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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

As the countries of the world become more and more industrialized, there will be fewer jobs available to poor readers and the need for excellence in reading instruction will further increase. John Downing estimates that the proportion of people in the world over fifteen years of age who lack functional literacy is approximately 35 percent (13 percent in the United States). Various research efforts have attempted to define the extent of reading disability in the United States:

A. Recent achievement tests given to New York City's 84,000 third graders show that 59.9 percent are reading below grade level.

B. A study of 50,000 eighth graders showed only 14 percent with eighth-grade reading ability. Eight percent read at the fifth-grade level and 7 percent at the twelfth-grade level. The remainder was distributed between the two extremes.


There are multiple causes of reading disability. Larger school enrollments, more distractions, increased pressures to learn more in a shorter period of time are often cited. Certainly students with learning difficulties stay in school longer today than in past decades.

Treatment of reading difficulties must move on many fronts. No one person can solve all the reading problems in a school district, nor can any one approach to reading instruction fit the needs of all children. Cooperation is needed among teachers, supervisors and administrators acting on the problems in their respective spheres of influence. When one or more fails to contribute the part his role provides, he interferes with the progress of the comprehensive program.

In most schools, the classroom teacher provides the diagnostic and corrective instruction in the classroom, or refers the child to the reading specialist who can give more individualized treatment. Estimates place 10 to 25 percent of the school population in need of that specific kind of help in reading.⁴ The reading specialist and the classroom teacher of reading work cooperatively in helping the student perform in reading at a level that is commensurate with his ability. The classroom teacher must reinforce the activity of the reading specialist and must provide the reading specialist with feedback on attitudinal and interest changes.

⁴ Ruth Strang, Reading Diagnosis and Remediation (Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1968), p. 114.
If the reading specialist finds that the child is not making expected progress, he should refer the child to a reading clinic for more specialized and comprehensive diagnosis. It is estimated that one to five percent of the school population need highly technical diagnosis and treatment of severe reading disabilities which may be caused by emotional, social or physical problems. Funds, support, and encouragement for a comprehensive program of clinical diagnosis and treatment must come from the top-level administrator. Unless the top-level administrator, the principal, the reading specialist, and the classroom teacher work with one another in referrals, treatment and evaluations, pupils will not receive the effective help that otherwise would be available and the reading specialist will not receive the job satisfaction and role clarification that is important to his functioning effectively.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study is to identify and compare concepts of the ideal role and functions with the actual role and functions of the reading specialist in the public elementary schools of Franklin County, Ohio, as perceived by: reading specialists, classroom teachers, principals, and reading supervisors. The study is designed to:

1. Provide a valid description of present role perceptions of the elementary school reading specialist in Franklin County, Ohio, as seen by various related educational groups.

2. Provide guidelines for changing the organizational patterns of existing reading programs.
3. Provide data for further research.

4. Identify areas of cooperation among school personnel who are directly involved in the remedial reading program.

HYPOTHESES

The study will test the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference between the ideal and actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as they are perceived by elementary school reading specialists.

2. There is no significant difference between the ideal and actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as they are perceived by elementary school principals.

3. There is no significant difference between the ideal and actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as they are perceived by elementary school classroom teachers.

4. There is no significant difference between the ideal and actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as they are perceived by elementary school reading supervisors.

5. There is no significant difference between the correlation of the elementary school reading specialists' perception of ideal and actual roles and the correlation of the elementary classroom teachers' perception of ideal and actual roles.

6. There is no significant difference between the correlation of the elementary school reading specialists' perception of ideal and actual roles and the correlation of the elementary principals' perception of ideal and actual roles.
7. There is no significant difference between the correlation of the elementary school reading specialists' perception of ideal and actual roles and the correlation of the elementary reading supervisors' perception of ideal and actual roles.

8. There is no significant difference in the ideal roles of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by elementary school reading specialists and as perceived by elementary school classroom teachers.

9. There is no significant difference in the ideal roles of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by elementary school reading specialists and as perceived by elementary school principals.

10. There is no significant difference in the ideal roles of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by elementary school reading specialists and as perceived by elementary school reading supervisors.

11. There is no significant difference in the actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by elementary school reading specialists and as perceived by elementary school classroom teachers.

12. There is no significant difference in the actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by elementary school reading specialists and as perceived by elementary school principals.

13. There is no significant difference in the actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by elementary school reading specialists and as perceived by elementary school reading supervisors.
In addition to the above hypotheses an attempt will be made to determine how elementary school reading specialists, elementary school principals, elementary school reading supervisors, and elementary school classroom teachers perceive the specific responsibilities of elementary school reading specialists in reference to the reading specialists' ideal and actual roles. This will be accomplished by determining which of the Q-sort items were given the greatest and the least importance by each group in their respective sorts.

DEFSITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of this research, in reference to the various people involved in the teaching of reading, the following definitions of roles should serve as a guide to the particular duties of each: A reading specialist is that person (1) who works directly or indirectly with those pupils who have either failed to benefit from regular classroom instruction in reading or those pupils who could benefit from advanced training in reading skills and/or (2) who works with teachers, administrators, and other professionals to improve and coordinate the total reading program of the school.

---

5Definitions and analyses of qualifications for each of the roles were developed by the Professional Standards and Ethics Committee of the International Reading Association, and are taken from Glen R. Rasmussen and Hope W. Dunne, "Roles, Responsibilities, and Qualifications of Reading Specialists," Journal of Reading, XII (October, 1968), 60.
A special teacher of reading has major responsibility for remedial and corrective and/or developmental reading instruction.

A reading clinician provides diagnosis, remediation, or the planning of remediation for the more complex and severe reading disability cases.

A reading consultant works directly with teachers, administrators, and other professionals within the school to develop and implement the reading program under the direction of a supervisor with special training in reading.

A reading supervisor (coordinator) provides leadership in all phases of the reading program in a school system.

Developmental reading instruction is characterized by starting at the instructional level of a child, helping him proceed at his own rate, and following a sequential series of reading activities. This type of instruction is done in the classroom by the classroom teacher.

Remedial reading instruction includes the characteristics of developmental instruction but deals with children who read at two or more years below their capacity or grade level. This type of instruction is given by a remedial reading teacher outside the regular classroom setting, usually in a clinic or special classroom.

While the term reading specialist refers to one who works directly or indirectly with pupils, the present investigation is limited to an exploration of the role of the reading specialist who works directly with students.
IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

In the process of defining the problem, the investigator visited reading centers in five Franklin County School Districts. In two of the five districts reading specialists were assuming a role quite different from that of the previous year. They had moved from working with small groups of disabled readers to working exclusively with teachers. In surveying the current Ohio Department of Education requirements for reading specialists, no course in curriculum and supervision is listed. For the reading supervisory certificate, a course in organization and supervision of reading programs is suggested but not required. Because extensive federal funding for reading programs was not available prior to the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, reading specialists were not included on most school staffs prior to that time. It was not until 1972 that the Ohio Department of Education adopted specific requirements for certification and validation of certificates in remedial reading. This may partially explain the paucity of the research in the area of role perceptions of the reading specialist. Yet, because of the cooperative nature of the endeavor, the chance of conflict and diverse role expectations is evident.

Several studies devoted to role perceptions of the reading specialist have been undertaken. One such study by Richard Wylie surveyed 100 classroom teachers and 100 reading consultants chosen randomly from four

---

new England States. He found dramatic differences between the concepts of the role(s) of the elementary school reading consultant as viewed by the classroom teacher and as perceived by the reading consultant. Differences appeared to lie chiefly in the areas of instructional versus administrative and organizational schemes. Wylie concluded: "If the elementary reading consultant is to improve the quality of reading instruction the role(s) of the specialists must be 1) well defined 2) understood by all, and 3) agreed upon."

Albert J. Harris attempted, in a major address to members of the International Reading Association at its 1974 conventions in New Orleans, to delineate the role of the classroom teacher as he relates to the reading specialist. His address entitled, "Can the Teacher be a Diagnostician?" suggested three major areas of concern for the classroom teacher of reading--assaying the reading levels, the skills, and the interests of all students. Exploration of causal factors of reading disability are seen to be much less important in the role and function of the classroom teacher. He surmised that the current trend toward a diagnostic-prescriptive pattern of teaching constitutes an added burden to the classroom teacher and requires that the teacher receive some relief from what can become an overwhelming clerical load.


8 Albert J. Harris, "Can the Teacher be a Diagnostician?" in Joseph S. Nemeth (ed.), The Teacher: Key to Excellence in Reading, Abstracts of the International Reading Association, 1974, pp. 48-49.
Prior to the selection of a research topic, the investigator surveyed the group of Franklin County, Ohio, reading specialists and their supervisors who had been selected to cooperate with Capital University in the training of reading teachers, by providing a laboratory experience in the schools. It was felt that because these teachers and their supervisors had met the rather rigid requirements for participation in this course, their concerns in the field of reading would be valuable to the investigator. A simple forced choice questionnaire was used (see Appendix A). Respondents were asked to designate the category representing the area of greatest need in reading instruction. The four categories were:

1. Research in teaching reading skills.
2. Dissemination of empirical and theoretical data
3. Procurement of reading materials suitable for the diverse needs of students.
4. Role definition of the reading specialist, the classroom teacher, principal and the reading supervisor.

The following table shows results of the questionnaire.
TABLE I

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF TEACHERS AND SUPERVISORS CHOOSING EACH CATEGORY OF NEED FOR READING INSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responding to Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Research in Teaching Reading Skills</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissemination of Data</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Procurement of Suitable Materials</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Role Definition</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among reading specialists and their supervisors the need for role clarification is indicated.

ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions were made regarding the study:

1. That a minimum of one year of experience in a given school is a sufficient amount of time for the reading specialist, supervisor of reading, principal, and classroom teacher, to attain a knowledge of the position of the elementary school reading specialist.

2. That the reading specialists selected for this study were well qualified to perform their duties as elementary school reading specialists since they met the requirements for inclusion in the study.
3. That the Q-sort, as developed by the investigator, adequately reflects a sample of the possible behaviors of the elementary school reading specialist.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

From the outset of the study, several limitations were evident:

1. Because of the limited scope of the investigation (Franklin County, Ohio) and the uniqueness of membership, generalizations made about other populations would be tentative.

2. The study is limited to elementary reading specialists assigned to first through sixth grades; generalizations cannot be made about the role of the reading specialist in the secondary school.

ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION

This report of the study is organized into five chapters.

Chapter II follows with a review of relevant research and theory.

Chapter III details the design of the study and the procedures employed in the investigation.

Chapter IV reports the major findings.

Chapter V presents a summary of the study, findings, conclusions, implications and suggestions for additional research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Basic to the development of this study was a review of theoretical and empirical data in three broad areas -- role theory as such; social psychology, and education. These areas are considered fundamental to the understanding of role and role relationships involved in teaching remedial reading.

ROLE THEORY

The process of developing a conceptual framework for the utilization of role theory as a basis for empirical investigation is complicated by the state of role theory itself. Consensus among role theorists is difficult to establish and terminology is often used inter-changeably. Biddle, et al., attempted to remedy this situation and succeeded to some extent in organizing the literature in a more meaningful whole. They provided much needed leadership in delimiting the field, seeing it as sharing with the more mature fields of behavioral sciences some rudiments of a unique theory. Yet Biddle and his associates deplored the seemingly endless process of redefinition that has heretofore characterized the field. Although they cite a

---

need for exploration of the propositional structure in this field, its
domain of study, they assert, is "...real behavior as it is displayed
in genuine on-going social situations."  

Relative to the study of teacher role and therefore pertinent to
the present investigation of the role of the reading specialist, was
Biddle's and Thomas's assessment of the inadequacy of previous empirical
studies of teacher role, and their suggestion of the need for future
well designed studies concerned with increasing the understanding in
this area. They provide a basis for sophisticated exploration of the
teacher role in their attempt at classification upon the basis of a
suggested limited set of phenomenal referents -- behaviors, persons, or
persons and their behaviors.

To a greater extent than many contributors in the field of role
theory, Cottrell, and later Kingsley Davis approached the study of
role through not only what an actor does but also what is expected of
him. They point to the importance of significant others in determining
how roles are formed, and treat role primarily as behavior.

Role conflict exists when contradictory expectations are held for
an occupant of a particular position. The behavior of the occupant

10 Ibid., p. 7.
11 Ibid., p. 9.
may satisfy one set of pressures while simultaneously violating another set of expectations. For example, elementary school principals often expect the reading specialist to work with students in the upper grades whose reading achievement is below grade level, while the reading coordinator may be giving priority to preventative programs at kindergarten or pre-kindergarten levels.

Getzels and Guba deal with this type of conflict in their study of two organized roles; those of officers and teachers in the military. This study included an analysis of the conflict when these roles were held by a single individual, and the consequences of conflict for the effective management of one of the roles. They found that the greater the intensity of conflict the greater the ineffectiveness of the individual. They also found that the intensity of involvement in conflict is related to personal characteristics.

From a survey of relevant role theory, a major implication for the role of the reading specialist emerges. It seems clear that a knowledge of the conditions which exist in the interaction system presently operating in reading programs is needed in order to make predictions of how the introduction of new roles into the interaction systems will affect these programs. More important, these data are needed to determine the functions that new roles should take to improve instruction in reading. This is extremely important at a time when a redefinition

---

of roles and the addition of new roles in education are occurring rapidly. Compounding the problem of the role of the reading teacher is the changing role of relevant others -- for example, the school principal. Thurman's suggestion to reallocate the role expectations normally associated with the principalship to two new positions, a Coordinator of Learning and a Coordinator of Administrative Services, is only one of many voices presently advocating drastic change in this position.\(^\text{15}\)

Sociologically oriented role theories can provide direction for those involved in the definition of roles in education. The concept of role represents the social scientist's acknowledgement of certain uniformities observable in human behavior which are specific to situations. The expectations vary systematically from one situation to another in which other people around an individual expect him to be (and not be) a certain kind of person or expect him to behave (and not behave) in certain ways. The role theorist oriented toward sociology regards role expectations as "culturally patterned" and as attached to the statuses, or positions, a person occupies rather than immutably to the person himself.\(^\text{16}\) The forces of expectations transmitted to the person during


interaction between himself and "significant others" is effective only as the person perceives the expectations. Role theorists in education are inclined to the view that perceived expectations constitute the behaviorally influential environment for the person, although Charters reports that other theoretical positions on the matter are tenable and, possibly, more fruitful.\textsuperscript{17}

Perceptions of the role of the reading specialist are easily diffused because of the transitive nature of the position. Often the reading specialist is expected to work with pupils in the morning and with teachers that afternoon. It is important while working with the same child that the classroom teacher and the reading specialist relate to the situation in an open manner revealing methods and understandings in an unthreatening environment. Moving from this to a highly visible position of leadership, a change agent in the area of reading instruction, requires flexibility on the part of the reading specialist and entails a drastic role reversal for the individuals involved.

In order for the school system to maintain itself and achieve its intended goals, roles must be performed adequately, even though the personalities filling them will vary; status positions are, in turn, variously interpreted.

In summary, the review of the literature concerned with role theory, while difficult to classify and delimit, does however, give direction to the investigator's intended goals, and upon closer examination can

\textsuperscript{17}Ibid., p. 788.
contribute to these goals. The concept of role as the individual's actions or behavior, while one of several definitions in the literature, is supportive to this attempt to define the role of the elementary school reading specialist. This definition lends itself to the use of the Q-sort instrument utilized in this study, which consists of descriptions of reading specialist behaviors representative of the more and less appropriate categories of his behavior.

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY

Since role study necessarily includes concepts and understandings from the discipline of social psychology, as well as from role theory and education, a review of the literature in social psychology should provide the broad perspective necessary to the interpretation of role and role relationships of the reading specialist.

As was the case with the study of role theory, the relationship between teacher personality and teaching effectiveness is nebulous and, even after a monumental research effort it is still an area needing further investigation. Since the role of the reading specialist is dependent on the quality of interpersonal relationships, it was necessary for this investigator to attempt to gain insight and direction from this complex field, even though definitive answers are not yet available.

Several social psychologists, however, do provide insights useful in defining the role of the reading specialist: Bennis, in his

---

description of our perceiving processes and their relationship to the
social world; Horrocks, 19 and later Osgood, 20 in their attempts to
measure attitudes or perceptions; and others have provided direction
even though there is no dominating theory in the field.

The understanding of the self has been an area of concern and is a
vital and basic area as it relates to teaching and learning. Bennis,
et al., agree with others that a successful relationship is built
around openness and trust. 21 They deduce that the experiences of
success in relationships with others will enhance one's self-esteem and
will result in constructive change in attitudes and behaviors.

Being able to take the role of "the other" in a relationship
enables one to predict the other's behavior and subsequently to antici­
pate the reactions of the other. Consciousness of one's role is vital
to the ability to adapt to role expectations. Adapting to role expecta­
tions begins with self awareness and the ability to overcome barriers
within oneself. Extreme self-criticism, for example, is a detriment to
growth. In trying to effect change in behavior, leadership personnel,

19 J. E. Horrocks, Assessment of Behavior (Columbus, Ohio: Charles

20 Charles E. Osgood, "Cross-Cultural Comparability in Attitude
Measurement via Multilingual Semantic Differentials," in Current Studies
in Social Psychology, ed. by I. D. Steiner and M. Fishbein (New York:

21 Bennis, op. cit., p. 391.
including the reading specialist working with classroom teachers, need to help teachers set realistic standards leading to success.

