

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Cathy Ellis for the degree of Master of Science
in Home Economics Education

presented on August 6, 1985

Title: Oregon Home Economics Teachers' Knowledge and
Use of Content Area Reading Strategies

Redacted for Privacy

Abstract approved: _____

Helen Hall

The major purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which home economics teachers know and use content area reading strategies in the classroom. The study looked at a variety of personal and school variables to determine their relationship to the teachers' knowledge and use of content area reading strategies. The study was designed to determine what role the home economics teacher plays in reading instruction. Finally, the study examined reading training and needs.

The sample used in this study included thirty-four Oregon home economics teachers. Seventeen had participated in a content area reading, writing and

mathematics strategies workshop in the summer of 1984. The remaining seventeen Oregon home economics teachers were randomly selected from a list secured from the state specialist.

Data for the purpose of this study were collected by means of a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was developed by the researcher and validated by a panel of experts. The questionnaire include sections on: content area reading strategies knowledge and use, teachers' role in reading instruction, and personal and school data.

This study revealed that workshop training could have a significant impact on teachers' knowledge and use of content area reading strategies. Training is an issue with home economics, many feeling inadequately trained. Teachers support the contention that there is room in the home economics curriculum to integrate and teach reading. The time consuming nature of developing reading strategies was reported.

Oregon Home Economics Teachers'
Knowledge and Use of
Content Area Reading Strategies

by

Cathy J. Ellis

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirement for the
degree of

Master of Science

Completed August 6, 1985

Commencement June 1986

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Home Economics Education in charge of
major

Redacted for Privacy

Head of Vocational Technical Education Department

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented August 6, 1985

Typed by Cathy J. Ellis

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Helen Hall, my major professor, for all her help and support. Her enthusiasm, interest and help on the thesis project was appreciated!

A special thank you is extended to Dr. Sylvia Lee. It was during my graduate assistantship with Dr. Lee that I began my work in content area reading strategies. It was a pleasure and honor to have her serve on my committee.

I would like to thank Pam Bodenroeder, Survey Research Specialist and Dave Niess, Statistical Consultant for their technical assistance.

Last, but not least, a special thanks to my family. To my husband, Larry for his encouragement and support and to my daughters, Alana and Patricia for their patience, love and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER I	
Introduction	1
Statement of Purpose and Objectives.....	4
CHAPTER II	
Review of Related Literature.....	6
Historical Perspective of Reading in the Content Area.....	6
Content Reading versus Reading Instruction.....	9
Reading Instruction in Home Economics.....	12
CHAPTER III	
Research Design.....	22
Description of the Sample.....	22
Development of the Questionnaire.....	23
Data Collection Procedures.....	26
Statistical Analysis.....	27

CHAPTER IV

Presentation of Findings.....	29
Description of the Sample.....	29
Instruments Used in Data Collection.....	30
Testing the Hypothesis.....	44
Hypothesis Ia.....	45
Hypothesis Ib.....	46
Hypothesis II.....	49
Hypothesis III.....	55

CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.....	59
Summary.....	59
Findings and Conclusions.....	60
Implications and Recommendations.....	65
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	69

APPENDICES

A. Questionnaire.....	74
B. Letter to Workshop Participants.....	81
C. Letter to Control Group.....	83
D. Follow-up Postcard.....	85

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Percentages of Knowledge and Use of Content Area Reading Strategies.....	32
2 Percentages Regarding Home Economics Teachers' Role in Content Area Reading Instruction.....	34
3. Percentages of How Often the Home Economics Teachers Use Each of the Four Reading Purposes.....	36
4. Distribution of Total Sample by Number and Percent of Subjects as to Teaching Experience, School Size, Grade Levels Taught and Number of Daily Preparations.....	37
5. Distribution of Sample by Number and Percent of Subjects as to Amounts and Types of Training They Have Had.....	39
6. Distribution of Sample by Number and Percent of Subjects Who Wish Additional Training.....	40
7 Preferences as to the Type of Delivery System Teachers would Likely Choose for Additional Content Area Reading Training.....	41
8 Summary of Hypothesis Ia.....	46
9 Summary of Hypothesis Ib.....	47
10 Summary of Hypothesis IIa.....	50
11 Summary of Hypothesis IIb.....	51
12 Summary of Hypothesis IIc.....	52
13 Summary of Hypothesis IID.....	53
14 Summary of Hypothesis IIE.....	54
15 Summary of Hypothesis IIIa.....	56
16 Summary of Hypothesis IIIb.....	57
17 Summary of Hypothesis IIIc.....	58

OREGON HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS'
KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF CONTENT AREA READING
STRATEGIES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The current rise in the back-to-basics movement has given impetus to the notion that all teachers are teachers of reading. The various reports concerning quality and excellence in education has stirred public interest and prompted many educators to review their programs in light of the current curricular concerns (USOE, 1983; Goodlad, 1983). The middle and secondary school curricula of the 1980s reflect a fast-moving society in which vast amounts of knowledge must be disseminated to develop a more literate and capable future generation. As teacher education programs have improved since the mid 1960s, teachers now are more aware of the individual differences of students as well as the necessity of reading instruction for student's learning of content material (Cheek and Cheek, 1983). Teachers are encouraged to infuse reading instruction into content subjects to enhance learning. Disciplines, such as home economics, are being asked to take an active part in the content teaching of reading.

The home economics profession has responded to the various reports concerning quality and excellence in education. A coalition representing the American Home Economics Education Association, The American Vocational Association and the Home Economics Education Association responded to the various reports. The following is from the coalition statement,

Consumer and Homemaking Education classes contribute to the development of reading skills. Reading is emphasized through comparison analysis and interpretation in nutrition, child growth and development as well as physical, emotional, and economic concerns of families. Reading is stressed in Consumer and Homemaking Education classes through textbook assignments, product labels and directions, magazine articles, and newspapers. Also, library research and vocabulary development are appropriate in such areas as family relations, nutrition education, consumer education, parenting, and child development. (Dobry, 1985, p. 6-7)

Since home economics education does use considerable printed information with students, it is imperative that reading content instruction be utilized.

Teacher preparation in Oregon has focused attention on the teaching of reading in the content area. All secondary teachers in the state are required to have preparation for teaching reading in their content area in order to be eligible for a basic

teaching certificate. Home economics teachers completing their basic certification program in Oregon colleges and universities have to meet this requirement. In addition, all secondary teachers are required to have an advanced course in teaching reading in order to qualify for a standard teaching certificate.

Oregon State University's Home Economics Education Program has recently addressed the issue of teaching reading in the content area. Oregon State University was contracted by the Oregon Department of Education to do a curriculum project. The project called for the formation of a steering committee to examine curricular needs in home economics. The recommendation of the steering committee was that the curriculum project should focus on strategies to teach reading, writing and mathematics in home economics.

Teachers were asked to apply for a summer curriculum workshop involving the development of reading, writing and mathematics strategies for home economics. Nineteen teachers from around Oregon were selected to participate in a week long workshop. Eighteen teachers (including the author) participated in the workshop. Consultants in reading, writing and mathematics strategies gave training sessions for all workshop participants. The author was the reading

consultant. Three groups were formed; a reading, writing and mathematics group. Each group developed, revised and reviewed strategies in the particular basic skill they were assigned. A resource guide was developed. The guide was field tested from January to May, 1985 by approximately sixty Oregon home economics teachers.

Statement of Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which home economics teachers know and use teaching strategies for reading in the content area. The study compared the seventeen workshop participants with non-participants. In addition, the study was designed to determine home economics teachers' perceptions of their role in teaching reading. Finally, the research examined how much training in reading in the content area teachers received and how much more, if any, they felt they needed.

Objectives

The objectives of this study were to:

1. determine the knowledge and use of strategies in reading in the content area by home economics teachers in Oregon.
2. compare workshop participants and non-participants regarding their knowledge and use of strategies for teaching reading in the content area.
3. identify attitudes toward the teaching of reading in the content area.
4. compare workshop participants and non-participants regarding their attitude toward the teaching of reading in the content area.
5. identify further training needed by home economics teachers in Oregon in strategies for teaching reading

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Historical Perspective of Reading in the Content Area

The approach of teaching reading through the content areas is a relatively young educational endeavor. It was in the late 1940s that basal readers first broached the concept of teaching reading through social studies and science subject matter. Secondary reading instruction up to this time was remedial instruction. William S. Gray and Eva Bond wrote the first professional book on reading instruction in the secondary school, published in 1941 by Macmillan (Cheek and Cheek, 1983) titled Developmental Reading in High School. Literature, social studies, science and mathematics were the reading in the content area disciplines addressed.

Interest in reading in the content area was kept alive by research studies such as those by Norwell (1941) and Artley (1944). Their research indicated that implementing the teaching of reading in the content areas was a sound educational pursuit. Thus, reading in the content areas became more important. The research gave credence to the continued development of reading in the content area instruction. In the early sixties Gray and Strang gave insight into the future of reading

instruction. In 1961, Gray suggested that reading in the content area instruction would produce mature, competent readers in the future. Strang (1962) suggested that we should analyze the reading processes that are actually used by students with varying backgrounds and degrees of ability when they read different kinds of material for different purposes. She stressed that up to now instruction in reading had been much too general.

Research had indicated the need for the teaching of reading through the content area, yet few programs had been implemented. In 1961, Burton suggested that colleges could be blamed since many did not encourage or provide such training.

Since the mid 1960s, reading instruction in the content areas has been a major concern of secondary schools. Still, it was not until 1970 that the first textbook was published that was devoted exclusively to the concept of teaching reading in the content area. The book Teaching Reading in Content Areas was by Harold L. Herber (1978). This book was followed by others, such as those of Estes and Vaughn (1978), Singer and Donlan (1980), Forgan and Mangrum (1981), Thomas and Robinson (1977), Robinson (1978), Smith, Smith and Mikulecky (1978), and Cheek and Cheek (1983), that have provided content teachers with ideas on how

reading instruction can assist content teaching. Since 1970, interest in this aspect of reading instruction has steadily increased and has been reflected in many ways, not the least of which is through a variety of publications including: major textbooks, special bulletins, numerous monographs, and many articles. The 1981 Certification Requirements in Reading report by the International Reading Association reported that many states are now requiring training in this field for all teachers.

