THE ROLE OF THE DISTRICT READING PROGRAM COORDINATOR IN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR AS PERCEIVED BY PRIMARY AND ELEMENTARY TEACHERS AND BY READING PROGRAM COORDINATORS

THERESA JARVIS

The Role of the District Reading Program Coordinator In Newfoundland and Labrador as Perceived by Primary and Elementary Teachers and by Reading Program Coordinators

by

© Theresa Jarvis, B.A., B.A.(Ed.)

A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education

Department of Education
Memorial University of Newfoundland

August, 1987

St. John's Newfoundland

ISBN 0-315-39466-8

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to analyze the role of the reading program coordinator in an attempt to determine whether the reading program coordinator's perception of his/her role differed significantly from the primary/elementary classroom teacher's perception of the reading coordinator's role. The overall aim of this study was to help clarify the role of the reading program coordinator in Newfoundland and Labrador. More specifically, the study attempted to determine the following: (a) the role of the reading coordinator as discussed in the literature; (b) primary/elementary teachers' and reading coordinators' perceptions of the role of the reading coordinator in Newfoundland and Labrador; (c) primary/elementary teachers' and reading coordinators' perceptions regarding the importance of the role of the district reading coordinator; and (d) primary/elementary teachers' and reading coordinators' perceptions regarding the distribution of the reading coordinator's time.

Two methods of gathering data were employed. First, literature related to the role of the reading coordinator was analyzed to help define the role of the reading

coordinator. Second, data was obtained from responses to two questionnaires which were administered to reading coordinators and classroom teachers. The questionnaire consisted of thirty-eight tasks and three categories of task areas: (a) Knowledge Area; (b) Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes; and (c) Administrative and Organizational Activities. The data from the questionnaire was analyzed for each of the three categories of tasks. The questionnaire also required repsondents to indicate their perceptions of the importance of the role of the district reading coordinator and their perceptions regarding distribution of the reading coordinator's time.

The findings from this study have shown that the reading coordinator's own role conception differs from the classroom teacher's perception of the reading coordinator's role. Reading coordinators were very positive in their perceptions of their performance, whereas, classroom teachers were less positive in their perceptions of the reading coordinator's performance.

Findings from this study have implications for reading coordinators, the Department of Education and school boards in Newfoundland and Labrador. Since the reading coordinator's role is influenced by the perceptions

and expectations of others, he/she should be aware of the perceptions of significant others for his/her role. A job description should be written for the reading coordinator's role. This would help clarify the role for reading coordinators and other school personnel related to his/her position.

Acknowledgements

The following people are deserving of thanks for their cooperation and assistance in the completion of this thesis: Dr. Marc Glassman, under whose supervision this thesis was prepared; Dr. Leonard Williams for his suggestions regarding the Manuscript; Gwen Brokenshire for her invaluable assistance in the preparation of the questionnaire; Helen Banfield for her assistance in processing the data; the panel of experts who participated in the pilot study; and Trius Word Processing Services for typing the manuscript.

Special thanks are due to my family for their support and encouragement. Also, I thank Jack for his support and patience throughout the completion of this work.

Table of Contents

Chapter

Chapter

List of Tables

Chapter I

The Problem

Introduction

The importance of reading has been the subject of a considerable body of literature. Cushenberry (1983) suggests that helping children develop appropriate reading competency for the twenty-first century is one of the most important functions of teachers of reading.

> Of all the literacy skills which we educators emphasize that of reading may be the most important. Certainly students will not be able to function in today's society until they are able to recognize words, comprehend words, react to words and then make a logical decision based on what they have read or learned. (p.59)

Currently in Canada there are four and one-half million functionally illiterate adults (Chatelaine, August, 1986). According to the article, these individuals cannot read signs, fill out job applications, read medical prescriptions or help their children with their homework. Squires (1986) reports that in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador "one in five adults cannot read

the instructions on a medicine bottle, cannot fill in a job application form or cannot read a bedtime story to their children (p.21).

According to Dobbin (1974) there are many school children in Newfoundland who are not learning to read adequately and many others who require some form of remedial instruction. In the words of Strang (1969 as cited in Dobbin, 1974), "Inability to read is recognized as the most important single cause of school failure" (p.2).

The need to improve the reading ability of our students is of extreme importance. As Allen (1972) argues:

> All individuals deserve the right to read. It is a right as fundamental as the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The ability to read well is extremely important to the dignity and worth of the individual. Those who do not gain this ability in the course of their early education lack a skill necessary to all other areas of learning and are being denied a fundamental educational right - the right to read. (p.8)

Dobbin (1974) insists also that the children in Newfoundland schools claim the right to read. She argues that

there are too many of them who cannot read and many others who lack the skills and interest necessary to read to the limits of their capability.

It is the responsibility of educators to ensure that our students become as proficient as possible in reading. Many people, ranging from teachers, administrators and reading program coordinators, to community agencies and parents are involved in a child's education, and consequently have a part to play in his/her learning to read. However, two of the most influential groups who can directly affect a child's reading proficiency are the reading program coordinator and the classroom teacher. The classroom teacher being the closest to instructional activity is utlimately the most important in helping students learn to read (Bell, 1982). However, the program coordinator being the closest to instructional activity after the teacher, also plays a pivotal role. Being freed of classroom teaching duties and being a subject expert in the field of reading, the coordinator is in a position to assist the teacher in planning, organizing, coordinating and appraising the school reading program. Therefore, reading program coordinators, as instructional supervisors, must work very closely with teachers to ensure that students reach their full potential in reading.

Introduction to the Problem

The stated aim of instructional supervision is to improve instruction (Wiles & Lovell, 1983). Yet, as Harris (1976) points out, if the role of the instructional supervisor is not clearly defined it can limit his/her effectiveness in the instructional improvement process. Hence, any confusion surrounding the role of the instructional supervisor must be eliminated and the role clarified, if we are to obtain maximum effectiveness from the supervisor in the improvement of instruction.

Instructional supervisors need to ascertain how their work is perceived by teachers in comparison to how they i.e., (supervisors) perceive their work. Studies such as Parsons (1973), Davies (1973) and Vatcher (1984) have shown that a high degree of congruence in the perceptions of teachers and supervisors is necessary if the instructional program is to function properly.

Today, with increased demands for change in the instructional program, reading coordinators/supervisors face the tremendous challenge of leading our teachers and our schools toward improved reading instruction. Harris (1976) puts forth this point when he writes, "The time seems unusually right for supervisors of instruction, whatever their titles might be, to assert themselves as

leaders in the instructional improvement process" (p.335).

Although the time is right for instructional improvement, there is a great deal of confusion surrounding the role of the instructional supervisor/program coordinator which can severely limit their effectiveness in the instructional improvement process (Wiles & Lovell, 1983).

Harker (1973) suggested that reading coordinators often sense that their effectiveness in improving reading instruction is limited. He goes on to say that teachers and administrators often feel that reading coordinators are not as helpful as they might be. This attitude could result from teachers, administrators and other staff members lack of clarity regarding the precise nature of the reading coordinator's job responsibilities.

The role of the supervisor is not clearly defined and there is a lack of agreement on the exact functions associated with supervision (Markowitz, 1976).

According to Alfonso, Firth & Neville (1975 as cited in Markowitz, 1976);

> In all too many cases supervisors have spoken with little authority. Unsure of their own esteem and organizational status they have too often spoken timidly and behaved conservatively. They have been reactor consultants and

> instructional counselors almost exclusively rather than intervention agents seeking to influence teachers directly. They have responded rather than initiated. (p.367)

Harris (1976) further reiterates this point by stating that "supervisors have sometimes been more eager to be accepted than to be effective agents of change" (p.333).

In a recent study by Hubeny (1985), which investigated role stress and burnout for reading coordinators, it was found that considerable confusion surrounds the goals and job descriptions of the reading coordinator. Some coordinators portrayed their coordinator status as a "no man's land" in which they have responsibility without authority.

It would appear that if the reading coordinator/supervisor is to be effective in the instructional improvement process then an effort must be made to clarify the specialized professional functions which comprise a coordinator's role. According to Babin (1981), "Unique responsibilities must be clearly delineated, otherwise the supervisor's role will become so diffused he/she will become a professional cripple" (p.96).

Crocker & Riggs (1979), in their Task Force Report on

Education in Newfoundland and Labrador, also emphasized the need for clear delineation of the program coordinator's/supervisor's role:

> As some teachers see it in too many cases the supervisor's role has not been sufficiently articulated. In other cases the role which has been assigned to supervisors has been unacceptable to teachers. Consequently, a substantial gap exists between the assigned duties of supervisors and the teacher's perception of the supervisor's role. (p.201)

One may readily acknowledge that the supervisor's role is difficult to define. As Babin (1981) describes it, so complex and so diverse are the settings within which supervisors operate that no definitive statement applicable to all situations is possible. Nevertheless, regardless of the complexities it is important that the lines of communication between teacher and coordinator are open and that the roles of the supervisor are clarified. Lucio (1969) stated that "In order to obtain maximum effectiveness from the supervisor it is necessary to define and redefine what the supervisor does and who the supervisor is" (p.13).

Wiles & Lovell (1983) also maintain that the

confusion over roles and responsibilities illustrates the need to clarify the purpose and functions of the instructional supervisor. While it might not be possible to develop a "universal role" which is appropriate for all supervisors, a variety of roles should be defined at the systems level in order to eliminate much of the indefiniteness and lack of understanding currently associated with the role of the instructional supervisor.

The need for clarification of the supervisor's role must be emphasized if he/she is to meet the needs of the teachers and ultimately the students he/she serves. Although there are indications that School Districts in Newfoundland and Labrador are attempting to establish specific duties and responsibilities for program coordinators, there is still a problem with the lack of a clear, concise definition of the program coordinator's role.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to analyze the role of the reading program coordinator in an attempt to determine whether the reading coordinator's perception of his/her role differs significantly from the classroom teacher's perception of the reading coordinator's role. The overall aim of this study is to help clarify the role of the

reading program coordinator by examining the perceptions of primary/elementary teachers and reading program coordinators in Newfoundland and Labrador, together with an examination of literature and research relevant to the role of the reading coordinator.

The study attempted to determine the following:

1. The role of the reading coordinator as discussed in the literature.

2. The perceptions of primary/elementary teachers and reading program coordinators throughout the province of Newfoundland and Labrador regarding the role of the reading program coordinator and any differences in their respective perceptions of the role of the reading program coordinator.

3. The functions of the reading/language arts coordinator that are most and least performed by reading program coordinators.

4. The extent to which reading coordinators, and primary/elementary teachers valued the role of the district reading coordinator.

5. How reading coordinators and primary/elementary teachers felt the reading coordinators could best distribute their time.

Rationale

Program coordinators or instructional supervisors were first allocated to school districts in Newfoundland and Labrador in 1969. Since then, there has been a steady increase in the number of program coordinators available to teachers in this province. Currently, there are 280 program coordinators listed in the Newfoundland and Labrador Schools Directory, 35 of whom are reading/language arts coordinators.

The Department of Education for Newfoundland and Labrador, does not have a written job description for the reading/language arts program coordinator operating at the district level. Rather, the role of the Department of Education is to set the qualifications and experience required for certification of program coordinators. The actual job specification or description for the reading program coordinator is the prerogative of the respective School Board or District. The Newfoundland Schools Act (1970) does not set down any duties for the board supervisor except insofar as "The appropriate superintendent shall prescribe for and assign to ... board supervisors and other personnel appointed under section 20 duties thereof" (p.4735, Section 21).

In that, district reading coordinators are in a

position to shape and to influence directly, the district reading program, it is important to examine their role and responsibilities. Through an examination of the role of the district reading coordinator one should arrive at some consensus regarding the actual and perceived job responsibilities of the reading coordinator throughout the province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

It is understandable that the needs and resources of school districts vary considerably and, as a result, roles of reading coordinators will tend to vary from district to district. However, some common duties and responsibilities for reading coordinators should exist throughout the province.

The results of this study will provide information as to how teachers perceive the role of the reading coordinator/supervisor and the degree to which the supervisor's own role conception agrees with or differs from that perception. According to Parsons (1973),

> Numerous studies have shown that the effectiveness of supervisors is measured in terms of what they are expected to do and what they are perceived to be doing. A high degree of congruence in the perceptions of supervisors and teachers is desirable and necessary if the

> instructional program is to function properly. Because the expectations of others as well as the expectations of the individual are vital to the effective fulfillment of the supervisory position occupied, it is essential to establish the degree to which congruence or incongruence exists. (p.21)

Lucio & McNeil (1979) have noted that the satisfaction of teachers with the school system has been found to depend upon the extent to which they perceive that the role of their supervisors meet their expectations.

Reading program coordinators should have an awareness of the teacher's perception of, and expectations for, his/her role. Expectations which are not clearly communicated, or which are unexpressed represent an important source of misunderstanding between the supervisor and those possessing expectations for his/her role (i.e., teachers). This might constitute a major problem in their working effectively together (Gorton, 1980). As Campbell (1957) noted, "Only by an understanding of these expectations can the supervisor anticipate the reception of specified behaviour on his part. Such anticipation seems necessary if the area of acceptance is to be extended and the area of disagreement minimized" (p.264).

Although Campbell wrote this nearly thirty years ago, much of what he said is still applicable today. Supervisors need to be aware of expectations from various sources, particularly teachers, regarding their role, in order to enable them to serve most effectively.

Rupley (1985) emphasizes the need for clarification of the reading coordinator's role by arguing that the identification of existing job responsibilities of reading coordinators should enable the more accurate specification of their role in education, thus enhancing the training of reading coordinators and maximizing their benefit to the school reading program.

It is essential for reading coordinators to be aware of teachers' perceptions regarding the reading coordinator's role. According to Oliva (1976),

> Feedback from the troops is the best way to find out whether or not the supervisor is actually accomplishing the mission. The teachers the supervisor serves are in a real sense the consumers of the product which he brings to them, and they are in the best position to judge whether that product is effective. (p.417)

Need or Significance of the Study

This study could assist in clarifying the role of the district reading program coordinator by analyzing the perceptions of classroom teachers and reading coordinators in Newfoundland and Labrador, regarding the role of the reading coordinator. Clarification of the role of these coordinators is essential to maximize their contribution to the school reading program. A more effective utilization of the reading coordinator's services to the school reading program could possibly improve district reading programs and help to foster improved reading abilities of students.

Also, a study such as this can increase teacher awareness of the actual services provided by the reading coordinators. Further, the instrument used in this study could be helpful to reading coordinators at the district level in determining teacher perceptions and expectations regarding the role of the reading coordinator.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study the following definitions will be used:

Role: Roles are defined in terms of role expectations. A role has certain normative

obligations and responsibilities which may be termed "role expectations", and when the role incumbent puts these obligations and responsibilities into effect he is said to be performing his/her role. The expectations define for the actor whoever he may be what he should or should not do as long as he is the incumbent of the particular role. (Getzel, 1958, p.154)

Reading Program Coordinator (RPC): a person who is responsible for planning, organizing, and coordinating the district reading program. His/her title may range from reading supervisor, director of reading, reading coordinator, reading consultant, or language arts consultant. Despite the variety of titles this person works out of central office and is responsible for coordination of the district reading program. (Jurata, 1974)

Supervisor: a person formally designated by the organization as supervisor to improve curriculum and instruction in order to improve the quality of learning of students. (Wiles & Lovell, 1983, p.11)

Instructional Supervision: behaviour officially

designated by the organization that directly affects teacher behaviour in such a way as to facilitate pupil learning and achieve the goals of the organization. (Markowitz, 1976)

Classroom Reading Teacher (CT): The classroom reading teacher provides instruction in all phases of the regular classroom reading program. (Rauch, 1974)

Scope and Limitations

The chief limitation of the study is that it involved a questionnaire. As a result, the study was limited by the validity of the questionnaire and the accuracy to which it was completed. Also, the study focused on primary and elementary teachers' views of the role of the reading coordinator, therefore, results and generalizations regarding the role of the reading program coordinator are based only upon perceptions of primary and elementary teachers across the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The results and generalizations do not necessarily reflect the viewpoints of junior and senior high teachers in regard to the perceived role of the reading program coordinator.

Chapter II

A Review of Related Literature

This chapter is organized into three main sections. The first section includes an explanation of role expectation theory which is important background information for this study. The second section deals with some of the specific job responsibilities of the reading coordinator as outlined in the literature. This section also examines the idea of the reading coordinator as a change agent who must possess interpersonal and communication skills if he/she is going to influence teachers in the instructional improvement process. The third and final section of this chapter presents a review of similar studies which have been conducted in an attempt to clarify the role of the reading coordinator/supervisor.

