THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A SURVEY OF READING INSTRUCTION IN

THE SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS OF ALBERTA

by

© PATRICK JAMES FAHY

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1972

ABSTRACT

The study was concerned with four questions concerning reading instruction in the high school: (1) To what extent do teachers of English in Alberta accept in principle the responsibility to teach reading? (2) To what extent do teachers of English attempt to teach certain skills, and employ procedures related to the reading instruction program? (3) How do teachers of English evaluate their preparation, and their own and their school's efforts to teach reading? (4) What importance do these teachers attach to certain elements of a high school reading instruction program?

Data were gathered by means of a mailed Questionnaire and a School Data Sheet, from 165 teachers in 55 schools in Alberta; this return constituted 65 per cent of the Questionnaires, and 82 per cent of the School Data Sheets. Analysis was performed for the sample as a whole, and for each of four sub-groups: Sub-group 1 -- reading teachers compared with non reading teachers; Sub-group 2 -- teachers with courses in reading instruction compared with teachers without such courses; Sub-group 3 -- comparisons among teachers according to years of teaching experience (two years or less, three to six years, and seven years or more); and Sub-group 4 -- comparisons based on undergraduate concentration in English (major, minor, or neither). Percentage computations for each questionnaire item, with Chi-Square values exceeding the 0.05 and 0.01 levels, were reported in summary tables.

The findings showed acceptance by these teachers of responsibility for reading instruction, widespread classroom teaching of reading skills, and employment of related procedures. In their self-evaluations, the

most experienced teachers, those with academic courses in teaching reading, and reading teachers rated themselves best prepared and most successful in teaching reading; only the least experienced teachers believed the school's efforts were successful. Teachers repeatedly mentioned student motivation, personal preparation, a qualified reading teacher in the school, and time as factors crucial to the success of the program.

The School Data Sheets showed that the Reading 10 course was offered by 58 per cent of the responding schools; that only 13 per cent of these schools offered other forms of reading instruction besides Reading 10; that 31 per cent of the schools had a reading teacher; and that 24 per cent had a school reading policy.

The study recommended the dissemination of information about high school reading instruction to all teachers; the hiring of teachers who had interest and/or training in reading; the inclusion of instruction in the principles of high school reading, in the teaching methods courses offered by Faculties of Education in Alberta; provision in the high school for reading instruction for every student; and the appointment of a reading teacher in every school.

The study concluded by recommending that further research attempt to verify these findings by means of observations and case studies of high school reading programs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

xv

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

AND NATURE OF THE STUDY

Hill (1970), reporting on the history of professional concern for
reading instruction at the high school level, notes that attention was
first focused on the problem of high school reading during the 1930's.
In the period following World War II, when attention was again directed
to the reading inadequacies of many high school students, universities
began to offer courses in high school reading instruction. During the
1950's, about one-fourth of the high schools began to offer some form of
reading instruction; in the last decade, about one-half of the high
schools have initiated such programs. In the 1960's, there has been a
continuous increase in teacher and administrator interest in high school
reading instruction, more and better pre-packaged materials are available,
and more research has been directed at the scope and nature of reading
problems at the high school level. Despite this improvement, Hill's
assessment of the current state of high school reading instruction programs
is not optimistic. He estimates that where reading instruction is under-
taken, it is primarily remedial in nature, indicating a lingering belief
that the elementary school is responsible for reading instruction; that
such programs are often poorly planned and lack correspondence between
objectives and methods; and that high school reading programs, for the
most part, fail to result in overall academic improvement for the students
who take them. Hill would agree with this description of the history of

high school reading instruction:

> Throughout these years [of research in reading] actual
> classroom practice in reading has lagged behind the
> kind of reading instruction considered desirable in
> terms of current needs. Many schools are fifty years
> behind the currently defined needs.
>
>   (Bond and Tinker, 1967, p. 32)

THE PROBLEM

Several investigators (Summers, 1965; Early, 1969; Harris, 1969;

Dulin, 1971) have concluded that the teacher is the most crucial factor

in the success or failure of the reading instruction program. Despite

the increasing accessibility of materials and the greater awareness of

administrators, if teachers themselves do not accept the need for reading

instruction, it will be neglected. The extent to which teachers of

English in Alberta accept responsibility for reading instruction is the

problem to be investigated by this study.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The problem of acceptance of responsibility for reading instruction

is approached from two perspectives: (1) the statements teachers make

concerning their actual classroom practices; and (2) the attitudes these

teachers express in judging various aspects of a high school reading

instruction program. Four questions are posed to guide the investigation:

(1) To what extent do teachers of English in Alberta accept in

principle the responsibility to teach reading as part of the high school

English program?

(2) To what extent do teachers of English attempt to teach certain

reading skills, and employ procedures related to the instruction program?

(3) How do teachers of English evaluate their preparation, and their own and their school's efforts to teach reading?

(4) What importance do these teachers attach to certain elements of a high school reading instruction program?

NEED FOR THE STUDY

There have been no studies in Alberta concerned wholly or in large part with the place of reading instruction in high school English classes, or with the views of high school English teachers about the place of reading instruction in the high school. The Department of Education in this province has assembled and distributed a Secondary School Reading Handbook, and has authorized "Reading 10," a course intended to develop the reading skills of high school students. The Handbook, printed in 1969, and the "Reading 10" course, the curriculum guide for which appeared in 1970, are still in the early stages of implementation and evaluation. Through these publications, the Department of Education has shown its awareness of the need for high school reading instruction; the intent of this study is (1) to determine the extent to which these efforts have been accepted by teachers in the high schools, and (2) to describe the present state of high school reading instruction in Alberta.

LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS

(1) Although authorities insist that an "all-school" reading program is eventually the most desirable form which high school reading instruction may take, the present study is concerned only with the activities and views of English teachers. As Alm (1957) has argued,

the English department may be regarded as the impetus and guiding spirit
of the school's reading program; as English teachers lead in reading
instruction, so may other content area teachers follow.

(2) The study is delimited to include a systematic random sample
of approximately one-fourth of the high schools in the province, and the
teachers of grades 10, 11, and 12 English in these schools. It was hoped
that the sample thus employed would be representative of teachers of high
school English in the province as a whole, but as the data reported in
Chapter III show (p. 20 ff), accurate comparisons with the broader target
population proved impossible.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

(1) "Reading instruction" was not defined for the teachers in this
study, except that they were asked to note that the study "assumes that
reading instruction is a separate activity from the teaching of literature
or language" (Appendix A; unnumbered first page of the Questionnaire,
following the Introduction). From the behaviors and attitudes reported by
the teachers in response to the questionnaire items, it was hoped that a
definition of reading instruction might be inferred; therefore, the note
on the Questionnaire was intended only to emphasize that instruction in
reading may be (as in this study) a separate and distinct concern of the
English program, and not merely an adjunct. As will be noted in conjunction
with discussion of item number thirty-two (Appendix A, unnumbered third page
of the Questionnaire), this assumption was not universally held by these
teachers.

(2) The terms "remedial," "corrective," and "developmental," as used
in the text of this report, retain the definitions supplied in the Reading 10

Handbook (Department of Education, 1970, p. 1).

> Developmental Reading - (60 to 65 per cent of the school popu-
> lation). These students require only the teaching of new skills
> as the reading expected of them becomes deeper and wider in scope.
> The responsibility for developmental reading must be undertaken by
> the subject area teachers as well as by the teachers of reading.
> Corrective Reading - (about 35 per cent of the school population).
> These students could be considered educational casualties because
> of reading-learning difficulties. It is hoped that Reading 10
> will aid these people in moving into the developmental stream.
> Remedial Reading - (1 to 5 per cent of the school population).
> These students require teaching on a one-to-one basis, and are
> best handled in a clinical situation.

Though these definitions were not supplied in the questionnaire

sent to the teachers, remedial and corrective instruction were clearly

related, in the context of item number thirty, to "problem readers." The

term "developmental reading" does not occur in the instrument.

(3) The unlovely term "Non Reading Teachers" was adopted to desig-

nate teachers who indicated on the Questionnaire (Appendix A, unnumbered

first page) that they had not taught a class "specifically intended to

improve student reading abilities by systematic instruction in reading

skills" in either of the past two years. Conversely, teachers who indi-

cated they had taught such a course were termed "Reading Teachers."

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The remainder of this report contains a review of other studies

which have a bearing on the present investigation (Chapter II); a dis-

cussion of the design of the study and the characteristics of the sample

(Chapter III); an analysis of the data and report of the findings of the

study, for the sample as a whole and for each of four sub-groups (Chapter

IV); and a report of the conclusions and recommendations which follow

from the findings of the study (Chapter V). Copies of the instruments,

correspondence, and summary tables are included in the Appendix.

REFERENCES

CHAPTER I

Alm, R. S., "Teaching Reading Is Our Business," English Journal, 46:11 - 19; 1957.

Bond, G. L. and M. A. Tinker, Reading Difficulties, Their Diagnosis and Correction, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Department of Education, Province of Alberta, Reading 10, Senior High School Curriculum Guide, Edmonton, Alberta, 1970.

_____, Secondary School Reading Handbook, Edmonton, Alberta, 1969.

Dulin, K. L., "Preservice Training in Reading of the Secondary Level Classroom Teacher," 1971. (ERIC Documents, No. 053 876).

Early, M. J., "What Does Research in Reading Reveal About Successful Reading Programs?" English Journal, 58:534 - 547; 1969.

Harris, T. L., "Reading." In R. L. Ebel (ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research, (4th Edition), New York: Macmillan, 1969.

Hill, W., "Characteristics of Secondary Reading: 1940 - 1970," December, 1970. (ERIC Documents, No. 049 887).

Summers, E. G., "Toward a Research Definition of Reading," August, 1970. (ERIC Documents, No. 047 902).

CHAPTER II

RELEVANT LITERATURE

The studies reviewed below will be examined for their relevance to
the four questions under consideration in the present study: (1) To
what extent do teachers in these studies appear to accept responsibility
for reading instruction? (2) What skills do they teach, and what pro-
cedures do they undertake in the reading instruction program? (3) How
successful do they believe they are in teaching reading skills? (4) What
elements do they regard as essential to the success of the program?

THE SQUIRE AND APPLEBEE STUDY

OF HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH PROGRAMS (1968)

This study examined, among a great number of other areas of the
English program, the opinions and practices of English teachers regarding
the place of reading instruction in the English program. One hundred
fifty-eight schools were chosen on the basis of consistently superior
performance of their graduates in the Achievement Awards program of the
National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE); the study is thus con-
cerned with the characteristics of the "best" high school English programs
in the United States. In all, over 13,000 students and 1,331 teachers of
English were involved in the study.

Acceptance of Responsibility for Reading Instruction

These teachers appeared to accept some responsibility in principle

for reading instruction, though several other concerns took precedence.
Responses from 112 English departments indicated that 16 perceived a
"great" responsibility to teach reading, and 37 "some" responsibility,
but that 14 departments felt "no" responsibility to teach reading, and
33 felt that instruction in reading was the responsibility of a reading
specialist (p. 153).* The investigators concluded:

> In discussing their teaching responsibilities, most
> departments identified literature, language and
> composition as major concerns. Speech, logic and
> critical thinking, and reading are also definitely
> accepted as responsibilities of the English program
> by at least two-thirds of the departments, although
> individuals were sorely pressed to account for their
> exact place in the program of instruction. (p. 33)

Practices Undertaken in the Reading Instruction Program

Examination of classroom practices showed a gap between acceptance
of the abstract concept of reading instruction, and the actual place of
reading instruction in the English program. These emphases were observed
in classroom time allotments:

```
52.2% - literature
15.7  - composition
13.5  - language
 4.9  - speech
 4.5  - reading
 1.3  - mass media
 0.8  - no content
 7.1  - other  (p. 40)
```

The only shift in emphasis was the discovery that in terminal classes,
10.4 per cent of the time was devoted to instruction in reading skills
(pp. 41-2).

A list of "Practices in Widespread Use," obtained from 187 reports
on 107 schools, showed 27 reports of the presence of a developmental

---

*These four categories of response equal 100, not 112; the
discrepancy is not explained by Squire and Applebee.

reading program, 22 reports of a remedial program, and 17 reports of
reading laboratories (p. 48); eight other practices were listed more
frequently and observed more widely than reading instruction of any kind.
On the basis of these and other observations, the investigators noted four
general weaknesses of the instructional programs in these schools; the
third weakness noted was "inadequate provision for teaching reading"
(p. 52).

Evaluation of the Reading Instruction Program

The teachers' evaluation of the success of the reading program must
be inferred from other data. While the importance of reading appears to
be accepted in principle by many teachers, the lack of systematic and
concerted classroom efforts to teach reading led to this judgment:
" . . . the average English teacher does not consider a conscious effort
to teach reading a significant aspect of the English program" (p. 155).
Two explanations are offered by the investigators for this failure:
(1) the belief that reading skills ought to be taught in the elementary
school persists; and (2) the attitude that reading skills are "taught all
the time" (p. 152) in the literature program was frequently expressed.
The writers suspect that, as a result, reading is not taught in an
integrated or sequential manner at any level -- remedial, average, or
advanced (p. 152). These attitudes and the general bleakness of the
reading picture, despite teachers' apparent awareness of the importance
of reading to the high school student, led Squire and Applebee to
conclude: "If teachers would start to recognize that the teaching of
literature in high school must necessarily involve the teaching of
reading, at times explicitly, it would at least be a beginning" (p. 156).

Essential Elements in the Reading Instruction Program

Two findings of this study have bearing on the question of which factors most affect the success or failure of the reading instruction program. First, the teachers themselves, half of whom had master's degrees, complained most about the conditions under which they were teaching; specifically, they reported feeling overwhelmed and unable to accomplish all that was required of them (p. 70). Squire and Applebee interpreted this complaint as an indication of the depth of professional concern possessed by these teachers. Second, the study concluded that two broad influences most affected the character of the English program: (1) "the quality of instructional and administrative leadership demonstrated by the building principal; (2) the tradition of learning and education within the school and the community" (p. 15). If teachers are indeed pressed by time and heavy class loads, and if they feel "overwhelmed" as a result, they may depend heavily on the leadership and initiative shown by the administration simply to accomplish what is required of them. The extra planning and coordination required to incorporate reading into an English program which lacks it, may be sacrificed; administrative help, perhaps prompted by community concern, may be requisite to such curriculum revision. In this regard, it is instructive to note that the number one weakness found in these schools by the investigators was the "general ineffectiveness of many department chairmen" (p. 52). Leadership and time seem to be extremely influential in determining the direction of the English department; it seems reasonable to assume that they would also have some bearing on the organization and scope of the reading instruction program.

THE McGUIRE SURVEY OF READING PRACTICES

OF ENGLISH TEACHERS IN THE UNITED STATES (1969)

The McGuire survey was concerned with the teaching of reading by English teachers; it was conducted by means of a questionnaire mailed to 2,004 teachers of English in forty-six states. The final report is based on an analysis of 912 questionnaires, and is limited to public school teachers only; McGuire reports that this number is 55-60 per cent of the possible total number of public school teachers contacted (p. 14-15). As in the Squire and Applebee study, the sample is not representative, because the teachers involved were chosen from a list of members of the secondary school section of the NCTE. Also as found in the Squire and Applebee study, these teachers tend to have more academic preparation than English teachers as a whole -- 47 per cent of these respondents held advanced degrees, while only a fraction (0.11 per cent) had less than a bachelor's degree (p. 17). McGuire's remark in reference to his sample is probably true both of his and the Squire and Applebee study:

> . . . however bright or dark the picture indicated by the findings of this study, it is at least probable that a study based on a sample more completely representative of public high school English teachers would not present a brighter picture. (p. 2)

One other point should be made concerning the difference between the McGuire survey and the Squire and Applebee study. Since McGuire is concerned solely with the reading practices of the teachers surveyed, his information is more detailed; however, since it is a questionnaire survey, the McGuire study represents what the respondents believe is true about their teaching. The Squire and Applebee study repeatedly showed discrepancies between what teachers stated they did in the classroom, and what the observers actually witnessed. The McGuire study should therefore

be regarded as an indicator of the attitudes and intentions of the teachers involved, more than of their actual classroom practices. The Squire and Applebee study shows more reliably what is actually being done in English classrooms to meet the reading needs of students.

Acceptance of Responsibility for Reading Instruction

Three items in the questionnaire bear directly on the question of teacher awareness of the responsibility to teach reading. When asked if they believed that a course in teaching reading should be compulsory for prospective high school teachers, 84 per cent said yes; 82 per cent of these teachers believed that regardless of the quality and efficiency of elementary reading instruction, they had an obligation to teach reading in high school; and 78 per cent stated reading instruction for students who were reading at their grade level was as important as remedial instruction for those who were reading below the grade level (p. 21). McGuire concluded:

> This study offers very convincing evidence that, if it
> ever existed, the time has passed when high school English
> teachers believed that reading instruction should have
> been completed by the time pupils leave the elementary
> school. (p. 21)

Practices Undertaken in the Reading Instruction Program

Thirty-six of the 100 questions in the questionnaire dealt with the specific practices of these teachers in reading instruction. Seventeen of these questions were concerned with the teaching of "Reading Units": reading of newspapers and periodicals; propaganda analysis, semantics, critical reading of non-fiction prose, and study-type reading (p. 28). The data indicated that, with the exception of study-type reading, the

English program as a whole included "reading units" such as these, and
that the majority of the respondents had personally given instruction in
them at least once in the past five years (p. 28). Concerning the "unit
on a method of reading for the purpose of studying" (study-type reading),
which was not included in a majority of the programs or taught personally
by a majority of the respondents, the author reported that a cross-
tabulation showed 52.5 per cent of the junior high school teachers had
taught such a unit, while only 36.6 per cent of the senior high school
teachers had (pp. 28-9). McGuire inferred from these figures that senior
high school teachers assumed instruction in study skills had been given
in the junior high school, and need not be repeated in grades 10 through 12.

Twelve of the thirty-six questions dealing with specific units
concerned the teaching of reading skills in the context of the literature
program. Eighty per cent of the respondents indicated that they taught
reading skills chiefly in the literature program, while 37 per cent taught
these skills solely in this context; about 44 per cent indicated that they
used "reading units" to teach reading, at least to some extent, and 14.5
per cent taught reading skills more through the use of these reading units
than in the context of the literature program (p.29). Clearly, while
reading units may be a form of reading instruction, most of these teachers
regarded the literature program as the most natural context for the study
of reading skills.

Seven additional questions refer to "other" practices in the teaching
of reading. Among these other practices, "word study" received "great"
emphasis by 26 per cent of the teachers, and "considerable" emphasis from
42 per cent; "expansion of vocabulary" was a "great" concern in 39 per cent
of the classrooms, and a "considerable" one in 46 per cent of them.

However "speed" in reading was given "great" emphasis by only 3.5 per cent of the respondents, and "considerable" attention by only 12.4 per cent; 50.1 per cent claimed speed in reading received "little or no" attention in the classroom. McGuire comments:

> Probably the most notable finding [among these "other" practices] . . . is that few schools and even fewer teachers are stressing increase in speed of reading. That the regular classroom teachers are not doing so is neither surprising nor particularly regrettable. It is proper that they should be more concerned with comprehension; and it is at least probable that activities designed to increase reading rate are better carried on in special classrooms and reading clinics and laboratories than in the regular classroom. (p. 31)

Further questions in this "other" section indicated that two-thirds (68.1 per cent) of these teachers made some use of special materials for reading instruction, while 27 per cent never used such materials; 56 per cent used inventories of students' reading interests, while 39.4 per cent never used them; and 77 per cent used reading records, while 21.2 per cent did not use them (p. 32). Finally, one question concerning grouping of students for reading instruction showed that 11.4 per cent of these teachers regularly did so, 29.3 per cent occasionally did, 17.2 per cent rarely grouped students, and 29.9 per cent never did so.