Attitudes toward teaching reading by secondary content teachers seem to be changing. In 1979, Jackson found that "nearly three-quarters of the secondary teachers surveyed felt that content teachers could be reading teachers, more than two-thirds felt they were reading teachers and more than three quarters were willing to take a course in teaching reading" (p.232). This finding was in contrast to Karlin's 1969 research in which secondary teachers indicated that the responsibility for teaching reading belonged to the elementary teacher. Jackson's research suggests that secondary teachers are now accepting the responsibility of providing content reading instruction.

Content Reading versus Reading Instruction

Classroom experiences in the content areas have shown that as students are instructed at appropriate levels and taught how to study content information, their learning improves, as does their self-concept and attitude toward learning. Reading instruction is being incorporated into the content classroom in order to better meet the cognitive as well as the psychological and sociological needs of the student.

Content reading differs from general reading instruction in that content reading is provided in conjunction with content teaching, while reading instruction usually is thought of as a special reading class or elementary content. General reading instruction places emphasis on skill development and independent reading, while content reading relates reading instruction to specific content materials (Cheek and Cheek, 1983).

Reading instruction at the secondary level has focused on a skills approach. Most articles and textbooks dealing with reading instruction state that it should focus on skills necessary to understand the concepts found in textbooks. In one such text Cheek and Cheek (1983) defined reading as a developmental process, introduced in the primary grades, refined in

the upper elementary grades, and applied exclusively to learning situations at the middle and secondary school levels. Reading has no content, only the learning and application of skills for gaining information and enjoyment.

The skills approach to reading instruction suggests that materials in each of the content areas have their own organizational format, technical vocabulary and unique written style. Smith (1976) has focused on the skills approach to reading instruction with his "outside-in" theory. Teachers using the "outside-in" theory are asked to begin with the content of the reading material being presented and let the nature of that content, its ideas and methods, dictate the selection of reading skills (Fielding, 1982). The curriculum materials in a course should be the organizing element for reading instruction. The reading instruction is based on the principle that "content determines process" (Herber, 1978 p. 4). What determines what reading skills are to be taught in any given discipline is the information being presented, the concepts to be developed and the very organization of the material being used. Unlike the reading teacher who teaches a set of reading skills, the content area teacher teaches only those skills needed by the student to understand the content of the subject matter being presented. The content will determine the

reading skills instruction needed and the order in which they are taught. The content teacher is not concerned with the sequential development of reading skills, but with the sequential development of ideas.

Thus the content teacher teaches reading skills and subject content simultaneously (Herber, 1978).

Cunningham, Cunningham, and Arthur (1981) emphasized that "content teachers are not teachers of reading, reading is used by content teachers to facilitate their content areas....Each content-area subject requires specialized tools" (p. 71). The content reading instruction is the tool the student uses to better understand the concepts being presented by the content teacher. "The content teacher does not 'give up' part of the teaching time to teach some reading; rather reading is 'used' to teach more content" (p. 71).

In order for students to comprehend content material, they are given reading skills instruction. Through reading instruction students will gain the necessary skills to enhance their understanding of the content material being presented. In order for all students to maximize their content learning, content reading instruction is necessary (Cheek and Cheek,

1983). It is assumed that content teachers will provide the necessary instruction so that students can learn how to read and understand the specialized content information of the discipline being taught.

Reading Instruction in Home Economics

The first articles related to teaching reading in home economics appeared in the home economics publication Illinois Teacher in the early 1970s and were written by Spitze (1970, 1971). These articles emphasized the importance of matching reading materials with individual student's reading level. It was recommended that curriculum material be rewritten on different readability levels to accommodate all students in a classroom. Further, she felt that students should have some choice in the selection of their reading materials so that they would be more motivated to read the material and they would gain self-confidence in the process. This position of readability was reiterated in Ley's article in 1978.

It is the professional responsibility of the home economics teacher to make learning experiences involving reading more relevant to their students. Once you have evaluated the materials you use in your classroom, you will be able to construct more relevant and less frustrating reading experiences for learners in your home economics classes. You may even want to try your hand at writing materials dealing with the same concept at various reading levels (p. 48-49).

Although Ley dealt with readability, she added a new dimension to reading instruction for home economics teachers to consider. In this article the taxonomy of reading comprehension was explained. It now became evident that having materials at a student's readability level was not the only consideration to helping a student comprehend the subject matter being presented. The examples given by Ley using Barrett's taxonomy were limited. Her purpose was to help teachers comprehend the taxonomy so that successful teaching-learning experiences would be developed for the classroom.

Home economics teachers were to wait until 1984 to again read professional home economics articles that addressed the teaching of reading in home economics. In 1984, articles by Thompson and Davis, and Harbour appeared in Illinois Teacher. The article by Thompson and Davis emphasized reading readability testing. They suggested that the first step in helping students understand the subject matter is to closely examine the material to be used by students in the classroom. The article stated that, "Many of the reading problems which interfere with learning in home economics classes can be traced to the reading material rather than the students" p. 156. The article suggested that teachers assess materials used in home economics by estimating grade reading levels of texts and other

reading materials. The article did not present a readability formula, instead it gave bibliography references of the four most commonly used readability formulas; Fry, Flesch, SMOG. and Dale-Chall. The article did show how to graph the readability score of a text and how to interpret its meaning. A more complete description of this readability procedure appeared in Thompson, Davis and Wade (1982) curriculum guide from Pennsylvania State University.

Although the Thompson and Davis article was titled "Readability: A factor in selecting teaching materials," it dealt with more than just readability. It was the first journal article written that included specific reading strategies for the home economics classroom teacher. The article stressed that reading strategies would further enhance students' comprehension of content reading. The article focused on some of the reading skills commonly used with home economics materials including: vocabulary development; following directions; locating main ideas and supporting details; reading diagrams, patterns, graphs, charts and labels; and making inferences and judgments. Examples of strategies for teaching each of these skills were given.

Harbour's article reported on a content area reading program in Manhattan High School in Kansas. The program began in 1979 with 100 Manhattan high school

teachers participating including two home economics teachers. The teachers received extensive training and the opportunity to develop and implement a variety of reading strategies for their home economics program. These home economics teachers observed that reading strategies could be adapted to home economics reading materials. After content reading strategies were integrated into the home economics classroom the following observations were made of home economics students; increased student participation, greater self-confidence, positive attitudes toward reading, increased vocabulary, improvement in study skills, increased comprehension and improved organizational and questioning skills (p. 56). Because of these student benefits, the home economics teacher concluded that the time and effort necessary for implementation were worthwhile.

Harbour's article demonstrated to home economics teachers that they can become competent in using content area reading strategies to improve their student comprehension. Perhaps a testimonial like Harbour's will be enough to encourage apprehensive home economics teachers to try their hand at content area reading instruction. Very few studies of teachers' knowledge and attitudes toward content area reading instruction have included home economics teachers in their samples. According to Thompson (1983) these

studies indicated that home economics teachers supported reading instruction, but they felt inadequately prepared to teaching reading in their content area.

The Harbour article also supported the contention that teaching content area reading skills does not infringe on the time needed to cover home economics subject matter. She pointed out that by integrating reading instruction into home economics when appropriate, no home economics content subject matter was sacrificed. Harbour was bearing out what Herber (1977) said about content area reading instruction when he stated:

Appropriate reading skills are to be taught in the content areas as the students read what they are required to read. Reading skills and subject content are taught simultaneously. There need not be a dichotomy between the content of a subject and the skills for learning the content (p. 4).

Harbour, like Thompson and Davis, showed several specific examples of content area reading strategies. Since very few home economics examples exist in content area reading strategy resource materials Harbour, presented the first published home economics examples of Kelley and Homes' (1979) guided lecture strategy and of Manzo's (1968) modified ReQuest strategy. In addition, she mentioned additional content area reading strategies she found adaptable to home economics

reading materials and listed the corresponding resources for home economics teachers to research.

Although until recently there were limited resources on content area reading strategies written specifically for home economics teachers, that is changing. The Thompson, Davis and Wade (1982) curriculum guide provided many home economics examples of content area reading strategies. Integrating Basic Skills in Home Economics Education which has just completed field testing in Oregon is another such example. This resource guide was a joint effort with the State Department of Education and Oregon State University's Home Economics Education Program. Most of the other home economics curriculum guides that have been published in the last three years have generally addressed the "basics" of reading, writing and mathematics. These guides have either provided no specific home economics content area reading strategy examples or their coverage of content area reading strategies has been limited.

Teaching reading in home economics has been addressed by some authors of textbooks on content area reading. However, the coverage of home economics in reading in the content area textbooks for university coursework or for extended reading have provided few examples of home economics reading in content strategies. Perhaps the reason is that few teacher

preparation programs have responded to the need for reading instruction in home economics. Conway (1979) indicated that only 20 percent of the states were found to require a reading course in the teacher education program for home economics teachers. "This reflects little change in the 20-year period since Dennis found many homemaking teachers had no formal coursework to aid their students to become better readers" (Thompson, 1983, p.20). Oregon, however, is among the 20 percent cited by Conway that do require college course work in reading for home economics educators.

The textbook authors that have included content area home economics reading strategies have consistently offered skill related strategies like developing technical vocabulary; following directions; and reading diagrams, patterns and graphs. In Thomas and Robinson (1977) they gave examples of how to teach a student to read directions on package mixes, recipes and sewing patterns. Cheek and Cheek's (1983) only home economics content area reading strategy example addressed vocabulary skill development and following directions in a recipe.