Role Expectation Theory

Heyns (1958) stated that social behaviorists found it useful to analyze the complex organizations of society through the positions occupied by the people within it. Gue (1977) has suggested that all social institutions may be analyzed in terms of roles.

According to Grace (1972) an individual usually has a reasonably clear idea of how his/her role should be performed, but it is apparent that no role exists in a social vacuum. Each role is articulated in a network of other roles representing positions with which the individual interacts. This network of roles is referred to as the "role set". Each position in the role set may be regarded as having expectations for the role of the 'focal person' and these expectations may not agree, with the result that a potential 'role conflict situation is created for the focal person. Conflict may occur because the individual perceives that others hold different expectations for him as the incumbent of a single position or because the expectations of one or more members of the role set conflict with the individual's own role conception. The behaviour of an individual in a social setting is in large measure determined by the expectations of others who may be considered his referent groups. The referent groups holding expectations for the reading program coordinator consist of students, parents, community organizations, School Board, superintendent, principals, colleagues and teachers.

Katz & Kahn (1966) have commented about the relative interdependence of members of a role set. They hold that

because role members have a stake in the focal person's performance they develop beliefs and attitudes about what he should and should not do as part of his role. These prescriptions and proscriptions held by members of a role set are designated as role expectations. Role expectations can be considered as the privileges, responsibilities, and powers of the role (Gue, 1977). There are two kinds of role expectations for every administrative position in an organization. These two expectations are:

1. Formal Expectations, which are specific responsibilities that are defined in a written job description. (e.g. School Boards have written formal expectations.)
2. Unexpressed Informal Expectations, which originate with the various individuals or groups with whom the supervisor comes into contact. (Gorton, 1972). (p.323)

Together, both sets of expectations comprise a behavioural definition of the role which different individuals believe the supervisor should perform in a particular situation. As evaluative standards applied to an incumbent in a position, the expectations of important others represent a powerful source of potential influence on any supervisor's behaviour (Gorton, 1972). However, it

is neither reasonable nor practical for the supervisor to attempt to discover and understand the expectations of everyone in the school organization and the community. Rather, he/she must concentrate on developing an awareness and understanding of those individuals or groups who may influence his/her effectiveness in some important regard (Gorton, 1972).

In summary, it is important for the reading program coordinator to learn the expectations of those individuals or groups (teachers) whose evaluation of him/her may impair or enhance his/her effectiveness.

Job Responsibilities of the Reading Coordinator

According to Burg, Kaufman, Korngold & Kovner (1978), a total reading program, in order to be effective, must be planned, organized, coordinated and appraised. These responsibilities describe a role that is filled by an individual often referred to as a reading coordinator/supervisor.

Burg (et al., 1978) argue that in attempting to clarify the role of the reading coordinator we should be less concerned with the question, "Who is the reading supervisor?" Rather, we should focus our attention on the more pragmatic question, "What does a reading supervisor do?"

The International Reading Association (1968) established the following requirements and job responsibilities for the reading program coordinator:

1. The reading supervisor should develop a system wide reading philosophy and curriculum and interpret this to the school administration, staff and public.
2. The reading supervisor should exercise leadership with all personnel in carrying out good reading practices.
3. The reading supervisor should evaluate reading personnel and personnel needs in all phases of a school wide reading program.
4. The reading supervisor should make recommendations to the administration regarding the reading budget.
5. The reading supervisor/coordinator should survey and evaluate the ongoing reading program and make suggestions for needed change.
6. The reading supervisor should translate the district philosophy of reading with the help of the principal of each school into a working program consistent with the needs of the students, the teachers and the community.

7. The reading supervisor should work with classroom teachers and others in improving the developmental and corrective aspects of the reading program. (p.62-63)

The International Reading Association (1968) describes the reading coordinator as that person who works directly with teachers, administrators and other professionals to improve and coordinate the total reading program of a school district.

Oliva (1976) described the role of the supervisor in the following way:

1. a curriculum expert, informed about the curriculum and ways to improve it.
2. an expert on instruction, knowledgeable about the latest and best methodology.
3. a communicator who can relate information and ideas to teachers and is a good listener.
4. an organizer, skillful in establishing various kinds of programs of value to teachers.
5. a master teacher, able to demonstrate good teaching as well as talk about it.
6. a group leader, who knows how to work with groups and get the most out of them.
7. an evaluator, who helps teachers evaluate

the curriculum and themselves.

8. a stimulator, who suggests ideas for teachers to consider.

9. a coordinator who seeks to achieve articulation between programs and levels and helps teachers to become aware of each other's problems.

10. an orienter who helps teachers who are new to the system and the community to become acquainted.

11. a consultant, on call to individual teachers and groups who wish to take advantage of his expertness.

12. a researcher, who instigates research studies, particularly action research.

13. a public relations person, who may be invited to interpret the school's curriculum to the public either in written communication or in talks to lay groups.

14. a change agent, a catalyst for helping teachers to change and improve. (p.414-415)

Oliva (1976) says: "Todays supervisor plays a number of varied roles within the domains of instructional, curricular and teacher development." (p.17) Supervisors

should possess sufficient knowledge and skills to perform all functions effectively, since they are in a strategic position for effecting change in individual classrooms.

One of the most comprehensive descriptions of the role of the reading consultant/coordinator was devised by Robinson & Rauch (1965). They summarized the role of the reading consultant/coordinator as having seven main functions. These functions are as follows:

1. **a resource person:** the reading consultant supplies materials on request, helps select and evaluate materials, and answers questions about reading asked by staff members and members of the community.
2. **an adviser:** the reading consultant advises administrators, teachers and other staff members about the teaching of reading within the school system, keeps teachers up to date on new developments in reading as reflected in research reports and experimentation in other school districts, reports at professional meetings and confers with parents in order to interpret the school reading program or discuss individual problems.
3. **as an inservice leader:** the reading

consultant arranges for and sometimes teaches inservice courses in reading, conducts demonstration lessons, and plans and helps to implement the total inservice program.

4. **an investigator:** the reading consultant encourages teachers to experiment with new materials and methods.

5. **a diagnostician:** the reading consultant directs or conducts diagnoses of individual students who have been identified as having problems in reading, helps teachers learn to diagnose more effectively and attempts to help teachers make use of information from diagnoses.

6. **an instructor:** the reading consultant helps teachers learn about methods and materials that will be useful to them, and may demonstrate new ideas or new procedures.

7. **an evaluator:** the reading consultant directs or supervises schoolwide testing programs involving reading achievement and conducts with the help of the total staff periodical evaluations of the reading program. (p.1-3)

Robinson & Rauch (1965) hoped that their job descrip-

tion of the reading coordinator would eliminate some of the confusion surrounding the roles and responsibilities of the reading coordinator and provide teachers and administrators with a better understanding of the role of the reading coordinator.

Otto, Peters & Peters (1977) outlined twelve areas where the reading coordinator should demonstrate competency. These areas are as follows:

1. Planning and directing evaluation of the ongoing program and making recommendations for change.
2. Assisting the principal and other administrators in the planning and implementation of the school reading program.
3. Working with the school administrators and support staff to coordinate the reading program with the total curriculum.
4. Keeping the community informed as to the purposes and progress of the reading program.
5. Consulting regularly with classroom teachers on matters relating to reading instruction.
6. Helping teachers to diagnose reading strengths and weaknesses and to match these skills with appropriate techniques and

materials.

7. Recommending materials to aid instruction.

8. Orienting beginning teachers to the philosophy, procedures and materials for the school reading program.

9. Provide continuous and systematic procedures and opportunities for professional growth for classroom teachers, e.g. demonstrations, in-service courses, workshops, seminars, and conference reports.

10. Working as a resource person for special cases whose difficulty or complexity requires a high degree of professional skill and knowledge.

11. encouraging and facilitating implementation of promising ideas.

12. Keeping teachers informed about new developments in reading. (p.229)

Otto, Peters & Peters (1977), similar to Robinson & Rauch (1965), outlined specific tasks and duties for the reading program coordinator. They concluded that there are nine areas in which the reading coordinator should be able to demonstrate competency: program assessment, goals development, materials and methodology, instructional management, evaluation of pupil progress, staff develop-

ment, multidisciplinary team operations, parent and community relations and professional standards.

Robinson (1976) sums up the role of the reading coordinator in the following manner:

> the reading coordinator is a person whose main responsibility is to aid all persons dealing with children's reading but definitely not to threaten teachers who are concerned with promotion, tenure or just being the best teachers that they are able to be. The coordinator is concerned with all pupils in the school and all aspects of their learning to read in every activity of the school day. (p.54)

The reading coordinator's role is to perfect the teaching of reading within a school or school system. He/she should be concerned not only with that portion of the curriculum labeled reading but with the reading process as it is used for learning and recreation throughout the total curriculum (Robinson, Alan H., 1967).

Robinson (1967) stated further that the coordinator should be concerned with the development of lifetime readers not just concerned with reading skills. A well trained coordinator is one who conceives of the school reading program as permeating the total curriculum, who

helps teachers adjust the program to the individual needs of students such as stimulating independent reading and motivating reluctant readers.

The reading coordinator is not a teacher of developmental reading (i.e., directly teaching children how to read in a classroom situation). Rather, the reading coordinator is a person who works directly with teachers, administrators and other school personnel to develop and coordinate a school reading program. As Robinson (1976) describes it, the greater part of the coordinator's time should be spent with teachers through whom children are expected to learn to read and use reading more effectively each year.

Reading Coordinator as a Change Agent

According to Blumberg & Amidon (1965), the process of supervision in the schools has as its stated aim the improvement of instruction. Essentially the supervisor is a change agent who through his interaction with the teacher brings forces into play to facilitate the teacher's efforts at self improvement.

Wiles & Lovell (1983) have stated that the measure of a supervisor's success lies in the worthwhile change he is able to effect.

> If a supervisor is effective, teachers are trying more new things than they were a year ago. If a supervisor is not effective more teachers will have discontinued their search for better ways of teaching and will be following lesson plans and procedures that they developed last year or several years before. (p.287)

Gorton (1980) argues that the rationale for change is based on the following premises:

1. Although the status quo is not necessarily bad there is usually room for improvement.
2. While all change does not necessarily lead to improvement, improvement is not likely to occur without change.
3. Unless we attempt change we are not likely to know whether a proposed innovation is better than the status quo. (p.293)

Hence, there is a strong argument for supervisors to be open minded about change. To be progressive and effective he/she must be willing to evaluate traditional approaches to curriculum and show initiative and skill in modifying and adapting them where appropriate, or rejecting them if necessary and replacing them with more effective ones. Gorton (1980), supports this assertion,

"In most situations change is inevitable, a supervisor can watch it occur, can resist it or can help guide and direct it but he cannot avoid it" (p.310).

The reading program coordinator/supervisor has a unique potential and indeed an obligation to promote change and improvement in the school reading program (Pendergast, 1978). This view is supported by others. Criscuolo (1975) states that:

> There are so many new issues and trends evolving in the field of reading that change is essential. A reading curriculum always resistant to change remains stagnant. Change for the sake of change accomplishes little; but school personnel committed to improved reading instruction must be willing to make changes necessary for better instructional programs. (p.155)

Guss (1961) also argues for change in the instructional program. She insists that:

> Supervisors should not perpetuate the status quo; they must be sensitive to changes and must be prepared to help teachers adjust to change. They must instill in teachers a desire and a zeal to dig deeper, to extend their horizons and to advance the frontiers of knowledge. (p.102)

The reading coordinator should possess a predisposition towards change and should constantly be promoting improvement. According to Oliva (1976) "it is he/she who sparks a dissatisfaction with the status quo and causes teachers to want to make revisions" (p.231).

Interpersonal Skills of the Reading Coordinator

The reading coordinator should have a special ability to relate and communicate with others both in group settings and one to one relationships.

A review of the existing literature Arbell (1978), Wylie (1969), Vacca (1981), Bean (1979), and Pikulski (1979) indicates that reading coordinators should have positive attitudes about people and should respond well in interpersonal relationships. Working with classroom teachers necessitates interpersonal and communication skills. New methods and techniques in reading will be of little use unless the reading coordinator has the communication skills necessary to convey this information to teachers.

Effective communication practices within an organization are essential. As St. John (1970, as cited in Gorton, 1980) has observed, "No one can manage a modern organization who is not knowledgeable in communication

principles and techniques and skilled in their use" (p.251). Also as Guarino (1974, as cited in Gorton, 1980) has noted: "In the area of leadership there is no talent more essential than one's ability to communicate" (p.251). The ability to communicate is a characteristic that the reading coordinator should possess. "If the supervisor wishes to influence or be influenced by teachers he/she must communicate. Communication is the means of learning and growth and therefore a fundamental element of the supervisor's effort" (Wiles & Lovell, 1983, p.92)

Perception Studies on the Role of the Reading Coordinator

Although the existing literature on the role of the reading coordinator is limited, studies have been conducted to determine the most important functions of the reading coordinator and the overall effectiveness of the coordinator in improving school reading programs.

Wylie (1969, as cited in Otto, Peters & Peters, 1977) surveyed elementary classroom teachers and reading consultants to determine their respective perceptions of the consultant's role. Results indicated that three of his four conclusions described divergent opinions among teachers and reading consultants regarding the role of the reading consultant.

1. Classroom teachers saw the consultant as a supplier of materials, demonstrator of techniques, or director of diagnostic and corrective procedures. By contrast consultants placed emphasis on administrative needs - organization, time allotments, grouping and the school curriculum.

2. Teachers wanted consultant aid to be accomplished through personalized, informal, small group activity. Consultants favored involvement with greater numbers through grade level meetings, orientation programs or bulletins for teachers.

3. Teachers felt that depth of background in reading and related areas, ability to criticize constructively and willingness to consult were necessary attributes of an effective reading consultant. Consultants felt that being able to establish rapport, to offer constructive criticism and to be impartial were of importance in the order named. (p.225)

Conclusions from the Wylie study indicated that information, materials, and procedures for helping new teachers produced the only area of agreement between the

two groups. Also, a major priorization by classroom teachers as the most important qualification of the reading consultant is an indepth knowledge of the reading process.

Harker's (1973) study outlined the role of the reading consultant as having two main functions. The most obvious role of the consultant was one of providing information to teachers regarding instructional objectives, teaching methods, instructional materials and evaluation procedures. The second role of the consultant is that of a supportive agent to teachers and administrators who have feelings of uncertainty over implementing new programs.

Hesse, Smith & Nettleton (1973) attempted to obtain classroom teachers', reading consultants' and school principals' views of the competencies that specialized personnel in reading should possess. The results of this study indicated that there are differences in perceptions regarding the role of the reading consultant among administrators, classroom teachers and reading consultants. While classroom teachers wanted consultants to offer diagnosis, instruction and certain kinds of assistance, consultants reported that their most important functions were diagnosing student weaknesses, assisting classroom teachers and offering inservice.

Ahern & White (1974) polled reading consultants from forty-three states across the United States and four Canadian provinces concerning the consultant's role in influencing reading instruction in their locales. Results of the study indicated that:

1. In some areas no formal guidelines exist to give direction to the reading and language arts program.

2. Consultants felt they should decide priorities for education in reading, thereby giving local districts direction for improving reading programs.

Burgy (1974) studied the responsibilities of the reading consultant. She concluded that the reading consultant had five major areas of responsibility.

1. Supervision of Instruction (65% of time) visitation to classes and conferring with teachers about reading problems.

2. Inservice Teacher Education (15% of time)

3. Reading Curriculum Development (15% of time)

4. Public Relations (5% of time)

5. Professional Growth and Development (ongoing activity)

This study clearly indicated that supervision of instruction is a very important responsibility of the reading consultant.

Pikulski & Ross (1979) conducted a perception study to try and determine classroom teachers' perceptions of the reading consultant's role. The results of this study indicated that:

1. Reading consultants were seen as important necessary personnel. Overall only six percent of all teachers surveyed felt it unimportant to have a reading consultant.
2. Teachers felt that reading consultants should know their area well and should respond well in interpersonal relationships.
3. The most important skills and attitudes one could expect from a reading consultant could be categorized into three primary areas: (a) Knowledge, (b) Interpersonal, (c) Administrative/organizational skills. Overall the knowledge items were clearly treated as most important with interpersonal skills next and administrative/organizational skills seen as least important for a reading consultant.