Evaluation of the Reading Instruction Program

Teachers in the McGuire study were asked, "How well prepared, on the whole, do you consider yourself to be for giving instruction in reading at the high school level?" (question no. 13, p. 76). Fifty per cent declared themselves poorly or very poorly prepared; only 19.1 per cent felt well prepared. The largest group, 30.06 per cent, felt they were fairly well prepared to teach reading. Another question (no. 14, p. 76) examined the academic backgrounds of these teachers for university

courses in reading instruction at the high school level. Among these teachers, 63.63 per cent had not had a course in reading instruction at any time, 11.21 per cent had had such a course as undergraduates, and 19.89 per cent had had a graduate course in reading. Two comments by McGuire, prompted by these figures, bear inclusion here:

> Clearly, whether the English teachers in our public high schools become well prepared to teach reading is dependent chiefly on their own efforts to prepare themselves, rather than on deliberate and systematic effort by teacher training institutions to give appropriate preservice training or by school administrators or supervisory personnel to provide inservice training. (p. 22)

> On the whole . . . it appears that the preparation, both preservice and continuing, of the teachers for the teaching of reading has been poor. It is hardly surprising that only 5 per cent of the sample consider themselves to be very well prepared, and only an additional 14.1 per cent, well prepared; the surprising thing is that only slightly over half consider themselves to be poorly prepared. (p. 23)

In general, teachers with more extensive preparation for teaching reading skills rated themselves more successful at it than their less well prepared colleagues. McGuire adds that these teachers also seem to engage in "various desirable practices to a considerably greater extent" than the less well prepared (p. 68). The investigator's conclusion is that preparation in the form of university-level courses in teaching reading does make a difference in the attitudes and practices of teachers (p. 59).

All teachers, regardless of their preparation, shared the belief that their efforts in the classroom were more effective with the above-average readers, and least so with students who read below their grade level; further, they believed this was true at all grade levels of the English program (p. 78).

Essential Elements in the Reading Instruction Program

Although the teachers in this study were not asked directly to rate the importance of various aspects of the reading program, McGuire's recommendations do follow from his analysis of the factors which seem to be most crucial in the practices of these teachers. The following five recommendations represent the essential elements as noted by this study:

(1) That colleges and universities which train English teachers require all these teachers to have a course in the teaching of reading.

(2) That students who are preparing to teach English in high school take a course in teaching reading, whether it is presently required or not.

(3) That methods courses in teacher training programs distinguish between teaching literature and teaching reading, and that students be prepared to teach both.

(4) That inservice programs be initiated and/or improved, and that English departments coordinate their collective efforts in reading instruction.

(5) That reading specialists endeavor to aid teachers in their efforts to teach reading in the classroom. (p. 70-1)

McGuire's summary of the general implications of the findings, stated "briefly and bluntly," is: "High school English teachers are expected to teach reading. They are poorly prepared to do so. They should be well prepared." (p. 70)

OTHER STUDIES

The Cawelti Survey (1963)

A survey of forty-two midwest high schools by Cawelti showed that 27 schools (64 per cent) offered some kind of reading instruction, mostly remedial. Usually, these programs were incorporated into the regular English class. Early (1969) notes that this study indicates a broad and imprecise definition of "remedial" as used by the respondents.

One encouraging note in this study concerns the apparent involvement of
the administrators:

> Administrators frequently said they would like to do
> more, or would like to improve existing programs, but
> were handicapped by the unavailability of trained
> personnel. (p. 37)

The Simmons Survey (1963)

In another questionnaire survey, Simmons contacted 152 upper mid-
west schools, using a forty-item instrument; 127 schools (84 per cent)
responded. These results were obtained: one-third of the responding
schools reported no reading instruction program; those which did report a
program indicated that they emphasize remediation -- "very little develop-
mental reading instruction was being carried on in the schools sampled"
(p. 34-5); there appeared to be little systematic, careful diagnosis of
ability, or attempt to guide recreational reading; administrators lacked
professional background to encourage the program's development; and content
reading instruction, when it occurred, was restricted to the English depart-
ment. Simmons concluded:

> These findings . . . paint a dreary picture of today's
> secondary reading programs. Where programs are not totally
> absent, they are narrowly conceived and rigidly presented.
> The concept of expanded scope in high school reading
> instruction has apparently made little impact on our present
> school system. (p. 35)

The Otto Survey (1968)

In another survey conducted in an upper midwest state, Otto examined
the views of eighty-seven junior and senior high school content area
teachers in Wisconsin. He reported finding this surprisingly open response
from these teachers: (1) they recognize the need for reading instruction

in all content areas; (2) they are willing to accept the responsibility for reading instruction in their content areas; (3) they feel an acute need for more training.

The Hill Summary of the History of Secondary Reading Instruction (1970)

Hill's observations led him to draw these conclusions about reading instruction programs: (1) urban-suburban areas are more likely to have programs in high school reading instruction than rural or small-town schools; (2) programs are most successful when their objectives are narrow; (3) teachers involved in the reading program often feel undertrained and overburdened, especially when the task of reading instruction is not shared by the whole staff; (4) recognition of the need for reading instruction is not necessarily followed by the initiation of the program; (5) information about the successes of various approaches and the effectiveness of programs is not complete nor detailed enough to be used in planning a program.

The Campbell Study of Leisure Reading Programs in Alberta Senior High Schools (1962)

Campbell studied the leisure reading program in Alberta senior high schools by means of a questionnaire. One question asked, "Do you in any sense teach reading formally in the Leisure Reading Program?" Respondents were asked to check up to three of the following five responses supplied for the question. Teachers from all types and sizes of schools indicated this order of frequency:

(1) Arrange for leisure reading periods under your class supervision.

(2) Arrange for class time for leisure reading without close supervision.

(3) Pursue a speed-comprehension reading program as explained in

Let's _Read_ and _English_ _for_ _Today._

(4) Conduct developmental reading classes regularly.

(5) Use a remedial reading program such as the SRA program.
   (p. 100)

Numbers four and five consistently ranked below 10 per cent in

frequency of mention; the leisure reading program does not appear to have

been context for systematic and regular reading instruction in Alberta

senior high schools ten years ago.

The Bliss Study of Junior High School Literature Classes (1963)

In another study bearing tangentially on the reading program in

Alberta, Bliss observed seventy junior high school English classes for one

period each, and asked each teacher to complete a questionnaire after his

observation. Though these observations were in the junior high, the

responses of the teachers are illustrative of the discrepancies between

what observers witness and what teachers believe they are doing.

On the basis of his observations of the literature classes, Bliss

concluded that the teachers accepted the three criteria he had identified

as the most important basis for teaching literature: (1) development of

reading competence; (2) development of self-understanding and a balanced

perspective on life; and (3) understanding qualities of good literature,

and understanding of the relation between the content of the author's

ideas and the artistry by which it is presented (p. 168). However, these

teachers indicated on the questionnaire that they held different goals for

the literature program -- or at least that they held these goals in a

different order of importance. These were the goals mentioned on the

questionnaire (frequency of mention in parentheses): enjoyment (26);

development of appreciation, understanding good literature (20);

understanding of self in the world (17); encouraging interest in reading (13); developing good reading habits and skills (13) (p. 161). Although enjoyment was not one of the three criteria emphasized in Bliss' observations, it received most frequent mention in the questionnaires as the goal of the program. Also, whereas "development of reading competence" appeared to be the first goal emphasized in practice, "developing good reading habits and skills" received only half as many mentions as enjoyment among the goals of the program, as listed by the teachers on the questionnaire.

If, as the McGuire study indicates, the literature program is the most popular context for the teaching of reading skills, Bliss' study shows the relative neglect of reading in favor of other activities, in these junior high school classrooms. This information, along with the previously mentioned lack of congruence between questionnaire statements and observed behavior, is in agreement with what has been noted in the other studies reviewed above. Taken together, all these investigations give the impression of reading as an accepted and legitimate concern of the English program, the systematic and regular teaching of which has failed to reach the high school.

REFERENCES

CHAPTER II

Bliss, E. H., "A Study of Objectives and Procedures in Teaching of
    Literature in Seventy Junior High School Classrooms in Alberta,"
    Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1963.

Campbell, C. H. S., "A Survey of Leisure Reading in the Senior High
    Schools of Alberta." Unpublished Master's thesis, University
    of Alberta, 1962.

Cawelti, G. L., "Reading Improvement Programs in Selected Midwestern
    High Schools," The Reading Teacher, 17:36 - 37; 1963. Cited by
    M. J. Early, "What Does Research in Reading Reveal About
    Successful Reading Programs?" English Journal, 58:534 - 547; 1969.

Early, M. J., "What Does Research in Reading Reveal About Successful
    Reading Programs?" English Journal, 58:534 - 547; 1969.

Hill, W., "Characteristics of Secondary Reading: 1940 - 1970," December,
    1970. (ERIC Documents, No. 049 887).

McGuire, G. K., The Teaching of Reading by English Teachers in Public
    High Schools: A National Survey, Chicago: Illinois State-wide
    Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School
    English Teachers, 1969.

Otto, W., "Junior and Senior High School Teachers' Attitudes Toward
    Teaching Reading in the Content Areas," December, 1968. (ERIC
    Documents, No. 026 266).

Simmons, J. S., "The Scope of the Reading Program for Secondary Schools,"
    The Reading Teacher, 17:31 - 35; 1963.

Squire, J. R. and R. K. Applebee, High School English Instruction Today,
    New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Overview

Data for the study were gathered by mail, using a forty item questionnaire (see Appendix A), and a fifteen item School Data Sheet (see Appendix B). An alphabetized list of senior high schools in Alberta was assembled, from which each fourth school was selected, yielding a systematic random sample of sixty-seven schools. An estimate of the number of English teachers was made for each school, and sufficient questionnaires, with a pre-addressed, stamped envelope affixed to each, were mailed on March 10, 1972, to the principal of each school. In all, a total of 307 question-naires were mailed. The principal was requested to ask each teacher of grade 10, 11, or 12 English in his school to complete and return the questionnaire; he was also asked to request one teacher to complete and return the School Data Sheet with his completed questionnaire. (See Appendix C for a copy of the Letter to the Principal). On the basis of information received from the fifty-five schools which returned a School Data Sheet, the total number of possible respondents was reduced to 255; estimates made at the time of mailing were retained for the twelve schools which did not return a School Data Sheet. By April 17, 1972, 165 questionnaires had been returned -- 65 per cent of the adjusted possible return. These completed questionnaires were coded for computer analysis by the Division of Educational Research Services, at the University of Alberta. (See "Analysis of the Data," page 24, for a description of the procedure).

THE INSTRUMENTS

The Questionnaire

Two studies discussed above (Squire and Applebee, 1968; Bliss, 1963) noted discrepancies between what teachers stated they were doing in the classroom, and what observers actually witnessed. Since the present study involved no observations, and therefore relied totally on each respondent's subjective judgments of his own practices, it was felt that more emphasis should be placed on an assessment of the attitudes of the teachers involved regarding the importance and place of reading instruction in the high school, than on an attempt to discover their actual classroom practices. Therefore, fifteen questions in the questionnaire refer to actual classroom teaching of specific reading skills, and to procedures related to the reading instruction program (numbers 1 - 12); the other twenty-five questions concern the responsibility for high school reading instruction (numbers 25 - 36), an evaluation of the theoretical or actual success of such a reading instruction program (numbers 37 - 39), and a rating of factors which might influence the success of the program (numbers 16 - 24; 40).

The questionnaire underwent several revisions, until it was felt that it asked the four research questions as clearly and concisely as possible. Because a lengthy and time-consuming instrument would have discouraged returns, an arbitrary 40-item limit was imposed; pre-tests at this number of items showed that an average of ten minutes was required to complete the form. In addition to the "Introduction" printed on page one of the questionnaire, a short note was attached to each copy informing the respondent of the nature and purpose of the study, and asking his cooperation. (See Appendix D for a copy of the Note).

The School Data Sheet

One copy of the School Data Sheet was sent with each mailing of questionnaires, with the request that it be completed and returned by one teacher. Question 1, asking the number of English teachers on staff in the school, was used to determine the accuracy of the estimates of the number of English teachers per school, made when the instruments were mailed. Questions 2 and 3 concerned the forms of reading instruction which the school might be offering; questions 4 and 5 asked about the reading teacher and the reading policy. A detailed discussion of the data obtained by the School Data Sheet will follow the analysis of the data in Chapter IV.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

For the sample as a whole, percentage computations* were obtained for each of the forty items on the questionnaire; for the four sub-groups and the School Data Sheet, the Chi-Square test of significance** was used with percentage computations to determine the reliability of the differences observed. The percentage tabulations and Chi-Square values exceeding 0.05 are reported in the tables in subsequent sections of this report.

The four sub-groups were derived from the sample as a whole by segregating respondents on the basis of four variables in the personal data. Thus, Sub-group 1 contains the responses of the reading teachers compared with those of the teachers who had not taught reading in either of the past two years (see p. 5, definition number 3); similarly, Sub-group 2 presents a comparison between respondents who had had undergraduate or graduate

---

*Accessed as program NONP10, Division of Educational Research Services (DERS), University of Alberta.

**Accessed as program NONP02, DERS, University of Alberta.

courses in teaching reading, and those who had had no such courses.
Summary tables containing a comparative description of the samples,
tabulation of the responses for each of the forty questionnaire items,
and levels of significance beyond 0.05 obtained by the Chi-Square test,
are included in Chapter IV.

The analytic procedure for Sub-groups 3 and 4 was somewhat more
complex, as three groups were isolated for comparison in each sub-group.
Thus, Sub-group 3 contains a comparison of responses for teachers
according to undergraduate concentration in English; the three groups in
this sub-group are: (1) teachers with English majors; (2) teachers with
English minors; and (3) teachers with neither a major nor a minor in
English. Similarly, Sub-group 4 contains a comparison of responses based
on years of teaching experience; the three groups are: (1) teachers with
two years experience or less; (2) those with three to six years of experi-
ence; and (3) those with seven or more years of teaching experience.
Appendix F contains summary tables presenting percentage tabulations for
all questionnaire variables for the three groups isolated in Sub-groups 3
and 4. The discussion in Chapter IV is based on questionnaire variables
for which significant differences were obtained when one group within a
sub-group was compared with the other two groups combined. Thus, in Sub-
group 3, the responses of teachers with English majors were compared with
the combined responses of teachers with English minors, and those with
neither a major nor a minor in English; then teachers with English minors
were compared with the combined group of teachers with English majors, and
those with neither a major nor a minor in English; finally, teachers with
neither a major nor a minor in English were compared with teachers with
either an English major or minor. The same procedure was followed in Sub-
group 4. In the tables included in Chapter IV, asterisks (one or two,

depending on the level of significance obtained) are used with the per-
centages of the group which differed, on the basis of the comparisons
described above, from a combination of the other two groups. Thus, for
example, Table 46 (p. 103 below) shows a difference significant beyond
the 0.01 level on the variable of undergraduate courses in teaching reading
between teachers with an English major, and the combined group of teachers
with a minor, or neither a major nor a minor, in English. Also on this
variable, a difference significant beyond the 0.01 level was observed
between the teachers with neither a major nor a minor in English, and the
other two groups combined. Each such difference will be discussed in
detail in Chapter IV; in this case, the differences observed indicate
that teachers with an English major in this sample had undergraduate
courses in teaching reading significantly more often than did the combined
group of teachers with an English minor, and those with neither, and the
teachers with neither a major nor a minor in English had such courses
significantly less often than the combined group of teachers with a major
or minor in English.

THE SAMPLE AS A WHOLE

Characteristics of the Sample as a whole

Since the study was conducted by choosing schools to which the
instrument was sent, the present study differs from the McGuire survey,
in which teachers who were members of the secondary school section of the
NCTE were contacted directly. Also, as the present study used a system-
atic random sample, it differs from the Squire and Applebee study, which
was an examination of selected schools, whose graduates consistently
achieved high standing in the Achievement Awards program of the NCTE.

The present study was intended to survey a representative sample of high school teachers of English in Alberta. Immediate difficulties arise, however, in attempting to a. alyze the sample in reference to the target population, because Alberta Department of Education (1971) statistics do not distinguish between senior high schools and their teachers, and the rest of the teachers and schools in the province. Table 1 is a description of the sample as a whole, with comparative statistics describing all teachers in Alberta, and teachers in the McGuire, and Squire and Applebee studies.*

Most notable in this display of personal data is the place of the present sample in comparison with the McGuire, and Squire and Applebee samples. Specifically, the proportion of teachers with advanced degrees is four times greater in the two American studies than in the present one, and the proportion of teachers with less than a bachelor's degree is nearly one-tenth in the present study, while constituting only a fraction of the McGuire sample. Further, while more than 95 per cent of the teachers in the McGuire study have either a major or minor in English, 76.7 per cent of the teachers in the present study do; the possible significance of this will be explored in Chapter IV.

Despite these differences in academic background and preparation favoring the selected teachers in the McGuire, and Squire and Applebee studies, the present sample shows some significant strengths. For example, over 36 per cent of the teachers in the present study stated they had had

---

*Teachers were asked their sex in the erroneous belief that this might be one more means of determining the representativeness of the sample. Since the Department of Education does not classify teachers according to sex, the item becomes meaningless, and is disregarded throughout the remaining tabulations and comparisons.

Table 1:   Analysis of Personal Data for the Sample as a Whole

Comparison of the Present Sample with Teachers in the
Province of Alberta, and Respondents to the McGuire Survey,
and the Squire and Applebee Study

Personal Data	Present Study (N=165)	Province of Alberta (N=22,054)	McGuire Survey (N=912)	Squire and Applebee Study (N=1,331)
DEGREES HELD				
No degree	8.5%	52.2	0.11	
B.A.	12.0	10.9		
B.Ed.	44.8	34.7		
B.A. and B.Ed.	21.8		55.9[a]	50.0
M.A. or M.Ed.	12.1	4.5	47.2	
UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR IN ENGLISH	56.7		73.6	71.8
UNDERGRADUATE MINOR IN ENGLISH	20.0		21.9	19.2
YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE				
2 years or less	21.1		36.8[b]	
3 - 6 years	23.0			
7 years or more	55.7		63.1	
YEARS TEACHING IN THIS SCHOOL				
2 years or less	43.0			
3 years or more	57.0			
PERCENTAGE WITH ONE OR MORE COURSES TOWARD AN UNCOMPLETED GRADUATE DEGREE	34.5			
PERCENTAGE WITH ONE OR MORE UNDER-GRADUATE COURSES IN TEACHING READING	36.3			
PERCENTAGE WITH ONE OR MORE GRADUATE COURSES IN TEACHING READING	7.9			
PERCENTAGE WHO HAD BEEN "READING TEACHERS IN THE PAST TWO YEARS	21.9			

[a] Percentage of respondents with Bachelor's degrees

[b] Percentage of respondents with six years teaching experience, or less

an undergraduate course in reading instruction,* as against 11.2 per cent of McGuire's sample. And while 19.9 per cent of the McGuire sample had graduate reading instruction courses, compared with 7.9 per cent of the present sample, in all 44.2 per cent of the teachers in this study had had either graduate or undergraduate training in reading teaching, while 31.1 per cent of McGuire's sample did.

Table 2 shows geographical and population statistics for the respondents' schools, again with some comparative data. Two more major differences should be noted between the present study and the McGuire survey: (1) there are no respondents in the present study teaching in schools with enrollments of more than 2,000, while 20 per cent of McGuire's teachers did; (2) the present study did not include the designation "suburban" for school location, and no respondent complained of the lack, though 23 per cent of McGuire's informants indicated they taught in such schools.

Provincial statistics in this table continue to be inconclusive at best. It may be noted that slightly over one-quarter of the schools in the province are exclusively senior high schools (grades 10 - 12), and that the present study received the greatest proportion of replies (44 per cent) from them. Also, information contained in the "Location" distribution indicates that almost two-thirds (61.8 per cent) of these respondents taught in rural or small town schools, which make up 37.2 per cent of the schools in the province, while 38.1 per cent of the respondents were from large town or

---

*Although teachers were asked to specify the number of under-graduate and graduate reading courses, and the number of courses toward an uncompleted graduate degree, the analysis will be made for those who had such courses, whatever the number, against those who had no such courses. This is done for simplicity, and because very few respondents indicated more than one course in any of those three items -- far too few to be meaningful statistically if set as a separate group against the rest.