What authors of textbooks and researchers on content area reading have done for home economics teachers is to identify the skills which are needed by students for effective reading in the home economics classroom. Some examples of reading skills for home economics include the following:

- ability to understand the technical vocabulary
- ability to follow directions
- critical reading ability
- creative reading ability
- ability to locate a directly stated main idea
- ability to locate significant details
- ability to use specialized reference material
(Miller, 1974, p. 433)

Morrison (1980) identified the following reading skills as necessary for use with home economics narrative material at the secondary level.

Word attack and vocabulary skills:

- using roots, prefixes, and suffixes
- seeking appropriate meaning for technical words and phrases
- using clues from the sentence to determine the meaning of an unfamiliar word

Comprehension skills:

- interpreting specialized notations
- distinguishing fact from opinion
- identifying details that support a position
- making use of transitional words, phrases, and clauses as bridges to join ideas

Study skills:

formulating questions relevant to the purpose for reading

adjusting reading speed to the purpose for reading

taking notes in informal/formal outlines

utilizing sources to locate materials

Textbook authors and researchers in the area of content area reading have provided home economics teachers with a list of content area reading skills that can be addressed in home economics classes. Additional reading skills listed by teachers as being important were spelling, listening and following directions (Thompson, 1983). It is evident that home economics teachers could teach a variety of content area reading skills. The types of content area reading instruction addressed in a home economics class will be limited by the amount of time spent on reading related activities and by the selection of reading materials for the classroom.

Thompson (1983) has indicated that research has found that home economics students and home economics teachers agreed that reading problems should be addressed by home economics teachers. Research, however, has indicated that the home economics teachers in Conway's (1979) study showed a limited dependence on reading. The teachers in the study stated that students had a certain image of home economics that limited the

amount of assigned reading. Students in this same study reported that home economics classroom reading assignments were neither difficult nor excessive, the teachers believed the assignments they assigned were demanding.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

The major purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which home economics teachers know and use teaching strategies for reading in the content area. The research was to compare knowledge and use of reading in the content area workshop participants with randomly selected home economics teachers. The study was to compare personal and school variables with teachers' knowledge and use of reading strategies. In addition, it was designed to determine home economics teachers' perceptions of their role in reading instruction. Also, the research was to examine how much training in reading in the content area teachers have received and how much more, if any, they perceive they need.

Description of the Sample

In the summer of 1984, seventeen Oregon home economics teachers volunteered for a curriculum development workshop held on the Oregon State University campus. The teachers were given the responsibility to develop a state resource guide in reading, writing and mathematics teaching strategies for secondary home economics programs. At the workshop, the author gave a three hour presentation on

"Strategies for Teaching Reading." After each participant received training in reading, writing and mathematics, they were asked to focus their attention on developing strategies for one of these areas. Six of the seventeen home economics teachers developed reading in the content area strategies; the others worked on writing and mathematics strategies. This study focused on comparing the knowledge, use, and attitudes toward teaching reading in the content area of the seventeen teachers attending the workshop to a group of seventeen who did not attend. Twenty-five teachers were randomly selected from the Home Economics Teachers in Oregon 1984-85 list available from the Home Economics Specialist at the Oregon Department of Education. The list obtained had a total of 507 teachers from 367 schools (188 Jr.High/Middle School teachers and 326 high school teachers). Every twentieth teacher on the list was selected, for a total of twenty-five, to insure an adequate number for the control group.

Development of the Questionnaire

Data for the purpose of this study were collected by means of a structured questionnaire. The items on the questionnaire were developed by the researcher based on a review of related literature and the objectives of this study. The content of the instrument was validated by a panel of experts. These

included: Dr. Cecelia Thompson, Home Economics Educator, University of Hawaii; Dr. Dwayne Adcock, Curriculum Specialist, Eugene, Oregon School District 4J; Dr. Ken Ahrendt, Reading Educator, Oregon State University; Dr. Warren Suzuki, Vocational-Technical Educator, Oregon State University; and Pam Bodenroeder, Survey Research Specialist, Oregon State University. A draft version of the questionnaire was sent to the panel for review. Suggestions and comments were incorporated into the final version of the questionnaire (Appendix A).

The questionnaire, "Reading in Home Economics Questionnaire," used for data collection included the following sections:

1. Reading Strategies Knowledge and Use
2. Teachers Role in Reading Instruction
3. School and Personal Data

Reading Strategies Knowledge and Use

The first section of the questionnaire was designed to secure information about the knowledge and use of reading strategies in the home economics classroom. The ten reading strategies selected are commonly recommended by reading experts for content area teachers wishing to expand students knowledge and understanding of the subject matter being presented. These strategies were presented at the workshop and were included in the field test version of the resource guide.

Teachers' Role in Reading Instruction

This section of the questionnaire requested information regarding the home economics teachers' perception of their role in teaching reading in the content area of home economics. A seven-point Likert-type scale, to measure attitudes was chosen because of the ease of responding and familiarity of categories (Carrugh and Anderson, 1977) as well as its ease of construction and good reliability (Oppenheim, 1966). Possible responses were "Strongly Agree," "Partly Agree" "Agree," "Unsure," "Partly Disagree" "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree."

School and Personal Data

In the school and personal data section respondents were asked to provide information concerning their years of teaching experience, reading training and instruction, reading training and instruction needs, reading use in their classroom, school size, average class size, grade levels taught, and the number of daily preparations.

Data Collection Procedures

Forty-two individuals were asked to respond to the questionnaire. Seventeen teachers had participated in the July 1984 curriculum workshop that developed the field test version of Integrating Basic Skill in Home Economics Education resource guide. The remaining twenty-five teachers were randomly selected. These subjects were mailed the following items.

A cover letter of introduction describing the study and requesting their participation (Appendix B and C). The subjects were instructed in the letter to return the blank questionnaire if they did not wish to participate in the study. Two different letters of introduction were written, one for the seventeen curriculum workshop participants and one for the remaining randomly selected teachers.

A six page questionnaire requesting: reading strategies knowledge and use, teachers' role in reading instruction, and personal and school data (Appendix A).

A self-addressed stamped envelope for returning the completed questionnaire.

A period of two weeks was allowed for response. A follow-up post card (Appendix D) was sent as a reminder for those who had not returned the questionnaire within two weeks. Ten subjects received a follow-up phone call reminder after three weeks.

Statistical Analysis

The plan for statistical analysis involved the following hypothesis and statistical tests:

Hypothesis I

There is no significant difference between responses of workshop participants and randomly selected teachers regarding the:

- a. knowledge and use of individual reading strategies
- b. home economics teachers' role in reading instruction

Statistical Technique:

- a. Student's t test
- b. Chi-Square

Hypothesis II

There is no significant relationship between teachers' knowledge and use of reading strategies related and the following personal and school variables:

- a. years of teaching experience
- b. school size
- c. average class size
- d. grade level taught
- e. number of daily preparations

Statistical Technique: Kruskal-Wallis One-Way
ANOVA by Ranks

Hypothesis III

There is no significant difference between home economics teachers' knowledge and use of reading strategies related to the following school or school district variables:

- a. reading specialist(s) within the school
- b. reading instruction coordination
- c. established district or building level reading goals and objectives

Statistical technique: Kruskal-Wallis One-Way
ANOVA by Rank

The .05 level of probability was selected as the criteria for acceptance or rejection of the hypotheses.

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

The study was designed to determine the extent to which Oregon home economics teachers know and use strategies for teaching reading in the content area. The study compared reading in the content area workshop participants to a control group of randomly selected teachers regarding their knowledge and use of content area reading strategies. The purpose was to compare personal and school variables with teacher's knowledge and use of ten reading strategies. In addition, the study was designed to determine the attitude of the home economics teacher regarding reading instruction in the school. The study also examined how much training in reading in the content area home economics teachers have received, and what additional training, if any, was needed.

Description of the Sample

The sample for this study was thirty-four Oregon home economics teachers. Seventeen of the thirty-four teachers had volunteered to participate in a reading, writing and mathematics teaching strategies workshop in the summer of 1984. A control group of twenty-five teachers were randomly selected from the 1984-85 list of Oregon Home Economics Teachers.

All seventeen workshop participants returned completed questionnaires. Of the twenty-five randomly selected teachers who were sent packets, seventeen (68%) returned completed questionnaires. One teacher returned a blank questionnaire and seven randomly selected teachers did not return the questionnaire. All thirty-four completed questionnaires were used. Unanswered questions were considered missing data and therefore "n's" vary among reported items.

Instruments Used in Data Collection

The questionnaire, designed by the researcher and validated by a panel of experts, included the following sections:

1. Reading Strategies Knowledge and Use
2. Teachers' Role in Reading Instruction
3. School and Personal Data

An Alpha Coefficient, an internal-consistency method for determining reliability, was computed (Novick and Lewis, 1967). A reliability of .65 was computed for the ten Teachers' Role in Reading Instruction questions. A reliability of .82 was computed for the ten Reading Strategies Knowledge and Use questions.

Reading Strategies Knowledge and Use

To secure information about the knowledge and use of reading strategies in the home economics classroom, the participants were asked to indicate their knowledge and use based on the following five point numerical scale. KNOWLEDGE AND USE NUMERICAL RESPONSE SCALE

- 5 - Know the strategy and Use it Regularly when appropriate
- 4 - Know the strategy and Use it Occasionally
- 3 - Never Heard of the strategy
- 2 - Know the strategy, but don't use it, because Question its Value
- 1 - Know the strategy, but don't use it, because see No Value in using it

The control group was more likely to have never heard of a reading strategy than the workshop participants except for item i, "looking for the main idea."

Forty-five percent or more of the control group had never heard of the following content area reading strategies: cloze test, advanced organizer, concept guide, three level study guide, and study skills strategies (Refer to Table 1 for a summary of responses).

