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This study is a descriptive survey of secondary reading programs in British Columbia. A review of the literature indicated that secondary reading programs were largely remedial or developmental in nature, with teachers of such programs having little training in reading education.

All 331 secondary schools in the province of British Columbia were surveyed using a modified version of Hill's (1975) questionnaire. Responses were sought from the school administrators. A stamped, addressed return envelope was included with the questionnaire. An initial and follow-up mailing yielded a return of 88.8%. Results were analysed through the University of British Columbia's computer facilities using the standard Laboratory Of Educational Research Test Analysis Package and the Multivariate Contingency Tabulations computer programs.

The results for the population used in this study are in general agreement with the finding noted in the review of the literature. The majority of secondary reading programs in the province are remedial and/or developmental in nature. Many administrators are dissatisfied with the existing reading programs in their schools. Most teachers of secondary reading were found to have little training in reading instruction.

A comparison of available secondary reading programs, teacher training, administrators' attitudes toward reading programs, and availability of special, in-school reading facilities is made between junior and senior secondary schools.
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CHAPTER I

The Problem

Although there is much discussion and concern over the reading proficiency of British Columbia's secondary school graduates, there seems to be little or no information available as to the quality, quantity, or scope of reading instructional programs in the secondary schools of the province. As knowledge of the types of reading programs available would facilitate both comparison of reading programs between schools and school districts, and future planning in the areas of teacher and monetary requirements in reading programs, it is felt that a definitive survey with regard to secondary reading programs in British Columbia would be most valuable.

I. Rationale for the Study

Early has stated the need for objective, detailed, comparative descriptions of secondary reading activities (Hill, 1975). The above statement seems logical, since only through surveys which indicate present status can programs on a regional basis be compared to theoretical constructs of "good" reading programs. It is only through such comparisons that areas of shortcomings, areas of necessary improvement, can be gleaned.

Martin (1969) listed the following among justifications for
conducting a survey as to the status of secondary reading programs in the upper midwestern United States:

1. A growing recognition of the complexity of the reading process on the high school level.
2. Recognition by administrators of the need for improving the reading of junior and senior high school students.
3. An accelerated move toward developmental classes in reading for all students of a school.
4. An increased willingness to experiment with many different types of reading programs.
5. Increased stress on every teacher a teacher of reading in his subject.
6. An increase in the demand for reading consultants and a change in the role of the reading specialist from a remedial teacher to a consultant for other teachers. (p.467)

The above reasons are no less valid today if we wish to determine where the areas of emphasis in secondary reading instruction are at present.

Graham (1969) stated:

There has been a strong upswing of interest in the teaching of reading at the secondary level.... Secondary school administrators and teachers are now beginning to realize that properly planned and executed programs are an effective means of solving [reading] problems. Unfortunately, because of lack of experience in developing reading programs at the secondary level, many of these programs tend to be limited in scope and somewhat superficial. (p.563)

Thus, Graham used a survey technique to "ascertain the status and characteristics of reading programs in the public secondary schools of California."

Shami (1974) surveyed opinions regarding educational goals. He sent 23,990 questionnaires to a cross-section of people in the state of Maryland. A 51.3% return was received. Eleven groups were polled, including students, parents, educators, business/industry, elected officials, and the general public.
Of the eleven groups polled, nine considered mastery of reading skills to be the highest educational priority. The remaining two groups considered it to be the second highest. Shami stated:

> With the growing recognition toward accountability in education, the public will demand a thorough accounting of programs in reading. Educators must realize this and prepare their programs to meet the needs and aspirations of their students. (p. 96)

A status survey of secondary reading programs in British Columbia would be a step toward recognizing areas of needed improvement. The next step would be expansion or modification of existing secondary reading programs to meet those needs.

The province of British Columbia has seen little research in the area of reading at the secondary level, and there has been next to nothing done in the area of the status of reading programs in the province as a whole. Chronister and Ahrendt (1968) attempted such a survey. Their study, however, has several shortcomings. The survey instrument and the raw data are not available for perusal and although a return of 100% was cited, schools were not broken down as to either size or grade levels encompassed. As over seven years have passed since the Chronister-Ahrendt study, and since the secondary schools in British Columbia have grown in number by over 100, more complete and up-to-date data could be gathered and would be of value.
II. Objectives of the Study

The major objectives of this study were to answer the following questions:

1. What reading programs are currently available in British Columbia's secondary schools?

2. What are the major reasons given for a lack of reading programs?

3. Is there a difference in type and number of reading programs between junior and senior secondary schools?

4. What are the special qualifications, if any, of the teachers of secondary reading programs?

5. Has there been a trend toward expansion of secondary reading programs? If so, in which area (e.g., remedial, developmental, etc.) has the greatest expansion occurred?

6. What do the people being surveyed feel will be the area (in secondary reading) needing the most attention and support in future?

7. What is the reaction of the people being surveyed regarding the contribution of the reading program in their school?

8. Is there an observable relationship between teacher training and types of reading programs offered in schools?
9. Is there an observable relationship between school size and reading programs offered in secondary schools?

III. Definition of Terms Used

Although the terms used in this study are those often encountered in the professional literature, their meanings may vary slightly from author to author. As this study is based on a survey conducted by questionnaire, it is most important for all concerned to know the operational definitions which were assigned to the following terms. The definitions were included in the survey instrument. The first five definitions were taken from a questionnaire developed by Dr. W. Hill (1975).

Organized Reading Activity: Any regularly provided, teacher directed, reading instructional programs of a minimum six weeks duration. It does not include momentary or incidental reading aid to a student in a classroom learning situation.

Developmental Reading Classes: Systematic instruction in reading skills, regardless of the relative reading ability of the student.

Corrective Reading Classes: Adjusted group instruction in reading for students revealing some difficulty in reading and its use.

Remedial Reading Program: Individualized reading treatment for students with serious reading disability.
Content or Subject-Area Reading Instruction: Systematic instruction in reading within the subject-area setting, and oriented to the needs of that area.

Disadvantaged Reader Program: Special, reading oriented programs, limited to students meeting certain criteria of socio-economic or cultural disadvantage. For example, reading programs dealing with the problems encountered by our native Indian population or programs for new Canadians may fall into this category. In the United States, these programs are usually associated with those criteria attached to special funding.

Special Reading Facility: An area of the school which is designated as the place where instruction in reading occurs. Designations such as "center," "lab," "clinic," or "L.A.C." may come under this definition.

Subject or Content-Area: Any part of the school curriculum, other than instruction geared for "slow learner" or "remedial" students.

Reading Teacher: The teacher(s) responsible for instructing students in any of the various types of reading programs described above.

Secondary Grades: Grades 8-12, as opposed to grades 7-12 in the United States.
IV. Basic Assumptions

1. A questionnaire-survey would be an appropriate method with which to answer the questions posed in Section II of this chapter.

2. Information obtained from the persons responding to the questionnaire would be accurate.

V. Limitations of the Study

In interpreting the results of this study, the following should be noted:

1. Validity of results is limited to the population of this study: all of the schools in British Columbia encompassing one or more of the secondary grades (8-12).

2. All results are on the basis of number of responses, that is, number of questionnaires returned, and not the total population.

3. Although it was requested that the school administrator answer the questionnaire, it may be that in some cases the answers were supplied by the school reading teacher(s).
VI. **Organization of the Remainder of the Study**

Chapter II presents a review of the literature with regard to findings of regional surveys. A discussion of the methods used and the definition of the population is found in Chapter III. Chapter IV presents the results. The discussion of results, as well as conclusions and recommendations, is presented in Chapter V. The bibliography and appendices are contained in the final section of this paper.
CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

The review of the literature is organized around two main areas:

1. The use of the questionnaire as a valid research tool.

2. Research relating to survey studies of reading education, focusing primarily upon secondary grade level.

Three studies (Hill, 1975; Chronister & Ahrendt, 1968; Narang, 1973) will be discussed in some depth, as the questionnaire used in this study is based upon Hill's. The latter two studies will be focused upon because they are Canadian surveys. Comparisons of Narang's and Chronister and Ahrendt's findings may thus have greater validity to the author's present research than might some of the other studies cited.