Bean (1979), like Wylie (1969) and Pikulski & Ross (1979) conducted a study to ascertain the functions of reading consultants that were most valued by teachers. Three of the four functions most valued by teachers were

those in which the reading consultant acts as a resource to teachers. They were inservice training, development of materials, and conferring. Also, implicit in the Bean study is that working in the classroom with the teacher is one of the most difficult roles for the reading consultant. Knowledge of reading and expertise in diagnostic instruction do not seem to be enough. In order to work with the classroom teacher it is important for the consultant to possess interpersonal and communication skills.

Mangieri & Heimberger (1980) analyzed the role of the reading consultant in an attempt to discover whether the reading consultant's perception of his/her role differed significantly from the school administrator's perception of the reading consultant's role. Reading consultants and administrators were asked to rank seven functions of the reading consultant in order of importance. The results led to two lists almost in reverse order:

School Administrators	Reading Consultants
Instructor	Inservice Leader
Diagnostician	Resource Person
Evaluator	Investigator
Adviser	Adviser
Investigator	Evaluator
Inservice Leader	Instructor
Resource Person	Diagnostician

(p.529)

It was concluded that school administrators and reading consultants do have widely varying beliefs about how reading consultants can best spend their time. However, neither reading consultants nor administrators expressed disapproval of any of the seven roles described for the reading consultant.

Ngandu & Strum (1981) conducted a study to discover how the reading consultant's perception of his role compared to the school administrator's, special education instructor's and classroom teacher's perception of the reading consultant's role. The results of this study, unlike those of the previously cited studies, indicated that roles rated in the top three positions by reading coordinators were also rated in the top three positions by administrators, special education instructors, and classroom teachers.

Another study which attempted to determine perceptions of the reading consultant's role was the Rupley, Mason & Logan study (1985). This study tried to determine how much disagreement existed between administrators, reading consultants, and professors of reading regarding the job responsibilities i.e., (past, present, and future) of reading consultants. The categories of the reading coordinator's job that were examined related to (a)

diagnostic, (b) inservice, and (c) instructional job responsibilities. In regard to past and present duties of the reading consultant there were some general areas of agreement and disagreement among reading consultants, administrators and professors of reading. The three groups were in very close agreement concerning perceptions of the future role of the reading consultant.

The Newfoundland Supervisors' Special Interest Council issued a special publication in 1981 entitled, "The Program Coordinator: Who ... From Where ... and What." This publication included a brief historical background on the coordinators, a profile of coordinators, and a model of what the roles should be. Babstock's (1981) article states the major tasks of coordinators to be:

> ... diagnosing and identifying curriculum needs; initiating, planning, organizing, and carrying out inservice; working with teachers who request assistance with programs, or who have had problems identified by other personnel; coordinating subject offerings in schools, systems and district wide; inservicing programs introduced by the Department of Education, ensuring that these programs are properly followed, and helping to obtain suitable supplementary

material. (p.18)

The Newfoundland Teacher's Association (1983) outlined a role description for program coordinators in Newfoundland and Labrador. They supmarized three key functions for program coordinators. These functions are as follows:

1. **General:** Program coordinators should possess expertise in curriculum, curriculum implementation, teaching methodology, and curriculum evaluation. Program coordinators should possess functional authority within the areas of curriculum, curriculum implementation, teaching methodology, and curriculum evaluation. This authority supercedes that of Department Heads and Curriculum Personnel functioning at the school and school system level. This authority in these areas is held jointly with school principals.

2. **Position in Administrative Structure:** Program coordinators are responsible to the School Board through the District Superintendent. In the areas of curriculum, curriculum implementation, teaching methodology, curriculum evaluation and administrative matters, the program coordinator reports to and receives direction from the superintendent or his designate.

3. **Duties:** Program coordinators monitor, develop,

refine and adapt school curricula and services as directed by assessments of the needs of the school, school system and district. Program coordinators have administrative responsibility within the domain of their expertise. Program coordinators' duties include:

(a) identifying, diagnosing and assessing curriculum needs,

(b) initiating, planning, organizing, and delivering inservice in response to these needs,

(c) delivering initial and follow-up inservice for programs introduced by the Department of Education, and ensuring that these programs are implemented according to Department direction,

(d) assisting teachers in curriculum delivery,

(e) coordinating program offerings at the district, system and school levels,

(f) assisting the superintendent or his designate in the formulation and modification of district curriculum policy,

(g) assisting principals and teachers in the identification, location and acquisition of suitable supplementary materials for programs.

(h) evaluating school, school system, and district programs, and

(i) assisting as required in the selection and formative evaluation of school staff.

Summary

Throughout the preceding sections, role expectation theory has been examined. It seems clear from the research presented that the individual's perception of his role may differ sharply from the perception held by others in his role set. Recent research has also indicated that if role relationships are to function in the educational setting there must be some degree of overlap in the perception of expectations by several complementary role incumbents.

A description of specific job responsibilities associated with the role of the reading program coordinator, as outlined in the literature, has been presented. It was noted that the reading coordinator should be a change agent who possesses interpersonal and communication skills and is able to aid teachers in the instructional improvement process.

Most of the studies reviewed indicated that differences do exist between reading coordinators' perceptions of their role in comparison to teachers' perceptions of the coordinator's role.

Chapter III

Methodology

Introduction

The methodology consists of two major parts. The first part describes the locale of the study, the sample population of the study, the research instrument used and the pilot study. The second part concentrates on the distribution and return of the questionnaire and the method used for analysis of the data.

The Locale of the Study

The study involved the entire province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The province is divided into 35 school districts which include 21 Integrated School Districts, 12 Roman Catholic School Districts, one Pentecostal School District, and one Seventh Day Adventist School District. Although the province has 35 School Districts, only 32 School Districts were used in this study due to the fact that three of the school districts did not have reading program coordinators.

The 19 Integrated School Districts in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador used in this study are given in Table 1.

Table 1

Integrated School Districts Used in the Study

101. Vinland	112. Burin Peninsula
103. Deer Lake	113. Bay D'Espoir-Hermitage-Fortune Bay
104. Green Bay	114. Port Aux Basques
105. Exploits Valley	115. Bay of Islands - St. Georges
106. Notre Dame	116. St. Barbe South
107. Terra Nova	117. Labrador East
108. Cape Freels	118. Labrador West
109. Bonavista-Trinity-	126. Burgeo
110. Avalon North	129. Conception Bay South
111. Avalon Consolidated	

It should be noted that Integrated Board #102 Straits of Belle Isle and Board #127 Ramea Integrated were not used in this study due to the fact that neither of these boards has a reading program coordinator.

The 12 Roman Catholic School Districts throughout the province of Newfoundland and Labrador used in the study are given in Table 2.

Table 2

Roman Catholic School Districts Used in the Study

501.	Bay St. George	508.	Gander-Bonavista-Connaigre
502.	Burin Peninsula	509.	Humber-St. Barbe
503.	Conception Bay Center	510.	Labrador
504.	Conception Bay North	511.	Placentia-St. Marys
506.	Exploits-White Bay	512.	Port Aux Port
507.	Ferryland	514.	St. John's

All Roman Catholic School Districts in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador were included in the study because all of these school districts had reading program coordinators. The Pentecostal Assemblies School Board was included in the study because they had a reading program coordinator. The Seventh Day Adventist School District was not included in the study due to the fact that they did not have a reading program coordinator.

Population of the Study

For this study a letter and a questionnaire (see Appendix B) was sent to 34 district reading coordinators for the primary/elementary grades. Also included in this study were 200 randomly selected primary and elementary teachers from across the province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The target sample of returns on the questionnaire for primary and elementary teachers was 100 although the larger number of 200 was used when randomly selecting and sending out questionnaires.

The population of reading coordinators for this study was obtained from the Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Education Directory for the school year 1986-87. There was one School Board that had two reading/language arts program coordinators, one for primary/elementary and one for high school. Since the study focused on primary/elementary teachers' perceptions of the role of the reading program coordinator only one of these reading coordinators (primary/elementary) was included in the study. The sample population of primary/elementary teachers for the study was obtained from the Department of Education Teachers' Payroll list for the school year 1986-87.

Instrument and Materials

A questionnaire (see Appendix B) was compiled on the basis of a study by Pikulski & Ross (1979) and by a review of the literature on the role of the reading coordinator. The questionnaire was divided into two parts. Part I, which contained 14 items, was a background information section in which respondents were required to give information regarding their present positions, their age, sex, the grade level being taught and the teaching certificate held.

Part II of the questionnaire contained 38 items and focused on classroom teachers' and reading coordinators' perceptions regarding the job competencies expected of the reading coordinator in the following areas: (a) Knowledge, (b) Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes and (c) Administrative and Organizational Activities. A one through six response scale ranging from strongly agree (1), to not applicable (6), was used for each of the 38 job competencies listed in the questionnaire.

The Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted to ensure that the questionnaire was valid and reliable. A 45 item questionnaire (see Appendix A) was compiled on the basis of a

study by Pikulski & Ross (1979) and by a review of the literature. The questionnaire was submitted to two reading faculty members at Memorial University of Newfoundland, three reading program coordinators, and one vice principal-classroom teacher to verify the subcategories i.e., (Knowledge, Interpersonal and Administrative Job Competencies) used in the questionnaire. Changes were made in the original questionnaire on the basis of this pilot study. Decisions were made regarding the deletion of some items, and some items which originally included two duties of the reading coordinator were rewritten and ambiguous language changed. Also, a change was made in the format of the questionnaire. Originally there was one questionnaire for reading program coordinators and primary/elementary teachers. The questionnaire was changed to include two formats (e.g., one for classroom teachers and one for reading program coordinators). The revised questionnaires each contained thirty-eight identical items. These questionnaires differed from the original questionnaire in only one respect, in that the instructions for completion of the revised questionnaires were worded so that they would allow respondents to indicate their perceptions of the actual role of the reading program coordinator rather than the ideal role of

the reading program coordinator.

Distribution and Return of the Questionnaire

Table 3 indicates the two groups to whom questionnaires were mailed and by whom returned.

Table 3

Distribution and Return of Questionnaires

	Reading Coordinators	Classroom Teachers	Total
Questionnaires Sent	34	200	234
Usable Returns	29	100	129
Non-Usable Returns	2	20	22
Percentage of Usable Returns	88	50	55

Questionnaires were mailed to each subject in late April, 1987. An introductory letter, a stamped, self-addressed envelope and a request to return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible were also included. The

introductory letter for reading program coordinators, teachers and principals explained the purpose of the study and assured confidentiality of individual responses to the questionnaire. On May 29, 1987 one hundred of the teacher questionnaires had been returned in usable form. Another twenty questionnaires had been returned but were unusable. Also, by May 29, 1987, twenty-nine of the reading program coordinators surveyed had returned their questionnaires. Four reading program coordinators had not responded to the questionnaire, so telephone calls were placed to the reading coordinators on June 1, 1987 asking for their cooperation in completing and returning the questionnaire. Since the end of the school year was approaching it was assumed that teachers and coordinators would be busy with reports and other year-end finishing activities, therefore June 10, 1987 was set as a cut-off date for incoming questionnaires.

Treatment of the Data

The data collected in this study was analyzed to determine the following:

1. Does the reading program coordinator's perception of his/her role differ significantly from the classroom teacher's perception of the reading program coordinator's

role? The questionnaire was analyzed for each of the thirty-eight tasks and differences found between the two groups regarding the reading coordinator's role were reported. For each of the thirty-eight tasks the frequency and the mean were calculated for each of the two groups of respondents. Also, a T-test was conducted on the thirty-eight tasks to see if any statistically significant differences existed between item responses for each of the two groups of respondents.

2. Cross tabulations and chi-square coefficients were used to examine a possible relationship between the importance of the reading coordinator's position and classroom teachers' and reading coordinators' perceptions regarding the importance of the role of the reading coordinator.

3. Cross tabulations were used to determine if any relationship existed between classroom teachers' and reading program coordinators' perceptions regarding the distribution of the reading program coordinator's time.

Chapter IV

Analysis of the Data

This chapter analyzes primary/elementary teachers' and reading program coordinators' perceptions of the reading program coordinator's role in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Classroom teachers and reading program coordinators participating in this study were asked to examine thirty-eight possible tasks or skill areas of the reading program coordinator and to indicate their perceptions of the reading coordinator's performance in each of the skill areas identified.

This chapter is divided into five sections. The first section contains a population description of the primary/elementary teachers and the reading program coordinators who participated in the study. The second section presents an item by item, area by area analysis of the three skills areas identified in the questionnaire. Perceptions of the reading coordinator's performance held by classroom teachers and by reading coordinators are reported, together with differences found between classroom teachers' and reading coordinators' perceptions

regarding the reading coordinator's role. The third section presents the responses of reading program coordinators and classroom teachers regarding the importance of having a reading program coordinator at the district level. The fourth section examines classroom teachers' and reading program coordinators' perceptions in reference to the distribution of the reading program coordinator's time. The fifth and final section is a summary of the chapter.

Questionnare.

The respondents who received this questionnaire were asked to circle, for each of the thirty-eight tasks or skills listed, one of six responses concerning their perception of the extent to which the reading coordinator was performing that particular task: (e.g. 1 - Strongly Agree; 2 - Agree; 3 - Neutral; 4 - Disagree; 5 - Strongly Disagree; and 6 - Not Applicable). The data for the population description is presented in eight tables in the first section of this chapter and is followed by a summary discussion. The data for the item by item analysis is presented in three tables corresponding to the three categories within the questionnaire. Each table is followed by a summary analysis. The remaining data

contained in the study regarding the importance of having a reading coordinator at the district level and the distribution of the reading coordinator's time is also presented in tabular form followed by a summary analysis.

Population Description

Presented in this section is data which describes the reading coordinators and the primary/elementary classroom teachers who participated in this study. This section includes a discussion of the following:

1. Sex and age of respondents.
2. Level of education of respondents.
3. Level of education in reading.
4. Total years teaching of respondents.
5. Teaching certification level of respondents.
6. Current teaching level of teachers.
7. Total number of years as a reading coordinator.

Sex and age of respondents.

Table 4 indicates that 72 percent of the reading program coordinators surveyed were male with the remaining 28 percent being female. The classroom teachers surveyed were 72 percent female and 28 percent male.

Table 4

Sex of Respondents

Sex	Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers
Male	21	28
Female	8	72
	N = 29	N = 100

Table 5 indicates that the majority of respondents (83 percent of reading program coordinators and 88 percent of classroom teachers) were between 30-49 years of age.

Table 5

Age of Respondents

Age	Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers
20-29	-	8
30-39	14	55
40-49	10	33
50 or more years	5	4
	N = 29	N = 100

Level of education.

Table 6 indicates that 3 percent of reading program coordinators who responded to this survey had one degree; 42 percent had two or more degrees; 45 percent had a masters degree in Curriculum and Instruction and the remaining 10 percent had a masters of education in an area other than curriculum and instruction.

Table 6

Level of Education of Respondents

Level of Education	Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers
Degree not completed	-	18
B Ed Primary	-	9
B Ed Elementary	-	10
B Ed Secondary	-	1
B A (Ed)	1	44
Other Bachelor Degree	-	2
M.Ed Curriculum and Instruction	13	2
M.Ed (other area)	3	1
Two or more degrees	12	13
	N = 29	N = 100

Of the classroom teachers surveyed, 66 peroent had one degree; 13 percent had two or more degrees; 3 percent

had a masters degree in education, while the remaining 18 percent had no degree completed.

Level of education in reading.

Table 7 indicates that 55 percent of the reading program coordinators surveyed had a masters degree with a concentration in reading; another 36 percent of reading program coordinators had completed between 1-9 graduate courses in reading; 6 percent of reading program coordinators had 1-6 undergraduate courses in reading and only 3

Table 7

Level of Education in Reading

Level of Education in Reading	Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers
M.Ed with concentration in reading	16	3
7-9 graduate courses concentration in reading	5	3
4-6 graduate courses concentration in reading	2	2
1-3 graduate courses concentration in reading	3	3
4-6 undergraduate courses in reading	1	32
1-3 undergraduate courses in reading	1	39
No concentration in reading	1	18
	N = 29	N = 100

percent of reading program coordinators had no concentration in reading.

In reference to the classroom teachers who responded to the questionnaire, 3 percent had a masters degree with a concentration in reading; another 8 percent had completed between 1-9 graduate courses in reading. The majority of classroom teachers (71 percent) had completed between 1-6 undergraduate courses in reading while the remaining 18 percent had no concentration in reading.

Total years teaching.

Table 8 indicates that 55 percent of reading program coordinators who participated in this study had between 10-19 years teaching experience, while another 42 percent of reading program coordinators had twenty or more years

Table 8

Total Years Teaching of Respondents

Total Years Teaching	Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers
0 - 4 years	-	5
5 - 9 years	1	12
10 - 14 years	9	30
15 - 19 years	7	22
20 or more years	12	31
	N = 29	N = 100

teaching experience and the remaining 3 percent of reading program coordinators had between 5-9 years teaching experience.