Attention to self-awareness and self perceptions as these concepts are related to role is implied in Newcomb's definition of role behavior which he distinguishes from prescribed role. Newcomb sees role behavior as referring to the actual behavior of specific individuals as they take roles and as having all the characteristics of any motive pattern. In addition, role "...is behavior both determined by and perceived in terms of shared frames of reference." This definition allows for the inclusion of what the individual is as a human being. The behavior of the reading specialist cannot be determined exclusively by situational factors; the reading specialist is first a human being and secondly a reading specialist. Regardless of the extent of training, the idiosyncratic aspects of behavior will be reflected in the teacher's performance. This constitutes the teacher's own unique style and is complementary to the development of the skills of teaching.

There is a growing awareness among educators of the importance of the self as it relates to learning. Attitudes and emotions so relevant to the study of roles are included in this study of the self. Horrocks defines attitude as an expression, by word or deed, of an individual's reaction toward or feeling about a person, a thing, or a situation. Representing the sum of his fears, inclinations, wishes, prejudices,

---

preconceived notions, ideas and convictions, attitudes result from the impact of environment, past and present, acting upon the personality of an individual. Attempting somehow to measure or estimate growth in the attitudinal objectives of the curriculum presents difficulties. Horrocks reviewed procedures for measuring perceptions including inventory techniques, questionnaire techniques, and rating scales. Establishing reliability and validity of these instruments is challenging. The effects of social desirability affect answers and must be considered, as do other factors which make growth in these areas of attitudes difficult to substantiate.

Extensive studies of attitude measurement have been conducted, among them Osgood's studies using the Semantic Differential Technique. As a result of these data, there is general consensus that (a) perceptions or attitudes can be measured, (b) they are learned (c) they are implicit, (d) they are predispositioned to respond evaluatively to perceptual or linguistic signs, and (e) the evaluation predisposition may fall anywhere along a scale from "extremely favorable" through "neutral" to "extremely unfavorable."

Changing attitudes or perceptions is the subject of extensive

---


comment among social psychologists, and is a worthwhile area for study by the student of role perception. Social perception, the means by which people form impressions of one another, is not always conscious or rational but it can be developed with training and living experience. Generally, the greater the similarity of attitudes and beliefs expressed by another individual to one's own beliefs and attitudes, the more positive the affective response toward that individual. This idea, of course, holds important implications for educators in a multi-ethnic society, and especially for reading and language teachers in a multi-lingual culture.

Donn Byrne offers a concise overview of social perception. Because behavior is the goal-directed attempt of the organism to satisfy its needs as experienced and perceived, it is a function of expectancies from and toward other organisms. The satisfaction of the need for positive regard depends on other human beings, and an individual can be more influenced by this need than by his actual experience.

Because each individual is characterized by an internal organization of qualities that are the residue of that person's experiences, each brings his personal interpretation to a role. A person cannot enact a role for which he lacks knowledge of the necessary role expectations, and these must be acquired through experience. Without such experience, personal interpretation is based on the available perceptions

which may result in invalid perception. These ideas have been expressed and substantiated in numerous empirical efforts and have strong implications for teaching. The notion that a subject's performance can be influenced by the expectations of the teacher, although not new, is well worth reviewing.

This section has presented an analysis of the literature from the perspective of the social psychologist; these data are basic to the study of education and more especially essential to the study of role perception in education.

EDUCATION

There are few, if any, schools in the world without some students who have difficulty in learning to read. The numbers will vary according to the home backgrounds of the children, their intelligence, the excellence of the teaching staff, materials available, and the motivation and attitudes of students and staff. But every school, even those with adequate funding, enlightened leadership, interested parents and community, and well educated and dedicated teachers, has some students whose reading achievement is not commensurate with their ability. 26

Reading programs can be divided into four categories based on the degree of reading disability. The most severe cases of reading disability include readers who show evidence of physical, psychological, or

neurological interference, or a combination of these symptoms. The extent of such serious reading difficulties is estimated at one to five percent of the school population.27 These children require clinical treatment with a one to one ratio of teacher and pupil.

The second category encompasses moderately severe cases of reading disability. Reading specialists say they are reading below their "expectancy level." They show little or no evidence of physical, psychological or neurological interference. Their skill weaknesses can be corrected, but they require more careful diagnosis, more expertise, and more time than the classroom teacher is able to give. Although such children are not in need of clinical treatment, they usually respond to remedial classes in which their skill deficiencies can be treated individually. These classes usually meet in a reading center in the same building as their regular classes, but with a reading specialist, trained in diagnosis and aware of the emotional and social implications of reading failure. It is estimated that from 10 to 25 percent of the school population suffers from this type of disability.28

A third group of children experience mild disability in learning to read. They may lack certain skills or they may need different materials, more relevant to their interests and needs. They often need help in effective study skills. These children can be helped by the regular

27 Ruth Strang, Reading Diagnosis and Remediation (Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1968), p. 114.
28 Ibid., p. 114.
classroom teacher. Approximately 40 to 60 percent of children occasionally need additional help with minor problems in learning to read.29

A fourth group of children become avid readers, enjoy reading and present few problems to the classroom teacher. Many of these children were reading prior to school entry.

The diagnosis of reading difficulties is a continuing process, with prescription leading out of the diagnosis, and back again into further diagnosis after treatment. There is wide agreement among authorities in reading that diagnosis should be conducted in four broad areas and should involve: (1) determining a student's expectancy level by measuring the difference between his level of performance in reading and his potential ability, (2) assessing the various processes involved in learning to read, including specific reading skills, (3) determining causes for the disability, and (4) assessing interests. There is consensus among authorities that diagnosis should not be reserved only for the student with reading difficulties, but should be used as a preventive measure with early assessment of the factors leading to reading even before reading instruction begins. The earlier diagnosis begins the greater the chance for successful teaching.

Major authorities agree that three key staff members are needed to provide a sound program of reading instruction. These are a reading coordinator (sometimes called supervisor or consultant), remedial reading teacher, and classroom teacher. Smith includes a fourth person in

29 Ibid., p. 115.
his discussion of diagnosis -- the reading clinician. Large districts across the nation have a reading clinician who works within an interdisciplinary setting along with a diagnostic team of psychologists, social workers, and nurses. The type of diagnosis indicated, the expertise of examiner, and the amount of time needed are criteria used in determining which member of the professional team is involved in the diagnosis. The classroom teacher usually uses primarily group standardized and informal testing and observation of reading behavior; the reading specialist (including remedial reading teacher and clinician) and the psychologist use individual tests and more extensive observation.

Several writers in the field use four classifications of diagnosis, separating the reading clinician from the psychologist and other members of the interdisciplinary team. The writer prefers the three level classification, as shown in Table 2, since the individualized types of psychological and physiological testing is done at the clinical level even though it may be accomplished by different members of the diagnostic team.

If there is consensus on anything among reading authorities, it is that reading disability is a result of multiple causes. It is rare to find a child with one specific cause and one discrete reading difficulty. Therefore careful diagnosis of specific skill weaknesses is vital to overcoming the problems.

---

Smith, op. cit., p. 16.
### TABLE 2
LEVELS OF DIAGNOSIS OF READING DISABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Diagnosis</th>
<th>Technique Employed</th>
<th>Staff Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description of performance</td>
<td>Standardized group tests, Observation, Informal tests, Personality tests, Interest inventory</td>
<td>Classroom teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific analysis of reading process</td>
<td>Individualized reading diagnostic tests, Informal tests, Observation, Interest inventory, Standardized tests</td>
<td>Remedial reading specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination of mental ability</td>
<td>Intelligence testing, Physiological evaluations, Informal testing, Psychological projective tests, Interviews</td>
<td>Reading Clinician and interdisciplinary staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests of memory, association, reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptual and motor evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the identification of children who need remedial help outside the classroom or in developing preventive programs, the reading specialist can be of great assistance in determining which tests and which materials and methods to use in the classroom or in the reading clinic. Informal tests may be devised by teachers or may be published commercially. Locally developed tests often are more adapted to the problems of a specific population. For example, children who bring a nonstandard
dialect or informal language to the reading situation may not have adequate vocabulary or concept development to enable them to use the nationally normed tests.

Formal standardized group tests are, however, useful for a variety of purposes in reading:

1. Grouping, both in the classroom and in the reading center.
2. Screening candidates for special classes, remedial or gifted.
5. Diagnosing individual and group needs.
7. Establishing need for special programs.

Smith offers a word of warning in standardized test utilization,
"...it is clearly invalid to base a school's corrective and remedial reading program on the scores from group standardized tests alone."

Because the norming population used in standardizing a test may not resemble that of the local school, it is not always wise to compare the test results with the national norm. Test data revealing the status of reading performance as it relates to each child's potential is a more useful comparison.

In addition to standardized testing, some children who are experiencing reading difficulties need further diagnosis. Such a program may

---

Ibid., p. 20.
include the following steps, depending upon the severity of the disability:

1. Develop a case history showing emotional, social physiological and academic data.
2. Evaluate the effect of failure on the child's behavior.
3. Make an evaluation of the child's self concept and social adjustment.
4. Make suggestions for remediation of reading skills and adjustment.
5. Re-evaluate the case at intervals.
6. Plan for further referrals if necessary.

A sound reading program for a school system, kindergarten through senior high school, must include adequate diagnostic facilities for students with learning difficulties.

Since this study is concerned with the role of the reading specialist who works directly with children, discussion concerned with planning for instruction after diagnosis with emphasis on the role of the reading specialist is warranted. Representative examples of the research and theory relevant to the role of the reading specialist will be included.

It is generally agreed that the materials and equipment used in a remedial program should be different from those of the regular classroom with which the child is failing. Therefore a basal reading program is seldom used in the reading center or clinic. A variety of materials is selected to fit the diverse needs of a completely individualized and personalized program. Selection of equipment and materials for the
pupil should be based on the diagnosis of his reading ability and dis-
ability. Materials are available which are specifically designed for
the learning modality preferences of children. For example, if the
child seems to respond best to auditory stimuli, an exciting array of
choices are available in "read-a-long" books, tapes, or records, many
of them with musical accompaniment. Some pupils need the extra assis-
tance of the tactile and kinesthetic experience. For them, materials,
such as sandpaper letters and manipulative materials, are available
along with the opportunity to trace words and sentences in salt, sand,
oatmeal, chocolate pudding, or any substance the creative teacher
desires. An endless variety of games and activities designed for the
success and delight of the learner should be available and often are,
and special attention must be given to the selection of a collection of
high-interest but low readability-level books on a variety of topics,
basic to a sound reading program for the disabled reader. Teachers
often make many of their own teaching materials in the reading center,
for even with an unlimited budget it would be impossible to anticipate
fully the specific and diverse interests and needs of the students.

Constance McCullough, 1974-75 president of the International Read-
ing Association, offers a word of advice relative to the cavalier manner
in which schools change materials, methods and even basic philosophical
orientation in reading. Her statement is analogous to this discussion.

Much of the knowledge we now have about the
teaching of reading has been developed by a
curious and -- in terms of the lives of children --
wasteful pattern of extremes. We learned a great
deal about oral reading by having too much of it,
about silent reading by neglecting oral, about
extensive reading by neglecting intensive, about
sight vocabulary by neglecting phonics, about
phonics and speed by neglecting comprehension.
We are now involved in a great controversy over
the relative virtues of a developmental program
with systematic instruction and an individualized
program with incidental instruction.
One would think that it should finally have
dawned on us that all of these practices have
value and that the sensible, most efficient
program encompasses them all.32

The reading specialist working the "lush" environment of the
reading center, today, does "encompass them all" as he selects from a
kaleidoscope of materials and methods to satisfy the specific needs of
his charges. And this is reflective of current research in reading
methodology. One of the best-known government sponsored studies is the
Cooperative Research Program in First Grade Reading Instruction. The
effort involved twenty-seven individual studies carried on in various
places in the United States, and attempted to discover if there were an
approach to initial reading instruction that would produce superior
reading and spelling achievement. Instructional approaches currently
in use, including linguistic, basal reader, individualized, programmed,
i.t.a., and language experience methods were used, as well as combina-
tions of these methods. Its findings and conclusions are significant
in relation to pupil achievement in reading, and the implications for
teaching are cogent. The authors reporting the findings of the studies
concluded, "...no one approach is so distinctly better in all situations
and respects than the others that it should be considered the one best

32 Constance M. McCullough, "Individualized Reading," NEA Journal,
XXXXVII (March, 1958), 163.
method and the one to be used exclusively. Clearly, factors other than methodology and materials, are operating in the learning of reading. In agreement with the findings of the Cooperative Research Program, is a similar statement made by Ramsey in an evaluation of three grouping procedures for teaching reading. He concluded, "The thing that the study probably illustrates most clearly is that the influence of the teacher is greater than that of a particular method, a certain variety of materials, or a specific plan of organization. Given a good teacher other factors in teaching reading tend to pale to insignificance."

A more recent study reported by Harris and Morrison reiterated the conclusions of Ramsey and the authors of the Cooperative Research Program. These authors reported a three-year study and a replicated two-year study of two approaches to teaching reading, basal vs. language experience. They found, as did Bond and Dykstra, that differences in mean reading scores within each method were much larger than differences between methods and approaches. Their conclusion is that "...the teacher is far more important than the method." When added to other similar comment and research, this seems clearly to suggest a closer look at the effective teacher. What teacher characteristics or teaching

---


behaviors appear to differentiate the effective teacher from one less effective in teaching reading? Research must answer this question.

And yet another question which needs to be asked is whether or not an effective teacher of developmental reading in the classroom will be an effective teacher in a remedial situation. Dorothy Klausner suggests that because of the special problems of many disabled readers, the teacher-pupil relationship is somewhat different in a remedial reading situation from that relationship in the developmental reading situation. Factors operant in the remedial reading situation but not in the developmental situation are such as: dealing with parents of children who are failing, administering diagnostic tests which may seem too immature to an older child who is lacking in adequate reading skills. Helping these children would seem to require that the reading specialist be more cognizant of each pupil's feelings and interests and, in turn, that he find ways of modifying attitudes and behaviors. This is an area in which much research remains to be accomplished.

A review of the literature relevant to the study of the role of the reading specialist, would be incomplete without mention of the closely related area of self concept development. Not only does poor self-concept interfere with learning to read, but the resulting reading disability leads to a negative self concept. An entire spiral of cycles with

---

reading disability and the negative concept of the self continuously reinforcing each other is described by Bond and Tinker\textsuperscript{37} and later by Holmze.\textsuperscript{38} Not only does poor self-concept interfere with learning to read, but the resulting disability leads to an even poorer self concept.

With the current emphasis that society places upon reading ability, inability to read becomes socially unacceptable. When an individual feels that those people who are significant regard him as incompetent, he attempts to counteract this appraisal.\textsuperscript{39} In his quest for feelings of overall importance, psychologists agree, the child has only four alternatives regarding any competency even though he may not be conscious of them:

1. He may deny the importance of the activities.
2. He may make it clear that he has extended no effort.
3. He may actually feel competent in those activities.
4. He may hide or disguise his lack of ability.

For most children who are failing in reading, denying the importance is difficult because of the emphasis placed on reading in the schools. Only two alternatives, then, are available: disguising incompetency or withdrawing effort. Few children are clever enough to hide or disguise


\textsuperscript{38}Alma C. Holmze, "Reading and the Self-Concept," Elementary English, XXXIX (n.m., 1962), p. 211.

from both teachers and peers something as obvious as reading disability. Therefore they are forced into a position where they must imply that effort has not been extended. In order to avoid having his self concept lowered even more, the child may exhibit behaviors such as: showing apparent lack of effort to learn to read, or showing disinterest even disdain for reading.

Quite the reverse of this occurs if the child is successful in reading. If the people important to him enable him to recognize his success, he will develop a concept of himself as a "reader." As a result, he will attempt more difficult material, he will take more pleasure in reading, and he is apt to read more widely. The wide reading makes the child a better reader and as the people important to him notice it, his concept of himself as a reader is enhanced; and the cycle continues.

In conclusion, some pertinent questions concerning the relationship of self-concept to reading are appropriate: How far can good self-concepts take us as we attempt to give every child the right to read? Can every child with a reading difficulty be aided by improving his self-concept? Should self-concept building become a standard part of the curriculum? Although answers to these important questions remain to be discovered, sufficient evidence has been found and enough support from authorities in education and psychology has been accumulated to suggest that many disabled readers can be helped by improving their self-concepts. Ivan Quandt, in his interpretive paper produced for the International Reading Association, suggests that the question is not can teachers improve reading and other abilities through self-concept building as
much as it is will they. The importance of self-concept in learning to read must not only be recognized, it must be demonstrated and planned for as a vital integral part of the process of education.

The review of the selected literature in role theory, social psychology and education has served to verify the investigator's contention that the need for the present study is indeed real. The study will increase understanding of the role of the reading specialist as it is perceived by key personnel in the schools of Franklin County, Ohio, an understanding that must precede the pursuit of the very pertinent questions being raised in the literature.

For the purposes of this study, role will be defined in terms of the actions performed by the person to validate his occupancy of a position or status. The official, institutional role of the reading specialist will be investigated as this role is perceived by the reading specialist and by persons in adjacent statuses.

---

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Review of the literature relevant to this study reveals that the role of the reading specialist is interrelated with a complexity of operations and professional roles, designed to approach the teaching of reading on many fronts. This study focuses on the role relationship dimension of the teaching of reading in an effort to determine the degree of consensus, the role conflict, and role diffusion in the perception of the population under investigation.

An attempt in this study was made to identify how the reading specialist perceived his role, and to compare his perceived role with the role assigned to him by significant others in the school setting. Significant others was defined for the purpose of this study to mean other members of the school staff who work closely with the reading specialist, more specifically, the classroom teacher, principal and the reading supervisor. In pursuit of this purpose, relevant others in the school setting were requested to: identify the duties and responsibilities that the reading specialist would perform if he were to do his job to perfection, and identify the duties and responsibilities of the reading specialist in terms of what the reading specialist was currently doing in his present position.