I. The Questionnaire as a Research Tool

In 1907, Gault investigated the history of the questionnaire as a research method. Gault included interviews under the general heading of questionnaires. He found that such methodology had been in use for over 70 years. The earliest written questionnaire was found to be published in 1838 by the
Statistical Society of London, which chose the questionnaire as the most appropriate method for enquiring into social and industrial conditions in England at that time. In his conclusions, Gault stated:

We have found that the questionnaire method probably had its rise in statistical science [and] that it was applied first to the collection of educational statistics. (p. 381)

The National Education Association (N.E.A.) Research Bulletin (1930) noted that ever since Horace Mann sent his ten-page "Circular" to teachers in Massachusetts in 1847, desiring to "obtain the opinion of teachers... on a subject of great importance... to the cause of popular education" (p. 381), educators have complained over an apparent deluge of questionnaires. Such complaints spurred the N.E.A. to undertake a study of the problem, finding that although questionnaires were not as abundant as they seemed to the recipients, many were poorly constructed and were therefore not valid. As a remedy to the above problem, the N.E.A. published guidelines for what they termed a "good" questionnaire, from which was developed the following checklist:

1. Is the questionnaire adequately sponsored, i.e., is it from a reputable institution or individual?
2. Is the purpose of the questionnaire frankly stated?
3. Is the questionnaire on a worthy educational topic? In other words, the results should be of value to people other than the sender.
4. Is the questionnaire well organized?
5. Are the questions clearly and briefly worded?

6. Can most questions be briefly answered?

7. Is the information requested unavailable elsewhere?

8. Is the questionnaire set up in proper mechanical form, i.e., enough and proper space for the answer?

9. Are the demands of the questionnaire reasonable?

10. Is a proper return promised the respondents?

Oppenheim (1963), Wiersma (1969), and Isaac & Michael (1974) may be used as sources of reference with regard to criteria and methodology relating to survey techniques using questionnaires. From reviewing their work it can be concluded that guidelines for questionnaires have not changed significantly in the 34-year span since the N.E.A. published its checklist. The following statement by Hill & Bartin (1971) serves to summarize the validity and value of the survey questionnaire:

The usefulness of survey research is highly dependent upon the assumptions that the gathered data are individually valid and collectively representative... [However,] controlled survey research serves a necessary and useful function in [reading] program research. Probably, it is less susceptible to error than historical-comparative reviews of individual program descriptions appearing in the literature. If the reviewer is quite aware of conditions under which the survey was conducted, and if great reliance is not placed on the specificity of the findings, the comparative results may be used to determine trends in the development of secondary reading programs. (p. 10)
II. Survey Studies of Reading Programs

The major reviews of secondary reading surveys have been compiled by Hill (1971) and Hill & Bartin (1971). Hill (1971) noted that the organization of secondary reading programs began largely after 1940, and, Hill stated, "it is possible that the secondary teacher provided more incidental help with the learning and language process at the turn of the century than has been provided in modern schools" (p. 22). As secondary teachers began to see themselves as specialists within restricted subject areas, they neglected teaching the skills related to the language process in that area. Special programs in reading instruction thus became necessary.

The most dramatic increase in reading instructional programs took place during the 1960-1970 decade. From 1950 to 1960 approximately 25% of United States secondary schools provided planned reading instruction. During the next ten years, the number of reading programs in secondary schools increased from 25% to 75%. The major reason for the increase seemed to be an influx of federal funds. Administrators who did not have reading programs in their schools offered four reasons: lack of funds, lack of trained personnel, scheduling complexities, and staff apathy. Hill & Bartin (1971) found only 25 surveys of secondary reading programs in a space of 30 years. This prompted them to emphasize an apparent lack of research as to the status of reading programs. Bleismer (1967) also noted the apparent lack of such research.

In 1942, the N.E.A. published results of a nationwide
survey of United States reading programs at the secondary level. The study found that 46% of responding principals reported difficulties in reading as a serious problem in their schools, while over 50% felt reading difficulties to be "something of a problem." Only 2% felt that their students had no problems with reading skills. Forty-one percent of the schools had a regular testing program, with more testing being done in junior high schools than in senior high schools. Junior high schools also reported more developmental reading classes than did senior high schools. Most principals rated the reading program in their school as only "fair."

Witty & Brink (1949) noted that formal reading instruction stopped at the grade five or six level, and related that statement to Kottmeyer's earlier findings that 2,169 of 7,380 eighth-grade graduates read at or below sixth-grade norms, as measured by a standardized reading achievement test. Kottmeyer's findings prompted Witty & Brink to gather data as to reading programs on a national basis. A questionnaire-interview method was used to survey 500 United States school systems having one or more secondary schools with a pupil population of over 700. Ninety-seven of the responding school systems had remedial reading programs as part of regular English classes. The reading programs were taught by the English teachers. Only 28 of the 126 teachers of remedial reading taught reading on a full-time basis.

Thornton (1957) used a questionnaire to survey the people responsible for developmental reading programs in Texas secondary schools. Of 120 returns, Thornton found that 23% had
a developmental program (defined as being designed for the non-remedial reader), and that 47% of schools without such a program were completely in favor of instituting one. Budgetary restrictions and a lack of competent teachers and curriculum time were given as reasons for the lack of a program. Only one in three secondary reading teachers was found to have any training in reading instruction.

The lack of secondary reading programs was also pointed out by Jordan (1958) and by Baughman (1960). In a survey of 452 Florida secondary schools, Jordan found that only 17% of the respondents had a remedial reading program. Baughman, who surveyed 113 Illinois secondary schools, noted that only 85 had some form of reading program. Only 23 remedial programs and 23 developmental programs were available. Only three schools were found to have a reasonably comprehensive school reading program, encompassing remedial, developmental, and corrective instruction in reading.

Baughman (1961), in a questionnaire survey of 269 Illinois junior secondary schools, based his results on a 49% return. He found some form of reading instruction in 64% of responding schools. Remedial and developmental reading programs were the most common. Again, only three schools had a comprehensive program. Although 60% of schools with reading programs delegated responsibility for the program to their English departments, only 37% of schools stating the existence of a reading program had teachers with at least some training in the instruction of reading. No pattern was found as to the involvement of the content-area teachers.
Madeira (1961) used a questionnaire to determine the training of reading teachers in 404 Pennsylvania secondary schools. A 91% return was obtained. Although a compulsory, mandated reading program for grades seven and eight was favored by 81% of the responding school principals, a lack of trained teachers was cited as the major stumbling block to the implementation of such a program. As 69% of the reading teachers were found to have fewer than three semester hours of reading courses, and 50% had none at all, Madeira suggested that reading courses be required for all secondary English teachers.

Grissom (1961) used a questionnaire-observation technique to survey 107 secondary schools which had stated the existence of a reading program. He found that smaller schools provided reading improvement programs through special reading and remedial English classes. Larger schools employed a combination of programs, often centering effort around a school reading clinic. Grissom noted that the latter approach was more effective and flexible than the former.

Geake (1961) replicated Smith's (1956) study of Michigan secondary school reading programs, using the same questionnaire and sampling technique. A questionnaire was mailed to a 20% systematic alphabetical sample of secondary schools of four sizes: more than 1,000 students, 500-999 students, 200-499 students, 0-199 students. Smith's results were based upon an 84% return, while those of Geake were based on a return of 90%. Geake reported a 10% increase in number of reading programs (from 40% to 50% of the respondents). He noted that smaller schools showed an increase in number of reading programs, while
larger schools showed a decrease. Geake pointed out that 15 reading programs had been discontinued in Michigan since 1945. Four of those programs were discontinued due to the unavailability of trained reading personnel.

In a multi-state study to determine the qualifications of those responsible for teaching reading, Simmons (1963) mailed questionnaires to 152 secondary schools in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, and Wisconsin. A return of 83.6% was received. Although 75% of respondents felt there was a need for content-area instruction in reading skills, little was actually being done. Over 50% of the responding schools assigned the responsibility for reading instruction to the English department. Five percent of reading program supervisors had a reading specialist's certificate, and only one school reported having a staff member trained as a secondary reading teacher. Simmons pointed out that although the bulk of the responsibility for teaching reading rested with English teachers, these teachers teach mainly the reading of literature and "probably have little awareness of those reading problems present in other content areas of the curriculum" (p. 88).

A theoretically sound reading program was outlined by Simmons (1963b). A 40-item questionnaire was sent to a random, stratified sample of 152 secondary schools in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, and Wisconsin. Schools were categorized according to staff population, and an 84% return was obtained. Of the respondents, 33% had no program, and most available programs were of the remedial type. There seemed to be little developmental reading instruction and an insignificant
amount of instruction in the skills of content-area reading. On the whole, Simmons found that reading teachers had no formal training in the teaching of reading.

In a replication of Simmons' study, Martin (1969) received a 90% total return. He found a 12% increase in reading programs over the six-year span. Reading instruction was still said to be integrated with the English program. There was still very little being done with regard to reading in the content areas, and there was still a lack of qualified teachers of reading. Programs had expanded and improved, however, and expansion was thought to be a direct result of federal funding programs.

