4-1991

A Comparative Study of the Effects of Affective Response Techniques on Seventh Grade Students of Low and High Abilities When Applied to Reading in the Content Areas

James G. Bennett
The College at Brockport

Recommended Citation

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF AFFECTIVE RESPONSE
TECHNIQUES ON SEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS OF LOW AND HIGH
ABILITIES WHEN APPLIED TO READING IN THE CONTENT AREAS.

THESIS

Submitted to the Graduate Committee of the

Department of Education and Human Development

State University of New York

College at Brockport

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree of Master of Science in Education

by

James G. Bennett

State University of New York

College at Brockport

Brockport, New York

April, 1991

SUBMITTED BY

Samra D Bennett

APPROVED BY

Arthur E Smith 4/15/91

Thesis Advisor   Date

Marvin A Been 4/20/91

Second Faculty Reader   Date

Harold H Emmerson 4/23/91

Chair, Graduate   Date
Policies Committee

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to introduce concepts of the Affective Response Approach to Literature to students in two seventh grade classrooms in order to determine whether the use of affective responses changes students' attitudes about reading and about social studies. Also measured was student achievement in both areas.

The subjects for the study were the 88 seventh graders enrolled in the Blessed Sacrament Catholic Junior High School in the 1989-1990 school year. Prior to the study all students were evaluated using a modified Rhody attitude assessment tool in order to measure their attitude toward reading and social studies. A modified primary trait scoring system, modeled after Cooper's writing evaluation tool, was used to measure student aptitude in reading and social studies.

For a period of ten weeks, content area teachers implemented elements of Bleich's heuristic and affective response techniques in covering reading in their perspective areas. The language arts teacher reinforced concepts covered in content areas with expanded uses of both Bleich's heuristic and personal responses. Some seventh graders were absent on test days or failed to complete assignments. These students' scores were not included in the analysis.

i

At the end of the study, the students' abilities and attitudes were again evaluated using the above measurement tools. Results of the study showed a significant increase in both student attitude and. aptitude in both reading and social studies as a result of using affective response approaches. These results were consistant when the class scores were compared as a whole and when they were compared in thirds when grouped by ability.

In all comparisons, student aptitude improved markedly as shown in pre to post test scores. Student attitude scores never reflected the same improvment. In comparison of pre and post test of the top third of the class, attitude assessment scores reflected almost no improvement in attitude due to use of affective response techniques. However, since the attitude of the class as a whole was shown to improve significantly at the end of the study, and since the aptitude of the students, as a whole and at each level, reflected an important improvement, it can be said that affective response techniques are a useful and effective new set of strategies for teaching reading in the content areas.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Page

Table

Chapter I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to introduce concepts of the Affective Response Approach to Literature to students in two seventh grade classrooms in order to determine whether the use of affective responses changes students' attitudes about reading and about social studies. Also measured was student achievement in both areas.

Questions

Is there a significant statistical difference in the mean pretest and posttest scores of the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment (also modified for Social studies) given to seventh grade students who participated in an affective response program? Is there a significant statistical difference between the mean pretests and posttests of the Primary Trait Scoring forms of the students who participated in the program? Is there a significant difference between the improvement of the top 33% of the class as compared to the bottom 33% in each area?

Need for the Study

Many students in the seventh grade have difficulty in reading, writing and social studies. This is due, in part, to the fact that a number of these students are weak readers. Much of the coursework in the content areas consists of reading several pages of text per night. This is extremely difficult for those students with reading problems. Students who dislike reading often turn away from content areas because a great deal of required reading is involved.

Social studies is the content area that most requires students to read, yet, social studies teachers do not have the time or the training necessary to devote to poor or slow readers. They are often occupied with explaining events and concepts that have been previously covered in the text. If these teachers were given a strategy to improve their students' reading comprehension, much time and frustration could be spared.

Often, teachers try to teach such comprehension techniques as SQ3R and QAR to their students. Yet the teaching of complex strategies such as these takes valuable class time in both instruction and evaluation. Some content area teachers feel that this teaching time is not profitably spent because they see little or no improvement in their students' comprehension. If the teacher himself were taught to use tenets of Bleich's heuristic in class discussion and

in comprehension questioning, the burden on the student to learn a new technique would be minimized and the class time spent to teach the strategy would be nominal.

Students using affective response approaches commit more of themselves to the act of comprehending of a text, become more involved in the text and so come to a better understanding of the text (Bleich, 1975). Since David Bleich first experimented with college students enrolled in freshmen English courses, his heuristic has received much attention at the college and high school levels. It is important to conduct research to determine whether his methods can be adapted to reading in the content areas and to determine if the procedure works well with junior high school students.

Definition of Terms

Bleich's Heuristic: A methodology created to help readers approach literature at the higher levels of cognitive thought. This is done by increasing their affective involvement with the text. Various strategies are introduced which enable the reader to apply his own opinions, experiences and perception of the text to his understanding of the text (Bleich, 1979).

Bottom Up Approach: The technique of teaching reading which concentrates on building meaning from the text using decoding skills. Students are taught to concentrate on the

parts of the text (phonics, letter sounds, words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs) in order to reach the ultimate goal of comprehension. The meaning is always found in the text without consideration of the student's personal response.

New Critics Approach: That philosophy which holds that all meaning in literature is to be found in the print without consideration of the biography of the author or of the individual nuances of the readers. Only the print is a valid source of meaning. There is one truth to be uncovered and no deviation is acceptable. (Brooks and Warren, 1947).

Question Answer Relationship: {QAR} A reading strategy used to aid students in reading in the content areas. Students are taught that identitfying the type of questions asked aids in finding answers. Students identify question types as fitting into one of three catagories. The answers are always "Right There" (explicitly stated in the text), "Think and Search" (implicitly stated by the text), or "On My Own" (Suggested by the text but personal experience and opinion form the substance of the answer.)

SO3R: That reading strategy which teaches students to scan textual material for pertinent information. It is used as a comprehension aid in the content areas to enable students to glean from texts only that material which is pertinent to their purpose in reading.

Schemata: Structures of knowledge which develop in peoples' minds through experience.

Top Down Approach: The technique of teaching reading which concentrates on building meaning from the text using context clues. Students are taught to search for meaning in the text as a whole. Students use this knowledge of syntax, semantics and genre to make predictions about the probability of word type and meaning. In this process students continually make predictions and check their guesses against the reality of the text in order to reach the ultimate goal of comprehension. The meaning is always found in the reader based on the student's personal interpretation of the text.

Transactionalism: That reading philosophy which holds that the discovery of meaning in a text is a result of the transaction between a reader and a text. Meaning, to a transactionalist, is found not in the print or in the reader's mind separately. Meaning is derived from mixing a reader's past experiences with perceptions of the print.

Limitations of the Study

1. The greatest limitation of this study would have to be the relatively short time period in which it was performed. The project spanned the ten weeks of a junior high school marking period. This is a relatively short period of time in which to show attitudinal and or

aptitudinal changes. However, the task of aligning the lesson plans of three teachers necessitated limiting the study to a ten week period.

2. The fact that three teachers were used as instructors and evaluators of the research limited the research in that it was impossible to guarantee uniformity of instruction or to monitor teaching styles which could have affected student progress. Therefore the validity of the cause- effect relationships between the use of affective response techniques and attitude/cognitive scores could be called to question due to the adulterations of a variety of teaching techniques.

3. Evaluation of student attitude change was based on pre and posttests of a modified Rhody Reading Attitude Assessment Survey. This is a prevalent survey, however, its effectiveness is not uniformly accepted. Furthermore, this survey has been modified by the researcher to fit the needs of this research and to measure attitudes toward Social studies. These modifications may be called into question by some readers.

4. The evaluation of student aptitude was based on pre and posttests of writing samples. These were rated using Cooper's Primary Trait Scoring Techniques. This technique is not widely used and claims have been made about the subjectivity of the scorer. This fault has

been alleviated somewhat by the fact that three teachers scored the essays. The average score of each essay was used in the statistical analysis.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to introduce elements of David Bleich's heuristic into the content area reading strategies of students in the seventh grade. Since many poor readers turn away from content areas that involve much reading, it was decided that research would best be done on poor readers in social studies classes. Due to the fact that content area teachers prefer to teach their subject over reading it was decided that a reading strategy should be taught to the teachers which could be imparted to the students using a minimal amount of time and a nominal amount of reading instruction. Since Bleich's heuristic most closely fits the ideal, the research centered around instructing the teachers to use his strategies in their classes.

The research was limited by the relatively short duration of the project. The evaluation of student affective and effective progress is subject to some question as is the causal relationship between the heuristic and student response; this is due to the minimal amount of classroom monitoring possible.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to introduce concepts of the Affective Response Approach to Literature to students in two seventh grade classrooms in order to determine whether the use of affective responses changes students' attitudes about reading and about social studies. Also measured was student achievement in both areas.

Reading Comprehension

Overview

Reading comprehension has been the subject of much debate and study. Many experts disagree on the best ways to teach or to improve reading comprehension. Educational philosophies are said to swing, as a pendulum, from one belief to its antithesis. Currently, many researchers have swung toward the idea that the reader is the central component of reading instruction. There has been a shift away from skills towards analysis of response. Yet many proponents of teaching phonics and grammar have strongly defended their approach and their philosophy. The review of the research in this paper reflects the tendancy toward a student centered aproach. However, the researcher does not wish to imply that the teaching of skills should be excluded

or denigrated, merely that a shift of focus should be brought about which includes the strengths of all teachers and strategies.

