

17-96-01
II - A - 38

**AN EVALUATION OF
HEARING TEST PROGRAM
BROCHURES AND
SOUNDS ALIVE**

**Two Elements of the
Quiet School Program**

Submitted by:

Consumer Dynamics
11300 Rockville Pike
Rockville Maryland 20852

AN EVALUATION OF THE
HEARING TEST PROGRAM BROCHURES
AND SOUNDS ALIVE

Two Elements of the
Quiet School Program

Prepared by:
George W. Moore
PhD candidate
and
Peter V. Murphy
Project Manager

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
QUIET SCHOOL PROGRAM	1
HEARING TEST PROGRAM BROCHURES	3
Introduction	3
Data Collection	4
Data Analysis	4
Perceived Needs	7
SOUNDS ALIVE	8
Introduction	8
Data Collection	8
Data Analysis	9
Some Written Comments	10
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	13
APPENDIXES	
A: SURVEY FORMS	A-1
B: TABLES	B-1
C: REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION	C-1

QUIET SCHOOL PROGRAM

In the United States, there are approximately 60 million youth between the ages of 4 and 21. Recent research indicates an alarming increase in hearing impairment among these school-age citizens. Most noise-induced hearing impairment leads to the misunderstanding of verbal communication. This handicap can have social, psychological, and emotional implications. Equally important are the learning difficulties resulting from hearing loss and excessive noise.

Federal, State, and community noise laws and ordinances exist as a means to help reduce excessive noise. However, the success of prevention ultimately depends on public action resulting from awareness and education programs. Prevention efforts are important for children who have not yet been or are just beginning to be exposed to excessively high levels of environmental noise. In spite of this, it has been found that few school systems have approved noise education curricula. Textbooks address other forms of pollution, but courses of environmental study often include little information on excessive noise.

In an effort to reach the decisionmakers of tomorrow, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Noise Abatement and Control (EPA-ONAC) has developed a Quiet School Program. School programs and school-based programs in public and nonpublic schools are one of the most important features of a comprehensive noise public education program. In many communities throughout the United States, schools represent the single most important focal point for community activities and community life. Other reasons for school-based programs include the following:

- Through the school community, large numbers of children can be reached. This can lead to a modification of noisy behavior and the development of a "quiet ethic" for teens and preteens.

- Teachers and school administrators place a high value on quiet. One cannot teach or learn in a noisy environment. This makes teachers and school administrators sensitive and also receptive to a Quiet School Program.
- Teachers' organizations are very influential community organizations and can be provided with information necessary for them to make informed judgments relative to noise and its control through education.
- Parents become involved since children take home most of the materials they receive in school; therefore, the potential for parental interest and motivation is created--especially if it is considered to be in the best interests of their children.
- Parent-Teacher Associations (PTA's) reflect the views and interests of parents and teachers as they relate to the local school system. The PTA often will want to assist in creating a quieter, more educational environment for the students.

The Quiet School Program is designed as an umbrella under which various aspects of noise in the school can be addressed. The basic elements of this program are:

- The Hearing Test Program
- Elementary Student Noise Workbook and Teacher's Guide
- Secondary Noise Workbook for Teachers
- The Quiet Driver Program/Student Motor Vehicle Noise Check
- Facility Noise Evaluation
- Teacher Orientation

An educational program can only remain relevant through frequent evaluation and, if needed, modification. Realizing this, EPA-ONAC has begun the evaluation process. This report, based on information collected during the 1979-1980 school year, summarizes the findings related to the first two elements of the Quiet School Program--the Hearing Test Program and Sounds Alive.

HEARING TEST PROGRAM BROCHURES

INTRODUCTION

The Hearing Test Program is an integral part of the EPA-ONAC's Quiet School Program. The Hearing Test Program coordinates the distribution of three student brochures (depending upon student grade level) with a hearing screening test.

Most States have laws that require hearing screening tests. The tests are administered to students to determine their level of hearing or possible loss of hearing.

Social surveys indicate that generally children and their parents are not adequately informed about the importance of these tests. Since it was felt that there was a great need to educate children about the harmful effects of too much noise and what can be done to protect their hearing, EPA, in collaboration with the American Speech, Language, and Hearing Association (ASLHA), developed three student brochures designed for specific age groups. The brochures are:

- "Noise and Your Hearing" (Kindergarten through 3rd Grade)
- "Hear Here" (Grades 4 through 6)
- "Think Quietly About Noise" (Grade 7 and Up).

Since many students do not know or cannot appreciate the importance of hearing tests, the brochures were developed to be distributed immediately before or immediately after the tests. They provide information on noise and its effects on hearing and learning. The brochures also provide the students' parents with a message about the harmful effects of excessive noise and offer suggestions on how they can help protect their children's hearing.