The following sequence of steps was followed in accomplishing the above-stated purpose:

1. Development of an instrument capable of identifying the ideal and actual role assigned to the elementary school reading specialist by the population of the study.
2. Selection of the population of the study.

3. Development of efficient and reliable procedures for the collection, recording and analysis of the data.

This chapter describes the procedures employed by the investigator in resolving these three problems.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENTS

Original instruments were developed by the investigator since no instrument was presently available which could collect the necessary data for this study. The major instrument used in the study is based on the process of Q-methodology, a general term used by Williamson Stephenson to express a group of psychometric and statistical procedures he developed.\(^\text{41}\) Q-technique, a set of procedures used to implement Q-methodology, was described concisely by Kerlinger, who stated, "Q technique centers particularly in the sorting of decks of cards called Q sorts and in the correlations among the responses of different individuals to the Q sorts."\(^\text{42}\)

Four distinct processes were involved in the development of the major instrument used in the study:

1. Review of pertinent literature
2. Design of the instrument
3. Framing of the Q-sort statements


4. Pretesting the Q-sort instrument

Review of Literature

The concept of role used throughout this study and therefore fundamental to the selection of items for the Q-sort instrument, was described by Charters:

In theoretically slanted conceptualizations of social role, as opposed to the operationally slanted conceptualizations of Gross and Biddle, the aspects of status occupants relevant to social role are often more narrowly restricted. Role expectations are limited to those expectations bearing upon the mode of interaction between incumbents of particular statuses.

Charters further suggests that if these narrowly restricted aspects of status occupants were followed through in empirical studies, only those expectations on status occupants would be measured which were involved in reciprocal relationships with persons in adjacent statuses. It is the interlocking expectations between a status occupant and occupants of particular counterstatuses which constitute the proper subject matter of role expectations from this point of view. The role associated with the status of teacher, from this frame of reference, exists only with respect to the role of student, the role of parents, the role of principal, and so on. Therefore, this study was concerned with the official institutional role of the reading specialist, and this definition of role influenced the kind of statements selected for the Q-sort instrument.

---

Definitions, descriptions and analyses of behaviors constituting the role of the reading specialist were based on a complete review of the literature with primary considerations given to the work of Carl B. Smith published by the International Reading Association. Smith suggests six broad areas which cover the responsibilities of the reading specialist who works directly with children:

1. Selecting the children who would profit by remedial work.
2. Determining the frequency and length of sessions.
5. Evaluating pupil progress.
6. Reporting results.

Writers in the field generally agree that the staff needed for an effective remedial reading program varies according to the size of the school, the kind of school population, and the excellence of the developmental reading program itself. There is general consensus that three key staff members are needed to provide a good reading program: (1) a reading supervisor, (2) a reading specialist, and (3) a classroom reading teacher.

Design of the Instrument

The Q-sort instrument developed by the investigator utilized the balanced block design proposed by Stephenson. Therefore it was

---

45 Stephenson, op. cit., p. 78.
structured artificially rather than selected from a random sample of a parent universe of items. Twenty-five more and twenty-five less appropriate reading specialist behaviors constituted the domain of statements included in the instrument. In selecting and structuring a sample of statements for use with the Q-sort technique, Stephenson lists considerations to guide the researcher:

"...(i) The sample should be balanced with respect to at least one effect. (ii) It should be homogeneous, as judged by the ease with which the transitory postulate can apply for any operator. It is usually a simple matter to achieve condition i: thus, for every statement with a positive assertion or meaning, there can always be chosen another with a negative."

From the six broad areas of reading specialist responsibility determined by Smith, the investigator selected a set of statements empirically and theoretically based and thereby held to be valid by writers and authorities in the role theory and reading fields. In other words, the investigator chose from the literature functions or behaviors of the reading specialist which were viewed by major contributors in the field as being important. From this parent universe of items, statements were placed into a design on the basis of a theoretical structure of reading specialist's role. This structure was chosen by the investigator to represent the five groups of school personnel who occupy adjacent statuses to the reading specialist. The structure contained the following five categories of reading specialist behavior as shown in Table 3:

\[46\text{Ibid.}\text{, p.}\ 79\text{.} \]
1. Assistance to classroom teacher of reading.
2. Assistance to principal.
3. Assistance to children.
4. Assistance to supervisor of reading.
5. Assistance to parents and community.

The structuring of the sample provided for its representativeness.

**TABLE 3**

CATEGORIES OF READING SPECIALIST'S ROLE AND EXAMPLES OF SELECTED STATEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Reading Specialist's Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>To confer during regular school hours with the classroom teacher who works with the same child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child</td>
<td>To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>To schedule opportunities to examine, evaluate and recommend materials to the principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Supervisor</td>
<td>To cooperate with the reading supervisor in giving priority to prevention rather than remediation of reading disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Community</td>
<td>To report results of treatment to the child and his parents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In framing the Q-sort statements Jacobs' list of criteria was modified for use with the present study. Six criteria adapted from Jacobs' list were used in evaluating the statements:

1. Is the meaning clear?
2. Does it have any other meanings?
3. Can the statement be shortened?
4. Does the statement "lead" the respondent?
5. Does it ask the respondent to go against his basic inclinations?
6. Is the statement ambiguous?

From a universe of negative statements collected by the investigator during observations in the Franklin County, Ohio, public school reading centers, items were selected which also had been suggested in the literature as being inappropriate reading specialist behaviors. These inappropriate statements were combined with the appropriate statements to complete the balanced sample of items, a segment of which is shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4
SEGMENT OF THE BALANCED DESIGN OF THE Q-SORT STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Reading Specialist's Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>1. To confer during regular school hours with the classroom teacher who is working with the same child. (appropriate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To arrange for inservice training in reading for the classroom teachers. (inappropriate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To further verify the importance of the items and to determine validity of the instrument, a jury of ten was selected to judge the value of the initial list of items. This consisted of sixty items (thirty appropriate and thirty inappropriate) descriptive of the role of the reading specialist. These were selected from the literature by the investigator, because he felt these to be the most important functions of the reading specialist as these behaviors relate to the five categories under investigation. A group of professors, reading specialists, principals, reading supervisors, and classroom teachers, (ten in total) were requested to serve on the jury because of their current interest and experience in teaching reading. After these ten educators agreed to serve as jurors, a list of the five categories, the thirty appropriate and thirty inappropriate items were mailed to each of the jurors (see Appendix L). The jury was asked to grade each statement A, B, C, D, or F, in terms of its importance to the category in which it was structured and to the field of teaching reading and to role theory. In addition to judging the value of each question, the jury was asked to evaluate the statement in terms of Jacobs' six criteria which were used in framing the statements. The responses and grades of the jurors suggested minor changes on several occasions. After several drafts were developed, the jurors were unanimously satisfied with the statements.

After jury grading of the statements, the twenty-five statements with highest grades were selected to be included in the sample as the appropriate Q-sort statements, along with the same number of inappropriate statements. Therefore the final instrument consisted of
twenty-five more and twenty-five less appropriate reading specialist behaviors—five more and five less appropriate items in each of the five categories.

Pretesting the Instrument

In order to gather data on the reliability of the instrument, to rule out the possibility of systematic error, it was pretested in two school districts adjoining Franklin County, Ohio; Fairfield County School District and Big Walnut School District in Delaware County. The population selected for testing the instrument consisted of thirty-five educators who had fulfilled the same criteria as was required of the population in the study. Respondents were asked to complete the Q-sort using written directions in exactly the same way in which the instrument was to be administered to the population in the study in Franklin County, Ohio.

All of the thirty-five packets of materials mailed to the participants for pretesting were returned. The ideal and actual sorts of each of the four groups were correlated by means of the rank order method. Results of these correlations are included in Table 5, page 46.

Results of pretesting the instrument indicate that it is, indeed, a reliable measure of the ideal and actual role of the reading specialist as perceived by these groups of school personnel.

The forced choice method of sorting the Q-sort statement was adopted for the present study. Jack Block substantiates the use of the forced choice distribution of the statements by stating that: "...from a computational standpoint, forced-sort data offer more discrimination
TABLE 5
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN IDEAL AND ACTUAL SORTS
OF PARTICIPANTS PRETESTING THE INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlations*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Specialists</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level

than item sortings under the unforced condition."48

The question of proper frequency distribution to be used for sorting the cards was discussed by Kerlinger, who concluded that distributions are an arbitrary matter but there are some distinct advantages in the normal or quasi-normal forced distribution. These advantages are mainly statistical.49 The investigator used the normal distribution in the present study. The frequency distribution consisted of nine piles, with pile #1 designated as the least appropriate end of the continuum


and pile #9 designated as the most appropriate end of the continuum. The number of cards forced into each of the piles were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Piles</th>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
<th>#9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four brief questionnaires were developed by the investigator to solicit basic demographic data which was considered to be necessary in ascertaining the qualifications of each respondent for inclusion in the study, and to elicit a satisfied, unsatisfied or undecided reaction to the remedial reading program in the schools. In addition, because the Q-sort instrument was identical (except for the color of the cards) for all four groups of respondents, the questionnaire was designed to verify group identification (Appendix J).

SELECTION OF THE POPULATION

The population of the study consisted of elementary school reading specialists, elementary school principals who were currently working with a reading specialist, elementary school teachers who were currently working with at least one child who was working with a reading specialist, and elementary school reading supervisors in fourteen of the sixteen public school districts in Franklin County, Ohio.

Two of the school districts did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the study, because reading specialists in these two schools were not working directly with children. In order to meet the criteria
for inclusion in the study, the elementary school reading specialist needed to:

1. Possess a standard elementary teaching certificate validated for teaching reading, as a reading specialist.

2. Have been working in his present position as a reading specialist working directly with children, for a period of at least one year.

3. Be currently employed at the elementary level.

Fulfillment of the above criteria was determined by the Division of Computer Services and Statistical Reports, Ohio Department of Education. Questionnaire data were used to verify the computer data. A total of 97 reading specialists were determined to have met the established criteria.

Criteria for inclusion of principals in the study were:

1. A minimum of one year of experience in his present position.

2. Be currently employed as a full time principal who works with a reading specialist who is included in the study.

Criteria for inclusion of classroom teachers in the study were:

1. A minimum of one year of experience working with a child who also works with a reading specialist participating in the study.

2. Possession of a standard elementary certificate for teaching in the elementary school.

Criteria for inclusion of supervisors for inclusion in the study were:

1. Possess a valid reading specialists' certificate.

2. A minimum of one year of experience in his current position.
An introductory letter was sent to the school administrator in charge of personnel in each of the school districts in Franklin County, Ohio, to seek their cooperation in the study and to solicit a list of reading supervisors working in their respective school districts (Appendix B). All administrators volunteered their cooperation in the study.

An introductory letter and the questionnaire (Appendix C) were sent to each of the twenty-one supervisors of reading programs in each of the school districts participating in the study. The purpose of the questionnaire was to seek their cooperation in the study. All twenty-one supervisors, one-hundred percent, volunteered their cooperation to participate in the study. In cases in which the reading teacher served in two schools, both principals were included in the study. In no case did the reading specialist serve in more than two schools. In each of twelve schools, two reading specialists were serving. Teachers were randomly selected from a list of classroom teachers currently working with children who were attending sessions with the reading specialist. Therefore the population of the study consisted of ninety-seven classroom teachers and twenty-one supervisors of reading programs, ninety-seven reading specialists and ninety-five principals.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTRUMENTS

A packet of materials was mailed to each of the 265 individuals selected for participation in the study. The materials in the packet were arranged in the following sequence:
A letter containing a brief explanation of the purpose of the study, steps to be followed in completing the instruments, and a statement of appreciation for the cooperation of the participant (Appendix F).

A brief questionnaire designed for the purpose of soliciting basic demographic data (Appendix J).

A manila envelope (labeled I) which contained
1 set of directions for completing the ideal role Q-sort (Appendix I).
1 set of 50 Q-sort cards
1 set of small envelopes (numbered 1 through 9) for sorting the Q-sort cards

A manila envelope (labeled II) which contained
1 set of directions for completing the actual role Q-sort (Appendix I).
1 set of 50 Q-sort cards
1 set of small envelopes (numbered 1 through 9) for sorting the Q-sort cards

A large, self-addressed, stamped envelope for returning the questionnaire and the sorted cards to the investigator.

One week following the initial mailing a telephone call was made to each individual. Students enrolled in a seminar in reading disability at Capital University placed the call. Two weeks following the telephone call a postal card was sent to each individual reminding him of the desire for the return.

When the Q-sort data and questionnaires were received by the investigator, the position of the sorted statements was recorded on a fortran statement secured from the Instruction and Research Computer Center at The Ohio State University. The data for each of the four groups were separated on the basis of color coded Q-sort cards and questionnaires. The fortran statement was then submitted to the Customer Services Department of the Instruction and Research Computer Center for key punching.
COLLECTION OF THE DATA

When the investigator concluded that the highest possible percentage of returns had been received (85.4 percent as shown in Table 6) the Q-sort information was transferred from the envelopes to the fortran sheet, in preparation for key punching. Columns on the fortran sheet correspond to the columns on the computer card. Columns 1 through 3 were reserved for recording the identification number for each respondent. Column 4 was used to designate ideal or actual Q-sort. Columns 5 through 7 were reserved for the designation of whether or not the respondent held a standard elementary teaching certificate, whether this certificate was validated for teaching reading, or whether or not he held a reading supervisor's certificate. Column 8 and 9 were reserved for years of experience in the respondent's present position, column 10 was reserved for the designation of satisfied, unsatisfied or undecided concerning the reading program in which each respondent works. Columns 1 through 60 were reserved for recording the positions of the Q-sort statements according to the pre-arranged frequency distribution. Column 61 was reserved for the group identification number. The groups were assigned the following numbers: (1) reading specialists; (2) classroom teachers; (3) principals; and (4) reading supervisors. In column 73 was recorded the respondent's own evaluation of his understanding of the role of the reading specialist, whether good, average, or poor. Column 75 was full or part time and column 76 was reserved for designation college degree or no degree.
A separate IBM card was used for recording the ideal and for recording the actual Q-sort data of each respondent. A SOUPAC computer program utilizing Fortran language was selected by the investigator, with the assistance of the computer personnel at the Instruction and Research Computer Center, The Ohio State University. This program was adopted for the statistical analysis of the data. The output of the program consisted of the following data for each group: (1) the mean, rank order, and standard deviation of each of the Q-sort statements for the ideal and actual sorts; (2) the rank order coefficient of correlation between the sorts of each of the four groups; and (3) rank order coefficient of correlation between the ideal and actual sorts for each of the Q-sort statements in each of the four groups.

The significance of the correlations was determined on the basis of a table of the critical values of t prepared by Fisher and Yates, and using the large sample method of testing the r's for significance.\(^50\)

**SUMMARY**

This chapter has provided a description of the design of the study and the procedures utilized.

A Q-sort, developed by the investigator, was the principal instrument used for gathering the data for the study. The instrument was pretested in two school districts located in counties adjoining Franklin
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\(^50\) Sidney Siegel, *op. cit.*, p. 248.
County--Fairfield County School District and Big Walnut School District in Delaware County, Ohio.

The population of the study itself was drawn from the public school districts in Franklin County, Ohio. All elementary reading specialists whose teaching certificates had been validated for teaching reading as a reading specialist, and who had been teaching in their present positions for at least one year, were included in the study. Fourteen of the sixteen school districts in Franklin County, Ohio had satisfied the criteria for inclusion in the study. Four groups of elementary school personnel were included in the study. Besides the reading specialists, reading supervisors, principals, and a sample selected randomly, of classroom teachers who had worked with the reading specialists for a minimum of one year, participated.

A SOUPAC computer program for obtaining correlations was adopted for the statistical analysis of the data.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The data presented in Chapter IV are divided according to the following topics: (1) the response to the data gathering instruments; (2) descriptive data pertaining to each of the four participating groups; (3) the relationship between the ideal and actual reading specialist roles as perceived by each of the four groups participating in the study; (4) the relationship between the reading specialists' ideal and actual perceived roles and the ideal and actual reading specialist roles as perceived by the three other groups participating in the study; (5) the relationship between the ideal role of the reading specialist as perceived by reading specialists and the ideal role as perceived by each of the other four groups participating in the study; (6) the relationship between the actual role of the reading specialist as perceived by the reading specialist and the actual role as perceived by each of the other three groups participating in the study; (7) the five most and five least appropriate ideal and actual reading specialist behaviors as perceived by the reading specialists and other groups. These data will be interpreted and implications noted in Chapter 5.

RETURN OF THE INSTRUMENTS

Of the 310 packets of materials mailed to the participants, 265 (85.4 per cent) were returned. Since one of the instruments was not
complete, the usable return was 264 (85.1 per cent), see Table 6.

**TABLE 6**

RETURN OF THE INSTRUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Number of Instruments Mailed</th>
<th>Number of Usable Returns</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Specialists</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Supervisors</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>81*</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One of the 82 classroom teacher returns was not usable.

The percentage of return for each of the five groups was considered by the investigator to be adequate for further analysis of the data. This decision was made on the premise that the original population was selected on the basis of a very limiting set of criteria.

**DESCRIPTIVE DATA**

The information contained in the questionnaire was considered pertinent to the development of the study. Knowledge of the educational and experiential background of the four groups provide a basis for accepting or rejecting the credibility of the respondents.
In addition, the fact that the groups were asked to present a satisfied, unsatisfied, or undecided decision regarding the reading specialist program in their schools, helps to establish the felt need, or lack of need, for changing the reading program.

This section will be subdivided according to the five groups participants.

