DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 281 CS 009 186

AUTHOR Stahl, Norman A.; And Others
TITLE The Materials of College Reading Instruction: A Critical and Historical Perspective from 50 Years of Content Analysis Research. College Reading and Learning Assistance Technical Report 87-03.
PUB DATE Sep 87
NOTE 40p.; Tables contain small but clear print.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Content Analysis; Higher Education; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Materials; Reading Research; Research Methodology; Study Skills; *Textbook Content; Textbook Evaluation; Textbook Research
IDENTIFIERS *Research Styles; *Research Trends

ABSTRACT

Focusing on research from the mid-1920s to the mid-1980s, a study examined the published content analyses of college reading texts from the standpoints of methodology employed by various writers, specific information presented in respective content analyses, and observed trends in content presentation that have emerged since the mid-1920s. Examination showed that content analyses of college reading materials issued before 1975 focused on studies analyzing the overall content of a text, and studies analyzing specific skills or subskills presented in a text. Contemporary content analyses concentrated on the perspectives of theory/research-driven analysis and curricular-driven analysis. Analysis revealed the following conclusions: (1) a consensus across texts as to what constituted effective study methods did not exist; (2) research evidence for most of the advocated techniques was missing; (3) adequate instruction and practice for presented skills and subskills were limited in scope and validity; (4) transfer value of many practice activities to actual postsecondary reading and study tasks was in question; and (5) reliance on impressionistic evidence rather than research and statistical evidence was the norm. Furthermore, the findings of the early content analyses did not seem to influence the authors of contemporary college reading texts. (Two tables of data are included, and a master list of college reading and learning assistance technical reports and 33 references are appended.) (MM)

College Reading and Learning Assistance

Technical Report 87-03

The Materials of College Reading Instruction: A Critical and Historical Perspective From 50 Years of Content Analysis Research

Norman A. Stahl

Northern Illinois University

Michele L. Simpson

University of Arizona

William G. Brozo

Northeastern Illinois University

Abstract

Content analysis research of instructional materials published for the college reading and study-skills market provides a unique view of the educational practices driving the field for the past 60 years. Hence, this article examines the published content analyses of college reading texts from the vantage of (1) methodology employed by various writers, (2) specific information presented in respective content analyses, and (3) observed trends in content that have been presented since the mid-1920s.

The Materials of College Reading Instruction: A Critical and Historical Perspective From 50 Years of Content Analysis Research

In reviewing the annual summaries of reading research of the past ten years, one observes that a varied set of investigations falls within the general category of document or content analysis. In educational research, the content analysis is an objective, systematized examination of a particular document or set of instructional materials to determine the quantitative and qualitative characteristics present (Borg & Gall, 1983). The process, according to North, Holsti, Zaninovich, and Zinnes (1983), involves (1) perusing a representative sample of documents and coding information into categories so that frequency counts can be undertaken and (2) interpreting the data as it relates to theory, research, and educational practice. Reading researchers have tended to scrutinize two broad categories: textual factors (readability levels and text formatting) and content factors (subject matter units such as main idea instruction and study strategies). According to Best (1977), reliable content analysis research not only adds important knowledge to a field, but also can be of assistance in evaluating and improving educational practices

Content analysis can be traced back to the early 1920s (Starch, 1921, Wood, 1920). Since that time, many content analyses have been directed toward curricular materials and basal reading series for primary and middle school reading instruction. However, at the postsecondary level, there is a near dearth of content analyses research on materials for reading and study-skills instruction, even though historical investigations (Stahl, Hynd, & Brozo, 1987) show that more than 500 college reading and/or study-skills texts have been issued since the 1890s. Five distinct categories of texts or workbooks exist: (1) college study-skills texts (Pauk,

1984; Sherman, 1984), (2) college reading-skills texts (Brown, 1987; Maker & Lenier, 1986), (3) speed-reading texts (Brozo, Schmelzer, & Andrews, 1984; Smith, 1984), (4) vocabulary development texts (Levine & Levine, 1980; Shepherd, 1987), and (5) college survival texts (Johnson, Springer, & Sternglanz, 1982; Walter & Siebert, 1984). Additional writers (Heinrichs & LaBranche, 1986; Radencich & Schumm, 1984) have developed categorization schemes as well.

With such a diverse set of texts and workbooks available to the college reading specialist, one would expect that many researchers would have undertaken systematic content analyses of this body of work. This is not the case. Furthermore, even the limited set of investigations on the topic is not covered in the methods texts for the profession (e. g. , Maxwell, 1979; Trillin & Associates, 1980).

As instructional texts for college reading programs continue to proliferate, the need for reading specialists to integrate findings from content analysis research with the knowledge of how to best teach college reading becomes more critical. With a knowledge of this research, college reading specialists can be more discriminating in the selection of instructional materials that are based on proven research rather than on time-honored, but often questionable, tradition.

The purpose of this study was to examine the published content analyses of college reading texts from the standpoints of (1) methodology employed by various writers, (2) specific information presented in respective content analyses, and (3) observed trends in content presentation that have emerged across the decades. Finally, recommendations for future content analysis research will be set forth.

Content Analyses of College Reading Materials Issued Before 1975

Today's college reading specialists are understandably concerned with the materials currently available for instruction. Nevertheless, it is important to hold a professional world view that incorporates a historical perspective of the field.

Content analyses conducted in past years allow specialists to examine the concepts and materials that shape our current endeavors. Hence the discussion of content analysis research pertinent to college reading and study-skills instruction begins with those investigations of materials in press prior to 1975.