Interviews with principals or, if available, with the teachers responsible for the reading programs in 42 midwestern United States secondary schools formed the basis for Cawelti's (1963) research in the area of secondary reading programs. He found that 27 of the 42 schools had reading instruction other than incidental classroom help. Fifteen of those programs were remedial in nature. Twenty-one of the schools maintained the reading program as a part of regular classes (generally English), and the eight schools with a developmental reading program admitted students to the classes on a voluntary basis. Only 15% of the schools had both developmental and remedial classes. Even though the school administrators stated their willingness to either initiate or expand reading programs, they felt handicapped in doing so as a result of a lack of adequately trained personnel.

Peyton & Beylow (1965), in an effort to determine the areas of reading instructional needs in secondary schools, sent a
questionnaire to 95 secondary school principals in Kentucky. Of the respondents, 47% admitted to having no reading program in their school. Ninety-five percent felt there was a need for developmental reading instruction, 93% felt there was a need for remedial instruction in reading, and 70% thought that students would benefit from remedial instruction in reading skills. Although 51% felt that all three types of reading instruction should be available in their school, lack of funds and lack of qualified teachers were once again mentioned as obstacles to the establishment of a reading program.

Most of the research referred to thus far points out a general feeling that a school's English department should be responsible for the teaching of reading skills. Applebee's (1966) national study of English programs (based upon 2 1/2 years of in-class observation) found that class time was proportioned as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of Applebee's results, reading instruction seems not to be a high priority (in terms of instructional time) in most English classrooms. The above situation should not be surprising if one considers the fact that the average teacher of secondary English has had no formal training in the teaching of reading.

Only one study was found which sought a response from a school's content-area teachers, as well as its principal and, if applicable, its reading teacher(s). Brahm and Roehm (1967)
mailed questionnaires to 16 secondary schools within a 25-mile radius of Syracuse, New York. A usable return of 47.7% was obtained. It was found that 63% of the teachers had no formal training in reading. Five of the sixteen schools had a full-time reading teacher, five had a part-time reading teacher, and six had none or did not respond to the questionnaire. While 64% of teachers surveyed stated that there was a reading program in their school, in only four cases were all of the teachers in agreement that there was indeed a reading program extant in their school. This lack of agreement, say Brahm & Roehm, points to either a poorly publicised program or one which is considered to be ineffective by the school's staff. Furthermore, the insufficient training of the reading teachers prompted the authors to state:

Reading teachers or specialists appear to be no more sophisticated about the matter of a reading program and the duties of a reading teacher than are subject area teachers or administrators. (p. 59)

Criscuolo (1969) also indicated concern over the number of people teaching reading without certification. He felt that the reading teacher should work more closely with a school's content-area staff.

In 1968, Chronister & Ahrendt forwarded a questionnaire regarding reading programs to all 216 secondary school principals in the province of British Columbia. A 100% return was cited. One hundred sixteen principals stated the existence of a remedial-corrective program in their school, while 33 had a developmental program in their school. The developmental program was said to be the responsibility of the school English
Although Chronister & Ahrendt do not give actual statistics as to the training of reading instructors, they do note that 116 of the 216 principals indicated that their school's reading program was not satisfactory. The principals also declared a desire for all secondary school teachers to have at least some training in the area of reading instruction.

Chronister & Ahrendt concluded their study with the statement:

Secondary school administrators made recommendations to the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia that all teachers of English be required to complete coursework in reading instruction at the secondary school level. The recommendation was accepted and is being implemented. (p. 427)

The above statement is now misleading, however, as the requirement was in effect for only one year and was dropped in 1969-1970. At the present time, compulsory courses in reading education at the secondary level do not exist at the University of British Columbia.

A comprehensive study of secondary school reading programs was done in New England by the New England Educational Assessment Project (1970), which compared available reading programs in grades seven and ten. With regard to grade seven programs, 60% were based on out-of-date curriculum guides, had no consultant available, and were rarely found in content-area classes; more than one-third of the schools surveyed had no remedial program. Staffing for existing programs was deemed inadequate. Less than 32% of the reading teachers had three or more credits of college reading courses.

Little difference was noted in the grade ten sample, although programs were available for college-bound and superior
students. Teacher training in reading instruction was approximately equal to that of reading teachers in grade seven. Reading programs for disadvantaged or physically, emotionally, or perceptually handicapped students were rare. Developmental programs were infrequently offered and when available, were a part of regular English classes. Content-area instruction was less available for the tenth-grade students. Seventh-grade teachers, however, had participated in more inservice education in reading, and also stated a greater willingness to participate if reading inservice was made available.

Graham (1969) obtained a return of 85% of questionnaires he had mailed to 355 secondary schools in California. A surprising 78% of the respondents stated the existence of a reading program, with more programs being found in larger, rather than smaller, schools. Sixty-four percent of schools having a reading program had a special facility, or reading center, in the school. Twenty percent did not use test scores as criteria for admission to available programs. Little was noted in the area of total staff involvement with reading programs. Remedial rather than developmental programs were emphasized, and funding and teacher qualifications were thought to be major problems.

Smith & Austin (1969) conducted a national survey of reading programs using a population of 632 school systems. Questionnaires as well as personal and telephone interviews were used to gather data. Six categories of reading programs and criteria for evaluating those programs were used. The response rate was 75%. Remedial and developmental programs encompassed 65% of available reading classes, and inadequate training of
personnel was given as "the major problem in implementing reading programs." The report lists recommendations and guidelines for the organization of general reading programs, remedial programs, developmental programs, enrichment programs, and inservice programs in reading.

In an extremely thorough state survey of both elementary and secondary reading programs in Indiana, Farr et al. (1969) sent questionnaires to every junior and senior high school principal in that state. The principal was to secure the assistance of school reading personnel, if needed, when completing the form. Eighty-three percent of the secondary principals responded. The results noted that almost 75% of the responding schools had required reading courses, and that programs were staffed mainly by English teachers. Reading programs were not content-area oriented. Most teachers were untrained or inexperienced in reading instruction, and respondents reported a lack of satisfaction with available reading programs. Recommendations for program organization, teacher training, and program evaluation are included in the report.

Bowren (1970) in a status study of secondary reading in New Mexico based on a sample of 217 schools, felt that the most influential factor with regard to the existence or quality of a reading program was trained personnel, not funding. He noted, however, that little could be accomplished in the way of a schoolwide program in reading without a firm commitment by the school's administration. As only 79 of 217 schools reported having a reading program, and as 76% of the people teaching
reading were unqualified, Bowren noted an "astounding lack of concern" with regard to reading instruction for all students, and felt that "universities should give priority consideration to the training of secondary-oriented reading specialists" (p. 517).

A survey of reading programs in Florida secondary schools was conducted by Boyle (1971), who received a 66% return. Schools were divided into two groups: those with student populations of less than 1,000 and those with student populations of more than 1,000. She found that the larger schools had more programs and a far greater number of certified instructors in reading than did the smaller schools. Little or no content-area instruction was found in either of the two groups. Funding and teacher training were areas of concern for administrators.

In a Canadian study, Narang (1973) surveyed secondary reading programs in Saskatchewan. He classified and defined programs as developmental, corrective, remedial, and those for college-bound students. Questionnaires were sent to 400 schools encompassing grades 9-12, and a return of 68% was received. Sixty percent of responding schools had no reading program. Of the remainder, 19% had a corrective program, 18% had a developmental program, 17% had a remedial program, and 5% had a reading program for the college-bound student. In most schools, students were admitted to programs on the basis of standardized reading tests and/or teacher referral. Little diagnostic testing was done. English teachers had the major responsibility for teaching reading in the majority of the schools. Although
26 schools had a special facility in which to teach reading, only 23 teachers felt that adequate materials and supplies were available. A large number of content-area teachers were found to give little or no reading instruction, and only 58 of 268 schools had teachers with over four semester-hours of reading courses. It seemed, however, that the administrators would have liked to institute reading programs in their schools, as 95% of those who did not have a program in their school indicated a desire for one, but cited lack of personnel or funds as obstacles.

Freed (1973) surveyed state education departments and school districts on a national basis. He discovered that 34% of junior secondary schools and 45% of senior secondary schools in the United States offered no program in reading. Over 90% of state education departments set no minimum requirements as to reading instruction, and 34 states required no courses in reading for teachers of English. Eighty-eight percent of state education departments and 94% of school districts felt that reading programs must be improved.

Hill (1975) sent a 40-item questionnaire to all secondary school principals in western New York and received an 85% total return. Organized reading activity was said to exist in 77% of the responding schools, with 65% of the programs coming into being after 1965. Administrative commitment, availability of funds, and attitude of school staff (in that order) were cited as reasons for an increase in programs. Little content-teacher involvement and a lack of trained personnel were noted.