**Reading Specialists.** As a group, the reading specialists in the study were experienced in their role as the reading specialist in the school where they are presently teaching, having taught at least one year in their present positions. Results of the study indicate that 76 percent of the reading specialists had been teaching in their present positions for more than one year. Sixty-two (69 per cent) of the reading specialists expressed satisfaction with the reading program in which they were working. Thirteen of the reading specialists said they were dissatisfied, and fourteen were undecided.

**Classroom Teachers.** All eighty-one of the classroom teachers participating in the study had received the baccalaureate degree, but slightly more than one-half of them (50.7 per cent) had worked in their present positions more than the one year required for inclusion in the study. Sixty-eight of the classroom teachers (83 per cent) said they were satisfied with the current program, and five said they were undecided. This general agreement is important because of the cooperation needed between the reading specialist and the classroom teacher when sharing the task of teaching reading to the same child.
When asked to rate their understanding of the role of the elementary school reading specialist, forty-seven classroom teachers said their understanding was good, thirty-two said their understanding was average, while only two classroom teachers said their understanding of the role of the reading specialist was poor.

**Principals.** Seventy of the 73 elementary school principals had had more experience than the minimum one-year required for inclusion in the study. In fact, the principals had an average of 8.5 years of experience in their present positions.

Sixty-one (83.5 percent) of the elementary principals said they were satisfied with the present remedial reading program in their building. Nine of the principals said they were undecided and three said they were unsatisfied. When asked to rate their understanding of the role of the reading specialist, not one of the principals said their understanding was poor; forty of them said their understanding was good and thirty-three said their understanding was average.

**Supervisors.** All of the twenty-one supervisors had met the criteria for inclusion in the study, having standard elementary teaching certificates which were validated for teaching as a reading specialist, and having spent a minimum of one year in their present positions. Only three of them (14.2 percent) however, hold valid certificates for supervision of reading programs in the State of Ohio. Ten of the supervisors (47.6 percent) were less than satisfied with the reading program in which they worked; six were unsatisfied and four said they were undecided. Eleven of the reading supervisors said they were
Satisfied. Reading supervisors had an average of 5.3 years of experience in their present positions; eighteen of them (85.7 percent) had worked in their present positions more than the required one year which was necessary for inclusion in the study.

Summary

Participants in all of the four groups in the study had received the baccalaureate degree. Nearly all of the classroom teachers and elementary principals said their understanding of the role of the reading specialist was better than average. A high proportion of principals and classroom teachers were very well satisfied with the remedial reading programs; both groups were more satisfied than were the reading specialists or supervisors. Reading supervisors were least satisfied with the remedial reading programs in which they worked, and principals were more satisfied than any of the other three groups.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF IDEAL AND ACTUAL READING SPECIALIST ROLES

The first five null hypotheses posed by the investigator were designed to test the proposition that there would be no difference between the ideal and actual roles of the elementary school reading specialists as perceived by each of the five groups of educators participating in the study. In other words, an attempt was made to determine the extent to which the participants perceived the reading specialist to be currently performing the role that they believed the counselor should ideally perform in the elementary school. Results for this section are presented in the order of the stated hypotheses.
Reading Specialists. The first hypothesis was: there will be no difference between the ideal and the actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as they are perceived by the elementary school reading specialists. The intent of the hypothesis was to determine the degree to which the reading specialists perceived their ideal role to be similar to their actual role. One might interpret agreement, a high correlation, to signify job satisfaction on the part of the reading specialists, or that they are self-satisfied; see no ways to improve. On the other hand, a lack of agreement, a low correlation, might indicate job dissatisfaction on the part of the reading specialist, or they are aware of great needs which presently they are unable to meet.

To test this hypothesis, the ideal and the actual sorts of the reading specialists were correlated by means of the Spearman rank order method. The correlation between the ideal and actual sorts of the reading specialists as a group was found to be .949, which is statistically significant at the .01 level. A correlation equal to or greater than .242 is more than a chance correlation. The null hypothesis cannot be refuted. The relationship between the ideal and the actual roles of the reading specialists, therefore, was not only positive, but also extremely high, as perceived by the reading specialists. This may be interpreted as suggesting that the reading specialists, as a group, are satisfied with their current role, or that with limited outlook, they perceive the ideal as being simply what they are doing.

Principals. The second hypothesis was: there will be no significant difference between the ideal and actual roles of elementary
school reading specialists as they are perceived by elementary school principals. The intent of the hypothesis was to determine the degree to which the ideal and the actual roles of the elementary school reading specialist were similar as perceived by the elementary school principals. The degree of similarity may represent the relative satisfaction on the part of the principals regarding the reading specialists' current role in the elementary school. A high correlation suggests satisfaction with the reading specialists' current role, while a low correlation suggests a lack of satisfaction with the reading specialists' current role. A high correlation may mean that principals do not know what such specialists should do ideally.

To test this hypothesis, the ideal and the actual sorts of the principals were correlated by means of the Spearman rank order method. The correlation between the ideal and the actual sorts of the principals as a group was found to be .914, which is significant at the .01 level. A correlation as high as .273 differs significantly from 0 to be statistically significant. The null hypothesis cannot be refuted. The relationship between the ideal and actual roles of the reading specialists was quite high as perceived by the elementary principals. The findings suggest that the principals, as a group, are satisfied with the current role of the elementary school reading specialist, or that the principals are unaware of what a reading specialist should do ideally.

**Classroom Teachers.** The third hypothesis was: there will be no difference between the ideal and actual roles of elementary school
reading specialists as they are perceived by elementary school classroom teachers. The intent of the hypothesis was to determine the degree to which the ideal and the actual roles of the elementary school reading specialist were similar as perceived by the classroom teachers. The degree of similarity may represent the relative satisfaction on the part of these teachers regarding the reading specialists' role in the elementary school. A high correlation suggests satisfaction with the reading specialists' current role, while a low correlation suggests a lack of satisfaction with the counselors' current role. A high correlation may be the result of a lack of awareness on the part of the classroom teacher concerning the ideal role of the reading specialist.

To test this hypothesis, the ideal and the actual sorts of the teachers were correlated by means of the Spearman rank order method. The correlation between the ideal and the actual sorts of the teachers was found to be .944, which is significant at the .01 level. The null hypothesis cannot be refuted. A correlation as high as .256 is significantly different from 0 at the .01 level. The relationship between the ideal and the actual roles of the reading specialists, therefore, was very high as perceived by the classroom teachers. These findings suggest that these teachers, as a group, are satisfied with the current role of the elementary school reading specialist, or that they are unaware of what the reading specialist should do ideally.

Reading Supervisors: The fourth hypothesis was: there will be no difference between the ideal and actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as they are perceived by elementary school reading
supervisors. The intent of the hypothesis was to determine the extent to which the ideal and the actual roles of the elementary school reading specialist were similar as perceived by the reading supervisors. The degree of similarity may represent the relative satisfaction on the part of these supervisors regarding the reading specialists' role in the elementary school. A high correlation suggests great satisfaction with the reading specialists' current role, while a low correlation suggests a lack of satisfaction with the reading specialists' current role.

To test this hypothesis, the ideal and the actual sorts of the supervisors were correlated by means of the rank order method. The correlation between the ideal and the actual sorts of the supervisors as a group, was found to be .891, which is significant at the .01 level. The null hypothesis cannot be refuted. The relationship between the ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist, therefore, was high as perceived by the reading supervisors. The findings suggest that these supervisors, as a group, are satisfied with the current role of the elementary school reading specialist, but less satisfied than the other three groups of participants.

Summary

Hypotheses one through four were related in that each was concerned with the degree of relationship that existed between the ideal and the actual reading specialist roles as perceived by a selected group of elementary school personnel. The ideal and the actual sorts of each of the five groups participating in the study were correlated by means of
the Spearman rank order method, using the item means from each of the four groups. From Table 7, it can be seen that all correlations were found to be positive, very high, and statistically significant.

TABLE 7
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN IDEAL AND ACTUAL SORTS OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Correlations*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Specialists</td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Supervisors</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .01 level

Therefore, the four null hypotheses could not be rejected. The findings may be interpreted as suggesting that the participants of the study were satisfied with the role performed by the elementary school reading specialist. The lowest of the four correlations was that of the supervisors, suggesting that these supervisors are more aware of the ideal role of the reading specialist.
RELATIONSHIP OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE IDEAL AND ACTUAL PERCEIVED READING SPECIALIST ROLES

Hypotheses five through seven were designed in an attempt to determine the extent of difference between the correlation existing between the reading specialists' perceptions of their ideal and actual roles as compared to the correlation existing between the perceptions of the reading specialists' ideal and actual roles held by the other groups participating in the study. In general, these hypotheses stated that there would be no difference between the correlation existing between the elementary school reading specialists' perception of their ideal and actual roles and the correlation existing between the ideal and actual roles of the reading specialists as perceived by the other groups of elementary school personnel included in the study. The purpose of the hypotheses was to determine whether the reading specialist's ideal role was more closely related to his actual role when sorted by the reading specialists or when sorted by one of the other groups.

Since the acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis was based on the analysis of the difference between the correlation of the ideal and the actual sorts of the reading specialists and the ideal and the actual sorts of each of the other groups, it is necessary to determine the significance of the difference between these correlations. In order to make this analysis possible, the correlations in question were converted to z-scores by the method recommended by Hays. 50 The z-scores were then

tested for significance. Findings for this section are presented in the order of the stated hypotheses.

**Reading Specialists vs. Classroom Teachers.** The fifth hypothesis was: there is no significant difference between the correlation of the elementary school reading specialists' perceptions of ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist and the correlation of the elementary classroom teachers' perceptions of ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist. This hypothesis was designed to determine the differences, if any, between the correlation of the reading specialists' perceptions of ideal and actual reading specialist roles and the classroom teachers' perceptions of ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist. The degree of similarity will enable the investigator to determine which group perceives the reading specialist as currently performing more closely to his ideal role.

The correlation between the reading specialists' perceptions of his ideal and actual roles was .949, while the correlation between the classroom teachers' perceptions ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist was .944. When these correlations were converted to z-scores, it was found that the difference between them may be due to chance. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The difference between the correlation of the elementary school reading specialists' perceptions of his ideal and actual roles and the correlation of the elementary classroom teachers' perceptions of ideal and actual reading specialist roles is not statistically significant. These findings suggest that the classroom teachers and the reading specialists are equally unable
to distinguish differences between ideal and actual roles. This may mean that they are equally convinced that reading specialists are presently performing on an ideal basis.

**Reading Specialist vs. Principal.** The sixth hypothesis was:

there is no significant difference between the correlation of the elementary school reading specialists' perceptions of his ideal and actual roles and the correlation of the elementary principals' perceptions of ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist. This hypothesis was designed to determine the differences, if any, between the correlation of the reading specialists' perceptions of ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist and the principals' perceptions of the ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist. The degree the similarity will enable the investigator to determine which group perceives the reading specialist as currently performing more closely to his ideal role.

The correlation between the reading specialists' perceptions of his ideal and actual roles was .949, while the correlation between the principals' perceptions of ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist was .914. When these correlations were converted to z-scores, it was found that the difference between them may be due to chance. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected. There is no statistically significant difference between the correlation of the elementary school reading specialists' ideal and actual sorts and the correlations of the principals' ideal and actual sorts. These findings suggest that the reading specialists and the principals are quite close in their inability to distinguish between the ideal and the actual roles of the
reading specialist. This may denote that the specialists and principals are equally satisfied with the current role of the reading specialist.

**Reading Specialist vs. Reading Supervisor.** The seventh hypothesis was: there is no significant difference between the correlation of the elementary school reading specialists' perceptions of his ideal and actual roles and the correlation of the reading supervisors' perceptions of ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist. This hypothesis was designed to determine the differences, if any, between the correlation of the reading specialists' perceptions of his ideal and actual roles and the correlation of the reading supervisors' perceptions of ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist. The degree of similarity will enable the investigator to determine which group perceives the reading specialist as currently performing more closely to his ideal role.

The correlation between the reading specialists' perceptions of his ideal and actual roles was .949, while the correlation between the reading supervisors' perceptions of ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist was .891. Even though this is the largest observed difference among the comparisons, it would have only minor importance, assuming it was not due to chance. When these correlations were converted to z-scores, it was found that the difference between them may be due to chance. Thus, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. There is no statistically significant difference between the correlation of the elementary school reading specialists' ideal and actual
sorts and the correlations of the reading supervisors' ideal and actual sorts. Thus, there is no certainty that the observed difference is not due to chance. These findings suggest that the reading specialists and the reading supervisors are equally unable to distinguish between ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist in the elementary school. Or it may mean that the reading supervisors feel that the actual performance of the reading specialist is close to ideal.

Summary

The hypotheses in this section investigated the possibility that there would be no difference in the correlation of the elementary school reading specialists' ideal and actual perceived roles and the correlation of the perceptions of the ideal and actual reading specialist roles held by the other groups of elementary school personnel. The correlations between the ideal and actual sorts of each group were converted to z-scores for the purpose of analysis. The greatest difference between the correlations in question was found to exist between the .949 of the reading specialists and the .891 of the reading supervisors. The difference between these two correlations fell far short, however, of being due to anything other than chance. The findings from this section of the study suggest that not only is there agreement between the ideal and the actual reading specialist roles as perceived by the participants, but that participants are unable to distinguish between ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist.
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF IDEAL READING SPECIALIST ROLES

Hypotheses eight through ten were concerned with the question of agreement or lack of agreement between the ideal roles of the elementary school reading specialist, as perceived by the classroom teachers, principals, reading supervisors, and reading specialists. In other words, the investigator sought to determine the relationship that existed, if any, between the perceptions of the reading specialists and each of the other groups regarding the functions the reading specialists should ideally perform in the elementary school. In order to facilitate this analysis, the ideal sorts of the reading specialists were compared with the ideal sorts of each of the other groups participating in the study. The results of this analysis will be presented separately for each of the groups.

Reading Specialists-Classroom Teachers. The eighth hypothesis was: there will be no difference in the ideal roles of elementary reading specialists as perceived by the elementary school classroom teachers. This hypothesis was designed to assess the degree of similarity in the understanding of the ideal reading specialist role as perceived by reading specialists and the classroom teachers in the study. This hypothesis may be considered important to the development of a generally accepted role definition for the reading specialist because it focuses on the agreement or disagreement of these two groups concerning what functions the reading specialist should perform on the elementary level.
To test this hypothesis, the ideal sorts of the reading specialists and the ideal sorts of the teachers were correlated by means of the Spearman rank order method. A correlation of .943, which is significant at the .01 level, was found to exist between the ideal sorts of these two groups. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected. A high degree of similarity exists between the understanding of the ideal reading specialist role as perceived by the reading specialists and classroom teachers participating in the study.

Reading Specialist-Principals. The ninth hypothesis was: there will be no difference in the ideal roles of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by the elementary school reading specialist and elementary school principals. This hypothesis was designed to assess the degree of similarity in the understanding of the ideal reading specialist role as perceived by the reading specialists and the principals in the study. This hypothesis may be considered important to the development of a generally accepted role definition for the reading specialist because it focuses on the agreement or disagreement of these two groups concerning what functions the reading specialist should perform on the elementary level.

To test this hypothesis, the ideal sorts of the reading specialists and the ideal sorts of the principals were correlated by means of the Spearman rank order method. A correlation of .913, which is significant at the .01 level, was found to exist between the ideal sorts of these two groups. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected. A high degree of similarity exists between the understanding of the
ideal reading specialist role as perceived by the reading specialists and elementary principals participating in the study.

Reading Specialist-Reading Supervisor. The tenth hypothesis was: there will be no difference in the ideal roles of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by the elementary school reading specialists and elementary school reading supervisors. This hypothesis was designed to assess the degree of similarity in the understanding of the ideal reading specialist role as perceived by the reading specialists and the reading supervisors in the study. This hypothesis may be considered important to the development of a generally accepted role definition for the reading specialist because it focuses on the agreement or disagreement of these two groups concerning what functions the reading specialist should perform on the elementary level.

To test this hypothesis, the ideal sorts of the reading specialists and the ideal sorts of the reading supervisors were correlated by means of the Spearman rank order method. A correlation of .891, which is significant at the .01 level was found to exist between the ideal sorts of these two groups. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected. A high degree of similarity exists between the understanding of the ideal reading specialist role as perceived by the reading specialists and elementary reading supervisors participating in the study.

Summary

Hypotheses eight through ten were related in that each was concerned with the comparison of perceptions of the role the elementary school reading specialist should ideally perform. When comparing the
perceptions of the reading specialists with the other groups of selected elementary school personnel, the investigator found all correlations to be significant (Table 8). These findings indicate that while agreement does exist between the reading specialists and the other elementary school personnel as to what the role of the elementary school reading specialist should include, it varies from close agreement between teachers and reading specialists to moderate between specialists and supervisors.

TABLE 8
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN IDEAL SORTS OF READING SPECIALISTS AND OTHER GROUPS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Correlation*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Supervisors</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .01 level

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF ACTUAL READING SPECIALIST ROLE

The purpose of the last three null hypotheses, numbers eleven through thirteen, was to assess any inconsistency in the understanding of the reading specialists' current role as perceived by elementary school personnel. An attempt was made to determine the extent to
which the actual roles of the elementary school reading specialists were perceived to be alike by the reading specialists and the other participants in the study. In order to accomplish this purpose, the actual sorts of the reading specialists were correlated with the actual sorts of each of the other four groups. Findings for this section are presented in the order the hypotheses were stated in Chapter I.

Reading Specialist-Classroom Teachers. The eleventh hypothesis was: there will be no difference in the actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by elementary school reading specialists and by elementary school classroom teachers. In testing this hypothesis, the investigator attempted to determine the degree of mutual understanding between the reading specialists and the classroom teachers concerning the current role of the reading specialist in the elementary school setting. By comparing the actual sorts of the reading specialists and the actual sorts of the classroom teachers, the degree of similarity between their perceptions of the reading specialists' current role may be demonstrated.

