capitalization.   1 2 3
3. Proofread materials carefully before distribution.   1 2 3
4. Used common abbreviation correctly.   1 2 3
5. Gave simple directions clearly.   1 2 3
6. Used telegraphic style effectively in making
   blackboard notes.   1 2 3
7. Showed awareness of fine distinctions in word meanings.   1 2 3
8. Used grammatical terms appropriately in discussing writing.   1 2 3

IF YOU WISH TO ELABORATE ON ANY ITEM, OR TO MAKE ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ABOUT ORAL OR WRITTEN EXPRESSION, PLEASE FEEL FREE TO USE THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

Part 4. TEACHING LANGUAGE ARTS

In order to instruct successfully in the language arts,
student teachers need to develop a number of teaching
competencies. Some of these competencies are listed here.
Please respond to the list by circling the number which
best represents your assessment of your performance in these
areas, using the following scale.

1 = I was satisfactory or better
2 = I need some improvement
3 = I need considerable improvement

When TEACHING LANGUAGE ARTS,I:

1. Printed and/or wrote on the chalkboard with
    reasonable speed and legibility.   1   2   3

2. Gave clear,well sequenced instructions for
    oral and written activities.   1   2   3

3. Read aloud to children with expression and
    enjoyment.   1   2   3

4. Demonstrated familiarity with childrens'
    literature;e.g.titles,authors.   1   2   3

5. Showed ability to use different levels of
    questions;e.g.recall,explanation,prediction
    and judgement.   1   2   3

6. Modelled correct pronunciation and speech
    patterns for children.   1   2   3

7. Demonstrated familiarity with childrens'
    language background such as songs,games,verses,
    nursery rhymes etc.   1   2   3

8. Modelled good listening behaviour for the
    children.   1   2   3

9. Understood and used teaching manuals
    appropriately.   1   2   3

10. Demonstrated knowledge of, and ability to use,
    the library or resource centre.   1   2   3

11. Used media such as photographs,models,film
    strips and tape recorders with some ease.   1   2   3

12. Constructed useful charts and other learning
    aids.   1   2   3

13. Demonstrated ability to assess and evaluate
    students' progress.   1   2   3

14. Demonstrated ability to recognize childrens'
    interests and concerns and incorporate them into
    language arts lessons or units.   1   2   3

15. Involved children in activities that show the
    interrelatedness of the language arts;e.g.
    writing and listening,reading and dramatizing   1   2   3

16. Designed and moderated group or class discussion
    effectively.   1   2   3

IF YOU WISH TO EXPLAIN AN ANSWER OR ANSWERS, OR TO
MAKE ANY COMMENT ABOUT TEACHING LANGUAGE ARTS, PLEASE
FEEL FREE TO USE THE BACK OF THIS PAGE.

APPENDIX D

COVER LETTERS SENT

TO PARTICIPANTS

APPENDIX E

LETTER TO SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENT

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
2075 WESBROOK MALL
VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA
V6T 1W5

Dept. of English Education
FACULTY OF EDUCATION

April 11, 1980

Dr. Wickstrom
Superintendent
North Vancouver School District #44
721 Chesterfield Ave.
North Vancouver, B.C. V7N 2M5

Dear Dr. Wickstrom:

Dr. Wendy K. Sutton and I are currently preparing a report for the NITEP Advisory Council on the English/language arts components of the program. Given the facility in English so necessary in teaching practice, as well as in university coursework, it is important that this part of the NITEP program be reviewed and assessed as to its effectiveness.

Although the teachers in your school district have already contributed a great deal to NITEP through their sponsorship of students, their participation in our needs assessment would be invaluable. The questionnaires which we have for sponsor teachers ask them to reflect on their experience with NITEP students and to respond to:

1. a section on their perception of the students' language use, and

2. a section dealing with the emphases that they would recommend for language arts methodology courses.

I am enclosing a copy of everything that would be sent to the teachers if you give permission. As we are so rapidly moving toward the end of the school year, I would appreciate hearing from you as soon as possible. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Sally Clinton
Graduate Teaching Assistant,
NITEP

SC/cjk
Encl.