Table 2: Analysis of School Data for the Sample as a Whole

Comparison of the Present Sample with Teachers in the
Province of Alberta, and Respondents to the McGuire Survey

School Data	Present Study (N=165)	Province of Alberta (N=22,054)	McGuire Survey (N=912)
GRADES INCLUDED IN THE SCHOOL			
1 - 12	30.9%	0.12	
7 - 12	15.2	0.13	13.2
9 - 12	9.7		33.6
10 - 12	44.2	26.7	25.1
ENROLLMENT OF THE SCHOOL			
under 200	9.1		3.2
200 - 499	40.6		10.2
500 - 999	27.9		28.2
1000 - 1999	22.4		38.3
over 2000	0.0		20.1
LOCATION OF THE SCHOOL			
rural	13.3	37.2[a]	10.3
small town	48.5		23.6
large town	14.5	62.8[b]	13.1
city (over 60,000)	23.6		23.1
suburban			23.2

[a]Rural and small town percentages combined
[b]Large town and city percentages combined

city schools, which comprise 62.8 per cent of the province's schools. Thus one-third of the schools furnished two-thirds of the respondents for the present study.

It appears from the above comparisons that the sample involved in the present study is more representative of high school teachers of English as a whole, than previous studies of selected schools or teachers. However, a specific comparison of the sample with senior high school English teachers in Alberta is not possible.

REFERENCES

CHAPTER III

Bliss, E. H., "A Study of Objectives and Procedures in Teaching of Literature in Seventy Junior High School Classrooms in Alberta." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1963.

Department of Education, Province of Alberta, Education, Government of Alberta: The Sixty-Sixth Annual Report of the Alberta Department of Education, Edmonton: The Queen's Printer, 1971.

Squire, J. S. and R. K. Applebee, High School English Instruction Today, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter presents the findings of the study which bear directly
on the four questions posed for investigation: (1) To what extent do
teachers of English in Alberta accept in principle the responsibility to
teach reading as part of the English program? (2) To what extent do
teachers of English attempt to teach certain reading skills, and employ
certain procedures related to the reading instruction program? (3) How
do teachers of English evaluate their preparation, and their own and their
schools' efforts to teach reading? (4) What importance do these teachers
attach to certain selected elements of a reading instruction program?
Analysis will be presented first for the sample as a whole, then for each
of four sub-groups (see "Analysis of the Data," p. 24, above).

THE SAMPLE AS A WHOLE

Acceptance of Responsibility for Reading Instruction

Twelve questions in the instrument dealt with the principle of high
school reading instruction. Five of those questions were intended to de-
termine the attitudes of teachers toward high school reading instruction
generally; the other seven questions concerned the specific place of
reading instruction in the high school. Table 3 shows the responses of
the sample as a whole to the five general questions, ranked, for the sample
as a whole only, in descending order of agreement. Table 4 contains
responses to the seven specific questions.

The Sample as a Whole

Table 3: General Questions Regarding Responsibility
for Reading Instruction

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
31. During their undergraduate training, all prospective secondary English teachers should be required to take a course in high school reading instruction.	37.0%	52.2	9.3	1.5
29. Each student requires some reading instruction throughout his high school career.	21.1	61.5	14.3	3.1
26. Every student should have some specific reading instruction regardless of his present reading abilities.	23.6	48.5	21.1	6.8
27. If elementary reading instruction is successful, little further instruction should be necessary in high school.	7.3	28.7	45.7	18.3

	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
25. Proof that the need for reading instruction exists in a particular school, before considering such a /reading instruction/ program.	25.8	28.8	19.0	26.4

The Sample as a Whole

Table 4:   Specific Questions Regarding Responsibility
for Reading Instruction

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
32. High school English teachers teach reading, whether they know it or not, when they teach literature.	29.2%	57.1	11.2	2.5
33. Each teacher should teach the reading skills necessary to his own subject area.	21.0	61.7	15.4	1.9
30. Classroom teachers do not have the time to attempt remedial or corrective reading instruction; the reading teacher should assume responsibility for these "problem readers".	24.1	52.4	19.8	3.7
34. It is possible to establish an "all-school" reading program, involving every teacher of every subject.	10.6	61.9	23.1	4.4
35. Reading instruction is primarily the responsibility of the English department.	5.6	41.6	39.1	13.7
28. The appointment of a reading teacher and the structuring of special reading classes relieves teachers of the responsibility to teach reading.	3.1	12.4	50.9	33.6

	Very Important	Quite Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
36. How important is the teaching of reading at the high school level?	51.2%	34.1	12.8	1.8

Question 36 asks most directly the question being explored here; the response indicates acceptance of responsibility for reading instruction, but as Squire and Applebee found (p. 8, above), this acceptance alone does not indicate the actual place of reading instruction in the English program. In fact, the 46.9 per cent who indicated reading instruction was "quite" or "somewhat important" might be maintaining that reading deserves to be included in an ideal course, but may not be included under less than ideal circumstances. What actually constitutes reading instruction in these classrooms will be discussed below.

Responses to items included in these tables indicate that these teachers regard reading as an on-going responsibility of the high school, appropriate and necessary for every student, and, ideally, involving every teacher of every subject. Over 70 per cent believe that an "all-school" reading instruction program is possible, but the majority feel that the reading teacher should assume responsibility for "problem readers." The all-school program accepted by these teachers is apparently a developmental reading program, for students whose reading is not severely retarded.

Response to item number 31 introduces a problem which is freely admitted later by these teachers: lack of personal preparation for teaching reading. The 89 per cent who agree that a course in reading should be compulsory for prospective teachers of high school English recognize at once the importance of reading instruction, and their own lack of preparation for it. The same response by teachers in McGuire's survey has already been noted (p. 12 above). This consensus, along with the two-thirds rejection of the assertion that efficient elementary reading instruction should make high school instruction relatively unnecessary, gives the clear impression that these teachers accept responsibility for teaching

reading in high school, as a necessary accompaniment to what has been done in earlier grades.

In view of this acceptance, response to item number 25 is anomalous. The item maintains that before a reading program is considered, proof must be supplied that it is actually needed in a particular school. Over 54 per cent indicated that such proof was "essential" or "very important," while over one-quarter rejected the assertion by indicating that proof of need was "unimportant." Two explanations for this apparent incongruity seem possible. First, teachers may believe that high school reading instruction is made necessary, after all, by previous failures in teaching, and that there may be cases (schools) in which the problem does not occur because of previous teaching successes. Responses to the other items in this section, however, make this explanation improbable. A second possible explanation is that these teachers are concerned that precise analysis and identification of the reading situation in each particular school be made, before implementation of an instructional program. What is "important," under the second interpretation, is the formulation of goals and directions for the program: there is not necessarily an a priori denial of the need for one.

The question of what the reading instruction program encompasses is raised by item number 32. The idea that a teacher may inadvertantly teach reading seems to be accepted by these teachers, as is the notion that reading and literature study are a natural combination (p. 13, above). This view of reading, and the teaching of reading, receives more direct attention in the next section.

Actual Classroom Teaching of Specific Reading Skills, and Employment of

Procedures Related to the Reading Instruction Program

Tables 5 and 6 show the frequency with which certain skills are

taught, and the related procedures undertaken by these teachers. For

simplicity, the contents of these two tables may be summarized as follows:

Seventy per cent or more of the respondents at least occasionally:

(1) teach listening skills

(2) teach skills to improve efficiency in reading comprehension

(3) encourage students to increase speed and rate of comprehension
    in reading

(4) recommend leisure reading books to individual students

Fifty to seventy per cent of the respondents at least occasionally:

(1) test the reading ability of individual students

(2) teach word recognition skills

(3) give instruction in the use of the library

Fifty to seventy per cent of the respondents seldom or never:

(1) use exercises to develop flexibility in students' reading rate

(2) teach reading

(3) assess student out-of-school, nonassigned reading

Seventy per cent or more of the respondents seldom or never:

(1) confer with the reading teacher

(2) encourage teachers in other content areas to teach reading

(3) group students according to reading ability for literature study

As Table 6 shows, the teaching of reading is undertaken at least

occasionally by less than half (46.7 per cent) of the sample as a whole.

Those who do teach reading appear to concentrate their efforts in four

areas: listening skills, improving efficiency in reading comprehension,

increasing speed and rate of comprehension, and recommending leisure books.

The Sample as a Whole

Table 5: Actual Classroom Teaching of Specific Reading Skills

	Regu- larly	Occasion- ally	Seldom	Never
9. Teach listening skills.	32.3%	40.2	18.9	8.5
10. Teach skills to improve efficiency in reading comprehension.	38.5	32.9	19.9	8.7
15. Encourage students to increase speed and rate of comprehension in reading.	37.4	32.5	19.6	10.4
5. Teach vocabulary "word attack" skills.	26.8	39.0	16.5	17.7
3. Teach study skills.	21.3	43.9	25.6	9.1
7. Teach word recognition skills.	22.0	36.0	24.4	17.7
2. Test the reading ability of individual students.	17.7	38.4	17.7	26.2
8. Use exercises to develop flexibility in students' reading rate.	14.9	42.9	28.0	29.2

The Sample as a Whole

Table 6:   Employment of Procedures Related
to the Reading Instruction Program

	Regu- larly	Occasion- ally	Seldom	Never
1. Teach reading.	20.6%	26.1	25.5	27.9
11. Recommend leisure reading books to individual students.	72.6	20.1	5.5	1.8
4. Give instruction in the use of the library.	25.5	36.0	21.1	17.4
13. Assess student out-of-school, nonassigned reading.	17.2	22.1	30.7	30.1
8. Encourage teachers in other content areas to teach reading.	11.7	19.6	18.4	50.3
14. Group students according to reading ability for literature study.	6.2	19.4	23.1	51.2
6. Confer with the reading teacher.	7.7	14.1	16.7	61.5

As was noted above (p. 36), these skills are more developmental than corrective; the words "improve" and "increase" appear in two of the items, implying the presence of some initial proficiency.

Among the related procedures, the most popular was the recommendation of leisure reading books to individual students. The proportion who indicated they engaged in this activity indicates strong acceptance of the provincial Leisure Reading program among these teachers (Department of Education, 1970). On the other hand, three procedures were "never" undertaken by at least 50 per cent of the respondents. The least popular, conferences with the reading teachers, may be due to the large proportion (69.1 per cent) of these schools which simply do not have a reading teacher (see Analysis of the School Data Sheets, p.107 ff, for a discussion). Grouping students for literature study may be unpopular because of physical limitations of the classroom, the size of the class, lack of information about the reading abilities of the students, or any of a number of other reasons, including the teachers' admitted lack of knowledge about methods for teaching reading. This last reason may also contribute to the reluctance of English teachers to encourage other content teachers to teach reading; without confidence in their own preparation for teaching reading, English teachers cannot be expected to encourage others to undertake it.

Evaluation of Personal Preparation, and Personal and School Success in Teaching Reading

Tables 7, 8 and 9 contain responses to the three items which concerned personal preparation, and personal and general success of the reading instruction program, as perceived by these teachers. The three tables speak adequately for themselves: these teachers are dissatisfied

The Sample as a Whole

Table 7:   Evaluation of Personal Preparation to Teach Reading

	Very well prepared	Quite well prepared	Adequately prepared	Poorly prepared	Very poorly prepared
37. In general, how well prepared do you feel you are to teach high school reading?	4.9%	14.0	28.0	36.0	17.1

The Sample as a Whole

Table 8:   Evaluation of Personal Success in Teaching Reading

	Very successful	Quite successful	Somewhat Successful	Unsuccessful
38. In general, how successful are your efforts to teach reading?	3.3%	28.9	54.6	13.2

The Sample as a Whole

Table 9:   Evaluation of the School's Success in Teaching Reading

	Very well	Quite well	Adequately	Poorly	Very poorly
39. In general, how well does your school succeed in teaching high school reading?	1.9%	10.9	33.1	36.9	17.2

with their own preparation, their performance in the classroom, and the success of the reading program as a whole. In evaluating themselves, they parallel remarkably closely the opinions expressed by the teachers in the McGuire study, as shown in Table 10.

The Importance of Certain Elements to the Success of the Reading Instruction Program

In order to determine what factors most influenced the reading program, nine items were presented for rating from "essential" to "unimportant." In addition, the last question on the questionnaire invited respondents to supply an answer to the question, "In your opinion, what is the most important factor in the success or failure of a high school reading instruction program?" Tables 11 and 12 present the response to these items.

Of the nine factors listed in Table 11, all were regarded as essential or very important by 70 per cent of the respondents. There is a clear correspondence between the rating of the supplied factors (Table 11), and the responses to the free-response question, shown in Table 12: interest of students and personal preparation were cited as the two most important factors in both places on the questionnaire; a qualified reading teacher, mentioned by more than one-fifth of those who replied to the free-response question, and second in that list, was the third most frequently cited in the supplied list. The fourth factor in the supplied list, time, was fifth in free-response mention.

Though for the sample as a whole all the factors listed in Table 11 were felt to be important, from the replies to the free-response question (Table 12), it appears that the most crucial factors, in order,

Table 10: Comparison of the Present Sample with the McGuire Sample:

Evaluation of Personal Preparation for Teaching Reading

	Very well prepared / Very well prepared	Quite well prepared / Well prepared	Adequately prepared / Fairly well prepared	Poorly prepared / Rather poorly prepared	Very poorly prepared / Very poorly prepared
(The present study) How well prepared do you feel you are to teach high school reading?	4.9%	14.0	28.0	36.0	17.1
(The McGuire study) How well prepared, on the whole, do you consider yourself to be for giving instruction in reading at the high school level?	4.97%	14.14	30.06	29.94	20.88

The Sample as a Whole

Table 11: The Importance of Certain Factors to the Success
of the Reading Instruction Program

	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
17. Interest of students in improving their reading.	61.2%	31.5	7.3	0.0
16. Additional personal preparation for teaching reading.	51.8	32.9	13.4	1.8
22. Presence on staff of a qualified reading teacher.	45.1	34.1	17.7	3.0
18. Time in the school timetable.	39.9	36.8	21.5	1.8
20. Leadership in organizing and administering the program.	37.8	37.2	22.6	2.4
24. In-service programs on high school reading instruction.	19.6	53.4	22.1	4.9
21. Interest and cooperation of all teachers on staff.	35.6	37.4	20.2	6.7
23. Personal access to professional publications on teaching high school reading.	26.2	46.3	25.6	1.8
19. Special teaching materials or devices.	34.4	37.4	23.3	4.9

The Sample as a Whole

Table 12: Most Important Factors in the Reading Instruction Program,
as Reported by Teachers in Reply to a Free-Response Question:
"In your opinion, what is the most important factor
in the success or failure of a high school
reading instruction program?"

Factor	Percent (N=147)
Interest and motivation of students.	25.9%
A qualified reading teacher in the school.	21.8
Cooperation of all teachers of all subjects.	14.3
Preparation of teachers, including personal preparation.	11.6
Time for organizing and operating the program.	9.5
Materials.	6.1
A knowledgeable English department, committed to teaching reading.	5.4
Administrative help and cooperation, especially in scheduling classes, limiting class size, and providing materials.	4.1
A systematic approach to diagnostic testing within the school.	1.4

were: the interest, motivation, and cooperation of students; the personal preparation of the teachers involved; the presence in the school of a qualified reading teacher; and time, both to organize the program, and to give individual attention to students who require it.

Summary

The sample as a whole accepts in principle the responsibility to teach reading; further, they believe the responsibility should extend to all teachers of all subjects, and should include all students throughout their entire high school career. In practice, however, less than half of the sample teaches reading with any frequency; those who do, concentrate on the development of abilities among students who have no serious reading debilities. There is a strong conviction that the reading teacher should assume responsibility for the school's "problem readers"; there is an equally strong feeling that current personal and general efforts to teach reading in the high school are unsuccessful. Both of these reactions may be due to the poor preparation these teachers feel they have had for teaching reading. As a group, the teachers regard student motivation, personal preparation, the presence of a reading teacher, and time as the most crucial factors in the success or failure of the reading instruction program.

SUB-GROUP 1:

READING TEACHERS COMPARED WITH NON READING TEACHERS

<u>The Sample</u>

Table 13 shows the personal characteristics, and Table 14 the
school data, for the two groups to be examined in this section. As
might be expected, a significantly greater number of reading teachers
(as defined on the questionnaire, those teachers who had taught, in
either of the past two years, "a course specifically intended to improve
student reading abilities by systematic instruction in reading skills")
indicated they had had one or more undergraduate reading courses than
did the non reading teachers (those who had not taught such a reading
course). In addition, the two groups differed with respect to graduate
reading courses at a significance level of 0.13. The two groups did not
differ significantly in other personal characteristics, or in school data
variables.

Table 13: Reading Teachers Compared with Non Reading Teachers

Analysis of Personal Data

	Reading Teachers (n=36)	Non Reading Teachers (n=129)
DEGREES HELD		
No degree	8.3%	8.5
B.A.	19.4	10.9
B.Ed.	44.4	45.0
B.A. and B.Ed.	19.4	22.5
M.A. or M.Ed.	8.3	13.2
UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR IN ENGLISH	52.8	57.4
UNDERGRADUATE MINOR IN ENGLISH	25.0	18.6
YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE		
2 years or less	20.6	20.2
3 - 6 years	17.6	24.8
7 years or more	61.8	55.0
YEARS TEACHING IN THIS SCHOOL		
2 years or less	44.4	42.6
3 years or more	55.6	57.4
ONE OR MORE COURSES TOWARD AN UNCOMPLETED GRADUATE DEGREE	41.7	32.6
*ONE OR MORE UNDERGRADUATE COURSES IN TEACHING READING	52.8	31.8
ONE OR MORE GRADUATE COURSES IN TEACHING READING	13.9	6.2

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 1 degree
of freedom

Table 14: Reading Teachers Compared with Non Reading Teachers

Analysis of School Data

	Reading Teachers	Non Reading Teachers
GRADES INCLUDED IN THE SCHOOL		
1 - 12	27.8%	31.8
7 - 12	16.7	14.7
9 - 12	8.3	10.1
10 - 12	47.2	43.4
ENROLLMENT OF THE SCHOOL		
under 200	11.1	9.3
200 - 499	33.3	42.6
500 - 999	33.3	25.6
1000 - 1999	22.2	22.5
LOCATION OF THE SCHOOL		
rural	16.7	12.4
small town	41.7	49.6
large town	16.7	14.7
city	15.0	23.3

Acceptance of Responsibility for Reading Instruction

Tables 15 and 16 contain comparative responses for the two groups to general and specific questions regarding the locus of responsibility for reading instruction. Table 15 shows the only two items among these twelve on which the two groups differ significantly. More than 85 per cent of the reading teachers feel each student should have some reading instruction, regardless of his reading abilities, and a greater percentage "strongly" hold this view, than do the non reading teachers. On the other hand, 40 per cent of the reading teachers believe that high school reading instruction would be less necessary if elementary programs were more successful, while 34.9 per cent of the non reading teachers do; twice as many reading teachers "strongly disagree" with the assertion than do non reading teachers, and a majority of non reading teachers simply "disagree" with it, but on this item the reading teachers, more than non reading teachers, appear to see their job as a result of earlier instructional failures.

The other data in these two tables, though not presenting significant differences between the groups, contain some suggestive differences. In comparison with the non reading teachers, the reading teachers "strongly agree" more often: that every student should have reading instruction, regardless of his abilities, and that the instruction should continue throughout his high school career; that all prospective high school English teachers should have a course in teaching reading; that reading teachers should assume responsibility for "problem readers"; and that subject area teachers should teach the reading skills necessary to their subject. Also, more of them were inclined to regard high school reading instruction as "very important." The reading teachers "strongly disagree" more often: that proof is needed before a reading instruction program should be considered for a particular school; that the presence on staff of a reading teacher relieves teachers

Table 15: Reading Teachers Compared with Non Reading Teachers

General Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	Reading Teachers				Non Reading Teachers			
	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
25. Proof that the need for reading instruction exists in a particular school, before considering such a program.	22.2%	22.2	13.9	41.7	26.8	30.7	20.5	22.0

Table 15: Reading Teachers Compared with Non Reading Teachers
(continued)

General Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	Reading Teachers				Non Reading Teachers			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
**26. Every student should have some specific reading instruction regardless of his present reading abilities.	44.1%	41.2	14.7	0.0	18.1	50.4	22.8	8.7
*27. If elementary reading instruction is successful, little further instruction should be necessary in high school.	2.9	37.1	28.6	31.4	8.5	26.4	50.4	14.7
29. Each student requires some reading instruction throughout his high school career.	28.6	60.0	11.4	0.0	19.0	61.9	15.1	4.0
31. During their undergraduate training, all prospective secondary English teachers should be required to take a course in high school reading instruction.	45.7	48.6	5.7	0.0	34.6	88.1	10.2	1.6

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 16:   Reading Teachers Compared with Non Reading Teachers

Specific Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	Reading Teachers				Non Reading Teachers			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28. The appointment of a reading teacher and the structuring of special reading classes relieves teachers of the responsibility to teach reading.	5.7%	2.9	48.6	42.9	2.4	15.1	51.6	31.0
30. Classroom teachers do not have the time to attempt remedial or corrective reading instruction; the reading teacher should assume responsibility for these "problem readers."	28.6	51.4	11.4	8.6	22.8	52.8	22.0	2.4
32. High school English teachers teach reading, whether they know it or not, when they teach literature.	22.9	57.1	14.3	5.7	31.0	57.1	10.3	1.6
33. Each teacher should teach the reading skills necessary to his own subject area.	28.6	57.1	14.3	0.0	18.9	63.0	15.7	2.4
34. It is possible to establish an "all-school" reading program, involving every teacher of very subject.	2.9	71.4	25.7	0.0	12.8	59.2	22.4	5.6
35. Reading instruction is primarily the responsibility of the English department.	5.9	38.2	41.2	14.7	5.5	42.5	38.6	13.4

53

Table 16: Reading Teachers Compared with Non Reading Teachers

Specific Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	Reading Teachers				Non Reading Teachers			
	Very Im- portant	Quite Im- portant	Somewhat Important	Unim- portant	Very Im- portant	Quite Im- portant	Somewhat Important	Unim- portant
36. How important is the teaching of reading at the high school level?	62.9%	34.3	2.9	0.0	48.1	34.1	15.5	2.3

of responsibility for reading instruction; and that classroom teachers
cannot teach "problem readers." For their part, a greater percentage of
non reading teachers "strongly agree": that the teaching of literature
involves the teaching of reading, even though it may not be explicit, or
even intentional; and that an all-school reading program is possible.