Table 1. Percentages of Knowledge and Use of Content
Area Reading Strategies

	N	5	4	3	2	1
		Know Use Reg.	Know Use Occ.	Never Heard Of	Know Quest. Value	Know No Value
a. Informal reading inventory	WP 15	33%	47%	7%	13%	0%
	CG 16	19%	50%	25%	6%	0%
b. Textbook Use Inventory	WP 14	22%	64%	14%	0%	0%
	CG 16	6%	62%	32%	0%	0%
c. Cloze Procedure	WP 12	8%	50%	25%	17%	0%
	CG 15	7%	20%	53%	7%	13%
d. Vocabulary Development Using Context Clues	WP 16	31%	69%	0%	0%	0%
	CG 16	50%	32%	6%	6%	6%
e. Vocabulary Overviews	WP 16	38%	62%	0%	0%	0%
	CG 16	69%	25%	0%	0%	6%
f. Advanced Organizers	WP 14	21%	57%	7%	15%	0%
	CG 16	13%	31%	50%	6%	0%
g. Concept Guide	WP 15	20%	60%	13%	7%	0%
	CG 15	20%	33%	47%	0%	0%
h. Three level Study Guide	WP 13	15%	69%	0%	8%	8%
	CG 15	13%	27%	47%	13%	0%
i. Looking for Main Idea	WP 14	43%	43%	7%	0%	7%
	CG 16	50%	38%	0%	6%	6%
j. Study Skills Strategies	WP 13	23%	30%	30%	17%	0%
	CG 16	6%	6%	69%	13%	6%

WP = Workshop Participants
CG = Control Group

Teachers' Role in Reading Instruction

This section of the questionnaire asked respondents ten questions regarding the home economics teacher's role in teaching reading in the content area. Possible responses for this section of the questionnaire were "Strongly Agree" (SA), "Partly Agree" (PA), "Agree" (A), "Unsure" (U), "Partly Disagree" (PD), "Disagree" (D) and "Strongly Disagree" (SD). Eighty percent or more of the home economics teachers in this study agreed with the following statements: all teachers are teachers of reading; specialized vocabulary is best taught in the content area in which it is used, teachers should individualize reading assignments, reading instruction in home economics will result in better understanding of the subject matter, it is the home economics teachers responsibility to make learning experiences involving reading more relevant to their students, and students image of home economics limits the amount of reading assignments given. Over sixty percent of the teachers agreed that it is time consuming to develop reading assignments.

Workshop participants and the control group differed notably on their responses to two questions. The workshop participants (76%) agreed that home economics teachers are not adequately trained in reading instruction compared to 47% of the control

group. Seventy percent of the workshop participants disagreed with the statement that students would best be served by trained reading specialist while fifty-two percent of the control group agreed with the statement (Refer to Table 2).

Table 2. Percentages Regarding Home Economics Teachers' Role in Content Area Reading Instruction.

		SA	A	PA	U	PD	D	SD
a. All teachers are teachers of reading.	WP	47%	35%	6%	0%	0%	12%	0%
	CG	59%	18%	23%	0%	0%	0%	0%
b. Home ec. teachers are not adequately trained to teach reading in the content area	WP	18%	23%	35%	0%	6%	12%	6%
	CG	0%	12%	35%	12%	6%	23%	12%
c. The home ec. curriculum is too full to also integrate and teach reading.	WP	0%	0%	18%	0%	12%	52%	18%
	CG	5%	12%	12%	0%	18%	18%	35%
d. Students would best be served by having trained reading specialist teach reading.	WP	6%	12%	12%	0%	12%	52%	6%
	CG	12%	28%	12%	6%	18%	12%	12%
e. Developing assignments that teach reading in the content area is time consuming.	WP	24%	24%	12%	0%	12%	28%	0%
	CG	24%	17%	17%	12%	12%	12%	6%

Table 2 - continued on page 35.

		SA	A	PA	U	PD	D	SD
f. Specialized and technical vocab. is best taught in the content area in which it is used.	WP	59%	41%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	CG	59%	35%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%
g. Teachers should individualize reading assignments to the level of the learner.	WP	12%	70%	12%	0%	0%	6%	0%
	CG	18%	36%	23%	0%	23%	0%	0%
h. Reading instruction in home economics results in better understanding of the subject matter.	WP	35%	47%	12%	0%	0%	6%	0%
	CG	35%	24%	35%	6%	0%	0%	0%
i. It is the professional responsibility of home ec. teachers to determine how to make learning experiences involving reading more relevant to their students.	WP	35%	47%	6%	0%	12%	0%	0%
	CG	41%	29%	18%	6%	0%	6%	0%
j. Students have a certain image of home ec. that tends to limit the amount of reading related assignments given.	WP	24%	47%	23%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	CG	41%	29%	24%	6%	0%	0%	0%

WP = Workshop Participant (n=17)

CG = Control Group (n=17)

Teachers were asked to indicate how often they use reading for each of four purposes. For the most part respondents indicated that they often assign reading for the purposes of following directions and extracting specific information for home economics classroom activities. Teachers reported that they seldom assign reading for pleasure (Refer to Table 3).

Table 3. Percentages of How Often the Home Economics Teachers Use Each of the Four Reading Purposes (n=33).

	Often	Occasion- ally	Seldom	Never
a. To extract specific information for classroom activities	79%	18%	3%	0%
b. Used for supplemental or background reading	42%	58%	0%	0%
c. Reading to follow directions	91%	9%	0%	0%
d. Reading for pleasure	6%	30%	52%	12%

School and Personal Data

In the school and personal data section, respondents were asked to provide information concerning their years teaching experience, school size, grade levels taught, and number of daily preparations. They were also asked to indicate the amount and types of reading instruction they have received and their current need for training. Further, they were asked questions about their school and district regarding reading specialists, coordination with the reading program and district goals and/or competencies in reading.

Most of the teachers in this sample, 64% had 6-15 years of teaching experience; 46 taught in schools with enrollments of 800 or more students; 49% had average class sizes of 21-25; 58% taught at the senior high level and 33% had four preparations a day (Refer to Table 4).

Table 4. Distribution of Total Sample by Number and Percent of Subjects as to Teaching Experience, School Size, Average Class Size, Grade Levels Taught and Number of Daily Preparations.

<u>Demographic Variable</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Teaching Experience (n=33)		
1-2 Years	2	6%
3-5 Years	4	12%
6-10 Years	10	30%
11-15 Years	11	34%
16 or More Years	6	18%
School Size (n=33)		
Less than 300	6	18%
300-499	4	12%
500-799	8	24%
800 or more	15	46%
Average Class Size (n=33)		
Fifteen or fewer	4	12%
Sixteen to twenty	8	24%
Twenty-one to twenty-five	16	49%
Twenty-six and over	5	15%
Grade Levels Taught (n=33)		
Middle/Junior High School	11	33%
Senior High School	19	58%
Middle and Senior High School	3	9%
Number of Daily Preparations (n=33)		
One	1	3%
Two	4	12%
Three	8	24%
Four	11	33%
Five	5	16%
Six	3	9%
Eight	1	3%

One section of the questionnaire was designed to gather information regarding content area reading instruction training. Teachers were asked how much training they have had (Refer to Table 5). They were also asked to indicate content area reading strategies in which they could use additional training (Refer to Table 6). Finally, those who wished additional training were asked what type of delivery system they would most likely choose (Refer to Table 7).

Most teachers, 79 percent, had completed the graduate level reading course required for standard teaching certification in Oregon. Some teachers, 36 percent, had taken additional graduate credit courses in reading in the content area. Twenty-five percent of the respondents had taken workshops for credit and 21 percent had taken non-credit courses. Fourteen teachers, 44 percent, had attended one or more short sessions or professional meetings on reading in the content area (Refer to Table 5).

Table 5. Distribution of Sample by Number and Percent of Subjects as to Amounts and Types of Training They Have Had.

	Number	Percent
Graduate Level Reading Course Required for Standard Certification (n=33)		
Not taken course	7	21%
Completed Course	26	79%
Additional Graduate Credit Course in Reading in the Content Area (n=33)		
None	21	64%
One or More Courses	12	36%
Workshops for Credit in Reading (n=32)		
None	24	75%
One or More Credit Workshops	8	25%
Workshops for Non-Credit in Reading (n=33)		
None	26	79%
One or More Non-Credit Workshops	7	21%
One - Two Hour Sessions or Professional Meeting Dealing with Reading in the Content Area (n=32)		
None	18	56%
One or More Sessions	14	44%

Fifty percent or more of the teachers indicated they could use additional training in each of the following reading strategies: textbook use inventory; cloze test, advanced organizer, concept guide, three level study guide, and study skills strategies. At least thirty-eight percent of the teachers could use additional training in: informal reading inventory; vocabulary development using context clues; vocabulary overviews and looking for the main idea (Refer to Table 6).

Table 6. Distribution of Sample by Number and Percent of Subjects Who Wish Additional Training. The percent represents those subjects that indicated they could use additional training in the strategy.

	Number	Percent
Informal Reading Inventory (n=34)	16	47%
Textbook Use Inventory (n=34)	17	50%
Cloze Test (n=32)	20	63%
Vocab. Devel. Using Context Clues (n=34)	16	47%
Vocabulary Overviews (n=34)	13	38%
Advanced Organizers (n=34)	26	77%
Concept Guide (n=34)	23	68%
Three Level Study Guide (n=32)	24	75%
Looking for Main Idea (n=34)	13	38%
Study Skills Strategies such as; SQ4R, MAPPING, MURDER (n=34)	20	61%

Teachers that indicated they could use additional training in reading in the content area did not have a strong preference for one delivery system for training over another. Twenty-one percent did indicate they would not likely attend a one-two hour session or professional meeting for additional training (Refer to Table 7).

Table 7. Preferences as to the Type of Delivery System Teachers Would Likely Choose for Additional Content Area Reading Training.