Content analyses holding historical importance can be categorized into two basic groups: studies analyzing the overall content of a text (Bahe, 1970; Laycock & Russell, 1941; Miller, 1957) and studies focusing on specific skills or subskills presented in a text (Browning, 1976; Ironside, 1963; Utsey, 1968).

Full Text Studies

In the earliest identified content analysis of how-to-study materials, Laycock and Russell (1941) reviewed recommendations for successful studying in 38 manuals published between 1926 and 1939. An analysis of the 3,473 discussions, examples, and exercises in the manuals revealed that the authors of the era emphasized reading habits and skills; preparing for and taking examinations; developing good habits of learning, outlining, and notetaking; participating in classroom activities; memorizing textual materials; using the library; and understanding the physical and psychological conditions for studying. Although a number of study activities surfaced regularly in the manuals, there was a lack of consensus across texts as to what constituted effective study methods. In addition, few of the techniques in the manuals were supported by research findings from the period.

At the time of the expansion of the college reading movement to serve students drawn into higher education by the "G.I. Bill" after World War II and the Korean War, a second content analysis of manuals appeared in the literature. In 1957 Miller summarized and evaluated the significant features of 33 college reading workbooks and texts, of which 20 books were of recent vintage. Miller classified the texts into four categories based on textual factors and production factors: pamphlets with

limited practice exercises (1 book), expendable workbooks with practice exercises (19 books), textbooks with limited exercises (9 books), and paired sets of textbooks and workbooks (4 books).

An analysis of the subject matter in the books showed that word meaning and vocabulary development exercises (23 books) were most apt to be included in the texts under review. Other categories of exercises in descending order of frequency included study or thinking exercises (22 texts), critical or analytical reading exercises (18 texts), exploratory or continuous reading exercises (18 texts), skimming or idea reading exercises (15 texts), phrase and sentence meaning exercises (8 texts), eye span exercises (-xts), and number and letter recognition exercises (4 texts). In examining the length of the reading passages in each book, the investigator found most of the texts contained passages of 800 to 2,000 words.

In the latter 1960s, when the doors of higher education were opening to previously under-represented populations, Bahe (1970) analyzed 23 current college reading manuals. The writer placed 38 subskills within seven instructional groups and then reviewed each manual to determine whether discussions or practice activities were presented for each subskill.

Bahe noted that frequently the reader was informed of what to do but rarely was told why or how the skill should be mastered. In addition, research evidence supporting the strategies or suggested habits was usually disregarded in favor of preachments. Bahe advocated that future authors include ten generally neglected subskills: (1) flexibility, (2) retaining new word meaning, (3) word attack, (4) selecting significant details, (5) sequencing, (6) interpreting graphics, (7) syllogistic reasoning, (8) analogy patterns, (9) content field study, and (10) interpreting figurative language, along with statistical evidence supporting the effectiveness of the instructional program forming the foundation for each text.

Skill Specific Studies

The content analyses which center on specific skills were generally incorporated within a broader discussion on the pedagogical implications of teaching the respective skill. Hence, these studies were limited in both scope and breadth of texts under review. The three studies that fall into this category of content analysis focus on perception and word recognition (Ironside, 1963), vocabulary instruction (Utsey, 1968), and underlining and other text study techniques (Browning, 1976).

Eleven college reading improvement manuals of the 1950s were surveyed by Ironside (1963) to ascertain the varying approaches for developing perception and word recognition. After summarizing the relevant content of each text, Ironside identified seven common perceptual training techniques: (1) quick-recognition tasks, (2) analytical procedures in word recognition, (3) reading for key words, (4) rapid phrase reading, (5) skimming, (6) vocabulary items employing context, and (7) speed drills to improve perceptual efficiency. Timed and untimed drills with numbers, nonsense words, meaningful words, phrases, sentences, paragraphs, and articles ranged from single examples to hundreds of items in the various manuals. Ironside questioned the transfer value of the activities using the numbers, nonsense spellings, or isolated phrases. However, he supported the utilization of perceptual and word recognition training when the activities were related to continuous prose.

In a published speech on several issues pertinent to college vocabulary instruction, Utsey (1968) briefly details a limited survey of 52 texts, programmed materials, and manuals for learning machines. The observed instructional content tended to be conventional, emphasizing the study of antonyms and synonyms, denotation and connotation, etymology, word elements, and dictionary and glossary entries. Crossword puzzles were often provided for practice activities, and study techniques (SQ3R) were regularly advocated for independent skill

development. Since the researcher unfortunately failed to list materials under review or to provide a frequency count of the observed instructional elements, the study does not meet the full criteria for a content analysis. Still, the work does provide at least a glimpse of the content employed in college vocabulary programs of the era.

In the only research-oriented content analysis of the early period, Browning (1976) reviewed 19 books and one journal article published between 1957 and 1975. Although his main thrust was to demonstrate the inclusion or exclusion of underlining techniques in study-skills manuals, the end result was a clear picture of the study aids advocated widely during the 19 years under review. The investigator subjectively ranked authors' primary and secondary preferences for five frequently advocated procedures of independent text study. A summary of authors' preferences shows that most often a recitation, self-testing procedure was recommended (16 manuals), followed in order by outlining (15 manuals), SQ3R style systems (13 manuals), underlining (8 manuals), and marginal notes (7 manuals). Browning detailed specific issues pertaining to the texts' coverage of the underlining study method and reviewed the pertinent research on the topic. He concluded that until an effort is made to investigate key research questions, authors would continue to rely on anecdote, opinion, and intuition in recommending how, when, and whether underlining could serve as a technique for studying.