DATA COLLECTION

Three school districts were identified to assist EPA-ONAC in evaluating the Hearing Test Program brochures. The pilot school districts were: Des Moines, Iowa; Phoenix, Arizona; and Baltimore, Maryland. Additionally, the parents of children attending public schools in three Maryland counties were polled. These counties were: Montgomery, Anne Arundel, and Baltimore Counties.

The three brochures were sent to a noise program coordinator in each of the three school districts. The noise coordinator met with teachers and explained the Hearing Test Program. The teachers were given the brochures and asked to supply the noise program coordinator with data on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the brochures.

Because of the teachers' hectic schedules, the data supplied by the participating teachers consisted primarily of verbal communication with the noise program coordinators. The coordinators, in turn, supplied EPA-ONAC with a summary of the teachers' responses. In an effort to obtain additional information and to better assess teacher, student, and parent responses to the brochures, EPA-ONAC conducted telephone interviews with each coordinator.

In the initial development of the three hearing test brochures, ASHLHA conducted the Maryland study to determine the effectiveness of the brochures. The evaluation included students and teachers, in addition to the parents, and ASHLHA continues to support the use of the Hearing Test Program brochures.

DATA ANALYSIS

Response to the written evaluation form, Teacher's Comments on Hearing Test Program (Appendix A, Form A), was less than anticipated. The data were incomplete and not suitable for detailed analysis. Generally, speaking, though, the teachers considered the brochures grade-level appropriate and

felt they were educational and interesting to the students. Teacher response on the comment sheet indicated a need for more information on noise.

The noise coordinators in the pilot districts completed a general evaluation form on the Hearing Test Program brochures (Appendix A, Form B). More than 4,000 brochures were distributed in the piloting effort. Coordinator response indicated that they were distributed to a varied audience and were well received. In addition to students, brochure recipients included:

- teachers
- school system administrators
- school nurses
- speech therapists and pathologists
- audiologists, and
- patients in waiting areas of Health Department Ear, Nose and Throat Clinics.

In an effort to receive more specific information, EPA-ONAC conducted a telephone conversation with each noise program coordinator (Appendix A, Form C).

The coordinators indicated that, in most cases, the brochures were given to the students immediately after the hearing test. In a few instances, the students were given the brochures while they waited to be given their hearing tests. The point in time at which the brochures were distributed appears not to have influenced the student interest in the materials. The brochures were developed to have the greatest impact when distributed at the time of hearing tests. The brochures help explain the importance of the hearing tests, how to protect hearing, and help reduce the anxiety children feel about testing. Hopefully, the teacher will pursue "noise" in classroom study.

The noise program coordinator in Baltimore discussed a novel approach. Two pilot schools were identified--both were high schools. Each of the brochures was distributed to participating students. The coordinator indicated that Noise and Your Hearing, designed for use with primary and lower elementary school students, was distributed to low-level 10th graders (many of them with severe learning disabilities). According to the coordinator, those students reacted very favorably to the brochures. The coordinator also stated that the response of other students to Hear Here! and Think Quietly About Noise was excellent. As a result, community feedback was positive. Teachers in nonparticipating schools have requested the brochures to be used as part of a curriculum unit on noise.

Data from the ASHLA study included a parent questionnaire (Appendix B, Table 1). The data support the observations of the teacher and noise program coordinator (i.e., the brochures were effective in introducing noise as a concern). All of the responding parents agreed that the information was appropriate. Only one responding parent felt that the graphics were inappropriate for the age of his/her child. (No further data are available on this comment.)

The activities in the brochures were rated by the parents as being both interesting and age-level appropriate (95 percent and 89 percent, respectively). Age-level appropriateness is further supported by the fact that only 31 percent of the parents believed their children needed assistance with the activities.

An interesting value associated with the brochures is parent education. Eighty-two percent of the parents felt that the brochures increased their own awareness about the hazardous effects of noise on hearing. This should not be surprising, since 89 percent of the parents questioned said they either discussed the brochure with or read it to their child.

High parental interest might be associated with parents' perception of child interest in the brochures. Ninety percent of the parents thought that their child had been interested in the brochure.

Appendix C (see C-5) provides a partial listing of individual teacher requests for the hearing test brochures. The map on C-8 shows request distribution and reflects teacher interest nationally for noise materials.

PERCEIVED NEEDS

The teachers and noise program coordinators feel that, although the educational process could develop a quiet ethic in children, most public school curricula need more noise-related materials. The addition of trained acoustical or health personnel would help enhance the subject of noise and the presentation of the brochures.