	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Not too Likely	Not At All Likely
Credit Course	40%	44%	16%	0%
Workshop Credit or Non-Credit	35%	55%	10%	0%
1-2 Hour Session or Professional Meeting	43%	36%	21%	0%

Several questions were asked regarding reading specialists within their building and what student populations were being served by the specialist. The question regarding the presence of a reading specialist within their school revealed that 91 percent of the schools had a reading specialist. All these schools had a reading specialist for remedial students. Sixty percent of the schools had a developmental reading teacher. More of these school may have had a developmental reading teacher since 17 percent did not

know if their school had one. Teachers identified four percent of the schools as having a reading specialist that works with gifted students. There were 26 percent that did not know if a reading specialist works with gifted students in their school.

Respondents were asked what other persons in the school were responsible for reading instruction. Eighty-seven percent of the responses indicated that the special education instructors were responsible for reading instruction. Eighty-three percent indicated that remedial reading teachers were responsible for reading instruction. This was evident since the study already revealed that all schools with reading specialist were addressing the remedial student population.

Although fifty percent of the respondents indicated that developmental reading teachers were responsible for reading instruction in their school, a considerable number (29 percent) left the question blank and another 12 percent did not know if a developmental reading instructor teaches reading in their school. Respondents may be unfamiliar with the title of developmental reading teacher or one who instructs the "average" student in content area reading to further develop his/her reading skills.

English teachers were known to be responsible for reading instruction in 91 percent of the schools.

Subject matter teachers (mathematics, science, home economics, etc.) were responsible for reading instruction in 56 percent of the schools. In 33 percent of the schools, subject matter teachers were not responsible for reading instruction. Some teachers, 11 percent, did not know if subject matter teachers were responsible for reading instruction in their school.

The questionnaire asked questions regarding the coordination of the home economics and reading program. Thirty-two teachers responded to this question. Nine, or 28 percent, indicated that presently there was coordination between the reading specialist and/or reading program and the home economics program. Respondents that were not presently coordinating with the reading specialist and/or reading program responded to four additional coordination questions. Seventeen percent of the respondents had examined the feasibility of coordinating home economics curriculum with the school's reading program and decided against it. Four percent had planned for coordination between the two programs during the next school year. Twenty-two percent were presently considering looking into the possibility of coordinating with the reading specialist and/or reading program. Lastly, forty-four percent had never considered coordinating with the reading specialist and/or reading program.

Testing of Hypotheses

The first hypothesis compared workshop participants and a control group of randomly selected teachers regarding knowledge and use of content area reading strategies, and home economics teachers' role in reading instruction. Hypothesis II examined the relationship between teachers' knowledge and use of reading strategies and personal and educational variables. Hypothesis III examined the relationship between teachers' knowledge and use of reading strategies and school or school district variables. Three statistical tests were used to test the hypothesis: Chi-Square, Student's t test and Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA by Rank.

Hypothesis Ia

Statistical Technique: Chi-Square

There is no significant difference between responses of workshop participants and randomly selected teachers regarding knowledge and use of the following content area reading strategies:

- a. informal reading inventory
- b. textbook use inventory
- c. cloze procedure
- d. vocabulary development using context clues
- e. vocabulary overviews
- f. advanced organizers
- g. concept guide
- h. looking for the main idea
- i. study skills strategies

The Chi-Square value revealed a significant difference between workshop participants and randomly selected teachers regarding the use of the three level study guide (Table 8). Therefore, the null hypothesis for that strategy was rejected at the .05 level. No significant differences were found for the other strategies.

Table 8. Summary of Hypothesis Ia.
Chi-Square Comparing Workshop
Participants and the Control Group on
Knowledge and Use of Content Area Reading
Strategies.

	Chi-Square	df	p
a. Informal reading inventory	2.67	3	.44
b. Textbook Use Inventory	2.21	2	.33
c. Cloze Procedure	5.33	4	.25
d. Vocabulary Development Using Context Clues	5.94	4	.20
e. Vocabulary Overviews	5.04	2	.08
f. Advanced Organizers	6.56	3	.08
g. Concept Guide	4.92	3	.17
h. Three level Study Guide	10.16	4	.03*
i. Looking for the Main Idea	2.03	4	.72
j. Study Skills Strategies	6.82	4	.14

* $p < .05$, H_0 rejected

Hypothesis Ib

Statistical Technique: Student's t test

Results show that there is no significant difference in responses of workshop participants and the control group of randomly selected teachers regarding their perceptions of the home economics teacher's role in reading instruction. However, item b, home economics teachers are not adequately trained to teach reading in the content area, approached significance with a probability of .06. Results are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9. Summary of Hypothesis Ib.
Student's t Test.

a. All teachers are teachers of reading.

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	2-Tail Prob.
WP	5.8	1.56	-1.08	.22
CG	6.3	.86		

b. Home economics teachers are not adequately trained to teach reading in the content area.

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	2-Tail Prob.
WP	4.88	1.83	1.93	.06
CG	3.7	1.72		

c. The home economics curriculum is too full to also integrate and teach reading.

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	2-Tail Prob.
WS	5.58	1.37	.88	.38
CG	5.05	2.07		

d. Students would best be served by having trained reading specialists teach reading.

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	2-Tail Prob.
WS	4.8	1.84	1.67	.10
CG	3.7	2.05		

e. Developing assignments that teach reading in the content area is very time consuming.

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	2-Tail Prob.
WS	3.4	2.09	.46	.86
CG	3.2	1.9		

Table 9 - continued on page 48.

- f. Specialized and technical vocabulary is best taught in the content area in which it is used.

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	2-Tail Prob.
WS	6.5	.50	1.01	.32
CG	6.2	1.34		

- g. Teachers should individualize reading assignments to the level of the learner.

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	2-Tail Prob.
WS	5.7	1.0	1.64	.11
CG	5.0	1.5		

- h. Reading instruction in home economics results in better understanding of the subject matter.

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	2-Tail Prob.
WS	6.0	1.1	.32	.75
CG	5.9	.96		

- i. It is the professional responsibility of home economics teachers to determine how to make learning experiences involving reading more relevant to their students.

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	2-Tail Prob.
WS	5.9	1.24	.13	.89
CG	5.8	1.36		

- j. Students have a certain image of home economics that tends to limit the amount of reading related assignments given.

Group	Mean	SD	t-Value	2-Tail Prob.
WS	5.9	.89	-.56	.57
CG	6.1	.92		

$p < .05$, H_0 rejected

WP = Workshop Participants (n=17)

CG = Control Group (n=17)

df = 32

Hypothesis II

Statistical Technique: Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA
by Rank

Home economics teachers' knowledge and use of content area reading strategies are not related to the following personal and school variables:

- a. years of teaching experience,
- b. school size,
- c. average class size,
- d. grade level taught, or
- e. number of daily preparations.

The second hypothesis was tested using the teachers' knowledge and use scores. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA by Ranks was computed for each personal and school variable. A summary of the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA by Ranks is shown for each personal and school variable, see Tables 10-14. Only one strategy "three level study guide" was found statistically significant when compared with the variable "number of teacher preparations". The teachers with four preparations were less likely to know and use the three level study guide strategy than teachers with more or less daily preparations. Though this was statistically significant perhaps the way the data was collapsed disguised the data's critical information. The data

revealed that 64 percent of the teachers know and use the three level study guide regardless of the number of daily preparations. The probability was statistically significant at .04 and the null hypothesis was rejected. None of the other Chi-Square values were found to be statistically significant. Based on the statistical test Hypothesis II was accepted for all the other variables.

Table 10. Summary of Hypothesis IIa.
Years of Teaching Experience. Kruskal-Wallis
One-Way ANOVA by Rank.

	N	Chi-Square	p
a. Informal Reading Inventory	30	.62	.43
b. Textbook Use Inventory	29	.66	.41
c. Cloze Test	26	.05	.81
d. Vocabulary Development Using Context Clues	31	2.33	.12
e. Vocabulary Overviews	31	1.45	.22
f. Advanced Organizers	29	.06	.79
g. Concept Guide	29	.36	.54
h. Three Level Study Guide	27	1.80	.17
i. Looking for Main Ideas	29	.00	.93
j. Study Skills Strategies	28	.12	.72

* $p < .05$, H_0 rejected

Table 11. Summary of Hypothesis IIb.

School Size. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA by Rank.

	N	Chi-Square	p
a. Informal Reading Inventory	30	4.1	.25
b. Textbook Use Inventory	29	5.25	.15
c. Cloze Test	26	3.36	.33
d. Vocabulary Development Using Context Clues	31	3.29	.34
e. Vocabulary Overviews	31	1.86	.60
f. Advanced Organizers	29	1.28	.73
g. Concept Guide	29	4.15	.24
h. Three Level Study Guide	27	3.63	.30
i. Looking for Main Ideas	29	2.41	.49
j. Study Skills Strategies	28	.77	.85

* $p < .05$, H_0 rejected

Table 12. Summary of Hypothesis Iic.

Average Class Size. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way
ANOVA by Rank.

	N	Chi-Square	p
a. Informal Reading Inventory	30	1.83	.40
b. Textbook Use Inventory	29	1.22	.54
c. Cloze Test	26	3.42	.18
d. Vocabulary Development Using Context Clues	31	2.00	.36
e. Vocabulary Overviews	31	.84	.65
f. Advanced Organizers	29	2.22	.32
g. Concept Guide	29	1.39	.49
h. Three Level Study Guide	27	1.57	.45
i. Looking for Main Ideas	29	1.28	.54
j. Study Skills Strategies	28	.29	.86

* $p < .05$, H_0 rejected

Table 13. Summary of Hypothesis II d.

Grade Level Taught. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way
ANOVA by Rank.