Even though the content analysis research from this earlier period is unsophisticated by today's standards, it provides us with more than a passing glance at texts and workbooks important to the field throughout the first 75 years of college reading instruction. Moreover, it gives us an unique perspective of the traditions that molded the very foundations, if not the controlling interests, of the current materials of instruction.

A cursory review of the content identified by these researchers suggests that topics presented in years past are indeed the topics covered today. Hence, we pose an evaluative, rather than a historical, question: How did the recommendations or findings from these past analyses influence either the content factors or the textual factors observable in modern texts? On the surface, at least, it appears that the modern writers did not heed the relevant content analysis findings, suggesting that topics in the early texts had limited support from research and that authors offered little more than pedantic recommendations drawn from personal experience and considered opinion.

To answer our question, however, one does not need to rely on subjective perusals of current texts alone. The reading specialist can turn to a recent set of investigations employing facets of modern content analysis.

Contemporary Analyses of College Reading Materials

In the most practical sense, modern content analysis attempts to determine the validity of individual texts based on a combination of factors, such as (1) existence/soundness of theoretical or research underpinnings, (2) breadth and depth of coverage of subject, (3) appropriateness of text to existing or proposed instructional goals or educational situations, and (4) value of content to both learners and instructors. Hence, validity is a measure of the relation of content to such considerations. If the desire is to evaluate the basic content validity of a particular text or a corpus of related texts, the foundations in current theory or soundness of supporting research should be weighted more heavily than the other factors. If, however, the primary concern is directly related to local conditions that are controlled by developed programmatic goals or instructional objectives, then the latter three factors are more important.

Each of these two directions for content analysis (i.e., theory/research driven or curricular/instructional objective driven) are of equal importance but tend to be employed for different purposes. The contemporary content analyses with college reading materials present both perspectives.

Theory/Research-Driven Analysis

In a theory-driven analysis, the researchers cull the professional literature extensively to establish a theoretical premise or to accept a previously postulated theory or a verified construct. Then the investigators judge whether the content factors and textual factors found in individual texts and across the sample of texts are supported by the theory/research serving as the benchmark. With regard to materials for the college reading program, there are two examples of theory/research-driven analysis.

Stahl, Brozo, and Simpson (1987) proposed an overall thesis that generative approaches to vocabulary instruction were superior to additive approaches when promoting independent vocabulary acquisition by college students. This proposition was based on extensive reviews of the literature on vocabulary instruction (Simpson, 1985). With such a premise to guide the analysis, the writers systematically classified and tabulated the units of content within each of the 55 books. Then the reviewers evaluated the data to determine whether generative or additive approaches to vocabulary instruction were employed by the author/s of each text. With this procedure, a measure of validity for both content classifications and extant texts was put forth, and in most instances materials were found to be less than acceptable, given the overall postulate guiding the analysis. Even when generative categories of instruction were present, the potential of such strategies was lost because of irrelevant or invalid exercises. Furthermore, the findings, summarized in Table 1, point out that vocabulary texts for postsecondary reading

populations have not tapped the full promise of generative instruction for independent vocabulary mastery.

Insert Table 1 about here

A second but somewhat different theory/research-driven content analysis of college reading materials was issued by Brozo and Johns (1986). These writers focused on content in 40 speed-reading texts. Particular concern was given to discovering the relationship between acceptable research and three content factors: eye movements, span of recognition, and rates of reading. Unlike the previously discussed analysis by Stahl, Brozo, and Simpson (1987), which utilized research to substantiate a broad-based premise for evaluating vocabulary texts, Brozo and Johns attempted to evaluate the three content factors in light of specific research related to each factor. For instance, 16 authors suggested that students using recommended techniques could achieve extremely rapid rates of reading at or above 1,000 words per minute, while other authors (12 books) stated that rates up to 1,000 words per minute were feasible. The researchers pointed out that numerous investigations suggest the upper limits of actual reading rates are well below the level of 1,000 words per minute and such a rate is actually akin to skimming materials. Additional findings, summarized in Table 1, show that when authors of speed-reading texts cover topics pertaining to eye movements and/or span of recognition, they rarely offer content derived from acceptable research.

When writers of any unit-by-unit, research-driven content analyses offer recommendations, they must limit responses to the strengths and weaknesses of the specific content factors under review. Hence, the readers of such reports must be

careful to view the finding within the delimitations set forth by the researchers. For instance, Brozo and Johns (1986) suggested that authors of speed-reading books should reconsider the inclusion of several of the regularly recommended methods for increasing reading rate. The readers of such research, however, are left to judge for themselves how questionable content units might influence the overall validity of each speed-reading text.

Of course, the validity of either of these analyses (Brozo & Johns, 1986; Stahl, Brozo, & Simpson, 1987) holds only as long as the theory is judged to be sound or the interpretations of the research are accurate. As new evidence is obtained, or as new paradigms are introduced, texts in various content areas should be reevaluated. The data should then be used in future texts or revisions of current editions to update/upgrade the materials.

Curricular-Driven Analysis

Another reason to conduct a content analysis of reading materials is to substantiate a curricular model or instructional orientation. Unlike the theory-driven or the research-driven approaches, which are primarily concerned with the basic validity of the content of the various texts, the curriculum-driven approach identified texts or units within the texts that support the local programmatic philosophy and the associated instructional goals. Usually the goals and the objectives have been conceptualized previously by the faculty, organized in a course description or a syllabus, and accepted by the appropriate institutional committees. Hence, the standard outcome is not to redesign texts or textual units, but rather to form a match between available materials and the instructional program.