Of the classroom teachers surveyed, 52 percent had between 10-19 years teaching, 31 percent had 20 or more years teaching experience and the remaining 17 percent had between 0-9 years teaching experience.

Level of teaching certificate.

Table 9 indicates that 24 percent of reading program coordinators who responded to this questionnaire had a grade VI teaching certificate and the remaining 76 percent of reading program coordnators had a grade VII teaching certificate.

Table 9

Level of Teaching Certificate of Respondents

Level of Teaching Certificate	Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers
Grade I	-	-
Grade II	-	3
Grade III	-	1
Grade IV	-	22
Grade V	-	46
Grade VI	7	24
Grade VII	22	4
	N = 29	N = 100

In reference to the classroom teachers surveyed, 68 percent had either a grade IV or grade V teaching certificate; 24 percent had a grade VI teaching certificate and 4 percent had a grade VII teaching certificate. A total of 96 percent of classroom teachers had a teaching certificate ranging from grade IV to grade VII. The remaining 4 percent of classroom teachers had either a grade II or grade III teaching certificate.

Current teaching level.

All teachers who participated in this study were primary and elementary teachers, teaching grades K-6. Table 10 indicates that 46 percent of the teachers part-

Table 10

Current Teaching Level of Classroom Teachers

Current Teaching Level		Classroom Teachers
K-3:	Primary	46
4-6:	Elementary	47
K-6:	Primary and Elementary	7
7-9:	Junior High	-
K-9:		-
10-12:	Senior High	-
7-12:	Junior and Senior High	-
All Grade		-
		N = 100

icipating in the study were primary teachers i.e, (K-3), 47 percent were elementary teachers i.e, (4-6), and the remaining 7 percent were primary and elementary teachers teaching (K-6).

Total years as a reading coordinator.

Table 11 indicates that 66 percent of reading program coordinators who participated in this study had been reading coordinators for 1-9 years; 28 percent had been reading coordinators for 10-14 years; and the remaining 6 percent had been reading coordinators for 15-20 or more years.

Table 11

Total Years as a Reading Coordinator

Total Years as Reading Coordinator	Reading Program Coordinators
0 - 4 years	9
5 - 9 years	10
10 - 14 years	8
15 - 19 years	1
20 or more	1
	N = 29

Item by Item Analysis of Knowledge Area

Analyzed in this section is data concerning the perceived role of the district reading program coordinator in the area of knowledge items. Knowledge area included tasks/skills which required that the reading coordinator have information (generally of a technical-professional nature) available to dispense or apply to teachers as needed.

Table 12 shows the mean score and percentage for each of the 15 items in this area as perceived by reading program coordinators, by classroom teachers and by the total group. The mean score for each item, as given by the total group, indicates that all items received a mean score between 1.71 and 3.22. The mean scores for the total group indicated that responses tended to range from agree to neutral in regard to whether reading program coordinators were performing tasks/skills in this area.

Both classroom teachers and reading program coordinators rated Skill 4, "has a broad understanding of the role of reading in the curriculum", as the skill which reading coordinators demonstrated most in the knowledge area. The reading coordinators rated Skill 6, "is up to date regarding research findings and new theories in reading", as the second skill which they demonstrated most. The

Table 12

Mean Score and Percentage of Each Task in the Knowledge Area as Perceived by Reading Coordinators and by Classroom Teachers

	Tasks		Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers	TOTAL
1.	develops a district wide reading philosophy with the help of teachers, administrators, remedial instructors and other specialized personnel.		1.75	2.59	2.17
		SA-A	(97)	(60)	
		N		(20)	
		D-SD	(3)	(19)	
		NA		(1)	
2.	translates the district philosophy of reading into a working program consistent with the needs of the students, the teachers and the community.		1.55	2.71	2.13
		SA-A	(100)	(55)	
		N		(23)	
		D-SD		(22)	
		NA			
3.	knows the appropriate materials and equipment needed to support the defined district reading program.		1.51	1.98	1.74
		SA-A	(93)	(81)	
		N	(7)	(12)	
		D-SD		(7)	
		NA			
4.	has a broad understanding of the role of reading in the curriculum.		1.32	1.91	1.61
		SA-A	(100)	(85)	
		N		(6)	
		D-SD		(9)	
		NA			
5.	keeps the parents informed of the goals, needs, and rationale of the reading program.		2.82	3.42	3.22
		SA-A	(48)	(14)	
		N	(24)	(28)	
		D-SD	(24)	(57)	
		NA	(4)	(1)	

	Tasks		Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers	TOTAL
6.	is up to date regarding research findings and new theories in reading.		1.37	2.05	1.71
		SA-A	(97)	(76)	
		A	-	(19)	
		D-SD	(3)	(5)	
		NA			
7.	diagnoses specific reading abilities and deficiencies of students.		2.34	3.17	2.75
		SA-A	(76)	(37)	
		N	(7)	(21)	
		D-SD	(10)	(40)	
		NA	(7)	(2)	
8.	helps teachers to diagnose reading strengths and weakness of students.		1.86	3.14	2.50
		SA-A	(90)	(36)	
		N	-	(23)	
		D-SD	(7)	(40)	
		NA	(3)	(1)	
9.	influences the quality of a school system's reading program so that all students move toward their full potential in reading.		1.69	2.87	2.28
		SA-A	(90)	(43)	
		N	(7)	(31)	
		D-SD	(3)	(26)	
		NA			
10.	encourages teachers to use several strategies such as Language Experience, Individualized Reading and Directed Reading Thinking Activities in their reading instruction.		1.44	2.24	1.84
		SA-A	(100)	(70)	
		N		(14)	
		D-SD		(16)	
		NA			
11.	is familiar with a wide variety of children's books.		1.51	2.07	1.79
		SA-A	(97)	(71)	
		N	(3)	(21)	
		SD-D	-	(7)	
		NA	-	(1)	

Tasks	Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers	TOTAL
12. has an indepth knowledge of the reading process.	1.51	1.95	1.73
	SA-A (97)	(81)	
	N -	(12)	
	SD-D (3)	(7)	
	NA -		
13. has a broad background in reading courses.	1.96	2.13	2.04
	SA-A (79)	(67)	
	N (7)	(23)	
	SD-D (14)	(9)	
	NA	(1)	
14. consults regularly with classroom teachers on matters relating to reading instruction.	1.44	3.11	2.27
	SA-A (100)	(38)	
	N	(19)	
	SD-D	(42)	
	NA	(1)	
15. knows the important approaches to the teaching of reading.	1.48	2.19	1.83
	SA-A (97)	(72)	
	N (3)	(19)	
	SD-D	(8)	
	NA	(1)	

Note: Numbers in brackets refer to % of responses to an item.

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
N - Neutral
SD - Strong Disagree
D - Diagree
NA - Not Applicable

classroom teachers rated Skill 12, "has an indepth knowledge of the reading process", as the second skill which reading coordinators demonstrated most in the knowledge items. The mean score of the total group, 1.71, indicates that Skill 6 was rated by both reading program coordinators and classroom teachers as the second skill demonstrated most by reading program coordinators.

The two skills in the knowledge area which were perceived as demonstrated most by the reading program coordinator as indicated by the mean scores of the total group were Skill 4, "has a broad understanding of the role of reading in the curriculum", and Skill 6, "is up to date regarding research findings and new theories in reading".

Classroom teachers' and reading program coordinators' perceptions of the reading program coordinator's performance (as indicated by mean scores) differed in regard to certain tasks in the knowledge area. The reading program coordinator's performance, as rated by classroom teachers, was considerably less than that rated by reading program coordinators on 6 of the 15 tasks/skills in the knowledge area. The six tasks which classroom teachers rated the reading program coordinator as performing least were Task 7, Task 8, Task 14, Task 9, Task 2 and Task 5. A discussion of each of the six tasks follows:

(A) **Task 7, "diagnoses specific reading abilities and deficiencies of students".** The reading coordinator's performance as perceived by classroom teachers was less than that perceived by reading program coordinators. Only 37 percent of classroom teachers agreed or strongly agreed that reading coordinators were performing Task 7. Another 21 percent of classroom teachers indicated neutral responses regarding Task 7, while 40 percent of teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that reading coordinators were performing Task 7. However, 76 percent of reading program coordinators indicated by their strongly agree or agree response that they perceived themselves as performing Task 7.

(B) **Task 8, "helps teachers to diagnose reading strengths and weaknesses of students".** The reading coordinator's performance as perceived by classroom teachers, was less than that perceived by reading program coordinators. Only 36 percent of classroom teachers indicated, by their agree or strongly agree response, that they perceived reading coordinators to be performing Task 8. Another 23 percent of classroom teachers indicated neutral responses in regard to Task 8, while 40 percent of classroom teachers

disagreed or strongly disagreed that reading coordinators were performing Task 8, whereas, 90 percent of reading program coordinators agreed or strongly agreed that they were performing Task 8.

(C) **Task 14, "Consults regularly with classroom teachers on matters relating to reading instruction".** The reading program coordinator's performance as perceived by classroom teachers was less than that perceived by reading program coordinators. Only 38 percent of classroom teachers indicated, by their strongly agree or agree response, that they perceived reading program coordinators to be performing Task 14. Another 19 percent of classroom teachers indicated neutral responses in regard to Task 14, while 42 percent of classroom teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that reading program coordinators were performing Task 14, whereas, 100 percent of reading program coordinators agreed or strongly agreed that they were performing Task 14.

(D) **Task 9, "influences the quality of a school system's reading program so that all students move toward their full potential in reading".** The reading coordinator's performance as perceived by classroom teachers was less than that perceived by reading

program coordinators. Only 43 percent of classroom teachers agreed or strongly agreed that reading program coordinators were performing Task 9. Another 31 percent of the classroom teachers indicated neutral responses regarding Task 9 while the remaining 26 percent of the classroom teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that reading program coordinators were performing Task 9, whereas, 90 percent of reading program coordinators strongly agreed or agreed that they were performing Task 9.

(E) Task 2, "translates the district philosophy of reading into a working program consistent with the needs of the students, the teachers and the community". The reading program coordinator's performance as perceived by classroom teachers was less than that perceived by reading coordinators. Only 55 percent of classroom teachers agreed or strongly agreed that reading program coordinators were performing Task 2. Another 23 percent of classroom teachers indicated neutral responses in regard to Task 2, while the remaining 22 percent of classroom teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that reading program coordinators were performing Task 2, whereas, 100 percent of reading coordinators agreed or

strongly agreed that they were performing Task 2.

(F) Task 5, "Keeps the parents informed of the goals, needs and rationale of the reading program." Neither reading program coordinators nor classroom teachers rated the reading coordinator highly on performance of Task 5. Only 14 percent of classroom teachers strongly agreed or agreed that reading coordinators were performing Task 5. Another 28 percent of classroom teachers indicated a neutral response to Task 5, while 57 percent of classroom teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that reading program coordinators were performing Task 5.

In summary, it appears that (based on mean scores and percentages) reading coordinators rated themselves highly on performance of 14 of the 15 tasks/skills listed in the knowledge section of the questionnaire. The two skills which reading coordinators rated themselves as demonstrating most were Skill 4 and Skill 6. The task which reading coordinators rated themselves as performing least was Task 5, "keeps the parents informed of the goals, needs and rationale of the reading program". Only 48 percent of reading program coordinators perceived themselves as performing this task.

In contrast, classroom teachers perceived reading

program coordinators as performing to a greater degree only 9 of the 15 tasks/skills in the knowledge section of the questionnaire. The two skills which classroom teachers rated reading program coordinators as demonstrating most were Skill 4 and Skill 12. The six tasks which classroom teachers rated reading coordinators as performing least, were Task 2, Task 5, Task 7, Task 8, Task 9 and Task 14.

Item by Item Analysis of Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes

Analyzed in this section is data concerning the perceived role of the reading program coordinator in the area of Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes. Interpersonal skills and attitudes section included items on personal-social qualities and attitudes that could allow the coordinator to interact more effectively with classroom teachers. Table 13 shows the mean score and percentage for each of the eight skills listed under "Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes", as perceived by reading program coordinators, by classroom teachers, and the total group.

The mean scores for the skills in this area for the total group were between 1.76 and 2.01. The mean scores for the total group indicated that responses tended to

Table 13

Mean Score and Percentage of Each Skill in the Area Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes as Perceived by Reading Coordinators and Classroom Teachers

	Tasks		Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers	TOTAL
16.	has confidence in his/her own ability.		1.75	1.94	1.76
		SA-A	(93)	(79)	
		N	(4)	(17)	
		D-SD	(3)	(4)	
		NA			
17.	has the ability to criticize constructively.		1.62	2.37	1.99
		SA-A	(97)	(65)	
		N	(3)	(23)	
		D-SD		(12)	
		NA			
18.	establishes rapport and open communication with teachers.		1.51	2.43	1.97
		SA-A	(100)	(61)	
		N		(19)	
		D-SD		(20)	
		NA			
19.	avoids conveying the impression of having the answer to all problems faced by teachers.		1.51	2.51	2.01
		SA-A	(93)	(60)	
		N	(7)	(22)	
		D-SD		(18)	
		NA			
20.	encourages the implementation of promising ideas.		1.48	2.28	1.88
		SA-A	97	(65)	
		N	(3)	(26)	
		D-SD		(9)	
		NA			
21.	Works effectively in one to one relationships.		1.44	2.59	2.01
		SA-A	(100)	(51)	
		N		(33)	
		D-SD		(15)	
		NA		(1)	

Tasks		Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers	TOTAL
22. works effectively in group settings.		1.69	2.33	2.01
	SA-A	(93)	(68)	
	N	(7)	(21)	
	D-SD		(11)	
	NA			
23. perceives his/her primary role as being a helper to teachers.		1.41	2.37	1.89
	SA-A	(93)	(64)	
	N	(7)	(20)	
	D-SD		(16)	
	NA			

Note: Numbers in brackets refer to % of responses to an item.

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
N - Neutral
SD - Strongly Disagree
D - Disagree
NA - Not Applicable

range from strongly agree to agree.

Reading program coordinators rated Skill 23, "perceives his/her primary role as being a helper to teachers", as the foremost skill which they were demonstrating and Skill 21, "works effectively in one to one relationships", as the second skill which they were demonstrating most. Classroom teachers rated Skill 16, "has confidence in his/her own ability", as the foremost skill demonstrated by reading program coordinators, and Skill 20, "encourages the implementation of promising ideas", as the second skill which reading program coordinators demonstrated most.

The two skills in the area of Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes which reading coordinators were perceived by both reading coordinators and classroom teachers as demonstrating most were Skill 16, "has confidence in his/her own ability", and Skill 20, "encourages the implementation of promising ideas".

Classroom teachers' and reading program coordinators' perceptions of the reading program coordinator's performance differed (as indicated by mean scores) in regard to certain skills in the area of Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes. On Skill 21, "works effectively in one to one relationships", the reading program coordinator's perform-

ance as rated by classroom teachers was considerably less than that rated by reading program coordinators. Only 51 percent of classroom teachers indicated by a strongly agree or agree response that they perceived reading program coordinators as performing Skill 21. Another 33 percent of classroom teachers indicated neutral responses in regard to Skill 21, whereas, 100 percent of reading program coordinators agreed or strongly agreed that they were performing Skill 21.

Reading coordinators rated themselves highly on performance of all the skills listed under Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes. The two skills which reading coordinators rated themselves as demonstrating most were Skill 23 and Skill 21.

In contrast, classroom teachers perceived reading program coordinators as performing to varying degrees, seven of the eight skills listed in this section of the questionnaire. The two skills which classroom teachers rated reading program coordinators as demonstrating most were Skill 16 and Skill 20. The skill which classroom teachers rated the reading coordinator as demonstrating least was Skill 21.

Item by Item Analysis of Administrative and Organizational Activities

Analyzed in this section is data concerning the perceived role of the reading program coordinator in the task area of Administrative and Organizational Activities. Administrative and organizational activities included tasks related to the organization, guidance and direction of the reading program. Table 14 shows the mean score and percentage for each of the 15 tasks listed under "Administrative and Organizational Activities", as perceived by reading program coordinators, by classroom teachers and by the total group.

The mean score for tasks in this area for the total group were between 1.71 and 3.15. The mean scores for the total group indicated that responses tended to range from agree to neutral in regard to whether reading program coordinators were performing tasks in this area.