The majority of programs were found to be corrective (78%),
remedial (74%), or developmental (68%) in nature, with larger schools having more programs and better trained reading teachers. Seventy-three percent of the reading programs were taught in a special facility. Respondents felt that future support should go to individualized remedial programs (32%), content-area programs (27%), developmental programs (24%), corrective programs (15%), and disadvantaged reader programs (2%).

III. Summary

The questionnaire has been in use as a research method for over 130 years and is a valid and useful data-gathering technique if certain guidelines are followed (Gault, 1907; N.E.A., 1930; Hill & Bartin, 1971). Although several authors have cited a lack of survey research in reading at the secondary level (Bleismer, 1967; Hill & Bartin, 1971), enough studies are available in the literature to report a general trend in results.

The lack of teachers trained in the instruction of reading and, to a lesser degree, budgetary constraints were common themes in the studies cited. Most administrators surveyed felt reading to be a major problem area in their school and felt that programs should be provided and/or improved. The advantages of having a special reading facility in schools was noted (Grissom, 1961), although a relatively small number of schools had such a facility. Reading programs were narrow in scope. Remedial and developmental reading classes were most commonly found, but
corrective, disadvantaged, or content-area reading programs were few in number.

A majority of the studies commented that reading programs were generally the responsibility of a school's English department, whose teachers had no special training in the area of reading instruction. Most school administrators felt that such training should be compulsory for secondary teachers of English. Some educators felt that compulsory training in the teaching of reading should be required for all teachers.

It is evident that reading programs have increased significantly in number over the more than three decades since the N.E.A. (1942) national survey. The greatest increase has occurred in the past ten years, but only 50% to 60% of secondary schools seem to have any form of organized reading activity at the present time.

The status survey allows both for historical comparisons of secondary reading programs and for prediction of future needs on the basis of observed trends. Although extensive surveys are becoming difficult to execute due to the increasing amount of effort and expense involved in such research, it is hoped that status surveys in secondary reading will appear more frequently in the literature than has been the case in the past.
CHAPTER III

Description of the Study

I. The Instrument

The data-gathering instrument used in this study was modified from Hill's (1975) questionnaire (see Appendix A). Semantic changes were made in Hill's questionnaire in order to conform to Canadian terminology (i.e., eighth grade became grade eight), and several of Hill's questions were omitted since it was felt that they were not relevant to the province of British Columbia at the present time. A covering letter (see Appendix B) and a stamped, addressed return envelope were included with the questionnaire.

Randomly selected individuals found that the time required for completion of the questionnaire was approximately one-half hour. The sender assigned both a reference and a code number to each questionnaire, allowing identification of responding schools and the grades included in those schools.

The questionnaire is organized into eight general sections:

1. Questions regarding school statistics, e.g., questions about the student population.

2. Questions regarding background information as to school reading programs, e.g., questions regarding the existing reading program, and the length of time such a program has been available.
3. Questions regarding school-wide reading activity, e.g., the specific type of organized reading activity available in the school (according to definitions given) and the increase or decrease in scope of specific, currently available programs.

4. Questions regarding availability and use of a school reading facility.

5. Questions regarding specific reading programs available in the school, e.g., questions regarding required as opposed to elective reading classes, and availability of reading classes in specific grades.

6. Questions regarding testing of students' reading ability.

7. Miscellaneous questions, including questions regarding content-teacher involvement in reading programs, administrative responsibility for school reading programs, and teacher training of reading teachers.

8. Space for respondents in which to write (if they so desired) specific comments and/or suggestions regarding the improvement of secondary reading programs in British Columbia. This section included space for comments regarding the validity of the questionnaire to the respondents' school and reading program.

The questionnaire was typed, reduced by a factor of three, and printed back to back on letter-size paper. Questions were
followed by a numbered range of choices (answers). Respondents were asked to place the number corresponding to the answer chosen in a box located at the right-hand side of the question. Such a manner of response allowed for greater control over semantic differences between respondents and also increased speed of completion. Respondents could note an inability to answer using the choices provided in the final section of the questionnaire (see number eight above).

II. The Population

The finite population in this study was the entire number of secondary schools in the province of British Columbia. All secondary schools rather than a random sampling were surveyed in order to increase validity of results. A list of schools in British Columbia, distributed annually by the B. C. Department of Education and including school addresses, principals' names, and grades encompassed, was obtained from the Student Teaching Office, University of British Columbia. Forty-seven percent of the population consisted of schools with a student population of 500 to 999. The majority of schools surveyed were from rural population areas. Thirty-one of the schools included elementary grade levels and only one or two secondary grades, e.g., K to nine. Unreturned questionnaires were mainly from such schools, probably because elementary rather than secondary programs are emphasized. A questionnaire, covering letter, and return envelope were mailed to the principals of the 334 schools having one or more of the grades 8-12. Three schools were discarded
from the population since one no longer included secondary grades, one had been converted into an unstructured "free" school (making it impossible to gather data by grade level), and one had only one student in grade eight, which was its total secondary student population. The total number of secondary schools in the population was thus 331.

Questionnaires were addressed to school principals, as school staff would not, in all likelihood, have had the necessary background information to complete Sections II and III. Although not instructed to do so, respondents may have sought the advice of school reading personnel in completing certain parts of the survey instrument.

Through the use of the reference and code numbers, the population may be subcategorized into schools within a given student population range (e.g., 200 to 249 students), schools servicing various population areas (e.g., urban, rural, etc.), and schools encompassing certain grade levels (e.g., 8-10 or 10-12). This capability serves to facilitate comparisons and analysis of results.

III. Procedure

As a "Language Arts Survey" was in progress in the province and since duplication was thought undesirable, the Department of Education was informed of the writer's proposed study (see Appendix C). The reply from the Department of Education may be seen in Appendix D.

Each of the 334 secondary schools in the province of
British Columbia was assigned a reference number, from 1 to 334. Each school was also assigned a code number referring to the grades included in the school (see Table I).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>FROM TO</th>
<th>CODE #</th>
<th>OPERATIONAL DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-2</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regular School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jr. Secondary Schl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sr. Secondary Schl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-7</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A master list was compiled, including each school's name, reference number, code number, principal's name, and a space to note the questionnaire's date of return. Questionnaires were then mailed to the 334 secondary schools in British Columbia. The investigator arbitrarily decided to cut off data gathering after two follow-up mailings. Six weeks were to be allowed between the initial and the second follow-up mailing. The response after the initial mailing was 58.6%. A follow-up mailing (again including a questionnaire, covering letter, and return envelope; see Appendix E) brought the usable return to 88.8%. A second follow-up mailing was not felt necessary.
IV. Analysis of the Data

The raw data was keypunched onto computer datacards and was analyzed through the University of British Columbia's computer facilities. The questionnaire had been constructed to facilitate computer analysis of responses. The boxes in which respondents were to place answers were numbered corresponding to the 80 columns on computer datacards. Two cards per questionnaire were needed to compile the data.

Two "stock" computer programs were used to interpret the datacards: the Laboratory of Educational Research Test Analysis Package (LERTAP) and the Multivariate Contingency Tabulations (MVTAB) programs. The former was used to generate a simple tabulation of results. The MVTAB generated tables allowing comparison between answers to various questions on the questionnaire. The tables allowed the author to answer the questions posed in Chapter I, Section II of this study. For example, responses regarding a school's student population could be compared to responses regarding available reading programs, answering the question "Is there a relationship between school size and reading programs offered in schools?" Responses to questions 4, 11, 12, 127, 128, and 129 were compared to responses received to all of the other questions on the questionnaire. Comparison across the generated tables was done manually. Thus, answers both within and across questions were compared in analyzing the data.
Results were analyzed in purely descriptive terms. More intricate analyses can be performed, but are beyond the scope of this study.

V. Summary

Chapter III begins with a description of the data-gathering instrument and describes its organization. Section II focuses upon the population of the study and the data-gathering instrument. A discussion of the method used in the analysis of the raw data concludes the chapter.
CHAPTER IV

Analysis of the Data: Results and Discussion

I. Introduction

This chapter presents a descriptive analysis of the data relevant to the answering of the questions posed in Chapter I, Section II, of this study. Three of the 334 schools were rejected and the population was thus reduced to 331. The usable return was 294 questionnaires or 88.8%.

Isaac and Michael (1974:93) point out that "percentages under 20% [nonresponding subjects] can be reasonably ignored." As nonresponding subjects in this study totaled only 11.2%, no need was felt to statistically balance the returned questionnaires to increase validity. The high response rate seems to indicate the concern that educators in British Columbia feel regarding secondary students' reading skills. Tables referred to in this chapter are located at the end of the chapter.
II. The Questions Answered

QUESTION 1: What reading programs are currently available in British Columbia?