In an example of a curricular-driven content analysis, Heinrichs and LaBranche (1986) analyzed 47 textbooks, published for the most part between 1982 and 1985. The team of five evaluators developed a set of criteria based primarily on the

observed characteristics of their students and on the short- and long-term academic needs of students traditionally enrolled in the reading program. Although supplemental support for the criteria was drawn from the literature, the overall analysis was driven by the curricular goals and objectives of an existing learning/study-skills course. The procedure for analysis was concerned primarily with the identification and frequency of units of content as well as organizational factors corresponding to the stated criteria. Upon completion of this process, the data from the analysis (e.g., page counts and qualitative rankings) provided the evaluators with a bird's-eye view of the content of 47 texts across five subject areas as related to their program. From this information, the authors observed that none of the texts was all inclusive of the course goals and objectives. Hence, they decided to use a multiplicity of materials in support of the course instruction.

One more contemporary study which can be best described as a curricular-driven content analysis is the work by Radencich and Schumm (1984). In this analysis of a limited number of books drawn from four subject matter categories, the authors used reported research, related literature, and judgmental statements to develop a list of content factors and textual factors which should be included in texts. Next the writers subjectively rated each book as to its presentation of each factor. Finally, the authors put forth a list of generalized statements about the content of materials on the market and, like Heinrichs and LaBranche (1986), these authors recommended that instructors adopt texts from two categories (reading instruction and college survival instruction).

The results of this analysis employ some of the characteristics of research-driven studies. However, since the corpus of texts was limited in number, support for content factors and text factors rested heavily on judgment rather than research. Thus, evaluations/conclusions were more applicable to the text selection process at

the local level, and the analysis serves pragmatically as a curricular-driven content analysis.

These examples demonstrate that the underlying strength of this approach is that it provides data which is usable at the local level. On the other hand, its inherent weakness is that the programmatic goals and instructional objectives of the program or course might rest upon a foundation of research, instructional practices, or traditional content that is outdated, ill-conceived, or of questionable merit. The actual value of any curricular-driven content analysis is only as valid as the basic theoretical or research foundation upon which the college reading curriculum rests. In some instances, the individuals undertaking such a process might better reevaluate the concepts and principles underlying program goals and objectives. Such action could then be followed by a curricular-driven content analysis.

Lessons Learned and Future Directions

Through this review of content analysis research of college reading materials, we are able to discover the subject matter covered in the many texts under review. We also note that the evolving analysis process is becoming more sophisticated from the standpoints of type of analysis, content under analysis, and data provided in the study (refer to Table 2). Yet, the discussion of the issues covered here has been

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

based on a form of secondary research--i.e., we have drawn our information from analyses published across several eras. Such a process limits the nature of the generalizations that can be raised, given the information or data provided by the

primary authors. The problem is further compounded when findings are integrated with our interpretations of the principles and theories guiding postsecondary reading instruction in the latter 1980s.

Nevertheless, when the conclusions of the varied authors are taken in total and across the years, five generalizations regularly surface: (1) a consensus across texts as to what constituted effective study methods did not exist, (2) research evidence for most of the advocated techniques was missing, (3) adequate instruction and practice for presented skills and subskills were limited in scope and validity, (4) transfer value of many practice activities to actual postsecondary reading and study tasks was in question, and (5) reliance on impressionistic evidence rather than research and statistical evidence was the norm. Furthermore, it does not appear that the findings of the early content analyses have influenced those individuals who are currently authoring texts. In fact, a comparison of the data from the content analyses of past eras with the contemporary studies might lead to the accusation that the field of college reading is overly dependent upon a curriculum of tradition as opposed to a curriculum driven by current applied research and/or theory. Although such a conclusion is indeed open to debate, a comparison of the findings from the Ironside analysis (1963) with the Brozo and Johns study (1986), as well as a comparison of the Utsey work (1968) with the more recent analysis by Stahl, Brozo, and Simpson (1987), demonstrate that over the years texts have retained content factors of questionable value. On the other hand, textual factors (e.g., advance organizers) and content factors (e.g., metacomprehension) began to appear in texts as they gained a combination of pedagogical validity and professional trendiness. Hence, it appears that new content does find its way into texts, but often more traditional factors, even of questionable worth, are

maintained. Perhaps the inclusion or the exclusion of content is as much a product of market research as educational research.

Although a number of content analyses have been undertaken in recent years, more research is needed. Authors of the content analyses (particularly those issued before 1984) tended to direct their investigations toward the frequency of specific subject matter and also the inclusion of factors that promoted or hindered the presentation of the content (e.g., readability, graphic presentations, teacher's guides). We need to return to the primary sources to determine how the many authors presented or taught the content (topics) to the students across generations of textbooks. Through such cross-generational content analysis, the field can come to understand the unique interaction of tradition with modern thought in the authoring/marketing of texts for college reading instruction. For instance, it is evident that several subject areas or skills (outlining, notetaking) have been included in texts across the years. We may discover that the sheer power of tradition in college reading is of such force that content and instructional presentation remains static through the succeeding generations of texts. On the other hand, recent pedagogical understanding may have led to more effective presentation of various concepts, methods, or techniques. Hence, we may discover that while content remained somewhat static, instructional method has evolved along with changing theory, recent research, and even regularly occurring fads. Furthermore, with such work the specialist can glimpse into the evolution of a field and learn of the methods seemingly lost to the years (e.g., the three-level outline method, the self-recitation study method).