The pilot project in Baltimore resulted in requests to the Health Department for both materials and resource people. The industrial engineer was called upon to give presentations on noise and noise measurement to school classes. Such expertise may not be available to some school systems, but other resources should be available: EPA regions, noise counselors, ASLHA, etc. Inservice training for teachers might assist in the development of both viable local school noise education programs and a cadre of trained personnel to call upon.

The coordinators stated that more materials related to noise and hearing are needed. Specifically mentioned was the need for a film. One of the coordinators stated that she knew of one film that was commercially available. However, her district did not have the funds available to purchase the film. She suggested that EPA commission the production of a film to augment the Hearing Test Program materials.

SOUNDS ALIVE

INTRODUCTION

Teachers often have latitude with respect to lesson planning within their approved curricula. Therefore, curriculum modules have been developed that serve to increase noise awareness in students and educate those students about noise and its health effects. The modules are also designed to show students that they can help reduce noise at school, home, and elsewhere. Sounds Alive is one of the curriculum modules.

Sounds Alive is an elementary school noise curriculum for students in kindergarten through fourth grade. The module includes a teacher's guide and a workbook for students. The students learn about noise and its effects on people through noise activities, games, and other accepted teaching techniques. The teacher's guide for the module contains background information on noise and its effects, lesson plans, and suggested films and other resources.

DATA COLLECTION

Three pilot cities were identified to participate in the evaluation of the Sounds Alive curriculum module. The cities were: Des Moines, Iowa; Fayetteville, North Carolina; and Salt Lake City, Utah. The materials were distributed to the schools by a local noise program coordinator. The participating teachers were asked to complete a brief evaluation form (Appendix A, Form D). They were requested to return the form to EPA-ONAC through their local noise program coordinator. The response rate was approximately 22 percent. Five unsolicited responses were received from teachers who obtained Sounds Alive either at professional meetings or by request from EPA-ONAC.

It was hoped that teacher response to the questionnaire would be greater. It is felt that two factors contributed to the low response rate. First, EPA-ONAC was dependent upon nonstaff personnel for data collection. These people were busy professionals with many duties within their community. Unfortunately, they did not have the time or additional staff necessary to conduct followup contacts with the teachers. Second, the questionnaires were collected early in the second semester of the school year. It is possible that some teachers had not used Sounds Alive at the time the survey was conducted.

Three other communities were involved in mini-pilots of this material. They were: San Diego, California; Albuquerque, New Mexico; and Norman, Oklahoma. Responses were also received from: Daly City and El Monte, California; St. Petersburg, Florida; and Jonesboro, Georgia.

DATA ANALYSIS

The teachers were requested to make "Yes" or "No" responses to six questions dealing with Sounds Alive (Appendix B, Table 2). The responding teachers unanimously agreed that the curriculum module was both useful and interesting to their students. In the past, many teachers expressed a need for curricular materials on noise and its health effects; the teachers who responded to the questionnaire indicated that Sounds Alive helps fill that curricular void.

The teachers overwhelmingly agreed (95 percent) that Sounds Alive was appropriate for the grade level they taught. This curriculum module is designed for use with kindergarten through fourth grade students. As expected, most teachers (62 percent) needed to adapt the material to correspond with their students' abilities. Many of the teachers indicated that the vocabulary in Sounds Alive is advanced. The Fry Readability Scale supports the teachers' findings. Three 100 word passages were selected at random from Sounds Alive and tested for readability. Seventh grade was the

average readability level (Fry Readability Scale). Even though the vocabulary level is high, some teachers indicated that their students enjoyed "working with hard words."

Teacher acceptance of Sounds Alive is further demonstrated by their willingness to interest other teachers in the curriculum. Approximately 80 percent of the teachers responding to the questionnaire indicated that they had shared their enthusiasm for Sounds Alive with their peers.

One interesting value of the curriculum is the effect it has on developing other noise-related activities in addition to those provided. Teachers indicated that Sounds Alive provided an impetus to develop additional language arts, social studies, health, mathematics, and science activities in the area of noise.

SOME WRITTEN COMMENTS

Many teachers took the time to add written comments in the spaces provided on the questionnaire. A sample of the comments follow.

- "I hope this program will become a part of the curriculum.... The students were quite surprised how much some noise is really unnecessary."
- "...include [the] school nurse and pathologist."
- "I would like another module."
- "Perhaps with some classes it would be necessary to help them with some of the vocabulary - I have taught several classes in the past in junior high who would have trouble [with some of the words]."
- "...include a section in the back on extension activities..." [Respondent goes on to describe an activity that might be included].
- "We have learned a great deal of information...."
- "...easily correlated with Health and Social Studies...."