The two tasks in the area of Administrative and Organizational Activities which classroom teachers, reading program coordinators and the total group perceived the reading program coordinator as performing most were Task 35, "attends and participates in local, regional and national workshops, conferences and meetings concerned with the improvement of reading instruction", and Task 31,

Table 14

Mean Score and Percentage of Each Task in the Area of Administrative and Organizational Activities as Perceived by Reading Coordinators and by Classroom Teachers

	Tasks		Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers	TOTAL
24.	orients beginning teachers to the philosophy, procedures and materials for the school reading program.		1.58	2.84	2.21
		SA-A	(90)	(34)	
		N	(10)	(44)	
		D-SD		(21)	
		NA		(1)	
25.	has reading materials available for the teacher to supplement reading programs.		1.93	2.66	2.29
		SA-A	(86)	(52)	
		N	(10)	(21)	
		D-SD	(4)	(27)	
		NA			
26.	initiates and supervises experimental and innovative instructional strategies.		2.06	2.78	2.42
		SA-A	(79)	(44)	
		N	(14)	(31)	
		D-SD	(7)	(25)	
		NA			
27.	previews and evaluates the selection of reading and language arts textbooks, tests and other media.		2.06	2.50	2.28
		SA-A	(83)	(53)	
		N	(10)	(33)	
		D-SD	(4)	(14)	
		NA	(3)		
28.	directs district wide testing programs involving reading achievement.		3.24	3.04	3.14
		SA-A	(28)	(36)	
		N	(28)	(34)	
		D-SD	(41)	(26)	
		NA	(3)	(4)	
29.	compiles and interprets profiles of standardized reading test scores.		3.34	2.97	3.15
		SA-A	(31)	40	
		N	(17)	34	
		D-SD	48	21	
		NA	4	5	

	Tasks		Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers	TOTAL
30.	conducts evaluation programs that accurately determine the effectiveness of the existing reading program.		2.79	3.15	2.97
		SA-A	(52)	(32)	
		N	(24)	(31)	
		D-SD	(21)	(34)	
		NA	(3)	(3)	
31.	organizes inservice sessions that give teachers a better understanding of the reading process and how to teach reading.		1.58	2.37	1.97
		SA-A	(93)	(70)	
		N	(7)	(15)	
		D-SD		(15)	
		NA			
32.	arranges for short term, informal workshops in which groups of teachers may give specific attention to certain problems that may arise in carrying out the instructional program in reading.		1.62	2.76	2.19
		SA-A	(90)	(52)	
		N	(10)	(17)	
		D-SD		(31)	
		NA			
33.	evaluates inservice programs to see if they are achieving desired ends and to discover ways of improving future programs.		1.75	2.88	2.31
		SA-A	(86)	(41)	
		N	(7)	(33)	
		D-SD	(7)	(26)	
		NA			
34.	heads committees to develop guides, curriculum or courses of study in reading.		2.00	2.68	2.34
		SA-A	(76)	(49)	
		N	(17)	(30)	
		D-SD	(4)	(19)	
		NA	(3)	(2)	

	Tasks		Reading Program Coordinators	Classroom Teachers	TOTAL
35.	attends and participates in local, regional and national workshops, conferences and meetings concerned with the improvement of reading instruction.		1.44	1.99	1.71
		SA-A	(97)	(78)	
		N	(3)	(19)	
		D-SD		(3)	
		NA			
36.	provides leadership in getting cooperation from parents, teachers, administrators and other specialized personnel for the reading program.		1.79	2.92	2.35
		SA-A	(86)	(40)	
		N	(14)	(29)	
		D-SD		(31)	
		NA			
37.	spends funds allocated for reading materials wisely.		1.79	2.82	2.30
		SA-A	(86)	(35)	
		N	(7)	(52)	
		D-SD	(4)	(6)	
		NA	(3)	(7)	
38.	prepares an annual report for the School Board summarizing the year's activities and makes recommendations for change if necessary.		1.65	3.17	2.41
		SA-A	(86)	(27)	
		N	(10)	(55)	
		D-SD	(4)	(3)	
		NA		(15)	

Note: Numbers in brackets refer to % of responses to an item.

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
N - Neutral
SD - Strongly Disagree
D - Disagree
NA - Not Applicable

"organizes inservice sessions that give teachers a better understanding of the reading process and how to teach reading".

Classroom teachers' and reading program coordinators' perceptions of the reading program coordinator's performance differed in regard to certain tasks in the area of Administrative and Organizational Activities. The reading program coordinator's performance, as rated by classroom teachers, was considerably less than that rated by reading program coordinators on 6 of the 15 tasks in the area of Administrative and Organizational Activities. The six tasks which classroom teachers rated the reading program coordinator as performing least were Task 38, Task 36, Task 33, Task 24, Task 37 and Task 26. A discussion of each of the six tasks follows:

(A) Task 38, "prepares an annual report for the school board summarizing the years activities and makes recommendations for change if necessary". Only 27 percent of classroom teachers indicated by their strongly agree, agree response that they perceived reading program coordinators as performing Task 38. Another 55 percent of classroom teachers indicated a neutral response regarding Task 38, whereas, 86 percent of reading program coordinators indicated by

their strongly agree, agree response that they perceived themselves as performing Task 38.

(B) **Task 36, "provides leadership in getting cooperation from parents, teachers and other specialized personnel for the reading program".** Regarding Task 36 only 40 percent of classroom teachers strongly agreed or agreed that reading program coordinators were performing this task. Another 29 percent of classroom teachers indicated a neutral response to Task 36, while the remaining 31 percent of classroom teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that reading program coordinators were performing Task 36, whereas, 86 percent of the reading program coordinators agreed or strongly agreed that they were performing Task 36.

(C) **Task 33, "evaluates inservice programs to see if they are achieving desired ends and to discover ways of improving future programs".** Only 41 percent of classroom teachers strongly agreed or agreed that reading coordinators were performing Task 33. Another 33 percent of classroom teachers indicated a neutral response regarding Task 33, while 26 percent of classroom teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that reading program coordinators were performing

Task 33, whereas, 86 percent of reading program coordinators agreed or strongly agreed that they were performing Task 33.

(D) Task 24, "orients beginning teachers to the philosophy, procedures and materials for the school reading program". Only 34 percent of classroom teachers agreed or strongly agreed that reading program coordinators were performing Task 24. Another 43 percent of classroom teachers indicated neutral responses regarding Task 24, while 21 percent of classroom teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that reading program coordinators were performing Task 24, whereas, 90 percent of reading coordinators agreed or strongly agreed that they were performing Task 24.

(E) Task 37, "spends funds allocated for reading materials wisely". Only 35 percent of classroom teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they perceived reading program coordinators as performing Task 37. Another 52 percent of classroom teachers indicated a neutral response regarding the performance of Task 37, whereas, 86 percent of reading program coordinators indicated by their strongly agree or agree response that they perceived

themselves as performing Task 37.

(F) Task 26, "initiates and supervises experimental and innovative instructional strategies". Only 44 percent of classroom teachers agreed or strongly agreed that reading program coordinators were performing Task 26. Another 31 percent of classroom teachers indicated a neutral response regarding the performance of Task 26, while 25 percent of classroom teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that reading program coordinators were performing Task 26, whereas, 79 percent of reading program coordinators indicated by their strongly agree or agree response that they perceived themselves as performing Task 26.

In summary, it appears that (based on mean scores and percentages) reading coordinators were very positive in the rating of their performance on the majority of tasks in the Administrative and Organizational section of the questionnaire. In contrast, the reading coordinator's performance as rated by classroom teachers was considerably less than that rated by reading program coordinators on 6 of the 15 tasks in the area of Administrative and Organizational Activities. The six tasks which classroom teachers rated reading program coordinators as performing least were Task 38, Task 36, Task 33, Task 24, Task 37 and Task 26.

Summary

Table 15 shows the mean score ranking of the thirty-eight tasks as perceived by classroom teachers and reading program coordinators. Table 15 indicates that reading program coordinators' and classroom teachers' perceptions of the reading coordinator's performance of the thirty-eight tasks differed.

Both classroom teachers and reading program coordinators ranked Skill 4, "has a broad understanding of the role of reading in the curriculum", as the foremost skill demonstrated by the reading program coordinator. The second skill demonstrated most by the reading program coordinator as ranked by the classroom teacher was Skill 16, "has confidence in his/her own ability", whereas the second skill demonstrated most by the reading program coordinator as ranked by the reading program coordinator was Skill 6, "is up to date regarding research findings and new theories in reading".

As previously stated, Table 15 indicates the differences in reading program coordinators' and classroom teachers' ranking of the reading coordinator's performance of the 38 tasks/skills listed in the questionnaire. Several notable differences in the ranking of the tasks/skills were Task 14, Skill 21, and Skill 23.

Table 15

Mean Score Ranking for Each of the Thirty-Eight Tasks as Perceived by Classroom Teachers, and Reading Program Coordinators

Tasks	Classroom Teachers	Reading Coordinators
1	19	24
2	23	15
3	4	10
4	1	1
5	38	36
6	6	2
7	36	33
8	34	28
9	28	22
10	10	4
11	7	10
12	3	10
13	8	30
14	33	4
15	9	8
16	2	16
17	13	19
18	16	10
19	18	10
20	11	8
21	19	4
22	12	22
23	15	3
24	27	16
25	21	29
26	25	32
27	17	32
28	32	37
29	31	38
30	35	35
31	13	16
32	24	19
33	29	24
34	22	31
35	5	4
36	30	26
37	26	26
38	36	21

Task 14, "consults regularly with classroom teachers on matters relating to reading instruction", was ranked differently by classroom teachers and reading coordinators. The mean score ranking of Task 14 for classroom teachers was 33, whereas, reading coordinators' ranking of this task was 4.

Also Skill 21, "able to work effectively in one to one relationships", was ranked differently by classroom teachers and reading coordinators. The mean score ranking of Skill 21 for classroom teachers was 19, whereas, reading program coordinators' ranking of this task was 4.

Skill 23, "perceives his/her primary role as being a helper to teachers", was ranked differently by classroom teachers and reading program coordinators. The mean score ranking of Skill 23 for classroom teachers was 15, whereas, reading program coordinators' ranking of this task was 3.

In summary, the mean score ranking of the thirty-eight tasks did indicate differences in reading program coordinators' and classroom teachers' perceptions of the reading program coordinator's performance of the thirty-eight tasks. Although both groups of respondents ranked the reading program coordinator highly on knowing their area well, reading program coordinators, unlike classroom

teachers, rated themselves highly on being able to work effectively in one to one relationships, as being primarily a helper to teachers, and as consulting regularly with classroom teachers on matters relating to reading instruction.

Discussion of Results Regarding the Importance of Having a Reading Coordinator at the District Level

Anabyzed in this section is data concerning the importance of having a reading program coordinator at the district level. Table 16 indicates that teachers were generally positive with respect to the importance of having a reading program coordinator at the district level. Overall, only 3 percent of the classroom teachers felt it was of minor importance to have a reading program coordinator at the district level. Forty-six percent of the teachers indicated that it was important to have a reading program coordinator at the district level. Another 21 percent of the teachers indicated that it was very important to have a reading program coordinator at the district level and the remaining 30 percent of teachers indicated that it was essential to have a reading program coordinator at the district level.

Table 16

Percent and Frequency of RPC and CT Indicating the Importance of Having a RPC at the District Level

Category	Reading Program Coordinators		Classroom Teachers	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Unimportant	0	0	0	0
Minor Importance	0	0	3	3
Important	0	0	46	46
Very Important	5	17	21	21
Essential	24	83	30	30
	N = 29		N = 100	

Table 16 indicates that reading program coordinators were very positive with respect to the importance of having a reading program coordinator at the district level. Seventeen percent of reading program coordinators indicated that it was very important to have a reading program coordinator at the district level and 83 percent of the reading program coordinators indicated that it was essential to have a reading program coordinator at the

district level. Results indicated that reading coordinators were perceived as important, and necessary personnel by classroom teachers and by reading coordinators.

Distribution of Reading Program Coordinators' Time

Reading program coordinators and primary/elementary classroom teachers were asked to indicate the percentage of time they felt the reading program coordinator should spend on each of the following three activities: working directly with children in the classroom; working with teachers on an indvidual basis; and working with teachers on a group basis.

Tables 17, 18, and 19 indicate the percentage of time reading program coordinators and classroom teachers assigned to each of the three activities.

Perceptions regarding percentage of time readng program coordinators should work directly with children in the classroom.

Analyzed in this section is data concerning reading program coordinators' and classroom teachers' perceptions regarding the amount of time reading coordinators should spend working directly with children in the classroom. Table 17 shows the frequency and percentage of these

responses. Responses to these questions suggest that reading program coordinators felt that they should spend less time working directly with children, whereas, classroom teachers felt reading program coordinators should spend a slightly higher percentage of time working directly with children in the classroom.

Table 17

Percent and Frequency of RPC and CT Indicating Percent of Time RPC Should Work Directly With Children

Percent of Time	Reading Program Coordinators		Classroom Teachers	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
0 - 9	10	34.5	18	18.
10 - 19	7	24.1	17	17.
20 - 29	5	17.2	16	16.
30 - 39	2	6.9	16	16.
40 - 49	1	3.4	7	7.
50 - 59	3	10.3	18	18.
60 - 69	1	3.4	2	2.
70 - 79	0	0	3	3.
80 - 89	0	0	2	2.
90 - 100	0	0	1	1.
	N = 29		N = 100	

Results indicated that 35 percent of the reading program coordinators felt that they should spend 0-9 percent of their time working directly with children in the classroom whereas, only 18 percent of classroom, teachers felt that reading program coordinators should spend that amount of their time working directly with children in the classroom. Fifty-nine percent of reading program coordinators indicated that 0-19 percent of the reading program coordinator's time should be spent workng directly with children in the classroom, whereas, 35 percent of classroom teachers felt that 0-19 percent of the reading program coordinator's time should be spent working directly with children in the classroom. A total of 83 percent of reading program coordinators felt they should spend 0-39 percent of their time working directly with children in the classroom compared to 67 percent of classroom teachers who felt that reading program coordinators should spend 0-39 percent of their time working directly with children in the classroom. The remaining 17 percent of reading program coordinators felt that 40-69 percent of their time should be spent working directly with children in the classroom. Twenty-seven percent of classroom teachers indicated that reading program coordinators should spend between 40-69 percent

of their time working directly with children in the classroom. Only 6 percent of classroom teachers indicated that reading program coordinators should spend 70 percent or more of their time working directly with children in the classroom.

It appears that the majority of respondents would not want the reading program coordinator to spend more than 29 percent of their time working directly with children in the classroom. Responses differed in that classroom teachers favoured slightly higher percentages of time for reading program coordinators working directly with children than reading program coordinators did.

Perceptions regarding percentage of time reading program coordinators should work directly with teachers on an individual basis.

Analyzed in this section is data concerning reading program coordinators' and classroom teachers' perceptions regarding the amount of time the reading program coordinator should spend working with classroom teachers on an individual basis. Table 18 shows the frequency and percentage of these responses. Responses to these questions suggest that the majority of reading program coordinators (90 percent) and classroom teachers (96

Table 18

Percent and Frequency of RPC and CT Indicating Percent of Time RPC Should Work With CT on an Individual Basis

Percent of Time	Reading Program Coordinators		Classroom Teachers	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
0 - 9	2	6.9	35	35
10 - 19	6	20.7	21	21
20 - 29	12	41.4	18	18
30 - 39	4	13.8	11	11
40 - 49	2	6.9	11	11
50 - 59	2	6.9	3	3
60 - 69	1	3.4	0	0
70 - 79	0	0	1	1
80 - 89	0	0	0	0
90 - 100	0	0	0	0
	N = 29		N = 100	

percent) indicated that between 0-49 percent of the reading program coordinator's time should be spent working directly with teachers on an individual basis.

Only 7 percent of reading program coordinators felt that they should spend 0-9 percent of their time working with teachers on an individual basis, whereas, 35 percent of classroom teachers indicated that reading program coordinators should spend that amount of time working with classroom teachers on an individual basis. Over 56 percent of classroom teachers indicated that reading program coordinators should spend 0-19 percent of their time working with classroom teachers on an individual basis, whereas, only 28 percent of reading program coordinators indicated that they should spend that amount of time working with classroom teachers on an individual basis. Sixty-two percent of reading program coordinators indicated that they should spend between 20-49 percent of their time working with classroom teachers on an individual basis, whereas, 40 percent of classroom teachers indicated that reading program coordinators should spend 20-49 percent of their time working with classroom teachers on an individual basis.