A second avenue of future research should be category specific and directed toward texts currently on the market. Content analyses driven by theory or research have been undertaken with an extensive number of recent texts drawn from

adjunct categories of college reading materials (i.e., vocabulary texts and speed-reading texts). On the other hand, recent works by Heinrichs and LaBranche (1986) and Radencich and Schumm (1984) analyzed texts across several categories, so neither study can be viewed as in-depth analyses of books from any particular category. Hence, we believe that researchers need to undertake in-depth theory/research-driven analyses of college study-skills texts, college reading-skills texts, and college survival texts. In addition, reviewers should look carefully at the pedagogical recommendations contained in the instructors' manuals accompanying many texts on the market. Finally, in-depth analyses need to be undertaken with computer software that appears appropriate to the postsecondary reading program. Such software can be utilized by instructors as the primary vehicle of instruction or as supplementary aids. Hence, researchers would need to view the content from the perspective of theory and research as well as the corresponding subject matter in the respective corpus of published texts.

A final direction for future research should be to utilize various forms of integrative research review (e.g., critical analysis, meta analysis) with content analysis to investigate the validity of specific content factors. As an example, a researcher might undertake a content analysis of college study-skills texts to ascertain how current texts evaluate readiness for notetaking, teach the role and value of notetaking, and present strategies for notetaking. Then, using the findings presented in the critical analyses (e.g., Hartley & Davies, 1978; Rickards, 1979) and the meta analysis (Henk & Stahl, 1985), a set of acceptable research-supported criteria is ordered in a coding system. As the next step, the texts in a particular category would be evaluated using the system. The work of Browning (1976) with underlining and, to a lesser degree, that of Brozo and Johns (1986) with rate development, approach this style of analysis. Whenever critical analysis or meta

analysis reviews have not been undertaken for a particular topic, the content analysis will by necessity include an exhaustive, in-depth review of the literature.

A word of caution must be noted for those considering the conduct of a content analysis with college reading materials. Researchers who undertake content analysis with current texts and especially with out-of-print texts must be careful to study a corpus of materials that accurately represents all of the primary texts for each subject category and for each era under review. A mere sampling of documents may identify readily accepted content factors or textual factors, but the sampling itself may overlook texts which contain "experimental" or innovative factors that signal new emerging trends in postsecondary reading instruction. Hence, we recommend that writers strictly delimit the breadth of the content analysis to a particular category or subcategory of text. They should then strive to review as many texts as can be obtained, using personal libraries, institutional libraries, interlibrary loan, and the good will of publishers and colleagues. Hopefully, some day the sampling problem will be obviated, as the field of postsecondary reading will have a national repository of curricular materials (perhaps the Stauffer Library at I.R.A. headquarters or any of the textbook collections at Hofstra University, Trinity College, Northern Illinois University, Columbia University, or the University of Pittsburgh) that can lend materials to researchers undertaking content analysis research.

References

Bahe, V. R. (1970). A content analysis of current college reading manuals. In G. B. Schick & M. May (Eds.), Reading: Process and pedagogy, 19th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference (Vol. 2, pp. 11-25). Milwaukee: National Reading Conference.

Best, J. W. (1977). Research in education (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bliesmer, E. P. (1957). Materials for the more retarded college reader. In O. S. Causey (Ed.), Techniques and procedures in college-adult reading, 6th Yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference (pp. 86-90). Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research: An introduction (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Brown, J. I. (1987). Reading power (3rd ed.). Lexington, MA: Heath.

Browning, W. G. (1976). A critical review of research and expert opinion on the underlining study aid. In W. D. Miller & G. H. McNinch (Eds.), Reflections and investigations in reading, 25th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference (pp. 8-21). Clemson, SC: National Reading Conference.

Brozo, W. G., & Johns, J. L. (1986). A content and critical analysis of 40 speed reading books. Journal of Reading, 30, 242-247.

Brozo, W. G., Schmelzer, R. V., & Andrews, D. A. (1984). Setting the pace: A speed, comprehension, and study skills program. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Hartley, J., & Davies, S. K. (1978). Note-taking: A critical review. Programmed Learning and Educational Technology, 15, 207-224.

Heinrichs, A. S., & LaBranche, S. P. Content analysis of 47 college learning skills textbooks. Reading Research & Instruction, 25, 277-287.

Henk, W. A., & Stahl, N. A. (1985). A meta-analysis of the effect of notetaking on learning from lecture. In J. A. Niles (Ed.), Issues in literacy: A research perspective, 34th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Blacksburg, VA: National Reading Conference.

Ironside, R. A. (1963). Perception and word-recognition in workbooks at the college level. In R. C. Staiger & C. V. Melton (Eds.), New developments in programs and procedures for college-adult reading, 12th Yearbook of the National Reading Conference (pp. 63-72). Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia.

Johnson, M. K., Springer, S. P., & Sternglanz, S. H. (1982). How to succeed in college. Los Altos, CA: Kaufmann.

Laycock, S. R., & Russell, D. H. (1941). An analysis of 38 how to study manuals. School Review, 49, 370-379.

Levine, H., & Levine, R. (1980). Vocabulary resources for the college student. New York: Amsco.