- "I don't know if your budget will allow you to continue to supply these free of charge. Cost could be cut by providing masters to run off the consumable portions of the book."
- "The noise module is very good as is. Please check Crossword Puzzle on (p. 25) A and 3." (An error did exist. This was the only teacher to identify the error. The error has since been corrected.)
- "Since we were able to use a sound level meter, the unit was particularly useful."
- "...there has been a tremendous response from teachers using the workbooks."
- "I modified the material by using parts that applied to what we were doing in science."
- "We had students bring pictures of noise sources and made a bulletin board in the main hallway for the whole school. It really affected the students' behavior as far as their 'noise' level."

This last teacher comment calls for some amplification. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to measure an actual reduction in decibel levels as a result of student participation in Sounds Alive. Learning theorists and behaviorists state that an increase in information frequently results in behavioral change. The results of observations in an elementary school in Des Moines, Iowa, tend to support the above.

The local noise program coordinator gave a number of presentations to second and third grade classes that were using Sounds Alive. A study was then conducted in the lunchroom. The coordinator found that when the fifth and sixth graders (nonusers of Sounds Alive) ate, noise levels of 72 dB or more were common. During the lunch period for second and third graders, noise levels usually remained near 68 dB. The coordinator concedes that the noise level has risen slightly. However, it continues to remain below that of the older students.

Finally, the same noise coordinator states that an antinoise campaign in a second elementary school appears to have reduced schoolwide noise. Participating

students give short presentations on noise to other classes. While no attempt has been made to quantify data, visitors to the school have remarked about the reduction of noise levels in the hallways.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This report is based on information collected by EPA-ONAC, ASLHA and noise program coordinators. The information indicates that the Hearing Test Program brochures and the Sounds Alive curriculum module have been well received by those people who have used the materials. EPA-ONAC continues to receive a large number of requests for information and materials associated with the above programs (see Appendix C).

The respondents to the questionnaires believe that the brochures and the curriculum module are viable programs. Observations indicate that students participating in either program appear to become more aware of excessive noise. Therefore, the materials can aid in developing a "quiet ethic" in tomorrow's citizens.

The Hearing Test Program brochures are designed to be shared with the childrens' parents. Since parents often learn things from their children, this program can increase parental knowledge about the impact of excessive noise, thus having a great multiplier effect.

Sounds Alive was designed for use in kindergarten through fourth grade. However, the module was used with students through sixth grade. The teachers and students expressed interest in the curriculum. Some teachers indicated that the vocabulary was too advanced for their students. If a revised edition is planned, it is recommended that the readability level be adjusted to grade level. A supplementary vocabulary list currently being developed should be helpful to teachers and students using this module.

The teachers and noise program coordinators indicated a need for additional materials. Obviously, fiscal constraints influence EPA-ONAC's ability to respond to that need. Alternative ways to develop and reproduce

educational materials, including audiovisual aids, are being explored. A cooperative effort between EPA-ONAC and other Federal Agencies (e.g., Department of Education) or civic/fraternal organizations will assist in strengthening the program and providing additional resources.

It is important that noise education materials for both youth and adults be relevant to the world in which they live. Only through continued evaluation and revision of current materials and development of additional noise materials can this goal be accomplished.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A
SURVEY FORMS

Form A

TEACHER'S COMMENTS ON HEARING TEST PROGRAM

Name: _____

Address: _____

Grade Level: _____

School: _____

Number of brochures
given in class

NOISE AND YOUR HEARING (K to 4)

HEAR HERE! (5 to 8)

THINK QUIETLY ABOUT NOISE (9 and up)

Did you

- Consider brochure appropriate for your grade level?
- Find that students better understood reasons for hearing tests?
- Feel that brochure held your students' interest?
- * Initiate other noise projects because of this interest?
- Receive any reactions from parents because of these brochures?
- Use brochures without hearing tests (already given, received too late, etc.)?
- Feel more noise information is needed?

YES	NO

* If yes, please list additional classroom noise activities: _____

Any other comments: _____

Please mail to: State and Local Programs
EPA Noise Office, ANR-471
Washington, D.C. 20460

Thank you.

Form B

EVALUATION
HEARING TEST PROGRAM BROCHURES

To be completed by the Hearing Test Program Coordinator for the school system and sent to the EPA Noise Office.

Please complete the following information:

Brochure	Number given	No. of schools giving hearing test
NOISE AND YOUR HEARING	_____	_____
HEAR HERE!	_____	_____
THINK QUIETLY ABOUT NOISE	_____	_____

Did any other groups receive the brochures? _____

Please list groups, brochure, and number given: _____

Do you feel that the brochures were effective? _____

Did any of the schools conduct a classroom-teacher evaluation to ascertain the amount of interest in the subject of noise? _____

Have any of the schools and/or classrooms reported being quieter since students received brochures? _____

Has the school system and/or schools received any requests for additional information on noise? _____

Please give a brief summary of the brochures' impact in your school district.