Both groups of respondents indicated that between 0-49 percent of the reading program coordinator's time should be spent working with classroom teachers on an individual basis. It is also evident from the data presented that reading program coordinators indicated that

they would prefer to spend a greater percentage of time working with classroom teachers on an individual basis than classroom teachers would prefer.

Perceptions regarding percentage of time reading program coordinators should work directly with teachers on a group basis.

Analyzed in this section is data concerning reading program coordinators' and classroom teachers' perceptions concerning the percentage of time reading program coordinators should spend working with classroom teachers on a group basis. Table 19 shows the frequency and percentage of these responses. Responses to these questions suggest that the majority of reading program coordinators (97 percent) and classroom teachers (96 percent) feel that between 0-49 percent of the reading program coordinator's time should be spent working directly with classroom teachers on a group basis. Forty-five percent of reading program coordinators who participated in the study indicated that they should spend between 0-19 percent of their time working with teachers on a group basis. Also 57 percent of classroom teachers indicated that reading program coordinators should spend between 0-19 percent of their time working with teachers on a group basis. Fifty-

Table 19

Percent and Frequency of RPC and CT Indicating Percent of Time RPC Should Work With CT on a Group Basis

Percent of Time	Reading Program Coordinators		Classroom Teachers	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
0 - 9	6	20.7	32	32
10 - 19	7	24.1	25	25
20 - 29	9	31.0	21	21
30 - 39	3	10.3	9	9
40 - 49	3	10.3	9	9
50 - 59	1	3.4	2	2
60 - 69	0	0	1	1
70 - 79	0	0	0	0
80 - 89	0	0	1	1
90 - 100	0	0	0	0
	N = 29		N = 100	

two percent of reading program coordinators indicated that they should spend between 20-49 percent of their time working with teachers on a group basis. Also, 39 percent

of classroom teachers indicated that reading program coordinators should spend between 20-49 percent of their time working with teachers on a group basis.

It appears that both groups of respondents agreed that reading program coordinators should spend up to 49 percent of their time working with teachers on a group basis.

Summary

Two groups of school personnel completed this questionnaire indicating their perceptions of the performance of the district reading program coordinator. These two groups were reading program coordinators and primary/elementary teachers.

The Chapter's main findings regarding the performance of the reading program coordinator as perceived by classroom teachers and reading program coordinators will be summarized in the following points:

1. The role of the district reading program coordinator was seen as important and necessary by a majority of classroom teachers and reading program coordinators.

2. Both reading program coordinators and classroom teachers perceived Skill 4, "has a broad understanding of the role of reading in the curriculum", as the foremost

skill being demonstrated by reading program coordinators, and Skill 6, "is up to date regarding research findings and new theories in reading", as the second skill being demonstrated most by reading program coordinators in the knowledge section of the questionnaire.

3. The reading program coordinator's performance as rated by classroom teachers was considerably less than that rated by reading program coordinators on 13 of the 38 tasks/skills listed in the questionnaire.

4. The 13 tasks rated by classroom teachers as being least performed by reading program coordinators comprise 6 of the 15 tasks in the knowledge area. They include:

(a) Task 2, "translates the district philosophy of reading into a working program consistent with the needs of the students, the teachers, and the community".

(b) Task 5, "keeps the parents informed of the goals, needs and rationale of the reading program".

(c) Task 7, "diagnoses specific reading abilities and deficiencies of students".

(d) Task 8, "helps teachers to diagnose reading strengths and weaknesses of students".

(e) Task 9, "influences the quality of a school systems reading program so that all students move

toward their full potential in reading."

(f) Task 14, "consults regularly with classroom teachers on matters relating to reading instruction".

5. Reading program coordinators rated themselves highly on their performance of 14 of the 15 tasks in the knowledge area. A majority of reading program coordinators did not perceive themselves as performing Task 5, "keeps the parents informed of the goals, needs and rationale of the reading program".

6. Results of mean scores and percentages on knowledge items indicated that reading program coordinators were very positive in their perceptions of their performance on knowledge items, whereas, classroom teachers were less positive in their perceptions of the reading program coordinator's performance of tasks in the knowledge area.

7. Results of the T-test indicated that statistically significant differences existed between both groups of respondents in their perceptions of the reading program coordinator's performance on 14 of the 15 tasks/skills in the knowledge section of the questionnaire. No statistically significant difference existed between responses of classroom teachers and reading coordinators on Task 13.

8. Classroom teachers perceived reading program

coordinators as performing to varying degrees seven of the eight skills in the interpersonal skills and attitudes section of the questionnaire. Classroom teachers rated Skill 21, "able to work effectively in one to one relationships", as the skill least demonstrated by reading program coordinators.

9. Results of mean scores and percentages for reading program coordinators in the area of Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes indicate that reading program coordinators were very positive in their perceptions of their performance of these skills. Reading program coordinators perceived themselves as performing eight of the eight skills in the Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes area.

10. While both groups of respondents perceived the reading program coordinator as performing the skills in the Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes area there was a significant discrepancy in the ratings of classroom teachers and reading coordinators regarding the degree to which these skills were performed by reading program coordinators. Classroom teachers, unlike reading program coordinators, were less positive in their perceptions of the reading program coordinator's performance of the skills in this section of the questionnaire.

11. Statistically significant differences existed between responses of classroom teachers and reading program coordinators on eight of the eight skills in the Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes area.

12. The reading program coordinator's performance as perceived by classroom teachers was considerably less than that perceived by reading program coordinators on 6 of the 15 tasks listed in the Administrative and Organizational section of the questionnaire. They are as follows:

(a) Task 38, "prepares an annual report for the school board summarizing the year's activities and making recommendations for change, if necessary".

(b) Task 36, "provides leadership in getting cooperation from parents, teachers, administrators and other specialized personnel for the reading program".

(c) Task 33, "evaluates inservice programs to see if they are achieving desired ends and to discover ways of improving future programs".

(d) Task 24, "orients beginning teachers to the philosophy, procedures and materials for the school reading program".

(e) Task 37, "spends funds allocated for reading materials wisely".

(f) Task 26, "initiates and supervises experimental and innovative instructional strategies".

13. Reading program coordinators rated themselves as performing a majority of the tasks in the area of administrative and organizational activities.

14. Results of the mean scores and percentages for reading program coordinators and classroom teachers indicated that differences existed in classroom teachers' and reading program coordinators' perceptions of the reading program coordinator's performance in the area of Administrative and Organizational Activities.

15. Statistically significant differences existed between responses of classroom teachers and reading program coordinators on 12 of the 15 tasks in the Administrative and Organizational section of the questionnaire. No statistically significant differences existed on Task 28, Task 29, and Task 30.

16. Both groups of respondents indicated that reading program coordinators should spend 0-49 percent of their time working with teachers on a group basis and 0-49 percent of their time working with teachers on an individual basis. In regard to the amount of time reading program coordinators should spend working directly with children, a majority of classroom teachers and reading program coordinators indicated that they would not want the reading program coordinator to spend more than 29

percent of their time working directly with children in the classroom.

17. Results of the T-test indicated that no statistically significant difference existed between classroom teachers and reading program coordinators on 4 of the 38 tasks listed in the questionnaire. The four tasks were Task 13, Task 28, Task 29 and Task 30.

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

This Chapter is divided into two major sections. The first section summarizes the problem and the findings of the study. The second section contains recommendations and implications for further research.

Summary of the Problem

The major purpose of this study was to analyze the role of the reading program coordinator in an attempt to determine whether the reading program coordinator's perception of his/her role differed significantly from the primary/elementary classroom teacher's perception of the reading program coordinator's role. The overall aim of the study was to help clarify the role of the reading program coordinator in Newfoundland and Labrador by examining the perceptions of primary/elementary classroom teachers and reading program coordinators regarding the role of the reading program coordinator and by examining research relevant to the role of the reading program coordinator.

Conclusions

Analysis and synthesis of all data from the literature and research led to the following findings:

1. It was noted that the reading coordinator should be a change agent who possesses interpersonal and communication skills and is able to guide and direct teachers in the instructional improvement process. The reading coordinator is responsible for planning, organizing, coordinating and appraising the total reading/language arts program of a school district.

2. The responsibilities most often reported for reading coordinators were: reading curriculum development; knowledge of the reading process; leadership in inservice teacher education; expertise in diagnostic instruction; supervision of instruction (which included conferring with teachers) and continued professional growth and development.

Analysis and synthesis of all data from the perceptions of classroom teachers and reading program coordinators who participated in the study led to the following findings:

1. A majority of reading program coordinators and classroom teachers indicated that the role of the district reading program coordinator was perceived as important and

necessary.

2. Among classroom teachers the most performed tasks/skills of the reading program coordinator were in the areas of interpersonal skills and attitudes and the knowledge area. The least performed tasks of the reading program coordinator as perceived by classroom teachers were in the area of administrative and organizational activities.

3. Among reading program coordinators the most performed tasks/skills of the reading program coordinator were in the areas of interpersonal skills and attitudes and the knowledge area. The least performed tasks of the reading coordinator were in the area of administrative and organizational activities.

4. Regarding distribution of the reading program coordinator's time, classroom teachers felt that reading program coordinators should spend a slightly higher percentage of time working directly with children than reading program coordinators did. However, a majority of reading program coordinators and classroom teachers were in agreement that reading program coordinators should spend 0-49 percent of their time working with teachers on a group basis and 0-49 percent of their time working with teachers on an individual basis.

Results of this study indicated that there are differences in perceptions regarding the role of the reading program coordinator between primary/elementary teachers and reading program coordinators. Reading program coordinators were very positive in their perceptions of their performance of the majority of tasks listed in the questionnaire. However, classroom teachers were more critical in their perceptions regarding the reading program coordinator's performance of the tasks listed in the questionnaire. While there was agreement among both groups of respondents that reading program coordinators did perform to some degree all of the tasks listed in the questionnaire, there were distinct differences in classroom teachers' and reading program coordinators' perceptions regarding the degree to which the reading coordinator performed the tasks associated with his/her role.

Recommendations

1. The researcher recommends that the Department of Education in Newfoundland and Labrador define the role of the reading program coordinator outlining as specifically as possible the duties and responsibilities associated with this role. This role description should help to clarify the role of the reading program coordinator and

increase the awareness of teachers, administrators, and other school personnel of the actual services the reading program coordinator should provide. According to Rupley (1985) the identification of existing job responsibilities of reading coordinators should enable the more accurate specification of their role in education thus enhancing the training of reading coordinators and maximizing their benefit to the school reading program.

2. The role of the reading program coordinator as identified by the Department of Education should be examined by individual school boards throughout the province and adapted to suit the needs of their particular district.

The school board, with the help of teachers, principals and other school personnel involved with the reading program coordinator should formulate a role description for the reading program coordinator that meets the needs of their individual districts. As Wiles & Lovell (1983) argue, while it might not be possible to develop a "universal role" which is appropriate for all supervisors, a variety of roles should be defined at the systems level in order to eliminate much of the indefiniteness and lack of understanding currently associated with the role of instructional supervisor. The

role of the reading program coordinator is one of the most important in today's educational system, if its main goal, the improvement of instruction, is carried out. The reading coordinator should be aware of the perceptions of classroom teachers for his/her role in order to accomplish this goal. As outlined in the section on role expectation theory, the reading coordinator's role reflects the demands and expectations of others. What a reading coordinator does or does not do is influenced by the perceptions and expectations of others for his/her role. Reading program coordinators are instructional supervisors whose primary purpose is instructional improvement. They are in a position to influence and shape directly a school district's reading program and to influence teaching behaviour in such a way as to improve learning opportunities for students. Therefore, reading program coordinators should ascertain how their role is perceived by teachers in comparison to how they perceive their own role. This would enable reading program coordinators to serve more effectively in their instructional leadership role.

Implications for Further Research

1. The questionnaire used in this study could be

replicated by reading program coordinators in their individual districts to determine the perceptions of the teachers he/she serves regarding his/her role.

2. This study focused on primary/elementary teachers' perceptions of the reading program coordinator's role. A similar study could be conducted in order to determine Junior/Senior High teachers' perceptions of the role of the reading program coordinator.

3. This study attempted to determine classroom teachers' and reading coordinators' perceptions of the actual role of the reading coordinator. A study could be conducted to compare perceptions of the actual and ideal role of the reading program coordinator.

4. Further research could be conducted to determine perceptions of school administrators, special educational instructors, and other school personnel involved with the reading program coordinator regarding their perceptions of the reading program coordinator's role.

References

Abrell, R. & Hanna, C. (1978). Symbolic interactionism and supervisor teacher relationships. Clearing House, 51, 439-43.

Ahern, P. & White, D. (1974). A state reading consultant: What do you do? Journal of Reading, 17, 344-51.

Allen, J.E. (1972). The right to read: Education's new national priority. In S.L. Sebesta & C.J. Wallen. (Eds). Readings on teaching reading. United States of America: Science Research Associates.

Babin. P. (1981). Canadian curriculum issues in perspective. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

Bean, R.M. (1979). Role of the reading specialist: A multifaceted dilemma. Reading Teacher, 32(4), 409-13.

Bell, L.C. (1982). Supervising reading teachers. Reading World, 21, 333-39.

Blumberg, A. & Amidon, E. (1965). Teachers perceptions of supervisor teacher interaction. Administrators Notebook, 14.

Bohning, G. (1979). Sources of self-development for the reading supervisor. Reading Improvement, 16, 103.5.

Burg, L.; Kaufman, M.; Korngold, B. & Kovner, A. (1978). The complete reading supervisor. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

Burgy, D. (1974). Supervisory strategy in reading. Journal of Reading, 18, 119-21.

Campbell, R.F. (1957). Situational factors in educational administration. In R. Campbell & G. Russell. (Eds), Administrative behaviour in education, (pp.264). New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Cohen, E.G.; Intili, J.K. and Robbins, S.H. (1978). Teachers and reading specialists: Cooperation or isolation. Reading Teacher, 32(3), 281-87.

Criscuolo, N. (1975). Strategies for developing a dynamic reading program. Peabody Journal of Education, 52, 155-59.

Crocker, R.K. & Riggs, F.T. (1979). Improving the quality of education: Challenge and opportunity. St. John's, Newfoundland.

Cushenberry, D. (1983). Helping children develop reading competency for the 21st century. Reading Horizons, 24, 59-63.

Davies, R.A. (1973). The perceived real and perceived ideal roles of the mathematics supervisors. Unpublished Doctors Dissertation, Columbia University.

Dobbin, Sr. T. (1974). Reading problems: A curriculum bulletin on corrective reading for primary and elementary schools. St. John's, Newfoundland.

Drake, S. & Drake, T. (1978). What can supervisors do to improve reading instruction? Illinois School Research and Development, 14, 95-99.

Getzels, J.W. (1958). Administration as a social process. In A.W. Haplin. (Ed). Administrative theory in education, (pp.154). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Gorton, R.A. (1972). Conflict, controversy and crises in school administration and supervision. Iowa: W.M.C. Brown Company Publishers.

Gorton, R.A. (1980). School administration and supervision. Iowa: W.M.C. Brown Company Publishers.

Grace, G.R. (1972). Role conflict and the teacher. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Guarino, S. (1974). Communication for supervisors. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University.

Gue, L.R. (1977). An introduction to educational administration in Canada. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Ltd.

Guss. C. (1961). How is supervision perceived? Educational Leadership, 19, 99-102.

Harker, J.W. (1973). Getting your money's worth from a reading consultant. Journal of Reading, 17(1), 29-31.

Harris, B. (1976). Supervisor compentence and strategies for improving instruction. Educational Leadership, 33, 332-35.

Hesse, K.D.; Smith, R. & Nettleton, A. (1973). Content teachers consider the role of the reading consultant. Journal of Reading, 17(3), 210-4.

Heyns, R.W. (1958). The psychology of personal adjustment. In A. Unruh & H.E. Turner. (Eds). Supervision for change and innovation. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hubeny, D.P. (1985). Role stress and perceived intensity of burnout among reading specialists. Reading World, 24(4), 41-52.

Imagine not being able to read. Then read this. (1986, August). Chatelaine. Toronto: Maclean Hunter-Ltd., p.45.

Jurata, G. (1974). Roles of central office reading personnel. In J. Nemeth. (Ed). Better teachers, better supervisors, better programs. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Katz, D. & Kahn R. (1966). The social psychology of organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lucio, W.H. (1969). The supervisor: New demands, new dimensions. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lucio, W.H. & McNeil, J.D. (1979). Supervision in thought and action. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Mangieri, J. (1980). Perceptions of the reading consultant's role. Journal of Reading, 23, 527-30.

Markowitz, S. (1976). The dilemma of authority in supervisory behaviour. Educational Leadership, 33, 367-72.