Karel Rose has come up with a list of points on which reading experts generally agree. It is important to refer to this list when evaluating a new teaching strategy or idea. This is not to say that all ideas must conform to an underlying philosophy of this list, yet the list serves as a good reference for lesson-evaluation.

Points on which reading experts generally agree:

1) Children learn to read by reading
2) Language development contributes to reading success
3) Experience plays an important role in learning to read
4) A positive environment assists the reader
5) Family background affects reading achievement
6) The teacher matters in reading achievement
7) There is no one magic method for teaching reading
8) Learning to read is a cumulative and lifelong process building on previous skills
9) It is important that children acquire independent skills for unlocking words (Rose, 1982).

In the struggle to improve reading comprehension, Patrick Finn has concluded that

> comprehension cannot be taught directly, but can be improved, facilitated, and enhanced (1) through exposure to rich and varied language experiences; (2) through experiences that encourage students to reflect upon and make explicit the connection between their general use of language, their experience, and their knowledge of the world; and (3) through exercises and experiences that encourage students to reflect upon and make explicit the connection between their use of particular aspects of language (those known to cause difficulty) their experience, and their knowledge of the world (Finn, 1985, p. 189).

In the 1930's educators began researching the ways that teachers and students approach learning. Teachers were becoming interested in how students learn from text and from teachers. John Dewey (1939) researched the field of comprehension and analyzed the ways that teachers measure comprehension and the ways that instructors ask questions. He has suggested that instructors move away from simple identification queries and help the students move up the taxonomy of thinking skills.

Dewey described the "art of questioning" as the art of showing pupils how to "direct their own inquiries and so to form in them the habit of inquiry" (1939, p. 266). Dewey offered five suggestions to accomplish this goal.

1) Questions should require students to use information rather than to produce it literally and directly.
2) Emphasis should be on developing the subject and not on getting the one correct answer.
3) Questions should keep subject matter developing; each question should add to a continuous discussion. Questions should not be asked as if each one were complete in itself so that when the question is answered, the matter can be disposed of and another taken up.
4) There should be periodic reviews of what has gone on before in order to extract the net meaning and focus on what is significant in prior discussion and to put old material into the new perspective that later material has supplied.
5) At the end of a question/discussion session there should be a sense of accomplishment and an expectation and desire that more is to come (Dewey, 1939, p.266).

Comprehension has here been portrayed as an element of a greater whole. The study of reading comprehension is then a study of a student's background, family life, and experience.

It is suggested that a problem with comprehension may have little to do with a person's decoding skills, but more to do with synthesis/interpretion skills. "It's not that the majority of students can't read. Most choose not to because they have never been shown how to explore and interpret effectively" (Vacca and Vacca, 1986, p. 6). The challenge, then, is to find ways to assist comprehension through means that encourage interpretation and exploration.

Affective Response

Many researchers have come to the conclusion that true comprehension involves the assimilation of new concepts with personal beliefs and conceptions. A primary researcher in this field is Louise Rosenblatt. A contemporary of Dewey, she was concerned with enhancing and understanding students' abilities to comprehend and interpret literature. Rosenblatt postulates in <u>Literature as Exploration</u> (1938), that the meaning of literature is found not in the text but is created in the interaction between the reader and the text. In order for a reader to come to a whole or even a valid understanding of literature he must "be given the opportunity and courage to approach literature personally, to let it mean something to him directly" (Rosenblatt, 1938, p. 81).

David Bleich (1975) has taken the basic tenets of Rosenblatt's ideas and applied them to the classroom. He teaches students to interpret literature based on their personal reactions to it. Students pick out the most

important word in or their most vivid association to the text, analyse their choice and determine which qualities of the text elicited their response. Their critique of a text is as much an analysis of their ratiocination as it is an evaluation of the work as a whole.

The use of a reader's emotional response to the written word is also useful as a technique to increase reading comprehension for beginning or "slow" readers. Some researchers have advised that instructors downplay the importance of diagnosis, prescription and testing in favor of increased dialogue with the student and the text (Gage, 1971). Educators have come to the conclusion that a student's interpretation of a text, indeed his ability to interpret the text, is largely shaped by his personal experience. Instructors have learned to help students use their experience to help them interpret context clues. For instance, if a reader encounters the words "Some squares do not have four sides" a confusion will result.

> [This] sentence, like all reading situations, demands reader interaction. The [reader] might react in any number of ways. "This is a misprint-it should say, 'all squares have four sides.' No, maybe that's not the kind of square it means; Michael Philbutt is a square, and he doesn't have four sides. No, that's not what it means. Now a square is a plane figure, but it has a front and a back, or does it have a back side? That's either five or six sides"(Heilman, Blair & Rupley, 1981, p. 6).

The reader portrayed here is reacting to the text in a personal way. He is trying to comprehend what he has read

using the knowledge he has gathered from his environment. He uses his schema in order to come to an understanding of new print material. The meaning that he uncovers in the text comes as much from his own environment as it does from the print.

It has been theorized that the reader's background correlates closely with comprehension of the text (Adams and Bruce, 1980). Comprehension is not an automatic result of mastering decoding skills (Cooper, 1986.), but relies more heavily on the reader's prior knowledge of his world. (Harris and Hodges, 1981). Researchers have come to see comprehension as the "building of bridges between the new and the known" (Pearson and Johnson, 1978, p. 24). Comprehension is now seen as an interaction of the reader's schema with the text itself.

Affective Response in Action

A number of researchers have experimented with teaching styles which draw on student shemata in order to comprehend the text. Marie Dionisio has taught her remedial reading students to evaluate literature via letters to the teacher. She has abandoned isolated reading skills in favor of personal response and higher level thinking skills (Dionisio, 1989). Martha Dudley (1989) has used more structured tenets of Atwell and Romano to fit the diverse needs of culturally/ability mixed classes. Carol Giles (1989) has chosen to use study groups and interpersonnel dialogue in her

classes as a means to come to an interpretation of the text. Robert Probst (1988) sees reading as a dialogue with a text. The teaching of skills is secondary to the response to literature as literature.

Bill Corcoran has an interesting analogy to the interpretation of literature. He argues his "case for personal, operational and cultural dimensions of literary response." Like Bleich, he feels that students should start with their initial, visceral response to the work. He sees literature as "anatomies of discourse, as bodies of language to be pleasurably dismembered and reconstituted, no matter how apparently inaccessable and serious the text in question" (Corcoran, 1988, p. 39).

Steven Athanases (1988) sees students as legislators of meaning. He imbues the students with a sense of ownership of the text as he builds on the works of Rosenblatt and Bleich. Carlson (1988) and Schaars (1988) have also successfully implemented the tenets of Rosenblatt and Bleich into their classsrooms. Researchers have shown that increasing student ownership, accountability and involvement with the text increases their success with the text.

Reading/Writing Correlation

Other researchers of the reading process have strongly advocated the integration of reading and writing instruction. The work of Evanechko, Ollila, and Armstrong (1974) indicated that "reading and writing use certain skills in common and

that the presence of those skills should result in better performance in both areas" (Harris and Sipay, 1984, p 87). They determined fluency of language to be the single most important factor in reading success. This ties in with the theories of Kenneth Goodman and Roach Van Allen.

Evanechko suggests reinforcement of language fluency and competency in the use of varying and more complex syntactic structures as the first step in improving reading performance (Harris and Sipay, Ibid). Allen (1969) first described the language experience approach (LEA) in a paper presented at the Early Childhood Lecture Series, Ypsilanti, Mich., in 1969. Harris and Sipay offer this approach as one technique for achieving the goal of improved reading performance through language integration.

> This approach integrates the teaching of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. As described by Allen [ED 034 571], LEA involves allowing students to talk about topics of interest, discuss those topics with others, listen to the language of many authors, dictate their own stories or poems to teachers or other adults, tell stories, explore writing as a recreational activity, write their own books, and relate reading to speaking and writing through hearing their own stories read aloud. (Harris and Sipay, 1984, p 87)

Using LEA ensures increased aptitude in all areas of language use. With enhanced language the students gain enhanced thought (Bruner, 1983). A central component of LEA is dialogue and communication between the students and their peers and their teacher. J. David Cooper, in his textbook, Improving Reading

<u>Comprehension,</u> has suggested some ideas about integrating reading and writing.

Readers and Writers as Composers of Meaning

	Reader	Writer
Planner	Have purpose for reading Generate background	Have purpose for writing Generate background
Composer	Read and compose meaning	Write and compose meaning
Editor	Reread, reflect, revise meaning	Revise
Monitor	Finalize meaning	Finalize copy

The processes of proficient reading and writing not only have many similarities in how they function, but they also tend to be processes that are used together. . . Whenever possible, reading and writing activities should be tied together and not taught as seperate subjects. The teaching of reading and writing together involves

1. teaching students the writing process,
2. pointing out the relationships that exist between reading and writing.
3. using writing activities as a part of the reading lesson and using reading materials as a stimulus for writing.