Of the 294 respondents, 214 indicated the availability of some form of organized reading activity in their school (see Table II). Over 50% of available reading programs are remedial or corrective in nature. Secondary reading programs in British Columbia, therefore, are not balanced, and students with reading difficulties other than of the remedial or corrective type are probably not being helped.

The availability of reading programs in each of the secondary grade levels is seen in Table III. All types of reading programs are less available at higher than at lower grades. Schools in rural areas seem to have more balanced school-wide programs than do schools in other areas (see Table IV). Schools serving urban population areas show the highest percentage of remedial programs, and remedial instruction is the most available reading program in all population areas. Developmental and corrective reading programs are the next most common, regardless of population area served. With the exception of rural areas, content instruction is the program least commonly found in all population areas.

QUESTION 2: What are the major reasons given for the lack of a reading program?
The major reason given for the lack of a secondary reading program was an inability to find trained personnel (see Table V). Insufficient funding was the next most common reason given. These findings are consistent with results of status surveys noted in the review of the literature. Only 2.7% of respondents whose schools did not have a reading program felt that there was no need for such instruction. This suggests that were trained personnel and funds made available, most schools presently without a school-wide reading program would institute one. The third most common reason for the lack of a reading program, however, was a lack of staff concern or interest. This is a cause for alarm because respondents stated that the factor most significant in the initiation or expansion of reading programs in their schools was the attitude of the school staff.

QUESTION 3: Is there a difference in type and number of reading programs between junior and senior secondary schools?

There are more corrective reading programs available at the junior secondary school level than are available at the senior secondary level (see Table VI). The senior secondary schools, however, emphasize disadvantaged reader programs to a greater degree than do the junior secondary schools. Remedial and corrective reading programs are the most available at either level. Content instruction in reading is the program least available in both junior and senior secondary schools.
QUESTION 4: What are the special qualifications, if any, of the teachers of secondary reading programs?

...The majority of reading teachers in British Columbia are untrained in the teaching of reading skills (see Table VII). Seventy-three percent of reading teachers do not have an undergraduate concentration in the methods of teaching reading, and the International Reading Association (1965) minimum training requirements for secondary reading teachers are met by approximately 10% of secondary reading instructors in British Columbia. As one or two professional courses, followed by inservice training, make up the majority of teacher training in reading at the present time, inservice reading education may be the easiest and most efficient way to upgrade reading teachers' qualifications. Inservice courses may also be beneficial in improving the general attitude of school faculties toward reading and may result in content-area teachers doing more reading instruction within their subject area. Since trained reading personnel are not available, and as teachers will have to upgrade their qualifications while on the job, inservice and extension courses may be of great value.

QUESTION 5: Has there been a trend toward expansion of secondary reading programs? If so, in which area (e.g., remedial, developmental, etc.) has the greatest expansion occurred?
As shown in Table VIII, only 15 secondary reading programs were available in British Columbia before 1964. The vast majority of programs began after 1970. This finding is in contrast to Hill's (1971) statement that reading programs in the United States experienced the greatest boom during the 1960 to 1970 decade, due to federal funding. The Department of Education in British Columbia began to stress reading instruction in secondary grades around 1970, and real recognition of students' reading difficulties was first indicated in secondary curriculum guides in 1965. In all likelihood, it is the initiative shown by the Department of Education which has resulted in the number of secondary reading programs beginning after 1970. The increase in secondary reading programs was reported in the following ways: increase in number of students instructed (91.6%), extension of instructional time (75.6%), greater variety in instructional offerings and services (82.6%), more active involvement by subject-area teachers (59.4%).

QUESTION 6: What do the people being surveyed feel will be the area (in secondary reading) needing the most attention and support in future?

On the basis of results presented in Table IX, developmental and remedial reading programs will continue to expand during the next several years. Over 60% of the respondents felt that remedial and developmental reading programs will need the most administrative support in future.
years. This is unfortunate, since remedial and developmental programs already make up the bulk of available reading programs in the province. If a balanced reading program in British Columbia is to appear, educators must be prepared to support other types of reading programs, while not neglecting programs presently available. Some secondary administrators do seem to be realizing that instruction in the skills of content reading is also important, for content-area programs are fourth on the list of programs needing future administrative support. Hopefully, the next five years will see greater emphasis placed upon reading in the content areas than is presently the case.

QUESTION 7: What is the reaction of the people being surveyed with regard to the contribution of the reading program in their school?

Approximately 49% of the respondents who have a reading program in their school are less than satisfied with it (see Table X). Unfortunately, specific reasons for dissatisfaction are not known. A comparison of administrators' attitudes and teacher training (Table XI) however, yields the information that 41.3% of the dissatisfied administrators have reading teachers in their schools with less than undergraduate training in reading instruction. Of the administrators having teachers with an undergraduate concentration or a graduate degree in reading, only one indicated great dissatisfaction with his school's reading program. Clearly, administrators are more satisfied with reading programs taught by qualified reading teachers.
Unfortunately, the results in Table XI force one to question the value of inservice reading education. Approximately 50% of administrators are dissatisfied with reading programs taught by teachers with inservice training. Roughly the same percentage of administrators are dissatisfied with reading courses taught by teachers with no training in reading instruction.

Only 1.5% of the respondents doubt the value of a secondary reading program. Thus, 98.5% feel that instructional programs in reading skills have a place at the secondary school level. The responding administrators do not doubt the value of a secondary reading program, but are dissatisfied with programs presently available. This dissatisfaction may be a direct result of the lack of teachers trained in the teaching of secondary reading.

QUESTION 8: Is there an observable relationship between teacher training and types of reading programs offered in secondary schools?

Table XII shows that qualified teachers in reading instruction teach more types of reading classes than do untrained reading teachers. A school having a reading teacher with a graduate degree in reading thus has more chance of having a well-rounded, school-wide reading program than does a school with a reading teacher who has little or no training in reading instruction. The diversity and availability of reading instruction from trained personnel may also be reasons for administrators' satisfaction with reading programs taught by
qualified personnel. Unfortunately, content-area instruction is still the least available program, even in schools having a highly trained reading teacher.

QUESTION 9: Is there an observable relationship between school size and reading programs offered in secondary schools?

Larger schools seem to offer a greater variety of reading programs than do smaller schools (see Table XIII). For example, less than 10% of schools with a student population of under 250 contain a disadvantaged reader program, while over 55% of schools with a student population greater than 1,000 have such a reading program. Of the six secondary schools with a student population of over 2,000, all but one offer all of the reading program types defined in the questionnaire. This may tie in with the fact that all six schools have teachers with no less than an undergraduate concentration of courses in reading instruction. This finding is consistent with the answer to the previous question, which noted that reading teachers with greater training provide more balanced school-wide reading programs.
III. Other Findings

The majority of secondary reading programs in British Columbia have increased in scope (Table VIII). Some secondary reading programs, however, have decreased (see Table XIV). The decreases were outlined in the following ways: reduction of instructional time (18.4%), decrease in number of students instructed (18.4%), and less active involvement of subject-area teachers (13.3%).

With regard to developmental reading instruction in grades eight, ten, and twelve, 36.2%, 10.7% and 5.6% of respondents (respectively) indicated that over 50% of the students in their schools were enrolled in developmental reading classes. Thus, the higher grades seem to stress developmental reading programs to a lesser extent than do the lower secondary grades. Sixty-one percent of developmental reading courses are embedded in English classes, although most English teachers are untrained in reading instruction.

One hundred fifty-four respondents indicated the existence of a special reading facility in their school. The reading instructional activities taking place in those facilities are categorized in Table XV. In most in-school reading facilities, individualized remedial treatment makes up the major part of the reading program. Developmental classes are the least stressed. Also, the more training a teacher has in reading instruction, the more likely the possibility that the teacher works out of a special in-school facility for reading instruction (see Table XVI). All 21 reading teachers with a graduate degree in reading
Currently teach in a special reading facility, while only 50% of reading teachers with no training in the field are teaching in such a facility. This is probably because untrained reading teachers are mainly part-time teachers of reading who do not leave their normal subject-area classroom.