The reading teachers, then, tend to hold stronger views about
responsibility for reading instruction, particularly where the scope of
the program, or the preparation and cooperation of other teachers is in-
volved. Their willingness to accept responsibility for remedial and
corrective reading instruction, and their agreement that an all-school
program is possible, and that every teacher should be a reading teacher
in his own subject area, shows a tendency on the part of reading teachers
to encourage developmental reading on an all-school basis, while devoting
themselves to remedial and corrective instruction. In this role, they
appear to be supported by their colleagues in the classrooms.

Actual Classroom Teaching of Specific Reading Skills, and Employment of Procedures Related to the Reading Instruction Program

One of the findings for the McGuire study (noted on p. 15 above)
was that teachers with training in reading seemed to engage in "various
desirable practices to a considerably greater extent" than teachers without
such training (McGuire, 1969, p. 68). Tables 17 and 18 show that this
appears to be true of the present sample as well.

Table 17 shows those skills in which reading teachers provided
instruction significantly more often than non reading teachers: only in
the teaching of study and listening skills are the two groups nearly equal.
Recall that in the McGuire study (pp. 12 - 13 above), only 36.6 per cent
of senior high school English teachers included "study-type reading" in

Table 17:   Reading Teachers Compared with Non Reading Teachers

Actual Classroom Teaching of Specific Reading Skills

	Reading Teachers				Non Reading Teachers			
	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
**2. Test the reading ability of individual students.	33.3	47.2	11.1	8.3	13.3	35.9	19.5	31.3
3. Teach study skills.	25.0	44.4	22.2	8.3	20.3	43.8	26.6	9.4
*5. Teach vocabulary "word attack" skills.	41.7	44.4	5.6	8.3	22.7	37.5	19.5	20.3
**7. Teach word recognition skills.	47.2	36.1	11.1	5.6	14.8	35.9	28.1	21.1
9. Teach listening skills.	44.4	41.7	8.3	5.6	29.8	38.9	21.9	9.4
**10. Teach skills to improve efficiency in reading comprehension.	66.7	25.0	8.3	0.0	30.4	35.2	23.2	11.2
**12. Use exercises to develop flexibility in students' reading rate.	41.7	41.7	13.9	2.8	7.2	24.0	32.0	36.8
**15. Encourage students to increase speed and rate of comprehension in reading.	66.7	22.2	11.1	0.0	29.1	35.4	22.0	13.4

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 18: Reading Teachers Compared with Non Reading Teachers

Employment of Procedures Related to the Reading Instruction Program

	Reading Teachers				Non Reading Teachers			
	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
**1. Teach reading.	52.8%	25.0	16.7	5.6	11.6	26.4	27.9	34.1
4. Give instruction in the use of the library.	27.8	36.1	19.4	16.7	24.8	36.0	21.6	17.6
6. Confer with the reading teacher.	16.1	12.9	16.1	54.8	4.8	14.5	16.9	63.7
8. Encourage teachers in other content areas to teach reading.	11.1	33.3	19.4	36.1	11.8	15.7	18.1	54.3
11. Recommend leisure reading books to individual students.	75.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	71.9	18.8	7.0	2.3
13. Assess student out-of-school, nonassigned reading.	11.1	22.2	44.4	22.2	18.9	22.0	26.8	32.3
**14. Group students according to reading ability for literature study.	11.1	36.1	25.0	27.8	4.8	14.5	22.6	58.1

**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

their courses; here, two-thirds of the teachers in both groups emphasize study skills at least occasionally.

Among the related procedures, the difference between the groups is less marked. The two significant differences favor the reading teachers; in addition, non-significant, though suggestive, differences favor this group on two items: conferences with the reading teacher, and encouraging teachers in other content areas to teach reading. Some reading teachers, in referring to item six, noted that they had not yet begun to talk to themselves; others indicated that, although they had been the school's reading teacher in the previous year, they had left the position in the present year, and were therefore involved in consultations with the present reading teacher. Still others reported that, since they were not full-time reading teachers, they used information gleaned in the classroom to guide instruction given to specific students in the reading classes; they believed that this merging of roles constituted "conference."

Unexpected results were obtained in response to item one: over 20 per cent of the reading teachers indicated here that they "seldom" or "never" taught reading! Fully one-quarter taught reading "occasionally," leaving barely half of the reading teachers to indicate that they taught reading "regularly." It appears that the reading teachers give instruction in reading in their reading classes, but do not feel they teach reading in all of them. Thus the data presented for the reading teachers in Table 17 probably represents the content and practices of reading classes, and does not necessarily represent the constant difference between classroom practices of reading teachers, and those of non reading teachers. This interpretation, though speculative, is consonant with the apparent opinion of reading teachers (p. 55, above) that their responsibility is for remedial and

corrective instruction, while classroom teachers should undertake developmental programs. In other than special reading classes, then, the reading teacher might not consider that he is teaching reading in the same sense in which he provides instruction for retarded readers in classes specifically designed for them.

For three of the related procedures the practices of the two groups were nearly identical. Both showed a great interest in the leisure reading of students, though relatively few teachers in either group made efforts to determine what students read outside of school. A majority in both groups gave instruction in the use of the library, though more than 16 per cent in both groups indicated they never gave such instruction.

Evaluation of Personal Preparation, and Personal and School Success in Teaching Reading

The reading teachers feel better prepared to teach reading than do non reading teachers, as Table 19 demonstrates. McGuire drew this same conclusion about the teachers in his sample (pp. 14-15, above). More reading teachers rated themselves "very well" and "adequately" prepared than did non reading teachers, though equal proportions in both groups indicated they felt "very poorly prepared." It should be recalled, in connection with this point, that almost one-half of the reading teachers had no reading courses in their academic backgrounds (see Table 13, p. 47, above), and that almost one-third of the non reading teachers had one or more such courses. (Further discussion of the influence of academic courses in reading instruction will be found in the analysis of Sub-group 2, below.) On the whole, 60 per cent of the reading teachers felt at least adequately prepared, as opposed to 43.4 per cent of the

Table 19: Reading Teachers Compared with Non Reading Teachers

Evaluation of Personal Preparation for Teaching Reading

	Reading Teachers					Non Reading Teachers				
	Very well pre-pared	Quite well pre-pared	Ade-quately pre-pared	Poorly pre-pared	Very poorly pre-pared	Very well pre-pared	Quite well pre-pared	Ade-quately pre-pared	Poorly pre-pared	Very poorly pre-pared
**37. How well prepared do you feel you are to teach high school reading?	11.4%	14.3	34.3	22.8	17.2	3.1	13.9	26.4	39.5	17.1

**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 4 degrees of freedom

Table 20: Reading Teachers Compared with Non Reading Teachers

Evaluation of Personal Success in Teaching Reading

	Reading Teachers				Non Reading Teachers			
	Very suc-cessful	Quite suc-cessful	Somewhat successful	Unsuc-cessful	Very suc-cessful	Quite suc-cessful	Somewhat successful	Unsuc-cessful
38. In general, how suc-cessful are your efforts to teach reading?	8.6%	34.2	51.5	5.7	1.7	27.4	55.6	15.4

Table 21:　　Reading Teachers Compared with Non Reading Teachers

Evaluation of the School's Success in Teaching Reading

	Reading Teachers					Non Reading Teachers				
	Very well	Quite well	Ade-quately	Poorly	Very poorly	Very well	Quite well	Ade-quately	Poorly	Very poorly
39. In general, how well does your school succeed in teaching high school reading?	2.9%	14.7	35.3	26.5	20.6	1.6	9.8	32.5	39.9	16.2

61

non reading teachers.

The most interesting contrast here is probably between ratings of personal and school success in teaching reading (Tables 20 and 21). Both reading and non reading teachers, by a great majority (94.3 per cent and 84.6 per cent, respectively), attribute at least some success to their personal efforts; however, 47.1 per cent of the reading teachers and 56.1 per cent of the non reading teachers feel their schools' efforts, in general, meet with "poor" or "very poor" success. Despite the difference in preparation, both groups perceive that the high school is failing to teach reading successfully.

The Importance of Certain Factors to the Success of the Reading Instruction Program

Tables 22 and 23 taken together show a slight difference in the rating of crucial factors by these two groups. In the supplied list (Table 22), the reading teachers indicated they felt personal preparation and student interest were equally important, access to professional publications followed, and leadership in organizing and administering the program was fourth. Interestingly, presence on staff of a specially qualified reading teacher was fifth in importance. Among the non reading teachers, student interest was followed by personal preparation, while presence of a qualified reading teacher, time, and leadership were third, fourth, and fifth.

In the free-response question (Table 23), the reading teachers chose time, student interest, a qualified reading teacher in the school, personal and general preparation, and cooperation of all teachers as most crucial; the non reading teachers cited student interest, time, personal and general preparation, a qualified reading teacher in the school, and cooperation of all teachers. By combining the selections of each group in the two tables,

Table 22: Reading Teachers Compared with Non Reading Teachers

The Importance of Certain Factors to the Success of the Reading Instruction Program

	Reading Teachers				Non Reading Teachers			
	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
16. Additional personal preparation for teaching reading.	63.9%	30.6	5.6	0.0	47.4	34.7	15.6	2.3
17. Interest of students in improving their reading.	63.9	30.6	5.6	0.0	60.5	31.8	7.8	0.0
18. Time in the school timetable.	38.9	33.3	22.2	5.6	40.2	37.8	21.3	0.8
19. Special teaching materials or devices.	44.4	33.3	16.7	5.6	31.5	38.6	25.2	4.7
20. Leadership in organizing and administering the program.	44.1	38.2	11.8	5.9	36.7	37.5	24.2	1.6
21. Interest and cooperation of all teachers on staff.	38.9	44.4	16.7	0.0	34.6	35.4	21.3	8.7
22. Presence on staff of a specially qualified reading teacher.	41.7	36.1	19.4	2.8	46.1	33.6	17.2	3.1
23. Personal access to professional publications on teaching high school reading.	36.1	47.2	16.7	0.0	23.4	46.1	28.1	2.3
24. In-service programs on high school reading instruction.	22.2	52.8	22.2	2.8	18.9	53.5	22.0	5.5

63

Table 23: Reading Teachers Compared with Non Reading Teachers

Most Important Factors in the Reading Instruction Program,
as Reported by Teachers in Reply to a Free-Response Question:
"In your opinion, what is the most important factor
in the success or failure of a high school
reading instruction program?"**

Factor	Reading Teachers	Non Reading Teachers
Time for organizing and operating the program.	28.1%	20.0
Interest and motivation of students.	25.0	26.0
A qualified reading teacher in the school.	12.5	11.3
Preparation of teachers, including personal preparation.	9.4	15.6
Administrative help and cooperation, especially in scheduling classes, limiting class size, and providing materials.	9.4	1.1
Cooperation of all teachers of all subjects.	6.2	10.4
Systematic approach to diagnostic testing within the school.	6.2	5.2
A knowledgeable English department, committed to teaching reading.	3.1	0.8
Materials.	0.0	7.7

**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 8 degrees
of freedom

a ranking of the four most important factors may be made:

Reading Teachers	Non Reading Teachers
1. Student interest	1. Student interest
2. Personal and general preparation	2. Personal and general preparation
3. Cooperation of all teachers	3. A qualified reading teacher in the school
4. A qualified reading teacher in the school	4. Time

It is perhaps not surprising that the reading teachers indicated personal preparation and the hiring of a qualified reading teacher as crucial to the success of the program; as has been shown (Tables 20 and 21; pp. 60 - 61, above), 40 per cent of these teachers feel poorly prepared to teach reading, and almost half feel the school's reading instruction program succeeds poorly. Their experiences (and frustrations) may have led them to rank student and teacher interest and cooperation so highly here.

Similarly, the non reading teachers show a concern for personal preparation, and the leadership which a qualified reading teacher might provide, perhaps in lieu of further academic preparation. In addition, the inclusion of time in the list may indicate a feeling on the part of these teachers for the complexity of classroom reading instruction, both in planning and in execution. Again, student interest is the foremost concern, receiving more than one-quarter of all free-response mentions made by the non reading teachers.

Summary

The comparison of the two groups shows a greater concern among the reading teachers for universal high school reading instruction, and a greater proportion of strong opinions supporting whole-staff preparation for and involvement in the reading program, than among the non reading teachers. It appears, however, that many reading teachers confine their

teaching of specific reading skills to special reading classes, which they
seem to regard as remedial or corrective. In employment of procedures
related to the reading instruction program, the two groups are about equal.
The reading teachers rated themselves better prepared to teach reading,
and were somewhat more likely to see their efforts as successful than were
the non reading teachers: neither group felt the school's efforts to teach
reading were successful. In rating the importance of various factors to
the success of the program, both groups cited student interest, and personal
and general preparation as the two most crucial elements; cooperation of all
teachers, and the presence in the school of a qualified reading teacher were
third and fourth in importance to the reading teachers, while a qualified
reading teacher in the school, and time, completed the list for the non
reading teachers.

SUB-GROUP 2:

TEACHERS WITH READING COURSES COMPARED

WITH TEACHERS WITHOUT SUCH COURSES

The Sample

A comparison of these two groups for variables in personal and school data (Tables 24 and 25) show significant differences in the proportion of teachers with reading courses who had undergraduate majors in English, in the number who were reading teachers, and in years of experience; in addition, nearly two-thirds of the teachers with reading courses had been teaching in the same school for three years or more, as opposed to slightly more than one-half of the teachers without reading courses (a difference significant beyond the 0.10 level). No significant differences obtain for any item in the school data.

Table 24:   Teachers With Reading Courses Compared
with Teachers Without Such Courses

Analysis of Personal Data

	Teachers With Reading Courses (n=64)	Teachers Without Reading Courses (n=101)	Degrees of Freedom
DEGREES HELD			
No degree	6.2%	9.9	
B.A.	7.8	15.8	
B.Ed.	50.0	41.6	
B.A. and B.Ed.	20.3	22.8	
M.A. or M.Ed.	15.6	9.9	
*UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR IN ENGLISH	67.2	49.5	1
UNDERGRADUATE MINOR IN ENGLISH	18.8	20.8	
**YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE			2
2 years or less	14.1	25.7	
3 - 6 years	14.1	28.7	
7 years or more	71.9	45.5	
YEARS TEACHING IN THIS SCHOOL			
2 years or less	34.4	48.5	
3 years or more	65.6	51.5	
ONE OR MORE COURSES TOWARD AN UNCOMPLETED GRADUATE DEGREE	31.3	36.6	
*HAD BEEN A "READING TEACHER" IN EITHER OF THE PAST TWO YEARS	31.3	15.8	1

*Significant beyond the .05 level
**Significant beyond the .01 level

Table 25:   Teachers With Reading Courses Compared
                with Teachers Without Such Courses

Analysis of School Data

	Teachers With Reading Courses	Teachers Without Reading Courses
GRADES INCLUDED IN THE SCHOOL		
1 - 12	23.4%	35.6
7 - 12	17.2	13.9
9 - 12	10.9	8.9
10 - 12	48.4	41.6
ENROLLMENT OF THE SCHOOL		
under 200	1.7	10.9
200 - 499	46.7	38.6
500 - 999	26.7	28.7
1000 - 1999	25.0	21.8
LOCATION OF THE SCHOOL		
rural	15.6	11.9
small town	45.3	49.5
large town	17.2	13.9
city	21.9	24.8

Acceptance of Responsibility for Reading Instruction

Although none of the responses among the general questions re-
garding responsibility for reading instruction yielded significant differ-
ences, non-significant, perhaps suggestive, differences favoring the
teachers with reading courses did occur on three items: a lower total
percentage of these teachers required proof before considering a reading
program for a particular school; more of them disagreed strongly that if
elementary reading instruction were more efficient, the need for instruction
in high school could be lessened; and more of them agreed more strongly
that prospective high school English teachers should be required to take
a course in high school reading instruction.

The seven specific questions showed a significant difference
between the two groups on the issue of corrective and remedial instruction
in regular classrooms (Table 27): almost 10 per cent of the teachers with
reading courses strongly disagreed with the idea that the reading teacher
alone should be responsible for "problem readers." In judging the feasi-
bility of the "all-school" program, a significant difference beyond the
0.10 level was noted, indicating that teachers with reading courses were
more likely to agree strongly, and to disagree less strongly, that such a
program was possible, than were teachers without reading courses. On three
other items, non-significant differences occurred favoring teachers with
reading courses, who tended to disagree, as a group, slightly more strongly
that the appointment of a reading teacher removed the responsibility for
teaching reading from the other teachers; a greater proportion of them
strongly agreed that subject area teachers should teach the reading skills
of their subject; and a higher percentage of these teachers felt the teaching
of high school reading was "very important," than did their colleagues
without reading courses.

Table 26: Teachers With Reading Courses Compared with Teachers Without Such Courses

General Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	Teachers With Reading Courses (n=64)				Teachers Without Reading Courses (n=101)			
	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
25. Proof that the need for reading instruction exists in a particular school, before considering such a program.	21.9%	26.6	17.2	34.4	28.3	30.3	21.2	20.2

Table 26:   Teachers With Reading Courses Compared with Teachers Without Such Courses
(continued)

	Teachers With Reading Courses				Teachers Without Reading Courses			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
26. Every student should have some specific reading instruction regardless of his present reading abilities.	24.6%	50.8	19.7	4.9	23.8	46.5	22.8	6.9
27. If elementary reading instruction is successful, little further instruction should be necessary in high school.	4.8	27.0	41.3	27.0	8.9	29.7	49.5	11.9
29. Each student requires some reading instruction throughout his high school career.	23.0	60.7	16.4	0.0	20.0	62.0	13.0	5.0
31. During their undergraduate training, all prospective secondary English teachers should be required to take a course in high school reading instruction.	37.1	59.7	3.2	0.0	37.0	48.0	13.0	2.0

Table 27:   Teachers With Reading Courses Compared with Teachers Without Such Courses

Specific Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	Teachers With Reading Courses				Teachers Without Reading Courses			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28. The appointment of a reading teacher and the structuring of special reading classes relieves teachers of the responsibility to teach reading.	1.6%	9.8	49.2	39.3	4.0	14.0	52.0	30.0
*30. Classroom teachers do not have the time to attempt remedial or corrective reading instruction; the reading teacher should assume responsibility for these "problem readers."	24.6	49.2	16.4	9.8	23.8	54.5	21.8	0.0
32. High school English teachers teach reading, whether they know it or not, when they teach literature.	29.0	56.5	12.9	1.6	29.3	57.6	10.1	3.0
33. Each teacher should teach the reading skills necessary to his own subject area.	26.2	63.9	9.8	0.0	17.8	60.4	18.8	3.0
34. It is possible to establish an "all-school" reading program, involving every teacher of every subject.	14.5	59.7	25.8	0.0	8.2	63.3	21.4	7.1
35. Reading instruction is primarily the responsibility of the English department.	6.5	41.9	38.7	12.9	5.1	41.4	39.4	14.1

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 27: Teachers With Reading Courses Compared with Teachers Without Such Courses
(continued)

	Teachers With Reading Courses			Teachers Without Reading Courses		
	Very Important	Quite Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Very Important	Quite Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
36. How important is the teaching of reading at the high school level?	57.1%	33.3	7.9	1.6	47.5	34.7	15.8	2.0

Actual Classroom Teaching of Specific Reading Skills, and Employment of
Procedures Related to the Reading Instruction Program

As Table 28 shows, the teachers with reading courses engaged in
the teaching of three specific skills more frequently than did their
colleagues: significant differences beyond the 0.05 level obtained for
the teaching of study and listening skills, and for use of methods to
improve efficiency in reading comprehension. (It should be recalled that
in the comparison of reading and non reading teachers, the teaching of
study and listening skills were the only two items in the list of specific
skills on which the two groups did <u>not</u> differ significantly; p. 56, above.)
In the teaching of word recognition skills, and in the use of exercises to
develop flexibility in reading rate, the differences favoring the group
with reading courses exceed the 0.10 level. In their teaching of "word
attack" skills the two groups were equal.