The teacher should not assume that the teaching of writing automatically improves comprehension or vice versa. Students must be taught how to write just as they must be taught how to comprehend. However, if the two processes are systemetically taught and related to each other, they will reinforce each other (Cooper, J. 1986, p. 312).

What is interesting about Cooper is that he too calls readers composers of meaning. With his advocacy of integration of reading and writing coupled with his belief that meaning is

created (composed) by the reader, he contributes to the beliefs and works of researchers along the Rosenblatt line.

Many teachers and researchers of the teaching of writing have espoused techniques and attitudes that enhance the learning process in all areas. Janet Emig has presented some fallacies about the teaching of writing that can be easily applied to the teaching of reading.

Tenets of Magical Thinking Paradigm--Current Credo

1) Writing is taught--not learned
2) Writing is taught atomistically, bottom up
3) There is essentially one process that serves all
4) Writing Process is linear
5) Writing Process is almost exclusively conscious
6) Because writing is conscious, it can be done swiftly and in order
7) No community or collaboration in writing, it is a silent, solitary entity

Developmental Research Findings

1) Writing is learned
2) Writing process is complex-wholes to parts and back again
3) There is no monolithic writing process
4) Non-linear writing is natural, real
5) Writing is often pre-conscious
6) Writing has varying rhythms
7) Process is enhanced by group work

(Emig, 1987, p.63-4)

The developmental research findings correlate with the beliefs of many researchers of the reading process. For this reason, and because reading and writing have been shown to be two facets of the same process, many research techniques that have been tried in writing experiments are readily adaptable to study of

the reading process. Furthermore, many of these techniques can also be profitably adapted to use in the content areas.

Reading Comprehension in the Content Area

Content area teachers are quite occupied with their caseload. Many look on the field of reading instruction as something complex, overwhelming and beyond their ken. They feel that it is not their job to teach reading. They have enough trouble teaching social studies or science.

According to Vacca and Vacca (1986, p. 7), "a content teacher's job is not to teach skills per se, but to show students how to use reading effectively to comprehend and learn from text materials".

Early (1964) said content area teachers should draw three implications about their role:

1) They have something important to contribute to the reading development of students, but they need not become reading specialists to contribute it.
2) They should not be held responsible for direct reading instruction, since a qualified reading teacher will be in a better position to deliver a program that meets the specialized needs and abilities of learners at every bend of the spiral.
3) A reading program works best when reading specialist and content teachers respect and understand each other's roles (Vacca and Vacca, 1986, p.12).

According to Vacca and Vacca, the teacher's role is often to facilitate the conversations in the classroom. As they see it, classroom learning consists of conversations between a teacher and students, students and other students, and readers and the text (Vacca and Vacca, 1986, p. 5).

If the teacher can follow the questioning guidelines of Dewey, the class will come to interpretations and

comprehensions of the text without the need or the crutch of typical reading comprhension quizzes. In fact, boring, end of chapter study questions can be supplemented, if not supplanted, by discussion sessions involving students as legislators of meaning. Levstik (1986, p. 12) has said that "topics in content areas can often be treated thoughtfully and effectively through narrative text."

What is needed, in fact, what is most helpful, is an infusion of whole language activities into content area strategies. For "in the new paradigm, knowledge is internal and subjective, learning is constructing meaning, and teaching is a dynamic combination of coaching and facilitating (Hiebert and Fisher, 1990, pp. 62-3). The questions need to be student rather than text originated, and the tasks should be authentic. While most teachers who use whole language in reading and writing periods have been unable to make the jump to using whole language in social studies, science, and mathematics (Hiebert and Fisher, 1990), the lessons of Probst, Bleich, and Rosenblatt can easily be adapted to content area reading. Steven Tchudi (1989), whose goal it is to enable all students to use critical thinking skills, calls for "interdisciplinary exploration of a wide range of topics" using a diversified array of media which stretch the boundaries between content areas, making them fairly ephemeral.

The approach of instructors like Tchudi increases a student's awareness of the interrelationship of educational concepts and worldly applications. This is a major benefit of "whole language" approaches to education. When the student is the central component of the learning process, and all the world's experience is the text, the student's learning potential is limited only by his or her ability to learn.

COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

Theories and Models

A number of researchers have studied the correlation between cognitive development and language development. Conclusions have been drawn showing a relationship between cognitive growth through language usage and educational success. Barnes (1976) and Goodman (1987) have devoted much time to deliniating an environment which is most conducive to growth through language development and usage. From their findings a model of a classroom environment can be envisioned which greatly facilitates the learning process.

Given the view of the reader as the central element of the learning process and the reader's experience/schema as the key to unlocking learning potential, it is easy to view the world and all new experiences as a 'text.' Students experience many new worlds through the vicarious activities

in reading. Strategies that help them interpret literature would also help them understand their personal experiences. The converse is also true.

According to Goodman, Smith, Meredith, and Goodman (1987), if you consider reading to be a process rather than a product you may consider learning to also be a process. The goal of educators is to facilitate this process as much as possible. The process is provided by the curriculum; its depth of use is determined by the approach of the teacher and by the ability of the student. A student can be shown ways to evaluate his environment by helping him develop his language. "Language development follows and is facilitated by cognitive development and in turn facilitates such development. Both language and thought expand through this interaction, and it is this expansion that becomes the key objective of the school curriculum" (Goodman, Smith, Meredith & Goodman, 1987, p.3). The more you expose the students to varied language use the more you increase the tendency of that student to expand his schema and so increase his cognitive development (Rumelhart, 1988). The idea is to increase the student's awareness.

The school provides many rich experiences to students. The goal of the educator is to facilitate the student's incorporation of these experiences in his or her own learning process. The school serves as a setting for personal development through language development.

> School for every child is a confrontation of
> between what he "knows" already and what the
> school offers, this is true of both social
> learning and of the kinds of learning which
> constitute the manifest curriculum. Whenever
> school learning has gone beyond meaningless
> rote , we can take it that a child has made
> some kind of relationship between what he knows
> already and what the school has represented
> (Barnes, 1976, p.22).

Due to this 'fact' each student's perception of the school and profit from the lesson varies as his/her schema correlates with the content/language of the lesson.

In Barnes' opinion, it is usually profitable to begin lessons with concrete and familiar ideas. Teachers must contain within a lesson material which the students already understand. Intermingled with the familiar ingredients are new and challenging ideas. Learning is not additive but perceptive/interpretive. Teachers should mix experience with past knowledge, allowing the students to assimilate, conjecture, store and use this knowledge (Barnes, 1976). Remembering that language and learning assist each others' development, it is most profitable to have the students engage in informal, but guided, discussion about their new knowledge.

As students discuss their thoughts and feelings they are forced to put this inchoate information into words (Weaver, 1979, and Chomsky, 1975). In so doing, they clarify their impressions both to themselves and to the group.

As teachers lead such discussions it is important that they ensure that all relevant information is considered.

Every student should be encouraged to contribute to discussion any thoughts and impressions that they have concerning the learning experience. Once the general impressions have been gathered and assimilated by the group, it is neccessary to guide the members of the group to be explicit about facts, to postulate theories that are based on and extended from these facts and the students' primary impressions. Finally the group can consider effects and conclusions of the learning process (Barnes, 1976). This discussion process puts the responsibility to learn on the shoulders of the group as a whole. This model empowers the students to use their personal schemata to come to a comprehension of the new material. Furthermore, this model does not entail reteaching the instructors in new techniques nor does it enatil the purchase of new materials. With this philosophy in mind, it is easy to see how these open discussions can be used in all areas of instruction with an increase of comprehension on the part of the students.

If there are, as Barnes states, two kinds of teaching,[1] then the above technique would surely be of the hypothetical mode. The students are actively involved in the learning. They are the substance of discussion as they contribute to the discussion. In this mode the students feel an ownership

---

[1]   Expository Mode: teacher controlled,may or may not involve student wholly, Hypothethical Mode: Cooperative, more wholly involves student with lesson (Barnes, p114, 1976).

not only of the learning process, but of the content matter as well. This is essential in establishing the setting which Rosenblatt described as central to the workings of transactionalism (Barnes, 1976).

Considering the chart below, with which Barnes contrasts two teaching styles, it is easy to see how closely the methods of the Interpretation Teacher match the ideals of Louise Rosenblatt.

Transformation Teacher

   --Believes knowledge exists in form of public
     disciplines which include content and criteria
     of performance.
   --Values learner's performance insofar as it
     conforms to criteria/discipline.
   --Perceives teacher's task to be
     evaluation/correction of students' performance,
     according to criteria of which he is the
     guardian.
   --Perceives learner as uninformed vessel to be
     filled with knowledge.

Interpretation Teacher

   --Believes knowledge exists in knower's ability to
     organize thought and action.
   --Values learners commitment--shared contribution
     to learning.
   --Perceives teacher's task to be the setting up of
     a dialogue in which the learner can reshape his
     knowledge through interaction with others.
   --Perceives learner as possessing knowledge that
     only needs to be reshaped and stretched.
                                    (Barnes, 1976 pp. 144-145)

Establishing the Atmosphere for Learning

The Interpretation teacher establishes an atmosphere of tentativeness in her classroom. The students are engaged in the learning process rather than sitting on the sidelines. Truth is discovered and created with and by the students rather than for them. An interpretive teacher encourages discussion, thinking aloud, hypothetical explanations. For if teachers demand too much structure and conformity the result might be too little thought (Barnes, 1976).