Maker, J., & Lenier, M. (1986). College reading: Book 2 (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Maxwell, M. (1979). Improving study learning skills. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, L. (1957). Evaluation of workbooks for college reading programs. In O. S. Causey (Ed.), Techniques and procedures in college-adult reading, 6th Yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference for College and Adults (pp. 75-85). Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

North, R. C., Holsti, D. R., Zaninovich, M. G., & Zinnes, D. A. (1963). Content analysis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Pauk, W. (1984). How to study in college (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Radencich, M. C., & Schumm, J. S. (1984). A survey of college reading/study skills texts. Reading World, 24 34-47.

Rickards, J. P. (1979). Notetaking: Theory and research. Improving Human Performance Quarterly, 8, 152-161.

Shepherd, J. F. (1987). College vocabulary (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Sherman, T. M. (1984). Proven strategies for successful learning. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Simpson, M. L. (1985). The characteristics of effective vocabulary instruction. Georgia Journal of Reading, 11, 5-10.

Smith, B. D. (1984). Picking up the pace: Efficient reading for life. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Stahl, N. A. Brozo, W. G., & Simpson, M. L. (1987). Developing college vocabulary: A content analysis of instructional materials. Reading Research & Instruction, 26, 203-221.

Stahl, N. A., Hynd, C., & Brozo, W. G. (1987). A comprehensive list of college reading and study skills books. Georgia State University, Unpublished manuscript.

Starch, D. (1921). The contents of readers. In G. M. Whipple (Ed.), The Twentieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II: Report of the Society's Committee on Silent Reading (pp. 145-151). Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.

Trillin, A., & Associates (1980). Teaching basic skills in college. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Utsey, J. (1968). Special materials to aid in vocabulary development at the college level. In J. A. Figurell (Ed.), Forging ahead in reading: Proceedings of the 12th Annual Convention of the International Reading Association (Part I) (pp. 103-106). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Walter, T., & Siebert, A. (1984). Student success: How to do better in college and still have time for your friends (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Woody, C. (1920). The overlapping in the content of fifteen second readers. Journal of Educational Research, 2, 465-474.

Table 1

Content Analyses with Contemporary Postsecondary Reading Materials

Researcher/s	Content Analyses Procedures	Text Category and Number of Texts	Text Factors and Content Factors	Findings and Recommendations
Radencich & Schumm (1984)	Analysis - Curricular Driven: Analysis based on limited research and judgmental validity supporting content factors.	Four categories of texts published between 1976 and 1983. (n=17) 1) College survival texts (n=4) 2) College reading instruction texts (n=4) 3) College survival and reading instruction texts (n=5) 4) College reading practice texts (n=4)	The number and nature of the text factors and the content factors differed according to the purpose of the text. For instance, college survival texts were analyzed for 11 text factors and 17 content factors. The writers utilized a four-point rating (i.e., 1) no inclusion, 2) fair coverage, 3) good coverage, and 4) excellent coverage) to evaluate text factors and content factors. A readability level for each text is provided.	Elements common to most texts include advance organizers, use of subheadings and lists, provision of learning strategies, and instruction of previewing, main ideas, and paragraph organization. Few texts include review questions, instruction on self-appraisal, spelling, non-textbook reading, writing, critical reading, or content specific instruction. Supplementary reading selections in texts tended to be of a broad range of readability levels and passages tended not to be organized in a progression of levels. Teacher's guides were not offered routinely. The lack of instruction in college reading practice texts make them the least useful. Instructors should assign a college survival text and a college reading instruction text.

Table 1

Content Analyses with Contemporary Postsecondary Reading Materials (continued)

Researcher/s	Content Analyses Procedures	Text Category and Number of Texts	Text Factors and Content Factors	Findings and Recommendations
Heinrichs & LaBranche (1986)	Analysis - Curricular Driven: Analysis based primarily on the objectives and goals of local conditions.	Five categories of texts issued since 1981. (n=47) 1) Reading skills texts (n=14) 2) Learning skills texts (n=6) 3) Combined reading and study skills texts (n=13) 4) Speciality texts (n=6) 5) Resource or supplementary texts (n=8)	Organizational factors included reading passages, instructor's manuals, answers in student texts, index, glossary, and overall quality. Content factors included vocabulary, main ideas and details, reading speed, reading comprehension, critical reading, organizational patterns, notetaking, study systems, memory, test taking, content areas, reasoning/problem solving, graphics, and library/ dictionary skills. For each of the texts, the writers note 1) the number of pages devoted to each content factor 2) the presence of various organizational factors 3) the overall qualitative ranking.	Examination of texts revealed little variation with regard to format. Newer texts (since 1982) present more content area-specific material, techniques of test-taking skills, memory aids and procedures, and instructor's manuals. They devote whole chapters to direct instructions in patterns of organization of text. Reading speed is related to purpose of reading, rather than as a skill isolated from meaning and purpose. Meta-cognitive awareness is often covered. Very few textbooks are all inclusive; hence, authors decided to use more than one text in their program.