Grade-wide testing in reading is not done to any great extent past the grade eight level (see Table XVII). The large decrease in grade-wide testing from grade 8 to grade 9 could be due to secondary schools wishing to note students' reading levels as they enter the secondary grades. Since the Canadian Test of Basic Skills is almost universally administered in grade 7, those reading scores should be used rather than retesting students in grade 8. Students' reading ability could be tested in grade 9, after they have been exposed to the secondary school's environment and more specialized content-area instruction for a longer period of time. Although 53.3% of respondents stated that group diagnostic tests are used (see Table XVIII), one wonders if the result of such testing is of value, considering the training of most reading teachers. A relatively large number of respondents indicated that reading data gathered through individual diagnostic assessment by a reading specialist is used in their schools. This finding must be questioned when one considers the low number of trained reading specialists available in British Columbia.
IV. Discussion

Secondary reading programs in British Columbia came into being after 1970 (Table VIII). The rapid expansion of reading programs since that date caused a demand for trained reading teachers which has not been met. University teacher training programs in the province have not been able to keep up with the demand for trained personnel in secondary reading, and administrators cite the lack of such teachers as the major reason for the lack of a reading program (Table V). Many administrators were of the opinion that the best way to improve the quality of secondary reading instruction in British Columbia is to make university courses in the teaching of reading a requirement for all teachers. Very few administrators doubted the value of secondary reading programs or felt that such programs were not needed in their schools (Tables V, X, XI).

Reading programs in British Columbia are less available in higher grades than in lower grades (Tables III, VI). Remedial and developmental programs are the most common, with content-area instruction in reading being the least available program in the province (Tables II, IV, VI, XIII). The lack of content-area programs should be remedied. It may be a good sign that 10% of respondents felt that content-area instruction needs the greatest support during the next several years (Table IX).

Larger schools generally have better qualified reading teachers, and thus also have a better balanced school-wide reading program than do smaller schools (Tables XII, XIII). The majority of trained reading teachers work in a special in-school
reading facility and concentrate on reading instruction of an individualized nature (Tables XV, XVI). The prevailing opinion is that developmental reading instruction belongs in the regular English class, but this study did not quantify the amount of such instruction actually being done in secondary English classes.

Relatively little testing of students' reading ability is done on a grade-wide basis, although group and individual diagnostic assessment of reading skills is noted in over 53% of schools having some form of reading program (Tables XVII, XVIII). As a large number of reading teachers have only inservice training in the teaching of reading, and many inservice courses focus upon informal testing techniques, it is not surprising that informal testing procedures are used in over 60% of schools having a reading program (Tables VII, XVIII).

V. Summary

Chapter IV begins with an introduction discussing the validity of the 88.8% return rate upon which the results of this study are based. The questions posed in Chapter I, Section II are answered in the following section. The general findings for the population in this study were that:

1. The great majority of secondary reading programs in British Columbia are remedial and/or developmental in nature. There is less emphasis upon corrective, content-oriented, and disadvantaged reading programs.
2. The majority of secondary reading teachers in British Columbia are untrained in the teaching of reading. Only 10% meet the IRA minimum training standards for reading instructors.

3. Secondary school administrators do not doubt either the value of or the need for secondary reading programs.

4. Secondary school administrators feel that more trained reading personnel should be made available.

A discussion of results is seen in Section IV of this chapter. All tables referred to in Chapter IV are located at the end of the chapter.
### TABLE II
NUMBER AND TYPES OF SECONDARY READING PROGRAMS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM TYPE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE III
AVAILABILITY OF SECONDARY READING PROGRAMS IN GRADES 8-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM TYPE</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. Of Schools with this Grade</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE IV
AVAILABILITY OF SECONDARY READING PROGRAMS WITH REGARD TO POPULATION AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM TYPE</th>
<th>URBAN INNER-CITY</th>
<th>URBAN GENERAL</th>
<th>SUB-URBAN</th>
<th>SMALLER CITY</th>
<th>RURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total no. of Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE V
REASONS FOR THE LACK OF A SECONDARY READING PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASONS GIVEN</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Staff Concern or Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling Complexities</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Need for a Program at the School</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE VI

**AVAILABILITY AND TYPES OF SECONDARY READING PROGRAMS IN JUNIOR AND SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM TYPE</th>
<th>JR. SECONDARY</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
<th>SR. SECONDARY</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE VII

**SPECIAL TRAINING IN READING INSTRUCTION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA SECONDARY READING TEACHERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIAL TRAINING IN READING INSTRUCTION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF TEACHERS</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Special Training</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice Training</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 Professional Courses</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Concentration</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE VIII**

GROWTH OF SECONDARY READING PROGRAMS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before 1960</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1964</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-1969</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1970</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE IX**

ADMINISTRATORS' OPINIONS REGARDING SECONDARY READING PROGRAMS NEEDING THE GREATEST SUPPORT OVER THE NEXT SEVERAL YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM TYPE</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE X

**Administrators' Attitudes Toward Reading Programs in Their Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>% OF RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt the Value of Programs at Secondary Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XI

**Administrators' Attitudes Toward Secondary Reading Programs Compared to Teacher Training of Reading Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDE</th>
<th>NO RDG. COURSES</th>
<th>INSERVICE TRAINING</th>
<th>1-2 COURSES</th>
<th>UNDERGRAD. TRAINING</th>
<th>GRAD. DEGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Dissatisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt Value of Program at Secondary Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XII

**TEACHER TRAINING RELATED TO NUMBER AND TYPES OF AVAILABLE SECONDARY READING PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM TYPE</th>
<th>NO RDG. COURSES</th>
<th>INSERVICE TRAINING</th>
<th>1-2 COURSES</th>
<th>UNDERGRAD. TRAINING</th>
<th>GRAD. DEGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total No. Of Teachers</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XIII

**AVAILABILITY OF SECONDARY READING PROGRAMS RELATED TO SCHOOL SIZE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM TYPE</th>
<th>UNDER 250-2499</th>
<th>2500-4999</th>
<th>5000-999</th>
<th>10000-1999</th>
<th>20000 OR MORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total No. of Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>108</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XIV
 NUMBER AND TYPE OF SECONDARY READING PROGRAMS WHICH HAVE DECREASED SINCE 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>NO. OF PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XV
 SECONDARY READING ACTIVITIES TAKING PLACE IN IN-SCHOOL READING FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Classes</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Developmental</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective Classes or Groups</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Remedial Treatment</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged Reader Programs</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XVI

AMOUNT OF SPECIAL TRAINING IN SECONDARY READING INSTRUCTION RELATED TO TEACHERS TEACHING IN AN IN-SCHOOL READING FACILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPECIAL TRAINING IN READING INSTRUCTION</th>
<th>NO. TEACHING IN SPECIAL FACILITY</th>
<th>TOTAL NO. OF TEACHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Special Training</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice Training</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or 2 Professional Courses</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Training</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE XVII

NUMBER OF SECONDARY SCHOOLS USING STANDARDIZED TESTS IN READING ON A GRADE-WIDE BASIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XVIII

**READING ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA SECONDARY SCHOOLS USED TO SUPPLEMENT STANDARDIZED READING TEST DATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE</th>
<th>NO. OF SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUP STANDARDIZED TESTS</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESTS FROM COMMERCIAL MATERIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMAL TESTS</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT BY A READING SPECIALIST</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NO. OF SCHOOLS</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

Summary and Recommendations

I. Introduction

This chapter summarizes the study and draws conclusions based upon the findings. Implications and recommendations pertinent to the population of this study are suggested. Generalizations drawn from this research should be limited to the population used for the study or to similar populations.

II. Summary

This study gathered descriptive data concerning the status of secondary reading programs in British Columbia. The review of the literature indicated that few status surveys of reading have been performed, even though they are thought to be of considerable value. Status surveys of secondary reading have generally noted an unavailability of trained personnel and funds as major reasons for the lack of a reading program. Teachers of reading were often found to be untrained. A dearth of content-area reading instruction was also common in the studies reviewed in Chapter II.
B. Objectives of the Study

The major objectives of this study were to answer the following questions:

1. What reading programs are currently available in British Columbia's secondary schools?
2. What are the major reasons given for a lack of reading programs?
3. Is there a difference in type and number of reading programs between junior and senior secondary schools?
4. What are the special qualifications, if any, of the teachers of secondary reading programs?
5. Has there been a trend toward expansion of secondary reading programs? If so, in which area (e.g., remedial, developmental, etc.) has the greatest expansion occurred?
6. What do the people being surveyed feel will be the area (in secondary reading) needing the most attention and support in future?
7. What is the reaction of the people being surveyed regarding the contribution of the reading program in their school?
8. Is there an observable relationship between teacher training and types of reading programs offered in schools?
9. Is there an observable relationship between school size and reading programs offered in secondary schools?

B. Procedures and Analysis of the Data

A questionnaire addressed to the principal was sent to all schools in British Columbia containing one or more of the grades 8-12. Results were based upon a return of 294 questionnaires or 88.8%. The survey instrument was a modified version of a questionnaire developed by Dr. W. Hill (1975) and was divided into eight general sections (see Chapter III, Section I).