In a class such as this it is important for the teacher and the students alike to distinguish between speech as reflection and speech as communication (Barnes, 1976). It helps, when grappling with new or difficult material, to talk one's self through the problem. This forces an organization upon previously jumbled thought and emotion. Such dialogue is applicable to classrooms whenever speech as reflection is seen in the "open" interaction of students working/discussing in small groups. This encourages openness, self-evaluation, and more complete answers (Barnes, 1976).

The teacher must serve as a mentor as he models the most beneficial approach to discussion of varied ideas. Barnes (Barnes, 1976) points out that as there are two types of teaching, there are two approaches to discussion.

UNDERSTANDING.........VERSUS............ JUDGING	
Accepts Idea	Positive Evaluation (Good)
Clarifies Understanding	Negative Evaluation (Wrong)
Reflects or Paraphrases Ideas	Counter Proposals, Suggestions
Expands on Someone Else's Idea	Implies Judgments (Should-Should never, you always, everybody ought) --(Barnes, 1976, p. 112)

Some students tend toward the "Judging" approach. They feel that it is their duty to point out errors in other's logic. They point out the good and the bad points of ideas without consideration that these ideas might be good beginnings that need development. Garth Boomer (1987) states that it is of prime importance to stress the understanding mode of sharing ideas. With Rosenblatt and Barnes he puts emphasis on establishing the proper setting for enhancing learning.

> The teachers's role is to make sure that the learners have the opportunity to clarify the problem, to make observations in potentially profitable areas, to form and test hypotheses, and to reflect on the results. To omit any of these opportunities would be to jeopardize the learning (Boomer, 1987, p. 12).

If a setting such as this can be established and sustained, the learners will feel that they own, they create, they benefit from the learning process. They are using their language to asses and to communicate their experiences with the world.

Now that the students no longer feel that meaning and value of learning is not found elsewhere: neither encoded within the text nor enshrouded within the intellect of the teacher, but is within and from their own thoughts and experiences, it is neccessary for the school to "provide intellectually supported experiences for the growth of students' thought and language" (Goodman, Brooks, Meredith & Goodman, 1987, p. 3).

The curriculum must present a challenge to teachers as well as students. The worthiness of the subject matter must be evaluated satisfactorily by both student and teacher. Each must be satisfied with the what and the why of learning (Boomer, 1987). If the literature can be based on the familiar with forays into the challenging, the students will be better equipped to meet the challanges. "Language and thinking develop together as children confront new problematic situations" (Goodman, Smith, Meredith & Goodman, 1987). Ideally, the curriculum and the classroom atmosphere should combine to create opportunity for expansion of student experience, thought, and language.

Established Atmospheres for Learning

Nancy Atwell (1987), Patricia Reed (1987), and Sylvia Ashton-Warner (1987) have each created such atmospheres in their own classrooms. Each of these teachers use dialogue as the main ingredient of the teaching process. Kohl (1984), Rosenblatt (1938), Bleich (1975), and Ashton-Warner (1963)

have in common a sense of student as center. The student is
the one interacting with the text, the school and the world.
The teacher must create a curriculum, a style of questioning,
and environment that stimulates and facilitates the students'
growth.

Nancy Atwell (1987) is perpetually involved in classroom
research. Students in her classrooms, are given choice and
responsibility in book choice. They record their responses
(initially their emotional and affective responses; i.e.
Bleich and Rosenblatt) and opinions in informal letters to
the teacher. A dialogue in written form is established.
This dialogue is easily expanded in the form of classroom
discussions. But the students, and their opinions, form the
impetus of discussion. She has created an atmosphere of
openness and tentativeness. Students are free to ask
questions without undue censure or worry of accusations of
digression. Like Sylvia Ashton-Warner, she has established a
setting where the children know, with out conscious
cognizence, that they own the tools of education. The
subject matter, the vocabulary, the spelling list- all are
from and of the students. The writing process is quite
similar to the process proposed by J. David Cooper (1986):
its central tenet is dialogue.

Atwell is studying much more than the products of the
student's writing. She has even gone beyond study of the
overt writing process. She is studying the background, the

schema, the ratiocination of her students. She communicates closely with her students to determine the sociolinguistic roots of their writing patterns and prejudices. She acknowledges the role that a person's environment has upon a person's writing ability. This is the mirror image of Rosenblatt's emphasis on environmental effects on reading ability.

Patricia Reed (1987) developed specific goals to use in dialogue with students. She stressed the importance of examining students' attitudes toward their past writing, of determining how the students view their writing activities of previous years in order to determine attitudinal patterns and prejudices. She had students "look at their writing of past years and from that identify some attitudes that were very much hurting their writing, and [she] tried to work on changing them" (Reed, 1987, p. 129).

After review of this research it became evident that a student's environment and schema have great influence upon their approach to both reading and writing. Students develop attitudes about reading and writing that effect their ability to comprehend and express language. In order to optimize the students' ability to comprehend and utilize language the subject matter must be appropiate to the student. The transaction between the reader/writer and the text must be stressed, and an atmosphere of openness, tentativeness and

acceptance must be established in the classroom. The
following reccomendations by Goodman et al. (1987) make a
good checklist for establishing the proper setting for
classroom research in helping students learn to read.

```
1]   Encourage creativity in Language Arts
2]   Encourage children to experiment with style
3]   Encourage writing (and reading) while self evaluating
4]   Avoid demanding absolute conformity
     --give ownership to children
5]   Expose children to wide variety of language
6]   Expand ("real"-owned) vocabulary
7]   Encourage risk-taking.
     (Goodman, Smith, Meredith, and Goodman, 1987, p. )
```

Once the researcher has sufficient philosophical
background, it is important to find some models of research.
Some aspects of research can be culled from the works of
Atwell, Ashton-Warner, and Reed. These are excellent models
of determining student background/attitude and for monitoring
change: monitoring the process of language.

David Bleich has supplied an interesting topic for
research. He has set an example of classroom research on
subjective criticism with his work with college students. In
this research the students are asked to read literature from
poetry to novels. They then write essays which detail their
responses to the literature. Specifically they record and
analyse their associations to the work, their
affective/emotional responses, and their opinions concerning
the most important word in the passage or in the work as a
whole. It is fairly obvious that this is a direct contrast
to the tenets of the New Critics. Here, literature is

evaluated in terms of how it effects the reader. The depth of this evaluation is also a measure of the reader's comprehension of the work.

Summary

The research reviewed in this chapter form the philosophical base for establishing a classroom atmosphere which best facilitates student learning. The literature has shown correlations between cognitive growth and affective interaction, cognitive growth and language use, and reading ability and writing ability.

The research of Probst, Rosenblatt, Barnes, Atwell, and others suggests that dialogue with the student and with the text is central to the learning process. These authors have suggested guidelines and approaches which encourage student participation and ownership. Further research has shown ways to integrate cognitive and affective growth and approaches.

David Bleich's heuristic serves as a working model of one technique applicable to content areas in seventh grade. Cooper and Rhody have supplied measurements of student aptitude and ability.

The research reviewed above combines insights into overall classroom philosophy and approach, specific techniques and applications of the tenets of researchers, and accurate methods of evaluating student progress.

CHAPTER III

THE RESEARCH DESIGN

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to introduce concepts of the Affective Response Approach to Literature to students in three seventh grade classrooms in order to determine whether the use of affective responses changes students' attitudes about reading and about social studies. Student achievement in both areas was also measured.

Hypothesis

The following null hypotheses were investigated for this study:

1. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring ability of all students in social studies.

2. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring ability of all students in reading.

3. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring attitude of all students in social studies.

4. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring attitude of all students in reading.

5. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring ability of the top third students in social studies.

6. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring ability of the top third students in reading.

7. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring attitude of the top third students in social studies.

8. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring attitude of the top third students in reading.

9. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring ability of the bottom third students in social studies.

10. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring ability of the bottom third students in reading.

11. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring attitude of the bottom third students in social studies.

12. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring attitude of the bottom third students in reading.

Methodology

The subjects involved in this study were 88 students enrolled in the seventh grade at Blessed Sacrament Catholic Junior High School in the 1989 to 1990 school year. Several students were not used due to absence on test days or to withdrawal from school. The school population is a heterogeneous one in terms of socioeconomic background and ability of students. The seventh grade consists of three classes of approximately 30 students. Classes were grouped to provide a balanced mix of all students. Approximatley 75% of the student population resides in the city of Rochester; 25% live in nearby suburbs.

The Language Arts teacher incorporated concepts of Reading and Social studies in daily lesson and unit plans from the beginning of the year. Reading strategies such as SQ3R and QAR were applied to both short fiction and text book reading. Historical events and conceptual changes were the topics of creative and expository writing assignments. By January of 1990, all students were accustomed to covering content area concepts in Language Arts class.

At the beginning of the third marking period all students were given a modified Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment for reading and for social studies. These tests were modified with the assistance of the reading and the social studies teachers to assess students' attitude toward their classes.