APPENDIX F

TABLES DESCRIBING RESPONDENTS AND RESPONSE

TABLE A

Characteristics of Participating Instructors

Question	Optional responses	Number of respondents
1. Course description	Arts	9
	Education	16
	Non-credit	7
2. Location	Community college	11
	University	7
	Off-campus center	13
3. Identity of students in classes	NITEP only	17
	NITEP plus others	10
4. Length of courses	One semester or less	17
	Two semesters	9
5. Number of courses taught which have included NITEP students	One	8
	Two	6
	More than two	13
6. Nature of courses	Demanding in oral English	4
	Demanding in written English	4
	Demanding in oral and written English	15
	Not demanding in oral or written English	4
7. Teaching role	English teacher	11
	Former English teacher	7
	Never an English teacher	9
8. Number of NITEP students taught	Fewer than 5	1
	5 to 15	12
	16 to 25	4
	More than 25	10

TABLE B

Characteristics of Participating Senior Students

Question	Optional responses	Number of respondents
1. Year in the program	Third year	1
	Fourth year	7
	Unclassified	0
2. Teaching concentration	Intermediate	4
	Primary	4
3. Academic concentration	Anthropology	2
	Physical education	1
	Theatre	1
	English	1
	Sociology	3
4. Grade interest	Primary	5
	Intermediate	2
	Other	1
5. First language	English	4
	Native Indian language	1
	Carrier	1
	Nishga	1
	Thompson	1
6. Age at which English was learned	3 to 4 years	2
	5 to 6 years	0
	7 to 8 years	2
7. Family speaks English	All of the time	3
	Some of the time	4
	Rarely or never	1
8. Community speaks English	All of the time	2
	Some of the time	5
	Rarely or never	1

TABLE C

Characteristics of Participating Junior Students

Question	Optional responses	Number of respondents
1. Year in the program	First year	10
	Second year	9
	Unclassified	1
2. Teaching concentration	Social studies education	2
	Special education	1
	Native Indian education	4
	Primary education	2
	Reading education	1
	Young children education	1
3. Academic concentration	Sociology	2
	Theatre	1
	Anthropology	5
4. Grade interest	Primary	12
	Intermediate	6
	Other	0
5. First language	English	13
	Carrier	2
	Chilcotin	1
	Thompson	1
	Coast Salish	1
	Cowichan	1
	Haida	1
6. Age at which English was learned	3 to 4 years	2
	5 to 6 years	2
	7 to 8 years	3
7. Family speaks English	All the time	10
	Some of the time	9
	Rarely or never	1
8. Community speaks English	All the time	9
	Some of the time	11
	Rarely or never	0

TABLE D

Characteristics of Participating Sponsor Teachers

Questions	Optional responses	Number of respondents
1. School districts	District A	29
	District B	34
2. Teaching Assignment	Primary	31
	Intermediate	30
	Other	2
3. Teaching certificates	Professional	43
	License	18
	Standard	2
4. Teaching experience	1 to 2 years	1
	3 to 4 years	0
	5 to 6 years	16
	7 to 10 years	15
	11 to 15 years	13
	16 to 20 years	6
	21 to 25 years	6
	26 to 30 years	3
	31 years and over	2
5. Professional concentra-tion	Art	2
	English	5
	Intermediate	9
	Library	2
	Music	2
	Physical education	3
	Primary	22
	Reading	1
	Secondary	1
	Social studies	3
	Special education	5
	Young children	4
	(No response)	4

TABLE D (Continued)

Questions	Optional responses	Number of respondents
6. Academic concentration	Anthropology	2
	Canadian studies	1
	Fine arts	4
	French	2
	General science	1
	Geography	1
	History	9
	English	16
	Mathematics	1
	Physical education	2
	Psychology	6
	Science	1
	(No response)	17
7. Professional memberships	B.C. Primary Association	24
	Intermediate Association	5
	N.C.T. English	0
	C.C.T. English	0
	Int. Reading Association	1
8. Total number of NITEP students supervised	One	33
	Two	14
	Three	7
	Four	5
	Five	2
	More than Five	1
9. Year of involvement in the program	Up to and including 1977	15
	From 1978 to 1980	47
10. Student teaching supervision outside NITEP	Frequently	20
	Occasionally	35
	Never	8

TABLE E

Distribution and Return of Questionnaires

Participant groups	Number sent	Number returned	Percentage returned	Number not analyzed[a]	Number analyzed	Percentage analyzed[b]
Sponsor teachers						
Group 1	39	30	77	2	28	72
Group 2	64	34	53	1	33	51
Junior Students						
Group 1	11	10	90	-	10	91
Group 2	13	11	85	1	10	77
Instructors						
Group 1	17	10	59	-	10	59
Group 2	23	19	83	2	17	74
Senior Students	13	8	62	-	8	62
Totals	180	122	73	6	116	69

[a]This includes questionnaires returned because individuals were erroneously identified as being in the program; returned as undeliverable by post office; where the responses could not be coded.

[b]Percentages are rounded numbers.