The actual sorts of the reading specialists and the actual sorts of the classroom teachers were correlated by means of the Spearman rank order method. The correlation between the actual sorts of the two groups was found to be .920, which is significant at the .01 level. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The relationship between the perceptions of the reading specialists and the classroom teachers concerning the reading specialists' current role in the
elementary school was judged to be high and positive. There is little discrepancy in the understanding the reading specialists have of their role as compared with how the classroom teachers understand the reading specialists' current role.

Reading Specialists-Principals. The twelfth hypothesis was: there will be no difference between the actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by elementary school reading specialists and by elementary school principals. In testing this hypothesis, the investigator attempted to determine the degree of mutual understanding between the reading specialists and the principals concerning the current role of the reading specialist in the elementary school setting. By comparing the actual sorts of the reading specialists and the actual sorts of the principals, the degree of similarity between their perceptions of the reading specialists' current role may be demonstrated.

The actual sorts of the reading specialists and the actual sorts of the principals were correlated by means of the Spearman rank order method. The correlation between the actual sorts of the two groups was found to be .909, which is significant at the .01 level. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The relationship between the perceptions of the reading specialists and the principals concerning the reading specialists' current role in the elementary school was judged to be high and positive. There is little discrepancy in the understanding the reading specialists have of their role as compared with how the principals understand the reading specialists' current role.
Reading Specialists-Reading Supervisors. The thirteenth hypothesis was: there will be no difference in the actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by elementary school reading supervisors and by elementary school reading specialists. In testing this hypothesis, the investigator attempted to determine the degree of mutual understanding between the reading specialists and the supervisor concerning the current role of the reading specialist in the elementary school setting. By comparing the actual sorts of the reading specialists and the actual sorts of the reading supervisors, the degree of similarity between their perceptions of the reading specialists' current role may be demonstrated.

The actual sorts of the reading specialists and the actual sorts of the reading supervisors were correlated by means of the Spearman rank order method. The correlations between the actual sorts of the two groups was found to be .932, which is significant at the .01 level. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The relationship between the perceptions of the reading specialists and the reading supervisors concerning the reading specialists' current role in the elementary school was judged to be high and positive. There is little discrepancy in the understanding the reading specialists have of their current role as compared to how the reading supervisors understand the reading specialists' current role.

Summary

Hypotheses eleven through thirteen were related in that each was concerned with the comparison of the participants' understanding of
the role of the reading specialists as they were currently performing in the elementary school setting. When comparing the perceptions of the reading specialists with the other three groups of selected elementary school personnel, the investigator found all correlations to be very high in a positive direction (Table 9).

TABLE 9
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ACTUAL SortS OF READING SPECIALISTS AND SELECTED SCHOOL PERSONNEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Correlation*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teachers</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .01 level

The findings indicate that a high degree of similarity exists in the way the reading specialists perceived their current roles and the way the other elementary school personnel perceive the reading specialists' current functions. Although no judgment can be made on the basis of these findings as to the appropriateness of the reading specialists' current role, one may conclude that there is mutual understanding as to what the reading specialist is currently doing in the elementary school. The difference between the supervisor-reading specialist correlation of actual sorts and the principal-reading specialist
correlation actual sorts, suggests that the supervisor is more aware than is the principal of the actual role of the reading specialist. This would be expected.

SPECIFIC READING SPECIALIST BEHAVIORS

The purpose of the present analysis is to provide a more detailed description of the functions comprising the ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist as perceived by the participants of the study. The forced choice distribution of the Q-sort lends itself to this type of analysis. Statements ranked at the extremes of the distribution are considered more significant than the statements ranked in the middle of the distribution. Therefore, by determining which statements were accorded the higher and lower ranks by each of the four groups, the reading specialist's behavior considered the most and the least appropriate to his ideal and actual roles can be isolated.

The output of the SUPAC computer program provided the investigator with the ranks assigned to each of the Q-sort statements by each of the groups. The five highest and the five lowest ranked statements for each group on the ideal and the actual sorts will be presented here. The entire SUPAC program output used in the data analysis for this study is included in Tables 10 through 13 in the Appendix.

This section, for the purpose of clarity in presenting the data, will be subdivided according to the ideal and actual sorts as well as by the participating groups. The ideal role will be presented first, followed by the actual role.
Ideal Role

Reading Specialists. The following statements of behavior were most like those which the elementary school reading specialists perceived as comprising their ideal roles. The number in the parenthesis is the rank accorded the statement by the group of reading specialists. The number preceding the statement is the item number. Items were ranked from least ideal (number 1) to most ideal (number 50).

31. To select materials and techniques which enable the pupil to have immediate success. (50)

24. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program. (49)

45. To determine which students should meet with the special or remedial reading teacher. (48)

15. To use data from classroom teacher observations as well as standardized test data in selecting children to work with the reading specialist. (47)

10. To share knowledge fully with the classroom teacher concerning goals and methods of the remedial program, when working with the same child. (46)

The following statements of behavior were least like those which the elementary school reading specialists perceived as comprising their ideal roles.

35. To administer psychological projective tests and physiological evaluations. (1)

34. To conduct screening tests of the pupils's vision and hearing. (2)
28. To act as a curriculum adviser and supervisor to the principal. (3)

39. To write proposals for funding of reading programs. (4)

37. To survey community needs related to reading. (5)

Principals. The following statements of behavior were most like those which the elementary school principals perceived as comprising the ideal role of the elementary school reading specialist. The number in the parenthesis is the rank accorded the statement by the group of principals. The number preceding the statement is the item number. Statements were ranked from least ideal (number 1) to most ideal (number 50).

24. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program. (50)

10. To share knowledge fully with the classroom teacher concerning goals and methods of the remedial program, when working with the same child. (49)

30. To assist in choosing equipment and materials used in the reading center. (48)

1. To report results of treatment to the child and to his parents, to the classroom teacher and principal. (47)

15. To use data from classroom teacher observations as well as standardized test data in selecting children to work with the reading specialist. (46)

The following statements of behavior were least like those which the principals perceived as comprising the ideal role of the elementary
reading specialist.

35. To administer psychological projective tests and physiological evaluations. (1)

34. To conduct screening tests of the pupil's vision hearing. (2)

28. To act as a curriculum adviser and supervisor to the principal. (3)

19. To arrange for parents and other members of the community to assist in planning the special reading program. (4)

17. To decide what efforts each member of the staff should make in regard to the remedial program. (5)

Classroom Teachers. The following statements of behavior were most like those which the classroom teachers perceived as comprising the ideal role of the elementary school reading specialist. Rank is from most ideal (50) to least ideal (1).

24. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program. (50)

10. To share knowledge fully with the classroom teacher concerning goals and methods of the remedial program, when working with the same child. (49)

31. To select materials and techniques which enable the pupil to have immediate success. (48)

8. To plan for continuous coordination between the remedial or special reading teacher and the classroom teacher. (47)
30. To assist in choosing equipment and materials used in the reading center. (46)

The following statements of behavior were least like those which the elementary school classroom teachers perceived as comprising the ideal role of the elementary school reading specialist.

28. To act as a curriculum adviser and supervisor to the principal. (1)

34. To conduct screening tests of the pupil's vision and hearing. (2)

35. To administer psychological projective tests and physiological evaluations. (3)

40. To involve community groups in solving reading problems. (4)

39. To write proposals for funding of reading programs. (5)

Reading Supervisors. The following statements of behavior were most like those which the reading supervisors perceived as comprising the ideal role of the elementary school reading specialist. The number in the parenthesis is the rank accorded the statement by the group of supervisors. The rank ranges from most ideal (50) to least ideal (1). The number preceding the statement is the item number.

31. To select materials and techniques which enable the pupil to have immediate success. (50)

24. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program. (49)

10. To share knowledge fully with the classroom teacher concerning goals and methods of the remedial program, when working with the the same child. (47.5)
8. To plan for continuous coordination between the remedial or special reading teacher and the classroom teacher. (47.5)

13. To expect the classroom teacher to share knowledge and procedures of the classroom developmental reading program, when working with the same child. (46)

The following statements of behavior were least like those which the reading supervisors perceived as comprising the ideal role of the elementary reading specialist.

34. To conduct screening tests of the pupil's vision and hearing. (1)

39. To write proposals for funding of reading programs. (2.5)

35. To administer psychological projective tests and physiological evaluations. (2.5)

38. To bring in outside speakers for workshops in reading. (4)

17. To decide what efforts each member of the staff should make in regard to the remedial program. (5)

**Actual Role**

**Reading Specialists.** The following statements of behavior were ranked by the reading specialists as being most like the activities they were currently performing in the elementary school. The figure in the parenthesis is the rank assigned the statement by the reading specialists as a group. Figures range from 1 (lowest) to 50 (highest) rank. The figure preceding the statement is the number of the item.

31. To select materials and techniques which enable the pupil to have immediate success. (50)
24. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program. (49)

45. To determine which students should meet with the special or remedial reading teacher. (48)

15. To use data from classroom teacher observations as well as standardized test data in selecting children to work with the reading specialist. (47)

44. To determine how frequently children should meet with the special or remedial reading teacher. (46)

The following statements of behavior were ranked by the reading specialists as being least like the activities they were currently performing in the elementary school.

34. To conduct a case study which includes data from individually administered intelligence tests, interdisciplinary diagnostic data, and data from parent interviews. (1)

35. To administer psychological projective tests and physiological evaluations. (2)

39. To write proposals for funding of reading programs. (3)

37. To survey community needs related to reading. (4)

28. To act as a curriculum adviser and supervisor to the principal. (5)

Principals. The following statements of behavior were ranked by the principals as being most like the activities currently performed by the elementary school reading specialist in their school. The figure in the parenthesis is the rank assigned to the statement by the
principals as a group. Items are ranked lowest (1) to highest (50). The figure preceding the statement is the number of the item.

24. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program. (50)

11. To have access to the school records and to classroom observations. (49)

30. To assist in choosing equipment and materials used in the reading center. (48)

15. To use data from classroom teacher observations as well as standardized test data in selecting children to work with the reading specialist. (47)

31. To select materials and techniques which enable the pupil to have immediate success. (46)

The following statements of behavior were ranked by the principals as being least like the activities currently performed by the reading specialists.

34. To conduct screening tests of the pupil's vision and hearing. (1)

35. To administer psychological projective tests and physiological evaluations. (2)

40. To involve community groups in solving reading problems. (3)

37. To survey community needs related to reading. (4)

17. To decide what efforts each member of the staff should make in regard to the remedial program. (5)
Classroom Teachers. The following statements of behavior were ranked by the classroom teachers as being most like the activities currently performed by the elementary school reading specialist in their school. The figure in the parenthesis is the rank assigned to the statement by the classroom teachers as a group. The figure preceding the statement is the number of the item.

24. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program. (50)

45. To determine which students should meet with the special or remedial reading teacher. (49)

31. To select materials and techniques which enable the pupil to have immediate success. (48)

44. To determine how frequently children should meet with the special or remedial reading teacher. (47)

30. To assist in choosing equipment and materials used in the reading center. (46)

The following statements of behavior were ranked by the classroom teachers as being least like the activities currently performed by the reading specialists.

40. To involve community groups in solving reading problems. (1)

23. To act as a curriculum adviser and supervisor to the principal. (2)

34. To conduct screening tests of the pupil's vision and hearing. (3)
35. To administer psychological projective tests and physiological evaluations. (4)

19. To arrange for parents and other members of the community to assist in the planning of special reading programs. (5)

Reading Supervisors. The following statements of behavior were ranked by reading supervisors as being most like the activities currently performed by the elementary school reading specialists in their school. The figure in the parenthesis is the rank assigned to the statement by the reading supervisors as a group. Items are ranked from most like (50) to least like (1). The figure preceding the statement is the number of the item.

31. To select materials and techniques which enable the pupil to have an immediate success. (50)

15. To use data from classroom teacher observations as well as standardized test data in selecting children to work with the reading specialist. (49)

24. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program. (48)

44. To determine how frequently children should meet with the special or remedial reading teacher. (46.5)

50. To confer, during regular school hours, with the classroom teacher who is working with the same child. (46.5)

The following statements of behavior were ranked by the principals as being least like the activities currently performed by the reading specialists.
34. To conduct screening tests of the pupil's vision and hearing. (1)

39. To write proposals for funding of reading programs. (2)

35. To administer psychological projective tests and physiological evaluations. (3)

37. To survey community needs related to reading. (4)

28. To act as a curriculum adviser and supervisor to the principal. (5.5)

40. To involve community groups in solving reading problems. (5.5)

Summary

The ideal and actual sorts of each of the participating groups were examined to provide a more detailed description of the specific behaviors considered more appropriate and less appropriate for the reading specialists' ideal and actual roles. This was accomplished by determining which statements were accorded the higher and lower ranks by each group. The three with highest rankings were 24, 31 and 10.

The following two statements of behavior were ranked in the highest five of the ideal sorts of all four groups:

24. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program.

10. To share knowledge fully with the classroom teacher concerning goals and methods of the remedial program, when working with the same child.
The three highest in summary ranks of the actual sorts were 24, 31, 15 with 45 closely next. Two statements of behavior were ranked in the highest five of the actual sorts of all four groups:

24. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program.

31. To select materials and techniques which enable the pupil to have immediate success.

The fact that item 24 was ranked in the highest five by each of the four groups on both ideal and actual sorts indicates that this behavior was considered important by all groups and that it was perceived as being performed by the reading specialists in the schools in Franklin County, Ohio. Item 24 was given the highest rank on both the actual and the ideal sorts by classroom teachers and principals; item 31 was given the highest rank on both the actual and the ideal sorts by reading specialists and reading supervisors.

In considering the statements of behavior ranked on the less appropriate end of the distribution, the following two items were included among the five lowest in both the actual and ideal sorts, by all four groups:

34. To conduct screening tests of the pupil's vision and hearing.

35. To administer psychological projective tests and physiological evaluations.

These were the only two items found to be common to each group when considering the five least appropriate reading specialist
behaviors on the actual and on the ideal sorts. Three of the four groups ranked item #34 first, which was the lowest possible rank on the actual sort; one of the four groups ranked #3 first, or lowest, on the ideal sort. There appeared to be wide agreement that this function was least important to the actual role of the reading specialist.

**Ideal and Actual Correlations of Each Item**

In addition to the mean ranks of the summary data to determine which of the fifty items had the highest or lowest mean rank, the correlations between the ideal and the actual sorts of each item were computed for each of the four groups of participants. These raw data correlations indicate a relationship or lack of relationship between the placement of the item in the ideal and the actual sorts of each group. This correlation is important because it is concerned with the extent of relationship that exists between the ideal and actual reading specialist behaviors as perceived by individuals in each of the four groups of elementary school personnel. The degree of similarity will enable the investigator to determine on which items the reading specialist is perceived as performing more closely to the ideal as perceived by each group.

Forty-six of the fifty items, as sorted by the reading specialists showed a correlation between ideal and actual which was sufficiently different from 0 to be statistically significant. The five highest and five lowest ideal vs. actual correlations shown to be statistically significant follow:
19. To arrange for parents and other members of the community to assist in planning the special reading program. (.667)

32. To test and place new students. (.775)

33. To conduct a case study including individually administered diagnostic tests and in-depth parent interviews.

45. To determine which students should meet with the special or remedial reading teacher. (.691)

47. To determine priority ranks for those children who need help in reading if funds prohibit offering help to all who need it. (.710)

5. To schedule opportunities to examine, evaluate and recommend materials to parents. (.294)

9. To assist the supervisor by coordinating activities with the classroom teacher. (.263)

10. To share knowledge fully with the classroom teacher concerning goals and methods of the remedial program, when working with the same child. (.328)

12. To arrange for inservice training in reading for the classroom teachers. (.324)

22. To assist the principal in reporting goals, methods techniques and results of the reading program to the board of education and parents. (.322)

Low correlations between ideal and actual sorts are important because they provide guidelines for changing the reading program.
CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCH

The final chapter of the study is divided into four sections. In the first section, the investigator briefly reviews the study. The second section is devoted to a discussion of the findings and implications of the study. This is followed by a section presenting the conclusions drawn from the obtained data, including discovered limitations of the study. The chapter is concluded with a number of recommendations for further study.

Summary and Findings of the Study

Research during the past decade has led us to the conclusion that the teacher, and not the materials or method, is the most important variable in teaching reading. For this reason it seems imperative that we concentrate our efforts on a study of the factors that are most important in developing and maintaining strong reading teachers. One of these factors, the role of the reading specialist who works directly with pupils who have reading problems, has never been clearly defined. The present study was an effort to contribute to the solution of the problem of role definition. The purpose of the study was to identify and compare concepts of the ideal role and functions with the actual role and functions of the reading specialist in the public elementary schools of Franklin County, Ohio:

1. To provide a valid description of present role perceptions of the elementary school reading specialist in Franklin County, Ohio, as
perceived by reading specialists, classroom teachers, elementary school principals, and reading supervisors.

2. To provide guidelines for changing the organizational patterns of existing reading programs.

3. To provide data for further research.

4. To identify areas of cooperation among school personnel who are directly involved in the remedial reading program.

It was the investigator's assumption that such an analysis of the role and function of the elementary reading specialist would contribute markedly to a more precise definition of the reading specialist's role in the elementary school setting.