	N	Chi-Square	p
a. Informal Reading Inventory	30	.02	.98
b. Textbook Use Inventory	29	.09	.95
c. Cloze Test	26	.15	.92
d. Vocabulary Development Using Context Clues	31	1.89	.38
e. Vocabulary Overviews	31	.94	.62
f. Advanced Organizers	29	2.15	.34
g. Concept Guide	29	.62	.73
h. Three Level Study Guide	27	2.26	.32
i. Looking for Main Ideas	29	1.17	.55
j. Study Skills Strategies	28	.55	.75

* $p < .05$, H_0 rejected

Table 14. Summary of Hypothesis IIe.

Number of Daily Preparations. Kruskal-Wallis
One-Way ANOVA by Rank.

	N	Chi-Square	p
a. Informal Reading Inventory	30	1.17	.55
b. Textbook Use Inventory	29	1.12	.57
c. Cloze Test	26	.89	.64
d. Vocabulary Development Using Context Clues	31	.61	.73
e. Vocabulary Overviews	31	.13	.93
f. Advanced Organizers	29	2.74	.25
g. Concept Guide	29	1.60	.44
h. Three Level Study Guide	27	6.12	.04*
i. Looking for Main Ideas	29	.42	.80
j. Study Skills Strategies	28	1.11	.57

* $p < .05$, H_0 rejected.

Hypothesis III

Statistical Technique: Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA
by Rank

Home economics teachers' knowledge and use of content area reading strategies are not related to the following school or school district variables:

- a. reading specialist(s) within the school,
- b. reading instruction coordination, or
- c. established district or building level reading goals and objectives.

Hypothesis III was tested using the teachers' knowledge and use scores. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA by Ranks was computed for each school or school district variable, see Tables 15-17. For the variable related to established district or building level reading goals and objectives (Table 17), the Chi-Square value of 5.28 was statistically significant at the .02 level for the knowledge and use of the cloze test. The strategy, textbook use inventory, approached significance with calculated .07 probability. None of the other Chi-Squares values were found to be statistically significant in Hypothesis IIIc. Based on the statistical tests, the null hypothesis for Hypothesis IIIa and IIIb was accepted since no

significant difference could be found between reading specialist(s) within a building and reading instruction coordination, and teachers' knowledge and use of the ten identified content area reading strategies.

Table 15. Summary of Hypothesis IIIa.

Presence of a Reading Specialist in the
School. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA by
Rank.

	N	Chi-Square	p
a. Informal Reading Inventory	29	1.45	.22
b. Textbook Use Inventory	28	.03	.85
c. Cloze Test	25	2.54	.11
d. Vocabulary Development Using Context Clues	30	.56	.45
e. Vocabulary Overviews	30	.00	.96
f. Advanced Organizers	28	.18	.66
g. Concept Guide	28	.07	.78
h. Three Level Study Guide	26	.33	.56
i. Looking for Main Ideas	28	.00	.96
j. Study Skills Strategies	27	.80	.36

* $p < .05$, H_0 rejected

Table 16. Summary of Hypothesis IIIb.

Coordination Between Reading Program and Home
Economics Program. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way
ANOVA by Rank.

	N	Chi-Square	p
a. Informal Reading Inventory	29	.01	.89
b. Textbook Use Inventory	28	1.19	.27
c. Cloze Test	25	1.18	.27
d. Vocabulary Development Using Context Clues	30	.19	.65
e. Vocabulary Overviews	30	.07	.78
f. Advanced Organizers	28	.41	.52
g. Concept Guide	28	.02	.88
h. Three Level Study Guide	26	1.87	.17
i. Looking for Main Ideas	28	.20	.65
j. Study Skills Strategies	27	.00	1.00

* $p < .05$, H_0 rejected

Table 17. Summary of Hypothesis IIIc.

Established District or Building Level
 Reading Goals and Objectives. Kruskal-Wallis
 One-Way ANOVA by Rank.

	N	Chi-Square	p
a. Informal Reading Inventory	29	.02	.87
b. Textbook Use Inventory	28	3.14	.07
c. Cloze Test	25	5.28	.02*
d. Vocabulary Development Using Context Clues	30	.02	.87
e. Vocabulary Overviews	30	.00	.95
f. Advanced Organizers	28	.01	.89
g. Concept Guide	28	2.48	.11
h. Three Level Study Guide	26	1.72	.18
i. Looking for Main Ideas	28	.38	.53
j. Study Skills Strategies	27	.02	.86

* $p < .05$, H_0 rejected

Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which Oregon home economics teachers know and use content area reading strategies in the classroom. The study looked at a variety of personal and school variables to determine the relationship to the teachers' knowledge and use of content area reading strategies. The study was designed to determine what role the home economics teacher plays in reading instruction. Finally, the study examined reading training and needs.

Summary

The sample for this study included thirty-four Oregon home economics teachers. Seventeen had participated in a reading, writing and mathematics teaching strategies workshop in the summer of 1984. The remaining were Oregon home economics teacher randomly selected from a list provided by the Oregon Department of Education.

A 10-item scale, developed by this researcher, was used to measure the attitude of teachers toward statements concerning reading instruction responsibility in home economics education. To determine how reading was used in the classroom, teachers were asked to indicate how often they used reading for each of four purposes. A 10-item scale, developed by this researcher, was used to measure the

extent to which teachers know and use content area reading strategies. A series of questions examined the amount of training the teachers had had, the content area reading strategies in which they could use additional training and what types of training delivery systems were preferred. The personal and school data questions provided information concerning the years of teaching experience, school size, average class size, grade level taught, and number of daily preparations. The school and district questions provided information regarding the presence and purposes of reading specialists, reading instruction coordination and the school's emphasis on reading though established reading goals and objectives.

Findings and Conclusions

The results of the Student's t test for workshop participants versus the control group of randomly selected teachers revealed that the workshop did make a difference in the teachers' use of one content area reading strategy. The workshop participants were using three level study guides significantly more than the control group of teachers. In addition, the workshop participants were using vocabulary overviews and advanced organizers nearing the point of significance with a probability of .08.

Workshop participants knew and used nine of the ten content area reading strategies more than the teachers in the control group. The one strategy used more by the control group (50%) than the workshop participants (43%) was the strategy looking for the main idea.

The teachers in the control group were more likely to have never heard of a reading strategy than the workshop participants except for the strategy looking for the main idea in which one workshop participant had never heard of this strategy while all control group teachers had. Twenty-five percent or more of the control group had never heard of informal reading inventory or textbook use inventory strategies. Forty-five percent or more of them had never heard of the following content area reading strategies: cloze test, advanced organizer, concept guide, three level study guide, and study skills strategies. Over sixty percent of the total thirty-four teachers participating in the study revealed they could use additional training in each of the following strategies: cloze test, advanced organizer, concept guide, three level study guide, and study skills strategies.

The knowledge and use scale was not found suitable for all teachers for all ten strategies. Three teachers in the study added a sixth category to the knowledge and use scale. They added the category, heard of it, just do not use it.

Teachers did not have a strong preference as to the type of delivery system they would likely choose for additional content area reading training. However, 21 percent were not likely to attend a one to two hour session or professional meeting on reading in the content area.

In Hypothesis Ib there was no significant difference between workshop participants and the control group regarding the home economics teachers' role in reading instruction, yet, some interesting findings were found. Workshop participants (76%) tended to agree with the statement that home economics teachers are not adequately trained to teach reading in the content area while the control group of randomly selected teachers (41%) were likely to disagree with the statement. This question approached significance with a .06 probability. This study supports Conway's (1979) and others research that home economics teachers feel inadequately prepared to teach reading in their content area. Twelve percent of the control group were unsure whether or not home economics teachers are adequately trained.

Ninety-six percent of the teachers agreed that all teachers are teachers of reading yet in 33 percent of the schools, subject matter teachers were not responsible for reading instruction, and in 11 percent of the schools, the teacher did not know if subject matter teachers were responsible for reading instruction.

The notion that the home economics curriculum is too full to integrate reading instruction was dismissed by over seventy-five percent of the teachers in this study. This supported Harbour's (1984) contention that teaching content area reading skills does not infringe on the time needed to cover home economics subject matter.

Workshop participants (70%) disagreed with the statement that students would be best served by having trained reading specialists teach reading, while fifty-two percent of the control group agreed with the statement.

The teachers generally agreed with the following statements: reading assignments should be individualized, students receiving reading instruction in home economics will have a better understanding of

the subject matter, it is the teacher's responsibility to make learning experiences involving reading more relevant, developing assignments that teach reading is very time consuming, and home economics teachers are best qualified to teach their specialized vocabulary.

Ninety-four percent of the teachers in this study agreed that students have a certain image of home economics that tends to limit the amount of reading related assignments given. This supported Conway's (1979) findings. Her study showed a limited dependence on reading in home economics based on the fact that the students hold this image and teachers have responded by limiting the amount of reading assignments given.

The only relationship found between school and personal variables, and teachers' knowledge and use that was examined in Hypothesis II was found between the use of the three level study guide and the number of teacher preparations. The number of years teaching experience, school size, average class size and grade level taught were not related to the knowledge and use of content area reading strategies.

In Hypothesis IIIc statistical significance was found when the variable "established reading goals and objectives" was matched with the cloze test. Textbook use inventory approached significance with a .07 probability. When matched with the remaining eight content area reading strategies, no relationships were

found. No significant differences were found in Hypothesis IIIa, reading specialist(s) within the school or IIIB reading instruction coordination when compared with teachers' knowledge and use of content area reading strategies.

Implications and Recommendations

The findings of this study suggest that teacher training workshops in content area reading strategies can increase teachers' knowledge and use of strategies. In the three hour workshop presentation not all ten strategies could be adequately presented. The researcher focused the major instruction on vocabulary overview, advanced organizer, concept guide, and three level study guide. For the six remaining strategies including: informal reading inventory, textbook use inventory, cloze test, looking for the main idea, and study skills strategies, handouts were given to the workshop participants to be read at their convenience. Hence, it was not surprising that the study revealed that the workshop participants were using the three level study guide significantly more than the control group. The results for knowledge and use of vocabulary overviews and advanced organizers were approaching significance.