In their employment of related procedures (Table 29), the teachers
with reading courses held a significant advantage in three items: teaching
reading, providing instruction in the use of the library, and encouraging
other content area teachers to teach reading. The groups were equal in their
great concern for leisure reading, and in their relative lack of concern for
nonassigned, out-of-school reading.

Table 28: Teachers With Reading Courses Compared with Teachers Without Such Courses

Actual Classroom Teaching of Specific Reading Skills

	Teachers With Reading Courses				Teachers Without Reading Courses			
	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
2. Test the reading ability of individual students.	25.0%	34.4	20.3	20.3	13.0	41.0	16.0	30.0
*3. Teach study skills.	31.3	43.8	20.3	4.7	15.0	44.0	29.0	12.0
5. Teach vocabulary "word attack" skills.	32.8	42.2	12.5	12.5	23.0	37.0	19.0	21.0
7. Teach word recognition skills.	26.6	40.6	14.1	18.8	19.0	33.0	31.0	17.0
*9. Teach listening skills.	43.8	39.1	14.1	3.1	25.0	41.0	22.0	12.0
*10. Teach skills to improve efficiency in reading comprehension.	50.0	30.6	17.7	1.6	31.3	43.3	21.2	13.1
12. Use exercises to develop flexibility in students' reading rate.	17.7	33.9	30.6	17.7	13.1	24.2	26.3	36.4
15. Encourage students to increase speed and rate of comprehension in reading.	47.6	28.6	17.5	6.3	31.3	35.4	21.2	12.1

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 29: Teachers With Reading Courses Compared with Teachers Without Such Courses

Employment of Procedures Related to the Reading Instruction Program

	Teachers With Reading Courses				Teachers Without Reading Courses			
	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
**1. Teach reading.	34.4%	26.6	25.0	14.1	11.9	25.7	25.7	36.6
**4. Give instruction in the use of the library.	32.8	45.3	12.5	9.4	20.6	29.9	26.8	22.7
6. Confer with the reading teacher.	10.0	18.3	18.3	53.3	6.2	11.5	15.6	66.7
**8. Encourage teachers in other content areas to teach reading.	20.3	29.7	15.6	34.4	6.1	13.1	20.2	60.6
11. Recommend leisure reading books to individual students.	75.0	18.8	6.2	0.0	71.0	21.0	5.0	3.0
13. Assess student out-of-school, nonassigned reading.	17.2	19.7	31.3	21.9	17.2	17.2	30.3	35.4
14. Group students according to reading ability for literature study.	9.4	20.3	28.1	42.2	4.2	18.8	19.8	57.3

**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Evaluation of Personal Preparation, and Personal and School Success in
Teaching Reading

Tables 30 and 31 present another convincing indication that
academic courses in reading instruction foster confidence in one's prepa-
ration and ability to succeed in teaching reading. In judging their
preparation, two-thirds of the teachers with reading courses felt at
least adequately prepared, while two-thirds of those without reading
courses felt poorly or very poorly prepared. Those with reading courses
were more inclined to feel successful, as Table 31 shows, and fewer felt
they were unsuccessful in teaching reading, than were their colleagues.

In evaluating the school's reading success (Table 32), the teachers
with reading courses tended to be slightly less critical; a few even rated
the program "very" successful, and fewer of them rated it very poor. None-
theless, the groups concurred overall, with more than half of both groups
registering a poor or very poor rating for the school reading instruction
program. Once again, both groups saw their personal efforts as more suc-
cessful than those of the school as a whole (cf. p. 62, above).

Table 30: Teachers With Reading Courses Compared with Teachers Without Such Courses

Evaluation of Personal Preparation for Teaching Reading

	Teachers With Reading Courses					Teachers Without Reading Courses				
	Very well pre-pared	Quite well pre-pared	Ade-quately pre-pared	Poorly pre-pared	Very poorly pre-pared	Very well pre-pared	Quite well pre-pared	Ade-quately pre-pared	Poorly pre-pared	Very poorly pre-pared
** 37. How well prepared do you feel you are to teach high school reading?	9.5%	17.5	39.6	28.6	4.8	2.0	12.0	21.0	40.0	25.0

**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 4 degrees of freedom

Table 31: Teachers With Reading Courses Compared with Teachers Without Such Courses

Evaluation of Personal Success in Teaching Reading

	Teachers With Reading Courses				Teachers Without Reading Courses			
	Very suc-cessful	Quite suc-cessful	Somewhat successful	Unsuc-cessful	Very suc-cessful	Quite suc-cessful	Somewhat Successful	Unsuc-cessful
** 38. In general, how suc-cessful are your efforts to teach reading?	8.6%	36.2	46.6	8.6	0.0	25.5	58.5	16.0

**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 32: Teachers With Reading Courses Compared with Teachers Without Such Courses

Evaluation of the School's Success in Teaching Reading

	Teachers With Reading Courses				Teachers Without Reading Courses			
	Very well	Quite well	Ade-quately	Poorly	Very poorly	Very well	Quite well	Ade-quately	Poorly	Very poorly
39. In general, how well does your school succeed in teaching high school reading?	5.1%	12.2	31.0	37.9	13.8	0.0	10.1	35.4	35.4	19.1

The Importance of Certain Factors to the Success of the Reading

Instruction Program

Student interest and personal preparation continue to rank as the

two most important factors in a successful reading instruction program, in

the judgment of both groups (Tables 33 and 34). Beyond this agreement,

however, the groups diverge.

Among factors in the supplied list (Table 33), 75 per cent of the

teachers with reading courses rated access to professional publications,

cooperation of all teachers, and in-service programs as "very important";

in the same list, 75 per cent of the teachers without reading courses chose

a qualified reading teacher in the school, time, and leadership in organ-

izing and administering the program as most crucial. In the free-response

item, the teachers with reading courses listed, after student interest, a

qualified reading teacher, time, personal preparation, and leadership;

teachers without reading courses felt, after student interest, that time,

personal preparation, cooperation of all teachers, and systematic testing

were most important.

The amount of emphasis placed on professional publications and

in-service programs by teachers with academic backgrounds in teaching

reading may indicate a belief on the part of these teachers that additional

reading and periodic meetings with authorities are sufficient to keep them

abreast of new developments in high school reading. Less than 10 per cent

of these teachers indicated that a qualified reading teacher in the school

would be the most important improvement in the program. On the other hand,

the teachers without reading courses listed a qualified reading teacher,

leadership in organizing and administering the program, and personal prepa-

ration among factors they believed to be most crucial. One-fifth of the

Table 33: Teachers With Reading Courses Compared with Teachers Without Such Courses

The Importance of Certain Elements to the Success of the Reading Instruction Program

	Teachers With Reading Courses				Teachers Without Reading Courses			
	Essen-tial	Very Im-portant	Somewhat Important	Unim-portant	Essen-tial	Very Im-portant	Somewhat Important	Unim-portant
16. Additional personal preparation for teaching reading.	50.0%	32.8	12.5	4.7	52.5	33.7	13.9	0.0
17. Interest of students in improving their reading.	57.8	32.8	9.4	0.0	63.4	30.7	5.9	0.0
18. Time in the school timetable.	39.7	33.3	22.2	4.8	40.0	39.0	21.0	0.0
19. Special teaching materials or devices.	31.0	34.5	27.6	6.9	33.0	41.0	22.0	4.0
20. Leadership in organizing and administering the program.	36.5	38.1	22.2	3.2	38.6	36.6	22.8	2.0
21. Interest and cooperation of all teachers on staff.	40.3	37.1	17.7	4.8	32.7	37.6	21.8	7.9
22. Presence on staff of a specially qualified reading teacher.	36.5	36.5	22.2	4.8	50.5	32.7	14.9	2.0
23. Personal access to professional publications on teaching high school reading.	27.0	50.8	22.2	0.0	25.7	43.6	27.7	3.0
24. In-service programs on high school reading instruction.	17.5	58.7	20.6	3.2	21.0	50.0	23.0	6.0

Table 34:   Teachers With Reading Courses Compared
with Teachers Without Such Courses

Most Important Factors in the Reading Instruction
Program, as Reported by Teachers in Reply to a Free-Response Question:
"In your opinion, what is the most important factor
in the success or failure of a high school
reading instruction program?"**

Factor	Teachers With Reading Courses	Teachers Without Reading Courses
Interest and motivation of students.	25.5%	25.8
Time for organizing and operating the program.	20.0	22.5
Preparation of teachers, including personal preparation.	18.2	12.9
A qualified reading teacher in the school.	9.0	12.9
Materials.	9.0	4.3
Cooperation of all teachers of all subjects.	5.5	11.9
Administrative help and cooperation, especially in scheduling classes, limiting class size, and providing materials.	5.5	3.2
Systematic approach to diagnostic testing within the school.	5.5	5.4
A knowledgeable English department, committed to teaching reading.	1.8	1.1

**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 8 degrees of freedom

teachers in both groups felt time was the most crucial factor, perhaps in the belief that it could be devoted to additional preparation and motivation of students.

Despite some divergence, a high degree of unanimity continues to be present among these teachers in rating the importance of factors in the reading instruction program. For these two groups, clear agreement was found for these elements:

Teachers With Reading Courses	Teachers Without Reading Courses
1. Interest of students	1. Interest of students
2. Personal preparation	2. Personal preparation
3. Cooperation of all teachers	3. Time

Summary

Teachers with courses in reading instruction at the undergraduate or graduate level hold stronger opinions supporting reading instruction in the high school than do teachers without reading courses. As a group, the teachers with reading courses voted themselves significantly better prepared to teach reading, and significantly more successful at it, than did teachers without such courses. In actual teaching of specific skills, however, only three significant differences out of eight items were found favoring the group with reading courses; in employment of related procedures, three of seven significant differences favored this group. Some variance occurred in the rating of crucial factors, though student interest and personal preparation continue to predominate.

SUB-GROUP 3:

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS ACCORDING TO

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

For Sub-groups 3 and 4, analyses will be presented here only
for variables in which significant differences occurred; see pages
25 and 26, above, for a description of the procedure employed.
Summary tables, containing the precentages obtained on all the
questionnaire items for each of the three groups are included in
Appendix F.

The Sample

Tables 35 and 36 present personal and school variables on which
differences obtained. Among the personal variables (Table 35), the most
experienced teachers (seven or more years of experience) were favored by
all the significant differences; this finding is not surprising, as
increases in all these factors are, to a greater or lesser extent, a
function of time spent in teaching. One item here, however, is noteworthy.
Table 63 (Appendix F, p. 143, below) shows the proportions of teachers in
each group who reported having credits toward an uncompleted graduate
degree; the table shows 40.0 per cent of teachers with two years experi-
ence or less with such credit, as compared with 35.9 per cent of teachers
with seven years experience or more. That difference is not significant.
On the variable of graduate courses in teaching reading (Table 35), however,
the difference is significant: none of the least experienced teachers
(two years experience or less), despite the high proportion with graduate

Table 35:   Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Analysis of Personal Data

	2 Years or Less (N=35)	3 - 6 Years (N=38)	7 Years or More (N=92)	Degrees of Freedom
DEGREES HELD				4
No degree	20.0%*	10.5	3.3**	
B.A.	17.1*	13.2	10.9**	
B.Ed.	45.7*	50.0	42.4**	
B.A. and B.Ed.	11.4*	13.2	29.3**	
M.A. or M.Ed.	5.7*	13.2	14.1**	
YEARS TEACHING IN THIS SCHOOL				1
2 years or less	100.0**	39.5	23.9**	
3 years or more	0.0**	60.5	76.1**	
ONE OR MORE UNDERGRADUATE COURSES IN TEACHING READING	25.7	18.4**	47.8**	1
ONE OR MORE GRADUATE COURSES IN TEACHING READING	0.0**	5.3	12.0**	1

*Significant beyond the .05 level
**Significant beyond the .01 level

Table 36: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Analysis of School Data

	2 Years or Less (N=35)	3 - 6 Years (N=38)	7 Years or More (N=92)	Degrees of Freedom
GRADES INCLUDED IN THE SCHOOL				3
1 - 12	58.3%**	23.7	22.8**	
7 - 12	11.1**	21.1	15.2**	
9 - 12	0.0**	2.6	16.3**	
10 - 12	30.6**	52.6	45.7**	
ENROLLMENT OF THE SCHOOL				3
under 200	17.6**	7.9	7.6*	
200 - 499	64.7**	28.9	39.1*	
500 - 999	2.9**	31.6	28.3*	
1000 - 1999	14.7**	31.6	25.0*	
LOCATION OF THE SCHOOL				3
rural	20.0*	10.5	12.0*	
small town	62.9*	47.4	42.4*	
large town	2.9*	7.9	22.8*	
city	14.3*	34.2	22.8*	

*Significant beyond the .05 level
**Significant beyond the .01 level

87

credit, had a graduate course in teaching reading; among the most experienced teachers, on the other hand, one-third of those who had taken graduate credit indicated that one or more of their graduate courses was in teaching reading. Among the intermediate group (with three to six years of experience) about one-quarter of those with graduate credit had at least one graduate course in the teaching of reading. The explanation for the tendency is not apparent; further investigation is required to determine whether there is a trend among less experienced teachers to choose other areas besides reading for graduate study, or whether courses in reading are typically chosen later in a graduate program. At the undergraduate level, no such striking difference was observed, though again the most experienced group achieved significant superiority over the combined totals of the other two groups.

The school variables indicated (Table 36) that the most experienced teachers had the greatest proportion of members in schools with grades nine through twelve or ten through twelve (62.0 per cent), and the greatest proportion in large town or city schools (45.6 per cent); conversely, 58.3 per cent of the least experienced teachers taught in schools with grades one through twelve, and more than 80 per cent taught in rural or small town schools with enrollments of less than 500. Again, these differences are not particularly surprising. In a profession where experience is a major employment criterion, and where large numbers of teachers prefer to live and teach in metropolitan areas, the least experienced teachers can be expected to do less well in competition for positions in cities and large towns. This handicap, as the data for the intermediate group show, appears to be less severe after three to six years of teaching.

Acceptance of Responsibility for Reading Instruction

Two items among the general questions regarding responsibility for reading instruction yielded significant differences (Table 37). Although 34.1 per cent of the teachers with seven years of teaching experience or more strongly disagreed with the statement that high school reading instruction would not be necessary if elementary instruction were successful, 45.1 per cent agreed with the statement, and 9.9 per cent strongly agreed, more than the other two groups combined. The intermediate group disagreed with the assertion by a 57.9 per cent majority, but 42.1 per cent assented to it. The least agreement, 31.4 per cent, came from the least experienced teachers.

The three groups overwhelmingly agreed that prospective English teachers should be required to take an undergraduate course in teaching reading. The difference which occurs on this item is the result of the 5.3 per cent in the intermediate group who strongly disagreed with the idea, when no teachers in the other two groups did so.

Table 38 shows the three specific questions regarding responsibility for reading instruction where significant differences occurred. Teachers with seven or more years of teaching experience disagreed slightly more strongly than the other two groups that the appointment of a reading teacher relieves other teachers of a responsibility to teach reading. Greater differences obtained on the other two items, where the least experienced teachers were more skeptical than their colleagues that reading was taught perforce in the literature course, and were less insistent that teachers in other content areas should teach reading skills for their discipline.

Table 37: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

General Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	2 Years or Less (N=35)				3 – 6 Years (N=38)				7 Years or More (N=92)			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
27. If elementary reading instruction is successful, little further instruction should be necessary in high school.	5.7%	25.7	54.3	14.3	2.6*	39.5*	47.4*	10.5*	9.9**	35.2**	30.8**	34.1**
31. During their undergraduate training, all prospective secondary English teachers should be required to take a course in high school reading instruction.	34.3	60.0	5.7	0.0	42.1*	39.5*	13.2*	5.3*	36.0	55.1	9.0	0.0

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 38: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Specific Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	2 Years or Less (N=35)				3 - 6 Years (N=38)				7 Years or More (N=92)			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28. The appointment of a reading teacher and the structuring of special reading classes relieves teachers of the responsibility to teach reading.	2.9%	17.6	61.8	17.6	2.7	13.5	59.5	24.3	3.3*	10.0*	43.3*	43.3*
32. High school English teachers teach reading, whether they know it or not, when they teach literature.	11.4**	62.9**	20.0**	5.7**	37.8	56.8	2.7	2.7	32.6	55.1	11.2	1.1
33. Each teacher should teach the reading skills necessary to his own subject area.	14.3**	48.6**	34.3**	2.9**	23.7	65.8	7.9	2.6	22.5	65.2	11.2	1.1

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Actual Classroom Teaching of Specific Reading Skills, and

Employment of Related Procedures

As Tables 39 and 40 show, the most experienced teachers indicated greater involvement in the following specific skills and related procedures: testing the reading abilities of individual students; teaching study skills, word attack skills, word recognition skills, and skills to improve efficiency in reading comprehension; encouraging students to increase speed and rate of comprehension in reading; teaching reading; and encouraging teachers in other content areas to teach reading. The intermediate group was least involved in these five items: teaching word attack and listening skills; using exercises to develop flexibility in students' reading rate; encouraging students to increase speed and rate of comprehension in reading; and teaching reading. The least experienced group was least involved in giving instruction in the use of the library; no other significant differences occurred for this group.

Clearly, the most experienced teachers were most active in teaching reading skills and employing procedures related to the reading program, while teachers with three to six years of teaching experience were least active. Table 63 (Appendix F, p. 143) shows that the lowest proportion of reading teachers was found among the intermediate group; perhaps their relatively poor showing here is at least partially attributable to this fact. It has already been pointed out (Table 17, p. 56, above) that reading teachers differed markedly from non reading teachers on these same items.

Table 39: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Actual Classroom Teaching of Specific Reading Skills

	2 Years or Less (N=35)				3 - 6 Years (N=38)				7 Years or More (N=92)			
	Regularly	Occasion-ally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasion-ally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasion-ally	Seldom	Never
2. Test the reading ability of individual students.	13.9%	33.3	16.7	36.1	2.6	47.4	21.1	28.9	24.2	37.4	17.6*	20.9*
3. Teach study skills.	17.1	34.3	40.0	8.6	5.3*	50.0*	36.8*	7.9*	29.7**	45.1**	15.4**	9.9**
5. Teach vocabulary "word attack" skills.	17.1	45.7	17.1	20.0	7.9**	34.2**	26.3**	31.6**	38.5**	38.5**	12.1**	11.0**
7. Teach word recognition skills.	17.1	37.1	25.7	10.0	13.2	26.3	34.2	26.3	28.3*	39.1*	19.6*	13.0*
9. Teach listening skills.	25.7	54.3	11.4	8.6	27.0*	27.0*	29.7*	16.2*	37.4	39.6	17.6	5.5
10. Teach skills to improve efficiency in reading comprehension.	34.3	28.6	28.6	8.6	32.4	27.0	24.3	16.2	42.7*	38.2*	13.5*	5.5*
12. Use exercises to develop flexibility in students' reading rate.	22.9	25.7	22.9	28.6	10.8*	16.2*	27.0*	45.9*	13.7	33.5	30.3	22.5
15. Encourage students to increase speed and rate of comprehension in reading.	42.9	22.9	20.0	14.3	21.6**	27.0**	35.1**	16.2**	41.8**	38.5**	13.2**	6.6**

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

93

Table 40: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Employment of Procedures Related to the Reading Instruction Program

	7 Years or Less (N=35)				3 - 6 Years (N=38)				7 Years or More (N=92)			
	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
1. Teach reading.	11.4%	25.7	20.0	42.9	7.9*	18.4*	34.2*	39.5*	29.3**	30.4**	22.8**	17.4**
4. Give instruction in the use of the library.	17.1**	20.0**	34.3**	28.6**	25.6	41.0	23.1	10.3	28.4	40.9	14.8	15.9
8. Encourage teachers in other content areas to teach reading.	2.9	14.3	20.0	62.9	8.1	10.8	18.9	62.2	16.5**	15.3**	17.6**	40.7**

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Evaluation of Personal Preparation, and Personal

and School Success in Teaching Reading

Table 41 shows a relationship between teaching experience and confidence in one's preparation for teaching reading. Only 17.1 per cent of the teachers with two years experience or less felt adequately prepared, as against 23.7 per cent of the intermediate group, and 68.2 per cent of the teachers with seven or more years of experience.