A review of the literature was conducted in three areas considered to be pertinent to the study of the role of the reading specialist in the elementary school setting. Literature reviewed in the area of role theory suggested that the concept of role is nebulous. Three areas of emphasis in role definition, however, may be cited: (1) social or cultural demands; (2) the individual's personal definition; and (3) the individual's actions or behavior. The last definition was selected as being most appropriate for the purpose of the present study. The idea of role expectations as bearing upon the interaction of incumbents of particular statuses is particularly significant to this study of four groups of educators who share the responsibility of teaching the English language to our multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, multi-faceted society of children. Related ideas from social psychology, that a person cannot enact a role for which he lacks adequate role expectations, and that such knowledge must be acquired through experience
provide a base for interpreting responses of the four groups participating in the study. From the field of education recent empirical data highlighting the importance of the teacher variable in the teaching of reading gave impetus to the study of the role of the remedial reading teacher. Therefore, the literature indicated that the present study of the role of the reading specialist as this relates to the principal, supervisor and classroom teacher was amply justified.

The thirteen null hypotheses tested in the study may be generalized into the following four null hypotheses:

1. There are no significant differences between the ideal and actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as they are perceived by the participants in the study.

2. There are no significant differences between the correlation of the elementary school reading specialists' ideal and actual sorts and the correlations of the ideal and actual sorts of the other participants in the study.

3. There are no significant differences in the ideal roles of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by elementary school reading specialists and by the other participants in the study.

4. There are no significant differences between the actual roles of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by elementary school reading specialists and by the other participants in the study.

An attempt was also made to determine how elementary school reading specialists, elementary school classroom teachers, elementary school principals, and elementary school reading supervisors perceived the specific responsibilities of reading specialists in reference to the
reading specialists' ideal and actual roles.

Data for the study were collected by means of the Q-sort technique. An instrument was developed by the investigator for the purpose of this study. The instrument consisted of fifty statements of reading specialist behavior—twenty-five inappropriate items and utilized a Q-sort technique. The instrument was pretested in two county school districts adjoining Franklin County—Delaware County and Fairfield County. A separate questionnaire for each of the groups participating in the study, was developed by the investigator to obtain demographic data crucial to the selection of the population of the study, and to provide a rough evaluation of the reading program in which each participant worked. Data obtained from the forced choice distribution of the Q-sort items were statistically analyzed by means of a computer program—the SUPAC coefficient of correlation program to determine the relationship between the various sorts of the reading specialists and the sorts of the other groups participating in the study.

The population of the study was comprised of selected elementary school reading specialists, classroom teachers, principals, and teachers from Franklin County, Ohio. Selection of the participants was based upon fulfillment of simple criteria: the elementary school reading specialists had to: (1) possess a standard elementary teaching certificate validated for teaching reading as a reading specialist; (2) have been employed in his present position working directly with children for a period of at least one year; and (3) be presently employed only on the elementary level. The criteria for reading supervisors; principals and classroom teachers required that they:
(1) possess a standard certificate; and (2) have been employed in their present positions for at least one year. The population, therefore, was made up of 310 individuals from fourteen of the sixteen school districts in Franklin County in Ohio. Two of the school districts did not employ personnel who had met the above criteria. Of the 310 individuals, 265 returned the instrument (85.4 percent).

The participants were divided into four groups for the purpose of the analysis of the data. The four groups were reading specialists, principals, classroom teachers, and reading supervisors.

The descriptive data obtained from the questionnaires provided information regarding the education and work experience of the participants. Results of the study indicate that 76 percent of the reading specialists had been teaching in their present positions as remedial reading teachers, for more than the one year required for participation in the study, 95.8 percent of the principals had exceeded the minimum experience requirements, 85.7 percent of the reading supervisors had exceeded the minimum experience requirements, while only 50.7 percent of the classroom teachers had worked more than one year in their present positions. This amount of experience should have been sufficient for each participant to develop his own concept of the functions to be performed by the reading specialist in the elementary school; the experienced school personnel should have reached some conclusion concerning the type of behavior proper to the reading specialist in the elementary school. It is this experience that provides teachers, principals, and supervisors a basis for sorting the Q-sort statements to
arrive at a perceived ideal reading specialist role. It was further expected that each participant's sort would be tempered by his educational background.

When asked to rate their understanding of the role of the elementary school reading specialist, a majority of the classroom teachers saw their understanding as being better than average, while all of the principals said their understanding was average or better than average (good). Elementary principals in the group could well be expected to feel confident in understanding the role of the reading specialist since they had an average of eight and one-half years of experience in their present positions. Since the advent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, reading programs have proliferated in the elementary schools of Franklin County. Since 1972 the State Department of Education in Ohio has established standards for reading specialists which include twelve semester or eighteen quarter hours of reading instruction. Therefore most principals working in Columbus and Franklin County since that time would have had occasion to work with qualified personnel in reading.

Eighty-three percent of the classroom teachers and 83.5 percent of the principals said they were satisfied with the present remedial reading program in their building; while reading specialists and supervisors were less satisfied than the principals and teachers. Only 69 percent of the reading specialists and 52.4 percent of the reading supervisors expressed satisfaction with the present remedial program. This evaluation provided a check on the way in which the participants
sorted the Q-sort statements. If a participant was satisfied with his school's reading program in its present form, the correlation between his ideal and actual sorts might be expected to be high. If he stated that he was unsatisfied with the current program of remedial reading, the correlation between his ideal and actual sorts might be expected to be low.

The degree of satisfaction with the current reading program expressed by the principals was strengthened by the .914 correlation between the ideal and actual sorts of the principals as a group. From these data one may surmise that the principals are, as they indicated, satisfied with the role of the reading specialist in their school, or that they are unaware of what a reading specialist should do ideally.

The extent of agreement among classroom teachers concerning their satisfaction with the reading specialist's current role is equally impressive. Eighty-three percent expressed satisfaction with the present reading program; the correlation between the ideal and actual sorts of the classroom teachers was a very significant .944.

Only 52.4 percent of the reading supervisors expressed satisfaction with the remedial reading program, but while the correlation between ideal and actual sorts of the supervisors was less than the other three groups, it was still a high .891. Again, this could imply a dissatisfaction of factors other than the role of the reading specialist. Another dimension is also apparent in this situation--the nature of the supervisor who must act as a change agent in the reading program. It is within the role of the supervisor to search for areas of
growth and improvement in the reading program, which makes it imperative that he be less than satisfied with the current program. The fact that only 14.2 percent of the supervisors had completed State Department of Education requirements for the reading supervisor, may be still another factor in their expressed dissatisfaction with the reading program. This situation has the potential for lessening the effectiveness of the supervisor. Self-criticism among the supervisors who must work closely in a leadership position with reading specialists who are equally well trained, is a possibility and may explain the expressed dissatisfaction. Self-criticism in its extreme, becomes a detriment when a leader is constantly dissatisfied with his work even though it is satisfactory to others. He makes himself a failure in his own eyes by imposing standards he cannot fulfill. A necessary condition of projecting one's feelings to another involves the exposure of one's self. Since a successful relationship is built around openness and trust, it is important that the supervisor feel adequately prepared for his position in the reading program.

Only sixty-two (69 percent) of the reading specialists expressed satisfaction with the reading program in which they were working, but these same people saw their ideal and actual role as being very similar. The correlation between the ideal and the actual sorts of the reading specialists was .949. Several possible explanations might be examined here for this apparent discrepancy. For example, this high correlation implies they are self-satisfied; see no ways to improve, that perhaps they are unable to discriminate between ideal and actual and are not
getting the leadership they need from a supervisor who is no more qualified than the reading specialist to effect improvement in the program.

Another possibility is that the role of the elementary school reading specialist has not been sufficiently defined to allow for a distinction between the ideal and actual role of the reading specialist. Prior to 1966 there were very few remedial reading programs in Franklin County, Ohio, even though today two universities, The Ohio State University and Capital University have programs leading to validation of the standard elementary teaching certificate as a reading specialist.

There may be yet another explanation for the discrepancy between the reading specialists' expression of dissatisfaction with the program and the very high correlation of ideal and actual roles as expressed on the Q-sort. It must be remembered that 24 percent of the reading specialists had only one year of experience as a remedial reading teacher. Quite possibly the lack of extended experience may cause the teacher to expect a more rapid rate of reading improvement than is expected by more experienced teachers. The investigator has frequently found this to be true in working in the reading centers. The inexperienced reading teacher is usually disappointed at the rate of improvement in reading in even an ideal situation. Because of the multiple nature of the causes of reading disability, change from failure to success in reading achievement seems slow, especially to the teacher with limited experience.
Although there appeared to be wide and significant agreement between the ideal and actual roles of the reading specialist as viewed by each of the four groups of participants, there was much less agreement on the most important behaviors of the reading specialist and on the least important behaviors of this specialist as viewed by these groups. Only two of the fifty statements of behavior were ranked among the highest five by all four groups of participants when ranked according to their opinion of what a reading specialist does ideally; and only two statements of behavior were ranked among the highest five by all four groups when ranked according to their perceptions of what the reading specialist actually does. These statements of ideal behavior with highest ranks were:

1. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program. (Item number 24)

2. To share knowledge fully with the classroom teacher concerning goals and methods of the remedial reading program, when working with the same child. (Item number 10)

Statements of actual behavior ranked among the highest five were:

1. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program. (Item number 24)

2. To select materials and techniques which enable the pupil to have immediate success. (Item number 31)

The fact that item number 24 was ranked in the highest five by each of the four groups on both ideal and actual sorts indicates that this behavior was considered to be important by all groups and that
it was perceived as being performed by the reading specialists in the schools in Franklin County, Ohio.

While there was agreement with the high rank of these items, the means of the sorts of each group, correlations of actual with ideal of these same items showed considerable variation. Reading specialists' ideal-actual correlation on item number 10 was .328; which is not a high one. Reading specialists' ideal-actual correlation on the other two highest items were .632 (item 24); and .614 (item 31).

The two statements of actual behavior ranked among the lowest five by all four groups of participants were:

1. To conduct screening tests of the pupil's vision and hearing. (item number 34)

2. To administer psychological projective tests and physiological evaluations. (item number 35)

Again, while the mean rank of each of these two items was low in relationship to the other 49 items, ideal-actual correlation is moderately high, meaning that these were considered low both in actual and ideal sorts. Item 34 received the following ideal-actual correlations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sorts</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals'</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors'</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers'</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists'</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 35 received the following ideal-actual correlations:

Principals' sorts .167
Supervisors' sorts .335
Teachers' sorts .560
Specialists' sorts .510

These low to moderate correlations suggest that while the groups agreed on the position of these items in both actual and ideal, sorting individuals varied in placement of the items between ideal and actual.

FINDINGS

After investigating, identifying and comparing the concepts of the ideal and actual role and functions of elementary school reading specialists as perceived by classroom teachers, principals, and reading supervisors, in fourteen school districts in Franklin County, Ohio, the investigator has arrived at the following conclusions:

1. Elementary principals and classroom teachers are more satisfied with the remedial reading programs in Franklin County, Ohio than are the remedial reading specialists and reading supervisors.

2. Reading supervisors were less satisfied with the present reading programs than were the members of the other three groups.

3. A large majority of the reading supervisors in Franklin County, Ohio have not completed State Department of Education requirements for supervision of reading programs.
4. The elementary principals, classroom teachers, reading supervisors and reading specialists perceived the actual role of the reading specialists as being very close to their perception of the ideal role.

5. There is not total agreement among elementary school personnel who participated in the study concerning what the ideal role of the reading specialist should include. Only two of fifty behaviors were perceived as "most important" by all four groups.

6. There is not total agreement among elementary school personnel who participated in the study concerning what the actual role of the reading specialist does include. Only two of fifty behaviors were perceived as most important by all four groups.

7. Classroom teachers and principals who participated in the study considered the evaluation of student progress to be the most important of the fifty reading specialist behaviors.

8. Reading specialists who work directly with children and those who supervise the reading program consider the most important of the fifty reading behaviors to be selecting materials and techniques which enable the pupil to have immediate success.

9. Elementary school personnel participating in the study consider evaluation of physiological causes of reading disability to be the least appropriate reading specialist behavior.

10. Elementary school personnel participating in the study consider evaluation of physiological causes of reading disability to be least like what the reading specialist in their program actually does.
11. The small obtained differences between the ideal role of the reading specialist as perceived by reading specialists themselves and as perceived by the other four groups were not statistically significant and may have been due to chance.

12. The small obtained differences between the actual role of the reading specialist as perceived by reading specialists themselves and as perceived by the other four groups of school personnel participating in the study were not statistically significant and may have been due to chance.

Discussion and implications of the study

The study raises more questions than it answers concerning the role of the reading specialist in the elementary schools. Certainly there is wide agreement among and within the four groups studied, as to the ideal duties and responsibilities of the reading specialist and as to the duties and responsibilities the reading specialist actually performs. Yet some questions are worth considering:

1. What accounts for the wide differences of correlation between ideal and actual practices between the reading specialist and the classroom teacher on certain key items? Quantitatively, the differences in placement with regard to importance were small, but when examining the statements more carefully important basic differences appear. For example, the five statements concerned with reading specialist behaviors involved in assistance to the classroom teacher, which were considered by major contributors in the field of reading to be among the most important, were not correlated highly between
the ideal as perceived by the reading specialist or the classroom teacher, and actual practice as perceived by both groups. The five appropriate reading specialist behaviors are shown in Table 10 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Group*</th>
<th>Correlation Ideal-Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To plan for continuous coordination between the remedial reading teacher and the classroom teacher.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To share knowledge fully with the classroom teacher concerning goals and methods of the remedial program when working with the same child.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To provide the classroom teacher with a plan that will carry the student through additional growth activities in the regular classroom after the period of remedial help has ended.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To determine which students should meet with the remedial reading teacher</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To confer during regular school hours with the classroom teacher who is working with the same child.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Group I - Reading Specialists
Group II - Classroom Teachers
Group III - Principals
Group IV - Supervisors
Communication between the classroom teacher and the reading specialist is considered to be imperative to the effective functioning of the remedial reading program. Since the remedial reading specialist will have diagnosed the child's reading problems, it is a simple task to report the findings to the classroom teacher who can proceed to adjust the classroom reading program to the specific needs of the child. The rather low correlations between the ideal and actual reading specialists' behaviors with regard to these specific items indicate a need for program improvement along these lines.

If there is little communication between the classroom teacher and the remedial reading teacher, then the classroom teacher cannot reinforce the activity initiated in the remedial class, and the reading specialist does not receive feedback from the classroom teacher.

One explanation for the low correlation between the actual and ideal sorts of these statements appropriate to the role of the reading specialist as an assistant to the classroom teacher, is that in many federally funded reading programs the reading specialist is not directly responsible to the principal of the school; a central office administrator usually directs the program, hires personnel and provides for inservice education for the reading staff. This separation from the school staff would give the two teachers less opportunity to share ideas through organized channels of communication. This raises the question of the desirability of limiting the reading specialist to duties largely concerned with teaching. If this specialist worked directly with classroom teachers, the possibility of preventing much
of the reading disability would seem likely. Yet such a plan of organization does not lend itself to federal funding. Most federally funded reading programs in Franklin County, Ohio, require that the director be competent in reading, devote full time to these duties, and be a member of the central administrative staff. As such, he has little or no direct responsibility for the classroom reading program.

The mean rankings of items on the instrument generally follow rather closely authoritative opinion. Those statements given highest ranks, are considered to be important, while the items ranked lowest are perceived to be inappropriate.

The study raises the question of the ability of participants in the groups to distinguish between ideal and actual behavior, and more specifically between ideal and actual reading specialist behavior. Busy teachers and school administrators sometimes lose sight of alternative ways of working and need increased exposure to new ideas. Without this enlargement of horizons, one would expect the ideal performance to be very near the actual experience.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The present study, which attempted to determine perceptions of the role of the elementary school reading specialist in Franklin County, Ohio, suggested a number of problems for further investigation.

1. The question of whether or not the groups participating in this study were able efficiently to separate the ideal from the actual reading specialist behaviors deserves further investigation. Do the
respondents have insufficient knowledge of ideal practices? Do they lack contact with actual practices?

2. Since the number of qualified school reading specialists is on the increase, the investigator suggests that a similar study be conducted in a few years when a larger number of reading specialists who meet the established criteria can be found. By that time school personnel may be expected to have a much better knowledge of what the reading specialist's role is and what it should be.

3. Since the success of a remedial reading program can only be determined by the success of the program in helping the students, the investigator recommends a careful evaluation of current reading programs be conducted with a parallel study of the actual on-the-job behaviors of the reading specialist.

4. It is suggested that a study of reading specialists' roles be undertaken using a different methodology as a check on the validity of this study.
APPENDIX A
Questionnaire

Please place a check mark opposite the category which in your opinion represents the area of greatest need in the reading programs in Franklin County, Ohio. In other words, to which of the four areas should personnel working in the reading programs in Franklin County, Ohio, devote the major part of their time if we are to continue to move reading instruction forward.

It is not necessary for you to sign the questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Check one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Research in Teaching Reading Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dissemination of Empirical and Theoretical Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Procurement of Reading Materials Suitable for the Diverse Needs of Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Role Definition of the Remedial Reading Teacher, Classroom Teacher of Reading, Principal and the Reading Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whenever a new position is created in a school situation, a period for role definition and adjustment is needed. Since the advent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which resulted in the creation of a multitude of reading programs across the nation, the reading specialist finds himself in such a position. The classroom teacher, the reading specialist, and the supervisor of the reading program must make certain contributions to a workable comprehensive reading program. It has become necessary for the reading specialist to define his role and function, as this relates to the role of relevant others involved in reading instruction within his school district. Therefore, we are enlisting your cooperation as an administrator, in a study of the role and function of elementary reading specialists in the seventeen school districts in Franklin County, Ohio.