The raw data was punched onto computer data cards and was analyzed through the University of British Columbia's computer facilities. The standard LERTAP and MVTAB computer programs were used. The LERTAP program tabulated results while the MVTAB program generated tables through comparison of responses to questions 4, 11, 12, 127, 128, 129 with all other responses on the questionnaire. Comparison across the generated tables was done manually. The comparisons allowed the investigator to answer the questions noted under the objectives of the study. Results were reported in descriptive terms.
C. Conclusions

The conclusions, based upon the data gathered from the population used in this study, are:

1. Two hundred fourteen of 294 respondents indicated the existence of some form of organized reading activity in their school. The majority of available reading programs are remedial and developmental. There is less emphasis on corrective, content-oriented, and disadvantaged reader instruction.

2. Schools lacking secondary reading programs cite the unavailability of trained reading personnel, insufficient funding, and staff apathy (in that order) as major reasons for the lack.

3. Remedial and corrective reading programs are most available at both the junior and senior secondary school levels. Senior secondary schools, however, stress disadvantaged reader programs to a greater degree than do junior secondary schools, which emphasize corrective reading programs.

4. The majority of secondary reading teachers are untrained in the teaching of reading. Only 10% meet the IRA (1965) minimum training standards for reading instructors.

5. Most secondary reading programs in British Columbia came into being after 1970. The survey revealed the existence of only 15 secondary
reading programs prior to 1964.

6. Developmental and remedial reading programs are expected to receive the greatest administrative support over the next several years.

7. Approximately one-half of responding administrators having a reading program in their school are less than satisfied with it. Administrators cite secondary reading programs taught by untrained teachers as a major source of dissatisfaction.

8. In most cases adequately trained teachers provide a diverse program in reading while teachers untrained in reading education tend to emphasize only remedial or developmental reading.

9. Large schools offer a greater variety of reading instruction than do small schools.

10. The majority of schools (71.9%) with some form of organized reading activity have a special facility where such instruction takes place.

11. Grade-wide testing of reading is not common beyond the grade eight level. Informal tests are commonly used to supplement standardized reading test data.

The findings and conclusions are in general agreement with results noted in the review of the literature.
III. **Recommendations**

On the basis of the results and conclusions, the following recommendations are offered:

1. Greater emphasis should be placed upon disadvantaged, corrective, and content instruction in reading.

2. Teacher training institutions should require a course in reading instruction for all prospective secondary teachers. Also, prospective English teachers should have additional courses in the teaching of reading, since the prevailing opinion is that English teachers are responsible for the teaching of reading skills in secondary grades.

3. Since all but two administrators without reading instruction in their schools felt that such instruction is needed, every effort should be made to initiate organized reading activity in all British Columbia secondary schools.

4. More inservice education in reading should be made available. Since secondary administrators are more satisfied with reading programs taught by trained rather than untrained reading teachers, efforts should be channeled into upgrading the training of teachers through inservice and extension courses in reading instruction.

5. Since research has shown that reading instruction taking place in a special facility is more
effective than reading instruction taking place in a regular classroom, schools should designate a place specifically for instruction in reading skills.

IV. Recommendations for Future Research

This investigation has supplied partial answers to questions regarding the status of secondary reading programs in British Columbia. The study was intended as only a "first step", however, and further research in the area should be undertaken. The following are suggestions for further study:

1. It would be worthwhile to refine some of the questions used in the questionnaire. Since many of the questions in the instrument were of a general nature, more specific responses should now be determined. An entire study, for example, could be based on a population consisting of those giving an affirmative response to question 14, regarding the availability of special, in-school reading facilities.

2. More information regarding administrators' dissatisfaction with reading programs would be valuable. Further study should be done in this area.

3. The raw data for this study could be further analyzed to discover whether observed differences
(e.g., between junior and senior secondary school reading programs) are significant.

4. Smith (1963:37) stated that "in discussing [reading] programs, one needs to be cognizant of type and quality, for a reading program might be little more than one in name only." It may thus be valuable to further study schools which include a reading program, in order to relate actual instruction to stated program types and goals. An observation/interview method may be the most appropriate method for such research.
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APPENDIX A

The Data Gathering Instrument
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS:

PLEASE SELECT YOUR ANSWER FROM THE CHOICES LISTED AFTER EACH QUESTION. ENTER THE NUMBER OF YOUR ANSWER (THE NUMBER IMMEDIATELY PRECEDING YOUR CHOICE) IN THE BOX TO THE RIGHT OF THE QUESTION. PLEASE ANSWER ALL THE QUESTIONS ON BOTH SIDES OF EACH PAGE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE BOOKLET. ALL REPLIES ARE CONFIDENTIAL. THANK YOU.

1. What is the student population, in all grades, of your school?
   1 under 250 students
   2 250 to 499 students
   3 500 to 999 students
   4 1000 to 1999 students
   5 2000 or more students

2. Which of the following best describes the population area served by your school?
   1 urban inner-city
   2 urban general
   3 suburban
   4 smaller city
   5 rural

FOR ALL QUESTIONS ABOUT "ORGANIZED SECONDARY READING ACTIVITY": "organized reading activity" refers to any regularly provided, teacher directed, reading instructional programs of a minimum six weeks duration. It does not include momentary or incidental reading aid to a student in a classroom learning situation.

3. In your school, is some form of organized reading activity provided for one or more of the secondary grades (grades 8-12)?
   1 yes (SKIP TO QUESTION 5)
   2 no (PLEASE ANSWER QUESTION 4, AND RETURN QUESTIONNAIRE)

4. Which of the following best accounts for the absence of organized secondary reading activity in your school?
   1 little need for such activity in this school
   2 funds insufficient to support such activity
   3 lack of available, trained reading personnel
   4 facilities insufficient to operate or support program
   5 scheduling and/or administrative complexities
   6 lack of staff concern or interest

IF YOUR ANSWER TO QUESTION 3 WAS "NO". THEN PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE, IN THE ENCLOSED ENVELOPE. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

5. When was organized reading activity initiated in your school, for one or more of the secondary grades in your school (grades 8-12)?
   1 before 1960
   2 1960 to 1964
   3 1965 to 1969
   4 1970 or later

6. Since 1970, organized reading activity, in your school, has
   1 increased substantially
   2 increased a little
   3 shown no noticeable change
   4 decreased a little
   5 decreased substantially

7. Which of the following factors, in your opinion, contributed most to the trend indicated in question 6?
   1 provincial or local mandated program changes
   2 availability of funds
   3 local administrative factors
   4 availability of trained reading personnel
   5 attitude of school staff
ORGANIZED READING ACTIVITY CAN TAKE A VARIETY OF FORMS. THE FOLLOWING ARE THE MOST COMMON PATTERNS:

- **Developmental reading classes** — systematic instruction in reading skills, regardless of the relative reading ability of the student.

- **Corrective reading classes** — adjusted group instruction in reading for students revealing some difficulty with reading and its use.

- **Remedial reading program** — individualized reading treatment for students with serious reading disability.

- **Content or subject-oriented reading instruction** — systematic instruction in reading within the subject-area setting and oriented to the needs of that area.

- **"Disadvantaged" reader programs** — special, reading-oriented programs, limited to students meeting certain criteria of socio-economic or cultural disadvantage. For example, reading programs dealing with the problems encountered by our native Indian population, or programs for new Canadian students, may fall into this category.

8. Which of the following forms of organized reading activity are presently provided in one or more of the secondary grades (8-12) of your school?

(Answer each part using the following:)

1. Yes
2. No

- a. developmental reading classes
- b. corrective reading classes
- c. remedial reading classes or program
- d. content or subject-oriented reading instruction
- e. reading for "disadvantaged" students (special program)

9. Which one of the following forms of reading activity would you consider to be the major emphasis of the reading program currently in your school?

- 1. developmental reading classes
- 2. corrective reading classes
- 3. remedial reading classes or program
- 4. content or subject-oriented reading instruction
- 5. reading for "disadvantaged" students (special program)

10. Of the reading instructional activity presently provided in your school, which have increased, decreased, or remained unchanged since 1970?

(Answer each part using the following:)

1. Increased
2. No change
3. Decreased
4. No program of this type in this school

- a. developmental reading classes
- b. corrective reading classes
- c. remedial reading classes or program
- d. content or subject-oriented reading instruction
- e. reading for "disadvantaged" students (special program)
11. With regard to the reading instructional activities which have increased in your school, please indicate in which of the following ways the increase may be described.

(ANSWER EACH PART USING THE FOLLOWING:)

1 = yes  
2 = no

a. increase in number of students instructed ........................................... 30
b. extension of instructional time ......................................................... 31
c. greater variety in instructional offerings and services ........................ 32
d. extension of program to include more grade levels ............................... 33
e. greater (more active) involvement by subject-area teachers ................... 34

12. With regard to the reading instructional activities which have decreased in your school, please indicate in which of the following ways the decrease may be described?