In rating personal success, teachers were less clearly divided; nevertheless, it is apparent that, by great majorities, the teachers in these groups feel their efforts are at least somewhat successful. Teachers with three to six years of experience judged themselves most severely, with 28.1 per cent indicating they felt unsuccessful in teaching reading; among the most and least experienced groups, this rating comprised 9.2 per cent and 6.1 per cent, respectively.

The relative optimism expressed by the least experienced group about the success of their personal efforts extended, somewhat diminished, to their rating of the school's efforts: 57.5 per cent of these teachers felt the program in the school was at least adequate. The intermediate group's pessimism was also extended: only 37.8 per cent felt the school's efforts to teach reading succeeded adequately.

Table 41: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Evaluation of Personal Preparation for Teaching Reading

	2 Years or Less (N=35)	3 – 6 Years (N=38)	7 Years or More (N=92)
37. How well prepared do you feel you are to teach high school reading?			
Very well prepared	0.0**	0.0*	8.8
Quite well prepared	0.0**	5.3*	23.1
Adequately prepared	17.1**	18.4*	36.3
Poorly prepared	54.3**	50.0*	23.1
Very poorly prepared	28.3**	26.4*	8.8

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 4 degrees of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 4 degrees of freedom

Table 42: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Evaluation of Personal Success in Teaching Reading

	2 Years or Less (N=35)	3 – 6 Years (N=38)	7 Years or More (N=92)
38. In general, how successful are your efforts to teach reading?			
Very successful	0.0	0.0**	5.7*
Quite successful	30.3	15.6**	34.5*
Somewhat successful	63.3	56.3**	50.6*
Unsuccessful	6.1	28.1**	9.2*

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 43:

Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Evaluation of the School's Success in Teaching Reading

	2 Years or Less (N=35)					3 - 6 Years (N=38)					7 Years or More (N=92)				
	Very well	Quite well	Ade-quately	Poorly	Very poorly	Very well	Quite well	Ade-quately	Poorly	Very poorly	Very well	Quite well	Ade-quately	Poorly	Very poorly
39. In general, how well does your school succeed in teaching high school reading?	0.0*	15.1*	42.4*	23.7*	15.1*	0.0*	2.7*	35.1*	32.4*	29.7*	3.4	12.6	28.7	42.5	11.5

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 4 degrees of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 4 degrees of freedom

The Importance of Certain Elements to the Success

of the Reading Instruction Program

 In the supplied list of elements which these teachers were asked to rate (Table 44), 100.0 per cent of the least experienced teachers indicated additional personal preparation was very important to the success of the reading instruction program; 74.3 per cent felt it was essential. Among the intermediate and most experienced groups, the desire for additional personal preparation was also evident, by 79.0 and 81.4 per cent majorities, respectively. These proportions would be expected on the basis of the self-evaluations of preparation, discussed above (p. 95, above).

 Access to professional publications on teaching reading was also rated very important by a majority of the teachers in all three groups; the 55.3 per cent majority among teachers with three to six years of experience was the least unanimous. The least and most experienced groups accepted this method of increasing their expertise by proportions of 71.4 and 80.2 per cent, respectively.

 A slight difference obtained in the responses given in reply to the free-response question (Table 45), where 6.4 per cent of the teachers with two years of teaching experience or less mentioned increased personal preparation as the most important factor in the success or failure of a high school reading instruction program, compared with 17.1 per cent of the other two combined groups. Perhaps the least experienced teachers felt they had made their point by readily admitting a lack of preparation on the two previous questions which dealt with the issue (see Tables 41 and 44). The two elements which were firmly established as crucial by all groups were the interest and motivation of the students, and time.

Table 44: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

The Importance of Certain Elements to the Success of
the Reading Instruction Program

	2 Years or Less (N=35)				3 - 6 Years (N=38)				7 Years or More (N=92)			
	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Unimportant	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Unimportant	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Unimportant
16. Additional personal preparation for teaching reading.	74.3*	25.7*	0.0*	0.0*	47.4	31.6	18.4	2.6	45.1	36.3	16.5	2.2
23. Personal access to professional publications on teaching high school reading.	25.7	45.7	28.6	0.0	21.1**	34.2**	42.1**	2.6**	28.6	51.6	17.6	2.2

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 45: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Most Important Factors in the Reading Instruction Program,
as Reported by Teachers in Reply to a Free-Response Question:
"In your opinion, what is the most important factor
in the success or failure of a high school
reading instruction program?"

	2 Years or Less (N=35)	3 - 6 Years (N=38)	7 Years or More (N=92)
Interest and motivation of students.	25.8%*	27.3	25.0
Time for organizing and operating the program.	22.5*	33.3	16.6
A qualified reading teacher in the school.	9.6*	12.1	11.9
Cooperation of all teachers of all subjects.	9.6*	9.1	9.5
Systematic approach to diagnostic testing within the school.	9.6*	0.0	5.9
Preparation of teachers, including personal preparation.	6.4*	9.1	20.2
Materials.	6.4*	6.1	5.9
Administrative help and cooperation, especially in scheduling classes, limiting class size, and providing materials.	6.4*	3.3	3.6
A knowledgeable English department, committed to teaching reading.	3.2*	0.0	1.2

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 8 degrees of freedom

Summary

The data presented here indicate a tentative connection between length of teaching experience and: graduate courses in teaching reading; increased involvement in teaching specific reading skills, and employing procedures related to the reading instruction program; and self-evaluation of adequate preparation for teaching reading. A number of other factors besides experience may account for this connection, however; no causal relationship should be inferred. Here again, respondents attributed more success to their own than to the school's efforts to teach reading. Interest and motivation of students, and time were mentioned most frequently as crucial to the success of the program by all groups; personal preparation was regarded as next most important by teachers with three or more years of experience, while the presence of a qualified reading teacher in the school was indicated as third most important by teachers with two years of experience or less.

SUB-GROUP 4:

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS ACCORDING TO

UNDERGRADUATE CONCENTRATION IN ENGLISH

The Sample

Teachers with an undergraduate major in English held a decided
advantage over their colleagues on only one variable among the personal
data (Table 46): nearly half (45.2 per cent) had had a course in reading
instruction as undergraduates, as compared with 30.3 per cent of the
teachers with a minor in English, and 20.5 per cent of the teachers with
neither a major nor a minor in English. Though the group with the least
concentration in English (those with neither a major nor a minor) differed
significantly from the other two groups in reporting the lowest proportion
of members with undergraduate courses in teaching reading, their proportion
is commendably high in comparison with the 11.2 per cent of the teachers
in the select McGuire sample who reported having such courses (see Table
1, p. 28, above). Each of these groups is thus relatively well prepared
for giving instruction in reading (at least, as well prepared as one
undergraduate course can make them); among themselves, preparation in the
form of undergraduate training in reading appears to be a function of
undergraduate concentration in English.

The school data (Table 47) show that more than half of the teachers
with neither a major nor a minor in English taught in schools with grades
one through twelve or seven through twelve (61.5 per cent), with enrollments
of less than 500 (71.8 per cent), located in rural or small town communities
(84.6 per cent). Those with a major in English had the lowest proportion
in schools with enrollments of less than 200 (7.5 per cent), and the most

Table 46:   Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

Analysis of Personal Data

	Undergraduate Major in English (N=93)	Undergraduate Minor in English (N=33)	Neither (N=39)	Degrees of Freedom
One or more undergraduate courses in teaching reading.	45.2%**	30.3	20.5**	1

**Significant beyond the .01 level

Table 47:   Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

Analysis of School Data

	Undergraduate Major in English (N=93)	Undergraduate Minor in English (N=33)	Neither (N=39)	Degrees of Freedom
GRADES INCLUDED IN THE SCHOOL				3
1 - 12	26.9%	27.3	43.6*	
7 - 12	15.1	12.1	17.9*	
9 - 12	8.6	6.1	15.4*	
10 - 12	49.5	54.5	23.1*	
ENROLLMENT OF THE SCHOOL				3
under 200	7.5*	12.1	12.8**	
200 - 499	37.6*	27.3	59.0**	
500 - 999	24.7*	39.4	23.1**	
1000 - 1999	30.1*	21.1	5.1**	
LOCATION OF THE SCHOOL				3
rural	12.9**	6.1	20.5**	
small town	35.5**	63.6	64.1**	
large town	20.4**	12.1	5.1**	
city	31.2**	18.2	10.3**	

*Significant beyond the .05 level
**Significant beyond the .01 level

in schools of 1000 students or more (30.1 per cent); they also had the lowest proportion in rural or small town schools (48.4 per cent), and the highest proportion in large town and city schools (20.4 and 31.2 per cent, respectively). The probable explanation for this is that in rural schools, with more grades in the same building, teachers are more likely to be teaching outside their specialty -- teaching English with a major in another discipline. For whatever reason, the sample data show a relation between greater undergraduate concentration in English, and higher grade levels in the school, higher enrollment, and location in a large town or city.

Acceptance of Responsibility for Reading Instruction

Two differences were observed in acceptance of responsibility for reading instruction; both differences are between teachers with a major in English and the other two combined groups (Table 48).

On the first item, 80.6 per cent of the teachers with the greatest undergraduate concentration in English felt proof of need for a reading instruction program in a particular school was of some importance; nearly one-third (30.1 per cent) felt it was essential. Teachers with a minor, and those with neither a major nor a minor in English, reported nearly identical judgments: 63.6 and 64.9 per cent, respectively, felt proof was at least somewhat important.

On the second item, more than half (55.0 per cent) of the teachers with a major in English agreed that reading instruction was primarily the responsibility of the English department. Teachers with a minor in English expressed the next most agreement, 40.6 per cent; the least assent came from teachers with the least undergraduate concentration in English.

Table 48: Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

General Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	Undergraduate Major in English (N=93)				Undergraduate Minor in English (N=33)				Neither (N=39)			
	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
25. Proof that the need for reading instruction exists in a particular school, before considering such a program.	30.1%**	25.8**	24.7**	19.4**	18.2	30.3	15.1	36.4	21.7	35.1	8.1	35.1

**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 49: Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

Specific Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	Undergraduate Major in English (N=93)				Undergraduate Minor in English (N=33)				Neither (N=39)			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
35. Reading instruction is primarily the responsibility of the English department.	8.8%*	46.2*	31.9*	13.1*	0.0	40.6	40.6	18.8	2.6	31.6	55.3	10.5

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Summary

Probably the most notable finding of this sub-group is that teachers with an undergraduate major or minor in English do not differ in their attitudes or practices regarding reading instruction, from teachers with little or no undergraduate work in English. The differences which were noted are far too few to support any other generalization for this sub-group.

THE SCHOOL DATA SHEETS

The School Data Sheet was included in the study to determine the format of reading instruction in the school, the characteristics of the reading teacher's appointment, and the scope of the reading policy, if any. Table 50 presents the findings for the sample as a whole.

A close examination of the data show that four schools offered both Reading 10 and some other form of reading instruction; thus the total number of schools in the present sample which report some form of reading instruction is 35, or 63.6 per cent of the total.

In describing the reading teacher, several respondents checked both 4a and 4d. This may indicate that these respondents interpreted item 4d as reading "reasons in addition to interest or training," or it may show that training and interest developed after appointment as reading teacher.

Of the thirteen schools which have a reading policy, the majority appear to be concerned with corrective instruction (5b and 5e), and with students who elect a reading option (5d). Only one school reported an all-school program (5a), while five schools reported remedial help was available for students with severe reading handicaps (5c).

Table 50:   The School Data Sheet

Response of the Sample as a Whole

	Number	Percentage (n=55)
2. Offered Reading 10 in either of the past 2 years.	32	58.2
3. Offered other forms of reading instruction besides Reading 10.	7	12.7
4. Reading Teacher in the school.	17	30.9
The following obtain for the Reading Teacher in the 30.9% of the schools in the present sample which have such a teacher:		
a. Has training and/or interest in high school reading instruction	13	76.5
b. Has a permanent office, or other area in the school for testing, conferences, etc.	1	5.9
c. Has a budget allocation, or is consulted on financial matters related to reading instruction	4	23.5
d. Was appointed Reading Teacher for reasons other than interest or training	9	52.9
5. Has an explicit policy regarding reading instruction at the high school level.	13	23.6
The following groups are affected by the reading policy, in the 23.6% of the schools in this sample which have such a policy:		
a. All students	1	7.7
b. Students with some reading problems	9	69.2
c. Students with severe reading disabilities	5	38.5
d. Students who express a desire to improve their reading	7	53.8
e. Students who are assigned to reading improvement classes	7	53.8
f. Other	0	0.0

An examination of responses was made for schools with, and schools without a reading teacher. Table 51 shows that schools with a reading teacher differed significantly from schools without such a teacher in the proportion which offered Reading 10, other forms of reading instruction, or both of these; and in the number which reported having a reading policy. Of the thirteen schools which had a reading policy, eight had a reading teacher and five did not. Differences in the programs carried on in schools with and without a reading teacher, as reflected in the description of the reading policy, show a somewhat wider range of possibilities being met by schools with a reading teacher, though the numbers are far too small to provide a basis for confident generalization.

Summary

The School Data Sheets indicate that Reading 10 was offered by more than half of the schools in the study, and that this course was easily the most popular format for reading instruction in these high schools. Almost one-third of these schools reported having a reading teacher: of these, three-quarters had special training and/or interest in high school reading, though as many as half may have been appointed for other reasons; about one-quarter had financial resources at their disposal in their capacity as reading teacher, but only one school reported supplying office space to the reading teacher.

Less than one-quarter of the schools had a reading policy. Where there was such a policy, it appeared oriented toward corrective instruction, and the supplying of options to students (and teachers) who detected the need or desire for improvement. Only one school had a policy affecting all students, while five schools had remediation for retarded readers.

Table 51:   The School Data Sheet

Responses of Schools With a Reading Teacher
Compared with Schools Without a Reading Teacher

	Schools With a Reading Teacher (n=17)		Schools Without a Reading Teacher (n=38)	
	Number - Percent		Number - Percent	
*Offered Reading 10 in either of the past two years.	14	82.4	18	47.4
**Offered other forms of reading instruction besides Reading 10.	4	23.6	3	7.9
**Offered both Reading 10 and other forms of reading instruction.	3	17.6	1	2.6
**Has an explicit policy regarding reading instruction at the high school level.	8	47.0	5	13.2
Affected by the policy:[1]				
a. All students	1		0	
b. Students with some reading problems	4		4	
c. Students with severe reading disabilities	2		3	
d. Students who express a desire to improve their reading	5		2	
e. Students who are assigned to reading improvement classes	6		1	

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 1 degree of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 1 degree of freedom

[1]Chi-Square values were not computed for the following five items because of the low frequencies involved.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

The study was prompted by four questions: (1) To what extent do
teachers of English in Alberta accept in principle the responsibility to
teach reading as part of the English program? (2) To what extent do
teachers of English attempt to teach certain reading skills, and employ
certain procedures related to the reading instruction program? (3) How
do teachers of English evaluate their preparation, and their own and their
schools' efforts to teach reading? (4) What importance do these teachers
attach to certain selected elements of a reading instruction program? On
the basis of the findings reported in the previous chapter, the following
conclusions -- tentative answers to these questions -- are offered.

Acceptance of Responsibility for Reading Instruction

The sample as a whole and all sub-groups supported the principle
of high school reading instruction, the strongest favorable opinions
being held by reading teachers (Sub-group 1), and by teachers who had
had courses in teaching reading (Sub-group 2). These teachers particularly
stressed the need for an all-staff program, and they were most likely
to wish the program to include all students at all levels. It is notable
that there were no significant differences in comparisons of teachers
based on undergraduate concentration in English (Sub-group 4); those

the related procedures, followed closely by teachers with seven or more years of experience. (This last group had the greatest proportion of members with reading courses at the graduate and undergraduate levels; see Sub-group 3.) No significant differences obtained in this section for differences in undergraduate concentration in English; indeed, as in acceptance of responsibility for reading instruction, the group most favored by the non-significant differences which occurred was those with neither a major nor minor in English.

Evaluation of Personal Preparation, and Personal and
School Success in Teaching Reading

For the sample as a whole, respondents indicated themselves poorly prepared to teach reading by a 53 per cent majority, and rated their own and their school's efforts as unsuccessful. In the sub-groups, this opinion of the school's efforts remained constant, but teachers with seven or more years of experience, teachers with reading courses, and reading teachers felt at least adequately prepared to teach reading by majorities of 68, 66, and 60 per cent, respectively. The lowest proportion of teachers who felt adequately prepared to teach high school reading were found among the two groups with less than seven years of teaching experience (three to six years, 23.7 per cent; two years or less, 17.1 per cent), and among teachers without reading courses (35.0 per cent). The two factors which combined to produce the most extensive involvement in reading instruction and the most confidence in preparation for and success in that instruction, were undergraduate and graduate courses in reading instruction, and seven or more years of experience. The reading teachers seemed next most involved and self-assured. Least

so were teachers with a major or minor in English, but without special

courses in teaching reading.

The Importance of Various Factors to the Success
of the Reading Instruction Program

Factors consistently cited by all groups as most important to

the success of the reading instruction program were: student interest

and motivation; preparation of teachers, including personal preparation;

the presence of a qualified reading teacher in the school; time; and the

cooperation of all teachers. There is a clear appeal by these teachers

for information about teaching reading, and for the assistance of a

qualified reading teacher in structuring and guiding the program, and

for the appointment of a school reading teacher to take responsibility

for the program thereafter. For their part, the reading teachers appear

willing to give advice and assistance to other teachers, but they insist

that all teachers can and should be involved in the program, and that

corrective and developmental instruction can be carried on in regular

classes, by classroom teachers. Debate on this point is moot, however;

for the sample as a whole, the real question is still whether systematic

reading instruction of any kind will be attempted in the school, or not.

School Reading Program, as Portrayed by the School Data Sheets

The four major findings of the School Data Sheets were: (1) 58 per

cent of these schools offered Reading 10; (2) 13 per cent offered other

forms of reading instruction besides Reading 10 (in total, 64 per cent

had some form of reading instruction); (3) reading teachers were found

in 31 per cent of the schools; and (4) 24 per cent of the schools had a

reading policy.

The popularity of the Reading 10 course as the format of instruction indicates that developmental reading instruction (for students who are not "educational casualties" -- p. 5, above) is being left to classroom teachers, within regular classes. The relative scarcity of reading teachers in these schools constitutes neglect of one of the sources of aid for classroom teachers who lack preparation, and who appear eager for leadership and direction from a qualified teacher. Finally, the low proportion of schools which have an explicit reading policy is possibly the best indicator of the general lack of concrete involvement in high school reading instruction in these schools, despite the apparent willingness of teachers to attempt it.

Discussion

Early in this report, McGuire was quoted:

. . . however bright or dark the picture indicated by
the findings of this study, it is at least probable that
a study based on a sample more completely representative
of public high school English teachers would not present
a brighter picture. (p. 11, above)

The present study, which is based on a more representative sample, fails to support the supposition; instead, it appears that, to the extent that this sample is representative, high school English teachers in Alberta are aware of the need for reading instruction at the high school level, are fairly well prepared academically to undertake it, and, in their own eyes, are at least somewhat successful in their efforts. In this respect, the picture is bright.