Nemeth, J. (1975). Better teachers, better supervisors, better programs. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Newfoundland Teachers Association. (1983). The role of the program coordinator. St. John's, Newfoundland.

Ngandu, K. & Strum, C. (1981). The reading specialists role as perceived by reading specialists, administrators, special education instructors and classroom teachers. Reading Horizons, 22, 29-32.

Oliva, P.F. (1976). Supervision for today's schools. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Otto, W.; Peters, C. & Peters, N. (1977). Reading problems: A multidisciplinary perspective. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Parsons, L.; Oldford, R.; Bullen, F.; Doyle, T. & Condon, R. (1973). Who helps the teacher? St. John's, Newfoundland: Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Pikulski, J.J. & Elliott, R. (1979). Classroom teachers' perception of the reading specialist. Journal of Reading, 23, 126-35.

Prendergast, J. (1978). Establishing the reading consultant as an agent of change. Reading World, 18, 123-31.

Rauch, S.J. (1974). The administrator and the reading program: Clarifying roles of reading personnel. Reading World, 14, 37-39.

Robinson, H.A. (1967). The reading consultant of the past, present and possible future. Reading Teacher, 20(6), 475-82.

Robinson, H.A. & Rauch, S.J. (1965). Guiding the reading program: A reading consultant's handbook. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Robinson, H.M. (1976). Use the trained reading consultant. Reading Improvement, 13, 54-8.

Roles, responsibilities and qualifications of reading specialists. (1968, October). Journal of Reading, 12, 60-63.

Rupley, W.; Mason, G. & Logan, J.W. (1985). Past, present and future job responsibilities of public school reading specialists. Reading World, 24(3), 48-60.

Smith, R. (1975). Preparing specialized reading personnel for central office positions. In J. Nemeth. Better teachers, better supervisors, better programs. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Smith, R.J.; Otto, W. & Hansen, L. (1978). The school reading program: A handbook for teachers, supervisors and specialists. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Special Publication Supervisor's Special Interest Council. (1981). The program coordinator: Who, from where ... and what? A paper presented to the Newfoundland Teachers Association. St. John's, Newfoundland.

Squires, T. (1986). Teachers on wheels can help. The Newfoundland Herald, 41(31), 21.

St. John, W. (1970). A guide to effective communication. In R. Gorton. School administration and supervision. Iowa: W.M.C. Brown Publishers.

Strang, R. (1969). Diagnostic teaching of reading. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., p.3.

The Schools Act 1970. St. John's: Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Department of Education, Section 21.

Vacca, J.L. (1981). Inservice training and the reading specialist: A wider perspective. Reading World, 20, 259-62.

Vatcher, L. (1984). The role of the physical education coordinator: A synthesis of literature and of perceptions in one Newfoundland school district. Unpublished master's thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland.

What's in a name: Reading specialist? (1979). Journal of Reading, 20(7), 623-28.

Wiles, K. & Lovell, J.T. (1983). Supervision for better schools. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Wylie, R.E. (1969). Diversified concepts of the role of the reading consultant. In W. Otto; C. Peters & N. Peters. (Eds). Reading problems: A multidisciplinary perspective. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Appendix A

Pilot Study Questionnaire

February 26, 1987

Dear Fellow Educator,

I am a graduate student in Curriculum and Instruction at Memorial University of Newfoundland. At present, I am preparing a questionnaire for my thesis research on the role of the reading consultant as perceived by classroom teachers and by the reading consultant.

This study is under the direction of Dr. Marc Glassman of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and Dr. Leonard Williams of the Student Teaching Division at Memorial University of Newfoundland.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the role of the reading consultant in an attempt to determine whether the reading consultant's perception of his/her role differs significantly from the classroom teachers' perception of the role of the reading consultant.

I should like to request your assistance in determining content validity of the questionnaire and to verify the sub-categories of knowledge, interpersonal and administrative job competencies of reading consultants which are used in the questionnaire.

The questionnaire has been compiled on the basis of a study by Pikulski and Ross (1979) and by a review of the literature. The questionnaire is divided into two parts:

Part I: Background Information

Part II: Classroom teachers' and reading consultants' perceptions regarding the job competencies expected of the reading consultant in the following areas:

1. Knowledge items
2. Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes
3. Administrative and organizational activities

Your part in the study will include:

1. Indicating whether the items are relevant to the three areas (knowledge, interpersonal and administrative), investigated.

2. Indicating any changes necessary in construction so that each item is worded in a clear and unambiguous fashion.

3. Adding any comments or ideas which you feel would improve the questionnaire.

Your assistance and cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Theresa Jarvis

The total instrument consists of two parts: Form A and Form B.

In Form A, I would appreciate it if you would:

1. Scrutinize the items according to readability, semantic ambiguities, possible confusion, etc.

2. Respond to each item according to the instructions to Form A of the instrument.

3. Classify each item on the sheet marked Appendix I according to the categories identified for the study. The three categories are (A) Knowledge, (B) Interpersonal skills and attitudes, and (C) Administrative skills and organizational activities.

In Form B, I would again appreciate your scrutiny of the items, paying particular attention to semantic ambiguities and possible confusion. Please make appropriate comments in the space provided. If you are satisfied with the wording of the items, please place a check ( ) in the space provided.

Your cooperation is very much appreciated. Please respond at your earliest convenience.

Form A

Questionnaire: The role of the reading consultant as perceived by classroom teachers and by the reading consultant.

This questionnaire is divided into two parts: Part I, Background Information.

Part II, classroom teachers' and reading consultants' perceptions regarding the job competencies expected of the reading consultant in the following areas:

(a) Knowledge

(b) Interpersonal skills and attitudes

(c) Administrative and organizational activities

Part I Background Information

Please respond to questions 1 - 10 by circling the number of the appropriate response.

1. Sex

   1. Male
   2. Female

2. Age

   1. 20 - 29 years
   2. 30 - 39 years
   3. 40 - 49 years
   4. 50 or more years

3. Total years in the teaching profession

   1. 0 - 4 years
   2. 5 - 9 years
   3. 10 - 14 years
   4. 15 - 19 years
   5. 20 or more years

4. Level of teaching certificate

   1. Grade I
   2. Grade II
   3. Grade III
   4. Grade IV
   5. Grade V
   6. Grade VI
   7. Grade VII

5. Job Title

   1. Principal
   2. Vice principal
   3. Classroom teacher
   4. Reading/Language Arts Program Coordinator
   5. Other (please specify)

6. School size

1. Fewer than 100 students
2. 100 - 299 students
3. 300 - 499 students
4. 500 or more

7. Current teaching level

1. K-3: Primary
2. 4-6: Elementary
3. K-6: Primary and Elementary
4. 7-9: Junior High
5. K-9:
6. 10-12: Senior High
7. 7-12: Junior and Senior High
8. All Grade

8. How important do you think it is to have reading consultants available at the board level?

1. unimportant
2. minor importance
3. somewhat important
4. very important
5. absolutely essential

9. How much of the reading consultants time do you think should be spent working directly with children in the classroom?

1. 10-19%
2. 20-29%
3. 30-39%
4. 40-49%
5. 50-59%
6. 60-69%
7. 70-79%
8. 80-89%
9. 90-100%

10. How much of the reading consultants time do you think should be spent working directly with classroom teachers both on an individual basis (demonstration lessons) and on a group basis (inservice sessions)?

1. 10-19%
2. 20-29%
3. 30-39%
4. 40-49%
5. 50-59%
6. 60-69%
7. 70-79%
8. 80-89%
9. 90-100%

Part II

The following statements express feelings that the classroom teacher and the reading consultant might have about the role of the reading consultant at the board level. Please give your own feelings by circling the appropriate point on the scale.

1. strongly agree
2. agree
3. neutral
4. disagree
5. strongly disagree

Knowledge

The competent reading consultant:

1.	Should develop a district wide reading philosophy with the help of teachers, administrators, remedial instructors and other specialized personnel.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Should translate the district philosophy of reading into a working program consistent with the needs of the students, the teacher and the community.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Should identify appropriate materials and equipment needed to support the defined district reading program.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Should have a broad understanding of curriculum and evaluation with special attention to the role of reading in the curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Should keep the public informed of the goals, needs and rationale of the reading program.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Is up-to-date regarding research findings and new theories in reading.	1	2	3	4	5

7.	Can diagnose specific reading abilities and deficiencies of students.	1 2 3 4 5
8.	Should influence the direction and quality of a school system's reading program so that all students move toward their full potential in learning to read.	1 2 3 4 5
9.	Should encourage teachers to use different strategies such as language experience, programmed reading, etc., in their reading instruction.	1 2 3 4 5
10.	Is familiar with a wide variety of children's books.	1 2 3 4 5
11.	Should have an indepth knowledge of the reading process.	1 2 3 4 5
12.	Should have a depth of background in reading and related areas.	1 2 3 4 5
13.	Should help teachers to diagnose reading strengths and weaknesses of students.	1 2 3 4 5
14.	Should consult regularly with classroom teachers on matters relating to reading instruction.	1 2 3 4 5
15.	Should know the important approaches to the teaching of reading.	1 2 3 4 5

Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes

The competent reading consultant:

16.	Communicates well.	1 2 3 4 5
17.	Is experienced in group dynamics and human relations.	1 2 3 4 5
18.	Operates democratically rather than autocratically.	1 2 3 4 5

19.	Has confidence in his/her own ability.	1 2 3 4 5
20.	Has the ability to criticize constructively.	1 2 3 4 5
21.	Can accept and deal with other people's feelings as well as their ideas.	1 2 3 4 5
22.	Establishes rapport and open communication with teachers.	1 2 3 4 5
23.	Avoids conveying the impression of having the answer to all problems faced by teachers.	1 2 3 4 5
24.	Encourages the implementation of promising ideas.	1 2 3 4 5
25.	Is adaptable and flexible.	1 2 3 4 5
26.	Should possess those personal traits of warmth, friendliness, patience and a sense of humor.	1 2 3 4 5
27.	Is interested in helping people, both children and adults.	1 2 3 4 5
28.	Should be an idea person, one who starts persons thinking about new and improved ways of doing things.	1 2 3 4 5
29.	Should be able to work effectively in both one to one relationships and group settings.	1 2 3 4 5
30.	Should conceive his primary role as being a helper to teachers.	1 2 3 4 5

Administrative and Organizational Activities

The competent reading consultant:

31.	Orients beginning teachers as to the philosophy, procedures, and materials for the school reading program.	1 2 3 4 5

32.	Can make reading materials to supplement reading programs, readily available to teachers.	1 2 3 4 5
33.	Initiates and supervises pilot, experimental and innovative instructional strategies.	1 2 3 4 5
34.	Previews and evaluates the selection of reading and language arts textbooks, tests and other media.	1 2 3 4 5
35.	Directs schoolwide testing programs involving reading achievement and capacity.	1 2 3 4 5
36.	Conducts an evaluation program that accurately determines the effectiveness of the existing reading program.	1 2 3 4 5
37.	Organizes inservice sessions that give teachers a better understanding of the reading process and how to teach reading.	1 2 3 4 5
38.	Should prepare an annual report for the school board summarizing the years activities and make recommendations for change.	1 2 3 4 5
39.	Arranges for short term, informal workshops in which groups of teachers may give specific attention to certain problems that arise in carrying out the instructional program in reading.	1 2 3 4 5
40.	Evaluates inservice programs to see if they are achieving desired ends and to discover ways of improving future programs.	1 2 3 4 5
41.	Heads committees to develop guides, curriculum or courses of study in reading.	1 2 3 4 5
42.	Compiles and interprets profiles of standardized reading test scores.	1 2 3 4 5

43.	Attends and participates in local, regional, and national workshops, conferences and meetings concerned with the improvement of reading instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
44.	Spends funds appropriated for reading materials wisely.	1	2	3	4	5
45.	Provides leadership in getting support from parents, teachers, administrators and other specialized personnel for the reading program.	1	2	3	4	5

Definition of Terms

The following definitions of terms are to serve as guidelines for the classification of the items in the enclosed instrument.

1. **Knowledge** - information generally of a technical-professional nature that the consultant should have available to dispense or apply as needed.

2. **Interpersonal** - personal-social qualities and attitudes that should allow the consultant to interact more effectively with students, teachers, administrators and people in general.

3. **Administrative** - skills that should allow the consultant to contribute actively to the organization, guidance and direction of the reading program.

Appendix I to Accompany Form A of the Instrument

Please check the appropriate block according to item classification.

Item No.	Knowledge	Interpersonal	Administrative
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			

Appendix I - continued

Item No.	Knowledge	Interpersonal	Administrative
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
29			
30			
31			
32			
33			
34			
35			
36			
37			
38			
39			
40			
41			

Appendix I - continued

Item No.	Knowledge	Interpersonal	Administrative
42			
43			
44			
45			

Form B

Directions

The following statements are presented to you for your scrutiny. Look for possible confusion, semantic ambiguities, etc. Respond to the items as if you were to rate them on a scale from **strongly agree** to **strongly disagree**. Please state your comments in the space provided. If you are satisfied with the wording of the items, please place a check ( ) in the space provided.

Item	Comment
The competent Reading Consultant:	
1. Should develop a district wide reading philosophy with the help of teachers, administrators, remedial instructors and other specialized personnel.	( )
2. Should translate the district philosophy of reading into a working program consistent with the needs of the students, the teacher and the community.	( )
3. Should identify appropriate materials and equipment needed to support the defined district reading program.	( )
4. Should have a broad understanding of curriculum and instruction with special attention to the role of reading in the curriculum.	( )
5. Should keep the public informed of the goals, needs and rationale of the reading program.	( )
6. Is up-to-date regarding research findings and new theories in reading.	( )

7. Can diagnose specific reading abilities and deficiencies of students. ( )

8. Should influence the direction and quality of a school system's reading program so that all students move toward their full potential in learning to read. ( )

9. Should encourage teachers to use different strategies such as language experience, programmed reading, etc. in their reading instruction. ( )

10. Is familiar with a wide variety of children's books. ( )

11. Should know the important approaches to the teaching of reading. ( )

12. Should have an indepth knowledge of the reading process. ( )

13. Should have a depth of background in reading and related areas. ( )

14. Should help teachers to diagnose reading strengths and weaknesses of students. ( )

15. Should consult regularly with classroom teachers on matters relating to reading instruction. ( )

16. Communicates well. ( )

17. Has experience in group dynamics and human relations. ( )

18. Operates democratically rather that autocratically. ( )

19. Has confidence in his/her own ability. ( )

20. Has the ability to criticize constructively. ( )

21. Can accept and deal with other people's feelings as well as their ideas. ( )

22. Establishes rapport and open communication with teachers. ( )

23. Avoids conveying the impression of having the answer to all problems faced by teachers. ( )

24. Is adaptable and flexible. ( )

25. Should possess those personal traits of warmth, friendliness, patience and a sense of humor. ( )

26. Is interested in helping people, both children and adults. ( )

27. Should be an idea person, one who starts people thinking about new and improved ways of doing things. ( )

28. Should be able to work effectively in both one to one relationships and group settings. ( )

29. Should conceive his primary role as being a helper to teachers. ( )

30. Encourages the implementation of promising ideas. ( )

31. Orients beginning teachers as to the philosophy, procedures and materials for the school program. ( )

32. Can make reading materials to supplement reading programs, readily available to teachers. ( )

33. Initiates and supervises pilot, experimental and innovative instructional strategies. ( )

34. Previews and evaluates the selection of reading and language arts textbooks, tests and other media. ( )

35. Directs school wide testing programs involving reading achievement and capacity. ( )

36. Conducts an evaluation program that accurately determines the effectiveness of the existing reading program. ( )

37. Organizes inservice sessions that give teachers a better understanding of the reading process and how to teach reading. ( )

38. Should prepare an annual report for the school board summarizing the years activities and make recommendations for change. ( )

39. Arranges for short term informal workshops in which groups of teachers may give specific attention to certain problems that arise in carrying out the instructional program in reading. ( )

40. Evaluates inservice programs to see if they are achieving desired ends and to discover ways of improving future programs. ( )

41. Heads committees to develop guides, curriculum or courses of study in reading. ( )

42. Compiles and interprets profiles of standardized reading test scores. ( )

43. Attends and participates in local, regional and national workshops, conferences and meetings concerned with the improvement of reading. ( ) _____

44. Spends funds appropriated for reading materials wisely. ( ) _____

45. Provides leadership in getting support from parents, teachers, administrators and other specialized personnel for reading programs. ( ) _____

Appendix B

Questionnaires I and II and Correspondence

Questionnaire I

For Reading/Language Arts Program Coordinators

Reading Coordinator's Role Survey

This questionnaire is to examine the role of the reading coordinator at the board level as perceived by classroom teachers and by reading coordinators.