(ANSWER EACH PART USING THE FOLLOWING:)

1 = yes  
2 = no

a. decrease in number of students instructed ........................................... 35
b. reduction of instructional time ......................................................... 34
c. less variety in reading instruction and services .................................... 33
d. reduction of program to cover fewer grade levels ................................ 36
e. less active involvement by subject area teachers .................................... 37

13. Relative to your own secondary school situation (grades 8-12), which one of the following types of reading instruction needs the greatest administrative support for the next several years?

1 developmental reading classes  
2 corrective reading classes  
3 remedial reading classes or programs  
4 reading for "disadvantaged" students  
5 content or subject-oriented reading instruction  

14. Is there a special reading facility ("center", "lab", "clinic", L.A.C., etc.) presently in use in your school?

1 yes (CONTINUE WITH QUESTION 15)  
2 no (SKIP TO QUESTION 18)

15. The special reading facility ("center", "lab", "clinic", L.A.C., etc.) in your school can best be described by which one of the following statements?

Our reading facility:

1 is responsible for handling most of the reading program  
2 provides supplementary reading instruction and services  
3 provides supplementary reading instruction only  
4 provides supplementary reading services only  
5 plays little or no part in this school's reading program  

42
Which of the following types of reading instructional activities would your school's reading facility provide on a regular basis?

(ANSWER EACH PART USING THE FOLLOWING:)

1 = yes
2 = no

a. developmental reading classes .................................................................

b. developmental reading instruction (individualized) .....................................

c. corrective reading classes or groups .........................................................

d. individualized remedial treatment ............................................................

e. programs for "disadvantaged" students .....................................................

Which of the following additional responsibilities or functions are regularly assigned to your school's reading facility staff?

(ANSWER EACH PART USING THE FOLLOWING:)

1 = yes
2 = no

a. reading program administration ..............................................................

b. testing and diagnosis ..................................................................................

c. student counselling ....................................................................................

d. inservice education in reading ....................................................................

e. public relations activities ...........................................................................

Which grade levels, in your school, provide developmental reading classes regularly?

(ANSWER EACH PART USING THE FOLLOWING:)

1 = yes
2 = no
9 = grade is not included in this school

a. grade 8 ...........................................................................................................

b. grade 9 ...........................................................................................................

c. grade 10 ........................................................................................................

d. grade 11 ........................................................................................................

e. grade 12 ........................................................................................................
20. Please indicate those grade levels in your school where more than 50% of the students are enrolled in developmental reading classes.

(ANSWER EACH PART USING THE FOLLOWING:)

1 = yes
2 = no
9 = grade is not included in this school

a. grade 8
b. grade 9
c. grade 10
d. grade 11
e. grade 12

21. Which grade levels, in your school, provide corrective reading classes regularly?

(ANSWER EACH PART USING THE FOLLOWING:)

1 = yes
2 = no
9 = grade is not included in this school

a. grade 8
b. grade 9
c. grade 10
d. grade 11
e. grade 12

22. Which grade levels, in your school, provide remedial reading classes regularly?

(ANSWER EACH PART USING THE FOLLOWING:)

1 = yes
2 = no
9 = grade is not included in this school

a. grade 8
b. grade 9
c. grade 10
d. grade 11
e. grade 12

23. Which grade levels, in your school, provide reading programs for "disadvantaged" students?

(ANSWER EACH PART USING THE FOLLOWING:)

1 = yes
2 = no
9 = grade is not included in this school

a. grade 8
b. grade 9
c. grade 10
d. grade 11
e. grade 12
24. Please indicate those grade levels where standardized tests in reading are administered to most students.

(ANSWER EACH PART USING THE FOLLOWING:)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. grade 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. grade 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. grade 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. grade 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. grade 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Which of the following reading assessment procedures are regularly or frequently employed to supplement standardized reading test data on the students of your school?

(ANSWER EACH PART USING THE FOLLOWING:)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. group standardized diagnostic reading tests</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. reading tests as part of commercial instructional material</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. informal reading tests developed by reading teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. individual diagnostic assessment by reading specialists</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Which of the following best typifies the involvement of the subject-area teachers of your school with reading instruction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Involvement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 participate in a planned subject-area oriented reading program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 make independent effort to improve student skill in reading and use of materials related to subject area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 provide incidental and/or occasional instruction in reading skills related to subject area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 express verbal concern about the reading problems of students</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 generally, are unaware about reading needs of students in subject areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Which of the following curricular areas is making the most effective effort in developing reading instruction, within a subject area, in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 English (language arts and literature)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Applied arts and skills (drama, art, music, P.E., etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 other curricular area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Who handles the coordination and administration of the secondary grade (8-12) reading program in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Handler</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 district administrative personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 principal's office of this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 in-school reading administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 subject-area department head</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. In terms of full time equivalance, how many secondary reading teachers are hired to staff your school's reading program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 less than one</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 at least one, but less than two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 at least two, but less than three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 at least three, but less than four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 four or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Which of the following is most representative of the special professional training in reading among the teachers of reading in your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 general teacher training only</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 inservice training in reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 a professional course or two in reading education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 an undergraduate concentration in reading education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 a graduate degree in reading education or as a reading specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. Which of the following are major responsibilities of the secondary grade (8-12) reading teachers in your school?

(ANSWER EACH PART USING THE FOLLOWING:

1 = yes
2 = no

a. teaching developmental reading classes ..............................................

b. providing corrective and remedial instruction ..................................

c. testing and diagnosing reading difficulty in students ....................

d. providing supportive help for subject area teachers ........................

e. providing teacher inservice education in reading instruction ..........

32. If the reading teacher(s) in your school carry a partial teaching load in a subject area, in which of the following is the additional teaching responsibility concentrated?

1 English (language arts and literature)
2 Social Studies
3 Sciences
4 Mathematics
5 Applied arts and skills (drama, art, music, P.E., etc.)
7 other curricular area

33. Please rank the following forms of secondary reading activity according to how important you think the activities are (or would be) to the total educational program in your school, irrespective of whether or not they are presently included in your school program. Assign a rank of 1 to the most important, 2 to the second most important, etc., to 5, the least important.

a. developmental reading instruction ..................................................

b. corrective reading classes ............................................................

c. individualized remedial aid .........................................................

d. reading programs for "disadvantaged" students ...............................  

e. development of subject-matter oriented reading instruction ............

34. Which of the following best reflects your confidential reaction to the contribution of the secondary reading effort to your students and school program?

1 .very satisfied
2 satisfied
3 somewhat dissatisfied
4 very dissatisfied
5 doubt the appropriateness of reading instruction as a secondary school objective

35. Have you any specific suggestions for improving secondary reading education (grades 8-12) in the Province of British Columbia? Please comment below.

36. Please comment below, if you wish, on the validity of this questionnaire to your reading program or school.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION. PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE USING THE ENCLOSED STAMPED, ADDRESSED ENVELOPE.
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The Covering Letter Sent with the Initial Mailing
APPENDIX C

Letter to the Provincial Department of Education
March 24, 1976

Dr. Patrick L. McGeer
Minister of Education
Parliament Buildings
Victoria, B.C.

Dear Sir:

I am, at present, a graduate student enrolled at the University of British Columbia in the Department of Reading Education.

You are undoubtedly aware that the subject of reading in our school system is generating much discussion among the people in our province. I am writing, therefore, to inform you as to the subject of my graduate thesis, as both my advisor, Brother Leonard Courtney (Chairman, Reading Education Department) and I feel that it will complement the Language Arts Survey currently being completed, which concerns itself with grades four, eight, and twelve.

As a part of my thesis work, I propose to survey the secondary schools in the Province of British Columbia toward the clarification of the following questions:

1. What reading programs are currently available in secondary schools?
2. Are reading programs available in equal measure throughout the province, or do they "cluster" in certain school districts?
3. What are the qualifications of the teachers of these programs, and what qualifications do school administrators feel they should have (if any), beyond those of the teachers of regular classes?
4. Has there been a trend toward expansion of secondary reading programs (developmental, remedial, corrective, clinical), in which of these areas has the greatest expansion occurred, and what do the people being surveyed feel will be the area needing the most attention in the future?

The survey will be based on a questionnaire of approximately 30 items (similar to one developed by Professor Walter Hill, New York State University), and will be sent to the administrators of the approximately 315 secondary schools in the Province.

As has been stated, I realize that the Department of Education is in the process of completing a Language Arts Survey, and I trust that my study will not interfere with this.

Any comments which you wish to make will be gratefully received. It is my intention, upon completion of the study, to send a copy of the results to the Department of Education.

Sincerely,

Charles Kinzer

CK:ty
APPENDIX D

Reply from the Provincial Department of Education
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The Covering Letter Sent with the Second Mailing