In terms of actual practice, however, the fifty-five schools from which data were gathered reported little cause for joy: great reliance on Reading 10 (which, it will be recalled, is intended to move candidates

for corrective reading instruction -- the "educational casualties" --
into the developmental stream) as the major format for reading instruction
was evident; less than one-third of the schools had an appointed reading
teacher, despite the finding that 79.2 per cent of the sample rated the
presence on staff of a qualified reading teacher "very important" (45.1
per cent, "essential") to the program, and 21.8 per cent of the respondents
listed such a teacher as "the most important factor" in reply to the
free response question; and less than one-quarter of the schools had a
reading policy, and only one of the schools which had a policy attempted
a reading program for all students.

The most hopeful findings of the study, then, are not those
regarding the teaching of reading, or the scope of the program; rather,
the study is encouraging because it shows an awareness among these teachers
of the need for high school reading instruction, and a universal dis-
satisfaction with current efforts. In addition, there is an indication
here of what is needed to improve the involvement of teachers with reading,
besides a major or minor in English: academic courses, at the under-
graduate or graduate level, in teaching reading.

The major problem with which all groups felt confronted is that of
student motivation and interest. At least part of this problem may be
due to the narrow scope of reading programs in these schools. As nearly
all are concerned with students who are reading below grade level, reading
instruction may be regarded by these students as a punishment -- what
they have to take for not reading well. The program, emphasizing
remediation, carries with it its own motivation problems. If the concept
of high school reading instruction were widely accepted, on the other
hand, and if most students were involved in some reading instruction
program, whether corrective or developmental, the problem might be alleviated.

Finally, as to what may be done for the present, while reading instruction is still a relatively new concern of the high school, these teachers may be regarded as their best advisors: requests for resources to increase personal preparation, the presence in the school of a qualified reading teacher, and time to plan and execute the program, may be regarded as crucial to the development of present efforts to teach secondary reading.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations Based on the Findings

(1) That all teachers of all subjects, and particularly English teachers, have access to information about methods and aims of reading instruction, through print materials (especially The Secondary School Reading Handbook and the Reading 10 course outline), in-service programs and work shops, and, especially, through contact with qualified reading teachers.

(2) That special efforts be made by school boards and schools to release teachers for course work and/or in-service training on high school reading instruction, or that these agencies make special efforts to recruit teachers who present interest and/or preparation for reading instruction as part of their credentials.

(3) That Faculties of Education in Alberta expand existing programs to include courses in reading instruction for all prospective English teachers, and that compulsory methods courses for all prospective teachers devote some time to the principles of high school reading instruction which may be particularly relevant to specific disciplines.

(4) That schools examine the reading abilities of students, and

make provision for reading instruction for all students at all levels;
and that provision for instruction be reflected in an official school
reading policy, in which all teachers participate.

(5) That every senior high school designate at least one teacher
on staff as the school's reading teacher, and that a part of the reading
teacher's duties be to provide assistance and information to teachers
engaged in classroom reading instruction programs.

Recommendations for Further Study

The present study examined quantitatively the attitudes and self-
evaluations of high school English teachers regarding reading instruction.
A valuable complementary study might involve observations of high school
classrooms and reading instruction, leading to qualitative judgments about
the efficacy of various programs.

It would also be useful to know to what extent the views expressed
by English teachers in this study are shared by other groups, such as
administrators, teachers in other content areas besides English, teachers
of other grade levels (junior high school and elementary), and the
students themselves.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alm, R. S., "Teaching Reading Is Our Business," *English Journal*, 46:11-19; 1957.

Bliss, E. H., "A Study of Objectives and Procedures in the Teaching of Literature in Seventy Junior High School Classroom in Alberta." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1963.

Bond, G. L. and M. A. Tinker, *Reading Difficulties, Their Diagnosis and Correction*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Campbell, C. H. S., "A Survey of Leisure Reading in the Senior High Schools of Alberta." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1962.

Cawelti, G. L., "Reading Improvement Programs in Selected Midwestern High Schools," *The Reading Teacher*, 17:36-37; 1963. Cited by M. J. Early, "What Does Research in Reading Reveal About Successful Reading Programs?" *English Journal*, 58:534-547; 1969.

Department of Education, Province of Alberta, *Reading 10, Senior High School Curriculum Guide*, Edmonton, Alberta, 1970.

_____, *Secondary School Reading Handbook*, Edmonton, Alberta, 1969.

Dulin, K. L., "Preservice Training in Reading of the Secondary Level Classroom Teacher," 1971. (ERIC Documents, No. 053 876).

Early, M. J., "What Does Research in Reading Reveal About Successful Reading Programs?" *English Journal*, 58:534-547; 1969).

Harris, T. L., "Reading." In R. L. Ebel (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, (4th Edition), New York: Macmillan, 1969.

Hill, W., "Characteristics of Secondary Reading: 1940 - 1970," December, 1970. (ERIC Documents, No. 049 887).

McGuire, G. K., *The Teaching of Reading By English Teachers in Public High Schools: A National Survey*, Chicago: Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers, 1969.

Otto, W., "Junior and Senior High School Teachers' Attitudes Toward Teaching Reading in the Content Areas," December, 1968. (ERIC Documents, No. 026 266).

Simmons, J. S., "The Scope of the Reading Program for Secondary Schools," *The Reading Teacher*, 17:31-35; 1963.

Squire, J. R. and R. K. Applebee, High School English Instruction Today, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Summers, E. G., "Toward a Research Definition of Reading," August, 1970. (ERIC Documents, No. 047 902).

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS

Introduction

This questionnaire is concerned with practices and opinions of teachers of English in Alberta regarding reading instruction. The information requested in this questionnaire will help describe the current state of secondary reading instruction; the opinions expressed here will indicate teachers' views on the need for reading instruction, and their perceptions of the problems encountered in teaching reading at the high school level.

The questionnaire has two parts: Part 1 concerns procedures actually employed in the classroom; Part 2 asks your professional opinion of the place of reading instruction in the high school English program.

Please respond to each item in the questionnaire. You are not asked to place your name anywhere on this form; all responses will be treated as confidential. No specific information will be associated with any particular school, or with any individual.

Please Note: This study assumes that reading instruction is a separate activity from the teaching of literature or language. Please observe this distinction when responding to items in this questionnaire which refer to reading and reading instruction.

*　　*　　*　　*　　*　　*　　*　　*　　*

PERSONAL DATA

Sex _____   Degrees held _____   Undergraduate major _____

Undergraduate minor _____   Years teaching experience _____

Years teaching in this school _____

Number of courses toward uncompleted graduate degree _____

Number of undergraduate courses in teaching reading _____

Number of graduate courses in teaching reading _____

In either of the past two years, have you been a "Reading Teacher"? That is, have you taught a course specifically intended to improve student reading abilities by systematic instruction in reading skills? (Not including regular English courses which may have included reading instruction).

_____ Yes   _____ No

SCHOOL DATA

What grades are included in your school?

____ 1-12   ____ 7-12   ____ 9-12   ____ 10-12   ____ other (specify)

What is the enrollment of your school?

____ under 200   ____ 200-499   ____ 500-999   ____ 1000-1999   ____ over 2000

Where is your school located?

____ rural   ____ small town   ____ large town   ____ city (over 60,000)

I. Procedures: Please indicate your _actual_ _classroom_ _use_ of the following procedures by circling the appropriate number.

1 - I use this procedure _regularly_.
2 - I use this procedure _occasionally_.
3 - I _seldom_ use this procedure.
4 - I _never_ use this procedure.

1.	Teach reading.	1	2	3	4
2.	Test the reading ability of individual students.	1	2	3	4
3.	Teach study skills.	1	2	3	4
4.	Give instruction in the use of the library.	1	2	3	4
5.	Teach vocabulary "word attack" skills.	1	2	3	4
6.	Confer with the reading teacher.	1	2	3	4
7.	Teach word recognition skills.	1	2	3	4
8.	Encourage teachers in other content areas to teach reading.	1	2	3	4
9.	Teach listening skills.	1	2	3	4
10.	Teach skills to improve efficiency in reading comprehension.	1	2	3	4
11.	Recommend leisure reading books to individual students.	1	2	3	4
12.	Use exercises to develop flexibility in students' reading rate.	1	2	3	4
13.	Assess student out-of-school, nonassigned reading.	1	2	3	4
14.	Group students according to reading ability for literature study.	1	2	3	4
15.	Encourage students to increase speed and rate of comprehension in reading.	1	2	3	4

II. Opinions: Rate the importance of the following elements as you believe they would contribute to a _successful_ high school reading program.

1 - Essential
2 - Very Important
3 - Somewhat Important
4 - Unimportant

16.	Additional personal preparation for teaching reading.	1	2	3	4
17.	Interest of students in improving their reading.	1	2	3	4
18.	Time in the school timetable.	1	2	3	4
19.	Special teaching materials or devices.	1	2	3	4
20.	Leadership in organizing and administering the program.	1	2	3	4
21.	Interest and cooperation of _all_ teachers on staff.	1	2	3	4
22.	Presence on staff of a specially qualified reading teacher.	1	2	3	4
23.	Personal access to professional publications on teaching high school reading.	1	2	3	4
24.	In-service programs on high school reading instruction.	1	2	3	4
25.	Proof that the need for reading instruction exists in a particular high school, before considering such a program.	1	2	3	4

Indicate your opinion of each of the following
statements by circling the appropriate abbreviation.

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
D - Disagree
SD - Strongly Disagree

26. Each student should have some specific reading instruction,
regardless of his present reading abilities.   SA   A   D   SD

27. If elementary reading instruction is successful, little
further instruction should be necessary in high school.   SA   A   D   SD

28. The appointment of a reading teacher and the structuring of
special reading classes relieves teachers of the
responsibility to teach reading.   SA   A   D   SD

29. Each student requires some reading instruction throughout his
high school career.   SA   A   D   SD

30. Classroom teachers do not have the time to attempt remedial
or corrective reading instruction; the reading teacher should
assume responsibility for these "problem readers".   SA   A   D   SD

31. During their undergraduate training, all prospective secondary
English teachers should be required to take a course in high
school reading instruction.   SA   A   D   SD

32. High school English teachers teach reading, whether they know
it or not, when they teach literature.   SA   A   D   SD

33. Each teacher should teach the reading skills necessary to his
own subject area.   SA   A   D   SD

34. It is possible to establish an "all-school" reading program,
involving every teacher of every subject.   SA   A   D   SD

35. Reading instruction is primarily the responsibility of the
English department.   SA   A   D   SD

Check your response to the following questions.

36. How important is the teaching of reading at the high school level?

____ very important ____ quite important ____ somewhat important ____ unimportant

37. How well prepared do you feel you are to teach high school reading?

____ very well prepared ____ quite well prepared ____ adequately prepared

____ poorly prepared ____ very poorly prepared

38. In general, how successful are your efforts to teach reading?

____ very successful ____ quite successful ____ somewhat successful ____ unsuccessful

39. In general, how well does your school succeed in teaching high school reading?

____ very well ____ quite well ____ adequately ____ poorly ____ very poorly

40. In your opinion, what is the most important factor in the success or failure of
a high school reading instruction program?

APPENDIX B
(This is the "pink sheet" mentioned in the Letter to the Principal)

SCHOOL DATA

To the teacher who completes this sheet: These questions are intended to supply information about the English department and the school as a whole; therefore, only one teacher in each school is asked to complete this form. Please return this sheet along with your completed questionnaire.

1. How many teachers of high school English (grades 10 - 12) are there in your school? _____

2. In either of the past two school years, has your school offered the Reading 10 course? (circle)   Yes   No

3. In either of the past two school years, has your school offered reading instruction in other forms besides Reading 10; for example, in a depth elective? (circle)   Yes   No

4. Does your school have a "Reading Teacher"? (circle)   Yes   No

   a. If so, check any of the following which apply to the Reading Teacher:

   ____ has training and/or interest   ____ has a budget allocation, or is
        in high school reading   consulted on financial matters
        instruction   related to reading instruction

   ____ has a permanent office, or other   ____ was appointed Reading Teacher for
        area in the school for testing,   reasons other than interest or
        conferences, etc.   training

5. Does your school have an explicit policy regarding reading instruction at the high school level (grades 10 - 12)?   Yes   No

   a. If so, who is affected by the policy? (check as many as appropriate)

      ____ all students

      ____ students with some reading problems

      ____ students with severe reading disabilities

      ____ students who express a desire to improve their reading

      ____ students who are assigned to reading improvement classes

      ____ other (please explain briefly)

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO THE PRINCIPAL

10548 - 78 Ave. #303
Edmonton, Alberta

March 10, 1972

Mr. (Name), Principal
(Name) High School

Dear Mr. (Name):

    The enclosed questionnaires are part of a survey of
secondary reading instruction which I am undertaking as part
of my M.Ed. program at the University of Alberta. Would
you help me with this study by asking each teacher of English
at the grade 10, 11, or 12 level to complete a questionnaire,
and return it in the pre-addressed envelope? Also, would you
ask one teacher to complete the pink sheet, and return it with
his questionnaire?

    I am making this request of you and your staff in the
belief that the study will supply some needed information about
reading instruction at the high school level. If the study is
to be complete, the views of the English teachers on your
staff are essential.

Thank you for your kind help in this project.

Sincerely,

/s/

Patrick J. Fahy

APPENDIX D

NOTE ATTACHED TO THE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Teacher,

Sixty-seven schools in Alberta have been selected at random
to receive this questionnaire. Each teacher of grade 10, 11, or 12
English is being asked to complete a copy and return it to me.
This means there are about 350 teachers involved in the study, and
the views of each one are vital.

Will you take the time to complete this form (it takes about
ten minutes), and return it to me in the attached envelope?

Thank you for your time; I appreciate your kind help in this
project.

/s/

Pat Fahy

APPENDIX E

The following are some selected responses to free-response question number 40: "In your opinion, what is the most important factor in the success or failure of a high school reading instruction program?"

Motivating the student to read for himself. The only way to adequate reading skill is to read accurately and develop the largest mileage possible. Practice makes perfect. So many students read so little on their own. By far the best students are those who read constantly on their own. Not only do their mechanical reading skills develop, but their imaginative, descriptive and interpretive skills also.
There is no easy, instant or miraculous way to improve reading ability. The only way is to get the student to read accurately as much material as possible. The only variable should be the degree of complexity of the material offered.

Recognition by the administration in the school that students need reading instruction; that the 60% who are non-matric. may be very handicapped by their reading level; that even matriculating students often need reading instruction; and that the school's only essential function, in my view, is the formation of literate graduates, and to this end, all teachers should be working, yes, even to dropping, if necessary, the 20 or more extracurricular activities that are the unacknowledged but quite apparent raison d'etre for a disturbing number of high schools.

From our perspective in this particular school it is the time available, i.e., prep for such non-core subjects. We are so pressed for time in and out of class that we are unable to do anything about our flagrantly poor reading system. Teacher preparedness for teaching would be another factor on the whole.

Organizing the program to fit into timetable such that most, if not all, students could have access to the program.

Success would be more likely to occur if: 1) there were a well-trained reading specialist; 2) the specialist had facilities to offer a well structured program including all subject areas.

It is difficult to select a single factor.
Individualized instruction to permit a student's progress at his own rate after an expert diagnosis of his particular reading difficulties will certainly influence the success of a program.

That it is not done in a specialized situation at all times -- and workbook programs are avoided. If a reading skill program is subtly approached in all disciplines -- avoiding the high decibel harangue which only confirms a student's fears that he or she is suffering from the horrors of illiteracy -- a student will be more inclined to engage in "therapy". Further, a reading program must be accompanied with a speech therapy program so as to develop the oral and aural abilities.

First students should be highly motivated as they should be prepared to go back to the very elementary level in order to grasp concepts they were never taught or missed somewhere. Then they must be prepared to sacrifice a lot of time. They have to catch up on all the stages they missed in the past years. Reading can only be successful with young adults if they have individualized help. Classroom teaching has never been proved successful with all gimmicks, kits, etc.

The most important factor in any program of instruction is the teacher. I am trying to increase the reading speed of students with speed reading exercises. Vocabulary building is a must for high school students.

Most students refuse to accept the fact that they could use some help in reading skills; and most teachers on staff feel that reading is the responsibility of the English department and that all they should do is complain that the students don't know how to read.

As a rule, senior matriculation students are good readers as far as I have observed. Diploma students are weak not only in reading but in other subjects which demand dealing with abstract ideas. Few teachers show much concern over reading weaknesses in this group (so it seems).

Student has to be motivated. Reading of books should be encouraged: time given for it, example shown, books reviewed. Genuine interest and enthusiasm on teacher's part is essential. Low level, high interest books, not dry, uninteresting books or materials with questions.

Neither myself nor our school actually teaches reading per se in high school, although we do attempt to help students when the problem occurs. Many of our diploma students can't improve their typing speeds because they can't read any faster.

Table 52:   Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

Analysis of Personal Data

	Undergraduate Major in English (n=93)	Undergraduate Minor in English (n=33)	Neither (n=39)
DEGREES HELD			
No degree	6.5%	9.1	12.8
B.A.	12.9	9.1	15.4
B.Ed.	45.2	36.4	51.3
B.A. and B.Ed.	21.5	30.3	15.4
M.A. or M.Ed.	14.0	15.2	5.1
YEARS TEACHING IN THIS SCHOOL			
2 years or less	54.7	51.5	48.7
3 years or more	45.3	48.5	51.3
ONE OR MORE COURSES TOWARD AN UNCOMPLETED GRADUATE DEGREE	30.1	42.4	38.5
** ONE OR MORE UNDERGRADUATE COURSES IN TEACHING READING	45.2	30.3	20.5
ONE OR MORE GRADUATE COURSES IN TEACHING READING	6.5	12.1	7.7
HAD BEEN A READING TEACHER IN EITHER OF THE PAST TWO YEARS	20.4	27.3	20.5

**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 1 degree of freedom[a]

[a]The Chi-Square levels reported for the tables in this Appendix are for differences among the three groups; for significant differences which occurred between groups, see Sub-groups 3 and 4. (See also Chapter III for a description of the analytic procedure employed.)