Although 79 percent of the teachers had already taken a graduate level reading course to meet the Oregon requirement for standard certification, there was evidence that teachers still felt inadequately trained in reading instruction. Seventy-six percent of the workshop participants and forty-seven percent of the control group felt they were not adequately trained to teach reading in the content area. This supports Conway's (1979) and others research indicating home economics teachers feel inadequately trained in reading instruction. Over sixty percent (n=34) of the teachers in the study revealed they could use additional training in five of the ten strategies listed. The data did not compare the amount of training of the workshop participants and the control group. The researcher can only speculate on the reasons why the majority of the workshop participants felt inadequately trained. If it was assumed that the workshop participants had more content area reading instruction than the control group the percentages are even more puzzling. Perhaps it supports the premise that the more one knows about a subject, the more one realizes how little one knows.

The Oregon home economics teachers in this study supported Harbour's (1984) contention that spending time in home economics on reading instruction does not

infringe on the time needed to cover home economics subject matter. Teachers disagreed with the statement that the home economics curriculum is too full to also integrate and teach reading.

Teachers have indicated in this study that home economics teachers have an active part to play in reading instruction. Further research is warranted in content area reading instruction and its implications on student learning. The following are suggestions for continued study:

1. Refinement of the knowledge and use of content area reading strategies scale.
2. Refinement and expansion of the home economics teachers' role in reading instruction scale.
3. Replication of portions of this study with a larger sample size.
4. Teacher preparatory institutions could use the knowledge and use scale to assess content area reading training needs of their graduates.
5. Replication of the reading strategies knowledge and use scale gathering data from the home economics teacher and his/her students.

6. Replication in a state with less rigid certification requirements for teaching reading in the content area.
7. Replication of this study in other subject matter areas.
8. Replication of this study in other basic skill areas such as mathematics and science.
9. Replication of the home economics teacher's role in reading instruction scale comparing data from administrators, home economics teachers and other subject matter teachers within a school.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anang, A. J. (1982). What is reading?: A social theory of comprehension instruction. (Report No. 62). Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Allington, R.L. (1980). Poor readers don't get to read much. (Report No. 31). Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- American Psychological Association. (1983). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association. (3rd ed.) Washington, DC: Author.
- Artley, A. S. (1944). A study of certain relationships existing between general reading comprehension and reading comprehension in a specific subject matter area. Journal of Educational Research, 37, 464-73.
- Bawden, R., Buike, S. & Duffy, G.G. (1979). Teacher conceptions of reading and their influence on instruction. (Report No. 47). Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Bettelheim, B. & Zelan, K. (1981). Why children don't like to read. Atlantic Monthly, 25-31.
- Burton, D.L. (1961). Some trends and emphasis in high school reading and literature. In J.A. Figurel (Ed) Changing Concepts of Reading Instruction. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Carruth, B.R. & Anderson, H.L. (1977). Scaling criteria in developing and evaluating an attitude instrument. Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 70, 42-47.
- Cheek, E.H., Jr. & Cheek, M.C. (1983). Reading instruction through content teaching. (1st ed.). Columbus, OH: Bell & Howell.
- Conway, E.D. (1979). The development and assessment of a course on teaching reading skills for home economics preservice teachers. Doctoral dissertation. Cornell University.
- Cunningham, J.W., Cunningham, P.M. & Arthur, S.V. (1981) Middle and secondary school reading New York: Longman.

- Dillmam, D.A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Dobry, A.M. (Ed.). (1985). A quest for quality: Consumer and homemaking education in the 80s. Washington, DC: Home Economics Education Association.
- Duffy, G.G. & Anderson, L. (May 1982). Conceptions of reading project final report. (Report No. 111). Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Duffy, G.G. & Metheny, W. (1979). Measuring teachers' beliefs about reading. (Report No. 41). Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Duffy, G.G. & Roehler, L.R. (1982). An analysis of the instruction in reading instructional research. (Report No. 52). Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Estes, T.H., & Vaughan, J.L. (1978). Reading and learning in the content classroom. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Fielding, M.A. (1982). Skills versus meaning: An appraisal fo two rival approaches to secondary reading. Curriculum inquiry, 12.(1).
- Forgan, H.W., and Mangrum, C.T. (1981). Teaching content area reading skills. (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Fry, E. (Dec.1977). Fry's readability graph: Clarifications, validity, and extension to level 17. Journal of Reading, 21, 242-52.
- Goodlad, J. (1983). A place called school. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Gray, W.S. (1961). Looking ahead in reading. Educational Digest, 26, 26-28.
- Harris, L.A. & Smith, C.B. (1976). Reading instruction. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Harbour, M.J. (1984). Back to basics: Teaching reading in home economics. Illinois Teacher, 28, 56-57.
- Harker, W.J. (Ed) (1977). Classroom strategies for secondary reading. Newark, DE : International Reading Association.

- Herber, H.L. (1978). Teaching reading in the content areas (2nd. ed.) Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hittleman, D.R. (1978). Readability formulas and cloze: selecting instructional materials. Journal of Reading, 22, 117-21.
- Incardone, P. (1978). Help! I can't read. Vocational Education Journal, 53, 51-52.
- International Reading Association. (1981). Certification requirements in reading. (3rd ed.). Newark, DE.
- Jackson, J.E. (1979). Reading in the secondary school: A survey of teachers. Journal of Reading, 23, 229-32.
- Kelley, Brenda & Homes Janis. (1979). The guided lecture procedure. Journal of Reading. 2. p. 602-605.
- Karlin, R. (1969). What does research in reading reveal about reading and the high school student? In M. Agnella Gunn (Ed.). What we know about high school reading. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Ley, C. (1978). Reading: Its place in the home economics classroom. Illinois Teacher, 22, 48-50
- Manzo, A. V. (1968). Improving Reading Comprehension through Reciprocal Questioning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Syracuse University.
- Metheny, W. (1980). The influences of grade and pupil ability levels on teachers' conceptions of reading. (Report No. 69). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
- Miller, W.H. (1974). Teaching Reading in the Secondary School. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Morrison, B. (1980). The Identification of Reading Skills Essential for Learning in the Seven Content Areas at Postsecondary Levels. Madison, Wisconsin University.
- Norwell, G.W. (1941). Wide individual reading compared with the traditional plan of studying literature. School Review, 49, 603-13.
- Novick, M.R. & Lewis, C. (1967) Coefficient alpha and the reliability of composite measurements. Psychometrika, 32:1-13

Oppenheim, A.N. (1966). Questionnaire design and attitude measurement. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Oregon Department of Education and Home Economics Education Dept., Oregon State University. (1985).

Integrating Basic Skills in Home Economics Education. (field test copy) Home Economics Education Dept., Oregon State University: Oregon Department of Education.

Oregon Department of Education. (1984). Relationships between math, science and language skills and vocational education. Salem, OR. :Author

O'Rourke, W.J. (1980). Research on the attitude of secondary teachers toward teaching reading in the content classrooms. Journal of Reading, 23, 337-39.

Pauk, W. (1977). Reading needs of vocationally inclined students. Reading Improvement, 7 (2), 46-48, 55.

Robinson, H.A. (1978). Teaching reading and study strategies. (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Roe, B. D., Stoodt, B.D. & Burns, P. (1978). Reading instruction in the secondary school. (revised ed.) Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Co.

Roehler, L.R., Duffy, G.G., Book, C. & Wesselman, R. (1983). Direct teacher explanation during reading instruction: A pilot study. (Report No. 131). Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Salem School District and Vocational Technical Ed. Division. (1981). Reading in Vocational Education. Salem, OR. : Oregon Department of Education.

Singer, H. & Donlan, D. (1980). Reading and learning from text. Boston: Little, Brown.

Smith, C.B. (1976). Teaching reading in the secondary school. Educational Leadership, 33, 509-512.

Smith, C. B. & Elliott, P. (1979). Reading activities for middle and secondary schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Smith, C.B., Smith, S.L. & Mikulecky, L. (1978). Teaching reading in secondary school content subjects. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Smith, R.J. & Otto, W. (1969). Changing teacher attitudes toward teaching reading in the content areas. Journal of Reading, 12, 299-304.

Spitze, H.T. (1971). Consumer education and the literacy problem. Illinois Teacher, 15, 55-57.

Spitze, H.T. (1970). Slow readers in home economics. Illinois Teacher, 14, 46-47.

Strang, Ruth. (1962). Progress in the teaching of reading in high school and college. Reading Teacher, 16, 173.

Thelen, J. (1976). Improving reading in science. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Thomas, E.L. & Robinson, H.A. (1977). Improving reading in every class (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Thompson, C.K. (1983). Home economics teachers' perceptions and practices related to reading comprehension. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University.

Thompson, C.K. & Davis, P.L. (1984). Readability: A factor in selecting teaching materials. Illinois Teacher, 28, 156-161.

Thompson, C.K., Davis, P. & Wade, B. (1982). Home economics reading strategies. University Park, PA: Division of Occupational and Vocational Studies: Pennsylvania State University.

United States Department of Education. (1983). A nation at risk. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vacca, R.T. (1981). Content area reading. Boston: Little, Brown.

Walters, G.L. (1977) Monograph of the development and refinement of reading skills in business education. 128 : South-Western Publishing Co.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

READING IN HOME ECONOMICS QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Below is a list of statements about the teaching of content area reading skills. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the statements by circling the letter that best describes your opinion. Refer to the scale.