At the same time the students were assigned essays by their content teachers to assess student comprehension of concepts covered in class. These essays were graded by both the content area teacher and the Language Arts teacher. Grades were recorded in both classes. The essays were evaluated using forms developed by the Language Arts and content teachers modeled on Cooper's Primary Trait Scoring technique.

The Language Arts teacher provided the content teachers with a copy of Dewey's "art of questioning" (page 10 of text). Tenets of Atwell, Rosenblatt and Bleich were discussed. It was agreed that each teacher would consciously develop an atmosphere of openness and acceptance in the classroom. (It must be here noted that each of these teachers have over ten years experience with junior high students and that each had already established warm and open classrooms. The ideas of researchers cited in this study often served only to reaffirm attitudes and approaches already in practice in their classrooms).

Over the next ten weeks the 'dialogue with the text' approach was used in all three classes. The teachers met frequently to discuss progress, problems and suggestions. Complete conformity was not consistently met in all classes due to circumstances which often necessitated straight lecture, rote memorization, and skills reinforcement. However, Bleich's heuristic was used consistantly in Language

Arts class to aid in reading text book material and in reading short fiction.

At the end of the ten week period the students were again given the modified Rhody attitude assessments for each content area. The students were also assigned essays which counted for credit in each content area and in Language Arts. The content area teacher and the Language Arts teacher evaluated the essays using the same modified primary trait scoring system used earlier.

Analysis of the Data

Pretest and posttest scores were compared to see if there was a significant statistical difference in student 1) attitude toward reading, 2) attitude toward social studies, 3) aptitude in reading, and 4) aptitude in social studies.

The group was divided into thirds based on the rank of each student's mean scores on the pretest. The pretest and posttest of the top 33% of the class were compared to see if there was a significant statistical difference in student 1) attitude toward reading, 2) attitude toward social studies, 3) aptitude in reading, and 4) aptitude in social studies.

The pretest and posttest of the bottom 33% of the class were compared to see if there was a significant statistical difference in student 1) attitude toward reading, 2) attitude toward social studies, 3) aptitude in reading, and 4) aptitude in social studies.

A correlated _t_ test was used to compare student's individual gains from pretest to posttest in each area.

Limitations of the Study

1. The greatest limitation of this study would have to be the relatively short time period in which it was performed. The project spanned the ten weeks of a junior high school marking period. This is a relatively short period of time in which to show attitudinal and or aptitudinal changes. However, the task of aligning the lesson plans of three teachers neccessitated limiting the study to a ten week period.

2. The fact that three teachers were used as instructors and evaluators of the research limited the research in that it was impossible to guarantee uniformity of instruction or to monitor teaching styles which could have affected student progress. Therefore the validity of the cause effect relationships between the use of affective response techniques and attitude/cognitive scores could be called to question due to the adulterations of a variety of teaching techniques.

3. Evaluation of student attitude change was based on pre and posttests of a modified Rhody Reading Attitude Assessment Survey. This is a prevalent survey, however, its effectiveness is not uniformly accepted. Furthermore, this survey has been modified by the researcher to fit the needs of this research and to

measure attitudes toward social studies. These
modifications may be called into question by some
readers.

4.	The evaluation of student aptitude was based on pre and
posttests of writing samples. These were rated using
Cooper's Primary Trait Scoring Techniques. This
technique is not widely used and claims have been made
about the subjectivity of the scorer. This fault has
been alleviated somewhat by the fact that two teachers
scored the essays. The average score of each essay was
used in the statistical analysis.

Summary

This study was designed to study the effects of
incorporation of Bleich's heuristic in content area reading
of seventh grade students' attitude toward reading and social
studies and on their aptitude in both areas. The scores of
the whole group were examined as were the isolated scores of
the top and bottom thirds of the class. A correlated t test
was used to compare each student's individual gains from
pretest to posttest in each area.

The study was limited by its relatively short duration.
Some readers may question the validity of the attitude
assessments and the primary trait scoring system due to
modifications made by the author. Variations in teacher
attitude and approach may have adulterated the findings due
to the fact that three teachers participated in the research.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to introduce concepts of the Affective Response Approach to Literature to students in two seventh grade classrooms in order to determine whether the use of affective responses changes students' attitudes about reading and about social studies. Also measured was student achievement in both areas.

Findings and Interpretations

The following null hypotheses were investigated for this study:

1. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring ability of all students in social studies.

2. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring ability of all students in reading.

3. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring attitude of all students in social studies.

4. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring attitude of all students in reading.

5. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring ability of the top third students in social studies.

6. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring ability of the top third students in reading.

7. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring attitude of the top third students in social studies.

8. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring attitude of the top third students in reading.

9. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring ability of the bottom third students in social studies.

10. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring ability of the bottom third students in reading.

11. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring attitude of the bottom third students in social studies.

12. There will be no significant statistical difference between the mean pretest and posttest scores measuring attitude of the bottom third students in reading.

The first null hypotheses states that there will be no statistically significant improvement in the ability of all seventh graders studied in social studies as measured by comparison of mean pretest and posttest scores of essays graded with Cooper's Primary Trait Scoring system. The first set of results in summarized in table 1.

Table 1

Mean and Standard Deviation of pretest and posttest scores
measuring all students abilities in social studies
using the primary trait scoring system

	Pretest	Posttest
Number of students	88	88
Mean	11.50	18.73
Standard Deviation	3.00	4.10
Difference in Means	7.23	
t value	18.14	
Significance one-tailed	0.0001	
t crit (88) = 2.65		

The data in table 1 show that there was an important statistical difference (7.23) in the mean pretest and posttest scores of student essays evaluated with the Cooper Primary Trait Scoring System. With 88 degrees of freedom, the calculated t value (18.14) was greater than the critical t value (2.65) required for significance at the 99% confidence level. Therefore the first null hypotheses was rejected.

The second null hypotheses states that there will be no statistically significant improvement in the ability of all seventh graders studied in reading as measured by comparison of mean pretest and posttest scores of essays graded with Cooper's Primary Trait Scoring system. The second set of results in summarized in table 2.

Table 2

Mean and Standard Deviation of pretest and posttest scores
measuring all students abilities in reading
using the primary trait scoring system

	Pretest	Posttest
Number of students	88	88
Mean	11.08	18.36
Standard Deviation	3.06	4.10
Difference in Means	7.28	
t value	18.13	
Significance one-tailed	0.0001	
t crit (88) = 2.65		

The data in table 2 show that there was an important statistical difference (7.28) in the mean pretest and posttest scores of student essays evaluated with the Cooper Primary Trait Scoring System. With 88 degrees of freedom, the calculated t value (18.13) was greater than the critical t value (2.65) required for significance at the 99% confidence level. Therefore the second null hypotheses was rejected.

The third null hypotheses states that there will be no statistically significant improvement in student attitude of all seventh graders studied in social studies as measured by comparison of mean pretest and posttest scores of a modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Form. The third set of results in summarized in table 3.

Table 3

Mean and Standard Deviation of pretest and posttest scores
measuring all students attitudes toward social studies
using a modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Form

	Pretest	Posttest
Number of students	88	88
Mean	48.16	52.28
Standard Deviation	11.91	11.45
Difference in Means	4.13	
t value	4.85	
Significance one-tailed	0.0001	
t crit (88) = 2.65		

The data in table 3 show that there was a significant statistical difference (4.13) in the mean pretest and posttest scores of student attitude as measured by modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Forms. With 88 degrees of freedom, the calculated t value (4.85) was greater than the critical t value (2.65) required for significance at the 99% confidence level. Therefore the third null hypotheses was rejected.

The fourth null hypotheses states that there will be no statistically significant improvement in student attitude of all seventh graders studied in reading as measured by comparison of mean pretest and posttest scores of a modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Form. The fourth set of results in summarized in table 4.

Table 4

Mean and Standard Deviation of pretest and posttest scores
measuring all students attitudes toward reading
using a modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Form

	Pretest	Posttest
Number of students	88	88
Mean	97.06	102.08
Standard Deviation	18.71	18.38
Difference in Means	5.02	
t value	3.93	
Significance one-tailed	0.0002	

t crit (88) = 2.65

The data in table 4 show that there was a significant statistical difference (5.02) in the mean pretest and posttest scores of student attitude as measured by modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Forms. With 88 degrees of freedom, the calculated t value (3.93) was greater than the critical t value (2.65) required for significance at the 99% confidence level. Therefore the fourth null hypotheses was rejected.

The fifth null hypotheses states that there will be no statistically significant improvement in ability of the seventh graders ranked in the top third in social studies as measured by comparison of mean pretest and posttest scores of essays graded with Cooper's Primary Trait Scoring system. The fifth set of results in summarized in table 5.

Table 5

Mean and Standard Deviation of pretest and posttest scores measuring the top 33% students' abilities in social studies using the primary trait scoring system

	Pretest	Posttest
Number of students	29	29
Mean	14.79	21.21
Standard Deviation	1.76	2.04
Difference in Means	6.41	
t value	13.58	
Significance one-tailed	0.0001	
t crit (29) = 2.756		

The data in table 5 show that there was an important statistical difference (6.41) in the mean pretest and posttest scores of student essays evaluated with the Cooper Primary Trait Scoring System. With 88 degrees of freedom, the calculated t value (13.58) was greater than the critical t value (2.756) required for significance at the 99% confidence level. Therefore the fifth null hypotheses was rejected.