We appreciate your help and coordination in the hearing test program. Please mail to:

EPA Noise Office
ANR-471
Washington, DC 20460

Form C

Telephone Survey
Hearing Test Brochures

We appreciate your help.

1. When was the hearing test conducted?
2. In how many schools?
3. How many of the schools received hearing test brochures?
4. Approximately how many students were tested?
Preliminary screening?
Follow-up screening?
5. Are hearing tests mandated by State Law?
6. Who sponsors the hearing tests? School system? Health department?
Health clinics? Other?
7. How many times will a student be tested during school years?
At what intervals?
Elementary - grades: _____
Secondary - grades: _____
Both: _____
8. Do you know what kind of information was given to students before the hearing tests?
Teacher discussions in classrooms?
Nurses, audiologists or other health personnel?
9. Are parents notified in advance of hearing tests?
10. Who presented EPA's hearing test brochures?
Audiologist _____
Teacher _____
Other _____
11. Did you present a briefing for participating teachers before they disseminated the materials?
12. Were the brochures given out to students before or after the hearing tests?
Before _____
After _____
13. What was the reaction of the students to the materials?
 1. - no reaction
 2. - enthused
 3. - wanted more materials
 4. - discussed information later

14. Was any kind of publicity received on the hearing test program?
Through: TV _____
Radio _____
Newspaper articles _____
School flyers _____
15. Do you know if the brochures were taken home to parents?
16. Did you receive any feedback from parents/teachers? If so, what kind?
17. Regarding the hearing tests, would you say that hearing loss in students was
More than expected _____
Same as last year _____
Less than expected _____
18. What percentage of those tested were recommended for a second screening?
19. Do you think we can instill a "Quiet Ethic" in children through the educational process?

Future use of brochures:

1. Would you suggest that a brief discussion on hearing protection be conducted by the teacher, nurse, audiologist prior to or immediately after the test? What additional materials do you suggest?
2. Do you feel there is value in sensitizing the parents in regard to excessive noise and its effect on health? How can we best reach parents?
3. Do you have any suggestions on how the hearing test program, as it relates to noise, can be improved?
4. Are you interested in knowing more about the Quiet School Program?

Form D

TEACHER'S COMMENTS ON SOUNDS ALIVE

Name: _____

Address: _____

Grade Level: _____

School: _____

Did you

consider material appropriate
for your grade level?

find it necessary to adapt the
material to your grade level?

find the material useful?

feel that material held
your students' interest?

initiate other noise projects
because of this interest?

find other teachers within the
school interested in the module?

YES	NO

If you feel that the noise module should be modified, could you tell us what you think should be done to improve it. (We would appreciate it if you could mark up a copy of the workbook with your comments and send it to us with this sheet.)

Any other comments: _____

Thank you.

Please mail to: State and Local Programs
EPA Noise Office, ANR-471
Washington, DC 20460

APPENDIX B
TABLES

TABLE 1.

Parent Questionnaire Results*

1. The information in the brochure was:	Beneficial	- 43	Not beneficial	- 0
	Informative	- 55	Not informative	- 0
	Thorough	- 14	Not thorough	- 4
	Appropriate for age	- 37	Not appropriate for age	- 0
2. For your child, the graphics were:	Interesting	- 51	Not interesting	- 0
	Realistic	- 24	Not realistic	- 2
	Appropriate for age	- 33	Not appropriate for age	- 1
	Attractive	- 21	Not attractive	- 0
3. The activities (drawing, coloring, games) for children were:	Interesting	- 38	Not interesting	- 2
	Appropriate for age	- 33	Not appropriate for age	- 4
4. Did your child need help with the activities?	Yes	- 20	No	- 45
5. The size of the brochure was:	Appropriate	- 55	Not appropriate	- 1
			Too large	- 10
			Too small	- 2
6. Did the brochure increase your awareness of the hazardous effects of noise on your hearing?	Yes	- 56	No	- 12
7. Did you discuss the brochure with your child (or read it to him/her)?	Yes	- 60	No	- 7
8. Did your child seem interested in the brochure?	Yes	- 57	No	- 6

* As developed by the American Speech, Language, and Hearing Association.

9. What did you like best about the brochure?	Subject matter	- 37		
	Graphics	- 15		
	Size	- 15		
	Appropriateness for age	- 9		
	Activities (coloring, games, drawings)	- 25		
10. What did you like least about the brochure?	Subject matter	- 6		
	Graphics	- 10		
	Size	- 19		
	Appropriateness for age	- 5		
	Activities (coloring, games, drawings)	- 5		
11. Has your child had a hearing test?	Yes	- 64	No	- 4
12. Was your child's hearing within normal limits?	Yes	- 62	No	- 5
13. If no, did you follow-up with a visit to a medical doctor or Audiologist?	Yes	- 5	No	- 4
14. Do you already take precautions to protect your child's hearing?	Yes	- 56	No	- 7

TABLE 2.