We are confident that the participants will find the instruments employed in the study to be interesting and helpful in clarifying the reading specialist's role. Two instruments will be utilized; a fifty item Q-sort, and a brief questionnaire. A package containing the instruments and instructions will be mailed to the reading specialist, the building principal, the supervisor of reading and one classroom teacher from each elementary school participating in the study. Each participant will be asked to complete the instruments and to return them directly to the investigator. All information will be considered confidential; neither names of participants nor school districts will be identified in the study.

In order to expedite the study we are requesting that you forward to us in the enclosed envelope, a list of reading supervisors and a list of reading or language teachers in your remedial or reading improvement program (please do not include classroom teachers of reading or language). Please limit the staff list to elementary levels, pre-kindergarten through grade six.

We sincerely hope that your staff will consent to become a part of the population. Since the population with which we are working is so select, it is essential that we receive a high percentage of returns. In addition, we feel that the results of such a study will be of interest to you and your staff. We will, therefore, be happy to supply you with an abstract of the study.
Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Merle Ivers  
Asst. Professor of Education  
Capital University

Dr. I. Keith Tyler  
Professor of Education  
The Ohio State University
APPENDIX C
Whenever a new position is created in a school situation, a period of role definition and adjustment is needed. Since the advent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which resulted in the creation of a multitude of reading programs across the nation, the reading specialist finds himself in such a position. The classroom teacher, the reading specialist, the supervisor of the reading program, and the building principal must make certain contributions to a workable comprehensive reading program. It has become necessary for the reading specialist to define his role and function, as this relates to the role of relevant others involved in reading instruction within his school district. Therefore, we are enlisting your cooperation as an administrator, in a study of the role and function of elementary reading specialists in the seventeen school districts in Franklin County, Ohio. The instrument which we will use to measure the perceptions of participants in the study, needs to be pretested to determine its reliability. We would greatly appreciate it if your staff would help to pretest it.

We are confident that the participants will find the instruments employed in the study to be interesting and helpful in clarifying the reading specialist's role. Two instruments will be utilized; a fifty item Q-sort, and a brief questionnaire. A package containing the instruments and instructions will be mailed to the reading specialist, the building principal, the reading supervisor, and one classroom teacher from each elementary school participating in the study. Each participant will be asked to complete the instruments and to return them directly to the investigator. All information will be considered confidential; neither names of participants nor school districts will be identified in the study. In the appendix, credit will be given to the school districts in which the instrument was pretested.

In order to expedite the study we are requesting that you forward to us in the enclosed envelope, a list of reading or language teachers in your remedial or reading improvement program (please do not include classroom teachers of reading or language). Please limit the staff list to elementary levels, pre-kindergarten through grade six, and include the name(s) of the person supervising or directing the reading improvement program if someone other than yourself is in charge.

We sincerely hope that your staff will consent to become a part of this study. We feel that the results of such a study will be of interest to you and your staff. We will, therefore, be happy to supply you with an abstract of the study.
If you have any additional questions, you may call me at 486-7675 or 236-6301. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Merle Ivers
Asst. Professor of Education
Capital University

Dr. I. Keith Tyler
Professor of Education
The Ohio State University
## TABLE 11

GROUP I READING SPECIALIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ideal Sort</th>
<th>Actual Sort</th>
<th>Ideal-Actual Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Means Rank S.D.</td>
<td>Means Rank S.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.629 45.0 1.517</td>
<td>6.505 44.0 1.672</td>
<td>.514 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.056 28.0 1.932</td>
<td>5.303 33.0 1.734</td>
<td>.523 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.471 17.0 1.877</td>
<td>4.730 21.0 1.737</td>
<td>.368 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.820 22.0 1.410</td>
<td>4.382 14.0 1.442</td>
<td>.600 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.213 30.0 1.201</td>
<td>5.269 32.0 1.285</td>
<td>.294 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.348 15.0 1.784</td>
<td>4.853 22.0 1.563</td>
<td>.533 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.719 37.0 1.758</td>
<td>5.955 38.0 1.751</td>
<td>.498 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.179 42.0 1.450</td>
<td>6.516 45.0 1.197</td>
<td>.083 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.640 19.5 1.447</td>
<td>4.966 26.5 1.633</td>
<td>.263 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.640 46.0 1.198</td>
<td>6.393 43.0 1.386</td>
<td>.328 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.101 40.0 1.365</td>
<td>6.146 42.0 1.799</td>
<td>.540 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.224 11.5 1.710</td>
<td>4.337 12.0 1.468</td>
<td>.324 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.629 36.0 1.393</td>
<td>5.213 31.0 1.229</td>
<td>.636 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.764 38.0 1.314</td>
<td>4.921 24.0 1.486</td>
<td>.026 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.752 47.0 1.700</td>
<td>6.696 47.0 1.681</td>
<td>.517 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.640 19.5 1.391</td>
<td>5.067 30.0 1.321</td>
<td>.017 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.483 6.0 1.357</td>
<td>3.651 8.0 1.288</td>
<td>.172 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.292 32.0 1.150</td>
<td>6.022 40.0 1.157</td>
<td>.381 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.752 8.0 1.392</td>
<td>3.955 10.0 1.389</td>
<td>.667 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.932 25.5 1.550</td>
<td>4.539 16.0 1.692</td>
<td>.365 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.606 35.0 2.254</td>
<td>5.707 35.0 1.878</td>
<td>.483 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.921 24.0 1.575</td>
<td>4.629 18.5 1.456</td>
<td>.322 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.112 41.0 1.849</td>
<td>5.808 37.0 1.594</td>
<td>.402 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.539 49.0 1.454</td>
<td>7.247 49.0 1.687</td>
<td>.632 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.775 21.0 1.621</td>
<td>4.651 20.0 1.288</td>
<td>.361 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.269 13.0 1.321</td>
<td>4.157 11.0 1.117</td>
<td>.555 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.112 10.0 1.488</td>
<td>4.404 15.0 1.600</td>
<td>.579 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.719 3.0 1.959</td>
<td>3.426 5.0 2.131</td>
<td>.627 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.528 34.0 2.174</td>
<td>5.449 34.0 2.005</td>
<td>.648 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.213 43.5 1.256</td>
<td>5.988 39.0 1.555</td>
<td>.520 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.595 50.0 1.838</td>
<td>7.359 50.0 1.967</td>
<td>.614 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.932 25.5 2.065</td>
<td>4.932 25.0 2.358</td>
<td>.775 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.179 29.0 2.208</td>
<td>5.000 29.0 2.315</td>
<td>.809 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.337 2.0 1.821</td>
<td>2.146 1.0 1.825</td>
<td>.570 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.280 1.0 1.685</td>
<td>2.415 2.0 1.911</td>
<td>.510 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.853 23.0 1.319</td>
<td>4.966 26.5 1.401</td>
<td>.605 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.438 5.0 1.177</td>
<td>3.269 4.0 1.379</td>
<td>.494 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.292 14.0 1.226</td>
<td>4.629 18.5 1.334</td>
<td>.624 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.179 4.0 1.648</td>
<td>3.258 3.0 1.548</td>
<td>.413 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.820 9.0 1.675</td>
<td>3.449 6.0 1.858</td>
<td>.593 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.977 27.0 1.107</td>
<td>4.977 28.0 1.186</td>
<td>.370 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.741 7.0 1.310</td>
<td>3.584 7.0 1.704</td>
<td>.420 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.393 16.0 1.302</td>
<td>4.550 17.0 1.609</td>
<td>.339 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6.213 43.5 1.598</td>
<td>6.550 46.0 1.322</td>
<td>.419 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GROUP I READING SPECIALIST (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ideal Sort</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Sort</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Ideal-Actual Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7.168</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>1.653</td>
<td>6.988</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>1.968</td>
<td>.691 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.516</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>4.359</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>.349 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.932</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>1.710</td>
<td>5.786</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>1.945</td>
<td>.710 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.224</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1.451</td>
<td>3.896</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>.531 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.269</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>1.756</td>
<td>4.887</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>.339 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.505</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>6.112</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>1.818</td>
<td>.397 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level.
TABLE 12

GROUP II CLASSROOM TEACHERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ideal Sort</th>
<th></th>
<th>Actual Sort</th>
<th></th>
<th>Ideal-Actual</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.567</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>1.359</td>
<td>6.333</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>1.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.876</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>2.304</td>
<td>5.407</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>2.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.086</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td>3.962</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.481</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1.314</td>
<td>4.469</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.358</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>5.382</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.197</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.742</td>
<td>4.604</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.246</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td>5.555</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>2.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.814</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>5.765</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>1.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.876</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>4.345</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7.234</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>1.098</td>
<td>6.345</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>1.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.765</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>6.259</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>1.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.975</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.244</td>
<td>3.629</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.938</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>1.575</td>
<td>5.827</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>1.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.469</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>5.246</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.456</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>1.378</td>
<td>6.246</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>1.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.691</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>1.586</td>
<td>5.209</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>1.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.358</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>3.629</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.716</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td>5.654</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>1.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.407</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.385</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.172</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.587</td>
<td>5.172</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>1.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.716</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1.988</td>
<td>6.333</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>1.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.345</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td>5.345</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>1.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.580</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>6.296</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>1.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7.469</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1.141</td>
<td>7.790</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.123</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.676</td>
<td>5.049</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>1.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.259</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.802</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>3.419</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.456</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>3.160</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.222</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>1.890</td>
<td>4.617</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.765</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>1.247</td>
<td>6.469</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>1.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7.012</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>1.826</td>
<td>7.086</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>1.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.345</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1.943</td>
<td>4.740</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>2.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.691</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.729</td>
<td>4.679</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.543</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.943</td>
<td>3.234</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.555</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>3.308</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.061</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.712</td>
<td>4.839</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>1.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.432</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.404</td>
<td>3.382</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.516</td>
<td>3.777</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.950</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.456</td>
<td>3.419</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>2.938</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>3.049</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.246</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>4.938</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>1.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.829</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>3.555</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.444</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1.732</td>
<td>4.296</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.851</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>6.864</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>1.367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GROUP II CLASSROOM TEACHERS (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ideal Sort</th>
<th>Actual Sort</th>
<th>Ideal-Actual Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Means Rank</td>
<td>Means Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideal Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Sort</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.543</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>1.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.185</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>1.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.222</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>1.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4.703</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.481</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5.419</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1.801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level.*
## TABLE 13

### GROUP III PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ideal Sort</th>
<th>Actual Sort</th>
<th>Ideal-Actual Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.698</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>1.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.643</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>2.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.273</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>1.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.890</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.479</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>1.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.397</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>1.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.835</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>1.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.383</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>1.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.150</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.876</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>1.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.027</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>1.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.191</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>1.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.931</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>1.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.219</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>1.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.671</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>1.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.383</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.191</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.164</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>1.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.164</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.301</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>2.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.890</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.890</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.397</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>1.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7.575</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.068</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>1.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.863</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.082</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.095</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.739</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.835</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>1.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.260</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>1.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.876</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.643</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>2.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.191</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2.178</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.369</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>1.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.424</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.123</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.246</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.479</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.342</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>1.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.123</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.232</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>1.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.027</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ideal Sort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.123</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>1.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.342</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>1.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.246</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>1.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.561</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>1.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.520</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.561</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>1.481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level.
# TABLE 14

**GROUP IV SUPERVISORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Ideal Sort</th>
<th>Actual Sort</th>
<th>Ideal-Actual Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Means Rank</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Means Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.809</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>1.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.666</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.857</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.285</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>1.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>1.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>1.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.095</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>1.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.380</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>1.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.142</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>1.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.809</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>1.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.761</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>1.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.857</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>1.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.761</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>1.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.095</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.761</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>1.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.714</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.571</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>1.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.285</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>9.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.285</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>2.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.571</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>1.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.571</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>9.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.952</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>5.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.190</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>1.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.523</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>2.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.523</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.809</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.809</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.714</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>1.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.476</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.095</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.380</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.285</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.952</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.142</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.523</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.476</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.523</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.238</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.571</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.380</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>1.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.190</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>1.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.952</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.666</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>9.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ideal Sort</td>
<td>Actual Sort</td>
<td>Ideal-Actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.047</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.619</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.571</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>9.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.380</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>8.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.285</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>1.953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.476</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>1.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .01 level.
APPENDIX E
Q-SORT

1. To report results of treatment to the child and his parents, to classroom teacher and principal.

2. To include parental guidance as a part of his work in correcting reading difficulties.

3. To have daily planning and conference periods after the regular school hours.

4. To assist the principal by serving as resource person to introduce new procedures and materials to colleagues.

5. To schedule opportunities to examine, evaluate and recommend materials to parents.

6. To assist the supervisor in scheduling students during the time set aside for language arts in the student's classroom.

7. Cooperate with the supervisor in arranging classes so that the children do not miss classes they enjoy, such as music, art and physical education.

8. To plan for continuous coordination between the remedial or special reading teacher and the classroom teacher.

9. To assist the supervisor by coordination of activities with the classroom teacher.

10. To share knowledge fully with the classroom teacher concerning goals and methods of the remedial program, when working with the same child.

11. To have access to the school records and to classroom observations.

12. To arrange for inservice training in reading for the classroom teachers.
13. To expect the classroom teacher to share knowledge and procedures of the classroom developmental reading program, when working with the same child.

14. To provide the classroom teacher with a plan that will carry the student through additional growth activities in the regular classroom after the period of remedial or special help has ended.

15. To use data from classroom teacher observations as well as standardized test data in selecting children to work with the reading specialist.

16. To determine specific objectives for a remedial reading program if the school system has a greater need than they have resources to handle that need.

17. To decide what effort each member of the staff should make in regard to the remedial program.

18. To aid the principal in determining means for reporting findings about individual children.

19. To arrange for parents and other members of the community to assist in planning the special reading program.

20. To be responsible for five or more one-hour classes each day.

21. To work with groups of from two to ten pupils with a maximum case load of 50.

22. To assist the principal in reporting goals, methods, techniques and results of the reading program to the board of education and to parents.

23. To evaluate the procedures used within the special or remedial reading program.
24. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program.

25. To function as a resource person for the classroom teachers of reading in his building.

26. To show the classroom teacher how to group children according to given needs.

27. To teach demonstration lessons for the classroom teachers.

28. To act as a curriculum adviser and supervisor to the principal.

29. To cooperate with the curriculum supervisor in preventing rather than in the remediation of reading disability.

30. To assist in choosing equipment and materials used in the reading center.

31. To select materials and techniques which enable the pupil to have immediate success.

32. To test and place new students.

33. To conduct a case study including individually administered diagnostic test data and data from in-depth parent interviews.

34. To conduct screening tests of the pupil's vision and hearing.

35. To administer psychological projective tests and physiological evaluations.

36. To conduct interviews with parents for gathering data for diagnosis of reading disability.

37. To survey community needs related to reading.

38. To bring in outside speakers for workshops in reading.

39. To write proposals for funding community reading programs.
40. To involve community groups in solving reading problems.
41. To promote innovation in the school reading programs.
42. To assess community resources for increasing reading achievements.
43. To devise school organizational plans which promote effective teaching and learning of reading skills.
44. To determine how frequently children should meet with the special or remedial reading teacher.
45. To determine which students should meet with the special or remedial reading teacher.
46. To aid the supervisor in implementing new ideas in teaching reading.
47. To determine priority ranks for those children who need help in reading if funds prohibit offering help to all who need it.
48. To instruct volunteer parents in the use of tutoring techniques for teaching reading.
49. To give attention to the students who are not reading up to their potential even though they may be reading at grade level.
50. To confer, during regular school hours, with the classroom teacher who is working with the same child.
Dear Participant:

We are happy that the director of your special or remedial reading program has consented to cooperate in our study of the role of the reading specialist in the elementary school. We hope that the study will help in determining the perception of teachers, principals, reading and language development specialists, and reading supervisors concerning the role of the reading specialist in the seventeen school districts in Franklin County, Ohio. Since the success of the study is dependent upon a 100 percent return from each reading program selected, we hope that you will take the time to complete carefully the enclosed instruments.

Included with this letter you will find a brief questionnaire; an envelope labeled I; an envelope labeled II; and a stamped, self-addressed envelope for returning the instruments to the investigator.

We ask your cooperation in following these four steps in completing the instruments:

**Step 1:** Complete the questionnaire. Information requested is pertinent to analyzing the data collected in the study.

**Step 2:** Open Envelope I in which you will find 50 Q-Sort cards and the directions for completing the Q-sort. Please be sure to read the directions carefully. The items on the cards are written so that you may interpret them as you please. After you have completed the Q-Sort as directed, place all the materials back into Envelope I and seal it.

**Step 3:** Open Envelope II in which you will find 30 Q-Sort cards and the directions for completing the Q-Sort. Please be sure to read the directions carefully. The items on the cards are written so that you may interpret them as you please. After you have completed the Q-Sort as directed, place all the materials back into Envelope II and seal it.

**Step 4:** Finally, place the questionnaire, Envelope I and Envelope II into the stamped envelope and return it to the investigator.