The sixth null hypotheses states that there will be no statistically significant improvement in ability of the seventh graders ranked in the top third in reading as measured by comparison of mean pretest and posttest scores of essays graded with Cooper's Primary Trait Scoring system. The sixth set of results in summarized in table 6.

Table 6

Mean and Standard Deviation of pretest and posttest scores measuring the top 33% students' abilities in reading using the primary trait scoring system

	Pretest	Posttest
Number of students	29	29
Mean	14.45	21.00
Standard Deviation	1.30	2.92
Difference in Means	6.55	
t value	11.21	
Significance one-tailed	0.0001	
t crit (29) = 2.756		

The data in table 6 show that there was an important statistical difference (6.55) in the mean pretest and posttest scores of student essays evaluated with the Cooper Primary Trait Scoring System. With 29 degrees of freedom, the calculated t value (11.21) was greater than the critical t value (2.756) required for significance at the 99% confidence level. Therefore the sixth null hypotheses was rejected.

The seventh null hypotheses states that there will be no statistically significant improvement in attitude of the seventh graders ranked in the top third in social studies as measured by comparison of mean pretest and posttest scores of a modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Form. The seventh set of results in summarized in table 7.

Table 7

Mean and Standard Deviation of pretest and posttest scores measuring the top 33% students' attitude in social studies using a modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Form

	Pretest	Posttest
Number of students	29	29
Mean	61.03	61.07
Standard Deviation	5.53	6.04
Difference in Means	0.03	
t value	0.03	
Significance one-tailed	0.4868	
t crit (29) = 2.756		

The data in table 7 show that there was no significant statistical difference (0.03) in the mean pretest and posttest scores of student attitude as measured by modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Forms. With 29 degrees of freedom, the calculated t value (0.03) was not greater than the critical t value (2.756) required for significance at the 99% confidence level. Therefore the seventh null hypotheses was not rejected.

The eighth null hypotheses states that there will be no statistically significant improvement in attitude of the seventh graders ranked in the top third in reading as measured by comparison of mean pretest and posttest scores of a modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Form. The eighth set of results in summarized in table 8.

Table 8

Mean and Standard Deviation of pretest and posttest scores
measuring the top 33% students' attitude in reading
using a modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Form

	Pretest	Posttest
Number of students	29	29
Mean	117.00	118.17
Standard Deviation	7.10	9.11
Difference in Means	1.17	
t value	0.66	
Significance one-tailed	0.2595	
t crit (29) = 2.756		

The data in table 8 show that there was no significant statistical difference (1.17) in the mean pretest and posttest scores of student attitude toward reading as measured by modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Forms. With 29 degrees of freedom, the calculated t value (0.66) was not greater than the critical t value (2.756) required for significance at the 99% confidence level. Therefore the eighth null hypotheses was not rejected.

The ninth null hypotheses states that there will be no statistically significant improvement in ability of the seventh graders ranked in the bottom third in social studies as measured by comparison of mean pretest and posttest scores of essays graded with Cooper's Primary Trait Scoring system. The ninth set of results in summarized in table 9.

Table 9

Mean and Standard Deviation of pretest and posttest scores measuring the bottom 33% students' abilities in social studies using the primary trait scoring system

	Pretest	Posttest
Number of students	29	29
Mean	8.69	17.17
Standard Deviation	1.00	4.77
Difference in Means	8.48	
t value	9.47	
Significance one-tailed	0.0001	

t crit (29) = 2.756

The data in table 9 show that there was an important statistical difference (8.48) in the mean pretest and posttest scores of student essays evaluated with the Cooper Primary Trait Scoring System. With 29 degrees of freedom, the calculated t value (9.47) was greater than the critical t value (2.756) required for significance at the 99% confidence level. Therefore the ninth null hypotheses was rejected.

The tenth null hypotheses states that there will be no statistically significant improvement in ability of the seventh graders ranked in the bottom third in reading as measured by comparison of mean pretest and posttest scores of essays graded with Cooper's Primary Trait Scoring system. The tenth set of results in summarized in table 10.

Table 10

Mean and Standard Deviation of pretest and posttest scores
measuring the bottom 33% students' abilities in reading
using the primary trait scoring system

	Pretest	Posttest
Number of students	29	29
Mean	7.38	16.21
Standard Deviation	1.61	5.07
Difference in Means	8.83	
t value	9.75	
Significance one-tailed	0.0001	
t crit (29) = 2.756		

The data in table 10 show that there was an important statistical difference (8.83) in the mean pretest and posttest scores of student essays evaluated with the Cooper Primary Trait Scoring System. With 29 degrees of freedom, the calculated t value (9.75) was greater than the critical t value (2.756) required for significance at the 99% confidence level. Therefore the tenth null hypotheses was rejected.

The eleventh null hypotheses states that there will be no statistically significant improvement in attitude of the seventh graders ranked in the bottom third in social studies as measured by comparison of mean pretest and posttest scores of a modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Form. The eleventh set of results in summarized in table 11.

Table 11

Mean and Standard Deviation of pretest and posttest scores measuring the bottom 33% students' attitude in social studies using a modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Form

	Pretest	Posttest
Number of students	29	29
Mean	35.48	42.97
Standard Deviation	7.17	11.17
Difference in Means	7.48	
t value	4.80	
Significance one-tailed	0.0001	
t crit (29) = 2.756		

The data in table 11 show that there was a significant statistical difference (7.48) in the mean pretest and posttest scores of student attitude toward social studies as measured by modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Forms. With 29 degrees of freedom, the calculated t value (4.80) was greater than the critical t value (2.756) required for significance at the 99% confidence level. Therefore the eleventh null hypotheses was rejected.

The twelfth null hypotheses states that there will be no statistically significant improvement in attitude of the seventh graders ranked in the bottom third in reading as measured by comparison of mean pretest and posttest scores of a modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Form. The twelfth set of results in summarized in table 12.

Table 12

Mean and Standard Deviation of pretest and posttest scores measuring the bottom 33% students' attitude in reading using a modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Form

	Pretest	Posttest
Number of students	29	29
Mean	77.03	85.07
Standard Deviation	11.78	12.05
Difference in Means	8.03	
t value	3.74	
Significance one-tailed	0.0006	
t crit (29) = 2.756		

The data in table 12 show that there was a significant statistical difference (8.03) in the mean pretest and posttest scores of student attitude toward reading as measured by modified Rhody Attitude Assessment Forms. With 29 degrees of freedom, the calculated t value (3,74) was greater than the critical t value (2.756) required for significance at the 99% confidence level. Therefore the twelfth null hypotheses was rejected.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to integrate elements of Bleich's heuristic into content reading practices in the seventh grade in order to determine if use of affective response techniques would improve junior high students' aptitudes and abilities in content areas.

The results show that all students' abilities in reading and in social studies improved significantly. This was shown to be true whether progress was measured of the whole group, those ranked in the top 33% or those ranked in the bottom 33%.

The results show a greater improvement in student attitude toward reading and social studies of those ranked in the bottom 33% than either those of the whole group or of those in the top 33%. The measured results of the whole population shows a significant improvement in student attitude although the gains of the students in the top third did not show a statistical significant improvement.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to introduce concepts of the Affective Response Approach to Literature to students in three seventh grade classrooms in order to determine whether the use of affective responses changes students' attitudes about reading and about social studies. Also measured was student achievement in both areas.

Conclusions

1. It was determined, as shown in tables 1-4, that there was an important increase in student attitude and aptitude in both reading and social studies when assessed as a whole group.

2. It was determined, as shown in tables 5 and 6, that there was an important increase in student aptitude in reading and social studies when measuring only the gains of those students ranked in the top 33% of the class.

3. It was determined, as shown in tables 7 and 8, that there was no significant increase in student attitude toward reading and social studies when measuring only the gains of those students ranked in the top 33% of the class.

4. It was determined, as shown in tables 9 and 10, that there was an important increase in student aptitude

toward reading and social studies when measuring only the gains of those students ranked in the bottom 33% of the class.

5. It was determined, as shown in tables 11 and 12, that there was a significant increase in student attitude toward reading and social studies when measuring only the gains of those students ranked in the bottom 33% of the class.

Implications of Research

The study shows a marked increase in both the attitudes and aptitudes of all students who used affective response techniques to assist comprehension of text material in both reading and social studies. The student population consists of representations of a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds. They come from single-parent, two-parent, and latchkey homes. About 75% of the students reside in the city of Rochester. About 25% live in suburbia.

All students were asked to respond personally, in writing, to textual material in short fiction and in content areas. There was some marked reluctance to voice opinion honestly and to write copiously. However, in the process of the study, most students learned to actively participate in the learning process as they learned to apply knowledge in their schema to new material discovered in books and in class.

As the study shows, when measured as a whole group, the students enjoyed a significant, and in fact an important increase in their comprehension of material covered in both reading and in social studies. This was illustrated through the significant gains of the scores they received on essays covering content concepts. The attitude of the group as a whole, also improved as is shown in the significant increase of the scores of the attitude survey.