Table 1

Content Analyses with Contemporary Postsecondary Reading Materials (continued)

Researcher/s	Content Analyses Procedures	Text Category and Number of Texts	Text Factors and Content Factors	Findings and Recommendations
Stahl, Brozo & Simpson (in press)	Evaluation - Theory Driven: Generative methods of vocabulary instruction are superior to additive methods when teaching students to independently develop word knowledge in college.	Vocabulary development texts currently in print. (n=55)	Thirteen instructional categories were observed, and three categories were noted as generative in nature (word elements, dictionary/reference sources, and context clues) while ten categories were said to be additive instruction (pronunciation, confused/misused words, related words, historical contexts, foreign words, descriptive words, figures of speech, content field, proper nouns, synonym/antonym).	The generative potential of the three generative strategies was lost to irrelevant or invalid exercises. When all the texts were categorized in total, 45 were found to have an additive philosophy, three were of a generative philosophy but treated presentations in an additive manner, and seven texts had a mixed philosophy. Materials should encourage students to independently develop their vocabularies. Materials should stimulate students' deeper levels of understanding about each word of study. Materials should teach contextual analysis with actual texts. Materials which emphasize the mastery list or additive approach to vocabulary development should cognize words in semantically-related sets. Materials should incorporate mnemonic devices and rehearsal guidelines to promote long-term vocabulary learning. Textbook authors should carefully scrutinize the validity of each exercise format.

Table 1

Content Analyses with Contemporary Postsecondary Reading Materials (continued)

Researcher/s	Content Analyses Procedures	Text Category and Number of Texts	Text Factors and Content Factors	Findings and Recommendations
Brozo & Johns (1986)	Evaluation - Research Driven: Results of analysis were compared with recent empirical findings on span of recognition, regressions, and rates of reading.	Speed reading texts issued since 1950. (n=40)	Text factors included elements related to layout (e.g., glossary, preface, position of assessment checks, stated objectives, and theoretical foundations of the book). Content factors included elements on methods and techniques to increase reading speed (e.g., instruction in using pen or finger as pacer, increasing span of recognition, discussion of subvocalization). Particular concern directed at content related to eye movements, including span of recognition, and the upper rates attainable through practice.	Authors of speed reading texts should reconsider some of their methods. Practice exercises in reading entire lines or blocks of print should be eliminated from future books. Readers must recognize that claims of 1,000 w.p.m. rates are of question. Some speed reading texts seem to treat poor eye movements as the cause of slow, inefficient reading and suggest that by eliminating eye regressions and increasing span of recognition that reading ability will improve. Considerable work must be done to bring practices in line with current research understandings.

Table 2

Summary of Analysis Procedures

	Authors' Description of Texts	Number of Texts	Range of Copyright Dates	Text Categories and Number	Type of Analysis	Content Analyzed	Data Provided
Laycock & Russell (1941)	How to study manuals	38	1926-1939	Not categorized	Curricular driven	Content factors	Frequency counts Instructional discussion
Miller (1957)	College reading workbooks	33	1928-1956	Pamphlet (1) Workbooks (19) Textbooks (9) Paired Sets (4)	Curricular driven	Content factors Textual factors	Frequency counts Individual descriptions Instructional discussion Book list
Ironside (1963)	College reading improvement manuals	11	1943-1961	Not categorized	Curricular driven	Content factors (perception and word recognition)	Individual descriptions Research discussion Instructional discussion Book list
Utsey (1968)	Vocabulary development materials	52	Not stated	Commercial workbooks Texts Machine systems Programmed materials Nonpublished materials	Curricular driven	Content factors (vocabulary)	Instructional discussion

Table 2

Summary of Analysis Procedures (continued)

	Authors' Description of Texts	Number of Texts	Range of Copyright Dates	Text Categories and Number	Type of Analysis	Content Analyzed	Data Provided
Bahe (1970)	Comprehensive college reading manuals	23	1961-1969	Considered "multi-purpose publications"	Curricular driven	Content factors Textual factors	Individual descriptions Instructional discussion Book list
Browning (1976)	How to study manuals	19	1957-1975	Not categorized	Research driven	Content factors (study aids)	Individual descriptions Research discussion Book list
Radencich & Schumm (1984)	Reading/study skills textbooks	17	1976-1983	College survival texts (4) College reading instruction texts (4) College survival/ reading instruction texts (5) College reading practice texts (4)	Curricular driven	Content factors Textual factors	Subjective ratings Individual descriptions Research discussion Instructional discussion Book list

Table 2

Summary of Analysis Procedures (continued)

	Authors' Description of Texts	Number of Texts	Range of Copyright Dates	Text Categories and Number	Type of Analysis	Content Analyzed	Data Provided
Heinrichs & LaBranche (1986)	College learning skills textbooks	47	1977-1985	Reading skills texts (14) Learning skills texts (6) Reading and study texts (4) Speciality texts (6) Resource or supplementary texts (8)	Curricular driven	Content factors Textual factors	Subjective ratings Frequency counts Individual descriptions Instructional discussion Book list
Brozo & Johns (1986)	Speed reading books	40	1958-1985	Not categorized	Research driven	Content factors (eye movements, recognition span, regressions, reading rates) Textual factors	Frequency counts (AFA)* Research discussion
Stahl, Brozo, & Simpson (in press)	Postsecondary vocabulary books	55	1939-1985	Workbooks (33) Textbooks (3) Popular press/ trade books (11) Programmed instruction (8)	Theory driven	Content factors	Frequency counts Individual descriptions (AFA)* Theoretical discussion Research discussion Instructional discussion