Summary of Teacher Response to
Sounds Alive Questionnaire

Did you:	YES	NO	NO RESPONSE
consider material appropriate for your grade level?	95%	5%	
find it necessary to adapt the material to your grade level?	33%	62%	5%
find the material useful?	100%		
feel that material held your students' interest?	100%		
initiate other noise projects because of this interest?	86%	4%	10%
find other teachers within the school interested in the module?	81%		19%

APPENDIX C
REQUESTS FOR
INFORMATION

PARTIAL LISTING OF TEACHER REQUESTS FOR SOUNDS ALIVE

REGION I

Bridgeport, Connecticut
Bucksport, Maine (2)
Pittsfield, Maine
Boston, Massachusetts
Gloucester, Massachusetts
Marblehead, Massachusetts
New Bedford, Massachusetts
Burlington, Vermont
Montpelier, Vermont

REGION II

Cherry Hill, New Jersey
Flanders, New Jersey
Jersey City, New Jersey (2)
Little Falls, New Jersey (2)
North Bergen, New Jersey
Oakland, New Jersey
Palisades Park, New Jersey
Ridgewood, New Jersey
River Edge, New Jersey
Short Hills, New Jersey
Somerville, New Jersey
Teaneck, New Jersey (2)
Wayne, New Jersey
West Paterson, New Jersey
Cincinnatus, New York
Franklin Square, New York
Grand Island, New York
Levittown, New York
North Syracuse, New York
APO New York (Germany) (3)
Caquas, Puerto Rico
Guanica, Puerto Rico
Quebradillas, Puerto Rico
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico
Veja Baja, Puerto Rico

REGION III

Washington, D.C. (6)
Baltimore, Maryland (2)
Bel Air, Maryland
Frederick, Maryland
Hagerstown, Maryland (3)
Lanham, Maryland
Lexington Park, Maryland
Edinboro, Pennsylvania
Erie, Pennsylvania
Fredericksburg, Pennsylvania

Hegins, Pennsylvania
New Cumberland, Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Richboro, Pennsylvania
Slatington, Pennsylvania
Willow Street, Pennsylvania
Arlington, Virginia (3)
Springfield, Virginia
Charleston, West Virginia (2)
Huntington, West Virginia
Keyser, West Virginia
Logan, West Virginia
Omar, West Virginia
Parkersburg, West Virginia

REGION IV

Athens, Alabama
Auburn, Alabama
Birmingham, Alabama (4)
Cullman, Alabama
Gardendale, Alabama
Lester, Alabama
Boca Raton, Florida (2)
Jacksonville, Florida
Miami, Florida (2)
Port Orange, Florida (2)
St. Petersburg, Florida (2)
Tallahassee, Florida
West Palm Beach, Florida
Atlanta, Georgia (3)
Jonesboro, Georgia
Louisville, Kentucky (4)
Monticello, Kentucky
Brandon, Mississippi (2)
McComb, Mississippi
New Albany, Mississippi (2)
Charlotte, North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina
Durham, North Carolina
Fayetteville, North Carolina
Goldboro, North Carolina
Anderson, South Carolina (3)
Winnsboro, South Carolina
Chattanooga, Tennessee (2)
Collierville, Tennessee
Franklin, Tennessee
Morristown, Tennessee
Nashville, Tennessee
Tullahoma, Tennessee

REGION V

Arlington Heights, Illinois (2)
Bellwood, Illinois
Berwyn, Illinois
Calumet, Illinois (2)
Calumet Park, Illinois
Champaign, Illinois
Chicago, Illinois
Des Plaines, Illinois (3)
Elk Grove, Illinois
Evanston, Illinois (3)
Forest Park, Illinois (2)
Glen Ellyn, Illinois
Glenview, Illinois (2)
Harvey, Illinois (2)
Hillside, Illinois
Justice, Illinois (2)
Moline, Illinois
Mt. Prospect, Illinois
Naperville, Illinois
Niles, Illinois
Northfield, Illinois
Oak Brook, Illinois
Park Forest, Illinois
Park Forest South, Illinois
Richton Park, Illinois (2)
Rockford, Illinois (2)
Rolling Meadows, Illinois
Schaumburg, Illinois
Skokie, Illinois (3)
Walnut, Illinois
Wheaton, Illinois
Chestertown, Indiana
Columbus, Indiana (2)
Greenwood, Indiana (3)
Hamilton, Indiana
Hammond, Indiana (2)
Merriville, Indiana
Muncie, Indiana
Terre Haute, Indiana (2)
Brighton, Michigan
Detroit, Michigan (3)
East Lansing, Michigan
Flint, Michigan
Hartford, Michigan
Livonia, Michigan
Mt. Clemens, Michigan (2)
Rochester, Michigan (2)
Royal Oak, Michigan