We thank you for the time that you have taken to complete our instruments. We know that this is a busy time of the year, and we have attempted to make our instruments as simple and as brief as possible. You may rest assured that the information you have given us will be treated as strictly confidential.
Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Merle Ivers  
Asst. Professor of Education  
Capital University

Dr. I. Keith Tyler  
Professor of Education  
The Ohio State University
EDUCATORS WHO PRETESTED THE Q-SORT INSTRUMENT

1. Mr. William Competti  Principal, Fairfield Union School District
2. Mrs. Janet Clark  Reading Teacher, Fairfield Union School District
3. Mrs. Fern Stalder  Reading Teacher, Fairfield Union School District
4. Mrs. Bernice Detwiler  Reading Teacher, Fairfield Union School District
5. Mrs. Robert Drury  Principal - Coordinator, Liberty Union - Thurston School District
6. Mrs. Shelby Snapp  Reading Teacher, Liberty Union - Thurston School District
7. Mrs. Kathleen McGuire  Reading Teacher, Liberty Union - Thurston School District
8. Mrs. Ann Maze  Reading Teacher, Liberty Union - Thurston School District
9. Mrs. Diane Eversole  Reading Consultant, Fairfield County Schools
10. Mr. Stephen Gahn  Principal, Amanda-Clearcreek School District
11. Mrs. Carolyn Solt  Reading Teacher, Amanda-Clearcreek School District
12. Mrs. Claudyne Hill  Reading Teacher, Amanda-Clearcreek School District
13. Mrs. Wanda Tilley  Reading Teacher, Amanda-Clearcreek School District
14. Mr. Robert Christy  Reading Teacher, Amanda-Clearcreek School District
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mrs. Grace Young</td>
<td>Reading Teacher</td>
<td>Amanda-Clearcreek School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mr. Carroll Reeves</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Bloom Carroll School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mr. William Cox</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Bloom Carroll School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mrs. Cheryl Heller</td>
<td>Reading Teacher</td>
<td>Bloom Carroll School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mrs. Joyce Schneider</td>
<td>Reading Teacher</td>
<td>Bloom Carroll School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mr. Daniel Harris</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Berne Union School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Miss Faith Teitelbaum</td>
<td>Reading Teacher</td>
<td>Berne Union School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ms. Nancy Ivers</td>
<td>Reading Specialist</td>
<td>Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mrs. Lola Searles</td>
<td>Reading Specialist</td>
<td>Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mrs. Marianna Chaney</td>
<td>Reading Specialist</td>
<td>Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mrs. Pat Cavendish</td>
<td>Reading Specialist</td>
<td>Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mr. Thomas Hannan</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mr. Estel Miller</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mrs. Helen Bond</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mrs. Frances Mallow</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Mrs. Luciile Nash</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Educators Who Pretested the Q-Sort Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Mrs. Jean Stimmel</td>
<td>Teacher, Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mrs. Rese Hendrix</td>
<td>Teacher, Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Miss Penny Ellsworth</td>
<td>Teacher, Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Mrs. Sue Farnham</td>
<td>Teacher, Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Mr. Mike Reck</td>
<td>Teacher, Big Walnut Local School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JURORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Dr. John Kirker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mr. Thomas Hannan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Walnut Local School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mrs. Diane Eversole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield County School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mrs. Cheryl Heller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloom Carroll School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dr. Harold Horton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mr. Estel Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Walnut Local School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Miss Nancy Ivers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Walnut Local School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mrs. Ann McCrystal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Public School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mrs. Lucille Nash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Walnut Local School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Miss Faith Teitlebaum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berne Union School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I
ACTUAL READING SPECIALIST ROLE

Enclosed are fifty statements describing possible activities of an elementary school reading specialist. (For this study, the reading specialist is defined as that person who works directly or indirectly with those pupils who have either failed to benefit from regular classroom instruction in reading or those who could benefit from advanced training in reading skills. The reading specialist, is not the reading coordinator or supervisor; neither is he the reading clinician or the learning disabilities teacher.) Please sort these statements into piles according to whether you feel that a given activity is most like or least like that which the reading specialist in your building actually performs.

Briefly, the statements are to be placed into three unequal-sized piles and these piles are each to be further divided into three additional piles. This will leave the fifty statements sorted into nine piles ranging from what is least like to what is most like the activities the reading specialist in your building actually performs.

Listed on the following pages are fourteen steps designed to help you sort the statements into the appropriate piles. Please note carefully the number of items that should go into each pile. After you have completed the task, place the sorted cards into the small envelopes numbered 1 through 9.
1. Pick the 12 items which you feel are most like those a reading specialist actually does. This is Pile A.

2. Pick the 12 items which you feel are least like those a reading specialist actually does. This is Pile C.

3. This will leave 26 items which fall somewhere between what is most like and what is least like what a reading specialist actually does. This is Pile B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pile C</th>
<th>Pile B</th>
<th>Pile A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 items</td>
<td>26 items</td>
<td>12 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>least like, actually</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>most and least like, actually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. From Pile C, pick the 2 items which are least like what a reading specialist actually does. Place these 2 items in the small envelope number 1.

5. From Pile C, pick the 6 items which are most like what a reading specialist actually does. Place these 6 items in envelope number 3.

6. This will leave 4 items from Pile C which are neither most like nor least like what an elementary reading specialist actually does. Place these 4 items in envelope number 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pile C</th>
<th>Envelope #1</th>
<th>Envelope #2</th>
<th>Envelope #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>6 items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>least like, actually</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>most and least like, actually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. From Pile B, pick the 8 items which are least like what a reading specialist actually does. Place these 8 items in envelope number 4.

8. From Pile B, pick the 8 items which are most like what a reading specialist actually does. Place these 8 items in envelope number 6.

9. This will leave 10 items from Pile B which are neither most like nor least like what a reading specialist actually does. Place these 10 items in envelope number 5.
Pile B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Envelope #4</th>
<th>Envelope #5</th>
<th>Envelope #6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 items</td>
<td>10 items</td>
<td>8 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>least like, actually</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>most like, actually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most and least like, actually</td>
<td></td>
<td>actually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. From Pile A, pick 6 items which are least like what a reading specialist actually does. Place these 6 items in envelope number 7.

11. From Pile A, pick the 2 items which are most like what a reading specialist actually does. Place these 2 items in envelope number 9.

12. This will leave 4 items from Pile A which are neither most like nor least like what a reading specialist actually does. Place these 4 items in envelope number 8.

Pile A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Envelope #7</th>
<th>Envelope #8</th>
<th>Envelope #9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 items</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>2 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>least like, actually</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>most like, actually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most and least like, actually</td>
<td></td>
<td>actually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Check to see that each envelope contains the following number of items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Envelope Number</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Seal each envelope and place them in the medium-sized manila envelope (No. II) from which they came. Seal the manila envelope (No. II). Place both medium sized manila envelopes (No. I and No. II) in the large manila envelope and return.
Enclosed are fifty statements describing possible activities of an elementary school reading specialist. (For this study, the reading specialist is defined as that person who works directly or indirectly with those pupils who have either failed to benefit from regular classroom instruction in reading or those who could benefit from advanced training in reading skills. The reading specialist is not the reading coordinator or supervisor; neither is he the reading clinician or a learning disabilities teacher.) Please sort these statements into piles according to whether you feel that a given activity is most like or least like what an elementary reading specialist should ideally perform. In other words, if an elementary reading specialist were doing a perfect job, which activities would be most like or least like what he would be doing?

Briefly, the statements are to be placed into three unequal-sized piles and these piles are each to be further divided into three additional piles. This will leave the fifty statements sorted into nine piles ranging from what is least like to what is most like the activities that an elementary school reading specialist should ideally perform.

Listed on the following pages are fourteen steps designed to help you sort the statements into the appropriate piles. Please note carefully the number of items that should go into each pile. After you have completed the task, place the sorted cards into the small envelopes numbered 1 through 9.
1. Pick the 12 items which you feel are most like what an elementary school reading specialist should do, ideally. This is Pile A.

2. Pick the 12 items which you feel are least like what an elementary school reading specialist should do, ideally. This is Pile C.

3. This will leave 26 items which fall somewhere between what is most like and what is least like what an elementary school reading specialist should do, ideally. This is Pile B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pile C</th>
<th>Pile B</th>
<th>Pile A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 items</td>
<td>26 items</td>
<td>12 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>least like, ideally</td>
<td>between most and least like, ideally</td>
<td>most like, ideally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. From Pile C, pick the 2 items which are least like what an elementary school reading specialist should do, ideally. Place these 2 items in the small envelope number 1.

5. From Pile C, pick the 6 items which are most like what an elementary school reading specialist should do, ideally. Place these 6 items in envelope number 3.

6. This will leave 4 items from Pile C which are neither most like nor least like what an elementary school reading specialist should do, ideally. Place these 4 items in envelope number 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pile C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Envelope #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>least like, ideally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. From Pile B, pick the 8 items which are least like what an elementary school reading specialist should do, ideally. Place these 8 items in envelope number 4.

8. From Pile B, pick the 8 items which are most like what an elementary school reading specialist should do, ideally. Place these 8 items in envelope number 6.

9. This will leave 10 items from Pile B which are neither most like nor least like what an elementary school reading specialist should do, ideally. Place these 10 items in envelope number 5.
Pile B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Envelope #4</th>
<th>Envelope #5</th>
<th>Envelope #6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 items</td>
<td>10 items</td>
<td>8 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>least like, ideally</td>
<td>between most and least like, ideally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. From Pile A, pick the 6 items which are least like what an elementary school reading specialist should do, ideally. Place these 6 items in envelope number 7.

11. From Pile A, pick the 2 items which are most like what an elementary school reading specialist should do, ideally. Place these 2 items in envelope number 9.

12. This will leave 4 items from Pile A which are neither most like nor least like what an elementary school reading specialist should do, ideally. Place these 4 items in envelope number 8.

Pile A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Envelope #7</th>
<th>Envelope #8</th>
<th>Envelope #9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 items</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>2 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>least like, ideally</td>
<td>between most and least like, ideally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Check to see that each envelope contains the following number of items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Envelope Number</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Seal each envelope and place them in the medium-sized manila envelope (No. I) from which they came. Seal the manila envelope (No. I) and open envelope No. II. Follow the instructions therein.
READING SPECIALIST QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Educational Background

1. Do you presently hold a standard elementary or secondary teaching certificate for teaching in Ohio? ____ Is this certificate validated for teaching reading as a reading specialist? _____

2. Do you presently hold a reading supervisor's certificate? _____

II. Work Experience

1. How many years have you been teaching in a remedial or special reading program? ______

III. Evaluation

1. How do you feel about the special or remedial reading program in which you are working?

   Satisfied ____ Unsatisfied ____ Undecided ______
PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Work Experience

1. How long have you held your present position of elementary principal? _______

2. Do you hold other professional positions in your school district? _______ If yes, is 1/2 or more of your time devoted to your position as principal? _______

II. Evaluation

1. How would you rate your understanding of the role of the elementary school reading specialist?

   Good _______ Average _______ Poor _______

2. How do you feel about the special or remedial reading program in your school?

   Satisfied ____ Unsatisfied ____ Undecided ____
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Educational Background

1. Do you hold a college degree? _______

II. Work Experience

1. How many years have you worked with pupils who were also working with a reading specialist? _______

III. Evaluation

1. How would you rate your understanding of the role of the elementary school reading specialist?

   Good _______ Average _______ Poor _______

2. How do you feel about the remedial or special reading program in your school?

   Satisfied _____ Unsatisfied ____ Undecided _______
READING SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Educational Background

1. Do you presently hold a standard elementary or secondary certificate for teaching in Ohio? _____ Is this certificate validated for teaching reading as a reading specialist? _____

2. Do you presently hold a reading supervisor's certificate? _____

II. Work Experience

1. How many years have you been working as a supervisor of a remedial or special reading program? _____

III. Evaluation

1. How do you feel about the special or remedial reading program in which you are working?

   Satisfied _____ Unsatisfied _____ Undecided _____
Dear Participant:

We are happy that the director of your special or remedial reading program has consented to cooperate in our study of the role of the reading specialist in the elementary school. We hope that the study will help in determining the perception of teachers, principals, reading or language development specialists, and reading supervisors concerning the role of the reading specialist in the seventeen school districts in Franklin County, Ohio.

Preliminary to the study we ask your cooperation in completing the enclosed brief questionnaire and in forwarding it to us in the enclosed self-addressed envelope along with a list of classroom teachers who presently work with a child who also attends your reading or language development program. Data derived from this questionnaire is pertinent to the selection of the sample for the study.

Your contribution to our study of the role of the reading Specialist can be significant and we thank you for the time and effort you have expended.

Sincerely yours,

Merle Ivers
Asst. Professor of Education
Capital University

Dr. I. Keith Tyler
Professor of Education
The Ohio State University
Assistance to the Child.
Inappropriate Statements.

1. To be responsible for five or more one-hour classes each day.
2. To conduct screening tests of the pupil's vision and hearing.
3. To administer psychological projective tests and physiological evaluations.
4. To test and place new students.
5. To conduct a case study including individually administered diagnostic test data and data from indepth parent interviews.

Assistance to the Teacher.
Inappropriate Statements.

1. To have daily planning and conference periods after the regular school hours.
2. To arrange for inservice training in reading for the classroom teachers.
3. To function as a resource person for the classroom teachers of reading in his building.
4. To show the classroom teacher how to group children according to given needs.
5. To bring in outside speakers for workshops in reading.
Assistance to the Parents and Community.

**Appropriate Statements.**

1. To schedule opportunities to examine, evaluate and recommend materials to parents.

2. To report results of treatment to the child and his parents.

3. To include parental guidance in teaching reading as a part of his responsibilities to the child.

4. To have access to family data, school records, and classroom observations.

5. To instruct volunteer parents in the use of tutoring techniques for teaching reading.

**Inappropriate Statements.**

1. To conduct interviews with parents for gathering data for diagnosis of reading disability.

2. To survey community needs related to reading.

3. To assess community resources for increasing reading achievement.

4. To assist parents and community groups in preventing reading problems.

5. To write proposals for funding community reading centers.
**Assistance to the Principal. Inappropriate Statements.**

1. To decide what efforts each member of the staff should make in regard to the remedial reading program.

2. To aid the principal in determining means for reporting findings.

3. To act as a curriculum adviser to the principal.

4. To assist the principal in reporting goals, methods, techniques and results of the reading program.

5. To promote innovation in the school reading program.

---

**Assistance to the Supervisor. Inappropriate Statements.**

1. To devise school organizational plans which promote effective teaching and learning of reading skills.

2. To determine specific objectives for a remedial program if the school system has a greater need than they have resources to handle that need.

3. To assist the reading supervisor in guiding parents and other members of the community in setting up goals for the reading program.

4. To evaluate the procedures used within the special or remedial reading program.

5. To assist the supervisor in teaching demonstration lessons for the classroom teacher.
**Assistance to the Child. Appropriate Statements.**

1. To expect the classroom teacher to share knowledge and procedures of the classroom developmental reading program when working with the same child.

2. To use data from classroom teacher observations as well as standardized test data in selecting children to work with the reading specialist.

3. To work with groups of from two to ten pupils with a maximum case load of 50.

4. To evaluate progress of students enrolled in the special or remedial reading program.

5. To select materials and techniques which enable the pupil to have immediate success.

**Assistance to the Teacher. Appropriate Statements.**

1. To plan for continuous coordination between the remedial or special reading teacher and the classroom teacher.

2. To share knowledge fully with the classroom teacher concerning goals and methods of the remedial program.

3. To provide the classroom teacher with a plan that will carry the student through additional growth activities in the regular classroom after the period of remedial or special help has ended.

4. To determine which students should meet with the special or remedial reading teacher.

5. To confer during the regular school hours with the classroom teacher who is working with the same child.
Assistance to the Principal. Appropriate Statements.

1. To assist the principal by serving as resource person to introduce new procedures and materials to colleagues.

2. To assist in choosing equipment and materials used in the reading center.

3. To assist the principal in determining how frequently children should meet with the special or remedial reading teacher.

4. To assist the principal in determining which students should meet with the special or remedial reading teacher.

5. To assist the principal in determining procedures for programs for students accelerated in reading.

Assistance to the Supervisor. Appropriate Statements.

1. To cooperate with the supervisor in preventing rather than remediating reading disability.

2. Assist the supervisor in scheduling students during the time set aside for language arts in the students' classrooms.

3. Cooperate with the supervisor in arranging classes so that the children do not miss classes they enjoy, such as music, art and physical education.

4. To assist the supervisor by coordinating activities with the classroom teacher.

5. To aid the supervisor in implementing new ideas in teaching reading.
Directions for Evaluation of Framing of Q-Sort Statements

Directions: Please give a letter designation S (Satisfactory) or U (Unsatisfactory) to each statement, in terms of the criteria stated below:*  

1. Is the meaning clear?  
2. Does it have any other meaning?  
3. Can the statement be shortened?  
4. Does the statement "lead" the respondent?  
5. Does it ask the respondent to go against his basic inclinations?  
6. Is the statement ambiguous?  

Dear

Thank you for consenting to serve on the jury to judge the validity of an instrument designed to elicit the behaviors and actions making up the role of the elementary school reading specialist.

Attached you will find a list of five categories representing the major of responsibility for the reading specialist: There are:

1. Assistance to Child
2. Assistance to principal
3. Assistance to classroom teacher
4. Assistance to supervisor
5. Assistance to parents and community

Under each of the above headings, you will find listed six statements of behavior appropriate to the role of the reading specialist in the elementary school, and six statements of behavior inappropriate to the role of the reading specialist in the elementary school.

Please read the appropriate statements and grade them A, B, C, D, and F, in relation to their importance in the field of teaching remedial reading, using the letter grade A as a designation of a behavior very important to the field and the letter grade F if you feel the statement represents a behavior of very little importance to the field. It is not necessary to use all of the letters. Next read the inappropriate statements and grade them A, B, C, D, F, in relation to their inappropriateness to the field of reading as they relate to the category in which they are situated. In other words, if an inappropriate behavior would seem to make very little difference to the
over-all goals of the remedial program, a letter grade of F would be
given. If an inappropriate behavior would seem to make a great
difference to the over-all goals of the remedial program, a letter
grade of A would be given.

After grading the statements according to their importance to
the field of reading, please turn to page 6 where you will find
these same statements. Please rank them Satisfactory (S) or Unsatis­
factory (U) in terms of the six criteria listed at the top of the
page.

Again, thank you for assisting with the development of this
instrument.

Sincerely,

Merle Ivers
Assistant Professor
Capital University
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