There was a difference in improvement between the students ranked in the top 33% and those ranked in the bottom 33%. The top third of the class already enjoyed some academic sucess in both reading and social studies. Their attitude toward those classes reflected, to some degree, their success. While their grades did reflect a statistically significant improvement, their attitude scores reflected no statistical change.

Those students ranked in the bottom 33% posted important gains in both aptitude and attitude. Their mean posttest scores in aptitude reflected a gain to above the pretest scores of the top 33%. The data in table 13 reflect an insignficant difference (1.76) in means between the pretest scores of the top 33%, and the posttest scores of the bottom 33%. The t value (1.95) is not greater than the critical t value (2.756) required for significance at the 99% confidence level. This shows that the students at the bottom 33% had reached the pre-study comprehension level of the top 33%.

Table 13

Mean and Standard Deviation of pretest and posttest
scores comparing the bottom 33% students' posttest
scores with the top 33% pretest scores in aptitude
using the primary trait scoring system

	Pretest top 33%	Posttest low 33%
Number of students	29	29
Mean	14.45	16.21
Standard Deviation	1.30	5.07
Difference in Means	1.76	
t value	1.95	
Significance one-tailed	0.0291	
t crit (29) = 2.756		

Since it is reasonable to assume that student attitude
toward content areas is somewhat affected by student success,
it is reasonable to expect that attitude improves with
academic success. This was shown to be the case in this
study by the significant statistical increases in gains
reflecting student attitude in both social studies and
reading of those students ranked in the bottom 33%. This
could also explain why there was no significant gain in
attitude scores of the top third of the class. Their
comprehension of content concepts was sufficient to develop a
reasonably good attitude toward reading and social studies
before the study. Participation in this research had no
noticible effect on their attitude, perhaps because their
attitude needed little improvement.

Further research needs to be done in integrating affective responses with math and science. In order to do so it would seem that these less verbal content areas would need to become integrated with those studied above. Whole Language and Language Experience Approaches may offer some avenues of study. Math Their Way promises to open doors to student expression and contribution in this area.

Bleich's heuristic is one aspect of affective response. Affective response is one facet of whole language, child centered approaches. More research needs to be done in bringing students more fully into the learning process. Too many students still see the process and the content of education as being untenable, unusable, and undesirable. It is the primary responsibilty of educators to demonstrate to the students that education is applicable to real life. Increasing student ownership of the content and the process of education through strategies like those outlined above will increase student involvement and so increase student success.

Implications for Classroom Practice

This study was undertaken in order to determine the viability and usefulness of implementing aspects of Bleich's heuristic into content area instruction in the seventh grade. In order to fully integrate the heuristic the researcher had to adopt many tenets of the affective response and child-centered approaches. A gestalt from the point of view of researchers like Rosenblatt, Probst, Bruner, and others had

to be accepted by the researcher. It would not be possible to introduce elements of affective response into the clinically objective classrooms of the New Critics.

The viability of affective response approaches is predicated on a classroom environment which enhances student growth, exploration, and honest response. It could be argued that much of the gain shown in this study is partially a result of the teacher's ability to finally attain such an atmosphere in the classroom. This researcher would concede that student gains were made in part due to a positive learning environment. However, it should be noted that the researcher also feels that the classroom atmosphere was positively enhanced by the nature of the study. While it is true that affective responses work best in an open atmosphere, it is also true that affective responses tend to open and lighten a classroom's atmosphere.

Future researchers in this field, and those who wish to implement Bleich's heuristic must conform to a new order. They must accept nonconformity within their classrooms. They must relinquish some of their authority over content and comprehension; teachers must allow for disagreement over what a passage or a poem means. It is up to the student to form meaning gleaned from the text. It is the teacher's role to establish a setting in which a student can have an enlightening dialogue with the text.

The teacher must trade in comprehension and identification questions for those which encourage thought

and introspection. It is a good idea for a teachers to keep ✓

copies of Dewey's guidelines and Goodman's checklist under

the plastic on his desk blotter for daily reminder and

reinforcement.

Teachers and students must grow accustomed to much

dialogue; they must come to see writing as written discourse,

a changable, flowing and imperfect conversation with teacher

and self. Both will need to learn to evaluate such discourse

on the basis of less tangible higher level thinking skills

like assimilation and evaluation rather than easy to monitor

areas like grammar, spelling, and identification. As Cooper

has shown in his primary trait scoring sheets, it is possible

to evaluate student writing with emphasis tailored to

individual needs.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to introduce concepts of the

Affective Response Approach to Literature to students in

three seventh grade classrooms in order to determine whether

the use of affective responses changes students' attitudes

about reading and about social studies. Also measured was

student achievement in both areas.

It was shown that implementation of affective response

approaches is intertwined with a student-centered philosophy,

an atmosphere of trust and tentativeness, and a practice of

teaching through dialogue. The results of the study show that

use of Bleich's questioning heuristic is useful in helping

seventh graders better interpret and better appreciate reading in the content areas. More importantly, the study suggests that perhaps any viable teaching strategy can be applied to use in a classroom whose central tenet is dialogue. When David Bleich's strategies for teaching literature in college are wedded to the child-centered philosophy of such teachers as Nancy Atwell and Sylvia Ashton-Warner, new venues for teaching and learning are created.

Instructors can now turn to the task of developing atmospheres of trust and openness in their own classrooms. Students can feel free to experiment, question, and risk being wrong in their search for knowledge. In turn, teachers can feel free to experiment, be tentative, and risk mistakes in their approaches to instruction. Affective response is an element of open dialogue; it is a catalyst of and a precursor to comprehension. Bleich's heuristic has been shown to be a useful tool in inspiring and sustaining dialogue. Affective responses can be a useful tool in inspiring and sustaining learning even with seventh graders struggling with reading in the content areas.

REFERENCES

Adams, M., and Bruce, B. (1980). Background knowledge and reading comprehension. (Report N. 13). *Study of Reading.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service N. ED 181 431).

Allen, R. (1984). Language experiences which promote reading. Paper presented at the Early Childhood Lecture Series, Ypsilanti, Mich., 1969. 16 pp. [ED 034 571].

Alvino, L. (1987). Objectives and procedures of research, In D. Gaswami and P. Stillmark (Eds.), *Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an agency for change.* Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers Inc.

Ashton-Warner, S. (1963). *Teacher.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Athanases, S. (1988). Developing a classroom community of interpreters. *English Journal,* 77 (1) pp. 45-48.

Atwell, N. (1987). Class-based writing: teachers learning from students. In D. Gaswami and P. Stillmark (Eds.), *Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an agency for change.* Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers Inc.

Atwell, N. (1987). *In the middle: Writing, reading and learning with adolescents.* Upper Mountclair New Jersey: Boynton/ Cook.

Barnes, D. (1976). *From communication to curriculum.* New York: Penguin Books.

Bleich, D. (1975). *Readings and feelings: An introduction to subjective criticism.* Urbana, Illinois, Indiana University, National Council of Teachers of English.

Bloom, B. (1982). *Creative problem solving: Planning, new worlds.* Pleasantville, New York: Sunburst Communications.

Boomer, G. (1987). Addressing the problem of elsewhereness: A case for action research in schools, In D. Gaswami and P. Stillmark (Eds.), *Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an agency for change.* Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers Inc.

Brooks, C., & Warren, R.P. (1943). *Understanding fiction.* New York: F.S. Crofts and Company.

Britton, J. (1987). A quiet form of research. In D. Gaswami and P. Stillmark (Eds.), *Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an agency for change.* Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers Inc.

Bruner, J. S. (1983). *Child's talk: Learning to use language.* with the assistance of Rita Watson. New York: W.W. Norton.

Carlson, J. (1988). Readers responding to Rappaccini's Daughter. *English Journal,* 77 (1) pp. 49-53.

Chomskey, N. (1975). *The logical structure of linguistic theory.* New York: Plenum Press.

Cooper, C. R., & O'dell, L. 1977. *Evaluating writing: Describing, measuring, judging.* Urbana, Illinois: State University of New York at Buffalo, National Council of Teachers of English.

Cooper, D. J. (1986) *Improving reading comprehension.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Corcoran, B. (1988). Spiders, surgeons, and anxious aliens: three classroom allies. *English Journal,*77 (1) pp. 39-45.

DeBoer, J., Kaulfers, W., & Miller, H.R. (1951). *Teaching secondary English.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Dewey, J. (1933) *How we think.* Boston: D.C. Heath.

Dionisio, M. (1989). Filling empty pockets: Remedial readers make meaning. *English Journal,*1 (78) pp. 28-33.

Dudley, M. (1989) The writing workshop: Structuring for success", *English Journal,*1 (78) pp. 25-28.

Early, M. (1964). *Reading instruction in secondary schools* (M. Early. Ed.). Newark, Deleware: Prepared by a committee of the International Reading Association.

Emig, J. (1986). Non-magical thinking: Presenting writing developmentally in schools. Rutgers University. In D. Gaswami and P. Stillmark (Eds.), *Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an agency for change.* Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers Inc.

Evanechko, P., LLoyd O., & Armstrong, R. (1974). An investigation of the relationships between children's performance in written language and their reading ability. *Research in the Teaching of English,* (8) pp. 315-25. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 115 739).