St. Clair Shores, Michigan
Selfridge A.N.G. Base, Michigan
Sterling Heights, Illinois
Warren, Michigan
West Bloomfield, Michigan
Ypsilanti, Michigan
Lake Elmo, Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota (2)
Proctor, Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota (3)
Stillwater, Minnesota
Wabasso, Minnesota
Ada, Ohio
Barnesville, Ohio
Campbell, Ohio
Sylvania, Ohio
Irma, Wisconsin
Kimberly, Wisconsin
La Crosse, Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin
Merrill, Wisconsin

REGION VI

Broussard, Louisiana
Lake Charles, Louisiana
Albuquerque, New Mexico (3)
Central, New Mexico
Farmington, New Mexico
Las Cruces, New Mexico
Maxwell, New Mexico
Roswell, New Mexico
Ardmore, Oklahoma
Lindsay, Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma (3)
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Wayne, Oklahoma
Austin, Texas (2)
Brownsville, Texas
Bryan, Texas
Burkburnett, Texas
Dallas, Texas
El Paso, Texas
Houston, Texas (3)
Livingston, Texas
Lubbock, Texas
San Antonio, Texas
Shepherd, Texas
Southlake, Texas
Waco, Texas

REGION VII

Boone, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa (53)
Ottumwa, Iowa
Haysville, Kansas
Newton, Kansas
Topeka, Kansas
Wichita, Kansas (2)
Kansas City, Missouri
Parkville, Missouri (2)
Lincoln, Nebraska
Pierce, Nebraska

REGION VIII

Security, Colorado
Bismarck, North Dakota (3)
Sidney, North Dakota
Wahpeton, North Dakota
Sioux Falls, South Dakota (2)
Vermillion, South Dakota
Ogden, Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah (3)

REGION IX

Mesa, Arizona (2)
Phoenix, Arizona (4)
Alameda, California
Chatsworth, California
Daly City, California
El Monte, California
Glendale, California
Long Beach, California
Los Altos, California
Los Angeles, California (4)
Mission Viejo, California
Quincy, California
Reseda, California
Sacramento, California
San Diego, California (2)
San Fernando, California
APO San Francisco (2)
San Rafael, California
Santa Cruz, California
South San Gabriel, California
Ventura, California
Kaneohe, Hawaii
Sparks, Nevada (2)

REGION X

Anchorage, Alaska (2)
Idaho Falls, Idaho
Pocatello, Idaho (3)
Dallas, Oregon (2)
Aberdeen, Washington (2)
Eastsound, Washington

PARTIAL LISTING OF TEACHER REQUESTS FOR HEARING TEST BROCHURES

REGION I

Bridgeport, Connecticut
Bridgeport, Connecticut
Bridgeport, Connecticut
Bucksport, Maine
Boston, Massachusetts
Gloucester, Massachusetts
Gloucester, Massachusetts
Marblehead, Massachusetts
Marblehead, Massachusetts
Norton, Massachusetts
South Attleboro, Massachusetts
Bennington, Vermont
Burlington, Vermont

REGION II

Cherry Hill, New Jersey
Jersey City, New Jersey
Little Falls, New Jersey
Little Falls, New Jersey
Little Falls, New Jersey
Little Falls, New Jersey
Palisades Park, New Jersey
River Edge, New Jersey
Teaneck, New Jersey
West Paterson, New Jersey
West Paterson, New Jersey
Franklin Square, New York
Grand Island, New York
Levittown, New York
Lewistown, New York
Oneonta, New York
Wayne, New York
APO New York
Caquas, Puerto Rico

REGION III

Washington, D.C.
Washington, D.C.
Washington, D.C.
Baltimore, Maryland
Bel Air, Maryland
Bel Air, Maryland
Hagerstown, Maryland
Hagerstown, Maryland
Hagerstown, Maryland
Hagerstown, Maryland
Lexington Park, Maryland
Pylesville, Maryland
Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Drexel Hill, Pennsylvania
Erie, Pennsylvania
New Cumberland, Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Richboro, Pennsylvania
Willow Grove, Pennsylvania
Willow Street, Pennsylvania
Arlington, Virginia
Arlington, Virginia
Arlington, Virginia
Springfield, Virginia
Follansbee, West Virginia
Huntington, West Virginia
Keyser, West Virginia
Logan, West Virginia
Man, West Virginia
Omar, West Virginia
Parkersburg, West Virginia