SCALE: SA STRONGLY AGREE
 A AGREE
 PA PARTIALLY AGREE
 U UNSURE
 PD PARTIALLY DISAGREE
 D DISAGREE
 SD STRONGLY DISAGREE

- a. All teachers are teachers of reading. . . SA A PA U PD D SD
- b. Home ec teachers are not adequately trained to teach reading in the content area. SA A PA U PD D SD
- c. The home ec. curriculum is too full to also integrate and teach reading. . . .SA A PA U PD D SD
- d. Students would best be served by having trained reading specialists teach reading. SA A PA U PD D SD
- e. Developing assignments that teach reading in the content area is very time consuming. SA A PA U PD D SD
- f. Specialized and technical vocabulary is best taught in the content area in which it is used. SA A PA U PD D SD
- g. Teachers should individualize reading assignments to the level of the learner. SA A PA U PD D SD
- h. Reading instruction in home economics results in better understanding of the subject matter. SA A PA U PD D SD
- i. It is the professional responsibility of home economics teachers to determine how to make learning experiences involving reading more relevant to their students. SA A PA U PD D SD
- j. Students have a certain image of home economics that tends to limit the amount of reading related assignments given. SA A PA U PD D SD

2. Please indicate how often you use reading for the following purposes in your home economics classroom; OFTEN, OCCASIONALLY, SELDOM OR NEVER?

	OFTEN	OCCASION- ALLY	SELDOM	NEVER
a. To extract specific information for classroom activities	1	2	3	4
b. Used for supplemental or background reading.	1	2	3	4
c. Reading to follow directions	1	2	3	4
d. Reading for pleasure	1	2	3	4
e. Other (please list):				

3. Listed below are ten content area reading strategies. Circle the number which best demonstrates your knowledge and use of the strategy in your home economic classes. Refer to the numerical scale below. Please recognize that some of the strategies may only dictate their use once with each new group of students.

NUMERICAL SCALE

- 5 - KNOW THE STRATEGY AND USE IT REGULARLY WHEN APPROPRIATE
 4 - KNOW THE STRATEGY AND USE IT OCCASIONALLY
 3 - NEVER HEARD OF THE STRATEGY
 2 - KNOW THE STRATEGY, BUT DON'T USE IT, BECAUSE QUESTION ITS VALUE
 1 - KNOW THE STRATEGY, BUT DON'T USE IT, BECAUSE SEE NO VALUE IN USING IT

READING STRATEGIES :

a. informal reading inventory	5	4	3	2	1
b. textbook use inventory	5	4	3	2	1
c. cloze test.	5	4	3	2	1
d. vocabulary development using context clues	5	4	3	2	1
e. vocabulary overviews	5	4	3	2	1
f. advanced organizers	5	4	3	2	1
g. concept guide	5	4	3	2	1
h. three level study guide	5	4	3	2	1
i. looking for the main idea	5	4	3	2	1
j. study skills strategies such as; SQ4R, MAPPING, MURDER	5	4	3	2	1

4. For each of the following types of training listed below, please indicate whether or not you have had the training. (Circle one number for each)

	YES	NO
a. Graduate level reading course required for standard certification.	1	2
b. Additional graduate credit courses in reading in the content area.	1	2
Number of hours		
c. Workshops for credit in reading	1	2
Number of workshops		
d. Workshops for non credit in reading.	1	2
Number of workshops		
e. One - two hour sessions or professional meeting dealing with reading in the content area.	1	2
Number of sessions or professional meetings		
f. other		

5. Please indicate whether or not you feel you could use additional training in the following reading in the content area strategies. (Circle one number for each)

	YES	NO
a. Informal reading inventory	1	2
b. Textbook use inventory	1	2
c. Cloze test	1	2
d. Vocabulary development using context clues	1	2
e. Vocabulary overview	1	2
f. Advanced organizers	1	2
g. Concept guide	1	2
h. Three level study guide	1	2
i. Looking for the main idea	1	2
j. study skills strategies such as; SQ4R, MAPPING, MURDER	1	2

IF YOU HAVE INDICATED YOU COULD USE MORE TRAINING IN ANY OF THE AREAS IN QUESTION 5, PLEASE GO ON TO QUESTION 6. OTHERWISE SKIP NOW TO QUESTION 7.

6. These are a number of delivery systems that could provide you with additional training. Please indicate how likely is it you would attend each of the following types. (Circle one number for each)

	VERY LIKELY	SOMEWHAT LIKELY	NOT TOO LIKELY	NOT AT ALL LIKELY
a. Credit course	1	2	3	4
b. Workshop credit or non credit course	1	2	3	4
c. 1-2 hour sessions or professional meetings	1	2	3	4
d. other				

7. Did you participate in the field testing of Integrating
Basic Skills in Home Economics Education Resource Guide?

- 1 YES
2 NO

8. Do you have a reading specialist working with the students
in your school?

- 1 DON'T KNOW (SKIP TO QUESTION 8b)
2 NO (SKIP TO QUESTION 8b)
3 YES (GO TO 8a)

8a. Please indicate whether or not a reading specialist
works with each of the following student groups.

YES NO DON'T
KNOW

a. Remedial	1	2	3
c. Developmental	1	2	3
d. Gifted	1	2	3

8b. Please indicate whether or not there is coordination
between the reading specialist and/or reading program and
the home economics program.

- 1 YES (SKIP TO 9)
2 NO

YES NO

8c. Have you examined the feasibility of
coordinating home economics curriculum with
the school's reading program and decided
against it. 1 2

8d. Coordination between the reading program and
home economics is planned for next year. . . . 1 2

8e. Presently considering looking into the
possibility of coordinating with the
reading specialist and/or reading program . . . 1 2

8f. Never considered coordinating with the
reading specialist and/or reading program. . . 1 2

9. Is there a list of district goals and/or competencies in
reading for the age level of students you teach?

- 1 NO (SKIP TO 10)
2 YES (GO TO 9a)

9a. Indicate whether or not your home economics program
helps meet these goals and/or competencies?

- 1 NO
2 YES

10. In the last year has their ^{re} been an increased emphasis on the teaching of reading skills in your district and/or community?

- 1 NO (GO TO 11)
- 2 YES (GO TO 10a)

10a. Briefly explain the changes resulting from the increased emphasis in teaching reading skills.

11. Identify whether or not each of the following persons is responsible for reading instruction in your school.

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
a. Special Education Teacher	1	2	3
b. Remedial Reading Teacher	1	2	3
c. Developmental Reading Teacher	1	2	3
d. English Teacher	1	2	3
e. Subject Matter Teachers (math, social studies, home ec, etc.)	1	2	3
f. Other (please list)			

12. How many years have you taught home economics?

- 1 CURRENTLY IN FIRST YEAR
- 2 ONE TO TWO YEARS
- 3 THREE TO FIVE YEARS
- 4 SIX TO TEN YEARS
- 5 ELEVEN TO FIFTEEN YEARS
- 6 SIXTEEN OR MORE

13. How many students are enrolled in your school?

- 1 Less than 300
- 2 300-499
- 3 500-799
- 4 800 or over

14. What is your average class size?

- 1 TEN OR FEWER
- 2 ELEVEN TO FIFTEEN STUDENTS
- 3 SIXTEEN TO TWENTY STUDENTS
- 4 TWENTY-ONE TO TWENTY-FIVE STUDENTS
- 5 TWENTY-SIX TO THIRTY STUDENTS
- 6 OVER THIRTY

15. Please indicate whether or not you teach each of the following grades. (Circle one number for each grade)

	YES	NO
a. 6TH GRADE	1	2
b. 7TH GRADE	1	2
c. 8TH GRADE	1	2
d. 9TH GRADE	1	2
e. 10TH GRADE.	1	2
f. 11TH GRADE.	1	2
g. 12TH GRADE.	1	2

16. How many different preparations do you usually have daily?

----- NUMBER OF PREPARATIONS

17. Is there anything further you would like to share regarding the teaching of content area reading?

Thank you for completing this questionnaire!

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope by June 1, 1985 to:

Cathy Ellis
 South Eugene High School
 400 E. 19th Ave.
 Eugene, OR. 97405

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

CATHY ELLIS
South Eugene High School
400 E. 19th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97401

May 18, 1985

Dear

I am finally collecting my research data for my thesis and need your help. At last Summer's curriculum development workshop on Oregon State University's campus I talked with you about my research. Enclosed you will find a questionnaire that will take about ten minutes to complete. My research is examining the status of reading in home economics.

I would appreciate the return of the questionnaire by June 3, 1985. You may rest assured that all data will be held in strictest confidence. Coding of questionnaires is for purposes of follow-up only. All responses will be combined into statistical tables and group analysis only, thus assuring individual anonymity.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Cathy Ellis
Graduate Student
OSU

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO CONTROL GROUP

CATHY ELLIS
South Eugene High School
400 E. 19th Avenue
Eugene, OR. 97401

May 18, 1985

Dear

I am conducting a study of the current status of reading in home economics in cooperation with Oregon State University. You have been chosen randomly to participate in this study from a list of Home Economics Teachers in Oregon.

Enclosed is a questionnaire that will require about ten minutes of your time to complete. If you choose to participate in this study, please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed pre-paid envelope. If you do not wish to participate, simply return the blank questionnaire.

I would appreciate the return of the questionnaire by June 3, 1985. You may rest assured that all data will be held in strictest confidence. Coding of questionnaires is for purposes of follow-up only. All responses will be combined into statistical tables and group analysis only, thus assuring individual anonymity.

Thank you for your cooperation. We do hope you can participate!

Sincerely,

Cathy Ellis
Graduate Student
Oregon State University

Helen Hall
Asst. Professor
Home Ec. Ed.
OSU

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD

June 1, 1985

Last week a questionnaire seeking information on reading strategies in home economics was mailed to you. If you have already completed and returned it to me, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, I would appreciate you completing and sending it to me today.

Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative sample of teachers, it is extremely important that your responses be included in the study.

If by chance you did not receive the questionnaire or it got misplaced please call me collect at (503) 688-9131 evenings and I will mail you another immediately.

Sincerely,

Cathy Ellis
Home Ec. Teacher
South Eugene High School