Finn, P. J. (1985). *Helping children learn to read,* New York: Random House.

Gage, T. (1971). *The reader as performer,* Las Vegas, Nevada, NCTE. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 073 414).

Gaswami, D., and Stillmark, P. (Eds.). 1987. *Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an agency for change.* Upper Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers Inc.

Giles, C. (1989). Reading, writing, and talking: Using literature study groups. *English Journal, 1* (78) pp. 29-32.

Goodman, K. S., Smith, E. B., Meredith, R. & Goodman, Y. (1987). *Language and thinking in school--A whole language curriculum.* New York: Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

Harris, T.L., & Hodges, R.E. (1981). *A dictionary of reading and related terms.* Newark, Del., International Reading Association.

Harris, T. L. and Sipay, E. (Eds.). (1984) *Readings on reading instruction.* New York: Longman Inc.

Heilman, A. W., Blair, T.R. & Rupley, W.H. (1981). *Principles and practices of teaching reading, 5th edition.* Columbus, Ohio. Charles E. Merril Publishing Company.

Hiebert, E. H. & Fisher, C. W. (1990). Whole language, three
     themes for the future. *Educational Leadership,47* (6) pp.
     62-64. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 405
     142).

Kohl, H. (1984). *Growing minds: On becoming a teacher.* New
     York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.

Levstik, L. S. (1986, Winter). The relationship between
     historical response and narrative in a sixth grade
     classroom. In *Theory and Research in Social Education,
     14* (1) pp. 1-19. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.
     EJ 332 191).

O'dell, L. (1987). Planning classroom research. In D. Gaswami
     and P. Stillmark (Eds.), *Reclaiming the classroom:
     Teacher research as an agency for change.* Upper
     Montclair, New Jersey: Boynton/Cook Publishers Inc.

Pearson, P. D., & Johnson, D. (1978). *Teaching reading
     comprehension.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Probst, R. E. (1989). Mom, Wolfgang, and me: Adolescent
     literature, critical theory , and the English classroom.
     English Journal, 77, (6) pp. 33-39.

Probst, R. E. (1989). Dialogue with a text. *English
     Journal,77,* (1) pp. 32-37.

Reed, P. (1987). Interview In D. Gaswami and P. Stillmark
     (Eds.). *Reclaiming the classroom: Teacher research as an
     agency for change,* Upper Montclair, New Jersey:
     Boynton/Cook Publishers Inc.

Rose, K. (1982). *Teaching language arts to children.* New
    York: Harcourt Brace Jovanvich.

Rosenblatt, L. (1938). *Literature as exploration,* New York:
    D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc.

Rumelhart, D. E. (1989, May). The Connectionist approach to
    language. In *Papers and reports on child language
    development, 27,* (8). (ERIC Document Reproduction
    Service No. ED 302 078).

Schaars, M. J. (1989) Teaching my Antonia with guidance from
    Rosenblatt. *English Journal, 77,* (1) pp. 51-55.

Tchudi, S. (1989). Invisibile thinking and the hypertext.
    English Journal, 77, (1) pp. 22-25.

Vacca, R. t. & Vacca, J. A. (1986). *Content area reading,
    second edition.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Weaver, C. (1979). *Grammar for teachers: Perspectives and
    definitions.* Urbana, Illinois: National Council of
    Teachers of English.

Weaver, C. (1988). *Reading process and practice: From socio-
    psycholinguistics to whole language.* Portsmouth, New
    Hampshire: Heinemann Educational Books, Inc.

Appendices

Appendix A   **Primary Trait Scoring Sheets**

Form A--Social Studies

Student essays are evaluated based upon demonstration of the following items:

	low	average		high
answers questions asked	1	2	3	4	5
supports answers with historical facts	1	2	3	4	5
facts cited are accurate and understood	1	2	3	4	5
intellectually creative	1	2	3	4	5
appropiate style and usage	1	2	3	4	5

score _____

Form B--Reading

Student essays are evaluated based upon demonstration of the following items:

	low	average		high
answers questions asked	1	2	3	4	5
supports answers with literary facts	1	2	3	4	5
facts cited are accurate and understood	1	2	3	4	5
intellectually creative	1	2	3	4	5
appropiate style and usage	1	2	3	4	5

score _____

Form A--Social Studies

Directions: This is a test to tell you how you feel about Social Studies. The score will not effect your grade in any way. You read the statements silently as I read them aloud. Then put an X under the letter or letters that represent how you feel about the statement.

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

		SD	D	U	A	SA
1]	You feel you have better things to study than Social Studies.	__	__	__	__	__
2]	You are willing to tell people that you do not like Social Studies.	__	__	__	__	__
3]	You have alot of History books in your room at home.	__	__	__	__	__
4]	You like to read about History whenever you have free time.	__	__	__	__	__
5]	You get really excited about Social Studies.	__	__	__	__	__
6]	You love to read about History.	__	__	__	__	__
7]	You like to read books about famous people.	__	__	__	__	__
8]	You like to read books about important events.	__	__	__	__	__
9]	You think studying History is a waste of time.	__	__	__	__	__
10]	You think History is boring.	__	__	__	__	__

11] You hate Social Studies. ___ ___ ___ ___ ___

12] History helps you understand ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
the present better.

13] Reading books about other's ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
problems and decisions helps you
with your own.

14] There aren't any people in ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
history books that have the same
problems and feelings as you.

15] Nothing that happens in History ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
matters to your life today.

16] Social Studies helps you prepare ___ ___ ___ ___ ___
for the future.

Scoring;   To score the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment, as modified for social studies, a very positive response receives a score of 5, and a very negative response receives a score of 1.   On items 3,4,5,6,7,8,12,13, and,16, a response of "strongly agree" indicates a very positive attitude and should receive a score of 5.   On the remaining items, a "strongly disagree" response indicates a very positive attitude and should receive the 5 score.   Therefore, on the positive item, "strongly agree" receives a 5, "agree" receives a 4, "undecided" receives a 3, "disagree" receives a 2, and "strongly disagree" receives a 1.   The pattern is reversed on the negative items.   The possible range of score is 5 x 16 (80) to 1 x 30 (30).

Form B--Reading

Directions: This is a test to tell you how you feel about reading. The score will not effect your grade in any way. You read the statements silently as I read them aloud. Then put an X under the letter or letters that represent how you feel about the statement.

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

		SD	D	U	A	SA
1]	You feel you have better things to do than read.	__	__	__	__	__
2]	You seldom buy a book.	__	__	__	__	__
3]	You are willing to tell people that you do not like to read.	__	__	__	__	__
4]	You have alot of books in your room at home.	__	__	__	__	__
5]	You like to read whenever you have free time.	__	__	__	__	__
6]	You get really excited about books you have read.	__	__	__	__	__
7]	You love to read.	__	__	__	__	__
8]	You like to read books by well-known authors.	__	__	__	__	__
9]	You never check out a book from the library.	__	__	__	__	__
10]	You like to stay home and read.	__	__	__	__	__
11]	You seldom read except when you have to do a book report.	__	__	__	__	__
12]	You think reading is a waste of time.	__	__	__	__	__
13]	You think reading is boring.	__	__	__	__	__
14]	You think people are strange when they read alot.	__	__	__	__	__

		SD	D	U	A	SA
15]	You like to read to escape from problems.	___	___	___	___	___
16]	You make fun of people who read alot.	___	___	___	___	___
17]	You like to share books with your friends.	___	___	___	___	___
18]	You would rather someone just tell you information so that you won't have to read to get it.	___	___	___	___	___
19]	You hate reading.	___	___	___	___	___
20]	You generally check out a book when you go to the library.	___	___	___	___	___
21]	It takes you a long time to read a book.	___	___	___	___	___
22]	You like to broaden your interests through reading.	___	___	___	___	___
23]	You read alot.	___	___	___	___	___
24]	You like to improve your vocabulary so you can use more words.	___	___	___	___	___
25]	You like to get books for gifts.	___	___	___	___	___
26]	You feel reading books helps you have a better vocabulary.	___	___	___	___	___
27]	Reading helps you understand life better.	___	___	___	___	___
28]	Reading books about other's problems and decisions helps you with your own.	___	___	___	___	___
29]	There aren't any characters in any books that have the same problems and feelings as you.	___	___	___	___	___
30]	You would like to be a better reader, read more books and enjoy them more.	___	___	___	___	___

Scoring; To score the Rhody Secondary Reading Attitude Assessment, a very positive response receives a score of 5, and a very negative response receives a score of 1. On items 4,5,6,7,8,10,15,17,20, 22,23,24,25,26,27,28, and 30, a response of "strongly agree" indicates a very positive attitude and should receive a score of 5. On the remaining items, a "strongly disagree" response indicates a very positive attitude and should receive the 5 score. Therefore, on the positive item, "strongly agree" receives a 5, "agree" receives a 4, "undecided" receives a 3, "disagree" receives a 2, and "strongly disagree" receives a 1. The pattern is reversed on the negative items. The possible range of score is 5 x 30 (150) to 1 x 30 (30).

Reprinted from R. Tullock-Rhody and J. Alexander, ", "A Scale for Assessing Attitudes Toward Reading In Secondary Schools," *Journal of Reading,* April 1980, by permission of the authors and the International Reading Association