REGION IV

Athens, Alabama
Athens, Alabama
Auburn, Alabama
Birmingham, Alabama
Gardendale, Alabama
Boca Raton, Florida
Fort Orange, Florida
Fort Orange, Florida
Longwood, Florida
Miami, Florida
St. Petersburg, Florida
St. Petersburg, Florida
Atlanta, Georgia
Atlanta, Georgia
Atlanta, Georgia
Richmond Hill, Georgia
Louisville, Kentucky
Louisville, Kentucky
Brandon, Mississippi
Jackson, Mississippi
McComb, Mississippi
New Albany, Mississippi
Durham, North Carolina
Fayetteville, North Carolina
Fayetteville, North Carolina
Raleigh, North Carolina

Anderson, South Carolina
Anderson, South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina
Winnsboro, South Carolina
Chattanooga, Tennessee
Tulahoma, Tennessee

REGION V

Berwyn, Illinois
Calumet City, Illinois
Champaign, Illinois
Chicago, Illinois
Chicago, Illinois
Chicago, Illinois
Des Plaines, Illinois
Evanston, Illinois
Glen Ellyn, Illinois
Hillside, Illinois
Justice, Illinois
Naperville, Illinois
Niles, Illinois
Northfield, Illinois
Oak Brook, Illinois
Richton Park, Illinois
Rolling Meadows, Illinois
Wood River, Illinois
Chestertown, Indiana
Columbus, Indiana
Greenwood, Indiana
Greenwood, Indiana
Hamilton, Indiana
Hammond, Indiana
Hammond, Indiana
Marrillville, Indiana
Muncie, Indiana
Muncie, Indiana
Terre Haute, Indiana
Brandon, Michigan
Brighton, Michigan
Detroit, Michigan
Detroit, Michigan
Detroit, Michigan
East Lansing, Michigan
Farmington Hills, Michigan
Mt. Clemens, Michigan
Redford, Michigan
Rochester, Michigan
Rochester, Michigan
St. Clair Shores, Michigan
Selfridge Air Force Base, Michigan
Sterling Heights, Michigan
University Center, Michigan

Warren, Michigan
Bloomington, Minnesota
Lake Elmo, Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Proctor, Minnesota
Roseville, Minnesota
Roseville, Minnesota
Roseville, Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota
St. Paul, Minnesota
Stillwater, Minnesota
Wabasso, Minnesota
Barnesville, Ohio
Cleveland, Ohio
St. Clairsville, Ohio
Cumberland, Wisconsin
Green Bay, Wisconsin
Kimberly, Wisconsin
La Crosse, Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin
Merrill, Wisconsin

REGION VI

Bossier City, Louisiana
Broussard, Louisiana
Lake Charles, Louisiana
Lake Charles, Louisiana
Albuquerque, New Mexico
Farmington, New Mexico
Maxwell, New Mexico
Roswell, New Mexico
Ardmore, Oklahoma
Lindsay, Oklahoma
Tulsa, Oklahoma
Burkburnett, Texas
Dallas, Texas
Dallas, Texas
Dallas, Texas
El Paso, Texas
Ft. Sam Houston, Texas
Houston, Texas
LaPorte, Texas
Lubbock, Texas
Waco, Texas

REGION VII

Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa

Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Des Moines, Iowa
Kansas City, Kansas
Topeka, Kansas
Wichita, Kansas
Wichita, Kansas
Kansas City, Missouri
St. Louis, Missouri
Omaha, Nebraska
Pierce, Nebraska
Sidney, Nebraska

REGION VIII

Security, Colorado
Bismarck, North Dakota
Bismarck, North Dakota
Bismarck, North Dakota
Wahpeton, North Dakota
Sioux Falls, South Dakota
Vermillion, South Dakota
Vermillion, South Dakota
Vermillion, South Dakota
Ogden, Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

REGION IX

Mesa, Arizona
Mesa, Arizona
Phoenix, Arizona
Phoenix, Arizona
Phoenix, Arizona
Phoenix, Arizona
Alameda, California
Chatsworth, California
Daly City, California
El Monte, California
Glendale, California
Long Beach, California
Los Altos, California
Los Angeles, California
Los Angeles, California

Los Angeles, California
Los Angeles, California
Mission Viejo, California
Sacramento, California
Sacramento, California
San Francisco, California
APO San Francisco
APO San Francisco
Santa Cruz, California
South San Gabriel, California
Stockton, California
Vallejo, California
Honolulu, Hawaii
Kaneohe, Hawaii
Sparks, Nevada

REGION X

Anchorage, Alaska
Anchorage, Alaska
Anchorage, Alaska
Pocatello, Idaho
Pocatello, Idaho
Pocatello, Idaho
Dallas, Oregon
Portland, Oregon
Portland, Oregon
Aberdeen, Wisconsin