*Available from authors

Master List
College Reading and Learning Assistance Technical Reports

Technical Report No.	
84-01	Brozo, W.B., Schmelzer, R.V., & Spires, N.A. A Study of Test Wiseness Clues in College/University Teacher-Made Tests with Implications for Academic Assistance Centers. (ERIC No. ED 240-928)
84-02	Stahl, N.A., Brozo, W.G., & Henk, W.A. Evaluative Criteria for College Reading-Study Research. (ERIC No. ED 240-933)
84-03	Schmelzer, R.V., Brozo, W.G., & Stahl, N.A. Using a Learning Model to Integrate Study Skills into a Peer-Tutoring Program. (ERIC No. ED 256-244)
84-04	Brozo, W.G. & Stahl, N.A. Focusing on standards: A Checklist for rating Competencies of College Reading Specialists. (ERIC No. ED 248-762)
84-05	Stahl, N.A., Brozo, W.G., & Gordon, B. The Professional Preparation of College Reading and Study Skills Specialists. (ERIC No. ED 248-761)
84-06	Stahl, N.A. & Brozo, W.G. Vocabulary Instruction in Georgia's Post-secondary Reading Programs. (ERIC No. ED 248-759)
84-07	King, J.R., Stahl, N.A., & Brozo, W.G. Integrating Study Skills and Orientation Courses. (ERIC No. ED 248-760)
84-08	Brozo, W.G. & Schmelzer, R.V. Faculty Perceptions of Student Behaviors: A Comparison of Two Universities. (Not Submitted to ERIC--See the Journal of College Student Personnel, Vol. 26, #3)
84-09	Henk, W.A., Stahl, N.A., & King, J.R. The Readability of State Drivers' Manual. (Not submitted to ERIC--please refer to Transportation Quarterly, 38(4), 507-520).
84-10	Stahl, N.A., Henk, W.A., & King, J.R. Are Drivers' Manuals Right for Reluctant Readers? (ERIC No. ED 245-208)
85-01	Stahl, N.A., Hynd, C.R., & Henk, W.A. Avenues for Chronicling and Researching the History of College Reading and Study Skills Instruction. (ERIC No. ED 256-245)
85-02	Smith, B.D. & Elifson, J.M. Do Pictures Make a Difference in College Textbooks? (ERIC No. ED 256-246)

85-03 Brozo, W.G., Stahl, N.A., & Gordon, B. Training Effects of Summarizing, Item Writing, and Knowledge of Sources on Reading Test Performance. (ERIC No. ED 256-247)

85-04 Brozo, W.G. Teaching Students to Recognize and Manipulate Structures of Cohesion. (ERIC No. ED 256-248)

85-05 Henk, W.A. & Stahl, N.A. A Meta-Analysis of the Effect of Notetaking on Learning from Lecture. (ERIC No. ED 258-533)

85-06 King, J.R. & Stahl, N.A. Training and Evaluating Notetaking. (ERIC No. ED 263-537)

85-07 Chase, N.D. Reader Response Techniques for Teaching Secondary and Post-Secondary Reading. (ERIC No. ED 263-535)

85-08 Hynd, C.R. & Alvermann, D.E. The Role of Refutation Text in Overcoming Difficulty with Science Concepts. (ERIC No. ED 264-525)

85-09 Best, P.A. & Brozo, W.G. Current Research on Studying: A Qualitative Analysis. (ERIC No. ED 263-534)

85-10 Stahl, N.A., Henk, W.A., Brozo, W.G., & Sickele, M. Developing Independent Learners: Strategies and Tactics for Mastery of Text. (ERIC No. ED 263-536)

85-11 King, J.R., Stahl, N.A., & Brozo, W.G. Quality Assessments of Prospective Teachers: Surveys of Previous and Present Practices. (ERIC No. ED 266-133)

86-01 Hynd, C.R., Chase, N.D., Stahl, N.A., & Smith, B. Reader Response in the College Developmental Classroom. (ERIC No. ED 270-729)

86-02 Stahl, N.A. & Henk, W.A. Tracing the Roots of Textbook Study Systems: An Extended Historical Perspective. (ERIC No. ED 270-723)

86-03 Brozo, W.G. & Tomlinson, C.M. Literature: The Key to Lively Content Courses. (ERIC No. ED 271-720)

86-04 Brozo, W.G. & Johns, J.L. A Content Analysis of Forty Speed-Reading Books. (ERIC No. ED 270-724)

86-05 Hynd, C.R., Stahl, N.A., & Whitehead, E.H. Computers in the College Reading Program: A Basic Primer. (ERIC No. ED 269-753)

86-06 Singer, M. & Etter-Lewis, G. Personality Type and College Reading Comprehension. (ERIC No. ED 278-967)

86-07 Stahl, N.A., Brozo, W.G., & Simpson, M.L. Developing College Vocabulary: A Content Analysis of Instructional Materials. (ERIC No. ED 278-970)

86-08 Brozo, W.G. & Curtis, C.L. Coping Strategies of Four Successful Learning Disabled College Students: A Case Study Approach. (ERIC No. ED 281-149)

86-09 Stahl, P.C., Stahl, N.A., & Henk, W.A. Historical Roots, Rationales and Applications of Peer and Cross-Age Tutoring: A Basic Primer for Practitioners and Researchers. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. pending)

87-01 Brozo, W.G. & Curtis, C.L. Unskilled College Readers' Comprehension of Connected and Disconnected Text. (ERIC No. ED 281-150)

87-02 Nist, S.L. Teaching Students to Annotate and Underline Text Effectively -- Guidelines and Procedures. (ERIC No. ED 281-155)

87-03 Stahl, N.A., Simpson, M.L., & Brozo, W.G. The Materials of College Reading Instruction: A Critical and Historical Perspective From 50 Years of Content Analysis Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. pending)

87-04 Simpson, M.L., Stahl, N.A., & Hayes, C. PORPE: A Comprehensive Study Strategy Utilizing Self-Assigned Writing (ERIC Document Reproduction No. Pending)