It is divided into two parts:

Part I: Background Information

Part II: Classroom teachers' and reading coordinators' perceptions regarding the job competencies of the reading coordinator in the areas of (a) Knowledge; (b) Interpersonal skills and atittudes; and (c) Administrative and organizational activities.

Part I Background Information.

Please respond to questions 1 - 14 by circling the number of the appropriate response.

1. Sex

   1. Male
   2. Female

2. Age

   1. 20 - 29 years
   2. 30 - 39 years
   3. 40 - 49 years
   4. 50 or more years

3. Level of Education

   1. Degree not completed
   2. B.Ed (Primary)
   3. B.Ed (Elementary)
   4. B.Ed (Secondary)
   5. B.A.(Ed)
   6. Other Bachelor Degree, e.g. B.A., B.Sc.
   7. M.Ed (Curriculum and Instruction)
   8. M.Ed (Other area, e.g. Ed.Administration, Ed.Psychology)

4. Level of Education with concentration in reading

   1. M.Ed with concentration in reading
   2. 7 - 9 graduate courses with concentration in reading
   3. 4 - 6 graduate courses with concentration in reading
   4. 1 - 3 graduate courses with concentration in reading
   5. 4 - 6 undergraduate courses in reading
   6. 1 - 3 undergraduate courses in reading
   7. No concentration in reading

5. Total years in the teaching profession

   1. 0 - 4 years
   2. 5 - 9 years
   3. 10 - 14 years
   4. 15 - 19 years
   5. 20 or more years

6. Level of teaching certificate

   1. Grade I
   2. Grade II
   3. Grade III
   4. Grade IV
   5. Grade V
   6. Grade VI
   7. Grade VII

7. Job Title

   1. Principal
   2. Vice principal
   3. Classroom teacher
   4. Reading specialist in the school
   5. Remedial Reading Teacher
   6. Reading or Language Arts Program Coordinator
   7. Other (please specify)

8. School Size

   1. Fewer than 100 students
   2. 100 - 299 students
   3. 300 - 499 students
   4. 500 or more

9. Current teaching level

   1. K-3: Primary
   2. 4-6: Elementary
   3. K-6: Primary and Elementary
   4. 7-9: Junior High
   5. K-9:
   6. 10-12: Senior High
   7. 7-12: Junior and Senior High
   8. All Grade

10. How important do you think it is to have reading coordinators available at the board level?

    1. Unimportant
    2. Minor importance
    3. Important
    4. Very important
    5. Essential

11. How much of the reading coordinator's time do you think should be spent working directly with children in the classroom?

    1. 0 - 9%
    2. 10 - 19%
    3. 20 - 29%
    4. 30 - 39%
    5. 40 - 49%
    6. 50 - 59%
    7. 60 - 69%
    8. 70 - 79%
    9. 80 - 89%
    10. 90 - 100%

12. How much of the reading coordinator's time do you think should be spent working directly with classroom teachers on an individual basis (demonstration lessons)?

    1. 0 - 9%
    2. 10 - 19%
    3. 20 - 29%
    4. 30 - 39%
    5. 40 - 49%
    6. 50 - 59%
    7. 60 - 69%
    8. 70 - 79%
    9. 80 - 89%
    10. 90 - 100%

13. How much of the reading coordinator's time do you think should be spent working directly with classroom teachers on a group basis (inservice sessions)?

1. 0 - 9%
2. 10 - 19%
3. 20 - 29%
4. 30 - 39%
5. 40 - 49%
6. 50 - 59%
7. 60 - 69%
8. 70 - 79%
9. 80 - 89%
10. 90 - 100%

14. If you are a reading or language arts coordinator, please indicate the number of years you have been in this position.

1. 0 - 4
2. 5 - 9
3. 10 - 14
4. 15 - 19
5. 20 or more

Part II

The following statements express job competencies of the reading/language arts coordinator at the board level. Please indicate your perception of what you are doing by circling the appropriate point on the scale.

1	Strongly Agree	SA
2	Agree	A
3	Neutral	N
4	Disagree	DA
5	Strongly Disagree	SD
6	Not Applicable	NA

Knowledge

As a reading/language arts coordinator ...

		SA	A	N	DA	SD	NA
1.	I develop a district wide reading philosophy with the help of teachers, administrators, remedial instructors and other specialized personnel.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	I translate the district philosophy of reading into a working program consistent with the needs of the students, the teachers and the community.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	I know the appropriate materials and equipment needed to support the defined district program.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	I have a broad understanding of the role of reading in the curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	I keep the parents informed of the goals, needs and rationale of the reading program.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.	I keep up-to-date regarding research findings and new theories in reading.	1	2	3	4	5	6

7.	I diagnose specific reading abilities and deficiencies of students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	I help teachers to diagnose reading strengths and weaknesses of students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	I influence the quality of a school system's reading program so that all students move toward their full potential in reading.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	I encourage teachers to use several strategies such as Language Experience, Individualized Reading and Directed Reading Thinking Activities in their reading instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	I familiarize myself with a wide variety of children's books.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	I have an indepth knowledge of the reading process.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	I have a broad background in reading courses.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14.	I consult regularly with classroom teachers on matters relating to reading instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15.	I know the important approaches to the teaching of reading.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes

As a reading/language arts coordinator ...

16.	I have confidence in my own ability.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17.	I have the ability to criticize constructively.	1	2	3	4	5	6

18.	I establish rapport and open communication with teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19.	I avoid conveying the impression of having the answer to all problems faced by teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20.	I encourage the implementation of promising ideas.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21.	I am able to work effectively in one to one relationships.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22.	I am able to work effectively in group settings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23.	I perceive my primary role as being a helper to teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Administrative and Organizational Activities

As a reading/language arts coordinator ...

24.	I orient beginning teachers to the philosophy, procedures and materials for the school reading program.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25.	I have reading materials available for the teacher to supplement reading programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26.	I initiate and supervise experimental and innovative instructional strategies.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27.	I preview and evaluate the selection of reading and language arts textbooks, tests, and other media.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28.	I direct district wide testing programs involving reading achievement.	1	2	3	4	5	6

29.	I compile and interpret profiles of standardized reading test scores.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30.	I conduct evaluation programs that accurately determine the effectiveness of the existing reading programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31.	I organize inservice sessions that give teachers a better understanding of the reading process and how to teach reading.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32.	I arrange for short term, informal workshops in which groups of teachers may give specific attention to certain problems that arise in carrying out the instructional program in reading.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33.	I evaluate inservice programs to see if they are achieving desired ends and to discover ways of improving future programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34.	I head committees to develop guides, curriculum, or courses of study in reading.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35.	I attend and participate in local, regional and national workshops, conferences, and meetings concerned with the improvement of reading instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36.	I provide leadership in getting cooperation from parents, teachers, administrators, and other specialized personnel for the reading program.	1	2	3	4	5	6

37.	I spend funds allocated for reading materials wisely.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38.	I prepare an annual report for the school board summarizing the year's activities and make recommendations for change, if necessary.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Questionnaire II

For Classroom Teachers

Reading Coordinator's Role Survey

This questionnaire is to examine the role of the reading coordinator at the board level as perceived by classroom teachers, and by reading coordinators.

It is divided into two parts:

Part I: Background Information

Part II: Classroom teachers' and reading coordinators' perceptions regarding the job competencies of the reading coordinator in the areas of (a) Knowledge; (b) Interpersonal skills and attitudes; and (c) Administrative and organizational activities.

Part I Background Information

Please respond to questions 1 - 14 by circling the number of the appropriate response.

1. Sex

   1. Male
   2. Female

2. Age

   1. 20 - 29 years
   2. 30 - 39 years
   3. 40 - 49 years
   4. 50 or more years

3. Level of Education

   1. Degree not completed
   2. B.Ed (Primary)
   3. B.Ed (Elementary)
   4. B.Ed (Secondary)
   5. B.A.(Ed)
   6. Other Bachelor Degree, e.g. B.A., B.Sc.
   7. M.Ed (Curriculum and Instruction)
   8. M.Ed (Other area, e.g. Ed.Administration, Ed.Psychology)

4. Level of Education with concentration in reading

   1. M.Ed with concentration in reading
   2. 7 - 9 graduate courses with concentration in reading
   3. 4 - 6 graduate courses with concentration in reading
   4. 1 - 3 graduate courses with concentration in reading
   5. 4 - 6 undergraduate courses in reading
   6. 1 - 3 undergraduate courses in reading
   7. No concentration in reading

5. Total years in the teaching profession

1. 0 - 4 years
2. 5 - 9 years
3. 10 - 14 years
4. 15 - 19 years
5. 20 or more years

6. Level of teaching certificate

1. Grade I
2. Grade II
3. Grade III
4. Grade IV
5. Grade V
6. Grade VI
7. Grade VII

7. Job Title

1. Principal
2. Vice principal
3. Classroom teacher
4. Reading specialist in the school
5. Remedial Reading Teacher
6. Reading or Language Arts Program Coordinator
7. Other (please specify)

8. School Size

1. Fewer than 100 students
2. 100 - 299 students
3. 300 - 499 students
4. 500 or more

9. Current teaching level

1. K-3: Primary
2. 4-6: Elementary
3. K-6: Primary and Elementary
4. 7-9: Junior High
5. K-9:
6. 10-12: Senior High
7. 7-12: Junior and Senior High
8. All Grade

10. How important do you think it is to have reading coordinators available at the board level?

    1. Unimportant
    2. Minor importance
    3. Important
    4. Very important
    5. Essential

11. How much of the reading coordinator's time do you think should be spent working directly with children in the classroom?

    1. 0 - 9%
    2. 10 - 19%
    3. 20 - 29%
    4. 30 - 39%
    5. 40 - 49%
    6. 50 - 59%
    7. 60 - 69%
    8. 70 - 79%
    9. 80 - 89%
    10. 90 - 100%

12. How much of the reading coordinator's time do you think should be spent working directly with classroom teachers on an individual basis (demonstration lessons)?

    1. 0 - 9%
    2. 10 - 19%
    3. 20 - 29%
    4. 30 - 39%
    5. 40 - 49%
    6. 50 - 59%
    7. 60 - 69%
    8. 70 - 79%
    9. 80 - 89%
    10. 90 - 100%

13. How much of the reading coordinator's time do you think should be spent working directly with classroom teachers on a group basis (inservice sessions)?

1. 0 - 9%
2. 10 - 19%
3. 20 - 29%
4. 30 - 39%
5. 40 - 49%
6. 50 - 59%
7. 60 - 69%
8. 70 - 79%
9. 80 - 89%
10. 90 - 100%

14. If you are a reading or language arts coordinator, please indicate the number of years you have been in this position.

1. 0 - 4
2. 5 - 9
3. 10 - 14
4. 15 - 19
5. 20 or more

_____

Part II

The following statements express job competencies of the reading/language arts coordinator at the board level. Please indicate your perception of what <u>your</u> reading coordinator is <u>doing</u> by circling the appropriate point on the scale.

1	Strongly Agree	SA
2	Agree	A
3	Neutral	N
4	Disagree	DA
5	Strongly Disagree	SD
6	Not Applicable	NA

Knowledge

The reading/language arts coordinator ...

		SA	A	N	DA	SD	NA
1.	develops a district wide reading philosophy with the help of teachers, administrators, remedial instructors and other specialized personnel.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	translates the district philosophy of reading into a working program consistent with the needs of the students, the teachers and the community.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	knows the appropriate materials and equipment needed to support the defined district program.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	has broad understanding of the role of reading in the curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	keeps the parents informed of the goals, needs and rationale of the reading program.	1	2	3	4	5	6

6.	is up-to-date regarding research findings and new theories in reading.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7.	diagnoses specific reading abilities and deficiencies of students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	helps teachers to diagnose reading strengths and weaknesses of students.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9.	influences the quality of a school system's reading program so that all students move toward their full potential in reading.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10.	encourages teachers to use several strategies such as Language Experience, Individualized Reading and Directed Reading Thinking Activities in their reading instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11.	is familiar with a wide variety of children's books.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	has an indepth knowledge of the reading process.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	has a broad background in reading courses.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14.	consults regularly with classroom teachers on matters relating to reading instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15.	knows the important approaches of the teaching of reading.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Interpersonal Skills and Attitudes

The reading/language arts coordinator ...

16.	has confidence in his/her own ability.	1	2	3	4	5	6

17.	has the ability to criticize constructively.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18.	establishes rapport and open communication with teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19.	avoids conveying the impression of having the answer to all problems faced by teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20.	encourages the implementation of promising ideas.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21.	works effectively in one to one relationships.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22.	works effectively in group settings.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23.	perceives his/her primary role as being a helper to teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Administrative and Organizational Activities

The reading/language arts coordinator ...

24.	orients beginning teachers to the philosophy, procedures and materials for the school reading program.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25.	has reading materials available for the teacher to supplement reading programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26.	initiates and supervises experimental and innovative instructional strategies.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27.	previews and evaluates the selection of reading and language arts textbooks, tests, and other media.	1	2	3	4	5	6

28.	directs district wide testing programs involving reading achievement.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29.	compiles and interprets profiles of standardized reading test scores.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30.	conducts evaluation programs that accurately determine the effectiveness of the existing reading programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31.	organizes inservice sessions that give teachers a better understanding of the reading process and how to teach reading.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32.	arranges for short term, informal workshops in which groups of teachers may give specific attention to certain problems that arise in carrying out the instructional program in reading.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33.	evaluates inservice programs to see if they are achieving desired ends and to discover ways of improving future programs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34.	heads committees to develop guides, curriculum, or courses of study in reading.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35.	attends and participates in local, regional and national workshops, conferences, and meetings concerned with the improvement of reading instruction.	1	2	3	4	5	6

36.	provides leadership in getting cooperation from parents, teachers, administrators, and other specialized personnel for the reading program.	1	2	3	4	5	6
37.	spends funds allocated for reading materials wisely.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38.	prepares an annual report for the school board summarizing the year's activities and make recommendlations for change, if necessary.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Correspondence

St. John's, Newfoundland

Dear Colleague,

I am a graduate student in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Memorial University of Newfoundland. I am conducting a study on the role of the reading coordinator as perceived by the classroom teacher, and by the reading coordinator.

This research is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Marc Glassman of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire, a form letter to teachers and brown envelopes for selected teachers in your school. Each brown envelope contains the questionnaire, the letter, and a stamped self-addressed envelope. Would you please distribute these to the teachers to whom they are addressed? Because the teachers were selected randomly there may be some teachers to whom this questionnaire is not applicable e.g. a music teacher. If this occurs at your school, would you please give the questionnaire to another classroom or reading/language teacher.

The information will be strictly confidential.

Questionnaire responses from your school will be combined with those from other schools. No attempt will be made to identify individual teachers, or schools.

I would appreciate your time and assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Theresa Jarvis

St. John's, Newfoundland

Dear Colleague,

I am a graduate student in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Memorial University of Newfoundland. As part of the requirements for my Masters degree, I am conducting thesis research concerning the role of the reading program coordinator at the school board level.

This research is being conducted under the direction of Dr. Marc Glassman of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Memorial University of Newfoundland.

I would like to request your assistance in my research project. I am enclosing a questionnaire on the role of the reading program coordinator. I would appreciate it if you would complete the questionnaire and return it to me at your earliest convenience.

The information will be strictly confidential. Questionnaire responses from your school will be combined with those from other schools. There will not be any possibility of identifying individual teachers, or schools.

Yours cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Theresa Jarvis

GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

P. O. BOX 4750
ST. JOHN'S, NFLD.
A1C 5T7

March 19, 1987

Ms. Theresa Jarvis
Apartment #304, Building #1A
Valleyview Apartments
St. John's, NF
A1B 1G2

Dear Ms, Jarvis:

This is in reference to your letter of March 3rd inquiring about the job descriptions for District Language Arts Coordinators.

The role of the Department is to set the qualifications and experience required for certification of Coordinators. The actual job specification is the prerogative of the respective District Administration keeping, of course, within the general intention of the purpose for Coordinators which is to coordinate the work of the respective subject area within the schools under its jurisdiction.

At the present time, a Committee is working on the revision of the qualifications and identification of subject areas for Coordinators but it is unlikely that the Department will make any changes to the current policy with respect to autonomy of the Districts.

I trust this information will be of help to you in your study.

Sincerely,

Edna Turpin-Downey, Ed.D.
Assistant Deputy Minister
Educational Programs

ETD/nr