Table 53: Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

Analysis of School Data

	Undergraduate Major in English	Undergraduate Minor in English	Neither
GRADES INCLUDED IN THE SCHOOL			
1 - 12	26.9%	27.3	43.6
7 - 12	15.1	12.1	17.9
9 - 12	8.6	6.1	15.4
10 - 12	49.5	54.5	23.1
*ENROLLMENT OF THE SCHOOL			
under 200	7.5	12.1	12.8
200 - 499	37.6	27.3	59.0
500 - 999	24.7	39.4	23.1
1000 - 1999	30.1	21.1	5.1
**LOCATION OF THE SCHOOL			
rural	12.9	6.1	20.5
small town	35.5	63.6	64.1
large town	20.4	12.1	5.1
city	31.2	18.2	10.3

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 54: Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

General Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	Undergraduate Major in English (n=93)				Undergraduate Minor in English (n=33)				Neither (n=39)			
	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
25. Proof that the need for reading instruction exists in a particular school, before considering such a program.	30.1%	25.8	24.7	19.4	18.2	30.3	15.2	36.4	21.6	35.1	8.1	35.1

Table 54: Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English
(continued)

	Undergraduate Major in English				Undergraduate Minor in English				Neither			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
26. Every student should have some specific reading instruction regardless of his present reading abilities.	20.9%	49.5	20.9	8.8	25.0	46.9	21.9	6.2	28.9	47.4	21.1	2.6
27. If elementary reading instruction is successful, little further instruction should be necessary in high school.	9.6	24.5	47.9	18.1	3.1	25.0	50.0	21.9	7.7	41.0	35.9	15.4
29. Each student requires some reading instruction throughout his high school career.	17.6	67.0	12.1	3.3	32.3	45.2	19.4	3.2	20.5	61.5	15.4	2.6
31. During their undergraduate training, all prospective secondary English teachers should be required to take a course in high school reading instruction.	40.7	50.5	6.6	2.2	40.6	50.0	9.4	0.0	25.6	59.0	15.4	0.0

Table 55:   Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

Specific Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	Undergraduate Major in English				Undergraduate Minor in English				Neither			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28. The appointment of a reading teacher and the structuring of special reading classes relieves teachers of the responsibility to teach reading.	2.2%	13.2	50.5	34.1	6.5	6.5	41.9	45.2	2.6	15.4	59.0	23.1
30. Classroom teachers do not have the time to attempt remedial or corrective reading instruction; the reading teachers should assume responsibility for these "problem readers".	23.9	56.5	16.3	3.3	28.1	37.5	28.1	6.2	21.1	55.3	21.1	2.6
32. High school English teachers teach reading, whether they know it or not, when they teach literature.	30.8	57.1	9.9	2.2	31.3	56.3	9.4	3.1	23.7	57.9	15.8	2.6
33. Each teacher should teach the reading skills necessary to his own subject area.	19.6	62.0	16.3	2.2	31.1	59.4	9.4	0.0	15.8	63.2	18.4	2.6
34. It is possible to establish an "all-school" reading program, involving every teacher of every subject.	10.0	64.4	21.1	4.4	12.9	48.4	38.7	0.0	10.3	66.7	15.4	7.7
35. Reading instruction is primarily the responsibility of the English department.	8.8	46.2	31.9	13.2	0.0	40.6	40.6	18.8	2.6	31.6	55.3	10.5

Table 55:   Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English
(continued)

	Undergraduate Major in English				Undergraduate Minor in English				Neither			
	Very Important	Quite Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Very Important	Quite Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Very Important	Quite Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
36. How important is the teaching of reading at the high school level?	52.7%	35.5	10.8	1.1	56.3	28.1	9.4	6.2	43.6	35.9	20.5	0.0

Table 56: Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

Actual Classroom Teaching of Specific Reading Skills

	Undergraduate Major in English				Undergraduate Minor in English				Neither			
	Never	Seldom	Occasion-ally	Regularly	Never	Seldom	Occasion-ally	Regularly	Never	Seldom	Occasion-ally	Regularly
2. Test the reading ability of individual students.	29.3	22.8	30.4	17.4%	24.2	9.1	57.6	9.1	20.5	15.4	41.0	23.1
3. Teach study skills.	9.8	27.2	41.3	21.7	6.1	33.3	45.5	15.2	10.3	15.4	48.7	25.6
5. Teach vocabulary "word attack" skills.	16.3	19.6	39.1	25.0	21.2	9.1	33.3	36.4	17.9	15.4	43.6	23.1
7. Teach word recognition skills.	20.7	27.2	29.3	22.8	15.2	21.2	42.4	21.2	12.8	20.5	46.2	20.5
9. Teach listening skills.	7.6	18.5	39.1	34.8	9.1	24.2	36.4	30.3	10.3	15.4	46.2	28.2
10. Teach skills to improve efficiency in reading comprehension.	8.8	18.7	33.0	39.6	6.1	24.2	33.3	36.4	10.8	18.9	32.4	37.8
12. Use exercises to develop flexibility in students' reading rate.	31.1	24.4	33.3	11.1	30.3	36.4	15.2	18.2	23.7	28.9	26.3	21.1
15. Encourage students to increase speed and rate of comprehension in reading.	8.8	25.3	27.5	38.5	6.1	21.2	42.4	30.3	15.4	7.7	35.9	41.0

Table 57: Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

Employment of Procedures Related to the Reading Instruction Program

	Undergraduate Major in English				Undergraduate Minor in English				Neither			
	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
1. Teach reading.	18.3%	25.8	30.1	25.8	24.2	24.2	18.2	33.3	23.1	30.8	17.9	28.2
4. Give instruction in the use of the library.	30.3	38.9	15.6	15.6	18.2	42.4	30.3	9.1	21.1	23.7	26.3	28.9
6. Confer with the reading teacher.	6.7	12.4	15.7	65.2	9.1	15.2	24.2	51.5	8.8	17.6	11.8	61.8
8. Encourage teachers in other content areas to teach reading.	9.8	20.7	19.6	50.0	9.1	18.2	24.2	48.5	18.4	18.4	10.5	52.6
11. Recommend leisure reading books to individual students.	73.9	16.3	7.6	2.2	72.7	24.2	3.1	0.0	69.2	25.6	2.6	2.6
13. Assess student out-of-school, nonassigned reading.	20.7	19.6	28.3	31.5	12.1	24.2	39.4	24.2	13.2	26.3	28.9	31.6
14. Group students according to reading ability for literature study.	7.8	17.8	27.8	46.7	6.1	21.2	18.2	54.5	2.7	21.6	16.2	59.5

Table 58: Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

Evaluation of Personal Preparation for Teaching Reading

	Undergraduate Major in English					Undergraduate Minor in English					Neither				
	Very well prepared	Quite well prepared	Adequately prepared	Poorly prepared	Very poorly prepared	Very well prepared	Quite well prepared	Adequately prepared	Poorly prepared	Very poorly prepared	Very well prepared	Quite well prepared	Adequately prepared	Poorly prepared	Very poorly prepared
*37. How well prepared do you feel you are to teach high school reading?	5.3%	15.1	26.9	37.6	15.1		6.2	18.8	40.6	15.8		2.6	7.7	38.4	28.2	23.1

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 4 degrees of freedom

Table 59: Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

Evaluation of Personal Success in Teaching Reading

	Undergraduate Major in English				Undergraduate Minor in English				Neither			
	Very successful	Quite successful	Somewhat successful	Unsuccessful	Very successful	Quite successful	Somewhat successful	Unsuccessful	Very successful	Quite successful	Somewhat successful	Unsuccessful
38. In general, how successful are your efforts to teach reading?	3.5%	30.6	54.1	11.8	6.7	16.7	63.3	13.3	0.0	37.8	45.9	16.2

Table 60: Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

Evaluation of the School's Success in Teaching Reading

	Undergraduate Major in English					Undergraduate Minor in English					Neither				
	Very well	Quite well	Adequately	Poorly	Very poorly	Very well	Quite well	Adequately	Poorly	Very poorly	Very well	Quite well	Adequately	Poorly	Very poorly
39. In general, how well does your school succeed in teaching high school reading?	2.3%	14.8	28.4	33.0	21.5	3.2	3.2	32.3	45.2	16.1	0.0	7.9	47.4	36.8	7.9

Table 61: Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

The Importance of Certain Elements to the Success of the Reading Instruction Program

	Undergraduate Major in English				Undergraduate Minor in English				Neither			
	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
16. Additional personal preparation for teaching reading.	49.5%	34.4	12.9	3.2	57.6	24.2	18.2	0.0	53.8	35.9	10.3	0.0
*17. Interest of students in improving their reading.	63.4	29.0	7.5	0.0	57.6	30.3	12.1	0.0	59.0	38.5	2.5	0.0
18. Time in the school timetable.	42.4	35.9	21.7	0.0	33.3	39.4	18.2	9.1	39.5	36.8	23.7	0.0
19. Special teaching materials or devices.	41.3	32.6	20.7	5.4	30.3	39.4	21.2	9.1	21.1	47.4	31.6	0.0
20. Leadership in organizing and administering the program.	43.5	34.8	20.7	1.1	39.4	33.3	21.2	6.1	23.1	46.2	28.2	2.6
21. Interest and cooperation of all teachers on staff.	35.9	38.0	19.6	6.5	31.3	43.8	21.9	3.1	38.5	30.8	20.5	10.3
22. Presence on staff of a specially qualified reading teacher.	50.0	30.4	17.4	2.2	33.3	45.5	15.2	6.1	43.6	33.3	20.5	2.6
23. Personal access to professional publications on teaching high school reading.	23.8	42.6	31.7	2.0	27.3	39.4	30.3	3.0	25.6	51.3	23.1	0.0
24. In-service programs on high school reading instruction.	22.2	52.2	22.2	3.3	21.2	42.2	27.3	9.1	12.8	66.7	17.9	2.6

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 62: Responses of Teachers According to Undergraduate Concentration in English

Most Important Factors in the Reading Instruction Program, as Reported by Teachers in Reply to a Free-Response Question: "In your opinion, what is the most important factor in the success or failure of a high school reading instruction program?"**

	Undergraduate Major in English	Undergraduate Minor in English	Neither
Time for organizing and operating the program.	26.8%	7.4	20.0
Interest and motivation of students.	20.9	29.6	31.4
A qualified reading teacher in the school.	12.8	11.1	8.6
Preparation of teachers, including personal preparation.	12.8	22.2	14.3
Cooperation of all teachers of all subjects.	8.1	11.1	11.4
Materials.	8.1	0.0	5.7
Systematic approach to diagnostic testing within the school.	4.8	11.1	2.9
Administrative help and cooperation, especially in scheduling classes, limiting class size, and providing materials.	3.5	7.4	2.9
A knowledgeable English department, committed to teaching reading.	1.2	0.0	2.9

**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 8 degrees of freedom

Table 63:   Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Analysis of Personal Data

	2 Years or Less (n=35)	3 - 6 Years (n=38)	7 Years or More (n=92)	Degrees of Freedom
*DEGREES HELD				4
No degree	20.0%	10.5	3.3	
B.A.	17.1	13.2	10.9	
B.Ed.	45.7	50.0	42.4	
B.A. and B.Ed.	11.4	13.2	29.3	
M.A. or M.Ed.	5.7	13.2	14.1	
UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR IN ENGLISH	45.7	65.8	56.5	
UNDERGRADUATE MINOR IN ENGLISH	17.1	21.1	20.7	1
**YEARS TEACHING IN THIS SCHOOL				
2 years or less	100.0	39.5	23.9	
3 years or more	0.0	60.5	76.1	
ONE OR MORE COURSES TOWARD AN UNCOMPLETED GRADUATE DEGREE	40.0	26.3	35.9	1
**ONE OR MORE UNDERGRADUATE COURSES IN TEACHING READING	25.7	18.4	47.8	1
*ONE OR MORE GRADUATE COURSES IN TEACHING READING	0.0	5.3	12.0	
HAD BEEN A READING TEACHER IN EITHER OF THE PAST TWO YEARS	25.7	15.8	22.8	

*Significant beyond the .05 level
**Significant beyond the .01 level

Table 64:   Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Analysis of School Data

	2 Years or Less	3 - 6 Years	7 Years or More
**GRADES INCLUDED IN THE SCHOOL			
1 - 12	58.3%	23.7	22.8
7 - 12	11.1	21.1	15.2
9 - 12	0.0	2.6	16.3
10 - 12	30.6	52.6	45.7
***ENROLLMENT OF THE SCHOOL			
under 200	17.6	7.9	7.6
200 - 499	64.7	28.9	39.1
500 - 999	2.9	31.6	28.3
1000 - 1999	14.7	31.6	25.0
*LOCATION OF THE SCHOOL			
rural	20.0	10.5	12.0
small town	62.9	47.4	42.4
large town	2.9	7.9	22.8
city	14.3	34.2	22.8

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 65: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

General Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	2 Years or Less				3 - 6 Years				7 Years or More			
	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
25. Proof that the need for reading instruction exists in a particular school, before considering such a program.	14.3%	28.6	25.7	31.4	31.6	28.9	15.8	23.7	27.5	29.7	17.6	25.3

Table 65: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience
(continued)

	2 Years or Less				3 - 6 Years				7 Years or More			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
26. Every student should have some specific reading instruction regardless of his present reading abilities.	28.6%	45.7	20.0	5.7	10.8	48.6	29.7	10.8	27.3	50.0	17.0	5.7
*27. If elementary reading instruction is successful, little further instruction should be necessary in high school.	5.7	25.7	54.3	14.3	2.6	39.5	47.4	10.5	9.9	35.2	30.8	34.1
29. Each student requires some reading instruction throughout his high school career.	24.2	54.5	21.2	0.0	10.5	65.8	15.8	7.9	24.4	62.2	11.1	2.2
31. During their undergraduate training, all prospective secondary English teachers should be required to take a course in high school reading instruction.	34.3	60.0	5.7	0.0	42.1	39.5	13.2	5.3	36.0	55.1	9.0	0.0

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 66:   Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Specific Questions Regarding Responsibility for Reading Instruction

	2 Years or Less				3 - 6 Years				7 Years or More			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28. The appointment of a reading teacher and the structuring of special reading classes relieves teachers of the responsibility to teach reading.	2.9%	17.6	61.8	17.6	2.7	13.5	59.5	24.3	3.3	10.0	43.3	43.3
30. Classroom teachers do not have the time to attempt remedial or corrective reading instruction; the reading teacher should assume responsibility for these "problem readers".	25.7	51.4	22.9	0.0	28.9	55.3	13.2	2.6	21.3	51.7	21.4	5.6
32. High school English teachers teach reading, whether they know it or not, when they teach literature.	11.4	62.9	20.0	5.7	37.8	56.8	2.7	2.7	32.6	55.1	11.2	1.1
*33. Each teacher should teach the reading skills necessary to his own subject area.	14.3	48.6	34.3	2.9	23.7	65.8	7.9	2.6	22.5	65.2	11.2	1.1
34. It is possible to establish an "all-school" reading program, involving every teacher of every subject.	0.0	70.6	23.5	5.9	16.2	51.4	27.0	5.4	12.4	62.9	21.3	3.4
35. Reading instruction is primarily the responsibility of the English department.	2.9	42.9	48.6	5.7	8.3	47.2	38.9	5.6	5.6	38.9	35.6	20.0

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 66: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience
(continued)

	2 Years or Less				3 - 6 Years				7 Years or More			
	Very Important	Quite Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Very Important	Quite Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Very Important	Quite Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
36. How important is the teaching of reading at the high school level?	42.9%	40.0	17.1	0.0	44.7	36.8	18.4	0.0	57.1	30.8	8.8	3.3

Table 67: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Actual Classroom Teaching of Specific Reading Skills

	2 Years of Less				3 - 6 Years				7 Years or More			
	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
2. Test the reading ability of individual students.	13.9%	33.3	16.7	36.1	2.6	47.4	21.1	28.9	24.2	37.4	17.6	20.9
**3. Teach study skills.	17.1	34.3	40.0	8.6	5.3	50.0	36.8	7.9	29.7	45.1	15.4	9.9
**5. Teach vocabulary "word attack" skills.	17.1	45.7	17.1	20.0	7.9	34.2	26.3	31.6	38.5	38.5	12.1	11.0
7. Teach word recognition skills.	17.1	37.1	25.7	10.0	13.2	26.3	34.2	26.3	28.3	39.1	19.6	13.0
9. Teach listening skills.	25.7	54.3	11.4	8.6	27.0	27.0	29.7	16.2	37.4	39.6	17.6	5.5
10. Teach skills to improve efficiency in reading comprehension.	34.3	28.6	28.6	8.6	32.4	27.0	24.3	16.2	42.7	38.2	13.5	5.6
12. Use exercises to develop flexibility in students' reading rate.	22.9	25.7	22.9	28.6	10.8	16.2	27.0	45.9	13.7	33.5	30.3	22.5
*15. Encourage students to increase speed and rate of comprehension in reading.	42.9	22.9	20.0	14.3	21.6	27.0	35.1	16.2	41.8	38.5	13.2	6.6

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

Table 68: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Employment of Procedures Related to the Reading Instruction Program

	2 Years or Less				3 - 6 Years				7 Years or More			
	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never	Regularly	Occasionally	Seldom	Never
**1. Teach reading.	11.4%	25.7	20.0	42.9	7.9	18.4	34.2	39.5	29.3	30.4	22.8	17.4
*4. Give instruction in the use of the library.	17.1	20.0	34.3	28.6	25.6	41.0	23.1	10.3	28.4	40.9	14.8	15.9
6. Confer with the reading teacher.	5.9	20.6	11.8	61.8	2.8	13.9	19.4	63.9	10.5	11.6	17.4	60.5
8. Encourage teachers in other content areas to teach reading.	2.9	14.3	20.0	62.9	8.1	10.8	18.9	62.2	16.5	15.3	17.6	40.7
11. Recommend leisure reading books to individual students.	62.9	25.7	8.6	2.9	76.3	15.8	7.9	0.0	74.7	19.8	3.3	2.2
13. Assess student out-of-school, nonassigned reading.	11.4	20.0	37.1	31.4	18.4	21.1	23.7	36.8	18.9	23.3	31.1	26.7
14. Group students according to reading ability for literature study.	0.0	21.1	15.2	63.6	2.6	26.4	23.8	47.4	10.1	15.7	25.8	48.3

*Significant beyond the .05 level, at 3 degrees of freedom
**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 3 degrees of freedom

150

Table 69: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Evaluation of Personal Preparation for Teaching Reading

	2 Years or Less					3 - 6 Years					7 Years or More				
	Very well prepared	Quite well prepared	Adequately prepared	Poorly prepared	Very poorly prepared	Very well prepared	Quite well prepared	Adequately prepared	Poorly prepared	Very poorly prepared	Very well prepared	Quite well prepared	Adequately prepared	Poorly prepared	Very poorly prepared
**37. How well prepared do you feel you are to teach high school reading?	0.0%	0.0	17.1	54.3	28.3	0.0	5.3	18.4	50.0	26.4	8.8	23.1	36.3	23.1	8.8

**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 4 degrees of freedom

Table 70: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Evaluation of Personal Success in Teaching Reading

	2 Years or Less				3 - 6 Years				7 Years or More			
	Very successful	Quite successful	Somewhat successful	Unsuccessful	Very successful	Quite successful	Somewhat successful	Unsuccessful	Very successful	Quite successful	Somewhat successful	Unsuccessful
38. In general, how successful are you in your efforts to teach reading?	0.0%	30.3	63.6	6.1	0.0	15.6	56.3	28.1	5.7	34.5	50.6	9.2

Table 71:   Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Evaluation of the School's Success in Teaching Reading

	2 Years or Less					3 - 6 Years					7 Years or More				
	Very well	Quite well	Ade-quately	Poorly	Very poorly	Very well	Quite well	Ade-quately	Poorly	Very poorly	Very well	Quite well	Ade-quately	Poorly	Very poorly
39. In general, how well does your school succeed in teaching high school reading?	0.0%	15.1	42.4	23.7	15.1	0.0	2.7	35.1	32.4	29.7	3.4	12.6	28.7	42.5	11.5

Table 72: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

The Importance of Certain Elements to the Success of the Reading Instruction Program

	2 Years or Less				3 - 6 Years				7 Years or More			
	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant	Essential	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Unimportant
16. Additional personal preparation for teaching reading.	74.3%	25.7	0.0	0.0	47.4	31.6	18.4	2.6	45.1	36.3	16.5	2.2
17. Interest of students in improving their reading.	68.6	28.6	2.9	0.0	52.6	39.5	7.9	0.0	62.0	29.3	8.7	0.0
18. Time in the school timetable.	34.3	37.1	28.6	0.0	42.1	34.2	23.7	0.0	41.1	37.8	17.8	3.3
19. Special teaching materials or devices.	31.4	40.0	20.0	8.6	42.1	31.6	21.1	5.3	32.2	38.9	25.6	3.3
20. Leadership in organizing and administering the program.	37.1	40.0	22.9	0.0	47.4	28.9	21.1	2.6	34.1	39.6	23.1	3.3
21. Interest and cooperation of all teachers on staff.	34.3	34.3	17.1	14.3	23.7	50.0	21.1	5.3	41.1	33.3	21.1	4.4
22. Presence on staff of a specially qualified reading teacher.	54.3	20.0	22.9	2.9	41.0	43.6	15.4	0.0	42.9	36.3	16.5	4.4
23. Personal access to professional publications on teaching high school reading.	25.7	45.7	28.6	0.0	21.1	34.2	42.1	2.6	28.6	51.6	17.6	2.2
24. In-service programs on high school reading instruction.	14.3	65.7	17.1	2.9	18.9	48.6	27.0	5.4	22.0	50.5	22.0	5.5

Table 73: Responses of Teachers According to Years of Teaching Experience

Most Important Factors in the Reading Instruction Program, as Reported by Teachers in Reply to a Free-Response Question: "In your opinion, what is the most important factor in the success or failure of a high school reading instruction program?"**

	2 Years or Less	3 - 6 Years	7 Years or More
Interest and motivation of students.	25.8%	27.3	25.0
Time for organizing and operating the program.	22.5	33.3	16.6
A qualified reading teacher in the school	9.6	12.1	11.9
Cooperation of all teachers of all subjects.	9.6	9.1	9.5
Systematic approach to diagnostic testing within the school.	9.6	0.0	5.9
Preparation of teachers, including personal preparation.	6.4	9.1	20.2
Materials.	6.4	6.1	5.9
Administrative help and cooperation, especially in scheduling classes, limiting class size, and providing materials.	6.4	3.3	3.6
A knowledgeable English department, committed to teaching reading.	3.2	0.0	1.2

**Significant beyond the .01 level, at 8 degrees of freedom